THE JOURNAL

OF THE

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOLUME FORTY-TWO

NUMBER TWO

1950

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

FRIENDS HOUSE, EUSTON ROAD, LONDON, N.W.1

also obtainable at Friends Book Store

302 Arch Street, Philadelphia 6, Pa, U.S.A.

Price 5s. Yearly 10s.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

The present membership of the Friends' Historical Society does not provide sufficient income to enable the Society to do its work as effectively as it desires.

Documents and articles of historical interest remain unpublished, and at least 50 more annual subscriptions are needed.

The Committee therefore appeals to members and others interested to:

(1) Secure new subscribers.

(2) Pay 10s. for the Journal to be sent as a gift to someone.

(3) Pay a larger annual subscription than the present minimum of 10s.

(4) Send a donation independent of the subscription.

The Society does important and valuable work, but it can only continue to do so if it is supplied with more funds.

Contributions should be sent to the Secretary, Friends House.

ALFRED B. SEARLE,
President.

Contents

Vol. XLII No. 2 1950

THE JOURNAL

OF THE

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Publishing Office: Friends House, Euston Road, London, N.W.1.

Communications should be addressed to the Editor at Friends House.

Editorial

The presidential address for the year 1950 was delivered at Friends House on Thursday, 6th July, by Alfred B. Searle. The address aroused much interest as a welcome contribution to our knowledge of a traditional Quaker testimony. Alfred Searle's paper, "Friends (Quakers) and Arbitration" has already been printed in full in the September 1950 number (vol. 16, N.S., no. 3) of *The Journal of the Institute of Arbitrators (Incorporated)*, pp. 53-90.[1]

Among other material, this number includes a study by Dr. W. A. C. Stewart, Professor of Education at the University College of North Staffordshire, Stoke-on-Trent, concerning school punishment methods and their development, from the early days of Ackworth until the end of last century. We are also glad to print two short contributions from Dr. Henry J. Cadbury, and a bibliographical note by Dr. Geoffrey Nuttall which clears up some obscure points in early Quaker controversy.

* * * *

Quaker Literature

THE flood of pamphleteering which can be conveniently dated from 1640 when events were hastening towards civil war between King and Parliament and which can be studied in the great Thomason Collection of tracts[2] now in the British Museum had a profound influence on the

[1] Published by the Institute, 10 Norfolk Street, London, W.C.2. Price 1s. There is a copy in the library at Friends House.

[2] Catalogue available in the library at Friends House.

development of English prose as a vehicle for the conveyance of ideas on all sorts of topics to all conditions of people.

The place Friends took in this field of activity deserves more study than has been given to it. Opponents were known to jeer at them for their lack of learning, for their misuse of the English language and even (in that age of diversities of spelling) for their orthography. Nevertheless, that they were able to produce passages of beauty as well as hold their own in hard-hitting polemics, shows that Friends were not without craftsmen in their efforts to publish Truth by the written and printed word.[1]

Of the early Friends, some, like Samuel Fisher, had already received a formal education to a high degree, and Quakerism came too late to have any decisive influence on their style and composition; many doubtless had received an education insufficient to give them complete command of language (John Audland was said not to have been able to write two lines of good English together); but there are others competently educated and practised in the spoken word, on whose writing the impact of Quakerism may be expected to show some influence. Hasty pamphleteering does not lend itself to distinguished writing, but it may produce clear and workmanlike sentences which (unless ruined by the compositor) convey the writer's meaning.

As the years pass the emphasis shifts from the pamphlet for the day (many also unnecessarily enshrined in bulky folio volumes of *Works*) to the spiritual diary of the soul's journey. These last, being works of contemplation, may be expected to have stylistic merits, and we know some were widely read and they have an established place in English literature. It is however the earlier works, the forerunners, whose ephemeral interest has long since passed, but which may still repay study as tracers to the student of literary development.

Today there are signs of revived interest in seventeenth century theology, but many aspects of the varied life of that troubled period are still overlooked. The increased literary activity which marked the middle of the century is a reflection of increased intellectual activity dating from King James's Authorized version of the English Bible, 1611, and from the junction of Puritan religious movements with political trends which came apparent during the reign of Charles I, and which together worked in the ferment of ideas of the two decades at the mid-century. The period of freedom in printing came at a time when ideas had free play and when men had become well accustomed to the use of the printed word in religious and political activity.

The part taken by the not inconsiderable Quaker output deserves study—in general from the literary point of view, and in particular aiming to resolve such questions as the amount to which Friends were indebted to tracts and polemics for their growth under the Republic and consolidation after the Restoration.

[1] See Luella M. Wright: *Literature and Education in Early Quakerism* (University of Iowa, 1933).

Punishment in Friends' Schools, 1779-1900

By W. A. CAMPBELL STEWART, Ph.D.

ACKWORTH was founded when the negative doctrines of Quietism had strong influence. If adults had to regulate their lives to the Quaker pattern, how much more severe was the control of children who were susceptible, as Friends thought, to all the wayward gusts of evil. They were placed in a "guarded" community, shown the Quaker pattern of life and taught subjection of own-will. One of the results was a record of punishment during the first half-century covered by this survey which is at times astonishing in a body which was responsible for so many humanitarian reforms.

One of the main reasons for the establishment and prolongation of severity in Quaker schools was that Ackworth, the Yearly Meeting school, was at first a pattern and example to Sidcot, Islington, and Wigton. Its rules, drawn up in 1779, were adopted almost completely by the schools for children of those disowned, founded in the 'thirties and 'forties. Ackworth was founded for the children of those not in affluence, and life was, at first, so dull that mischief and disorder were common. With no organized free-time pursuits and a limited school curriculum of reading, writing, spelling and arithmetic, with no freedom to leave the estate and no real comfort in the building, the children, hungry as they often were, became unruly. Until 1809, there was one fire in schoolrooms with stone floors fifty feet by twenty feet. The Meeting House, in which three lengthy Meetings were held each week, had also a stone floor, and had no heating at all until 1820. The boys used to go to the bath (a cold bath in an open air pool into which the smaller boys were thrown if they did not wish to go and were then helped out by the bigger boys) before 6 a.m. up to 1825. The wash house for ordinary daily washing was in the cellars and had one long trough in it until 1826, and this was filled by water from a force-pump

worked by one of the school employees who apparently neglected his work frequently. There was one iron saucer for drinking water, and if boys wanted a wash during the day, this water supply only could be used, for the early morning wash in the cellars was the only one permitted there during the day. If, during the day, a boy had to dry himself after an improvised wash, he could only use his handkerchief. In this same handkerchief he might carry the produce of his allotment to add to his tea![1]

The whole situation was made the more difficult to manage by the swift, if irregular, increase in the numbers. In 1780 there were 123 children in the school. By 1781 there were 310. So, with too few adults, and the acceptance of apprentices, it is small wonder that, from the disciplinary point of view, as well as from the scholastic point of view, Ackworth started badly. The rigour of the repression established the form of control for seventy years and became a pattern of experience for the other schools.

The authorities started off with temperate conditions, for, so that punishment should be administered with coolness and in proportion to the offence, a special method was agreed upon :

> that the treasurer and each master keep a book and minute down offences committed within the day ; that once a week or oftener they meet together and inspect these books and administer such punishments as may be agreed upon, using their endeavours to convince the children that the only purpose of correction is for their amendment, and to deter others from the commission of like offences.[2]

This machinery seems humane and admirable. Inside a year it was found to be unworkable. With over 150 boys in the school a quicker method was needed. So it was stated that a master could call in two colleagues when any offence like rudeness or disobedience or laziness was involved, and a group decision would be promulgated. Punishment was allowed :

> Inflict it with the rod with due caution, not exceeding three strokes, to be done by one of the masters not offended.[3]

[1] Valuable details of the early life at Ackworth are to be found in the first few chapters of Henry Thompson's *History* (1879).

[2] *Collection of Rules*, published 1785.

[3] *Ibid.*

The more serious offences could still be judged by the weekly " court." This record book was kept carefully from 1781-85 and contains some interesting accounts of the order maintained and the methods by which it was preserved. After 1785 the record is discontinued, and from then until 1815 we have no systematic account of what took place. After 1815 there are more careful written records again, though the special punishment record-book disappears.

This 1781-85 record shows the patience with which the authorities at first administered their responsibilities. For example, in 1783 we have records of forgiveness on promise of amendment, or one stroke as a punishment, or a memory task set by the " court " (the perennial grammatical rules or tables). There was a place of detention (we shall mention this again later) which the pupils called " the new prison " or, more colloquially, " the Holes ", and there are records of short periods of solitary confinement for offences such as rudeness, teasing, fighting, causing wilful disturbance, cruelty to other children, or even only half an hour for " stealing worsted," or for damaging school books by tearing out pages. There were some domestic duties (often work in the kitchens, or seasonal work in the garden or on the estate) which were much enjoyed by the pupils as variants in their dull lives. The " court " used occasionally to deprive children of this " privilege " as a punishment.

The " court " also developed a system of guarantors, a form of security or bail for the offender. This meant that (say) two children would guarantee the good behaviour of a friend who was to be punished, for a period, and would undertake to surrender him if he broke the promise. This form of moral compulsion might now be criticized but it was an original variation on the monotonous theme of birching, flogging, expelling, that occurred in the " public " schools of the time. There were occasions recorded in this book when the children had to confess their guilt publicly before the whole school, or a concerned group, ask for their forgiveness and seek guarantors for their good behaviour.

At any rate, the public confession, or the public recitation of a learned task (a frequent variant), or the public exposure when a child would stand, say, at meal-times with a large card round his neck saying " I am a liar," or " I must remember to write home," were not having a strong enough

effect by the end of 1782. The first reaction was to become stricter. In the autumn of 1783 members of the Committee went to the school to stay for a time and to give the staff support in its disciplinary efforts. Chastisement and solitary confinement increased in 1784, and there were many cases of boys deliberately inciting disturbance. The school seems to have taken on all the surface appearances of a penitentiary. Between 1780 and 1783 floggings were rare. Between 1784 and 1785, when the records end, there were between 40 and 50 records of whipping or birching or chastising with a rod. These were sometimes carried out in the presence of the "court," sometimes in public in the dining room, school-rooms, bedrooms and elsewhere.

Once the method of corporal punishment was firmly established, it set the pattern of harsh treatment, and for thirty years Ackworth underwent a dark period. This can best be illustrated by the words of a writer who recalls vividly his own schooldays in 1819, by which time some of the worst features were passing. In 1819 were built "the Light and Airy Rooms," to replace "the Holes" as places of solitary confinement:

> (They were) of quite plain and white-washed walls and tolerably lofty with one small window at the top from which it was impossible to look out without getting on to something. The furniture was limited to one chair and one small deal table, and no books or other articles of amusement were allowed except the Bible or such book as the boy might be required to learn a task from: but as the windows were made to open a short way, a surreptitious communication was frequently kept up with the outer world by means of a piece of string and an accomplice . . . Except in very bad cases, confinement in these rooms did not exclude from the usual school business, but the meals had to be taken in them and were conveyed by one of the apprentices; and the journeys to and from the rooms were performed under escort, and no conversation was allowed with any other boys . . . About this time . . . flogging or birching was altogether abolished, and caning was but seldom resorted to, both having hitherto been the most usual punishments inflicted. The improved remedial means . . . were tasks and solitary confinement and the restriction from certain amusements, with the prohibition from talking or keeping company with your favourite companions; and it was marvellous how candid and honest most of the boys were in submitting to their punishments—it was a sort of Spartanism . . . unless there was a chance of breaking through it with a certainty of not being found out.[1]

[1] "William's Schooldays at Ackworth in 1819." *Friends' Quarterly Examiner*, No. 307, pp. 160-1.

Corporal Punishment

We have shown how chastising grew at Ackworth. John Bright, speaking of the years about 1820 said:

> In the matter of punishments it was harsh, if not barbarous, and the comfort and health of the children were very inadequately attended to.[1]

At Sidcot, established in 1808, "open thrashing" (that is, thrashing in public) was the usual form of punishment, often given, so its historian reports, for only slight offences. In the early 'twenties one boy was repeatedly caned. Though flogging and birching were not permitted, as occurred at Ackworth, this caning can have been scarcely less painful:

> (He was) repeatedly caned, thirty or forty cuts on the palm of the hand. He was looked on as a hero for bearing it without flinching, whilst the master seemed determined to go on caning until the boy broke down. But . . . I do not remember that he ever did.[2]

Barton Dell, one well known Sidcot master of the 'twenties and 'thirties, used to use a strap, and thrashed "on the hand, as a rule." The history of one of his chastisements will indicate something of the tension of life in the school. One boy, goaded by Dell's unrelenting precision, flew at him and tried to attack him with a knife. He succeeded in gashing Dell's hand. Barton Dell immediately rang the bell and summoned all the boys together, and, holding up his bleeding hand, said, "Look, boys, at your master's bloody hand!"[3]

The cane and the strap were often used in the 'thirties and early 'forties at Sidcot. The Committee, in 1844, had asked for a list of all canings in the previous quarter, and gave severe warning that corporal punishment must become an exception. The changes in staff were frequent up to the 'sixties, and in the 'fifties some of the inexperienced newcomers cuffed their pupils. One older and respected boy in 1858 stood up in class to protest against such treatment of a younger boy, but there was little noticeable change in the staff's behaviour. Resentment was such that in the next year the boys staged a rebellion. This deep ill-will in staff-pupil attitudes poisoned relationships for some years,

[1] Quoted R. M. Jones: *Later Periods of Quakerism*, II, p. 631.
[2] F. A. Knight: *History of Sidcot School*, p. 82.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

but it is worth noting that the result of the mutiny of 22nd October, 1859 was that no teacher thereafter struck the pupils as a regular form of punishment.

Islington, from its foundation in 1811, followed the early Ackworth pattern of having a different master inflict chastisement from the master emotionally involved. This had to be administered after a careful public examination, and in the Great Hall. In their anxiety to gain the maximum effect in terms of public justice, dramatic value and deterrent conditions, Friends largely overlooked the emotional conflict such public trials would cause in the culprits.

At Islington, as at Ackworth, practical problems in handling growing numbers meant that the impressive machinery of public enquiry was not adequate. Private arbitrations meant *ad hoc* punishments, and while there is no record of severe punishment, the cane was freely used. Wigton, founded in 1815, started with a severe discipline, and the cane was recognized as a legitimate weapon, though, in a smaller school like Wigton, it was easier to have control of affairs without regular use of such measures.

Bootham and the Mount did not use methods of corporal punishment. The Heads approached matters differently, and the emotional blackmail of respected Quaker homes was often served on the boys and girls of the York schools instead. Lydia Rous at the Mount in the 'sixties introduced the significant new pressure of "a school for young ladies," albeit young Quaker ladies.

The Friends' Educational Society reported in 1839 at one of its earliest meetings that corporal punishment was no longer in use in Friends' schools in this country. This seems to have been a considerable piece of wishful thinking. The Sidcot Committee asked, in 1844 as mentioned above, for a record of canings, and when the schools for those disowned were founded in the 'thirties and 'forties the discipline was hard :

> "No namby-pamby methods sufficed, and though cuffs, blows and beatings were conspicuous only by their rarity, the normal master demanded, expected and received quick obedience."[1]

This was said of Ayton, and it is said of various other schools in one way and another. Of Sibford, in 1897 over

[1] G. A. Watson : *History of Ayton School*, p. 110.

fifty years after the Friends' Educational Society said corporal punishment was no longer used in Friends' schools, a School Enquiry Committee reported :

"Ten years ago, fines of small amounts paid into the Games Fund of the School, the writing of lines and very occasional corporal punishment, constituted the discipline in use . . . There is now no corporal punishment, and the Superintendent intends to avoid it in future, not as being an undesirable method of punishment . . . but as being specially liable to cause misapprehension to those unacquainted with the circumstances."[1]

We can conclude then, that corporal punishment as one of the main methods of maintaining order in Quaker schools died between 1840 and 1850, but that it remained a subordinate method in some schools for varying periods, until nearly the end of the century in one case, at least. The change was due partly to a more generous proportion of adult staff who were progressively better trained as the century passed. It was due in part to a wider scope of work for the children, better equipment, and more varied out-of-school society work. It was due in part to greater opportunity for the children to get away from the schools for short periods, and for more people to visit the schools because of improved communications. These considerations make for a wider horizon and a truer perspective of points of tension in the relationship between teacher and pupil. Besides such factors, there was of course, the public concern for the lot of children. Friends, whose "antennae" are always stretched and sensitive to moral and social concerns, saw corporal punishment of children as an inadequate method of solving conflicts in community. They were roughly seventy years ahead of most of the rest of the country in coming to this conclusion.

Punishment by "Detention"

It should not be thought that chastisement was the only severe means of control which Friends applied. Another important general heading is detention. By this is meant here any kind of incarceration. The two main forms which this took were detention with a set task (writing, knitting, chores), or detention with no task (such as standing in public with a pasteboard notice hung round the pupil's neck, or

[1] Report of Sibford School Enquiry Committee, 1897, p. 9.

sitting still with arms folded, or "standing to the line" with hands behind back).

"The Light and Airy Rooms" built at Ackworth in 1819 were mentioned earlier. Solitary confinement may have commended itself especially to Friends because of their emphasis on personal and direct communion with God. The punished child would have time to attend to the voice of God and to repent. Certainly the children were often given enough time in these rooms to listen. Sometimes, as has been said, half-an-hour sufficed in "the Holes" in the early days at Ackworth, when the extent of punishment was very carefully weighed. After the severe thirty years from about 1785 to 1815, we find children in solitary confinement for six days reasonably frequently, occasionally for eleven or twelve days, and at times for periods up to three weeks. Offences which called down these penalties were such as "disobedience, taking bread out of the dining room and telling several lies." The predominant evil from 1821-25, we are told, was lying and general unruliness, and there was also some pilfering. In the great majority of cases the offender was allowed to take part in school work, but was isolated at meal times and in free time. Usually he was allowed to sleep in his own bed, but with a rule of silence in the bedrooms, it did not mean that legitimate social contact was being granted.

At Sidcot there was an astonishing variant on this solitary confinement. Boxes were made, 5 feet 6 inches by 20 inches by 21 inches, and in these (there were three of them, placed near the teachers' beds) offenders had to stand.[1] They were on a diet of bread and water, and they might have to stand in these "coffins", as they were colloquially called, for hours each night, and for several nights. It should not be thought that the "coffins" were sparingly used. They were used first in 1821 and for two years they made life miserable for many children, for masters seemed agreed about 1820 that the School was unruly and that severity was the only practicable method of control. This unruliness was partly due, as in so many of the Friends' schools at their foundation and in their early years, to very frequent changes of staff as teachers

[1] The curious can still see what they were like in the relic preserved at Sidcot.

and apprentices found themselves dissatisfied with living conditions, food, payment and hours of work. It was due also, of course, to bare and uninviting premises and lack of free time activity, as at Ackworth.

However, in 1823, the Committee ordered that the "coffins" should be removed. The strain and misery they had caused were blatant. One observer comments on the "coffins": "(It was) a punishment by refined cruelty, far worse than the open thrashing which was often inflicted."[1]

There was a recurrence of a similar type of punishment at Sidcot about 1850. The Committee discovered that one of the masters had made a small pen in which he confined offenders in the dormitories. By this time the feeling of most Friends was against such forms of solitary confinement, and the Committee asked the Head to have the pen immediately removed.[2] But confinement was a common method of punishment for many years, and not only for the boys. A Sibford girl, writing of the early 'forties, when the school was in its first years, reports that girls were shut up alone with endless knitting tasks and were fed only on gruel for periods varying from an afternoon and a night to several days. Disobedience or dishonesty were the usual offences which led to this, but this pupil quotes that a girl was sent to bed without dinner and was shut off from her fellows for a time for smiling across at a girl friend during Meeting for Worship.[3] One boy offender at Sidcot in the late 'forties had to stand through all the school periods for a week, and during that time was debarred from all playtime and conversation. Compared with that, the four hours "standing to the line" with hands behind back which a senior underwent was lenient. In the 'sixties two new senior teachers went to Sidcot, Josiah Evans and William Kitching. Their relationships were altogether more harmonious, but they still gave standard punishments of two hours of confinement, either sitting or standing. These punishments were usual at all the schools except the York schools. Of course, many writing or learning tasks were

[1] Knight, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-2.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 150.

[3] Jane Shemeld: "Some Reminiscences of Sibford School." *Friends' Quarterly Examiner*. Vol. 61.

given. Children at Wigton, set to copy words out of a spelling manual as punishment in detention, were known, in the first half of the century, to have copied a thousand before they were released. The learning might vary from mathematical formulae to poetry or prose of an improving nature. At Sibford in the late 'fifties a girl was heard humming a line from a hymn. After a severe rebuke for her wickedness she was set sixty rounds of stocking knitting as a task.[1]

There is no need to multiply these instances. Those given help to indicate the proportion of time spent in single detentions as punishment during two-thirds of the nineteenth century. "Gatings," that is confining children to premises, and often to rooms on half-holidays, were another form of detention.

Exposing to Public Censure

We have already mentioned in passing the method of exposing a child to the ridicule of his or her fellows by wearing and displaying a board in a public place. An Old Scholar of Rawdon recalling his early days at the school in the 'thirties says :

> "He remembered very well that one great grievance was their aptness to speak very vulgarly and ungrammatically, and so to check that the scholars used to have a pasteboard card on which was printed 'Vulgar boy'."[2]

Jane Shemeld at Sibford recalls that the girls in the 'forties had often to stand on a form in a public place so that the whole school could see them, and this is mentioned as a form of "disgracing" which was much employed at most of the schools. At Ackworth there was "disgracing" of boys exiled from company of their fellows by making them take exercise on the "green" under a guard of their fellows specially chosen to see that the boy marched round. The cards with "Liar," and "I must write home" appeared on pupils at Sidcot and Sibford and Islington and Ackworth, for certain, and probably at the other schools, except the York schools. One girl at Sibford had to stand with the board round her neck and on the board was "I am not allowed to sing."

[1] A. Johnstone : *Odd Facts*. 1942.
[2] John Wood speaking at Rawdon Jubilee, 1882.

"Disgracing" by public exposure, a form of detention, is a punishment-mechanism which can tell us a good deal of the psychological temper of the schools. By naming the offence it states without equivocation the official attitude to the offence and to anyone who commits that offence. So, by strong suggestion a moral attitude is encouraged, an inculcation of an attitude to a principle, and a minimizing of personality factors. The basis of this inculcation is fear, fear of exposure rather than realization of the positive value of the moral principle. Enforcement of such a form of control stresses superior-inferior relationships, it emphasizes the authoritarian position and social distance of the staff and its standards, and it minimizes the power of the scholars. That such a method is used regularly indicates that the subjection is accepted by the scholars, though there are occasional instances of resistance. This method divides the unity of the scholar-group in relation to resistance, though it may unite them in sympathy.

"Disgracing" as a regular mode of punishment, that is a public display of faults to the whole school, or to a large group, occurs rarely after 1860, and so far as has been ascertained, the display of a board is not found after the late 'fifties. Standing on a form, however, as a form of isolating, occurs until early in this century reasonably often.

"Plain Meals"

There are many instances of stopping children having the food that the others had: bread and water sometimes in solitary confinement at Ackworth and Sidcot, gruel only with salt in for some of the girls of Sibford at dinner time. When we remember that in the 'twenties, 'thirties and 'forties at Ackworth, Sidcot, Islington, Wigton, Rawdon, one or more additions to the diet were ordered by the school doctors, we can see that this form of punishment could be particularly hard. However, it is fair to say that, compared with many other boarding schools of the times, the records of health were satisfactory in the Quaker schools. But the importance for our purpose of this possible reduction to plain food, even to bread and water, is to indicate again the modes of control. The Ackworth historian advances

a frail defence: "(This was) the sympathy of a rigid Puritan father: but better Puritanism than licence."[1]

The worst that happens after 1870 is "a plain tea," that is an absence of delicacies such as jam and cakes. This deprivation one has known to be used as punishment for dining room indiscipline up to the present day.

Expulsion

The most severe of punishments, because the most final, was expulsion. The positive desire to educate children in a Quakerly environment has caused Committees and Heads to resort to expulsion with the greatest reluctance. From the point of view of the researcher it is difficult, if not impossible, to get any clear picture of the situations to which expulsion seemed the only adequate answer, for the minutes are, understandably, vague and generalized. For example, in December 1848 the Sidcot Committee investigated "a serious moral trouble—most of the boys were implicated." Then, we read, that it was necessary for the moral purification of the school that four of the most flagrant offenders should be expelled.[2]

At Ackworth, after a long period of conflict and tension, we find that there was in the 'forties:

"Extensive use of profane language in the private conversation of boys, some of the Monitors and many other boys being implicated."

After persuasion and other punishment, a few boys were expelled, and they were also considered as examples of boys who showed "much want of respect for sacred things" about the same time.

Sidcot provides some further cases of expulsion. In April, 1846, there was a mutiny in the school (we have already mentioned the more protracted insurrection of 1859), and as a result of this short-lived defiance, the ringleaders were expelled.[3] It is interesting to note that there were no expulsions after the rebellions of 1859 and the early 'eighties. It was not then at once assumed that the pupils were to be broken of dangerous ways of thinking and acting by "making examples" of a few and expelling them.

[1] Henry Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 63.
[2] F. A. Knight, *op.cit.*, p. 148.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 113.

At Bootham we hear of another vague expulsion in the 'sixties :

"In face of facts definite and owned to, [the Head] held his hand, wept over, prayed with, accepted the snivellings and lying half-confessions of the hardened, restored him to the fold presently to find him at his tricks again and had to expel after all."[1]

Profanity, "moral" offences of a serious nature, organized and persistent resistance to authority, were the rather ill-defined causes for the expulsions named. Where boys and girls were in the same building or in buildings near to one another, there are a few expulsions because of nocturnal expeditions. But not every master allowed the matter to come to the full light :

"There were naughtinesses afoot of which Thorp knew nothing, at which some of his staff winked: to wit, those after-dark excursions across intervening garden walls to visit the girls at No. 25. The masters must have known."[2]

It is true that offences which often meant expulsion from other schools, like stealing or dishonesty in work, were, to Friends, weaknesses which they were always fully prepared to try to overcome. In common with many Victorians and Edwardians, they seemed to lose proportion in face of sexual difficulties, and, when religious "shaming" and persuasion did not provide a satisfactory answer, expulsion, for the sake of the other children, seemed the only answer. When once co-education became a settled method in the majority of their schools and they had learned what they could from psychologists, Friends emerged from this repressive sex-attitude, and expulsion is not now considered automatic for escapades such as those night trips named above, though expulsion is often still their reward on the very rare occasions on which they are recorded as having taken place.

The purpose of considering punishment as we have is to deduce something of certain aspects of the school life and something of the psychological climate of the community. Though it is not strictly under the heading of punishment, we shall know more of the inner life of the community if we consider some of the rules over our period.

[1] Bootham *History*, p. 61.

[2] *Ibid.* In the Mount *History* there is no mention to show that the boys did more than watch the windows from afar. As one of the boys says: "Cool and unsatisfying work."

School Rules

There are many rules which enjoin sober behaviour. Here are some examples from the Ackworth collection of 1785 which was the pattern for other schools :

" 1st. That they rise at 6 o'clock in the Summer and 7 o'clock in the Winter, and dress themselves quietly and orderly, endeavouring to begin the day in the Fear of the Lord which is a foundation of life preserving from the snares of death.

" 3rd. That they refrain from talking or whispering in the schools . . .

" 5th. That when the bell rings for breakfast, dinner or supper, they collect themselves together in silence and in due order, having their faces and hands washed, their hair combed, &c., and so proceed quietly into the dining room.

" 6th. That they observe a Solemn Silence, both before and after meals, that they eat their food decently and refrain from talking.

" 7th. That they avoid quarrelling, throwing sticks, stones, and dirt, striking and teazing one another, and they are enjoined not to complain about trifles, and, when at play, to observe moderation and decency.

" 9th. That they use a sober and becoming behaviour when going to, in, and coming from religious Meetings."

Silence, restraint, modesty, sobriety. These are the key-words of the Quaker pattern for their school community. Silence, for adults, had a symbolic significance, and young Friends in the first half of the nineteenth century grew up with a greater imposition of silence in their schools than there was in the public schools and other boarding schools of the period. Adults felt it was " good for the children," it encouraged the right Friendly behaviour, and it gave scope for nurturing the Seed :

" Order in school, at collect, in preparation, in the bedrooms, was secured by the rule of silence. ' No Talking ' stood as the official word on official occasions . . ."[1]

In bedrooms at Sibford in the 'forties and 'fifties, a monitor presided, and reported to the master in the morning : " Please Master, no boy has talked, half-talked, signed, whispered, hummed or motioned."[2]

These conditions of silence were relaxed as the last quarter of the century ran its course, for they are really an aspect of the " guarded " conception of education. At Sibford one of the compromises at meal times was to allow

[1] G. A. Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

[2] Sibford School : *The Schools' Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 2, Nov. 1923, p. 94.

speaking, but if the master thought it too much, he would ring a bell and stop all conversation for the rest of the meal.

Other rules kept a sense of strain in some of the schools at different times. At the Mount in the 'fifties there was much emphasis on punctuality, and a lost monthly holiday for girls who were late twice for lessons or collects or bed. Half an hour was allowed for brothers from Bootham to visit sisters, which meant a considerable hurry.

Bootham boys complain of pettifogging rules in the 'sixties like that which ordered boys who entered the garden by one gate to come out by the same gate. Jumping the wire barrier, which was about two feet high, was forbidden.

Until about the middle of the century all letters written by scholars at Ackworth, Sidcot and Islington were read by the Superintendent. It is possible similar practices were followed elsewhere. This was ostensibly to make sure that the children had addressed their letters correctly, and in the days when they wrote only once in a long period (three months at Ackworth) because postage was as much as elevenpence, this was probably a necessary thing. But it went on for some time after the Penny Post was in force, and it was, of course, an invaluable means of noting and thwarting complaint. Indeed, for some years at the beginning of Ackworth history, children were not allowed to go off the premises with visitors. Since a regular vacation was only established at that school in 1847 (other schools arranged this earlier), a visit to a tried School friend like Luke Howard might, up to the 'thirties, provide the first home table at which an Ackworth scholar had sat for four or five years. In the second half of the century, of course, excursions, walks, visits and vacations were encouraged and much enjoyed in all the schools.

While punishment has been reviewed, it is only fair to say that systems of rewards and a carefully controlled number of prizes were tried at some schools to encourage good behaviour. Ackworth had a system of tickets from 1817-44, when it was discarded. Sidcot tried a similar system 1825-32. A boy started as a "Blank," and good behaviour could raise him to a "Third," a "Second" and a "Veteran." These systems did not please Friends much, for rewards were considered as indulging a competitive spirit lacking in true humility. Most of the prizes were

given after the 'sixties, interestingly enough, and were not given for schoolwork, but for work done in spare time and in Societies. No school had more than half a dozen prizes, most had none.

The Present Century

What has been the prevailing form of punishment in this century? Most schools have adopted the House System, and some, for many years, worked a punishment statistics section into House competitions, the idea being that this entailed working for a larger group. This has been substantially dropped as being altogether too cumbersome. Merit holidays have acted as rewards which can be lost if punishment records are bad, and detention usually entails a nominal amount of work, the actual detaining being considered the main reminder. The Inspectors of 1904 characterize the climate of the schools as:

> "(A) quiet family life averse from the stimulus of competition and all artificial forms of rivalry . . . of a character which is retiring and peaceable rather than combative and ambitious."

Those concerned with Friends' Schools today may feel that they could not accurately be called "retiring and peaceable"!

Library Rules, 1699

The following inscription is to be found in a copy of George Fox's *Epistles* (1698) now in the possession of Roger Clark of Street.

This Book was brought from Banbury ye 18 of the 6th Mo 1699
By the Order of friends for the use of friends bellonging to Southnewington Meeting

And after some time who ever they be
Retturne it againe that others may see
But if it be kept time out of minde
Some they may want, But cannot it finde
And also be Careful that it be not Toare
For such they desarve to have it noe More
And those that observe these Rules that yee see
By Reason should have it, whoever they be.

William Dewsbury and the Popish Plot

By HENRY J. CADBURY, Ph.D.

IN 1948 I published a group of thirty-three letters connected with William Dewsbury and long practically unknown though well preserved in the record room of Friends at York (*Letters to William Dewsbury and Others*, Supplement No. 22 to the Journal of the Friends' Historical Society). One of them (p. 62) was unique in that it was a letter of the infamous Titus Oates exonerating William Dewsbury of complicity with Popery. It alone of these pieces had been published in Dewsbury's works. It is in answer to a letter of inquiry from a Mr. Whitfield, who appears to be John Whitfield (*c.* 1631-1705), rector of Bugbrooke in Northamptonshire, and it refers to a certificate by some other persons on behalf of Dewsbury. It was therefore only one of three associated documents.

I have come by accident on copies of all three, actually printed in a controversial London newspaper of the time. It is *The Observator*, published by Roger L'Estrange, No. 159, Wednesday, 21st June, 1682. Oates' letter is in slightly different wording and is therefore reproduced below along with the other two. The journalist claims that it was known to him in Oates' own hand, and that Whitfield was a friend to L'Estrange. The twenty signatories to the other certificate can nearly all be recognized as London Friends.

The dialogue preceding and following the documents runs in part as follows :

> *Whig.* Dr. Oates swore his Narrative before the Council, Sept. 28. 1678. and in March following there was a Person taken up at Northampton for a Jesuit; whereupon a worthy Friend of mine wrote to Dr. Oates this Letter, & received the Following Answer. But take notice, that it was first read Publikely at a Quakers Meeting, as I am well Enform'd, and after delivered by a Quaker to my Friend, according to the Address. . . . Here's the Doctors Letter, Spelling and all, and I'me sure he will not deny it.

William Dewsbury was probably not the only Friend to suffer as a result of the extraordinary fiction of a Popish Plot and it is to the credit of the scoundrel who invented

it that he was willing to defend Dewsbury and implicitly other Friends. Conversely, we are told that somewhat later the Quaker, William Penn, attempted to intercede for Titus Oates.

Sir, I presume, though utterly unknown to give you notice, that on Thursday last there was taken up at Northampton, one Dewsborough, a Great Pretended Apostle of the Quakers, but, as I have it from very good hands, You can make him appear to be a Jesuite. He is a Person that has usually made Triennial Visitations in these Parts, wherein he has been highly Mischievous ; & particularly in the Parish of Bugbrook, near Northampton, occasioning great Confluences, and withall Great Seductions of People from their Loyalty & Allegeance to the King, into Seditious & Dangerous Factions. If you please to send anything of Notice to Me, or the Mayor of Northampton concerning him, that may be anyway Significant, you will do a great kindness to this Country, and more particularly to

March 10. 1678. Your Humble Servant. J.W.

Mr. W.

Yours I received in which you mention one dewsbrough his Name is William Deusberry a Quaker, whome you wold doe well to discharge. hee is noe Jesuit, nor lyke one : I looke on it to bee our discretion not to meddle with any protestant dessenter in this day, but bend our forces against the common Enemy of protestant religion and the papists & endeavour to win by argument those that are dessentors from us. Sr here is a Certificate from some that have knowne him these 20 yeares and upwards, who are men of repute in their Generations and protestants. and I pray did you ever know that there was any such Correspondency betwixt Jesuits and Quakers as might render them Suspicious ? or did you ever know any priests or Jesuits in their Meettings or there Suffer'd to preach ? for I know the Jesuits and the Quakers ; and there is such vast difference in points of religion, that it is as possible to reconcyle light and darknes as to reconcyle them, though they may appeare different from us yet they are I thinke no Murderers as the Papists have been & are. I have no more but that I am yours though Unknown,

13 Mar 78. stilo novo. TIT. OATES.

London the 13. primo call'd March 1678.

Whereas We understand that Will. Dewsberry of Warwick is apprehended & Imprisoned at Northampton upon Suspicion of being a Jesuit or Papist : these are to Certifie all persons concerned, that we whose names are underwritten, being Inhabitants in and about London, and having known the said Will. Dewsberry for many years (Some of us above 20 years) do testify, that to our Certain knowledge, he is neither Jesuite, Popish Priest, nor Papist, nor in the least so much as Popishly-Affected, or inclined thereunto,

but has been known for these many years to be a Peaceable man in his Conversation, in Society with the People call'd Quakers, and hath frequently born publick testimony against the Spirit, Root, and branch of Popery, and farther we do not understand, that ever he was out of the 3 Nations of England, Scotland and Ireland.

Ezekiel Woolley[1]	Will. Welch	Tho. Hart
E. Billinge	Ri. Cannon[3]	Nat Bowman[2]
Tho. Tanton	Hugh Lambe	Tho. Zachary[5]
Tam. Brain Elder.[2]	John Tyse[4]	James Claypool
Avery[2]	Samuel Claye[2]	Rich Mew
Alex. Parker	Geo. Whitehead	Will. Crowch
Tho. Rudyerd	Sam. Groom	

[1] For most of the signatories see notes in George Fox's *Journal* (Camb.) and the *Short Journal*; see also Besse's *Sufferings*.
[2] Not identified.
[3] Richard Cannon of London.
[4] John Tyso [?= John Tyse] of London, c. 1627-1701.
[5] Thomas Zachary of London, c. 1622-1686.

Thomas Shillitoe's Dying Testimony

Hugh Doncaster has called my attention to the fact that a copy of this testimony was printed in William Hodgson's *The Society of Friends in the 19th Century*, vol. 1, p. 312 seq. (Philadelphia, 1875), and that it is there stated that the "last work" of J. J. Gurney's was the new edition of his *Peculiarities of Friends*. The identification is in brackets and clearly editorial, but its source is not given, nor is information given as to the source of the testimony.

It seems probable that the historian, who was himself strongly opposed to Joseph John Gurney's teaching, had access to the copy of the testimony which we know to have been used by John Wilbur, and that this was also the ground for the identification of the book in question. T.E.H.

Periodicals Exchanged

Receipt of the following periodicals is gratefully acknowledged :

Bulletin of the Friends Historical Association (Philadelphia).
Wesley Historical Society, Proceedings.
Presbyterian Historical Society, Proceedings.
Presbyterian Historical Journal (U.S.A.).
Unitarian Historical Society, Transactions.
Mennonite Quarterly Review (U.S.A.).
Institute of Historical Research, Bulletin.

Defoe, Bugg and the Quakers

By HENRY J. CADBURY, Ph.D.

ACCESS to a complete file (in reprint, with modern index) of the rare periodical *A Review of the State of the British Nation*, published thrice a week for several years by Daniel Defoe,[1] enables me to add what seems a kind of echo of early Quaker controversy on miracles.

In 1708 some of the Camisards came to England and under the title of French Prophets secured a considerable following. The movement passed its zenith about 29th May of that year on which day they prophesied that one Dr. Thomas Emes would rise from the dead in St. Paul's Churchyard. Defoe in his *Review* contributed to the discussion both before and after the disillusionment of the event.[2] He says that efforts have been made to lay the delusion "all at the door of the Quakers, whom they would fain have be reckoned the broachers of these novelties. And this they have especially spread over the Nation in the most remote parts of it, where I have frequently met with it, as entirely thrown upon the Quakers, that it was wholly of kin to the former extravagancies, as they called them, of those people, and was only the same game of enthusiasm acting over again."

Defoe in reply stoutly affirms "that there were fewer of the Quakers among them, than of any sort or sect of people in this nation." He continues to speak, as elsewhere in defence of the Quakers, without espousing their principles, and repeats, "These prophets and their delusions have not their rise among the Quakers, nor have they any Quakers, worth naming as to number, among them."[3]

It may well be asked what led Defoe's contemporaries as late as 1708 to associate the Quakers with such miracle mongering and what made Defoe himself react against the

[1] Published for the Facsimile Text Society, 1938, in 22 facsimile books, and *Index to Defoe's Review*, by William L. Payne, 1948 (both Columbia University Press).

[2] March, 2, April 24, June 10, June 12, July 17, 1708.

[3] Vol. V, pp. 132 (should be 131) -132 (June 12, 1708).

charge. I think the answer to both questions is Francis Bugg. It will be recalled that although George Fox described as a " mad whimsey " an effort of a Friend at Worcester to raise a corpse fifty years before, and though his followers never made public his own book of miracles, their claim to miracles was kept before the public year after year by the ex-Quaker Francis Bugg[1] for a quarter century after 1694 when Fox's *Journal* was published.

And precisely against this same Bugg Defoe had a strong dislike which made him discount his attacks on the Quakers. In the passage just cited the *Review* refers to him as " the learned Mr B— who has done more by raving at them to make any man turn Quaker, than all the authors I have met with."

Some years later he refers to " some late Books written by Mr B— against the Quakers. Those they were wrote for would not read them ; those they were wrote against did not value them ; those that read them did not understand them ; those that understand them did not like them ; those that liked them would not buy them ; his friends would not vindicate them, his enemies would not trouble themselves to answer them, and he that wrote them did not believe them ; and all this but the last was from the character of the author."[2]

A literary altercation about the Quakers took place between Bugg and Defoe in 1705-6. In his *Review* Defoe had occasion to answer a suggestion that Dissenters were not Christians by the statement that he hoped they were all Christians and that he was not so narrow in his charity as not to think the Quakers to be Christians, and many of them better Christians too than those that pretend to condemn them.

In reply " a certain man of many volumes . . . whose name it seems is Mr Bugg " wrote " a penny book entitled, *The Quakers Catechism*, to which as a shoeing horn to draw in the people to buy it, is added in the title, *The Shortest Way with Daniel De Foe.*" Defoe reiterates his defence of the Quakers, even twice quoting from Barclay's *Apology*, and more extensively from a later Quaker publication *The Christianity of the Quakers Asserted*, etc. 1689. But, what is

[1] See my *George Fox's Book of Miracles*, 1948 (Cambridge University Press), pp. 13, 85-91.

[2] Vol. VII, p. 30 (April 13, 1710).

more to our present point, he speaks slightingly of "Mr. Bugg, who, I am informed may be much sooner confuted than silenced." He refers also to Bugg's "large folio which he says he is printing. I dare say nobody will give themselves the trouble to reply to him, and not many to read him, who will find it very difficult, as I am told, to print anything he has not printed before, and been answered and answered till he is given over as a lunatick."[1]

[1] Vol. III, pp. 62-64 (February 5, 1706).

Researches in Progress

G. F. A. Baer, M.A., M.Ed., 173 Hampstead Way, London, N.W.11, of Kimberley, South Africa, is writing an account of William Edward Forster's work for the establishment of a national system of education in England. Special attention will be paid to the formative influence of Quakerism on W. E. Forster. The thesis is to be presented in 1952 for the University of London Ph.D. in the Institute of Education. The author will welcome any information as to documents relating to W. E. Forster, and especially his educational work.

Elizabeth Brewster, a Canadian student and author of "Life in a Quaker Auburn" (*University of Toronto quarterly*, xviii, 124-130), is preparing to submit for the degree of Ph.D. at Indiana University a thesis on *The Irish Peasantry in some minor Anglo-Irish Writers of the early 19th Century*. This will include a study of the writings of Mary Leadbeater.

Alan M. Rees, B.A., of Keble College, Oxford, is preparing for the D.Phil. degree a study on the origins of the Anti-slavery movement in England and the abolition of the slave trade.

Juliet Reeve, of Friends University, Wichita, Kansas, is preparing a study of Daniel Defoe and the Quakers, and seeks any information concerning Defoe's relations with Friends.

Dr. Marek Waysblum, 81 Elgin Crescent, London, W.11, is collecting material for a study of the relations between early Friends and Poland until the end of the 17th century.

A Tribute to John Bright by John Greenleaf Whittier

The following letter written by Whittier the year he died, recently came into the possession of C. Marshall Taylor, with whose permission it is printed here and to whom we are indebted for the further information.

Newburyport
2 Mo. 19. 1892

My dear Friend
W. Walker Jubb ;

No one can have a higher estimate than myself of the character, and public services of John Bright. As an orator, he had no equal among the public men of his time. The beauty, strength, and adaptability of our grand old English tongue was scarcely ever better exemplified than in some of his great speeches. As a statesman he believed that "Righteousness alone exalteth a nation," and that justice is always expedient. He had all the courage which his strong convictions required, and having once taken what he regarded as his rightful position, he stood immovable as a firm-rooted old English oak, let the winds of public opinion blow as they might. Time has vindicated, and justified his approval, or disapproval of the important measures which claimed his consideration, during his long and brilliant parliamentary career. His strong healthful nature tolerated no cant, or affectation, and he made no special professions of personal religious experience, or attainment, but his Christian faith was always manifest, and he made the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount the rule of his speech, and action. He was a member of a small religious society, but he was too broad and liberal to be a sectarian. He was just, and even generous towards all other nationalities, but he was proud of his own birthright, and we love him none the less that he was a true and loyal Englishman. As Americans, we owe him a debt of gratitude, which can never be paid for his unwavering advocacy of the Union Cause during our Civil war. But for him the Confederacy might have been recognized by the British Government.

Can we better express our gratitude for his invaluable services, than by keeping his example before the young men of our land, that when called to participate in the affairs of State, they may be influenced by the same purity of motive, and prove themselves as uncompromising defenders of the right ?

Very sincerely thy friend
John G. Whittier

There are two self-explanatory notes signed by S. T. Pickard, attached to the letter :

" 401 Newbury St
Boston Jan 21/03

My Dear Mr Midge :

This letter is genuine, & I recognize the hand of his amanuensis. The date shows that it was written when he was seriously ill at the house of his cousin Gertrude Whittier Cartland, in Newburyport. My wife was then nursing him. He died eight months after it was written.[1]

Unable to sit up, except in his bed, Gertrude wrote the letter at his dictation, & he signed it in his best style. It is the only dictated letter of his I have ever seen . . .

Yours sinc
S. T. Pickard "

" I think this letter to Mr. Jubb an excellent specimen of Mr. Whittier's prose style. It is probable he wrote it, in first draft, in pencil while in bed, & that Gertrude copied it for him, & he appended his signature, which is a fine one. It is one of the best tributes to Bright I have seen.
S. T. Pickard "

For relations between John Bright and J. G. Whittier, see J. T. Mills: *John Bright and the Quakers*, II, 307-11, and compare Whittier's sentiments expressed 3.iv.1889 in a letter to Annie Fields just after John Bright's death :

> " We had much in common—in our religious faith, our hatred of war and oppression. His great genius seemed to me to be always held firmly in hand by a sense of duty, and by the practical common sense of a shrewd man of business, . . . his eloquence was only called out by what he regarded as the voice of God in his soul."[2]

C. MARSHALL TAYLOR.

[1] S.T.P.'s error, should be seven months.

[2] Quoted from S. T Pickard's *Life of Whittier*, 738-9.

A Bibliographical Note

The effect of this note is to identify a publication[1] against Quakerism omitted from Joseph Smith's *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana* and to distinguish between two pieces there confused ;[2] and also conjecturally to identify a publication[3] by a Friend omitted from Smith's *Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books.*

In 1690 there appeared the following item of Quaker apologetic : *The Christianity of the People Commonly Called Quakers, Vindicated from Antichristian Opposition. I. In a serious Examination of Doctor Ford's Preservative against Quakerism ; in a large fallacious Scheme Tendered by S.F. D.D. as he stiles himself. II. In a brief Answer to Henry Osland's Manuscript against the said People. III. In a brief Consideration of an Epistle directed to Friends and Brethren at their next General Meeting in London. Signed N.N. but no Name to it. Sincerely Tendered in behalf of the aforesaid People and their Ancient Friends, by some of them.* It is attributed by Joseph Smith, *Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books* (1867), ii. 897 to George Whitehead : and with good reason, for in the margin of p. 28 are printed the words " To this I subscribe, Geo. Whitehead."

The passage in the text against which these words appear is of some interest. In the following transcription of it the round and square brackets and italics of the original are preserved, as are the asterisk and dagger indicating the statements to his subscription to which George Whitehead wished to draw attention.

> The words cited against *G.W.* and others, Thus, *Viz. and here thy Antiquity, thy Reasons, (and [about] the* 3 *Persons thou dreamest of, which thou wouldst divide out of one like a Conjurer,) are all denyed, and thou with them* (*i.e.* his dark Reasons and Imaginations,) shut up in perpetaal [*sic*, G.F.N.] Darkness, *&c.*

[1] Simon Ford : *Preservative against Quakerism.* (*Term Catalogue*, ii, 331 ; not in J. I. Dredge : *A few sheaves of Devon bibliography*, iv (1893) ; no copy known.)

[2] Henry Osland : *Antiquaries.* MS. [*ante* 1658 ; not extant] : *An Epistle directed to Friends and Brethren.* MS. [*post* 1675 ; not extant].

[3] John Humphreys : . . . *Persecution for conscience sake.* (Wing H3722, copy in Bodleian Library and in Dr. Williams' Library.)

> *G.W.* positively disowns the Words, and affirms they are none of his, and that he writ not that part of the Answer to *Townsend* (which was about the Year 1654.) yet looks on the words as wrong writ or wrong printed, and that he raced them out, or corrected them long since, where he has met with that Answer. For instead of [*and the* 3 *Persons*,] it should have rather been [*about the* 3 Persons.] And *G.W.* shall neither stand by, nor own those words as charged ; after he see them in Print, he was sorry his Name was to that Paper without distinction between what he writ, and what he did not write in it, wherein those words are which give the Occasion. Let this Advertisement clear *G.W.* and others, and suffice every charitable and ingenuous Reader, as we hope it will.

The Townsend to whom George Whitehead refers was Sampson Townsend, who in 1661 was ejected from the Vicarage of Whitwell with Hackford, Norfolk (see A. G. Matthews, *Calamy Revised*, *s.v.*). In 1654 he published *The Scripture proved to be the Word of God, and the only foundation of Faith, and rule for our obedience ; or a clear conviction of the errours of those that are called Quakers*. The answer to this to which George Whitehead contributed, together with Christopher Atkinson, James Lancaster and Thomas Simonds, then his fellow-prisoners at Norwich, was entitled *Ishmael and his Mother, cast out into the Wilderness, amongst the Wild Beasts of the same nature : or a Reply to a Book entitulled, The Scriptures proved to be the word of God* (1655).[1] The piece is noticed by Smith *s.vv.* Atkinson, Lancaster and Whitehead, but not *s.v.* Simonds.

George Whitehead's disclaimer *post eventum* of the false doctrine charged to him is characteristic and illuminating. In 1690, shortly after the passing of the Toleration Act, by the terms of which Unitarians were still excluded from toleration, it was highly desirable for Friends to dissociate themselves from any apparent anti-Trinitarianism. In 1655, on the other hand, when Friends were in the first flush of their enthusiasm and when Whitehead himself was not yet twenty, their impatience with " notions " led them not infrequently into rash statements which proved all too easy for theologically equipped opponents to turn against them. In none of the three copies of the reply to Townsend which are preserved in the Society's Library at Friends House has the offending passage been altered to the form which Whitehead preferred.

[1] Reprinted by Francis Bugg in *A Modest Defence* (1700).

The passage quoted above, to which George Whitehead drew attention by adding his name in the margin, occurs in the third part of his tract, in reply to " An Epistle directed to Friends and Brethren, at their next general Meeting in London." In *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana* (1873), Smith includes this as *An Epistle, s.v.* N.N., with a cross-reference to George Whitehead's reply (here misdated 1694). There seems no evidence from the reply or from bibliographical sources that the *Epistle* was printed. It is probably vain to attempt the identification of " N.N.," which is no more than an accepted form for " anonymous."

The piece to which the second part of George Whitehead's tract replies is expressly described by him as an " abusive and insulting Manuscript." Its author, Henry Osland, was ejected from the curacy of Bewdley, Worcs., in 1662 (see *Dict. Nat. Biog.* and *Cal. Rev., s.v.*, as Oasland; in letters to Richard Baxter preserved among the Baxter MSS. at Dr. Williams' Library he always signs Osland, the form George Whitehead uses). It is treated by Smith, *Bibl. Anti-Quak., s.v.* Oasland, as the same MS. work as that replied to in 1657 by the Quaker John Humphryes (see below). This is a mistake. Passages quoted from the MS. and answered by George Whitehead include references to " Dr. Ford " as an " able ancient Preacher " " in the publick Assembly " " at Stowerbridge " and to " a young lively Non-conformist " " at the licensed Meeting House." This provides for the piece a date not only in or after 1672, when licenses for Nonconformist worship were first granted, but in or after 1676, on 22nd May of which year Dr. Simon Ford received the rectory of Old Swinford or Stourbridge, Worcs. (see *D.N.B.*). It is unlikely, in any case, that in 1690 George Whitehead would have published a reply to a manuscript written in or before 1657.

The first part of George Whitehead's tract is " a serious Examination of Doctor Ford's Preservative against Quakerism." This piece, by the Dr. Simon Ford to whom reference has just been made, was missed by Smith, who does not even note it *pro forma* (as he does the *Epistle* by " N.N."), and it should therefore be added to the other works by Ford which do find a place in *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana*. It bore the title *Dr. Ford's Preservative against Quakerism: in answer to a Paper pretending to contain*

the Christianity of the people called Quakers. It appeared "In one large sheet. Printed for R. Wilde at the Map of the World in St. Paul's Churchyard" (see *Term Catalogue*, ii, 331). It was published at Michaelmas 1690, so George Whitehead was evidently prompt in issuing his reply. It does not appear that any copy of the *Preservative* is now extant.

The earlier work by Henry Osland (mentioned above) was answered in 1657 by *The Bíos πάντων εἰδέοτος, or* נבט *or the Vision of Eternity Held forth, in Answer to some Antiquaeries Which were given forth from Ægypt by one of Babels Builders, a pretended Minister of Christ, living in Worcestershire at Beaudly, that is called Mr. Henry Osland* . . . by one . . . whose name is known to God by these three Jews Letters in the sequel, יאם but to men by John Humphryes (as Smith, *Descr. Cat.*, *s.v.*; not Humphreys, as Smith, *Bibl. Anti-Quak.*, *s.v.* Oasland). There is no proof that Osland's *Antiquaeries* were not printed (Smith's identification of them with Osland's later anti-Quaker manuscript having been shown to be mistaken); but it is likely that they were only in manuscript. The Quaker queries to which they were a retort were probably not printed, either. At this time the issuing of queries simultaneously in many different parts of England was part of the nation-wide Quaker campaign. Some of these were printed. To the short list given in my *Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, p. 153, n. 3, may be added two by Fox entitled *Here are several Queries Put forth in Print for all, or any of you whose names are hereunder written* (1657: "For Robert Gell, William Lilly, and other Astrologers and Doctors of Physick") and *A few Queries for Thomas Moor the Elder* (*s.a.*; dated 1660 by Smith).

Others of the Quaker queries were not printed but can be recovered in whole or in part from the retorts they provoked, or even from the Quaker replies to those retorts. Thus Humphryes refers back to a query he had put forth to Osland "on the Catechism of your Assemblies Agreement" (p. 15), *i.e.* to the catechism published in *The Agreement of the Associated Ministers of Christ in the County of Worcestershire* (1656). The Voluntary Association of ministers of all parties in Worcestershire inspired and led by Richard Baxter was much concerned with the challenge

of Quakerism at this time. Quaker queries also reached Baxter, and in "An Answer to the Quaker's Queries" in *The Quakers Catechism* (1655) he, like Osland, replied to them. (The inclusion by Smith of the *Answer* as a separate piece is a mistake, which appears to have been caused by the mishap that one copy of this second part of *The Quakers Catechism* was severed from the first part and preserved separately in the Library at Friends House.) A collation of Baxter's *Quakers Catechism* and Osland's *Antiquaeries* (as quoted in Humphryes' reply) makes it plain that they were not retorts to the same queries. As ministers who were leaders of the Worcestershire Association, however, Baxter and Osland were as united against the Quakers as were the Quakers against them. Humphryes quotes Osland as saying that "Burraston and Baxter thy fellow Priests are more fitter to whip me then dispute with me" (p. 16): and Boraston also, the Rector of Ribbesford, was a member of the Association.

In her work at Dr. Williams' Library, where she is compiling a Bibliography of Early Nonconformity, Miss G. Woodward recently came upon a work with the following title: הבל הבלים *Or, Persecution for Conscience sake, most vain, cruel and destructive to the Promoters and Abettors of it* . . . by John Humphreys, London, Printed for the Author, 1682. This work is in the form of "a Discourse from *Matth.* 2.16, 17, 18," and is therefore hardly likely to have been written by a Quaker; but the use of Hebrew and Greek in the title and margins gives it a certain similarity to the work published in 1657 by the Quaker John Humphryes. The latter was certainly an unconventional Friend. His having a new "name . . . known to God" is an aspect of the early enthusiasm which fed upon *Revelation* and is not without parallel (cf. Fox himself in his *Journal*, ed. N. Penney, i. 162; and *Rev.* ii. 17), nor is his mystagogic use of Hebrew unique. What is stranger is the Latinity of his letter to the reader, beginning "Charissime Lector," and his dating it "Juno 3° 1657"; for by 1657 few Friends used the names of the months. That he departed in these ways from the Quaker norm makes it perhaps a little more probable that he also wrote the tract published in 1682; it further suggests that by that date he may have ceased to be a Friend.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Addition to the Library

Dr. Henry J. Cadbury has presented to the library a copy of John Hodgson's rare tract:

> *A Letter from a Member of the Army, to the Committee of Safety, and Councell of Officers of the Army, that they may do that which is required of them to be done, that the Lord may delight to dwell among them, and do them good: that they may not be over-turned as others, who have served themselves, and not the Lord.*
> London, Printed for Giles Calvert, at the Black-spread-Eagle near the West end of Pauls, 1659.

The *Letter* is a small quarto of eight pages. Henry J. Cadbury has also presented a photostat reproduction of the only other copy of the *Letter* known which is in Harvard College Library.[1]

The author's name appears at the end of the piece: "Given forth the 8th day, of the 9th Moneth. From a Member of the Army, who wishes them well, but a witnesse in measure, against all deciet therein, JOHN HODGSON."

The text begins on p. 3 with "Dear Friends" and from the outset the work adopts a minatory tone. John Hodgson calls to mind the downfall of the former powers in the land and the impending fall of the Committee of Safety if its supporters continue "seeking to please the world, by upholding of those things that they love, as lordly Titles, whereby the children of this world love to please and flatter one another, with Humble Servant, Excellency, Highnesse, Honour, Worship, and the like, when they are the Divels servants, and would destroy one another for earth and titles, having not truth in the heart." He warns that the Lord would not consider them worthy to continue in power "if you yet flatter the lying Hirelings of this Nation . . . and their Mother, their two blind eyes, and offspring of filth, the two Universities, so called." After more in this vein, towards the close, John Hodgson turns to pleading: "Therefore my deare friends, prize your time, and examine your hearts, that you may know what is the good, and acceptable will of our God, to do it, that we may all with hand, and heart, go along with you, and helpe to carry on the Lords worke." He reminds the authorities of "the blood and sufferings of the Lord's dear Ones" and asks that strict and impartial inquiry may be made "that Justice may be done upon the impenitent and hard-hearted." He ends: "I have discharged my self before the Lord, in love to you all, what is required of me; and if you will be partakers of their Sinnes, of their Plagues you must have part; in that which altereth not, I wish you well."[2]

[1] See Donald Wing's *Short title Catalogue, 1641-1700* under Hodgson.

[2] Punctuation altered.

Who was John Hodgson the author? This question is not easy to answer. Joseph Smith's *Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books* records a work by John Hodgson (of Yorkshire?):

> *Love, Kindness, and due Respect, By way of Warning to the Parliament of the Common-wealth of England, That they may not neglect the great opportunity now put into their hands, for the redemption and freedom of these Oppressed Nations . . . From a Servant of the Lord, who hath born his Testimonie for the Lord in the day of Apostacy, and hath been a Sufferer for the Testimonie of a good Conscience, by Oppressors, under the name of a Quaker.*
>
> J. Hodgson.
>
> London, Printed for Giles Calvert. 1659.

In this 8-page tract Quaker John Hodgson remarks on the course of events which had brought the Parliament back into power—with another chance to follow the Lord's counsel. Even as he wrote the opportunity was being cast aside by persecuting men "that cannot bow, swear, and give respect to persons." The author warns the Parliament "think not to your selves you shall be established, if you be found hindring the Lords work; for except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of those that was before you . . . you shall not escape the vengeance." In particular he calls upon them to "consider the great oppression of the filthy proceedings of the Laws of this Nation, and the vexatious covetous Lawyers . . . and consider the oppression of the Ministry of England, and their forced maintenance." In all these points, and in its general tenor, *Love, Kindness, and due Respect* is quite consistent with the *Letter*, and it may be that the same person is the author of both.

Certain similarities stand out in reading the text of the pamphlets. The titles strike the same note of warning—even using the same verb "overturn" concerning the changes of government which ushered in the new authorities. Some phrases are closely paralleled in both works: "I have discharged myself before the Lord"; "that he may rule whose right it is"; "overturning many and sparing you." It would perhaps be dangerous to carry argument from the point of style too far, particularly as the basis for comparison is so slight.

It is difficult to base any argument concerning authorship on the dating of the pamphlets. The *Letter* is dated 8. ix. (1659)—the year is not in doubt. *Love, Kindness and due Respect* has no day and month date, but the fact that it is addressed to the Parliament limits the date of writing to between May and October 13, 1659, or between early January and March 16, 1660 (N.S.).[1]

If the authors are identical, it seems unlikely that *Love, Kindness, and due Respect* was written in the summer of 1659. At this period

[1] The periods between the recall of the Rump Parliament in May 1659, and the "interruption" of October 13, and the recall of Parliament in January 1660 and its final dissolution on March 16, 1660—this latter period assuming Giles Calvert dated his publications Old Style (*i.e.* not changing to the New Year until March 25).

a Friend (even if he had remained in the Army during the Protectorate) would be very unlikely to join it, however strongly his sympathies may have been claimed for the support of the tottering republican government. If this tract was written in the early months of 1660 (N.S.), it seems unlikely that the authors are identical unless we assume that Quaker John Hodgson's sufferings (due probably to the fact that he " could not so much idolize mens persons, and worship the beasts Image, as was required ") were of very recent date, and that he was cashiered in the winter of 1659-60 for insubordination. If this was the case would he not probably have given more particulars concerning events which must have been fresh in his mind ? On the dating evidence it is difficult to believe that the two works were written by the same person.

It might have been easier to settle the question of authorship of the tract presented by Henry J. Cadbury if we knew anything of John Hodgson the Quaker. Joseph Smith thought he might be a Yorkshireman, and the surname is certainly fairly widespread in the West Riding. There were Friends of that name around Halifax in the time of Charles II (see Oliver Heywood's *Diary*). Further information on the question would be appreciated.

The *Autobiography* of Captain John Hodgson, of Coley Hall, near Halifax, first published in 1806, and edited with additional notes by J. Horsfall Turner (Brighouse : A. B. Bayes, printer. 1882), is of no assistance. Captain Hodgson was a leading non-conformist who saw much service in the Civil Wars. In the later years of the Protectorate he was mostly in Yorkshire. At Newcastle, December 10, 1659, he received arrears of army pay (*Autobiography*, p. 50). As between Monk and Lambert, Hodgson's sympathies were with the latter, and it is not surprising to find him in trouble after the Restoration ; spied upon, imprisoned and constantly suspect for his republican and sectarian sympathies. There is no hint that he wrote the *Letter*.

THE *Bulletin of Friends Historical Association*, Vol. 38, No. 2, autumn number, 1949, opens with an article by William Wistar Comfort entitled " Quaker Visitors to American Presidents in the Nineteenth Century." In the course of this, we learn that, in 1827, John Quincy Adams informed Thomas Shillitoe " he was at liberty to receive me at such time as best suited myself " —tribute both to the tempo of public business and to the respect for that much travelled Friend. The visits of J. J. Gurney, William Forster (1846), Edward Grubb (1904), are also described. Opal Thornburg, of Earlham College, writes on David Huddleston, and Edwin B. Bronner of Temple University writes on the interesting subject of " John Bright and the Factory Acts : humanitarianism versus *laissez faire* "—" the same John Bright who opposed factory legislation was in large part responsible for giving to the working man enough to eat and the right to vote."

Recent Publications

Quakers in Science and Industry : being an account of the Quaker contributions to science and industry during the 17th and 18th centuries. By Arthur Raistrick. London, Bannisdale Press, 1950. Pp. 361, 9 plates. 21s.

Students of Quaker history have largely been concerned to study the development of religious manifestations in the Quaker movement, and to tell the story of the leaders. This is naturally so, for the main interest of a religious movement must be religious. It is unfortunate, however, that this should so often mean that social interests and industrial activities (which influence and are in turn influenced by religion) are apt to be overlooked or treated in a cursory manner.

The connection between Dissent and commercial enterprise and success has often been alluded to, but there are few books which have dealt with this aspect of economic and industrial history from the Quaker point of view. Dr. Raistrick has placed in his debt students both of Quaker history and of the growth of British industrialization in the age of Mercantilism and the first half of the Industrial Revolution for the many new facts and welcome light on diverse topics which he has here brought together.

Quakers in Science and Industry carries forward into industry the general picture of Quaker attitudes given twenty years ago by Isabel Grubb in her *Quakerism and Industry before* 1800, a book which should be read in connection with the work under review. Dr. Raistrick is concerned with industrial and commercial activities, from ironfounding and mining to banking, and likewise with scientific interests. The scientists from Thomas Lawson in the 17th century to John Dalton and William Allen in the early 19th century, the 18th-century clock and instrument makers and the Quaker doctors all receive notice. There are some useful genealogical charts showing family and business connections.

John Hepburn & His Book against Slavery, 1715. By Henry J. Cadbury. Worcester, Mass., American Antiquarian Society, 1949. (Reprinted from the Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society for 1949. Pp. 89-160.)

Henry J. Cadbury proves that the author of the rare *American Defence of the Christian Golden Rule, or An Essay to prove the Unlawfulness of making Slaves of Men* (1715) was John Hepburn the Friend. In this article we learn all that is known about the man,

and there is a brief study of the little book itself, as well as a facsimile reprint of more than 40 of its 100 pages, containing Hepburn's contribution to the volume. Two copies only of the book are known—one in the British Museum, and an incomplete copy in Boston Public Library.

Worship : John Woolman. Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Pa., U.S.A. 1950. Pp. 32. 35 cents.

A selection from the writings of John Woolman, arranged under eight aspects of his inward experience, without further commentary than a brief foreword. The source for each paragraph is given in a list of sources at the end.

This is a valuable introduction to Woolman's living, speaking and thinking experience of worship, the central exercise of his life.

Religious Trends in English Poetry. By Hoxie Neale Fairchild. (Vol. 1 : 1700-1740—Protestantism and the Cult of Sentiment. 1939. Vol. 2 : 1740-1780—Religious Sentimentalism in the Age of Johnson. 1942. Vol. 3 : 1780-1830—Romantic Faith. 1949.) New York, Columbia University Press.

These three volumes form part of the author's project of devoting a "series of studies to religious thought and feeling as reflected in English poetry from the eighteenth century to the twentieth." The stress is laid, throughout, on the historical rather than on the aesthetic or metaphysical aspects of the theme, and Professor Fairchild has been at pains to show the continuity of English poetry reflected in the gradual unfolding of the "cult of sentiment" in literature, and of evangelicalism in religion, which culminated at the close of the eighteenth century in the flowering of Romanticism.

We may feel that it is a far cry from the "enthusiasm" of the sects of the seventeenth century to the Romantic period, separated as they are by the gulf of Reason. But the age of Reason was not wholly without its undercurrents of far different character, and the author sees the dissenting sects (particularly Baptists and Quakers) as carriers—to a great extent unconscious, and perhaps unwilling, since they had become sober and anxious to avoid the imputation of enthusiasm—of certain tendencies from the seventeenth century which looked forward to the "religion of sentiment."

The fact that this influence was in the main unconscious means that there is very little material to be discussed, and the interest for Friends lies rather in the contemporary references to Quakers and their worship than in the work of any specifically Quaker poets.

For the latter the reader is referred to Luella Wright's *Literary Life of the Early Friends*, and Professor Fairchild confines himself to noting the plain sincerity with which Thomas Ellwood sets forth the Quaker ideal in his verse, and the rather feeble rhymes of Richard Bockett the younger (1693-1721) whose work is "almost completely lacking in distinctively Quakerish doctrine and feeling."

There were, however, frequent references to Friends in the poetry of the eighteenth century. The distinctive Quaker beliefs and way of worship made them a target for wit, and not infrequently for parody. John Dunton for example, gives Friends credit for being opposed to Popery, and acknowledges that they "Are Friends at Heart, as well as in their Speech," but he cannot forbear to point a witty contrast: "Their Light within does keep them in the Dark" and says that they "Are very Just, as well as very Rich."[1] It is obvious that the sober righteousness of many eighteenth-century Friends tended to irritate their contemporaries. On the other hand, John Gay in his *The Espousal, a Sober Eclogue* parodies the excesses to which religious enthusiasm may lead in a dialogue between the Quakeress Tabitha and her lover.

It must not be thought that Quakers are always mentioned unsympathetically, for now and then we find a writer whose acquaintance with Quakerism is less superficial than usual, and who can evince a certain amount of serious respect even when he prefers another form of worship for himself. Matthew Green (1696-1737) had an admiration for the Quakers and devotes some verses to the praise of Barclay's *Apology*, although he eventually rejected the advice to

> "... go the quakers' by-way,
> 'Tis plain, without turnpikes, so nothing to pay,"

and could write sardonically:

> "I never am at meeting seen,
> Meeting, that region of the Spleen;
> The broken heart, the busy friend,
> The inward call, on Spleen depend."

Samuel Wesley the younger (1691-1739), a High Churchman, could praise the virtue of a dead Quakeress in "On the death of a Friend, a Dissenter from the Church of England," with assurance that, in spite of doctrinal errors, at last she

> "rests secure from Dangers and from Dread,
> Where Unbelief dare never lift its Head;
> Where none the Sacred Gospel dare disown,
> Nor fav'rite Clarke the Son of God dethrone."

The second volume includes a short study of John Scott of Amwell (1730-1783), in whom, apart from a spark of hatred of war, Professor Fairchild sees little distinctly Quakerly. He does detect however a love of nature and capacity for accurate observation running through Scott's verse, and this may well be another example of the

[1] From *The Pulpit-Fool* (1707) attributed to John Dunton.

Quaker's interest in natural sciences carried over into literature. John Scott had his *Poetical Works* embellished with engravings. Four of them were done by William Blake.

Whilst the references to Friends are interesting, and the material collected helps to fill in the picture of the place occupied by Quakerism in eighteenth century England, it must be confessed that the work presents a gloomy picture of the state of religion particularly during the early period—the gloomier perhaps because it is only one side of the picture, for the religion of an age is never fully reflected in its poetry.

Elisabeth von der Pfalz, Fürstabtissin von Herford. Zum Stand der Forschung; von Bernhard Rang. This article in the 55. Jahresbericht des Historischen Vereins für das Grafschaft Ravensberg, Jahrgang 1948-49 (Bielefeld, 1949. Pp. 50-71) includes a general survey of the printed sources and the state of knowledge concerning Elizabeth, Princess Palatine, abbess of Herford. It contains an interesting section on Elizabeth's connections with the Labadists and the Quakers. There are good notes on source materials and bibliographies of printed works.

Monsignor Ronald Knox in his recent book *Enthusiasm: a chapter in the history of religion, with special reference to the XVII and XVIII centuries* (Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1950. 30s.) has tried to bring together and study in historical perspective those religious movements on which the 18th century looked down and which were dubbed collectively *Enthusiasm*. Friends will be particularly interested in the chapter on George Fox and 17th-century Protestantism, with a note on the pre-history of Quakerism (based largely on Robert Barclay's *Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth*, 1876). A. C. Bickley's story of the Coppinger information (Jan. 1655 [1654 O.S.]) alleging that the Quaker leaders in London were Romish Friars is repeated, without any qualifying statement that London Friends denied knowledge of any among them having been or being Catholics. Bringing together facts on the "enthusiastic" aspect of Quaker development results in a study of early Friends slightly reminiscent of a caricature, but this is a book which deserves to be read.

In the *History of the Pre-Romantic Novel in England* (New York, *Modern Language Association of America*, 1949), James R. Foster, Professor of English in Long Island University aims "to give an account of the pre-romantic narratives which appeared in England during the eighteenth century and to describe the French novels influencing them."

In the chapter on Early English Sentimentalists, the author deals with John Shebbeare (1709-88). Quakers, along with Scots, Jews, the Duke of Newcastle and George II, were Shebbeare's aversions, and it is not surprising to find in his *Lydia, or Filial Piety* (1755), that Jabez Sly, a Quaker of "great external purity," makes away with the savings of Lydia's mother which had been entrusted to him.

A chapter entitled Liberal Opinions has more of general interest from the Quaker viewpoint as it includes a full study of the work of Robert Bage (1728-1801) the novelist. His Quaker upbringing, though he had little other connection with the Society, can doubtless be traced in his liberal outlook and sustained interest in philosophical theories and scientific advancement.

Thomas Parke, M.B., Physician and Friend, an article by Whitfield J. Bell, Jr., Associate Professor of History at Dickinson College, Carlisle, Penna. appeared in *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. 6, no. 4 (October 1949), pp. 569-595. Thomas Parke (1749-1835), grandson of Thomas Parke who came to Pennsylvania from Ireland in 1724, was president of the Philadelphia College of Physicians. From 1771 until 1773 he pursued medical studies in London and Edinburgh, and an interesting part of the story is how he came to England armed with a pouchful of letters of introduction from his Philadelphia friends and teachers to Dr. Fothergill and other friends and teachers in London and Edinburgh. Physician of the Pennsylvania Hospital for many years, president of the College of Physicians, member of the American Philosophical Society and a director of the Library Company, Parke participated in many activities suitable to his profession and station. At his death he "left a reputation for cautious practice and solid worth that was a greater tribute to his character than to his learning."

In *The William and Mary Quarterly* for January 1950 (3rd series, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 3-25) there is an interesting article by Frederick B. Tolles, on George Logan's mission to France in 1798 in which he acted in a private capacity trying to effect a *rapprochement* with the French Directory at a time when war between the infant republics seemed likely. Logan's excursion into diplomacy was from the beginning the subject of much criticism, and Frederick Tolles' final judgment is worth consideration: "Despite the slurs of Federalist spokesmen and the persistent disparagement of historians, George Logan's mission to France can be assigned some share of credit for preventing the diplomatic imbroglio of 1798 from degenerating into the first foreign war of the independent United States."

In the same issue (pp. 95-106) Margaret Kinard edits *John Usher's Report on the Northern Colonies*, 1698, and we note in his report on Pennsylvania

> " as to Philadelphia, abundance of fine Brick buildings, but in truth its a monster the head too big for the body ; and believe in few Years will prove Soe. There is a fine Citty ; but the place is settled by Farms and not by Townes. Consequently people not sufficeintt to Continue a Trade for the Citty, that being over populated. The Govermtt in the Quakers hands. They are Civill and Curtious."

IN the *Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society*, Vol. 9, No. 3 (October, 1949), H. Lismer Short, M.A., has an article on " The Evolution of Unitarian Church-Building " and makes (p. 146) an interesting observation on the influence on meeting house construction, of Calvinistic ideas about the Lord's Supper. " This was to be the likeness of an actual meal, with the participants sitting at or near a table ; in contrast to medieval sacramentalism, according to which a mysterious sacrifice was performed by a priest at an altar. When at the Reformation medieval church-buildings were adapted for the " Reformed " worship, the table was placed in the body of the church, with the pulpit behind it against one of the side walls, and the pews facing inwards from the other three sides. When new buildings were erected the same arrangement of the necessary furniture was continued.

> This was the original form of the Meeting House ; it was built round a central table. Even the Friends Meeting Houses followed this style : the seats face inwards to a central space (often with a table in it, though there is no Lord's Supper), and the elders' seats, in the place of a pulpit, are raised up in the middle of one of the long sides."

Notes and Queries

John Rous's Will

In 1907 in this *Journal* (iv. 51-54, 82-83) was printed the will of John Rous, son-in-law of Margaret Fox, dated 26th October, 1692. In 1941 when I was in Barbados I found in the Registration Office at Bridgetown a codicil to the will of which a certified copy is transcribed below. It is dated 30th August, 1694 and was entered 26th November, 1695. It indicates that when he was in Barbados he no longer felt so harshly as to leave to his "daughter Margaret who hath several ways disobliged me the sum of ten pounds only." Unfortunately, through my own fault, this information never reached Isabel Ross in time to permit her to use it on page 345 of her *Margaret Fell: Mother of Quakerism*. Neither the witnesses of the codicil nor the executors in trust of the estate are named in the lists I have of Friends upon the island. There were legal advantages in their being non-Friends.

Barbados—Whereas heretofore vizt—on or about the 12th day of the month called November 1692 I John Rous being then in the Citty of London in the Kingdom of England made my last will and testament in writeing and set my hand and seale thereto which I hereby ratifie and confirme and appoint this writeing to be a Codicell to be appended thereto and therefore and the said Jno: Rouse being now in the Island of Barbados and in good health of body and of sound minde doe further give and bequeath unto my eldest daughter Bethia the wife of David English of Pontefract in the County of York in ye Kingdome of England the sume of five hundred pounds sterling money by my executor Nathaniel Rous my sonne But if my son should meet with any great loss by sea or land then the aforesaid sume of five hundred pounds to be paid in five years by one hundred pounds per annum.

Item. I give and further bequeath to my daughter Ann over and above wt. I have formerly bequeathed her ye sume of five hundred pounds sterling to be paid her in like manner as I have appointed my sonn Nathaniel to pay his sister Bethia.

Item. Whereas my daughter Margaret disobliged me and I formerly gave authority to my wife to give her after my decease what sume of money she thought fitt not exceeding five hundred pounds but my will and pleasure is now hereby manifested and I doe hereby give unto her five hundred pounds sterling to be paid by my sonn Nathaniell Rous in like manner and at such time and times as before I have appointed the legacies of my aforenamed daughters.

Item. It is my will if any of my daughters dye without issue the portion unpaid that then I give the same unto Nathaniell Rous my sonn whom I appoint whole and sole executor.

Item. I appoint my loveing friends John Whetstone Esq and

James Coates Esq and David Ramsay Esq and Peter Fuelling gent to be exors in trust of my estate in Barbados untill my sonn Nathaniell shall otherwise order and appoint or settle ye same and doe give unto each of them to be paid by my executors aforesaid tenn pounds a piece to buy them a ps. of plate and in testimony hereof and to a Duplicate of the same have set my hand and seale this 30th day of August 1694.

Signed Sealed and delivered in ye prsence of } John Rous (S)

Jno: Kirton Henry Gibbs
Jno: Heathcott

By His Excellency

Henry Gibbs one of the wittnesses to the within will personally appeared before me and made oath on the holy Evangelists of Almighty God that hee saw John Rous within menconed (now deceased) signe seale publish and declare the same as his last will and testament and that at the doeing thereof he was of sound and disposeing mind and memory to the best of this deponents judgment. Given under my hand this 31th day of August 1695.

F. Russell

Henry J. Cadbury, 7 Buckingham Place, Cambridge, Mass.

Quaker China

I asked [xli, p. 4] for information about the so-called Quaker china. The editor has asked me to write further about it.

Alfred B. Searle, who is an expert on such matters, states that it is not china but earthenware, and that it was not of Quaker origin. I used the word "china" in the sense in which it is used by housewives, meaning the cups, saucers, etc. used at meals. There is a definite tradition in Irish Quaker families that this ware was made especially for Friends in the drab colour because they did not think it right to use the similar pattern in blues, reds, etc. I have once seen this coloured pattern in a non-Friend household.

Alfred Searle informs me that the best specimens he has seen were made at Liverpool but some appear to have been made at Lowestoft, and some in London —probably Lambeth. Most of it was decorated by printed transfers applied to the ware before glazing.

There are a number of varieties of cups, saucers, plates, and bowls, including posset bowls, all with a white glazed ground. They are moulded with a slightly raised pattern, or formalized scrolls or shell patterns, or a kind of network. (Not being an artist I do not describe these patterns technically.) On this white background are printed various designs in a drab colour. (1) Rural scenes, with animals, waterfalls, trees, castles, cottages, churches, etc. (2) Bunches and sprays of flowers of various sorts. (3) Shells. (4) Roses. Some have both the flowers and scenes.

The cups are of generous proportions the large ones holding well over half a pint and the coffee cups are as large as ordinary teacups. I know of three Irish families in which this ware has been or was for three or four generations—Pims of Mountmellick, Newsoms of Edenderry and Grubbs of Clonmel. Another set has had an interesting history. It was presented to Jane Fisher (1789-1877), wife of Abraham Fisher of Youghal,

because of the work she had done in the anti-slavery cause. In the bottom of each cup, and centre of each plate, etc. is reproduced the figure of a slave in chains kneeling, such as is often seen in connection with anti-slavery propaganda. (Alfred Searle informs me that these slave scenes date from the time of the writing of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. They were, of course, not made exclusively for Friends.)

When she died Jane Fisher had about 100 descendants and specimens of her "china" travelled to California with one of them. A few years ago he sent it back to these countries and some is now at Friends House, and some in the Friends Historical Library in Dublin.

Quite apart from this ware are pieces of china which have fragments of design from Benjamin West's "Treaty with the Indians." Ellen Starr Brinton has written of this in the Bulletin of Friends Historical Association, Autumn, 1941. She tells me that Thomas Green of Fenton, England, made Staffordshire china at the Minerva works from 1830 to 1859. Amongst the historical views which he used was West's picture of "Penn's Treaty with the Indians." There are still cherished in Philadelphia pieces of this old Staffordshire china in blue, brown, green and pink. She also found candle screens of Parian ware with the same picture on them.

I should be very glad to have further information about sets of ware similar to those I have described, or of others which have a definite connection with Quaker history.

ISABEL GRUBB, Seskin, Carrick-on-Suir, Ireland.

JAMES NAYLER'S LAST TESTIMONY [xli. p. 3]

DR. GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL has kindly brought to our notice the extended version with a concluding paragraph commencing "Thou wast with me when I fled," quoted in Robert Rich, *Hidden Things brought to Light*, 1678, pp. 21-22 and printed *Christian Life, Faith & Thought* (*Christian Discipline*. I), p. 26.

SHALL JONATHAN DIE?

Can any reader trace the Irish Friend who is referred to in the following anecdote?

"When three hundred thousand pounds reward was offered for the apprehension of Swift (the author of the Drapier Letters), a patriotic Irish Quaker applied this text to the case; —And the people said unto Saul, shall Jonathan die, who hath wrought this great salvation in Israel? God forbid: as the Lord liveth, there shall not one hair of his head fall to the ground; for he hath wrought with God this day, and so the people rescued Jonathan that he died not." [I Sam. xiv, 45.]

This story doubtless belongs to the last great period of Swift's popularity, when his Drapier Letters, 1724-1726 written against Wood's Halfpence, made him for the time the idol of the Irish people. In the form reproduced above it comes from *Lambeth and the Vatican: or Anecdotes of the Church of Rome, of the Reformed Churches, and of Sects and Sectaries* (3 vols., London, 1825), Vol. 3, p. 151. One cannot easily envisage any English Friend speaking in such terms of the High Church Dean, but the turmoil of eighteenth century Irish politics made strange bed-fellows.

Index

Passed for Press 16.vi.1951

THE JOURNAL

OF THE

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOLUME XLII

1950

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY
FRIENDS HOUSE, EUSTON ROAD, LONDON, N.W.1

PRINTED BY
HEADLEY BROTHERS LTD
THE INVICTA PRESS ASHFORD KENT
AND 109 KINGSWAY
LONDON W C 2

Contents

SUPPLEMENTS TO THE JOURNAL OF FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

6. JOHN AP JOHN and early Friends in Wales. 1s. 6d., post 2d.

7. THOMAS POLE, M.D. (1753-1829). 2s. 6d., post 4d.

14. Record of the SUFFERINGS OF FRIENDS IN CORNWALL, 1655-1686. 152 pp., 7s. 6d., post 4d.

15. QUAKER LANGUAGE. F.H.S. Presidential address by T. Edmund Harvey, 1928. 30 pp., 1s. 6d., post 2d.

16-17. PEN PICTURES OF LONDON YEARLY MEETING, 1789-1833. Ed. Norman Penney. 227 pp., price 10s., post 6d.

20. THE SWARTHMORE DOCUMENTS IN AMERICA. Edited by Henry J. Cadbury, Ph.D. 1940. 90 pp. Thirty-five 17th c. MSS., originally in the Swarthmore Hall collection. 5s., post 2½d.

21. AN ORATOR'S LIBRARY. John Bright's books. Presidential address 1936 by J. Travis Mills. 1946. 24 pages, 2s., post 1d.

22. LETTERS TO WILLIAM DEWSBURY AND OTHERS Edited by Henry J. Cadbury, Ph.D. 1948. 68 pp. Thirty-three. early Quaker letters, 1655 to 1678. 5s., post 2½d.

PRINTED BY HEADLEY BROTHERS LTD, 109 KINGSWAY LONDON WC2 AND ASHFORD KENT