The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society

Volume 55 Numbers 1 & 2

Contents

PAGE

Editorial 1

A Mid-Somerset Meeting in the Seventeenth Century: Long Sutton. *Stephen C. Morland* 4

Places of Worship in the National Census of 1851. *David M. Butler* 25

History and Quaker Renaissance: The Vision of John Wilhelm Rowntree. *Thomas C. Kennedy* 35

Reports on Archives 57

Recent Publications 58

Notes and Queries 64

Annual Membership Subscriptions (Personal) £4 (Institutional) £6 Subscriptions should be paid to the Treasurer and Membership Secretary, FHS, 32 Bolehill Road, Bolehill, Wirksworth, Derbyshire, DE4 4GQ. Orders for single issues and back numbers should be sent to FHS c/o The Library, Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ.

Vol. 55 Nos. 1 and 2 1983 and 1984 issued 1986

THE JOURNAL of the FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Publishing Office, Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ
Communications should be addressed to the Editor at Friends House

Editorial

One of the first duties of a new editor is to pay tribute to the work of his predecessors. In December 1948 Russell S. Mortimer was appointed assistant editor to John Nickalls and upon the latter's relinquishing the editorship in 1959 he became joint editor with the late Alfred Braithwaite. Following Alfred Braithwaite's death in 1975 he continued to serve as joint editor with Christopher J. Holdsworth. In these capacities he served the *Journal* for nearly 37 years. The volumes that have appeared during that long period are a tribute to the meticulous way in which he carried out his duties sometimes in circumstances not wholly propitious. The wide range of his reading made his contributions to the section entitled Notes and Queries extremely valuable. We wish to express our thanks to him for all he has done for the *Journal.* Christopher Holdsworth, a distinguished historian, has earned our gratitude for his scholarly editorship over the past nine years and it was with regret that we heard of his wish to resign because of increasing academic commitments.

In recent years the committee of the Friends' Historical Society has suffered losses by death and resignation. Richenda C. Scott who died on 24 December 1984, aged 81 years, was a member of the committee from 1945 until her death. Early on she made a considerable contribution to the history of medieval agriculture

and her presidential address to the Friends' Historical Society in 1959 entitled "Authority or experience: John Wilhelm Rowntree and the dilemma of nineteenth century British Quakerism" was a pioneering contribution to work on the Quaker renaissance the fruits of which are further presented in this number of the *Journal.* The committee was much helped in its deliberations by the clarity of her thinking.

Beatrice Saxon Snell who died 17 January 1982, aged 81 years, served on the committee from 1948 until 1978 and was president in 1939. We are indebted to her and to her sister Nina for indexing the first 45 volumes of the *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* and also for their work in transcribing monthly and quarterly meeting minutes from their establishment until the early or mid-eighteenth century.

From 1948 until 1972 George W. Edwards who died on 27 December 1983, aged 91 years, served on the committee. His knowledge of Quaker London and, in particular, of "London south of the Bridge" was unrivalled and many will remember with pleasure and gratitude his London Quaker walks.

After serving on the committee for 33 years and as its chairman from 1952 to 1962, Geoffrey F. Nuttall asked to be released from membership. Dr Nuttall, an outstanding ecclesiatical historian, though not a Quaker, probably knows more about George Fox and the foundation of the Society of Friends' than any member of the Society. His profound and wide-ranging knowledge of the seventeenth century has enabled him to remind Friends that they should avoid the danger of being inward-looking and that Quaker history needs to be seen in the wider religious context. The pertinence of his questionings was of invaluable help to the committee.

Finally the committee wishes to express its deep gratitude for the long, devoted and stimulating service of Elfrida Vipont Foulds. She served as a member from 1951 to 1985, chairing the committee most skilfully from 1962 to 1985. Her many publications have brought an understanding of Quakerism and Quaker history to a wider public.

A successful one-day conference was held in Manchester on 19 April 1986 with some 55 attending and at the same time a general meeting of the Friends' Historical Society was convened. Three papers were read, one by David Boulton on "The Use of non-Quaker Sources", another entitled "What about the Buildings?"

by David M. Butler and the third by David Blamires on "The Biographical Approach".

The general meeting agreed to the executive committee's proposal to increase the personal subscription from £2 to £4 and the corporate subscription from £3 to £6 from 1 January 1987. In response to requests, the first newsletter was sent to members in June 1986 and the committee is giving active consideration to further meetings and one-day conferences.

The Friends' Historical Society had joint-presidents for the first time in 1986. William and Marjorie Oats of Tasmania gave their presidential addresses on 28 June 1986. The former read an interesting and thought-provoking paper on "Conscription in Australia 1911–15 as seen in the Anglo-Australian Quaker context" and in the afternoon Marjorie spoke on her work on the "Biographical Index of Quakers in Australia before 1862". Marjorie Sykes is to be president in 1987.

For a variety of reasons the *Journal* has failed to keep up to date, volume 54, number 7 for 1982 being circulated to subscribers in 1985. Our intention is to publish a double number entitled volume 55, numbers 1 and 2 (this copy). These two numbers are the numbers for 1983 and 1984 issued in 1986. We then intend to issue in the Spring or early Summer of 1987 another double issue (volume 55, numbers 3 and 4, 1985–86 issued in 1987). Thereafter we hope to issue volume 55, number 5, 1987 in the autumn of 1987 and so to bring the *Journal* up to date.

With a revival in the Historical Society the editor hopes to receive sufficient manuscripts of an acceptable standard to fulfil the plan outlined above.

LONG SUTTON MEETING

I

The history of few Quaker meetings during their earlier years is better documented than that of Long Sutton. The minutes of Somerset Quarterly Meeting and of Ilchester and South Somerset Monthly Meetings are available. The record of the Sufferings of Long Sutton Friends during 1670 and the first part of 1671 is most detailed, and illuminates vividly village life at the time. From 1676 onwards we know the value of the crops seized from farming Quakers refusing to pay tithe. The parish of Long Sutton was a "peculiar", and the churchwardens had a duty to 'present' annually to the Chapter's Court at Wells the names of parishioners not attending church or otherwise dissenting: copies of their presentments have survived for 11 of the years between 1662 and 1689. Rent rolls of the chief manor in Long Sutton are available for 1663 and 1692; the latter gives not only the rent due from each tenant, but the acreage he held and his approximate age.

These documents make it possible to trace the development of the meeting. Persecution lost a few members to the Society; disorderly walking many more; but convincements continued, some the result of marriage to a Friend. A fall in numbers during the period of persecution seems to have been followed by a recovery towards the end of the century. I have prepared lists of members in 1670 and 1700 but the latter is too full of uncertainties for a safe comparison to be made.

Meetings began in a cottage at Knole, attended at first by a group of cottagers; by 1670, when the move to Long Sutton was made to a house provided for Richard Nowell, several yeomen and husbandmen were Quakers. The present meeting house, completed in 1717, was provided by a legacy from William Steele; he left £200 to build the Meeting House, and farms in Long Sutton and in Dorset to support poor Friends, rather than allow his son-in-law to enjoy any part of his estate. By this time, yeomen and husbandmen formed the bulk of the meeting.

II
to 1671

The start of Quakerism in Long Sutton, may have been stimulated by large meetings held in 1657 in Thomas Budd's orchard at Ash in Martock, three miles away. Thomas had been vicar of Montacute in 1647, was extruded apparently on becoming a Baptist, and was a Quaker in 1657. The meetings at Ash were addressed by Thomas Salthouse and Thomas Budd and were interrupted by the priest of Martock and by a crowd with staves and cudgels. The preachers were imprisoned for causing a disturbance.

The name of no Long Sutton Friend appears among the 210 who were imprisoned in 1660 in Somerset as a result of the Fifth Monarchy rising, but the list of those 'presented' by the churchwardens in 1663 for refusing "to come into the publicke Assemblies" includes eight who were soon known to be Quakers. In addition Joseph Bull had "irreverently kept on his hatt in time of divine service" and Andrew Ousley had abused an 'Apparitor', the messenger of the Bishop's Court. The eight included Joseph Gaylard of Long Sutton, and Adrian Ford, Widow, Richard Nowell and his wife, John Nowell, Jacob Turner and his wife, and Elizabeth wife of William Thresher (alias Calway) all of Knole; these were all cottagers. Next year Richard and John Nowell were imprisoned for absence from church. In April 1667 Jacob Turner's young daughter Frances testified against the vicar in church, saying "Woe to thee John Crabb who runest, whom the lord never sent". Peter Pople struck her in the mouth, drawing blood, and she was sent for a week to the house of correction.

When Monthly Meetings were settled in 1668 the names were recorded of men from each meeting who were "judged meete to keep the mens meetings". For "Sutton and Knole" these were Roger Slocombe, Thomas Gaylard, Robert Banton, Richard Nowell, Robert Ford, Edward Perris, Jacob Turner and William Thresher. Meetings in 1669 were being held at Knole at Robert Ford's house, and according to the Episcopal Returns, were addressed by (Christopher) Bacon (of Sutton Mallet), (John) Anderdon (of Bridgwater) and (Jasper) Batt (of Street); and attended by 100 Quakers. By 1670 Friends had established Richard Nowell in a house in Long Sutton, which became the meeting house.

One purpose in establishing Monthly Meetings was to strengthen discipline, to correct the disorderly. During 1668 John Burt and Elizabeth had gone to a priest to marry; they produced a paper condeming their evil conduct. William Pinkard was visited for neglecting meetings, and John Tucker for slackness. Pitney and Somerton meeting was less satisfactory. No member was "judged meete to keep the mens meetings"; 11 were to be visited for various disorders in 1668.

Quakers were liable to fines and imprisonment for refusing to take oaths, to pay tithes, to remove their hats in court, to attend church. Nonconformity persisted; Quakerism spread. By the Conventicle Act of 1670 Parliament hoped to stamp out dissenting worship by means of immensely heavy penalties, and the act specified fines of £20 for a householder harbouring a conventicle, £20 for preaching in one and 5s. or 10s. for attending one. One third of the fine could be claimed by an informer giving evidence leading to a conviction. If the householder or preacher could not pay, their fines could be levied on any of those present at the meeting. Refusal to pay a fine laid a Quaker open to seizure of his goods, often greatly in excess of the amount due.

The powers under the Act were enthusiastically exercised in Long Sutton against the Quakers, who during 1670 and 1671 made almost a week by week record of their sufferings. This gives a fascinating picture of their life in adversity.

In April 1670, Andrew Ousley, Edwards Perris and Robert Banton were imprisoned for refusing to pay tithes. On June 22nd Peter Pople and Thomas Greenfield, "Two fellows which have been always reputed as the Baser sort of the people before they were Informers", went to a meeting with a constable, three overseers and two churchwardens, of whom one was Robert Banton Senior, father of the Quaker. They did not come in to the meeting, but gave information to Justice Helyar who convicted those present, fining them 5s. each. The whole party then visited the houses of Friends to seize goods to pay the fines. Thomas Witcombe and his wife, "two poore old people weake and lame", lost "one Caldron and his wife's best pettycoate", worth £1.4.0, for a fine of 10s. Jacob Turner, a shoemaker, lost one pair of boots, three pairs of shoes, and some leather; William Calway, a trendle (a bundle of wool for spinning?) and his wife's whittle. Anne Dabb, "A poore widow whose husband was recently buryed" having left everything to his two infant daughters, lost "all the Bacon to the value of 15s.". (Friends had clearly advised William

Dabb to leave all his property to his daughters in the hope that their goods could not be seized to pay their mother's fines; such legal niceties were disregarded where Quakers were concerned.) In all, 14 Friends were fined 5s. or 10s. each. The officers also demanded £20 from Richard Nowell, in whose house the meeting had been held, but "not finding goods to their minde", they took two oxen from William Copp and five cows from Andrew Ousley, worth together £32. A further £20 levied for the preacher Thomas Salthouse, was divided between Alice Gaylard, Charity Gaylard and John Burt. Alice lost two oxen worth £11; from Charity they took five kine which she had sold to John Tucker; he redeemed them for £6, and when they were seized again, for £4 more. John Burt's doors were broken open with an axe, and groceries that might be worth £1.10.0 taken.

On July 3rd the informers "with a whole trayne of officers came to friends meeting, where finding none that spoke, they used many vayne words with many Scoffs Taunts and reproachful terms, and then tooke names and went away..." The informers went to old Justice Phelips, who ordered many who had been there to appear before him at Montacute, questioned them and dismissed them.

So the informers followed Friends meetings, from meeting to meeting, "Smoking tobaccho amongst them using many filthy and unsavoury words...", and on July 21st warned nigh 40 Friends to appear before Edward Phelips the younger, a Justice of the Peace so-called. They were examined and convicted, although there had been no preacher. Amongst them were Roger Slocombe who had written a paper to admonish the informers, beginning "Cain was the first persecuter..."; John Burt who had delivered the paper, and William Copp who had spoken to one of them upon the highway: these three were all bound over to the next sessions.

During August raids on meetings continued. On the 14th, Hester Collins, a girl of 14 was abused, "haling her about the house pulling and wringing her by the nose" until Frances Turner protested, bidding them repent. This, they claimed, was preaching; her father was liable for £20. Many Friends were summoned to appear at Yeovil before Justice Helyar, "a violent and subtill persecutor". Altogether, following a series of meetings and applications to several justices, the informers were able to make seizures from a large number of Quakers, amounting in total to almost £100.

Robert Thomas, a very poor man with wife and many children, for 10s. lost three kettles worth 20s. From Thomas Gaylard "who is a young man and lives under his mother", Ann Gaylard, they demanded £10.10.0 and took 44 of her sheep worth £20. Ann Dabb's daughters lost wheat, hay and two cows, worth £15. John Collins who was in prison, lost shop goods worth £30 "for an uncertaine fine layd upon his daughter Hester..." William Gee had taken from him a mare worth £5 for his sons' Henry and Robert going to meeting; £2.10.0 was charged on her. He appealed to the justice, but got no relief "and soone after this poore fearefull man wholy leaves friends and their meetings and goes to common prayer againe and so becomes an enemy of truth".

During September visits to meetings, taking names, and seizures on warrants continued. Edward Perris lost two more ewes, and Andrew Ousley two sheep worth £4, on account of their wives' attendance at meetings, they themselves being in prison. Other Friends fared much worse. John Burt lost his wearing apparel, most of his wife's and children's clothes, and their household goods. William Dyer, a poor man, "all his goods" for a fine of 10s. From Robert Ford they took his wood, 6s.8d., and three stocks of bees, 30s., which they burnt. They broke into Joan Nowell's house, and took two beds, "one of the beds filled with dust, the other with flocks", blankets, a coverlet, and bolsters, and other goods including a barrel of beer and one trendle. The meeting house at Richard Nowell's was broken open, "where they carryed away well nigh all the goods that was moveable..." These included "The poore mans working seat, most of his trade being to mend shooes; and his wifes spinning turne"; four forms; "the matts for the Benches": and "A beere barrell and cast the beere into the street".

Clearly the goods that could be taken from the poorer Quakers, Richard Nowell in particular, were now much reduced, and the informers "turned another course". They applied to "the leaders of the church at Wells", Francis Poulett the Bishop's son-in-law and Henry Deane the Bishop's Chancellor, who summoned 11 Long Sutton Friends to appear before the Bishop's Court at Wells. There the informers would and did swear that meetings held on December 4th and 11th met, not at Richard Nowell's house, but in an outhouse belonging to Andrew Ousley, "thinking thereby to have the greater spoile upon Andrew Ousley who had yet some goods to loose". Ten Friends appeared, (John

Fry was in prison), at the Bishops Palace (which "seemed to Friends to be like a nursery of uncleane spiritts, but the lord was with them") where they were examined by the Bishop, Robert Creighton and Poulett and Deane, sitting as an ecclesiastical court. The claim that the meetings had been held in Andrew Ousley's outhouse was dropped, so Richard Nowell was fined £20 for each meeting, and those present, 27 on December 4th and 25 on December 11th, were fined 10s. for each occasion. The fact that there was no fine for a preacher suggests that both meetings were silent.

Jacob Turner, Robert Ford and William Calway seem to have walked to Wells, but seven of the Long Sutton Friends, Richard Nowell, Roger Slocombe, Thomas and Joseph Gaylard, Henry Gee, John and William Burt, had borrowed horses in the hope that, not being their own property, the horses could not be seized. The Court decided that the seven riders should share Richard Nowell's fines, £3 a piece for each meeting, and that the borrowed horses should be seized and sold. When asked by the justices whether the sales would cover the fines, the informers "answeared noe, whereupon those three churchmen so called sitting and rejoycing in their judgment over the innocents, gave order to strip the prisoners also of their clothes to make up the fines". The Friends were turned out of the palace in the dark for this to be done, but were able to appeal to the townsmen at the Cross who indignantly prevented further outrage.

During February more seizures followed on various warrants from the Bishop's Court and several justices. Andrew Ousley, still in prison, lost a colt for his wife's presence at meetings. Anne Dabb's children lost two cows, two calves and a colt; unsuccessful legal proceedings to recover them were taken before the County Clerk by the trustees for the children, and by John Anderdon, a prisoner with legal experience. The informers with constable, tithingman, overseers and churchwardens also entered William Calway's house, and rifled it. He and his wife "having noe house of their owne nor a plott of ground but their labour which begins to be decayd in both...", lost bacon, eggs and a barrel of good beer, (all consumed by the informers) bedding, furniture, a brand iron, crook, a spinning turn, cards and trendles. His plough was pressed in the King's name. Jacob Turner was lucky; he lost goods worth 18s. for a fine of 20s.; as the informers had money in hand they took no more.

Henry Walrond of Ile Brewers, "called a Justice", fined John Tucker, William Copp, Richard Ploughman and Richard Parsons £5 each for not coming to the aid of the churchwardens in "Suppressinge of an unlawfull assembly or conventicle" held in Richard Nowell's house. The two former appealed to Quarter sessions on the ground that they had no legal obligation to help the informers, and lost a further £10 each.

The final drama of which an account remains began at the end of February. The informers, now numbering four, believed that goods belonging to Friends were stored in the house of the younger Robert Banton, still in prison, and obtained a warrant from Edward Phelips Junior to break open the doors. On their return from Montacute they went to Mary Bull's house "where they made themselves well nigh drunk with strong waters". When they asked Roger Slocombe for the key which was in his care, he refused to give it until he had seen the warrant; this they refused to show, but knocked him down, rubbed dirt in his face, bruised him, threatened him with a pistol and a sword, took the key from his pocket, and having opened the house, kept him there under guard for two days and two nights. They also carried away without warrant some of Robert Banton's property; pans of suet and butter, a cheese, books and papers. This was too much for the Justices. Edward Phelips, Senior, committed three of the informers to prison at Ilchester "for diverse assaults and batteryes and false imprisonments under the pretence of a justice a peace his order..." The fourth informer was bailed. It was a fortnight before the authorities could find grounds for releasing the three.

Robert Banton and Edward Perris were released from Ilchester on March 11th, and it may have been their departure that ended the detailed account of the Sufferings of Long Sutton Friends, written in the prison by John Anderdon.

I have made what I believe to be a reasonably complete list of the adult members of Long Sutton meeting in 1670. This includes those present at the meetings on December 4th and 11th that year; those known to be then in prison; those others whose sufferings Friends recorded; John Pinkard and John Tucker against whom Friends were taking disciplinary action, and Adrian Ford and Margaret Yard who were receiving relief from Monthly or Quarterly meetings. Altogether there were 51 names (not including Frances Turner and Hester Collins, those active Quaker girls) representing 35 families or single people.

The occupation and means of most of these individuals and families are indicated in these records. Thirteen were Yeomen, Husbandmen or their widows, including Robert Banton, who at the age of 24 may not yet have been farming independently. There was no clear distinction between a Yeoman and a Husbandman. I have included Richard Nowell amongst the Tradesmen as most of his living came from mending shoes; in legal documents he was a Husbandman; on several occasions he and his family were relieved by Friends. Eight shopkeepers and tradesmen included John Collins who lost shop goods to the value of £30, and Roger Slocombe the Blacksmith. Joseph Gaylard was probably a tradesman; he lived in a cottage but was one of those fined £6 at Wells. Twenty-one families therefore had means, more or less adequate. There seems to have been six families of labourers, including William Dyer, a mason and a poor man, and Richard Parsons and Richard Ploughman "having nothing" when they were fined £5 each. Of these poorer Friends, Richard Ploughman had already lost a mare worth £7 and William Calway a mare and colt worth £4. There were also four poor widows; three were relieved by Friends. Elizabeth Pollett was a single woman, occasionally relieved. No clear line can be drawn, but about a third of the meeting in 1670 were labourers or other poor people and about 40 per cent were farming.

QUAKERS IN LONG SUTTON 1670

F. Fined 1670/1, I. Imprisoned 1670/1, P. 'Presented' by Churchwardens 1668/70, M. Attended MM 1670/1, Q. Attended QM 1670/1, R. Relieved by Friends, D. Disciplined by Friends.

		Approx. Age 1670	Occupation	
1.	Robert Banton	24	Son of Yeoman	IPMQ
2.	Mary Barnard			F
3.	Joseph Bull		Husbandman	F
4.	John Burt		Grocer?	FPD
5.	Elizabeth		(Spinner)	FD

		Approx. Age 1670	Occupation	
6.	William Burt		Husbandman	F
7.	Anne			
8.	William	23		
9.	William Calway (or Thresher) of Knole			FPQ
10.	Elizabeth		(Spinner)	FP
11.	John Collins		Shopkeeper	FI
	Hester	14		F
12.	William Copp	43	Husbandman	FP
	(William Dabb)	died 1669?	(Husbandman)	P
13.	Anne Dabb		Widow of above	F
	Joan			F
	Anne			F
14.	William Dyer		Mason	F
15.	Adrian Ford of Knole		Widow, poor	PR
16.	Robert Ford of Knole		Tailor	FM
17.	John Fry of Knole		Journeyman Shoemaker	FI
18.	Alice Gaylard	40	Widow of Yeoman?	FP
	Alice	18		
	Anne	12		
19.	Anne Gaylard		Widow of Yeoman?	FP
20.	Thomas			FP
21.	Joan			F
22.	Charity Gaylard		Widow of Yeoman?	F
23.	Joseph Gaylard		Tradesman?	F

		Approx. Age 1670	Occupation	
24.	William Gee		Husbandman	FP
	Mary			
25.	Henry			F
26.	Robert	25		FPD
27.	Dorothy Luckes	28	Widow, poor	FR
28.	Joan Nowell of Knole		Widow, poor (Spinner)	FP
29.	Richard Nowell	32	Shoe Repairer, Husbandman	FPMQ
30.	Anne (Thatcher)		(Spinner)	F
31.	Andrew Ousley	32	Husbandman	FIPMQ
32.	Anne	32		F
33.	Richard Parsons		"having nothing"	F
34.	William Perris of Knole?			
35.	Edward Perris of Knole	32	Husbandman	FIPMQ
36	Susan (Ryall) of Knole			F
37.	William Pinkard		?	PD
38.	Richard Ploughman	27	"having nothing"	F
39.	Elizabeth Pollett		Single women	F
40.	Roger Slocombe	28	Blacksmith	PMQ
41.	Alice Slocombe		?	F
42.	Robert Thomas		a very poor man	FIPR
43.	Joan (Thresher, see Calway)		with 5 children	
44.	John Tucker	43	Husbandman?	FPD

		Approx. Age 1670	Occupation	
45.	Jacob Turner of Knole		Shoemaker	FPM
46.	Dorothy, of Knole			FD
	Frances, of Knole			F
47.	John Wallis		Husbandman	F
48.	Thomas Witcombe			FP
49.	Elizabeth		Poor old people	F
	(Peter Yard)	died 1669		P
50.	Margaret, of Knole		Widow, poor	R (1672)
51.	Joan, of Knole			FR (1672)

III
to 1700

There are few references to Long Sutton in the Records of Sufferings between 1671 and 1684, but trouble certainly continued.

Persecution there after 1671 may have been less intense; the Declaration of Indulgence of March 1672 gave a respite that lasted until the next year. A document from Wells records the examination by the Bishop of William Bryant, a labourer of Long Sutton, who voluntarily confessed that he had accompanied Peter Pople to Wells, who promised him "money to buy him a new suite of clothes, and to apparell his children" if he swore that Edward Cousins had been at a meeting of Quakers at Nowell's house on November 2nd 1675. "What he did sweare against the said Cousins was false and he had thereby perjured himself". In June 1676 Quarterly Meeting decided to give £2 towards legal expenses "in the Common Defence of Friends of that meeting (Long Sutton), against their wicked and false accusers".

Robert Banton, Robert and Henry Gee, John Bull and Joseph Gaylard attended the Bruton Sessions in 1683, "Andrew Ousley engaging for their appearance". They were not called, and were discharged. Andrew had probably ceased to be a Quaker, but was still helpful. In June 1684 John Bull, Sarah Hurd and John Ballam, all from Long Sutton, were imprisoned for absence from church; Sarah's imprisonment is described in some detail by John Whiting who was intending to marry her.

After the accession of William and Mary and the passing of the Toleration Act active persecution ceased. The record of sufferings gives the value of wheat and other produce seized for tithe, and a few Quakers were imprisoned for non-payment. These included William Dyer and Gabriel Richards from Long Sutton.

In 1670 Quarterly Meeting had advised Friends in Pitney, Somerton and Muchelney to attend Long Sutton meeting; they were few and often disorderly; their meeting was weak. Money was raised two years later to provide a meeting house at Long Sutton; possibly the house where Richard Nowell lived was too small; he certainly continued as Resident Friend in the new meeting house, about which more later. By 1697 Friends in Somerton were gaining in numbers, and a room hired for meetings; in 1703 Somerton again had a separate meeting.

Of the Friends whose Sufferings we have studied, Robert Banton prospered in spite of heavy fines and seizures. He married Joan, daughter of Anne Gaylard in 1677, which may have brought him land; after her death he married Hannah Lincoln of Crewkerne. He was farming 58 acres in 1692, and was adding to his property; he was Clerk of the Monthly Meeting and fully involved with Quarterly Meeting land and affairs; an active and valuable Friend. When he died in 1709 his son and son-in-law were appointed to write up the Monthly Meeting minutes, which in his later years he had been unable to complete.

Roger Slocombe the blacksmith married Frances Turner, and together they served the meeting for many years. Hester Collins married and returned to her father's house as a young widow. In 1684 she married Edward Cousins against the advice of the meeting; "considering that he was not a fit husband for her, nor shee a fit wife for him, in regard to his family of children, she being not of so milde and gentle a spirit as was necessary for the well-discharging the duty of such a place..." He was well-disposed towards Quakers, (and had been wrongly accused of attending meeting in 1675) but they would not be a "comfort and

blessing one to another", so she would be unlikely to gain him for Quakerism. She was disowned, but was again 'presented' by the churchwardens in 1686 for not attending church, and in 1689 for refusing to pay church rates.

Andrew Ousley and William Copp as well as William Gee deserted Friends. The two former were churchwardens in their later years. William Gee died in 1673 and was buried among Friends. His son Robert was already causing the meeting anxiety; he was living in one house with Mary Culliford, a widow of Upton. In 1676 when they married he was said to be "of Muchelney", where he may have moved to spend a period apart from Mary so that Friends would allow their marriage; she must have become a Quaker. Robert attended Monthly and Quarterly meetings for many years before his death in 1710, and was probably regarded as a yeoman. Henry Gee also won a wife for Quakerism. He was living with Joan Culliford, and Friends testified against him for doing so in 1676. No marriage was registered, but it was accepted as a fact; they and their children continued within the Society.

Possibly John Tucker had also deserted Friends. He had been warned in 1670 for slackness, but had been fined and suffered seizures that year and the next. He may have been the John Tucker of Muchelney who was disowned in 1684 for taking an oath to get released from prison; he was certainly holding a little land in Long Sutton in 1692.

John Fry and Joan Yard caused an unspecified scandal in 1679. John Fry condemned his ways, but Joan's repentance was less whole-hearted. A report was heard of her uncomely and wanton carriage at an Inn at Somerton. She was not disowned until 1682 when she had been married by a priest to a bad man, possibly John Tucker's son John, who in 1692 occupied a small property "late Peter Yard".

Thomas Hurd, a Somerton yeoman, was one of those to be visited and admonished after the Quarterly Meeting in September, 1668. After several short imprisonments, he was at Ilchester for 11 years from 1677 until 1688, which may have strengthened his Quakerism. He had a large family of daughters, two of whom were involved with Long Sutton Friends. In 1680 Joseph Gaylard was found to be disorderly; he would not desist from prosecuting a marriage with Hannah Hurd, against the wishes of herself and her father. In 1680 John Ballam gave notice of marriage with her; this was deferred and did not proceed. Three years later John was

disowned; he had been married by a priest. Joseph Gaylard was also in further trouble. In 1688, Monthly Meeting heard that he and Mary Davies, two single persons, were living together alone in one house, and told him that "his duty was first to have had friends advice before he extended forth his pitty to the maid... and that their continuance together is a scandall to the pretious trueth... and a breath of their own reputation". Two years later she married Giles Knight of Chiselborough.

During Thomas Hurd's imprisonment his daughter Sarah moved to Long Sutton to keep a linen-draper's shop, and John Whiting, a young Quaker from Nailsea, joined him as a prisoner at Ilchester. In his *Persecution Exposed*, John Whiting described his own imprisonment, his attachment to Sarah, her short imprisonment, and his difficulties and adventures during the Monmouth rebellion when prisoners were free to go. (He says nothing about a previous attachment while he was at Ilchester, to Elizabeth Davies, possibly a daughter of the jailer Edward Davies, and possibly sister to Mary; this involvement delayed his marriage with Sarah.) On the day after Sedgemoor he was at Long Sutton "and lay innocently" in Sarah's garden, while Edward Phelips, "judge of the Sessions" sat and slept in her chair and while his men "went a hunting about the fields to take men..." Soon after this John Whiting returned to the prison, "the safest place as things were..." although the jailers, Edward Davies in particular, treated him most severely. After their marriage, he and Sarah lived in Long Sutton until 1688 when they moved to Wrington "as soon as I could order my business, and put off my shop..."

A letter sent by Somerset Quakers to London repudiated the accusation that they had been involved in the rebellion states that on the Saturday before Sedgemoor, Roger Slocombe "and his brother (which is no Quaker) were taken up, by some soldiers, and carryed to Somerton before the officers of the Kings Army, where he was charged for making Sythe weapons; but be denyed that he made any, but his brother acknowledged that he made them (about ten) but not for the service of Scotts (Monmouth's) Army, but for the security of the parish... in much danger by some rude soldiers... it was objected against the friend that he was an excomunicate person and Rebell to the Church". However, he was discharged, his brother being freed before. The latter also describes some who were involved, but had previously ceased to be Quakers. One man "rode in the Army who pretty long since had forsaken the society and fellowship of the people called

Quakers, because of sufferings". This could have been Andrew Ousley; a man of this name was tried and bound over at Wells.

Immense trouble was caused to Long Sutton meeting by one of its founder members Richard Nowell, the poor man who lived in the meeting house "as a Trustee for the service of Truth". His wife Anne died in 1681 when he was 43. In May 1690, he gave notice to the Monthly Meeting of an intention of marriage with Edith Samways of Somerton. Elizabeth Pollett of Long Sutton claimed that he "both in words and behaviour towards her have given her cause to expect that he would have married with her." He had in fact entertained her "in his house, giving thereby an occasion of scandall and reproach unto the trueth, but on advice given to her caused her to remove". All the efforts of Friends over many months failed to dissuade Richard from pursuing Edith; in April 1691 they went together to Weston meeting, "and there mentioned their taking each other in marriage", although several present protested; they returned to live as man and wife in the Long Sutton meeting house. To Elizabeth "he hath bin a great distraction in drawing out her affections..."; she was "keeping company with a man of the world in order to take him to be her husband..." knowing "that she is in the way of destruction and cannot help it". With her too the advice of Friends failed. Richard, Edith and Elizabeth were disowned.

Richard and Edith were turned out of the meeting house; some compensation was paid "for such materials as he left there (that were of his providing)". In 1695 Quarterly Meeting accepted from him a paper condemning his miscarriages, and he was allowed to return to the meeting house, and after eight years to attend Monthly Meetings. Nothing was recorded about Edith, but the Rent Roll of the manor of Long Sutton shows that after his death she, his widow, continued in occupation. Whatever Quakers thought about it, the marriage was legally valid.

It was possible to make a fairly reliable list of the Friends in Long Sutton in 1670/1; this cannot be done for 1700. The registers of burials are very incomplete; no persecution was in progress at the later date involving almost all Quakers; there was a surprising degree of mobility. Some factors affecting membership are clear.

First; a comparison of those 'presented' by the churchwardens in 1668 and in 1686 for not attending church shows that at the earlier date 22 or 23 out of 31 presented were Quakers. Eighteen

years later 30 or 31 out of 36 were Quakers; the remaining five included Hester Cousins who had been disowned. If the meeting had grown, it was partly at the expense of other dissenting bodies.

Second; in 1685, four Long Sutton Friends were regularly suffering seizures for non-payment of tithes; in 1700 and 1701 the number had doubled.

Third; members of several Long Sutton families with no early traceable connection with Friends had apparently joined the meeting, sometimes through marriage. Mary and Joan Culliford had already been mentioned. Gabriel and William Richards were probably Friends before 1688. In 1697 Samuel Cresen married Alice Slocombe; in 1700 Thomas Field married Joan Oram of Pibsbury; in 1702 Richard Bicknell married Mary Wills and William Bicknell was appointed to inquire into his clearness. In 1707 John Bicknell was attending Monthly Meetings. The parties must all have been accepted as Friends, before their marriages were allowed.

Fourth; several Quakers moved into Long Sutton, sometimes by marriage, sometimes probably young people working there who married and settled. John Cuffe, probably from Ashill, but with Long Sutton connections married Richard Nowell's daughter Mary in 1692. Lionel Gould from Mark married Anne Dabb's daughter Joan in 1683. Two other marriages had much future importance for the meetings. In 1697 John Gillett, from Wootton Fitzpaine married Mary Brown, probably relative to Grace Collins (Brown); he bought the grist mill in 1715 and converted it to milling cloth; his descendents were active in the Monthly Meeting for 200 years. In 1704 William Palmer, possibly son of David Palmer whose daughter Mary died in 1683/4, married Mary Smith who originated in Stathe; three of their descendents left Long Sutton to make biscuits in Reading, 140 years later. Philip and Joan Hawker were in Long Sutton from 1692. In 1700 or 1701 Robert Wills from Chiselborough moved to Long Sutton with two daughters; he was pursued with slanderous accusations by women he left behind. One entry in the Registers of Friends House Library is particularly puzzling; the marriage in 1700 of Andrew Gaylard and Mary Smith; no abode is given, but the folio reference indicates Long Sutton. There is no reference in the minutes to this marriage; were they not Quakers?

In the other direction, at least three of those in the 1670/1 list deserted Friends; six were disowned, of whom Richard Nowell

was reinstated; some moved away, many died; and of several I have found no further trace. In 1700 the most responsible men in the meeting were Robert Banton, aged 54, Robert Gee, 55, Edware Perris, 62, Roger Slocombe, 58, John Bull, 49 and William Burt, 53. In 1700 when Robert Barclay's "Apologie" was to be reprinted, nine copies were ordered for the meeting. There is no doubt that at this time it was a strong community of Friends.

A rent-roll was prepared when the Earl of Devonshire bought the manor of Long Sutton from the Earl of Northampton in 1692. This gives the acreage of arable land, meadow and pasture rented by each tenant, and the rent due for land cottages, gardens and shops. Most tenancies were for three lives; the ages of those involved are stated. Ninety five tenants are named, of whom 17, possibly 21, were Quakers, this amounts to at least 18 per cent of the village. There was however, land in the parish that belonged to other and smaller manors, so there is no complete record of Quaker holdings.

My list of adult Friends at Long Sutton in or about 1700 includes over 60 names, but of these several may have died or moved before that year, others may not have arrived. The younger Robert Banton and John Bull, both yeoman in 1711 were probably not of age in 1700. William Palmer and Mary Smith, were both "of Long Sutton" when they married early in 1704. The rent-roll of 1692, the seizures for tithe, and other records show that of the 29 families or single persons involved, 16 were yeomen or husbandmen (including Anne Ousley who remained a Quaker when her husband defected) and six were tradesmen, including Richard Nowell. Only five seem to have been labourers or poor; of these Robert Ford, John Fry, Dorothy Luckes and John Cuffe and his family received relief from Friends. Compared with Long Sutton 30 years earlier the number of Quaker families of adequate means was almost unchanged; those farming had increased from 40 per cent to 57 per cent, but that of labourers and other poor people had halved. This may have been a real decrease in the number of poorer Friends, or it may only be a result of lack of information; the poor, unless disorderly or relieved by the meeting, may not have been recorded. Some families of husbandmen in 1670 were yeomen in 1700; had Friends prospered or had descriptions changed?

QUAKERS IN LONG SUTTON 1700

T. Seizures for Tithe: M. Attending MM: Q. Attended QM: R. Relieved by Friends: *M.* Appointment by MM 1700.

	Approx. Age 1700	Occupation	Land/ House 1692		Rent 1692
Robert Banton	54	Yeoman	TMQ	58 acr	£30
Hannah (Lincolne)			*M* (1701)		
Anne	22				
Robert		Yeoman (1711)			
?John Bicknell			M (1707)		
Richard Bicknell	22	Husbandmen(?)			
Mary (Wills) 1702					
William Bicknell	27	Yeoman (1715)	*M* (1702)	50 acr	£20
John Bull	49	Yeoman	TMQ	64 acr	£30
Elizabeth			*M* (1701)		
John		Yeoman (1711)			
William Burt	53	Husbandman	TQ	13 acr	£ 6. 3.4
Christian (Gould)					
William	18				
Grace Collins (Brown)	70	Shopkeeper	*M*	House/ Shop	£ 2.10.0
?Samuel Cresen	38	Cottager		House/ Garden sold 1696	£ 0.10.0
John Cuffe	31	Cottager	R (1702)	House?	£ 0.10.0
Mary (Nowell)	32				
?Anne Dabb		Widow of Husbandman			

	Approx. Age 1700	Occupation	Land/ House 1692		Rent 1692
?William Dyer		Mason			
? Margaret (Burt)					
Thomas Field		Married 1700			
Joan (Oram)					
Robert Ford		Tailor	R (1704)		
?John Fry		(at Ilchester?)	R (1705)		
?Alice Gaylard	70	Widow of Yeoman			£16.13.4
?Andrew Gaylard		married 1700			
? Mary (Smith)					
?Joseph Gaylard	51	Tradesman (?)		House	£ 0.13.4
Robert Gee	55	Yeoman	TMQ	?	?
Mary (Culliford)					
Joan Gee (Culliford)		Widow of Husbandman		32½ acr	£16. 0.0
John Gillett		Clothier (?)	M		
Mary (Brown)					
Lionel Gould		Husbandman	T (1697)	5 acr	£2.10.0
Joan (Dabb)					
Philip Hawker		Yeoman	TM		
Joan			*M*		
Dorothy Luckes	58	Widow	R (1701)	House	£ 0.10.0
Richard Nowell	62	Shoe Repairer	M (1702)	House and Burial Ground	£ 1. 0.0
? Edith (Samways)					
?Anne Ousley	62	Wife of Yeoman		(40 acr)	£27. 0.0
?William Palmer		of Long Sutton 1703			
? Mary (Smith)		married 1703			

	Approx. Age 1700	Occupation		Land/ House 1692	Rent 1692
Edward Perris	62	Yeoman (1715)	TMQ	16 acr	£ 5. 0.0
Susan (Ryall)					
William	26	Yeoman (1711)			
Gabriel Richards	42	Husbandman(?)	T	30 acr	£15. 0.0
William Richards	38	Husbandman(?)	T	30 acr	£18. 6.8
?John Slocombe		Inn Keeper		House/ Garden	£ 1. 0.0
? Anne					
Roger Slocombe	58	Blacksmith	MQ	House/ Smithy	£ 1.10.0
Frances (Turner)			R (1707)		
Roger	22				
?Mary Smith	(Married Andrew Gaylard 1700)				
?Mary Smith	(Married William Palmer 1704)				
?Robert Wills	Yeoman (moved from Chiselborough 1700 or 1701)				
Elizabeth	(Married 1702?)				
? Mary	(Married Richard Bicknell 1702)				
William Witcombe		Husbandman	T (1697)		
Mary (Combe)					

IV
After 1700

In 1704 a London Quaker, William Steele of Bishopsgate, bought an estate in Long Sutton, and entrusted his daughter Rebecca to Elizabeth Fisher wife of John Fisher of Somerton, "both for Education and Preservation". (He resold the greater part of the land in 1707, but retained a farm at Upton.) Early in 1706 report was made to Monthly Meeting that Elizabeth Fisher had betrayed her trust, and "without the consent or the least approbation of the said William Steele, but on the contrary to his

great grief, got the said Rebeckah married by a priest to her son James Fisher, or was very instrumental therin." He was not a Friend. Elizabeth Fisher was disowned; Rebecca condemned her sin in a paper that was acceptable to the Monthly Meeting. But by his will made in 1715 William Steele made sure that his daughter and son-in-law would not easily benefit from his estate. The Upton farm was put in trust for "the poor of the people called Quakers in the Country of Somerset". His wife and grand-daughter were given a life interest in the income from his farm in Dorset, after which £20 a year was to go to Dorset Friends and the balance to Somerset. Rebecca Willoughby, the grand-daughter died in 1799.

William Steele's will also gave "the people called Quakers of Long Sutton" land and £200 to provide a meeting house and burial ground, conditional on their paying the whole cost of carrying the necessary materials, so that the meeting house "may be so much the better". He had expressed a strong wish that his remains should be interred in the ground he had given, and the Quarterly Meeting gave the necessary instructions when the new meeting house was "near all finished" to hire a hearse and convey his corpse from London, "tho we disown superstitious ceremonys and know that the dead receives no advantage... and being willing to prevent giving cause for any to charge us with ingratitude". The cost of transport was £15.2.6.

The cottages opposite the meeting house, the site of Richard Nowell's house, also remain the property of Friends. The beautiful meeting house, the Upton farm for many years let to a Friend, and the cottages where the meeting once met, have given Friends a continuing presence in Long Sutton; without these advantages there might well be none of the people called Quakers in Long Sutton today.

STEPHEN C. MORLAND

Places of Worship in the National Census of 1851

The only comprehensive census of places of worship undertaken in this country was made during the course of the 1851 National Census of Population. It was remarkable and useful because of its thorough cover of the subject and the detailed way in which the results were made public.

An earlier attempt to obtain information on places of worship was made when in 1810 the House of Lords

> Ordered,—That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, that He will be graciously pleased to direct the Archbishops and Bishops of each Diocese to report to His Majesty what Place or Places of Divine Worship, according to the Church of England, there is or are within every Parish which appears to contain a Population of 1,000 Persons or upwards; what Number of Persons they are capable of containing; and also, what other Place or Places of Divine Worship there is or are in every such Parish.[1]

The original returns as sent in by each parish priest are held in Lambeth Palace Library. From these were made abstracts which were printed for the House of Lords: *Returns of the Archbishops and Bishops of what places...*[2] Some dioceses delivered their information too late for this, notably York, and these were printed separately.

The effectiveness of the enquiry was limited by the exclusion of small parishes, by the slight information requested on the 'other' places, and by the fact, at least so far as Quakers were concerned, that some meeting houses were not reported.

The Act of Parliament which authorised the population census in 1851 said nothing of such an enlargement of scope, although it did instruct the registrars to "take Account of all such further Particulars as... they may be required to enquire into..."[3] The request for these further Particulars is set out in the letter from the Registrar General, George Graham, which prefaced the official report:

> To Lord Palmerston, Her Majesties Secretary of State for the Home Department, Census Office, 10th December 1853.
>
> My Lord,
> When the Census of Great Britain was taken, in 1851, I received

> instructions from Her Majesties Government to endeavour to procure information as to the existing accomodation for Public Religious Worship.
> Every exertion has been made to obtain accurate Returns upon which reliance may be placed, and the duty of arranging these Returns in a tabular form, accompanied by explanatory remarks, has been confided by me chiefly to Horace Mann...

Horace Mann's report *Religious Worship in England and Wales* was published in 1854.[4] It ran to over 150 pages, and included many tables which analysed and compared the towns and sects of England and Wales in considerable detail. Returns were obtained from Scotland as well, although these were not included in the *Report.* The whole machinery of the population census, with the same enumerators and registrars, was used to gain knowledge of the accommodation and attendances not only of the Church of England but of all Christian denominations and of the Jewish congregations. In only one essential point this part of the census differed from that of population: at the insistence of the House of Lords answers to questions on places of worship were to be voluntary, not compulsory. Apparently Friends co-operated with the Registrar General rather better than did the established church.

Early in the nineteenth century it had been seen that the movement of people from country areas into the new manufacturing towns had not been matched by much increase in accommodation for the Church of England, although some dissenting bodies had more readily grasped the opportunity which this situation offered. Looking at the dates and kinds of meeting houses built by Friends at this time there is little to suggest that they were among those bodies. Rather did Friends develop their activities in the inner cities in the latter part of the nineteenth century through the influences of the new evangelism and of adult education. The Church Building Commission, set up by Parliament in 1818, used public funds to remedy the shortage of churches, and when the Commission's work ceased in 1856 about 600 new churches had been built with its help. The 1851 census was evidently used to enquire whether an acceptable provision for public worship had then been achieved. In what follows I shall look at the Quaker returns alone without much reference to Mr Mann's comparisons.

The survey was carried out through Meeting for Sufferings:

> A communication having been read from Horace Mann of the General Register Office requesting the dimensions of our Meeting Houses and

> the numbers attending there. The subject is referred to the attention of the following Friends, viz. Samuel Sturge, George Stacey, James Bowden (Recording clerk), Samuel Fox and Joseph B. Braithwaite.[5]

At its next meeting in January 1851 Sufferings minuted its approval of the 'essay of a minute' brought in by these Friends, part of which read

> This application has claimed our deliberate consideration and as we desire not to obstruct any measure of the Government which does not interfere with the rights of conscience, this meeting invites the co-operation of the respective Monthly Meetings in carrying out the object of the application, so far as respects the Meeting Houses of our Society. A form, intended especially for our body, accompanied with instructions for making the return, has been prepared, copies of which are directed to be forwarded to the several Monthly Meetings. The Friends who may be appointed by the Monthly Meetings for this purpose are requested to make their returns in duplicate, on the form in question, to James Bowden, 86 Houndsditch, London, within 10 days after the day for which the said return is desired.[6]

Accordingly, this minute was read in Monthly Meeting at Lancaster that March, and

> ...this meeting therefore appoints the following Friends to carry out the said return ... and produce a copy of the return at our next Meeting, viz (two Friends from each).[7]

At their next meeting report was made that '... the committee appointed at our last... have attended thereto',[8] and the results were summarised in the minute book with one considerable error in transcription, by no means the only one to appear in the course of the census. The May Meeting for Sufferings minuted the conclusion of their part of the work, with a brief national summary, and ended 'James Bowden is requested to forward to the government office one each of the said accounts'.[9] Lancaster's actions represent a fairly thorough approach, as it is noted that neither Strickland nor Sedbergh Monthly Meetings make any reference at all to the matter in their minutes, although between them they had to make seven returns. At Kendal M M, with only one active meeting at that time the Monthly Meeting clerk, 'Saml. Marshall is appointed to afford the information required by the Registrar General with reference to the census, and to sign the document'.[10]

The second copy of the returns is preserved in a bound volume in Friends House Library and is prefaced by a two-page summary.[11] The order in which the returns are bound is by Quarterly Meetings, with some irregularities. The summary, whilst similarly by Quarterly Meetings, is arranged with greater accuracy but with the meetings in a different order: it does not serve as an index. In addition to giving the names of the meetings it sets out the attendance at each one in two columns, headed 'morning' and 'afternoon'. The latter in fact includes the few evening meetings. The summary was printed in Bishopsgate near to Devonshire House and it was presumably produced by Friends and was not an official census document.

In order to see whether the census was complete, the individual returns may be compared with the summary pages bound up with them, and with the *Book of Meetings* for the years 1851 and 1852. Discrepancies occur between all of these. In the case of Stebbing (Essex Quarterly Meeting) the second copy of the return has been lost but an entry appears in the summary. Four meetings are represented by a return but do not show in the summary:

> Olney (Bucks & Northants), Felstead (Essex), Brailes (Warwicks Leicester & Staffs), Garsdale (Westmorland).

All these are in the Books of Meetings. Two meetings which sent in returns however, do not appear in either Book of Meetings:

> Queenswood (Dorset & Hants), Torquay (Devon).

These are minor drawbacks compared with the number and nature of meetings which were apparently omitted from the census entirely, thirteen in number, and all appearing in the Book of Meetings:

> Wallingford (Berks & Oxon), Warborough (Bucks & Northants), Gosport, Guernsey & Jersey (Dorset & Hants), Stow & Tewksbury (Glos & Wilts), Trawden (Lancs), Wainfleet (Lincs), Gracechurch Street (London), Radway (Warwicks Leics & Staffs), Huby & Reeth (Yorks).

The Channel Island meetings may have been outside the scope of the Registrar General's instructions, and excluded on that

account. Several meetings were undoubtedly in the gradual process of starting or more usually of closing. A few occasional meetings may not have met on the last Sunday in the month, though some of these were included and gave as requested their average figures for attendance. The meetings at Trawden, Tewksbury and particularly Gracechurch Street were not in these straits however, and their omission does make a difference to the value of the census as a whole.

The Registrar General sought much information which would show the location of the meeting, whether or not it met in a meeting house, the latter's age, floor area and seating capacity on floor and gallery, and the number of worshippers present at the various meetings held on that particular day, Sunday 31 March 1851. Location was identified in civil services tradition by parish, county and registrar's district, which occasionally gave Friends the necessity of adding their own customary name of their meeting. Two questions were asked to establish the status of the building in which Friends met: whether a separate and entire building, and whether used exclusively as a place of worship. Although these questions do not yield a very clear picture, all but about 22, or six per cent of the 348 meetings for which we have returns, gathered in their own meeting house. The date of the meeting house was asked for, but only back to the year 1800. This was sufficient to distinguish those which might have been built or re-built in response to the demand which occasioned the census, but did not prevent some Friends from attempting to impart more distant historical information.

The space within the building will be discussed later; the same question also how many people it was capable of seating. Although in that period and before, it was expected that people would willingly be packed in a good deal more closely than now (for example when Race Street meeting house Philadelphia was built in 1856 only sixteen inches of bench was allowed per person) the figures given are often optimistic and occasionally in error. At least one meeting worked out its answer at five square feet of the total floor space per person; this was very likely the best way of assessing the number. William Alexander, writing in 1820, suggested four and a half square feet for comfortable accommodation, and rather less in the galleries.[12] Today we think ourselves quite closely seated if each of us has six square feet.

The final question asked the estimated attendance on census day at the morning, afternoon and evening meetings. Very few

figures were in fact rounded estimates and one Friend reported '3 or 4' present. The question seems to have aroused a sensitive and exaggerated response among the membership. Several meetings excused their answer with notes on illness, or inclement weather, or a funeral nearby. For the census as a whole, attendance on census Sunday was said to be below normal because it coincided with a period of unusually severe weather and of widespread illness. This makes the conclusions on Quaker attendance even more difficult to understand.[13] It must be the case that many Friends and attenders made a particular point of attending on that day, out of a sense of loyalty to the meeting. Regrettably we do not have an accurate knowledge of the number of Friends in 1851 to compare these figures of attendance. The first Tabular Statement of membership was for 1861, the next for 1868. Over the whole of London Yearly Meeting these two show an average annual increase of 14 Friends over the intervening years and a rather greater increase in attenders, thus it suggests that membership in 1851 was not markedly different from 1861, and if anything a little smaller. In 1861 there were just over 17,000 Friends and 'habitual attenders', and the total number who attended morning meeting on Census Sunday ten years before was shown as 13,361. While attitudes to attendance at meeting may have changed over the last century or so an attendance of about 75 per cent still seems a remarkable achievement and one that can have had little bearing on the customary habits of Friends of the time. After all, a Friend travelling in the Ministry in Herefordshire in 1850 remarked with evident pleasure on a meeting he attended at Ross, 'at which one-fourth of all the members of the general meeting must have been present'.[14] On three occasions since 1851 Yearly Meeting has taken a census of attendance at meeting, in 1904, 1909 and 1914 when the attendance on four Sundays in October was averaged out. For each of these years it showed that about 30 per cent of members and attenders were at morning meeting, to compare with the 75 per cent on that special day in 1851.[15] Nevertheless only once, mentioning a public meeting, did the Friend who filled in the census return make any comment on unusually high attendance. Otherwise he only remarked when it did not come up to expectation.

The pattern of afternoon and evening meetings, and attendance at them, was set out clearly showing that all but three of the 348 met in the morning; about 200 held a second meeting in the afternoon and about 20 in the evening; at this period none met

three times in the day. The frequency of the second meeting varied greatly between Quarterly Meetings, from Suffolk where all seven meetings were held twice, to only two of the 14 in Westmorland. Such information is not unique to the census and considering the omissions in the returns it may be more fully seen in the *Book of Meetings*, as may the mid-week meetings which were altogether outside the scope of the census.

The one census question which permits an objective and numerical comparison with known facts, and which is neither asked nor answered elsewhere in Friends' records, concerns the 'Space available for Public Worship'. Sufficiently accurate surveys exist for 210 out of the 326 meeting houses included in the census, that is about two thirds.[16] These have been compared, as carefully as may be, with the information given in the returns. This was generally given in square feet, though in 62 instances actual measurements were given as well or instead of the area. From this comparison it is possible to throw some light on the ways in which the question was understood.

Considerable variety is found in the degree of precision thought appropriate for the census, from those who expressed their answer down to the last few square inches to others who found a hundred square feet near enough. Despite our present wish for detailed and accurate information the latter were in fact doing just what was asked of them, as instructions for completing the return noted 'that complete accuracy of mensuration is not essential, and that a near approximation to it is all that is desired'. These well-rounded approximations appear in about seven per cent of the returns, which must be set aside before detailed comparisons can be made with the surveys. Naturally enough a few meetings were defeated by the mathematics and about 20 entries show more or less obvious errors. At Carlisle for instance one of two equal chambers was correctly measured and doubled, and then in error re-doubled. At two small and adjacent meetings in the Pennines Friends did not help themselves by measuring in yards as well as feet and inches, and then resolved the problems of arithmetic by adding instead of multiplying.

This last pair illustrate one of the few apparent exceptions to the arrangements made typically by Lancaster Monthly Meeting where one or two Friends were appointed to deal with each separate meeting house. Here the same Friends made the return for both, as the meeting used the two buildings alternately. It is clear that the appointed Friend was expected to be at the meeting

house on that day to count, to measure and to sign the return even if (as did occur two or three times) he was the only person present. Nowhere does it appear that a Monthly Meeting discussed how the details of the work should be carried out, or that it laid down any guidance for those it appointed to carry out the work. Thus we find the different ways of expressing the floor area and its accuracy, and thus we find differences in interpretation of the words of the census: how much of a meeting house was in fact *available for Public Worship*. It is clear that Friends asked themselves two questions in a typical traditional meeting house: whether to include the whole building both sides of the shutters, and whether to exclude the ministers' stand. The loft or public gallery figured separately on the return; there was little ambiguity and only a few were omitted presumably because they were unsafe or had been unused for years. However since it was referred to by the ambigous word 'gallery' the column was occasionally used instead for information on the ministers' gallery, or stand.

On considering the first question, it is usually fairly clear whether the whole floor area was entered, meeting rooms, lobby and staircase together. The instructions were that any 'space should be included which being divided off by moveable shutters, is occasionally made use of for the purpose of Divine worship, but no distinct room exclusively or chiefly used for Meetings for Discipline'. Meeting houses outside London seldom had this distinct room, but in a few instances the second chamber behind the shutters was nevertheless excluded, and rather more frequently an intervening lobby, also with shutters, was left out. In a few instances Friends are known to have leased out part of a meeting house they no longer needed, in others the meeting may simply have retreated into one chamber and totally neglected the other. Very seldom does it appear that the space occupied by the staircase to the loft was excluded from the calculations, though perhaps it was the least suitable place for worship. In about 15 per cent of the returns relating to useful surveys (spread fairly evenly over the country) some or all of the spaces beyond the meeting room were excluded.

The matter of whether to exclude the ministers' stand again shows a random distribution, suggesting again that it was a personal rather than an agreed decision.[17] Since the floor area occupied by the stand is a good deal smaller, usually a strip four or five feet wide across the end of the building, it is more difficult to determine this point and much depends on the accuracy of the

original returns and of the survey. Clearly the question was considered, for in about ten instances separate measurements were given for the stand and the problem was left to Mr Mann to resolve. A careful comparison of the measured plans with the returns suggest that the ministers' stand was left out of the stated floor area in another 40 or so cases, on the basis that the stand could not correctly be considered as part of the space available for public worship as it was for the exclusive use of elders and recorded ministers.

It would be interesting to speculate on how this figure relates to the year in which the census was taken. During the mid-nineteenth century the status of the traditional ministers' stand was in decline. Although nearly equal numbers of meeting houses were built in each half of the century, less than half as many were fitted with stands in the second half from 1851 to 1900 as were during the first 50 years. These last often had a platform for loose chairs and a table more suited to a speaker than a minister.

To summarise these numerical conclusions, it may be said that something like 15 per cent of the census returns for meeting houses are in error or are too roundly-figured to be of use. Of those for which we have measured plans about 15 per cent leave out at least one whole room and up to 25 per cent leave out the ministers' stand. The clearest conclusion to be drawn from this is that the figures do not necessarily say what we expect them to say: to pick out the area given for a particular meeting house certainly does not mean that we would find just that many square feet between its remaining walls. As E. Harold Marsh wrote in the report to Yearly Meeting of the 1914 Census of Attendance 'In considering the returns of this Census, the Committee has been impressed with the many anomalies that are brought to light, and it is easy to exaggerate the value and significance of the record'.[18]

When reading through these census returns some of the changes which have occurred since they were prepared 130 years ago are brought to life. The altered status of meetings in larger cities for instance, is illustrated by the figures for attendance. At Mount Street Manchester 453 worshippers sat down on that Sunday morning and 202 in the afternoon where now four dozen may be the usual number, while meetings which were not thought of in 1851 now encircle the city centre meeting house. The effect of a Friends School upon the life of a meeting is equally well shown. Taking the school which moved from Croydon out to

Saffron Walden in 1879; the attendance at Croydon dropped from 230 in 1851 to 118 in 1905, while in the same period numbers at Saffron Walden rose from 50 to 158, and continued to rise for some years as the school increased.

Thus the census presents us with a 'still' picture, mildly distorted, of several physical and numerical aspects of the Society of Friends as it was in 1851, which we can value for itself and for the view it gives of things we have seldom asked ourselves.

DAVID M. BUTLER

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1] Fulham Papers, Randolph, 1810.

[2] Ordered to be printed 5 April 1811.

[3] 13 and 14 Victoria Cap. 53.

[4] *Religious Worship in England and Wales. Abridged from the official report made by Horace Mann...* London, 1854.

[5] Meeting for Sufferings, minute 11 of 6.12.1850.

[6] *Ibid.,* minute 4 of 3.1.1851.

[7] Lancaster Monthly Meetings, 12.3.1851.

[8] *Ibid.,* 22.4.1851.

[9] Meeting for Sufferings, minute 18 of 13.5.1851.

[10] Kendal Monthly Meeting, 30.3.1851.

[11] Manuscript Volume 227.

[12] W. Alexander: *Observations on the Construction and Fitting up of Meeting Houses,* York, 1820, 60.

[13] A. Everitt: *Pattern of Rural Dissent,* Leicester, 1972.

[14] *Memoir of Thomas Pumphrey,* ed. J. Ford, 1864, 199.

[15] For membership and attendance figures in these years see *Yearly Meeting Proceedings* for the year following.

[16] I am indebted to several Friends and fellow architects for these measured surveys, and in particular to H. Godwin Arnold and the late Hubert Lidbetter who between them have supplied me with about one third of the plans used in the preparation of this paper. The surveys are of meeting houses evenly distributed over the country, except for Cheshire and south-west Lancashire which are not well represented.

[17] If there is any detectable geographical tendency, it is for southern England and the extreme north-west to show the greatest proportion of errors and to exclude the greatest proportion of ministers' stands.

[18] *Yearly Meeting Proceedings,* 1915. 226.

History and Quaker Renaissance: the Vision of John Wilhelm Rowntree

Between 1909 and 1921 William Charles Braithwaite and Rufus M. Jones produced the seven volumes of the Rowntree Series which are still recognized as the standard historical studies of the Society of Friends.[1] One might assume that the series derived its name from the fact that its publication was sponsored and financed through a Charitable Trust established by cocoa manufacturer Joseph Rowntree. In fact, both the name of the series and the books that comprise it have deeper roots in the life and works of Joseph Rowntree's eldest son, John Wilhelm. The volumes of the Rowntree Series are not only still recognized as solid, authoritative historical works,[2] but they have also had a profound influence on the development, some would even say the meaningful survival, of London Yearly Meeting as a viable religious community during the twentieth century.[3]

Because the Religious Society of Friends is a body of believers whose reputation and influence far exceed its miniscule size, outsiders are likely to categorize Quakers in rather narrow or singular ways which do not do justice to the diversity and complexity of the Quaker experience. Because of Friends' unique mode of worship, their odd method of conducting business, their deserved reputation for social conscience, honesty, gentleness and pacifism, many tend to think of Quakers as a truly Peculiar People. Furthermore, they assume that even contemporary Friends are part of a solid continuum from the days of George Fox and Robert Barclay to the "Holy Experiment" of William Penn, and from the philanthrophic zeal of Elizabeth Fry and the righteous rhetoric of John Bright right through to the inspiring, if seemingly futile, social activism and war resistance of so many twentieth-century Quakers.

Because most non-Friends know Quakerism only indirectly through what they have seen or read rather than through close personal acquaintance with Friends, the supposition of historical continuity is not surprising. Indeed, at the close of the nineteenth century many British and American Quakers saw themselves in a similar light, though, of course, for very different reasons. The

eminent Quaker philosopher and historian Rufus M. Jones, speaking of Friends in the late nineteenth century, noted that while his co-religionists generally paid deep and sincere homage to Quaker founder George Fox as their spiritual ancestor, many of them held views that Fox had explicitly denounced. It was Calvin, not Fox, who dominated Quaker religious thinking, Jones said. One reason for this paradoxical situation, he believed, was that Friends "were not historical-minded and no historian had yet traced the slow transformations through which the Society of Friends had passed in two centuries".[4]

Ignorance of history caused most British Friends to be equally ignorant of the spiritual evolution of their Society. To be sure, they might recognize some distance between the immediacy and dynamism of George Fox's message to seventeenth-century England and the retrogressive quietism of eighteenth-century Quakers. But most were convinced that their Society had been awakened from its spiritual slumber in the early nineteenth century through the sort of "fire and vision" evangelism exemplified by Joseph John Gurney, the most influential Quaker of his generation. In this, they were largely correct. Still, the Evangelical Movement had had other momentous effects on Friends. It had brought Quakerism into the mainstream of Protestantism for the first time. Not only did Quakers gradually shed their peculiar garb and speech, they also came to rely more and more on a strict and literal interpretation of the Bible as the inspired and infallible word of God as well as on the substitutionary doctrine of the Atonement. The ideas and practices that had earlier characterized Quakerism, especially the concept of the Inward Light, or Divine Seed in every man, were widely neglected.[5] The result, said Rufus Jones, was that "Quakerism was shot through with Calvinistic doctrine".[6] Furthermore, some observers believed that the fire of Gurney-type revivalism had largely burned out after the mid-nineteenth century, leaving in its ashes a "harsh and rigid scoria of credal thought which none must be allowed to challenge".[7]

Given the strict Biblical literalism to which most, though not all,[8] Victorian Quakers adhered, the late nineteenth-century Society of Friends was as vulnerable as any other Protestant denomination to the challenges of Darwinian science and the so-called higher criticism that questioned the literal accuracy and even the authenticity of much of the Bible. The problem for Friends, however, was doubly difficult because their Society was

not only tiny but also overwhelmingly middle class. Well-to-do and comfortable Friends tended to be the leaders of the Society because only they were apt to have the leisure to perform duties essential to the maintenance of a religious body without a paid ministry.[9] During the same period, the children, and likely successors, of these "weighty" Friends were in increasing numbers enrolling for the sort of advanced education that would expose them, at a most impressionable age, to theories and ideas that threatened to undermine their fundamental religious principles. Thus, ironically, the very means of preparing a new generation of Quakers for wordly success and spiritual leadership seemed all too likely to take these potential leaders right out of the Society they were expected to lead.

Many younger British Friends of prominent families, influenced by modern science and Biblical criticism, underwent the agony of religious doubt, made more painful and protracted by the feeling that there seemed to be no elder persons in the Society who were willing or able to minister to their needs.[10] In a religious organization as small as the Society of Friends, these circumstances portended disaster, even, eventually, extinction. As the editor of *The Friend* (London) told Rufus Jones in 1895:

> We have found for some years past... our Church losing grasp of the highly educated and intelligent young men and women belonging to our best old Quaker families who were receiving first class curriculum at College and then drifting theologically. If our Society was thus to lose its best, a few years might settle our fate. Every Christian Church *must* face modern criticism and modern scientific thought.[11]

During the 1860s and 1870s some younger Quakers had attempted to address these problems, but most influential Friends had viewed questioners as rebels or heretics; they were either silenced or expelled or, in some cases, they voluntarily resigned membership.[12] Not until the anonymous publication of *A Reasonable Faith* in 1884 by three mature Friends, followed two years later by Edward Worsdell's *The Gospel of Divine Faith* was an alternative liberal theology, incorporating both Biblical criticism and Darwinism science into the Christian context, available to more progressive, better-educated Quakers.[13]

Naturally, most Evangelical Friends did not take the challenge of liberal theology lying down. Their influence in the Society was of long standing and great depth. For example, in 1887, at an important transatlantic conference in Richmond, Indiana, Joseph

Bevan Briathwaite, probably the most influential English Evangelical Friend, drafted a Declaration which set out the essential principles of the Evangelical Creed. This "Richmond Declaration" was enthusiastically and almost unanimously approved by the Conference. When, however, Braithwaite attempted in 1888 to gain endorsement for his Declaration at London Yearly Meeting, the ruling Body for British Friends, his effort was frustrated by the resolute opposition of a number of well-educated, younger Friends, some of whom vowed to leave the Society if the Richmond Declaration was accepted.[14]

The rejection of the Richmond Declaration was a decisive moment in the history of British Quakerism, for it opened the way to a much enlarged influence by liberal, progressive thinkers. But it was not a complete victory for the advocates of "modern thought". The evangelical wing was still strong (indeed dominant in America west of Philadelphia). And if many of the young liberals had resolved their own lingering doubts, they could perceive no clear means for ensuring that succeeding generations of Friends would be adequately prepared to meet the challenges of modern thought and action in the twentieth century. Although they were filled with faith and fervour, they lacked guidance, direction and a real plan for taking advantage of the opportunities open to them. They were, as one Friend has put it, like the "Seekers After Truth" of the mid-seventeenth century who gathered around George Fox and became founding members of what was to become the Society of Friends.[15]

Eventually, these late-Victorian "Seekers" also found a prophet and champion. Unlike Fox, he did not lead his disciples up some Pendle Hill or on tramps of itinerant preaching. Rather John Wilhelm Rowntree steered his followers back into the mist-shrouded past of their religious fellowship, back to the tracts and letters and diaries of the "first publishers of the truth". As Rowntree believed that George Fox and early Friends had initiated a renewal of primitive Christianity by rediscovering the Inward Light, the direct link from man to God, so he sought more than two centuries later to renew a faltering Society of Friends through the recovery and proper exposition of its roots. John Wilhelm Rowntree's vision was to use the history of the Society of Friends to demonstrate the relevance and modernity of its message, not just to his Quaker contemporaries but to the great mass of seekers outside their Society who were longing for a place

of spiritual rest in an increasingly complex and bewildering modern world.[16]

When John Wilhelm Rowntree (born in 1868) began to take an active part in the affairs of the Society of Friends in the early 1890s, few could have imagined that he would become "a prophetic figure" or "one of the most potent influences in the life of Friends".[17] For although his family had impeccable Quaker credentials (made perhaps even more weighty by the recent success of Joseph Rowntree's cocoa works), John Wilhelm had not been a promising youth. Sensitive and temperamental, he had from childhood grown increasingly deaf, a disability which undoubtedly contributed to his generally indifferent performance as a scholar. Furthermore, as a young man he was found to have contracted *retinitis pigmentosa,* an incurable eye disease causing gradual deterioration of his sight.

After leaving school at seventeen, John went immediately to work in his father's factory where, for the first time, he began to show some aptitude as a man of business and as a leader of men. By the time he reached his early twenties, the eldest Rowntree son had achieved modest success becoming with his brother Seebohm, a partner in the family business, as well as a husband and father and an active member of the Friends Meeting at York. He also began to bloom intellectually, reading widely in theology and philosophy as well as pursuing a serious interest in art, particularly the paintings of the German Reformation artist Albrecht Dürer. The Rowntree home was the centre of a growing circle of friends attracted by John Wilhelm's charm and love of fun.[18] Despite the apparent happiness and stability of his life, John Wilhelm was a profoundly troubled young man who, though he earnestly wished to embrace the faith of his fathers, seemed in danger of collapsing into agnosticism under the accumulated weight of modern scientific and historical evidence. As he told a friend in 1893: "For two or three years I have been on the verge of resignation, and had it not been that I was favourably circumstanced, should no doubt have left Friends".[19] At this critical juncture, however, under the influence of a visiting American Friend, Dr. Richard Thomas of Baltimore, Rowntree experienced a spiritual catharsis which purged him of personal doubt and caused him to dedicate himself "to making the Society of Friends... a real and living force in the world".[20]

If John Wilhelm Rowntree had resolved his own spiritual disquiet, he had not made peace with the existing conditions of

British Quakerism. Reflecting on the deliberations of the London Yearly Meeting 1893, the first in which he had played a leading role, Rowntree noted: "We spent twenty-five minutes debating whether the women should be admitted to the men's meeting. It was Quaker caution and love of detail running to seed--the spectacle was not inspiring..." Yearly Meeting, along with the entire edifice of Quaker theology and organization, he said, "wants getting out of its ruts...".[21]

What were the "ruts" from which young Rowntree wished to drag from a reluctant Society of Friends? That question may best be considered in the context of the Manchester Conference of 1895 on the "Life and Work of the Society". Called by the Friends Home Mission Committee and attended by over a thousand persons, this meeting, in the words of one perceptive modern Friend, marked "the first time that the Society had made an effort to assess its position in the light of modern thought" and to deal with "the intellectual as well as the spiritual needs of its members...".[22]

At Manchester, progressive Friends began a systematic critique of the deficiencies of Quakerism which would continue unabated until John Wilhelm Rowntree's death a decade later and would, in the end, shape the image of twentieth-century Quakerism. This criticism, in general, can be subsumed under three major areas of concern – doctrine, education and the ministry and social questions. The last of these, which emphasized the need for the Society of Friends to go beyond traditional philanthropy in dealing with social evils, is outside the scope of this paper. The others, however, are intertwined and must be carefully considered in order to appreciate the thrust of liberal criticism and the role of John Wilhelm Rowntree and his circle in integrating that criticism into the theology and practice of modern British Quakerism.[23]

First of all, Rowntree and other younger Friends believed that Quakers had to rethink their fundamental theological position. During the nineteenth century, they said, the Society of Friends had acquired the ponderous spiritual baggage of protestant Evangelicalism which, together with the revelations of modern science and biblical criticism, had become a millstone threatening to drag Quakerism down into a welter of undistinguished, indistinguishable nonconformist sects. But they were convinced that the strangling bonds of Biblical literalism could be loosened through the recovery and repossession of the early and unique

sources of Quaker inspiration, especially the doctrine of the Inward Light which emphasized the indwelling spirit of God in each human soul. One knew God, they believed, by experiencing His presence, not through infallible books, harsh creeds or powerful priests. Religious authority was within the individual and salvation was obtained by allowing the Inward Light to lead on to Christ and by following the glorious example of His life.[24] As Rowntree remarked to a former teacher in 1897:

> We are free from any weight of tradition or ritual, and with our clearer perception of the indwelling nature of the Spirit, ought to strike more easily below class distinction and form to the recognition of the true brotherhood of man--the want of which it seems to me is the cause of much of the materialism of the present day.[25]

The second major concern of the proponents of modern theology was their Society's woeful neglect of education in general and of religious education in particular. Older, evangelical Friends, they said, not only attempted to shield, futilely to be sure, young people from the rigours of modern thought but also denied them the sort of religious instruction that would permit them to intelligently evaluate their faith and its compatibility with the modern world. As Rowntree, recalling his own despairing time of doubt, noted: "How can we demand of the young who are only on the threshold of experience an acceptance of dogmas the meaning of which they cannot fully grasp, and which experience alone can teach them to understand or value".[26]

This situation was made even more acute by the fact that British Quakers had rejected a "hireling ministry" and waited in silent meeting until God made his presence felt through one or more of the gathered faithful. While Victorian Friends followed the practice of "recording" particularly prominent or inspired speakers, male and female, as ministers, these non-professional ministers seldom had any special training and generally had neither the means nor the desire to deal with the troublesome questions and worrisome doubts of younger members. Rowntree believed that the reasons for spurning a professional clergy were as sound as when George Fox had denounced mercenary priests.[27] The real problem, he said, was that the Society had failed to live up to the serious responsibility of sustaining a free ministry. Some Friends regarded "intellect as an enemy to be fought rather than an ally to be welcomed"; while others seemed to believe that the

absence of special training and even of careful preparation was a badge of honour reflecting the belief in the immediate moving of the spirit by the inward relation with God. But in John Wilhelm's view it was "among the... chief causes of disaster in the recent history of our church".

> So feeble is the witness borne to the freedom of our spiritual heritage, so negative and barren is the interpretation of our testimony, so threadbare and so poor is our simplicity... that the glory of the Quaker ideal has drawn well nigh to extinguishment... To this generation has been given to decide whether the Free Ministry, nay even the Quaker testimony itself, shall survive in a living fellowship.[28]

As early as 1894 John Wilhelm Rowntree had begun planning a new enterprise with "the definite aim of waking up the Society to thought". The means to his end was to be a series of occasional papers on the major issues facing Friends, collected, edited and published by Rowntree and an editorial committee that included William Charles Braithwaite, Edward Grubb, and Henry Bryan Binns.[29] This project, however, was impeded by various distractions, the most significant of which was the pronouncement of Rowntree's doctors that his retinitis would inevitably lead to total blindness.[30] This blow was eventually softened when he discovered a Chicago oculist who concluded that if John Wilhelm retired from the cocoa works, moved to the country and underwent a rigorous regime of treatment, the progress of his ailment could be checked. With the enforced leisure of his retreat from the world of business, Rowntree began to issue the materials he had gathered in a monthly journal called *Present-Day Papers*. This periodical, which Rowntree said "must... remain independent and free from the restraints of tradition and the necessity for compromise", was the bane of many conservative Friends, addressing, as it did a wide range of controversial theological and social issues.[31]

In the meantime, Rowntree and his allies were working on other ways to ensure that the Society of Friends would not continue to be "an unintelligent spectator of the greatest revolution in religious thought since... the Reformation".[32] He believed that the problems of dealing with educational deficiencies and ministerial ineptitude among Friends were as much practical as spiritual. To this end he planned and organized a series of Summer Schools for Biblical and other studies which would incorporate the latest scientific and historical knowledge.

Rowntree and his growing circles of disciples mobilized their resources to attract leading Quaker and non-Quaker experts to a series of Summer Schools at Scarborough (1897), Birmingham (1899), Haverford (1900), Scarborough (1901) and Windermere (1902).[33] These gatherings proved to be so successful, especially with younger Friends, that they inspired the Birmingham chocolate magnate George Cadbury to donate his estate at Woodbrooke as "a permanent settlement for Bible study" and for the short-term training of Friends who would form the basis of a new, informed, vital yet truly "free" ministry.[34]

George Cadbury believed that the establishment of Woodbrooke might "save the Society" and heaped praise on John Wilhelm not only for inspiring the idea of a Quaker centre for religious education but also for his leadership in bringing about "a remarkable change in the general feeling" among British Friends.[35] But Rowntree himself was far from satisfied with the results of his efforts. Too many Quakers, he said, still regarded their church "as a collector regards his specimens"; they still would not or could not "comprehend the philosophical content, the tremendous spiritual impact of Fox's 'gospel' ". His dream was to see Quakerism move the religious life of England in the reign of Edward VII as "the primitive giants" of the Society had moved it in the days of Cromwell and the Stuarts.[36]

> [I]f the fire that lived in George Fox, Edward Burroughs, and... Isaac Penington... only could be rekindled; if Quakerism would only arise from the dust and speak to men in language of the twentieth century, there should be such a shaking of dry bones as had not been felt before. It was not to be a revival, but a revelation of the power of the Spirit.[37]

It was a powerful vision. But at the very time when Rowntree's influence among Friends seemed about to become paramount he was deprived of his most important means of communicating his message. In October 1902, on doctor's orders, he resigned as editor of *Present-Day Papers* and this organ of progressive Quakerism simply vanished from sight.[38] Still, if John Wilhelm Rowntree was forced to relinquish one forum, his fervent, fertile mind had already settled on other means for propagating his views to Friends, and to the world.

For a long time, certainly since 1897,[39] Rowntree had believed that a real key to realization of his work for the revitalization of the Society of Friends might be in the rescuing of Quaker history

from the obscuratism and neglect in which it had languished for nearly two centuries. The indolent complacency and resolute anti-intellectualism of many Quakers, Rowntree said, was

> closely associated with the strange haziness which characterises the mind of the average Friend, when questioned as to the historical and spiritual significance of his church. Our ignorance, both as to the facts of our church history with their meaning for the present and the future, and the want of any adequate conception of our spiritual heritage, is not likely to develop the gifts latent amongst us... A small body like the Society of Friends, which has with almost dramatic suddenness broken down its social barriers and mingled with the world after a century of aloofness, must have very clear convictions if it is not to lose its identity.[40]

Rowntree was convinced that the prevailing lack of solid historical knowledge, especially among young Friends, represented one of the gravest dangers to survival of the Society. He perceived that the rising generation of Quakers had, under the influence of modern thought, broken more completely with the ideas and attitudes of their fathers and grandfathers than any previous body of Friends. But if they rejected the evangelical tradition, the only one they had been taught, what was there left in Quakerism, seemingly sunk into "a torpor of undeveloped intellectual power", to hold their allegiance?[41] There was, Rowntree said, the glorious past – history – which he once described as "the voice of God, many tongued".[42] He was confident that a "fresh and sound historical interpretation of the entire Quaker movement", incorporating the most up-to-date canons of historical research, could lead to a rediscovery of the long submerged spiritual heritage of Quakerism.[43] Not only Friends but religious seekers everywhere awaited the inspiration of "Quaker History... worked out, not simply with the view of presenting biographical sketches, and interesting historical data, but in order to bring out... 'the practical, spiritual, and non-sacerdotal aspects of Divine truth', in relation to individual and national life".[44].

It may have been entirely coincidental that the British Friends Historical Society (FHS) was established in 1903, "for promoting research in a field hitherto but imperfectly worked",[45] just at the time that John Wilhelm Rowntree was becoming seriously involved in his projected History of Quakerism. It was certainly not an accident that in early 1904 the Society's *Journal* published a notice of Rowntree's intention "to trace the development of

Quaker thought and organization... with a view to the practical bearing upon current Quaker problems..."[46]

In any event, the founding of the Friends Historical Society most assuredly represents an aspect of the new spirit sweeping through the entire Society of Friends. For at the same time that the elderly Victorian evangelical J. Bevan Braithwaite, author of the Richmond Declaration, contemplated the formation of the FHS with grave anxiety for the mischief it might do,[47] John Wilhelm Rowntree was writing to Norman Penney, newly appointed librarian at Devonshire House in London, asking for permission to borrow a series of early reports which would provide "records in the very beginning of Friends all up and down the country".[48]

This incident reflects not just differing views about the value of historical investigations but a radically different way of looking at the world and the Divine Plan for it. J. Bevan Braithwaite viewed mankind as lost and helpless, indeed hopeless of salvation without strict adherence to the infallible Authority of Holy Writ; Rowntree, on the other hand, saw each individual as the agent of God, guided, if he or she would only recognize it, by the inward Authority of the Inner Light. One of the remarkable attributes of John Wilhelm Rowntree and of the other Quaker historians with whom he worked, especially Rufus Jones and William Charles Braithwaite, was their absolute lack of concern about where their research might lead them. Because they were convinced that a balanced and meticulous history of Quakerism could only enlarge the role their Society had played in bringing the true message of Christianity to all men, they were consumed with the desire to pursue every manuscript, to find every document, to read every diary in order to discover the real "inner life" of Quakerism. As Rowntree once noted in urging his co-religionists to follow his lead into the "pages of sprawling and faded writing..."

> "Do not be angry if they are dry... There is a fascination, hard to describe in these musty books, written by men who knew persecution, not by hearsay, but by experience; who perhaps saw and heard Fox, Dewsbury and Whitehead in the flesh, and who... were our spiritual ancestors..."[49]

John Wilhelm Rowntree's work on his History began in earnest during the summer of 1903 after a trip to the United States to see his oculist, visit American Friends and collect historical sources.

He told Norman Penney in July 1903 that he had acquired 200 essential volumes with the aid of the Haverford College librarian and that despite the "crude raw state" of his thinking, he was about to embark upon his project.[50] Within a month, however, Rowntree's work was interrupted by still another physical setback, "unpleasant heart symptoms, threatening angina pectoris". The illness seems to have, in turn, induced a fit of depression settling on him "with the blackness of night". By the end of the year, however, after a rest cure in Switzerland, he was back at his desk "making headway" and finding "queer things".[51]

Throughout the first nine months of 1904, Rowntree laboured away at his home at Scalby on the Yorkshire coast, warming to his work, corresponding with Quaker scholars for advice and old schoolmasters for approval. "My desire", he informed one of the latter, "is to strip my mind as far as possible of all prejudice and to examine the past in a scientific spirit... with the fairness of a disinterested historian". "My object", he told another, "is to provide a really scientific and impartial study, not an *ex parte* statement representing one school or another".[52] In late July he confessed to Rufus Jones that he had "got so closely absorbed in my Quaker History that I am finding it increasingly difficult to give time or thought to the mere outer world."[53]

John Wilhelm Rowntree expected to spend ten years at research and writing before his study would be ready for publication[54] – a legitimate prospect for most men of thirty-five. But, in fact, these few months were the only period of sustained historical work he was to be allowed. Fortunately, his labours did reach some fruition because he promised his Monthly Meeting to deliver a series of three lectures on "The Rise of Quakerism in Yorkshire" at a "Summer School" in Kirbymoorside in late September 1904. These lectures were printed and preserved[55] and thus provide the sole material for a critical assessment of Rowntree's skill and insight as a historian.

Not surprisingly, the Yorkshire lectures at times reflect the enthusiasm and naivety of the newly initiated. They also reveal the Quaker penchant for slipping, in spite of themselves, into a private sectarian language. Thus Rowntree here speaks of a "quicking in Leicestershire" or there of Friends following "the spirit of the hat".[56] But while these touches add quaintness to his work, they do not hide either a genuine literary ability or a powerful historical imagination.

Rowntree's absorption in the words and deeds of early Friends convinced him more than ever of the depths of their spiritual power, the courage of their relentless practice, and most significantly, the soundness of their saving message – not simply to the seventeenth century but to seeking, striving humanity of every place and time. First and foremost, his research gave him a fresh appreciation of the religious insight of George Fox. Fox's genius, Rowntree told Rufus Jones, was made manifest, not in the originality of his conception of Divine guidance (the Inward Light was not a new idea), but in the logical way that he worked out his beliefs as regards social attitudes and church organization. Just as important, Rowntree felt, was the escape offered by Fox from the "terrible shadow of predestination". The "sunlight and fragrance of the best Quaker character", he said, "would have been impossible but for this emanicipation".[57]

Still, Rowntree's enthusiasm for "Fox's day", when "the molten metal had not congealed", did not blunt his criticism of subsequent developments within the Society of Friends.

> Those were great days of high courage, noble sacrifice and rich fruit. It is hard to come back to the present without discouragement, for the promise of the past has failed. But there is still the future... We can afford to study the history of the great decline and to take its lessons to heart, because we have hope in the future and faith in the great renewal.[58]

Some of Rowntree's best, most picturesque writing describes those days of the "great decline" when, following the Toleration Act of 1689, "Quakers, like a rowing crew after a fierce race, rested on their oars". It was impossible, he said, "to white-wash eighteenth-century Quakerism" passing as it did "from the apostolic vision of the Kingdom of God into the prose of Quietism and Commerce".[59]

In one of his most effective critical passages, Rowntree compared the first two phases of Quaker history. In the early years, he said, the life of Friends was in the open. They would not remove their hats for any man; they would not swear oaths; they would not fight. "It was impossible to ignore the Quaker because he would not be ignored." But after the onset of the eighteenth century,

> the life that was in the open is in secret. Timidly the Quaker peeps over his hedge of prickly cactus, willing that his plain coat of sleek broadcloth should testify for simplicity, but loath indeed to take it off, like the

Methodist, and preach to a storming crowd at the street corner. He is... ponderous in the sobriety of his language and the dullness of his intellect. His culture is narrow, his outlook small; his dinners are good, and his worship somnolent.[60]

He was less hard on the Evangelicals of the nineteenth century because they, at least, had roused Quakerism from its slumber. Still, he blamed them for their rejection of "humane learning" which had "worked incalculable mischief throughout the Society". The Evangelicals had accomplished the necessary repudiation of Quietism and reawakened the vigour of Quaker spirit. But in their zeal to ensure their fitness in the narrow light of scriptural infallibility, Rowntree noted, they had unfortunately diminished those unique aspects of Quakerism which had caught and held the first Friends, most especially the Inward Light. The result, he said, could best be summarized in the words of Thomas Hancock, a Victorian critic of Friends, who had written: "In 1658 there was not a Quaker living who did not belive Quakerism to be the one only true church of God. In 1858 there is not a Quaker living who does believe it."[61]

Despite Rowntree's discovery of much that was "sad and gloomy" in the past two centuries of his church, he scorned the idea that Quakerism was "unsuited to the masses" or that its message had been absorbed by larger, more popular churches. His final Yorkshire lecture concluded with a ringing declaration of the purpose of his History and indeed, the purpose of his entire life:

> Quakerism absorbed?... No!... There is room yet for the teaching of the Inward Light, for the witness of a living God, for the reinterpretation of the Christ in lives that shall convict the careless, [and] language that shall convince the doubting...
>
> There is room yet for a fellowship, all-inclusive in its tender sympathy, drawn close in the loving bondage of sincerity and truth, for the noble simplicity of life and manners... for a freedom that scorns the flummeries of rank... because it know the worth of manhood and loves the privilege of friendship...
>
> Climb Pendle Hill with Fox and see once more his vision--'a great people to be gathered'...[62]

When John Wilhelm Rowntree, fresh from the success of his Yorkshire lectures, sailed for America in late February 1905, the future seemed as hopeful as the recent past had been fruitful. His closest friend Rufus Jones recalled: "Every dream was coming true. His impact on the youth of the Society of Friends was

everywhere in evidence. It seemed as though a new Epoch was dawning." Then, suddenly, in mid-Atlantic he was stricken with pneumonia. After several days of insensibility, he died on 9 March 1905 in a New York hospital. Jones, who had met the ship and was with Rowntree when he died, remembered how pitiful it was "to hear him dwell, in the delirium of fever, upon the great literary plan of his life." He was buried and still remains in the courtyard of Haverford Friends Meeting House.[63]

Rowntree's death profoundly shook the British Society of Friends. A relative remarked that no single event had "moved the Society, as John's death has done, for 200 years..."[64] One prominent Friend called it "the bitterest sorrow I have ever had to bear"; another published a long elegiac poem depicting John Wilhelm as "the pure boy knight... our Gallahad".[65] Still others, to greater purpose, called on surviving Friends, especially those "possessing the historical spirit", to set themselves to completing the sort of history that John Wilhelm Rowntree had hoped would "weld and unify... the Quaker faith... and... generate throughout the Society new life and vigour".[66]

Some of the first Friends to respond positively to John Wilhelm Rowntree's death were his father Joseph, his brother Seebohm and his wife Constance. Within a few days, they set about erecting an appropriate memorial to his life and work. First, they arranged for the collection and publication of his *Essays and Addresses*; then, more significantly, they began to sound out Quaker scholars who might make a contribution to the completion of his history.[67]

At Scalby in early September 1905, members of the Rowntree family met with Rufus M. Jones, William C. Braithwaite, A. Neave Brayshaw and others to discuss the Quaker History project. What emerged from this conference was a plan to combine Rufus Jones's proposed studies of European mysticism with John Wilhelm's projected history of Quakerism in order to produce a multi-volume series named in his memory.[68] Several scholars at the Scalby meeting indicated their willingness to help, but in the end the bulk of the work fell to Jones as overall editor and to William Charles Braithwaite, newly elected president of the Friends Historical Society. For the next sixteen years Jones and Braithwaite, generously supported by the Rowntree Charitable Trust, spent what ever time they could spare in preparing the fulfilment of John Wilhelm Rowntree's dream.[69]

The relationship between the two major authors, as reconstructed through their correspondence, was both refreshing in their

approach to the subject and fascinating for the ghost that hovered over it. From their first tentative feeling out of problems to their later, more confident, consideration of the evidence, their approach seems a model of industry, honesty and growing historical insight. Braithwaite set the tone with a letter indicating that he could "see nothing... but careful, detailed, historical work if the rise of Quakerism is to be correctly delineated on a correct background". As he perused the manuscripts and letters assembled at the Friends Library in London, Braithwaite reflected that the significance of these sources was "only apparent to a person who is already in possession of other material into which the new piece of information fits. It is like rebuilding structure out of dilapidated ruins."[70]

When questions arose as to how a particular topic should be handled, the authors agreed to refer to the outline and notes that John Wilhelm had developed before he died.[71] But they did not feel obliged to follow slavishly Rowntree's largely undigested plan. When, for instance, Braithwaite received a list of chapter titles Rowntree had compiled, he altered many of them and ignored others because he believed that they were better suited to interpretative discussions of certain narrow aspects of early Quaker experience than to a fully developed history of Quakerism. As he told Rufus Jones:

> Possibly J[oh]n Wilhelm had historical discussion a good deal in mind, but I am sure he would have made sure of his groundwork of facts first and would have given us a vivid history illuminated by historical discussion and not subordinated to it.

A really adequate history of the early movement, he said, could only be worked out from the mass of material at the Friends Library which provided "contemporary sources of the best kind... involving a great deal of detailed co-ordination of dates & facts but resulting in a vivid & in many respects fresh presentation..."[72]

John Wilhelm would no doubt have approved, just as he would have applauded Braithwaite's refusal, with the support of Rufus Jones, to tone down what the cautious Joseph Rowntree called "the extravagances of the movement" (for example, the fact that some early Friends, male and female, demonstrated their rejection of "creaturely" things by parading stark naked through northern English towns). Joseph Rowntree was concerned lest the

"ordinary reader... fasten upon these and let them bulk too large in his mind..." But the author and editor would not be deterred; they published the story of early Friends "extravagances" and all.[73]

Despite these concerns, which he never pressed beyond query, Joseph Rowntree's contribution to the series was surely admirable. He continually urged the authors to "spare no expense" in order to ensure that the History might be "a standard work broadly based upon full knowledge".[74] The elder Rowntree was also involved in an incident which is an amusing reminder of the smallness and intimacy of the British Edwardian elite. Once, when Rufus Jones expressed a desire to have one of his chapters on Wycliff and the Lollards read by the newly acclaimed G.M. Trevelyan, Joseph Rowntree responded that if Jones did not know Trevelyan, "Seebohn knows Charles Trevelyan the M.P. (I forget the historian's first name)... and Seebohm tells me... that he would have no difficulty in asking him to pass on this request to his brother, the historian."[75]

Of course, Rufus Jones's contribution to the series was the largest of all. This was only fitting, given the depth of his personal, intellectual and spiritual friendship with John Wilhelm Rowntree. After his dearest friend died in his arms, Jones said, "his life in some sense went into mine", and he vowed "in every way I could... toward the fulfilment of his interrupted plans".[76] Jones discharged his pledge by writing five volumes of the series as well as providing a long introduction to Braithwaite's books. This essay was intended to link all the volumes together and "to bring home to Friends and others the vital lessons of the history."[77]

William C. Braithwaite thought Jones's introduction "quite admirable" and "of great service in giving coherence to the study" as well as illuminating "the main lesson that our Quakerism of today needs to learn".[78] During recent years, however, many of Jones's historical interpretations, especially his fixing the origins of Quakerism in Continental Mysticism, have been challenged by historians who see early Friends as children of English Puritanism.[79] Indeed, both Braithwaite volumes have been re-issued without Jones's introduction on the ground that his views have been largely refuted.[80] Still, in the words of a latter day Quaker scholar, contemporary Friends "cannot understand who we are unless... we realize how much the way we put things today is colored by our reaction to Rufus Jones and to his generation."[81]

Of that generation, John Wilhelm Rowntree has been acknowledged as the greatest representative. Not only did he give life to the implementation of many of the practical reforms that allowed British Quakerism to escape from two centuries in a religious "backwater", but his vision of the revitalizing effects of a "fresh and sound" approach to Quaker history also inspired one of the most intellectual achievements among Friends since the seventeenth century. Questions about what "the History" might have been if he had lived or what his leadership might have contributed to Quaker war resistance during their second great testing time in the First World War[82] are, however intriguing, beyond the realm of historical investigation. Suffice to say that the influence of John Wilhelm Rowntree did not cease with his death and that his presence was distinctly felt among Friends of the succeeding generations. On the fiftieth anniversary of J.W. Rowntree's death, Maurice Creasey, Director of Studies at Woodbrooke, the permanent settlement for Quaker studies that Rowntree had first proposed, noted.

> it can be truthfully said that such stability and sense of direction and points of growth as the Society has possessed in recent years, are due in large measure to the influence and teaching and guidance of the Friends whom John Wilhelm Rowntree inspired.[83]

THOMAS C. KENNEDY

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1] Rufus M. Jones (1861–1948) was overall editor of the series which was originally published by Macmillan. Jones's contributions are *Studies in Mystical Religion* (London, 1909); *Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1914); *The Quakers in the American Colonies* (London, 1911), with Isaac Sharpless and Amelia M. Gummere; and *The Later Periods of Quakerism* (London, 1921), 2 vols. William Charles Braithwaite (1862–1922) wrote *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (London, 1912) and *The Second Period of Quakerism* (London, 1919).

[2] New editions have been published with only minor changes. For comments on the series, see Hugh Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England* (New Haven, 1964), ix, 260–261 and Elizabeth Gray Vining, *Friend of life: The Biography of Rufus M. Jones* (Philadelphia, [1958]), 194.

[3] Interview with Mary Hoxie Jones, 13 September 1983, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

[4] Rufus M. Jones, *The Trail of Life in Middle Years* (New York, 1934), 56.

[5] During the London Yearly Meeting of 1861, one member suggested that the use of "Inward Light" be abandoned by Friends because it was generally misunderstood outside of their Society and, more to the point, because it was not based on Scripture. See *The Friend* (London), 7 June 1861, 139–140. Also see Edward Grubb, *The Evangelical Movement and Its Impact on the Society of Friends* (Leominster, 1924), *passim* and Elizabeth Isichei, *Victorian Quakers,* (London, 1970), 3–16.

[6] Jones, *Middle Years,* 56–57. Jones was referring to the Society in general, although Calvinism was undoubtedly more influential among American Friends than their British counterparts.

[7] Richenda C. Scott, "Authority or Experience: John Wilhelm Rowntree and the Dilemma of Nineteenth Century British Quakerism", *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 49/2 (Spring, 1960), 75.

[8] There was always a small minority of conservative or quietist Friends who resisted the evangelical reliance on Biblical authority and continued to interpret Quakerism in the light of writings of early Friends, particularly Robert Barclay, see Isichei, *Victorian Quakers*, 16–25.

[9] *Ibid.,* 77–78.

[10] For examples of religious crises among young Friends in the 1870s and 1880s, see Edward Grubb, "Some Personal Experiences", *Friends Quarterly Examiner* (hereafter *FQE*) 72 (October, 1938), 300–302; *The Friend* (London), 27 January 1939, 69; Rufus M. Jones, *John Wilhelm Rowntree* (Philadelphia, 1942), [3–4]; and *The Trail of Life in College* (New York, 1929), 193.

[11] Henry Stanley Newman to Rufus M. Jones (RMJ), 25 Nov. 1895, Box 1, Rufus M. Jones Papers (RMJP), Haverford College Quaker Collections (HCQC), emphasis in the original.

[12] The most significant liberal challenge to Evangelical Quakerism was made by a group of Manchester Friends led by David Duncan; Duncan was disowned (expelled) in 1871. See Scott, "Authority or Experience", 76–81 and Isichei *Victorian Quakers*, 32, 61–67.

[13] The authors of *A Reasonable Faith* were all older Friends dissatisfied with the intellectual limitations of the evangelical creed: Francis Frith (1822–1898), William Pollard (1828–1893) and William Edward Turner (1836–1911); for commentary, see Jones, *Later Period,* II, 963–967. Edward Worsdell (1852–1908), an employee of the Rowntree cocoa firm and a former teacher at Bootham school, anticipated much of what John Wilhelm Rowntree and other proponents of liberal theology would say, although he is ignored by most Quaker accounts; but see Edwin B. Bronner, *"The Other Branch": London Yearly Meeting and the Hicksites, 1827–1912* (London, 1975), 33–34 and *The Annual Monitor,* 1904 (a Quaker obituary), 186–196. For Francis Frith's achievements as a pioneer in photography, see Bill Jay, *Victorian Cameraman: Francis Frith's Views of Rural England, 1850–1898* (Newton Abbot, 1973). Caroline Stephen's *Quaker Strongholds* (London, 1891) was another very influential non-Evangelical book, but Stephen, a convinced Friend, presented a moving personal witness to the spiritual possibilities of Quakerism rather than a critical analysis of its Victorian practice.

[14] For discussion of the Richmond Declaration see *Extracts from the Minutes and Proceedings of the Yearly Meeting of Friends* (hereafter *MPYMF*, with year), 1888, 27–48. Jones, *Later Period*, II, 931 called the Richmond Declaration "a relic of the past" which "reflected no sign of the prevailing intellectual difficulties over questions of science and history". Edward Grubb (1854–1939) vowed to leave the Society if the document was accepted; interview with Richenda C. Scott, 30 May 1976, Friends House, London and *The Friend* (London), 27 Jan. 1939, 68.

[15] Interview with Mary Hoxie Jones, 13 Sept. 1983, Haverford College.

[16] See Silvanus P. Thompson, "John Wilhelm Rowntree", *FQE*, 39 (April 1905), 260 and Howard Brinton, *Friends for 300 Years* (London, 1953), viii–ix.

[17] Maurice A. Creasey, *The Next Fifty Years* (London, 1956), 9; Elfrida Vipont, *The Story of Quakerism* (Richmond, Ind., 1977), 233–234; and Jones, *John Wilhelm Rowntree*, [1].

[18] Anne Vernon, *A Quaker Business Man: The Life of Joseph Rowntree, 1836–1925* (London, 1958), 76–92 contains information about John Wilhelm Rowntree's (hereafter JWR) early career.

[19] JWR to a Friend, 18 Sept. 1893, quoted in Rowntree's *Essays and Addresses*, edited by Joshua Rowntree (London, 1905), xiii.

[20] *Ibid.*, xxiv; R.M. Jones, *JWR*, [5–6]; Vipont, *Story of Quakerism, 234; and Bronner, "The Other Branch"*, 39.

[21] JWR, *Essays and Addresses*, xxiii–xxiv.

[22] Scott, "Authority or Experience", 86–87 and A. Neave Brayshaw, *The Quakers: Their Story and Message* (London, 1938), 214–315. Also see Henry Stanley Newman to RMJ, 25 Nov. 1895 and John W. Graham to RMJ, 19 Dec. 1895, Box 1, RMJP. *The Proceedings of the Manchester Conference...* were published (London, 1896).

[23] For analysis of JWR's "new movement", see Scott, "Authority or Experience", 89–91; Brayshaw, *The Quakers*, 315–321; Creasey, *Next Fifty Years*, 12–19; and Jones, *Life in College*, 195–96. Some Friends raised questions as to whether JWR was really the leader of the movement, see John W. Graham to *The Friend*, 8 July 1927, 643. It seems clear, however, that if Rowntree did not institute the reform movement, he was its most articulate and influential advocate.

[24] See JWR's "The Rise of Quakerism in Yorkshire", 28 and "The Present Position of Religious Thought in the Society of Friends", 195, in *Essays and Addresses*. Also see Isichei, *Victorian Quakers*, 35–36 and Creasey, *Next Fifty Years*, 11.

[25] JWR to Fielden Thorp, 1897, *Essays and Addresses*, xvi.

[26] JWR to a Friend, 18 Sept. 1893, *ibid.*, xiii.

[27] During his trips to the United States, JWR closely investigated the practice, widespread among western Friends, of appointing pastors to supervise and program Quaker meetings. He did not publicly attack it, but close friends recalled his deep concern that "the wide adoption of the pastoral system... was eating the heart out of Quakerism in the States." Thompson, "John Wilhelm Rowntree", 264 and Bronner, *"The Other Branch"*, 42n, 43n, 50. Also see JWR to RMJ, 19 May 1900, Box 2, RMJP.

[28] JWR, "The Problems of a Free Ministry", *Essays and Addresses*, 120–123 and "Pentecost", *Present-Day Papers* (*PDP*), 5/53 (1902), 383.

[29] JWR to Lawrence Richardson, 17 Oct. 1894, quoted in *Essays and Addresses*, xxi.

[30] See Jones, *JWR*, [6–7] and *Essays and Addresses*, xx.

[31] JWR, "Editorial Note", *PDP*, 3 [1900], 367–368. Also see *The Friend* (London), 17 March 1905, 162.

[32] JWR, "Present Position of Thought", *Essays and Addresses*, 241. This essay was originally published in *FQE* 39/153 (Jan. 1905), 109–122 and reprinted in *The American Friend*, 25 March 1905, 192–196.

[33] JWR to RMJ, 11 January 1899, Box 2, RMJP: JWR "The Need for the Summer School Movement", *Essays and Addresses*, 151–160. Also see JWR, "Our Educational Policy", *ibid.*, 181–190 *passim*; A. Neave Brayshaw, "Thirty Years", Pamphlet Group IV, *HCQO*; and Jones. *JWR*, [10–11].

[34] JWR to RMJ, 21 Jan. 1902, Box 3 and RMJ and JWR, 7 Feb. 1902, Box 38A, RMJP. JWR attempted, in vain, to persuade Rufus Jones to be the first Principal at Woodbrooke. For the history of the school, see Arnold S. Rowntree, *Woodbrooke: Its History and Aims* (London, 1923) and Robert Davis (ed.) *Woodbrooke, 1903–1953* (London, 1953).

[35] George Cadbury to RMJ, 26 Nov. and 5 June, 1902, Box 3, RMJP.

[36] JWR, "The Wages of Going On", *PDP*, 5/50 (15 Sept. 1902), 255: "A Study in Ecclesiastical Polity", *ibid.*, 5/51 (15 Oct. 1902), 302–303; and "Present Position of Thought", *Essays and Addresses*, 238.

[37] Thompson, "John Wilhelm Rowntree", 264. The quote is Thompson's paraphrase of JWR's words, emphasis in the original.

[38] See JWR, "A Personal Note to the Subscribers to *Present-Day Papers*", *PDP*, 5/53 (15 Dec. 1902), iii–iv. Rufus Jones, with the financial support of Joseph Rowntree, revived *PDP* in 1914 in America, but it ran only through 1915 when war conditions made it impossible to continue publishing the journal. See Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 22 Oct. 1913, Box 7, RMJP.

[39] Jones, *JWR*, [9] notes that JWR was already "forming... the lines of his proposed monumental History of Quakerism" when they met in 1897 on a holiday tour in Mürren, Switzerland; JWR's project neatly dovetailed with RMJ's plan for writing a history of mysticism which would set the scene for the message of George Fox. Also see David Hinshaw, *Rufus Jones, Master Quaker* (New York, 1951), 123–124.

[40] JWR, "Problems of a Free Ministry", *Essays and Addresses*, 123–124. Cf. Amelia Mott Gummere, "The Early Quakers and Parental Education", *PDP*, 5/50 (Sept. 1902), 284; "One of the first things we need to do is to learn to read Quaker history properly, and face our facts, then in the light of past experience, read more closely the lessons of the future".

[41] JWR, "The Present Position of Thought", *Essays and Addresses*, 237, 240.

[42] JWR, "God in Christ", *ibid.*, 279.

[43] Jones, *Trail of Life in College*, 195. Also see JWR "Problem of a Free Ministry", *Essays and Addresses*, 126.

[44] *Ibid.*, 130–131.

[45] "Forward", *The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, 1/1 (1903), 1.

[46] *Ibid.*, 1/2 (May 1904): 50.

[47] J.B. Braithwaite, *Journal*, 10 Sept. 1903, cited by Isichei, *Victorian Quakers*, 14.

[48] JWR to Norman Penney, 21 Oct. 1903, Box. 4, RMJP. Penney (1858–1933) was the first full-time librarian appointed to organize the Friends Library at the Society's offices, then at Devonshire House, London, with a view to aiding scholars interested in Quaker history and thought.

[49] JWR, "The Rise of Quakerism in Yorkshire", *Essays and Addresses*, 43–44. For a similar view, indicating that Fox and Barclay would have welcomed Biblical and other critical research, see Edward Worsdell, "The Restoration of the Bible", *PDP*, 1 (1898), 68–77.

[50] JWR to Norman Penney (copy), 3 July 1903, Box 4, RMJP. Rowntree collected nearly 2,000 volumes and pamphlets specifically for his history project, see *Essays and Addresss*, xxxvii and A. Neave Brayshaw, "J.W. Rowntree Biographical Notes", *The Friend* (London), 17 March 1905, 165.

[51] JWR to RMJ, 11 Aug., 28 Sept. and 4 Dec. 1903, Box 4, RMJP.

[52] JWR to Fielden Thorp (copy), 20 Jan. 1904, and JWR to William Tallack, 28 Oct. 1903, Box 4, *ibid.*

[53] JWR to RMJ, 27 July 1904, *ibid.*

[54] Jones, JWR, [14].

[55] JWR, "The Rise of Quakerism in Yorkshire", *Essays and Addresses*, 3–76.

[56] *Ibid.*, 5, 7.

[57] JWR to RMJ, 28 Sept. 1903, Box 4, RMJP; Thompson, "John Wilhelm Rowntree", 262–66; and JWR, "Rise of Quakerism", 69.

[58] *Ibid.*, 43, 40, 61.

[59] *Ibid.*, 65, 59 and "The Outlook", *PDP*, (1899), 9.

[60] JWR, "Rise of Quakerism", 62–63. Cf. with the comments of William Edmundson (1627–1712) in a letter of 1701: "Eagerness after the lawful things of this world... hinders many Friends Growth in the precious Truth, and their Service to it in their Day... two [sic] many of our Society... who have in measure escaped the Unclean, Unjust and Unlawful Things... now sit down in the Dust, in the Lawful Things of this World..." *A Journal of... William Edmundson* (London, 1715), 209.

[61] JWR, "Rise of Quakerism", 66, 73. Also see JWR and Henry Bryan Binns, "A History of the Adult School Movement", *PDP*, 5/50 (15 Sept. 1902), 262.

[62] JWR, "Rise of Quakerism", 59, 73, 75–76. Also see Thompson, "John Wilhelm Rowntree", 267–268.

[63] Jones, *JWR,* [15] and "John Wilhelm Rowntree" *The Friend* (London), 31 March 1905, 198.

[64] Arnold Rowntree to RMJ, 4 April 1905, Box 5, RMJP. Rowntree was quoting his uncle Joshua Rowntree. Also see Henry Bryan Binns to RMJ, 16 April 1905, *ibid.*

[65] Edward Grubb to RMJ, 21 March 1905, *ibid.,* and I.A.R., "In Memoriam, John Wilhelm Rowntree", *FQE.* 39/154 (April 1905), 269–272. Also see John Ellwood Paige, "John Wilhelm Rowntree – a Poem", *Friends Intelligencer,* 62/13 (1 April 1905), 193.

[66] "John Wilhelm Rowntree". *FQE,* 39/154 (April 1905), 128–131. Also see the obituary for JWR in *The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society,* 2/2 (April 1905), 46; George Newman (*FQE* editor) to RMJ, 15 July 1907; and Edward Grubb to RMJ, 12 Jan. 1906, Box 5, RMJP.

[67] Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 29 March and 28 April 1905; B. Seebohm Rowntree to RMJ, 1 June 1905; and Constance Rowntree to RMJ, 31 March 1905, Box 5, *ibid.*

[68] Jones, *Middle-Years,* 85–87 and Vining, *Friends of Life,* 115–117.

[69] For the origins and functioning of the Rowntree Charitable Trust, see Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 29 March and 14 Sept. 1905, Box 5, RMJP.

[70] W.C. Braithwaite to RMJ, 6 Feb. 1906, Box 5 and 5 Dec. 1909, Box 6, *ibid.*

[71] Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 14 Sept. 1905, Box 5, *ibid.* There is a typewritten copy of JWR's five-page outline entitled "A Study of the Development of Quaker Thought and Practice", Box 4, *ibid.*

[72] W.C. Braithwaite to RMJ, 6 Feb. 1906, Box 5 and 10 Jan. 1908, Box 6, *ibid.*

[73] Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 29 Aug. 1907, Box 5, *ibid.* For the early Quaker practice of "going naked as a sign", see Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism,* 148–151, 158; Braithwaite (148) emphasized that this practice "was not disowned by Quaker leaders". See Kenneth L. Carroll, "Early Quakers and 'Going Naked as a Sign' ", *Quaker History* 67/2 (Autumn 1978), 69–87.

[74] Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 30 July 1907, Box 5 and 28 April 1910, Box 6, RMJP. Joseph Rowntree also noted that while he was "responsible for all expenses... if there is any profit it will, of course, go to you"; Rowntree to RMJ, 3 Sept. 1908, *ibid.*

[75] Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 18 May 1908, *ibid.*

[76] RMJ, *A Way of Life and Service* (Oberlin, Ohio, 1939), 1–2; *Studies in Mystical Religion* (London, 1909), v–vi; and *Middle Years,* 188–191.

[77] Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 15 June 1908, Box 6, RMJP.

[78] Braithwaite to RMJ, 26 March 1911, Box 7, *ibid.*

[79] See especially, Geoffrey Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith* (Oxford, 1946); Alan Simpson, *Puritanism in Old and New England* (Chicago, 1955); and Barbour, *Quakers in Puritan England.*

[80] See L. Hugh Doncaster's "Forward" to the second edition of *The beginnings of Quakerism,* vii. In an extremely critical article, Daniel E. Bassuk, "Rufus Jones and Mysticism". *Quaker Religious thought* 17/4 (Summer, 1978), 23, believes Jones's view is "a compound of nineteenth century liberal religion and a theology whose origins lie in the Greek, Platonic tradition". On the other hand, Melvin B. Endy, Jr., "The Interpretation of Quakerism: Rufus Jones and His Critics", *Quaker History* 70/1 (Spring, 1981), 21 has suggested that "it may be time to stop beating the Rufus Jones horse... because it has many years of productive work left in it for those... interested in historical truth..." For another article supportive of Jones's views, see Donald F. Durnbaugh, "Baptists and Quakers – Left Wing Puritans?" *ibid.,* 62/2 (Autumn, 1973), 67–82.

[81] Chris Downing, "Quakerism and the Historical Interpretation of Religion", *Quaker Religious Thought* 3/2 (Autumn, 1961), 4.

[82] One of the tragic ironies of Quaker resistance to World War I was the fact that John Wilhelm Rowntree's only son, Laurie Rowntree, was killed in action in 1918. Originally a member of the Friends Ambulance Unit, Laurie Rowntree eventually enlisted because he could not bear to see men wounded and killed while he was largely removed from danger. Interview with Mary Hoxie Jones, 13 Sept. 1983 and Vining, *Friend of Life,* 197.

[83] Creasey, *Next Fifty Years,* 22

Reports on Archives

Lancaster Meeting House Archive

The bulk of this important archive has now been transferred to the Lancashire Record Office where it now bears the catalogue mark FRL. The collection was listed in 1976 and is described briefly by Michael Mullett in the *Journal* vol.54, no.1 (1976), pp.33–4.

At present (November 1985) all records over 60 years old have been transferred, but it is the Meeting's intention that only records less than 30 years old should be retained in the Meeting House. Enquries about the bulk of the collection should now be addressed to: The County Archivist, Lancashire Record Office, Bow Lane, Preston, PR1 8ND (Tel. 0772 54868, ext. 3026).

ANGUS WINCHESTER

Recent Publications

The Records and Recollections of James Jenkins. Edited by J. William Frost. Texts and studies in religion. Volume 18. The Edwin Mellen Press, New York and Toronto, 1984 lv, 634 pages.

James Jenkins (1753–1831) son of Zephaniah Fry and Ann Jenkins, was born in Bristol shortly before his parents were disowned by the Meeting; he was boarded out as a child in Kingswood, and sent to the family of John Fry at Whitechapel in 1763. From 1764 to 1767 Jenkins was at "a cheap poor boarding-school at Highflatts", Yorkshire, under Joseph Shaw. Returning to London, rather then being apprenticed to a clothier in Yorkshire, Jenkins was soon sent as apprentice to Hannah Jessup, grocer, in Woodbridge, Suffolk. In 1771, still an apprentice, Jenkins went to Ireland in the service of Robert Dudley of Clonmel who married Hannah Jessup.

When out of his apprenticeship, Jenkins went as clerk in the Strangman firm at Waterford, and then towards the end of the 1770s he set up in business, trading first to England, then in England importing Irish produce. Various occupations were tried later and in 1790 he was established as a grocer at Newbury, Berkshire, where he immediately found himself important as a Friend – "in a society point of view... the first man in the place" – and host to Friends travelling in the work of the ministry. However, in a couple of years he was back in London, but the tide turned for him financially in 1795 when he joined the stockbroking firm of which John Fry (then in his 70th year) was head. Jenkins soon found himself in a line of business where the profits were "more than adequate to all needful expenditure". A quarter of a century later he retired to Folkestone, where he died in 1831.

Jenkins must have kept diaries and journals throughout his long career, as well as travel itineraries which provided him with the basic information for this extensive account, supplemented from his wide reading in English literature and Quaker memorials.

In form the book is reminiscent of John Whiting's *Persecution Exposed* (reprinted in 1792 in a second edition, so doubtless Jenkins was familiar with it) with chronological framework – narrative account of personal recollections, punctuated with obituaries for Friends under the appropriate years. Whiting's book rested for two decades between manuscript and print. James Jenkins had had to wait much longer. The reasons are not far to seek: the size of the book; the fact that it deals equally with eminent Friends and the not so eminent without distinction; and that the account might not be one to improve the image of Quakerism in a period when *Piety Promoted* was still the style of reading provided for Friends.

James Jenkins in his notices of prominent Friends deceased does not pull his punches. In his sharp thumb-nail sketches he almost always includes a note of the physical appearance of the Friends concerned. We learn much concerning eighteenth-century Friends which would otherwise remain lost to us.

> "At this time a hierarchial influence govern'd the Society; our Ministers, and Elders, were looked up to, as great folks indeed!"
> "An Autocracy of Elders ruled with an almost exclusive sway."

This is not quite the "secret history" which Jenkins might have been able to write had financial success come to him earlier in life and allowed him then to devote leisure to the service of the Society in London. As things were, financial stability came too late, and we are left with an informed, perceptive and critical view taken at one remove from the seats of power of Friends in London.

At the beginning, we see the meeting at Devonshire House in the 1760s through the eyes of a ten-year-old: "in those days, every man wore a three-corner'd hat, and the distance between the brim and the crown constituted the criterion of plainness, or otherwise". The Irish period is interesting. The most valuable material is of Jenkins' mature London career. Jenkins had sympathy with figures like Dr Leeds, Thomas Letchworth and Hannah Barnard outside the main stream of Quakerism. The Barnard controversy is well covered.

James Jenkins shows that Friends even at the very end of the eighteenth century were still much involved in a tight discipline, to preserve the good name which the society was proud to have earned. Concerns over the state of English society, concerns for native races, and about slavery, are not so evident.

This edition cannot be viewed as definitive – indeed, the nature and extent of the material at hand makes it difficult to envisage such an edition as ever being possible. The editor has made great strides and opened the way for further research in his wake. Misprints and other matters need attention. Someone should tell America that the Leeds and Liverpool Canal is not a Railroad. There is ample material now made available for a new chapter on the mannerisms of ministers in some new volume of *Quaker Anecdotes*. The book will provide, for years to come, a hunting ground for readers to track down and identify references to individual Friends, and the sources of the literary allusions which abound.

RUSSELL S. MORTIMER

The Diary of Charles Fothergill, 1805: An itinerary to York, Flamborough and the north-western dales of Yorkshire. Edited by Paul Romney. (Yorkshire Archaeological Society. Record Series. Volume 142, for the year 1982.) Printed for the Society, 1984, ix, 281p. illus. £20 [Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Claremont, Clarendon Road, Leeds LS2 9NZ]

The Dairy of Charles Fothergill, 1805 is printed from records preserved in the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto. It is carefully edited by Paul Romney of Baltimore, Maryland, the author of a Ph.D. thesis (1981) which he entitled: 'A Man Out of Place: the Life of Charles Fothergill, Naturalist, Business Man, Journalist, Politician, 1782–1840'. The full title is needed to give the spread of interest of the man.

Charles Fothergill was great nephew of Dr John Fothergill, medical man and philanthropist, but as a family the Fothergills do not seem to have been vastly

rich, so Charles had not the backing which would have given him scope to pursue his cultural interests.

The *Diary* opens with his return to York in May 1805 intent on collecting material and subscriptions for his projected, but never completed, 'Natural and Civil History' of Yorkshire. An Appendix gives a partial list of some twenty subscribers – a drop in the ocean of the hundreds which would be required to see the work completed, even in the days of the classic county histories. The itineraries from York to Flamborough and through the northerly Yorkshire Dales are full of the observations of a keen young man on natural history, topography, mining, ghost stories, and all the matter which would have formed a basis for his finished work. He made drawings too, but we have little evidence of his ability in this field, although the descriptions of wild life are particularly detailed.

A word about Charles Fothergill as he appears in York Friends' records. He is dubbed on the dust-jacket as a 'young Quaker', although the editor in his informative introduction is not so incautious.

Charles's birth was recorded in York Monthly Meeting: born 23 v 1782, to John and Mary Ann Fothergill, of Trinity parish, York. Monthly Meeting records are silent until the autumn of 1803, five months after he had returned from Surrey, rented a farm at Huntingdon, bought bloodstock, "and settled to a modestly dissolute existence", as the editor tells us. In October 1803 his name was brought forward by an overseer of York Meeting:

> "the Case of Charles Fothergill who had been very negligent in the Attendance of Meetings for a considerable time, & of late attended the Horse-Races near this City, on which Accounts he had been laboured with, but without his appearing sensible of the inconsistency of his Conduct."

Thomas Priestman and Henry Tuke visited Charles and reported back, "not with much hope of Amendment". The case was referred from month to month until, three months later, Monthly Meeting judged "that it is necessary to disown him as a Member of our religious Society." William Tuke and William Bleckly were appointed to prepare a Testimony of Denial against him. They did, and on 7 March 1804 the Clerk was desired to convey a copy to him. It read:

> "Charles Fothergill, by Birth & Education a Member of our Society & this Meeting, having been long very remiss in the Attendance of our religious Meeting, & in Conduct & Conversation manifested a general Deviation from our Christian Profession; this Meeting, after due Labour bestowed, judges it necessary, & doth hereby disown him as a Member of our Society. Yet we sincerely desire, that by faithful Attention to the Principle of Truth in his own Mind, he may be redeemed from vain Speculations, & be brought to a true Sense of his Deviations, and to a Life & Conversation consistent with our holy Profession."

One wonders whether he kept the copy with his papers (now in Toronto) – probably not. Nor would he keep a copy of Brighouse Monthly Meeting's

minute of 19 June 1812 disowning Charlotte Fothergill (late Nevins) his wife for her marriage to him "by a priest, to one not of our society". After his disownment, the *Diary* shows that Charles continued to attend meetings for worship on occasion at York, Reeth, Countersett, Bainbridge and Hawes.

Black sheep perhaps he was according to the established view, but this diary proves him to be a talented writer with the Fothergill ability for acute observation of the scene around him.

It is a pity that the illustrations are so few, that the endpaper map is on green paper, and 'The Little Rail of Wensley" appears only on the dust-jacket.

RUSSELL S. MORTIMER

Hallelujah! Recording chapels and meeting houses. Council for British Archaeology, 1985. 60pp. £2.95. illustrations and plans; bibliography.

This booklet is one of a series published by the Council for British Archaeology dealing with the recording of churches, meeting houses and buildings as part of our heritage. It is of special interest to Friends because David Butler has contributed a chapter giving practical advice on survey sheets, drawings and finished plans from his own rich experience. The cover shows a collage depicting a Quaker wedding in Hertford Meeting House; the interior of this fascinating early house is photographed on page 13.

The booklet is produced by offset, and the illustrations are of varying quality, but they are a revelation of architectural riches which until recently were mostly despised. John Piper, in his paintings of Nonconformist chapels, was one of the pioneers in revealing their attraction, and David Butler has contributed substantially; it is interesting that the Welsh in their great tradition, are now taking steps to preserve some of their best chapel buildings, under threat of becoming furnishing stores and bingo halls. Just take a look at the splendour of the King Edward Street chapel in Macclesfield (Fig. 15) or the Norwich Octagon (1754–6) or the medieval house in Tewkesbury which in the seventeenth century became a Baptist chapel (Fig. 2). Many East Anglian villages in the strong nonconformist tradition can still show two or three examples. In this booklet, not only the buildings but their liturgical uses are discussed and illustrated.

Quakers, of course, have a testimony against steeple-houses; the church is the people. But that's only half a gospel, though a necessary half. In their buildings, people show their love and skill; they are precious places where prayer has been valid. Look and see.

ORMEROD GREENWOOD

Wiltshire Dissenters' Meeting House Certificates and Registrations 1689–1852. Ed. J.H. Chandler, Wiltshire Record Society, Devizes, 1985.

The 1689 Toleration Act required all meeting places for religious worship to be certified to the local ecclesiastical (i.e. Anglican) or secular authorities and

registered though there were no penalties for failure to comply until a new act in 1812. Up to 1812 registration enabled congregations to escape penalties under earlier legislation directed against nonconformists. A new Protestant Dissenters Act in 1852 made the Registrar General the registering authority. This background is clearly and fully described in the introduction to this collection of Wiltshire certificates. Dr Chandler's work is based on the surviving certificates sent to the authority concerned, on the authority's registration of these and in a few cases the licence received by a congregation from the authority. This information is supplemented by the returns made under the 1852 act to the Registrar General, summarising all registrations since 1689.

The volume records 1780 certificates representing 1839 places of worship. Fifty-three certificates were from Friends. Both the total number and that for Friends can be deceptive, partly because not all the original documentation has survived and partly because the requirement to register will sometimes have been ignored (it was by the Moravians on principle). Nor of course does the number of certificates produced give any indication of the size of congregations and it would be dangerous to assume too much about the strength of Wiltshire nonconformity from the collection. A number of the certificates for Friends cover more than one place of worship, the most remarkable in 1690 no less than 22 places. Only a minority of these would be meeting houses in the modern sense and many were the homes of individual Friends so that several could be registered in the same area simultaneously or in quick succession. The pattern is interesting, only four of the 53 certificates came between 1750 and 1800 none after 1800. The trend for Presbyterians was similar while naturally there was a considerable Methodist development from the late eighteenth century. This will be a useful compilation and its introduction can be recommended for its general observations on the subject and notes on sources to anyone interested in studying other areas.

DAVID J. HALL

Church Planting, a study of Westmorland Non-conformity. Alan P.F. Sell, 1986. H.E. Walters, Worthing, £7.50

George Fox's words of 1682 to Friends 'going over to... make outward plantations in America, keep your own plantations in your hearts, with the spirit and power of God, that your own vines and lilies be not hurt', are recalled by Dr. Sell's book, for his theme is of vines and lilies planted in a wilderness, some flourishing and some hurt. He sets out to show how in one part of England the several dissenting churches were established, how they grew and divided, and how they influenced one another for good or ill. The chosen area is the old County of Westmorland, a place of particular interest to Friends for the early start they made there and for their rather uneven history since.

A good deal of attention is given to the Seekers and the early years of Quakerism, including pamphleteering for and against the new movement. Subsequent chapters have less to say, being more concerned with the development of other and later churches. Thus we miss the light which might have been thrown on Friends' failure to plant new meetings despite the outreach of travelling ministers and the circulating yearly meeting for the northern counties. The nineteenth century Beaconite controversy is discussed particularly in

its connection with the growth of the Brethern church in Kendal. In his final chapter Dr. Sell develops numerical comparisons where membership of most of the churches, and its proportion to the population as a whole, is considered for the years 1900 and 1970. One looks forward to future work allowing him to take these comparisons further back in time, for the present century is on the whole one of declining membership and the real interest of the book is in growth.

The text is reinforced with over 30 pages of notes and sources yet one must express reservations on its accuracy: the dates given for Friends meeting houses are seldom attributed to any source and are significantly at variance with original records and with printed work based on them. One must hope that this is exceptional and that other churches have been better served, for the book is a valuable study of relationships between denominations, in a field more noted for separate and unrelated work.

DAVID M. BUTLER

***

Attention is drawn to the following:

The Quakers of Fritchley, Walter Lowndes, reprint with additions, from Friends Book Centre, £6.00. Some corrections and additions enlarge on the moves from London YM towards reunification with Fritchley General Meeting.

Francis Frith's Travels; A Photographic Journey through Victorian Britain, text by Derek Wilson, J.M. Dent, London & Melbourne, 1985.

"The Papist Charges against the Inter-regnum Quakers" by Stephen A. Kent in *Journal of Religious History,* vol.12, no.2, December 1982.

"The Authorities and Early Restoration Quakerism by Barry Reay in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol.34, no.1, January 1983.

Notes & Queries

AMERICAN FRIENDS

Religious Enthusiasm in the New World: Heresy to Revolution, David S. Lovejoy, Harvard U.P., 1985.

> Chapter 6 (pp.110–34); Quakers of the first generation: the martyrs.
> Chapter 7 (pp. 135–53): Quakers from William Penn to John Woolman.

BAPTISM AT BISHOPTHORPE

The Bishopthorpe parish register, 1631–1837 (Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Parish Register Section, vol.150, 1986) has the following entries on page 21:

> Mr John Barlow (aged about 26) born of Quaker parents was baptiz'd in the parish church of Bishopthorpe, May the 6th being Assention day [1703].
> Mary daughter of Thomas & Elizabeth Ubank of York, born of Quaker parents, baptized at this church, 21 Jan. 1706/7.

Brighouse Monthly Meeting registers record the birth of John Barlow, son of Samuel Barlow of Leeds, 14 or 15 xi 1676 [Jan. 1677]. John Barlow was nominated as one of the trustees by Leeds meeting for the meeting house and burial grounds, 21 x 1698 (See *Jnl. F.H.S.,* 22 (1925), p.52), but there is no record of his appearance in business meetings at Leeds Preparative Meeting after March 1702 (see *Leeds Friends' minute book 1692 to 1712,* Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series, vol.139, 1980).

York Monthly Meeting registers record the burial of Mary Ewbank, daughter of Thomas & Elizabeth, 5 i 1710/11. Thomas Ewbank died 29 x, buried 1 xi 1754.

WILLIAM BARTRAM

"The Quaker background of William Bartram's view of nature" by Larry R. Clarke (U. of Miami), *Journal of the History of Ideas,* vol.46, no.3 (July–Sept. 1985), pp.435–48.

> This article illustrates the fact that Bartram's outlook was not that of the usual Quaker stance; for instance he hated and feared the Indians.

ENGLISH WOMEN

Women in English Society, 1500–1800, ed. Mary Prior, Methuen, London and New York, 1985.

> Appendix I. Provisional checklist of women's published writings, 1600–1700 by Patricia Crawford (U. of Western Australia). A considerable proportion of these Quaker works (more than a score by

Supplements to the Journal of Friends' Historical Society

12. ELIZABETH HOOTON, First Quaker woman preacher (1600–1672). By Emily Manners. 1914. 95pp., £3.00.

20. SWARTHMORE DOCUMENTS IN AMERICA. Ed. Henry J. Cadbury. 1940. £1.50.

21. AN ORATOR'S LIBRARY. John Bright's books. Presidential address 1936 by J. Travis Mills. 1946. 24pp., 50p.

22. LETTERS TO WILLIAM DEWSBURY AND OTHERS. Edited by Henry J. Cadbury. 1948. 68pp., £3.00.

23. SLAVERY AND "THE WOMAN QUESTION". Lucretia Mott's Diary. 1840. By F.B. Tolles. 1952. £2.00, cloth £3.00.

24. THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY OF EARLY FRIENDS. Presidential address by Frederick B. Tolles, 1952. £1.00.

28. PATTERNS OF INFLUENCE IN ANGLO-AMERICAN QUAKERISM. By Thomas E. Drake. 1958. £1.00.

29. SOME QUAKER PORTRAITS, CERTAIN AND UNCERTAIN. By John Nickalls. 1958. Illustrated. £1.00.

32. JOHN WOOLMAN IN ENGLAND, 1772. By Henry J. Cadbury. 1971. £2.00.

33. JOHN PERROT. By Kenneth L. Carroll. 1971. £2.00.

34. "THE OTHER BRANCH": LONDON Y.M. AND THE HICKSITES, 1827–1912. By Edwin B. Bronner. 1975. £1.25.

35. ALEXANDER COWAN WILSON, 1866–1955. By Stephen Wilson. 1974. £1.00.

Back issues of the *Journal* may be obtained: price £2.00 each issue.

Journals and Supplements Wanted

FHS would be glad to receive unwanted copies of back issues of the *Journal* and of the Supplements. Address to FHS, c/o The Library, Friends House, London NW1 2BJ.

JHFS 55 1 & 2

ISSN No. 0071 9587

E & E Plumridge Ltd, Linton, Cambridge