

IX

THE NEWCASTLE CLERGY AND THE QUAKERS

Roger Howell, Jr.

IN AUGUST 1653, James Naylor wrote a letter to George Fox following a well-attended meeting of Quakers at the home of Anthony Pearson, secretary to the governor of Newcastle, Sir Arthur Hesilrige; obviously pleased with the success of the meeting, he told Fox, "I belevee it will cause a Shatter in peoples minds in these parts."¹ The judgement was certainly correct, for the Quakers were to prove to be a very disturbing element in the religious history of the Newcastle area during the Interregnum, both their doctrines and their attitudes appearing to pose worrying threats to the oligarchical establishment that ruled the town in the aftermath of the English Revolution.² For all its importance, however, the history of the early Quaker movement in the Newcastle area is not well known. The usual sources on early Quakerism, such as the *First Publishers of Truth* and Fox's *Journal*, provide tantalizing hints rather than a fully documented story; in the first, there is no local report at all, while the second contains references to two visits by the Quaker leader, neither of them fully explicable without reference to other material.³ But one major source of information does exist in the form of controversial writings against the Quakers on the part of the Newcastle clergy and their supporters. By combining an analysis of that literature with the scattered references in Quaker sources, newspapers, and official papers, one can construct a reasonably coherent picture of the early Quaker movement in the Newcastle area, and, equally importantly, can identify the expressed reasons for the high level of animosity that existed between the Quakers and the clerical and magisterial establishment of the town.

In understanding both the impact of the Quakers and the reaction to them by the authorities, it is of some importance to remember that Newcastle, in the minds of most Englishmen, was seen as the centre of a religiously backward area of the country in the seventeenth century. Clearly one of those "dark corners of the kingdom", the North had been characterized before the Civil Wars as a place "where God was little better known than amongst the Indians",⁴ and there was little in the immediate post-war situation to lead Puritan observers to think any better of it. Although strenuous efforts, stemming from both local and national initiatives, were eventually to provide in the Newcastle area in the 1650s a more sufficient clerical provision than had been the case before 1640 (albeit a restricted one on doctrinal grounds), there is some validity to the suggestion that the Newcastle area remained something of a spiritual vacuum, "official" religion not adequately responding to the spiritual needs of the population, and thus creating fertile ground for the emer-

gence of new and enthusiastic sects.⁵ Certainly the early Quaker leaders saw the Newcastle area as one devoid of genuine spirituality. James Nayler, for example, described it in the following terms:⁶ “The thing that was seen concerning Newcastle, all his pillars to be dry, and his trees to be bare, and much nakedness, that they have not scarcely the bark, but are as a wilderness where much winde and cold comes, where there must be much labour before the ground be brought into order; for it’s a stony ground, and there is much bryers and thorns about her, and many trees have grown wilde long, and have scarce earth to cover their roots, but their roots are seen, and how they stand in the stones, and these trees bears no fruit, but bears moss, and much winde pierce thorow and clatters them together, and makes the trees shake, but still the rootes are held amongst the stones, and are bald and naked.”

Nayler’s characterization of the spiritual life of Newcastle is doubtless an exaggeration, but it was not wholly devoid of truth. It would appear that the Newcastle clergy, both independents and presbyterians, sensed as well the precarious nature of the Interregnum religious settlement in the area, and that this realization was a major contributing factor to the unusually high level of co-operation between the two major religious factions in the area. In a well-known passage, Cuthbert Sydenham remarked that at a time “when all the Nation have been in a puzzle about errors, sects, and schismes, even almost to bloud, you have sate as in a Paradise, no disturbances in your Pulpits, no railings or disputings, Presbyterians and Independents preaching in the same place, fasting and praying together, in heavenly harmony, expressing nothing but kindnesse to each other, in their meetings ready to help each other.”⁷ While Sydenham’s glowing picture is, like Nayler’s bleak one, not wholly accurate, it does identify an important characteristic in the religious life of the town,⁸ and that characteristic of co-operation was to be strengthened decidedly under the impact of the perceived threats in the 1650s to the established religious order by the emergent sects, especially the Baptists and the Quakers.⁹

The main outlines of the emergence of the Quaker movement in the area can be quickly sketched. George Fox visited the region in 1653, passing through Durham, Northumberland, and Newcastle. His visit left few records, but he appears to have secured a number of conversions, and he noted significantly in his journal that “ye preists began to bee in a mighty rage att Newcastle.”¹⁰ At about the same time Anthony Pearson, who was to play a key role in protecting and encouraging the nascent Quaker movement, was converted.¹¹ He was sitting as one of the judges at the sessions at Appleby in January 1653 when James Nayler was examined about his beliefs and activities. The experience was profoundly unsettling. As he noted in a letter several months later, he had long seen himself as serving and worshipping the true God and thought he had attained a high level of religious faith, but now he was confounded and felt his wisdom to be folly; he likened himself to a poor, shattered vessel tossed to and fro, and sought the spiritual aid of Fox and Nayler. “Though I was their Enemy, they are my ffreinds.”¹² The process of conversion was swift, and Pearson was soon addressing a statement to Parliament in favour of the Quakers, confidently asserting that “in the Northern Parts of this Nation, God hath raised and is raising up his own Seed in many people, according to his promises.”¹³

Pearson quickly became the hub of the movement. He visited Fox,¹⁴ Nayler visited him,¹⁵ and by the following year he was calling for a missionary tour by Nayler to the area: "those toward the East Side of Newcastle would faine see Jaimes once; when he comes it were well if he could passe thorough them."¹⁶

From about the time of Pearson's conversion, the pattern of Quaker activity began a noticeable increase. In October 1653 there was a large Quaker meeting at Bishop Auckland which ended in a riot.¹⁷ In the same year, various Quakers, including John Audland, Edward Burrough, and Miles Halhead, were active in Durham and Northumberland.¹⁸ From the very start, the Quaker spokesmen were faced with a violent antipathy; typical of the reception accorded them was the fate of Edward Burrough and his colleagues when they disrupted a church service in east Durham: "they knock't ym downe with clubs, as if they had been Beasts, their Hatts were driven off their Heads amongst ye rude Multitude, who appeared as if they had been without limitt to have devoured all before them, Yet Friends were preserved, & a meeting was settled at Shotton."¹⁹ Despite resistance that was at times violent, the Quakers were striking roots and gaining permanent converts. Even the other chief sect noted their impact on the area; the Hexham Baptist Thomas Tillam wrote in 1654 to the church at Leominster that "only those deceived souls, called Quakers, have been very active in these parts, and have seduced two of our society and six of Newcastle church."²⁰ During 1654 Pearson and Nayler held meetings in both Northumberland and Durham,²¹ and their followers began to mount a campaign of church visitations in an attempt to spread their views. Thomas Rawlinson reported in a letter from Durham in early March 1654 that eight Quakers had visited churches on the same day, at least one of them being put in the stocks for his efforts, though, Rawlinson added, the Lord soon delivered him out of the hands of "unreasonable" men.²²

One striking indication of the impact the Quakers were having was the sudden flow of anti-Quaker writings from the Newcastle clergy and their adherents. The first such attack appeared in the summer of 1653,²³ and was followed rapidly by the two main contributions to the debate, both written by a team of five Newcastle area clergymen, Thomas Weld, Richard Prideaux, Samuel Hammond, William Cole, and William Durant; *The Perfect Pharisee under Monkish Holinesse* appeared in 1653 and *A Further Discovery of that Generation of Men Called Quakers* was published in the following year as a response to the protestations the first tract had occasioned on the part of the Quakers themselves.²⁴ Nor were the attacks solely the province of the clergy, for the prominent alderman and former mayor Thomas Ledgard joined in the literary fray in 1653, and followed up his initial blast against the Quakers by two further publications, both unfortunately no longer extant.²⁵ Even works not primarily concerned with the controversy were drawn into it; Thomas Weld, writing in the preface to Cuthbert Sydenham's *Hypocrisie Discovered*, went out of his way to attack the Quakers.²⁶ There was, it might be noted, a fine irony in the fact that the latter publication was dedicated to Sir Arthur Hesilrige, whose secretary Pearson was at the heart of the troublesome Quaker movement.

After the flurry of anti-Quaker pamphleteering in 1653 and 1654, direct mention

of the threat occasioned by the Quakers in the vicinity of Newcastle became scanty. But various sources indicate that the movement was continuing a steady and worrying process of gaining converts. It would appear that the movement made more substantial progress in Gateshead than it did in Newcastle, probably as a result of the inability of the Newcastle magistrates to control developments outside the area of their immediate legal authority; in any case, a Quaker meeting in Pipewell Gate appears to have been already firmly established by the time George Fox revisited the area in 1657.²⁷ Scattered references indicate the continuation of Quaker activity in both Durham and Northumberland. Pearson's home at Rampshaw remained an active centre, while traces of the movement are also to be found at Durham, Heighington, Hartlepool, and Sunderland.²⁸ Less is known about the activities of the Quakers in Newcastle itself, but there are several indications that they continued their activities vigorously, despite the opposition of clergy and town magistrates. In December 1656 several petitions, including one from the ministers of Northumberland, Durham, and Newcastle, were presented to Parliament, complaining against the "growth and exorbitances" of the Quakers.²⁹ It would appear that the growth of Quakerism had also become a matter of concern for some of the chartered companies of Newcastle. The Merchant Adventurers' Company, for example, was worried about "a great apostacy and falling off from the truth to Popery, Quakerism, and all manner of heresy and unheard-of blasphemy and prophaneness" and passed an order as a result that no Catholics, Quakers, or others who failed to attend the public services of the town should be taken on as apprentices.³⁰ Nor was such concern an idle threat, for there is some evidence to suggest that the company was working on the basis that no known Quaker should be taken as an apprentice as early as 1654, before the passage of the act. In that year the enrolment of Thomas Turner, apprentice to Edward Hall, was suspended because it was suspected that he was a Quaker; he does not appear to have been able to satisfy the company, for his indenture was not enrolled.³¹

During the winter of 1657-8, it would appear that the Quaker movement was making a sustained effort with respect to Newcastle, and every indication points to Anthony Pearson as being one of the strong moving spirits of the effort. The activity of the Quakers at this point reached a sufficient level of intensity to arouse the interest and concern of national as well as local figures. General Monck wrote to Secretary Thurloe in February, enclosing books and papers to demonstrate the great efforts being made by the Quakers in the North and in the Borders to gain converts.³² He made a special point of mentioning the role of Pearson and noted that there was an extensive traffic in subversive books between Newcastle and the Scottish Lowlands. References in Quaker correspondence confirm the impression that Newcastle was frequently used as the crucial link in the chain of communication between English and Scottish Quakers.³³ At the same time, Fox made his second and more fully documented visit to Newcastle. It is of some significance that he came as a direct response to the published criticisms of the Quakers by the Newcastle alderman Thomas Ledgard, who had asserted that where churches existed and the saints dwelt, the Quakers dared not appear, for like owls they were bred in "dark places".³⁴ Fox's

own version of the challenge was worded somewhat differently, but the sense was the same; he noted in his journal that he came to prove false Ledgard's assertion that "ye Quakers would not come Into noe great toundes, but lived in ye ffells like butter flies."³⁵ As might be expected, Fox's visit amounted to little more than an uneasy confrontation with the authorities. In company with Pearson, he sought a meeting with Ledgard and some of the other aldermen; only Ledgard himself and one unnamed companion attended the meeting, which rapidly degenerated into an exchange of heated words, Fox taunting Ledgard with the term "butterfly", and Ledgard accusing Fox of violating the Sabbath by attempting to hold the meeting. To the latter point Fox retorted that it was the Newcastle magistrates who violated the real Sabbath by celebrating the first day of the week instead of the last. At best, it can be described as a distinctly unfruitful encounter, and Fox eventually withdrew from Newcastle and proceeded to the more hospitable ground of Gateshead where a Quaker meeting was well established.³⁶

The visit by Fox had an extraordinary aftermath which may, perhaps, be taken as indicative of the tense relations that existed between the Newcastle clergy and magistrates on the one hand and the Quaker meeting in Gateshead on the other. The Quakers in Gateshead seem to have made regular attempts to hold meetings in Newcastle, much to the displeasure of the Newcastle authorities. When Fox departed, he left George Whitehead behind to continue the efforts, and a series of confrontations occurred.³⁷ William Coatesworth of South Shields and some associates hired a large room in Newcastle with the intent of holding a Quaker meeting; before the meeting was fully assembled, the mayor and his officers appeared, dispersed those who had gathered, and escorted them to the limits of the town's liberties, charging them in the name of the Lord Protector to "come no more into Newcastle, to have any more meetings there, at your peril."³⁸ Undeterred, the Quakers were back the next day attempting to hold a meeting out of doors near the river side, and once again the magistrates promptly removed them. The next attempt involved a scheme to rent the Guildhall, a scheme foiled by the intervention of the Newcastle clergyman Samuel Hammond, who was promptly accused by the Quakers of bribing the keeper of the hall to go back on his promise to let it to the Quakers. In the end, a large outdoor meeting was held within the Castle liberties, no doubt to the great consternation of the town authorities. Whitehead himself preached for two or three hours, his voice, as he later claimed, carrying over the Tyne clearly into Gateshead.³⁹ The meeting passed off without undue incident, though a large and potentially disruptive crowd had gathered; Whitehead himself recalled feelings of gratitude towards the town authorities who escorted him safely through the crowd at the end of the meeting.⁴⁰ Having found themselves incapable of preventing the meeting, the town authorities apparently had gone out of their way to avoid its becoming a pretext for violence.⁴¹ This series of confrontations was followed by a bizarre incident that predictably was featured extensively in subsequent anti-Quaker propaganda. William Coatesworth, a key local figure in the attempt to hold the meetings, took horse for the South in a state which even his Quaker colleagues admitted was one of some discomposure. The Quaker version was that he was on his way to London to appeal

to Cromwell against the ill-treatment of the Quakers by the Newcastle clergy and magistrates. The establishment version was that he had gone mad and was fleeing to the South under the delusion that he had murdered the mayor of Newcastle. Both accounts agree that he got no further than Durham where he died within a matter of days.⁴² For those opposing the Quakers, it was a sign sent from God; not only had Coatesworth been struck down for his actions, but in his madness he had revealed precisely the sort of dangerous anarchism which they chose to associate with the Quakers.⁴³

Concern over the Quakers in the Newcastle area did not end with the excitement of Whitehead's preaching and the confusion of Coatesworth's hurried departure and death. The movement appears to have gained additional impetus in 1659 when Lambert's army was in Newcastle. There were a number of Quakers among Lambert's troops, and they appear to have indulged in some active proselytizing among the community.⁴⁴ Post-Restoration visitation returns indicate that, for all the harrassment during the Interregnum and after, the Quakers had struck permanent roots in Northumberland and Durham.⁴⁵ In any case, the concern expressed by the clergy of the Newcastle area did not diminish. John Bewick published in London in the year of the Restoration a further attack on the attitudes of the Quakers,⁴⁶ and the last, unpublished work of the sometime Newcastle schoolmaster George Ritschel was devoted to the same theme.⁴⁷

The history of early Quakerism in the Newcastle area reveals a clear pattern of hostility on the part of the Newcastle clergy and magistrates. On what grounds was that hostility based and how was the opposition to the Quakers expressed other than through overt attempts to prevent meetings from taking place? The anti-Quaker writings which have already been mentioned and the replies they called forth provide a useful and informative summary of such concerns, fears, and antagonisms. The arguments used against the Quakers were not original to the Newcastle area; anti-Quaker literature was, in many ways, built up from a series of over-lapping stereotypes, and the hostile assertions made against Quakers in one area were quickly picked up and copied in another; the Newcastle clergymen, for example, not only borrowed positions and information from other published anti-Quaker writings,⁴⁸ but solicited such information by letter from acquaintances outside the Newcastle area.⁴⁹ In general, the criticisms offered of the Quakers can be classified under five broad headings: theoretical or scriptural, social, political, psychological, and single-issue antagonisms. Though convenient for the purpose of analysis, these categories should not be seen as rigid or exclusive ones; a case of single-issue antagonism such as the question of tithes obviously had scriptural, political, social, and even psychological dimensions. But if the overlapping is allowed for, the division into categories will provide a useful framework for the analysis of this literature.

The Newcastle clergy made a strenuous effort to pitch their argument on scriptural or theoretical grounds. This is particularly noticeable in the two combined efforts of 1653-4, *The Perfect Pharisee under Monkish Holinesse* and *A Further Discovery of that Generation of Men Called Quakers*, but it is likewise reflected in Hammond's 1658 tract *The Quakers House Built upon the Sand* and Bewick's 1660 *An Answer*

to a *Quakers Seventeen Heads of Queries*. The first two of these tracts are the most elaborate attempts to argue a scriptural case against the Quakers. Both set out seventeen positions and three principles which were attributed to the Quakers and then attempted to confute them by argument from scripture. There is no doubt that the method employed, while effective as a format for argumentation, was open to considerable abuse. Some of the positions attributed to the Quakers, such as the argument that they postulated an equality of man with God,⁵⁰ were at best gross distortions of Quaker teachings, and were simply denied in Quaker replies.⁵¹ Such denials, it must be admitted, had little impact on the Newcastle clergy who simply saw them as a spur to the reiteration of the charges backed up by further circumstantial evidence and citation of scripture. Nayler's attempt to answer the first pamphlet was dismissed out of hand as an exercise in evasion: "There is such palpable shufflings, such miserable weaknesse, and such horrible rayling, as that we should not have medled with it at all, but that we beleeve it is the designe of God to lay more and more open the spirits of these men."⁵² Those insinuations which Nayler did not specifically deny but only dismissed in a general way were taken by the Newcastle clergy to be "confessed by him."⁵³

The attribution to the Quakers of positions which they did not hold and the treatment of their denials as mere evasion should not disguise the fact that there were genuine theoretical differences between the two groups that could be expressed in the familiar theological language of the day. To the Newcastle clergy, the Quaker views of justification and the inner spirit reduced man to the covenant of works. "Is not this to bring us perfectly under the Covenant of Works, and to make us our own reconcilers, and so to make void the death of Christ? ... And so this Antichristian Generation have totally renounced the Lord that bought them: For, this our standing perfect is in that assertion attributed wholly to our own power ... these are the people that pretend to lead you to Christ, that thus leave you to the meer strength of your weak and rotten natures, both for life and holiness."⁵⁴ The Quakers were quick to respond that the Calvinist emphasis on the sinfulness of man and the importance of scriptures denied the power of faith and neglected the role of the preacher as a physician of the soul. Thus George Fox commenting on *The Perfect Pharisee* noted "You are no more made wise than the Pharisees were with the Scriptures without faith: the Pharisees were not made wise unto Salvation by the Scriptures without faith, neither are you: But who are in the faith, they are made wise to Salvation through the Scriptures."⁵⁵ And referring to *A Further Discovery*, he observed sharply, "yee are pleading while men be upon earth they must have a body of sin and he that saith other wayes is a deceiver, and so ye keep them in their wounds and sores, putrifying and imperfect, and not makers up of the breach and binders up of the wounds."⁵⁶

Two aspects of the theoretical argument are perhaps worthy of special note. The first is the attempt by the Newcastle clergy to link the Quakers by association with other religious groups towards whom there would be a predictably hostile response. "Now besides those which we have named, the Reader will easily observe such a masse and heape of Arminian, Socinian, Familisticall errors in their Doctrines layd

downe in the *Perfect Pharisee*, that he may clearly observe where the spirit of Antichrist works in all deceiveableness in this last time."⁵⁷ In particular, there was an attempt to link the doctrines of the Quakers and the Catholics. Seven "similarities" between the Quakers and the Papists were identified and set forth by the Newcastle clergy. "It is as claere as the noone day ... that the Papall Apostacy and State is the Antichrist so often prophesied of in Scripture. Now it is as plaine that the very distinguishing Doctrines and practices of these men are such as are the maine principles of that man of sinne in opposition to Jesus Christ."⁵⁸ What was so unambiguously clear to Weld and his colleagues would appear less so to the modern eye; much of the similarity was found in the Quakers' attitudes towards scripture and salvation, both patently misconstrued by the Newcastle clergy, while the laboured attempt to link Catholic monastic practices with Quaker behaviour in renouncing the goods of the world was simply far-fetched.

The second theoretical point to be noted is the response of the Newcastle clergy to the charge that they were in no position to attack the Quaker attitude towards worship when they were themselves, as presbyterians and independents, divided on the same issue. The response tends to confirm the impression that the outward co-operation between presbyterians and independents in Newcastle was the product of perceived threats to their precarious position in an area where puritanism had not been strong before 1640, for it does not deny the existence of differences but attempts to gloss them over as being of the second order and subsumed by a common Christian faith. "Do we not all agree? and is not our reall agreement knowne in all the Doctrines of the Gospel? As for matters of discipline, we doe really confesse there is some difference in judgement amongst us. ... Could we not agree in the worship of God? or doth he know what the worship of God is? or what difference is betwixt worship and discipline?"⁵⁹ The marginal note introducing the discussion sums up the Newcastle position neatly: "Difference in judgement about discipline no breach of joynt appearance against the methods of Satan."⁶⁰

When the attack on the Quakers moved from theoretical questions of positions to practical questions of principles and actions, the argument frequently achieved a higher level of reality. The scriptural argument need not be dismissed as hypocritical, simply because it was often based on dubious assertions about Quaker beliefs. The perception of important theological distinctions touching the very central issues of Christian faith was real enough, even if the evidence on which it was based was unconsciously distorted or perversely misunderstood. But when it came to Quaker practices, on the other hand, the facts of the dispute were undeniable from both sides. The disruption of church services, the failure to show proper respect to magistrates and others by doffing hats and employing a deferential "sir" or "master", and the strong appeal of the Quaker message to members of the lower classes are all documentable phenomena, admitted and defended by the Quakers and feared by the traditional ruling groups. As such, these practices became key ingredients in the anti-Quaker attack both in Newcastle and elsewhere, and far-reaching implications were drawn from what may appear to modern readers to be surface or trivial actions. The social and political objections to the Quakers can be summed up by the obser-

vation that they were seen as disruptive to the fine balance of traditional society, a consideration that obviously had special meaning in a society that had just emerged from the confusion of civil war and the toppling of the monarchy.

Though the argument, in Newcastle at least, was seldom couched in precise terms, it is clear that there was concern that Quakerism had appeal among the lower orders. Samuel Hammond for one made the point in his attack that one group to which the doctrines of the Quakers had particular attraction was "the unlearned and unstable".⁶¹ But of even greater concern to those in authority was the unwillingness of the Quakers to observe traditional forms of deference and their plainly anti-social behaviour when it came to making a public demonstration of their beliefs. There was some attempt to argue this point against the Quakers on scriptural grounds. Thomas Ledgard, for example, asked how the Quakers could be expected to be of any "gracious attainment" so long as they walked by another rule than that of the Gospels.⁶² Weld and his colleagues attempted to prove that the Quakers were inconsistent in their application of scripture when they would not salute others, arguing that the scripture passage cited by them in defence of this⁶³ also forbade the wearing of shoes and carrying of purses, which they ignored "as is evident to any that observe them, especially if they be travelling a far journey."⁶⁴ In any case, Weld argued, the scriptural passage in question was not a binding example, but "a particular dispensation and command to the seventy Disciples at that time."⁶⁵

Likewise, the Newcastle clergy expressed considerable horror at such Quaker demonstrations as walking through the streets naked. Weld and his colleagues fulminated against "the wickednesse of this practice, besides the impudence and immodesty, even such as nature and ingenuity itselſe abhorres."⁶⁶ They went on to lament:⁶⁷ "Oh! What a fuell is this to the flames of lust, what accursed fires of Hell doth it kindle in the hearts of men? . . . And what is the horriblenesse of the temptation of such wicked practices? This is so loathsome and nauseous to any sober apprehensions, that surely it will make the very practices of such things to be a stinke in their nostrils and to be looked upon as a shame, both to Religion and Humanity, and we are fully certified from severall parts it doth so already." Needless to say, the clergy took a dim view of the interruption of church services, whatever form that interruption assumed. "While we are carrying on the work of the Gospel in our respective Congregations peaceably, some of them have come no lesse than three-score miles to revile us, and smite us with the tongue of bitter reproaches, in publique Congregations, nay even in the time of exercise to the great hindering of the seed of the Word, which questionlesse is the designe of Satan in those their Confusions. And are we the persecutors?"⁶⁸

It is readily apparent that behind the outraged morality and the indignation at being interrupted in their work, there lay deeper and more fundamental concerns. It would do less than justice to the Newcastle clergy to minimize the seriousness with which they viewed the interruption of approved church services. They had a deep calling to be pastors to a sinful mankind; to disrupt their work was both to hinder the work of God in the world and to place their congregations in eternal danger. There was little illusion on the part of the Newcastle clergy that they could

persuade the Quakers of the errors of their way; the concern was to guide their flock away from possible seduction. John Bewick expressed the deep conviction of their calling when he noted, "I did not rashly and rawly hasten to be a Pastor: for until I had seriously spent good time and study in the holy Scripture and divine things, being nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine, whereunto I had attained, I did not take upon me a Pastoral charge."⁶⁹ And Weld and his associates spoke for all the clergy in the expression of determination to carry on established forms and to attack error:⁷⁰ "We cannot apprehend that there is any hope of convincing these persons of the error of their way, so farre are they under the very power of the Spirit of delusion, and professed enmity to the Ordinances of Christ Jesus our Lord: Yet for the further securing and fuller satisfying of the people of God, we are induced to Answer . . . for the clearer manifesting of the wickednesse and folly of these men and their Principles: And though it cost us new revilings and more bitter cursings from this People, which we fully expect: Yet what are we, and our Names, though trodden underfoot, so Jesus Christ may have the glory and his people the advantage of our standing for the truth."

The sense of ministerial calling was deep enough, but the clergy also appreciated and expressed the fact that undoing authority in one sphere could rapidly lead to the undoing of authority elsewhere. In striking secular allusions, the Newcastle writers raised the spectre of the dissolution of the family, the collapse of authority in the army, the questioning of the legality of the Protector's rule, and indeed the crumbling of the whole political structure. Thomas Ledgard, for example, argued that Quaker practices led to the neglect of family duties and the decay of proper respect and authority within the most fundamental of all social units.⁷¹ Ledgard reflected the prevailing patriarchal views of the time, and in a society which could view the head of the family in terms of a magistrate, there is little doubt that he was correct in his assertion that conversion to Quakerism could entail considerable strain on family ties.⁷² Others saw an equal threat to the maintenance of army discipline in the Quakers' refusal to give outward respect to those in authority. "This is a high way to poure contempt upon persons in supreme Authority; as if a Souldier should say, He would honour the supreme office in the Army, but would not bear the Lord Gen: Cromwell."⁷³ Indeed, they reckoned, the application of this principle could undermine the secular authority of Cromwell himself. The reasoning of the Quakers, they maintained, "is as if when the Lord Protector should declare what is treason by Law in publique Proclamation, a Justice of Peace should, when a Person were proved before him guilty of treason, according to that Law; yet should say, he is not to judge what is treason according to the Law, but he should appeale from the Law to himselfe for what is treason, though the Law had determined it before."⁷⁴ The concern could be extended to embrace the whole area of authority in the state. In an aside directed to Anthony Pearson, Weld and his colleagues accused the Quakers of pursuing an illusory form of political organization in which no one ruled and sin was left to flourish unpunished.⁷⁵ "But what becomes of the Justices of Peace, will they be content to be turned out of their being by A.P.? But seriously, A.P., if there be Governments without Governors, who shall punish sin? Who shall

make Laws? Who shall preserve the Peace? Shall Government? When it is in no bodies hands? ... We may leave him amongst the rest of his fancies to study Sir Thomas Moores Eutopia or Platos Common-wealth, where probably he may find a Government without any Persons to Govern or be Governed."

There is a strong indication that concerns for such wider applications of Quaker principles were foremost in the minds of the Newcastle opponents of the Friends. Anarchy in religion could lead to anarchy in the state, and a once ordered common-wealth would be swallowed up in the incoherent strivings of that many-headed monster, the mass of common men. But the grounds for resisting the Quakers did not end here. There was what might be termed a psychological dimension to the opposition as well, a feeling that conversion to Quakerism bordered on diabolism or insanity and that converts were most likely to be found among the unstable, impressionable, or irresponsible elements of the population. The association of the Quakers with the devil was made early in the Newcastle literature and was never totally absent from it. The first anti-Quaker pamphlet to appear in Newcastle, *The Quakers Shaken*, related the temporary conversion of John Gilpin and his subsequent breaking with them on the grounds that it was the devil rather than God who had moved him. "I rest fully persuaded, and I think it doth evidently appear ... to persons unprejudiced that my quaking and trembling was of the devill, that I was acted wholly and solely by him whilst in this condition, and I doe really beleeve that others in the like condition which I was then in would be of the same mind with me upon serious tryall of their condition by the principles of Christian Religion and sanctified Reason."⁷⁶ Hints that diabolical forces were at work are scattered throughout the two books by Weld and his colleagues.⁷⁷ Samuel Hammond indicated a firm belief that Quaker converts were likely to be people of an unstable disposition or young people who had not yet formed clear Christian convictions and were easily seduced, and he took evident pleasure in relating the tale of the alleged madness of William Coatesworth and of a shoemaker in Newcastle who was struck mad after attacking Hammond in a public meeting place.⁷⁸

General opposition to the Quakers was built on grounds such as these, but there were at least two specific issues which also played a part in the Newcastle area, the question of tithes and the movement to establish a university at Durham. Opposition to tithes was by no means confined to the Quakers,⁷⁹ but the question became very much a part of the general Newcastle dispute with them. One reason for its prominence in the debate was the fact that the key Quaker leader Anthony Pearson had written a strongly worded attack on the institution of tithes.⁸⁰ But even before that date, during the 1653-4 flurry of pamphleteering, the Quakers attacked the Newcastle clergy for their support of tithes, claiming that they preached for hire, a charge vehemently denied by the clergy.⁸¹ Samuel Hammond was convinced that some were converted to Quakerism because they thought it was a way to get out of paying tithes.⁸² Bewick's tract of 1660 was the most extended effort by a member of the Newcastle clergy to answer the Quaker case against tithes. Noting that Christ never spoke against tithes, he argued that tithes "are Gods rent, reserved by himself, out of all the increase of every mans lands and goods to be paid by them as an

acknowledgement that he is both the sovereign Lord of all the whole earth, and the fulness thereof, of the world, and them that dwell therein.”⁸³ Denying that tithes were a price for preaching, Bewick argued that they were established by divine ordinance for the necessary maintenance of the clergy, and that the Quaker attacks on them were but one more example of the manner in which the Friends sought to disrupt the properly constituted order of things. “The murmure, which is among many in these times against mine and other faithful Ministers maintenance is doubtlesse a murmuring against God, because he did not make us to be creatures, to live without food and raiment, and other temporal necessities, but made us men like yourselves, compassed with the same infirmities, and needing like temporal supplies for back and belly, and other necessities, as all other men do.”⁸⁴

The Quakers were not simply critical of tithes as a means of providing maintenance for the clergy; they were outspokenly critical of the clergy themselves and of the institutions which trained them. It was this latter concern which provided the basis for yet another direct conflict with the governing groups in Newcastle. The early history of Durham College is very much a part of the history of Newcastle as well as that of the neighbouring county.⁸⁵ While it is by no means clear who first raised the scheme that a college should be created at Durham out of the property of the dean and chapter,⁸⁶ the Newcastle authorities had, by 1656, become deeply interested in the idea and at least four of the most outspoken local critics of the Quakers, William Cole, Richard Prideaux, Thomas Ledgard, and Samuel Hammond, were closely involved.⁸⁷ The Quakers generally and George Fox in particular were hostile to the project from the start. It is important in understanding the conflict to be clear about the basis of the Quaker objections. Fox’s views were typical of the Quaker position; he was careful to point out that he was not against learning in itself, so long as it was directed to its proper uses, but he was vehemently opposed to learning as a basis for preaching the Gospel and thus it was that he attacked the learning of parish priests as a vain delusion and a reason for not recognizing their authority.⁸⁸ Given such an outlook, there is little surprise to be occasioned by the fact that the Quakers denounced the scheme for a college at Durham, vigorously assaulting it as a foundation for the making of ministers, something, in their view, only God could do.⁸⁹ Fox joined directly in the onslaught and in fact took personal credit for the destruction of the college, although in doing so he clearly overstated both his own role and that of the Quaker movement.⁹⁰

The clash over education, and particularly over the college at Durham, was but one, and by no means the most important, of a series of frictions between the Quakers and the Newcastle authorities. In the last analysis, all the aspects of the conflict could be summed up under the awareness from both sides that radically different conceptions of order and authority were facing each other. The conservative emphasis on traditional forms and structures which was so much a part of the mental outlook of the Newcastle clergy and the secular authorities there was being challenged by a force that was equally convinced of moral rectitude and which was driven on by an inner light that was, both in theory and practice, a challenge to and a solvent of older conceptions of order, deference, and obedience. Passionately convinced of their own

rightness, the two sides simply talked past each other when it came to this point. John Bewick eloquently defended the role of the traditional clergy in opposition to what he could only see as the anarchistic inner light of the Quakers: "I am not in the steps of them who with faire speeches and good words deceive the hearts of the simple.⁹¹ ... The doctrines which I have taught them do naturally tend to bring them to Godlinesse, and to have a holy demeanour towards God and man; that impiety of mocking and scoffing, which some have expressed, flowes from the corrupt source of their own corrupt nature, but not from my mouth."⁹² But the Quakers were equally eloquent and equally adamant. Anthony Pearson, at the very start of the controversy, delineated clearly the attitudes and convictions that led to the conflict: "The reason why these People above all others are hated by all sorts of men is because the righteous Spirit of God that rules in them, as it will not comply or have fellowship with the wicked in their Pride, lusts, pleasures, customs, worships, fashions, and unfruitful works of darkness, so will it not wink at them, but reprove them where and in whomsoever they are."⁹³

The Newcastle clergy and magistrates doubtless thought they had won the battle when they kept the Quakers from meeting in the town. If the existence of the Gateshead meeting place so close to the limits of their authority remained a galling reminder of the Quaker threat, they could at least feel that they had done their utmost to preserve the spiritual purity of Newcastle itself. And yet, they were obviously wrong. Their own authority, nearly as precarious as the revolution on which it was built, was rudely shattered by the Restoration; while Newcastle became, in the post-Restoration period, a centre of dissent, the hegemony achieved during the Interregnum was not preserved. On the other hand, the Quakers had also, despite all the pressure and argument, struck deep roots, and their continued presence in the area after 1660 provides a clear indication of the vitality of the movement. In that sense, Fox's recollection of his departure from Newcastle was both prophetic and to the point: "As I was passing away by ye markt place, ye power of ye Lord risse in mee to warn ym of ye Lord yt was comeing upon ym. And soe not long after all those preists of Newcastle and there profession was turned out when ye Kinge came in."⁹⁴

NOTES

¹ Swarthmore MSS. (Friends' Library), iii, 61 (10 August, 1653).

² For the general background on Newcastle life in this period, see R. Howell, *Newcastle upon Tyne and the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford, 1967).

³ Cf. H. J. Cadbury, "Early Quakerism at Newcastle upon Tyne: William Coatesworth", *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, vol. 50, no. 3 (1963), p. 91. On the origins of the Quaker movement in Durham and Northumberland see also W. C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (London, 1912); W. H. Knowles and J. R. Boyle, *Vestiges of Old Newcastle and Gateshead* (New-

castle 1890), pp. 29-39; G. F. Nuttall, "George Fox and the Rise of Quakerism in the Bishoprick", *Durham University Journal*, vol. 36 (1943-44), pp. 94-7; J. W. Steel, *Early Friends in the North* (London, 1905); H. Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England* (New Haven, 1964).

⁴ J. A. Manning, ed. *Memoirs of Sir Benjamin Rudyerd* (London, 1841), pp. 135-6.

⁵ Cf. Howell, *Newcastle upon Tyne and the Puritan Revolution*, chap. VI.

⁶ E 738 (16), J. Naylor, *A Discovery of the Man of Sin Acting in a Mystery of Iniquitie* (London, 1654), p. 51.

⁷ E 1499 (1), C. Sydenham, *The Greatness of the Mystery of Godliness* (London, 1654), dedication to William Johnson, mayor of Newcastle.

⁸ Sydenham was not the only one to remark on this phenomenon. Cf. also W. H. D. Longstaffe, ed., *Memoirs of the Life of Mr. Ambrose Barnes* (Durham, 1867), Surtees Soc., vol. 50, p. 126. On the other hand, the 1656 order of the Common Council "for settleinge the Ministers in their preachinge att the severall Churches usque Death etc." mentions sectarian controversy within the town. M. H. Dodds, ed., *Extracts from the Newcastle upon Tyne Council Minute Book* (Newcastle, 1920), p. 225. Likewise an undated petition of James Mirlle also seems to indicate some difficulties. Baxter Treatises (Dr. William's Library), vol. 5, fol. 105. Such differences were also raised in the pamphlet controversy with the Quakers discussed later in this paper.

⁹ On the Baptist threat, see Howell, *Newcastle upon Tyne and the Puritan Revolution*, pp. 248ff.

¹⁰ N. Penney, ed., *The Journal of George Fox* (Cambridge, 1911), 1: 141.

¹¹ E 689 (19), G. Fox, *Saul's Errand to Damascus* (London, 1653), pp. 29ff. Swarthmore MSS. (Friends' Library), iii, 29 (18 May, 1653).

¹² Swarthmore MSS. (Friends' Library), i, 87 (9 May, 1653).

¹³ E 714 (10), A. Pearson, *To the Parliament of the Common-weath of England* (London, 1653), p. 1.

¹⁴ Fox, *Journal*, 1:108.

¹⁵ N. Penney, ed., *The First Publishers of Truth Being Early Records of the Introduction of Quakerism in the Counties of England and Wales* (London, 1907), p. 88.

¹⁶ Swarthmore MSS. (Friends' Library), iii, 35 (21 February, 1653-4).

¹⁷ Penney, *First Publishers*, p. 89.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 89-90, 202, 202-3.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

²⁰ B. Underhill, ed., *Records of the Churches of Christ Gathered at Fenstanton, Warboys, and Hexham 1644-1720* (London, 1854), Hanserd Knollys Soc., vol. 8, p. 352. There is ample evidence that the Quakers found converts in Baptist congregations. Cf. Swarthmore MSS. (Friends' Library), iv, 209 (14 March, 1654); 203 (11 February, 1656-7); and 240 (December, 1657).

²¹ Swarthmore MSS. (Friends' Library), iii, 71, 192 (mid-April, 1654).

²² *Ibid.*, iii, 15 (early March, 1654).

²³ *The Quakers Shaken or a Fire-brand snatch'd out of the Fire* (Gateshead, 1653).

²⁴ T. Weld, et al., *The Perfect Pharisee under Monkish Holinesse* (Gateshead, 1653); T. Weld, et al., *A Further Discovery of that Generation of Men called Quakers* (Gateshead, 1654).

²⁵ [T. Ledgard], *A Discourse concerning the Quakers* (n.p., 1653). On the authorship of this tract which exists in an apparently unique copy in the Friends' Library, see R. Howell, "Early Quakerism in Newcastle upon Tyne: Thomas Ledgard's Discourse concerning the Quakers," *Journal of the Friends Historical Society*, vol. 50, no. 4 (1964), pp. 211-16. Ledgard's two other tracts were entitled *Another Discourse* and *Anti-Quaker Assertions*. See J. Smith, *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana or a Catalogue of Books Adverse to the Society of Friends* (London, 1873), p. 266.

²⁶ E 1504 (2), C. Sydenham, *Hypocrisie Discovered in its Nature and Workings* (London, 1654), preface to the reader.

²⁷ M. Phillips, "Notes on Some Forgotten Burying Grounds of the Society of Friends: Gateshead, Whickham, Boldon, and South Shields", *AA*², xvi (1891-4), p. 192.

²⁸ Cf. Swarthmore MSS. (Friends' Library), iv, 62; i, 252, 241, 261, 164; iii, 187; iv, 25; i, 277, 278, 282, 283; iii, 78. The listing is chronological; for the dating and attribution of the letters, I am indebted to G. F. Nuttall, "Early Quaker Letters" (London, 1952, duplicated). Cf. also the references to Pearson's activities in A. R. Barclay, *Letters &c. of Early Friends Illustrative of the History of the Society* (London, 1911), pp. 12-13, 17, 33.

²⁹ *C.J.*, 7:470 (18 December, 1656); cf. also *The Publick Intelligencer*, no. 67, 15-22 December, 1656, p. 1067.

³⁰ J. R. Boyle and F. W. Dendy, eds., *Extracts from the Records of the Merchant Adventurers of Newcastle* (Durham, 1895-9), Surtees Soc., vols. 93, 101, 2:128. It is interesting to note that the provision prohibiting Quakers was retained until well into the eighteenth century although other parts of the act were repealed. *Ibid.*, 1:256.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 1:182-3.

³² T. Birch, ed., *Thurloe State Papers* (London, 1742), 6: 811-12.

³³ Swarthmore MSS. (Friends' Library), iv, 64. (15 February, 1656-7); 279 (14 November, 1659).

³⁴ Ledgard, *Discourse concerning the Quakers* p. 8.

³⁵ Fox, *Journal*, 1:310.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 1:311; cf. also the brief notice of this visit in *Mercurius Politicus*, no. 399, 14–21 January, 1657/8, p. 246.

³⁷ The following is based on G. Whitehead, *The Christian Progress of George Whitehead* (London, 1725), pp. 126–8; *Mercurius Politicus*, no. 399, 14–21 January, 1657–8, p. 246; *Nouvelles Ordinaires de Londres*, no. 400, 24–31 January, 1657–8, as printed in Cadbury, "Early Quakerism in Newcastle upon Tyne," pp. 93–4; S. Hammond, *The Quakers House Built upon the Sand* (Gateshead, 1658), pp. 24–5.

³⁸ Whitehead, *Christian Progress*, p. 126.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 127–8.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

⁴¹ Hammond, *Quakers House Built upon Sand*, p. 24 gives the same impression. While arguing that the magistrates were correct in attempting to prevent the meeting, he also notes that none of the Quakers were hurt because the magistrates had actively sought to prevent violence.

⁴² The Quaker version is given in Whitehead, *Christian Progress*, p. 129 and is followed in Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 373. The story of his madness appears in essentially identical form in *Mercurius Politicus*, no. 399, 14–21 January, 1657–8, p. 246 and *Nouvelles Ordinaires de Londres*, no. 400, 24–31 January, 1657–8, p. 1606.

⁴³ Cf. Hammond, *Quakers House Built upon Sand*, p. 24 who makes the point explicitly.

⁴⁴ J. Price, *The Mystery and Method of His Majesty's Happy Restauration* (London, 1680), p. 32.

⁴⁵ Cf. the authorities summarized in Howell, *Newcastle upon Tyne and the Puritan Revolution* p. 261, n. 3. It is striking, however, that the roots were established substantially outside Newcastle, no doubt as a result of the vigorous opposition to the Quakers by the town authorities in the 1650s.

⁴⁶ E 1038 (1), J. Bewick, *An Answer to a Quakers Seventeen Heads of Queries* (London, 1660).

⁴⁷ J. Brand, *History of Newcastle* (London, 1789), 2:93; A. Wood, *Athenae Oxoniensis*, 3rd. edn. (London, 1813–20), 2:754. On Ritschel, see R. Howell, "Georg Ritschel, Lehrer und Geistlicher: Ein böhmischer Vertriebener im England Cromwells," *Bohemia: Jahrbuch des Collegium Carolinum*, vol. 7 (1966), pp. 199–210.

⁴⁸ Cf. the acknowledgement to Samuel Eaton, *The Quakers Confuted Being an Answer unto Nine-*

teen Queries (London, 1654) in Weld, *A Further Discovery*, p. 3.

⁴⁹ In January 1653–4 the Newcastle clergy wrote to William Marshall, Michael Althan, and William Baldwinson for testimony about Fox. *Ibid.*, pp. 22–4. At about the same time an unnamed clergyman in Westmorland was writing to William Cole about a Quaker conversion. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

⁵⁰ Weld, *The Perfect Pharisee*, p. 3; Weld, *A Further Discovery*, p. 18.

⁵¹ E 735 (2), J. Nayler, *An Answer to the Booke called The Perfect Pharisee* (London, 1654).

⁵² Weld, *A Further Discovery*, p. 6.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁵⁴ Weld, *The Perfect Pharisee*, p. 12.

⁵⁵ G. Fox, *The Great Mistery of the Great Whore Unfolded* (London, 1659), pp. 75–6.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 231.

⁵⁷ Weld, *A Further Discovery*, p. 11.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 12–13.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁶¹ Hammond, *Quakers House Built upon Sand*, p. 3.

⁶² Ledgard, *Discourse concerning the Quakers*, p. 5.

⁶³ Luke 10:4.

⁶⁴ Weld, *The Perfect Pharisee*, p. 32.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

⁶⁶ Weld, *A Further Discovery*, p. 86.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁶⁹ Bewick, *An Answer to a Quakers Seventeen Heads of Queries*, p. 91.

⁷⁰ Weld, *A Further Discovery*, p. 3.

⁷¹ Ledgard, *Discourse concerning the Quakers*, p. 8.

⁷² On patriarchalism and the importance of the family, see the suggestive remarks in P. Laslett, ed., *Patriarcha and Other Political Works of Sir Robert Filmer* (Oxford, 1949), pp. 20–33; P. Laslett, *The World We Have Lost*, 2nd. edn. (London, 1971); G. J. Schochet, *Patriarchalism in Political Thought* (Oxford, 1975); G. J. Schochet, "Patriarchalism, Politics, and Mass Attitudes in Stuart England", *Historical Journal*, vol. 12 (1969), pp. 413–41.

⁷³ Weld, *The Perfect Pharisee*, p. 34.

⁷⁴ Weld, *A Further Discovery*, p. 69.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

⁷⁶ *The Quakers Shaken*, p. 16.

⁷⁷ Weld, *The Perfect Pharisee*, p. 26. "We can no otherwise look upon this, then the very Hold

Satan hath to keep this people under his delusions, by couzening them thus, to stop their eyes against the light." Weld, *A Further Discovery*, p. 9. "Truely these blasphemous Doctrines of these men, with their Diabolicall delusions and quakings, will make it appeare where the man of sin is now working."

⁷⁸ Hammond, *Quakers House Built upon Sand*, pp. 2-4, 24.

⁷⁹ On the significance of the debate over tithes in the English Revolution, see M. James, "The Political Importance of the Tithes Controversy in the English Revolution 1640-60", *History*, vol. 26 (1941), pp. 1-18.

⁸⁰ E 931 (2), A. Pearson, *The Great Case of Tythes truly Stated by a Countryman* (London, 1657).

⁸¹ Cf. Weld, *The Perfect Pharisee*, p. 39.

⁸² Hammond, *Quakers House Built upon Sand*, p. 4. It is interesting to note that among the few documented cases of Quakers in the region suffering at the hands of local justices before 1660, three of the sufferers had cattle distrained for non-payment of tithes. J. Besse, *An Abstract of the Sufferings of the People Call'd Quakers* (London, 1733-38), 1:82.

⁸³ Bewick, *An Answer to a Quakers Seventeen Heads of Queries*, p. 22.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

⁸⁵ On the early history of Durham College, see Howell, *Newcastle upon Tyne and the Puritan Revolution*, pp. 330ff.

⁸⁶ The idea was in circulation as early as 1649

when George Lilburne suggested to a jury that Durham be made a university. *The Vindication of Edward Colston to a most false and scandalous Remonstrance of George Lilburne* (London, 1649), p. 4.

⁸⁷ Cole, Prideaux, and Ledgard became visitors of the newly founded college at Durham in 1657, as indicated in the letters patent to the college 15 May 1657. *Allen Tracts* (Darlington, 1777), no. 44. Samuel Hammond was among those empowered to receive subscriptions for the college in 1656. *Publick Intelligencer*, no. 28, 7-14 April, 1656, p. 480; *Cal S.P. Dom.*, 1655-6, p. 262.

⁸⁸ E 731 (20), G. Fox, *A Paper Sent Forth Into the World from Them that are Scornfully Called Quakers* (London, 1654). Cf. also Nuttall, "George Fox and Quakerism in the Bishoprick", p. 95.

⁸⁹ See, for example, the anonymous *Some Quaeries to be Answered in Writing or Print by the Masters, Heads, Fellows and Tutors of the Colledge they are setting up at Durham* (n.p., n.d.).

⁹⁰ Fox, *Journal*, 1:311-12. But see also the note in *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, vol. 4 (1907), p. 128 which queries the statement that Fox prided himself on suppressing Durham College; there can, despite the argument in this note, be little doubt about his hostile view towards it.

⁹¹ Bewick, *An Answer to a Quakers Seventeen Heads of Queries*, p. 72.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 101.

⁹³ Pearson, *To the Parliament of England*, p. 2.

⁹⁴ Fox, *Journal*, 1:311.