

*The  
Journal of the  
Friends' Historical  
Society*

*Volume 57 Number 3*

## CONTENTS

Page	
221	A New Letter to George Fox. <i>Geoffrey F. Nuttall.</i>
228	Quaker Women in the Eighteenth Century: Opportunities and Constraints. <i>Jean E. Mortimer.</i>
260	Samuel Bewley (1764–1837), Silk Merchant and Philanthropist of Dublin. <i>Richard S. Harrison.</i>
272	The Lost Legacy? <i>Roger Poole and Charles Whistlecroft.</i>
277	What Hath Manchester Wrought? Change in the Religious Society of Friends, 1895–1920. <i>Thomas C. Kennedy.</i>
306	Recent Publications.
312	Notes and Queries.
317	Index.

---

## FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

---

<i>President:</i>	1996 Maurice J. Wigham 1997 H. Larry Ingle
<i>Clerk:</i>	Howard F. Gregg
<i>Treasurer:</i>	Michael S. Booth
<i>Editor of the Journal:</i>	Gerald A.J. Hodgett

Annual Membership Subscriptions due 1st January (Personal, Meetings and Quaker Institutions in Great Britain and Ireland) £8 US \$16 (Overseas Institutions) £13 US \$26. Subscriptions should be paid to the Treasurer and Membership Secretary, FHS, 169 Conway Crescent, Perivale, Greenford, Middlesex, UB6 8JE. Orders for single numbers and back issues should be sent to FHS c/o The Library, Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ

# THE JOURNAL OF THE FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Communications should be addressed to the Editor of the *Journal*  
c/o The Library, Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ.

---

---

## A NEW LETTER TO GEORGE FOX

**T**he discovery of a new, and early, letter to George Fox is of considerable interest. Extant letters to him from others than Friends are far to seek; and the writer, Morgan Llwyd, minister of the Congregational church at Wrexham, is a radical Puritan under constant investigation by students of the history and literature of Wales.<sup>1</sup> The discovery of the letter might more exactly be termed the identification of its recipient. The letter's existence has been known for some time, but only now is it in print, without date and to a nameless correspondent.<sup>2</sup> The evidence that it was written to Fox, though indirect, is substantial and, cumulatively, convincing.

Fox's statement in his *Journal* that in 1653 the 'preist at Rexam in Wales one ffloyde ... sent two of his preachers into ye north to try us & see what a manner of people wee was', with the result that one of the two, John ap John, 'stands a fine minister for Christ to this day',<sup>3</sup> has often attracted attention;<sup>4</sup> with what is known of the visit to Wrexham of Richard Hubberthorne and John Lawson, two of the 'First Publishers of Truth', in the following October, it provides a dramatic account of the first impact of Quakerism in Wales.<sup>5</sup> From his side, Llwyd's continuing though hesitant attraction to the Quaker message is likewise apparent from a number of passages in his correspondence. In 1654 he was asking Peter Sterry about Friends; in 1655-6 he was enquiring about Quaker books, and received a number from a friend in London; in 1656 he referred to Quakers as those 'who seeme at least to be more pure than

the rest'; and in correspondence with Richard Baxter in 1656-7 he was still more favourable to Friends than Baxter liked.<sup>6</sup>

A clue to the context and date of the letter under review is the name mentioned in it of T. Rawlinson: 'To him that told mee of some dissatisfaction I spake before', Llwyd writes, '(I meane T. Rawlinson) at whose carriage wee were here grieved & are desirious to deale further with him as with a friend'. Thomas Rawlinson, a Friend from Graythwaite (south of Hawkshead) and one of the 'First Publishers', had been present at the meeting in July 1653 when John ap John and his companion came from Wrexham on their visit of inquiry. This we know from a letter written to Fox, ten days after the meeting, by James Nayler, who had also been present. Whereas John ap John was 'convinced', Nayler writes, 'y<sup>e</sup> other ... did mutter to Thos. Rollison against the Judgement which had taken hould on him'.<sup>7</sup> Rawlinson was well known to Fox: he had been with him at his trial at Lancaster, and also during his imprisonment at Carlisle.<sup>8</sup>

Before we pursue this further, we may advert to the only other personal name in Llwyd's letter, that of Thomas Tillam. 'You have acted according to your light in Tho. Tillams,' Llwyd writes, '& I according to mine in breaking bread at Chester, for I have knowen & examined divers of them, & found them seekers after God, not daring to speake against the Godhead of Jesus'.

Llwyd's reference here to Chester is to be linked with a letter he wrote on 25 March 1651 'To the Heaven-Borne Children, Beloved of God, called to be saints ... now sojourning in West Chester', in which he refers to the 'great ould And yett new Controversye' among them, and urges them to 'Acknowledge Christ in God to be the Eternal wisdome and only God', as over against merely 'nominall Christians' who 'Crucifie his God head'.<sup>9</sup>

The church at Chester for which Llwyd was concerned had been going through troubled times. Its protector was Colonel Robert Duckenfield, of Dukinfield Hall, Dukinfield, High Sheriff of Cheshire and in 1653 M.P. for Cheshire in the Barebones Parliament.<sup>10</sup> With his support his chaplain, Samuel Eaton,<sup>11</sup> had gathered a Congregational church that met in the chapel of Dukinfield Hall.<sup>12</sup> When in 1650 Duckenfield was appointed Governor of Chester, Eaton moved with him, to be chaplain to the garrison there, and a church (or more exactly another congregation of 'the Church in Cheshire' meeting both at Dukinfield and at Chester) was gathered at Chester, meeting for worship in the Castle.<sup>13</sup> Soon, however, Eaton returned to Dukinfield. To his distress his successor at Chester (also, presumably, under Duckenfield's patronage), John Knowles, proved to be an ardent

Socinianizer.<sup>14</sup> Before the end of the year he too was gone, but not before Eaton had sent to Chester arguments for Christ's divinity, and Knowles had published them together with his reply. In July John Whittell was hauled before the Council of State for issuing this piece,<sup>15</sup> which was evidently held to be dangerously blasphemous; and it was to John Whittell that Llwyd added a postscript to his letter, requesting its communication 'to them that are taught of God in Chester'. These were the people, bemused by the Christological dispute between their ministers and now with no resident pastor, to whom Llwyd went over from Wrexham to administer the sacrament. They had further suffered from the attentions of Thomas Tillam, but he too had now left them for a Lectureship at Hexham in Northumberland.<sup>16</sup>

Thomas Tillam, whom Llwyd mentions, was a 'mercurial'<sup>17</sup> figure, 'forceful and often impetuous',<sup>18</sup> who, like Llwyd, has of late been much studied. At first an Independent, he became a Baptist, a Fifth Monarchist, a Seventh-Day man;<sup>19</sup> he eventually led a millenarian group to settle in the Palatinate. In the summer of 1650, 18 months before he went to Hexham, Tillam had gone, as he tells us himself, '(by a clear call from God and Saints) to preach in Cheshire, where I saw the Lords power; and there I incurred Mr. Eaton's displeasure.'<sup>20</sup> Hence Llwyd's mention of Tillam and the church at Chester in the same sentence.

Why should Llwyd mention Tillam? Because Tillam had gone to Chester from Wrexham, where he had been in membership, and briefly an elder, before withdrawing under a cloud.<sup>21</sup> Though he claimed that he left Wrexham on his own initiative, Samuel Eaton, who became involved in print with Tillam as well as with Knowles, claimed that Tillam was 'excommunicated by the church at Wrexham, and afterwards his Excommunication was found and declared just by the Church in Duckenfield.'<sup>22</sup> The church in Cheshire and the church at Wrexham were sister churches, and, just as Llwyd was concerned for Chester, so Dukinfield was concerned for Wrexham.<sup>23</sup>

If we now ask whether Tillam's name and the church in Cheshire would mean anything to George Fox, the answer (perhaps surprisingly) is that they would. A few pages before recording the visit of John ap John and his companion from Wrexham, Fox relates that he passed through Northumberland till he came 'to Hexam'. Here 'wee had a great meeting a toppe of a hill where ye preist came not though hee had threatned'.<sup>24</sup> The note of scorn here is in keeping with the tone of a letter Fox sent 'To the people of Hexham':<sup>25</sup> he was confident, expecting to dispute, and to have the victory. His language - 'I am the light of the world and do enlighten everyman that cometh' - echoes the

phraseology deemed at his trial to be blasphemous;<sup>26</sup> though it is fair to note that at Hexham 'all was turned to ye light of Christ', and at a less *exalté* level his language answers to Llwyd's words 'You have acted according to your light in Tho. Tillams'. Tillam is found engaging with Friends in the following year;<sup>27</sup> and when in 1657 he published *The Seventh-Day Sabbath sought out and celebrated*, Fox did not miss it and returned *An Answer* (1659),<sup>28</sup> as well as replying to it in *The Great Mystery of the Great Whore* (1659).

Fox also knew of the church in Cheshire. After their visit to Wrexham in October 1653 Hubberthorne and Lawson 'went back into Cheshire' and in a letter from Chester to Margaret Fell and others Lawson tells of the 'sort of people who are separated from the priests' in the city, 'who are in fellowship among themselves'.<sup>30</sup> With the other branch of the church Fox himself was acquainted, for in 1647, in the course of his early wanderings, he had had a brush with Samuel Eaton in Dukinfield: 'I went among the Professors at Duckenfield and Manchester,' he writes, 'where I stay'd a while and declared Truth among them ... the Professors were in a Rage'.<sup>31</sup> So early in his account place-names are almost non-existent, and one wonders why Dukinfield remained etched in his memory. Possibly the anti-trinitarianism which was rife at Dukinfield<sup>32</sup> as well as at Chester was present there from the beginning: these early pages of the *Journal* are notable for their firm high Christology. Fox did not return to Dukinfield but left it to other Friends: in November 1653 Eaton published *The Quakers Confuted: being an Answer unto nineteen Queries ... sent to the Elders of the Church of Duckinfield ... with an Answer to a Letter ... written by one of them (R. Waller)* (1654), together with the letter in question from Richard Waller, a Friend who had once been a member of Eaton's church.<sup>33</sup>

In his letter from Chester Lawson writes that, when Hubberthorne and he were at Wrexham 'the priest was silent, Richard laid more judgment on him, the priest sat sobbing'. Here we see 'convincement' at work, what in the psychology of conversion is called 'conviction' under judgment, often accompanied by self-abasement before someone with charismatic power. It is the perfect scenario for the burden of Llwyd's letter to his unnamed 'Deare and Honoured' correspondent. 'I am a child & a foole,' Llwyd writes. 'You have stood long in the gap, & reioyced many, you have been a stake in the hedge & a flower in the garden also'. 'I M. Ll. that write this is as dung & durt'. In none of his other numerous extant letters does Llwyd write remotely like this. To whom could he conceivably have been writing but Fox?

Llwyd's letter is part of a correspondence. He opens it with the words 'What you have written' and closes it with a humble defence of a former

letter from himself. We have no other letter from Llwyd to Fox, but there is a record of a letter from Fox 'To the priest of Rixsom in Wales', with the opening words 'Friend, thy desire is, that we would write unto thee'. In a paper in Nayler's hand which has been identified as a copy of this letter, but which is more probably a second letter, brought by Hubberthorne and Lawson in October, Fox writes 'freind thou hast tasted of y<sup>e</sup> power of god, & a light is raised up in the, but there is a mixture in thy voyce'.<sup>34</sup> It is to this letter that Llwyd is replying. 'I may not yet expresse the mixtures of heart in that kind,' he writes: 'I intended no quibs but love'. 'I am persuaded you will become dayly as a little child more & more'. 'I hope I shall not mistake that blessed spirit inhabiteth in you which also is knowen in yours, Mor. Llwyd'.<sup>35</sup>

All things considered, there cannot be much doubt that Llwyd's letter was written to George Fox, and may be dated to the second half of 1653, probably to November of that year.

Geoffrey F. Nuttall

#### NOTES AND REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> See M. Wynn Thomas, *Morgan Llwyd* (Writers of Wales: Cardiff, 1984), 77-9 (bibliography: critical and biographical studies); to which may be added M. Wynn Thomas, 'Disgybl a'i Athro: Morgan Llwyd a Walter Cradoc', in *Agweddau ar dwf Piwritaniaeth yng Nghymru yn yr ail ganrif ar bymtheg* (Welsh Studies, 6: Lewiston/Queenston/Llanbedr Pont Steffan, 1992), ed. J. Gwynfor Jones, 111-27, and G.F. Nuttall, 'A Parcel of Books for Morgan Llwyd', *J.F.H.S.*, 56.3 (1992), 180-8.
- <sup>2</sup> *Gweithiau Morgan Llwyd o Wynedd*, iii (Caerdydd, 1994), ed. J. Graham Jones and Goronwy Wyn Owen, item 81, pp.196-7.
- <sup>3</sup> George Fox, *Journal* (Cambridge, 1911), ed. N. Penney, i.141.
- <sup>4</sup> Cf. W.C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, 2nd edn. (Cambridge, 1955), 123, with footnotes, and with additional notes by Henry J. Cadbury on p.557.
- <sup>5</sup> See G.F. Nuttall, *The Welsh Saints 1640-1660: Walter Cradock, Vavasor Powell, Morgan Llwyd* (Cardiff, 1957), ch. IV ('The Impact of Quakerism').
- <sup>6</sup> *Gweithiau*, iii, items 70; 64, 66 and 43; 23; 36 and 37; Baxter's side of the correspondence was published in *Gweithiau*, ii (1908), ed. J.H. Davies, 270-5.
- <sup>7</sup> Friends House Library, Swarthmore MSS. 3.60; quoted in *Welsh Saints*, 56. We know from a manuscript memorandum by John ap John (printed by W.G. Norris, *John ap John* (1907), p.6, with facsimile) that he met Fox at Swarthmore on 21 July 1653, but not the exact date of the meeting at Kendal at which he was 'convinced', probably a few days earlier.
- <sup>8</sup> *Journal*, i.64, 121.
- <sup>9</sup> *Gweithiau*, iii, item 22, pp.47, 50, 49.
- <sup>10</sup> For Duckenfield, see *D.N.B.*; *Historical Sketches of Nonconformity in the County Palatine of Chester* (1864), [ed. W. Urwick], 340; *Extracts from State Papers relating to Friends 1654 to 1672* (1913), ed. N. Penney, 110; Tai Liu, *Discord in Zion: the Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution 1640-1660* (The Hague, 1973), 140-1.

- <sup>11</sup> For Samuel Eaton, see *D.N.B.*; *Calamy Revised* (Oxford, 1934), ed. A.G. Matthews, s.v.; Anne Laurence, *Parliamentary Army Chaplains 1642-1651* (1990), 23-4; G.F. Nuttall, *Visible Saints: the Congregational Way 1640-1660* (Oxford, 1957), 31.
- <sup>12</sup> This church, which 'Gangraena' Edwards termed, more rhetorically than exactly, 'the first Independent Church visible and framed that was set up in England', was defended by Eaton in *A Iust Apologie for the Church of Duckenfield* (1647); Duckenfield's son and grandson continued his patronage (J.T. Cliffe, *The Puritan Gentry Besieged 1650-1700* (1993), 194-5, 211-12, 260, n.17), and the church still exists, though (somewhat ironically, considering Eaton's vehemence against Socinianism) as a Unitarian church: see A. Gordon, *Historical Account of Dukinfield Chapel* (1896) and [G. Hague], *The Unitarian Heritage* (1992), 82-3.
- <sup>13</sup> For this church, see *Visible Saints*, 31-2.
- <sup>14</sup> For John Knowles, see *D.N.B.*; H.J. McLachlan, *Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1951), ch. XIII; Laurence, 143.
- <sup>15</sup> Cf. *C.S.P.D.* 1650, 518; this publication, *A Friendly Debate* (1650), Eaton followed up by *The Mystery of God Incarnate* (1650), with an epistle dedicatory 'To the Faithful and dearly beloved, the Saints of Jesus Christ, in, and about Chester', and by *A Vindication* (1651).
- <sup>16</sup> Tillam arrived at Hexham on 27 December 1651: see B.W. Bell, *The Seventh-Day Men: Sabbatarians and Sabbatarianism in England and Wales, 1600-1800* (Oxford, 1994), 301, n.89.
- <sup>17</sup> Stephen Copson, 'Advocate of the Reformed Protestant Religion: the writings (1645-58) of William Kaye, Yorkshire Puritan', in *Baptist Quarterly*, xxxv.8 (April, 1994), 232.
- <sup>18</sup> S.L. Copson, *Association Life of the Particular Baptists of Northern England 1699-1732* (English Baptist Records, 3; 1991), 14.
- <sup>19</sup> Cf. B.S. Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: a study in seventeenth-century English millenarianism* (1972), 266; Bell, 300-5, 268-75.
- <sup>20</sup> Thomas Tillam, *A Christian Account* (1656), 10.
- <sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 8-11.
- <sup>22</sup> *Thomas Tillam his Account examined* (1657), 1 (quoting Eaton) and 9 (quoting the Dukinfield church). For alerting me to these rare tracts, the latter of which only is in W.T. Whitley, *Baptist Bibliography* (1916), 41-657, and neither of which is in Wing, and for locating them in the Bodleian Library and the Angus Library (photocopy), Regent's Park College, Oxford, I am much indebted to the Rev. S.L. Copson.
- <sup>23</sup> Within this wider fellowship one could presume that Colonel Duckenfield would be known to Llwyd, as he was (*Gweithiau*, iii.121, as Puckenfield).
- <sup>24</sup> *Journal*, i.136. Fox's visit to Hexham seems likely to have taken place after his release from imprisonment at Carlisle (from 1 August, for seven weeks); possibly his letter to Hexham (see n.25, below) was written before his imprisonment (its highflown language might suggest this) and a visit he expected to make was delayed: 'the *Journal* is here innocent of all dates' (cf. Braithwaite, 116, n.3 119).
- <sup>25</sup> *Annual Catalogue of George Fox's Papers* (1939), ed. H.J. Cadbury, item 23, 13A; the latter is actually headed 'To the people of Hexam in Wales' and is sensibly indexed by the editor 'Hexam, see Wrexham', but the words 'in Wales' are probably a scribal addition through confusion with 'Rixsom in Wales' in item 6, 93A: the letter's tone would be out of place if addressed to Wrexham.
- <sup>26</sup> Cf. Braithwaite, 117-18.
- <sup>27</sup> See Tillam's postscript to Giles Firmin, *Stablishing against Shaking* (1658), postscript (quoted in *First Publishers of Truth* (1907), ed. N. Penney, 89, n.3); Edward Burrough,

- Stablishing against Quaking thrown down* (1656), 31, does not accept Tillam's account of what happened, but the date (19.3 mo. 1654) and place of the engagement are precise, and the meeting is confirmed by Swarthmore MSS., 4.209. Tillam also figures in *The Cruelty of some Fighting Priests published* (1660), 5.
- <sup>28</sup> Tillam's tract, which Joseph Smith (*Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana* (1873), 426) was unable to locate, is in the Angus Library; Fox's *Answer* is in the Bevan-Naish collection in the library of Woodbrooke: for access to this and other tracts I am indebted to the Librarian, Christina Lawson.
- <sup>29</sup> *First Publishers of Truth*, 17.
- <sup>30</sup> Swarthmore MSS., 4.65.
- <sup>31</sup> Since the first pages of the manuscript of the *Journal* are missing, we have to depend here on the 1694 edition by Thomas Ellwood, 12; Ellwood was not averse to making alterations to the text, but did not invent incidents.
- <sup>32</sup> For anti-trinitarianism at Dukinfield in 1653, see Adam Martindale, *Life*, ed. R. Parkinson (Chetham Soc., O.S., 4; 1845), 110. By 1654 Eaton had left Dukinfield for Stockport (D.N.B.).
- <sup>33</sup> The tract, dated 18 November 1653 by Thomason, received an anonymous *Answer* (1654) and was put first by Fox among the scores of attacks on Friends which he answered in *The Great Mystery*. For Richard Waller, see *Early Quaker Letters from the Swarthmore MSS. to 1660* (typescript; copies at Friends House and Woodbrooke), ed. G.F. Nuttall, 74.
- <sup>34</sup> For more of Fox's letter, see *Welsh Saints*, 56-7.
- <sup>35</sup> Llwyd acknowledges that his correspondent's expressions 'are rough hewen'. In his preface to Fox's *Journal* (1694) William Penn similarly acknowledges that, while 'his very Presence exprest a Religious Majesty', sentences would fall from Fox 'abruptly and broken'. For 'stood long in the gap ... a stake in the hedge', see Ezek. xxii. 30, a verse also dear to Penn: 'We are the People above all others, that must stand in the Gap' (*To the Children of Light* (1678), 3).

# QUAKER WOMEN IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY: OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS

‘**B**efore you can have equal opportunities, you have to have opportunities.’ These words were used as a slogan by a group of Oxford women dons in 1991, when they were pressing for greater access to professorships for women.

Quaker women in the eighteenth century certainly had a variety of opportunities - that is, ways in which they could serve the Quaker movement, while at the same time enjoying some freedom of action and scope for personal development and for the exercise of any talents they possessed. Such opportunities were not always equal to those available for men.

There were, naturally, some women to whom special circumstances gave a chance to show their capabilities. The name of William Penn’s second wife Hannah Callowhill springs to mind immediately. When William Penn fell ill and was unable to deal with his affairs, near the end of his life, Hannah rose to the occasion and took the chief responsibility for them; and after his death she administered the government of Pennsylvania, with the assistance of James Logan, while her children were minors.<sup>1</sup>

## *ELIZABETH HADDON*

William Penn himself influenced the destiny of Elizabeth Haddon. Penn’s visit to the Haddon family in London, when she was five or six, and his talk of America and the Indians there fired her imagination, and she longed to go to America. When John Haddon her father purchased a tract of land in New Jersey and found that he was not free to go and settle there, Elizabeth saw the opening of which she had dreamed, and asked to be allowed to take it over. When her mother asked her if she had reflected well on the difficulties for a young woman to farm unbroken land in a new country, she is said to have replied ‘Young women have governed kingdoms, and surely it requires less wisdom to manage a farm. But let not that trouble us dear mother. He that feedeth the ravens will guide me in the work whereunto He has called me. It is not to cultivate the farm, but to be a friend and physician to the people in that region that I am called.’

During the delay advised by her father, she took practical steps to learn as much as possible about household affairs, agriculture and the cure of common diseases. She went out to New Jersey in 1701, with a woman companion and several servants, and was successful in farming the land, and later in establishing a meeting.

She is credited with having taken the initiative in proposing to John Estaugh, when he came on a religious visit. She had heard him preach at Yearly Meeting at home when she was 11 years old, and had never forgotten him. Longfellow describes the occasion delicately in his poem "Elizabeth" - 'I have received from the Lord a charge to love thee, John Estaugh'. John Estaugh, perhaps taken aback, was obliged to say that as yet he had no light to direct him, and must return to England to complete the work laid upon him there.

Longfellow's evocative lines describe the separation—

Ships that pass in the night, and speak each other in passing,  
Only a signal shown and a distant voice in the darkness;  
So on the ocean of life we pass and speak one another,  
Only a look and a voice, then darkness again and a silence.

It is satisfactory to know that the silence was not for ever. John Estaugh returned, and they were married in 1702. He continued his travels in the ministry until his death in 1742, as well as taking part in the work at Haddonfield.

The pioneering work was Elizabeth's (she died in 1762). The town of Haddonfield paid tribute to her as its founder, when it celebrated in 1963 the 250th anniversary of its foundation.<sup>2</sup>

### TACE SOWLE

In quite a different sphere was the career of Tace Sowle (1666-1749), daughter of the London Quaker printer Andrew Sowle (1628-1695). When her father's sight began to fail she took over the management of the printing business, and soon increased the production of Friends' works. When Tace married Thomas Raylton, the business was carried on in the name of her mother, Jane Sowle, but the management remained in Tace's hands. The family connection continued until Tace Sowle Raylton's death in 1749, although the name of Luke Hinde had also appeared in imprints during the last ten years of her life. In all, the press issued upwards of 300 works in just over 30 years, including George Fox's *Gospel-truth demonstrated* in 1706.<sup>3</sup>

Tace Sowle was a business woman who did not neglect the financial side of the business. When Bristol Friends left their account for books

supplied unpaid for ten years, she sarcastically reminded them that poorer places had managed to pay at the second if not the first time of asking. It seems that Friends did not always appreciate the service which was provided.<sup>4</sup>

These women were exceptional, and their circumstances were also exceptional.

### *WOMEN'S MEETINGS*

For the ordinary Quaker woman (apart from those gifted in the ministry and able to travel), it was the women's meetings which provided opportunities for service, and gave them a sense of community. Not that the path towards their establishment was always smooth. John Wilkinson and John Story were not alone in seeing no service in women's meetings, except for the care of the poor. The women were not expected to take the initiative and in some places, the brethren dealt firmly with unauthorised actions by the women.

In Bristol, for instance, in 1671, the Men's Meeting appointed a committee of six men to go to the next women's meeting 'to find out on what grounds Margaret Hale and Jone Hily published a women's monthly meeting, and how it was first set up.' Significantly, the committee included William Rogers, a leading figure in the Wilkinson-Story opposition to George Fox. The episode had its comic side, because the committee had to report that the action had been taken following the receipt of a letter of George Fox's, which turned out not to be the one intended for the women, who should have received a paper against vanity and excess. It also transpired that the women did not agree among themselves about the need for a monthly meeting. They were told to defer the matter until they were in unity among themselves and with the men's meeting on the matter. The women had to know their place.<sup>5</sup>

Pearson Thistlethwaite, the historian of the Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting has established that a women's Quarterly Meeting of Yorkshire was first held at least as early as September 1677.<sup>6</sup> Here too, there may have been some difficulties. In the Leeds Women's Preparative Meeting minute book there is a copy of a paper addressed to women's meetings by Katherine Winn, dated 1706, in which she expresses thankfulness to the Lord for his favours since the setting up of the women's meetings 'remembering the great opposition & scofings then met with.'<sup>7</sup>

In some places, the men could not forbear to interfere. In his Presidential address to this Society in 1971, Stephen Morland, speaking of mid-Somerset Friends, noted a minute of 12th month 1706 by which

four men were appointed to 'advise the women friends to be careful in distributing their charity from the meeting to such as walk deserving;' he adds 'Men's guidance as well as God's was available for the women'. His study of the women's monthly meeting minutes for 1761 to 1793 led him to conclude that the range of the women's work was very restricted, and that after time for prayer and answering the Queries, the women 'were able to prepare food for their men'.<sup>8</sup>

It should be remembered however, that minutes do not reveal all the work that went on, particularly in two areas: assistance to poor women Friends, and preliminary enquiries into a couple's clearness of other ties, before they were allowed to lay their intention of marriage before the meeting.

#### *LEEDS WOMEN'S PREPARATIVE MEETING*

The Leeds Women's Preparative Meeting minutes begin in 1703, some years after the Men's Meeting minute books which begin in 1692, although a meeting had been established in Leeds many years earlier. The Women's Meeting continued its separate existence until 1904.

There was regular co-operation between the Men's and Women's Meetings, and no apparent 'subordination'. In fact, the men were anxious to be fair. In 1701, the Men's Meeting asked Brighouse Monthly Meeting's advice as to whether the women should have money from the public stock for the service of the women, or whether they should 'make pryvate Collections for publick business, which some think not so equall'. The Monthly Meeting decided that there should be only one collection for the necessities of the poor, 'yet the women are left to their freedom as to giveing a Particular Account to the men how they dispose of what they may see needfull to poor women'.<sup>9</sup> Some 20 years later, the women did begin to hold collections among themselves; perhaps the need had grown greater.

In the matter of marriages, the Men's Meeting minuted on 27th of 6th month 1701 'Wee having under our consitheration the way or method of publishing the intentions of marrage in the preparative meetings; doe agree that the man first signifie his said intention at the Wooman's Meeting & after amongst the Men'.<sup>10</sup>

During the years covered by the first women's minute book (1703 to 1771), some 184 intentions of marriage came before the Women's Meeting, and the majority of couples were given leave to go forward to the Men's Meeting without further ado.

It is interesting to note, as an example of the relationship between the meetings, that in December 1708, when Aaron Atkinson and Joshua

Barber were thinking of visiting Friends in Ireland, they courteously laid their concern before the Women's Meeting as well as before the Men's.<sup>11</sup>

Naturally enough, those who were in easy circumstances were those who were most active in running the meeting, travelling as representatives, and offering hospitality to visiting ministers.

Among the women who gave outstanding service in Leeds Meeting was Christiana Horner (1670-1751), wife of Benjamin Horner (1668-1740), a Leeds merchant. The Horners' house and stables in Boar Lane, Leeds, welcomed many travelling ministers, including John Griffith, back from America, who described Christiana as 'a truly openhearted woman, a mother in our Israel'.<sup>12</sup> Thomas Story also, was appreciative of her care, when he once arrived with a 'great cold' and was nursed until he recovered.<sup>13</sup>

Christiana Horner was representative to the Women's Monthly Meeting over 100 times, often going in company with Sarah Whitelock (d.1760), the wife of Isaac Whitelock (1667-1737) an oil drawer of Sheepscar, Leeds. There is still a Whitelock Street in Sheepscar. Unusually perhaps, Christiana Horner, and her daughter Tabitha each acted as Treasurer for Leeds Meeting, at various times, after the death of Benjamin Horner in 1740 and of his son Benjamin in 1742.<sup>14</sup>

#### *YEARLY MEETING OF WOMEN FRIENDS*

Many local women's meetings flourished, but the spirit of Wilkinson and Story lived on, and surfaced from time to time. Nowhere is it more clearly seen than in the curmudgeonly way in which the men staved off the establishment of a properly constituted women's yearly meeting.<sup>15</sup>

At York Quarterly Meeting in 1753, which John Pemberton<sup>16</sup> described as 'not a time of great rejoicing', his fellow countryman William Brown of Pennsylvania 'proposed the establishment of a women's yearly meeting as in Pennsylvania'.<sup>17</sup> The proposal was forwarded to Yearly Meeting in London, but deferred. In 1754 it was 'very weightily under the consideration' of Yearly Meeting<sup>18</sup> but nothing happened. The initial arguments by the men were that 'it was a matter of great difficulty', and that there were not enough qualified women but in fact, they adopted the time-honoured delaying tactics so successfully employed by Quintus Fabius Maximus against Hannibal in 217 B.C. The proposal was revived in 1765, but still the men delayed. One man pompously remarked 'I see it—but not now—I behold it, but not nigh.'<sup>19</sup> At last, in 1784, in the face of a deputation of influential

women Friends, reinforced by three American women Friends, including the highly respected Rebecca Jones, the Yearly Meeting grudgingly conceded 'that the meeting of women Friends held annually in London should be set up as the Yearly Meeting of Women Friends held in London' with however, the rider 'yet such Meeting is not so far to be considered a meeting for discipline as to make rules, nor yet alter the present Queries, without the concurrence of this Meeting'. Some men remained unconvinced. We are told that Martha Routh silenced David Barclay, but he 'surrendered very unwillingly'.

After the request had been granted, one of the brethren, who had revised his opinion, was candid about his previous opposition, 'I was no favourer of this measure, well knowing that POWER is a dangerous tool in some hands, who if one gives them an inch, may take an ell...'<sup>20</sup> Some men remained chary. Even in 1793 Anna Price, after attending the men's Yearly Meeting to tell them how the women's meeting had been conducted, felt obliged to say 'painful is the jealousy of men Friends'.

It is worth noting that the influence of American friends, both men and women, was an important factor in the decision of 1784. Rebecca Jones continued to take a keen interest in the Women's Yearly Meeting. In a letter to Joseph Williams, written from London in June 1787, she commented 'with solid satisfaction I may inform thee that the newly established women's Yearly Meeting here, increases in weight and experience; their deliberations have been profitable and solemn, and I am strong in the faith, that men Friends will not have cause to repent their *indulgence* in this and other instances.'<sup>21</sup>

The grudging and patronising attitude persisted among some men. It was not until almost the end of the nineteenth century that women were allowed to attend Meeting for Sufferings, and even then, as one of the first women members recalled, 'it was evident that the presence of women was not exactly welcomed by most of the other members, and the clerk impressed upon them that the Meeting was for business and not for speeches'.<sup>22</sup>

### THE MINISTRY IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

The men may have dragged their feet sometimes, and in some places, on the matter of women's meetings for business. They could not justify doing so when it was a matter of spiritual equality between the sexes. Women had played an important part in the first publication of the Quaker message. By the early 1700s they could assume that they had a right to preach; at the same time they were warned against seeking too

much of the limelight; the men were not prepared to take second place. The Morning Meeting had been candid about it:

This meeting finding that it is a hurt to Truth for women Friends to take up too much time, as some do, in our public meetings, when several public and serviceable men Friends are present and are by them prevented in their serving, it's therefore advised that the women Friends should be tenderly cautioned against taking up too much time in our mixed public meetings.<sup>23</sup>

Ann Audland was held up as an example to her sex - 'it was rare for her to preach in large meetings, where she knew there were brethren qualified for the service of such meetings'.<sup>24</sup> Loquacious women were not encouraged. There are many instances in the volumes of *Piety Promoted* of women being highly praised for not exceeding the limits of their gifts, and for knowing when to stop.

To speak in meeting was a great liberation for many women, even when the initial call to the service caused great stress and anxiety. There was no shortage of women ministers, though in the first part of the century they were not so numerous as the men. Pearson Thistlethwaite's table of Yorkshire ministers deceased shows that between 1701 and 1750 there were 83 women 'ministers deceased' and 134 men; between 1751 and 1800 the numbers were more nearly equal, with 61 women and 67 men.<sup>25</sup>

Outside the Society women preachers tended to be looked on as objects of curiosity, sometimes of ridicule. Dr. Johnson's dictum, pronounced in 1763, reflected a widespread attitude—'Sir, a woman's preaching is like a dog's walking on its hind legs. It is not done well; but you are surprised to find it done at all'. Publicity of an undesirable kind was the last thing Friends desired. The years of hostility and persecution had left their mark, and Friends did not wish, in the civil sphere, to draw attention to themselves, except as loyal, peaceable citizens.

One of the drawbacks of individual inspiration was that it could lead to extravagant behaviour. Friends still had a message to give to the world, but it was more acceptable if it was not reinforced by sackcloth and ashes, lighted candles or other visual aids. Unfortunately, there continued to be some ministry which was undesirable and unacceptable, both from men and women, which was difficult to control. There was an element of truth in what the old Quaker Andrew Pitt (c.1675-1736) is said to have told Voltaire, that they were obliged sometimes to suffer nonsense, 'because no one knows, when a man rises up to hold forth, whether he will be mov'd by the spirit or by foolishness'. Whether he really added that two or three of the women were often inspired to speak at one and the same time, is difficult to believe.<sup>26</sup>

In 1702 Leeds Friends suffered from troublesome behaviour on the part of Elizabeth Merry (née Benson), who refused to listen to advice, but 'fell into extravagant reflections & uncomly speeches'. Brighouse Monthly Meeting was asked for help.<sup>27</sup> A visit from two weighty men silenced her - for a time; but when she removed to York about 1704, York Friends had to deal with her for speaking too much in meeting, and then found themselves criticized by the Quarterly Meeting for not giving relief to her and her children, because they did not like her ministry.<sup>28</sup> Bristol Friends had trouble of a more public nature. Sarah Dickson and Grace Smythies (who with their husbands and some others had set up a separate meeting of their own and carried it on for some years) began to go about in 1718 'preaching and praying in our publick assemblys, in which they have sometimes uttered indecent reflections on their Friends &c. Brethren, not becoming the meekness and gentleness of the spirit of Christ'. All that Friends could do was to warn other meetings against them.<sup>29</sup>

There were some who meant well, but did not grasp the essence of the Quaker message. Such was Diana Caroline, wife of Thomas Hopwood, a tallow chandler of Leeds. She was brought up in the Church of England, went among the Presbyterians and then joined the Methodists. Dissatisfied with all, she began to attend Quaker meetings and insisted on speaking in meeting. When she applied for membership, Brighouse Monthly Meeting stalled for some time, but eventually accepted her (in August 1778), at the same time warning her that if she spoke 'she must be careful to do it from a right call'. From time to time she was told that her ministry was not acceptable, and she complained of 'the great insensibility and dead formality of the meetings'. She seems to have been one of those unquiet souls who never find what they are seeking, but she was able to write down her experiences, which were published after her death. She remained a Friend, and when she died in 1799 was buried in the Friends' Burial Ground in Meadow Lane, Leeds.<sup>30</sup>

The case of May Drummond (c.1710-1772) from Edinburgh, provided a cautionary tale. She commanded attention in London for her preaching, and had an interview with the Queen. Some anonymous verses, written in 1736 praise her 'soft persuasion', at the same time hinting that she worked on the emotions of her audience.

While with every theme the maid complies  
She bids alternate passions fall and rise.

William Cookworthy, with whom she travelled in the west country, felt that there was something 'a little theatrical' in the management and tone of her voice sometimes, and that her style was rather too learned, though he admired her quick lively apprehension. Sadly, her preaching proved unacceptable to Edinburgh Friends: she was discouraged from preaching, and faded into insignificance. She died in 1772.<sup>31</sup>

Unwanted ministry, however, came only from a few. Testimonies and obituaries give evidence of ministry that was not only acceptable but warmly welcomed.

### TRAVELLING IN THE MINISTRY

Many women were content to preach only in their own meetings. It was the bolder spirits who saw opportunities both for some freedom of movement, and for spreading the gospel message more widely. A divine call was the mainspring of a woman's concern to travel in the ministry, but it could also be accompanied by a sense of liberation and the prospect of freedom and semi-independence. Such freedom, of course, was available mainly to the better-off. Those with a Quaker upbringing did not have to justify themselves. Women coming newly to Friends could encounter disapproval and opposition from parents or husband. Mary Stokes (afterwards Mary Dudley, 1750-1823), who was connected with the Methodists, met with opposition from her mother, as well as strong disapprobation from John Wesley, when she was first drawn to Friends, though her mother was eventually reconciled, after hearing Mary speak at a meeting.<sup>32</sup>

Elizabeth Ashbridge (1713-1755), who was born at Middlewich in Cheshire and emigrated to America in 1732, made trial of other churches before being drawn to Friends. When she first heard a woman speak in meeting (in Boston), she was scornful as well as surprised - 'I looked on her with pity for her ignorance (as I thought), and with contempt of her practice', and vowed that if she ever turned Quaker, she would never be a preacher. Later on, she joined Friends, and aroused great anger in her second husband. He was furious when she used the word *thee* to him; and even more annoyed to think of her speaking in public. 'I'd go to meeting', he said, 'only I am afraid I shall hear your clack, which I cannot bear'.

After the death of her husband, who had joined the army and ended up in Chelsea Hospital in London, she kept a school and also 'travelled considerably in the service of truth'. Her third husband, Aaron Ashbridge, whom she married at Burlington, West Jersey, in 1746, gave her encouragement in her concern to visit Friends' meetings in England

and Ireland. She did not return home, but fell ill and died in Ireland on 16th of 5th month 1755.<sup>33</sup>

The length of time which elapsed between speaking in the local meeting and embarking on public ministry varied a great deal. Lydia Lancaster would have gained the approval of Samuel Bownas, who advised a gradual beginning 'be not over forward to visit Friends abroad'—since she nurtured her concern to engage in the service for some ten years, 'growing in wisdom and experience' before she came forth 'in a living powerful testimony'. Catherine Payton (1727-1794), on the other hand, had no hesitations—she appeared 'in supplication' in Dudley Meeting in 1748, and entered on her travels in the following year.<sup>34</sup>

Rufus Jones's description of the itinerant ministers as 'speaking generally, persons of radiant and saintly life' hardly gives a fair idea of the diversity of character and upbringing among the ministers; and his claim that 'these itinerant ministers were without question the makers and builders of the Society of Friends during the period now under review' [that is, the later period] fails to give sufficient credit to those who stayed at home and kept up the meetings for worship and carried on the business.<sup>35</sup> The support which a minister could give to her own meeting might be lessened by frequent absences.

There was a good deal of travelling in the eighteenth century. Knaresborough Monthly Meeting, for instance, between 1719 and 1804 issued 54 certificates for travelling Friends—11 men and 10 women, about half a dozen of them making several journeys.<sup>36</sup> Many of these travellers left no memorials. Some published their journals or were the subject of memoirs, which give an insight into the character and outlook of the travellers.

In the early years of the century there were several women in Leeds Meeting who travelled in the ministry. Little is known of Edna Walker<sup>37</sup> and her companion Eleanor Walker.<sup>38</sup> Rebecca Turner (d.1756), later the wife of John Cowell, a clothier of Quarry Hill, Leeds, visited almost every meeting in England and Wales as well as taking part in pastoral visits in the Leeds area; her testimony was described as 'plain, sound and informing'.<sup>39</sup>

A more prominent figure was Tabitha Horner, daughter of Benjamin and Christiana Horner of Leeds. Born in 1695, she first entered into the work of the ministry in 1722; and between 1724 and 1745 she visited Scotland, Wales and Ireland, as well as many parts of England. At home, she took part in family visits, and was frequently a representative to the monthly meeting. She was among Dr. John Fothergill's most valued correspondents: 'thy letters often do me good', he wrote to her in 1746,

and he acknowledged feelingly that there were none besides herself and Benjamin Kidd to whom he could unbosom himself 'with the utmost freedom'. He treated her as an equal. When she died, in February 1747, the Testimony drawn up by Brighthouse Monthly Meeting commended her as 'a Workwoman that needed not to be ashamed'.<sup>40</sup>

### *ANN MERCY BELL*

In 1747, the year when Tabitha Horner died, another Yorkshirewoman, Ann Mercy Bell<sup>41</sup> of York, set out on the first of her journeys in the ministry, after labours mostly at home or in places nearby.

In the York Quarterly Meeting archives, now housed in the Brotherton Library in the University of Leeds, there is a bound volume of the papers of Ann Mercy Bell - journals of her travels in the ministry, letters to her husband, correspondence with Friends and others, and a copy of a printed account of her visit to London in 1753, by Joseph Phipps.<sup>42</sup>

Ann Mercy was a Londoner, born about 1706, daughter of Martin and Ann Ellwood. She was educated at the newly-established Friends' School and Workhouse at Clerkenwell, and continued there as a schoolmistress for some years afterwards, teaching the children to read and write and keep accounts. Her writings do not show her as proficient in spelling. She was married on 29 April 1731 at Ratcliff to Nathaniel Bell of York (1703-1778). At that time Nathaniel was a schoolmaster, but in 1739 he set up as a bookseller in Pavement, York.<sup>43</sup> There were six children of the marriage, born between 1732 and 1742, but only two lived to grow up - Nathaniel junior (born in 1736) and Rachel (born in 1740).

The 1747 journey, to visit Friends in Lincolnshire, and to take some meetings on the way to London, began on 1st May and Mercy Bell returned her certificate to York Monthly Meeting in October. On this journey, Ann Mercy Bell seems to be feeling her way a little, at times diffident, even sometimes despondent. She felt herself given strength when she and her companion found groups of people 'sober, very attentive to hear the Gospel preached through the weaker vessel'.<sup>44</sup> On later journeys she was more confident, and we do not hear much about "Weaker Vessels" or "Meaner Instruments".

In 1752 Mercy Bell undertook a more extensive and more testing journey to pay a religious visit to Friends and others in London, Bristol and the west of England. Her companion at the beginning was Sarah Marsden (1707-1762), wife of Caleb Marsden of Highflatts, who had begun her ministry in 1749; and there were several others in the party,

including the blind Friend David Coulsen (1713-1765). Mercy Bell left a detailed account of the events of each day, though the chronology is not always clear.<sup>45</sup> The London visit, which took place in 1753, is covered in a printed account by Joseph Phipps.<sup>46</sup> These travels provided many opportunities to expound and explain the Quaker message to the world in general, in addition to the duty of keeping Friends up to the mark.

It would not be possible to follow every step of the minister's way, but there are aspects of Mercy Bell's travels in 1752 and 1753 which illustrate both the opportunities afforded, and the difficulties which might be encountered. To many ordinary citizens, a public meeting, especially when a woman was preaching, was a kind of show or entertainment. Curiosity was excited, and the woman preacher often had to face unseemly laughter and ridicule. They were to some extent prepared for it. Ann Mercy Bell frequently comments that 'the neighbours behaved as well as could be expected'. When she spoke in the market place in Bristol, some were anxious to listen, others were heard to say 'What doeth the woman do preaching here?'<sup>47</sup>

Samuel Neale (1729-1792) records a public meeting in the market place at Exeter in January 1753 when he accompanied Mercy and her companion Phoebe Cartwright, and they spent about three hours proceeding through the streets, warning people to repent, 'regardless of the contempt and mocking of the profane'.<sup>48</sup> Sometimes there would be a snub. Members of the town council at Exeter were approached, and some agreed to receive the two ministers; but some would not admit them, saying that 'they had preaching and praying enuff to carry them to heaven'.<sup>49</sup>

Some priests were friendly; others not so. At Tiverton, where no Friends resided, three meetings were held. The first was disturbed by an 'unruly priest' who got up to preach at the same time as our ministers; so they left him to it, but were able to have a 'pretty large opportunity' the next day, when the priest was not there.<sup>50</sup> Another 'unsteady priest' at Bath attended a meeting in the Town Hall; he had a newspaper with him and was reading it loudly so as to disturb the people around him, 'which he intended as much as he could by setting of them a laughing'. The sober part of the company cried shame on the priest for his unbecoming behaviour.<sup>51</sup> At Liskeard the parson of the town was prepared to listen to the two women, and did so 'pretty patiently', though he would not believe that their visit was a necessity laid upon them by the holy spirit. They had a discussion with him about the spirit of grace and the manner of its working, until the parson, finding himself at a loss in the argument, said it was just prayer time or he would have brought 'many texts out of scripture to convince me of my mistaken notions'.<sup>52</sup>

There were many such challenges to Mercy Bell's ability to give a clear explanation of the Quaker position. At Wilton, after a large and crowded meeting in the Town Hall, a magistrate said 'if ever the Gospel was preached it was preached that evening', and a man who 'had entertained an Opinion we denied the Scriptures' seemed to be convinced to the contrary, after she had treated 'a pretty deal upon them'.<sup>53</sup>

Sometimes physical courage was called for. Ann Mercy Bell would not overlook sights of which she could not approve. At Looe in 1752, on the way to an evening meeting appointed for Susannah Morris (1682-1755) and Elinor Pasmore, she passed a stage, with an actor 'in full career' making sport for his hearers, 'augmenting vanity and folly almost to madness'. Going through the crowd, Mercy could not forbear saying 'Oh abominable'. Sitting in meeting, she gradually realised that she had to go out and warn the people, though it seemed hard. She went out, with her companion and a man Friend, and heard a woman 'laughing in an extreme manner at the Merry Man's takeing the Sacred Name at large'. Standing on something so as to be heard, she cried out three times 'Oh unthinking Multitude', warning them to repent and amend their ways, because the Lord was angry and would bring his judgement on the workers of iniquity. To her satisfaction, some people heard with attention, and followed her into the meeting, where Susannah Morris was speaking; and Elinor Pasmore prayed for those who were yet in vanity and folly.<sup>54</sup>

A different encounter near 'Collham' [St. Columb] in Cornwall might have proved dangerous. Going out of the town, the party passed a group of men 'going to bait a bull'. Ann Mercy could not let that pass, and turned back and spoke what was in her mind. Some of the men seemed desirous to hear what she said, others were concerned to go on with their sport. However, having spoken, she felt at ease and was able to proceed to Wadebridge, where they lodged with Edward Fox.<sup>55</sup>

In the summer of 1753 Ann Mercy Bell spent some time in London. Joseph Phipps, who accompanied her in her peregrinations round the metropolis, kept an account of events as they occurred, and had it printed in 1754. The title of the pamphlet illustrates his sense of the unusual nature of the ministerial activities, *A summary account of the extraordinary visit to this metropolis, by the ministry of Ann Mercy Bell*. The visit appears to have caused a stir, and was to have repercussions later. It seems that some Friends were not quite happy about it. She wrote to Nathaniel on 21st September to allay his fears that 'Frds was not satisfied that I should appear', assuring him that she had consulted some Friends, who told her that it would not be considered out of the unity of the body.<sup>56</sup>

On 5th August 1753, accompanied by several Friends, she set out along Rosemary Lane, at the end of Red Lion Street, where there were many 'loitering people' to whom she preached the necessity of repentance and amendment, sometimes walking, sometimes standing a few minutes, 'recommending the grace of God, in mercy extended', so that tears streamed down the faces of some of her hearers, and some were smiting their breasts.<sup>57</sup>

The stay in London lasted until the beginning of December, and except when ill health obliged her to rest, she continued her practice of walking about the streets, preaching as she went, perhaps stopping in some half dozen places to address those who followed her about. It was by force of personality that a woman preacher could turn mockery into respectful attention. 'Some' says Joseph Phipps, 'who before were light and sportive, and owned they had followed us on purpose to disturb us, were reduced to seriousness and solidity.'<sup>58</sup>

She was not afraid to preach in the great yard of the Fleet Prison, where there were many prisoners, 'all pretty well, the circumstances of things considered.'<sup>59</sup> There could be hazards in the streets. Once, something was thrown at her, which narrowly missed her head; the offending party was seized by the crowd, and only released by the mediation of her friends.<sup>60</sup> On another occasion, 'a person in liquor, endeavoured to interrupt her by firing a gun close to the crowd, which startled and disturbed many'; but she was soon able to continue speaking, and the people soon became tolerably composed again.<sup>61</sup>

Joseph Phipps's account is in the nature of an Apologia. He acknowledged that the unusual nature of the concern 'at this time of day' rendered him somewhat dubious; but he and other Friends had gone into the affair 'in tenderness, with caution, and in dread' and had become satisfied that the concern was genuine.<sup>62</sup> After the strain of the London visit Ann Mercy Bell was at home for a time, and took her part in the work of the York Women's Preparative Meeting.

After a few years, however, she was ready to be off again. She had shown herself unpredictable, and when she proposed another visit to London in 1758, Yorkshire Friends were alarmed. It seems that they had not been quite happy about her previous visit to London; possibly there had been too much extempore preaching and publicity. Also, it appears that she had earlier made efforts to gain an audience with the King. In response to her request for a certificate, York Monthly Meeting, held at Selby on 3rd May, issued a certificate addressed to Friends of the city of London and the county of Kent, expressing unity with her concern, but with a caution as to her proceedings:

But Remembering the Manner of her last Visit, she was desired to be Plain and Open with Us, whether she apprehended any Concern to a certain great Person, or to appear in a publick manner as she did then, and her Reply leaving Us in some Uncertainty; We advise her, not to proceed in either case without laying her Concern before the Meeting of Ministers and Elders in London, for that Meeting's Advice, Approbation and Assistance. And we hereby Signify that what was our Advice to her in person, Remains to be our Mind and advice now, wherein we doubt not of her Compliance, for the Preservation of Unity & good Order in the Society and in giving no example nor Precedent to the Contrary.<sup>63</sup>

The Morning Meeting weightily considered the proposition, and at its meeting on 3rd July, decided to recommend that Mercy Bell should lay her concern before Meeting for Sufferings.<sup>64</sup> I have not found any record in the minutes of Meeting for Sufferings to show that she applied to that meeting.

The religious visit to Kent had taken place in June. In August she was writing from Southwark to a Friend, possibly Richard Partridge (1682?-1759), asking for his interest with some nobleman to procure an interview with the King. Nothing happened.<sup>65</sup> Things had changed since the free and easy days when Elizabeth Hooton had been able to follow Charles II to the tennis court or into the Park, until she got some response.<sup>66</sup>

It is true that May Drummond had in 1735 a 'gracious opportunity to declare her convincement' to Queen Caroline. Possibly the Queen had some curiosity to see a noted young woman preacher.<sup>67</sup>

Ann Mercy Bell was still in London in November 1758, and wrote to Nathaniel expressing her disappointment at not being granted a private interview with the Princess Amelia, daughter of George II, and because the King was indisposed her plans looked 'dark and obscure'. Friends had not been as helpful as she had hoped—'I am now sorry frds was Backward in giveing me Liberty & after, so slow in assistance, but as time past cant be Recaled, I hope no Oppertunity hereafter shall be let slip till I find myself free to Return to my dear Husband and children.'<sup>68</sup> She does not record whether she saw the King; but she did not return the certificate to York Monthly Meeting until April 1759.<sup>69</sup>

Meanwhile it is possible that the young Bells, Nathaniel and Rachel may have been amusing themselves more frivolously than some Friends approved. In July 1758 Joseph Oxley (d.1773) a solid minister from Norwich, wrote to them after a visit to York, expressing his concern for their good, begging them to be cautious, and prudent in their choice of company, since the eyes of the world were on ministers and their families, and because 'there is a Spirit in some that Rejoyces in the miscarriage of the Lords people'.<sup>70</sup>

*MARY RICKABY*

Doubts about a minister's proceedings may have been unusual, but were not unknown, as was shown in the case of Mary Rickaby (d.1752), widow of Thomas Rickaby (d.1742), weaver, of Ampleforth. Mary Rickaby arrived in London in 1747 with a certificate from Thirsk Monthly Meeting.<sup>71</sup> She was still there in November 1750, when the Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders was perturbed by some remarks which she made, 'which we apprehend reflected on the ministry'.<sup>72</sup> She was more than once advised to go home, but still she lingered. Then, on 29 July 1751 there came a complaint from some Friends about her public appearance in Gracechurch Street Meeting, 'to the great dissatisfaction of Friends, both as to matter and manner of delivery'.<sup>73</sup> A committee of four men visited her, but got no satisfaction.<sup>74</sup> At last, early in 1752 the Morning Meeting drew up a letter for Thirsk Monthly Meeting, expressing Friends' uneasiness at her long stay in the city, and regretting that her ministry was not always sound. The letter was sent to Roger Shackleton in York, to be transmitted to Thirsk Monthly Meeting.<sup>75</sup>

Thirsk Monthly Meeting appointed a committee of seven; and Yorkshire Meeting of Ministers and Elders appointed a committee to advise Thirsk.<sup>76</sup> But Mary Rickaby never returned to Yorkshire. She died in London on 20th of 7th month 1752 and was buried at Bunhill Fields.<sup>77</sup>

It may well be that Mary Rickaby had been in failing health, both mentally and physically for some time. Perhaps a visit from a few sympathetic women might have been more appropriate than committees of weighty men.

Unlike Mary Rickaby, Ann Mercy Bell did go home; but there were to be further constraints on her ministerial plans. In September 1770 she laid before York Monthly Meeting her concern to visit some meetings in Yorkshire and in the county of Durham. The meeting deferred the matter for further consideration; October Monthly Meeting was again asked for a certificate, 'but as divers Friends dont appear satisfied with her present Concern, William Morley and Thomas Doeg are appointed to inform her, that this Meeting requests she will endeavour to be easy to defer it.' This polite request revealed no reason for the withholding of a certificate, but York Friends may have felt that it was unsuitable for Ann Mercy Bell to preach outside Yorkshire after the scandal concerning young Nathaniel Bell and Judith Heron.<sup>78</sup>

*NATHANIEL BELL, JUNIOR AND JUDITH HERON*

Judith Heron was a member of Halifax Meeting.<sup>79</sup> She removed to York early in 1767, but the certificate of transfer from Brighthouse Monthly Meeting was delayed for some time because 'the Friends of Halifax seem to be under much dissatisfaction concerning her present situation'. It appears that she was already a member of the Bell household.<sup>80</sup> In May and June 1767 Nathaniel Bell junior and Judith Heron laid their proposals of marriage before York Monthly Meeting and were given leave to proceed.<sup>81</sup> Then came an unaccountable delay; at first Nathaniel said that there were some private difficulties, which a few weeks might remove; the delay continued; Judith said that the 'stop' was not on her side. York Friends were uneasy because the couple were living together in Nathaniel Bell senior's house, and the Quarterly Meeting was asked for assistance.<sup>82</sup> A committee was appointed by the Quarterly Meeting to visit the two Nathaniels and express the disquiet of Friends. Judith was ordered to go and live elsewhere, but Nathaniel junior objected strongly, apparently supported by his father.<sup>83</sup> Nathaniel junior was disowned in November,<sup>84</sup> and his father was removed from the office of elder, and was told to make 'reasonable satisfaction' to Judith by paying her £100.<sup>85</sup>

Early in 1768 however, he was discharged from his obligation, when it was found that the young couple had made a clandestine marriage at Clifford Meeting House near Tadcaster, with two York Friends, John Atkinson and William Shackleton as witnesses.<sup>86</sup> Judith was disowned,<sup>87</sup> as were the two witnesses (though John Atkinson later apologized and was reinstated).<sup>88</sup> York Monthly Meeting sent some Friends to visit the parents, 'concerning their son & Judith Heron's living together in their House', and also to enquire how far they were clear of countenancing or encouraging the irregular marriage.<sup>89</sup> In a letter of 30 June 1768 to the Monthly Meeting, Nathaniel Bell senior attributed some part of his actions to his own infirmities and the fact that 'parental affection is liable to bias the judgment'; he did not wholly excuse himself, but said that he had been to blame and was sorry. In August he resigned as an overseer.<sup>90</sup> Nathaniel junior eventually acknowledged the error of his ways and was reinstated (1774);<sup>91</sup> Judith did not apply to be reinstated.

It is perhaps little wonder, therefore, that York Friends were not anxious for Ann Mercy Bell to appear outside the county as a preacher. She continued to preach locally, and kept herself up to date by borrowing one of the six copies of Samuel Bownas's *Advice to ministers and elders* purchased by York Monthly Meeting Ministers and Elders in 1768.<sup>92</sup>

Among those who heard her preach was an eccentric Yorkshireman, Cornelius Cayley (1729-1780?),<sup>93</sup> who wrote her a letter in December 1771, intended to give encouragement. The letter begins with some rambling remarks about the new Jerusalem, and goes on to address her as 'Dear Mercy Bell my sister', 'Take courage! Thou has been beat and grieved by many—it shall all be made up. Go on and prosper. Preach Jesus in the warmth of thy heart, & fear not...'<sup>94</sup> He felt that he knew something about preaching. In his earlier years he had been a clerk in the Treasury of Augusta, widow of Frederick, Prince of Wales, but lost his place when he took to travelling about and preaching. After much travel, he settled 'near Leeds' and began to feel 'drawings towards Friends'. In February 1771 he applied for membership to Brighthouse Monthly Meeting.<sup>95</sup> The committee appointed to talk to him took some time to consider the application, and consulted Samuel Fothergill, who expressed a few doubts '... my jealousy arises from the activity of distinguished *self*, which loves the splendid pleasant picture'. Fothergill hoped that Friends would be tender to him, but firm and steady, 'for this will be beneficial to him if he ever come in *at the right door*'.<sup>96</sup> Cornelius Cayley never did come in *at the right door*. At Brighthouse Monthly Meeting in October 1771, Samuel Briscoe reported that Cayley had 'left off attending our Meetings some time since', and the application was dropped.<sup>97</sup> Mercy Bell may not have been greatly helped by the championship of such an unreliable person, but she kept his letter.

Towards the end of her life, Ann Mercy Bell was subject to asthma and other infirmities; but she was still concerned for the moral welfare of her fellow citizens, and was pained to see men of high rank, and their servants going to the races in York. On one occasion, she stood on a chair outside her house in Pavement, attended by her husband and son, and a few friends, and addressed the crowds passing the house on their way to Knavesmire. It is recorded that a large multitude collected, and some were convinced by her words, and said they would not go to the racecourse again.<sup>98</sup>

Ann Mercy Bell died on 30th December 1775. A Testimony drawn up by York Monthly Meeting on 17th March 1776 (and later read and approved in the Men's and Women's Quarterly Meetings at York on 27th and 28th March 1776) commended her ministerial labours and travels, and described her as an 'affectionate Wife, tender Parent, kind Neighbour'. The troubles of earlier days were not mentioned.<sup>99</sup>

*MARY PEISLEY AND CATHERINE PAYTON*

There is no hint that Ann Mercy Bell ever thought of going to America. That was left to younger women, without demanding family ties. At home in York, Mercy Bell received a letter from Edward Stabler, a York Friend who had recently settled in Pennsylvania. The letter was dated from Philadelphia, 18th of 10th month 1754, and acknowledged Mercy's letter of 27th November 1753.<sup>100</sup> He gave news of English Friends in America, and reported that Mary Peisley (1717-1757)<sup>101</sup> and Catherine Payton (1727-94)<sup>102</sup> had left the city that morning, in good health, after their visits to South and North Carolina, Virginia and Maryland, New England, Long Island and Rhode Island. He hoped their labours of love would not be without some good effort.

The young women had become friends when Catherine Payton visited Ireland, and had felt that they could be companions in a religious visit to America. It is to be feared that their work was not always carried out in a loving and charitable spirit. On first landing at Charlestown (Charleston, S. Carolina), they were highly critical of Friends there. 'It seems like a city of refuge for the disjointed members of our society', Mary Peisley wrote. They had 'very close work' in paying religious visits to everyone professing with Friends, with results which would not be welcomed today. Mary Peisley acknowledged 'I understand we have driven several from the meeting, who could not bear sound doctrine... I say amen to those leaving the profession, who are a scandal to it'. Many of her subsequent comments, as they went about the country, are in a similar uncompromising vein, as they found evidence of 'an unlawful familiarity with the world'.<sup>103</sup>

Catherine Payton and Mary Peisley travelled together in difficult wilderness country, sharing many trials and dangers. They had to encounter cold and damp and frosty weather, swollen rivers, dangerous ferries, wild animals in the woods where they were forced sometimes to camp, even the possibility of meeting Indians. One cannot but admire their courage. At length, however, on the way to Long Island from Oblong, 'a cloud came over our spirits', and they felt incapacitated for service, until after a rest, it was made plain to them that they must separate, 'for the gospel's sake'. It is fairly clear that neither of them could stand competition. Catherine wrote, 'I had long seen it would be so, and some of our Friends before we left Europe expected, and rather pressed it, fearing that our service would be less to the church by our keeping together, than if we separated'.<sup>104</sup>

Mary Peisley, for her part, felt that she had to give way to her younger companion—'I had been at times much straitened in my service

by preferring her and her gift'.<sup>105</sup> Accordingly, Mary proceeded towards Philadelphia, where Catherine joined her for a time, in order to show Friends 'that our separation was not occasioned by any difference betwixt us, or other improper cause or motive...'<sup>106</sup>

They did travel together on several subsequent occasions, and were in Philadelphia in March 1755, when war with French colonists seemed imminent. They endeavoured several times to persuade Quaker members of the Assembly to support Friends' peace testimony, and were accused of intruding into matters foreign to their proper business, and of being partly to blame for the continuation of calamities in the province. Catherine Payton maintained that she and her companion were clear of improperly meddling with the affairs of government, but their interference was unlikely to be welcome.<sup>107</sup> It was left for the more influential Samuel Fothergill to devote some months to patient negotiations to help the Friends concerned to come to a decision to withdraw from the Assembly.<sup>108</sup>

Catherine Payton and Mary Peisley arrived home in 1756, after an absence of three years. Sadly, Mary, who had been ill more than once in America, died early in 1757, only a few days after her marriage to Samuel Neale.

Catherine had reasonably good health, plenty of confidence, and stamina. Even falls from her horse did not daunt her. She was well educated, the family was comfortably off, and there were servants to do the work of the home. There was a certain element of adventurousness in her character, though she was at pains to say that she always tried to accomplish her duties in as short a time as possible, in order not 'to afford censure to such, as being unacquainted with the humbling weight of the service, may conclude that we travel for pleasure, or to gratify a roving or curious disposition'.<sup>109</sup> Travelling in the ministry became, for her, a way of life, almost a career. Nothing was allowed to stand in the way of 'the work'. Her elderly mother, and an ailing brother were frequently left to the care of Providence. Fortunately, Providence usually obliged. She could be ruthless. Even when her sister's children had the smallpox, and the unmarried sister went to look after them, Catherine did not contemplate staying at home.<sup>110</sup>

When the second sister also married, Catherine, returning home, as she hoped for a rest from her ministerial labours, was not best pleased when she had to undertake some domestic responsibilities.<sup>111</sup>

When William Phillips (d.1785), a widower with two grown up sons, first appeared on the scene as a possible husband (though they had been acquainted for many years), Catherine's first thought was not whether she would be a helpmeet for him, but whether he would be so to her, or

if he would be an obstacle to her ministerial labours. Fortunately, he was ready to support her service, though he had no share in it.<sup>112</sup> After their marriage in 1772, and removal to Cornwall, Catherine continued to travel and attend meetings, and was particularly concerned with the establishment of women's meetings in Cornwall.<sup>113</sup> She never spared herself in her efforts to promote Truth and uphold the discipline, but there was a less endearing side to her character. Her lack of humility was noted by several contemporaries, including James Jenkins (who admittedly was often sharp in his comments). He encountered her in 1778 at a Western Circular Yearly Meeting at Launceston - 'I recollect that Catherine Phillips, like a great Autocratrix, sometimes governed, and sometimes, without succeeding, attempted to govern, this Assembly. To an austerity of conduct that had much the appearance of domination, she added a sourness of temper that disgraced the woman, and assumed an overbearance, which (at least I thought) an humbler minister of the Gospel could not assume'.<sup>114</sup>

She may have mellowed a little, for, in London in 1784, Rebecca Jones commented, 'Dear Catherine Phillips labours indefatigably; seldom does she sit a meeting through in silence... She is improved in humility, tenderness and sympathy. She has shown much love to *us poor little Americans*'.<sup>115</sup> Catherine's labours continued until 'rheumatic gout' prevented her from moving far. In 1786 Rebecca Jones wrote to Christiana Hustler that Catherine Phillips was in a declining state of health, and that her constant companion Lydia Hawksworth (d.1788) (her aid de camp, as Rebecca Jones put it) was 'almost worn down with attending her'.<sup>116</sup> It seems that her demanding nature had not changed. She died after a long illness in 1794.

### REBECCA JONES

Rebecca Jones of Philadelphia was one who was influenced by the preaching in America of Catherine Payton and Mary Peisley. She was much pleased with 'divers testimonies' from the young women, and after a time began to attend meetings and to feel drawn towards Friends. Not for some years did she stand up in an evening meeting 'in great fear and trembling' and 'expressed a few sentences very brokenly'. There was a little opposition from her mother, but that soon gave way. After her mother's death, she was free to travel. Money was no problem. The school which she set up with her friend Hannah Cathrall was soon flourishing and they were 'blest with a sufficiency to live comfortably'.<sup>117</sup> Rebecca Jones became a highly respected minister, both at home in America,

and in this country. She was welcomed for her gentleness, ease and grace, and the genuineness of the gospel message which she preached.<sup>118</sup>

In her religious visit to England, which began in 1784,<sup>119</sup> she found a worthy companion in Christiana Hustler (d. 1811),<sup>120</sup> wife of John Hustler, of Undercliffe House, Bradford. They met at Yearly Meeting. Christiana offered herself as a companion, and the two women travelled hundreds of miles together. Not the least of the blessings which the ministers, both men and women received were the opportunities to form lasting friendships with people of different backgrounds. Rebecca Jones and Christiana Hustler became friends for life, and the friendship extended to Christiana's daughter Sarah (1765-1817) to whom Rebecca Jones wrote many loving and encouraging letters. In after years, Rebecca said of Christiana Hustler, 'I have loved her as my own soul'.<sup>121</sup> The stay in England brought many other Friends. Even at the beginning of her visit, she wrote, in a letter to Henry Drinker, 'I love Yorkshire; many Friends in it are near to my very life'.<sup>122</sup>

It is noteworthy that among the ministers of the time, both in this country and in America, there was a network of friendship and fellowship, as among equals, with no hint of patronage on the part of the men. Rebecca Jones's prestige as a minister, as well as her tact and tolerance, played a part in enabling her and some of her fellow-countrywomen to give active (and finally successful) support to English women Friends in their campaign for a properly constituted women's yearly meeting. The four years which she spent in this country were a blessing to English Friends.

### CHARITY COOK

Quite different in character and background was another minister from America, Charity Cook (1745-1822), described by her biographer, Algie I. Newlyn, as 'a liberated woman'.<sup>123</sup> As new settlements sprang up on the frontiers in America, men and women worked alongside each other, building houses, planting crops, and caring for livestock, and their roles could sometimes be interchangeable. Charity Wright grew up in the back country of the South, within a group which included several Quaker women ministers. She married Isaac Cook about 1762, and they had 11 children. She began her work in the gospel ministry in the early years of the revolutionary war, when Friends in the meetings she visited were divided. She was recorded a minister in 1773 by Bush River Monthly Meeting, South Carolina, and her travels in North and South Carolina did much to strengthen the scattered meetings there. Meanwhile Isaac Cook managed the farm and brought up the family.

Charity Cook came to England on a ministerial visit in 1797, and immediately scandalised Friends in London by strolling round the town with a pipe in her mouth.<sup>124</sup> She was blunt of speech and sometimes gave offence. She lacked the wisdom of Rebecca Jones, who wrote to John Pemberton in June 1784, shortly after her arrival in this country, 'the little opportunity I have had among Friends here, has furnished me already with a prospect of the need of steady circumspection and holy fear, to step along rightly and safely amongst the wise and great in this world'.<sup>125</sup>

Charity Cook was not always circumspect. She had the temerity to speak against the style of hats worn by some men in London Yearly Meeting;<sup>126</sup> furthermore, when she and her companion Mary Swett of New Jersey were in Bristol in 1800, they appeared 'not quite to general satisfaction', according to a Bristol Friend, Samuel Dyer, who recorded in his diary that Charity, in a first day morning meeting, had spoken on equality, and 'how hardly our servants were used'. 'Is it worthwhile?' he asked himself, 'to come from America to inculcate principles of equality? Can it be supposed that they are sent for no higher errand than this?'<sup>127</sup> It is pleasing to note that they were not always finding fault. Reginald Hine relates how in the interval of their ministry at Hitchin, Charity and her companion would teach English housewives 'how to make yeast, as they do in America'.<sup>128</sup>

They appear to have visited almost all the meetings in England, with numerous visits also to families - 70 families in the Kendal area, and 60 in Liverpool, in 1798.<sup>129</sup> Algie Newlyn comments that Charity Cook's reputation as a liberated woman grew from her long experience as a travelling minister, adding 'generally the course which she followed was within the limits of accepted Quaker practice and was tolerated by society in general. There were times however when she seemed to steer her course close to the borderline.'<sup>130</sup> Nevertheless, English Friends were in general in unity with the travellers, and supported them to the full when they were here. Altogether, Charity Cook was absent from her family for seven or eight years - a notable instance of freedom and emancipation.<sup>131</sup>

### *THE FRUITS OF THE TRAVELLING MINISTRY*

The travelling ministers often trod a difficult path, and their efforts frequently appeared unavailing. Yet, in public meetings they had opportunities to remind people in general of religious and moral issues, and perhaps to encourage a better way of life in a few. By their demeanour in the face of disagreement or even hostility, they made a

contribution towards the increase of tolerance on the part of the world's people. Among Friends, they were a support to small scattered meetings up and down the country, and the personal visits to families gave more intimate contacts and a better knowledge of individual needs.

Certainly the itinerant ministers did much to hold the Society together, but the overall picture seems to show that not a great deal was achieved in the way of inspiring the zeal of former times or of making converts. It was said of Catherine Phillips, for instance, that 'it was not permitted her to behold much fruits of her many labours'.<sup>132</sup> One reason may have been that visits were random affairs, the results of individual concerns. Travelling ministers were not sent out by monthly meetings, except in so far as the meetings issued certificates. There was no overall organisation, and no follow-up to maintain the momentum.<sup>133</sup>

If, as the years went by, ministers continued to complain of the weak and low state of meetings, it is reasonable to ask whether the ministers themselves did not contribute to a lack of life and growth. It may be that the 'hard close work', 'low distressing opportunities', 'hard digging times', 'exercising seasons' and so on were not wholly the fault of the meetings, but of uninspiring messages and admonishments which the meetings did not wish to hear.

Sarah (Tuke) Grubb (1756-1790), for example, especially in her early years as a minister, went about in a state of gloom; her spirit was frequently 'clothed with the garment of mourning', and the yearly meeting held over three days at Bristol in 1786 'afforded many opportunities for sufferings, and deep gloomy exercise'.<sup>134</sup> Others used the words 'deep draughts of the cup of suffering' and similar expressions concerning their personal feelings.

The journal or spiritual diary was a way in which some Quaker women could express themselves. It was not open to Quaker women to write novels or plays, nor even travel books in the modern sense, though there are passages in Catherine Payton's accounts of travels in the wild country in America which are vivid and immediate, and enliven the tedium of chronicles of difficult visits to dull and unresponsive meetings. Occasionally the minister gives a hint of sensitiveness to the world about her. Mary Dudley even ventured to use the word 'romantic' of a ride between very high rocks and mountains on a journey in France in 1788.<sup>135</sup>

In general the need for plain language made for clarity; but too often the attempt to suppress the self in the chronicle of events led to obscurity and clumsiness of expression in the journals of travelling ministers. There does not appear to be any regular pattern in the writings of Quaker women in the eighteenth century. A few women

wrote verses; there were also testimonies to deceased parents or husbands, sermons or epistles addressed to particular groups, advice on behaviour and warnings to backsliders. There was the occasional short treatise on a specific subject - Mary Brooks's *Reasons for the necessity of silent waiting*, published in 1774 went into 10 editions by 1816, and was translated into French and German.<sup>136</sup> Mary Knowles, widow of a London doctor, published an account of a controversy on water baptism with a clergyman of Coventry, about 1776. She was better known, however, for a *Dialogue* between her and Dr. Johnson, which achieved publicity in the *Gentleman's magazine* in June 1791 and in the *Lady's magazine* the following year.<sup>137</sup> Catherine Phillips, true to form, went outside the usual brief, with an address to the inhabitants of Cornwall 'on the mining concerns of this county' (1791, reprinted 1792); and with an even more topical subject, in *Considerations on the causes of the high price of grain ... and propositions for reducing them*, published in 1792, at a time when Friends were incurring some criticism for allegedly helping to keep the price high.<sup>138</sup>

In the next century there was to be a noticeable pattern of poems and stories on subjects like scripture, history, botany, geology, natural history, the seaside, and similar subjects, aimed at children and young people, attempting to make learning more pleasurable, and facts easier to remember.

### EDUCATION

Inequalities between rich and poor were as much a constraint as differences between the sexes, as far as opportunities were concerned. The establishment of schools such as Ackworth was a step in the right direction, enabling both girls and boys to develop the capabilities needed in later life. Teaching provided work for some women. Ann Mercy Bell taught for a time at the school in Clerkenwell. When a workhouse school was established at Gildersome near Leeds in 1772, the children were to be taught reading, writing and accounts; in addition, the boys were to be instructed in some parts of the woollen manufactory and of husbandry; while there was to be a mistress to teach the girls spinning, knitting and sewing. The emphasis was on a useful training.<sup>139</sup>

Many Quaker women found an occupation in running small private schools, particularly for Quaker girls, providing a much needed service as well as an outlet for their talents. Caroline Hopwood in Leeds set up a school to assist the family finances, and taught needlework, drawing, pastry &c., though she gave it up later, when it was borne in on her that she ought to settle for plain work.<sup>140</sup> Sarah (Tuke) Grubb opened a boarding school for 'female youth' at Clonmel, about 1788, and was worried at first lest it should interfere with the school at Mountmellick.<sup>141</sup>

Both schools flourished. Rebecca Jones spent a week at the Clonmel school during her visit to Ireland, and so endeared herself to the pupils that they worked a sampler for her as a memento of 'their close friendship and gospel unity'.<sup>142</sup> Rebecca Jones herself had run a successful school in Philadelphia. Her biographer wrote of her that she 'had remarkable qualifications for imparting knowledge, for training the youthful mind [and] developing its powers'.<sup>143</sup> She was genuinely interested in education. During her stay in Europe, she not only visited the Clonmel school, but went to Ackworth School twice, and was greatly impressed by the work of the 'pious mistresses' who taught the girls,<sup>144</sup> and was keenly interested in the proposals for 'another boarding school for girls only' to be established at York [Trinity Lane], 'under the particular inspection of Esther Tuke'.<sup>145</sup> One result of the establishment and success of such schools was the manifest need for women teachers who were better equipped than heretofore, and it began to become plain that some form of further education and training were required for governesses and teachers.

There was still a long way to go in the matter of equality in some spheres, but, as the century drew to a close, there were to be inspiring causes to catch the attention of Quaker women, as well as others, and glimpses of areas in which there was much work to be done—the anti-slavery movement (especially in America), women's rights, higher education for women. All that was in the future. In the meantime, Quaker women took what opportunities offered. The organisation and structures established by George Fox benefited them and gave them a place in the work of the Society. Whether they 'ran' the local women's meetings, seeing the fruits of their labours in helping the poor, or training the children, or whether they travelled abroad to deliver the Quaker message, Quaker women were able to demonstrate to Friends and to the world at large, that authority and leadership, and a gift for organisation were not solely the prerogative of men.

It may be fitting to apply to them words which appear on the title-page of Elizabeth Bathurst's little collection of *The sayings of women, which were spoken upon sundry occasions, in several places of the Scriptures* (published in 1683):

'So did all the women that were wise in heart, manage their particular talents, to the praise and glory of God.'

*Jean E. Mortimer*  
*Presidential Address given at*  
*Carlton Hill Friends' Meeting House,*  
*Leeds, 25 June 1994.*

## NOTES AND REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> Sophie H. Drinker, *Hannah Penn and the proprietorship of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia, 1958.
- <sup>2</sup> *Fragmentary memorials of John & Elizabeth Estaugh*. Preface by H.J. Sturge. Gloucester, (1881); H.W. Longfellow, "Tales of a wayside inn. The theologian's tale. Elizabeth." *The poetical works of Longfellow*. Oxford (1925), 436-441; "This is Haddonfield." Published by The Historical Society of Haddonfield, New Jersey. 1963. The year 1713 was regarded as the time of the foundation of Haddonfield.
- <sup>3</sup> R.S. Mortimer, "The first century of Quaker printers." *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, 40 (1948), 47-49.
- <sup>4</sup> See Tace Sowle to Charles Marshall, 27 Nov. 1697 (Bristol Record Office SF/A7/4, 97) referred to in Bristol Record Society's Publications, vol. 30, (1977), 186 and notes.
- <sup>5</sup> Minute book of the Men's Meeting of the Society of Friends in Bristol, 1667-1686. Edited by Russell Mortimer. Bristol Record Society's Publications. Vol. 26 (1971), 54-55.
- <sup>6</sup> William Pearson Thistlethwaite, *Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting (of the Society of Friends), 1665-1966*. Harrogate, Published by the Author, (1979), 23-27.
- <sup>7</sup> Copy of a letter, signed "Kathren Winn", dated Prumpton, y<sup>c</sup> 17th y<sup>c</sup> 4th mo: 1706. Leeds Women's P.M. minute book, 1703-1771, 15-19 (Carlton Hill Archives, Brotherton Library, Special Collections, University of Leeds, E 22) [hereafter: Carlton Hill Archives]; Catherine Winn, of Carlton-in-Coverdale died 23 i 1712, a minister. Thistlethwaite, op.cit. 423.
- <sup>8</sup> Stephen C. Morland, "Mid-Somerset Friends in the 18th century." *JFHS*, 52 (1971), 249-276.
- <sup>9</sup> Minute of P.M. held 26 March 1701. Leeds Friends' minute book, 1692 to 1712. Edited by Jean and Russell Mortimer. Yorkshire Archaeological Society. Record series, vol. 139 (1980), 62. [hereafter: Leeds Friends' minute book, 1692 to 1712].
- <sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 66.
- <sup>11</sup> Minute of 22 10mo. 1708. Leeds Women's P.M. minute book. (Carlton Hill Archives E22), 253.
- <sup>12</sup> John Griffith, *Journal* (1779), 158.
- <sup>13</sup> Thomas Story, *Journal* (1747), 600-601.
- <sup>14</sup> Wilfrid Allott, "Leeds Quaker Meeting". *Publications of the Thoresby Society. Miscellany, vol. 14 part 1* (1966), 27.
- <sup>15</sup> For a full account of the establishment of the Women's Yearly Meeting, see *London Yearly Meeting during 250 years* (1919), 93-122; see also: Margaret Hope Bacon, "The establishment of London Women's Yearly Meeting; a transatlantic concern". *JFHS*, vol. 57, no. 2 (1995), 151-165.
- <sup>16</sup> William Hodgson, Jr., *The life and travels of John Pemberton*. (1844), 32.
- <sup>17</sup> Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting, minute book, 1734-1766. (Clifford Street Archives, deposited in the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds, II.4), 278-9; 281; [hereafter: Clifford Street Archives]. Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting of Women Friends, minute book, 1746-1785 (Clifford Street Archives III.2.2), 21.
- <sup>18</sup> Epistles, advices, minutes &c. from the Yearly Meeting and Meeting for Sufferings. Vol. 1 pt. 2 (Clifford Street Archives VI.19.2), fol. 130.

- <sup>19</sup> *Memorials of Rebecca Jones*. Compiled by William J. Allison. Second edition. (1849), 64.
- <sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 66-67.
- <sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 138.
- <sup>22</sup> *Quaker faith and practice* (1995), 7.01
- <sup>23</sup> William C. Braithwaite, *The second period of Quakerism*. Second edition, prepared by Henry J. Cadbury. (Cambridge, 1961), 287.
- <sup>24</sup> *Piety promoted*. The third part. A new edition. (1812), 355-366.
- <sup>25</sup> W.P. Thistlethwaite, *op.cit.*, 422-430 ("Ministers deceased"); see also his *Yorkshire Quaker ministers*. (1983 and Supplement 1993), 20 (Table III).
- <sup>26</sup> F.M.A. de Voltaire, *Lettres écrites de Londres sur les Anglois. Seconde lettre sur les Quakers*. A Basle [London], (1734), 11-15; Letters concerning the English nation. [Translated by John Lockman]. (1733), 12.
- <sup>27</sup> Leeds Friends' minute book, 1692 to 1712. (1980), 77, 92, 93n.
- <sup>28</sup> W.P. Thistlethwaite, *Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting*. (1979), 52.
- <sup>29</sup> Bristol Men's Meeting minute book, 1716-1727. (Transcript by R.S. Mortimer), 28, 28a; see also Braithwaite, *Second period*, 480.
- <sup>30</sup> *An Account of the life and religious experiences of D. Caroline Hopwood, of Leeds, deceased...&c.* (Leeds, 1801); Leeds P.M. minute book, 1749-1792 (Carlton Hill Archives, E 3), 143, 144, 148; Brighouse M.M. minute books (Carlton Hill Archives, Q 6) (1767-78), 177, 179-80, 182; Q 7 (1778-86), 17-18.
- <sup>31</sup> *Dictionary of Quaker Biography; JFHS*, vol. 5 (1908), 47-8; William Cookworthy, *Memoir*, (1854), 10-16.
- <sup>32</sup> *DQB; The life of Mary Dudley, including an account of her religious engagements...&c.* (1825), chapter I.
- <sup>33</sup> *Quaker grey: some account of the forepart of the life of Elizabeth Ashbridge, written by her own hand...* An introduction by A.C. Curtis. *The Astolat Press*. 1904. (First published Nantwich, 1774, reprinted 1806 &c).
- <sup>34</sup> *DNB; DQB; Memoirs of the life of Catherine Phillips*. (1797), 16. [hereafter: Phillips].
- <sup>35</sup> Rufus Jones, *The later periods of Quakerism*. Vol. 1 (1921), 195, 229.
- <sup>36</sup> Knaresborough M.M. Certificates of Friends travelling in the ministry, 1719-1804. (Carlton Hill Archives C 11).
- <sup>37</sup> Edna Walker, née Heaviside (1663-1712), wife of Robert Walker of Healey Lane End.
- <sup>38</sup> Eleanor Walker née Middleton, second wife of Miles Walker; they removed to London in 1720. Eleanor Walker and her companion Edna Walker were granted a certificate in 1710 to visit Friends' meetings in Cornwall and Wales. (Carlton Hill Archives Q 2), 114.
- <sup>39</sup> Leeds Friends' minute book, 1692 to 1712, 198-9; *Collection of testimonies*, (1760), 336-8; C.T. Clay, "An Eighteenth-century Quakeress of Leeds..." *The genealogist*. N.S.xxxvi, (April 1920).
- <sup>40</sup> *Collection of testimonies* (1760), 191-193; for Fothergill's letter to Tabitha Horner, dated 20 xii 1745/6, see *Chain of friendship*. Selected letters of Dr. John Fothergill of London, 1735-1780. With introduction and notes by Betsy C. Corner and Christopher C. Booth. Cambridge, Mass. (1971), 112.
- <sup>41</sup> *DQB; Piety promoted*. Vol. 2. A new edition (1812), 454-5; also Vol. 3 (1854), 105.
- <sup>42</sup> Clifford Street Archives, I 10 Ann Mercy Bell: Journal and correspondence, etc. 1745-1786. [hereafter: Bell].

- <sup>43</sup> DQB: Robert Davies, *A Memoir of the York press* (1868), 325; R.S. Mortimer, 'Quaker printers, 1750-1850', *JFHS*, 50 (1963), 100-133.
- <sup>44</sup> Bell, 1-78.
- <sup>45</sup> Bell, 79-154.
- <sup>46</sup> Joseph Phipps, *A summary account of an extraordinary visit to this metropolis, in the year 1753, by the ministry of Ann Mercy Bell*. Printed in the year MDCCLIV. A copy of this work is bound in the Bell volume, 229-256. [hereafter: Phipps].
- <sup>47</sup> Bell, 154.
- <sup>48</sup> Bell, 205-8; *Some account of the life and religious labours of Samuel Neale*. Dublin (1805), 30-32.
- <sup>49</sup> Bell, 145.
- <sup>50</sup> Bell, 146.
- <sup>51</sup> Bell, 136-7.
- <sup>52</sup> Bell, 135.
- <sup>53</sup> Bell, 127.
- <sup>54</sup> Bell, 107-8, 130. The episode is mentioned briefly by Susanna Morris in her *Journal*. See *Wilt thou go on my errand? Journals of three 18th-century Quaker women ministers: Susanna Morris... Elizabeth Hudson ... Ann Moore*. Edited by Margaret Hope Bacon. Wallingford, Pennsylvania. *Pendle Hill Publications* (1994), 96-7.
- <sup>55</sup> Bell, 119.
- <sup>56</sup> Bell, 205-208.
- <sup>57</sup> Phipps, 3-4.
- <sup>58</sup> Phipps, 7.
- <sup>59</sup> Phipps, 15.
- <sup>60</sup> Phipps, 13.
- <sup>61</sup> Phipps, 9. This incident and several others in Joseph Phipps's account were wrongly ascribed by Reginald L. Hine and his editors to Mercy Ransom (c. 1728-1811), whose maiden name was Bell. (*Recollections of an uncommon attorney*, 1951, 84).
- <sup>62</sup> Phipps, 21.
- <sup>63</sup> York M.M. minutes, 5 iv. and 3 v. 1858. (Clifford Street Archives, D5, 31, 32).
- <sup>64</sup> Second Day Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders. Minutes. Vol. 5 (1734-1762), 185, 268, 361, 364, 365, 367. (Library, Friends House). [hereafter: Morning Meeting].
- <sup>65</sup> Bell, 289-290.
- <sup>66</sup> See Emily Manners, *Elizabeth Hooton, first Quaker woman preacher (1600-1672)*. With notes, etc. by Norman Penney. *JFHS Supplement* 12 (1914).
- <sup>67</sup> *A journal of the life, travels and Christian experience of Thomas Chalkley*. Written by himself. A new edition (1818), 376.
- <sup>68</sup> Bell, 273-6.
- <sup>69</sup> York M.M. minutes, 1755-1777. (Clifford Street Archives D 5), 43.
- <sup>70</sup> Bell, 279-282.
- <sup>71</sup> Thirsk M.M. Minutes. vol. 3 (1740-58) (Clifford Street Archives F 3.3), 100; Morning Meeting, vol. 5, 184.
- <sup>72</sup> Morning Meeting, vol. 5, 241.
- <sup>73</sup> Morning Meeting, vol. 5, 250.
- <sup>74</sup> Morning Meeting, vol. 5, 252-3.
- <sup>75</sup> Morning Meeting, vol. 5, 262-3, 265.
- <sup>76</sup> Thirsk M.M. Minutes, vol. 3 (Clifford Street Archives, F 3.3), 178; Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting of Ministers and Elders, minute book, vol. 1 (1689-1798) (Clifford Street Archives, I 5.1), 128.

- <sup>77</sup> A Testimony was read in Thirsk Women's M.M., 27 iii 1753 (Clifford Street Archives, F 4.1), 163. No text has been found in M.M. or Q.M. records. Mary Rickaby is recorded as having left in her Will £5 to Thirsk Women's M.M. (Clifford Street Archives F 4.1), 166.
- <sup>78</sup> York M.M. Applications for membership, disownments, documents of discipline &c. 6 ix 1672 - 29 xi 1797. Nos. 69-117: Documents concerning Nathaniel Bell Junior and Judith Heron (Clifford Street Archives K 2.1); W.P. Thistlethwaite, *Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting, 1665-1966*. (1979), 139-140; W.P. Thistlethwaite, *A bygone Quaker Meeting ('Tadcaster' - 'Clifford' - 'Wetherby')*. (1988), 10-11; Stephen Allott, *Friends in York*. York (1978), 55-56.
- <sup>79</sup> Admitted to membership 29 viii 1766. Brighouse M.M. minute book, 1747-67 (Carlton Hill Archives Q5) 264.
- <sup>80</sup> Halifax P.M. minutes, 1758-80 (Carlton Hill Archives, EE 16bis, 405-6; EE 17, 57-8, 64); Brighouse M.M. minutes, 1747-67 (Carlton Hill Archives, Q 5), 260, 261, 264, 272; York M.M. minutes (Clifford Street Archives, D 5), 140. [hereafter: D 5].
- <sup>81</sup> D 5, 141, 132; and York Women's M.M. minutes (Clifford Street Archives, F 2.1), 142.
- <sup>82</sup> D 5, 143, 144, 146; see also Brighouse M.M. minutes (Carlton Hill Archives, Q 6), 9, 11.
- <sup>83</sup> D 5, 148, 149, 150, 152; and Yorkshire Q.M. minutes (Clifford Street Archives, II 5), 15, 19-20, 27, 29, 33, 34.
- <sup>84</sup> D 5, 153-4, 156.
- <sup>85</sup> D 5, 150, 155, 157, 159, 162-3.
- <sup>86</sup> D 5, 164, 166, 167-8.
- <sup>87</sup> D 5, 170, 172. Judith Bell died 19 iv 1815, aged about 75 years, buried at York, not in membership.
- <sup>88</sup> John Atkinson: see D 5, 172, 176, 177; William Shackleton: disowned for marriage by a priest, and for encouraging a clandestine marriage, see D 5, 174, 189.
- <sup>89</sup> D 5, 168.
- <sup>90</sup> D 5, 179; and York P.M. minutes (Clifford Street Archives, H 1.4), 142.
- <sup>91</sup> His application for re-admission was judged to be too hasty (D 5, 160); but he was reinstated on a second application in 1774 (D 5, 284, 287). He removed to Cottingham in Hull M.M. in 1817, died 9 xii 1824 and was buried at York.
- <sup>92</sup> York M.M. of Ministers and Elders, minute book (1709-1775), (Clifford Street Archives B 11.1), 93.
- <sup>93</sup> Cornelius Cayley (1729-1780?) *DNB*; Smith I, 397. A copy of his "A tour through Holland, Flanders and part of France ... 1772" (Leeds, 1773) in the Library of The Thoresby Society, Leeds has inscriptions "The Author's gift to M. Wodhull 1780" and "The author died about Lady Day 1783".
- <sup>94</sup> Bell, 307-310.
- <sup>95</sup> Leeds P.M. minutes (Carlton Hill Archives E 3), 119; Brighouse M.M. minutes (Carlton Hill Archives Q 6), 88, 90.
- <sup>96</sup> George Crosfield, *Memoirs of Samuel Fothergill*. Liverpool, (1843), 500-504.
- <sup>97</sup> Brighouse M.M. minutes (Carlton Hill Archives, Q 6), 146.
- <sup>98</sup> Bell, 324. The account of this event is preceded by a copy (by Nathaniel Bell, junior) of lines entitled "On the Races" by Ann Mercy Bell, written during the race week in York in the 8th month 1775. Bell, 322-3.
- <sup>99</sup> D 5, 327, 328-9, 329-300; and Yorkshire G.M. minutes (Clifford Street Archives, II 5), 220, 222: *Piety promoted*. A new edition. (1812), 454-5.
- <sup>100</sup> Edward Stabler, the younger (1730-1785). For his letter, see Bell, 257-260.

- <sup>101</sup> *Some account of the life and religious exercises of Mary Neale, formerly Mary Peisley.* Principally compiled from her own writings. [By Samuel Neale]. Second edition. Dublin. 1795. [hereafter: Neale].
- <sup>102</sup> Catherine Payton, afterwards Phillips; see note 34.
- <sup>103</sup> Neale, 120-123.
- <sup>104</sup> Phillips, 118.
- <sup>105</sup> Neale, 152.
- <sup>106</sup> Phillips, 120.
- <sup>107</sup> Phillips, 131, 139-140.
- <sup>108</sup> R. Hingston Fox, *Dr. John Fothergill and his friends, Chapters in eighteenth century life.* (1919), 244.
- <sup>109</sup> Phillips, 143.
- <sup>110</sup> Phillips, 148-152.
- <sup>111</sup> Phillips, 188, 206.
- <sup>112</sup> Phillips, 207-8.
- <sup>113</sup> Testimony from the Monthly Meeting of Friends for the Western Division of Cornwall, held at Falmouth 6.iv.1795: read and approved in Quarterly Meeting for Cornwall, 7.iv.1795. Printed in Phillips, 305-309.
- <sup>114</sup> *The records and recollections of James Jenkins.* Edited by J. William Frost. Texts and studies in religion, vol. 18. New York and Toronto (1984), 118.
- <sup>115</sup> *Memorials of Rebecca Jones*, 64.
- <sup>116</sup> Op. cit., 63, 129.
- <sup>117</sup> Op. cit., 1-21.
- <sup>118</sup> Op. cit., 241-2.
- <sup>119</sup> Op. cit., chapters 3-5 (48-149).
- <sup>120</sup> Christiana Hustler (d. 27 vi 1811, aged 79); daughter of William and Sarah Hird; wife of John Hustler (1715-90). *Piety promoted IV* (1829), 33-6; Phillips, 192-4; H.R. Hodgson. *The Society of Friends in Bradford* (1926), 44-5.
- <sup>121</sup> *Memorials of Rebecca Jones*, 149.
- <sup>122</sup> Op. cit., 124.
- <sup>123</sup> For a full account of her life and travels, see Algic I. Newlyn, *Charity Cook, a liberated woman.* (Friends United Press), 1981. [hereafter: Newlyn].
- <sup>124</sup> J. William Frost, *The Quaker family in colonial America.* New York. (1973), 210; Newlyn, 127.
- <sup>125</sup> *Memorials of Rebecca Jones*, 70.
- <sup>126</sup> Newlyn, 126.
- <sup>127</sup> Op. cit., 126.
- <sup>128</sup> Reginald Hine, *A mirror for the Society of Friends, The Story of the Hitchin Quakers* (1929), 93; Newlyn, 130.
- <sup>129</sup> Newlyn, 69-70, 71.
- <sup>130</sup> Op. cit., 127.
- <sup>131</sup> Op. cit., 43.
- <sup>132</sup> Phillips, 308.
- <sup>133</sup> The three *Journals* of women travelling ministers, recently edited by Margaret Hope Bacon (see note 54) tend to give an impression of innumerable journeys of many miles, with short stops and apparent anxiety to visit as many groups of Friends as possible.
- <sup>134</sup> *Some account of the life and religious labours of Sarah Grubb.* Second edition (1794), 130.
- <sup>135</sup> *The life of Mary Dudley* (1825), 67-8.

- <sup>136</sup> Joseph Smith, *A descriptive catalogue of Friends' books*. (1867), I, 321-3.  
<sup>137</sup> Smith, II, 73-4.  
<sup>138</sup> Smith, II, 405.  
<sup>139</sup> Jean, E., Mortimer, *Quakers in Gildersome, Leeds* (1990), 33-47.  
<sup>140</sup> *An account of the life and religious experiences of D. Caroline Hopwood, of Leeds*. Leeds (1801), 17, 24.  
<sup>141</sup> *Some account of the life and religious labours of Sarah Grubb*. Second edition. (1794), 184-6.  
<sup>142</sup> *Memorials of Rebecca Jones*, 176-7.  
<sup>143</sup> Op. cit., 21.  
<sup>144</sup> Op. cit., 81.  
<sup>145</sup> See Stephen Allott, *Friends in York* (1978), 67-8.

# SAMUEL BEWLEY (1764 - 1837), SILK MERCHANT AND PHILANTHROPIST OF DUBLIN\*

**T**his study focuses on the Bewley family, and in particular on Samuel Bewley of Dublin. It is designed as a contribution to the micro-economic history of that city. As is the case for most Irish Quaker merchant families there is very little surviving business material such as ledgers available for a consistent statistical account. Nevertheless, through the use of private letters, of newspapers and sometimes of parliamentary papers, a history can be generated that throws light on aspects of contemporary merchant practice. Such an account might also illustrate wider patterns of commercial behaviour and organisation in a period of rapid economic development and political change as Irish and English people came to terms with the facts of the economic and political union formally declared between their two countries in 1800.

Some account of the Bewley family is necessary. Like most Irish Quaker families it originated in England, in this case in Cumberland.<sup>1</sup> Most members of the Irish branch of the Bewleys derive from Mungo Bewley (1677-1747) son of Thomas and Margaret Bewley of Woodhall, Cumberland. He settled 'within the compass' of what became Edenderry Monthly Meeting. His son Thomas (1719-95) married Susanna Pim in 1751. They were the parents of, among other children, John (1754-1830), Mungo (1755-1834) and Samuel (1764-1837) who figure chiefly in this account.

The Bewleys had probably been long involved in some aspect of the textile industry. Some Quakers, in and from the midland counties, and particularly the Pim family had made large profits in the bay-yarn industry.<sup>2</sup> There is some sign that the Bewleys were involved in wool-related trade. There are also indications that some may have been

\* a) Samuel Bewley's eventual residence was at Rockville, Co. Dublin. In 1806 he was a merchant of 72, Meath Street and later of 20, William Street where he lived with his family. A partnership with Corry Fowler was for a period operated from Suffolk Street, Dublin.

b) An obituary is to be found in *Irish Friend*, I, no 2 of 1 Twelfth-month 1837. This cites from obituaries of Samuel Bewley that appeared in the *Dublin Mercantile Advertiser* and in the *Irish Temperance and Literary Gazette*. *The Annual Monitor* (York, 1838), 16 also notes Samuel Bewley's death with some detail.

involved in the linen manufactory which between 1740-60 had been in a situation of development and growth. As late as 1788, a trade directory mentions Mungo Bewley jnr. as being a manufacturer of linens and cottons in Mountmellick.<sup>3</sup>

The mention of a cotton manufactory in itself indicates that the Bewleys of Mountmellick and Mountrath, like other merchants in both the midlands and in Dublin and Cork, had early recognised the big potential in this up-and-coming industry. The industry was heavily backed by government and came to rely on protective duties for its encouragement. Already many Quaker merchants in Cork and Dublin were, like other merchants, involved in the increasing import of the raw material. New technology was to encourage moves into factory-based production. Mountmellick Quakers were to be seen as chiefly responsible for the muslin weaving in that town.<sup>4</sup> Muslin weaving was a specialist activity and other forms of cotton textile were undoubtedly also produced as the market expanded.

Evidence has not been located as to where Samuel Bewley was apprenticed, but it may have been in Dublin where he set up business. Although his name does not appear in a Dublin directory of 1789, he must surely have been set up in business by then. John Bewley's name appears in 1785 in import lists in connection with tea and other products.<sup>5</sup> John Bewley must have operated chiefly in the grocery trade and dealt also in cotton which he supplied or bought from other Dublin merchants. This he often supplied to his Mountmellick relatives and connections. Most Quakers like other Irish merchants preferred a commission trade which even if it gave small margins of profit did not unduly tie up their capital. Whilst specialising in a central product they often handled a wide variety of goods. A degree of export trade was also engaged in, sometimes to the West Indies and to North America.

A background in the textile business has been posited for Samuel Bewley. He may have been apprenticed to a silk merchant judging by his ongoing involvement in silk related activity. Dublin poplin was far-famed. Many of his business connections were to be with the Levant from where he imported silk and a wide variety of exotic products. A number of letters detail the interconnected activities of John and Samuel Bewley. These include transactions with America for the import of potashes and of deer skins.<sup>6</sup> Dealings with Rotterdam and Smyrna are detailed. Purchases of cotton wool were made from or with other Quaker merchants: a typical purchase, in 1790, of 33 bags of cotton-wool gave one-third to Richard Pike with the other two-thirds shared in partnership with Tobias Pim and Samuel Bewley.<sup>7</sup> There was a shrewd awareness of prices in different markets whether Cork, Dublin,

London, Lisbon or other places. Sometimes cotton wool and other products were supplied at appropriate discounts to Mungo.<sup>8</sup> His word might be awaited concerning the best price, whether for West Indies and American 'sea-island' cotton or for varieties from the more traditional middle east markets, which might be available via London as well as direct.

I do not know if the Bewleys had ships of their own in the 1790s but they certainly did later on.<sup>9</sup> There is no evidence of a formal partnership between John and Samuel but their affairs closely impinged on each other. Samuel took a special interest in financial arrangements and the brothers, John and Samuel sometimes shared cargo space with each other and with other merchants. References about Charleston and Philadelphia in letters indicate round voyages consistent with merchant practice in Cork and also in Belfast. The sale of the outward cargoes of manufactured goods would leave room for return cargoes of 'sea-cotton' and other North American products.<sup>10</sup>

An interest in insurance was implied and was an increasingly important part of merchant practice in addition to the more traditional practice of protecting against loss by spreading cargoes over a number of bottoms. In the early nineteenth century Samuel Bewley was to be a central promoter of an Irish insurance company.<sup>11</sup> An insurance-related incident occurred in 1791 when John and Samuel made an insurance claim for unsold goods on the *Philadelphia* and the *Dublin Packet* which apparently were sunk on a return voyage. They concluded that some of the goods must have been sold at Philadelphia. It seemed best to remit a bill on a ship sailing the next day since there would not be further news from Philadelphia until vessels came from there the next year.<sup>12</sup> Not suprisingly John and Samuel had an interest in the new Royal Exchange Insurance of Ireland, Samuel having two shares on which he received dividends.<sup>13</sup>

John Bewley wanted to concentrate on the cotton manufacture. His factory at Irishtown, Mountmellick was probably set up around 1790 and employed 400 people, keeping 200 looms at work and amounting to perhaps one-half of the trade of the town.<sup>14</sup> The cotton thread was sometimes imported and the resultant unfinished cotton goods sent off to Dublin.<sup>15</sup>

Mungo supplied the Mountmellick manufactory with cotton yarn woven at his concern at Mountrath. The concern was operated with a breast-shot water-wheel, and had only recently been set up.<sup>16</sup> Mungo Bewley employed 100-150 people and spun 21,000 lbs. of cotton each year. He had the doubtful reputation of having broken up a combination of workers who wished to operate a closed shop system.<sup>17</sup>

Although contemporary Quakers were counselled to treat their workers with justice, they also tended to be unfavourable to combinations.

The Monthly Meeting of Friends had an important influence in encouraging business probity and justice in all transactions. As far as this involved employees, employers were encouraged to pay fair wages to their workers and not to oppress them. Friends were discouraged from going to law, a practice seen as contravening New Testament precedent. When a dispute arose between another Friend and John Bewley over a matter of non-performance of a legal obligation, Samuel Bewley wrote and reminded his brother of this. The matter was submitted to the arbitration of the Monthly Meeting.<sup>18</sup>

A difficult time occurred for the cotton industry in 1792-3 when a number of big concerns crashed, including Comerford & O'Brien in Dublin, a firm which went bankrupt in 1793. 'This must be the greatest thing of the sort that ever took place in this city' wrote William Alexander to John Bewley.<sup>19</sup> Workers also were becoming impoverished and unemployed. A contributory factor to the distress of manufacturers and workers was a lack of liquid capital towards payments, most capital being tied up in machinery and buildings. Pressure was on to match the bigger investments of English capitalists in similar textile concerns. Basically solvent businesses could easily be propelled into failure. Dublin Monthly Meeting, understanding some of the difficulties of weavers and others in these and other years advised employers to raise wages and not delay their workers from productive jobs on their own account when paying them. A fund of £544.12.10½ was raised to help those in Dublin who were 'in distress for lack of employment'. Samuel Bewley was one of the treasurers for this.<sup>20</sup>

The death, in 1795, of their father Thomas Bewley may have encouraged Samuel and John Bewley in their next business development. The cotton business promised enough profits to justify them setting up on 29 Ninth Month 1796, 'a partnership without articles'. This was to manufacture cotton goods and a stock of £4,000 was established, of which £1,000 was 'Samuel's profits' presumably out of some other set of transactions. Three years later to the day the property had accumulated to the amount of £8,000 and it was decided to let the profit remain as the capital of the concern.<sup>21</sup>

The years following the Act of Union appeared to bring increasing general prosperity, although it has been noted that in 1800-1 there was a higher incidence of bankruptcies, themselves perhaps independent of any effect of the developing economic union. A report for 1802 stated that there were then 2,400 looms at work in the counties of Meath, West Meath and Queen's county and 3,500 in Dublin and Kildare.<sup>22</sup> During

the first decades of the Union the cotton textile production still had protective duties. By 1800 there were in the region of 23 printing works in Ireland and additionally there were 23 printing works in the Dublin area alone.<sup>23</sup> Furniture printing being a "growth area" it must have seemed a logical extension of their business to open a calico printing establishment at Roper's Rest near Dublin and not too far from the Grand Canal. The premises were taken over from the Greenhems who owned several cotton manufactories around Dublin.<sup>24</sup>

These printed 'furniture' textiles could be competitively exported to England and were often commissioned from there. A new printing system utilising a flat copper plate instead of a wooden block, whilst expensive to install had reduced production costs by half.<sup>25</sup> John Bewley's manufactory employed 25 printers and ten labourers.<sup>26</sup> It was situated at a place appropriately called Haarlem. A letter of Anne Bewley, who was married to John, details the operation in 1803 after the move from their home at Irishtown, Mountmellick, 'We are here in the midst of business preparing for the new undertaking. The winds have been contrary for some time and detained the shipping with our new machinery on the other side, but yesterday to our satisfaction they arrived - so we expect to be still more busy in getting it fixed up and hope to commence our printing business in less than a month.'<sup>27</sup> The concern shared a millstream with a number of other concerns including a paper mill. A further letter, of 1804, indicates a halt in business already.<sup>28</sup> Bewley's trade may have folded up eventually under pressure from English goods, although a definite English interest in quality Irish fabrics continued.<sup>29</sup>

By 16 Seventh-month 1804 internal business tensions had emerged for John Bewley and his brother Samuel. It was difficult to confine the business to its nominal capital. Such a difficulty reflected the amounts of capital tied up in stocks and assets and which in an emergency could not be easily realised. Samuel Bewley, although he backed his brother, was not basically interested in manufacturing cottons, but if he withdrew his capital he might endanger his brother's business altogether. John Bewley suggested that he would take over the risks and advance £1,000 of the profit to Samuel immediately. The property would also be made over, presumably as security for the major sum.<sup>30</sup>

Samuel Bewley spent time giving advice to John about getting the business back on its feet. A letter also additionally mentions that £1,800 of the firm's capital had been provided by Joseph Beale of Mountmellick, another family connection with the bay-yarn business.<sup>31</sup> By 20 Ninth-month 1804 Samuel Bewley was getting even more anxious, waiting to be 'disencumbered from shackles that prevent my

living in comfort and following my other mercantile concerns without difficulty. I have been in difficulties for years and as capital and resources increased the burdens increased'<sup>32</sup> Only eight days later he dug his heels in for the very good reason that he had no money available to pay the men and bluntly stated that he refused to consent to or accept any more money 'on thy account'. Nevertheless, it was not until the following year that a deed was drawn up and John Bewley purchased his brother's interest for £3,000.<sup>33</sup>

The business was evidently not going to be a success story but it staggered on. In 1808 John was determined that he should himself continue to play a part in the business. He was obviously under pressure to hand it over in exchange for the settlement of his affairs. John Bewley's sons William (1787-1863) and John (1786-1855) did not want to go into partnership. A plan for profit sharing did not seem acceptable but the inventory for the works at Haarlem amounted to £10,000 and with John's interest in it, to £14,000.<sup>34</sup>

The furniture printing business was finally wound up in 1810 when John Bewley mortgaged to Samuel the lands and manufactory at Haarlem, Old Bawn (50-60 acres and including a bleach green) for a sum of £3,000. A further mortgage released lands at Irishtown, Mountmellick in consideration of £2,000.<sup>35</sup> John Bewley died in 1830 and was buried at Cork Street Friends Burial Ground Dublin.<sup>36</sup>

How this bore on Samuel Bewley's own business cannot be ascertained. For a while he was in partnership with Corry Fowler as silk merchants of Suffolk Street, Dublin. Some of his business activities seemed to have been designed to help out relatives and Friends in need of advice and help. Such may have been in 1813 when he was involved in a business partnership set up to manage the affairs of Richard Pim, recently bankrupted.<sup>37</sup> A further partnership in the next year involved a capital of £1,200. That partnership to buy, sell and manufacture salt<sup>38</sup> included Joshua Fayle, of Harold's Cross, and Anna Fayle (probably Samuel's sister).

The assumption is that Samuel Bewley's business was then stabilised and profitable. He was prominent in the promotion of a revived Chamber of Commerce in 1820<sup>39</sup> for he was certainly a central operator in this and the task was a challenging one in a Dublin where business was operated on implicit sectarian and political lines. During his years of office he was the Treasurer.<sup>40</sup> The Chamber helped to provide a harmonious and united merchant voice focusing commercial needs in bringing pressure on the government and others for necessary change in an era of 'free trade'. Samuel Bewley's influence towards harmony and

consensus is to be suspected in the drafting of the annual reports, which are of a piece with his other expressions of opinion.

Samuel Bewley played a notable role as a representative of the Chamber of Commerce as well as in his own knowledgeable capacity as a silk merchant. Some of these operations involved him in frequent high-level contact with the Chief Secretary and also with the English Chancellor of the Exchequer.<sup>41</sup> The names of politicians, such as John Newport, Sir Henry Parnell and T. Spring-Rice often occur in connection with Samuel Bewley, as also in other, Quaker, contexts.

When the 'Fourth Commission of Inquiry into the Revenue arising in Ireland' was instituted in 1822 Samuel Bewley was extensively interviewed. By 1824 the silk manufacture of Dublin would have much declined. In 1809 it was stated that it engrossed a capital of £250,000 and employed 3,760 workers. In 1815 6,400 yards of poplin were exported to Great Britain and 80,000 yards to the U.S.A.<sup>42</sup> Samuel Bewley's evidence incidentally sheds light not alone on aspects of the silk trade but also on his own business. The pattern of ship-owning relative to silk-gut was somewhat different to that obtaining in the New York and West Indies trade. Much of it was carried on in chartered vessels, which may account for the apparent lack of interest by the Bewleys in investing in the new steam-packet companies.<sup>43</sup> Samuel Bewley had direct silk-gut imports from the Levant, from Italy and via London but there was no direct service to the East Indies. His figures challenging official government statistical returns give some idea of the scale of his business. The direct imports of his house in the year ending 5 January 1820 had amounted to 5,690 lbs of prepared silk and 2,378 lbs of raw silk for further preparation in Dublin. The total value in British currency was £11,400. The goods paid £4,005 in duty. One positive side of the high costs involved was to stimulate the imports of unprepared silk, both direct and via London, thus giving extra employment to the Irish throwster.<sup>44</sup>

The first specific record of Samuel Bewley owning a ship occurred in 1826. In that year he owned the 'coppered' brig the *Cherub* which was engaged in the Barbadoes trade.<sup>45</sup> In November 1824 he imported quantities of Mediterranean goods, particularly drugs and dyestuffs from Smyrna on the ship *Commerce*. The cargo included 1,500 drums of new Turkey figs and 60 tons of valonia.<sup>46</sup> On 8 November 1824, he was advertising such items as gum arabic, opium, galls, liquorice paste, Gallipoli oil, silkworm gut and Turkey carpets.<sup>47</sup> He obtained a delivery on 1 March via London on the ships *Happy Return* and *Favourite* from which he landed 50 casks of Petersburg yellow candle tallow. He also had on sale a large range of other products.<sup>48</sup>

The Dublin Chamber of Commerce, in frequent contact with Chambers in other cities in Ireland and in Great Britain, was an important channel for promoting Irish trade. It played a significant role in freeing the tea trade from the oppressively monopolistic East India Company. Anticipation of the ending of the monopoly encouraged preparatory organisation noted in the Dublin Chamber's 'Report' of 1830<sup>49</sup> and in view of the central part of the Bewley family in the Irish tea business it is worth noting something of this. Some members of the Chamber clearly failed to grasp that the repeal of the East India Company's charter could be made to have significance for Ireland. Free trade conditions under the Union would enable Irish merchants to import tea direct to Dublin instead of via London but English interests challenged such a development and were backed by the customs authorities. The supposition that Samuel Bewley had creatively grasped if not forwarded this new possibility of direct tea imports is borne out by the subsequent activity of his firm. The first ship ever freighted direct to Dublin from China, the *Hellas*, was owned by Bewleys. It arrived in February 1835 to be followed by another Bewley ship, the *Mandarin*, in August of the same year. The *Mandarin* was loaded with 8,623 chests of tea.<sup>50</sup> An arrangement with the Sikes, a Quaker firm of Cork, is shown by the arrival of the Bewley's schooner *Hellas* with a direct delivery from Canton to Cork.<sup>51</sup>

The Dublin Chamber's Report for 1836 was already describing a further move. A memorial had been sent to the Lords of the Treasury requesting additional bonded warehousing for teas and representations were being made to have the rules changed so that Dublin merchants could also export teas to London. Free trade was not going to be all one way.

Apart from his expertise in business affairs Samuel Bewley used his skills in the promotion of several useful philanthropic schemes. His name usually occurs in connection with the job of treasurer. A number of the schemes which he was involved in were specially connected with the internal needs of the Religious Society of Friends. In 1798 a relief committee was set up to assist Quakers who had lost property in the traumatic events of the Rising of that year. The committee was set up on the grounds that since Friends were unable to assist the government or any other group in a military way, neither would it be correct to accept government relief. Samuel Bewley was treasurer of this Friends Committee.<sup>52</sup>

Another internal Friends scheme was the setting up of a "retreat" for the mentally sick of the Quaker community. The practice had been to send any Irish Friend so afflicted across to the Retreat at York, where the

patient could be assured of kindly treatment in a humane and enlightened atmosphere. A crisis occurred however in 1807 when an application for a mentally afflicted Friend to be sent from Dublin, was turned down at York. There was apparently too many English applications which were given priority. Dublin Friends requested the return of their £100 stl. [Ir£ 105] subscription and ten days later Samuel Bewley proposed at Dublin Yearly Meeting that Irish Friends should set up their own "Retreat" in the affairs of which he continued to be active. The institution was eventually set up at Bloomfield, Donnybrook, outside Dublin and adjacent to the modern headquarters of Ireland Yearly Meeting.<sup>53</sup>

Many philanthropic schemes promoted by Friends involved a practical ecumenism and a high degree of co-operation with a prominent group of Anglican evangelicals such as the Guinness and La Touche families. In 1811 the Kildare Place Schools were set up on a pragmatic and strictly non-sectarian basis seen as the only possible way in which they might flourish in the Ireland of the day. Such conclusions were arrived at from the practical experience of running the Dublin Free Schools, another Quaker promotion. Samuel Bewley clearly played a seminal and identifiable role in the promotion of the Kildare Place Schools. He was in frequent personal contact with the English Quaker, Joseph Lancaster, who devised the specific structure for the schools and wrote several of the books used in them.<sup>54</sup>

The increasing influence of evangelicalism led to Friends setting up in 1813 their own Bible auxiliary, the Dublin Tract Association (D.T.A.). It did not aim to act as a proselytising agency, which in the context of a developing sectarian unease would have been distinctly helpful. Many Irish Friends were not particularly favourable to the D.T.A. and were still coming to terms with a recent doctrinal upset of their own. Friends did however feel that they had a duty to ensure that in the clash of argument, their viewpoints also should be heard and defended from ill-informed and often aggressive attack. It was emphasised that the D.T.A. tracts did not contain any sentiment 'likely to offend any Christian of any denomination'.<sup>55</sup> Samuel Bewley interested himself in the D.T.A. as he did also in the Hibernian Society for the Promotion of Permanent Universal Peace,<sup>56</sup> the African Committee<sup>57</sup> and the Dublin committee for the Greek Refugees from the Island of Scio,<sup>58</sup> to all of which he subscribed.

There were numerous other institutions in the Dublin 'Liberties' which were promoted by Quakers with other of their fellow citizens. A contemporary clergyman remarked that 'the several charities of the Liberties are principally indebted to Quakers for their support'.<sup>59</sup> He

mentioned the Meath Hospital, the Cork Street Fever Hospital and the Sick Poor Institution.<sup>60</sup> In all of these Samuel Bewley played an active part. Another notable concern which he promoted was the Dublin Savings Bank. Of its 15 trustees three were Quakers including Samuel Bewley. The inaugural meeting in 1818 was held in another Quaker originated scheme, in the School at School Street. The trustees stood security for the bank in the way provided by contemporary legislation. The management by the esteemed citizens on the committee encouraged confidence. Such 'penny-banks' besides giving interest on deposits were attractive to those with little to save and helped them to improve their way of life through self-help.<sup>61</sup>

*Richard S. Harrison*

#### NOTES AND REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> E.I. Bewley, *The Bewleys of Cumberland and their Irish and other Descendants*. (Dublin, 1920).
- <sup>2</sup> L.M. Cullen, *Anglo-Irish Trade 1660-1800*. (Manchester, 1968), 92. Bay-yarn is fine worsted yarn.
- <sup>3</sup> Richard Lucas, *A general Directory of the Kingdom of Ireland*. (Dublin, 1788).
- <sup>4</sup> E. Wakefield, *An Account of Ireland, Statistical and Political*. (London, 1812), I, 707.
- <sup>5</sup> See, for instance, R. Bell, *Monthly Alphabetical Register of Imports and Exports 1785*. (Royal Irish Academy) *Halliday pamphlet*, HAL 490.
- <sup>6</sup> Samuel Bewley (Dublin) to John Bewley, 22 Tenth-month 1790. (Dublin Friends Historical Library, [hereafter, DFHL]) Port. 47(c),74.
- <sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>8</sup> Samuel Bewley to John Bewley, 24 Twelfth-month 1791 (DFHL) Port.47(c),106
- <sup>9</sup> John Bewley to Samuel Bewley, 2 Eighth-month 1791 (DFHL) Port.47(c),98. See also n.45, below.
- <sup>10</sup> Further observations on this trade may be found in Richard S. Harrison, *Dublin Quakers in Business, 1800-50* (unpublished M.Litt thesis, Trinity College, Dublin), I, 170-4.
- <sup>11</sup> Richard S. Harrison, *Irish Insurance: Historical Perspectives* (Skibbereen, 1992), 12-13. The company in question was the 'National' set up in 1822.
- <sup>12</sup> Samuel Bewley to John Bewley, 2 Eighth-month 1791 (DFHL) Port.47(c),98.
- <sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* See also, Harrison, *Irish Insurance*, 4, 12.
- <sup>14</sup> Charles Coote, *A General View of the Queens County* (Dublin, 1807),147.
- <sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 148.
- <sup>16</sup> Joseph Williams (Mountrath) to John Bewley, 16 Ninth-month 1795 (DFHL) Port.47(d),110.
- <sup>17</sup> *Ibid.* and also see, Coote, *Queens County*, 105.
- <sup>18</sup> John Bewley (Irishtown) to 'Dear cousin J. Robinson' n.d. (DFHL) Port.47(c),90. Samuel Bewley to J. Robinson, 18 Sixth-month 1791 (DFHL) Port.47(c)94, Samuel Bewley to John Bewley, 21 Sixth-month 1791 (DFHL) Port.47(c),95.
- <sup>19</sup> William Alexander to John Bewley, 6 Fifth-month 1793 (DFHL) Port.47(d),107. The crash of Comerford & O'Brien is referred to by David Dickson, 'Aspects of the Irish

- Cotton Industry' in L.M. Cullen and T.C. Smout (Eds.) *Comparative Aspects of Scottish and Irish Economic and Social History 1600-1900*, (Edinburgh, N.D.), 104.
- <sup>20</sup> Dublin Monthly Meeting Minutes, 10 Sixth-month 1800 (DFHL) MM II A.16.
- <sup>21</sup> Partnership without articles between John and Samuel Bewley. 29 Ninth-month 1796 (DFHL) Port.47(d),111. The sum of £8,000 was made up with £6,000 from John Bewley and £2,000 from Samuel Bewley.
- <sup>22</sup> See Harrison, Thesis, I, 81 and Dickson, 'Cotton Industry', 106. J.W. Warburton, J. Whitelaw and R. Walsh, *A History of the City of Dublin* (London, 1818), 372 has the reference to the number of looms.
- <sup>23</sup> Report of Trades and Manufactures of Dublin. 1834 (Royal Irish Academy). Halliday Mss 4b.31,1, 217-33, also Dickson, 'Cotton Industry', 106.
- <sup>24</sup> There were long connections between the Greenhams and Friends, extending probably back to a bleaching green at 'Haarlem' set up in the 1750s by the Northern Irish Quakers, the Greers. Greenhams were later involved with the Pim family in textile concerns. The Greenhams were not Quakers. See Harrison, Thesis II, 403-4, 398-9.
- <sup>25</sup> Report of Trades, 218-19.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>27</sup> Anne Bewley to Mary Shackleton. 9 Third-month 1803 (DFHL) Mss Box 32, c.109.
- <sup>28</sup> Also. Anne Bewley to Mary Shackleton, 30 First-month 1804 (DFHL) Mss Box 32, c.111.
- <sup>29</sup> Warburton et al. *History*, 372, Dickson, 'Cotton Industry', 110-11.
- <sup>30</sup> John Bewley to Samuel Bewley, 16 Seventh-month 1804 (DFHL) Port.47(f), 191.
- <sup>31</sup> Samuel Bewley to John Bewley, 23 Seventh-month, 1804 (DFHL) Port.47(f),193.
- <sup>32</sup> Samuel Bewley to John Bewley, 20 Ninth-month 1804 (DFHL) Port.47(d),195.
- <sup>33</sup> Samuel Bewley to John Bewley, 28 Ninth-month, 1804 (DFHL) Port.47(d),197.
- <sup>34</sup> John Bewley to Samuel Bewley, 30 Twelfth-month, 1808 (DFHL) Port.47(d),153.
- <sup>35</sup> Deed between John Bewley and Samuel Bewley, 16 Eleventh-month, 1810 (Registry of Deeds, Dublin) 633 129 432453 and Deed between John Bewley and Samuel Bewley, of same date (Registry of Deeds, Dublin) 633 129 432454.
- <sup>36</sup> Mary Bewley of Leixlip draws my attention to Mary Leadbeater, *Leadbeater Papers*, (London, 1862) I, 237-9, 'His wisdom, courage and benevolence at the time of the Rebellion of 1798'. His son John moved to Liverpool where he became a dry salter and then an agent for Guinness. for which see, Report of Trades, 220.
- <sup>37</sup> Harrison, Thesis II, 360-6, also see Dublin, Anonymous Partnership 2 Jan, 1813 (338) (Registry of Deeds). The parties to this deed with the amounts subscribed were as follows, Richard Pim (£500), Edward Clibborn (£1,000), Samuel Bewley (£500), Thomas Pim (£500), Tobias Pim (£500), Edward Croker (£500), Richard Darling (£500), Jonathan Pim (£500), James M. Pike (£500), Joseph Hone (£500).
- <sup>38</sup> Dublin, Anonymous Partnership, 30 April 1814 (368) (Registry of Deeds).
- <sup>39</sup> Louis M. Cullen, *Princes and Pirates: Dublin Chamber of Commerce 1783-1983*, (Dublin, 1983), 58-64.
- <sup>40</sup> *Report of the Chamber of Commerce*, (Dublin, 1825).
- <sup>41</sup> Harrison, Thesis I, 105.
- <sup>42</sup> Warburton et al. *History*, II, 977.
- <sup>43</sup> Ibid., 999. See also below, n.51.
- <sup>44</sup> *Fourth Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Irish Revenue* (British Parliamentary Papers, 1822.xiii.13) Section X, 264, the Evidence of Samuel Bewley, and 271.

- <sup>45</sup> *Dublin Mercantile Advertiser*, 30 January 1826.
- <sup>46</sup> *Ibid.* 1 November 1824.
- <sup>47</sup> *Ibid.* 8 November 1824.
- <sup>48</sup> *Ibid.* 1 March 1824. The goods included, 10 chests East India indigo, 8 bales safflower, 109 pipes linseed oil, 50 barrels potashes, 5 barrels pearl ashes, 30 casks coconut oil, 10 chests shellac, 1 bale fine sponge, 20 bags East India rice, 20 bags cocoa shell, 100 bags rough saltpetre, 20 casks palm oil, 30 tons barilla, 20 tons alum, 2 puncheons molasses, 2 casks smalts, besides Roman cement, Terra Scienna, salamoniac, ivory black, pumice stone, arrowroot, boxwood, soft soap, argol, cheviot wool, cotton goods etc.
- <sup>49</sup> *Report of the Chamber of Commerce*. (Dublin, 1830).
- <sup>50</sup> *Dublin Mercantile Advertiser*, 2 March 1835, 17 August 1835.
- <sup>51</sup> *Cork Constitution*, 7 May 1836. As a matter of interest when the name of the *Hellas* is recorded in the account book (DFHL) of Samuel Bewley Jnr., the son of Samuel Bewley, the net cost of a 16/64th share is noted as worth £1,093 for which see entry for 1832. The same account book would encourage a viewpoint that the Bewley interest in steamships might have been more significant than suspected. Between 1836 and 1837 more than 144 shares were noted as having been purchased in the British & Irish Steam Packet Company. Bewleys also invested in the City of Dublin Steamship Building Company in 1839.
- <sup>52</sup> Harrison, Thesis II, 450-51.
- <sup>53</sup> Harrison, Thesis II, 457-9.
- <sup>54</sup> Gráinne O'Flynn, 'Aspects of Concern in the Religious Society of Friends with Education in Ireland, 1627-1812' in *Capuchin Annual* 1975/6, 321, 331, 331-5.
- <sup>55</sup> Harrison, Thesis II, 459-60.
- <sup>56</sup> See list of subscribers in 'First Annual Report of the Hibernian Society for the Promotion of Permanent and Universal Peace', (Dublin, 1825) (Royal Irish Academy) *Halliday Pamphlets* Vol. 1348, 1825, also see, Richard S. Harrison, *Irish Anti-War Movements 1824-1974*, (Dublin, 1986), 10-15.
- <sup>57</sup> *Second Report of the Committee Managing a Fund raised for the Purpose of promoting African Instruction* (London, 1824). Samuel Bewley subscribed a £1.
- <sup>58</sup> *Subscription for the Greek Refugees from the Isle of Scio* (Dublin, 1823). Samuel Bewley was the treasurer of the Dublin committee.
- <sup>59</sup> Warburton et al, *History*, II, 835 and Harrison, Thesis, II, 456.
- <sup>60</sup> Harrison, Thesis, II, 450, 456.
- <sup>61</sup> 'Dublin Savings Bank' an unpublished paper by William R. Wigham (DFHL) Box III, 17.
- \* a) Samuel Bewley's eventual residence was at Rockville, Co. Dublin. In 1806 he was a merchant of 72, Meath Street and later of 20, William Street where he lived with his family. A partnership with Corry Fowler was for a period operated from Suffolk Street, Dublin.
- b) An obituary is to be found in *Irish Friend*, I, no 2 of 1 Twelfth-month 1837. This cites from obituaries of Samuel Bewley that appeared in the *Dublin Mercantile Advertiser* and in the *Irish Temperance and Literary Gazette*. *The Annual Monitor* (York, 1838), 16 also notes Samuel Bewley's death with some detail.

## THE LOST LEGACY?

**W**e doubt whether many readers will have heard of the William Gunn Charity but the essential details of it have appeared in the recently produced *Directory of Quaker and Quaker-related Grant-making Trusts* which has been compiled by Martin Rowntree of Leeds. This directory should be readily available in Quaker circles and information about it can be obtained from Britain Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends.

Our main purpose now is to write something of interest and to seek the help of anyone who can give us information about William Gunn himself, about past trustees of the Charity, and about any aspect of the Charity's history. This last includes one particular aspect which has puzzled us very much, as will become evident below.

The present writers are trustees of the William Gunn Charity which was established by the will of William Gunn (1738-1828) who by trade was a patten maker living on Ratcliff Highway. He was for a time a member of Worcester Monthly Meeting and was married at Worcester Meeting House in 1765 to Ann Corbyn (1739-1797). Though William Gunn had these ties with Worcester, he was much more strongly associated with the area around Bow in Middlesex where most of his life was spent. Throughout this time he was an active member of Ratcliff Monthly Meeting where he became overseer and elder.

In his will of 1813 he left two separate sums of £1,000 for the relief of needy Quakers. To be specific, he left £1,000 (£500 in his will plus £500 in a codicil) to Worcester MM, (since 1859 Worcester & Shropshire MM), naming three trustees whose responsibility it was to look after this legacy which, in accordance with his instructions, was invested in the 1726 3% Annuities. He left an identical amount (£500 in his will plus £500 in a codicil) to Ratcliff MM (since 1821 Ratcliff & Barking MM), to be invested in precisely the same way with precisely the same instructions as to its use. Again he named three trustees.

The trustees for Worcester were John Pumphrey (1739-1834), John Pumphrey (Jnr.) (1775-1835) and Julius Pumphrey (1778-1856). Those for Ratcliff were Richard Bowman (*ca.* 1758-1844), Charles Palmer (1759-1831) and Samuel Marsh (Jnr.) (1777-1854).

There were always to be three trustees who were to be appointed from members of Worcester MM on the one hand and Ratcliff MM on the other. Whenever a trustee died, the remaining trustees were to seek a replacement from amongst the members of their respective monthly meeting. Oddly, William Gunn does not appear to have envisaged the

resignation of any trustee, since he says nothing about replacements for this reason.

The present writers have researched the history of the Worcester branch of the Charity and we are very grateful to the Library staff at Friends House for supplying us with welcome biographical information. We have inherited from earlier Worcester trustees a certain amount of material but not very much. Our oldest paper dates back to 1874 but documentation is scarce and does not begin to accumulate until the 1960s.

In 1978 we became curious as to what had happened to the Ratcliff branch of the William Gunn Charity so, between February and June of that year we corresponded with some Friends of Ratcliff & Barking MM. The outcome was that they had no knowledge of any such charity.

Then, a few years ago, we decided it was time to write a history of the Worcester William Gunn Charity. Despite the paucity of our records, through our researches we managed to accomplish three things. First we were able to trace with a high degree of accuracy, the progress of William Gunn's Worcester bequest as it was translated from one investment to another, that is, from the original 1726 Annuities investment up to its present placing with the Charities Official Investment Fund (COIF). Secondly, we were able to draw up a chronological list of former trustees, though we have probably not been able to discover more than about three-quarters of them. Thirdly, we were able to assemble a certain amount of biographical and contextual information.

It was at this stage that our research revealed that there was an anomaly.

When we came to list the names of the trustees, we noticed that until about 1916 we had four, and sometimes five, trustees in office at the same time, though in his will, William Gunn is quite explicit in requiring the Charity to have exactly three trustees. Under the will, they were instructed to act as follows:

1st that the three trustees do divide the interest every half year as it become due into three equal parts that any one of them may hand to a poor Friend being a Member of the Society of Friends a sum not exceeding one guinea in the space of six months nevertheless if they should find it in a particular case to be prudent and necessary they may unite and give a guinea each to a poor Friend...

We then checked the trustees' biographies. This revealed another anomaly which was that seven trustees had no connection with Worcester but did have close connections with Ratcliff. These were William Nash (1790-1879); James Barringer (Snr.) (1810-1891); Edwin

Thorne (1837-1914); Isaac Sharp (1847-1917); James Barringer (Jnr.) (1848-1932); Samuel Giles (1851-1894); Alfred Henry Wright (1870-1956). The only slight qualification to the above is that Edwin Thorne moved to Worcestershire to spend the last six years of his life with one of his sons.

In thinking over this problem we gave passing consideration to the idea that Worcester and Ratcliff might have been operating a system of joint trusteeship. The initial difficulty with this is that it flies contrary to the rules for the foundation of the two trusts, while further reflection soon suggested that such an arrangement would have been highly inconvenient to all concerned. We therefore dismissed this hypothesis.

We next considered the case of one of the 'Ratcliff Seven', Isaac Sharp, who was a prominent Friend in his day, a headmaster, a writer and contributor to various journals and, from 1890-1917, Recording Clerk to London Yearly Meeting. He was an influential figure and had been overseer, elder, and clerk to Ratcliff & Barking MM.

We have two documents of his, the second of which is dated '14.V.1914'. It consists of a signed statement made by him in response to a query from the Inland Revenue respecting the William Gunn Charity. It names six trustees, past and present, as follows: Sharp himself, both the Barringers, Thorne, Giles and Nash. The first letter, dated '6.V.1914', names Alfred Henry Wright as a replacement for Edwin Thomas who had died earlier that year.

Isaac Sharp's two letters nowhere refer to Worcester but it was very natural for us to assume that all the papers handed down to us related to the Worcester foundation of the William Gunn Charity.

However, considering Isaac Sharp's active life and his long and close associations with Ratcliff and the London area, and considering also the fact that the other six trustees had Ratcliff and not Worcester associations, we now recognise that these two letters from Isaac Sharp must refer only to the Ratcliff branch of the Charity. Yet that is not the end of the tale. We continued our enquiries and a short time ago the Charity Commission sent us copies of two statements which summarize William Gunn's wishes as laid down in his will. They contain a few careless slips but we are not much concerned with the contents of the two statements since we already possess similar summaries.

What is of interest in both cases is first the heading of each statement, and secondly the three-line comment or explanation which appears at the foot of the statements proper. The point about the heading is that one clearly states 'Society of Friends/Worcester Monthly Meeting' and the other 'Society of Friends/Ratcliffe Monthly Meeting'. The three-line footnote to each is dated 1916 so that we now have confirmation

that the Ratcliff branch of the William Gunn Charity was in existence in 1916 and presumably had been in continuous existence since its foundation in 1828.

These identical footnotes read as follows:

The endowment is now (1916) understood to be represented by £1,317 : 8 : 8 Consols in the names of Alfred Henry Wright, James Barrington and Isaac Sharp.

'Barrington' represents one of the writer's slips. It should, of course, read 'Barringer' but, other slips apart, the writer, although he or she knows that there were two distinct William Gunn Charities, one based at Worcester and one based at Ratcliff, has made the mistake of assigning the Ratcliff trustees to both branches of the Charity.

The three Worcester trustees in 1914 were Joseph Dawe Clark who remained a trustee until his death in 1920, Alfred Sparkes who was a trustee until his death in 1923 (in fact, he was still 'officially' a trustee until 1924!), and Sarah Agnes Squire who was appointed a trustee in October 1914 and who continued in office till 1931. Moreover, the Worcester bequest of £1,000 was, in 1916, still invested in the 4½% Debenture Stock of the Great Western Railway Company where it had remained since 1874 and almost certainly since 1863. It did not move from the Great Western until the nationalisation of the railways on January 1st 1948 when it was converted into British Transport Stock.

Our conclusion, therefore, is that William Gunn's £1,000 bequest to Ratcliff MM was still in existence in 1916. It has taken us some time to assemble information unavailable at the time of our 1978 enquiry. We can only guess that at a date after 1916 their legacy was amalgamated with that of some other charity and subsumed under another name, which would be why our Friends in Ratcliff & Barking knew nothing of it.

However, we feel that there may be someone in that area who knows what happened to the bequest after 1916 and we should not be surprised if the Monthly Meeting minutes (or other documents) of Ratcliff & Barking do not contain at least a mention of it. We have only been able to pay one visit to the library of Friends House, on which occasion we inspected the minutes as carefully and as extensively as we could in the time available. We found quite an amount of interesting information about William Gunn, William Nash and others, but we discovered nothing about William Gunn's will or the setting up of the Charity in 1828. Indeed, so far as we could see, there was no mention of the Charity at all.

There is much we do not know about the history of the William Gunn Charity. Even in respect of the Worcester foundation we are short of information, and there must be a number of trustees whose names are unknown to us. It is unfortunate that at one stage the Worcester MM minutes for the years 1763-1840 were ruined in the early years of the twentieth century when water from a faulty still (an urn or variety of water heater used in catering), seeped into the safe containing the minutes.

We should be pleased to hear from anyone who can supply us with information. If we receive none, we shall be disappointed though not surprised in view of the passage of time and the lack of documentation. On the other hand we should be delighted if there was anyone, especially in the London area who might be interested enough and generous enough to conduct research on our behalf.

In the circumstances it does not now seem likely that we shall learn much about the early days of the Charity, or about the nature of the claims for assistance made on it both then and later. Even so, it is possible that we may learn the names of trustees at present unknown to us and it is quite likely that we could discover something more about the founder himself, William Gunn. We may have missed references when we searched the Ratcliff & Barking MM minute books; yet as he was a well-known and long lived local trader and manufacturer, there may be material about him in other sources.

Our knowledge of the Ratcliff William Gunn foundation is minimal which perhaps suggests that there is information about it waiting to be uncovered. In particular we are very interested to know what happened to the Ratcliff bequest in or after 1916. That date is not so very distant and we cannot imagine that records do not exist or that memories can be stirred.

We are engaged in writing a short history of the William Gunn Charity. It is intended mainly for private circulation but we should be happy to send a copy to anyone who applies to us for one. We have suspended work on it for the moment in the hope that this present article will produce further information, but we expect to complete the task later this year or early in 1997.

Finally, we shall be glad to try to answer any questions that readers may like to put to us.

*Roger Poole*

*61 Hampton Hill, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire, TF1 2ER.*

*Charles Whistlecroft*

*52 Shirley Road, Droitwich, Worcestershire, WR9 8NR.*

Friends of Ratcliff & Barking MM look forward to reassuring readers about their care of the William Gunn Trust in a future issue of the *Journal*. – *Editor*.

# WHAT HATH MANCHESTER WROUGHT? CHANGE IN THE RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS, 1895 - 1920

## I

When London Yearly Meeting gathered at Devonshire House 100 years ago to consider, among other things, a recommendation from its Home Mission Committee that an extraordinary Conference be convened in Manchester for the purpose of 'making known our distinguishing views' and broadening contact with the larger community, men's and women's meetings met separately, and men had supervision over all meaningful decisions regarding the life of the Society. The separation was not just physical.<sup>1</sup> As one exasperated female noted in the early 1890s, the Women's Meeting was 'chiefly occupied with reading aloud extracts from the *Book of Discipline*, to fill up the time till men Friends come out; some reform is certainly needed.'<sup>2</sup> This situation, said Mary Jane Godlee (1851-1930), an elder and overseer of Ratcliff & Barking Monthly Meeting, seemed 'very curious, and... rather painful to those... who may have believed in the theory that women Friends have always had an equal place with their brethren in the Church.'<sup>3</sup>

When Yearly Meeting again assembled at Devonshire House in the final months of the Great War, this same Mary Jane Godlee, for a time, sat in the Clerk's chair and presided over 'a reverent and prayerful silence...', which, as one participant told her husband, an imprisoned conscientious objector, gave her a sense of 'sharing in the... deep stand for truth in a way which I have not had a chance to do in public before.'<sup>4</sup>

Mary Jane Godlee's opportunity to act as Clerk of Yearly Meeting had resulted from another startling transformation in the public demeanour of Friends. In 1895 Quakers were as respectable and law-abiding as any body of citizens in the United Kingdom. But, in 1918, when John Henry Barlow of Birmingham (1865-1924), handed over the conduct of Yearly Meeting to M.J. Godlee, he proceeded directly to the Guildhall to demonstrate his solidarity with three Friends on trial for

defying, with the full sanction of Meeting for Sufferings, Government censorship regulations.<sup>5</sup>

The Quakers who met at Devonshire House in 1895 were widely renowned for their selfless devotion to appropriately philanthropic causes as well as justly celebrated for their worldly success. As behooves the wealthy and respectable in capitalist societies, Friends could be counted on to maintain the sort of social conservatism that looked askance at unruly behaviour, even in a good cause. In 1918, however, an official Committee on War and the Social Order recommended and Yearly Meeting endorsed a blueprint for collective Quaker social policy called the "FOUNDATIONS FOR A TRUE SOCIAL ORDER," which would unquestionably have shocked and even outraged what one critical voice at the Manchester Conference derisively called 'the dilettante circles of eminently Quaker society.'<sup>6</sup>

And while the War and Social Order Committee was flying in the face of respectable opinion, others officially representing London Yearly Meeting were openly defying the law of the land. By the time Yearly Meeting convened in May 1918, hundreds of Quaker men and a few Quaker women were in jail cells or detention camps for failing to obey Military Service or Defence of the Realm or other Acts imposed by the wartime Government. Most of those imprisoned were members or supporters of the Friends' Service Committee which had refused any cooperation with authorities implementing military conscription.

Thus, between 1895 and 1918 the British Society of Friends, like Jesus on the mountain (Matt. 17, 1-2), appeared to have been transfigured. To have, indeed, resumed aspects of its original form in the mid-seventeenth century when the comfortable and mighty looked upon the children of the Light as 'something new and terrifying.'<sup>7</sup> How had these drastic changes come about? Were they, by and large, instinctive responses to wartime circumstances, or could they be traced to more deeply rooted attitudes and ideas predating the War and being tested by it? How, in fact, had the early twentieth-century Society of Friends prepared for and responded to its greatest trial since the Restoration, a test by war, which for all its tragic circumstances and consequences, ended as a triumph of Quaker faith.

## II

In late November 1895, Henry Stanley Newman, long-time honorary secretary to the Friends Foreign Mission Association, wrote to Rufus Jones of Philadelphia, editor of the *American Friend*, with his assessment of a recent and momentous event for London Yearly Meeting:

The Manchester Conference will mark an era in the history of our Society in England. We have found for some years past... that our Church was *losing grasp* of the highly educated & intelligent young men and women belonging to our best old Quaker families who were receiving first class curriculum at College & 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 & modern scientific thought... This Conference is the effort *for the first time* in our Society to *face* this emergency...<sup>8</sup>

H.S. Newman, born in 1837, was not really part of the wave of the future for British Quakerism (although he was editor of *The Friend* from 1892 to 1912), but this former tent meeting evangelist had a clear sense of what Friends were obliged to relegate to the past. Like many others, Newman saw the Manchester Conference as a vital turning point. Indeed, the Conference quickly took on a life of its own which at times attained semi-mythic proportions. Half a century later one participant still recalled Manchester as the time and place where the question of 'Creed or no Creed... took on for me a deeper aspect' as 'the battle was joined' between the 'black of dogma' and the 'white of science.' Unfortunately for Friends, this observer became so engrossed in the prevailing spirit of modernity that he went over to the Christian Scientists.<sup>9</sup>

But that strayed-away Friend was, no doubt, the exception. Many of the intellectual and spiritual leaders of the Renaissance of Quakerism remembered the Manchester Conference as the moment when Friends shook free from the Calvinist doctrines of total depravity, the propitiatory Atonement and Biblical literalism and embraced a liberal theology that could accommodate both "modern" thought and primitive Christianity. Recently, Edward Milligan, in one of the small gems he periodically sculpts for the edification of the historically inclined, pointed out that anyone seeking a sense of the nature and degree of theological change in London Yearly Meeting might begin by comparing the *Christian Discipline...* of 1883 with *Christian Life, Faith and Thought...* published nearly 40 years later.<sup>10</sup>

To be sure, the accent of the *Book of Discipline* had been substantially altered during those years, but that theological metamorphosis was well underway by the time the Manchester Conference gathered. Beginning with the publication of *A Reasonable Faith* in 1884,<sup>11</sup> followed within two years by Edward Worsdell's *Gospel of Divine Help*, the intellectual cutting edge of Quaker religious thought had been moving with increased rapidity from evangelical to liberal, from a faith based on right belief apart from the world to one emphasizing Christian experience as the means of remoulding the world. The Manchester Conference did

not initiate any fundamental changes in the realm of Quaker theology, it confirmed the dominance of modern thought as the wave of the future.

There was a confrontation of sorts at Manchester between the aged patriarch of evangelical Quakerism, Joseph Bevan Braithwaite (1818-1905), and four intellectually prominent, liberally inclined Friends who, if they disagreed on theological details, collectively believed that the key to Quakerism was not the limiting Word of Scripture but the defining Light of Christ. The contest was manifestly uneven, not only because JBB could not be present to read his own paper but also because his adversaries, Thomas Hodgkin, Silvanus Thompson, John William Graham and J. Rendel Harris, seemed so spiritually fresh and intellectually *au courant*. No doubt many young Friends to whom JBB particularly addressed his remarks were alternatively amused and irritated by Braithwaite's admission that the substance of his remarks had been 'written nearly 50 years ago' while he simultaneously counselled them 'to put a check upon many curious but unprofitable enquiries... and be even content to remain ignorant of many things' better left unexamined.<sup>12</sup>

The rhetorical triumph of a New Theology at the Manchester Conference was said to have elicited 'widespread sympathy... especially amongst... younger Friends' who had been made aware 'that they could accept the new conclusions of scientific and historical research, without any loss of faith...'<sup>13</sup> But, in retrospect, the voice most frequently recalled and the name most widely celebrated was that of 27-year old John Wilhelm Rowntree (1868-1905).<sup>14</sup> When Rowntree pleaded that the 'sluggish self-complacency... spiritual pride [and] false respectability' of the contemporary Society of Friends be replaced by a faith 'deeper in its basis, clearer in its vision, [and] broader in its charity' which could speak with a strong, fresh voice to the 'seeming chaos' of the world, his words seemed to touch a deep core of Quaker sensibility and spirituality.<sup>15</sup>

The necessary re-evaluation of John Wilhelm Rowntree, or better the two John Wilhelms—saintly white knight on the verge of discovering what Larry Ingle has called the "Quaker Holy Grail" or very human young dynamo who died before his vision or his mission could be fulfilled—has barely begun.<sup>16</sup> But for our purposes a useful cue may be taken from Roger Wilson's assertion that meaningful and practical response to the Manchester Conference was in large measure due to 'the Christian passion, the intelligent imagination and the... entrepreneurial skill of John Wilhelm Rowntree.'<sup>17</sup>

Before he died in 1905, JWR brought many things to British Quakerism, one of the most important was his friendship with Rufus

Jones. The one really innovative religious idea to emerge from early twentieth-century Quakerism was not touched upon at Manchester but imported from America and planted in British soil by Rufus Jones. Well before he met John Wilhelm in 1897, Jones had developed a theory which connected the ideas of George Fox and other early Friends to a brand of Christian mysticism carried to England from the continent at various stages of the Reformation. Jones' research led him to conclude that Quakerism was not a radical spin-off from Puritan Calvinism but rather a thoroughgoing rejection of it, a life-enhancing spiritual religion fully compatible with the most challenging discoveries of modern thought.<sup>18</sup>

British Friends of a liberal persuasion enthusiastically embraced Jones' notion of Quakerism as a mystical faith, buttressed by traditions of Quaker life and worship and directly influenced by "leadings" of the Light. For them, Jones' mystical Inward Light theology was a sort of *deus ex machina*, permitting both the severance of ties with the harsher aspects of evangelical theology and the pursuit of spiritual answers entirely within the intellectually respectable context of modern, optimistic liberal thought. Placing human progress in the vanguard with a mystical faith in Christ, liberals in the era of the Quaker Renaissance seemed to have an unbeatable combination – a way open not simply for the survival of the Society of Friends but for its expanding influence as a vital religious community.<sup>19</sup>

John Wilhelm Rowntree and Rufus Jones became the titular leaders of Reformed Quakerism. And, to quote Maurice Creasey:

Out of that partnership... was to come a modern interpretation of the very meaning and universality of spirit of the Quaker Faith as one of the dynamic forms of mystical religion, the religion of life...<sup>20</sup>

Their collaboration also helped to spark a revitalization of interest in Quaker history which generated, among other things, the Friends Historical Society, the publication of Norman Penney's edition of *The First Publishers of the Truth* and, ultimately, the Rowntree Quaker History Series.<sup>21</sup>

Another of John Wilhelm Rowntree's contributions to the renewal of British Quakerism was in his collaboration with George Cadbury (1839-1922) in constructing the physical and spiritual base for Woodbrooke, an institution which would provide a vital intellectual and spiritual centre for Quakerism before, during and after the ordeal of the Great War. The earliest germination of Woodbrooke was in George Cadbury's complaint at the Manchester Conference about "the dead

formality” of so many Friends’ meetings. Their Religious Society would never again flourish, Cadbury asserted, until its members ‘realized the importance of earnest, life-giving, educated Gospel ministry.’<sup>22</sup> Eighteen months later John Wilhelm initiated the process which, through a fortuitous combination of Rowntree imagination and Cadbury generosity, would eventually lead to the launching of Quaker Summer Schools in 1897 and to the establishment of Woodbrooke six years later.<sup>23</sup>

The Manchester Conference did, then, directly or indirectly, advance or initiate theological and institutional developments which proved of enormous significance in transforming British Quakerism. But other vitally important questions were either ineffectively addressed at Manchester or simply ignored. Among these were the role of women, Quaker social policy and the peace testimony.

Nearly a third of the speakers at Manchester were women, unusual for the time perhaps, although fully in keeping with the tradition of a strong Quaker female ministry. But while Friends took pride in having had, unlike most Churches, the benefit of knowing ‘the work of God’s spirit when he speaks to the women,’ not a single *Minute* approved at Manchester mentioned the status of females. But when, in the midst of one intense discussion, the indomitable Ellen Robinson (1840-1912) called upon the Clerk to ‘kindly silence the men a little bit’ so that the meeting might receive more light and less heat, Friends were put on notice of a question with which they would be forced to grapple during the impending century.<sup>24</sup>

Such grappling as occurred in the next two decades produced no startling alterations. In 1898 women were, two centuries after George Fox’s death, finally admitted to Meeting for Sufferings. When the separate Women’s Yearly Meeting was abolished ten years later, Mary Jane Godlee was appointed second assistant Clerk of the united Yearly Meeting. These were, to be sure, modest advances, but given the growing general recognition of the need for an expanded social and political role for women, it is somewhat surprising that Friends, as a Society, were so silent on the question of women’s place or even women’s rights. When in 1910 a group of women Friends appealed to Meeting for Sufferings for the opportunity ‘to express their united sympathy with the cause of women’s suffrage,’ it was decided that the time was not yet ripe for such a dialogue.<sup>25</sup>

Two years later a statistical study revealed that with regard to assigning positions of responsibility and authority, Friends were more a microcosm of the larger society than many found comfortable. For while women constituted a majority in nearly every type of meeting in

Britain and made up two-thirds of attenders at meetings for business, all 17 Quarterly Meeting Clerks as well as 74 out of 80 Monthly Meeting Clerks were men.<sup>26</sup> The 1912 edition of the *Christian Discipline...* did forcefully re-emphasize the principle of spiritual equality in the 'freedom of the Gospel' where there was 'neither Jew nor Greek . . . bond or free . . . male or female,' while concluding, in apparent absence of mind, that 'all are one *man* in Christ Jesus.'<sup>27</sup> That was where matters still stood until the crisis of the Great War provided females not only increased opportunities for service but unprecedented occasions to lead, or sometimes to drag, their Religious Society in new, previously uncharted directions.

Another vexatious brush with the future at the Manchester Conference concerned Social Questions. Considerable time was given over to this topic, but the resulting discussion was largely confined to pious personal summaries of philanthropic deeds illustrating how Friends with a few spare hours or pounds could make meaningful contact with the working classes.<sup>28</sup> There were also uncomfortable moments which threw glaring light not only on the tepid quality of Quaker ideas about social reform but also on the nature of Quaker attitudes toward the equality of believers, at least in the sight of man. During one discussion, Kenerie Ward, a barely literate farm labourer, related how, after years of vainly seeking for spiritual comfort, the silence of a Friends' meeting had become 'the starting point in my life.' But lest Friends wax prideful at the winning of this humble soul, Ward struck a discordant note in describing how after 'I went to that meeting for five months... only one man... ever spoke to me.' Even years later, Ward said, some of the meeting's elders had still not recognized his presence. 'All these things keep people away from *your* Church,' Ward needlessly concluded.<sup>29</sup> This awkward moment underlined, as one female speaker noted, also the feeling of at least some working class people that while their worship might 'be good enough for the Lord,' it might not be 'good enough for Friends.'<sup>30</sup>

It was painful enough for the Society to be reminded of its propensity for embracing philanthropy while shunning its intended recipients. But when 25-year old Samuel Hobson (1870-1940) made a pitch for wholesale Quaker conversion to socialism, the comfortable bourgeois world of Victorian Friends seemed to be spinning out of control. Hobson, a Fabian Socialist and former secretary to Keir Hardie, asserted that by making 'some great corporate pronouncement... for social progress,' the Conference could provide the socialist movement with the 'religious enthusiasm' which might ensure its ultimate triumph would be peaceful.<sup>31</sup>

Hobson's dramatic appeal elicited no overwhelming response. But if the Manchester Conference could not get beyond traditional philanthropy and *noblesse oblige*, a small group of young Friends soon took up the cause Sam Hobson had heralded. In April 1898 the Socialist Quaker Society (SQS) was formed by seven young Friends who believed that the Universal Brotherhood implied by the Inner Light could not 'be realized under the present competitive system. . . .'<sup>32</sup>

Few of their fellow Quakers were impressed. When the newly formed SQS asked the Premises Committee at Devonshire House for use of a meeting room, they were unceremoniously turned down.<sup>33</sup> Although the keepers of Friendly space eventually relented and Socialist Quaker gatherings became a fixture at early twentieth-century Yearly Meetings, socialism made few inroads among Friends and SQS membership remained static at a few dozen through most of the pre-war period.<sup>34</sup>

One possible reason for the SQS's floundering was the emergence of the Friends' Social Union, an officially-sanctioned vehicle for the socially committed. Organized in 1903 by a group of weighty and respectable Quakers led by Seebohm Rowntree, the FSU was the first corporate body of Quakers to undertake a systematic and "scientific" approach to social concerns.<sup>35</sup> The Union diligently sought to 'evoke the spirit of Justice and of Social Service, and to apply our Religious Faith consistently to our Social and Civic Life...' But while FSU *Minutes* and published materials reveal an abundance of unwavering moral earnestness, it produced a paucity of meaningful social consequences.<sup>36</sup> The Union's *Minute Book* was full of references to the work to be undertaken and the means for developing it, but these are concurrent with complaints from bemused Friends about the 'indefinite nature' of FSU proposals, about a sense of inadequacy for remedying known evils or even about being 'unable to discover anything that needs to be remedied.'<sup>37</sup>

The Friends' Social Union wafted through the pre-war decade, active and earnest, full of respectably fashionable ideas about ways and means for putting Quakerism to the forefront of the campaign for social justice and moral rejuvenation, but, finally, unable to fix a unique role for their Religious Society. In the meantime, the Socialist Quaker Society had by 1912 managed to attract some attention and double in its membership (to around 120) by publishing an "Open Letter" to Friends on the futility of working within the capitalist structure to remedy the social ills caused by that rapacious system.<sup>38</sup> More significant was the launching of the SQS's own journal, *THE PLOUGHSHARE*, edited by William Loftus Hare (1868-1943), a convinced Friend and zealous advocate for

socialism. The fact that SQS survived at all was a tribute to the band of true believers who, with Hare, continued to see socialist principles as the political and economic counterpart to Quaker religious beliefs. One such enthusiast, after attending an inconclusive Friends Social Union Conference in the spring of 1914, noted: 'I have come away... with a strengthened sense of the need for the Socialist Quaker Society... May the SQS be ready... to present our message when the Society of Friends is ready to hear it.'<sup>39</sup> Within a few months, the Great War would begin to provide Quaker socialists with circumstances which seemed to make their message both relevant and timely.

Oddly, the principle which would undergo most drastic alteration and exert most profound influence on early twentieth-century Friends, the peace testimony, received but passing reference at the Manchester Conference.<sup>40</sup> One obvious reason for this neglect was the lack of a crisis to bring peace principles into focus. If the Jameson Raid had taken place in October rather than December of 1895, Friends might have had a great deal more to say about the dangers of militarism and imperialism. Still, this lack of focus may, in fact, have reflected a lack of any consensus as to what Friends' witness for peace would or should entail in the modern world. Certainly, as Hope Hewison has made abundantly clear in *A Hedge of Wild Almonds*, nothing like a consensus emerged when tensions in South Africa erupted into a long, nasty and popular war which provoked embarrassingly public disputes among Friends, leading some to question whether the peace testimony had become 'little more than a pious opinion.'<sup>41</sup> But the conflict in South Africa also forced the sort of pithy reconsideration of peace principles that Friends had avoided for a long time. One result was the appointment of a special Deputation charged to visit every Monthly Meeting in Britain 'with a view to arousing our members to their responsibility... of maintaining our "testimony for peace"...'<sup>42</sup>

In 1904 the Peace Deputation reported back to Yearly Meeting that it had received a 'warm response' noting especially the self-denying and untiring effort of younger Friends' to give practical effect to their peace testimony.<sup>43</sup> In fact, during the decade between the reception of this Report and the outbreak of the Great War, the size and scope of Quaker peace activities did surpass anything previously undertaken. There was much with which to be concerned and Friends responded with a multi-layered peace activism: opposing budgets, aggressive imperialism, the drilling of schoolboys, the National Service League's campaign for compulsory service and even the Australasia laws which introduced the compulsory training of youth in those Islands. On the positive side, Friends promoted peace societies, international peace congresses and

the Norman Angell Movement while Yearly Meeting in 1912 defined the content and meaning of "Our Testimony of Peace" more carefully than Friends had ever done before.<sup>44</sup>

The impetus for this activity came not only from the official Peace Committee of Meeting for Sufferings<sup>45</sup> but also from the Young Friends' Movement which, under the guiding hand of Neave Brayshaw, blossomed under the Edwardian period and would prove an indispensable vehicle for carrying social ardour and religious fervour in the Quaker struggle against the First World War.

In the midst of the glorious summer of 1914, *The Friend* reported on a campaign undertaken by Sussex Friends 'to place before rural people the evils of militarism.' Dozens of meetings had been held for audiences of up to 300 and despite the occasional "rough crowd," as at the Romsey horse-fair, the Quaker peace message had been well-received. Surely, the editor mused,

such sustained and well-organised work will have its effect in the promotion of a peaceable spirit and a right understanding amongst those who have not hitherto considered whether there is not 'a better way.'<sup>46</sup>

That was on 31 July 1914.

### III

And where were you when the war began?

... sitting on a bench looking out over the Irish Sea as my father talked with breaking heart ... about the world would never be the same again... The beauty of the sea, of the long stretching line of the Welsh Coast, seemed to mock at us. To think that the long & patient work for Peace should bring - this!<sup>47</sup>

These are two recollections: a Quaker boy of eight and a middle-aged Friend, each spending the final hours of peace on holiday by the sea and neither grasping what had transpired. 'All is bewildering, confused... and hidden', lamented *The Friend*, 'some ghoulissh terror of darkness or pestilence that wasteth in noonday'.<sup>48</sup> 'Many Friends do not know "where they are",' wrote Ernest Taylor (1869-1955) after his return from Wales. He feared that some Quakers, 'caught by the "urgency" and "righteousness of *this war*"', were becoming "very cold" with regard to peace'. Colder, perhaps, than he imagined. Friends may not have been surprised to learn that two Quaker Tory MPs had abandoned the peace testimony for the national cause, but members of Meeting for Sufferings were probably jolted when Henry Marriage Wallis enjoined

them to assist in recruiting Quaker youth for the crusade to crush the Hun.<sup>49</sup>

And they did join. Eventually nearly 1,000 or one-third of all male Friends of military age served.<sup>50</sup> About the same percentage of all Quakers openly supported the war and an indeterminate number drifted, confused and demoralized. In the spring of 1915, a *Minute* of Pontefract Meeting noted 'the depression... and... perplexity which so many Friends are feeling as to the right attitude to adopt'.<sup>51</sup>

One of those who attempted to speak to the condition of these wavering brethren was Wilfred Littleboy, a Birmingham chartered accountant and leader in the Young Friends Movement. 'No one,' Littleboy said,

can honestly take our stand against all war without being committed to a higher and more exalting service, one leading to love and life and not to hatred and death.<sup>52</sup>

Stirring stuff. But were even Friends prepared to heed such words while the siren song of Rupert Brooke pleaded for "the red/Sweet wine of truth"? Joshua Rowntree, a former MP, also wondered. It is very natural, he noted

that with the seething of the war fever all around some of our young people should long to do something to lessen the misery & prove that they do not shirk enlistment from cowardice.<sup>53</sup>

The Society, officially and otherwise, did attempt to provide active alternatives to young Quakers, the Friends Ambulance Unit and the Friends' War Victims Volunteers being the most prominent.<sup>54</sup> But amidst this wheeling and shuffling, one thing at least becomes clear. Quakers who marched away with the forces thereby lost all influence over the direction their Society would take with regard to the war. By and large, this direction was placed into the hands of young stay-at-homes who resisted the war and conscription.

The first opportunity for anti-war Friends to give corporate witness to their peace testimony was at Yearly Meeting in 1915. From this gathering the two most significant vehicles for organizing wartime resistance emerged. Yearly Meeting approved of the creation of a Committee of 20 young men 'to strengthen the Peace testimony among Friends of military age.' This group, calling itself the Friends Service Committee, held a separate meeting for young men of military age which produced a recommendation, endorsed by Yearly Meeting, that

in the event of conscription no exemption be given to Friends that was not equally applicable to non-Quakers.<sup>55</sup> A second new Committee originated in a recommendation from the Friends Social Union 'urging Friends to consider the relations between War and the prevailing Social Condition.'<sup>56</sup> Yearly Meeting responded by authorizing the appointment of a Committee 'to investigate what connection there is between the war and the social order... and to consult with those Friends who have been led, owing to the war, to... a personal readjustment of their way of life.'<sup>57</sup> The resulting War and the Social Order Committee (WSOC) had 36 original members (including 11 women), half of whom were drawn from the executive Councils of either the Friends Social Union or the SQS. Membership would change and grow, but the WSOC proved to be 'the most lively London Committee' of the wartime period and, for a time, the most radical as well.<sup>58</sup>

The sense of the first wartime Yearly Meeting was clear from the words of its Clerk, John Henry Barlow, that the peace testimony 'springs from the very heart of our faith... [and] must be a reality in our lives...'<sup>59</sup> Such decisiveness seemed to have the desired effect. Ernest Taylor thought 'Y.M. did good' in making Friends 'more contented.' But, he also remained concerned that members were still enlisting and that the peace camp was growing restless. 'One wants so to help in ways that some people call "radical"'.<sup>60</sup>

As the threat of conscription grew during the final months of 1915, the opportunity for radical action was at hand. The Service Committee responded by issuing a manifesto whose tone harkened back to the unbending religious radicalism of the first Quakers:

The stand Friends have always taken against military service has been based on deep conscientious conviction, and not on grounds of expediency... we assume that Friends will stand fast to their belief in... the principles of Jesus Christ... be the consequences what they may.<sup>61</sup>

At the time the FSC was announcing this no compromise course, one of its members, the Yorkshire MP Arnold Rowntree, was consulting with a group of influential Quakers, including William Charles Braithwaite, the official historian of Quakerism, and Richard Cross, the business manager of *The Nation*, on the feasibility of a special "conscience" clause being inserted into any future conscription act.<sup>62</sup> Their responses to this enquiry offer a surprising contrast to the attitudes and ideals expressed by the Service Committee. Braithwaite, for example, envisioned a bill specially designed for Friends, exempting them without individual proof of conscientious objection, and also requiring

that those exempted 'offer some alternative service approved by the authority,' including hospital service with the Royal Army Medical Corps, mine-sweeping or other 'indispensable work' such as munitions manufacturing.<sup>63</sup>

Braithwaite was counselling the sort of arrangement that the Service Committee had specifically rejected because, as he told Arnold Rowntree:

we ought to make it easy for the State to get good equivalent service. Our duty to our country is just as clear a demand on us as our duty to parents or neighbours, and holds us bound by these ties from which we cannot separate ourselves, and which are part of the relations of life which are to be discharged in fear of God.<sup>64</sup>

Richard Cross feared that 'a very large minority of the Society' were ready to abandon the peace testimony altogether, therefore he wished to ensure the unimpeachable righteousness of any position taken by the Society. Quaker objection to military service was, he said, 'a matter of high spiritual conviction,' and Friends 'ought not to dishonour that conviction by joining forces with disloyal cranks, who want to enjoin rights without performing duties.'<sup>65</sup>

The positions taken by Friends like W.C. Braithwaite and Richard Cross illustrate the dilemma of Quakers caught between their historical traditions and their patriotic impulses. These middle-aged Friends were committed to a peace testimony which while it would constrain Quakers from fighting with carnal weapons would also demonstrate that as loyal subjects of King and country, they were prepared to contribute to the commonweal. Leaders of the next generation had concluded that the only legitimate stand for Quakers to take was not just to oppose the war but to attempt to stop it.

With the passage of the Military Services Acts in 1916, Friends had to decide which of these interpretations to embrace. In an extraordinary "Adjourned Yearly Meeting" in late January 1916, the decision was for a policy of resistance to conscription and non-cooperation with the war effort. Thus, Friends officially put themselves in a position *vis-à-vis* the State not unlike that of their ancestors during the Restoration when the Quaker and Conventicle Acts threatened the free exercise of their faith.

There was still another dimension to the Quaker struggle against the war. Socialist Friends insisted that any Quaker scheme for re-ordering British society that might be devised by the War and Social Order Committee should incorporate a plan for the overthrow of the

competitive capitalist system which, as they believed, was the handmaiden of all wars and strife.

From February 1916 Quaker socialists trumpeted their adversarial relationship with the capitalist State in an enlarged and expanded version of *THE PLOUGHSHARE*.<sup>66</sup> The first issue of the new series, published immediately after the passage of conscription, announced that Friends, indeed all humanity, faced 'the Real Armageddon... not a war *between* the Kingdoms of the earth but *against* them all':

We believe that the greatest of all issues – the Armageddon issues – are becoming clearer than they have been for many a long day, and they who perceive them will infallibly fight on the right side in all the lesser wars here below.<sup>67</sup>

It remained to be seen if such a vision could somehow be transmitted to the entire Society of Friends.

Thus, two radical agendas took shape among anti-war Friends: the Service Committee's refusal to compromise its peace principles by co-operation with the State, and the Socialist Quaker Society's declaration of the need to overthrow that State and replace it with a Christian socialist regime preparing the way for the Kingdom of God on earth. A third formula might be added to this mix. During the final two years of the war, the radical thrust of Quaker pacifism and Quaker socialism was to a considerable extent directed by female Friends. Some of these women came to associate the origins and prolongation of the war with the same principles of force and domination which had kept their sex in a state of perpetual subjection for so long. For them, feminism and pacifism, and often socialism as well, became inseparable weapons in the struggle for human emancipation.<sup>68</sup>

As the contest against the authorities heated up, the no-compromise faction of the FSC had reason to be confident of the support of younger Quakers. In December 1915, a Service Committee poll of over a thousand male Friends revealed that about 85 per cent supported the FSC's pledge 'to refuse to enlist, to make munitions, or to do work entailing the military oath.'<sup>69</sup> Such a result clearly marked the flowering of the shoots planted during the pre-war Young Friends Movement. This blooming had been carefully nurtured by Neave Brayshaw, whose importance has, as it seems to me, been consistently underrated. Many simply did not take Neave seriously, perhaps because of his propensity to burst into tears at emotional moments which earned him the nickname "Puddles."<sup>70</sup> While organizing the "tramps" and other social activities of pre-war Young Friends, Brayshaw never neglected the 'deep spiritual basis for all our work.' At the Swanwick Conference of

1911, the high water mark for pre-war Young Friends, Brayshaw set the tone for reminding his audience that the peace testimony was 'a necessary outcome of our root belief... the... one organic, vital principle which permeates the whole...' Mere passive resistance, he noted, would not suffice, for the Quaker witness must be vital, 'not simply against the act of war but against the spirit that makes war possible.'<sup>71</sup> During the war years many of those present would act out the spirit Brayshaw was attempting to convey:

May... we go away from this place strong for the work that lies before us... and together build the Holy City... the way of perfect peace is also the holy war... the highest happiness is not known apart from fellowship in the sufferings of Christ.

And he concluded, evoking Albrecht Dürer's plea for Erasmus to lead the struggle against

the unjust tyranny of earthly power, the power of darkness... [and] in the face of all the sore need of the world, in this day of the battle of God... it may be for some of you, to gain the martyr's crown!<sup>72</sup>

Once the war began, Brayshaw consistently pursued the theme that the war and conscription were exactly that trial of faith for which Quakerism had been preserved and that those unequal to the task of resistance had no warrant to call themselves true Friends. The sole justification for the survival of Quakerism as a separate body, he noted, was

doing work... not being done elsewhere... We Friends are something more than a social or semi-religious club... We exist not for ourselves but to make our contribution to the world in bearing witness to our belief...<sup>73</sup>

In the end, however, the stance taken by Neave Brayshaw and the radical war resisters of the Service Committee was not the one to which most young male Friends adhered. When the Government actually made good on its threats to punish those who refused to serve, more and more Quakers, like the general CO population, opted for some form of alternative service. The way of these so-called "alternativists" was made smoother through the work of Quaker MPs like T.E. Harvey and Arnold Rowntree who took pains to ensure that the alternative service offered to alternativist COs did not involve even indirect connection with the armed forces. Still, this apparent working at cross purposes

caused some friction and hard feelings between the no-compromise camp and those who willing to accept alternatives.<sup>74</sup>

Some of the most vehement defenders of the absolutist stand were the women who were beginning to play an expanded role in the deepening and apparently all-consuming crisis facing Friends. A short time after the appointment of the Young Men's Service Committee a separate Women's Service Committee was also created, largely as an afterthought.<sup>75</sup> When young males began to be arrested and imprisoned as conscientious objectors and the ranks of the FSC thinned, Esther Bright Clothier (1873-1935), a granddaughter of John Bright, wrote to the Chairman of the men's committee expressing extreme displeasure at the fact that despite the expanding crisis, the women's committee had been given little to do,:

I think in Friends' things we ought not to exclude either sex... After all, the work the Friends Service Com[mitt]ee is doing is the great work of Friends at present and women have to share in the blessing that comes in such work - I am sick of being told Conscription is a man's question - it isn't - and I know you and probably all the Service Com[mitt]ee would agree.<sup>76</sup>

Within a month of this challenge, the Service Committee had ceased to be gender exclusive, and just in time. As more and more male Friends were consigned to prison or detention camps, Quaker women took an increasingly large and ultimately indispensable role in keeping their Society in the forefront of the struggle against conscription and the war.<sup>77</sup>

The presence of women on the Service Committee did not alter the hardline to which it adhered. On the contrary, the women seemed to sharpen the Committee's resolve to maintain its position against the Government, against the pliancy of compromising Friends and even against the political stance taken by secular CO allies as represented by the largely socialist and partly Quaker No-Conscription Fellowship. When the NCF determined to make the issue of occasional mistreatment and consistent hardship of prisoners for conscience a part of their struggle against the Government, the Service Committee not only rejected any connection with attempts to mitigate the conditions for imprisoned or interned COs but also convinced Meeting for Sufferings to support its position.<sup>78</sup>

Late in 1916, as older and influential Friends were attempting to strike some bargain with the Government that would bring about the release of imprisoned Quakers and prevent further detention of others,<sup>79</sup> Edith Wilson, an Assistant Clerk of Yearly Meeting since 1915,

addressed the question of Quakers and alternative service in an article for *THE PLOUGHSHARE*.<sup>80</sup> Although it was, Wilson said, quite natural for older male Friends to try to work out some means by which younger members could avoid both the spiritual inconsistency of military service and the physical unpleasantness of prison, it was not acceptable. Once individuals determined to place their religious convictions before the commands of a State engaged, as they believed, in an evil enterprise, such individuals, Wilson said, were no longer at liberty to compromise with that State and thereby, at least implicitly, to condone its evil actions. By arranging schemes for special treatment, older Friends were, Wilson believed, tempting the conscientious objector to bargain with a thing he regards as essentially evil,' and, in effect, to become a defector from the battle against militarism.

It is a tragedy of advancing years that wealth, and honours, and position, and comfort, gain such a hold upon us that it becomes well-nigh impossible to believe that young men are willing to sacrifice all these things, and life itself, in the pure joy of a quest for truth.<sup>81</sup>

With the absolutist faction of the Service Committee, Edith Wilson asserted that any attempt by Quakers to gain exemption or concessions from the Government was

an acknowledgement that the laws of God are not really applicable in the Kingdoms of this world, and therefore it is no use trying to make them universal... it [is]... an unconscious yielding to the temptation to use a religious conviction as a plea for a political concession rather than as an inspiration to service and to sacrifice.<sup>82</sup>

What Edith Wilson and other leaders of the absolutist camp were saying, if they were saying anything, that it was the war itself rather than any single act or group of acts arising from the war that the peace testimony was about; the question, they said, was not: 'Do Friends refrain from fighting with carnal weapons, but, were Friends trying by every possible means to stop the war?' Most other Christian COs, including the numerically larger Plymouth Brethren and Christadelphians, refused service because, as they saw it, the conflict in Europe was not their war. Quaker absolutists, on the other hand, would not perform even alternative service because the war emphatically was their war -the one their Society had been preparing to resist for two and a half centuries and the one from which it would emerge as a prophet society for transforming the world into the Kingdom of Christ.

One of the absolutists who articulated this view was Wilfred Littleboy, the Birmingham accountant who spent over two years in His Majesty's prisons. Writing to FSC secretary Edith Ellis (1878-1963) who would later be imprisoned herself, Littleboy noted that conscription was

absolutely wrapped up with the whole war question. We cannot conceive England or any other country continuing as a war state without some form of Conscription, and therefore... calling attention to the evils thereof is really a sort of addendum to the whole question.<sup>83</sup>

Only 145 young Quakers, or about five percentage of those of military age, joined with Littleboy in sustaining the "absolutist" position. But Meeting for Sufferings adopted and Yearly Meeting affirmed this stance as the official position of the Society. Thus, by establishing a radical new version of the peace testimony, a tiny body of absolutist conscientious objectors was able to set a new standard for Quaker war resistance. In so doing, they permanently transformed the way in which their Religious Society faced the secular world which they were engaging in a way their ancestors had never done. This was not because the crisis of war and conscription allowed Friends to reach a real consensus, but because a minority alliance of young pacifists and middle-aged zealots grasped the moment to lead their Society, kicking and screaming as may be, to support, as official policy, a new and radical interpretation of their historic, but previously somewhat amorphous, peace testimony.

The same process was, in fact, taking place with regard to Quaker social policies. As the crisis of Quaker resistance to the commands of the State broadened and deepened so did the response of the War and Social Order Committee. In its earliest manifestations the WSOC seemed to be firmly in the grasp of its liberal, FSU element. After the passage of conscription, however, the change in the Committee's demeanour may be illustrated by the public utterances of its Chairman, Jonathan Edward Hodgkin, consulting engineer, businessman and scion of an old and weighty Quaker family.<sup>84</sup>

Early in 1916, J.E. Hodgkin set out his own version of the Committee's objective for readers of *THE PLOUGHSHARE*:

We feel that... the present social system has as its outcome a state of international... warfare. It is to a new way of Life that men are looking, if we can embody in practical life an example of the testimony we hold, not only *against* all war, but for a new World Order, we shall surely have made an effective contribution to our day and generation.<sup>85</sup>

Speaking for the SQS, *THE PLOUGHSHARE*, maintained that because the capitalist warrior State was, by its very nature, 'antagonistic to the efforts of those seeking to establish the Kingdom of God,' winning such, the legacy of which Hodgkin spoke, would require front-line fighters to come to 'grips with present-day evils.' Men and women willing 'to suffer in an unpopular cause' and taking as their inspiration 'those early Quakers who did and dared everything for the right to express the truth which was working through them...' The days of the Apostles and the primitive Quakers are with us once again,' one Friend noted, and, for socialist Quakers at least, the model for their deportment was not George Fox but Gerard Winstanley who, 'whilst voicing the religious views of Friends, had a practical expression... far beyond anything of which... our forefathers dreamed.'<sup>86</sup>

In such an atmosphere the WSOC in 1916 presented its first report, entitled "Whence Come Wars?," to the most momentous Yearly Meeting since the days of the early Quaker martyrs. On behalf of the Committee, J.E. Hodgkin asked:

Is the Society... content to remain a highly respected body of spiritual epicures, or is it realising, as in the stirring days of its early history, that it has a message for the world which must be given, cost what it may?<sup>87</sup>

Yearly Meeting provided no definitive answers to Hodgkin's question. "Whence Come Wars?" was received with thanks and discussed at length but only as 'the first stage.' Still, as the historian of wartime Quakerism noted, some of those in attendance were 'unsettled, shaken... [that] one of Yearly Meeting's own committee's was asking whether this comfortably middle-class Society... was either relevant or useful.'

For its part, *THE PLOUGHSHARE* was pleased that the Committee had 'directed attention to the theoretical and historical efforts of a more or less revolutionary kind in the realm of industry and the social order,' but warned that: 'The Banks, the Tribunals, the Press, the Army and the Churches are all against us, and the people are still unawake to the truth that we wish to tell them.'<sup>88</sup> Some socialist Quakers indeed seemed to view their Society's confrontation with the Government as the long-awaited revival of the struggle between the forces of darkness and Children of the Light. For these Friends, a distinct, but discernible minority, the eschatological implications of this vision were reflected in the perception of one Friend who saw Yearly Meeting in 1916 as 'actually engaged in the age-long battle with "forces that control and govern this dark world - the spiritual hosts of evil arrayed against us in heavenly warfare."' <sup>89</sup>

Too much, perhaps, should not be made of this, but during the period in 1916 and 1917 when Quaker socialist influence in the WSOC 'was at its height, members of the SQS tended to look upon conscription not just as an attack on freedom of conscience but as an attempt to forge the final link in the chain with which capitalism had bound the working classes and would enshroud all others as well. Therefore, they perceived of themselves, as 'conscientious objectors to our whole social system, and our whole life . . . must be that of Christian revolutionaries.'<sup>90</sup>

Thus while the movement to radical or revolutionary solutions was a distinctly minority crusade, it also reflected, among Quakers of military age, the swiftness of pre-war liberalism's fall from grace as the means for creating the Kingdom of God on Earth. But if liberalism was found wanting, the goal of perfecting human society through a reasonable and relevant faith remained unchanged. Redrawing the ideological boundary so as to exclude private ownership for profit (self-help had already been eliminated by the New Liberalism), socialist members of the War and the Social Order Committee viewed all props of the old order as irredeemably compromised. The capitalistic Warfare State had, with the support of most Churches and other social institutions, appropriated for itself the accoutrements of traditional morality and proceeded to make a mockery of it.

The high water mark of radical socialist influence in the WSOC was during the spring and summer of 1917 at a time when some members of the Friends Social Union were expressing grave fears that the entire Committee was becoming 'a mere annexe of the Quaker Socialist Society [*sic*]'.<sup>91</sup> Meeting in June 1916 amidst the still inspiring afterglow of the first Russian Revolution and the formation of British Workers and Soldiers Councils at a Leeds Conference, the Committee heard Alfred Barratt Brown (1887-1947), an SQS member who had already been imprisoned as a CO, proclaim that 'Nothing short of Revolution, in the best sense of the word, would bring the better day for which we long.'<sup>92</sup> When the Committee met at Letchworth in September to hear Labour M.P. W.C. Anderson reflect upon the growth of "revolutionary feeling" in Britain and throughout the world, the WSOC responded with a *Minute* calling upon Friends 'to do their utmost to promote...the transfer of "capital" from private to public control.'<sup>93</sup>

Ultimately, the zealous would-be revolutionaries of the Socialist Quaker Society and the War and Social Order Committee failed to realize their vision of converting Friends into a truly radical spiritual cum political body fulfilling the social mission left undone by early Friends. The reasons for this failure are not difficult to discern. The

moment that Quaker Socialists were locked away in jail or Home Office Camps, their mission began to fail because as prisoners they were being denied the only means at hand for establishing the Kingdom of God in a physical as well as a spiritual sense. In their prison cells they could, like their absolutist brethren, suffer in obedience to the Light that led them and thus be spiritually redeemed, but they could not preach the Word of economic and social salvation to the storming crowd in the streets. When a mere 30 of 82 members of the War and the Social Order Committee met at Manchester early in 1918 to hear and discuss a paper on 'Quakerism and Capitalism' by SQS member J. Walton Newbold (1888-1943), many of the missing members were socialist conscientious objectors in custody. One result of these circumstances was that the rump of the Committee did not set a Quaker agenda for the sort of non-violent social revolution that Barry Brown had predicted; rather, it began the process fitting the idea to the reality and, thus, of pulling the WSOC and the Society it represented away from the abyss of social upheaval. In the circumstances, the failure of the SQS's vision became abundantly clear. Of course, that failure was not complete. Politically, the Society of Friends moved from the solid centre of the pre-war Liberal Party to a cautionary position on the edges of the Labour Camp. Socially, it completed the movement from philanthropic good works to serious consideration of the roots of social and economic injustice in British society. The War and Social Order Committee not only survived but remained both active and controversial, establishing and expanding Quakerism's new found involvement in social service as opposed to philanthropic causes.

The failure of this brief revolutionary thrust from within the Society of Friends may be usefully compared to the results achieved by spiritually radical members of the Friends Service Committee. When the Quaker absolutists were jailed for refusing to fight or even to accept some readily available alternative to fighting, their punishment at the hands of the authorities, however personally trying, represented a triumph for the ideals that they upheld. Because they would not violate their consciences by acquiescing in the commands of the State, they chose to suffer silently in imitation of early Quaker martyrs. As Wilfred Littleboy saw it, by putting themselves in God's hands they linked themselves to 'the dreamers of the dream who assure the future.'<sup>94</sup> In the end, absolutists like Littleboy did not dare to hope that by suffering they might aid somehow in a human resolution of the conflict that would inevitably produce a better world; rather, they accepted the daunting prospect of a personal Cross 'as all a piece of... growth toward

the establishment of His will on earth.’<sup>95</sup> And although absolutist sacrifices did not end the war or shorten it by one day or save a single human life, the redeeming power of their sacrificial act; in imitation of the Cross of Christ, was, in the great tradition of Quaker witness, a smashing victory over militarism, violence and death. It was not, of course, a universal triumph, any more than Quakerism was a universal faith, but it was the victory, the choice of life over death, that British Friends collectively, whatever their individual degree of war resistance or non-resistance, came to recognize as the most important outcome of the trail of faith imposed by the Great War.

Therefore, it was not surprising that Friends, in choosing the post-war route which the Society would follow, chose Wilfred Littleboy’s way of the Cross rather than J. Walton Newbold’s road to Marxist revolution. Newbold, of course, left Friends when they faltered in the march to socialism and, in 1922, became the first Communist member of Parliament.<sup>96</sup> Twelve years later Wilfred Littleboy was Clerk of Yearly Meeting, a position he retained until 1942 when his message to Friends in the midst of Second World War reflected both the persistence of the pacifist faith he had helped to establish and the roots of its inspiration:

War is evil... military victory will not bring true peace. Cannot our common suffering make us aware of our common brotherhood? Let us turn from the terrible deeds we do to one another... The way of friendship can overcome evil. We see it perfectly in... the Cross... which... showed us the triumphant power of God. For us as children of a common Father it is time to follow his lead.<sup>97</sup>

#### IV

One of the enduring accomplishments of the War and Social Order Committee was its recommendation of and planning for a gathering of Friends from throughout the world ‘for consideration of the nature... of our “Testimony against all War” ‘ and for reflection upon the social and political spheres of future Quaker witness within the world.’<sup>98</sup> The fruit of this effort was the first World Conference of All-Friends. When this meeting gathered in London in August 1920, what might Friends have said had been wrought by the Manchester Conference a quarter of a century earlier? In the light of the momentous events of the period from which British Quakerism had just emerged, the Manchester Conference might have seemed to have been overrated. It had, after all, produced no new theological insights nor innovative social philosophy; it had practically ignored the role of women and even the peace testimony in

the life of the Society. Still, such a judgement would have been premature and short-sighted.

What was truly wrought at Manchester was a new way of seeing many things and a new willingness to act upon things seen. This was the spirit that began the significant transformation of British Quakerism which prepared it for the testing time of the Great War. Indeed, the prevailing spirit of London Yearly Meeting in 1920 must have surprised and even shocked representatives from evangelical Midwestern American Yearly Meetings, who, on returning from England would cast their votes for the Republican presidential candidate, Warren Gamaliel Harding, a paragon of safe respectability if not, as events would show, of virtue. And there's the rub. While American evangelicals had fixed the boundaries of their religious witness with the Richmond Declaration of Faith, with the Manchester Conference London had, for better or for worse, expanded its frontiers, from evangelical to liberal in theology, from respectably philanthropic to socially engaged, from male dominated to female influenced, from theoretically anti-war to radically pacifist. And if a gathering as diverse as the All-Friends Conference proved to be was unlikely to produce any startling innovations, it did effectively endorse the radical pacifist doctrine hammered out in the fiery furnace of the Great War by a small group of Friends inspired by the example of the first generations of Quakerism and by an inspiring vision of a 'prophet Society, a body of moral pioneers, committed to upholding the truth, which though now unpopular, will one day be accepted by men...' <sup>99</sup> Furthermore, the cry of those socialist Friends who had sought to respond to the great modern crisis of industrial society with solutions as radical as those proposed by their spiritual ancestors over two centuries earlier were not entirely lost in the winds. The *Official Report* of the All-Friends Conference managed, however briefly, to incorporate a celebration of the vision that had moved Quaker socialists and the wartime War and Social Order Committee:

The Church is in the world in order to transform it into the Kingdom of God... we are to work as well as to pray for the coming of that Kingdom and the doing of God's will on earth... Surely this is the way to overcome the barriers of race and class and thus to make of all humanity a society of friends.<sup>100</sup>

*Thomas C. Kennedy*  
*Presidential Address*  
*10 June 1995*

## NOTES AND REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> Report of the Proceedings of the Conference... in Manchester..., 1895 (London, 1896), 11. Hereafter *Manchester Conference*.
- <sup>2</sup> Jane E. Newman, "About Monthly Meeting," *Friends Quarterly Examiner*, 25 (1891), 267-70.
- <sup>3</sup> Mary Jane Godlec, "The Women's Yearly Meeting," in *London Yearly Meeting During 250 Years* (London, 1919), 93-4.
- <sup>4</sup> Maude Robinson, 'Lest We Forget : A Memory of the Society of Friends in the War Years, 1914-1918' (London, n.d.), 26 and E[sther] Peet to Hubert Peet, 4 June 1918, Peet Family Papers, seen by permission of Stephen Peet, London.
- <sup>5</sup> The three Quakers, Ellis, Harrison Barrow, and Arthur Watts were all convicted; Barrow and Watts received six-month sentences and Edith Ellis served three months after refusing to pay a fine. For a detailed account of the incident, see the FSC pamphlet, *The Story of an Uncensored Leaflet* (London [1918]) and Leigh Tucker, 'English Friends and Censorship, World World I,' *Quaker History*, 71/2 (Fall, 1982), 114-24.
- <sup>6</sup> See *LYM Proc*, 1918, 78, 80 and *Manchester Conference*, 198; the speaker was Quaker socialist Samuel G. Hobson. The "Foundations" remain as paragraph 540 of the *Christian Faith and Practice* of London Yearly Meeting.
- <sup>7</sup> Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration*, (Oxford, 1985), 9.
- <sup>8</sup> 25 Nov. 1895, Box 1, Rufus M. Jones Papers (RMJP), Haverford College Quaker Collection (HCQC). The *American Friend* published a special edition on the Conference on 29 Nov. 1895.
- <sup>9</sup> Gilbert J. Fowler, "Some Recollections of my old friend J.W.G. & reflection thereon," 15 March, 1944, Box 3, John William Graham Papers (JWGP), John Rylands Library, Manchester University.
- <sup>10</sup> Edward H. Milligan, "How We Got Our Book of Discipline: the Revision of 1921 - From Doctrine to Experience," *The Friends Quarterly*, 25/3 (July, 1988), 110-17. Also see John Punshon, *Portrait in Grey* (London, 1984), 210.
- <sup>11</sup> *A Reasonable Faith* was published anonymously by three Friends, Francis Frith, William Pollard and William E. Turner, who subsequently revealed their authorship to Yearly Meeting in 1885.
- <sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 217. J.B. Braithwaite's paper was read for him by his son-in-law, Richard Thomas of Baltimore.
- <sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 247 and Richenda C. Scott, "Authority or Experience: John Wilhelm Rowntree and the Dilemma of 19th-Century Quakerism," *JFHS*, 49 (Spring 1960), 86-7.
- <sup>14</sup> *Manchester Conference*, 78.
- <sup>15</sup> *Manchester Conference*, 79, 82.
- <sup>16</sup> See Stephen Allott, *John Wilhelm Rowntree, 1868-1905* (York, 1994). Also see H. Larry Ingle, "On the Folly of Seeking the Quaker Holy Grail," *Quaker Religious Thought*, 25/1, May, 1991, 17-29.
- <sup>17</sup> Roger C. Wilson, ' "We Shall Never Thrive Upon Ignorance" (J.J. Gurney): The Service of John Wilhelm Rowntree 1893-1905,' in *A Quaker Miscellany for Edward H. Milligan*, edited by David Blamires, Jeremy Greenwood and Alex Kerr (Manchester, 1985), 155. Also see Maurice Creasy, *The Next Fifty Years* (London, 1956), 9-55 *passim*.
- <sup>18</sup> Howard Brinton, *Friends for 300 Years* (Philadelphia 1953), vii-ix and Elizabeth Isichei, *Victorian Quakers* (London, 1970), 38 briefly discuss the influence of neo-Hegelian thought on leaders of the Quaker Renaissance.

- <sup>19</sup> This discussion owes much to John Punshon's ideas as set out in his *Portrait in Grey*, 226-29 and in private conversation. Also see Daniel E. Bassuk, "Rufus M. Jones and Mysticism," *Quaker Religious Thought*, 17/4 (Summer, 1978), 1-26. Bassuk believed that Jones made his reinterpretation of Quakerism intellectually respectable by attempting to graft it onto the Greek metaphysical tradition of mysticism and by injecting into it affirmations of positive thinking and of the social gospel, thus bringing it into line with late nineteenth century religious liberalism. (23) Christopher J. Holdworth's splendidly incisive essay on "Mystics and Heretics in the Middle Ages: Rufus Jones considered," *JFHS*, 53/1 (1972), 9-30 is more sympathetic towards Jones but also rejects the idea that mysticism significantly influenced seventeenth-century Friends.
- <sup>20</sup> Sir George Newman on Rufus Jones' seventieth birthday, quoted by Elizabeth Gray Vining, *Friend of Life: The Biography of Rufus M. Jones* (New York, 1958), 237-38.
- <sup>21</sup> See Thomas C. Kennedy, "History and the Quaker Renaissance: the Vision of John Wilhelm Rowntree," *JFHS* 55/1-2 (1985-86), 35-56.
- <sup>22</sup> *Manchester Conference*, 51-2. For George Cadbury see A.G. Gardiner, *The Life of George Cadbury* (London, n.d.).
- <sup>23</sup> Correspondence and other materials concerning the planning for and early history of Woodbrooke may be found in the George Cadbury Papers deposited in the Woodbrooke Library.
- <sup>24</sup> *Manchester Conference*, 94.
- <sup>25</sup> "Appeal From Women Friends for Consideration of Women's Suffrage at Y.M., 1910," Box 2/16, LSF. This appeal was signed by Anna M. Priestman as Clerk and 75 other women.
- <sup>26</sup> Harold Marsh, "Women in the Church," *The Friend*, 22 March 1912, 179-81.
- <sup>27</sup> *British Friend*, June 1911, 161 and *Christian Practice*, Part II of *Christian Discipline of the Society of Friends* (London, 1912), 33-4, emphasis added.
- <sup>28</sup> See Chapter VIII below.
- <sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 87-9, emphasis added.
- <sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 125. The speaker, Harriet Green, was repeating the words of a working-class member in her meeting.
- <sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 197-99. Also see Hobson's autobiography, *Pilgrim to the Left: Memoirs of a Modern Revolutionist* (London 1938) and Peter d'Alroy Jones, *The Christian Socialist Revival, 1877-1914: Religion, Class and Social Conscience in Late Victorian England* (Princeton, 1968), 385-87.
- <sup>32</sup> Socialist Quaker Society, *Minutes*, 2 April 1898, microfilm copy; originals in LSF. Four women and three men were original SQS members. The only history of the SQS is T. Adams, "The Socialist Quaker Society, 1898-1924," M.A. Thesis, Leicester University, 1985 which is supplemented by his pamphlet *A Far-Seeing Vision: The Socialist Quaker Society (1898-1924)*. Peter d'A Jones's brief discussion of the organization in *The Christian Socialist Revival, 1877-1944* (Princeton, 1968), 367-89 is less partisan and in many ways more useful.
- <sup>33</sup> *SQS Minutes*, 28 March and 27 April 1899.
- <sup>34</sup> The *SQS Minute Book*, II, 22 Feb. 1910 listed only 52 members. Both the *British Friend* and the *Friends Quarterly Examiner* did publish explicitly socialist articles by SQS members. See *British Friend*, August 1903, 244 and Mary O'Brien Harris, "The Socialist Alternative to Poverty," *FQE*, 42 (1908), 408-27.
- <sup>35</sup> See *Minutes and Proceedings of London Yearly Meeting, 1910* (London, 1910), 155-56 and "The Friends' Social Union," 4, printed flyer in LSF. Also see Marwick, "Quaker Social Thought," *passim*. The FSU did not officially represent London Yearly Meeting until 1910 when it was made responsible to that body.

- <sup>36</sup> "The Friends' Social Union," *Annual Report*, 1905, LSF. The LSF contains the FSU's *Minutes*, 1904-1915, 1916-17, *Annual Reports*, and other *Reports and Pamphlets*, 1904-1915.
- <sup>37</sup> FSU, *Annual Reports*, 1904-1913, *passim*. and *Minutes*, 1908, 1910-12, FSU/3, LSF.
- <sup>38</sup> See Adams, *Far-Seeing Vision*, 11-12.
- <sup>39</sup> SQS *Minutes*, 26 June 1899 and 22 Feb. 1910; J[oseph] T. H[arris], "FSU Conference," *THE PLOUGHSHARE*, (PS) 1/7, May 1914, 85-6.
- <sup>40</sup> Only Priscilla Hannah Peckover (1833-1931), founder and President of the Women's Local Peace Associations, and Samuel J. Capper (1840-1904), one of the most active late nineteenth-century Quaker peace workers, referred to the peace testimony. See *Manchester Conference*, 49-50, 64.
- <sup>41</sup> John Stephenson Rowntree, "Memorandum on the Peace Committee, LYM 1902", 12pp. BOX H1/12, LSF. For divisions among Friends over the South African War, see Hewison, *Crown of Wild Almonds*, 127-224 *passim*.
- <sup>42</sup> This resolution was brought by Bristol and Somerset Quarterly Meeting. See *BF*, June 1902, 154.
- <sup>43</sup> *LYM Proc.*, 1904, 33-5.
- <sup>44</sup> Quaker peace activities in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are summarized in Thomas C. Kennedy, "Opposition to Compulsory Military Service in Britain Before the Great War," *Peace and Change*, 8/4 (Fall, 1982), 7-18 and "The Quaker Renaissance," *passim*. See *BF*, May, 1912, 134 for commentary on "Our Testimony for Peace," and William Oats, For a different view, see Brian David Phillips's Cambridge doctoral thesis "Friendly Patriotism: British Quakerism and the Imperial Nation, 1890-1910" (1989) which is extremely critical of both the motives and the efficacy of most Quaker peace activists during this period.
- <sup>45</sup> *Minutes of the Peace Committee*, 1888-1912 are contained in four *Minute Books* deposited in the LSF.
- <sup>46</sup> *TF*, 31 July 1914, 563.
- <sup>47</sup> Roger C. Wilson, "The Best Things in Ye Worst Time" in *Quakerism: A Way of Life*, edited by Hans Eirik Aarek (Norwegian Quaker Press, 1982), 9 [?] and Ernest E. Taylor, 'Diary, 1914-', Temp. MSS., Box 23/3, LSF. Mary Millior Braithwaite, aged ten in 1914, also recalls her family being on the Welsh Coast when the war began; her father was John Henry Barlow, wartime Clerk of London Yearly Meeting. Tape recorded interview with M.M. Braithwaite, 13 Aug. 1986, London.
- <sup>48</sup> *TF*, 7 Aug. 1914, 575-6.
- <sup>49</sup> Taylor, 'Diary, 1914-', 27 Aug., 4 and 25 Sept. 1914 and Elizabeth Isichei, *Victorian Quakers* (Oxford 1970), 201-2. Frank L. Harris and Alfred Bigland were Conservative members of Parliament; Henry Marriage Wallis was the zealous "war Friend."
- <sup>50</sup> *LYM Proc.*, 1915, 30; *TF*, 23 May 1915, 408-9; and *LYM Proc.*, 1923, 232. Also see Maude Robinson, "Lest We Forget" (London, n.d.), 3. Over a 100 Quakers died in service during the war.
- <sup>51</sup> *Minute 2*, 28 April 1915, *Minutes of the Meeting of Elders*, Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting, Brotherton Library (Bro. Lib.), University of Leeds.
- <sup>52</sup> "Our Peace Testimony and Some of Its Implications," *TF*, 2 Oct. 1914, 722-24.
- <sup>53</sup> Joshua Rowntree to Henry J. Mennell, 17 Nov. 1914, MS Box 5.114, LSF.

- <sup>54</sup> The official history of the Friends Ambulance Unit is Meaburn Tatham and James E. Miles, *The Friends' Ambulance Unit, 1914-1919* (London, [1919]). For a fascinating non-Quaker view of the Unit, see *Talking across the World: the Love Letters of Olaf Stapleton and Agnes Miller*, edited by Robert Crossley (Hanover, Conn. 1987). For "War Vics," see A. Ruth Fry, "Friends Relief Work Since 1914", n.d., Temp. MSS 481, LSF.
- <sup>55</sup> See *LYM Proc., 1915*, 193-4. For the FSC manifesto and list of original members, see *FSC Minutes, Records of Work and Documents Issued*, 3 vols. June 1915-May 1920, LSF. Also see the recollections of Horace Alexander, a founding member, in *Quaker History* 70 (Spring, 1981), 48.
- <sup>56</sup> FSU, *Minutes*, 11 Feb. 1915, FSU/3, LSF.
- <sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 9 June 1915, quoting from Minute 65 of L.Y.M., FSU/3, LSF.
- <sup>58</sup> *LYM Proc., 1915*, 274-75. The Committee was reappointed every year. The quotation is from a letter of Roger C. Wilson (1906-1992), Clerk of London Yearly Meeting in the mid-1970s, to the author, 6 August 1985.
- <sup>59</sup> Quoted in Mabel Cash Barlow's unpublished memoir of her husband in the J.H. Barlow Papers in possession of the Barlow family.
- <sup>60</sup> Taylor, "Diary", 14 July 1915, Temp. MSS., Box 23/3, LSF.
- <sup>61</sup> *To Our Fellow Members of Military Age of the Society of Friends*, FSC, printed documents, Temp. MSS., Box 31, LSF.
- <sup>62</sup> W.C. Braithwaite (1862-1922) had practiced law in London before accepting a partnership in Gillett's Bank in Banbury in 1896. He completed *The Beginnings of Quakerism* the first of his two volumes on early Quaker history in 1912. Cross (1864-1916) was closely connected with the Rowntree family and worked for their chocolate firm; he was also Secretary to the so-called Bryce Group. See Henry R. Winkler, *The League of Nations Movement in Great Britain, 1914-1918* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1952), 16.
- <sup>63</sup> W.C. Braithwaite to A.S. Rowntree, 19 Nov. 1915, Arnold S. Rowntree Papers (ASRP), Temp. MSS., 558, SR 310/5/2, and Memo. Re. "Conscience Clause", 18 Nov. 1915, *FSC Minutes*, Vol. I, 22, LSF.
- <sup>64</sup> WCB to ASR, 19 Nov. 1915, ASRP, Temp. MSS., 558, SR 310/5/2.
- <sup>65</sup> Richard Cross to ASR, 21 Nov. 1915, *ibid.* Rowntree also consulted with Edward Grubb (1854-1939), prominent Quaker journalist, teacher and theologian. Grubb's response, while more moderate than the FSC's hard line, reflected not only his long-standing commitment to pacifism but also the fact that he had recently become the Honorary Treasurer of the No-Conscription Fellowship.
- <sup>66</sup> Floyd Dell, editor of the *Masses* (New York), called *THE PLOUGHSHARE* "a beautifully printed, admirably written, very impressive paper." quoted in *PS*, I/6, July 1916, 196; Dell had urged the poet Witter Bynner to send his anti-war poems to *THE PLOUGHSHARE*. Monetary support for the new venture was provided by wealthy anti-war Friends.
- <sup>67</sup> "Commentary: The Seven Wars," *PS*, I/1, Feb. 1916, 3.
- <sup>68</sup> For an illuminating discussion of the growth of the view that the historical relationship between militarism and misogyny made pacifism a necessary aspect of the feminist struggle, see Jo Vellacott's "Introduction" to *Militarism versus Feminism: Writings on Women and War*, edited by Vellacott and Margaret Kamester (London, 1987), 1-34. Also see H.M. Swanwick, "The World After the War . . . Franchise Reform," *The Ploughshare*, I/9 n.s., Oct. 1916, 278: the war had revealed to many anti-suffragists that their potential philosophy was precisely the doctrine which . . . all . . . execrate as Prussianism.

- <sup>69</sup> Robert O. Mennell and Hubert W. Peet reporting the results of the FSC's poll of some 900 male Friends to *TF*, 17 Dec., 1915, 945 and E. Taylor, "Diary," 20 Dec. 1915, Temp. MSS., Box 23/3, LSF.
- <sup>70</sup> In his *Personal History* (London, 1983), 49-51, A.J.P. Taylor had kind things to say about Brayshaw but he obviously did not take him seriously either.
- <sup>71</sup> "Introductory Address," *Swanwick, 1911*, 26-31.
- <sup>72</sup> *Swanwick, 1911*, 37-8. Dürer had been the favourite subject of John Wilhelm Rowntree's lectures on religious art.
- <sup>73</sup> ANB, "Friends and the Inner Light", (London, [1915]), 70-2. For Brayshaw's letters to Young Friends, see MS. Box T 1/3, and his personal correspondence with Philip Radley, MS. Vols. 243-47 and Temp. MSS., 299, LSF. Also see ANB to *TF*, 9 April 1915, 78, 81.
- <sup>74</sup> See Thomas C. Kennedy, "Fighting About Peace: the No-Conscription Fellowship and the British Friends' Service Committee, 1915-1919," *Quaker History*, 69/1 (Spring 1980), 3-22 and "The Quaker Renaissance and the Origins of the Modern British Peace Movement, 1895-1920," *Albion*, 16/3 (Fall, 1984), 264-70.
- <sup>75</sup> *LYM, 1916*, 36 and John W. Graham, *Conscription and Conscience* (London, 1922), 161n.
- <sup>76</sup> Esther Bright Clothier to Robert O. Mennell, 11 and 20 June 1916, FSC Files, LSF. Also see Kennedy, "Quaker Renaissance," 261-62.
- <sup>77</sup> *LYM, 1917*, 170, lists only 13 female members, including Esther Bright Clothier, on the Service Committee out of a total of 36, but by early 1917 most of the Committee's male members were in prison or some other type of detention.
- <sup>78</sup> Kennedy, "Quaker Renaissance," 267-69.
- <sup>79</sup> See John W. Graham to Richard Graham, 14 and 15 March, 1916, John W. Graham Papers, John Rylands Library, Manchester in which the elder Graham discusses various efforts to attain specific relief for Quaker COs.
- <sup>80</sup> "Alternative Service": Friends and a Perplexing Problem,' *The Ploughshare* I/7 n.s. (Aug. 1916), 203-04. Edith Wilson also wrote "The Absolutists' Case Against Conscription," a shortened version of which was the basis for the "Challenge to Militarism" pamphlet for which Edith Ellis and two male Friends were tried at the Guildhall in 1918 (see above). See entry for Edith Jane Wilson, "Dictionary of Quaker Biography," LSF.
- <sup>81</sup> Wilson, "Alternative Service," 204-05.
- <sup>82</sup> Edith J. Wilson, "Law-Abiding Citizens," *The Ploughshare*, II/2 n.s. (March 1917), 62-63.
- <sup>83</sup> W.E. Littleboy to Edith Ellis, 27 Sept. 1917, FSC Correspondence, 1915-1919, LSF.
- <sup>84</sup> J.E. Hodgkin (1875-1953), whose brother Henry T. was founder of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, was both a town councillor in Darlington and a magistrate on the Durham County Bench. See *DQB*, LSF. Also see *Minutes, WSOC*, 3 Feb. 1916 which, as written by Hodgkin, stressed the need 'to look at the whole question of our social relationship in light of our testimony against *all* war.'
- <sup>85</sup> J.E. Hodgkin, "War and Social Order Committee, *PS*, I/1, Feb. 1916, 33-4.
- <sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, I/2, March 1916, 40-2, 52-4, I/3, April, 1916, 99: I/4, May 1916, 105; and I/8, Sept. 1916, 237.
- <sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, I/4, May 1916, 106, 128 and I/9, Oct. 1916, 290-1.
- <sup>88</sup> "War and the Social Order": A Study of the Committee's Report,' *PS*, I/5, June, 1916, 146-48.

- <sup>89</sup> ' "War and the Social Order": A Study of the Committee's Report,' *PS*, I/5, June, 1916, 146-48, and M[orland], "Impressions of Yearly Meeting", *ibid.*, 169-70. Also see "The Adjourned Yearly Meeting: A Churchman's Impressions" *ibid.* I/2 March, 1916, 41 for another observer's feeling that some Quakers were looking upon the State as a representative of the powers of evil 'antagonistic to . . . those seeking to establish the Kingdom of God.'
- <sup>90</sup> "Christian Revolutionaries," *ibid.*, I/7, Aug. 1916, 227.
- <sup>91</sup> *Minutes, WSOC*, 2-5 Feb. and 8-9 June, 1917; [A.H. Bayes], Act. Sec. FSU, to W.H. Sturge, n.d. [May-June, 1917]; and W.H. Sturge to FSU Council, 9 June 1917, FSU 3/4, LSF. At the time of this correspondence, the FSU was being absorbed into the WSOC.
- <sup>92</sup> *Minutes, WSOC*, 8-9 June, 1917.
- <sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 7-10 Sept., 1917.
- <sup>94</sup> W.E. Littleboy to his parents, 18 & 20 Jan., 1917.
- <sup>95</sup> Wilfred E. Littleboy, "Guardroom notes," 25 April, 1918.
- <sup>96</sup> See A.J.P. Taylor, *A Personal History* (New York, 1983), 37 for some commentary, *à la* Taylor, on Newbold's brief celebrity as "the English Lenin."
- <sup>97</sup> Reprinted in *Christian Faith and Practice* (London, 1916), para. 612.
- <sup>98</sup> *LYM Proc.*, 1916, 103-4. Also see *Minutes, WSOC*, 2-5 Feb. and 4-5 May, 1917.
- <sup>99</sup> *The Peace Testimony of the Society of Friends* (London, [1920]), 21-2.
- <sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 6-7 and *All-Friends Conference, Official Report* (London, [1920]), 201.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

*Light in the Dales, Volumes II and III, The Agrarian Background to the Rise of Political and Religious Dissent in the Northern Dales in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.* By the Revd. J. Breay, M.A. The Canterbury Press, Norwich, 1996. £14.95. (Obtainable from R.E.G. Hollett & Son, 6 Finkle Street, Sedbergh, Cumbria LA10 5BZ)

John Breay has a place in the long line of Anglican clergy whose industry and scholarship have been the backbone of many learned societies. He has already produced an edition of the Quaker registers of Ravenstonedale, Gisdale and Garsdale, 1650-1837, which forms volume I of the present work. As the title suggests, his account of the rise of Quakerism in the northern dales in the 1650s is set in a framework based on the events of the previous 100 years and on the changing conditions of land tenure in the area.

The dissolution of the monasteries and the change to lay ownership of the land brought about an uneasy relationship and constant struggles between landlord and tenant.

The Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536/37 was a protest against the religious changes, fuelled also by agrarian grievances concerning enclosures, tithes and heavy fines levied on the death of the lord or on change of tenant. The risings were ruthlessly suppressed by Henry VIII. Breay gives lists of the names of men hanged in Cumberland (21 men) and Westmorland (53). He argues that there are pointers to the families of men who suffered, 'who in a later age supported political or religious dissent'.

Breay also points to the Puritan influence emanating from St. John's College, Cambridge on the development of education and religious beliefs exercised by parish priests and schoolmasters, and particularly by Robert Holgate, President of the Council of the North in 1538 and later archbishop of York. Schools like Sedbergh became centres of Protestant teaching, laying the foundation for later dissent.

Possibly a more important factor was the greed of the new lay landlords, whose high-handed treatment of tenants stirred up discontent. When there arose rivalries among the great families, or family disagreements, as in the case of the Cliffords, earls of Cumberland, it was the tenants who suffered. When Lady Anne Clifford finally inherited the family estates, 'she spent more money on restoring useless castles, than improving the lot of her tenants.'

In the later part of the sixteenth century there were divisions of larger farms in Mallerstang into smaller units, which created a poor tenantry, unable to resist a succession of bad harvests or disease.

When James I came to the throne he adopted a policy of extracting money from tenants in confirmation of their customary tenures. All these causes, and the distress and poverty created by the civil war combined, in John Breay's thesis, to produce a climate favourable to George Fox's message when he came to Sedbergh in 1652.

Breay has been at pains to understand the thinking of George Fox and his followers, as shown in the *Journal* and in other Quaker writings. In spite of some disapprobation of the vituperative language used by early Friends against the clergy, he gives a sympathetic account of their steadfastness under extreme persecution, and concludes that 'despite all the sufferings of the dalesmen from the sixteenth century, that they remained Christian

is due to George Fox and the Religious Society of Friends'. It is a striking tribute to the power and moving quality of the words for readers of today, that he brings the account to an end with the words of Edward Burrough ('We went forth as commanded of the Lord') and the Testimony of Francis Howgill, 1663 (see *Quaker Faith & Practice*, 1995, para.19.08).

The debate will no doubt continue as to how far the rise of political and religious dissent in the northern dales was conditioned by the agrarian troubles of the northern customary tenants. John Breay has provided ample material for consideration. Some of the material seems ill-digested, and the numerous extracts together with the thorough documentation may well discourage the general reader. Nevertheless, this will remain a valuable source for Quaker and other historians of the northern dales. A map would have been helpful.

*Jean E. Mortimer*

*The Early History of Thaxted Monthly Meeting.* By Joyce Whittington. William Sessions, York, 1994. Pp vi + 113, facsimiles in text. £7.80.

Joyce Whittington's account of the early history of Thaxted Monthly Meeting, building on work by Mary Whiteman, is sub-titled at the beginning of part I 'with special reference to Saffron Walden' and this is an important qualification which should have appeared earlier. It draws largely on monthly meeting minutes and the brief text quotes very extensively from them. The journals of John Farmer of Saffron Walden (1667-1724) and some later yearly meeting minutes are also used as sources. There are neither footnotes nor bibliography. The index refers solely to Friends within the monthly meeting.

This short book contains a number of interesting extracts from minutes and illuminates some of the typical transactions to be found in them. Such illustrations may be of interest to those working on other areas for the same period. Examples are certificates for Farmer to travel in the ministry in 1699 and 1705 and for his widow to do so in Holland and Germany in 1725. The final substantial quotation is the moving 1760 testimony to William Impey. The more common business of tithes, marrying out, differences between Friends and financial difficulties of individuals is accompanied by lists of all the marriages recorded.

*David J. Hall*

*Conscientious Objection to Compulsions under the Law.* By Constance Braithwaite. William Sessions, York, 1995. £11.95 + £3.00 p&p.

This is an interesting book for two reasons. It provides a great deal of information which the layman may not easily find elsewhere and it also makes perceptive comments on various aspects of conscientious objection in general.

The book is divided into two parts. The first and longer part gives an historical

account of a number of fields where conscientious objection has been recognized in law and one area where it occurs, although not legally recognized. It covers the taking of oaths, compulsory vaccination against smallpox, compulsion for military service and allied defence purposes, provisions relating to the right of a parent to withdraw a child from religious worship in schools and provisions relating to the duties of parents in respect of the medical care of children. It will be appreciated that some of these matters are of historical interest and some are still topical.

As is mentioned in the book, one field that is not covered is the payment of tithes. The concern over the payment of tax for defence purposes, although mentioned, has expanded significantly since the book was written.

The second, shorter, part of the book, comments on various facets of conscientious objection as described in the historical accounts set out earlier.

The first chapter of this part of the book describes ways in which the state penalizes the illegal conscientious objector and comments on the problems of illegal conscientious objection from the state's point of view.

The tests that had to be satisfied before a person's conscientious objection was recognized are described in the following chapter. Sometimes all that was necessary was to complete a form but on other occasions one had to satisfy a tribunal. This raises the question, is it possible for a person or a group of people to ascertain the sincerity of someone else's conscientious objection? If so, how can it be done? From these queries the final chapter considering certain ethical and philosophical problems of conscientious objection follows on naturally.

In a future edition of the book there are two changes that might be considered. One relates to the notes at the end of each chapter. Where an unnumbered section of a statute is quoted or referred to in the text, it would be helpful if the number of the section could be listed in the notes. The other change suggested arises in the penultimate chapter, dealing with the various tests of conscientious objection. This contains considerable detail relating to tribunals considering conscientious objection to military service which might be more appropriately included in the earlier historical chapters.

As the decisions of the European Court of Human Rights and the European Court of Justice affect national law, it is increasingly likely that they will impinge upon the sphere of law covered in this book. In the future in order to obtain a complete picture it will be necessary to consider such decisions.

In conclusion, this is a book that individuals and Meetings may well decide to acquire. The first part gives useful factual information. The latter part stimulates thought on one aspect of the perpetual problem of the relationship between the individual and the state, with which Friends are rightly concerned.

*Peris M. Coventry*

*Hear the Word of the Lord: a Critical and Bibliographical Study of Quaker Women's Writing. 1650-1700.* By Rosemary Foxton. (BSANZ Occasional Publication). Melbourne: The Bibliographical Society of Australia and New Zealand, 1994. ISBN 0 9598271 3 7.

This short book is in two parts, the first being an account of Quaker women's writing during the first half-century of Quakerism, part of the author's Ph.D. research into the

publication of women's writing in England, 1660-1714. Published writing by women increased rapidly during the latter part of the seventeenth century, and Quaker women may have provided 20 per cent of the total for the century as a whole. In recent years the subject of Quaker women and their lives, including their writings, has received a considerable amount of attention, and readers familiar with the field will not find here much that they do not already know. Other readers may find it a useful brief summary, but should be warned that there are several minor errors.

The main value of the book, which is considerable, lies in the second, bibliographic, section. The author has painstakingly traced 261 published writings by 234 women Quakers, and also by women who wrote against Quakerism, as against an estimate of 80 in Barbour and Roberts *Early Quaker Writings*, and she has done this by including contributions by women to books whose main author may have been a man, signatories to epistles from women's business meetings and testimonies signed by a number of people. This means that a number of women are included who are only known as signatories to Women's Meeting epistles, and some of these names recur regularly. Cases of multiple authorship are cross-referenced up to a limit of fifteen signatories. Alternate forms of authors' names are given. Bibliographic information includes Wing and Smith references, and in many cases a brief note is added regarding the purpose and content of the publication.

My one grumble concerns the chosen format. The entries are set out according to regular bibliographic practice, with each entry as a separate paragraph. Reading through such a list is always tedious, and in this case the sheer wealth of information provided makes it more difficult than usual. A researcher wishing, for instance, to arrange this information by date, or to find out if particular publishers were favoured, would have a long and trying task. What a pity the author did not break with tradition and lay the information out as a database. Perhaps the publisher, a bibliographical society, objected.

Rosemary Moore

*Richard Davis Webb, Dublin Quaker Printer, 1805-1872.* By Richard S. Harrison. Red Barn Publishing, Co. Cork, 1993. Pp. ii + 84. Illustrated. No price.

Richard Davis Webb spent most of his busy life as a Friend, actively engaged in many of the radical and philanthropic activities of his time. Although he resigned from the Society in 1851 this did not prevent him undertaking, in 1852, the printing of the *Transactions of the Central Relief Committee*. This detailed account of Quaker responses in Ireland to the Great Famine, in which he took part, remains one of the most important documents in nineteenth century Irish Quaker history. What emerges from Richard S. Harrison's sympathetic portrait is a man of honesty, principle and deep concern for both Ireland and the wider world beyond it. Some striking insights are presented on the character of Irish Quakerism and the changing nature of Irish nationalism before 1850. However the study does raise reservations.

These lie principally in the structure and organisation of the text. A chronological narrative is adopted but this does not present the subject or the material to the best advantage. Thus in a chapter dealing with the onset of the Great Famine in 1846 the author devotes nearly two pages to Mrs. Asenath Nicholson, one of the many lively and difficult

radicals who found hospitality with the Webb family. It becomes difficult to keep adequate track of the several major preoccupations of Webb's social and religious concerns. These included abolition of slavery, peace and temperance. Webb also shrewdly observed Irish nationalist activities in the 1840s. (The index, useful in many details, does not unfortunately have entries for these major interests). This also affects the evaluation of Webb and his concerns not made easier by squeezing the last 20 years of his life into 1½ pages. This is too abrupt and fails to do justice to the ongoing course of Webb's interests in these years. Some effort is made to relate Webb to his radical contemporaries, Quaker and non-Quaker, but more needs to be done here. How does Webb compare, in methods and achievement, with other Quaker radicals, notably Bright and Sturge? Above all, there needs to be a move from a personal account to a critical evaluation which studies Webb and his activities in a wider historical context of the fortunes of the various movements he devoted such time and energy to. How far, for example, did splits and differences between radicals, both as individuals and as groups, affect the effectiveness and ultimate realisation of the goals Webb and others sought? A thematic approach, in separate chapters, would have allowed a critical and more concentrated examination of the several topics in Webb's biography and interests. A clear and more balanced account would then have been possible. Professor Alex Tyrrell's study of Joseph Sturge (1987) provides an interesting contrast here.

Nonetheless this book is valuable and worthwhile, not least in the questions it raises. I hope opportunity might allow Richard S. Harrison to take his researches further and engage more deeply with some of the issues here indicated.

Howard F. Gregg

*Friends in York The dynamics of Quaker Revival 1780-1860.* By Sheila Wright. Keele University Press, Keele, Staffordshire, 1995. Pp. 253. £35.00.

Sheila Wright's *Friends in York* is a short work. 123 pages of text are supported by 58 of appendices, 13 of bibliography and 35 of notes. Extensive statistics (30 tables in chapter seven as well as the material in the appendices) underpin the text. Like any other study of Friends in a particular area it can be read in at least two ways, as an account of part of a local community that sheds light on that, or as a local study that contributes to the picture of Quakerism nationally and in this case for a relatively neglected period. The absence of adequate comparable studies helps neither the author nor the reader in seeing just how far the local conclusions might apply more broadly. Sheila Wright's thesis is essentially that York meeting saw a significant revival in the period between 1780 and 1860 as the result of the development of a unique internal dynamic. She argues that women ministers in particular encouraged the growth of evangelicalism amongst York Friends. Evangelicalism in turn encouraged convictions and the retention of membership, major forces in the demonstrable numerical growth of the meeting. It is not always quite clear whether the subject is York Meeting or York Monthly Meeting. The growth was also the result of movement into the meeting motivated by economic reasons with York's increasing Quaker middle class providing employment, schools and the Retreat (an employer as well as a facility). Thus York does seem to have been an exceptional case in English Quakerism where our perception up to the mid-nineteenth century is generally of continuing numerical decline. The growth in numbers in York

was not the result of improving fertility or lower mortality rates. The demographic revolution of the late eighteenth century described in Vann and Eversley, *Friends in life and death* (Cambridge, 1992) was not responsible. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the York meeting house had to be extended to accommodate 130 more Friends while the membership of the Monthly Meeting rose from 108 in 1800 to 155 in 1820.

At the root of the evangelical movement in Quakerism there was the work of two York Friends, Henry Tuke and Lindley Murray. Sheila Wright gives a useful account of both, and especially of the development of Tuke's thought. Other members of the Tuke family were influential in the meeting too and three of Henry's sisters were evangelical ministers. It might be worth mentioning that Murray's *Power of Religion on the Mind* (1787) had at least 20 printings in the period covered by this work. Stephen Allott's *Lindley Murray* (York, 1991) is one of several relevant works which appear to have escaped Sheila Wright's notice. Her description of women's ministry and its organisation in York is valuable and the comparisons made with other nonconformist traditions particularly so. Women ministers were important before the spread of evangelicalism among Friends. Women were also of the greatest importance in the continuing Quaker tradition of pastoral care. A good part in the narrative is taken up with Friends' involvement in the community politically as well as philanthropically. Even before the 1828 Corporation Act they were deeply involved in York, perhaps rather more so than the Yearly Meeting would have liked as a general rule. Samuel Tuke campaigned on behalf of William Wilberforce in the 1807 election. Naturally major causes were the abolition of the slave trade and then of slavery. In some campaigns partnership with the Anglican evangelicals became natural. Philanthropic activity ranged widely and included the foundation of the Retreat and the encouragement of non-denominational education. Sheila Wright makes a serious and welcome contribution to the process of re-examining the history of English Friends in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

*David J. Hall*

# NOTES AND QUERIES

## QUAKERS IN FICTION

*Quakers in fiction an annotated bibliography* compiled by Anna Breiner Caulfield (Pittenbruach Press, Northampton, Ma., 1993), contains a listing of works of fiction considered by the compiler to contain major Quaker characters, written from varying points of view and published in Britain and the USA mostly in this century. There is a useful index of subjects and settings, including appearances by historical figures. Subjects include Fighting Quakers, Native American Indians, Humour (only Basil Donne-Smith's work), Ireland, Musicians (all four titles are by E. Vipont) as well as the obvious, Penn, Philadelphia etc.

David J. Hall

## EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY BRISTOL

*Reformation and revival in eighteenth-century Bristol*. Edited by Jonathan Barry and Kenneth Morgan. Bristol Record Society's publications, vol. 45, 1994. This volume consists of a sheaf of edited documents and papers ranging through the eighteenth century, from the Society for the Reformation of Manners at the very beginning of the period, progressing through Methodist Testimonials in the 1740s, the Moravians in the 1750s and 60s, to the divisions within Methodism in the 1790s after the death of John Wesley.

Of the strength of Quakerism in the city, one may note the John Evans List of dissenting congregations in 1717 (printed on p.71, from the manuscript deposited at Dr. Williams's Library, London) which adds a rider:

N.B. There is also in Bristol a great Body of Quakers, who are generally well-affected to the present Government, and large Traders and very rich. Their number may be supposed about 2,000 and upwards; and their wealth not less than £500,000.

These estimates, compared with the estimates of 4,300 "hearers" at the five dissenting congregations listed in the city, worth £770,000 may show that Friends, within a generation of Toleration, were already showing signs of economic success.

A handful of prominent Friends are noticed as being in the Society for the Reformation of Manners, 1700-05, which was concerned to combat abuses of the Lord's Day, to restrain boys playing in the streets, and to keep the stage players out of the city - endeavours which are echoed in the Friends' Men's Meeting minutes of the time. A moving spirit, the Revd. Arthur Bedford was the SPCK correspondent in Bristol, and his letter to London in January 1700-1 (p. 45-46) reported lack of progress in bringing over the Bristol Quakers to the Church of England after the visit of the Revd. George Keith to Bristol. Bedford suggested that the Archbishop should be asked to enjoin the clergy to confer with the Quakers. That might succeed in winning them over. Bedford's reasons included:

'1.

Because it has succeeded in the plantations.

2dly

because some of the Chief Quakers are grown more sociable etc.

3rdly  
because Wm. Penn is absent.'

William Penn was in Pennsylvania for his second time there, and when he returned to England he resided nearer to London.

Later, 3 May 1701, (p. 47) Arthur Bedford reported:

'That since Mr Keith was there, there have been no Converts from Quakerism: the reasons of which are, That he has not been Seconded [no one had followed up his visit], and that the Quakers, having been alarmed, make it their Business to hand about some of their subtlest Writers as *Barclay's Apology* [4th edition, 1701], *Dell's Works* [William Dell], *The Truth of God held by Quakers* [William Penn & Benjamin Coole, 1699], etc. but especially by helping new Converts to good Matches.'

This last remark may stem from common gossip, or may have come out of one of George Keith's pamphlet accounts of his controversies with Friends in Bristol. Keith noted the rapid rise to affluence of some Friends. Benjamin Coole, for instance, had come into the city from Wiltshire, had married a merchant's daughter and prospered in trade. Coole retorted with asperity. In his *Honesty the truest policy*, 1700, pp. 88-90, he replied to Keith:

'That Reflection on me as if it was, *but Lately I left the Loom, being a poor Lad, but am now worth Hundreds* shews how hard he (a man of words and store of Arguments) is put to it - for were it not that things are at a very low Ebb with him; he would not, surely have wounded me with that Weapon, what Ere he had done; it being so common to Oyster Women, Water-men and Porters. ... As to the Loom I left, I confess, it never agreed with my Constitution, nor did I ever like it, no more than G.K. did Scotland.'

Two possible identifications, for later in the eighteenth century:

- i. Elizabeth Vigor (page 84): connected with the Methodists. She may be Elizabeth (Stafford) Vigor, widow of Francis Vigor, woollen-draper (1699-1726); they were married 2 iii 1722.
- ii Robert Fry (page 142): from the diary of the Moravian Brother Andrew Parminter, December 1766. Parminter visited "Mr Fry", probably Zephaniah Fry, of Castle Street. At the time of his marriage to Abigail Hiscox, 11 iii 1741, Zephaniah is described as a clothier, of Sutton, Wilts. When Abigail died in 1781 they were living at Stapleton. Zephaniah died in 1787, aged 72. Their eldest son, Robert Fry (born 22 ii 1744; died 28 viii 1808) is noticed in *The Records and recollections of James Jenkins* (1753-1831). Edited by J. William Frost (1984).

*Russell S. Mortimer*

## ULSTER QUAKERS

Thomas Chapman, James Hunter and the parents of Ezekiel Vance are named as Quakers in A.T.Q. Stewart's book about the 1798 rebellion in Ireland, *The summer soldiers: the 1798 rebellion in Antrim and Down* (Belfast, The Blackstaff Press, 1995).

R.S.M.

## FRIENDS IN HERTFORDSHIRE

*Religion in Hertfordshire 1847 to 1851*. Edited by Judith Burg. (Hertfordshire Record Society, 1995. Publications vol. 11.). This volume prints the results of two surveys. The first, by the Revd. William Upton of St. Albans (1796-1865). The second, the 1851 Ecclesiastical Census. The Society of Friends is studied in the following places: Aldenham, Baldock, Berkhamstead, Great Berkhamstead, Bishop's Stortford, Broxbourne, Hemel Hempstead, Hertford, Hitchin, Hoddesdon, Kensworth and Ware.

R.S.M.

## QUAKER WOMEN

Anna Laurence's *Women in England 1500-1760* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1994) mentions Friends in the context of the wider field of nonconformity, both before and after the Restoration. 1660 is seen as a watershed. Two quotations only, may illustrate this:

'The best known of the small number of women who were attracted to the public exercise of new religious beliefs and practices were the Quaker women. Many religious beliefs were tolerated during the 1640s and 1650s, but it was possible to go too far and the Quakers frequently did so. They did not become pacifist good citizens until much later in the century...' (p.206).

## After 1660

'Despite women's activity, many nonconformist ministers... were unhappy about the prospect of enlarging women's participation. The Quakers were really the only group which allowed women a greater role, though even they did not achieve this painlessly. Quaker women established their own meetings during the 1660s, but these were more a vehicle for organizing charitable work than a means of participating in the government of the movement.' (p.207).

R.S.M.

## HUSBANDS AND WIVES EQUAL

Joan Perkin's *Women and marriage in nineteenth-century England* (Routledge, 1989) has the following sentence (pp. 265-66):

'A strand of idealism, in favour of fundamental equality between husbands and wives, was not new; it has been common since the seventeenth century at least, in dissenting religious thought, and perhaps most advanced among the Quakers.'

R.S.M.

## BRISTOL MERCHANTS

The final volume of David Richardson's *Bristol, Africa and the eighteenth-century slave trade to America* (Bristol Record Society's publications, vol. 47, 1996) has appeared. The volume covers the years from 1770 to 1807. There is little to note for this *Journal* to supplement information given previously in vol. 55, pp. 154-6 and vol. 56, p. 257 (1987, 1992).

John Champion, listed as part-owner of the *Wasp*, a privateer of 70 tons with 14 guns, bound for the Cape Coast in 1780, and later reported at Barbados and Jamaica before returning to Bristol, will not have been a Friend. Nor will the Charles Harford, part-owner of the *James* (106 tons, 4 guns) and the *Eliza* (192 tons, 6 guns) slavers in the 1790s. But the owners of the *Trusty* included three Harfords (sons of Truman and Mary Harford) - James (born 1734), John (b.1736) and Richard (b.1749) and grandson Richard Summers Harford (born 1763 in Queen Square, son of James (b.1734) and Anne; died at Cheltenham in 1837). The vessel was cleared for Sierra Leone in early 1792 in the service of the Sierra Leone Company (for resettling former slaves). The Company had received its charter in 1791; the chairman was Henry Thornton, and Granville Sharp and William Wilberforce were among the prime movers. John Clarkson, brother of Thomas, brought 1,100 former slaves from Nova Scotia in 1792. It looks as if the *Trusty* formed part of the same resettlement operation; it was lightly armed for a ship of its size (287 tons, 2 guns); after Sierra Leone it crossed the Atlantic, calling at Barbados and New York, and was lost on the return voyage in Barnstaple Bay, its crew saved.

R.S.M.

## GURNEY OF NORWICH

*The letters of Philip Stannard, Norwich textile manufacturer, 1751-1763*, edited by Ursula Priestley (Norfolk Record Society, vol. 57, 1994). This volume, illustrated by some pattern samples, in colour, is based on the Stannard and Gurney Archive in the Norfolk Record Office. The editor notes the article in this *Journal* by J.K. Edwards on "The Gurneys and the Norwich clothing trade in the eighteenth century." (vol. 50). The Stannard and Taylor enterprise faced bankruptcy in 1769 and Richard Gurney was one major creditor; Richard 'good Quaker that he was - was deeply concerned about the smaller creditors, especially the "little tradesmen with large families and poor widows" in Norwich'. (p. 19).

R.S.M.

## QUAKER ARCHIVES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HULL

Mary Rowlands (Archivist of Pickering and Hull MM) informs us that the archivist of the Brynmor Jones Library (University of Hull) has now listed the records deposited by Pickering and Hull MM in 1978 and 1984 and another considerable deposit made in 1994 [Ref. DQR and DQR (2)]. There is also a listing of the papers of Fred Fletcher (1915-1993) dealing with the history of Quakers in the East Riding. [Ref.DFF].

## SILVANUS P. THOMPSON

Jack Boag of Edinburgh informs us that it was on 27 February 1896 that Silvanus Thompson discovered radiation from uranium salts not 1895 (*JFHS* vol. 57/2, 204). Also he delivered the Swarthmore lecture in 1915 not in 1907 (*JFHS* vol. 57/2, 206).

## JOHN BELLERS

On page 111 of this volume George Hope should be George Clarke, J.B.'s biographer.

## GEST FELLOWSHIPS

Refer to page 219 altering the dates to June 1 1997 and January 31 1998. Application deadline February 1 1997.

**FRIENDS HOUSE LIBRARY  
WARNING**

**Friends House, London undergoes major building work from April 1997 into early 1988. As a result it is very likely that Britain Yearly Meeting's Library will be closed to readers for all or part of this time. Precise dates are not yet certain. We will announce them as soon as and as widely as possible. Please contact The Library, Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ (Tel. 0171-387 3601, Fax 0171-388 1977) for further information.**

# INDEX

FMH Friends' meeting house  
 MM Monthly meeting  
 PM Preparative meeting  
 QM Quarterly meeting  
 YM Yearly meeting

- Ackworth School 252-3  
 Alexander, William 263  
 Allen, Richard "Dress and deportment" 52-56  
 Allott, Stephen "J.W. Rowntree" 208  
 Amelia, Princess 242  
 America: visitors to 246-7  
 American trade 34  
 "The ancient way" 74-101  
 Anderson, William Crawford (1877-1919) 296  
 Archdale, Ann (aft. Lowe) 138, 140-3  
   Anne 138-9, 141-2  
   Elizabeth (b.1676) 138  
   Elizabeth (Booth) 138  
   John (1642?-1717) 138-50  
   Mary (aft. Danson) 138-42  
   Thomas (b.1661) 138  
   Thomas (b.1673?) 144, 145  
 Armfield, Joseph (1821-94) 81, 83, 87, 93-4, 99n.63  
 Arthington, James (1752-1833) 214  
   Jane 70  
   Maria (Jowitt) (1795-1863) 58, 60-2, 66-7, 71; silhouettes 214-8  
   Robert (1779-1864) 60  
   Sarah (Whitlock) (1753-1830) 214  
   Susannah 70  
 Ash, Edward 60  
 Ashbridge, Elizabeth (1713-55) 236-7  
 Atkinson, Aaron (c.1665-1740) 231-2  
   Christopher 124  
   John 244  
 Audland, Ann (1627?-1705) 234
- Bacon, Margaret Hope  
   "London Women's YM" 151-65  
 Bailey, Richard *New light on George Fox* [review of] 102-3; "Thomas Fell" 1-4  
 Balfour, Rev. James 17  
 Baltic trade 34, 37, 41  
 Baptism, Water 63-70
- Barber, J.H. 71  
   Joshua 231-2  
 Barclay, Abram Rawlinson 81  
   David 159, 233  
   John (d.1838) 77, 81  
   Lydia Ann (d.1855) 81, 82  
   Robert "A catechism" (1673) 27  
 Barlow, John Henry (1865-1924) 277, 288  
 Barnard, Hannah 76, 161  
 Barringer, James (1810-91) 273  
   James (1848-1932) 274, 275  
 Barrow, Robert 143-5, 147  
 Bates, Elisha 58, 63-4  
 Bath 239  
 Bathurst, Elizabeth quoted 253  
 Baxter, Richard 5-7, 9, 118, 119, 121, 128, 222  
*Beacon* controversy 57-73  
 Beadles, John 53  
 Beale, Joseph 264  
 Bealing, Benjamin 146  
 Bedford Institute First-Day School 93  
 Bell, Ann Mercy (Ellwood) 238-46, 252  
   Isaac 37  
   Nathaniel (1703-78) 238, 240, 244  
   Nathaniel (b.1736) 238, 242-4  
   Rachel (b.1740) 238, 242  
   Sarah (aft. Carroll) 33  
 Bellers, John (1654-1725) 111, 140  
 Bellows, John (1831-1901) 210-11  
 Bennett, Alfred William (1833-1902) 95  
   Edward Trusted (1831-1908) 92, 95, 183  
 Bentall, Walter 141  
 Bevan, Evan 55  
   Joseph Gurney (1753-1814) 159  
   Mary 161  
   Paul 81  
 Bewley, Anne 264  
   John (1754-1830) 260-5  
   John (1786-1855) 265  
   Mungo (1677-1747) 260
- Mungo (1755-1834) 260, 262  
 Samuel (1764-1837) 260-71  
 Thomas (1719-95) 260, 263-4  
   William (1787-1863) 265  
 Bible reading in meeting 188  
 Biddle, Esther 13  
 Billing (Byllynge), Edward 124  
 Bingley, William 146  
 Binyon, Alfred 76  
 Birchall, Alfred (1791-1853) 214  
   Edwin (1789-1877) 214  
   Elizabeth (Harding) 214  
   Maria (Atkinson) 214  
   Mary (Compton) 214  
   Samuel Jowitt (1788-1854) 215  
 Blackmore, Nicholas (d.1670) 5  
 Blake, Joseph 144  
 Blinman, Richard 13  
 Boer War (1899-1902) 206  
*Book of Extracts* 77  
 Borage, Timothy 139  
 Bottomley, John (1759-1820) 215  
 Boulton, William 76, 77, 79, 80  
 Bourne, Edward 5  
 Bower, David & John Knight  
   *Plain Country Friends* 110  
 Bowman, Richard (c.1758-1844) 272  
 Bownas, Samuel (1676-1753) 237, 244  
 Bradford, Andrew 21  
   Elizabeth (Sowle) 23-25  
   William (1663-1752) 21-32  
 Brady, Hannah (Wilson) (1787-1856) 215  
 Braithwaite, Constance  
   *Conscientious objection* [review of] 307-8  
   Joseph Bevan (1818-1905) 91, 185-7, 189-93, 280  
   William Charles (1862-1922) 114, 194, 288-9  
 Brayshaw, Alfred Neave 286, 290-1  
 Brayton, Patience 158, 160

- Breay, John *Light in the Dales* [review of] 306-7  
 Bridgman, Robert 132  
 Brighthouse MM and the Beacon 57-8, 62-71  
 Briscoe, Samuel 245  
 Brissot, Jacques Pierre 167-9, 173  
 Bristol Friends 235, 239, 250, 312-3; merchants 315; YM (1786) 251  
 British & American Steam Packet Co. 43  
*British Friend, The* 81, 90, 93  
 Broadhead, John (1761-1830) 215  
 Brock, Peter "Conscientious objection" 162-82; *Records of conscience* [review of] 107-8  
 Brockbank, Richard 88, 93  
 Bronner, Edwin B. 184-6  
 Brooks, Mary 252  
 Brothers, Andrew 141  
 Brown, Alfred Barratt (1887-1947) 296, 297  
   Edward Vipont 189  
   Isaac 91  
   William 155, 156, 232  
 Burrough, Edward 127  
 Butcher, John 146  
 Butterworth, John 76
- Cadbury, George (1839-1922) 281-2  
   Henry Joel (1883-1974) 113  
 Callowhill, Hannah (aft. Penn) 228  
 Careless, Elizabeth 5  
 Carey, Thomas (1675-1711) 138  
 Carolinas, the 140-7  
 Caroline, Queen (1683-1737) 242  
 Carr, George 39  
 "Carroll family" (of Cork) 33-51  
 Carroll, Barcroft Haughton 40-6  
   Edward 33-4, 38  
   Isaac (1745-1816) 33, 34, 36  
   James 38, 39, 43  
   John (1740-1819) 33-4, 36  
   John (d.1869) 40-6  
   Joseph 39  
   Joseph Hatton (b.1820) 40, 44  
   Joshua (d.1831) 34, 36-40, 44  
   Joshua (1820-85) 40, 44, 47  
   Joshua Hargrave (d.1872) 47  
   Kenneth L. 210; "John Archdale" 138-50  
   Thomas 33, 37-40
- Carroll, Thomas, & Co. 34-36  
 Carroll, William 42, 42  
 Cartwright, Phoebe 239  
 Cash, Newman 66  
 Casson, Isabel 215  
 Cathrall, Hannah 248  
 Cayley, Cornelius (1729-1780?) 245  
 Chadwich, Worcs. 118-20  
 Chandler, Thomas 118  
 Chapman, Thomas 88  
 Charity, Kate 210  
 Child, Isaac 157  
 Churchman, John 156, 157  
 Claridge, Richard 146  
 Clark, Benjamin 25  
   Hannah Priestman Bright 161  
   Joseph Dawe (d.1920) 275  
 Clerkenwell school 238, 252  
 Clifford, Yorks., FMH 244  
 Clonmel Annuity Co. 38  
 Clonmel school 252, 253  
 Clothier, Esther Bright (1873-1935) 292  
 Cole, Anthony (d.1661) 119  
 Comerford & O'Brien 263  
 Committee on a General Visit 77  
 Congénies 166-7, 172-4  
 Conscientious objection 286-92, 307-8; in France 166-82  
 Conservative Friends 74-101  
 Cook, Charity (Wright) 249-50  
   Isaac 249  
 Cookworthy, William 236  
 Corbyn, Sarah 159  
 Corfield, Sarah (aft. Carroll) 33  
 Cork, Carroll family of 33-51  
 Cork & Limerick Railway Co. 38  
 Cork & Passage Railway 42  
*Cork Constitution* (newspaper) 40, 43  
 Cork Steam Ship Company 44  
 Corry Fowler, Dublin, merchants 265  
 Cottrell, Kathleen L. 108-9  
 Coulsen, David (1713-65) 239  
 Courtenay family 18  
 Coventry, Peris M. 308  
 Cowell, John (1681-1730) 237  
 Creasey, Maurice Abner 281  
 Crewdson, Anna 76  
   Esther (aft. Boulton) (1784-1863) 215  
   Isaac (1780-1844) 215; and the *Beacon* 57, 60-73, 77, 79, 80  
   Joseph 76  
   William Dillworth 77
- Crosfield, George (1785-1847) 81  
   Joseph (1821-79) 95  
 Cross, Mary (Bayley, Fisher) 143, 150n.53  
   Richard (1864-1916) 288-9  
 Cudworth, John (1786-1861) 215  
   Rachel (Nevins) (1784-1854) 215  
 Cumberland QM (1862) 75  
 Cummings, Rosamund 132-7
- Danson, John 142, 147, 149n.38  
 Darby, Deborah 104-5  
 Deaves Bros. 39-42  
 Deaves, Ebenezer 35  
   Reuben 36  
   Reuben Harvey 35, 41  
   Sarah 35  
   Thomas 35, 41  
   Thomas Harvey 36  
 DeForest, Henry 21  
 Delavall, John 28  
 Dickenson, Jonathan 144, 145  
 Dickinson, James 143  
 Dickson, Sarah 235  
 Dillwyn, George 159  
 Dodge, Phebe 155  
 Dodwell, Henry (1641-1711) 139  
 Doeg, Thomas 243  
 Douglas, John Henry 95  
 Dowbridge, Anthony 119  
 Doyle, James 38  
 "Dress and deportment" 52-56  
 Drew, Sarah 5  
 Drewry, Thomas (1812-98) 74-5, 84, 86, 87, 90  
 Drinker, Henry 249  
 Drummond, May (c.1710-1772) 235-6, 242
- Dublin - Bewleys of 260-71;  
   Bloomfield "Retreat" 268;  
   Chamber of commerce 265-7; charities 268;  
   hospitals 289; Kildare Place Schools 268; silk manufacture 261, 266  
 Dublin Savings Bank 269  
 Dublin Tract Association 268  
 Duckenfield, Robert 222  
 Dudley, Mary (Stokes) (1750-1823) 215, 236, 251  
 Duncan, David 89-92, 183-5  
 Dunicliff, Joy *Mary Howitt* [review of] 103-4  
 Dunkirk 166, 167, 172, 173  
 Dunn, Mary Maples 163  
 Dyer, Mary 128  
   Samuel 250

- East India Company 267  
 Eaton, Samuel 222-4  
 Edmundson, William (1627-1712) 143  
 Edridge, John 141  
 Elcock, Charles 93  
 Ellis, Edith (1878-1963) 294  
 Ellison, Mark Andrew "Leeds Friends" 57-73  
 Ellwood, Ann 238  
     Ann Mercy see Bell  
     Martin 238  
     Thomas 140  
 Emlen, Samuel 159, 160  
 Erbery, Dorcas 7, 8  
     William (d.1654) 7  
 Estaugh, Elizabeth (Haddon) 228-9  
     John (d.1742) 229  
 Evangelicals, Quaker 183-94  
 Evans, Cecil 108  
     Samuel 87  
 Eveleigh, Samuel (d.1857) 215  
 Everard, John 132  
     Margaret 132-7  
 Evesham Friends 218  
 Exeter 239
- Falsington General Meeting 83, 86  
 Family of Love 219  
 Fardon, Joseph Ashby 94  
 Farnsworth, Richard (1625-66) 5, 118  
 Fassnidge, Harold *Quakers of Melksham* [review of] 108  
 Fayle, Anna 265  
     Joshua 265  
 Fell, Margaret 151  
     Thomas (1598-1658) 1-4  
 Field, John 146  
 Finsbury Technical College 203-4  
 Firth, Joseph (1756-1822) 215  
     Robert (1760-1828) 215  
     Sarah (Briscoe) 215  
 Fisher, Anna (aft. Carroll) 33  
     Mary 13  
 Fishery, Newfoundland 14-18  
 Fletcher, Fred 315  
 Forde, Helen 54  
 Forster, of Tottenham 81, 82  
 Forster, Josiah (d.1870) 187  
 Foster, Abby Kelley 163  
     Thomas 76  
 Fothergill, John (1712-1780) 237-8  
     Samuel (1715-72) 156, 245, 247  
*Foundations for a true social order* (1918) 278  
 Fox, Edward 240  
     George, 102-3, 151, 152, 212-3; miracles 8,9; at Chadwich 119; in Worcester 5-7; letters 24, 140-1, 221-7, 230; 'Canons and institutions' 27; "Journal" 113-7  
     Margaret (1614-1702) 151  
     Samuel (1781-1868) 215  
 Foxe, John "Acts and monuments" 128-9  
 Foxtan, Rosemary *Hear the Word* [review of] 308-9  
 France - Assemblée Nationale (1791) 169-73; Committee of Public Safety 175-6; military service in 166-82  
*Friend, The* (London) 81  
 Friends Ambulance Unit 287  
 Friends Service Committee 287-94, 297  
 Friends Social Union 284, 288, 296  
 Friends' War Victims Volunteers 287  
 Fritchley MM 86-88, 90, 101n.105  
 Frith, Francis (1822-98) 95, 96, 188-9  
 Fry, Sir Edward (1827-1918) 188  
     Joseph Storrs (1826-1913) 193
- Gibson, Elizabeth 159  
 Gilbert, C.D. "Puritan & Quakeress" 118-22; "Worcester Quakerism" 5-12  
 Gildersome school 252  
 Giles, Samuel (1851-94) 274  
 Gilkes, Louisa E. (1814-81) 85-7  
 Godlee, Mary Jane (1851-1930) 161, 277, 282  
 Goodaire, Thomas 5, 118  
 Gorges, Ferdinando 138  
 Grace, J. Thimbeck 95  
 Graham, John William (1859-1932) 92, 192-3, 201, 205, 280  
     William (1823-1911) 93-4  
 Gravestones 74  
 Green, Elizabeth (Robson) (1815-81) 99n.71  
 Greer, Alfred 42, 43, 45  
     Sarah (aft. Carroll) 33  
 Gregg, Howard F. 106-7, 212, 310  
 Gregoire, Henri (1750-1831) 169  
 Grellet, Stephen (1773-1855) 216  
 Griffith, John 232
- Grimshaw, Hannah (Burleigh) (1769-1849) 216  
 Growdon, Joseph 25  
 Grubb, Edward (1854-1939) 79, 97, 193, 194, 205  
     Eliza (aft. Carroll) 43  
     John (d.1841) 81  
     Mollie 57, 185-7  
     Sarah Lynes (1772-1842) 80  
     Sarah (Tuke) (1756-90) 251, 252  
     Thomas Samuel 37  
 Gunn, Ann (Corbyn) (1739-97) 272  
     William (1738-1828) 272-6  
 Gurney, of Norwich 315  
 Gurney, Joseph John (1788-1847) 60, 67, 77-80, 82
- Hack, Maria (1777-1844) 67  
 Haddon, Elizabeth (aft. Estaugh) 228-9  
     John 228  
 Hale, Margaret (d.1683) 230  
 Halhead, Miles 115  
 Hall, David J. 104, 110, 208-9, 219, 307, 311-2  
     Thomas (1610-65) 118-22  
 Harding, William 66  
 Hare, William Loftus (1868-1943) 284-5  
 Hardshaw East MM 76, 79, 80, 92, 93  
 Harris, Charles (1782-1847) 216  
     James Rendel (1852-1941) 201, 280  
     John 54  
     Joseph 39  
     Sarah (1785-1873) 216  
 Harrison, John (d.1852) 81  
     Richard S. "Carroll family" 33-51; "Samuel Bewley" 260-71; *Richard Davis Webb* [review of] 309-10  
 Harvey family 18  
 Harvey, Deaves & Harvey 35, 36, 39, 40  
 Harvey, Joseph Massy 36  
     Reuben (d.1830) 35, 36, 39  
     Thomas (in Carolina) 143  
     Thomas (of Cork) 36, 38  
     Thomas Edmund (1875-1955) 291  
     William (of Youghal) 36  
 Hatton, Helen E. 209-10  
     Mary (aft. Carroll) 34  
 Haughton, Elizabeth (aft. Grubb) 37  
     Helena (aft. Shaw) 37  
     John Barcroft 34, 37  
     Sarah (aft. Carroll) 34, 37, 43, 44

- Hawksworth, Lydia (d.1788) 248
- Heron, Judith (aft. Bell) (d.1815) 243-4
- Hertfordshire Friends 314
- Hewison, Hope Hay 211, 285
- Heywood, John 140, 141
- Hibernian Society for the Promotion of Permanent and Universal Peace 268
- Hicks, Willett (d.1766-1845) 216
- Hicksites 77, 82-3
- Higgs, Daniel 120
- Jane 118-22
- Hill, Christopher 7
- Hily (Hiley), Joan (d.1687) 230
- Hine, Reginald Leslie (1883-1949) 250
- Hipsley, Henry 189
- Hobbs, Barnabas 94
- Hobson, Samuel (1870-1940) 283-4
- Hodgett, Gerald A.J. 111
- Hodgkin, Jonathan Edward (1875-1953) 294-5
- Thomas (1831-1913) 192, 280
- Hodgson, Joseph Spence 91
- Mary (d.1886) 90, 91
- William (1804-78) 82-87, 91, 96
- Holloway meeting, London 189
- Home missions 93-95
- Hooton, Elizabeth 124
- Hopwood, Diana Caroline (d.1799) 235, 252
- Horner, Benjamin (1668-1740) 232, 237
- Benjamin (d.1742) 232
- Christiana (Readshaw) (1670-1751) 232, 237
- Tabitha (1695-1747) 232, 237-8
- Horsfall, Betsy (aft. Firth) (1790-1864) 216
- Howgill, Francis 124
- Howitt, Mary 103-4
- Hubberthorne, Richard (1628-62) 125; at Wrexham 221, 224, 225
- Hume, Sophia 156
- Hunter, Doris 156
- Hustler, Christiana (d.1811) 159-61, 248-9
- John (1715-90) 249
- Sarah (1765-1817) 216, 249
- Hutchinson, Jonathan (1760-1835) 78, 79
- Ingle, Homer Larry 280
- Inquirer* (Evangelical Friends) 67
- Insurance business 38
- Ireland - famine 218
- Irving, William 81
- Irwin, William 90,93
- Jacob, Joshua (1814-83) 88-9
- James, John 52
- Jarvis, Roger T. 211
- Jefferey, Arthur 14
- Jenkins, James (1753-1831) 248
- Mehetabel 158, 159
- Jennings, Samuel 140
- John, John ap 221-3
- Johns, David L. "William Bradford" 21-32
- Johnson, Dr. Samuel 234, 252
- Jones, Ann (Burgess) (1744-1846) 81, 216
- David 55
- George (d.1841) 81
- John 53, 54
- Rebecca 158-61, 233, 248-50, 253
- Rufus Matthew 184-6, 192, 237, 281
- Jowitt, Benjamin (1788-1867) 216
- Deborah (Benson) 66
- Elizabeth (1812-86) 66
- John (1811-88) 58, 64, 66-71
- Maria Esther 70
- Rachel (Crewdson) (1782-1856) 216
- Rachel (aft. Reed) (1817-54) 66
- Robert (1784-1862) 58, 60, 68-9, 71, 216
- Susannah 68
- Keen, William 15-7
- Keith, George (1638-1716) 21, 25-9, 132-7, 141, 312-3
- Keithian controversy 21-32, 132-7
- Kemp, Caleb Rickman 189-90
- Kennedy, Thomas C. "An angry God" 183-98; "What hath Manchester wrought?" 277-305
- Kent 242
- Kidd, Benjamin 238
- Kidder, William 141
- Kilroy, Phil *Protestant dissent* [review of] 211-2
- Kirkham, John (1766-1827) 216
- Knaresborough MM 237
- Knight, George 9
- William 16
- Knowles, John 222-3
- Mary 252
- Labouchere, Rachel *Deborah Darby* [review of] 104-5
- Lafayette, M.J. marquis de 172
- Lancashire & Cheshire QM, 1871-2 90, 93
- Lancaster, Joseph (1778-1838) 216, 268
- Lydia 152, 154, 237
- Lancaster, Duchy of 1-3
- Languedoc 166, 167, 172-4
- Larcum, Nicholas 142
- Lawson, John at Wrexham 221, 224, 225
- Lean, William Scarnell 193
- Lecky & Mark, of Cork 34
- Lecky, John (1764-1839) 36, 38
- "Leeds and the Beaconite controversy" 57-73
- Leeds Friends (silhouettes) 214-8
- Leeds women's PM 231-2
- Leeds, Daniel 25, 28
- Lees, Ann 67
- Leslie, Charles (1650-1722) 110
- Lewis, Edmund 53
- Mary 53
- Samuel 53
- Liskeard 239
- Littleboy, Wilfred 287, 294, 297-8
- Liverpool, Friends service centre 106
- Lloyd, Samuel (1768-1849) 77, 78
- Llwyd, Morgan 221-7
- Logan, James 228
- London - visitors to 238-43;
- Box meeting 152, 154, 155;
- Devonshire House MM 23, 24; Fleet prison 241;
- Gracechurch Street meeting 243; Second day's morning meeting 146, 234, 242, 245;
- Two Weeks meeting 152, 158; Women's YM see Yearly Meeting
- Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth 229
- Looe, Cornwall 240
- Lowe, Emanuel 142-3
- McAuliffe, J. 40
- Maine, U.S.A. 138, 143
- Manchester - Beaconite controversy 58-62, 64
- Manchester conference 1895 97, 194, 199-207, 277-305;
- "Difficulty" 183-4, 186;
- Friends' Institute 89-91;
- Memorial Hall meeting 90, 91
- Manchester Friend* 90
- Marcillac, Jean de 166-7, 169-70, 172-3

- Marietta, Jack 151  
 Mark, Jacob 38  
 Marriage, clandestine 244  
 Marriage procedure 231  
 Marriott, Mary (Wright) (1760-1832) 216  
 Marsden, Caleb 238  
   Sarah (1707-62) 238  
 Marsh, Anne Warner 96  
   Samuel (1777-1854) 272  
   Thomas W. (1833-1902) 95, 96  
 Martin, Henry "Truth vindicated" 61  
   William 38  
 Maskell, Mary 76  
 Matthews, William 158-60  
 Maule, John 86  
 May, Edward 81-2  
 Mead, William (1628-1713) 141  
 Meeting for Sufferings (London) 242; & peace 294; women at 162, 233, 282  
 Melksham Friends 108  
 Mennonites in France 166, 174-8  
 Merry, Elizabeth (Benson) 235  
 Mew, Richard 141  
 Microfilms (World Microfilms) 110  
 Middleton, Tabitha 159  
 Mifflin, Warner 168  
 Milhouse, Thomas 157  
 Military service - France 166-82; World War I in Britain 285-98  
 Milles, Isaac (1638-1720) 138-9  
 Milligan, Edward H. 187, 279; "The ancient way" 74-101  
 Millington, Joyce *Friends Service Centre* [review of] 106  
 Ministry, Quaker 233-6; travelling ministers 238-53; unwelcome ministry 234-6, 243  
 Mirabeau, Comte de (1749-91) 170-2  
 Mission movement 93-6; home missions 190-1  
 Moate 82  
 Monmouthshire Friends 52-56  
 Moore, Rosemary 309; "Reactions to persecution" 123-31  
 More, Henry (1614-87) 139  
   John 145, 146  
 Morgan, Margaret 55  
 Morland, Stephen Coleby 230-1  
 Morley, William 243  
 Morning Meeting see London  
 Morris, Sarah 158  
   Susanna (1682-1753) 151, 155, 156, 240  
 Mortimer, Jean E. 307; "Quaker women" 228-59  
   Russell S. 110, 218, 313-5  
 Mott, Lucretia 163  
 Mountmellick 216, 262, 264-5; school 252  
 Mountrath 261, 262  
 Mullett, Michael *New light* [review of] 212-3  
 Murray-Rust, David "Manchester conference, 1895" 199-207  
  
 Nash, William (1790-1879) 273, 275  
 Nayler, James 7-8, 115-7, 128, 211, 225  
 Neale, Samuel (1729-92) 156-7, 159-60, 239, 247  
 Neave family 18  
 Neave, Moses 18  
 Neild, Hannah 76  
   Isaac 76  
 Nevins, of Waterford 35  
 Nevins, Maria (b.1793) 69, 216  
   Pim (d.1834) 217  
 "New light on George Fox" 102-3  
 Newbold, John Turner Walton (1888-1943) 297, 298  
 Newey, Edward 118  
 Newfoundland 13-20  
 Newlyn, Algie I. 249, 250  
 Newman, Henry Stanley 278-9  
 Nimmo, Dorothy 211  
 No-Conscription Fellowship 292  
 Nuttall, Geoffrey F. 8, 103; "Letter to George Fox" 221-7; "Penn's Preface" 113-7  
  
 Oasland, Henry (1625-1703) 118  
 Oaths 54-55  
 Ohio YM 74, 83  
 Oldner, George 146  
 Owen, James (1822-71) 90  
 Oxley, Joseph (d.1773) 242  
  
 Page, Joseph 217  
 Palmer, Charles (1759-1831) 272  
 Parker, James 21, 29  
 Parliament, appeals to 125  
 Parnell, James (1637?-1656) 8, 125  
 Partridge, Richard (1682?-1759) 242  
  
 Pasmore, Elinor 240  
 Payne, Richard Ecroyd (1791-1870) 217  
 Payton, Catherine (aft. Phillips) (1727-94) 156, 237, 246-8, 251, 252  
 Peace testimony (20th century) 285-98  
 Pearson, Susan 8-10  
   Thomas 10  
 Pease, Sir Alfred Edward (1857-1938) 105-6  
   John 89  
   Joseph Gurney *Wealth of happiness* [review of] 105-6  
   Sarah (Jowitt) (aft. Aldam) (1787-1824) 217  
 Peasley, Mary (aft. Neale) (1717-57) 152, 156, 246-8  
 Pemberton, John 155, 158-60, 232, 250  
 Penington, Isaac (1616-79) 140  
 Penn, William 140, 141, 147, 218-9, 228; "Frame of the government" 22-23; *Preface* 113-7  
 Penney family 18  
 Penney, Norman (1858-1933) 113  
 Pennsylvania charter 25, 27  
 Penrose family 44  
 "Persecution, Reactions to" 123-31  
 Philadelphia MM 24-26, 28; printing 21-32; Women's YM 157, 158; YM 82, 83  
 Phillips, Catherine - see Payton  
 Phillips, James (1745-99) 169, 172  
   William (d.1785) 247-8  
 Phipps, Joseph (1708-87) 238-41  
 Pickard, Daniel (1828-1905) 81, 82, 84, 86-90, 93, 94  
 Pickering & Hull MM archives 315  
 Pike, Ebenezer 39, 43  
   Richard 261  
 Pim, Jonathan 46  
   Richard 265  
   Susanna (aft. Bewley) 260  
   Tobias 261  
 Pitt, Andrew (c.1675-1736) 234  
 Placentia, Newfoundland 17, 18  
 Plainness 52-56  
 "Ploughshare, The" 284, 290, 293-5  
 Pollard, William (1828-93) 95, 96, 188-9  
 Pool, William 9-10  
 Poole, Roger "Lost legacy?" 272-6

- Price, Anna 160, 233  
 Printing 22, 23, 229-30;  
   c.1670-1850 110; in  
   Philadelphia 21-32  
 Pumphrey, John (1739-1834)  
   272  
   John (1775-1835) 272  
   Julius (1778-1856) 272
- Quaker Family History Society  
 111  
 Queen, Address to the 145
- Rabaut Saint-Etienne, Jean  
   Paul 169, 172  
 Randall, Joseph 17  
 Ransom, Mercy 159  
 Ratcliff & Barking MM 272-6  
 Rawlinson, Thomas 222  
 Raylton, Tace (Sowle) (1669-  
   1749) 229-30  
   Thomas 229  
*Reasonable Faith*, A (1884) 189,  
 200, 279  
 Reynolds, John 120  
 Richardson, James N. 88, 89  
 Richmond Declaration, 1887  
 191-3, 299  
 Rickaby, Mary (d.1752) 243  
   Thomas (d.1742) 243  
 Rickman, Matilda (1799-1882)  
 86, 87  
 Ridgway family 18  
 Rigge, Alice 159  
 Robinson, Ellen (1840-1912)  
 282  
   George 119  
 Robson, Walter (1842-1929)  
 95, 96, 101n.96  
 Rogers, William (d.1711) 152,  
 230  
 Rollmann, Hans "George  
   Skeffington" 13-20  
 Ross, Thomas 159  
 Rotch, Benjamin 167, 169,  
 170, 172-3  
   William 166-7, 169-70, 172-3  
 Routh, Martha 159-61, 233  
 Row, Susanna 159  
 Rowntree, Arnold Stephenson  
 (1872-1951) 288-9, 291  
   Benjamin Seebohm (1871-  
   1954) 284  
   John Wilhelm (1868-1905)  
   184, 194, 208, 280-2  
   Joshua 287  
   Rachel (aft. Priestman)  
   (1800-37) 217  
 Royal Exchange Insurance of  
 Ireland 262  
*Rules of Discipline* (1834) 78, 79  
 Rutherford, Sir Ernest 205
- St. Columb, Cornwall 240  
 St. George Steam Packet Co.  
 38-9, 41, 43-4  
 Sargent, John G. 74-5, 82, 85,  
 87-8, 95, 96  
 Scattergood, Thomas 82  
 Schools, Friends' 248, 252-3;  
   see also Ackworth;  
   Clerkenwell; Clonmel;  
   Gildersome; Mountnellick;  
   Sidcot; York, Trinity Lane  
 Scott, Janet 213  
   Richenda 184  
 Seebohm, Benjamin 66, 71  
 Sewell, Joseph (b.1820) 71  
 Shackleton, Roger 243  
   William 244  
 Shambler, Samuel 13, 16  
 Sharp, Isaac (1847-1917) 274,  
 275  
 Shaw, Archibald Christy 37  
 Shillitoe, Thomas (1754-1836)  
 81, 217  
 Ships: Amphitrite 34; Apollo  
 41, 42; Bridgetown 45;  
 Brilliant 41; British Lion  
 47; Champlain 40; Cherub  
 266; Commerce 266;  
 Dublin Packet 262; Earl  
 Talbot: 36, 39; Favourite  
 266; Foxwell 34; Gaspee  
 39; Governor Douglas 40;  
 Happy Return 266; Heart  
 of Oak 35, 36; Hellas 267;  
 Henry Duncan 42; Industry  
 35, 36; Integrity 34; Irio  
 39; John 35; John  
 Campbell 41; John Francis  
 45; Julia 46; Kingston 45;  
 Lord Raglan 46;  
 Manchester 45; Mandarin  
 267; Nelson Packet 39;  
 Ospray 34; Philadelphia  
 262; Superb 39; Swift 35,  
 36; Try again 40; Volunteer  
 39; Welcome 23  
 Sidcot School - pupils' clothing  
 52-53  
 Silhouettes 214-8  
 Simpson, Thomas 76  
   William (1845-1914) 90  
 Singing hymns 93-95  
 Skeffington, George 13-20  
 Smith, Humphrey (d.1663)  
 124, 127  
   Robert 5, 10  
 Smythies, Grace 235  
 Socialist Quaker Society 284-5,  
 288, 290, 295-7  
 Sowle press 22, 23  
 Sowle, Andrew (1628-95) 22,  
 23, 25, 229  
   Jane 229  
   Tace (aft. Raylton) 229-30  
 Sparkes, Alfred 275  
 Sparks, Patricia R. 105  
 Speakman, Thomas H. (1827-  
   1904) 183-4  
 Squire, Sarah Agnes 275  
 Stabler, Edward (1730-85) 246  
 Stephenson, Isaac (1765-1830)  
 217  
 Stewart, Kathleen Anne York  
   *Retreat* [review of] 109  
 Story, John (d.1681) 152, 230,  
 232  
   Thomas (1670?-1742) 232  
 Strangman family 18  
 Sufferings literature 124-9  
 Summer schools 282  
 Swearing 54-55  
 Swett, Mary 250
- Tatham, Joseph (1767-1843)  
 58-60, 66, 217  
 Taylor, Ernest E. (1869-1955)  
 286, 288  
 Tea trade 267  
 Tennant, Margaret 66  
 Textile industries, Irish 260-71  
 Thaxted MM 307  
 Thirsk MM 243  
 Theology, Quaker 279-80,  
 298-9  
 Thistlethwaite, William  
   Pearson 230, 234  
 Thomas, John 55  
 Thompson, Charles (1819-  
   1903) 81, 87, 90-94  
 Silvanus Phillips (1851-1916)  
 199-207, 280, 316  
 Thorne, Edwin (1837-1914)  
 273-4  
 Thorp family 76  
 Tillam, Thomas 223-4  
 Tipperary Co. Friends 110  
 Tiverton 239  
 Tomkins, John (1663?-1706)  
 132  
 Travelling in the ministry 236-  
 53  
 Tristram, Andrew 118  
 Tuke, Esther 159, 161, 253  
   Samuel (1784-1857) 60, 65,  
   77  
   William (1732-1822) 159  
 Turner, Rebecca (aft. Cowell)  
 (d.1756) 237  
   William Edward 189
- Ulster Friends 314  
 Unitarian Tract Society 77  
 Updegraff, David B. 95  
 Upperside MM 140, 146-7  
 Valentine, Robert 159

- Voysey, Charles (1828-1912)  
92-3
- Wadebridge 240
- Wake, Henry T. 88
- Walker, Edna (Heaviside)  
(1663-1712) 237  
Eleanor (Middleton) 237  
John (1791-1862) 217
- Wallace, John William 23
- Waller, Richard 224
- Wallis, Henry Marriage 286
- Waln, Nicholas 159
- War and the Social Order  
Committee 288-9, 294-8
- Ward, Kenerie 283
- Wardell, Robert (d.1696) 143,  
144, 147
- Webb, Richard Davis (1803-  
72) 309-10
- Webley, Edmund 54  
Grace 54
- Welsh YM 52
- Wesley, John 236
- West India trade 35-41
- West, Jane (Bracher) (1792-  
1860) 217  
William (1792-1851) 217
- Western Circular YM (1778)  
248
- Western QM 93-94
- Western YM (U.S.A.) 1877 94,  
95
- Westmorland QM 65
- Weston, Mary 156
- Wheeler, Daniel (1771-1840)  
81
- Whistlecroft, Charles "Lost  
legacy?" 272-6
- Whitehead, George (1636-  
1723) 141, 146
- Whitelock, Hannah  
(Arthington) (1755-1840)  
217  
Hannah (aft. Walker) (1788-  
1864) 218  
Isaac (1667-1737) 232  
Sarah (d.1760) 232
- Whittell, John 223
- Whittington, Joyce *Thaxted*  
*MM* [review of] 307
- Widder, Robert 126
- Wilbur, John 77, 81-2, 95
- Wilkinson, John (Separatist)  
152, 230, 232  
John (1783?-1846) 77, 78
- Willan, Thomas 9
- Williams, Eryl Hall *Quaker*  
*relief* [review of] 106-7  
Joseph 233
- Wills, Monmouthshire 53-55
- Wilson, Edith Jane 192-3  
Isaac (1784-1844) 65  
Roger Cowan 185-6
- Wilton 240
- Winn, Katherine 230
- Winstanley, Gerard 295
- Women, Quaker 314
- "Women in the 18th century"  
228-59; women at London  
YM 1888 193; at  
Manchester 1895 282; and  
pacifism 290
- Women's meetings 151-65,  
230-33; in Cornwall 248
- Women's Service Committee  
292
- Women's writing 308-9
- Women's YM, London 151-65
- Woodbrooke 282
- Woods, Joseph 160
- Worcester Friends 5-12
- Worcester & Shropshire MM  
272-6
- Worfield, George 6
- World Conference of All  
Friends, 1920 298, 299
- Worsdell, Edward (1852-1908)  
189, 200, 279
- Wright, Alfred Henry (1870-  
1956) 274, 275  
Mary (1755-1859) 82  
Rebecca 158-60  
Sheila *Friends in York*  
[review of] 310-11
- Writer, Clement (1586-1662)  
5-8, 10  
John 5  
Ursula 6
- Wycombe 138-47
- Yearly Meeting, London 232-  
233; (1830) 77; (1833) 78,  
79; (1850) 74; (1855) 74,  
75; (1856) 74; (1861) 74;  
(1862) 83; (1875) 76; (1878)  
94; (1888) 193; (1915) 287-  
8; (1916) 289, 295
- Yearly Meeting, Women's 151-  
65, 232-3, 249, 282
- York Friends 235, 238-46, 310-  
11; the Retreat 109, 267-8;  
Trinity Lane school 253
- Yorkshire Meeting of Ministers  
& Elders 243
- Yorkshire QM 64, 155, 232
- Yorkshire Women's QM 230
- Young Friends 286, 290-1
- Young Men's Service  
Committee 292
- Zenger, John Peter 21



*The  
Journal of the  
Friends' Historical  
Society*

*Volume 57*

*1994—96*

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY  
FRIENDS HOUSE, EUSTON ROAD, LONDON, NW1 2BJ

## CONTENTS

Page	
1	Research Note on Judge Thomas Fell (1598-1658). <i>Richard G. Bailey</i>
5	Some Incidents on Early Worcester Quakerism. <i>C.D. Gilbert</i>
13	“Thy Real Friend George Skeffington”: Quaker and Salmon Fishing Pioneer in Eighteenth-Century Newfoundland. <i>Hans Rollmann</i>
21	Convincement and Disillusionment: Printer William Bradford and the Keithian Controversy in Colonial Philadelphia. <i>David L. Johns</i>
33	The Carroll Family: A Cork Quaker Business Dynasty. <i>Richard S. Harrison</i>
52	Dress and Deportment of Monmouthshire Friends c. 1655-1850. <i>Richard Allen</i>
57	Further Thoughts on Leeds Friends and the Beaconite Controversy. <i>Mark A. Ellison</i>
74	‘The Ancient Way’: the Conservative Tradition in Nineteenth Century British Quakerism. <i>Edward H. Milligan</i>
102, 208, 306	Recent Publications
110, 214, 312	Notes and Queries
113	Reflections on William Penn’s Preface to George Fox’s <i>Journal</i> . <i>Geoffrey F. Nuttall</i>
118	The Puritan and the Quakeress: Thomas Hall and Jane Higgs. <i>C.D. Gilbert</i>
123	Reactions to Persecution in Primitive Quakerism. <i>Rosemary Moore</i>
132	Some Unpublished Quaker Tracts (Margaret Everard fl. 1699-1704). <i>Rosamund Cummings</i>

- 138 John Archdale's Quakerism. *Kenneth L. Carroll*
- 151 The Establishment of London Women's Yearly Meeting: A Transatlantic Concern. *Margaret Hope Bacon*
- 166 Conscientious Objection in Revolutionary France. *Peter Brock*
- 183 An Angry God or a Reasonable Faith: The British Society of Friends, 1873-1888. *Thomas C. Kennedy*
- 199 The Manchester Conference and a memoir of Silvanus P. Thompson. *David Murray-Rust*
- 221 A New Letter to George Fox. *Geoffrey F. Nuttall*
- 228 Quaker Women in the Eighteenth Century: Opportunities and Constraints. *Jean E. Mortimer*
- 260 Samuel Bewley (1764-1837), Silk Merchant and Philanthropist of Dublin. *Richard S. Harrison*
- 272 The Lost Legacy? *Roger Poole and Charles Whistlecroft*
- 277 What Hath Manchester Wrought? Change in the Religious Society of Friends, 1895-1920. *Thomas C. Kennedy.*
- 317 Index

## *ERRATA*

### Volume 56

- Page 262, line 28. *For has read had*
- Page 266, line 30. *For is read it*
- Page 270, line 15. *For man read men*
- Page 272, line 9. *For incidently read incidentally*
- Page 277, line 8. *For delapidated read dilapidated*
- Page 300, line 15. *For form read from*

### This volume

- Page 57, line 12. *For Preparatory read Preparative*
- Page 64, line 23. ditto
- Page 70, line 34. ditto
- Page 72, note 22. *For Eliza read Elisha*
- Page 92, line 13. *For Heelaugh read Healaugh*
- Page 95, line 4. *For Tirnbeck read Thirnbeck*
- Page 104, lines 8 & 15. *For Derby read Darby*
- Page 159, line 14. *For John read Joseph*
- Page 216, note 10 line 2. *For Sarah Jones read Sarah Burgess*

Supplements to the Journal of Friends' Historical Society

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.

FHS, Occasional Series No. 1 MANCHESTER, MANCHESTER and MANCHESTER AGAIN: from 'SOUND DOCTRINE' to 'A FREE MINISTRY'. By Roger C. Wilson. 1990. Members £2, Non-Members £3.

**N.B. SPECIAL OFFER: until the end of 1997 back issues of the *Journal* may be obtained for 50p each issue plus postage.**

---

*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.

ISSN No. 0071 9587

---

E & E Plumridge Ltd, Linton, Cambridge