

# ARCHAEOLOGIA AELIANA.

## I.—THOMAS WANGLES AND PATRICK WAIT.

By the Very Rev. H. E. SAVAGE, D.D., dean of Lichfield, V.P.

[Read on the 27th day of July, 1910.]

There is almost a complete blank between the years 1640 and 1660 in the story of the church in Durham and Northumberland. In fact it could hardly be otherwise; for in the larger aspects of church life there was nothing to record. As an organization the church had practically disappeared for the time. For even apart from the ever-increasing repression of Prayer Book ministrations by the civil authority during those years, the field had been already deserted by all the leading clergy; and only some of the fiercer spirits, and a few besides of the poorer and humbler parish priests, remained. The bishop, the dean, and all the canons of Durham had fled precipitately before the advance of the Scottish troops under Leslie: and certainly when, after a ridiculously easy victory at Newburn in August, 1640, the invaders held Newcastle for a whole year, and overran the two counties, and impoverished them almost to destitution,<sup>1</sup> this district was no place for the prominent

<sup>1</sup> The Scots levied an impost of 300*l.* a day, besides supplies of hay and straw, on Northumberland; of 350*l.* a day on Durham; and of 200*l.* a day on Newcastle; and required the tenants of the episcopal and capitular estates to pay their rents to them, and that, too, when trade was at a standstill. 'And this burthen continued till the definite treaty was concluded on the 7th of August, 1641.' Hutchinson, *History of Durham*, ed. 1823, vol. I, p. 619. Rushworth, *Historical Collections* (abridged ed., 1706), III, 209. When the Treaty of Ripon had been concluded a letter was written, on October 19, by Lord Finch and four other peers to the gentlemen and freeholders of Northumberland, advising them to continue their contribution of 300*l.* a day, 'that greater Inconveniences might not fall upon them'; and promising that if they did so the Great Council would 'take care to secure 'em in their Persons and Estates'! Rushworth, III, 226.

officers of an episcopalian hierarchy. Nor did any of them return until after the restoration of the constitution in 1660.

Moreover, the departure of the cathedral body not only deprived the church of its proper leaders and officers, but also left a dozen or more of the more important parishes without responsible heads. For the canons were, nearly all of them, sad pluralists, after the fashion of the day; and had contrived to possess themselves of not a few of the larger livings in the diocese. Thus nine out of the twelve canons residentiary held amongst them, at the time of their flight, the rectories of Brancepeth, Easington, Elwick, Haughton-le-Skerne, Middleton-in-Teesdale, Morpeth, Ryton, Sedgfield, Stanhope, Whalton, and Wolsingham; and the vicarages of Aycliffe and Merrington.<sup>2</sup> As a result of this wholesale exodus, if for no other reasons, there were no episcopal and no capitular acts to record during the whole of that period. There were no ordinations, no institutions to vacant benefices, no visitations; there was no corporate life, and little or no pastoral activity. The diocese was virtually defunct.

Nor is it possible in the absence of diocesan annals to have recourse to the minor local records of the parish books. For these were kept but very irregularly, if at all; and where they were entered up, in many instances they were subsequently lost or wilfully destroyed. In the case of South Shields, for

<sup>2</sup> The twelve canons with their other preferments were:—i. Gabriel Clark, archdeacon of Durham, rector of Easington, and master of Greatham hospital. ii. Joseph Naylor, rector of Sedgfield. iii. John Neile, archdeacon of Cleveland, prebendary of York and of Southwell, and rector of Beeford. iv. Thomas Carr, vicar of Aycliffe, and rector of Hugget. v. Eleazar Duncan, rector of Haughton-le-Skerne, and prebendary of York. vi. John Robson, rector of Morpeth and of Whalton. vii. Matthew Levet, sub-dean of Ripon. viii. Anthony Maxton, rector of Wolsingham and of Middleton-in-Teesdale. ix. George Moorcroft. x. John Cosin, rector of Brancepeth and of Elwick, archdeacon of the East Riding, and master of Peterhouse, Cambridge. xi. Ferdinando Moorcroft, rector of Stanhope. xii. William James, rector of Ryton, and vicar of Merrington.

example, the earliest extant book of registers dates from 1653. But that there was an earlier book then in existence is shown by a notice of the Bellasis bequest which is copied on the last page of the book from an entry made in 1604, by a former incumbent (the rev. T. Turwhet) and the churchwardens in the previous register book. So, too, the first vestry book which is now to be found at the church begins in the year 1660. But twelve pages, apparently belonging to the years before 1660, have been cut out, probably at the time of the restoration; for they were already missing when Mr. Nicholas Fairles made extracts from the book in the eighteenth century.

It is therefore extremely difficult to recover any account of what happened during those twenty years in the several parishes; or of the men who stood by their posts through evil report (for there was little or no good report for them). And yet some very sparse gleanings may be gathered with patience from various odd sources; and it is possible by a careful study of these to form some idea of the characters of the inconspicuous clergy who were left behind when their superiors sought safety in flight. No doubt many of the less prominent men followed the example of their leaders, and also escaped. And it was nothing less than a matter of common prudence that they should do so if they could. In fact the wonder is that any of them should have stayed on in the north, in face of the conditions with which they were confronted. To judge by the very few careers of these men which can be partially traced, the motives which actuated them in their persistence were very diverse. It may be inferred that some were turbulent spirits who could not resist taking their part in the general conflict which was going on. Others were probably held fast by sheer poverty, and the consequent inability to seek refuge elsewhere. While others again may fairly be credited with a sincere devotion to their duty towards their people, on account of which they refused to

abandon their cures. Some few, no doubt, were time-servers, who kept their posts by bowing from time to time to the dominant views of those in authority. Of Henry Hutton of Witton Gilbert, for instance, Hutchinson adds after his name, in the list of the incumbents of the parish, the brief but significant remark: 'A true Vicar of Bray.'

Of the very few of whom anything definite can be traced there are two, of quite opposite types, who were associated with St. Hild's, South Shields: and it is perhaps worth while in the dearth of more general knowledge of the time, to collect what can be ascertained about them from various fragments of information, and so to endeavour to gather some estimate of what manner of men they were; as specimens of the larger body of which they formed a part, and of most of whom there is no memorial.

#### I. THOMAS WANDLES.

On 15 November, 1637, the dean and chapter of Durham appointed the rev. Thomas Wandles, one of the minor canons of the cathedral, to the living of St. Hild's, South Shields, vacant by the death of the rev. George Carre, who had been the pluralist incumbent of Monkwearmouth and South Shields for twenty-six years. This Thomas Wandles was the son of Edward Wandles of Durham, a dyer, and one of the first aldermen nominated under the municipal charter of bishop Matthews in 1602,<sup>3</sup> who was mayor of the city in 1603 and again in 1609.<sup>4</sup> In 1618, or 1619, Thomas Wandles was appointed to a minor canonry;<sup>5</sup> and it was in this capacity that he came into conflict with dean Hunt, who, acting under the instructions of bishop Howson, was endeavouring, against the wishes of the chapter, to reduce the services of the cathedral to a drab puritanical standard. The account of the fracas is quaintly told in a joint

<sup>3</sup> Hutchinson, II, 38.

<sup>4</sup> Hutchinson, II, 56.

<sup>5</sup> Randall's MS.

letter from Dr. Lindsell, rector of Houghton-le-Spring, and Dr. Cosin, rector of Brancepeth, both canons of the cathedral, addressed to Mr. Eleazar Dunkon, the chaplain of bishop Neile of Winchester; and himself also a canon of Durham. 'Upon the last Communion day,' they write, '(the first Sunday in January), according to the usuall custome, they sung, after the sermon was done, an anthem proper for the sacred action: but whereat Mr. Deane was so highly offended, that sitting in his Quire stall, and preparing to goe up towards the Altar, he cal'd him a saucie, proud, presumptuous, daring fellow that began it; and afterwards rated William Smith, the Sacrist, all to nought for it, nor wold he be pacified til he had proved it to be his worship's owne direction.' A marginal note specifies this leader of the anthem as 'Mr. Wanles.'<sup>6</sup> This letter is dated 'Durham, Jan. 16, 1630 . . . . this very day being Sunday': so that the day when the disturbance occurred was 2 January, 1630-31. And incidentally it appears that the Holy Communion was at that time celebrated only on the first Sunday in the month.

In this matter Wandles was clearly acting under the directions, or at least with the full sympathy, of some of the principal canons. But he had, some two years before, been in trouble, on his own account, with the dean, before whom he had been brought in the Court of High Commission, sitting in the Galilee chapel, for 'hyndering Divine Service at Munkehesliden Church, on the promocion of Mr. Marke Leonard.' Leonard, who was master of the song school of the cathedral on the palace green, was appointed in 1628 by the dean and chapter to the vicarage of Monk Hesleden. His predecessor there had been one Henry Wandles, who had held the living for fifty years; presumably he was a relative of Thomas Wandles, and apparently the appointment of his successor was resented by the latter, who

<sup>6</sup> *Bp. Cosin's Correspondence*, I (52 Surtees Soc. publ.), 201.

considered that he was entitled to receive it himself. For he went down to Monk Hesleden and took possession of the parish church on a Sunday, refusing entrance to Leonard, and advising the people to go to Hart or Castle Eden, saying that 'hee would be their warrantes to pay noe tithes to Mr. Leonardes, but to himself.' In the evidence given before the court at his trial some interesting, but scarcely relevant, particulars were brought out as to his general conduct. Thus Richard Smith of Hutton Henry deposed that 'Wangles doth keepe two greyhoundes and two or three good horses for the most part to ryde and hunt upon, and usually goeth a-hunting with the said greyhoundes.' At a subsequent sitting of the court a fortnight later, on October 1, Edmond Ellinor of Hutton stated that 'Wangles doth often use horse-coursing, and did himself runne his horse at Woodham Moor, and there he broke his collar bone.' With reference to this last escapade, Anthony Fawell of Durham stated that 'the 17 May, 1625, at Woodham Moore (he) did see Wangles course a bay maire there, and in the coursing of her gott a great and dangerous fall, and therewith broke his coller bone, as was reported.' The date given by the last witness shows that it was a long-past occurrence, considerably more than three years old, which was dragged up against him, to swell the Monk Hesleden case; and even then it was one that involved no moral delinquency. If that was all that could be alleged against him he was certainly not the turbulent character that the prosecution sought to represent him.

The result of this trial before the Court of High Commission was that Wangles was ordered to 'acknowledge his offence in Munckehesledon Church on Sunday, 7 December, in his ordinary apparell.' This obligation he duly performed, and so was discharged on payment of the costs, which were 'taxed with great moderation to 3*l.* 10*s.*'<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> *Court of High Commission at Durham* (34 Surtees Soc. publ.), pp. 12, 13.

This, then, was the man whom nine years later the dean and chapter appointed to St. Hild's. At first sight it might be thought a somewhat strange selection to make for a pastoral charge, to choose a man who had the reputation of being a rather wild and reckless character. But it would be an unfair aspersion on Wandles to regard him in such a light as this, simply because almost all that is recorded of his previous career happens to be in connexion with two scrapes in which he became involved. Indeed what is told against him in these cases really points the other way. In the first instance, in the cathedral service, he was but doing his duty, and had the support at any rate of some of the canons: while in his action at Monk Hésleden, if it was high-handed, at all events it was frank enough, and was as frankly repudiated by him when he was directed to do so publicly by the court before which he was arraigned. And with regard to his keeping dogs and horses, and practising coursing, why should he be censured more severely than a parson who rides with the hounds, or who plays in a football or cricket match, to-day? Sport always has, and always has had, an attraction, at times an irresistible attraction, for a healthy Englishman; and the pursuit of it does not in itself stamp a man as violent or discreditable.

The instrument of appointment of Wandles to the living of St. Hild's contains, in the customary emphatic form, the proviso that he was to serve the cure himself unless prevented from doing so by serious illness; in which case he was bound to secure the services of some fit and proper priest in his place; and in the event of the non-fulfilment of his duty he was to be removable at the will of the dean and chapter.<sup>8</sup> But the insertion

<sup>8</sup> *Registrum L. fol. 260 B* (bound in before fol. 365). . . . proviso tamen semper quod eidem ecclesiae sive capellae in divinis officiis et administracione sacramentorum parochianis [MS. *pobus*] et inhabitantibus de Harton, Westow, Sheles, et Shelehuge, ibidem honeste deservias ac omnia alia et singula onera

of these stringent terms was not intended to be taken seriously. It was but the usual formality employed on such occasions.<sup>9</sup> And the dean and chapter showed that they did not really expect Wangles to go into residence at South Shields, in that they continued him after this appointment in his position as a minor canon of the cathedral. Moreover in the following year they further elected him to be master of the song school at Durham, on the death of his old antagonist Mark Leonard.<sup>10</sup> Of course if he still kept his 'two or three good horses' he may have ridden over to Shields from time to time: but obviously he was not expected by his patrons to put in many appearances there. For his duties as master of the choristers and minor canon must have kept him continuously in close residence at Durham.

A man of this type, vigorous and fearless and frank, who had successfully braved the Court of High Commission in the worst days of its irresponsible tyranny, who had as a minor canon dared to ignore a puritanical dean, and who was a keen sportsman, was the last who was likely to run away on the approach of an invading force. As a matter of fact he was one of the three minor canons who remained in the north after 1640. William Smith, rector of St. Mary-le-Bow (for all of the six minor canons held livings: perhaps they should be called

*eidem ecclesiae sive capellae et Capellano ejusdem incumbentia per te, vel per alium presbiterum et ministrum [MS. minister] idoneum et sufficientem quamdiu aliquo [MS. aliqui] gravi morbo impederis, debite sustineas peragas et supportes; alioquin quandocumque te premissa sic (ut prefertur) non implevisse contigerit, licebit ex tunc nobis et successoribus nostris quandocumque pro libito nostro te predictum Tho: Wangles a dicta ecclesia sive capella sine scriptu et ordine judiciali libere amovere et alium ministrum idoneum pro nostro beneplacito ibidem collocare. . . .*

<sup>9</sup> The same formula is used in the appointment of Stephen Bordley, 27 July, 1664.

<sup>10</sup> The succession of the masters of the Song School was Maland, 1622; Leonard, 1627; Wangles, 1638.



'minor' livings!), James Green, curate of Croxdale, and Matthew Cooper, vicar of Dalton, all disappeared. The other three were apparently men of very different types. Elias Smith, the incumbent of St. Giles's, Durham, and master of the grammar school,<sup>11</sup> to the charge of which he had been appointed only a few weeks<sup>12</sup> before the Scottish army appeared upon the scene, was the faithful custodian of the chapter library, and of the copes and vestments of the cathedral, through all the long years of turmoil which followed.<sup>13</sup> In 1643 he received an appointment to the vicarage of Bedlington; but it does not appear from whom. Richard Wakelin was officiating in William Smith's church of St. Mary-le-Bow in 1646;<sup>14</sup> so that he probably conformed to the covenant. But not so Thomas Wandles. He stood his ground all the time that the Scots were in possession of the district, and remained to enter with zest into the fray, when the two chief interests in England came to blows. For he won for himself the soubriquet of 'Cavalier

<sup>11</sup> 'Fuit Archididascalus Scholae Gram. infra mentionatae Dec. & Cap. D. post Ric'um Smelt Clericum Archid. Scholae predictae.' *Mickleton MSS.*, No. 32, p. 52.

<sup>12</sup> 'Qui Scholam Gram. predictam adiit circa Festum S<sup>ti</sup>. Petri ad Vincula A<sup>o</sup>. 1640.' *Ibid.*, p. 61. These references are given in *Memorials of St. Giles's, Durham* (95 Surtees Soc. publ.), p. 62. The feast of St. Peter ad Vincula is on August 1. Dr. Gee has kindly supplied a list of the masters of the Grammar School at this time: Inglethorp, 1610; Walton, 1613; Miller, 1628; Smelt, 1632; Smith, 1640. The Song School was apparently a junior, or preparatory, school to the Grammar School.

<sup>13</sup> 'Curam habuit idem Elias in temporibus nequissimis post occisionem Regis Caroli Librorum in Bibliotheca Dec. & Cap. D., ac etiam omnium Caparum & vestimentorum et aliarum rerum ad dictam Ecclesiam pertinentium, salvaque omnia in eisdem temporibus custodivit.' *Mickleton, u.s.*, who states that he was himself one of Smith's pupils: 'Ejus discipulorum Unus, quem docuit dictus Elias . . . fuit I.M. Collector hujus operis.'

<sup>14</sup> As appears by a note in the parish register. He also baptized a child of William Church at St. Mary's in the South Bailey in August, 1659. See Mr. Wood's transcript; Dur. and Northumb. Par. Reg. Soc., vol. xvii, p. 9.

Wandles.' So Randall records. It would be interesting to know how he came by this title, and what part he took in the struggle. But on this point no details have been preserved. It is clear, however, that it could not have been on account of any part that he played in resisting the Scottish invaders. For they retired home in August, 1641, and it was not until the very end of that year that the use of the term 'cavalier,' as opposed to 'roundhead,' first came into vogue, from the conflicts between the disbanded officers in the king's retinue and the London apprentices, at Westminster.<sup>15</sup> Moreover, while the Scots remained in Durham and Northumberland they were so completely masters of the situation that no active resistance could be shown to them. This nickname, as applied to Wandles *par excellence*, suggests that it was after the outbreak of the civil war in the summer of 1642 that he distinguished himself by the ardour with which he threw himself into the conflict. The result was that he was eventually 'sequestered and cast into Prison, because he was of the King's side,' as Randall's note states. 'He was carried Prisoner to Shields, and from thence to Hull, where he was released out of gaol. However he never returned to Durham again, but continued to live at Hull, and died there about the year of our Lord, 1653.'<sup>16</sup>

This note again indicates clearly that it was not until 1642, or later, that Wandles incurred this treatment. For the phrase,

<sup>15</sup> 'From these skirmishes, and from the shortness of the Apprentices Hair, which was cut close about their ears, the two parties began first to be distinguished by the names of Roundhead and Cavalier. David Hyde, one of the Reformades, first drew his sword in Palace Yard, and swore, He would cut the throats of those Round headed Dogs that bauled against the Bishops.' Neal, *History of the Puritans*, II, 419.

<sup>16</sup> There does not, however, appear to be any entry of his burial in the registers of the two ancient parishes of Hull, Holy Trinity, and St. Mary's, Lowgate; nor in those of the neighbouring parishes of Drypool and Sculcoates. In the case of the latter the register is almost blank from 1640 to 1663.

'because he was of the king's side,' points unmistakably to the time when the parliamentary forces had taken the field against Charles. And he was sequestered as a 'malignant,' 'because he was of the king's side,' not as a 'scandalous minister' under the earlier method of proceedings: a charge which included not merely imputations of immorality, but might be brought against 'any ecclesiastical person having cure of souls, under the age of sixty, and not hindered by sickness or imprisonment,' for not preaching six times at least in the year, or for being absent from his cure above ten Sundays, or eighty days, in a year.<sup>17</sup> It is likely enough that Wandles might fairly have been charged with both of these last counts: yet it was not for those reasons, but for his political action, that he was sequestered. The attention of parliament had been specially drawn to the northern counties by the association formed there in November, 1642, to raise forces 'to succour the malignant party':<sup>18</sup> and again in December by the news of large importations of arms and ammunition into Newcastle 'to be employ'd against the Parliament,' which called forth an ordinance on December 10, authorising 'adventurers' to fit out privateers to intercept these supplies at sea.<sup>19</sup> At the beginning of the war the north was strong in its support of the king; and Wandles, taking an active part in the movement, naturally paid the penalty when he fell into the hands of the parliamentary forces.

He had stayed on in Durham all through the year of the Scottish occupation. If he was not a pattern as a parish priest, he was at all events a man of determination and valour, who so won the respect even of his captors as to be set at liberty in the midst of a very embittered strife.

<sup>17</sup> See Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, III, 10, 11.

<sup>18</sup> Rushworth, iv, 576, 577.

<sup>19</sup> Rushworth, iv, 595.

## II. PATRICK WAIT (OR WATT).

But if Wangles never pretended to reside at Shields, or to administer his cure there himself, there was during the whole period of his incumbency, and for several years besides both before and after it, a faithful and tenacious parish priest in charge of the place, one Patrick Wait.

His name is given promiscuously as Wait, Waite, Watt, or (most frequently) Wat. But when he signed the vestry book of St. Hild's in 1662, he himself spelt it 'Wait.'

He first appears in the diocese as in charge of the church of Norham-on-Tweed. There is preserved at Auckland castle a very interesting MS. list, originally drawn up in 1750, of all the parish churches and chapels in the diocese of Durham, with the names of all the traceable incumbents of each, and the dates of their appointments.<sup>20</sup> In this list Patrick Watt is entered under Norham, in the year 1614. But in the list of the vicars of Norham, which is given by Raine in his *North Durham*, he is placed a year later: 'Patrick Watt, Diac., M.A., 1 May, 1615 (occ.<sup>21</sup> Reg. Hunt. 1628).' Unfortunately the notices of the Durham ordinations at that time are missing; and therefore there is no opportunity of ascertaining when he was ordained priest; nor whether he was ordained deacon in this diocese, or in Scotland before he crossed the Tweed. For there is every presumption that he was of Scottish origin. He was a graduate of St. Andrew's university, where in 1609 'Patricius Waitt' was incorporated in the university album, from St. Salvator's college;

<sup>20</sup> The title on the first page is: 'Ecclesiarum v Parochial. Capellarum Dioces. Dunelm. Nomina Alphabetica cum Incumbentium Nominibus ad Ecclesiar. Evacuaciones, qua Morte, Resignatione, vel Deprivatione procuratas.' The handwriting is clearly that of Dr. Hunter [see Surtees, *Durham*, II, 287-9], as appears from a comparison with his MSS. in the Chapter Library at Durham. The latest appointment entered in his writing is in 1750. But another writer has continued the lists down to 1772.

<sup>21</sup> That is, 'occurs'; in reference to the subsidy assessment mentioned below.

and in 1611 'Patricius Wattus' obtained the degree of M.A.<sup>22</sup> A Patrick Watt was admitted to the M.A. degree at the Marischal college and university, Aberdeen, in 1633.<sup>23</sup> But it is, of course, quite uncertain whether this was our Patrick Wait; and indeed very improbable, uncommon as the combination of names is.

In one of the register books of Norham the following note is entered:<sup>24</sup> 'Memorandum. This church was repaired by the Parishioners 1617: Maister Patrick Waite being preacher there: 1617. The above was copied from an inscription on a stone on the porch which was taken down July, 1844. W.S.G.'<sup>25</sup> What the reparation then carried out was, is described by Raine, who wrote before the seventeenth century work had been removed, in very disparaging terms: 'The tower, porch, and south aisle have all disappeared, the latter totally, its arches being blocked up with masonry and tasteless windows, and the two former have been replaced by disproportioned erections, which prove their date and the wretched taste and parsimony and churchwardenism of the day.' But in fairness to Wait and his fellow workers it may be pointed out that, however unenlightened they may have been (in common with their contemporaries) in the matter of architecture, at all events they showed a commendable zeal in taking the church in hand at all. For Norham had been sadly impoverished some forty years before, when bishop Barnes surrendered the local revenues to the crown, on

<sup>22</sup> I have to thank Mr. J. Maitland Anderson, the librarian of St. Andrew's University, for this information.

<sup>23</sup> 'Anno 1633.—laurea magistrali donati sunt . . . Mr. Patricius Wattus . . .'. In the seventeenth century there were two universities in Aberdeen: The University and King's College; and Marischal College and University. Dr. R. Walker, the registrar of Aberdeen University has kindly supplied this reference.

<sup>24</sup> I owe this transcript of the entry to the Rev. C. E. Green, the present vicar of Norham. Raine gives it (*North Durham*, p. 259), but not quite accurately.

<sup>25</sup> The Rev. Dr. W. S. Gilly.

his appointment to Durham, as the first instalment of his involuntary concession to the rapacity of queen Elizabeth.<sup>26</sup>

How poor the living of Norham was, probably in consequence of this alienation, appears from a notice in one of the chapter registers at Durham, under the date of 1628, with reference to the payment of the second moiety of the subsidy due to the king's majesty on June 1 of that year. It is there stated, with regard to Norham, that Patrick Watt, though he had been admonished to pay the 26s. demanded of him as his assessment, had failed to comply with the monition. And the significant note is added: 'Nor have we been able to raise or recover it by any means from the emoluments of the benefice.'<sup>27</sup> The subsidy referred to in this note was not one of the five granted by parliament on 8 May, 1628 (the same day on which the Petition of Right was sent up to the House of Lords); for the first two of these were not returnable until July 10.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, these were lay subsidies. But it was one of those voted by the convocation of York on 19 May, 1628, when five subsidies were agreed to at the rate of 4s. in the pound.<sup>29</sup>

In 1631 Wait moved to South Shields.<sup>30</sup> Brockie has

<sup>26</sup> See *The Injunctions, etc., of Bishop Barnes* (22 Surtees Soc. publ.), Intro. p. x.

<sup>27</sup> *Registrum J.* fol. 447, 449. 'Secunda medietas primi subsidii Regiæ Majestati debiti per prelatos et clerum ejusdem dioces. primo die mensis Junii ultimi preteriti adhuc insoluta pro causis inferius specificatis, ut sequitur. . . .

Norham Patricius Watt vicarius ibidem monitus fuit die predicto ad vicar. solvendum die et loco predicto subsidium per ipsum debitum ut perfertur: sed predictus Patricius Watt hujusmodi subsidium adhuc non solvit nec satisfecit neque de proficuis dieti beneficii aliquo modo levare sive recipere potuimus. xxvi<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>28</sup> Rushworth, I, 353. They were first agreed upon on April 4, when 'they were voted by one general consent. It gave him [the King] no small content; that altho' five Subsidies be inferior to his Wants, yet it is the greatest Gift that ever was given in Parliament.' pp. 333, 334.

<sup>29</sup> *Records of the Northern Convocation* (113 Surtees Soc. publ.), p. 298.

<sup>30</sup> Note in Randall's MS. list of the incumbents of St. Hild's:—'1631—Watt. so says H.' [=Dr. Hunter].

recorded an amusing local tradition about his arrival on Tyneside.<sup>31</sup> 'There is an old story preserved of Mrs. Watt, that on their riding down Chirton Bank, where they first got a view of Shields, she reproached her husband "for bringing her frae Norham, frae the bonny banks o' Tweed, to Sodom and Gomorrah."' The steam and smoke from the rows of salt-pans along the river side was so thick that it is said to have been distinctly visible from the top of Cheviot, nearly forty miles away: and the nearer view must have been quite appalling to anyone coming to it for the first time from the beautiful scenery of an uncontaminated river. Poor Mrs Wait, however, was destined to pass the rest of her life in smoky Shields; where her burial is recorded twenty-seven years later, in 1658: 'May, 07, M<sup>strs</sup> Issobell Watt.' There is no doubt that this entry refers to her, for in the will of Henry Hilton (to be mentioned presently) Isabella Wat is mentioned as the wife of Patrick Wat.

Wait had been vicar of Norham, but came to Shields as curate-in-charge under the rev. George Carre, who apparently resided at his other cure of Monkwearmouth. What may have induced him to make such a change it is impossible to say. South Shields, however, was an important and busy place; and perhaps, therefore, offered him a wider scope than Norham. And it was a growing town: for in the same year that Wait came to it (1631) bishop Howson was called upon to consecrate an addition to the churchyard;<sup>32</sup> and such an event was far from being a frequent occurrence in the diocese in the seventeenth century.

A few odd glimpses may be caught here and there of Wait's position and work in Shields:

(1) 'Henry Hilton, of South Sheeles, Gent.' in his will dated 6 May, 1637, which is quoted by Surtees from certain summaries of Durham wills preserved in the chapter library, after giving

<sup>31</sup> *History of Shields* (1851), p. 76.

<sup>32</sup> Hutchinson (4to ed.), II., 483.

directions that he was to be 'buried in the chapel of St. Hild's, neere his father,' etc., adds: 'I give the rent of the house at the church stile for eighteen years to so many poore widowes in the Sheeles as shall be thought fitt by the churchwardens and Mr. Patrick Watt; the said rents being fiftie shillings.' And again: 'to Mr. Patricke Watt, the Lecturer at St. Hildes, *xxs.*'<sup>33</sup>

(2) In the same year Andrew Whitfield of South Shields was brought before the Court of High Commission at Durham, on June 20. 'He had been charged,' so the report runs, 'to invade the goods of the church, and to infringe the ecclesiasticall liberties which consist in the priviledg graunted over spirituall matters, and that he did usurpp and take upon him ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, and amongst others did make an order in writeing for distribucion of the goods of Eliz. Atkinson, widdow, late deceased, before any administracion thereof, the cognizance whereof belonged to the Ordinary of the dioces of Durham, or to his vicar generall . . . .' For this action he was pronounced excommunicate *ipso facto*, and ordered to 'make acknowledgement of his offence publiquelie in the chaple of St. Hild's,' and to pay 100 marks to the king. But on July 18 this fine was released, and the accused was allowed to make the acknowledgment 'before Mr. Watt, preacher of God's word, at St. Hilde's.' Subsequently, on October 24, even the performance of his submission was waived.<sup>34</sup>

It is no wonder that the Court of High Commission was detested, when it acted in this high-handed, and yet weak and vacillating, fashion in the defence of paltry pecuniary privileges.

(3) Besides the story of Mrs. Wait's disgust at her first sight of her future home, Brockie has also preserved<sup>35</sup> another local legend that Patrick Wait, who lived in the old parsonage house

<sup>33</sup> Surtees, *History of Durham*, II., 29, 104. The original will is not now to be found at the Registry.

<sup>34</sup> *Court of High Commission at Durham* (34 Surtees Soc. publ.), p. 173.

<sup>35</sup> *History of Shields*, p. 76.



on the Shields-heugh, at the corner of what was long afterwards named Wellington street, finding his parishioners in that quarter very unwilling to go to church, drove them down the hill before him good-naturedly with a drawn sword to the church. But the tradition was told to me by word of mouth some years ago by a very old resident of South Shields, in a less extravagant form: that Wait was a good performer on the violin; and that on more than one occasion he came out of his house ready robed for service with his violin in his hands, and played until he had attracted a crowd round him; and then at their head played them down past the houses and through the fields to the church; and when he had got them inside turned the key of the door on them and preached to them. Whatever truth there may be in either version of the story, at all events the fact that it was told so long after is evidence that the memory of Wait was preserved for several generations in South Shields, as of a remarkable man full alike of a certain humour, of good nature, and of imagination and resource.

That he won the respect and the confidence of his neighbours is shown by the trust reposed in him by Henry Hilton when making his will; and to some extent by the remission to his care of the case of Andrew Whitfield by the Court of High Commission.

Wait was also a preacher of some parts, who was welcomed in other parishes besides his own. On the first fly leaf of the second volume of the registers of St. Nicholas's church, Durham, two visits of his are recorded: 'Patrick Wat, Mr. of Arts and lecturer, at St. Hildes, Oct. 25, 1635. May 22<sup>d</sup>, 1636, Rogation Sunday.' Though there is no actual mention of sermons in these entries, it is clear that it is to his preaching that they refer; because further on in the book strange preachers are entered in an exactly similar manner.<sup>36</sup> Again in the Gateshead

<sup>36</sup> Mr. H. M. Wood has kindly given this reference.

churchwardens' accounts the following item occurs in the year 1641-2: 'Patrick Watt for two sermons, which was thought fitt to be done, 5s.'<sup>37</sup>

The date of this last reference brings the story down to the time of the civil war, which broke out in the summer of 1642. For the first four or five years of the struggle the Scots, whose military support was essential to the parliamentary cause, held, as the price of their assistance, a complete mastery over the House of Commons in all matters pertaining to religion. Their aim, of course, was to establish Presbyterianism in England. So long as they confined themselves to attacks upon the church they more or less carried the consent of the House. But when, in 1646, they and their English supporters attempted to enforce uniformity, and to refuse toleration to the Independents and others, they alienated the goodwill of the English army, whose sympathies were mostly with the Independents. From that time the influence of Presbyterianism was practically effete. Its promoters had gone too far. In October, 1647, the Westminster assembly of divines died out. In December, 1648, 'Pride's Purge' drove out the Presbyterian members, 143 in number, from the House of Commons.

During the dominance of the Presbyterians the clergy had been subjected to a constantly increasing pressure. At first the attack upon them was principally on political grounds, being directed against those who were accused of 'malignancy,' or support of the king's cause. On this count large numbers of them were extruded from their benefices. But this movement did not have much visible effect in Durham and Northumberland, because the principal incumbents had already fled before the storm. Soon, however, the direct insistence of Presbyterianism began to be felt.

(1) In September, 1643, the 'Solemn League and Covenant'

<sup>37</sup> *Memoirs of Ambrose Barnes* (50 Surtees Soc. publ.), p. 336.

was adopted by parliament; and it was subsequently ordered to be subscribed by every person in England above the age of 18 on 2 February following.<sup>38</sup> On 29 January, 1644-5, it was further ordered to be printed and hung up in every church.<sup>39</sup> And in October, 1645, the standing committee for the north, sitting at Lumley castle, issued directions that it should be signed over again by the parishioners of the several parishes within their jurisdiction:<sup>40</sup> so that there was no escape from the acceptance of this obligation in the north.

(2) In the meantime the 'Directory for Public Worship,' which abolished the use of the Book of Common Prayer, had been authorized on 3 January, 1644-5 (after it had been sent into Scotland for approval).<sup>41</sup> And in the following August it was enforced by the imposition of severe penalties: for using the Prayer Book, either privately or publicly, 5*l.* for the first time, 10*l.* for the second, and a year's imprisonment for the third; while a fine of 40*s.* was exacted for every occasion on which the Directory was not used.<sup>42</sup>

(3) The 'Form of Church Government,' establishing Presbyterianism, was passed in June, 1646.<sup>43</sup> But except in London and Lancashire it was virtually a dead letter.<sup>44</sup> Two years later, however, in August, 1648, it was revived, and parliament enacted that all parishes should be 'under Government of congregational, classical, provincial, and national Assemblies,' with 'ruling Elders in every parish':<sup>45</sup> though this act, too, was short-lived; for its influence died out at the end of the year when the Presbyterian dominance in parliament came to an end.

<sup>38</sup> Neal, *History of the Puritans*, III, 57, 61, 62. See *Arch. Ael.*, 2 ser., xvii, 300.

<sup>39</sup> Neal, III, 132.

<sup>40</sup> Cp. note in Easington Register. See *Arch. Ael.*, 2 ser., xvii, 301.

<sup>41</sup> Neal, III, 121. It is printed in full in his App. II, vol. III, pp. 446-479.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 124.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 231.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 263.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 394.

Through all these changes Wait retained his charge at South Shields: for in 'A Survey of Church Lands, Anno, 1649,' preserved in the library of Lambeth palace, the following entry occurs under the head of 'Jarrow parish': 'Also there is one chappell called St. Hylds scittuate att South Sheeles whereof Mr. Patricke Watt serves the cure.'<sup>46</sup> He had, as it seems, conformed to the Presbyterian *régime*, as was perhaps not unnatural in a man of Scottish origin, and so had been left undisturbed until now in his ministry.

But from this time onwards there is no further reference to him as the acting minister of the parish until after the restoration. It may therefore be fairly assumed, that he refused to accept 'the Engagement' in 1649. This 'Engagement,' which was 'To be true and faithful to the Government establish'd without king or house of peers,'<sup>47</sup> had been substituted by parliament, after the execution of Charles, for the customary oath of allegiance. At first it was appointed to be taken only by civil and military officers: but afterwards, 'to bring the Presbyterian clergy to the test,' all ministers were required to swear and subscribe it.<sup>48</sup> For the English Presbyterians had not acquiesced in the abolition of the monarchy, and were in correspondence with the Scots, in a design to bring the younger Charles to the throne upon the basis of the covenant.<sup>49</sup> If then, as appears to have been the case, Wait had thrown himself in with the Presbyterian party, it is natural to suppose that he would feel it impossible to bind himself by a sworn undertaking which was contrary to his principles. If of a less aggressive type of loyalty than his old chief, Wandles, he was still a loyalist, as were the Scots throughout.

In August, 1653, an act was passed by 'The Little Parliament' to enforce the proper keeping, in all parishes, of the

<sup>46</sup> Vol. iv, p. 100.

<sup>47</sup> Neal, iv, 14.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

records of marriages (by civil process, before justices of the peace), births (not baptisms), and burials; and directing that a 'Register' (or Registrar) should be appointed in every place for this purpose.<sup>50</sup> On the first page of the now earliest extant register book at South Shields, the appointment of Robert Chilton as 'Register,' pursuant to this act, is recorded. It purports to be signed by, or on behalf of, 'wee the minister and foure and twentie and the rest of the parishioners of the Chappelrye of St. Hylds.' Twenty-three signatures are appended, of which twenty-two are in two parallel columns. The remaining signature, Geo. Middelton, which is in a larger character than the rest, is written immediately after the notice of the appointment, above the double column of the other names. It would seem, therefore, that this George Middelton was then acting as minister of South Shields. I have not, however, been able to identify him from any other notice elsewhere. But at that time the arrangements for supplying the parishes with ministers were in hopeless confusion, and almost any self-appointed man might thrust himself into the charge of a church.

At all events Wait, if a loyalist, supposing he had not already been turned out, would come under the vigorous oppression of the Protector's ordinance of 28 August, 1654, 'for ejecting scandalous, ignorant, and insufficient Ministers and Schoolmasters.' The offences for which ejectment was to be the penalty are defined in a curious schedule; in which side by side with such things as blasphemy and immorality there are included not only the use of the Common Prayer Book, but even 'Disaffection to the present Government.'<sup>51</sup>

<sup>50</sup> This was the one practical reform carried out by the 'Little (or Barebones) Parliament' of 139 members, summoned by Cromwell on the nominations of the Independent Ministers of the three kingdoms, during its five months' tenure of office. See Ransome, *History of England*, p. 600. A copy of the first page of the St. Hild's Register Book is given on page 28. It is of special interest as giving the earliest known list of the twenty-four.

<sup>51</sup> Neal, iv, 100, 101.

In 1657 occurs the first definite information that Wait had been superseded in the cure of South Shields. This is the notice of the appointment of one Thomas Lupton, who was transferred there from Woodhorn. Of what had happened in the intervening years there is no trace. In the Commonwealth records preserved in the library of Lambeth palace there are three entries referring to the appointment of Lupton:

(1) 'March 18th, 1656 [that is, 1656-7]:<sup>52</sup>

'South Sheeles. Ordered that the yearly sune of forty poundes be and the same is hereby graunted to the Minister of South Sheeles in the County of Durham, to and for increase of his maintenance. And that the same be from time to time paid unto Mr. Thomas Lupton minister of South Sheeles aforsed (approved according to the Ordinance for approbation of publike preachers) to hold for such time as he shall discharge the duty of the minister of the said place—which we humbly certifie to his Highnes the Lord Protector and the Counsell. Edw. Cressett. Ri. Sydenham, Ra. Hall, John Humfrey, Jo. Pocock.'

The ordinance here referred to was that passed by the Protector and Council on 20 March, 1653-4, by which the approbation of ministers nominated for the charge of parishes was taken out of the hands of the presbyteries, and entrusted to a body of 38 commissioners, who were commonly known as 'The Triers.'<sup>53</sup> Edward Cressett was one of the eight laymen included in the original panel.<sup>54</sup>

But though Lupton was designated the minister of South Shields in March, he was not certified as having satisfied the commissioners until May. For

(2) In the book of admissions,<sup>55</sup> under the year 1657, the record is given thus:

'South Sheeles in	Mr. Thomas Lupton.	Admitted the first day of May
com. Durham.	1657 to y <sup>e</sup> chappell of South Sheeles Westoe Harton	
	and Sheelehugh in the County of Durham	Upon a non-

<sup>52</sup> Vol. 1004, p. 45.

<sup>53</sup> Neal, iv, 93.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 94.

<sup>55</sup> Vol. 998, p. 21.

ination exhibited the same day from the Inhabitants of y<sup>e</sup> said place And certificates from Tho. Weld<sup>56</sup> John Smith Jo. Wolfall<sup>57</sup> Rob. ffenwicke.<sup>58</sup>

(3) In another volume<sup>59</sup> the certificate of Lupton's appointment is entered. The general form of certificate in such cases is first given: 'These may certifie whom it may concerne that .....of.....was upon the.....day of..... approved by the Com<sup>e</sup> for approbation of publike preachers.' The particular entry runs as follows:

'South Sheeles, The like to Mr. Thomas Lupton of South Sheeles in y<sup>e</sup> rec<sup>d</sup> May 2<sup>d</sup> 1657. County of Durham. Dated at Whitehall the first day of May 1657. Jo. Nye Reg.'

Thomas Lupton may have been the son of Thomas Lupton, draper, of Holbeck, near Leeds. If so, he was educated at Leeds grammar school, and afterwards at St. John's college, Cambridge, where he was admitted at the age of twenty on 24 April, 1648. There is, however, nothing definite to identify this Thomas Lupton with the minister of South Shields; who for four years or more before he came to St. Hild's had been stationed at Woodhorn. For there, on 3 May, 1653, he married Anne Creswell of Creswell, and on 6 December of the same year he had a daughter baptized in Woodhorn church.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>56</sup> Put into the rectory of Gateshead by the sequestrators in 1647. Installed 1649. Refused (after having promised) to accede to the appointment of a Lecturer to preach and administer the Sacraments. 1657. *Memoirs of Ambrose Barnes* (50 Surtees Soc. publ.), pp. 349, 354, 375-382.

<sup>57</sup> Lupton's successor at Woodhorn: admitted the same day, 1 May, 1657, as Lupton to Shields. *Admission Book*, Lambeth Library, vol. 968, p. 118. At the Restoration he conformed, was ordained deacon by bishop Cosin on 21 Sept., 1661, and priest the following day, and continued at Woodhorn as vicar. *Bp. Cosin's Correspondence*, vol. II (55 Surtees Soc. publ.), p. 33.

<sup>58</sup> One of the three impugnors of the twenty-four of Gateshead, acting on whose representations the Protector nominated a new twenty-four, in 1658. *Memoirs of Ambrose Barnes* (50 Surtees Soc. publ.), p. 384.

<sup>59</sup> Vol. 968, p. 80.

<sup>60</sup> These two items are the sole entries in the Woodhorn register between 1652 and 1661.

In the Lambeth records he is twice mentioned as minister of Woodhorn in the year 1656.<sup>61</sup> After he moved to Shields he joined with eleven other signatories in sending a fulsome address to the Protector in the name of 'The Ministers of Durham and Northumberland.'<sup>62</sup> Calamy states that at the restoration he conformed;<sup>63</sup> but it does not appear what then became of him.<sup>64</sup>

It was during Lupton's tenancy of the incumbency of South Shields that Mrs. Wait died, in 1658, and was buried in St. Hild's churchyard on May 7.<sup>65</sup> It would seem, therefore, that Patrick Wait was then still residing in or near South Shields even though he had been superseded by Lupton: for he could not have been in a position to bring his wife's body any great distance for burial. But after that he disappeared, and did not as it seems, return to Shields until the summer of 1661. For here the vestry book of St. Hild's at last comes into evidence. The assessments for the poor in May, 1660, and May, 1661, are signed by 'Henr. Ashburn: Clerk' together with two churchwardens and two overseers. But in the marriage register there is the record on 8 August, 1661, of a wedding being taken 'by Mr. Watt.'<sup>66</sup> And on 31 March, 1662, the signatures to the minutes and accounts are headed by the names 'Patrick Wait, minister, Henr. Ashburn;' and again in April 'Patrick Wait, Minister' signs, but 'Henr. Ashburn' no longer appears.

The man who signs as 'Henr. Ashburn,' clipping short both

<sup>61</sup> On July 29, and Nov. 13. Vol. 1006, pp. 430, 367.

<sup>62</sup> Thurloe's *State Papers*, vol. vi, p. 431.

<sup>63</sup> Vol. III, p. 85.

<sup>64</sup> He was certainly not the Thomas Lupton who was rector of Bentham in Yorkshire from 1664 to 1720, and father of William Lupton, prebendary of Durham, 1715-1726. For in the baptistery of Bentham church there is a brass tablet to the memory of rector Thomas Lupton, which states that he died in his 81st year in 1720. He was therefore born in 1640, and was only 13 years of age in 1653 when Thomas Lupton of Woodhorn was married.

<sup>65</sup> Lupton himself buried an infant son, Phenehas, on 28 April, 1658.

<sup>66</sup> 'Aug. 08. James Hardy and Issobell Purdye—by Mr. Watt—2 askings. By licence.'



christian name and surname, had apparently succeeded Thomas Lupton in the charge of South Shields. A 'Mr. Henry Ashburne, preacher of God's word' is mentioned in the register of St. John's, Newcastle, as having officiated there in 1658.<sup>67</sup> He may have been the Henry Ashburnham, over whose nomination to the vicarage of St. John's in 1668 the Newcastle corporation incurred the displeasure of bishop Cosin.<sup>68</sup> But he was displaced from the lead when Patrick Wait reappeared at Shields, and retired.

Wait had thus come to his own again in happier times. But he did not live long to enjoy his restoration. He was not indeed of a great age. Assuming that he was about 24 when he was described as a deacon, in charge of Norham, in 1615, he would be about 70 when he returned to Shields. Three years later he died. In the register of burials there is simply the brief entry, under the year 1664, 'March 28, Mr. Patricke Watt.' It is curious that to the end his name was almost always given by others as 'Watt,' while he himself signed the vestry minutes as 'Wait.'

On July 27 the dean and chapter of Durham appointed Stephen Bordley, curate of Ryton, to 'the donative church, or chapel of St. Hild of Sheeles, now vacant by the natural death of the late incumbent thereof:' but the name of the last incumbent in question is not given, as is usually the case in the forms of presentations. The last incumbent appointed by the dean and chapter had been Thomas Wandles, who had now been dead for some eleven years. And yet no appointment had been made of a regular successor for four years since the restoration.

<sup>67</sup> *Memoirs of Ambrose Barnes* (50 Surtees Soc. publ.), p. 384. Mr. Longstaffe suggests that he may be the Henry Ashburnham who was at St. John's, Newcastle, in 1669. If so he was probably the vicar of Tynemouth, who was ordained deacon 17 August, and priest 21 September, 1662. See Mr. H. Adamson's list of the vicars of Tynemouth.

<sup>68</sup> *Bp. Cosin's Correspondence*, vol. II (55 Surtees Soc. publ.), p. 207.

But as soon as Wait died the vacancy was filled up. Taking into account then these three facts, the long delay in making an appointment, the prompt action after Wait's death, and the omission of the name of Bordley's predecessor, the inference is clear that Wait had won such respect for himself that he was left undisturbed, as the *de facto* incumbent of the parish so long as he lived; and was tacitly recognized by the dean and chapter, the patrons, as virtually the responsible parish priest.

Here, then, is the picture, necessarily fragmentary and imperfect, of one who lived all through the stormy period of the civil war and the commonwealth, and who during a considerable part of the time maintained an active ministry. Few as the actual notices of him are, and in most cases even then only formal entries, yet they are sufficient, when collected together, and placed in relation with the current trend of events, to reveal a man of no ordinary patience, and of faithful tenacity in his post; who commanded the confidence alike of his parishioners, of the presbyterian authorities, and of the vigorous churchmen of the restoration. What the conditions were, of poverty and of uncertainty, under which he served his cure, and still more when he was driven out from it, can only be conjectured. At the best he can never have been well off; while in the worse times through which he passed he must have been reduced to sore straits. But it surely is worth while to attempt to recover something of the story of his life. For he represents a distinct type of those men, and there must have been several of them here and there, who never came into marked prominence, but who remained faithfully at their posts as long as they were allowed, and could do so conscientiously: and who by their steadfastness did more than all others to keep alive the continuity of parish life in England through a great disruption.

The real history of the English people is to be found, not in

great military achievements, not in the larger political movements, not in the doings of the court, so much as in the humbler ordinary life of the simple citizens. And it is in no small measure due to the patient researches of antiquarian societies, such as this, that it has been made possible in our day to reconstruct the past in fuller detail, and in truer perspective.

Mr. Maberly Phillips remarked five years ago that 'papers of a personal character are now rarely brought before our society.'<sup>69</sup> But since he read his paper on John Lomax, this reproach (if reproach it was) has been removed from the society by papers which have appeared in *Archaeologia Aeliana* from the pens of Mr. Crawford Hodgson, Mr. Welford, and Mr. Raimes. The practice has, therefore, been re-established. And it has its use. For there is no better way to recast the episodes of an obscure and difficult period, and to clothe them with life, than to weave in the narrative of public events with the experience of an individual who was closely affected by them.

And there is no epoch in the history of the north that is more barren of definite information, about men and matters, than the years between 1640 and 1660. Nor is it in respect of church affairs alone that this dearth of detailed knowledge prevails. It is the same with all the various aspects of the story of Durham and Northumberland during those years. Even Mr. Welford's *Newcastle and Gateshead*, in the third volume, which treats of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, closes with a snap in 1640. And the local historian, who wishes to deal with those twenty years, has practically nothing to turn to, outside the pages of *Archaeologia Aeliana*, except Mr. Longstaffe's long appendix of north country notes and illustrations, attached to his *Memoirs of Ambrose Barnes*, published by the Surtees Society, and one or two other volumes of that Society's publica-

<sup>69</sup> *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 3 ser., vol. II, p. 33.

tions. And so it seemed to me to be worth while to attack this dark period, and to endeavour to bring out into clearer light one feature of the process of that long upheaval in our national history: to point out how the parochial clergy were affected, as instanced in the lives of Thomas Wandles and Patrick Wait.

THE FIRST PAGE OF ST. HILD'S REGISTER BOOK.

September the 20th Ao. 1653.

Whereas by an act of Parliament the twentieth fourth of August 1653 touching marriages births and burials and that every parish should make choice of a register for that purpose; wee the minister and foure and twentie and the rest of the p'ishoners of the Chappelrye of St. Hylds w<sup>thin</sup> the parish church of Jarrow in the Countie of Durham doe nominate elect and make choise of Robert Chilton to be Register for the said Chappelrie for all such marriages births and burials.

Geo. Middleton.<sup>70</sup>

Robert Anderson  
John Smart  
Tho. Pattison  
Robert Logan  
Alexander ffisher  
William Blythman  
Thomas Atkinson  
Richard Carr  
Willm. Lawson  
Thomas Smart  
Willam Wheatly  
Ralph Harle  
Thomas Pattison  
Edward Rawe

Thomas Pearson  
Anthony + Daue  
Edward Wallis (?)  
Richard Wollfe  
Will. Blaycklock  
John Chilton  
Cuth. Carre

According to y<sup>e</sup> tenor of y<sup>e</sup> Act of p'liament touching marriages Bureing date y<sup>e</sup> 24<sup>th</sup> of August 1653 I doe approue of Rob<sup>t</sup>. Chilton of South Sheeles to be y<sup>e</sup> parish Register for the Chappelrie of St. Hilds w<sup>thin</sup> y<sup>e</sup> p'ish of Jarroe. Sept. 22th 1653.

Rob. Claveringe.

<sup>70</sup> There was a 'George Middleton of South Shields, gent.', who married one of the Gills of Barton. [See *Court of High Commission at Durham* (34 Surtees Soc. publ.), p. 3.] But the position of this signature, and the reference to 'the minister' above, make it probable that this Geo. Middleton was the acting minister.

