

Dr Diana Newton
School of Arts and Media
University of Teesside
Middlesbrough
TS1 3BA

THE CLERGY, IDENTITY AND LAY SOCIETY IN THE DIOCESE OF
DURHAM 1561-1635*

DIANA NEWTON

University of Teesside

When Frances Matthews accompanied her husband, Toby, to take up his position as the new Dean of Durham, in 1583, she was patently unimpressed with the north-eastern diocese. Immediately upon their arrival, and after an excruciatingly awful journey, she implored, 'for gods sake get us gone hence' and demanded, 'why came we thither, who but we would tarry any longer here'.¹ It was not an encouraging start and it did not augur well for their integration into north-eastern society. But, even before the couple had left the south, it was clear that Toby Matthew was deeply suspicious of his new diocese, and especially its cathedral community. Not the least of his concerns were its very particular, not to say unusual, traditions. He had anxiously importuned his patron, Queen Elizabeth's Lord Treasurer, William Cecil, Lord Burghley, to permit him to go and take up his post as soon as possible.² It was imperative that he should be resident there for twenty-one days before Michaelmas, he explained, because otherwise the harvest and other tithes and glebeland of the dean's living 'must by a local statute of that church acrewe to the Prebendaries resident there this yeare past'. Increased familiarity with the diocese did not lessen his antipathy; rather, it was reinforced as Matthew directed his strictures far more broadly. For example, when he was pressing his suit to become the next bishop of Durham, in 1587, he drew to the attention of the Queen's Principal Secretary, Sir Francis Walsingham, the deplorable state of 'the diocese namely in Northumberland & especially about the borders'.³ It was 'most wretched & miserable', he

declared, and 'hable to burst the heart of anie honest well meaning pastor'. He expanded that this was largely because they could expect 'so small assistance for the publick services of Religion & the state both Ecclesiaticall & Civill'. It would seem that the diocese attracted hostile comment and criticism at every level, which encompassed its secular as well as its clerical communities.

Matthew's verdict on the diocese prevailed well into the twentieth century, as it continued to be perceived as remote, backward and conservative. In 1974, Mervyn James commented upon the fact that sixteenth-century Durham 'had mainly (if not wholly) a traditionalist Catholic character', especially amongst the social and intellectual elites.⁴ A little over ten years later, however, David Marcombe declared that Durham 'was unique as a stronghold of puritanism' in the 1560s,⁵ although he did caution against neglecting the political and religious complexities of the region. Michael Tillbrook's detailed work on county Durham in the second half of the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries concluded that whereas it was 'one of the first counties to have been subjected to the demands and outlook of officially appointed Calvinist churchmen' it was also 'perhaps the first county to witness the disintegration of the orthodox Calvinist consensus'.⁶ Moreover, studies of its clergy acknowledge that the north-eastern counties were far less backward than was often supposed.⁷ Thus, a slightly more nuanced picture of the diocese began to emerge.

At the same time, when the relative wealth of the clergy in Durham is analysed, the diocese seems to measure up very well against the rest of the kingdom. For, whereas just under 47 per cent of its livings were valued at under £10 a year as opposed to 51 per cent nationally, 16.5 per cent of its rectories (and some vicarages) were assessed at more than £30 yearly when the national figure was 4.5 per cent.⁸ However, because around 64 per cent of Durham's livings were appropriated – making it the worst affected diocese in that respect – the incumbents may not have felt the full benefit of securing a benefice in one of the wealthier dioceses.⁹ Certainly, this impacted on the standing of individual clergymen in the lay community. But, how did the

Durham clergy perceive themselves in relation to their secular neighbours? The interface between the clergy and laity in Durham, like other dioceses, has not been subjected to sustained analysis. Consideration of several aspects of this relationship will offer a fresh perspective on the place of the clergy in the diocese; especially insofar as it fostered a self-conscious sense of identity amongst the clerical community in early modern Durham.

I

That Toby Matthew could cite his wife's opinion of the diocese of Durham marked a new departure from the traditional dynamics of ecclesiastical life – as the fact of a married clergy became increasingly prevalent in the later sixteenth century.¹⁰ The status of clerical marriage had been open to some doubt before the ratification of the Thirty-Nine Articles by the Queen in 1571, which gave it the force of an act of parliament. But, with the declaration by Bishop Pilkington's spiritual chancellor, Robert Swift, in 1574, that clergy marriages were lawful, Durham's bishops, members of its cathedral community, and the parish clergy entered the married state.¹¹ This carried with it a number of implications. Not the least of these was that churchmen could advance and consolidate their position through judicious marriage, exploiting opportunities that had been unavailable, even a generation before. For example, Bishop Matthew Hutton's nephew, Robert, married a daughter of Bishop Pilkington's brother, Laurence, thereby integrating himself into another influential Durham family, which brought him substantial benefits. For as well as securing a prebendal stall, Robert Hutton was also appointed to the rectory of Houghton-le-Spring, in 1590, which, at £124 a year, was far and away the most valuable living in the diocese.¹² This was part of an exchange orchestrated by Bishop Hutton, which he had later to justify to the Queen. He explained that the incumbent of Houghton, Robert Bellamy, who was a preacher and physician, would be '... a man fitt to have chardge both of the soules and bodies of the poor, impotent, sicke persons of Sherburn hospital'. The hospital's master, Robert Hutton as 'a mere scholar' (he was actually very well qualified as a Bachelor of Divinity and one of the senior fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge) was better suited to occupy Bellamy's rectory and

prebendary.¹³ It was an arrangement which served the local communities' interests very well, so that, rather being than a matter of nepotism, it seemed to be based on a perfectly sound rationale.

Thirty years later, Gabriel Clarke also profited from his fortuitous marriage to the niece of another Bishop, Richard Neile, thereby reinforcing existing links between the families, for Robert Newell, Neile's half-brother, had married Gabriel's sister in 1612.¹⁴ Clarke was Archdeacon of Northumberland and then Durham, holder of a succession of prebendal stalls and rector of the comfortably endowed livings of Elwick, in Durham and Howick, in Northumberland, worth £20 18s. and £36 13s. 4*d.* respectively.¹⁵ As part of a 'self-confident group conscious of its direct links with the great world of the Court' whose members displayed '[e]xceptional talent, persistence, and determination',¹⁶ Clarke earned his advancement. Later, when children of the first clerical marriages reached maturity, they too became eligible to reap similar rewards, such as Bishop Barnes's son, Emmanuel, who held prebendal stalls and the reasonably valuable rectory of Washington, worth £18.¹⁷ As the need to provide for clerical offspring entered into the equation, an entirely new dimension was added to the exercise of ecclesiastical patronage.

What was also unprecedented were the ramifications that clerical marriage had in the clergy's relationship with the wider, secular community. For inevitably, marriage alliances began to be forged between the two, hitherto mutually exclusive, social orders. By and large, these tended to be made by members of the Cathedral Close community. For example, children of the prebendaries Clement Colmore and Robert Hutton married into the Fulthorpe family of Tunstall, Anthony Maxton's daughter married the son of Ralph Featherstonehaugh in Weardale, and Peter Smart's daughter married into the powerful Ogle family.¹⁸ There is not so much evidence of the minor parish clergy marrying into the local community, and, where they did, it was at a less exalted level. One example was John Hicks, rector of Whitburn, worth £39 19s. 4*d.*, who married a daughter of John Heath (of Ramside, as opposed to the more prosperous Heaths of Kepier) while his sister married George

Lilburne, of a relatively humble family which nevertheless had social pretensions.¹⁹ It has been argued that the clerical right to marry was the most significant distinguishing feature between Protestant and post-Tridentine Catholic clergy, for with marriage they became closer to their parishioners both physically and psychologically.²⁰ Certainly, in Durham, entirely new social dynamics were introduced as a consequence of clerical marriage into the secular community, with personal, familial relationships superimposed on to existing associations and networks .

The composition of the Elizabethan Durham chapter had resulted in its prebendaries being recruited from a much wider area, and from higher up the social scale, than the monks they replaced.²¹ This was reflected in the marriage alliances forged by these new entrants into the marriage stakes, particularly those of the highest Durham clergy, many of whom contracted exogenous marriages with brides of a superior social status. For example, Bishop Pilkington, from Rivington in Lancashire, was married to Alice Kingsmill from Hampshire; Toby Matthew's wife, Frances, was the daughter of William Barlow, the Bishop of Chichester; and Bishop William James's first wife, Catherine, came from Oxfordshire. There were also international marriages. Bishop Barnes's wife, Jane, was a Frenchwoman, who married Pilkington's brother, Leonard, after she was widowed, thus strengthening the ecclesiastical matrimonial web, while Dean Whittingham was married to Katherine, the daughter of Louis Jaqueman (who may or may not have been related to Jean Calvin).²² These wide-ranging attachments closely mirrored marriage patterns of the resident gentry, who, contrary to the traditional view, did not display 'exceptionally strong geographically endogenous tendencies', either.²³ And just as furthering the interests of their own socio-economic caste and securing or extending political and commercial advancement overrode territorial factors for lay society, clerical marriages might be arranged amongst a remarkably influential religious milieu for similarly pragmatic reasons.

Thereafter, married clergymen founded dynasties which were either integrated with, or rivalled those of, the resident landed gentry.²⁴ The prospect of this development meant that, in his pronouncement about the legality of

clerical marriage, Swift had further concluded that 'their wives [were] endowable and their children inheritable'.²⁵ As rector of Sedgefield, one of the most valuable livings in Durham, worth £73 17s., this was clearly a matter of some importance for Swift. Even so, sufficient doubts remained. Hence clergymen took great care to establish their wives' precise status in drawing up legal documents: Dean Whittington, when he drew up his will in 1579, designated his spouse, quite clearly, as Katherina Whittingham alias Jaqueman *my wiffe*.²⁶ So successful was Whittingham in securing the future of his lineage that his son, Timothy, was knighted in 1604 and bought the manor of Holmside, while the family appeared thereafter in a catalogue of armigerous gentry in the reign of Charles I.²⁷ Further examples included Robert Hutton, son of Robert Hutton, prebendary and rector of Houghton, who became a substantial gentleman there, marrying into the gentry and founding a very important county family.²⁸ Establishing close personal and familial relationships with the resident gentry may also have diffused any stresses and strains that could have arisen from perceptions that a *parvenu* clergy regarded themselves as their social equals.

Tensions were also relieved because the gentry became closely involved in the process of clerical marriage. This was formalized in a royal injunction which 'provided that no Priest nor Minister shall take to his wife any manner of woman without the advice & allowance first had upon good examination by the Bishop of the same Diocese & two Justices of Peace of the same shire...'. Accordingly, in January 1598, John Hedworth and Richard Bellasis approved the marriage of Richard Fawcett, rector of Bolden, to the widowed Eleanor Blakiston of nearby Hedley. On the grounds that, to their knowledge, she was 'of honest Conversion and virtuous Life',²⁹ she was no doubt considered to be a suitable wife for the 'exemplary shepherd',³⁰ Fawcett. With the Blakistons, Hedworths and Bellasises already connected by marriage, their network was extended to include clergymen. The subsequent matrimonial arrangements received as much care and attention as any other secular transaction of a personal nature. Thus was reinforced the way in which the interests of the clergy and lay society had become further integrated through intermarriage. At the same time, Fawcett's incorporation into the

county community may well have contributed to his affinity with the area he served so conscientiously.

Exemplifying the rewards that could be achieved as a consequence of entering the married state was Henry Ewbank, Toby Matthew's chaplain, who also managed to secure a permanent place in the county community for his family. His eldest son married Mary, the daughter of Sir Henry Gray of Chillingham, while his second son married the daughter of Robert Hutton, already noted.³¹ Rector of Washington from 1584, Henry Ewbank was commended by Toby Matthew for apprehending 'Bernard Pattenson, the first seminary priest that ever hand was laid upon hereabouts', sometime in 1586,³² thereby identifying himself with the best interests of the religiously conformist element in the diocese. He was also appointed to the Mastership of the Hospital of St Mary, in Newcastle, in 1585, received the rectories of Elwick, worth £20 18s. in 1596, and Winston in 1601, and was the chaplain of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, who recommended him to Bishop Hutton for a prebendal stall in Durham in 1594.³³ This was a very impressive clutch of appointments, which he may well have owed to his own fortuitous marriage to Anne Sampson from Oxford. For Matthew 'was supposed to have bin kind with' her and, certainly, when Ewbank expressed his gratitude to Mrs Matthew for a valuable preferment he had recently received, she replied, somewhat trenchantly, that 'he might thank the hot arsd Quene his wife and not her for it'.³⁴ There was no doubt that the Bishop's wife accepted the veracity of the rumoured relationship. The fact that Mrs Ewbank named her first son Toby (and none of her sons for her husband) can only have further fuelled suspicion.

Perhaps inevitably, the introduction of women into the Cathedral Close, 'for centuries a bastion of misogyny',³⁵ brought with it quarrels between them. Mrs Matthew, who was otherwise regarded as a 'very gallant woman & a good housewife... as those who had a desire to bestow good breeding upon their daughters' sought to secure a place for them in her service³⁶, was not above castigating the woman that she believed to be her husband's mistress in the most earthy of terms. On occasion disputes reached the consistory court.

Cases pertaining to sexual immorality and slander occupied a large proportion of the ecclesiastical courts' time (indeed, they were often referred to as 'bawdy courts')³⁷ and the wives of the clergy were soon to be found involved in them. For example, in 1588, the Dean of Durham's wife, Katherine Whittingham, was obliged to defend herself in the consistory court for casting unfounded accusations against Margaret Kay, wife of the vicar of Heighington and headmaster of Durham grammar school.³⁸ Unable to support her claims that Mrs Kay had a child with another man before her marriage, Mrs Whittingham, rather theatrically, announced that her opponent might 'doe your worst I will not flie the countrie'; the implication being that making false accusations was as damaging as any other aspect of the case, and which, moreover, might bring with it consequences for their continued co-existence thereafter in the close clerical community.

II

Contentious incidents between clerical wives were replicated by similarly fractious relations amongst the clergymen themselves, ranging from relatively trivial matters to those of a much more serious nature. The discord in Durham was most manifest in the continued dispute between the dean and chapter and the bishop who were almost constantly at odds with one another regarding their relative standing and authority. In 1580, the prebendaries lamented that 'there were two governments in this country', that of the dean and chapter and that of the bishop, which was impacting adversely on the ecclesiastical administration of the diocese.³⁹ Two years before that, Bishop Barnes had been instrumental in fomenting a series of disputes between Dean Whittingham and the Archbishop of York, Edwin Sandys, which took place in the chapter house of Durham. It arose from Sandys questioning the validity of Whittingham's orders and reached such proportions that the Earl of Huntingdon, as Lord President of the Council in the North, was obliged to arbitrate.⁴⁰ At the same time, there were fairly low key incidents, often arising as a result of the inappropriate behaviour of the lesser clergy. For instance, the assistant curate of Heddon on the Wall, William Wilson, was reprovved for drunkenness and his failure to conduct services according to the 'Articles of Religion'.⁴¹ Cautioned to have a greater respect for his coat, he responded

that 'I do not greatly care for my coate. I am a squire's sonne, and soe I respect my birth as much as my coate',⁴² which was more indicative of tensions that could arise from endeavouring to raise the social standing of recruits into the Church than a measure of the success of the drive.

For the most part, friction between the clergy and laity was exacerbated by the effects of marriage on the clergy and their desire to found landed dynasties. For this friction coincided with the conviction of 'new clergy', such as the Archdeacon of Northumberland, Ralph Lever, and Bishop Pilkington, that it was their moral duty to restore the economic base of the clergy. These disputes were superimposed on to existing areas of contention between the clerical community and their neighbours; in particular, those conflicts which concerned rights to coal mines, to leases, and to tithes.⁴³ Inevitably, this drive was at the expense of some of the established landed families. Its role in encouraging support for the rebellion of 1569 has been well documented.⁴⁴ And although current reassessments have resulted in the restoration of its popular religious character as the most important motivating factor for recruits,⁴⁵ Bishop Pilkington's efforts to stop secular encroachments on coal producing lands at Ryton and Chester-le-Street nevertheless provoked simmering resentment in those he targeted.

Such antagonism was reciprocated by the clergy at the parish level, as a consequence of the lay appropriation of tithes. The rectory of Kirkwhelpington in Northumberland, worth just £7 3s. 4d., was a case in point. Originally in the gift of the earl of Northumberland, it had devolved to the Crown, who, leased it to Thomas Newman in 1588. From 1607, it was in the hands of John Delaval and Roger Gray, who had come to an arrangement with two Londoners, before assigning it to Sir Edward Radcliffe, son of the recusant, Francis Radcliffe, of Dilston, in 1628.⁴⁶ The labyrinthine exchange of rentals and tithes can only have led to a sense of grievance on the part of the successive rectors of Kirkwhelpington, struggling to balance the books of a poorly endowed living. That struggle was replicated elsewhere in the diocese. In 1613, Richard Satherwaite, rector of Ingram and vicar of Wittingham, fought his Collingwood patrons through the Council in the North and Star Chamber

for his tithes at Fawdon and Ingram.⁴⁷ While not as financially pressed as his colleague in Kirkwhelpington (his livings were worth £24 16s. 5d. and £12 11s. 4d., respectively), Satherwaite clearly felt similarly aggrieved.

III

A further source of conflict between the clergy and the laity was a direct consequence of the seismic religious changes of the sixteenth century; and the way in which the Reformation was embraced and then adopted unevenly across the kingdom. For clergymen were not always preaching precisely the kind of message that all their parishioners wished to hear. On occasion, the efforts of some clergymen to convince a reluctant laity of the efficacy and value of the reformed word could result in outright confrontation. John Snaithwaite, rector of Elsdon in Northumberland, battled tirelessly against the largely Catholic, but politically powerful, Widdrington family. In the tense summer of 1605, when central government was cracking down on Catholic recusancy (as well as Protestant non-conformists), Snaithwaite took the opportunity to tackle Roger Widdrington, bailiff of Hexham. He was joined in his endeavour by Anthony Thompson and John Maughen, ministers of Hexham, William Morton, the Archdeacon of Durham, and the excessively anti-Catholic customer of Newcastle, Henry Sanderson.⁴⁸ They declared that Widdrington and his fellow 'ringleaders and most dangerous recusants ... do more harm than any priest', being able to rally two or three thousand followers to their cause, while they were virtually inviolable on account of Widdrington's sole authority in Hexham and Bywell. They pleaded for support from central government. But Sir Robert Cecil pronounced that, after careful consideration of 'all your advertisements', he had concluded that 'any extraordinary severity used towards him more than others' would be objectionable.⁴⁹ This reflected the more nuanced approach of King James, who was prepared to accommodate all but those at the very extremes of the religious divide.⁵⁰ Cecil went on to declare that he was fully aware of the antagonism between Sanderson and the papists, that Sanderson's nature made 'his advertisements to be rather apprehensions upon general grounds than any other matter of great consequence', and that he was disinclined to advise

action. As far as identity predicated on either shared religious outlook or geographic location was concerned, the experiences of Protestant clergymen and their Catholic parishioners was by no means a straightforward matter.

It has been convincingly argued that it is misleading to see the English Reformation as a 'struggle between two tightly consolidated blocs ... facing each other across a deserted religious no-man's-land'. Nor was it a 'coherent battle between two incommensurate world views' for the majority neither wholly embraced nor wholly accepted it.⁵¹ This was as applicable to the diocese of Durham as elsewhere in England. Moreover, Roger Widdrington did not represent a homogenous northern Catholic position, either. For, together with most of the northern Catholic gentry he supported the 1606 oath of allegiance, devised in response to the Gunpowder Plot, largely because they had been sympathetic to Mary, Queen of Scots, and, by extension, were fiercely loyal to her son, King James. Opposition to the oath was headed by the archpriest, George Birkhead, who was related to the Salvins and the Birkheads of Durham, as well as the ultra-Protestant Whittinghams, with their Continental Calvinist connections. Perhaps most significantly, in the highly charged months following the discovery of the plot, Sir Henry Widdrington was put in command of the sensitively placed Alnwick and Tynemouth castles and charged with hunting down Thomas Percy and any other fellow conspirators.⁵² This was despite his relationship to the 'notorious recusant', Roger. For Henry Widdrington's experience of conditions in the north-eastern reaches of the realm, together with his administrative and governmental abilities, outweighed his association with, or sympathies for, Catholics and Catholicism.

One of the most striking aspects of the Northern Rising, thirty-five years before the Gunpowder Plot, had been the fact that it attracted so little support from the Catholic gentry. This, it has been argued, was because they were unwilling to jeopardize their political standing in the local community;⁵³ which reflected the situation elsewhere in England. A study of London, contrasting 'the containment of religious tensions in the sixteenth century and their politically explosive force in the seventeenth', concluded that the quietude in the sixteenth century was a result of figures like Thomas Tresham,

performing important brokerage roles between rival religious groupings, albeit, for reasons of commercial self-interest.⁵⁴ These contradictory forces were mirrored in Newcastle in the 1590s, in the conflict between Henry Sanderson and the most privileged of the town's coalmine owners, or grand lessees, in particular, Henry Anderson.⁵⁵ Sanderson reported on the religious fortitude of those he designated 'non grand lessees', who happened to have been of the same opinion as himself regarding the dispute.⁵⁶ Sanderson was an ardent and zealous Puritan, and he was rabidly hostile to Catholics. But Anderson, too, was a deeply committed Puritan, who, in 1592, had recommended Sanderson, as an advocate of Newcastle's interests, to the Earl of Huntingdon, Lord President of the Council in the North.⁵⁷ But since then alliances within municipal circles had been transformed.

Newcastle, however, was something of a paradox throughout the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. It was demonstrably combating Catholicism, it being the site for the execution of the seminary priests, Joseph Lampton, in 1592, and Edward Waterson, in 1594.⁵⁸ Yet, in 1616, the Archdeacon of Durham, William Morton (writing under the name of Zeth Bridges), reported that 'popery flourishes' in Newcastle, and he provided the names of nine Catholic ladies married to principal men of Newcastle and Gateshead. The recusant and harbourer of priests, Dorothy Lawson, who lived by the Tyne from 1616, was even buried according to Catholic rites at All Saints' church, in the city, under the eyes of its civic dignitaries and a respectful crowd.⁵⁹ Newcastle in the seventeenth century was described as 'a very populous town, with multitudes of men, and no small variety of opinions'.⁶⁰ This was also evident within families. For example, William Jenison served as sheriff, mayor and member of parliament, despite being described as 'inclined inwardly to popery but one that hides it'.⁶¹ His nephew, Robert Jenison, by contrast, was a lecturer in Newcastle, much exercised by how to create a godly town there.⁶² Bishop Neile clearly recognised the full religious spectrum in Newcastle and endeavoured, like his king, to accommodate all but the most extreme. So that, whereas it once was argued that the Puritan faction in Newcastle was 'one of unconnected activity' until the opposition of Bishop Neile in the 1620s gave the 'movement ... its real

cohesion and organization',⁶³ recent verdicts on the Bishop are more circumspect. For instance, it has been acknowledged that Neile's flexibility in his dealings with Robert Jenison was in marked contrast to the latter's implacability. At the same time, the Bishop took care to distinguish between feared Jesuit priests and the less alarming seculars,⁶⁴ thereby demonstrating a more nuanced view.

Relations can rarely have been as strained as those between Luke Hutton and the inhabitants of the southern part of the diocese. Allegedly the son of Bishop (later Archbishop) Matthew Hutton, he had a 'strange' predilection for robbery. He led a band of like-minded individuals, 'stiled by the appellation of Luke Hutton and his twelve Apostles', who 'plyed much the edge of Yorkshire' despite the efforts of his mother (by whom he 'was much loved') and friends to dissuade him. Much in the manner of other anti-heroes, however, 'neither he nor his fellow Robbers ever shed blood'.⁶⁵ His notoriety was such that he featured in Sir John Harrington's work for Bishop Godwin of Llandaff. There, he was described as the youngest son of Matthew Hutton, and 'so valiant, that he feared not men, nor Laws; and for a robbery done on Saint *Luke's* day; for names sake, he died as sad a death (though I hope with a better minde) as the Thief of whom Saint *Luke* write'.⁶⁶ He went on that Matthew Hutton 'showed such constancy and severity worthy of his place, for he would not endeavour to save him, as the world thought he easily might', which suggests that he was mindful of his obligations to the community at large, even where a member of his family was concerned, for its interests took precedence over familial ties.

IV

The nature of the historical record dictates that incidents of disharmony between and within the clerical and secular communities tend to figure most heavily. But in many respects, the clergy and the county gentry had interests in common, which drove them together; not the least of which was their commitment to maintaining law and order. Traditionally this was the preserve of the secular authorities, but, with the later sixteenth century Protestant ideal

of a pastorate committed to the twin themes of instruction and discipline, gentleman and clergyman increasingly were found serving together as justices of the peace on the county bench. The hardest working magistrates in late-sixteenth-century Durham were ecclesiastics and palatinate officers, such as Clement Colmore, Chancellor of Durham, and William James, Dean and later Bishop of Durham. This clerical diligence continued into the 1620s, with prebendaries Ferdinand Moorcroft, Anthony Maxton and Daniel Birkhead proving themselves to be more conscientious than their secular counterparts. To a certain extent this was because, as a palatinate and the administrative centre of the bishopric, Durham had a higher proportion of legally trained and university educated personnel who were available to serve as justices of the peace. However, such concord was not always viewed wholly positively. For example, allegations of excessive clerical representation on the county bench were voiced in the 1621 parliament, with precedents in 1604 and 1614.⁶⁷ There was no such tension in Northumberland, where the composition and complexion of its magisterial bench were somewhat different. There, the sole cleric was John Craddock, Archdeacon of Northumberland⁶⁸. But the willingness of clergymen to sit on the magisterial bench could also be interpreted as a measure of their willingness to serve, and by extension identify with, their local communities.⁶⁹ This was despite the fact that, with more than half the Durham clergy originating from outwith the diocese,⁷⁰ they did not have the geographic ties with the area that their secular counterparts had.

Similarly engaged in the secular affairs of his diocese was the bishop. Durham's distinctiveness as a county, a diocese, and a palatinate meant that he had to operate at a number of different levels as both spiritual lord in his capacity as bishop of the diocese and temporal lord for the palatinate. On occasion, juggling the responsibilities of palatinate, bishopric and diocese impacted upon yet another of his obligations; as Durham's parliamentary representative in the House of Lords. For instance, in October 1597 Bishop Toby Matthew had to explain to Lord Burghley that he could not attend parliament, for he was busy with Border matters, especially 'compounding of those differences bred and nourished betwene [Lord Eure] and the gent of

Northumberland'.⁷¹ Thus was demonstrated his often diverse responsibilities, which included preserving harmonious relations between members of lay society beyond the palatinate, to the farthest extent of his diocese. Bishop Neile was similarly committed to the well-being of his secular flock. In particular, he was prominent in Durham's attempts to secure parliamentary representation in the House of Commons. Traditionally viewed as being responsible for defeating the Durham franchise bills, in 1621 and 1624, it has since been demonstrated that Neile actively countenanced reform as desired by the bulk of Durham's gentry, rather than risk alienating his associates in the government of the palatinate.⁷² He was also instrumental in ensuring that the county of Durham was not over burdened by the ratings for the privy seal loan issued in 1625. In yet another capacity, as lord lieutenant of the county, he drew up the original assessment, but complaints from his deputies, Sir John Calverley and Sir William Bellasis, that 'the charge as it is ... is very high considering the great poverty of the countrey', led to his issuing a revised list.⁷³ This concord between bishop and gentry, or 'community of interest' has also been cited to explain the absence of contention in Durham as a result of Bishop Neile's Arminianism.⁷⁴ This was despite the fact that he and William Laud, Bishop of London, were to be the chief targets of the 1628-9 parliament's drive against the perceived menace posed by Arminian churchmen to the religious consensus.

Embodying the cordial relations that could exist across the clerical, cathedral, and both county communities was Thomas Chaytor of Butterby. His diary, extant for the years between 1612 and 1617, offers an illuminating insight into his rich personal life as well as his career as registrar of the Durham consistory court and surveyor-general of the northern counties.⁷⁵ His social circle was very widely spread. He stayed with Sir Ralph Gray at Chillingham in the far north of Northumberland, and with the Countess of Shrewsbury at Bothal, near Morpeth. His passion for horse racing found him engaged with Henry Madison of Newcastle, the Conyers of Sockburn, in the far south of Durham, Sir John Fenwick and Sir Henry Widdrington of Northumberland, and Lord Scrope of Bolton Castle, in Wensleydale. Details of race meetings – which took him to venues throughout the North Riding and

Durham, and where more serious races were enlivened by a contest between a horse and a puppy on which was wagered £200 – were interspersed with matters of national significance, the health of his family, and the weather. In addition, he was part of a circle of gentlemen who regularly dined with the Bishop, William James. Despite his position at the heart of the diocesan establishment, Chaytor's second wife was a Catholic and at least two of their daughters were christened at Croxdale church, most probably according to Catholic rites. As with other relationships across the doctrinal divide, this connection did not present a problem in the normal way. Only in 1613, when there was a temporary alarm about a Spanish invasion, was he was threatened by Bishop James with the loss of his office. But not only did this come to nothing, he remained on excellent terms with the Bishop thereafter. Chaytor's diary is also ample testimony to his diligence in his offices and commitment to those he encountered in his professional capacity. Above all was his clemency towards offenders, such as one Richardson of Merrington who stole wood from him in the depths of winter. Chaytor noted that 'his Axe being taken from him it was returned upon hope he shall doe no more', which demonstrated genuine Christian charity and revealed his ability to relate to his neighbours at all levels, from petty thief to higher gentry and bishop.

V

Chaytor's particular brand of altruism was not necessarily replicated at an institutional level. For example, it has been observed that no master of a hospital, which, in theory were clerical strongholds, or other charitable foundation in the diocese, 'won applause for his personal virtues of generosity and compassion'.⁷⁶ The formal execution of poor rates at the local level tended to be in the hands of justices of the peace and specially appointed overseers of the poor. On the other hand, the role of individual ministers in administering bequests for the poor in private wills was recognized across the diocese. In 1586, Thomas Brickwell left £10 to the poor of Berwick and Darlington, at the discretion of Thomas Clerke, the vicar of Berwick. And in 1609, Gilbert Spense, vicar of Tynemouth, entrusted his £5 for the poor of the parish to the management of his executors, who included three clergymen.⁷⁷

Indeed, the Durham clergy were particularly generous in making charitable bequests of various kinds in their wills. It has been estimated that they were consistently more munificent than those of Surrey, for example.⁷⁸ Most generous of all was Bernard Gilpin, who was renowned for his liberality, most especially as regards the provision of education for the local community.

In this he reflected the wider concern of a number of clergymen as purveyors of education, which, it has been observed, 'was the affair of the parish'.⁷⁹ And even after 1560, when education expanded rapidly, 'in Durham, unlike any other county or region, [it] remained solidly in clerical, though now Protestant hands'.⁸⁰ This was significant, because, with reading the Bible for oneself one of the central planks of Protestantism, fostering the ability to read amongst the laity was crucial, especially to the more evangelistic of Durham's ecclesiastical establishment. Accordingly, Bishop Pilkington was heavily involved in promoting education, founding schools in Rivington and Lancaster and re-launching the school at Darlington in 1563.⁸¹ Later that year, Dean Whittingham was found to be personally involved in the educational process itself. Reporting to his patron, William Cecil, soon after his appointment, he touched on the grammar school in Durham and explained that, '[b]ecause we lack an able scholar I bestowe daily iij or iiij houres in teaching the youth til god provide us of some that may better suffice'.⁸² This concern for academic competence was also in evidence thirty years later, when Dean Toby Matthew issued new orders for the school in November 1593. They began, 'first and principally because that an unlearned schoolemaister cannot make a learned scholar; therefore it is ordered that the schoolemaister shalbe furnished with both in the Greake and Latin tongues, fully able to discharge his duty'.⁸³ Designed to inculcate Calvinist principals in the youth of Durham, they went on to provide that he should be 'a zealous and sound professor of true religion abhorring all papistrie', while the 'planting of true religion' was to be achieved through weekly lessons and teaching the catechism.

Similar conditions and aspirations were also at the heart of new schools founded by parish clergymen in the diocese. The most notable of these was the Kepier School – called after the dissolved hospital which

provided the lands and revenues for the school – which was a grammar school in Houghton, founded by Bernard Gilpin, its rector, in 1574. Like the grammar school at Durham, its original remit, drawn up in 1570, was ‘for the advancement of godly learning, & for the godly education of youth in virtue & good literature’, and it was designed to support ‘one godly honest & able schoolemaster and one usher ... and three score scholars a year’.⁸⁴ Gilpin maintained an interest in the school and its scholars, personally tutoring the most able and sponsoring their university careers thereafter. Slightly less ambitious was Robert Swift, rector of Sedgefield, whose school founded there in 1597 was also devoted to ‘Instructing Poore Children in the Principals of the Christian Religion’. However, this was to be executed by ‘the Parish Clerk there (for the time being)’ which was still the case in 1696, when the school was to be ‘augmented and bettered; for the teaching of youth in the Latin tongue & other part of liberall Arts & Sciences’.⁸⁵

It has been argued that there were no lay foundations in Durham before 1600. But there is clear evidence that about half of the schools founded or re-endowed in Durham were the result of secular initiatives, and lay benefactors were behind all the new schools in Northumberland in the same period.⁸⁶ Very often, education involved both the clergy and the laity, working together. Bishop Pilkington and the Earl of Westmorland collaborated in the re-launch of the grammar school at Darlington; which may well have been a shrewd move designed to reassure the doctrinally conservative Queen, with the Roman Catholic Earl perceived as a counterbalance to the radically Calvinist bishop. The school at Houghton was the result of a quadripartite indenture drawn up between its rector, Bernard Gilpin, Bishop Pilkington, the Dean and Chapter of Durham and a Londoner, John Heath, who had purchased a number of estates in the county, including the defunct hospital at Kepier.⁸⁷ The foundation of the free school at Heighington, by Elizabeth Jenison, widow of Thomas Jenison, in 1601, was another such enterprise. She was joined by her son, William, together with a local gentleman, a yeoman, the vicar of Aycliffe and two further clerics (one of whom was from Yorkshire), and the Dean and Chapter of Durham.⁸⁸ It was expedient to secure the support of the Dean and Chapter, for the parish of

Heighington lay within its officialty, or peculiar jurisdiction. But the school was supported materially by George Freville of Bishop Middleham, who later married Elizabeth Jenison and granted to her and her heirs £11 a year 'for the maintenance of an honest, discrete & learned schoole master... to keepe a schoole & teache & instruct children ...in grammer, humanity & other godly & virtuous learning...'.⁸⁹ Thus the school at Heighington was a truly collaborative ecclesiastical and lay venture, which illustrated the level of cooperation that could exist between the two spheres.

Over and above the encouragement of Calvinist ideals and the fostering of literacy to widen access to the reformed word, there were other practical motives for the establishment of schools. It has been posited that, from the sixteenth century, English boroughs saw a flourishing school as a sound investment in status which, in turn, helped to produce concentrations of literate people.⁹⁰ The point has also been made that a grounding in Latin was crucial for the industrialists of Newcastle, when that was the language in which technical works from abroad were produced.⁹¹ Accordingly, Newcastle had a 'free school' for the education of its freemen's sons. Unfortunately, its master, 'Mr Boroughs', became caught up in the conflict between Henry Sanderson and the grand lessees in the 1590s. Recommended by Sanderson as a diligent 'discoverer of seminaries', the schoolmaster had been approved by the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Durham and the late Lord President Huntingdon, all of whom had excellent Calvinist credentials. However, Boroughs had been removed by Henry Anderson during his term as mayor.⁹² Thus was exposed how secular interests could override other considerations.

Just as at Newcastle, schools were specifically designed to provide an education for the local youth. Heighington school was to 'be free for the children of all & every the Inhabitants & residents within the said parishe of Heighington & for all other children born within the said parish or mainteyned & kept at the charge of anie Inhabitant within the said parishe'. This was a feature common to the school at Houghton, whose pupils were required to be 'native born' in Durham or Northumberland, thereby conjoining the interests of both the constituent counties of the diocese. Yet, while the two schools were

established to cater for local youngsters, neither of their chief benefactors was a native of the north-eastern parts. George Freville – who had been instrumental in crushing the Northern Rising, thereafter settling on property forfeited to the crown and becoming a diligent servant of the county – was originally from Staffordshire,⁹³ while Heath's involvement in the Kepier school was a rare example of a Londoner contributing to local enterprise.⁹⁴ Geographic location did not always drive subsequent philanthropic interest, either. Elizabeth Jenison's son, Thomas, was described as being from Northamptonshire when he nominated John Robinson of Aycliffe to be the schoolmaster at his mother's school at Heighington in 1612.⁹⁵ This attention to supporting local scholarship was exemplified by Bernard Gilpin. For although he was originally from Westmorland, when he drew up his will he divided the residue of his estate between the poor of Houghton parish and its future scholars at Oxford.⁹⁶ There is also evidence of those scholars' continued attachment to the place of their birth. For example, the diary of Samuel Ward, later Master of Sidney Sussex College at Cambridge revealed a clear regard for his native Durham.⁹⁷ But above all, in their capacity as educators, the clergy had the opportunity to engage with, and even influence, some of the most significant members of their communities.

VI

Conversely, upon taking orders, many clergymen were dependent on lay benefactors to present them to livings. Even though Durham was unusual in the extent of ecclesiastical influence over advowsons, with the bishop and the dean and chapter exercising the rights over more than half the benefices in the diocese, a significant number was in lay hands. The most important of those lay patrons was the Crown, which was entirely reliant on the counsel of those with local knowledge. Indeed, it has been suggested that only three appointments were made on the recommendation of laymen who had no connection with the North-East of England.⁹⁸ But if local connections were crucial to clergymen's initial presentation to livings, the next stage of the process was far less narrowly circumscribed. Again as a consequence of the Reformation, a new Court of First Fruits and Tenths had been established to

handle the increase in revenue to the Crown from clerical taxation. Clergymen entered bonds to pay their first year's income to the crown in three instalments, at six monthly intervals, following their presentation to their livings, for which they had to provide sufficient sureties who undertook to pay any sums owing in the event of default.⁹⁹ Abolished in 1554, the court was replaced by an autonomous Office of First Fruits and Tenths within the Exchequer (which survived until its abolition in 1838). A register of bonds for first fruits (but not receipts) is extant in a series of composition books, which record details of the guarantors' designations or occupations as well as their place of residence.¹⁰⁰ These reveal much about relations between the clergy and their sureties.

As might be expected, there was a fair degree of interdependence within the diocese, with 22.5 per cent of Durham's clergy supported by those from the north-eastern parts. In addition, a little over 9 per cent were guaranteed by Yorkshiremen. Otherwise, for a part of the kingdom that was regarded as remote from the capital, reliance on London and Middlesex connections was considerable, amounting to just over a half of the diocese's sureties. North-eastern connections were not confined to a few parts of the capital, but were spread right across the city. Those that were concentrated in particular parishes supported clergy throughout the diocese, but it is difficult to discern any pattern that was otherwise peculiar to them. Londoners guaranteed the first fruits of 65 per cent of the wealthiest parishes in Durham and Northumberland and their archdeaconries, with the remainder divided pretty evenly between sureties from the diocese and from elsewhere. It could be inferred that the capital was better able to furnish guarantors of sufficient substance to underwrite sums as high as £124 for Houghton-le-Spring and £89 18s. 2d. for Bishop Wearmouth. However, a third of the guarantors for the poorest livings subject to payment of their first year's income (that is, more than £5 6s. 8d. but less than £15) also came from London.

A number of Durham clergymen (11.5 per cent) relied on support from family members. Of the forty-three such sureties that have been identified, seven were from the north-eastern counties, six were from Yorkshire and

almost all the others were from London. Apart from that, it is difficult to ascertain the motives for guarantors to stand surety, especially those from outwith the diocese. Because the vast majority were only involved in single arrangements, it could be assumed that the relationship between individual clergymen and their sponsors was personal. There were very few incidents of Londoners underwriting more than one clergyman. Of those that did, Benjamin Birkhead of St Martin's, Ludgate, and Richard Hook of Radcliffe, Middlesex, stood surety for their own relatives. William Todcaster of St Magnus, London, was always 'paired' with Roger Lever of the same parish, who backed several clergymen including John and Ralph Lever. Edward Lively of St Martin in the Fields supported a number of clergymen, but he had close links with the North-East, as MP for Berwick. He was also an associate of Bishop Neile, and the clergymen who enjoyed his support were part of the Bishop's own circle. Otherwise, it was Durham gentlemen who were involved in multiple sponsorships.

But, while around 90 per cent of Durham's clergy were supported from London, Yorkshire, Durham and Northumberland, the remaining sureties came from very far afield. Buckinghamshire, Coventry, Cumberland, Essex, Herefordshire, Kent, Lancashire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Somerset, Surrey, Sussex, Warwickshire, Westmorland and Wiltshire all provided guarantors. Far from being insular, it would seem that the diocese's clergy had extremely wide-ranging contacts. At the same time, while a little over a third of all the guarantors for the Durham clergy were styled as gentry (*generosus* and *armiger*), there were also representatives of almost fifty occupations who appeared in the composition books. They included doctors, lawyers, merchants, mariners, chandlers, cordwainers, salters, merchant tailors, haberdashers, drapers, innholders and grocers with a relatively high incidence of yeomen. In part, this reflected the nature of the north-eastern economy. But it also indicates that, far from being a closed caste, the Durham clergy had very broad connections across the social spectrum.

The difficulties that can be encountered in trying to reach an accurate evaluation of Durham from contemporary commentaries are epitomized in the oft-quoted letter from Richard Barnes to Burghley in February 1578, reporting his early efforts and achievements in his first year as its bishop. He observed that he had found ‘in the clergie a good reddinesse to applie their travels to their callings; onlie that Augian Stabulu the church of Durham excepted, whose stynke is grievous in the nose of god and of man, and which to purge farre passeth Hercules labour’.¹⁰¹ But it is not clear whether Barnes meant the cathedral and/or the city of Durham or the archdeaconry (coterminous with the county) of Durham or the entire diocese. It is significant that later writers have variously defined Barnes’s ‘Augean stable’ as the proliferation of ‘Papists’ in Durham, or else maintained that it referred to the Puritan clique which dominated the Dean and Chapter.¹⁰² Commenting on the so-called ‘Northern Rising’ of 1569, Barnes had expressly commended the obedience of the people of Northumberland, which he compared with ‘those stubborn, churlish people of the county of Durham and their neighbours of Richmondshire’.¹⁰³ The verdict was far from straightforward; and the secular picture was similarly inchoate.

For Barnes’s conclusions were in direct contrast to those drawn by the antiquary, William Camden, in his *Britannia*, begun in 1577, the same year that Barnes made his observations. Camden drew a clear distinction between the honourable Dunelmians and the perfidious Northumbrians.¹⁰⁴ Only Newcastle, in the northernmost archdeaconry, was perceived by Camden as having any redeeming features whatsoever. Yet, these conclusions were also far from consistent. In 1564, Newcastle, in direct contrast to other English towns, was perceived as being uniquely conformable, insofar as it was less hostile to the Elizabethan religious settlement than the counties of Durham and Northumberland.¹⁰⁵ By the 1580s, however, Newcastle had become the focus for a circle of particularly radical Puritans, including exiles from Scotland, while in the 1590s, Bishop Matthew was moved to complain that he felt himself powerless to tackle the more influential Catholics there.¹⁰⁶ But, even the picture that Matthew painted of the diocese was composed of a little

more light and shade than a bleak, monochrome tone. In his letter to Walsingham condemning his new diocese, in 1587, he nevertheless observed that since his arrival, 'friends both here & elsewhere have put some harte into me, by answering and replying to some of those obiections'.¹⁰⁷ And, in a postscript, he advised that, if his suit were successful, the authorities should 'consider of an honest sufficient man to succeed me here for I can assure you there is not a place in this land, all things to be considered, more worthy to be well beloved of this Calling'. In the face of these ambiguous and contradictory reports and evaluations, Walsingham, Burghley, and others representing the central authorities could be forgiven for their confusion about the state of the north-eastern parts. Mrs Matthews certainly became reconciled to tarrying for a further twenty years or more following her initial verdict on the diocese.

*I would like to thank Andrew Foster and A.J. Pollard for commenting on an earlier draft of this article. This is the outcome of research undertaken as part of the AHRC Centre for the North-East England History Institute, 2001-05, for which also see Diana Newton, *North-East England, 1569-1625: Governance, Culture and Identity* (Woodbridge, 2006).

¹ British Library, Cotton MSS, Titus B II, fols 284r-284v. For an account of the journey see H. Gee, 'A Sixteenth Century Journey to Durham', *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 3rd series, XIII (1915), 106. This was based on a Latin poem entitled *Iter Boreale*, composed by Dr Eedes, who accompanied Matthew to Durham.

² BL, Lansdowne MSS, 36, no 54.

³ BL, Cotton MSS, Titus B II, fols 284r-284v

⁴ Mervyn James, *Family, Lineage and Civil Society. A Study of Society, Politics, and Mentality in the Durham Region, 1500-1640* (Oxford, 1974), p. 61.

⁵ David Marcombe, 'A Rude and Heady People: the Local Community and the Rebellion of the Northern Earls', in *The Last Principality. Politics, Religion and Society in the Bishopric of Durham, 1494-1660*, ed. David Marcombe (Nottingham, 1987), p.123.

⁶ Marcombe, in idem, *Last Principality*, p.119; M.J. Tillbrook, 'Aspects of the Government and Society of County Durham, 1558-1642' (unpub. Ph.D. thesis, Liverpool Univ., 1981), p.478.

⁷ Jane Freeman, 'The Parish Ministry in the Diocese of Durham, c.1570-1640' (unpub. Ph.D. thesis, Durham Univ. 1979), 2. This was anticipated rather more cautiously by S.M. Keeling, in 'The Church and Religion in the Anglo-Scottish Border Counties, 1534 to 1572' (unpub. Ph.D. thesis, Durham Univ. 1975).

⁸ These calculations are based on the assessed value of clerical livings in the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* of 1535. Notwithstanding the problematic nature of this source it is possible to draw broad comparisons across the kingdom. The figures for Durham are in *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, ed. John Caley, Record Commission (1825), V, 299-330. They are compared with the analyses of Jeremy Collier in J. Collier, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain* (1852), IX, 362-63, cited in Rosemary O' Day, *The English Clergy. The Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession, 1558-1642* (Leicester, 1979), pp. 172-73.

⁹ I owe this perspective to Andrew Foster.

¹⁰ This was despite Queen Elizabeth's disapproval, whose 'exceptions' to his own marital status were acknowledged by Matthew. BL, Lans. MSS, 36, no 58.

¹¹ D(ean and) C(hapter) L(ibrary, Durham), Raine MSS, 124, fol. 160.

¹² The value of all the livings in the diocese have been extrapolated from the clerical subsidy roll of 1588, NA: PRO, E179 62/81; the 1603 visitation to the archdeaconry of Durham, D(urham) U(niversity) L(ibrary), DDR/A/ACD/1; the 1605 visitation to the archdeaconry of Northumberland, DUL, DDR/EV/VIS/2/2 ; the dean and chapter Officialty Act Book 1595-1606 (for October 1603), [No5], D/SJC/2; 'The severall sums to be payd to the proctors in the convocation of Yorke for 1605&1606. Viz of Parsons [rectors] vjd the pound & of vicars iijd the pound of the sayd severall valewes', DCL, Raine MSS fols 233-34; the Officialty Act Book 1608-1617 (for April 1615), D(urham) C(hapter) M(uniments), D/SJC/3.

¹³ See, BL, Lans. MSS, 68, no. 23.

¹⁴ I owe this latter piece of information to Andrew Foster.

¹⁵ John Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1541-1857, XI, Durham Diocese* (2004); BL, Additional MSS, 36776.

¹⁶ James, *Family, Lineage and Civil Society*, pp. 162, 114.

¹⁷ Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae, XI*; Jane Freeman, 'Ecclesiastical Patronage in Durham, 1558-1640', in Marcombe, *Last Principality*, p. 166.

¹⁸ *Pedigrees recorded at the visitations of the county palatine of Durham*, ed. Joseph Foster (1887), passim, for 1615 and 1666.

¹⁹ Through his 'artful conduct', George Lilburne went on to sequester the manor of Ford, part of the Hilton estate, in the turmoil of the 1640s. See Robert Surtees, *The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham* (Durham, 1816-40), II, 21-22_n.

²⁰ O' Day, *The English clergy*, p. 170 and she cites Bernard Folger, *Le clergé Protestant Rhenan au Siècle de la Réforme, 1555-1619* (Strasbourg, 1976), pp. 336-38.

²¹ Marcombe, 'The Dean and Chapter of Durham, 1558-1603' (unpub. Ph.D. thesis, Durham Univ. 1973), p. 136; Marcombe, 'A Rude and Heady People', in idem, *Last Principality*, p. 122.

²² Thomas Fuller, *The Church-History of Britain; From the Birth of Jesus Christ, Untill the Year M.DC.XLVIII*, 1655, XI, 133-34; *Wills and Inventories from the Registry at Durham*, II, ed. James Raine, (1860), p. 15; DUL, Mickleton and Spearman MSS, 10, p. 76.

²³ See Ralph A. Houlbrooke, *The English Family, 1450-1700*, (1984), p. 51, for the traditional view. In fact, the county gentry of Durham and Northumberland chose marriage partners from as far afield as Norfolk, Kent, London, Oxford and Somerset. Newton, *North-East England*, pp. 26-27.

²⁴ See, for example, pedigrees of bishops Pilkington, Barnes, Hutton and James in Surtees, *History of Durham*, I, lxxix, lxxxii, 149; *Ibid.*, IV, 141.

²⁵ DCL, Raine MSS, 124, fol. 160.

²⁶ My italics. *Wills and Inventories*, II, 15.

²⁷ Surtees, *History of Durham*, II, 326; J. C. Hodgson 'The Diary of Timothy Whittingham of Holmside', AA 3, xxi. The diarist was Dean Whittingham's great grandson. BL, Lans. MSS, 865, fols 88-96.

²⁸ Foster, *Durham Pedigrees*, for 1615 and 1666.

²⁹ DCL, Surtees MSS, 42, fols 110-11.

³⁰ The epithet is that of Tillbrook, thesis, p. 433.

³¹ Surtees, *History of Durham*, IV, 141.

³² *C(alendar of) S(tate) P(apers) D(omestic)*, 1580-1625, pp. 355-56. Toby Matthew to Lord Burghley, 16 October 1593.

³³ Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1541-1857, X, Coventry and Lichfield Diocese* (2003), pp. 70-71; 'Religious Houses: St Mary's hospital', in Eneas Mackenzie, *Historical Account of Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Including the Borough of Gateshead* (1827), pp. 137-45; BL, Add.

MSS, 33207, fol. 17. Essex had connections with the North-East. His sister Dorothy married the Earl of Northumberland the following year and, while the marriage was not successful, the brothers-in-law remained on good terms.

³⁴ DUL, Mickleton and Spearman MSS, 10, p.76.

³⁵ Marcombe, thesis, p. 26.

³⁶ DUL, Mickleton and Spearman MSS, 10, p.76.

³⁷ Martin Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570-1640* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 17-18.

³⁸ DUL, DDR/EJ/CCD/1/3 fol.127

³⁹ DCM, T/YB fols 77-78. According to Andrew Foster there is very little evidence of bishops complaining about their lack of power in Durham.

⁴⁰ BL, Add. MSS, 33207, fols 5, 7, 9-11. And see Newton, *North-East England*, pp. 135-36.

⁴¹ *The Acts of the High Commission Court within the Diocese of Durham*, ed. William H. D. Longstaffe, SS, XXXIV (1857), 9.

⁴² The canons of 1571 had expressly excluded husbandmen and suchlike from becoming clergymen to try and address the decline in clerical standards. See *The Canons of 1571*, Church Historical Society, XL, 26, 61.

⁴³ Evidence of many tithing disputes can be found in the depositions taken by commissioners for the King's Remembrancer's side of the Exchequer Court, NA: PRO E134.

⁴⁴ Marcombe, in idem, *Last Principality*, pp. 125-26, 145.

⁴⁵ For the most recent reassessment see K. J. Kesselring, "'A Cold Pye for the Papists': Constructing and Containing the Northern Rising of 1569', *Journal of British Studies*, XLIII (2004).

⁴⁶ NA: PRO, E178/1755; PRO, ADM 75/86.

⁴⁷ S. J. Watts, *From Border to Middle Shire. Northumberland 1586-1625* (Leicester, 1975), p. 89.

⁴⁸ NA: PRO, SP 14/21/18; Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Marquis of Salisbury Manuscripts*, XVII, 112, 189-90, 192-9. This was before the Gunpowder Plot of November 1605. See D. Newton, *The Making of the Jacobean Regime. James VI and I and the Government of England, 1603-1605*, Royal Historical Society, Studies in History (Woodbridge, 2005), passim, for the significance of the months beforehand and pp. 107-8, for Roger Widdrington.

⁴⁹ HMC, *Salisbury*, XVII, 293-5.

⁵⁰ Thus, the King and his Council had recently written to the sheriff of Northumberland, the diligent and conscientious Protestant, Ralph Delaval, 'not to be so forward against recusants', N(orthumberland) R(ecord) O(ffice) (Gosforth), 1 DE6/2.

⁵¹ Michael C. Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 9; Ethan H. Shagan, *Popular Politics and the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 2003), p. 7 and see Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation. Europe's House Divided, 1490-1700* (2003), pp. 382-93.

⁵² HMC, *Salisbury*, XVII, 483, 489, 495, 519; NA: PRO, SP 14/16/191, 199; PRO, 14/17/11.

⁵³ James, *Family, Lineage and Civil society*, p. 51 and passim.

⁵⁴ Iain W. Archer, 'The Government of London, 1500-1650', *The London Journal*, XXVI (2001), 23-24. As he identifies 1640-42 as the period when 'several key elements of the arrangements which had neutralized faction were challenged', it must be assumed the first quarter of the seventeenth century was relatively harmonious, too.

⁵⁵ For this see Newton, *North-East England*, chapter 5.

⁵⁶ BL, MS Lans. MSS, 81, fol. 104.

⁵⁷ HMC, *Salisbury*, IV, pp.208-10.

⁵⁸ *Memoirs of the Life of Mr Ambrose Barnes, Late Merchant and Sometimes Alderman of Newcastle upon Tyne*, ed. W. H. D. Longstaffe, SS, L, (1867), 293, 295.

⁵⁹ NA: PRO SP14/88/235; W. Palmes, *Life of Mrs Dorothy Lawson of St Antony's near Newcastle-upon-Tyne in Northumberland*, ed. G. B. Richardson (Newcastle, 1851), pp. 52-54.

⁶⁰ Thomas Jackson, *Works of Thomas Jackson* (repr. Oxford, 1884), I, xlii.

⁶¹ NA: PRO, SP 14/88/235.

⁶² Robert Jenison, *The Cities Safetie or a Fruitful Treatise (and Useful for these Dangerous Times): a Treatise on Psalm 127.1* (1630), pp. 6-9; And see D. J. Lamburn, "Digging and dunging": Some Aspects of Lay Influence in the Northern Towns', in *Life and Thought in the Northern Church, c.1100-c.1700. Essays in Honour of Claire Cross*, ed. Diana Wood (Woodbridge, 1999).

⁶³ Roger Howell, *Newcastle and the Puritan Revolution, A Study of the Civil War in North England* (Oxford, 1967), p. 85.

⁶⁴ Andrew Foster, 'Archbishop Richard Neile Revisited', in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c.1560-1660*, ed. P. Lake and M. Questier (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 169-70 and 164.

⁶⁵ DUL, Mickleton and Spearman MSS, 23, fol. 123. The precise relationship between Matthew and Luke Hutton has been a matter of debate. For instance, Thomas Fuller later mistakenly asserted that Luke's father was the prebendary Robert Hutton (Fuller, *Church-History of Britain*, X, 38-39). But, as Robert Hutton was not born until 1589, that relationship was impossible.

⁶⁶ Sir John Harrington, *A Brief View of the State of the Church ... to 1608 ... an Additional Supply to Doctor Godwin's Catalogue of Bishops*, 1653, p. 192. Harrington died in 1612.

⁶⁷ See, Andrew W. Foster, 'The Struggle for Parliamentary Representation for Durham, c.1600-1641', in Marcombe, *Last Principality*, p. 186 and 'The Clerical Estate Revisited', in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Basingstoke, 1993), pp. 149, 157. And see James, *Family, Lineage and Civil Society*, pp. 163-4, for the role of clerical JPs in Durham.

⁶⁸ These conclusions are based upon the attendance records in the Quarter Sessions Indictment Rolls in D(urham) R(ecord) O(ffice), Q/S/I 1-8 and the *Vetera Indictamenta*, or Quarter Sessions records, in NRO (Morpeth), QS1.

⁶⁹ For a discussion of this in relation to the county gentry and urban oligarchies see Newton, *North-East England*, pp. 56-63.

⁷⁰ This is according to those clergy whose origins are known. See Freeman, thesis, p. 22.

⁷¹ NA: PRO, SP 59/35/243. And see Newton, *North-East England*, chapter 5.

⁷² Foster, in Marcombe, *Last Principality*, pp.176-94.

⁷³ DUL, Mickleton and Spearman MSS, 2, fol. 387; *A(cts of the) P(rivy)C(ouncil)*, 1625-6, pp. 453-56.

⁷⁴ M. J. Tillbrook, 'Arminianism and Society in county Durham, 1617-1642', in Marcombe, *Last Principality*, pp. 202-19.

⁷⁵ DUL, Add MSS, 866.

⁷⁶ Freeman, thesis, p.323.

⁷⁷ *Wills and Inventories*, II, 129; DUL, Probate Records 1609.

⁷⁸ The average figures were 53.5% for Durham compared to 46% for Surrey. See Freeman, thesis, p.330, which makes the comparison with R. Christophers, 'The Social and Educational Background of the Surrey Clergy'. (unpub. Ph.D. thesis, London Univ., 1975), p.266.

⁷⁹ J.G.A. Pocock, 'Schools and schoolmasters in some Durham episcopal records, 1577-1801', *Research Review [Durham]*, III (1952), 15.

⁸⁰ J.J. Vickerstaff, *A Great Revolutionary Deluge?: Education and the Reformation in County Durham*, Teesside Papers in North Eastern History, 2 (Middlesbrough, 1992), pp. 5, 45.

⁸¹ BL, Lans. MSS, 981, fol.136; *Endowed Charities, Administrative County of Durham, and County Boroughs of Gateshead and Sunderland*, Great Britain Charity Commission (1904), I, 192.

⁸² BL, Lans. MSS, 7, no 12. Notwithstanding Whittingham's concerns about the quality of Durham grammar school's master in 1563, all its masters thereafter held MAs from Oxford or Cambridge. See Marcombe, thesis, p. 13.

⁸³ *The Victoria County History of Durham*, reprint of Constable ed., 1905-07, and St. Catherine P. ed., 1928 (1968), I, 377.

⁸⁴ BL, Lans. MSS, 902, fols 226r-228v.

⁸⁵ DCL, Hunter MSS, 13, item 1.

⁸⁶ Vickerstaffe. *A Great Revolutionary Deluge?*, p. 36; Freeman, thesis, 298 and Appendix C, 'Endowed Schools in Durham and Northumberland, 1500-1640'.

⁸⁷ BL, Lans. MSS, 902, fols 226r-228v.

⁸⁸ BL, Egerton MSS, 2877, fols 72r-73r.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, fols 73r-75v.

⁹⁰ R. A. Houston, *Scottish Literacy and the Scottish Identity. Illiteracy and Society in Scotland and Northern England, 1600-1800* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 51-52.

⁹¹ Brian Mains and Anthony Tuck, *Royal Grammar School, Newcastle upon Tyne, a History of the School in its Community* (Stocksfield, 1986), p. 3.

⁹² BL, Lans. MSS,81, fol. 104.

⁹³ Surtees, *History of Durham*, III, 34, 36; Newton, *North-East England*, p. 63.

⁹⁴ Londoners' interest was usually purely profit driven, with financing local infrastructure left to local contractors. See Newton, *North-East England*, p. 111; Ranald Michie, 'The City of London as a British financial centre: medieval to modern' (unpub. paper from the AHRC Centre for NEEHI colloquium at the University of Northumbria, September 2004).

⁹⁵ DCM, B/BA/7 fol. 258v. The Northamptonshire/Durham connections between the two families continued into the next generation when Nicholas Freville of Hardwick married Mary Jenison of Northampton.

⁹⁶ *Wills and Inventories*, II, 83-94.

⁹⁷ *Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries*, ed. M. M. Knappen (1933), pp. 33-43, 102-23, 108-9.

⁹⁸ Freeman, in Marcombe, *Last Principality*, p.163.

⁹⁹ For the history and process see Patrick Carter, 'The Records of the Court of First Fruits and Tenths: 1540-54', *Archives*, XXI (1994), 57-65.

¹⁰⁰ They are in NA: PRO, E334. A similar analysis of composition entries, by Alison Dalton at Oxford, for Gloucestershire and Worcestershire in the mid sixteenth century, reveal some striking similarities between the two, ostensibly distinctive, areas. I am very grateful to Ms Dalton for making her provisional findings available to me.

¹⁰¹ BL, Lans. MSS, 25, no 78.

¹⁰² James, *Family, Lineage and Civil Society*, p.148; Tillbrook, thesis, p.441_n.

¹⁰³ *The Injunctions and other Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Richard Barnes, Bishop of Durham, 1575-87*, ed. J. Raine, SS, XXII (1850), x.

¹⁰⁴ William Camden, *Britain, or a Chorographical Account of the Most Flourishing Kingdoms, England, Scotland, and Ireland*, trans. Philemon Holland (1610), pp. 685, 796. He cited the eminent Scottish poet, John Johnston, whose comments about Durham epitomized its enduring palatinate associations with the familiar juxtaposition of the pious warrior:

'Of Armes or of Religion may others boast, I grant,

Of Armes and Religion both, this City makes her vaunt'. *Ibid.*, p. 799.

¹⁰⁵ 'A Collection of Original Letters from the Bishops to the Privy Council, 1564, with Returns of the Justices of the Peace and Others within their Respective Dioceses, Classified According to their Religious Convictions', ed. Mary Bateson, *Camden Miscellany*, IX (1895), 65-67.

¹⁰⁶ Newton, *North-East England*, pp. 127-30; Rosamund Oates, 'Catholicism, Conformity and the Community in the Elizabethan Diocese of Durham', *Northern History*, XLIII (2006), 70.

¹⁰⁷ BL, Cotton MSS, Titus B II, fols 284r-284v.