The Journal of the Friends Historical Society

Volume 61 Number 2

CONTENTS

FRIENDS HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Annual membership Subscription due 1st January (personal, Meetings and Quaker Institutions in Great Britain and Ireland) £12 US $24 and £20 or $40 for other institutional members. Subscriptions should be sent to Brian Hawkins, Membership Secretary, Friends Historical Society, 12 Purbeck Heights, Belle Vue Road, Swanage, Dorset BH19 2HP. Orders for single numbers and back issues should be sent to FHS c/o the Library, Friends House, 173 Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ.

Volume 61 Number 2 2007 (Issued 2008)

THE JOURNAL OF THE FRIENDS HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Communications should be addressed to the Editor of the *Journal* c/o 6 Kenlay Close, New Earswick, York YO32 4DW, U.K.
email:howardgregg@hotmail.co.uk
Reviews: please communicate with the Assistant Editor, David Sox, 20 The Vineyard, Richmond-upon-Thames, Surrey TW10 6AN.

EDITORIAL

The Editor regrets the late despatch of this *Journal*.

Let me begin on a note of joy. After fifteen years of careful research Edward H. Milligan's BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF BRITISH QUAKERS IN COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY 1775-1920 is now available. Handsomely produced by Sessions of York, EHM hopes his book will be the inspiration for further research. It is good to have so wide-ranging and well-illustrated a reference work to both consult and enjoy. A full review will appear in the 2008 issue of *J.F.H.S.* A flier is enclosed with this issue and please see the FUTURE EVENTS page for an event on the 14 February 2008.

From joy to sadness at the loss of both Geoffrey Nuttall and Gerald A.J. Hodgett. A Congregational Minister, Geoffrey Nuttall made a distinguished contribution to the study of early Quakerism amongst other areas of his formidable scholarship. The Memorial Service held for him on the 16 November in London proved a moving and inspiring occasion.

Gerald A.J. Hodgett gave long service to the Friends Historical Society. He was President in 1979 and Editor of this Journal from 1986-96. Gerald too was a fine scholar and brought high standards to his editorship of the *Journal*. He could combine a serious and careful Quaker approach to all matters he dealt with with a quiet and gentle humour and a practical generosity which our Society benefitted from. There is to be a Memorial Meeting for Gerald at Westminster Meeting

House on Saturday, 26 January 2008 at 12.00 noon. An obituary, prepared by Rowena Loverance, is included in this issue.

The Executive Committee wishes Heather Rowland well on her move from the Library at Friends House to the Library and Collections of the Society of Antiquaries in the New Year.

Will readers please note carefully the FUTURE EVENTS page which gives notice of several events in 2008.

J.F.H.S. Vol. 61 No. 2 begins with Melanie Barber's Presidential Address which explores links between the Church of England and Quakers in two distinct periods. Drawing on her considerable knowledge of Quaker connexions in the archives of Lambeth Palace Library Melanie opens up a new and fascinating field for Quaker historians. Eighteenth Century records allow an exploration of how successive Archbishops of Canterbury viewed their Quaker contemporaries and the strength of their Meetings and witness. Contacts and Quaker initiatives with leading figures in the Anglican hierarchy between 1920 and 1960 are explored through several Quakers, principally the tenacious and visionary Edith Ellis.

Justine Williams, a postgraduate student, examines the controversial impact between Quakers and their opponents and supporters in Cambridge in 1659.

James Robertson demonstrates how a newly found letter of William Penn can illuminate his career at a specific date and context.

Adam Kidson's postgraduate research enables him to explore Irish Quakers and their response, through the Peace Testimony, to serious issues they faced in Ireland between 1880 and 1923. The Irish Revolution has seen much recent study so it is good to have a Quaker exploration of this troubled period in Anglo-Irish history.

The Editor welcomes articles or short items for consideration in future JOURNALS. He is willing to read drafts and advise where appropriate. He would like to include annotated Quaker historical documents, of reasonable length i.e. not too long, from contributors who have the expertise and enthusiasm to prepare them.

Contributors are advised to use the MHRA (Modern Humanities Research Association STYLE GUIDE in the preparation of material. This is available from Subscription Department, Maney Publishing, Hudson Road, Leeds LS9 7DL (e-mail: maneymaney.co.uk) or online at MHRA's website (w.w.w.mhra.org.uk).

The editor's decision is final as regards publication or revision.

Howard F Gregg

TALES OF THE UNEXPECTED: GLIMPSES OF FRIENDS IN THE ARCHIVES OF LAMBETH PALACE LIBRARY

By the very nature of the collections in Lambeth Palace Library [1] which reflect the views of establishment figures, Archbishops, Bishops, and to a lesser extent local clergy, it is inevitable that Friends are not always portrayed in a particularly sympathetic light, especially in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.[2] The collections as a whole illustrate the full breadth of change in society's and the Church of England's attitudes to Friends over the years. These range from virulent attack and total incomprehension of Quaker testimonies in the late seventeenth century to mutual accommodation in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when the Society of Friends was in general conceived less as a threat to the establishment; then finally in a more ecumenical age to an acceptance that Friends had a recognisable contribution to make as both individuals and a Society – at a time when a Quaker, Douglas Steere, was among the official observers present at a Lambeth Conference, in 1968,[3] and when an Archbishop of Canterbury, Robert Runcie, used his privilege under Peter's Pence Act of 1534 to grant a Lambeth doctorate of civil law to Sydney Bailey in 1985 in recognition of his services to international justice and peace, the first Quaker to receive a Lambeth degree.[4]

It is not my purpose to provide a lengthy catalogue of records or a guide to references to Friends in the manuscripts and archives at Lambeth, but rather to home in on a couple of different and contrasting collections dating variously from the eighteenth and the twentieth centuries which show Friends in less expected lights. The first set of records, which developed out of the long-established episcopal practice of visitation, illustrates the attitude of local clergy to their non-conforming neighbours, whereas the twentieth century's less formal collections of archiepiscopal and episcopal correspondence provide examples of the Archbishops' relations with a few individual Friends, but concentrating on one particular Friend, Edith M. Ellis (1878-1963), who relentlessly pursued the episcopal bench in her remorseless mission for a united Christian stand for international peace and reconciliation based on sound Christian principles.

Quakers viewed through Visitation Returns in the eighteenth Century

From the Middle Ages onwards, Bishops used the practice of visitation as a means of controlling and informing themselves of the state of religious and moral observance within the parishes in their dioceses. By the early eighteenth century, and no doubt affected by the introduction of a limited toleration of Nonconformists, some of the inherited formal methods of relying on the local churchwardens to present misdemeanours became increasingly less reliable and informative, unless perhaps the miscreants were withholding payment.of various dues, or tithes from the local incumbent.[5]

With the gradual decrease in the reliability of churchwardens' presentments for giving a true indication of the problems within a parish (many reporting omnia bene, or all is well), and the need for Bishops to gain a better understanding of what was happening among the clergy and parishes locally, there developed a practice, first initiated by William Wake as Bishop of Lincoln in 1706, and subsequently used by him as Archbishop of Canterbury from 1716, of circulating to his clergy just before his visitation a series of printed questions, with space beneath each question for their answers.[6] Unlike churchwardens' presentments, the answers or returns had no legal status and could not be used as a preliminary to prosecution in the church courts. The questions and answers, known as visitation articles and returns, were broader in scope and the answers by the clergy were more informal. The articles covered a variety of subjects about the extent and composition of the parish, the state of ministry, the times and number of religious services, the provision for catechising the children, the residence of the incumbent, local charities and schools, and use of the offertory money. Archbishop Wake's visitation articles of 1716 began with the following two sections of questions:

> What Number of Families have you in your Parish? Of these, how many are Dissenters? And of what Sort are they?
>
> Have you any Licensed or other Meeting House in your Parish? How many? Of what Sort? How often do they assemble? In what Numbers? Who teaches in them?[7]

These articles formed the basis of all visitation articles drawn up by the Bishops and Archbishops in both England and Wales, but often a Bishop or Archbishop would add his own individual emphasis depending on his own specific interests. This was particularly the case with Thomas Secker, first as Bishop of Oxford (1737-58), and subsequently as Archbishop of Canterbury (1758-68).[8] In general

Secker was more tolerant of Nonconformists than some of his fellow bishops, but he had a particular suspicion of Quakers, viewing them 'as extremely apt to be perverse in every thing'.[9] He had encountered them as Bishop of Bristol during their campaigns in support of the Quakers Tithe Bill of 1736, observing in his speech on the latter in the House of lords that the Quakers 'plead a Scruple of Conscience against paying the Clergy what is due to them by the Law of the land'....'they meet every year in very large Numbers, & write circular Letters to all their Congregations stirring up & exciting all their Friends in the strongest manner that words can express to disobey the Laws of the Land that require that AntiChristian Payment of Tithes',[10] a reference to Friends' testimony to be mindful of the AntiChristian yoke of tithes. As Bishop of Oxford, he paid particular attention to them in his visitation charge of 1750, advising clergy to take care especially in dealing with them over tithes: 'For they are a Generation, loud in their Complaints, unfair in their Representations, and peculiarly bitter in their Reflections, where we are concerned: unwearied in labouring to render us odious and surprisingly artful in recommending themselves to the Great'.[11]

Given this antipathy towards Friends, it is perhaps not surprising to find that Secker as Bishop of Oxford, and then as Archbishop of Canterbury, amplified and expanded the set of visitation articles he circulated to his diocesan clergy. In addition to questions about the extent of the parish, numbers of families, and people of note, the residence of the incumbents, local charities and schools, he asked the following very searching questions about all those who did not conform, starting perhaps understandably with detailed questions about Papists, continuing through Dissenters (excluding Quakers), and concluding with the following series of questions on Quakers.

> 'Are there any Quakers in your Parish, and how many? Is their Number decreased or increased of late Years, and by what number. Have they a meeting House in your Parish duly licensed, and how often do they meet there? Do any of them and how many in Proportion, pay your legal Dues without Compulsion. If not, do you lose such Dues, Or how do you recover them? And what Facts do you know, which may help to set their Behaviour towards the Clergy, or that of the Clergy towards them in a true Light?'[12]

The Secker visitation returns of 1758-9 consist of six volumes covering some 350 parishes, not only of the diocese of Canterbury, but of the Archbishop's far-flung exempt or peculiar jurisdictions in other dioceses, mainly in North Kent, the city of London, Middlesex,

Surrey, Sussex, and Buckinghamshire. As regards the diocese of Canterbury, which covered most of Kent south of the Medway, 32 out of the 265 returned record information on local Quakers, and for the Peculiars, 17 of the 90 returns provide such details. These figures were significantly less than those in 1716. Friends represented a small minority of all dissenting sects, with the exception of the rare instance of a Muggletonian.[13] Incidentally fewer of the returns recorded Papists, another group that periodically aroused even more public alarm and suspicion, though they were probably more numerous and were clustered around noble families, such as Sir Edward Hales, bart, in Hackington, and Lord Teynham in Lynsted.[14]

As a general observation. Quakers were not seen to be increasing in these areas covered by the 1758 returns – the only dissenting group perceived to be increasing in certain places was that of the Methodists. Most of the returns that referred specifically to Quakers suggest that the sect was thought to have decreased in numbers of late, a similar decline being attributed to some other Nonconformists, especially the Baptists (and this is borne out by comparing the returns to Archbishop Wake over forty years previously with those of 1758).[15] Some Quaker families had died out, or the children had been converted to the Church of England as at Wellesborough, where the four children of the wealthy Quaker farmer had been baptised, with his consent, the eldest in 1739, and the others in 1740.[16] At St. Mary Cray, the curate reported how the only Quakers there, a substantial miller and his sister, had been baptised by him in 1757, and had subsequently been confirmed, and had since been very constant in their attendance at the parish church.[17] At Bishopsbourne and Ruckinge there were instances of Quaker women married to Anglicans whose children had all been baptised by the local incumbent.[18] Some licensed Quaker meeting houses in Kent, such as those at Loose and at Birchington, were either being resorted to less than in the past, or had not been frequented for several years.[19] At Monk's Risborough in Buckinghamshire, it was reported that Quakers had formerly been very numerous and had a meeting house and a burial place.[20] On the other hand, very occasionally, Quaker families had moved to the parish from elsewhere as happened at Mersham in Kent and Putney in Surrey.[21] And in one of the city of London parishes in the Archbishop's deanery of the Arches, the numbers of Quakers had increased, partly as the parish was well situated for trade, and there were other Quakers in adjoining parishes, and it was near to 'their grand Meeting House in White Hart Court Lane, Lombard Street', namely Gracechurch Street

Meeting House.[22]

Folkestone had the largest number of Quakers. In a parish consisting of some 550 houses, there were twenty four families of Quakers. But even so their number was thought to have lessened, chiefly as a result of intermarriages with Anglicans – an effect noted as being very different from what intermarriage with other sectaries produced. Indeed Quakers were 'not so industrious to make Proselytes, as others are'.[23]

At Benenden in Kent, in a parish with 150 families, there were only three Quakers, one was a widower of 80 and upwards; the other two, a married couple, were described as 'very near as ancient'. Their children and grandchildren belonged to the Established Church, most of them having been baptised by the current incumbent, John Williams, who had been appointed in 1744. As regards payments, he noted 'As their Dues to me are but small, being only Sixpence a year from the three, one of them commonly works it out in my Garden. They are respected for their Honesty & upright dealing by all the Parish'.[24]

At Ashford where there were 314 houses, four or five families were Quakers. Their number had rather lessened that increased. They had a meeting house, said to be duly licensed, and they met every Sunday. Occasionally they met at other times, notably at Whitsuntide when they had 'a General Meeting, Assembly, or Visitation'.[25]

At Croydon in Surrey, where there was a meeting house, their meetings were more numerous in summer than in winter – 'Londoners of this Persuasion having Lodgings at this time of year at Croydon', clearly the wealthier Friends.[26] But Quakers were not the only ones who moved out of London to Croydon during the summer months. There was a similar increase in the numbers who frequented both the Baptist and Presbyterian Churches.[27]

As to the payment of various dues owing to the local incumbent, there was a general impression given of some accommodation, reporting either that the Quakers paid their dues or that the incumbent had no difficulty in levying church rates or tithes from them. The three Quaker families living in the city of London parish of St. Michael, Crooked Lane, wisely avoided 'the necessary expense of compulsion, which they know will come upon them' and therefore 'sometimes submit upon frequent threatening; and at other times they suffer themselves to be defrauded, as they call it, by the old Artifice of stopping the money in the hands of those, who have dealings with them in trade'.[28] At Monk's Risborough, it was

reported that since the Restoration there had been no dispute over the tithes of one Quaker family who had long occupied an estate valued at about £80 per annum. 'The person who rented the Parsonage usually went first with his Cart & took out the Tenth Cock and Shock, being for the most part allow'd a reasonable time to do so; and in lieu of Privy Tithes amounting annually to about twenty shillings, he took up a Load of Beans, which was judg'd an equivalent, from some part of the Quakers Lands.' This Friend's compliance was attributed to the fact that in the time of the Commonwealth ('Usurpation'), when 'the legal Incumbent had been ejected' and replaced by Nathaniel Anderson, his great grandfather had been prosecuted for withholding tithes. The Quaker 'was obstinate and lay in Goal for a considerable time'.[29]

There were however a number of Friends who still maintained the Society's testimony against payment of tithes and church rates, refusing to pay until compelled or distrained to do so. But perhaps surprisingly not all Quakers in a particular parish, who would presumably have attended the same meeting, followed the same policy. At Mersham, of the two Friends assessed for tithes, one paid by composition as other parishioners did, but the other 'will not yield to this, but he very civilly allous me to take all great Tithes in kind', and for the small tithes, the cleric had to apply to the local justice of the peace 'after first trying in vain to persuade him to pay such dues without compulsion'.[30] Similar differences were reported in other parishes. This is particularly interesting as one might have expected some pressure to conform within a meeting.

It took one outsider to observe that one solitary Quaker, a man of good disposition, was 'held to his profession more by the constraint of his Friends than by his own inclination'.[31]

Some clergy thought that their dues were too small to be worth pursuing, preferring to lose them than have the trouble and expense of a law suit. In one of the Canterbury parishes, St Andrew's the incumbent reported that none paid without compulsion. 'Of two of them, who are in good Circumstances, I recover them by Course of Law. The other being indigent, them I lose'.[32] Failure to pay was at times seen to be more the result of poverty than obstinacy. Indeed there were references to the low status of some of the Quakers, particularly in Canterbury.[33]

Unfortunately the returns rarely give the names of local Quaker families. One exception was at Cranbrook in Kent where Sherlock Thorp occupied land as a farmer, and also kept an ale house about

two miles out of town. He was, apparently, rather dilatory about paying his tithes, like some other parishioners, though he did not apparently 'declare against Payment of it'.[34]

Occasionally details are given about the nature of the meeting for worship itself. At Cranbrook, there was no ministry ('speaking') unless' some Person (which happens now & then) who pretends to that Gift comes from a Distance', a reference to Friends who travelled in the ministry. The incumbent reported that one of 'these Speakers (a Woman)' had visited the previous week, and had given 'an Exhortation to the Soldiers at the Barracks on Horseback behind a Man'.[35] At Dover, a silent meeting was held twice a week, there being 'no Speaker among them'.[36] At Margate, in the meeting held in Drapers Almshouses, there was very seldom any ministry ('Preaching'), perhaps only three to four times a year, and then chiefly at funerals.[37]

On the whole Quakers were viewed as inoffensive, quiet, an honest sort, or even respected, and in one parish, Charlwood, they joined their Anglican neighbours in public worship.[38] On the other hand, one Kent cleric observed: 'they seem extremely bigotted to their own Opinions and hold their Neighbours in great contempt as if for want of their light, everybody else was in the dark'.[39]

The same set of visitation articles was circulated by Archbishop Moore in 1786 to his diocesan clergy, followed shortly afterwards to the parishes within his exempt jurisdictions.[40] To a large extent, the returns reinforce the trends identified in 1758. But where the earlier answers indicated the presence of an elderly Friend or two, the later returns show that the Quaker presence in the parish had died out with them, as happened at both Ash-next-Sandwich and Benenden in Kent.[41] At Ashford, the meeting house had not been used for eight to ten years, leaving the three or four families of the 'lowest sort' to go to a distant meeting.[42] At Cranbrook, there were no longer any Quakers, though there was a meeting house and a burial ground, the former where meetings had previously been held annually, had not been resorted to during the past two to three years.[43] There were other parishes too where previously there had been a couple of Quaker families, but now there were none. However one of the Canterbury parishes showed an actual increase, no doubt reflecting changing patterns of population and work within the surroundings areas, and the shift towards the towns.[44]

Certain conclusions can be drawn by looking at these replies to the Archbishop: the comparatively small numbers of Quaker families in

the areas concerned, and relatively small number of parishes involved. Indeed the diocese of Canterbury was not one of the well populated areas for Quakers, certainly not by comparison with some of the northern dioceses.[45] There was generally a level of accommodation or adoption of some sort of compromise or acceptance of going through the motions as regards payment of tithes and other church dues, and in general good relations prevailed between Quakers and their neighbours, clerical or otherwise, especially in small rural parishes. Even where compulsion or distraint was resorted to, there seems to have been no apparent ill will on the part of the Quakers to the officials concerned. The picture contrasts with the Society's complaints, at times vocal, about their sufferings,[46] and the local picture as portrayed in these returns submitted by the clergy may well have misled some Archbishops and Bishops into dismissing the claims of Quakers, especially in those dioceses where Friends were thin on the ground. I suspect that Quakers and Bishops were sometimes relying on different evidence – the latter more concerned with actual prosecutions, rather than cases of distraint or the other ways of raising the dues, and indeed it may not have been in the interests of those making the returns to draw attention to the difficulties of their dealings with their Quaker neighbours.[47]

Twentieth century Friends

A different perspective on Friends and their relations with the Church of England can be seen in the extensive twentieth-century papers of the Archbishops of Canterbury, Randall Davidson to William Temple, and of George Bell, Bishop of Chichester. These collections are so interrelated even though the individuals ecclesiastics were very different personalities.[48] Friends feature in some of these as officials of organisations with which they were involved, such as Percy Bartlett, secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Gerald Bailey of the National Peace Council, and Lucy Gardner, honorary secretary of COPEC (the Conference on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship) held in 1924. In addition there are subjects, mainly humanitarian in the broadest sense, where Friends' testimonies prompted the Society in general or individual Friends to consort with Church leaders, over such subjects as South Africa, apartheid, the death penalty, refugees, race relations and emigration, conscientious objection, to name but a few. However I am primarily concerned with Friends where they express their own views as distinct from those of the organisation for which they worked.

One not infrequent, but much respected correspondent, of both Archbishop Temple and Bishop Bell during the Second World War was the very sensitive and thoughtful Friend, Stephen Hobhouse (1881-1961), who had suffered imprisonment, solitary confinement, and hard labour for his stand against conscription during the First World War. He felt called to resume his active membership of the Church of England, whilst remaining a Friend, for the sake of Christian unity and out of a feeling of affection and unity for the local vicar, David Parry Williams, who had helped to get together an inter-church prayer fellowship group at Broxbourne and Hoddesdon in Hertfordshire.[49] He shared his anguish with Bishop Bell, himself an outspoken opponent of the Allies' obliteration bombing of Germany: 'I expect your heart aches, as mine does, especially over these utterly devastating bombing raids. Worse to me, indeed, is the apparent blindness of most of our Church leaders and spokesmen to the fact that the deliberate, most carefully organised use of such systematic destruction is setting in train currents of anti-social soul force, tremendous hates and fears which are going to make the work of a "good" peace and national and international harmony so much more difficult, even than after 1918'.[50]

Given these views, it is perhaps surprising to find that Stephen Hobhouse asked Archbishop Temple, one of those Church leaders who refused to condemn these bombing raids, to write an introduction to the revised edition of his pamphlet, *Christ and our enemies*, first published by the Fellowship of Reconciliation in 1941. The original pamphlet itself had been born out 'of a long time of concern, of mental labour & pain, especially due to the pitiless way both newspapers & the BBC treated the Nazis (natural enough in war-time) as if they were quite irredeemable, quite apart from the highly monstrous attempt, encouraged by high quarters, to equate all Germans with them'.[51] Stephen Hobhouse's unexpected request was prompted by the knowledge that the original edition had received the Archbishop's blessing, but more importantly he was aware of the latter's desire to remain in friendship with Christian pacifists, even though he was not one himself.[52]

Archbishop Temple's immediate response was to refuse on the principle that he did not write introductions for others. However on reflection he felt impelled to do so 'Exactly because he was not only non-pacifist, but ant-pacifist', and yet he valued every means of expressing unity with pacifists for that very reason.[53] Stephen Hobhouse was delighted with Temple's draft. But what pleased him most was the evidence that the Archbishop appeared to have

changed his mind, now asserting that 'any thoughts of "punishing Germany" more than the course of the war is punishing her, must henceforth be excluded from the minds of those who are under obligation to find and to follow the way of Christ', a very welcome change of attitude which he gleefully shared with the Bishop of Chichester.[54]

This pamphlet was designed to be used for private meditation, reflection or for group discussion, and with the archiepiscopal imprimatur, it carried considerably more weight in Church circles. Copies were circulated to the Bishops with a covering letter of recommendation from Bishop Bell noting: 'Within the pages of this pamphlet you have a very striking exposition of something on which, in the Archbishop's words, all Christians should be agreed. It is the fact that the Archbishop says that which I think gives the book its particular interest.'[55] Copies were circulated to numerous clergy with a covering letter from Dame Sybil Thorndike, and in 1946, copies were sent via the Chaplain General to chaplains working in Germany.

Another Friend who shared a common concern with Bishop Bell was Bertha Bracey (1893-1989). She championed the cause of refugees, working first for the Germany Emergency Committee of Friends and then more generally for the Inter-Aid Committee of the Save the Children Fund, which later worked in close association with the Church of England Committee for Non-Aryan Christians, based at Bloomsbury House, of which Bell was the founder and chairman.[56] In writing to Henrietta Bell after the Bishop's death she counted it 'an honour and a joy' to have been allowed to work with the Bishop whom she regarded as 'so great a champion of righteousness, and so generous and magnanimous a person, that the glow of humble yet exalted satisfaction' she had in looking back to those years was 'difficult to relate though vivid to remember'. She particularly valued the fortitude he showed in the tragic situations which developed both in Germany, among German Christians, and in the world because of the Nazis.[57]

On his part, the Bishop had a considerable regard for her and her work. Called upon to write references on her behalf, he referred to her as 'a woman of quite outstanding character and capacity and balance, with a remarkable gift for working with people of all sorts. She had a very genuine sympathy and concern for those in any kind of need; extremely practical, with excellent judgement, and a fine understanding of human character – a woman of very high ideals.'[58] In consulting him about the advisability of working with the

Womens Affairs Branch for Scheleswig-Holstein, she shared her doubts: 'Women's Affairs Branch has a somewhat "Feminist" sound, but that is not a camp I want to join in principle or in practice.... Please help me to see more of the Way and to walk therein. I do long to worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness, but all the time I fall back into what Peguy calls "the ingratitude of sin"'.[59] This position gave her the opening to enable women to take a positive part in post-war social reconstruction in Germany.

Edith M. Ellis – a partial appraisal

There are other examples of Friends who can be briefly glimpsed in the modern collections of archiepiscopal and episcopal correspondence, but for the rest of the lecture, I propose to concentrate on one individual Friend whose activities can be traced through a number of Lambeth Palace Library's collections and whose ceaseless work for reconciliation between the Churches and nations has gone largely unrecognised even within the Society, namely: Edith Maud Ellis of Wrea Head, Scalby, Scarborough, who died aged 85 on 27 March 1963.[60]

Edith and her identical twin sister, Marian, were born on 6 January 1878, daughters of John Edward Ellis, first and foremost a paternalistic and socially responsible Nottinghamshire colliery owner, who subsequently entered parliament as a Liberal Member of Parliament for Rushcliffe in Nottinghamshire in 1885, a position he held until shortly before his death in 1910.[61] Second perhaps only to John Bright in Quaker political influence, he campaigned for Irish home rule and the alleviation of injustices there and in South Africa. He opposed both the arms and opium trades, and supported the temperance movement.

The twins continued their father's philanthropic and political activities, and shared a common concern for international peace and reconciliation.[62] Marian's contribution has been well documented,[63] partly perhaps as her marriage to Charles Alfred Cripps, Lord Parmoor, in 1919 inevitably elevated her to a different position in society with new opportunities, especially following his official involvement with the League of Nations.[64] By contrast Edith Ellis's life and work have been largely overlooked, with the exception of her imprisonment in 1918. In that year, as secretary of the Friends Service Committee, together with two other officials, Edith Ellis was put on trial at the London Guildhall, under the Defence of the Realm Act, for publishing an uncensored pamphlet, *A Challenge to Militarism*, and

after an unsuccessful appeal she was sentenced to three months in prison, rather than pay the alternative fine. Whilst in Holloway prison, she found herself in a cell next to Sinn Feiners, imprisoned following the 1916 Easter Rising: this shared experience of imprisonment was to give her an entrée into the hearts of some of those in Ireland who would otherwise have been unapproachable to her in her work there.[65]

In February 1923, when the newly established Irish Free State was threatened by renewed fighting and insurrection, she published *An Appeal to the Women of Ireland*, 'for the violence to cease', in which, as a postscript she listed her credentials, and it is perhaps interesting to see how she described herself at that date.[66] First and foremost she was a member of the Society of Friends, the daughter of the Rt. Hon. John E. Ellis, who for twenty five years as a Member of Parliament had worked for Irish self-government. She was 'a Pacifist imprisoned for three months in Holloway Goal on account of the Society of Friends protest against conscription', as she herself explained her imprisonment, and she was a member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

She had visited Ireland, each year between 1919 and 1923, to gain first hand knowledge of conditions there. She had worked hard for the release of Terence MacSwiney, the Lord Mayor of Cork, who had died in Brixton prison 74 days into his hunger strike in October 1920, and for the withdrawal of English armed forces from Ireland, and for a settlement of the political differences by Conference, or negotiation, rather than by force.

She had also administered relief on behalf of English Quakers 'in devastated places in Ireland' January to May 1921, and was a member of the White Cross Committee, a committee which took over responsibility for distributing aid, especially in Southern Ireland. She was also a member of the Peace with Ireland Council.[67]

It was in connection with her work for reconciliation in Ireland, and especially with the Peace with Ireland Council, that Edith Ellis had interviewed Eamon de Valera, the sole surviving leader of the 1916 Easter rebellion, and leader of the Dail, the independent Irish Parliament, together with other political leaders in both Ireland and England. She had also corresponded with George Bell, then chaplain to Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury. In June 1921 she forwarded a statement drawn up jointly by her brother-in-law, Lord Parmoor, Lady Aberdeen, and herself, which she hoped might prompt the Archbishop and other Church leaders (in whom she was

in contact) to sign to express their profound thankfulness to the British Prime Minister, Lloyd George, for his recent appeal to Irish leaders to attend a conference to settle the differences between the two countries, and stressing the belief that a settlement in Ireland must be based on fundamental Christian principles.[68]

In early July 1921, together with George Llewellyn Davies of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Edith Ellis was given an interview with Archbishop Davidson who in his diary described her as 'fanatical in her Sinn Fein sympathies'.[69] In view of the critical political situation in Ireland and the prevailing atmosphere of distrust and fear, their purpose was to ask the Archbishop to call for both prayers in support of the forthcoming conference between De Valera and the British Prime Minister, and for a general display, particularly on the English side, of a generous spirit of trust and reconciliation. Following the meeting and after due consultation with others, including Lord Stamfordham, private secretary to George V, the Archbishop wrote a letter to *The Times*, 8 July 1921, calling for prayers to uphold the participants, and appealing to each side to look 'with eyes of new and generous trust upon those with whom they are conferring'.[70] For some time afterwards Edith Ellis continued to correspond with the Archbishop passing on responses from de Valera or his wife that she thought might be helpful to the Archbishop, and thanking him for his letter to *The Times* following the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 6 December 1921, which ended a terrible chapter in Irish history; the Irish Free State came finally into existence a year later and the British troops left Ireland.[71] These encounters between Edith Ellis and Archbishop Davidson show the importance she already attached to published appeals and to the need for co-operation among the Churches to offer the spiritual guidance and support necessary for solving national or international conflicts.

So far as I can judge, the next occasion on which she features in the archiepiscopal correspondence dates to the 1930's. She was certainly in correspondence with the Archbishop of York, William Temple, from at least 1936, but it is not until 1939 that her work for international peace and reconciliation and a united Christian call for peace comes clearly into focus. In March 1939, Edith Ellis, then in her early sixties, made a three pronged approach to the Anglican hierarchy in an endeavour to enlist their support for a proposal to get the League of Nations to call a conference to consider the economic problems facing the world which were thought to be undermining any chance of a lasting peace.

Following an interview with Edith Ellis, Alan Don, chaplain to the

Archbishop of Canterbury. Cosmo Gordon Lang, and accustomed as he once put it to shielding the Archbishop 'from the attention of the feminists'.[72] wrote to the Archbishop of York, asking for enlightenment as to the nature of his support for her proposals:

'I have just had a visit from Miss Ellis whose activities are, I have no doubt, as well meaning as they are mysterious. She appears to flit between de Valera, Lord Halifax, Cardinal Hinsley and the Archbishop of York without being able to state definitely what her business really is'. She had, Don thought, convinced herself that de Valera as President of the League of Nations Assembly had a unique opportunity during his forthcoming visit to Rome for the coronation of the new Pope, Pius XII, on 12 March, of securing the support of the Roman authorities in an endeavour to summon a special meeting of the League to consider the economic problems afflicting the world. She had also informed him of her idea that Temple as chairman of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches should raise the proposal that the national committees should encourage their respective governments to pay more attention to these economic problems at the recent meeting in Paris. In conclusion, Don observed: 'As to Miss Ellis, I confess that she causes me considerable irritation, but that is doubtless owing to the large dose of original sin in my own composition'.[73]

Archbishop Temple's response to this enquiry began somewhat ominously: 'Miss Ellis is a problem – I have only once actually seen her and it will be my endeavour to avoid doing so again, but whether I can succeed in that, as she actually lives in my diocese, I don't know'. He supposed that it was through her connection with Lord Parmoor, when the latter was very prominent with the League, that she gained access to so many people. 'Anyhow she is constantly concerned with trying to secure the organisation of spiritual energy in the backing of schemes which seem to her and her friends likely to tend towards peace'.

He felt that 'along with a distinctly genuine devotion to the cause, she derives great enjoyment from the process of flitting about from one distinguished person to another'. He did not know how much she counted for with de Valera, which by her own account was a good deal. However Temple did think that one of the best hopes for peace would be for governments and nations to switch their attention to a joint enterprise to raise the standard of living of common folk, something that could only be achieved by international co-operation. His own position, he concluded, was 'Miss Ellis bores me stiff – but I think her idea is good one!'[74]

Edith Ellis had also written to George Bell, now Bishop of Chichester, to elicit his support. He in his turn had passed her letter on the Revd. Alan Don with the comment 'I think it tells its own story'.[75] Armed with Temple's reply, Don put the Bishop in the picture, advising him that she had come to see him and was 'as illusive as ever'. So far as he could make out, she proposed that de Valera would like to be fortified with the backing not only of the Pope, but of the Archbishop of Canterbury and other Bishops to summon a special meeting of the League of Nations. Don could not think that she was de Valera's accredited emissary, entrusted with the task of gathering the spiritual forces which would enable him to carry out his propose. 'Is she not', he queried, 'rather an exceedingly well-meaning woman and enjoys her self-appointed mission of flitting from one distinguished person to another and giving the impression that she is in the fullest confidence of them all?' Repeating the Archbishop of York's aphorism about her, he suspected that 'if all the other people whom she approaches were asked their opinion their answers would be somewhat similar'. And as to her precise proposal, the Archbishop of Canterbury could not but feel that the summoning of a special meeting of the League of Nations for the purpose of discussing world economics was unlikely to ease the international situation so long as Germany and Italy refused to take part in the proceedings and regarded anything that the League did 'with the greatest suspicion'.[76]

This correspondence, quoted or paraphrased at some length, illustrates the attitude of these Churchmen to her at this stage, and shows what she was up against. But clearly this was not an auspicious beginning, and nothing came of this particular proposal even though she was by no means the only person calling for such a course of action. Undaunted she continued to make suggestions and even to draft appeals for the Archbishop and other leading Churchmen to sign. She was fired by the belief that they 'had a unique opportunity for getting ahead of the Dictators and giving the Church a mission to help Humanity & Peace'.[77] In addition, with the new Pope, Pius XII's initial appeal for peace combined with the deterioration of the international situation, she changed tack and concentrated her efforts on trying to get support for the Pope's appeal and for a united stand under the leadership of the Pope, backed by leading Churchmen. That she was not alone in this desire for united action is evidenced by the Archbishop's Call to Prayer at Whitsuntide 1939, signed by Archbishop Lang, Germanos, Archbishop of Thyateira, the Archbishop of Uppsala, the Moderator

of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and the Moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches. This Call to Prayer was accompanied by Archbishop Lang's letter of explanation to *The Times* 17 May which referred to his original hope for a joint appeal of Christian leaders headed by the Pope, and continued: 'my experience in arranging even this measure of common action is sufficient to show how great the obstacles are. It is one thing to cry somewhat irresponsibly "Let something be done". It is a very different thing for responsible persons to try to do it'.[78] Archbishop Lang had found the entire negotiations over this appeal both frustrating and disillusioning: he in fact dismissed it in private as 'the damp squib'[79] and to some extent this feeling of having been heavily let down, especially on the Papal and French sides, would undoubtedly influence his response to any subsequent joint appeals, from whatever quarter, even from Bishop Bell, let alone Edith Ellis.

The declaration of war on 3 September 1939 gave considerably more urgency to Edith Ellis 's various crusades, though apart from a proposal for a truce at Christmas,[80] the focus of her attention shifted once again and this time to the need to set out the Christian principles which should form the basis for a future peace and to have these agreed and promoted jointly by the Church leaders here and overseas. She assured Lang that she believed she had 'a real call from God to do His Work at this time', and had been charged by Cardinal Pizzardo 'to work for the Kingdom of God', and even proposed going to Rome to see the Irish Minister to the Vatican, William J. Babington Macaulay, who was a friend of the Pope.[81] She continued writing to both the Bishop of Chichester and to the Archbishop of York. Her network of significant contacts also included the Apostolic Delegate to England, Archbishop William Godfrey. Apparently the Papal Nuncio in Dublin, Archbishop Paschal Robinson, to whom she was known from her work for reconciliation there, had telephoned Archbishop Godfrey telling him that his services were to be put at her disposal 'if anything more were required'.[82] He in his turn gave her an introduction to David Mathew, Auxiliary Bishop of Westminster, and to Cardinal Hinsley, Archbishop of Westminster. Another possibly unexpected contact was the Spanish diplomat, writer and pacifist, Salvador de Madariaga, then in exile in England, a vocal opponent of General Franco, who had spent some time as a permanent delegate to the League of Nations, and would probably have been well known to her brother-in-law, Lord Parmoor, and was much admired by Archbishop Temple.[83] Fortified by a private assurance that the Roman Catholic hierarchy would be willing to join in some joint statement with other

Church leaders, she seems to have arranged for de Madariaga to draw up a memorandum embodying the Pope's Five Peace Points for regulating international life (to which she was very firmly wedded) with a counterbalancing statement taken from the Report of the Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State held in 1937 entitled *The Churches Survey their Task.*[84]

After much correspondence with Edith Ellis, Archbishop Temple wrote to Archbishop Lang in October 1940 on a note of triumphant relief: 'Miss Ellis has at last produced something which I think might really be of value'. As a result of her conversations with others, she had reason to think that the draft statement would have a wide measure of support among Church leaders, including the Roman Catholic and the Free Churches. The putting together of the Pope's Five Peace Points with the five standards for economic and social life agreed at the Oxford Conference was, he thought 'a real gain, and the appearance of the various names in joint utterance would be worth something'.[85]

Lang, ever cautious, was rather less enthusiastic: 'I presume it emanates from the worthy Miss Ellis, but I am bound to say that a long experience makes me very sceptical about the real results of her many conversations. I know myself when I have expressed interest, sympathy, goodwill, etc., this is taken to mean complete approval of what she may have said'. Nevertheless, he agreed there was some value in the proposed document. But he was not prepared to sign the appeal unless Cardinal Hinsley or the Apostolic Delegate, and the representatives of the Free Churches did. He was doubtful about the reaction of some of the representatives of the Free Churches to the prominent part given to the Pope. The whole matter, he thought, required a good deal of careful consideration.[86]

Temple fortified him. To his mind 'the whole value of the thing is as a presentation of some measure of Christian unity. The political effect of the document itself and its publication cannot be great, but what there is will tell in the right direction'.[87] Temple queried the advisability of both Archbishops signing offering to drop out himself, but Lang insisted on his inclusion as he had promoted the document secured by Edith Ellis. Much negotiation went on behind the scenes, and a lot of consultation, with some editing to meet both the views of Archbishop Lang and Cardinal Hinsley, and in some of these Edith Ellis seems to have played a part. But undoubtedly her principal contribution had been the initiating and securing of an acceptable draft and the preparation of some of the ground via the Apostolic Delegate, and possibly Bishop Mathew, for the participation of Cardinal Hinsley.[88]

The final joint letter was published on 21 December 1940 on the middle page of *The Times* headed 'Foundations of Peace – A Christian Basis – Agreement among the Churches', with the signatures of the two Archbishops (Canterbury and York), the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council (The Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland had refused to sign on this occasion, a decision later regretted by subsequent Moderators).[89] It was accompanied by a lengthy editorial commending it. The letter made a very significant impact, much wider than the Archbishops had anticipated, and heralded an interlude of ecumenical activities and meetings previously unheard of in the country. It also prompted a deputation of Members of Parliament to see the Archbishop of Canterbury in support of the statement.[90] The editorial in *The Friend* welcomed it as' the foundation of hope at a time when hope was dim', and recommended that if Friends believed that an enduring new order must have a Christian foundation, they must not hesitate to co-operate with their fellow Christians who may differ from them in the matter of war.[91] As a member of Meeting for Sufferings. Edith Ellis drew the attention of the January meeting to both the important letter signed by Christian leaders and to the Pope's Christmas Eve statement. There were, she felt, clear signs of a more effective unity among the churches working for peace, of which Friends should be aware and by which they should be encouraged.[92]

The success of this joint publication, which came to be known as the Ten Point Letter, spurred Edith Ellis on even further and brought her into close contact with the Sword of the Spirit Movement, founded by Cardinal Hinsley soon after the Fall of France in 1940.[93] The movement took the opportunity afforded by this joint publication to promote ecumenical study groups and meetings on the subject of the Ten Point Letter. She frequently consulted A.C.F. Beales, and to a lesser extent Barbara Ward, both officials of the movement, and was later seen speaking at interdenominational meetings promoting the Ten Point Letter. She also went off to Dublin for a month (Jan-Feb 1941), apparently with the approval of Lord Cranborne, and the Ministry of Information, to promote its circulation through her various contacts there, including the Papal Nuncio in Dublin, who she hoped would get copies circulated to the Vatican and to the Roman Catholic hierarchy elsewhere. She was introduced to the newly appointed Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, John McQuaid, whom she described as most anxious to co-operate.[94] She also had 'much talk' with de Valera, now Prime

Minster of Eire. (Southern Ireland) The latter she reported to Archbishop Lang was reading *The Churches Survey their Task*, which apparently interested him 'very greatly'; she had lent him a copy but he wanted to possess it! He had also asked her to send him information of continental Protestant opinion published in the *Christian Newsletter*. 'All this', she observed, 'makes for the Unity of Christendom'.[95]

In Edith Ellis's mind, the Stoll Theatre meetings in May 1941, organised by the Sword of the Spirit around the Ten Point Letter, were the real pinnacle of success of this joint ecumenical venture.[96] Cardinal Hinsley and Archbishop Lang presided separately on consecutive days and the Archbishop's address was broadcast. On both days, a resolution was passed by a representative inter-denominational gathering (both the speakers and the audience) calling on the governments of the British Commonwealth and allies to adopt the Ten Point Letter as the basis of future statements of war and peace aims.

Not wishing the momentum to be lost, she sent Archbishop Lang a draft of another joint letter to be sent to *The Times* in November 1941. This she reported embodied ideas given to her by Archbishop Godfrey, had been drafted with assistance from her sister, Lady Parmoor, and had the approval of Professor Christopher Dawson (Vice-President and Chairman of the Sword of the Spirit) and Father Simon O'Hea of the Catholic Social Guild. She also mentioned that her proposal was welcomed by Dr. William Paton of the Peace Aims Group. It was thought that Cardinal Hinsley would be willing to sign something of the sort; and Archbishop Godfrey, she claimed, was very anxious that the letter should be got out as quickly as possible so that the Pope could refer to it in his Christmas Eve allocution.[97] This appeal reaffirmed the Pope's Five Peace Points in a slightly different form, together with the Ten Point Letter, but added references to a couple of basic human freedoms, recently defined by President F.D. Roosevelt in the Atlantic Charter.

The subsequent correspondence between the two Archbishops reveals a certain frisson of annoyance.[98] Lang did not see that there was any particular reason to issue another joint letter – there was nothing new except some needless reference to the so called Atlantic Charter. Such letters should be reserved for special occasions when they had something quite definite to say. He had 'a great esteem for this good lady's intentions and persistence', 'but', he observed 'there must be some limits to our giving way to her activities!'[99] Temple was equally dismayed and had written to tell her he felt she was

stampeding them. He also thought the Cardinal was a good deal annoyed at being confronted with a draft before he had been specifically consulted on the question. And, Temple observed, if they went on 'pushing this leadership of the Pope we shall lose the English Free Churches which are already very restive'.[100] However, and here was probably the real rub, her draft (discussed and possible approved by a number of other Churchmen and others of significance), prompted Temple to go and see the Apostolic Delegate and to redraft the letter. But this was all to no avail on this occasion. As Lang advised her, not even Archbishop Temple could give point and shape to a joint letter.[101] Unbeknown to her, others had been pressing the Archbishops to issue a joint statement elucidating the much needed distinction between retribution and vengeance, following the Prime Minister's statement that retribution must be one of the Allies war aims, and Temple had drafted an alternative joint letter, which the Cardinal had declined to sign, much to both Archbishops' dismay.

Not daunted she looked for other allies and one of these was Harold Buxton, Bishop of Gibraltar, whom she saw as a channel to the Churches overseas. She even arranged for him to see the Apostolic Delegate. It was thought that a joint statement signed by British Church leaders would be useful indicating to foreign countries the kind of guidance being given to Christians here; it would provide some assurance of the sincerity of Great Britain's peace aims, that these were quite different from those embodied in the Versailles Treaty following the First World War. Although Edith Ellis had corresponded with Archbishop Temple about this joint statement, it was arranged for the draft to be forwarded by Bishop Buxton to Archbishop Lang – a shrewd tactical move. This letter combined references to the Pope's last Christmas Eve Allocution and his Five Peace Points, with the four essentially humanitarian freedoms propounded by President F.D. Roosevelt in 6 January 1941 as freedoms of speech and worship, and freedoms from want and fear. The letter was duly signed in March 1942 by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and the Moderators of the Free Church Federal Council and of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland on the understanding that it was **not** to be published.[102] But the Bishop of Gibraltar was authorised to show it to the Cardinal Archbishop of Lisbon and other ecclesiastics in both Portugal and Spain during his visit to these countries. As Archbishop Temple later explained at some length to Edith Ellis 'the issue of a series of messages made up of quotations

partly indeed from the Pope and partly from a secular statesman is really unworthy of the Church. To do it once in our first letter was thoroughly sound and made a great impression. But if we are going on issuing joint messages we must have something quite specifically our own to say; otherwise... we shall undermine the influences of the Church by presenting it as an echo of a statesman and in the end we shall have done much more harm than good. On the other hand, to distribute privately... a statement that the religious leaders stand behind these particular points that have been put forward by others and so gather increasing support for [them]....is immensely to the good.... this is a case where the whole difference between doing good and doing harm turns on the avoidance of publication; but on the other hand the wide if discriminating use of the document through private channels is all to the good.'[103]

Yet even this measure of co-operation over what amounted to a statement for private circulation was not achieved without considerable cost of time and energy. She later recalled how she personally had persuaded Cardinal Hinsley to sign the Lisbon Letter. He had initially refused because the opening sentence included the word 'unity', to which he took exception, because 'the Catholic Church provided that unity'. She apparently told him there could be an alteration and he proposed instead 'all those who love and owe allegiance to our Lord Jesus Christ' which she accepted, and she described the incident to Bishop Bell some years later, 'with a smile he took up his pen & signed saying "We ought to love Him more, should not we?" – I said "yes"and we got our unity, a deeper one'.[104]

In the spring of 1943, another draft statement, couched in a rather different form, with no quotations from the Pope, but with a lengthy list of over twenty possible signatories including foreign pastors (all already consulted), landed on the desk of William Temple, now Archbishop of Canterbury. Once again this prompted him to compose his own draft, indicating to her that she might include a couple of sentences from her own text if she wanted (which of course she did): 'I think a call to the remembrance of God is really worth making. I do not think an exhortation to shew a loving spirit ourselves worth making. Everyone knows we are supposed to stand for that, and everyone knows that these exhortations have been given and passed unheeded for generations. I really think we rather betray our trust as Christians if we give the human side without the divine side in a call of this sort'.[105] This was rather harsh, as she was always anxious to emphasize the spiritual or Christian elements, but her terminology or expressions of faith were different from those of an

Anglican Archbishop.[106] In fact Bishop Bell had previously advised her that her draft might be better suited for private meditation, published anonymously.

On 19 April 1943, a letter headed 'The Church Leaders Appeal, Foundation of Peace' was published in *The Times*. This appeal 'to return to God, set his will before you as the guiding rule of life', was signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool (the see of Westminster was vacant following the death of Cardinal Hinsley), the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council, the Moderator of the Church of Scotland, with 15 other signatories, including Scandinavian and Swiss pastors, two Russian Orthodox priests, an Armenian priest, and two French politicians (including Andre Philip, Free French National Commissioner).

Edith Ellis, who was the prime mover, in getting all these signatories, was highly delighted with the publication, observing that 'it was something new to have got these different nationalities & Christian communions to put their hand to the same document concerning their faith'.[107] She had been left by the Archbishop with the responsibility of collecting these, and dealing with the niceties of the order of signatures, even though the final text was sent from Lambeth Palace.

Her prominence in ecumenical circles led to her appointment in 1943 as a member of the IX Commission of the London International Assembly with the task of looking at the role of religion in the post-war world, which was chaired by the Dean of Chichester, Arthur Stuart Duncan-Jones.[108] This gave her a new purpose: to draw in other religious faiths. She saw this as a means of providing a unity of spiritual forces and an opportunity for some united action. She was appointed to a sub-committee to collect authoritative documents and statements of Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu, Moslem beliefs. She wanted 'to get at the heart of these different people who also thought that religion mattered'.[109] The Commission, which totalled some thirty-six members representative of different nationalities and religions, included some of her friends, such as A.C.F. Beales of the Sword of the Spirit and the Revd. William Paton, but it also opened up new friendships and acquaintances, and her work here brought her into contact with the World Congress of Faiths. Alive to the value of broader co-operation, she started off on her own track of proposing the issuing of inter-faith statements and the calling of a large public meeting similar to the successful Stoll Theatre Meetings in 1941. However much Bishop Bell tried to warn her off to leave public inter-

faith meetings to the World Congress of Faiths, she carried on regardless, or as Bell would have put it 'ceaselessly'[110] – 'firing letters' at him and when he failed to reply getting into 'telephonic communication' with him![111]

Prompted by the receipt of her letter advising him that following conversations with Bishop of Chichester, Archbishop Godfrey and Lord Cecil, there was a project for a public meeting 'representing all religions which believe in a divine Creator', the idea being to give support to the notions that the Bishop of Chichester had expressed in April on the need for religion behind any new world authority, Archbishop Temple immediately wrote to Bishop Bell for his candid opinion. The Archbishop indicated that he would be glad of anything that would enable them 'to give some joint witness with the Jews on the supremacy of God and His Law, but does she mean to go beyond that and bring in the Moslems? That I think begins to make difficulties, because Allah is a different person from the God of either the Old or the New Testaments – and do you think such a meeting can avoid banality?'[112]

The Archbishop was also wary of inter-faith meetings and statements because 'they so easily suggest that those who take part in them assent to the view that all religions are varieties of some one thing called Religion: which is the really important matter; whereas of course Christians are committed to the view that Christianity itself rightly understood, is already the universal religion containing in itself all that is valuable in every other'.[113]

Bishop Bell was at considerable pains to explain to the Archbishop the differences between his own work through the World Congress of Faiths and her own proposals, needless to say raised with some of the Congress's officials, for both a large public meeting in the summer and subsequently a joint Christmas message in which Buddhists and Hindus collaborated with various Christian leaders. He was, he assured the Archbishop, 'rather shy of the multi-lateral pronouncements suggested by Edith Ellis.'[114]

The proposal of Edith Ellis for a joint inter-faith Appeal, which would not seem so radical now, was not the only occasion on which she allowed her ideas or enthusiasms to run away with her, only to discover at the eleventh hour that the joint enterprises, meetings, or even broadcasts she had planned foundered. She certainly had a large number of friends or acquaintances, Churchmen, politicians and organisations on whom she relied for support, and they backed her schemes with varying degrees of approval. She was supremely

confident in her self-appointed mission, and was not always aware of, or sensitive to others' reluctance. In August 1944 she was trying to persuade the Foreign Office to give her a visa to go to Rome with the Methodist ecumenist, Henry Carter, to see the Pope to establish contact for the future building of a new world order based firmly on Christian principles.[115]

Edith Ellis was just as committed in the post-war period. The autumn of 1947 saw her in Rome working on a scheme for Christian co-operation, though now she was aware of the changes in the political atmosphere, and was increasingly conscious of the dangers of Communism and its strong appeal for the dispossessed and underfed.[116] The following year she was back in Rome with a commission from Canon John Collins to gain support for his newly formed Christian Action.[117] This time she had an interview with the Pope.[118] Following each annual visit to Rome she reported back immediately to her various 'backers'. In January 1951, she saw Canon Collins, various United Nations Association officials, the Labour politician, Philip Noel-Baker, and the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Godfrey, all before going home to Scarborough for a rest – life in Rome had been very strenuous – she admitted to Bishop Bell in her letter hastily written from her bed.[119] She was by this date in her late seventies.

In late 1952 she drafted an 'Appeal to the Women of the World' which she wanted taken up at the forthcoming meeting of the Commonwealth Ministers. Did she perhaps see this as the 50th anniversary of *The Appeal to Women of Ireland* published by her in early 1923? Although the world had changed, it was still beset by fear, conflict, hunger, poverty, disease, and racial and social antagonisms. Science, which had opened up possibilities of a fuller, richer life for the whole human race, threatened to become 'a monster of destruction because of our lack of moral purpose'. She appealed to women, as 'custodians of life....with creative powers not fully utilized which are God given, to unite to combat the real evils which beset mankind...If we really care,... we shall be the instruments in the Hands of God for carrying out His Divine Purpose for mankind' 'In a world of shortages with potential wealth for all there is work for all women to discover the part they can play'.[120] The appeal included a quotation from the French philosopher, Jacques Maritain, whom she had met in Rome when he was the French ambassador to the Vatican. Bishop Bell, on whom she could rely for a considered judgement advised her that 'it contained important truths and had a very wide basis of a moral and philosophical kind – the kind of

appeal which should be signed by eminent women, or if thought appropriate, by philosophers and writers'.[121]

The last major proposal of Edith Ellis for which there is evidence in the papers in Lambeth Palace Library was that inspired by the forthcoming coronation and the self-evident dedication of the new young Queen, Elizabeth II. Looking back to the inspiration and success of the Stoll Theatre Meetings of 1941, she drew up proposals for a large public meeting to be supported by the Council of Christians and Jews, the Sword of the Spirit, the World Council of Churches, the World Congress of Faiths, Christian Action, and United Nations Association, to be chaired by an eminent layman – her first choice was the distinguished philosopher and diplomat, Sir Oliver Franks, just retiring as British Ambassador to the United States of America.[122] She even guaranteed the cost of the hire of the Stoll Theatre, some £202. She envisaged the meeting as a way of raising awareness among the religious consciousness to the fact that there could be no true peace while half the world's people were underfed and living in poverty, and also as the visible means of showing a sense of dedication to public service in solidarity with the Queen on the eve of her coronation. But as Bishop Bell remarked to Canon Collins: 'There is no Ten Point Letter to proclaim. If there were a sudden change in the international situation for good or for evil, then there might well be a case for reviving the idea'.[123] Once again she had gone her own way, and the proposal foundered as she failed to gain the leading figures required for such a meeting or the support of an organisation to take responsibility for arranging the event.

From this rather lengthy trawl through some of the correspondence,[124] one can perhaps share the irritations of some of the ecclesiastics she dealt with, all very busy men preoccupied with more important issues, especially in wartime. But one has to admire her persistence and tenacity, and her achievements, especially the publication of the Ten Point Letter in 1940, set against the background of the considerable prejudices then existing between the Churches, on all sides. She might have been irritating, but she continued to get interviews and replies to her barrage of letters, and her more influential contacts could have refused to see her. Surprisingly, perhaps, she went on visiting Archbishop Lang, not her greatest champion, even in his retirement. But of all her ecclesiastical contacts, and the ecclesiastic she visited more than any other was Archbishop Godfrey, the Apostolic Delegate, who was incidentally far less ecumenically minded than either Cardinal Hinsley or Bishop David Mathew, and indeed had less of a regard for the Church of

England.[125] He recommended her to other members of the Catholic hierarchy in England and to Monsignor Montini (later Paul VI) of the Papal Curia. The predominance of Roman Catholic contacts is certainly surprising, as indeed was the weight she gave to Papal pronouncements especially in her dealings with the Anglican hierarchy, and this would not always have endeared her to them.[126]

However it was her experience of working in Ireland in the 1920's that laid the foundations of her later work for international reconciliation. This showed her the need for co-operation among the Churches: that many of the problems were really deeply-rooted spiritual issues that needed the Churches' co-operation to overcome. Her standing there, as a Quaker concerned with peace and reconciliation, gave her access to Irish ministers, even to Eamon de Valera, and to the Roman Catholic hierarchy. They in their turn gave her introductions to various officials in Rome, and it was to the Irish Minister to the Vatican that she turned for support and advice, rather than to the British. She knew how to work the system and to use people, or name-drop to her advantage, or rather to her cause. Lord Parmoor, and Sir Stafford Cripps, his youngest son (by his first marriage), all counted for something in the circles in which she moved, both in England and overseas, as did the fact that her mission had received the blessings of so many – Cardinals, Archbishops, as well as the Bishop of Chichester.[127]

She was also prepared to do the ground work – smoothing paths and opening up channels of communications between differing Church leaders and politicians, and exchanging literature. The Papal Nuncio in Dublin sent a copy of the Pope's Five Peace Points; she circulated *The Churches Survey their Task*, and writings of William Temple.[128] She concentrated on joint statements as she saw them as a visible expression of unity, but she was aware that statements were no good in themselves unless came from understanding and sympathy, and for that reason she went on collecting 'friendships'.[129] But the value of such activities is difficult to assess even at the time, and even more so over sixty years later.

She was very much an individualist. She had served her apprenticeship working in an official capacity for the Friends Service Committee during the 1914-18 War and for the various committees involved in her service in Ireland. During the 1930's, with the deterioration in the international situation, she seems to have preferred to go her own way, though she still served on a variety of Quaker and non-Quaker organisations.[130] She shed the absolutist

approach which had led her to jail in 1918, and by the time of the Second World War she wished to ensure that pacifism did not split the Churches.[131] Secure in her Quaker heritage, both Ellis and Rowntree,[132] and in her financial independence she did not apparently seek any support of the Society for her mission, nor perhaps did she take many Friends into her confidence as to its precise nature.

Her ecumenical undertakings for the sake of international peace and reconciliation and a sound Christian foundation for society were clearly those of her own initiative, which developed, changed and matured depending very much on the international situation, and on the responses she received from her various contacts, both friends and acquaintances.[133] Marian was her staunchest supporter and critic until she predeceased her in 1952. Although the twins had different strengths, the tribute to Marian given in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* could equally apply to Edith: 'At every depressing turn of world politics, she would follow the direction of her idealistic conscience and struggle for the implementation of those ideals in international relations'.[134] But in this inevitably partial account (based as it is principally on the records in Lambeth Palace Library), the penultimate word should perhaps be left to Archbishop Temple, a not inconsiderable critic: 'She has done some immensely good service, but I also think she starts a great number of pretty futile hares!'[135] Yet given a longer perspective, those 'hares' may not have been so futile; they provide evidence of her courage and perspicacity, and a sound understanding of her principles needed for the foundation of international peace and a just society.

Not all of this lecture can be described as 'Tales of the Unexpected', but Lambeth Palace Library's collections certainly provide unusual glimpses of Friends, showing them in slightly different perspectives both in Kent in the eighteenth century and in an usually productive encounter between an indefatigable Friend and the Anglican hierarchy in the twentieth century.

Melanie Barber

Presidential Address given at Britain Yearly Meeting, 6 May 2007

FOOTNOTES

1 Lambeth Palace Library (hereafter LPL) is the historic public library of the Archbishops of Canterbury, dating back to its foundation under the will of Richard Bancroft in 1610. It is now the principal research library and record office for the history of the Church of England, but its substantial collections of manuscripts, archives and printed books range over a much wider spectrum of both subjects and countries. For admission details, see the Library's website: www.lambethpalacelibrary.org. I am grateful to the Lambeth Librarian for permission to use and quote from the collections, especially the letters of William Temple and George Bell whose copyright is vested in the Library.

2 See for instance letter from Henry Prideaux, Archdeacon of Suffolk, to Archbishop Tenison. 13 July 1698, in which he described Quakers as 'the dangerousest Sect among us they being regulated under a very formidable order & discipline which all the other Sectorys want, & for want of which must all in a short while come to nothing if we have but patience to wait for it' (LPL MS 930/57).

3 Douglas Steere, 'A Quaker Observer looks at the Lambeth Conference', *The Friend*, 126 (1968), pp.1081-3. He reported to the October Meeting for Sufferings, having been appointed their representative to attend the Conference (pp.923, 1270). Douglas Steere was chairman of the Friends World Committee for Consultation.

4 Wolf Mendle, 'A doctorate for Sydney Bailey', *The Friend*, 143 (1985), pp.821-2. See also *Festschrift* for the latter, *Explorations in Ethics and International Relations*, ed. Nicholas Sims, 1981, and obituary, *The Friend*, 154/3 (1996), pp.18-19.

5 For the practice of visitation in the early 17th century, see *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the early Stuart Church*, 2 vols. Ed. Kenneth Fincham, Church of England Record Society, 1 (1994), 5 (1998).

6 Norman Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1657-1737* (Cambridge, 1957), chap. 3.

7 Archbishop Wake's visitation returns for the diocese of Canterbury, 1716-28, are in the Library of Christ Church, Oxford (MS 284-7); a microfilm of these is available in LPL; the returns for the Archbishop's Peculiars, 1717, are in LPL (MS 1115).

8 *Articles of Enquiry addressed to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford at the Primary Visitation of Dr. Thomas Secker, 1738*, ed. H.A. Lloyd Jukes, Oxford Record Society, 38 (1957). The 1758 visitation articles are given in full in *The Speculum of Archbishop Secker*, ed. Jeremy Gregory, Church of England Record Society, 2 (1995), pp.xli-xlii.

9 LPL Secker Papers 4, ff.252-3; Archbishop Secker to the Master of Faculties, Dr. Francis Topham, 8 March 1760, in connection with the application of Joseph Sherwood for admission as a public notary. 'Joseph Sherwood, Quaker Attorney and Notary, c.1734-73', *A Quaker Miscellany for Edward H. Milligan*, ed. David Blamires, Jeremy greenwood and Alex Kerr (Manchester, 1985), pp.7-16.

10 Secker Papers, 7, ff.326-35. Cf. S.J.C. Taylor, 'Sir Robert Walpole, the Church of England and the Quakers Tithe Bill of 1736', *Historical Journal*, XXVIII (1985), 51-77

11 Thomas Secker, *Eight Charges delivered to the Clergy of the Dioceses of Oxford and Canterbury*, published by Beilby Porteus, London, 1769, p.131.

12 Secker visitation returns: LPL MS 1134/1-4 (diocese of Canterbury, 1758): 5, 6 (Archbishop's Peculiars, 1759). Secker's abstracts of all the returns are given in *The Speculum of Archbishop Secker*. The returns for the Archbishop's exempt parishes in Surrey are printed in *Parson and Parish in Eighteenth-Century Surrey: Replies to Bishops' Visitations*, ed. W.R. Ward, Surrey Record Society, XXXIV (1994).

13 MS 1134/5, f.39v (Little Brickhill, Bucks).

14 There are various returns which give overall figures for Papists (unlike Quakers): in 1767, there were 271 Papists in the diocese of Canterbury: *The Return of Papists*, 1767, ed. E.S. Worrall, Catholic Record Society, 1989, Occasional Publications 2, pp.142-3; by 1780, this figure had increased to 458, whereas the numbers of Quakers had further decreased. See also *The Speculum of Archbishop Secker*.

15 About 40 returns for the diocese of Canterbury in 1716 referred to the presence of Quakers within their parish, whereas in 1758 only 32 noted Quakers, and the numbers in specific parishes appeared to be more numerous.

16 MS 1134/4, f.221. The children had been baptised, 'with licence' from Archbishop Potter: by 1758 the father was dead.

17 MS 1134/6, f.42.

18 MS 1134/1, f.96 (Bishopsbourne); 3, f.258 (Ruckinge).

19 MS 1134/3, f.42 (Loose): two small families of 6 persons, occupied in husbandry; 1, f.88 (Birchington): there were no longer any Quakers in the parish.

20 MS 1134/6, f.74.

21 MS 1134/3, f.82 (Mersham): one Quaker from Sussex marrying and settling with his wife in the parish, and another coming from East Kent. 6, f.125 (Putney). There had also been fluctuations in numbers at Cliffe, nr. Lewes in Sussex (5, f.73).

22 MS 1134/5, f.86 (St. Dionis Backchurch, city of London).

23 MS 1134/2, ff.100-1.

24 MS 1134/1. ff.61-2.

25 Ibid., ff.29-30.

26 MS 1134/5, f.82.

27 *Ibid.*, f.81v.

28 MS 1134/6, f.62.

29 *Ibid.*, f.74. This probably refers to the White family. Library of the Society of Friends, Friends' House, Euston Road., London (FHL) Great Book of Sufferings, 1756-1761, 23, pp.4, 131, 286-7 bears out this practice of taking some of the crops of Joseph White of Meadle, Monks Risborough, at harvest time in lieu of tithes, and without any legal proceedings. However the 18th incumbent probably predates the imprisonment for non-payment of tithes to the Commonwealth, which probably occurred in the 1660's. According to Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers*, 1753, 1, pp.77, 78, John White of Monks Risborough was prosecuted by 'Timothy Hall, priest of Monks Risborough', and not only endured twenty-eight weeks imprisonment,

but had his goods seized to the value of £92 in 1667, and he also appears to have been imprisoned in 1665. But Hall was never the incumbent of Monks Risborough, though he held other benefices in Buckinghamshire, including Princes Risborough from 1669.

30 MS 1134/3, f.82. Only two of the 10 Quakers, including children, noted as living there were assessed for paying tithes. They generally went to Ashford meeting.

31 Kennington, Kent: Ms 1134/2, f.257.

32 MS 1134/1, f.176. See also Cliffe (5, f.73), and Deal (2, f.6). In the latter parish the only demand was for Easter Offerings which they refused to pay and 'as they are of so little consequence, I think it prudent rather to connive at it, than force them to pay'. In Secker's *Speculum*, this was rendered as 'Only Easter Offerings due from them: which R[ector] Connives at their not paying' (p.144).

33 Especially in the parishes of St. George (MS. 1134/1, f.188), St. Mildred (f.216), and St. Paul (f.220).

34 MS 1134/1, f.284.

35 *Ibid.*

36 MS 1134/2, f.27.

37 *Ibid.*, f.241. Parish known then as St. John's in Thanet. See also reference to Drapers Almshouses, which had been founded by a Quaker, Michael Yoakley, for ten people, both men and women, in 1708 (f.242).

38 MS 1134/5, f.54. These Quakers all paid their dues without compulsion.

39 Thomas Edwards, Vicar of St. Mary's, Dover (MS 1134/2, f.31).

40 VG 3/1a-d (Canterbury diocesan returns, 1786); VH 55/1 Archbishop's Peculiars returns, 1788). LPL has other visitation returns for both the dioceses of Canterbury and London, 18th-20th century, and although they do not include a separate question on Quakers, they often ask about the presence of Nonconformists in general.

41 VG 3/1a, p.19 (Ash); p. 435 (Benenden).

42 *Ibid.*, p.427 Only two in these families were assessed for payment of tithes: one paid willingly; the other suffered himself to be distrained 'cooly & quietly' every two years.

43 *Ibid.*, p.499.

44 Return of St. Andrew's, Canterbury, where there were five families consisting of 20 to 30 persons; one family had recently moved into the parish (VG 3/1a, p.259). Two out of the five paid without compulsion. Folkestone still had perhaps the largest number of Quakers (1b, p.67).

45 Gillian Draper, 'The first hundred years of Quakerism in Kent', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, CXII (1993), pp.317-40; CXV (1995), pp.1-22; Karl Showler, *A review of the history of the Society of Friends in Kent, 1655-1966*, (Canterbury, 1970). Neither of these used the visitation returns.

46 *The Later Periods of Quakerism*, Rufus M. Jones, (London, 1921), 1, pp.146-57. Joseph Besse published his *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers* in 1753.

47 FHL, Great Book of Sufferings, 1756-1761, 23, records the amounts claimed by Friends in Kent to have been taken mainly for tithes and, to a much lesser extent, for church rates. Relatively few families and even fewer places were

involved, the brunt being borne regularly by Thomas Finch of Bishopsbourne, in some years totalling over £30. But according to the visitation return for the latter parish, all dues were paid without compulsion (MS 1134/1, f.96).

48 There is a considerable overlap between the papers of George Bell and those of the Archbishops. Bell had been chaplain to Archbishop Davidson from the outbreak of the First World War until his appointment as Dean of Canterbury in 1924, and as Bishop of Chichester in 1929 until just before his death in 1958. The Davidson Papers run to 803 volumes; the Lang Papers to 322, William Temple Papers to 111 and the Bell Papers to 368 volumes.

49 W. Temple Papers 51, ff.114-15 (Hobhouse to Temple, 26 Dec. 1943). For local ecumenical invitation to prayer, study and meditation in fellowship, 1943 (Bell Papers, 69, ff.156-7).

50 Bell Papers 69, f.155 (Hobhouse to Bell, 5 Sept. 1943).

51 *Ibid.*, ff.114-15 (Hobhouse to Bell, 16 Aug. 1941).

52 W. Temple Papers 51, ff.114-15 Hobhouse, to Temple, 8 March 1944.

53 *Ibid.*, f.116 (Temple to Hobhouse, 26 March 1944).

54 *Christ and our enemies*, (SPCK 1944), p.4. See also review in *The Friend*, 102, (1944), p.497. W. Temple Papers 51, f.131 (Hobhouse to Temple, Good Friday 1944); Bell Papers 69, f.165 (Hobhouse to Bell, 5 April 1944).

55 Bell Papers 69, f.174 (Aug. 1944). See also draft 15 July (f.69). With annotation, prompted by a request from Temple, 'I ought to make it plain that the Archbishop has nothing to do with the sending of this to you'.

56 Bertha Bracey is remembered particularly for her role in the *Kindertransport* rescue of children, 1938-40. See: Sybil Oldfield, *Women Humanitarians. A biographical dictionary of British Women active between 1900 and 1959*, London, 2001, pp.27-8. Testimony from Banbury and Evesham Monthly Meeting, *Yearly Meeting Proceedings*, 199 (1990), pp.162-5.

57 Bell Papers 367, ff.29-30 (Bracey to Henrietta Bell, 7 July 1959).

58 Bell Papers 32, ff.323, 383v (10 May 1946, 16 March 1948).

59 *Ibid.*, ff.407-8 (Bracey to Bell, 12 Aug. 1948).

60 The principal LPL collections in which Edith Ellis features are: Davidson Papers, 392, ff.79-233 *passim* (June-Dec. 1921); W. Temple Papers 13, ff.214-308 (June 1936-May 1944); Lang Papers 56, ff.51-9 (March 1939); 84, ff.111-283 *passim* (Sept. 1939-Dec. 1941); 185, ff.123-37, (March 1942); Bell Papers 70, ff.335-8 (Feb. 1944); 73, ff.95-227 (May 1941-Sept.1945); 207, ff.71-161 (April 1946-Jan.1957).

61 John Edward Ellis (1841-1910), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (ODNB), 18, pp.241-2, where he is described as 'A highly principled man, as befits a Quaker'.

62 For instance, during the First World War the twins were very generous in their support of families of conscientious objectors, and initially contributed substantial funds to the non-denominational No-Conscription Fellowship, though the more obsolutist stand of the Friends Service Committee, on which they both served, caused them to reduce their contributions to the Fellowship: Thomas C. Kennedy, *The Hound of Conscience: a History of the Non-Conscription Fellowship, 1914-19*, (Arkansas Press, 1981). See especially Edith Ellis's letter of 5 June 1917, pp.211-12.

[63] ODNB 18, pp.242-3 (Ellis, Marian Emily, Lady Parmoor, 1878-1952)1; *Women Humanitarians*, pp.66-7. There were obituaries in *The Times*, 7 July 1952, and *The Manchester Guardian*, 8 July 1952, and a testimony from Hampstead Monthly Meeting printed in *Yearly Meeting Proceedings*, 1953.

[64] ODNB 14, pp.196-8 (Cripps, Charles Alfred, 1852-1941). Marian was his second wife, his first wife having died in 1893. Stafford Cripps, the distinguished Labour minister, was his youngest son, from his first marriage. Lord Parmoor was opposed to conscription during the First World War, campaigned for the establishment of the League of Nations, was President of the Peace Society, and in 1924 as Lord President of the Council in the first Labour government was charged with special responsibility for the League of Nations affairs.

[65] *The Friends*, 63 (1923), p.103, a reference she made to her imprisonment in her concluding report to Meeting for Sufferings on the laying down of the Committee set up in 1921 in connection with the Irish crisis. See also John William Graham, *Conscription and conscience: a history* (London, 1922).

[66] Copy in FHL, pamphlet 264. I have expanded some of her statements to give some background of the events in Ireland which would have been well known to her reader in 1923.

[67] *The Friend*, 61 (1921) includes a number of references to Edith Ellis's work in connection with Ireland. She also reported on the situation to Meeting for Sufferings, noting 'this was much more a spiritual question than a political one', p.22. See also Maurice J. Wigham, *The Irish Quakers. A short history of the Society of Friends in Ireland*, (Dublin, 1992).

[68] Davidson Papers 392, ff.79-83 (Ellis to Bell, 28 June 1921).

[69] Davidson Papers 14, f.121 (6 July 1921).

[70] Ibid., ff.122-3 (interview with Lord Stamfordham 7 July, and follow-up).

[71] Davidson Papers 392, ff.135, 144, 213, 224, 233 (Aug.-Dec. 1921).

[72] Don's diary, 13 June 1940, referring to his interviews with Dorothea Belfield of the Anglican Group for the Ordination of Women, and to Christobel Pankhurst (LPL MS 2868, f.63).

[73] Lang Papers 56, f.51 (Don to Temple 6 March 1939). Don, later Dean of Westminster, never changed his view of Edith Ellis, writing even after the Ten Point Letter in 1941 'Here is Miss E., still flitting about among the leaders of thought and drafting, for the signature of such leaders, platitudinous Epistles adorned with admirable sentiments culled for the most part from Papal pronouncements' (Don to Archbishop's secretariy, 12 Nov. 1941: Lang Papers, 84, f.259).

[74] Lang Papers, 56, f.57 Temple to Don, 8 March 1939).

[75] *Ibid.*, f.52 (Bell to Don, 6 March, enclosing letter from Ellis, 3 March, ff.53-4).

[76] *Ibid.*, ff.58-9 (Don to Bell, 19 March 1939).

[77] *Ibid.*, ff.53-54 (Ellis to Bell, 3 March 1939).

[78] *The Times*, 17 May 1939, pp.9 (Call to prayer), 15 (Archbishop's letter). See also Lang Papers 56, ff.60-303 (March-May 1939); and Don's diary, March to May (MS 2867, ff.34, 37, 49-56 *passim*). Marc Boegner, president of the Protestant Federation of France refused to sign. The Pope had already issued an appeal for peace, and a call for prayer at Whitsuntide. In addition Archbishop Lang was viewed in Germany at the time as a 'politically-minded prelate', whose impartiality was compromised.

79 MS 2867, ff.54, 56.

80 She left her appeal for a truce with Don, 7 Dec. 1939 (Lang Papers 84, ff.133-4), Don;s reply, 8 Dec. (f.135).

81 Lang Papers 84, ff.111-12 (Ellis to Lang, 24 Sept. 1939); f.165 (Ellis to Lang, 8 Aug. 1940). cf. Ellis to Don, 3 Jan. 1940. 'All I Know is the God is calling us as Christians to do something'. & 'I can't believe that Cardinal Pizzardo's charge to me was given for nothing' (*Ibid.*, ff.150-1).

82 Lang Papers 84, ff.143 (Ellis to Don, 11 Dec. 1939).

83 W. Temple Papers, 13, f.241 (Temple to Ellis, 4 Sept.1940): He is, of course, a really great person'.

84 Lang Papers 84, f.165 (Ellis to Lang, 8 Aug. 1940). Assurance from Bishop Mathew that the Roman Catholics would be prepared to come in provided she understood the initiative was not theirs. 'I replied I was carrying out the charge given to me by Cardinal Pizzardo to work for the Kingdom of God & I took full responsibility'.

85 *Ibid.*, ff.177-8 (Lang to Temple, 1 Oct. 1940). The draft appeal at this stage was headed 'Principles accepted by Christian Leaders in England – with government support'. See also W. Temple Papers 13, ff.241-52 (Sept. 1940-Jan. 1941).

86 Lang Papers 84, f.179 (Lang to Temple, 5 Oct. 1940).

87 *Ibid.*, ff.181-2 (Temple to Lang, 30 Nov. 1940, with appeal (ff.183-4).

88 Her assessment of the cardinal's contribution prompted by Bell's appreciation of the Cardinal in *Blackfriars* (Bell Papers 73, ff.153-4: Ellis to Bell, 11 May 1943). She thought Bell gave the Cardinal too prominent a role as regards the Ten Point Letter.' The impetus for collaboration came from the Apostolic Delegate...I only mention these tiny points because I gather there is a feeling in some quarters that the Cardinal's friendly nature was the mainspring of action at the time'.

89 The Ten Point Letter asserted there could be no permanent peace in Europe unless the principles of the Christian religion were made the foundation of national policy and social life. They accepted the Pope's Five Peace Points for regulating international order, namely the right of every nation to life and independence, a reduction in armaments, an international body to maintain international order, recognition of the rights of minorities, and the submission of human law to 'the sacred and inviolable standards of the laws of God'. To this were added the five standards for economic and social life from the Oxford Conference report: abolition of extreme inequalities of wealth, equal opportunities of education for every child regardless of race or colour, the safeguarding of the family as a social unit, the restoration of the sense of the divine to daily work, and the use of the earth's resources as God's gift for the whole human race, both current and future. The Letter concluded on the confident note that these principles would be accepted by rulers and statesmen throughout the British Commonwealth as the true basis for a lasting peace.

90 Lang's account of the deputation, 12 Feb. 1941 (Lang Papers 84, f.203). Although wanting the Ten Point Letter to be widely circulated, the Archbishop made it clear that he did not wish it to be used 'as a mere piece of British propaganda'.

[91] *The Friend*, 99 (1941), p.4.

[92] *Ibid.*, p.20.

[93] Stuart Mews, 'The Sword of the Spirit', *The Church and War*, Studies in Church History, 20 (1983), ed. W.J. Sheils, pp.409-30. Originally designed to unify Catholic social efforts, with a view to promoting justice in war on the basis of Pius XII's Five Peace Points, the movement was initially open to non-Roman Catholics, but by the end of 1941, full membership was restricted to Roman Catholics. Religion and Life developed as a equivalent non-Catholic movement.

[94] 'with whom I have formed a friendship' Lang Papers, 84, ff.208-9 (Ellis to Lang, 23 Feb. 1941).

[95] *Ibid.*, In her letter to Lang, she referred to her intention to see Lord Cranborne to report on her visit to Rome, which prompted the Archbishop to write him a somewhat cautionary letter, 27 Feb. 1941 (f.224). She subsequently had an interview with Lang, in which he noted 'she fully realised it would not do for the British government to express any official opinion about the letter lest it should be regarded as a bit of British propaganda', 7 March 1941 (f.224). However on 28 May 1941, Convocation passed a resolution that the Ten Point Letter embodied principles on which lasting peace and social order could be established, and asked for it to be sent to the Prime Minister. Churchill's reply to Lang, 2 July 1941 read. 'I noted at the time this striking sign of the unity of purpose between the Christian religious bodies towards the issues of the war. I feel confident that this unity will not only be a strength to our stern endeavour in war, but will also prove an earnest of success in the difficult time of reorganization afterwards.' Lang Papers 84, f.258. *The Chronicle of Convocation*, 1941, pp.110-11, 146-51.

[96] She looked back to the Stoll Theatre meetings 'as a land-mark in Christian co-operation' Ellis to Bell, 31 May. 1945: Bell Papers 73, ff.220-1).

[97] Lang Papers 84, ff.260-4 (Ellis to Don 12 Nov 1941, with draft of appeal), forwarded on by Don (f.259).

[98] *Ibid.*, ff.265-83 *passim* (Nov-Dec. 1941); W. Temple Papers, 13, ff.263-6 (Nov-Dec. 1941).

[99] Lang Papers 84, f.265 (Lang to Temple, 18 Nov. 1941).

[100] W. Temple Papers 13, f.264 (Temple to Ellis, 14 Nov. 1941).

[101] Lang Papers 84, f279 (Lang to Ellis, 16 Dec. 1941).

[102] Lang Papers 185, ff.123-37 (March 1942); W. Temple Papers 13 ff.270-8 (March-May 1942). Includes (f.276) report of the Bishop of Gibraltar's interview with the Cardinal Archbishop of Lisbon in which the latter thanked God 'that the religious leaders in your country are giving this guidance, and reveal such unanimity, with regard to the Christian Principles which alone can form the basis of a true peace'.

[103] W. Temple Papers 13, f.278 (Temple to Ellis, 22 May 1942).

[104] Bell Papers 207, ff.75-6 (Ellis to Bell, 2 Feb. 1947). The original draft began with 'We, who are religious leaders in Great Britain, recognise our fundamental unity in allegiance to Christ Our Lord, and see in the tragedy of the world situation a call to reconsider the obligations of our faith to meet the challenge.' (Lang 185, ff.126-7). The final copy stated 'We, who are religious leaders in

Great Britain, recognising our love and allegiance to Christ Our Lord, see...' (Bell Papers 73, ff.216-17; Temple 13, ff.274-5).

105 Bell Papers 73, ff.120-51 (Feb- April 1943); W. Temple Papers 13 ff.280-93 (March-April 1943).

106 She wanted 'doctrinal phrases avoided' as these caused difficulties for the Roman Catholics (W. Temple Papers 13, ff.282-3: Ellis to Temple, 21 March 1943). After minor changes, her two sentences included in the final version read: 'We need a vision, in the hearts of men and women who are freed from selfishness and greed, of a world ordered according to God's purpose and law. We need the spirit of love and repentance, humbly beseeching God to forgive us our past sins, and to give us the spirit of forgiveness for wrongs done to ourselves'. Bell had advised her to reproduce Temple's draft without her additions as they spoilt the flow of the Archbishop's writing.

107 Bell Papers 73, f.151 (Ellis to Bell, Saturday in Holy Week, 1943). But for Temple's view of this letter, see W. Temple Papers, 13, ff.294-5 (Temple to Bell, 18 May 1943). The Archbishop felt under pressure to rewrite the letter because so many signatures had already been promised, and 'put in some sentences which by extreme compliment might be called points, though I am afraid they were very round at the tip even so'. The Archbishop of York, Cyril Garbett, refused to sign, questioning whether it was 'really worth while for the leaders of religion to sign this kind of document? It only tends to cheapen their signatures to really important declarations.' Frederick Iremonger, *William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury. His life and Letters* (Oxford, 1948), pp.561-2).

108 The Commission published their report in 1945: *The place of religion in post-war reconstruction: the report of a commission of the London International Assembly*, with an introduction by A.S. Duncan-Jones. This included a list of members. For correspondence on her membership of the commission and its sub-committee, see Bell Papers 73, ff.151-96, passim, 210-211, 214-15 *passim* (April 1943-Oct.1944).

109 Bell Papers 73, ff.177-8 (Ellis to Bell, 14 July 1943).

110 *Ibid.*, f.157 (Bell to Temple, 21 May 1943) – 'It is extremely difficult to know about Miss Ellis. There is usually a grain of goodness in what she proposes: but she is ceaseless in operations'.

111 *Ibid.*, f.203 (Bell to Temple 1 Dec. 1943).

112 W. Temple Papers 13, ff.294-5 (Temple to Bell, 18 May 1943).

113 *Ibid.*, f.299 (Temple to Ellis, 12 July 1943).

114 Ibid., f.305 (Bell to Temple, 1 Dec. 1943); also Bell Papers 73, f.203.

115 Bell Papers 73, f.212 (Ellis to Bell, 16 Aug. 1944).

116 Bell Papers 207, ff.81-5 (Oct-Nov 1947).

117 *Ibid.*, f.103 Collins to Ellis, 14 Sept. 1948).

118 Papers of Canon Collins – minutes of Christian Action, Caxton Hall, 14 Feb. 1949 (LPL MS 3290, ff.62, 71). Canon Collins thanked her for her 'immense amount of work' in Rome. She was a member of Christian Action from 1949 until her death, and was a co-opted member of Council in 1951 (MSS 3312, ff.14-20 *passim*; 3318).

119 Bell Papers 207, ff.108-9 (Ellis to Bell, 17 Jan. 1951).

120 *Ibid.*, ff.115-16 (appeal), with covering letter to Bell, 23 Nov. 1952 (ff.113-14).

[121] *Ibid.*, f.117 (Bell to Ellis, 27 Nov. 1952).

[122] *Ibid.*, ff.121-41 (March-June 1953).

[123] *Ibid.*, f.137 (Bell to Collins, 8 May 1953).

[124] Her correspondence with Bishop Bell continues until January 1957 (*Ibid.*, f.161).

[125] Of Archbishop Godfrey, she wrote 'I am thankful that the door is always open for me to go to Wimbledon [his residence] to seek advice before I take any action' (Ellis to Bell, 11 May 1943; Bell Papers 73, ff.153-4). She had high hopes of his appointment as Archbishop of Westminster in December 1956, writing 'I shall be much nearer to [the] position we had at the time of the 10 Point Letter when the Archbishop of Westminster is back in London early in February, giving a much needed leadership' (Ellis to Bell, 14 Jan. 1957: Bell Papers 207, f.157). Cf. assessment in ODNB 22, pp.273-4. Cardinal Hinsley 'opened a door for me on Christian co-operation (Ellis to Bell, 2 Feb. 1947, Bell Papers 207, ff.75-6). See also ODNB 27, pp.291-2 In another context, Bishop Mathew's informal comment to Bell is of relevance here, 'Among the Free Churches, I am drawn to the prayer and spirit of the Society of Friends' (Mathew to Bell, 3 Sept. 1941: Bell 71, ff.200-1). The same letter showed his understanding and appreciation of the 'great moulding force of the whole ethos of the Church of England'. See also ODNB 37, pp.286-8.

[126] 'The Pope is the greatest spiritual personality which we have & it is spiritual power that is needed to overcome the evil principles as well as the power to restrain' (Ellis to Lang, 24 April 1940: Lang Papers 84, f.159). 'I am much amused by your referring to the Pope as the head of Christendom; I regard him as one especially influential Bishop.' (Temple to Ellis, 4 Sept. 1940: W. Temple Papers 13, f.241). The Anglican hierarchy did not wish to be limited to the Popes' Five Peace Points, or to be sponsoring statements that were not as inclusive as those of secular statesmen, who included other freedoms, such as freedom of worship.

[127] Bell Papers 73, ff.96-7; 207, ff.75-6, & 108-9, 146-7. These included Cardinal Pizzardo (Rome), Cardinal Hinsley, and Cardinal MacRory, Archbishop of Armagh; Archbishops Lang and Temple; and Bishop Bell, the latter being the first to have taken her into his chapel and asked for God's blessing on her work. In December 1953 during a papal audience, she received a blessing from Pius XII, both for herself and for Dame Isobel Cripps.

[128] Lang Papers 84, ff.157, 159 (April 1940). Later on she circulated speeches of Strafford Cripps, especially to Jacques Maritain in Rome (Ellis to Bell, 22 June 1948; Bell Papers 207, f.97).

[129] Bell Papers 73, ff.161-2 (Ellis to Bell, 29 May 1943).

[130] Her membership of Quaker committees included the Continental Committee, 1916-19; Friends Service Committee, 1917-20; War Victims Relief Committee, 1919-21; War and Social Order Committee, 1919-28; Penal Reform Committee, 1920-32; Council for International Service, 1921-7; Friends Service Council, 1927-30; Industrial and Social Order Committee, 1928-36. She was appointed a representative on Meeting for Sufferings from 1920 until 1949, but as an elder of Scarborough meeting she could have attended meetings thereafter. She was a founder member of the Committee on Christian Relationships from 1942 until 1960. As to non-Quaker Committees, these included the Women's International

League for Peace and Freedom, The League of Nations/United Nations Association, of which she served on their regional committee, and Christian Action.

131 'I am greatly concerned that people who stand for true & righteous peace should not be divided on the matter of pacifism' (Ellis to Don, Easter Tuesday 1940: Lang Papers 84, f.157).

132 Her mother, Maria (1845-1941), was the 5th child of John and Jane Rowntree of Scarborough. Her great uncle, James Ellis, had undertaken relief work in Connemara following the Irish famine, setting up a model farm at Letterfrack (1849-57).

133 By 1953, her interest shifted to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation, and she gave as her motto 'Faith, Food and Friendship'. Bell Papers 207, f.144 (Ellis to Bell, 28 Sept. 1953).

134 ODNB 18, p.243.

135 W. Temple Papers 13, ff.294-5 (Temple to Bell, 18 May 1943). Further research, particularly in other archives, would help to produce a more rounded account of Edith Ellis's activities.

DISPUTE AND PRINT IN CAMBRIDGE, 1659

Throughout the 1650s and 1660s, Cambridge appears to have been a focal point for Quaker disputes. As early as 1654 Thomas Firmin wrote a pamphlet called *The First New Persecution: or a True Narrative of the Cruel usage of two Christians, by the present Mayor of Cambridge.* Firmin recounts the imprisonment the previous year of two Quaker women by the Mayor, William Pickering, for preaching to the scholars. Firmin asks his audience to question whether their punishment of being whipped 'untill the blood came' is in any way justifiable given that 'by what Law [this was permissible] no man knows'. The prose validates its title of *Cruel usage,* depicting its protagonists as almost martyrs who, far from wincing from the pain, embraced their sentences, praising God in song throughout. The intention behind this pamphlet is clear: Firmin's pro-Quaker (his contemporaries describe him as Socinian), emotive narrative is designed to appeal to the populance through its portrayal of two innocent females being debased by a corrupt authority. What is most interesting about this pamphlet is the pains which Firmin takes to ensure his readers that William Pickering alone is responsible for the events described, indeed the postscript is solely concerned with clarifying this issue, and therefore exonerating the Cambridge Justices of playing any part in the proceedings. Kate Peters identifies that the experiences of Mary Fisher and Elizabeth Williams were instrumental to the latter reception of Quakers in Cambridge, as their plight had established the invaluable sympathy of local justices. The printer of this work was Giles Calvert, whose relationship with Quaker-related pamphlets was in its infancy, though his association with the movement soon led to his shop being referred to as an apothecary's selling soul-poison. Having first published Quaker writings in 1653, by 1654 thirty of his thirty-eight published works were by Quakers, which comprised forty-seven per cent of all known Quaker publications that year. Though not a Quaker himself, Firmin's use of the rapidly established Quaker-printer is further proof of his support of Quaker toleration.

The reception of Quakers in Cambridge was far from welcoming. Between 1657-59, Gerard Crose provides the following account:

> the students in the University of *Cambridge* had not yet

sufficiently insulted over, and exercised their Rage against the Quakers; they therefore at this time reassumed their former Licentiousness, Wantonness, and Impudence, and did not alone, but accompanied with the Populacy and meaner sort of People, that are ready for all audacious, facinorous and vile doings several times, but more especially thrice break into the Quaker Meeting, and Assault them, after they had broke the Locks and Doors with great Hammers, and break all things with their Hands and Feet to pieces, frighten some of the Men away, use others basely, and throw Dirt and such like filth in the Faces, beat others with sticks tear their cloaths, prick and wound them with Knives till the Blood gushed out, others they haled cruelly by the hair of the Head, and having so done, let them down and soaked them in Ditches, and the Kennels of the Street; neither did they spare any of them, had no regard to any Age, nor Sex, nor Degrees of Men, for when an Alderman came to them the second time they were engaged in this Work.

It is the repetition of such violence that is most striking about this account, and the general fear of the spread of Quakerism was quite unfounded with regards to the actual numbers of Quakers in Britain. Barry Reay speculates that in 1660, while comprising the largest radical sect, Quakers represented less than one per cent of England's total population. The reaction of the Cambridge students thus seems wholly exaggerated to the actual 'threat' of Quaker domination, and this statistic makes their impact so much more remarkable. William C. Braithwaite states, 'clearly, in the two universities, the Quaker message, with its scorn of human learning, would only find utterance amid much persecution'. Quakers were concerned with the leadings and promptings of the spirit,. nor were they in the least hesitant about sharing their opinions with the population at large.

Ivan Roots remarks that 'Quakers did not withdraw from the world, they wanted to change it', which would account both for the discussion which occurred in Cambridge in 1659, and for the pamphlets which were subsequently published in response to this debate. It was in 1659 that Thomas Smith compiled a pamphlet called *The Quaker Disarmed, or A True Relation of a Late Publick Dispute held at Cambridge\By Three Eminent QUAKERS, against One Scholar of Cambridge\WITH A Letter of Defence of the Ministry, AND AGAINST LAY-PREACHERS, ALSO Several Queries proposed to the Quakers to be answered if they can*, in which he recounts his version of a debate he had with George Whitehead, George Fox and William Allen. As with the title of Firmin's pamphlet, Smith chose evocative language for his

own title, which immediately gives the reader an indication as to the forthcoming content of the text. Smith was clearly preoccupied with the injustice that he alone argued against three others, especially as he had only engaged himself to argue against Whitehead, and in the text records that he said,

> I came not hither to dispute with *Fox* or *Allen;* but since you are resolved to dispute three of you against one, I shall reply to you all (yea if there were three hundred, if you speak but one at once)

The interposed comments of Fox and Allen in the debate which was intended to be a dialogue between Whitehead and Smith alone was indeed unfair, especially as it took place in the meeting-house as the mayor was uneasy about such a discussion taking place in the town-hall. The detail that the Scholar argued against three Quakers simultaneously proclaims a self-satisfied pride that he managed, in his own mind at least, to refute the arguments of all them combined. Yet it is the final three words of the pamphlet's title which can afford the modern reader a small smile: *Several Queries proposed to the Quakers to be answered* <u>*if they can*</u> (my emphasis). Whether Smith included this antagonist sentiment in the certainty that his queries could not be satisfactorily answered, thereby reinforcing his own superiority in debate, or because he belatedly recalled a number of issues after the discussion had taken place which he then wished he had made to support his point of view is now a matter of conjecture, but what is irrefutable is that his words were considered to be a thrown gauntlet, and the challenge was not to go answered: it has been suggested that Smith's pamphlet was in fact a challenge issued to John Bunyan, whom he had encountered preaching in a barn outside of Cambridge in May 1659, but Bunyan did not directly respond to this pamphlet. Smith had previously encountered Whitehead preaching at Westminster, and had attempted to engage him in debate, but had been forced to withdraw fearing 'the Q. would do him a mischief'.It may have been this frustrated incident which prompted the Cambridge librarian to confront Whitehead when the latter was preaching on 25th August 1659 in the meeting-house in Cambridge. Smith records that he was prompted to write a note the following day suggesting to the Mayor of Cambridge that he and Whitehead engage in a public debate as he (Smith) had reflected 'how apt silly Women were to be led captive by such deceivers'. This voiced altruistic intention fails to mask Smith's enjoyment of engaging in a dispute in which he clearly felt he had excelled.

Smith notes that, as he had not been given any details as to the

location of the debate by Saturday 27th August, he sought out the Mayor to discover what had been the result of his proposition. His account reads, 'next day, Aug. 29.' he received a letter from Whitehead suggesting they met at the meeting-house; Whitehead dates his missive '29th. of the 6th moneth'. The dating of these communications appears to be inconsistent. Smith's 'next day' could be explained as being the next working day, taking into consideration that such discussions would be deemed inappropriate on a Sunday, but I have been unable to account for Whitehead's description of August as being the '6th moneth'. The discussion began an hour or so after Smith received Whitehead's note and commenced with what appears to have been a somewhat heated argument about the heretical nature of Whitehead's preaching. Smith asserted that 'You who writ this book are a Papist', holding Whitehead accountable for the content of a written tract with an evocative comment which intimates the ever-present fear of the spread of Papism in the population. The discussion continues by focusing on Whitehead's understanding of the Trinity, and the refusal of Quakers' to swear oaths, and in total Smith records forty-seven (often overlapping) points which were raised. Hammond remarks Smith's account illustrates opposing forms of rhetorical debate: Smith, the scholar, repeatedly using a syllogistic form of arguing in comparison to the Quakers' 'imaginative theological language'. This form of argument is consistent with the education which Smith received; William T. Costello records 'more peculiar to scholasticism that the lecture was the disputation, a debate between students on the matter learned in the lectures or privately from tutors'. It is highly probably that Smith received such an education during his time at Christ's College, and was therefore well-practised in the art of public debate.

Yet it was not a Quaker, nor Bunyan, who first responded to Smith's pamphlet, but the Baptist Henry Denne. The title of his pamphlet is equally revealing about the nature of its content – *The Quaker No Papist, in Answer to The Quaker Disarm'd. or, A brief Reply and Censure of Mr. Thomas Smith's frivolous Relation of a Dispute held betwixt himself and certain Quakers at Cambridge.* Given the generally hostile attitude towards Quakers at this time, it is curious that Denne so quickly leapt to their defence, yet he does so vigorously, vilifying Smith with phrases such as, 'to punish in print so disgraceful a Combat, and to fill the world with a victory so ignoble, what is it for him to glory in his own shame?' Denne's diatribe – which rather amusingly includes condemnation of Smith's egocentric divulgence of what text he was engaged in studying before hearing Whitehead preaching in Cambridge – primarily concerns itself with the issue of

whether or not it is lawful for Christians to swear oaths. It was Whitehead's refusal to swear the Oath of Abjuration which formed the basis of Smith's argument that Whitehead was a Papist. Denne argues that it is inherently wrong to force men to swear this oath as,

> it is swearing a thing to be false, which for ought he knows may be true; it is exposing a mans self to evident peril of taking a false oath, and thereby of committing a most grievous and heinous sin in the sight of God.

and he holds the government responsible for trying to force this issue. Denne's final gambit shrieks of patronising moralism, and could easily be interpreted as being solely intended to rile Smith; 'I have onely to desire him (at parting) to consider how much an over acting zeal oftentimes obstructeth sound judgement'. A postscript to the main body of the text is even more inflammatory, calmly requesting Smith to consider the two points which Denne provides to demonstrate how Smith's behaviour smacks of Papism:

> I will not say you are a Papist; it should be too much contrary to Charity, considering what you profess. But this I do say, that you give more cause of suspicion that way, than any thing you have objected against George Whitehead.

This carefully phrased appeal to Smith's 'better judgement', could equally be seen as a calculated provocation to Smith's clearly fiery temper. Indeed, Smith's reaction to Denne's work was swift and reactionary, resulting in a scathing pamphlet entitled *A Gagg for the QUAKERS/WITH AN ANSWER TO Mr. DENN'S Quaker no Papist*. In this work, Smith tackles another aspect of debate, and the discussion progresses to questioning whether it is acceptable to have Protestant clergy. Yet always at the heart of these tirades are personal attacks on individuals accusing them of being a Papist. In his address *To The Reader*, Smith insinuates that Denne has Papist inclinations, but it is his biting sarcasm about Denne's scholastic ineptitude which encourages his audience to continue reading:

> if your leisure will not permit you to read the whole be pleased (for a tast) to peruse the 58, 59 and 60th § of the letter to Mr Den. and the 14th and 16th pages of the Queries.

He then instructs his audience to 'beware of wolves in sheeps-clothing'. Smith's thinly veiled accusation that Denne has not read

The Quaker Disarm'd is made explicit later in the text, 'one reason why I think you have not read the *Quaker Disarm'd*, is because you put a case and three queries in your 4th page, which are answered in the letter to Mr. E § 35', and this pedantic approach to refuting Denne's arguments replaces the more refined syllogisms of his earlier pamphlet. Also in this work Smith makes numerous references to Biblical passages – a technique he had not employed in his previous text, and one of which Quaker preachers were very fond. It can therefore be interpreted that Smith chose in this pamphlet to imitate the argument structure most frequently employed by the Quaker movement proving that he could overcome their arguments using their own methods.

Smith's sarcasm litters this pamphlet, and almost reduces this serious discussion to a farcical comedy: 'I am glad to meet with a man that hath read *ALL the books of Papists in those times, and ALL their Histories*... I entreat you to cite not *all* of them (though the more the merrier)'. This pamphlet also seems to have been more hastily constructed than Smith's previous publication, and this public wrangle necessitated the reader's knowledge of what had passed before. Indeed it would have been difficult for the audience to fully appreciate the full force of Smith's argument in this work as he frequently makes reference to precise points of paragraphs of Denne's pamphlet, suggesting that the reader must have had a copy of this pamphlet before them when they read Smith's second offering. This assumption on the part of Smith reveals an interesting insight into his supposition of the nature of his relationship. Smith adopts a degree of familiarity with his audience, as indicated by his references to his first pamphlet and that of Denne's. He expects the reader to be wholly familiar with the arguments which have gone before, which could be construed as being a fairly arrogant assumption given the relatively limited circulation of such pamphlets. But perhaps to endow Smith with arrogance is to do him a disservice; the circulation of pamphlets after publication has not yet been fully traced, perhaps individuals distributed them amongst a select group which could mean that the next instalment of this exchange of printed animosity was anticipated with the same relish as today's media intrigues.

Perhaps one of the reasons that Cambridge was a focal point for Quaker activities was that it was there that pastors were trained 'under great leaders...to give their lives for their people'. If Quakers could convince these trainee pastors to connect to their inner light, then the spiritually leaderless population could, possibly, be more easily converted. Hugh Barbour also suggests that Oxford and

Cambridge appealed especially to young northern Quaker preachers, as they presented 'virgin territory' for Quaker conversions which, he proposes, was attractive to these young enthusiasts. Early Quakers have been described as being 'far more radical' than their modern counterparts, and possessed a religious zeal for spreading the Quaker message which is not discernible in modern Friends. Braithwaite states that the volume of printed literature concerning Quakers can be understood by 'the zest with which Friends threw themselves into public disputing and polemic [which], is, in fact, only another evidence of the large claims and wide ambitions of early Quakerism', and Barry Reay records that one of the means of accomplishing this global aim was to provide Quakers entering a new area were with a list of separatists who resided in that area, as these were the most likely candidates for conversion, Barbour asserting that experienced Quaker preachers were required primarily in London and Bristol. Though he explains that such experienced leadership was distributed amongst new meetings as well, it is interesting that such high-profile figures as George Fox, George Whitehead and William Allen should all have been present at the debate with Thomas Smith. Whether this was accidental or intentional, given Smith's reaction to Whitehead preaching in Whitehall, cannot be conclusively ascertained, but the fact that all three were present to refute the arguments of one of the most influential academics of the day is worthy of comment. If their presence was pre-arranged, it was an unfair strategy to effectively 'gang up' upon Smith, but the benefits of winning the debate may well have swayed their decision about what constituted just tactics. However, if the presence of these three men was coincidental then our understanding of their characters makes it impossible for us to believe that Fox and Allen would not interject their own comments into a publicly held 'private' discussion. It is speculative, but reasonable, to suggest that Cambridge became a focal point of Quaker attention for such a motive; to have decisively demolished Smith's arguments would have sent ripples through the academic and theological communities, thereby materially strengthening the Quaker position. Peters identifies the years 1652-3 were crucial in establishing a system for the spread of Quaker ideas, and argues that Quakers were a very visible, highly organised, self-conscious and homogeneous movement, conscientiously presenting 'an identifiable, national movement, to which all displaced or disillusioned Independents and separatists could belong'. Her belief in the organisation of the movement supports the proposal that it was not mere coincidence which brought together three such influential

Quakers in Cambridge at this time, especially as her research has revealed that Cambridge had been a Quaker target since the arrival of Mary Fisher and Elizabeth Williams in 1653.

The printing and distribution of pamphlets has long been established as playing a key role in the establishment of the Quaker movement. By 1659, Margaret Fell's residence, Swarthmore Hall, was the administrative centre of the Society. Fox's desire to tighten his hold on the direction in which the society was moving led to his request that all material for publication be first sent to Swarthmore Hall for validation, which (if the text were approved) then advanced money to cover the cost of printing in London. Such regulation of printed material necessitated an intricate network to enable the transportion of the tracts, yet Henry Denne was not a Quaker. His religious reliefs and choice of printer strongly indicates that he did not follow Fox's desired method of regulation. Rather than approaching Giles Calvert, Denne chose Francis Smith to be the printer of his pamphlet, which provides evidence to support Hammond's assertion that Thomas Smith's original intention was to provoke a response from Bunyan. Francis Smith became the principal publisher of Bunyan's work, and Denne's preference for his printing house implies a connection, however circumstantial the evidence may appear. In a time when the government was cracking down upon the content of published texts, the choice of printer was crucial. Printing-houses which produced inflammatory works were subject to fines, closure or the imprisonment of their owners, so printers tended to be somewhat discerning in their choice of material. When Denne could be almost guaranteed that Calvert would have published his work, it is interesting that he chose rather to patronise the printing-house of Francis Smith,who was Bunyan's printer of choice.

Norman Penney's collection of documents which chart the introduction of Quakers throughout England and Wales shows that the years following this exchange of pamphlets,Quakers were still being violently abused in Cambridge. While it was unlikely that the debate between Smith and Denne would have significantly changed the attitude of the Cambridge populance towards Quakers and Quakerism, the level of hostility which was still encountered by individuals is surprising – one record claiming that there was 'rejoyceing to se us beaten', and stating quite wonderfully that 'heare all may see what moudie waters this fountayne of Cambridge streams forth'. Edward Sammon's 1659 pamphlet, *A Discovery of the Education of the Schollars of Cambridge; by Their Abominations and wicked Practises acted upon, and against, the Despised People, in scorn called*

QUAKERS, is a catalogue of grievances against individuals. Sammon accuses the 'Savage Schollers' of Cambridge of following the practices of Oxford Scholars, 'which two Places are called the...Fountains of Piety, and Nurses of Virtue: Now see whether...their People are bred up in filth, and to fithyness as their Actions and Fruits declare it to all People'. Sammon's wonderfully impassioned fire and brimstone style of writing accuses Thomas Smith of playing his part in rousing the crowd to atrocities, 'there hath been almost a whole streetfull of them hollowing and tearing of Us, and the Keeper of the Library in *Cambridge*, hath boasted of these and such like Actions at the Schollers'. It is then apparent that Quakers of 1659 believed themselves to be persecuted by, and themselves targeted, two main protagonists; Thomas Smith, the Librarian and William Pickering, the Mayor. Pickering's motivations for wishing the speedy and permanent removal of all Quakers from his jurisdiction are easily identified and largely justified. The peaceful methods of communication which are nowadays associated with Friends were generally unknown to the first Quakers. Their presence in an area resulted in public disruptions of organised religious and secular events, and often led to civil unrest amongst the local population. Pickering's stance of zero tolerance on all matters regarding Quakers was, arguably, the rational response to dealing with such disruptions. Thomas Smith's vehement and outspoken dislike of Quakers was largely the result of theological differences of opinion. His social status and education clearly made him feel responsible for, and capable of, publicly refuting Quaker theology, and consequently Quaker practises. Such vociferous and easily identifiable public figures made them a logical target for Quaker attacks, which only fanned the flames of religious intoleration.

The early Quaker movement quickly organised itself into a highly efficient system of networks. Targeted campaigns at key locations was soon established as an effective means of spreading the Quaker message. As a university town, and therefore extolling the virtue of contemplation though, lamentably, also being a centre of promoting human-learning, Cambridge was an obvious choice for a sustained Quaker campaign. Beginning in 1653, Friends consistently converged here in attempts to convert the populance from hierarchical religion to exploring the promptings of their inner light. Such an aggressive operation resulted in frequent altercations with powerful Cambridge figures who were as systematically and rigorously trying to exterminate the movement as Quakers were to establish it. Public debate and printed tracts rapidly became identifiable methods of spreading and strengthening the Quaker movement. The public

debate between Thomas Smith, George Whitehead, George Fox and William Allen is most notable for the high profile of these men. Whether we choose to condone Fox and Allen for unfairly conspiring against Smith, or applaud the fervour which prompted them to support their Friend and religious beliefs, their presence at the debate had a marked effect upon Smith, who chose to consolidate his position and continue the debate in a printed, rather than verbal, form. It was not until 1660 that Whitehead penned his own response to Smith's pamphlet, and it is surprising that it was a non-Quaker who offered the first rejoinder; perhaps the peripatetic nature of many early Quakers hindered a rapid response to printed tracts. Denne's defence of Quaker principles suggests both his sympathy with Quaker theology and his antagonism towards Smith, either due to his symbolic representation of authority, or on a personal basis. If Bunyan was truly the intended recipient of Smith's first attack, he spared no pains in his attempts to humiliate Denne and to repudiate his arguments. The relatively detached tone of *The Quaker Disarm'd* is replaced in *A Gagg for the Quakers* by a biting sarcasm and directs its comments less at wide theological issues and more at attacking Denne as an individual.

The pamphlets of 1659 give us an insight into the political and religious debates which were important to the English population at the time. It is entertaining to see the progression of an educated and intelligent man from a carefully constructed series of syllogisms, digress to the petty rivalry of a now personal vendetta. Yet the greatest interest of this collection of three pamphlets is that though they were written about Quakers, they were not written or published by Quakers. The influence which the movement had upon the general psyche of the nation can be established from this fact alone. Quakers were no longer a disorganised rabble, but a force to be reckoned with, debated with and written about.

Justine Williams

Bibliography

Barbour, Hugh. *The Quakers in Puritan England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1964).

Braithwaite, William C. *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, 2nd ed. revised by Henry J. Cadbury (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961).

Costello, William T., *The Scholastic Curriculum of Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958).

Croese, Gerard, *The General History of the Quakers: containing the Lives, Tenents, Sufferings, Tryals, Speeches and letters of all the most eminent Quakers, Both Men and Women: From the first Rise of the SECT, down to this present Time* (London: John Dunton, 1696).

Denne, Henry, *The Quaker No Papist, in Answer to the Quaker Disarm'd. or, A brief Reply and Censure of Mr. Thomas Smith's frivolous Relation of a Dispute held betwixt himself and certain Quakers at Cambridge (London: Francis Smith, 1659): in Early English Books Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:168715> [accessed 3rd March 2006].

Dixon, Philip, 'Firmin, Thomas (1632-1697)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn., Oct. 2005 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9482, accessed 22nd March 2006].

Firmin, Thomas, *The First New Persecution; or a True Narrative of the Cruel usage of two Christians, by the present Mayor of Cambridge. As it was certified from thence by an Eminent Hand* (London: G. Calvert, 1654): in *Early English Books Online.* <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx ver=Z39.88-2003 &res id=xri:eebo&rft id=xri:eebo:image:118133> [accessed 3rd March 2006)

Hammond, Paul, 'Smith, Thomas (1624-1661)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/68258, accessed 22nd March 2006].

Hessayon, Ariel. 'Calvert, Giles (*bap.* 1612, *d.* 1663)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/39669, accessed 22nd March 2006].

Lynch, Beth, 'Smith, Francis (d. 1691)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/39672, accessed 22 March 2006].

Penney, Norman (ed.), *The First Publishers of Truth.* (London: Headley Brothers, 1907).

Peters, Kate, "Quaker pamphleteering and the Origins of the Quaker Movement in East Anglia, 1652-1656", in *Religious Dissent in East Anglia III*, ed. David Chadd (Norwich: Print Group at the University of East Anglia, 1996).

Reay, Barry, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985).

Roots, Ivan, *The Great Rebellion 1642-1660* (London: Batsford Academic 1966; rep. 1986).

Sammon, Edward, *A Discovery of the Education of the Schollars of Cambridge; by Their Abominations and wicked Practises acted upon, and against, the Despised People, in scorn called QUAKERS* (London: Giles Calvert, 1659): *in Early English Books Online* <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx ver=Z39.88-2003 &res id=xri:eebo&rft id+xri:eebo:image=62086/ [accessed 3rd March 2006].

Smith, Thomas, *A Gagg for the QUAKERS\WITH AN ANSWER TO Mr. DENN'S Quaker no Papist: in Early English Books Online.* <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx ver=Z39.88-2003 &res id=xri:eebo&rft id=xri:eebo:image:167147> [accessed 3rd March 2006].

Smith, Thomas, *The Quaker Disarmed, or A True Relation of a Late Publick Dispute held at Cambridge \ By Three Eminent QUAKERS, against One Scholar of Cambridge \ WITH A Letter of Defence of the Ministry, AND AGAINST LAY-PREACHERS, ALSO Several Queries proposed to the Quakers to be answered if they can* (London: J.C., 1659): in *Early English Books Online* >http//gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx ver=Z39.88-2003 &res id=xri:eebo&rft id=xri:eebo:image:62083> [accessed 3rd March 2006].

Vipont, Elfrida, *The Story of Quakerism: through three centuries*, 2nd ed. (London: The Bannisdale Press, 1954, repr. 1960).

WILLIAM PENN, THE OGLETHORPES AND AN ELECTION IN HASLEMERE: A NEW LETTER

A rediscovered letter by William Penn illuminates his political dealings in 1702, at the opening of Queen Anne's reign, when he was on the verge of semi-retirement after returning to England from Pennsylvania. (See Appendix) It demonstrates not only his continued involvement in English politics at this juncture, but also his willingness to involve both local Quakers in such affairs.[1] On April 30th, Penn wrote to two leading Friends in the Haslemere area, urging them to support Lewis Oglethorpe (1681-1704), the young heir of a former Member of Parliament for the borough,Sir Theophilus Oglethorpe (1650-1702), in the forthcoming general election for Queen Anne's first Parliament. The Haslemere seat would be fiercely contested, with a losing candidate casting sufficient doubt on Lewis Oglethorpe's victory to persuade the returning officer to make a double return. In the event the young Oglethorpe heir won this case too – which had questioned his age rather than the size of his majority – and by December was seated in his father's former seat in the House of Commons. However, while Lewis Oglethorpe could demonstrate his social position in August 1702, ahead of the election, being listed as one of the Deputy Lieutenants for the county when new lists were compiled, any further electoral support that the heir to the Oglethorpe interest could secure prior to a contentious election would be valuable.[2] This gesture by Penn on Oglethorpe's behalf was potentially useful in its own right and suggests that the respect that Penn had long received from leading politicians at Westminster as someone who could mobilize the 'dissenting' vote remained well-earned.

In broader terms, the letter demonstrates contacts between William Penn and Sir Thomas Oglethorpe, a high-Tory M.P. whose wife's Jacobite sympathies were notorious.[3] This is also useful. It helps to confirm an identification suggested by the editors of the *Papers of William Penn* when annotating a letter of Penn's written from Pennsylvania in July 1701, where Penn cited 'Sr,Th:O' as his source for the key role being played by William Blathwayt, the long-serving Secretary at War, Commissioner of the Board of Trade and a Whig Member of Parliament for Bath, in promoting a wartime Parliamentary measure proposed by William III's government to rein

in proprietary governments in the colonies to reunite them with the Crown.[4] The 'S r Th:O,' who supplied advice on who was behind a measure that threatened Penn's role as Proprietor in Pennsylvania would, indeed, seem to be Sir Theophilus. This is in keeping with Alison Olson's argument that in fending off this major legislative assault, Penn turned to the Tories for allies, including some individuals from the party's crypto-Jacobite wing.[5] This new letter shows Penn, recently returned from America, coming to visit Oglethorpe in his house in St James's Westminster, and his arrival becoming a proximate cause of Sir Thomas's death. We can also see why, two days before a meeting with the Council of Trade and Plantations where some of his louder critics were to attend and several of his actions as Proprietor in Pennsylvania were likely to face detailed critiques. Penn still took time from preparing his defence to write this note.[6]

Demonstrating Penn's dealings with the Oglethorpe family may also help to explain why Lewis Oglethorpe's younger brother and eventual political heir as M.P. for Haslemere, James Edward Oglethorpe, would be aware of William Penn's proposals for colonial projects – even if the future General and colonial founder was only seven when this electoral support was offered. In the 1730s, when Sir Theophilus's youngest son and now M.P. for Haslemere was helping to float the Georgia scheme, a tract of Penn's on colonisation was among the texts reprinted in the volley of pamphlets that General Oglethorpe and the thoroughly Anglican Georgia Trustees published recommending a new American settlement.[7] The choice may now appear less of a bibliographical surprise.

As for the letter's recipients, John Smyth and Caleb Woods were brothers-in-law and established Surrey Friends who were likely to have contacts in Haslemere.[8] They were both among the ten co-signatories of a Lease, Release and Counterpart Release of 19 and 20 August 1684, relating to the premises held for the Guildford Meering of the Religious Society of Friends. Thirty three years later Symth, now described as 'mealman' rather than 'haberdasher', was listed again, this time as one of 'three' surviving grantees of the [...] premises'.[9] In 1695 a John Smith of Godalming, draper, was once again a co-signatory with Caleb Woods, senior, of Guildford, witnessing a set of title deeds. John Smyths are always legion, so firm identifications are difficult, but, given Caleb Woods's citing 'John Smith of Godalming, Corn merchant' in his will of 1713, this is probably also the John Smith or Smyth, mercer of Godalming , who features in a lease of the Quaker burial ground in Brinscombe, Godalming, in 1695.[10] These legal documents cite a number of trades

to describe a single individual, but if he started in the cloth trade in the 1680s before transferring to trading in grain, then the various descriptions do cluster together, sometimes viewing him as a wholesaler, sometimes as a retailer. He may also be the John Smith who the Surrey Quarterly Meeting appointed to wait on members of Parliament in 1721.[11] In the latter case prior involvement in local elections may have done no harm.

Caleb Woods was a more substantial figure from Guildford. Two generations of Caleb Woods were maltsters there: the elder died in 1713, the younger in 1716.[12] Woods senior, who we have already encountered co-signing property deeds in the 1680s and '90s, can also be found as a leading Friend in the Guildford area under Charles II, when the memorandum book kept as a justice of the peace by Sir William Moore, Bart. of Loseley Hall, the then lord of the manor of Haslemere, notes Caleb Woods hosting an illegal conventicle in his house. With the Moore influence in abeyance after Sir William's death in 1684, these would be useful people to contact prior to a local election.[13] The tone of Penn's letter suggests that this was not the first time that he had asked for their assistance in supporting an Oglethorpe candidate at a Haslemere election. As Sir Theophilus Oglethorpe did not stand for election in December 1710 and was unopposed in January 1701, Woods's and Smyth's earlier interventions would have been in 1698, when Sir Theophilus first ran for the Haslemere seat as a highly contentious candidate.[14]

***

Fresh letters from William Penn remain unexpected discoveries, with few gleanings left after the search undertaken by the editors of the *Papers of William Penn*. This stray letter is now in Jamaica, in the West Indies Collection at the Library of the University of the West Indies, Mona. It has been bound into an extra-illustrated version of Thomas Clarkson's *History of the Rise, Progress, and Accomplishment of the Abolition of the African Slave Trade by the British Parliament*, first published in 1808, to celebrate the end of British participation in the Slave Trade and reprinted in 1839 to mark 'full free' and the conclusion of the post-Emancipation 'Apprenticeship' transition for the ex-slaves. This lavish early Victorian compilation was donated to the newly-founded University College of the West Indies in 1954 by Ansell Hart, a leading Jamaican lawyer and book collector who had purchased West Indian material from dealers in London during the 1920s and '30s.[15]

The lithographed title page to the second volume describes the

compilation as 'illustrated with Portraits, Autographs, Views, maps &c. &c. by Arthur West in Two Vols, 1846.' It is an interesting example of the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century fad for creating 'Graingerised' or 'extra-illustrated' editions of prized volumes, where the compiler bound in further engravings and autographs: producing 'a customised version of a mass-disseminated book that represented the owner's engagement and intimacy with the contents of that volume.'[16] In this instance the additional material virtually doubles the size of the original book. Clarkson's retelling of the prominent part that English and American Friends played in the early stages of the campaign against slavery prompted the compiler to insert seventeenth and eighteenth-century documents alongside autographs and engravings. These include a 1684/5 letter by George Fox (printed from another text in the 1902 edition of his *Journal*, though with its lay-out and punctuation modernised there), which *may* be an autograph copy and is a contemporary transcript;[17] this letter by William Penn and a further long letter signed with the pseudonym 'Tobias Seealittle', that seems to have been written for publication as a contribution to the debates against purchasing slave-produced material, where Seealittle proposed extending the existing boycott of sugar to include any Friends who as retailers sold not just slave-grown Sugar or Rum, but also Tobacco and Snuff. The last text was assigned a date of 1790 by the volume's 1846 compiler. It probably dates from the first phase of the wider British anti-Slave Sugar campaign that began in 1791.[18] There are also further Quaker-related illustrations, including three different engravings of William Penn and an autograph of Anthony Benezet's.

Can any more inferences be extracted? Perhaps. One swallow hardly makes a summer, but this instance does demonstrate how the historical prominence of some early Quakers could result in their autographs and autograph letters appealing to unexpected collectors. A later generation who traced – and then extra-illustrated – histories of Abolition and Emancipation prompted collections which may yet include further early letters. Today the 'gentle art' of extra-illustrating books has lost favour with curators, so that libraries which own these volumes tend to downgrade them, postponing the heavy chore of the retroactive cataloguing of the host of autographs that busy 'Graingerisers' inserted into their compilations.[19] Occasional complete letters from individuals who late eighteenth and nineteenth-century collectors respected may yet drowse between these ornate covers too. The 2007 bicentennial of the end of the slave trade along with the individual stages of the subsequent reform programme up to 1838 and "full free", with the successive

exhibitions the anniversaries of these reforms are likely to prompt, should bring further extra-illustrated volumes addressing slavery and emancipation out from the dimmer corners of libraries' reserve collections. If so, it may be worth while looking through such compilations to see if any more unknown Fox, Penn or Benezet letters lie concealed there.

James Robertson

APPENDIX

De. Friends, }
Caleb Woods & } Lond - 30 th 2nd
John Smyth } 1702

Being surprised with the
Death of Sr. The: Oglethorp
at his door, when I went to –
visit him (knowing nothing
of his illness) I resolved, upon
so sorrowfull an occasion, & to
serve his family, for his
very friend by healp! of
me & all my friends, &
his honourable principles
at large; and perceiving by
his Lady she designes her son
to
(v) succeed his father, if the Bur-
ough of Haselmore [Haslemere, Surrey] will be as
kinde to him (and truly the
young gentleman seems to
deserve it) I do earnestly In-
terest my selfe in his favour
with you (my old, & always
true friends) that you would
lend him your best, Influence
& endeavours in this ~~pasage~~
affair, and after what I
have heard from him, I dare
assure you of your aid in
it, & our persuasion, on all
occasions. Besides, his father
missing of it as he did <last time> ~~last time~~
'tis almost a debt due to the
son.
2) Your very affec[tionate]
Warm Friend
Wm Penn

For my [ ]
Friends C[aleb]
Wood Joh[n Smyth]

* I am grateful to Rollo Crookshank, to Michael Page at the Surrey Historical Centre, Woking, Surrey and to Josef Keith and Julia Hudson at Friends House Library for references and advice. Reading a version to the History Club at the University of the West Indies, Mona, also helped.

NOTES

1. Caroline Robbins, 'William Penn, 1689-1702; Eclipse, Frustration, and Achievement' in *The World of William Penn* ed. by Richard S. Dunn and Mary Maples Dunn, (Philadelphia, Penn: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), pp. 71-84; downplaying the retirement theme, Mary K. Geiter, *William Penn* (Harlow: Longman, 2000).
2. Eveline Cruickeshanks and Perry Gauci, 'Oglethorpe Lewis (1681-1704)', in Eveline Cruickeshanks, Stuart Handley and D.W. Hayton, *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons, 1690-1715*, 5 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), v. *Members 0-Z*, pp. 9-10; Perry Gauci, 'Haselmere', *ibid.* II, *Constituencies*, pp. 581-584; as a deputy lieutenant, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the reign of Anne, preserved in the Public Record Office, I, 1702-1703*, ed. Robert Pentland Mahaffy, (London: H.M.S.O., 1916), p. 393, 25 August 1702.
3. Eveline Cruickeshanks and Perry Gauci, 'Oglethorpe, Sir Theophilus (1650-1700)', *Members O-Z*, pp. 10-12; Phinizy Spalding, *Oglethorpe in America* (Athens, Ga: University of Georgia Press, 1984), pp. 2-3, and for the continuity of these Jacobite sympathies into the next generation, Keith Thomas, 'James Edward Oglethorpe, sometimes Gentleman Commoner of Corpus', in John C. Inscoe, ed. *James Edward Oglethorpe: New Perspectives on His Life and Legacy - A Tercentenary Commemoration* (Savanna, Ga: Georgia Historical Society, 1997), pp. 16-34.
4. To Charlwood Lowton,2 July 1701, in *The Papers of William Penn*, 4 vols. (Philadelphia, Penn: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), IV, *1701-1718*, eds. Craig W. Horle, Alison Duncan Hirsch, Marianne S. Wokeck and Joy Wiltenburg, pp. 57-59; also Geiter, *Penn*, pp. 90-93, and *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and the West Indies*, XVIII, 1701, ed. Cecil Headlam, (London: H.M.S.O., 1910), pp. xxxiv-xxxix, 179.
5. Alison Gilbert Olsen, 'William Penn, Parliament and Proprietary Government', *William & Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Ser. 18 (1961), pp. 176-195.
6. For the dispute with Robert Quarry that was one of the items before the Board, *Penn Papers*, 4: 160-167, where they suggest 28 April as the date for Penn's reply. Also, Geiter, *Penn*, pp. 90-93; *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies* XIX, *Jan-Dec 1 1702*, (ed.), Cecil Headlam, (London: H.M.S.O., 1912), pp. 370-371.
7. Robbins, 'Eclipse, Frustration and Achievement', 74.
8. Kew, The National Archives, the Public Records Office, Canterbury Probate Court, PROB 11/533, ff. 199v-205, will of Caleb Woods, elder, Maltster of St. Mary, Guildford, f. 205, describes Smith as 'my brother in law'.

9. Typescript handlist of documents from the Godalming Preparative Meeting, prepared by the Surrey Records Office, (now the Surrey History Centre), unpaginated, consulted at Friends House Library, 'Miscellaneous Papers', Records relating to the premises of the Guildford Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, 5021/1/11, 12, 13, and 17, 18, 19, 2 and 4 April 1717.
10. Guildford, Surrey History Centre, LM/354/7; Chichester, West Sussex Records Office, Lytton/377-379, 21, 22, 25 May, 1695.
11. Surrey History Centre, 6189/1/1/19.
12. The elder, above note 8; the younger, P.R.O. PROB 11/544, ff. 215v-216, 31 October 1716.
13. Surrey History Centre, LM 1046/1; Gauci, 'Haselmere', 581.
14. Cruickeshanks and Gauci. 'Oglethorpe, Theophilus', 11-12.
15. The hobby was promoted by the publication in 1769 of *A Biographical History of England, from Egbert the Great to the Revolution, by the Rev. James Grainger (1723-76)*. University of the West Indies, Mona, West Indies Collection, 'List of Books Donated to the University College of the West Indies by Mr. Ansell Hart, 1954', (typescript), p. 5; writing up some of his other bibliographical finds, Ansell Hart, 'Bryan Edward's Copy of Long's History', *Jamaican Historical Review*, 1 (1945), P. 100, and Shirley Davis, 'A gift of the late Ansell Hart to the Library of the University College of the West Indies in 1954', *Jamaica Journal*, 8:2 (1974), pp. 26-32.
16. Lucy Peltz, 'The extra-illustration of London: the gendered species and practices of antiquarianism in the late eighteenth-century', in *Producing the Past: Aspects of Antiquarian Culture and Practice, 1700-1850*, eds. Martin Myrone and Lucy Peltz, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), pp. 115-134 (p. 116), and, more generally, *idem*. 'Engraved Portrait Heads and the Rise of Extra-Illustration: The Eton Correspondence of the Revd. James Granger and Richard Bull, 1769-1774', *Walpole Society*, 66 (2004), pp. 1-161.
17. George Fox, *The Journal of George Fox: Being an Historical Account of His Life, Travels, Sufferings, and Christian Experiences* 8th ed. 2 vols. (London: Headley Brothers, 1902), II. pp. 408-9, 18th of the 12th Month 1684-5.
18. Claire Midgley, *Women Against Slavery: The British Campaigns, 1780-1870* (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 35-40, also idem. 'Slave Sugar Boycotts: Female Activism and the Domestic Base of British Anti-Slavery Culture', *Slavery and Abolition*, 17:3 (1996), pp. 137-162, and Charlotte Sussman, 'Women and the Politics of Sugar, 1792', *Representations*, 48 (1994), pp. 48-69.
19. Robert R. Wark, 'The Gentle Pastime of Extra-Illustrating Books', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 56 (1993), pp. 151-165.

[Editor: The modern spelling of Haslemere is used throughout the article rather than the 1702 spelling of 'Haselmore' or 'Haselmere']

QUAKER PACIFISM DURING THE IRISH REVOLUTION

At the beginning of the twentieth century the Quaker peace testimony had been in place for 240 years and despite serious challenges, it remained intact. For better or worse and very often monetary loss, the Society of Friends remained true to its principle of non-violence. In Ireland this had a positive effect. The compassion with which the Quakers received both army and insurgents during 1798 and the concern they showed towards Catholics and fellow Protestants during the Famine endeared them to the nation and gave them respectability not easily bestowed upon religious groups. During this period the community expended its commitment to the peace principle as part of a much broader reorientation of Quaker thought, initiated in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Originating in Britain and prompted by a general resurgence of spirituality, the instigators of this reform were mostly young Friends who sought a new basis for their beliefs rather than the strongly evangelist, and bible-based theology that had taken hold. They favoured a return to 'grass-root Quakerism' of which pacifism was a basic tenet. 'They saw the peace testimony primarily as a reflection of the Quaker doctrine of the Inner Light rather than as a biblically based injunction, and they urged Friends to join with non-Christians in the fight against war'.[1] While the Society's official attitude to war remained the same, individuals began to speak of replacing 'passive resistance' with a more militant approach: 'Our testimony against war, if it is to be vital, must not be mere testimony against armed forces – it must cut at the roots of war'[2] wrote John Rowntree in the *The Friend* of January 26th 1900. What was being pronounced was a more dynamic attitude toward peace action: the extension of the meaning of Quaker opposition to war and a strengthened commitment to peace, which would see pacifism as the one principle 'which distinguished Quakerism from other Christian denominations'.[3] For the Quakers in Ireland this development placed great strain upon their membership and produced an immediate concern in the shape of a resurgent nationalism with militant claims to independence; the effects of which brought revolution and violence once more to Ireland's shores. This paper is concerned with the response Friends made to the outbreak of these hostilities and the extent to which they were successful in maintaining their

commitment to the revised 'principle of peace'.

The revolution of 1916-1923 was the apogee of Irish nationalist agitation and it saw the political framework in Ireland changed forever. Indirectly it was the product of a revitalised Irish identity that found expression within a number of movements at the end of the nineteenth century; the Gaelic League, Gaelic Athletic Association and Literary Revival each sought to celebrate Irish culture and in doing so had re-established a distinct sense of pride among the Irish nation. These movements lent intellectual weight to the political argument for independence and inspired a group of nationalists under the direction of Patrick Pearse to declare an Irish republic in 1916 following an armed uprising during the Easter celebrations. In the aftermath of the failed rebellion constitutional politics quickly became marginalised as moderate public opinion turned against British rule following the harsh reprisals levied against the Easter week insurgents. In the forthcoming years radical change befell the country; republican Sinn Fein won a majority in Ireland in the 1918 general election and an independent republic was declared with the creation of 'an avowedly separatist parliament, *Dail Eireann*, in 1919.[4] The same day as the creation of an Irish parliament the Irish Volunteers, reformed as the Irish Republican Army, began a guerrilla war against British occupation in Ireland. The conclusion of this nationalist labelled War of Independence two years later saw the nation divided; a Unionist state loyal to Britain remained in the North while the rest of country fought a bloody civil war before finally emerging as a 'Free State' in 1923.

The precursor to these dramatic events was the British Liberal party's introduction of a home rule bill in 1886, which set the foundation for a separate parliament in Ireland. Motivated by a renewed nationalist impetus, William Gladstone acknowledged 'the fixed desire of a nation'[5] after Charles Parnell's Home Rule party won an overwhelming victory in the 1885 election. The following year his third administration placed a home rule bill before Parliament. This was a big step toward independence and although it was taken without aggression, with the best intention by the Liberal party, it provoked a series of events that militarised Irish society and greatly increased the chances of a violent encounter like that eventually witnessed in Easter week 1916. The opportunity to govern their own country raised the hopes of Irishmen and women to such an extent that when it was denied because of the outbreak of war in 1914 many lost faith in the constitutional approach, turning instead to armed resistance as the only means for achieving their aim. The reaction of Friends to the prospect of home rule, and the associated tensions it

generated during this period, is worthy of some consideration; it offers an interesting insight as to their largely ignored political affiliation and underlines their efforts during the 1919-1921 conflict and the ensuing civil war.

The prospect of home rule was quick to divide the Irish nation and the Society of Friends was no different. Among many of the older generation there was a great concern as to the position of the Society should a new government be elected. Following the introduction of the Government of Ireland Bill of 1893, a large number of Irish Friends[6] made an address to Friends in Britain. In it they made plain their fears and called upon their co-religionalists to assist in efforts to oppose the bill, which in their eyes 'cannot fail to be disastrous to Ireland'.[7] One area of concern for the signatories of this address appeared to be a strongly felt belief that any new executive would be unable to guard the rights of minorities as effectively as that already in existence.

> 'Living thus under the free and equal administration of laws enacted by the United Parliament and carried out by an Executive responsible to it; actuated by no party spirit or sectarian prejudice [...] we are solemnly convinced that our rights and liberties, both civil and religious, and those of our fellow-countrymen in Ireland of all conditions and of all religions, cannot be securely guaranteed, as they now are, under the new and unprecedented arrangements proposed to be made'.[8]

The foundation of this particular concern is only hinted at within the address. However a more detailed reasoning comes from a letter written by one of the signatories to a member in England a month after the address in April 1893. The author recalls the events of the 1879-1882 Land War where 'the reign of terror in Ireland was quite as real, if not so violent, as France in 1793' and asks the question: 'does anyone, with the least acquaintance with history, believe that the remedy for such a state of things is to place the administration in the hands of the men who have contrived at, if not perpetrated, the crimes by which it has been sustained?'[9] For the author, and many other Friends, the implication is that the proposed home rule bill would see power given to an intolerant body of people who terrorised others simply because they 'would not become members of the Land League or subscribe to its funds'.[10] This particular concern for the protection of minorities has a long standing within the Society of Friends, and can perhaps be linked with their own persecution as a religious minority in the seventeenth century.

However its complete trust in the existing power also suggests that among elements of the Society there resided a great belief in the existing relationship between Ireland and Britain. This last point is well emphasised later in the letter when the author admits to the need for some reform in parliament, but believes such action to be best achieved under the British system:

> 'We, in Ireland, are fully alive to the fact that the present condition of affairs in Parliament is highly unsatisfactory, that many reforms are pressing for accomplishment; but surely the means to achieve these reforms is not necessarily through a revolution in the whole constitutional system of the country [...] it is just *because* we see so clearly the urgent need for liberal legislation [...] that we deprecate the overthrow of the engine by which all our progress hitherto has been achieved – the British parliamentary system'.[11]

In this passage the author is clearly of the opinion that Ireland is better off under the direct control of Westminster and that anything else would be detrimental to the country's moral and economic prosperity, particularly if the reins were handed over, the author continues, 'to those who, up to the present, have shown no signs of breadth of mind or of liberality of thought'. On the basis of this letter and the address itself, signed by more than 81% of the adult membership, it would appear that at this time the Society was broadly Unionist in outlook and viewed the developing circumstances in a less than favourable light. This opinion would prove to be controversial as the situation became more explosive and less inhibited Friends were desirous to intervene.

Although many Quakers were evidently opposed to the idea of home rule, the Society could never unanimously reject it. Perhaps not enjoying majority status, there were Friends who fully supported the proposal, believing that 'there must be some national life and feeling'[12] for the people to feel contented. In a reply to the 1893 address, twenty-two members of the Society laid out their own views towards the proposed bill, citing its importance in bringing about 'a lasting treaty of peace between the two peoples'.[13] In challenging their co-religionalists, the signatories of this address evidence a growing divide among the Society over the home rule issue, suggesting that Friends opposing it 'have largely become associated with those holding the narrow and intolerant views of the Orange Society'.[14] This particular charge is perhaps one born more from emotion than substance' drawing from the accused the 'equally

preposterous accusation...that they [the twenty-two], in promoting their Home Rule canvass, associate with Roman Catholic priests'.[15] The argument lacks heavy substance as Friends were well known for their compassion towards other religions and are particularly favourable to civil liberties and opportunities. The credibility of the address was later seriously undermined by James Richardson[16] but what it was successful in doing was to emphasise the raw passions that home rule engendered within the membership at this time.

Despite being a minority, those Friends who supported home rule demonstrate a more progressive trend within the Society, like Mary Leadbeater and Abraham Shackleton before them, and to a great extent were the primary Irish supporters of the movement towards a less bible-based theology. Among the older of these supporters was Alfred Webb son of Richard Davis Webb, a printer in Dublin, best remembered for his 'small but vital link in the move to free the slave'.[17] Like his father Alfred Webb was unimpressed by the emergent conservatism of the Society and embraced its radical wing, becoming involved in nationalist politics as early as 1865 after witnessing the trial of Thomas Clarke Luby, Charles Kickham and John O'Leary. Writing in his autobiography forty years later, Webb reflects upon the impact of this event in revelatory terms:

> 'All three afterwards my friends either personally or by correspondence, condemned to 20 years endurance of a system of punishment the most barbarous... perhaps ever invented by human ingenuity [...] I felt that there must be something radically wrong, as there was, in a state of things when such men could rise up and submit themselves to such a doom. Like Paul on his road to Damascus a sudden light shone on my mind and I left Green-street Court House a changed man'.[18]

It would appear that Webb was most affected by the severity of the punishment delivered and, particularly, the commitment of the prisoners to their cause. It was his humanitarianism though, together with the Quaker instinct to relieve suffering, that finally brought him into contact with the nationalist circle; becoming involved with the Amnesty campaign and the effort to support the prisoners' families convinced Webb of the nationalist cause. From this point on he was committed to home rule, becoming treasurer of the Home Rule League on its inauguration in 1873 and serving as Parnell's MP for West Waterford until 1895 and the defeat of their Liberal supporters. Although Webb had earlier resigned his membership of the Society of Friends, he is an example of the breadth of opinion that existed

within the religious group.[19] On a somewhat negative note however, his resignation is also an indication as to the monopoly enjoyed by the more conservative among them.

The devision that the home rule debate created among the Society of Friends became much more entrenched as events took a more radical turn. By 1912 a third bill was introduced in Parliament strongly opposed by the Conservative Party. Fearing the forthcoming introduction of a separate parliament in Ireland, unionists in Ulster set about protecting their membership with Great Britain by raising a militia that would 'use "all means" necessary to defeat home rule'.[20] The Ulster Volunteer Force marked a growing crisis within the province and the reaction from Friends was mixed. While there was a general desire to avoid a violent confrontation, opinions remained varied regarding the political issues involved. Some Friends used the threat of violence to lend weight to the anti-home rule campaign, stating that, if passed, the bill could 'only be put into force by the military conquest of Ulster'[21] which would only lead to further discontent. Others accepted the right of Ireland to govern itself but believed that the same right extended to those in Ulster, where a large proportion of the population identified themselves as British citizens. Consequently they advocated a revised bill that would allow Ulster to 'opt out' and remain a part of Great Britain. Opposing each of these views were a third group who sought home rule for Ireland on the basis that it would break down the old rivalries between Nationalist and Unionist and actually 'open the way for a scheme of Federation'[22] as enjoyed in countries like Sweden and Norway. In the face of potential rebellion Friends could not reach a consensus and rather than unite the Society, the 'Ulster crisis' only encouraged Friends on each side to make their case more vociferously. In an attempt to overcome this division Quarterly Meeting in Ulster concluded, in September 1913, that '"prayer is by far the most powerful weapon with which we are armed, and *whatever our political views,* [author's italics] we may truly unite at the Throne of Grace, asking that our country may be kept in peace".'[23] In seeking an agreement over the need for peace and stability above all else, Friends hoped to raise the Society from the political depths in which it was beginning to drown.

Politics had disunited Friends and the strengthening of the peace testimony extended this disunity. The question of home rule and the related 'Ulster crisis' exposed an increasingly conservative attitude among the community that had not been present in the heady days of 1798. At this time Friends had been dynamic and quick to respond to the mounting tensions, many actually sympathising with the

ideology of the rebels whilst maintaining a pacifist stance. Since that time however, many had prospered and were 'unwilling to risk their possessions on behalf of the Society's pacifist principles'.[24] Henry Richard, a Welsh pacifist and secretary general of the London Peace Society found evidence of this feeling as early as 1873 whilst conducting a tour of Ireland. His biographer, C.S. Miall, wrote of an address Richard made in Limerick:

> 'Mr Richard did not find the Friends at Limerick at all zealous in the peace cause. There was a gathering of some 30 persons at their meeting-house, and the gas-meter being out of order, they had to be content with the light of two tallow candles, and he addressed this select company without being able to see their faces'.[25]

The greater emphasis now placed upon Quaker pacifist credentials exposed the depth of this material concern, and at the outbreak of hostilities in 1919[26] there was disagreement concerning the scale of assistance that Quakers should provide. The conservative elements desired a less public role for the Society, afraid that the situation was too political, and that any undue action could jeopardise their standing. For others, especially the younger members, the peace testimony implied an obligation to assist in aid work regardless of the consequences. At a conference of Friends called in November 1920, they rebuked the ' "immovable conservatism of the older Friends" and denied that the [relief] committee "in any way represented the aspirations of the younger part of the Society" '.[27] In the highly charged political atmosphere of early 1920's Ireland, the Quakers had reached an impasse that threatened to split their community irreparably if an agreement could not be reached. The eventual outcome saw those who desired an active role emerge as the victors. This was not simply a victory for the younger Friends over their elders, but a re-affirmation of the authority of their peace testimony:

> 'All our business is over shadowed by the thought of sin and suffering in our country.The loss to the community through the interruption of the spirit of goodwill and fellowship cannot be estimated, and we desire that every word and act of ours may be in that spirit and power which take away the occasion of all strife and contention, and that God will guide our country into the way of peace'.[28]

Although politics had come close to undermining the Society, its violent manifestation had united them once more in the cause for peace.

The peace efforts of the Quakers during the War of Independence and carried into the Irish Civil War were characterised by two new initiatives. In addition to the traditional non-sectarian relief efforts that made the Quaker reputation in the past, 1919-1923 saw the creation of an organised relief effort and the early signs of a Quaker attempt at mediation, first between the British Government and the Irish-elected Dail Eireann, and later between the anti-Treaty and Free State Forces. These initiatives were a product of the new direction Quakers was taking: to work more actively for peace, the Society would be more effective if it provided an organised service rather than rely upon individual exertions. The fruits of such action was first discovered during the Great Famine where the Quakers were able to dispense much sought relief after setting up a committee dedicated to the alleviation of suffering. The success of this venture and the modern demands of the peace testimony made a similar response in 1920 ever more necessary. Consequently, after the decision to participate was made, the Friends' Irish Relief Committee was established and they began investigating the situation in Ireland and where their assistance would be best put to use. It became evident that reconstruction and employment were high priorities and consequently much Quaker aid came in the form of monies raised by the committee for assisting the victims of the conflict. One letter to a supporter in the north of Ireland, dated 14th February 1921, bears this out clearly: 'enclosed is a cheque for £150 for Father O'Boyle of Lisburn. It is our wish that it should be used for relieving the poorer people who have been dispossed (sic) of home or thrown out of work by reason of the destruction of property in that town'.[29] This example is just one of the many acts that Quakers undertook during the period of unrest, and from it there is a real feeling of humanity without sectarian bias, as the letter continues:

> 'When you go to Lisburn I should be very glad if you would try and find out whether any Protestants have suffered loses and are in distress in consequence of the burnings, for we are anxious to relieve such cases equally with the others, if they are not already helped'.

As with their relief efforts during the famine and earlier uprising, the Irish Quakers were careful not to distinguish between religions.

Although not under the auspices of the relief committee, Quaker

organised service came from another quarter and made a great impact upon their relief work. The Irish White Cross was set up early in 1921 by James Green Douglas, a Friend who would later become a Senator in the Irish Republic, after receiving money from Friends in America who were keen to assuage the suffering of the Irish people. In his memoirs Douglas recalls the spontaneity with which the group took place.

> 'I was awakened at about 7 a.m. by the telephone bell. On answering the call I was informed that a telegram had arrived from New York. As far as I can recollect the telegram was worded as follows: "Sending twenty-five thousand dollars for relief work in Ireland – more to follow – writing" and was signed Wood'.[30]

The American Committee for Relief in Ireland from whom the money came were, in true Quaker spirit, very desirous that the funds were not used for political purposes and therefore they sought out a fellow Friend to whom they could entrust their offering. Douglas proved to be a fine choice, quick to organise a committee for the efficient distribution of the funds but also astute enough to include representatives from practically all the Churches in Ireland and even Sinn Fein, although the latter did not take an active role. Before turning to the relief activities of this group, it is worth looking, for a moment, at its relationship with the various political forces in Ireland and in particular the nationalist movement with which it had a curious connection. Douglas, himself a professed home ruler, concedes in his memoirs that although no money went to the IRA 'it was none the less obvious to all concerned that the White Cross was an important factor in the struggle for Irish independence'[31] and throughout its short lifetime was closely watched by the British Army. Prominent Sinn Fein members, including both Michael Collins and Arthur Griffith, were on the governing committee and Douglas it seems enjoyed a great rapport with the IRA chief, lamenting his early death as a personal blow after having 'formed a real affection for him'.[32] Despite this seemingly nationalist formation, the White Cross also involved unionist members such as the Trinity College Professor Edward Culverwell and even appointed ex British Army Captain David Robertson as its honorary secretary, although it would later transpire that Robinson had become a member of the IRA. It would appear that the organisation was well within the nationalist camp and to a certain extent it was. Douglas however remained committed to the Quaker ideas of pacifism, for him the

White Cross was an opportunity for these people to 'conscientiously give their help without approving of violence in any form.'[33]

The Irish White Cross was arguably one of the most successful relief organisations to emerge during the War of Independence. Although it was not exclusively made up of Friends, it is a good example of both Quaker organised service and their preparedness to work with anyone concerned with peace. Catholic nationalists certainly played a big part in the set up but so too did many Protestant figures, with James Douglas estimating support of more than one thousand.[34] In this sense the organisation helped to bring religions together under a united banner at a time when sectarianism was rife and the communities looked poles apart. In terms of relief success, their published report up to 31st August 1922, show that the White Cross raised and distributed £1,374,795[35] to the distressed in Ireland regardless of political or religious affiliation. Much of the money went to those who had lost their homes as a result of the conflict, while a large proportion also went to provide for the many 'Catholics in Belfast who had suffered as a result of an anti-Catholic pogrom in that city'.[36] Throughout the period, the Friends Relief Committee worked closely with the White Cross so as to reach as many people as possible and not squander resources by overlapping. It was a co-ordinated effort on the part of the Society of Friends to alleviate the suffering of the Irish people; through such efforts the impact of the armed struggle upon the civilian population, though not minimised, was made easier to bear.

It is important to stress that the relief efforts of the Irish Quakers did not follow sectarian or political lines. Assistance was given to those in need and any lobbying of government was done out of a sincere desire for peace in accordance with their beliefs. In a letter to David Lloyd George, dated 11th June 1921, this feeling is clearly voiced: 'as professing Christian people we feel the greatness of our responsibility to almighty God to do everything in our power to promote peace and goodwill'.[37] Within the letter Irish Friends had laid out a proposal for a truce between the British and Irish forces in the hope that it would then enable them to sit together around a negotiation table. The proposal included: the re-establishment of British law, Irish leaders to prevent acts of aggression and the British authorities to parole Irish political prisoners, a cessation to the transport of arms during the period of the truce, both sides to observe the truce to the letter and finally that the truce last for one month with its expiration by mutual agreement. Though by no means comprehensive, these suggestions reflect a much more involved attempt by the Society to bring about a resolution to the conflict in

accordance with the recently strengthened peace testimony. Rather than just deal with the consequences of war, the Society began to implement a policy of positive peace *making*, an endeavour that would see the Friends taken an even greater role in Irish life later in the century. For the moment however, their steps remained fairly tentative with some of the older members still reluctant to involve themselves too deeply in the political scene. As such the letter was also quick to emphasise their neutrality should the Prime Minister think they were beginning to take sides. 'We do not support a solution of the problem of the government of Ireland, but we think the proposals [...] would create an atmosphere on which negotiations for a political settlement could be carried on.'[38] Throughout the period, Friends were very keen not to daub themselves in any particular colour but instead to use their position as a non-violent and respected organisation to forge a peaceful solution to the war.

In the spirit of greater involvement in the peace-making process, the Irish Revolution also saw the emergence of a mediating role for the Society of Friends. The opportunity for such a role came out of their glowing reputation for non-violence and impartiality. James Douglas in particular, the Friend who had been so instrumental in the creation of the Irish White Cross, became a good conduit through which warring parties could communicate and hammer out a consensus. After being elected to the Free State Senate in 1922 Douglas was significantly active in the move to end the Civil War:

> '[...] He was sent for secretly by de Valera, and he was the first person on the Free State side with whom de Valera had peace talks. After their first meeting Father (JGD) was not prepared ot [sic] continue the negotiations on his own, and after considering a number of names de Valera agreed that Father should be joined by Andrew Jameson. These talks brought about the end of the civil war'.[39]

Whilst being personally known to De Valera, Douglas's Quakerism gave him an extra quality that made him an ideal choice for the task of mediator. Long respected within Ireland, they had the trust of many on both sides of the religious, and political, divide and perhaps most importantly of all they were emphatically in favour of a peace agreement. Indeed De Valera admitted upon their first meeting that it was a speech the Quaker made upon the Senate's obligation to find a solution to the situation that finally prompted him to get into contact. Throughout the duration of their communication Douglas maintained the trust of the republican leader, recalling one particular

incident late in the negotiations when any army truck appeared outside their meeting place: 'on peeping through the curtain we saw that a military lorry had drawn up outside. De Valera turned pale but said at once that he knew we were not responsible [...] the military had entered the house next door'.[40] In relation to the negotiations between them, Douglas demonstrated the integrity so often associated with his Society and a compromise was reached. Peace and order finally found its way to Ireland and the Quakers had once again played an important part, guiding it upon its journey and giving a helping hand when it stumbled. For the Quakers themselves, a new avenue had opened up in front of them and no longer would they simply be content with providing relief when their efforts could also be directed toward conflict resolution.

Adam Kidson

REFERENCES

1. Peter Brock, *The Quaker Peace Testimony 1660-1914* (York: Sessions Book Trust, 1993), p. 291.
2. Ibid., p. 292.
3. Ibid., p. 294.
4. Peter Hart, 'The Geography of Revolution in Ireland 1917-1923', *Past and Present*, 55 (1997), p. 142.
5. T.W. Moody, 'Fenianism, Home Rule and the Land War (1850-91)', in *The Course of Irish History*, ed. by T.W. Moody and F.X. Martin, 2nd edn. rev. by F.X. Martin (Dublin: Mercier Press, 1994), p. 289.
6. 1,376 out of the estimated 1,690 adult Friends in Ireland at this time signed the Address. The total membership including children was around 2,600. Linen Hall Library, Home Rule Ireland Pamphlets, Pamphlet Book 2013, p. 4.
7. *The Government of Ireland Bill, 1893. Address from members of the Society of Friends in Ireland 'to our Fellow-Members of the Religious Society of Friends in Great Britain'*, Ibid., p. 7.
8. Ibid., p. 6.
9. *Letter from a member of the Society of Friends in Ireland to a fellow-member*, Ibid., p. 10.
10. Ibid., p. 13.
11. Ibid.
12. *Alfred Webb: The Autobiography of a Quaker Nationalist*, ed. by Marie-Louise Legg (Cork: Cork University Press, 1999), p. 4.
13. A nationalist response to the address of March 1893. *To Our Fellow Members of the Religious Society of Friends in Great Britain*, Dublin Friends' Historical Library (DFHL), PB 21/97, p. 36.
14. Ibid., p. 35.
15. *Letter from a member of the Society of Friends in Ireland to a fellow-member*, p. 23.

16. In a speech to the Unionist Friends Conference held in London in April 1893, Richardson questioned the commitment of its signatories, pointing out that several had signed both testimonies and a significant proportion of the others were perhaps not the best judges of the political implications involved. See J.N. Richardson, *Two Irish Members of the Society of Friends on the Irish Question*, (Gloucester, 1893), pp. 3-4. Copy of which was kindly provided to the author by Howard Gregg.
17. Richard S. Harrison (a), *Richard Davis Webb: Dublin Quaker Printer (1805-72)*, (Skibbereen: Red Barn Publishing, 1993), p. 1.
18. Legg, p. 38.
19. Other nationalist Friends included: William Glynn, a school teacher whose knowledge of Irish was often used by the Cork prison authorities during the War of Independence, Herbert Moore Pim a writer and poet who later underwent a conversion to Unionism writing *Unconquerable Ulster* and the IRB activist J. Bulmer Hobson. See Richard S. Harrison (b) *A Biographical Dictionary of Irish Quakers*, (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997) and also Sandra King, *History of the Religious Society of Friends, Frederick Street, Belfast* (Belfast: Privately Published, 1999).
20. Donal McCartney, 'From Parnell to Pearse (1891-1921)' in Moody and Martin, p. 305.
21. William Atkinson, 'The Political Crisis in Ireland, by Six Irish Friends' in *Friends' Quarterly Examiner*, 189 (1914), p. 75.
22. "Celt", ibid., p. 110.
23. Atkinson, ibid., p. 73.
24. Brock, p. 355.
25. Richard S. Harrison (c), *Irish Anti-War Movements, 1824-1974*, (Dublin: Irish Peace Publications, 1986), p. 38.
26. Apart from one or two individual efforts the events of Easter week largely passed Friends by. James Douglas initiated a small relief programme for the poor who could not get food after the rising, while J. Ernest Grubb, a magistrate, emphasised his pacifism by declining to work while the courthouse was under the protection of the Army. See Maurice J. Wigham, *The Irish Quakers: A Short History of the Religious Society of Friends in Ireland*, (Dublin: Historical Committee of the Religious Society of Friends in Ireland, 1992), pp. 117-118 and J. Anthony Gaughan ed., *Memoirs of Senator James G. Douglas: Concerned Citizen*, (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 1998), pp. 4-6, 52-54.
27. Helen Hatton, *The Largest Amount of Good: Quaker Relief in Ireland 1654-1921*, (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1993), p. 244.
28. *Letter to the Yearly Meeting from Dublin, 1921*. DFHL, Pamphlet Box 24, pamphlet 7, no. 8.
29. Letter from Samuel Graveson to F. Lucius O'Brien 14/2/1921, DFHL, MSS Box 69, folder 3, no. 16.
30. Gaughan, p. 61.
31. Ibid., p. 65.
32. Ibid., p. 89. See also James Douglas' Encomium on Michael Collins and his letter to the Provisional Government upon first hearing of his death, both in

appendix four of Gaughan ibid.

33. Ibid., p. 67.
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid., p. 167 and Hatton, Op. cit., p. 246.
36. Ibid. p. 68.
37. *Letter to Lloyd George by Irish Friends 11/6/1921*, DFHL, Pamphlet Box 24, no.10.
38. Ibid. A truce was signed on 9 July 1921 (effective, 11 July).
39. Letter from James Douglas's son, J. Harold Douglas, to Olive Goodbody, 30th September 1966, quoted in Garreth Byrne, 'Quaker Non-Violence in Irish History', in *Dawn*, No. 38/39 (April 1978), p. 9.
40. Gaughan, p. 104.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Print Culture and the Early Quakers Kate Peters, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005. xiv + 273pp. ISBN: 0 521 77090 4 (hardback) Price £53

From the first Quaker publications in late 1652 an average of more than one item a week was published to the end of 1656, a total of 291 according to Kate Peters, by almost one hundred authors. Of these authors eight men were responsible for more than half the titles published while many tracts had composite authorship and half the total number of authors were contributors rather than sole authors. This flow of tracts is clearly an important factor in the early history of Quakerism, in establishing that history in the broader context of the English revolution and in the history of English print culture, Kate Peters argues, on the basis of a systematic reading of those early Quaker tracts and many contemporary manuscript letters, that: "Quakers were highly engaged with contemporary political and religious affairs, and were committed in very practical ways to the establishment of Christ's kingdom on earth" and that their published pamphlets were fundamental to this engagement. The introduction presents a valuable survey of the considerable secondary literature on the period, much of it relatively recent, with its fierce arguments and notes the reluctance of modern political historians to give sufficient value to the contemporary printed material. While the book is firmly grounded in the study of the original literature there is abundant and valuable consideration of the writings of other modern historians, illustrating the great interest in early Quakerism from very varied and developing viewpoints.

The book is divided into three sections. These cover:

I the organisation of Quaker pamphleteering in the early 1650s;

II the part played by printed texts in the emergence of a recognisable Quaker identity as a national movement, the early use of the term "Quaker" in print and the role of women's public preaching;

III the evidence of printed texts for intention of the Quakers towards religious reform nationally and the establishment of a godly commonwealth.

Tracts were initially circulated in manuscript, printing them enabled much more widespread distribution and was often intended to support the oral use of their content as well. Much of the later

Quaker printed literature was a record of religious experience; while this did feature in the earlier tracts their use was directed to proselytising and publishing Quaker belief with an expectation that the writings would reach and persuade others. Tracts were aimed variously at opponents, the less literate general population and at informing those already convinced. Kate Peters demonstrates that effective writing and publishing was possible from prison with the example of Thomas Aldam as a prisoner in York. She quotes contemporaries not in sympathy with Friends noting that Quaker tracts were an efficient means of propaganda. Publishing activities of Giles Calvert, a radical printer not a Friend (though his sister Martha Simmonds was), and Thomas Simmonds who worked from the Bull and Mouth meeting house are described. Kate Peter's figures for early Quaker publications (p.48) vary, though perhaps not that significantly, from those published by others. She explains some of the discrepancies but it may be interesting to compare table III in Rosemary Moore's *The Light in Their Consciences* (University Park, PA 2000). The vast majority of Quaker tracts were, predictably for the times, printed in London. They were sometimes specifically relevant to areas in which ministers were travelling. Distribution was facilitated by a growing network of ministers and local groups of Friends who might raise funds or buying tracts. There is a useful description of the role of the Kendal Fund in financing publications and the travels of ministers and in supporting prisoners. There is then an original case-study of the introduction of Quaker ideas to East Anglia.

Part II has a substantial discussion of the name Quaker and its early usage, reminding us that Friends used it themselves and that its appearance in the titles of a large number of tracts identified their subject to readers very promptly. It goes on to look at the role of women; despite the Quaker doctrine of equality and the acceptability of women's ministry (presented in print in only four tracts) this was sometimes problematic. It was also untypical in contemporary protestant churches and Quaker women contributed a disproportionately large part of women's writing overall in England in the 1650's.

Part III is devoted to the contribution of Quaker tracts to religious and political debate in England and to the Quaker aim that everyone should become involved in the moral and religious reform of the country. Many tracts formed part of debates with particular ministers of other denominations. Kate Peters describes the general nature of the national debate and illustrates its variety with reference to

particular exchanges. Quakers mounted an active defence in print of those imprisoned on both legal and theological grounds and expressed their concerns at magistrates interfering in matters of religion. Some of these tracts were addressed to Parliament but there was no well-defined specifically political Quaker programme. Kate Peters concludes her main argument with the literature resulting from the Nayler crisis and provides a valuable case-study examining the constitutional issues raised, or fudged, by Nayler's trial by Parliament. She also looks at the involvement of Martha Simmonds and the possibility of there having been a leadership struggle with Friends partly based on gender with Nayler as a figurehead for the Simmonds faction.

Kate Peter's stimulating and thoroughly argued book ends: "Only when we understand why and how people made use of the press, and why and how they read printed pamphlets, can we properly assess the likely significance of the actual material in print". It is important to recognise her argument that the study of the production, distribution and readership of these tracts is needed as much as that of their content. Her work is thought provoking not only to those seeking an up-to-date understanding of early Quakerism but also to those studying print culture in England and indeed the English revolution.

David J. Hall

The Art and Science of William Bartram Judith Magee, The Pennsylvania State University Press in association with the Natural History Museum, London, 2007, 264 pages, £30.

In *Quaker Plant Hunters* I noted a remarkable connection of Quaker botanists in Britain and North America in the eighteenth-century. Among them were father and son John and William Bartram, Peter Collinson, William Curtis and John Fothergill. Collinson was pivotal to John Bartram and Fothergill was the patron of William Bartram.

William Bartram (1739-1823) was a prototypal late bloomer. It was not until he was 34 (four years before his father died) that he explored southeastern America on his own. Previous to that experience Billy (as he was known) had made unsuccessful attempts to be an independent trader and agricultural worker. After Peter Collinson died (1768) Billy wrote from Cape Fear in North Carolina that he was finally ready for 'the only business I was born for and which I am only good for'.

It was Fothergill who saved Billy. The English botanist was greatly impressed by botanical drawings by Billy sent by his father. Fothergill suggested that Billy might collect plants for him in southeastern America and make botanical drawings of them as well. He ended his proposal with touching advice:

> 'But in the midst of all this attention, forget not the one thing needful. In studying nature forget not its author. Study to be grateful to that hand which has endowed thee with a capacity to distinguish thyself as an artist. Avoid useless or improper company. Be much alone, and learn to trust in the help and protection of him who has formed us and everything.'

The drawings to Fothergill from Bartram make up the bulk of the Bartram collection held at the Natural History Museum in London. Now for the first time all 68 drawings at the Natural History Museum have been published. Judith Magee is Collection Development Manager in the Library of the Museum therefore in an excellent position to use the remarkable collection. It is these drawings which make this book so valuable for naturalists and libraries.

Magee's scholarship also insures a comprehensive survey of Bartram's background, explorations and scientific contribution to early America. Bartram's *Travels* is his major achievement and I feel that we must turn to Francis Harper's 'naturalist edition' to fully appreciate Bartram's poetry which so inspired Coleridge, Wordsworth and Chateaubriand. Magee can be coldly analytical at times.

It is good, however, that she notes Bartram's observations on the extinction of various animals and plants. He was well ahead of his time in this respect. Magee also remarks on the rare concern Bartram had for Native Americans and animals. His Quakerism is much in evidence here when he states that the animal creation 'excites our admiration, and equally manifests the almighty power, wisdom, and benefice of the Supreme Creator and Sovereign Lord of the universe'.

David Sox

David Sox volunteers in the botany department of the Natural History Museum, London and his *North America's Early Frontier to the South Pacific* was published by Sessions of York in 2004.

The Diary of Joshua Whiting (1861-73). Compiled by Sarah Graham. ISBN 1 85072 318 4 122 pages Publisher: Sessions of York £9.50 From Sessions, Huntington Rd, York YO31 9HS tel 01904 659224 And from Friends House Bookshop, or from other booksellers.

Why do we keep diaries? Why write a Journal? Joshua Whiting would never declare (like Cicily, in *The Importance of Being Earnest*), "I never travel without my diary. One should always have something sensational to read in the train." Nothing in Joshua's diary, or in his life, is "sensational". He is not a George Fox, recording in his travelling Journal the contentious and exhilarating birth of a religious movement. Nor is he a Samuel Pepys, at the hub of the nation's affairs (and affaires) in London. If he recalls any well-known diarist it is probably Gilbert White of Selborne whose writings Joshua owned and enjoyed.

Nevertheless, the surviving part of Joshua's diary that Sarah Graham presents to us is both charming and compelling reading. She writes in her Introduction: "Its first attraction for me is simply in the family link with the writer, my great-great uncle; but that receded as I began to realise that this is a rich document for Quakers, for Hitchin residents, gardeners, bankers and beekeepers, and indeed for anyone interested in how a quiet life was lived in unquiet times." That list probably includes just about everyone who reads the FHS Journal?

Does Joshua Whiting's *Diary* portray "a quiet life"? Yes. It records the weather, the seasons, the doings of his neighbours, the life of a small market town, events in his own family, comings and goings at the bank where Joshua is a clerk, walks and picnics, the ministry at First Day Meeting, MM agendas, family gatherings, birthdays, outings on foot or horse, the building of the local railway branch line (LMS), moving house, planting up gardens, catching swarms.... Like all personal diaries, it captures the preoccupations and activities of daily life in a certain time and place. In this case: a husband and wife in a Quaker family household in a Hertfordshire market town in the mid nineteenth century.

Was this "an unquiet time". Yes. In Quaker terms (on both sides of the Atlantic) there is a struggle between the dogmatic evangelical Friends who are Bible literalists keen on original sin and the liberal questioning Darwin-minded Friends keen on social reform and service. Whilst Joshua was in his teens, this Beaconite Controversy nearly split the Society of Friends. Joshua inclines to the liberals, and sighs "Where will it all end?" when the evangelicals in his Meeting insist on long passages of the Bible being read by appointment in

Sunday Morning worship. He is clearly more comfortable with upholding those local Friends who are packing their bags for Paris, where poverty and homelessness are rife in the wake of the German occupation after the Franco-Prussian War and where the new Republican government has ruthlessly crushed the communards of the Paris Commune.

And there are plenty of other areas for Quakerly concern in 1861-1873. The American Civil War starts in 1861; in 1865 Abraham Lincoln is assassinated, American slaves are freed, Nobel invents dynamite, there are Fenian uprisings in Ireland and England, Africa is opening up and there's a vigorous Friends' Mission in Madagascar. Such world affairs rarely appear in Joshua's diary. (But world issues rarely feature, I realise, in my own daily diary). Joshua and Rebecca Whiting live a life of closer focus: their concerns are for ageing neighbours in the local Union (workhouse), the loss of local woodlands to new house building, the witness made by a hospitable home and a carefully, joyfully tended garden, the care of their local Meeting community, the cherishing and sustaining of a widespread Quaker family, long beekeeping or gardening chats with good neighbours. As Sarah Graham comments, the diary gives "a picture of the Whitings as very good Christians" but never (to quote *Middlemarch*) "too religious for family comfort".

Readers who are keen gardeners will delight over the guidelines for landscaping that Joshua and Rebecca favour, and the careful lists of varieties of fruit trees, roses and vines they plant and tend. Keen beekeepers (like me) will be hugely grateful for the frequent notes supplied by Will Messenger (a Quaker historian of beekeeping) which explain the techniques and equipment that Joshua uses with his bees, at a time when beekeeping is transformed by new discoveries. Naturalists will enjoy his keen and careful observations of the local flora and fauna.

Quaker genealogists will relish Sarah Graham's lively appendix of "Biographical Sketches" of the family names that repeatedly appear: Allen, Alsop, Brown, Gilpin, Harvey, Latchmore, Lucas, Ransom, Seebohm, Sewell, Sharples, Shillitoe, Steed, Tuke and (of course) Whiting. Joshua worked forty years as banker's clerk for Sharples, Tuke and Co. which became Barclays Bank in 1896, 13 years before Joshua's death. In these "Biographical Sketches", and in her "Notes", Sarah Graham reveals herself as a meticulous and lively Quaker historian, and social historian. For example she reports Francis Lucas (1816-1896) sitting in Yearly Meeting amongst Friends who are "too intent on their mortgages and bonds, their interest and compound

interest". Of the session he wrote: "The silence of meeting is such that the drop of 1/8 in consols is clearly audible." And there are some starting revelations of Friends who "walk disorderly". Sarah Graham comments: "Never think you can guess the contents of a Quaker family's bran tub."

Finally, the illustrations. Wonderful early photography from Joshua's nephew Thomas Benwell Latchmore, which captures Joshua and his fellow Quakers, but also Hitchin's local history. Pen and ink sketches by Quaker Samuel Lucas, but also his colourful portraits of the Hertfordshire countryside. The book is a delicious "Period piece". Do buy it.

David B. Gray

OBITUARY

Gerald A.J. Hodgett

Economic historian who mapped lives of monks and nuns after the Reformation

Gerald Hodgett, who has died aged 90, brought a humane spirit to the potentially dry study of medieval church records. One of the first to focus on the unpensioned plight of ex-monks and nuns after Henry VIII's dissolution of the monasteries, he understood that one incentive for ex-religious to set up house together was 'to share the burdens of housekeeping.' His own valued membership of the London club, The Athenaeum, sprang from a similar root.

Born in Nottingham, after his father's death , to a family with strong roots in the north Midlands Gerald's academic development was encouraged by his mother, a substantial influence in his life. After school and university, he taught first in Nottinghamshire and then, during the war, at Friends' School, Lisburn, Northern Ireland. Gerald had been brought up in the Presbyterian Church, but joined the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) in the early 1940s. In 1943, whilst at Lisburn, he was one of the ten signatories of a letter of protest about the 'dambuster' bombing raids, arguing that such an act could be 'represented in Germany as one of deliberate cruelty to the German people' and thus run counter to one of the war's expressed aims of encouraging Germans 'to play a useful part again in the life of Europe'. This early expression of interest in European cooperation was to recur throughout his life.

Gerald took up a lectureship at King's College London in 1947 and became reader in 1961. He enjoyed two periods of communal living, at the Quaker Penn Club, where he was a contemporary of John Harris, better known as science fiction writer John Wyndham, and for many years as a warden at the university's Commonwealth Hall. After his retirement in 1982, his hospitable flat near Euston was conveniently located both for the historic Quaker library at Friends House and for the mainline stations, for Gerald loved to travel. He had visited France and Germany before the war, and continued to be an avid attender at medieval conferences in Europe and beyond. He relished his European touring holidays: travelling companions included KCL classicist H.H. Scullard and Oxford church historian Gary Bennett. In later years Gerald pursued his interests in Quaker history to the USA: he was a research scholar at the Huntingdon Library in California, and taught several terms in St Louis, Missouri. He regularly visited Hawaii and made at least two visits to Australia. Informed, eager and gregarious, Gerald was the perfect travelling companion. It was entirely appropriate that he suffered

his last, mercifully short, illness while on a regular visit to friends in Scotland for the Edinburgh and Pitlochry Festivals.

Gerald's wider interests co-existed with a lifelong academic attachment to his own corner of England, the Lincolnshire/Nottinghamshire borders. His first foray into the extensive records of the Lincoln diocese was his MA thesis on 'The Dissolution of the Monasteries in Lincolnshire' (1947), which bore fruit in his monograph *The State of the Ex-Religious and Former Chantry Priests in the Diocese of Lincoln, 1547-1574* (1959); one of the last was his ODNB entry for the Thorold family of Marston, near Grantham (per. C. 1492-1717), beneficiaries of the sale of monastic lands. Though his contribution to Lincolnshire's agrarian history was inevitably overshadowed by that of Joan Thirsk, his *Tudor Lincolnshire* (1975), the third in the county history series, examined all aspects of local society, from the response to the 1536 rising to the demography of book-ownership.

Gerald's views on the unhappy fate of the ex-religious, in his seminal article 'The Unpensioned Ex-Religious in Tudor England' (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 1962), though they did not win universal acceptance, spurred others into further archival research. He himself then took on one of the great lost monasteries of London, Holy Trinity Priory, Aldgate, the first post-Conquest religious house to be established inside the City, in 1107-08, and the first to be dissolved, in 1532. The 1000 entries in its 1425-27 cartulary, listing its City properties and tenants, give an extraordinary picture of the economic lives of Londoners in the early fifteenth century. Gerald's edition and translation (*The Cartulary of Holy Trinity, Aldgate*, London Record Society, 1971), heralded as a major event in London studies, was enhanced in 2005 by the Museum of London's publication of the surviving archaeological evidence, just in time for the priory's 900th anniversary.

Gerald's writing was always accessible, and his undergraduate textbook, *A Social and Economic History of Medieval Europe* (London 1972), with its discussion of capitalism in the pre-modern textile industry, brought him probably his widest audience, both in the UK and overseas. He persuaded the young Delia Smith to write an introduction for his *Stere Htt Well, a book of medieval refinements, recipes and remedies* (London 1972), based on a manuscript in Samuel Pepys' library, now in Cambridge. He placed his writing and editorial skills at the service of the Quakers through his devoted membership of the Friends Historical Society, serving as its President in 1979 and editing its Journal from 1986 to 1996. This was just one aspect of his considerable service to the Society in over 60 years as an active Friend.

Of Sir Anthony Thorold, MP, Gerald wrote 'No doubt it helped him that he was considered reliable in religion, being described as 'earnest' in

1564...; his father, by contrast, was named as a hinderer.' A modest man, Gerald Hodgett was content to be considered reliable, but his many friends remember him with gratitude as one of life's enhancers.

Gerald Augustus John Hodgett, MA, FSA, FRHistS, economic and church historian, born 27 November 1916; died 15 September 2007

Rowena Loverance

(An abridged version of this obituary appeared in *The Times* of 3 January 2008)

FUTURE EVENTS 2008

Thursday, 14 February: at 6.30 pm in Friends House Library Edward H. Milligan will speak about his BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF BRITISH QUAKERS IN COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY 1775-1920.

Sunday 25 May (the Sunday of Britain Yearly Meeting): Presidential Address and General Meeting. David Sox will speak on 'Quakers and the Natural Order'. Venue and time to be announced in Newsletter.

Saturday 14 June: at Friends House, London at 2.00 pm. Thomas C. Kennedy will speak on ' "Waking up the Society to thought": John Wilhelm Rowntree in London Yearly Meeting, 1893-1905'.

Saturday 18 October: at Kendal Meeting House. Presentation of a web-site on George Fox's Journey through the North-West 1652 by a team from the University of Lancaster. David Boulton will also speak on Gervase Benson: the life and times of George Fox's lawyer.

BIOGRAPHIES

MELANIE BARBER
Melanie Barber trained as an archivist, spending most of her professional career as Deputy Librarian and Archivist of Lambeth Palace Library. She was granted a Lambeth degree by Archbishop Runcie for services to the Library. Her Quaker service has included the editorship of *The Friends Quarterly*, clerkship of the Society's Library Committee, and membership of the Executive Committee of the Friends Historical Society. She is a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries.

JUSTINE WILLIAMS
My family association with the Religious Society of Friends began when my Grandfather and Mother began attending Wandsworth Friends Meeting House when she was 7 years old, and my siblings and I were raised as Quakers. I attended numerous events for young people – KWINK, Summer School, Senior Conference JYM – but it was not until I was 19 years old that I applied for membership: I had just left home to attend university and wanted to be sure that I was not applying just because of my close-knit PM/MM, but because I was committed to being a Friend. I am now studying for a PhD in Early Modern literature, and it was my MA course which gave me the opportunity to do some research about early Friends. I look forward to being able to do some further research in the future.

JAMES ROBERTSON is a Senior Lecturer in History at the University of the West Indies, Mona, in Kingston, Jamaica. His first book, *Gone is the Ancient Glory: Spanish Town, Jamaica, 1534-2000* Kingston, Ian Randle Publishers) was published in 2004. He serves on the boards of the Archaeological Society of Jamaica and the Jamaican Historical Society, of which he is currently Vice President.

ADAM KIDSON gained his MA in Irish Studies at Bath Spa University in 2002 having written his thesis about the Quaker Peace Testimony in Ireland from the seventeenth century to the late twentieth century. After spending several years working with disadvantaged children he is currently undertaking teacher training for the post-compulsory sector. Away from education, Adam enjoys outdoor pursuits and is involved with local groups that provide opportunities for young people to test themselves in Britain's wild places.

ERRATA

Vol 61 No 1

Page 4: the title of the map should read 'MAP OF YORKSHIRE QUARTERLY MEETING SHOWING YORK AND THIRSK MONTHLY MEETING IN 1773'.

Page 45, line 12: 'twenty first' should read 'twenty-first'.

Page 55, line 22: 'Pen' should read 'Penn'.

Page 53, line 05: 'other' should read 'others'.

Page 65, footnote 1, line, line 1: 'Caire' should read 'Claire'.

Supplements to the Journal of Friends Historical Society

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

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. Menbers £2.00, Non-Menbers £3.00.

Recent back issues of the *JOURNAL* can be obtained for £3 per issue for members and £5 for non-members to include postage and packing. Overseas applicants are asked to add £2 to cover the additional cost of post. Requests should be made to the Treasurer c/o The Library, Friends House, 173 Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ

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