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Volume 1

Edited by Sidney Leslie Ollard and Philip Charles Walker
The Anniversary Reissue of Volumes from the Record Series of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society

To celebrate the 150th anniversary of the foundation of the leading society for the study of the archaeology and history of England's largest historic county, Cambridge University Press has reissued a selection of the most notable of the publications in the Record Series of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society. Founded in 1863, the Society soon established itself as the major publisher in its field, and has remained so ever since. The *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* has been published annually since 1869, and in 1885 the Society launched the Record Series, a succession of volumes containing transcriptions of diverse original records relating to the history of Yorkshire, edited by numerous distinguished scholars. In 1932 a special division of the Record Series was created which, up to 1965, published a considerable number of early medieval charters relating to Yorkshire. The vast majority of these publications have never been superseded, remaining an important primary source for historical scholarship.

Current volumes in the Record Series are published for the Society by Boydell and Brewer. The Society also publishes parish register transcripts; since 1897, over 180 volumes have appeared in print. In 1974, the Society established a programme to publish calendars of over 650 court rolls of the manor of Wakefield, the originals of which, dating from 1274 to 1925, have been in the safekeeping of the Society's archives since 1943; by the end of 2012, fifteen volumes had appeared. In 2011, the importance of the Wakefield court rolls was formally acknowledged by the UK committee of UNESCO, which entered them on its National Register of the Memory of the World.

The Society possesses a library and archives which constitute a major resource for the study of the county; they are housed in its headquarters, a Georgian villa in Leeds. These facilities, initially provided solely for members, are now available to all researchers. Lists of the full range of the Society's scholarly resources and publications can be found on its website, www.yas.org.uk.
Archbishop Herring’s Visitation Returns, 1743
(Record Series volumes 71, 72, 75, 77 and 79)

This edition of the 1743 visitation returns appeared in the Record Series in five volumes. The original document is held at the Borthwick Institute for Archives of the University of York, with the reference Bp. V. 1743/Ret, and the Institute also holds other records relating to that visitation. A description of the process of editing the text may be found in the obituary of Rev. Philip Charles Walker (1878–1934) by his co-editor, Sidney Leslie Ollard, D.Litt., in the *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 31 (1934), 426–9. The obituary also gives a picture of the life of a well-connected clergyman-antiquary of the period. Ollard (1875–1949), a Fellow of St Edmund Hall, Oxford, was a historian of the Anglican Church and a canon of St George’s Chapel, Windsor. His papers are held at Pusey House, Oxford, and among his publications are *A Short History of the Oxford Movement* (London, 1915), *Fasti Wyndesorienses: The Deans and Canons of Windsor* (London, 1950). He edited, with G. Crosse, *A Dictionary of English Church History* (London, 1912; revised 1919 and 1949) and, with W. Spens, *English Theologians* (London, 1923).
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INTRODUCTION.

Among the muniments of the Archbishop of York at Bishopthorpe are four stout volumes, lettered A, B, C, and D respectively, which contain the replies made to a series of questions issued by Archbishop Herring in preparation for his primary Visitation of the diocese of York in 1743. They are commonly called Archbishop Herring’s Visitation Returns. Their existence has long been known to students, and by the kindness of the present Archbishop they have been made most accessible to those who wished to consult them, but they have never hitherto been printed. They are now given here in their entirety, the spelling of the MS. has been strictly retained, the contractions have not been extended, so that the reader has before him in this book the exact text of the document. The long labour of the transcription has been the work of my co-editor, though together we have checked each line of the transcript with the original. This work was made possible by the generous trust of the present Archbishop who allowed us to take away the volumes, one by one as we needed them. The result is a picture of the Church in 1743 which is very minute in its details and which will serve, we hope, as a quarry not for the local historian only, but for the general historian as well, since the Returns contain a collection of facts which are valuable for the economic, and social as well as the ecclesiastical history of England.

Archbishop Thomas Herring, son of John Herring, Rector of Walsoken, Norfolk, and Martha his wife, was born in the old Rectory house there and was baptised in the noble parish church of All Saints’ on 10th October, 1693. He was educated at the Grammar School at Wisbech, a mile and a half away, and was admitted a Pensioner at Jesus College, Cambridge on 21st June, 1710. He took his B.A. degree in 1713. On 14th July, 1714 he migrated to Corpus Christi College and was elected a Fellow there in 1716. He took his M.A. degree in 1717, his B.D. in 1724, and became D.D. (Com. Reg.) in 1728. He was ordained Deacon, 23rd September, 1716, by William Fleetwood, Bishop of Ely, and Priest in 1719. On 15th January, 1737 he was consecrated Bishop at Lambeth by Archbishop Potter of Canterbury, Bishops Clagget of S. Davids, Butts of Norwich, and Secker of Oxford, on his appointment to the See of Bangor. He was translated to York, 6th April and his election

1. Masters in his History of Corpus Christi College, 1753, gives the year of Archbishop Herring’s priesthood. Probably he was ordained by the then Master of the College, Samuel Bradford, Bishop of Carlisle, on 25th September, 1719, at the same time as Samuel Kerrich (Memoirs of a Royal Chaplain ed. Hartshorn, p. 16). Dr. Bradford’s Register at Carlisle has no record of Kerrich’s ordinations. Doubtless they took place at Cambridge and in Corpus Christi College Chapel.
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confirmed 21st April, 1743. He was nominated to Canterbury, 27th October and his election confirmed 24th November, 1747. He died on Sunday morning 13th March, 1757 at Croydon and was buried in S. Nicolas Chantry of the parish church there, aged 64. A fuller account of the Archbishop than space permits here will be found in Appendix D of this book; here it is possible only to quote an extract from a very full and particular account of him published thirty years after his death—"He may be said without exaggeration to have united in his person the most amiable qualities of the best of his predecessors; the magnificence and penetration, without the pride, of Wolsey; the mildness and moderation, without the timidity, of Sandys; the learning of Sharpe, with the politeness and affability of Dawes." (1) Such an enthusiastic estimate of Archbishop Herring has not been usual among historians who have tended to treat him as unimportant, perhaps because he left few materials for his story, and destroyed all his papers before he died.

Archbishop Herring was no stranger to Visitations; he had begun his work as bishop at Bangor by visiting the diocese formally, in person. He did the same at York: he had not been in full possession of the See ten days (the temporalities were restored to him on 23rd April) before he addressed, on May 2nd, his letter to the Clergy of the diocese with its accompanying questions. Both the letter and the questions were, technically, no part of the Visitations, they were a new and very useful contrivance invented by Archbishop Wake as Bishop of Lincoln in 1706, developed by Bishop Edmund Gibson in 1718, as will be seen below.

A Visitation by a bishop is one of the oldest parts of the administrative machinery of the Christian Church. It goes back, in principle at any rate, to the occasion when S. Paul said to S. Barnabas "Let us go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached the word of the Lord and see how they do." (2) The long history of the growth of Visitations in the Church in the East and in the West has been told with profound learning by the present Bishop of Truro, Dr. Frere, in a work that is so easily accessible that it needs only to be referred to here. (3) It is enough to say that in England, Visitations in their simplest form reach back to circuits made by S. Aidan and S. Chad as recorded by S. Bede. (4) The machinery was perfected as time went on; by the thirteenth century it was in full order and has continued to

the present day, save only that the jurisdiction in the case of morals is no longer exercised. But the procedure in Archbishop Herring’s Visitation of 1743 was practically identical with that of his mediaeval predecessors.

A citation was issued to the clergy of the diocese and to the wardens of each church or chapel to attend the diocesan at some centre on a fixed day, and a book of Articles of the Visitation would be issued at the same time, upon which the wardens were to make their presentments to the bishop. Those presentments were concerned chiefly with offences against the moral law and were dealt with by the Chancellor of the diocese sitting at a special Correctional Court. At a Primary Visitation “Every parson, vicar, curate, schoolmaster and other person licensed whosoever” (and this included by the Act 3 Henry VIII. c. ii. physicians and surgeons and, by Canon Law, all midwives) were to exhibit their Letters of Orders, Institution, and Induction, and all other Dispensations, Licences and Faculties whatsoever to be signed, if approved, by the Registrar; and further, at his Visitation every third year, the bishop was required, if he visited in person, to confirm.

At each centre, the proceedings opened with a sermon by a preacher appointed by the bishop, and the wardens elected in Easter week were sworn in (if they had not already been admitted at the Visitation of the Archdeacon). These proceedings left their record in documents which were preserved in the Diocesan Registry. Of this Visitation of 1743 there exist in the Archbishop’s Registry at York two records which have been transcribed and incorporated into this present book. They are—

1. The Call Book. This contains the name of the Parson, Vicar, or Curate of each church or chapelry; the names of the warden or wardens, a note of their presentment (if there be such) and of the further proceedings in such a case.

2. The Exhibits Book (in this case part of two separate volumes). Here are recorded, rather hastily sometimes, the names of those who appeared and the dates of their Letters and Licences revealed by their exhibits. The particulars of the ordination, institution or admission of the various clergy and parish clerks who occur here have usually been taken from these Exhibits Books. In passing, it may be noticed that these authorities are of considerable value to historians and antiquaries, though they do not seem to have been generally used.

The Call Book records further the dates and centres of the Visitation and the name of the preacher on each occasion. Of the Confirmations and of the Bishop’s charge to the assembled clergy and churchwardens no official record was kept. Nor are the Articles of the Visitation ministered to the wardens always
preserved. The Bishop of Truro and Professor W. M. P. Kennedy have printed and edited a valuable collection of such Articles of the period 1536-1603(1), and a larger collection ranging from 1561-1730 is printed as Appendix E. to the Second Report of the Royal Commission on Ritual(2). But no Articles after 1730 appear to have been published, possibly because they had become “common form,” and had ceased to be interesting. A change in method was taking place, and of that change this book is one result. In May and June, 1706 the distinguished prelate Dr. William Wake held his Primary Visitation of the diocese of Lincoln, to which he had been consecrated on the previous 21st October. In preparation for it he addressed a formal Letter of Advertisement to the Clergy of the Diocese. It was short and to the point and asked the clergy seven questions(3). Two of those questions in a rather enlarged form are found in Archbishop Herring’s Questions here. Dr. Edmund Gibson, who succeeded Dr. Wake as Bishop of Lincoln held his Primary Visitation in 1718 and as a preparation for it he followed his predecessor’s example and issued a Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese with 12 Queries appended to it(4). Those Queries are the basis of the 11 Questions of Archbishop Herring; indeed the Archbishop does little more than alter slightly here and there the phrases of Bishop Gibson, and for the most part he repeats them word for word. Thus, Archbishop Herring’s Question 1 is a repetition of Bishop Gibson’s, 2 is Bishop Gibson’s with the words “of what sort?” added, 3 is Bishop Gibson’s, so are 4, 5, and 6, so is 7, only to it the Archbishop has added “or that being Baptized and of a competent Age, are not confirmed?” 8 is Bishop Gibson’s question with one word changed. 9 is Bishop Gibson’s question considerably shortened. 10 is Bishop Gibson’s, word for word. 11 is Bishop Gibson’s question, enlarged. The twelfth of Bishop Gibson’s questions Archbishop Herring omits. It asked about the number of Publick Penances performed in Church since the last Visitation, whether any such had been commuted for money and by whom? Why Archbishop Herring omitted to ask it there is no means of judging; Archbishop Drummond who issued an even fuller “Paper of Queries” (based entirely on those of Bishop Gibson in 1718) in preparation for his Primary Visitation in 1764 restored the question about “publick penance” to the series(5).

1. Visitation Articles and Injunctions, 1536-1575, Alcuin Club Collections XV. and XVI. and Elizabethan Episcopal Administration, 1575-1603, XXVI. and XXVII.


5. The Returns to these Queries of Archbishop Drummond are carefully preserved among the MSS. of the Archbishop of York at Bishopthorpe. They show, speaking generally, that the Church had lost ground between 1743 and 1764. It is much to be wished that they also could be printed, for they are full of interesting information.
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The diocese of York in 1743 was very much larger than it is in 1928. It included all Yorkshire excepting that part of it which lay in the Archdeaconry of Richmond, all Nottinghamshire, and the part of Northumberland known as Hexhamshire. It possessed one cathedral and two collegiate churches, viz., the Minsters of York with its Dean and Chapter, Ripon with its Dean and Chapter, and Southwell with its Chapter. The diocese was divided into four archdeaconries, those of York, Cleveland, the East Riding, and Nottingham, and into sixteen Deaneries, viz., City of York, New Ainsty, Old Ainsty, Pontefract, Craven, and Doncaster, in the Archdeaconry of York; Bolster, Cleveland and Ryedale in the Archdeaconry of Cleveland; Buckrose, Dickering, Harthill and Holderness in the Archdeaconry of the East Riding; and Bingham, Newark, Nottingham and Retford in the Archdeaconry of Nottingham. Besides these there were the group of parishes which was under the peculiar jurisdiction of the Chapter of Southwell, and the districts of Ripon and of Hexhamshire; the two last were outside any Archdeaconry.

The Returns in these volumes were arranged, it will be noticed, under their respective Deaneries. Within this large area were some 903 parishes and chapelys and there were ministering in it, in 1743, at least 711 clergy, whose names appear in the Returns. There may have been, in fact, a few more than this, for in rare instances the incumbent says "I have a Residing Curate," but no assistant exhibits a licence from the parish, as at South Cave and Elloughton where the incumbent replies "I have the Assistance of a Young Gentn. in Deacon's Orders, he Teaches a Private School in a Gentleman's Family" etc. But he does not give the young gentleman's name. As the 711 names include all the Prebendaries of York and Southwell, several of whom were not otherwise benefited in the diocese, probably the figure represents pretty correctly the number of clergy at work.

From 836 of the 903 parishes there are Returns; from 67 there are none. The 836 Returns are bound up in the four volumes at Bishopthorpe as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol. A</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. B</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. C</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. D</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vols. A, B, and C contain the Yorkshire parishes and Hexhamshire, Vol. D has Nottinghamshire. 47 Yorkshire and 20 Nottinghamshire parishes make no Return, but since the names of their incumbents and wardens appear in the Call Book, these parishes have been added at the end of the volume in which their Returns should have appeared.

2. The Returns from Hexhamshire are loose at the end of Vol. C; a few of the Notts. Returns, evidently sent in late, are loose at the end of Vol. D.
x.
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The eleven questions asked by the Archbishop elicited a mass of information, some of which will be found analysed and tabulated in Appendices at the end of the last volume of this book: only a summary of it is given here.

Question I. asks the population of the parish and the number and kind of Dissenters in it. Twelve towns in the diocese are returned as having over 1000 families, 11 in Yorkshire, and Nottingham alone outside it. In descending order these are Halifax 6200, Leeds 4000 (reckoning 5 persons to a family, for the Vicar returns the total population, 20,000 persons), Nottingham 2628, York 2250(1), Bradford and Sheffield each 2000, Birstall and Scarborough each 1500, Wakefield 1400, Almondbury 1300, Huddersfield 1100, Hull 1009. Thus the mass of the town population was in the West Riding.

From the last half of Question I. with Question II. comes a considerable amount of material for the history of the various bodies outside the English Church. This is dealt with in Appendices A, B, and C. These bodies of Dissenters are—

1. Roman Catholics (called sometimes “Papists,” sometimes “Romans”; they are never once in the Returns called *simpliciter* “Catholics”).
2. Presbyterians.
3. Independents.
5. The Society of Friends (invariably styled “Quakers”).
6. Moravians, and 7. (though these were not then Dissenters), Methodists.

1. Roman Catholics occur in 262 of the Returns; in most cases they are few, one family or one person. In 59 parishes there were however regular congregations, and 36 chapels and places used for worship are reported. The names of but 12 however of their “Teachers” are given. Two parishes, Haxham and Swine, had two Roman Catholic chapels. In the case both of chapels and chaplains the clergy evidently display considerable reticence, which in the case of the chaplains must have been deliberate. The names of some 40 Roman Catholic clergy, regular and secular, who were working in the diocese in 1743 are given in Appendix A; probably there were in fact 50 or 60. In only two instances Bransby(9) and Broughton(9) is there evidence of direct hostility on the part of the incumbent to his Roman Catholic parishioners; for the rest the matter seems rather gently slurried over. Thus at such well known missions as Everingham, Frickley, and Holme-on-Spalding Moor there is no mention of a chapel and its chaplain, though the existence of both must have been well known. In the case of the Protestant Dissenters, Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists there was no need for reticence; no penal laws would be invoked against them.

1. The figures for York are not complete, for twelve parishes make no Returns.
2. See below p. 82.
3. See below p. 54.
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2. Presbyterians appear in 205 of the Returns, the names of 51 of their “Teachers” are given; 70 Presbyterian chapels are reported. One parish, Haworth had 4 such chapels, and four parishes (Birstall, Calverley, Hexham, and Leeds) had two each.

3. Independents are rarer; they are reported in 24 Returns, 5 only of their “Teachers” are mentioned and they are credited with but 5 chapels.

4. Baptists appear in 62 Returns; 13 of their “Teachers” are named; and they are credited with 18 chapels, 2 in one parish, Kildwick-in-Craven.

5. Far the most numerous were the members of the Society of Friends: they occur in 310 of the Returns; they had 107 Meeting Houses (two parishes had 3 of these, two had 2). The names of only 25 of their “Teachers” however are given.

6 and 7. Moravians appear in 4 and Methodists in 22 of the Returns. The bond between the Methodists and the Moravians was close in 1743 and it is not easy in the Returns to distinguish between them. Ten of their “Teachers” are reported, among them the famous names of Mr. John and Mr. Charles Wesley, and of John Nelson. 22 Moravian and Methodist Meeting Houses are reported, nearly all in one district, viz., 3 in Adwalton, 5 in Birstall, 3 at Cleckheaton, 3 at Liversedge. The hostility of the clergy to the Methodists is marked; the incumbent of Tinsley Chapel repeats a slanderous report, that “they have washed Women naked in a Tub full of Water under Pretence of Cleansing ‘em from yr. Sins.”

The most interesting points in this part of the Returns, apart from the beginning of the Methodist Revival are the wide prevalence of the Society of Friends in town and country in 1743 and the fact that, but for them, there was little or no Dissent then in the country parishes.

QUESTION III. produced a large amount of information of considerable interest in the history of education, in some 266 places of the 645 Returns from Yorkshire there is no mention of a school or of any secular teaching whatever. Many of these are East Riding villages. It is hoped in an Appendix to analyse these facts further and to distinguish the Grammar and Private (or Petty) English Schools and to give a list of the parishes where the Parish Clerk was the schoolmaster. One distinguished schoolmaster appears in the Returns, the Rev. John Clarke, Head Master of Beverley Grammar School from 1735 until 1751, and of Wakefield Grammar School from 1751 to 1758.

QUESTION IV. The answers to this provide a mass of material. A large number of parishes had small endowments for the parish church and for the poor. Beverley Minster heads the list with an annual income of £284 from land, and a legacy of £4000 at 5 per cent. interest. The trusts appear from the Returns to have been
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well administered on the whole, though occasionally the Archbishop notes, in his private Memoranda, a scandal that needs inquiry.

**Question V.** produces matter of unusual interest, for it reveals the degree to which the two evils of Pluralities and Non-residence existed in this large part of England. Out of the 836 Returns 393 had non-resident parsons (excluding the York city parishes in which non-residence was technical—the incumbent lived in the city). This is a very considerable number, amounting in fact to nearly half the parishes which give information.

In estimating the facts about Pluralism, a Pluralist is taken to mean a priest who held two distinct offices to which he had been instituted and licensed. But in calculating the numbers, neither clergy who were schoolmasters and curates or assistant curates in the same parish, nor clergy who were also private tutors or domestic chaplains are reckoned. But when a curate of one parish is a schoolmaster in another he is reckoned a pluralist. So is the priest who besides a benefice holds a prebend or canonry in a cathedral or collegiate church. Taking the number of the clergy at 711 it appears that, according to this standard 335 were pluralists, again as in the case of non-residence, nearly half.

The human interest of the answers to this question are considerable. A certain number of the replies are evasive, others are entertaining, some are pathetic. There are some lunatics.

Thus at Flamborough it is reported “the proper Incumbent is an old craz’d Man and resides at Hornsea” (the same incumbent was also nominally Curate of Bempton); and at Bingham, the Rector “has been held for many years with an uncommon phrensy” (though he was resident).

Ill-health is a constant excuse for non-residence, the house is “mean, the situation damp and low, and not being able to perform duty myself, being only prop’d by Physick” writes the Rector of Bulwell who was also Vicar of Basford: the Rector of Cowshby “is not resident at present but is indisposed at Birmingham with his Relations.” The Rector of Clifton and Vicar of North Wheatley (Dr. Standfast) “resides at Bath on account of a streak of the Palsey.” Another, the Vicar of Orston, is “advised for the Benefit of the Air to retire to the place of my Nativity” which happened to be in Lincolnshire.

By far the commonest excuse for non-residence is the possession of another benefice; and another not uncommon reason is the smallness of the income. Some of the excuses offered seem, in the strict sense of the word, impertinent: thus the Rector of Elvington sleeps there but once a week because, he writes “I have the Happiness of Reading Prayers in York, which I humbly presume is not at all inconsistent with any Duty in my own parish,”
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and the Rector of Easingwold writes, “I reside at Manchester in Lancashire, where I am entrusted with ye Education of a few Young Gentlemen.” But he had received a Dispensation from the late Archbishop. One absentee was an Army Chaplain, two were Chaplains to the Royal Navy. Two incumbents of good family (both of them pluralists), Richard Lowther and Richard Sutton, were Chaplains to H.R.H. the Princess of Orange “in Friesland,” one of them, Mr. Lowther, is returned at one of his benefices (Swillington) as being “abroad on the King’s business.” The Rector of Stanford gives an unusual reason, “The Curate resides in ye Parsonage House and being A marreid (sic) Man having A child every year and now six living there is not convenience for me to make use of a Room and Furniture wch. I reserv’d for that purpose;” the Rector was, of course, a pluralist. Sometimes there is no reason: the curate-in-charge of Birkin writes tartly, “ye Rector is now in London, but I suppose his necessary affairs call him thither;” so does the curate-in-charge at Kirk Burton, “Mr. Doyley resides at Windsor, but what is the reason I know not.” Mr. Doyley was, indeed, non-resident at both his Yorkshire benefices, Kirk Burton and Wickersley and when his curate at Kirk Burton had in 1736 written to say that the parishioners were grumbling and reproaching him for the Rector’s absence, the genial pluralist wrote a facetious reply, “Methinks Yorkshire nettles are very forward this summer and sting mightily……the people grumble and upbraid you with my absence? Silly people for so doing. How can you help it?” At Kirkby Moorside the curate-in-charge records simply, “The Vicar resides at London,” which was perhaps more convenient for performing the duty of his other benefice, a Canonry of Lichfield. Other incumbents were non-resident on account of their duties in various Cathedrals, the Vicar of Sturton (Notts.) was a Vicar Choral of York and beneficed in that city, holding also the attractive Rectory of Loundesborough; the Vicar of Bole and Rector of Stanton on the Wolds was a Minor Canon at Chester; while the Rector of Grandby (Notts.) was Precentor of Peterborough. The list of reasons alleged for non-residence might be continued for some pages, but these extracts give a specimen of the contents of the Returns under this head.

In pluralism the higher dignitaries in the diocese set the worst example. The Dean of York, Dr. Osbaldeston (who became Bishop of Carlisle in 1747 and of London in 1762) was Rector of Hinderingwell, Vicar of Hummanby, Rector of Folktoun and Curate of Muston. The Archdeacon of York, Dr. Hayter (who became Bishop of Norwich in 1749 and of London in 1761) held the sinecure Rectory of Kirkby Overblows, the Sub-deanery of York, the Prebend of Strensall at York, the Prebend of North Muskam at Southwell and a Prebend at Westminster; while of the parochial clergy, the Rector of Stokesley, Henry Cooke, who had been

Domestic Chaplain to Abp. Sir William Dawes held a Prebend at York and a Prebend at Southwell, to which he added in 1743 the Prebend of the 2nd stall at Ripon; and the Rector of Gamston (Notts.), John Henry Ott, a Swiss by birth and a protégé of Archbishop Wake (whose Librarian he had been at Lambeth), held also Cromwell Rectory, Notts., the Rectory of Blackmanstone, Kent, a Prebend at Lichfield, a Prebend at Peterborough and one of the Six Preacherships in Canterbury Cathedral.

Some of the most deservedly respected priests whose names occur in this book were among the worst offenders, e.g., Dr. Heneage Dering, Archbishop Sharp’s son-in-law, had been in 1743 for over 40 years Archdeacon of the East Riding and for over 30 years Dean of Ripon. He held also the Mastership of two Hospitals at Ripon, a Prebend at York and the Rectory of Scrayingham, while his private fortune was such that he was reckoned the richest ecclesiastic in England. His brother-in-law, the excellent Thomas Sharp, a son of the good Archbishop, was in 1743 Prebendary of Wistow at York, of Norwell Overhall at Southwell, and of the 10th stall at Durham, Archdeacon of Northumberland, and Rector of Rothbury. It is small wonder that lesser men thought little of the evils of pluralism, and sought to heap up prebents.

QUESTION VI. produces no answers of special interest. In a very few cases an assistant curate was allowed £40 a year, more commonly it was half that sum or less. Pitiful cases of the poverty of these clergy, with appeals to the Archbishop for preferment, occur in the Returns, notably at Kirk Bramwith and at Bransby.

QUESTION VII. is specially interesting because Archbishop Herring has here added to Bishop Gibson’s original one a further inquiry about Confirmation. Opportunities of confirmation had been disgracefully few under the rule of Archbishop Blackburn. During his 19 years’ episcopate (1724-1743), that Archbishop had “visited” the diocese but twice; once in person in 1726—1727 and once in 1737 by Bishop Benson of Gloucester. That Archbishop Herring expected to find a large number of Confirmation candidates awaiting him is plain from the fact that he took care to bring with him the Bishop of Chichester to help him in confirming, and at the conclusion of his Visitation the Archbishop wrote “I am confident I have confirmed above thirty thousand people.”(1) His assistant, the Bishop of Chichester (Dr. Mawson) seems to have regarded confirmation in a most perfunctory way, for to a friend who sympathised with him on his supposed fatigue after his exertions, he replied “Why truly, Mr. Pyle, the places were very large and the people very numerous, but yet I saw nothing in the business of Confirmation but what one pair of hands might well have performed.”(2)

1. *Letters from Archbishop Herring to William Duncombe, Esq.* (1778) p. 64.
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The other interest in the answers to this question is the small number of parishes in which First Communion was equated with Confirmation, i.e., where it was considered unnecessary by the incumbent, for those who had already received Holy Communion to be confirmed. Teaching to that effect had been given by Fleetwood, Bishop of Ely in 1710[1]. Archbishop Herring's early patron, and the Vicar of Routh says here that some who have "received, are ignorant whether it wd. be now proper to be confirmed, his late Grace seeming to be of opinion that it was unreasonable." The Vicar of Thorganby states that he has advised such communicants "to offer themselves." Out of the 836 Returns there are instances of such teaching in 35. In the vast majority of cases the reply is commonly on such lines as "I know of none such, save those that will be presented to your Grace at this coming Confirmation." In the district of Hexhamshire the neglect had been scandalous, and the Commissary reports that no Confirmation had been held there within living memory. Nor did Archbishop Herring apparently penetrate so far in this Visitation: the first record of a Confirmation there is in 1760 when the Bishop of Durham confirmed at Hexham for Archbishop Gilbert.

QUESTION VIII. elicits answers which throw a very clear light on the Church life of the time. Obviously if there were 903 churches and but 711 clergy to serve them, there could not easily be two services, i.e., Mattins and Evensong, in each church every Sunday. Nor were there. In a few cases the answers are ambiguous and in one case, Scrooby, evasive; but allowing for ambiguity, the results of the answers seem to be as follows:—313 churches had only one service on Sunday, of these 103 were in Nottinghamshire. Of this 313 some 12 had 2 services on Sunday for half the year, i.e., in the summer months. 13 churches had one service a Sunday three Sundays out of four. 89 churches had one service a fortnight or two in three weeks. 26 churches had a service once a month. 12 churches had a Sunday service less frequently than this: they range from Bessingby, Speeton and Wilton Chapel (Ryedale) with a Sunday service once in six weeks, to Ergham where the church had disappeared and there was an annual service in a field. Middlesborough also had lost its church, so its parishioners attended at West Acklam. Roughly then out of the 836 churches for which information is given here, 453 failed to have both Mattins and Evensong on Sunday all the year round, and 383 had them. Mattins and Evensong were said daily in 24 churches, chiefly in the large towns: thus 4 such churches were in York, 2 in Beverley and 2 in Hull, and others are Doncaster, Halifax, Leeds, Mansfield, Newark, Nottingham, Retford, Scarborough, and Wakefield. Some country churches did the same, Arksey, Elland Chapel, Guisborough, Heimley.
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Laughton-in-the-Morthen, Stokesley and Sprottley. A much larger number, 80, had services on Wednesdays, Fridays and Holy Days, while 134 had services on Holy Days, and 40 of these added Wednesdays and Fridays in Lent. At some places, e.g., Eakring and Mapplebeck in Notts. the incumbent endeavoured to have week-day service but could get no congregation: the idea that the service could be said without a congregation had, apparently, faded from view for the time. A few others had services on Wednesdays and Fridays, some in Lent only, others on Wednesdays only, one, Felkirk, only on Wednesdays in Lent. The total number of this miscellaneous group is 15. So that 253 parishes had some kind of week-day service, more or less frequently.

Question IX. was one to which the Archbishop evidently attached much importance. In his Observations on the Returns he makes such notes as “Q. How often does the Curate Catechise” (Cockan Chapel). “Q. Why are not the Children Catechiz’d” (Deighton). “To Catechize offener” (Kirby Moorside). “Exhort to Catechise” (Leckonfield). “No Catechising there” (Marfleet). “Q. As to Catechising no Answer” (S. Olave’s, York and West Rounton). “Q. does the present Rector Catechize” (Ordsall) while against five parishes he has written “Bad Catechising” (Norton, Rawdon Chapel, Skipton, Skelbrooke, and Holy Trinity, King’s Court, York), adding to it in the last case “only at Confirmation.”

In fact the Returns shew that on the whole this part of the work of the parish priests was done regularly. In one case, that of Laurence Sterne at Sutton-on-the-Forest, the young vicar had adopted the very practical and original method of catechising and instructing the youth of the parish on Sunday evenings in Lent in his vicarage.

Question X. produces a series of answers which like those to Question VIII. shew very clearly the level of sacramental teaching. The period of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1645-1660 had left a mark which took long to efface. Dean Granville of Durham has recorded how difficult it was to restore the weekly celebration of the Holy Communion even in Cathedral Churches after the Restoration, and certainly the diocese of York as revealed here had nothing like the standard of the Non-Jurors and the “Oxford Methodists” in this matter. In all the Returns not one country parson resembles the Rector of Uffington, Lincs. (1719 to 1744), Mr. C. M. Bertie, who celebrated the Holy Communion every Sunday, though one town parish church had a weekly Sunday Eucharist, the Church of Holy Trinity, Hull.

55 churches had monthly Communion, 17 had it more frequently, i.e., monthly and at the Great Festivals. 54 churches had 6 celebrations a year, 89 had 5; 40 churches varied from 7 to 11

1. This is a MS. among the muniments at Bishopthorpe.
2. See Speculum Ducis. Lincoln, p. XIV.
celebrations yearly; thus 265 churches in all rose above the very general use of 4 Eucharists, celebrated at Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide and Michaelmas. But of these 265 churches some 143 practically adopted that standard, for the 5 or 6 celebrations in the year meant that 2 or 3 were at or around Easter, viz., on Palm Sunday and Good Friday as well as Easter Day, to enable the parishioners to make their Easter communion. The custom of reckoning Easter communion as including Palm Sunday and Holy Week was not confined to Anglicans or to the 18th century but was customary among the English Roman Catholics both in the 18th and early 19th centuries.

A number of the Returns disclose an even lower standard of practice than 4 communions a year. 147 churches had a Eucharist but thrice annually, 21 had one twice, 20 had it but once, and 13 churches never had it at all. 10 of these last were chapellies of an older parish and the people went to the Mother church for communion; 2 had no church (Ergham and Middlesborough) and one, Cowlam, had no communicants. Seven of the Returns give such doubtful answers that it is impossible to fit them into any of the categories above, e.g., at Bempton, the question is ignored, and at Hickleton the Curate, who was a Deacon, replies that he has the service as often as he can procure assistance. Thus, 208 of the Returns fall below the standard of 4 Eucharists a year. The majority of the parishes 363 in number were content with that, so that the sum total of the Returns in this respect arranged in tabular form is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Churches with Holy Communion 4 times a year</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches with Holy Communion more than 4 times a year</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches with Holy Communion less than 4 times a year</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question XI.** Provokes a great many stereotyped replies, but a few of interest. Everywhere due notice is given, but only in 24 of the 836 cases do the communicants send in their names beforehand. In one of these, Kirkby Grindalythe, each communicant pays a “Wine Penny” presumably to help to pay for the cost of that element; at Willerby the wardens go about the parish beforehand taking the names.

In 10 other parishes the names are sent in occasionally, e.g., at S. Mary’s, Beverley, by “such as receive the Sacrament for a qualification;” at Braithwell, Campsall, and Rawmarsh, names are sent in before First Communion. “Young persons who have never yet received come for direction” the excellent old Vicar of Campsall explains. Elsewhere as at Bracewell, Easingwold, and
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Rastrick Chapel names are sent in “seldom.” Several clergy reply that they will admonish their people to do this for the future, one says that he has tried to introduce the practice but “found them very averse to it.” Various clergy say that they have never heard of the practice being used, some of these being benefited close to parishes where it is stated to be the rule.

In 26 of the Returns the parish priest states that he has refused communion. The reasons given vary from offences against the moral law such as adultery (Gate Helmshy), fornication Catwick, Hollym, Tinsley Chapel, “vehement suspicion of fornication” (Kilham), bastard children (Lund), perjury in a law suit (Arnold), unlawful wedlock (Cottingham), causing variance (Waddington Chapel), open and notorious drunkenness (Withernwick), on the one hand, to “long absence from Church” (Beeford), “not being then 14 years of age” (Birstall), “a scandalous petition against the incumbent” (Selby), and “leaving another Church” (Stonegrave). One reason alleged is pitiful, and provoked the comment of the Archbishop; it was the case of persons who had been excommunicated by the Spiritual Court but were too poor to pay the fees for their Penance (Patrington, and Skelton by Broton). The Vicar of Scarborough had refused “some who came to get part of the Collection,” the Vicars of S. Mary’s, Beverley and S. Mary’s, Nottingham had had to deal with persons of scrupulous conscience. The Vicar of Featherstone had refused “one who evidently did not know what he was about,” but the Vicar of Fishlake expresses his practice and the Church’s rule most clearly, if not quite logically in the phrase “I admit no notorious and evil livers before repentance.”

The Supplementary Questions produced few answers. One incumbent in answer to the inquiry about “any particular Difficulties,” writes “None but such as have beset the clergy in every age.” Here and there come appeals for preferment, and one incumbent seems to have sought to ingratiate himself by offering the Archbishop a mare.

On the whole the strong impression left by these Returns is that of a body of conscientious and dutiful men, trying to do their work according to the standard of their day. Over the grave of one of them, the Rector of Bainton, William Territt, was written, when he died in 1783, this tribute (directed, I think, in part at his successor) “a very learned and sound divine, cheerful and peaceable, constantly resident and attentive to the duties of a Minister.” With the possible exception of the words “very learned” (for Mr. Territt had been Fellow of S. John’s College, Oxford) close examination of these Returns suggests that a like inscription would apply to many others of those who made them.

Among the seven hundred and eleven clergy named here, two have become famous, for very different reasons: one, the Vicar
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of Sutton-on-the-Forest, Laurence Sterne, the other the Curate of Haworth, William Grimshaw. Sterne’s writings and Grimshaw’s connexion with the Evangelical Revival (and his use of his horse whip as a pastoral weapon), have made secure the place of both men in the temple of fame. Neither of them in 1743 would have seemed half as sure of immortality here as many other clergy in the list. Among the parochial clergy were two who were to become Archbishops. Dr. Matthew Hutton, Rector of Spofforth and of Tunstal and Prebendarry of York and of Westminster appears in these Returns as Bishop-elect of Bangor in succession to Archbishop Herring. He was destined to succeed him both at York and Canterbury. The Rector of Etton and Vicar of Hutton Bushell, Richard Robinson, after holding three Irish bishoprics in succession, became Archbishop of Armagh in 1765 and received the rare honour of being created a temporal peer as first Baron Rokeby in 1777. The Rector and Vicar of Gedling (Notts.), Richard Chenevix, was a friend of the well-known Earl of Chesterfield by whose influence he became in 1745 Bishop of Killaloe, whence he was translated a few months later to the see of Waterford and Lismore. His great-grandson, Richard Chenevix Trench (1807-1886) was the famous Archbishop of Dublin. The Dean of York, Dr. Osbaldeston, and the Archdeacon of York, Dr. Hayter both became Bishops, as has been noticed above; the Dean ultimately succeeded the Archdeacon as Bishop of London.

These five Archbishops and Bishops, with Grimshaw and Sterne have a place in the Dictionary of National Biography. Seven others of the clergy here have won the same honour, viz., John Balguy, Vicar of North Allerton and John Jackson, Rector of Rossington (who wrote at least 36 books), both divines of Bishop Hoadly’s school, Samuel Drake, Rector of Treeton and Vicar of Holme on Spalding Moor, divine, and brother of the more famous Francis, author of Eboracum; John Clarke, of Beverley and Wakefield, and Robert Midgley of Coxwold, Curate of Hithwaite and of Carlton Chapel, won fame as schoolmasters; Samuel Ogden, Curate of Coley Chapel became celebrated as a preacher and a Professor at Cambridge; John Brailsford, Rector of Kirkby-in-Ashfield, was a minor poet. Dr. Henage Dering, Dean of Ripon, and his brother-in-law, Dr. Thomas Sharp have already been mentioned; another brother-in-law of Dr. Sharp, Granville Wheler, Rector of East and Vicar of West Leake, was F.R.S. and an early researcher into the use of electricity; Bernard Wilson, Vicar of Newark and Rector of Windthorpe (Notts.), Prebendarry of Lincoln, Lichfield and Worcester, divine, author and ultimately miser, has also found a place in the Dictionary. Besides these 18 names, 14 others of the clergy of these Returns are mentioned there through the fame of their fathers or their sons; these are Thomas Dade, Claudius Dauzbuz, Richard Fawcett, Jeremiah Fawkes, William Mason, Edward Moises, senr., John Scott, Calvert Tennant, Matthew Topham,
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George Wakefield, George Wood, and Charles Zouch. Archdeacon Jacques Sterne appears under the name of his famous nephew; Sir Mark Sykes finds a place under the names of his two grandsons. One country parson who has no place in the Dictionary was yet an author and a minor poet, Henry Travers, Rector of Nûrburnholme.

The list of the clergy presents other points of interest, though lack of space forbids detailed treatment of them. Thirty-eight were ordained before 1700; the senior of them in Holy Orders was Arthur Tempest, Vicar of Bracewell and Vicar of Barnoldswick, ordained Deacon at Chester, 5th May, 1684. The dates of the ordinations shed a light on the system of the day: it will be seen how often the better-born or more highly placed clergy were ordained Deacon and Priest within a few days or a few weeks, and then admitted to a benefice, which they held for life. There was little of that previous training in pastoral work as an assistant-curate, which is the rule to-day. At least eight of the curates-in-charge of parishes or chapelries were only Deacons; some of long standing. The attempt to trace the degrees of the clergy shows that an appreciable number were graduates of Scots Universities, Edinburgh or Glasgow, a fact that is little realized. Other facts are the large proportion of graduates to non-graduates; and the remarkable number of members of S. John’s College, Cambridge. The full figures require an Appendix, but it may be noted here that of the 163 clergy whose ordinations appear in Volume A, 27 are from Oxford (1 an undergraduate) 113 are from Cambridge (7 undergraduates), 3 are graduates of Glasgow, 1 is a graduate of Edinburgh, 13 are Literates, the status of 6 is unknown but of them one is described as B.A. and another as M.A. Of the 113 Cambridge men 52 came from S. John’s College; Christ’s and Peterhouse each with 13 and Trinity with 12, are very far behind. Another point of some interest is that 7 out of the 711 possess two Christian names; only one of these, John Henry Ott was of foreign birth.

Two other matters demand some comment. The figures of “communicants” in the parishes are often startling in their size. Examination of the point has made it clear that the term “communicant” is used in the sense of “potential communicant,” i.e., they are of age to become communicants, and might be communicants if they wished.

Further, in comparing the number of Easter communicants here with the figures of to-day it must be remembered that the Test and other Acts were still in force, and that not to be a communicant argued a disagreement with the State in the matter of religion. These legal and penal sanctions have now happily ceased for a century past, but in 1743 they existed; every office-holder in the State was obliged in England and Wales to be a communicant. In the country parishes too, in 1743 as has been shewn above, there was then no real rival to the Church; the case was very different.
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a generation later when the Methodist Revival had not only gathered in multitudes of adherents but had quickened into fresh life some of the older English Dissenting bodies. The figures should be read in the light of these facts.

The cases of moral and other offences which were presented by the Churchwardens need a comment. That jurisdiction has practically lapsed now; cases which would have been presented in 1743 are dealt with by the State Courts. In the cases of sexual immorality the names of the persons have not been printed but letters of the alphabet substituted. Where there is more than one name involved, A.B., E.F., and the subsequent odd pairs of letters are used for the man’s name; C.D., G.H., and the subsequent even pairs of letters for the woman’s. In the matter of the procedure the stages which are marked by the terms “Excommunicated” or “Denounced” were those ordered by Canons 65 and 107. The Ministers and Churchwardens were sworn to present moral offenders (and by Canon 112, all parishioners, being of the age of 16 years who had not received Holy Communion at Easter) to the Ordinary (in this Visitation the Archbishop), when the cases were tried by the Chancellor of the diocese. If the persons presented were convicted they were either put to penance or excommunicated. Excommunication involved various civil disabilities; no excommunicate could bring an action nor be a witness. By Canon 65, if excommunicate persons did not ‘reform themselves, and obtain the benefit of absolution’ within three months, they were, every six months ensuing, to be denounced excommunicate in their Parish Church and in the Cathedral Church of the diocese. This was to be done openly by the Minister, during Divine Service upon a Sunday. Persons so denounced could not make a will nor be entitled to Christian burial.(1) If the excommunicate person repented, he was adjudged a penance which followed a regular form. The offender “bare headed, bare foot and bare legged, having a white sheet wrapped about him from the shoulders to the Feet, and a white Wand in his Hand, immediately after the Reading of the Gospel, shall stand upon some Form or Seat before the Pulpit, or Place where the Minister readeth Prayers, and say after him as followeth.” A form of confession of the offence with a prayer for forgiveness followed, after it the congregation repeated, with the offender, the Lord’s Prayer. A certificate of the performance of the penance was then signed by the Minister and Churchwardens. The penance quoted here was performed in the parish church of Burnnall, on the 12th July, 1791.(2)

Up and down these Returns are scattered interesting survivals of a terminology which was older than that of the

2. Hundreds of such forms of penance, certified as duly performed, are preserved in the Archbishop's Registry. This of 1791 was taken per accidens, and there are no doubt many of still later date. The forms are all printed forms, shewing that this discipline was regular and normal.
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existing Prayer Book of 1662, the Canons of 1604 or even the Articles of 1571. These survivals are all the more interesting because they are clearly quite artless. Such names as Palm Sunday (for the Sunday next before Easter) Passion Week (used commonly for Holy Week but sometimes for the week before) and a celebration of Holy Communion at 6 a.m. as well as at noon on Easter Day (S. Mary’s, Nottingham) show that in spite of the break caused by the Puritan triumph a century before, custom still retained its hold, and not in country districts only. The use of the word “Altar” in some Returns is another witness to the same truth.

Yet another fact which these Returns make clear is the scandalously slothful rule of Archbishop Herring’s predecessor, Archbishop Blackburn. Whether the reports of the licentiousness of his life be true or not, it is plain from the official records that the Archbishop grossly neglected his diocese. To take two obvious tests—visitation and ordination—the peculiar offices of a bishop. During the 18 years Archbishop Blackburn held the see he “visited” it in person but once, at his Primary Visitation in 1726-1727. In 1737 he induced the good Bishop of Gloucester, Dr. Martin Benson, to hold a visitation of part, at any rate, of the diocese for him; for this fatiguing duty he left Bishop Benson a service of plate in his will. But he never “visited” himself after 1727. And he lived till 23rd March, 1742-3.

The record of his ordinations is equally discreditable. He ordained only in the months of July, August, and September, when he was in residence at Bishopthorpe. In his first year, 1725 he ordained twice—19 Deacons and 10 Priests; in 1726, once—3 Deacons and 17 Priests; in 1727 twice—14 Deacons and 11 Priests; in 1728, once—7 Deacons and 31 Priests; in 1729 not at all; in 1730, once—8 Deacons and 33 Priests; in 1731, once—5 Deacons and 16 Priests; in 1732, once—5 Deacons and 12 Priests; and in 1733, once—3 Deacons and 20 Priests. Then he ceased and for the next ten years candidates for Holy Orders in this large diocese were given Letters Dimissory “to any Catholic Bishop” and betook themselves to Carlisle, Chester, and Lincoln for the most part, and sometimes to London and even further afield. That Archbishop Blackburn was most astute and witty is known to everyone who troubles to read his history, but that he was an extremely negligent diocesan bishop is equally clear.

To appreciate fully the facts displayed in these Returns it is essential to get them in their contemporary setting. And for this the records of the clergy themselves are invaluable. One of them, Dr. Heneage Dering has written his Autobiographical Memoranda to 1739, while for Laurence Sterne and William Grimshaw, there

1. Yorkshire Diaries. S.S. No. 65.
INTRODUCTION.

is no lack of material. (1) Of an excellent country parson who was quite undistinguished, Thomas Cleworth, Vicar of Campsall, there are delightful glimpses in the contemporary Diary of James Fretwell. (2)

Of the Roman Catholics of the diocese a vivid picture is given in an article by Mr. R. C. Wilton on “Some Annals of Everingham” (3) and in the same writer’s “Early Eighteenth Century Catholics in England.” (4) The story of the Society of Friends is illustrated by the Journal of John Richardson (1667-1753), An Account of that Ancient Servant of Christ, etc.; (5) while for the Baptists some information is to be found in the works of David Crosby (1670-1744) who was in early life the friend of John Bunyan, and in later years a correspondent of George Whitefield. (6)

No attempt is made here to appreciate the judgments which have been passed on the Church in England in the eighteenth century. The Returns here afford some evidence for such a judgment, but they deal with the period before the Rising of 1745 had taken place and before the Methodist and the Evangelical Revivals had made much way. Broadly it may be said that if the Church of England, which was emphatically in possession in 1743, had been true to its message, there would have been no need and no demand for those Revivals, nor for the Revival that completed them, the Oxford Movement, of ninety years later. It seems from these records that though the Church was, on the whole, doing her work far better and more thoroughly than is commonly supposed, yet she lacked the “zeal” and “fire of love” which those Revivals in their turn, supplied.

To thank adequately those who have helped the Editors in their work is, frankly, impossible. To His Grace the Lord Archbishop of York is due the fact that the Returns are printed at all. But for his generous kindness the task could not have been accomplished, and future historians of the eighteenth century in England will realize their debt to an Archbishop who was trained as an historian and won the highest distinction in that science that the Schools at Oxford can give. Second only to His Grace, our thanks are due to his Registrar, Mr. A. V. Hudson. He has allowed us access to MSS. without which, the Returns would have been deprived of half their value, and thus he has helped in the work as no one else could. To Mr. Hudson and to his chief clerk, Mr. Frost, we owe a great debt of gratitude. We have to thank also many others who have supplied Ordination records of the clergy,

1. See the authorities appended to their Lives in the Dictionary of National Biography.
4. Catholic Historical Review (U.S.A.), October, 1924.
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particularly the Rev. Canon C. W. Foster, F.S.A., for his generous help at Lincoln, Mr. A. N. Bowman, the Diocesan Registrar and the Rev. Canon O. C. Quick, at Carlisle. We have to thank also the Lord Bishop of Peterborough, the Deans of Canterbury, of Gloucester, of Wells, and of Exeter, Canon Wordsworth, at Salisbury, Canon Goodman, at Winchester, Canon Bannister, at Hereford, Canon C. J. Smith, at Ely, Canon Bell, at Norwich, Dr. Claude Jenkins at Lambeth, Dr. Stone, Principal of Pusey House at Oxford, and the Registrars of the Welsh dioceses of St. David’s, of St. Asaph, and of Llandaff. Despite the fact that the Church in Wales is disendowed, these Registrars have like the other Registrars already mentioned given us information without fee. Not all English Diocesan Registrars were so generous. We have succeeded in finding the dates of ordination of all but three of the 711 clergy, and the degrees or other status of nearly all. Unfortunately there appear to be no records at Chester of the ordinations of Bishop Peploe (1726-1752); so that the academic status of some of the clergy here is unascertainable. For those from Oxford and Cambridge we owe much to Foster’s Alumni Oxonienses and Venn’s Alumni Cantabrigienses.

To the President of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Colonel John Parker, C.B., F.S.A., to the Hon. Sec., Mr. E. W. Crossley, F.S.A., and above all to the Hon. Sec. of the Record Series, Mr. J. W. Walker, O.B.E., F.S.A., our grateful thanks are also due; while to his friend, Mr. Gordon Crosse, the writer of this Introduction owes no small debt for his kind help.

Not a few others have helped in this work, we would ask them to accept this acknowledgment of their kindness and care. Those scholars, who have aided us with the various Appendices, will be mentioned there.

It has fallen to me to write this Introduction, but the task would have been beyond me unless my co-editor had helped me with carefully tabulated statements. I can only put on record here my gratitude for his minutely accurate and devoted work, a gratitude which every reader of this book will share.

S. L. OLLARD.

Bainton, 16th March, 1928.

NOTE.—The dates throughout are given as they are in the MS. authorities, when the year still began on 25th March. Thus January, February and March (up to 24th), 1742, are printed 1742, and not 1742/3 nor, in the modern manner, 1743.