D.

Price 5/- ($1.00)

THE JOURNAL

OF THE

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOLUME THIRTY-NINE

1947

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

American Agent: J. B. HUTCHINSON
525 Chews Landing Road, Haddonfield, New Jersey, U.S.A.

THE JOURNAL

OF THE

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOLUME XXXIX

1947

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

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

American Agent: J. B. HUTCHINSON

525 Chews Landing Road, Haddonfield, New Jersey, U.S.A.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
HEADLEY BROTHERS
109 KINGSWAY, LONDON, W.C.2
AND ASHFORD, KENT

Contents

Vol. XXXIX 1947

THE JOURNAL
OF THE
FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

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

American Agent: J. B. Hutchinson, 525 Chews Landing Road, Haddonfield, New Jersey, U.S.A.

Communications should be addressed to the Editor at Friends House.

Annual Meetings

SINCE the appearance of the last volume of the *Journal*, the Society has resumed its normal activities and has held two meetings.

Members and friends to the number of over one hundred who were able to meet at Friends House on 5th December, 1946 for the first annual meeting since the war, were well rewarded by listening to a broad survey of some eighteenth century Friends and family relationships written by the late Arthur J. Eddington, who was president at the time of his death, based on his intimate knowledge of the Gurney manuscripts and other Norwich records. The late president's address was sympathetically read by T. Edmund Harvey, a former president of the Society. Among those attending was Mr. Quintin Gurney, on whose family archives the address was based.

At the close of the meeting Mr. Gurney expressed his particular interest in the address, and coupled his hope with that of the late president that it would be the means of making more widely known the contents of the manuscripts which he had placed on permanent deposit at Friends' Reference Library for the use of students. It may be mentioned here that, in furtherance of this desire, the Society hopes to publish the address with a representative selection from the manuscripts.

The meeting for 1947 was brought forward to 3rd July to coincide with the vacation visit to this country of Henry J. Cadbury, Hollis Professor of Biblical Literature at Harvard University, the Society's president for the year. Last minute fears that he would not arrive in time were

laid to rest by the arrival of Henry J. and Lydia Cadbury at Paddington, direct from their ship at Plymouth, little more than two hours before the meeting.

There being little formal business to transact, after a warm welcome on behalf of the Society from Herbert G. Wood, the president immediately entered on his address, entitled "Answering That of God"—a scholarly exposition drawing on the author's wide knowledge and insight into religious history. The address is printed in full in this issue. After a short discussion the meeting closed. There was a large attendance.

The Society's president for 1948 was elected at this meeting and is Emilia Fogelklou-Norlind. Emilia Fogelklou-Norlind is best known to English Friends as the author of *James Nayler, the rebel saint.* She hopes to visit England in 1948 and to give her address on Individual and Community in Quaker Experience.

IN this issue the articles on Felsted burial ground, Norfolk poor administration and the Western Circular Yearly Meeting point to the strength of interest in the history of Friends in the country districts—with which of course the great mass of extant documents is largely concerned. Anna Corder's study of Friedrichstadt based on minute books at Friends' Reference Library breaks new ground and opens up a portion of the unexplored field of early continental Quakerism.

Continuing the policy of encouraging further study of the later periods of Friends' history, we print a survey of the Bulgarian relief work during the Russo-Turkish War.

The first portion of the work on the Norfolk poor, and the three theses noticed in "Quaker Education" show how wide is the field to be covered among Friends' records even in small subjects. Among central and local archives there is great wealth of information waiting to be sought and applied, as well by the student of religious and social conditions as by the local historian. The Society is always glad to hear of and to advise on historical work undertaken locally.

DEAR FELLOW MEMBER,

You are asked to help to enlist a larger subscribing membership. This is essential if the fruits of Quaker historical work are to be made available by means of this *Journal.* Specimen copies of the *Journal* will be sent to prospective members on request.

Answering That of God

By HENRY J. CADBURY, PH.D.

Presidential Address to the Friends' Historical Society, 1947

DO the classical positions of Quakerism form a logical and consistent system, developed from some central principle, or are they a congeries of independent tenets? The former alternative represents the usual answer. The central principle is mostly defined as the Inner Light, and then the theological and practical tenets of the Society of Friends are commonly demonstrated to be in the relation to it of source and inference, cause and effect.

Such an interpretation of a religion is quite usual. The interpreters are strong on theology and they tend to be interested in fitting phenomena into a theological system. Is it presumptuous to question whether religion itself develops that way? Is there not an alternative—priority of experience over theory—of unrelated phenomena preceding logical correlation? Conversely, is not experience itself often developed and interpreted in the light of some established theory?

Questions like these suggest that we might usefully look at some features of early Quakerism from a little different angle, and examine some of the material more from the historical than from the theological point of view. There is a phrase sometimes used in England: "Historical theology." I am not quite sure how it is used. I am thinking of it as applicable to the study of religious positions as based not so much on revelation or dogma as on practical experience and on logic.

It is the practical character of Quakerism that is much in the public eye today. Our Society seems to have a peculiar social conscience, and some noteworthy features of social technique. Of course in interchurch councils we are conspicuous for other reasons, the inconvenience with which our sheer existence prevents certain easy definitions of the nature of the church, worship, the sacraments, the means of grace, the formulation of faith, and so on. The curious lay observer of Quakerism has other questions

to ask. He wants to know what is the past and present connection between our personal religion, our corporate worship and the recurrent emergence among us of a radical social concern. Since Friends have differed from contemporary Christian groups (a) in their unprogrammed worship and (b) in their serious scruples about certain current practices, some connection is assumed between these two phenomena. Even apart from the supposed mystical roots of our social testimonies, there is much about their origin and character that even Friends, not to mention outsiders, probably fail to grasp.

The names for the supposed central principle of Friends are of rather baffling variety. By something of an accident one of them, the Light, has come to prevail. I am not denying that in the form "Light Within" it was fairly common, in the early period, even though it went out of style for a time. Yet it is only one of several scriptural terms. It is derived primarily from what their opponents called the Quakers' text (John 1, 9).[1] The term "Seed," which today seems so appropriate to our recognition of the genetic character of religion, was again probably due to a single biblical reference of quite different import, viz. the Seed of the Woman (Genesis 3, 15), used proleptically and messianically of Christ. Indeed both Christ and the Holy Spirit express frequently the same notion or inward principle. The early interchangeability of Christ and Light left the way open for the evangelical *vs.* anti-evangelical conflict of later times. A favourite self-depreciation by George Fox was expressed in his frequent statement that Christ had come or would come "to teach his people himself." Fox and his friends could only lead men to Christ their teacher and leave them there.

What Friends emphasized by these terms in theological controversy is quite familiar. They express the inward rather than the outward, the continuous rather than the historic, the experience rather than the doctrine. We might even describe it as mystical, if we are careful to recall the fact that mystical is a word that was not much used by Friends themselves until recently and would have been for them a term of reproach.

[1] Then was the true Light, even the Light which lighteth everyone coming into the world.

Every social action has both its subjective and its objective side. The Inner Light is undoubtedly regarded as working subjectively. If, as is sometimes said, the Puritans objected to bear-baiting not because it brought pain to the bear but pleasure to the spectators, so there is a sense in which the early Friends were moved by an inner impulse, to satisfy which they avoided bearing arms, taking oaths, holding slaves and the like. The effect of their actions on others they could hardly ignore but their own " clearness," to use a well-known Quaker term, was their impelling ambition. When a modern student speaks of Fox's Light Within as that which shows us what is evil[1] the insight is considered almost entirely from the subjective side. The leading is not consciously based on the implications of our acts, it is not sensibly motivated by the humanitarian results. It is often negative, but the practical ill effects of the other course are not primarily appealed to. We obey it not because we calculate the results of alternative courses, but by a kind of intuition and *noblesse oblige*.

This one sided character of the springs of Quaker action is what is meant by Clarkson when he says that the Friends act upon principles rather than upon consequences. For many Friends the leading seemed, I am sure, something entirely inward, something not deduced, something not even inherited—but immediate, detached, direct. They did not work it out into a mutual relationship, or estimate my duty to my neighbour in terms of his needs or wants, or of his duty to me. Possibly—indeed probably—such considerations were often in the back of their minds or were even adduced in corroboration, but they would deny the suggestion that social duty was a social contract, or that it was inappropriate for the individual to ascertain the divine leading for himself pretty much as in a vacuum.

This concentration on the subjective side of social action is not unusual in religion, nor unique to Quakerism. There is a good deal of it in historic Christianity. I have repeatedly had occasion to point it out in the Gospels. Jesus' advice is to the individual directly without much apparent thought of social consequences or of the relation of

[1] Rachel Hadley King, *George Fox and the Light Within*, 1940, Chapter IV.

one man's act to another's. It is unilateral, if I may use a more modern term. It is not contingent or calculated or reciprocal. It is subjective, in the sense in which I have been using the term. That accounts for the apparent emphasis on the results or rewards to the doer of good himself rather than on the benefit derived by his beneficiaries.

It fits this emphasis that when early Friends recommended social action they were not thinking of the Light within others, within the object or recipient of their enlightened behaviour, but within themselves. I know of no mention of the Light Within others as a motive for our own action. Modern thinkers commonly maintain that the Friends emphasized the sacredness of personality, the value of the individual and the equality of all men (including women), and they assume that recognition of the divine Light or Spirit or Seed in our neighbours will lead us to the appropriate conclusions for our own action. Logically it should do, yet in so far as Friends actually did maintain these principles, the principles appear to be independent of any such deduction.

Democracy in early Quakerism was clearly quite limited. Of course increased intimacy and the warmer fellowship of a small persecuted sect had their effects. Their enemies suspected the Friends of "levelling" beyond anything they ever were guilty of. Surprisingly, in economic affairs they did not go far towards communism. Biblical precedent, the trend in some contemporary groups, and the highly enthusiastic character of the movement would have made such an outcome natural.

Social distinctions were not forgotten. Any modern study of William Penn's social philosophy shows how far he himself was from egalitarianism. It was no Quaker who asked,

> When Adam delved and Eve span
> Who was then the gentleman ?[1]

So the strong humanitarian trend in early Quakerism was much less motivated from without than one would anticipate. The Friend might well have been deterred from slave owning

[1] Said to have been quoted by John Ball at Blackheath, 12th June, 1381, to rebels in Wat Tyler's Insurrection.

or from soldiering by regard for the inner Light in the slave or in the enemy, but I think he was not. He may occasionally have quoted the Golden Rule or the phrase of Paul about "the brother for whom Christ died." More decisive for him was the direct sense of his own duty. He believed that he was forbidden to do such things, and he relied on this sense of duty at work in others as well as in himself as the basis for dealing with these and other social ills.

Pity and altruism are inevitably attributed to Friends, even though not mentioned. We may assume of the early Friends, what I have been told that we should assume of Jesus, namely that regard for others' comfort and happiness and life was taken for granted in what they preached even though it is not specifically appealed to in their recorded teaching.

We do not like the imputation that Friends have acted out of love of their own peace of mind. Yet that imputation is largely true. They suffered from an uneasy conscience until it drove them to do to others what they felt to be right. This often produced outward distress for them, persecution, financial loss, imprisonment, or scorn. A modern reproach against the religious pacifist is superficially true, viz. that he is so concerned to keep his own hands clean that he stands to one side when a dirty business like war is necessary. Such a critic of course assumes that war *is* necessary. He is as little conscious of the possible social value of the pacifist's attitude as in fact is the naïve Quaker himself. For, as I have said, the potential social effects of a Friend's abstention is not prominent in his own focus of attention.

Having said so much of the subjective character of Quaker initiative I have yet to mention an important external factor, for which I may use the classic phrase "that of God in everyone." When a non-Quaker modern writer uses a Quaker phrase he often appears to be ignorant of its origin. Thus I read in a recent book by a Baptist: "There is in man what is often described as 'that of God.'"[1] But the phrase has an unmistakable original. It is characteristic of George Fox. "That of God in everyone" occurs dozens of times in his writings and other dozens of times in

[1] H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of the Bible*, 1942, p. 173.

slightly variant forms, like " the principle " or " the witness of God," or " the Truth in everyone."[1]

The phrase, however, is almost invariably used with the verb " answer " as in the oft quoted passage :

> Be patterns, be examples . . . that your carriage may preach among all sorts of people. Then you will come to walk cheerfully over the world, answering that of God in everyone.[2]

Without giving the evidence piece by piece let me summarize what this idiom seems to imply.

Fox is still speaking to Friends about their own conduct —both conduct within their own group, and conduct within the wider community. As he says he wants their lives to preach and he reminds them that if their conduct is suitable it will answer, that is, correspond to and appeal to an inner witness in other persons. This witness in others is beyond the individual whose conduct is under consideration ; it provides not so much a motive or a sanction for his conduct as a corroboration.

Some quotations will illustrate both the variety of phrase and the variety of application. Writing to Friends in Ireland who might be buying Irish land in 1669, Fox says: " Keep to justice and equity, that you may answer that which is equal and just and true in every man and in yourselves." Writing to wider audiences he says : " Adorn the Truth in all things and answer truth and righteousness in everyone " (17, 131F) ; " be faithful that ye may answer that of God in everyone " (Ep. 117); " walk in the wisdom of God, answering that of God in everyone " (Ep. 143) ; " in pureness live over the deceit and answer the witness of the Lord God in everyone " (Ep. 134) ; " sound deep to the witness of God in every man " (Ep. 195). Referring to plainness of address and the use of a fixed price he says, " You come to answer that of God in all " (Ep. 251).

Sometimes the term is Light, but very often in the sense not of John 1, 9, but of the Matthean texts " Ye are the Light

[1] A partial list of occurrences in Fox's epistles is given by A. Neave Brayshaw in his *Personality of George Fox*, 1933, p. 18, note 2. The term in one form or another was used throughout the four decades of his writings, and was not confined chiefly to a single period as were some of his other favourite phrases, e.g. " the occasion of war."

[2] *Journal* (Bi-Cent.), I, 316.

of the world," " let your light so shine before men that they seeing your good works may glorify your Father which is in Heaven." " By your light shining," he writes to Friends in Carolina, " you may answer the Light in all men " (Ep. 371) ; and those in Holland he bids to " be the salt of the earth and the light of the world, to answer the light of Christ in all " (Ep. 374).

Of particular interest is Fox's use of this phrase in application to non-Christian peoples. Thus to Friends captive in Algiers he urges conduct that may answer the Spirit of God both in Turks and in Moors, and the rest of the captives [that is, white Europeans] (Ep. 366), or answering God's witness in the Turks, Jews, Moors and your patroons (Ep. 388). Speaking of the heathen in general he writes in 1656, " Be diligent answering the witness of God in all their consciences and . . . bring the truth over all the head of the heathen to the witness " (Swarth. MSS. ii, 90). In Pennsylvania he brackets the Indians and whites together, for Friends are by their behaviour to answer that which is good both in the people among you and in the Indians (Ep. 412), or to answer the truth in all the professors (i.e. nominal Christians) and the heathen (Ep. 404). So too with regard to Negroes " Let your light shine among the Indians and the blacks and the whites, that ye may answer the truth in them " (*Journal*, 1694, p. 610). " You may answer that which may be known of God in all both white and black and make them confess with that of God in them which they do transgress that God is in you of a truth " (12, 109F). Speaking in 1675 specifically of the slaves of the Quakers in Barbados, George Fox wrote, " You should preach Christ to the Ethiopians that are in your families, that so they may be free men indeed and be tender of and to them and walk in love, that ye may answer that of God in their hearts " (*Gospel Family Order*, 1701, p. 15).

In universalizing this responsive inner principle outside of Christendom the Friends were quite aware that they were going counter to current Christian doctrine. They were not satisfied to take it merely for granted as Fox did in writing to his fellow Quakers. It remains to indicate some logical conclusions and the efforts made to confirm by experience this wider revelation.

The Quaker doctrine of something of God shows itself

in their treatment of extra-canonical writings. They held that the scripture writers had no monopoly on revealed truth. They pointed out that the Bible did not include all the writings of prophets and apostles ; other books whether lost or extant deserved the same reverence. There are various references in early Quaker literature to Hermes Trismegistus, reputed to have been an Egyptian author some centuries before Moses. The Book of Enoch and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs would serve the same purpose, though only the latter work was then available. Samuel Fisher, the learned Kent Friend, mentions both of these, and the equally learned Thomas Lawson hoped some Friend in Holland could find Enoch's writings.

Quite outside the Biblical tradition the early Friends believed they found written evidence of an indigenous comprehension of truth. George Keith in his less evangelical days actually translated from the Latin a work by an Arabic philosopher that purported to be the life of Hai Ebn Yokdan, and Barclay, too, eagerly accepted its evidence in his *Apology*. Similar evidence from farther East was published by Friends in the pamphlets *The Upright Lives of the Heathen briefly noted : or Epistles and Discourses betwixt Alexander the Conqueror and Diudimus King of the Brachmans*, and *A Dialogue betwixt an East Indian Brachman and a Christian.*[1]

Apart from literary evidence of that of God in the unevangelized heathen of the past, Friends believed that there were divine potentialities in the heathen about them. We little realize today how far the Friends penetrated not only in Christendom but outside of Christendom in the first decade of their history, more than 150 years before one commonly dates the era of Protestant foreign missions. While other white settlers in America were concerned for the Christianization of the Indian—I think largely on the basis that they were not really heathen, but Jews of the lost ten tribes, the Friends addressed themselves also to the peoples and rulers of Asia and Africa. The assumption behind this movement can be seen in the documents that Fox addressed to the Cham of Tartary, the Emperor of China, to the Great Turk or the Great Mogul and to the

[1] On all these compare my article on "Early Quakerism and Uncanonical Lore" in *Harvard Theological Review*, XL, 1947, pp. 177-205.

King of Suratt.[1] We are all familiar with the dramatic visit of Mary Fisher to the Sultan at Adrianople. There were other missionaries who at least tried to penetrate into Turkey, Palestine, Egypt and the East Indies.

The audience sought and found by Friends in these countries would scarcely be Christians. Yet in 1661 a Friend was back in England after three years' successful missionary work in the East Indies while several others were reported planning to go there.[2] One would like to find a copy of the pamphlets in Arabic that John Stubbs and Henry Fell distributed along with others in Hebrew and Latin in the city of Alexandria in 1661.[3]

No doubt the Friends had hopes of converting the Moors who took them captive to Algiers, Mequinez and Fez. As for their own captives, the Negro slaves, long before Friends had a conscience as slave owners or slave traders, they felt a deep concern for their conversion and George Fox's words were taken to heart and repeated. The first non-Quaker pamphlet on the subject, *The Negro's and Indian's Advocate*, by Morgan Goodwyn (1680), was inspired by a pamphlet which he does not name but which I have identified with George Fox's *To the Ministers, Teachers and Priests . . . in Barbados* (1672).

Perhaps the logic of the Quaker theory of that of God is seen best in connection with the American Indian. I do not doubt that wishful thinking entered their ideas about the inherent religion and morality of the aborigines. The Friends also wished to put the persecuting Christians to shame by contrast, just as sometimes the biblical writers contrasted outsiders with the chosen people, to the discredit of the latter. More than once the inhospitality of the white men to the Quaker missionaries is pointed up by

[1] See published pieces listed in Smith's *Catalogue of Friends' Books*, 1867, I, p. 661, and the unpublished pieces listed in my *Annual Catalogue of George Fox's Papers*, 1939, p. 77. The dates, 1660 and 1661, coincide with the height of the Quaker missionary impulse towards the East. Possibly "Sur Rat" meant the West Indian Montserrat as Fox's later endorsement implies, not the principality in Bombay, but I am not sure that in 1661 Fox knew the difference. As his broadside of 1660, *The Promise of God Proclaimed*, indicates he knew there were both "East and West Indies."

[2] Braithwaite, *Second Period of Quakerism*, p. 217; *Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 418. John Swinton was believed to be intending for the same destination in 1670. *The Lauderdale Papers*, ii, p. 180.

[3] Braithwaite, *Beginnings*, p. 430.

comparing the generosity of the Red Indians. George Bishop's *New England Judged* (1661) begins with a long and invidious recital to prove that the men and rulers of New England had behaved worse than all other religious groups and peoples, with examples from Jews, Turks, Mahometans and notably the American Indians.

The Friends endeavoured to support this theory of the Indians more positively. When Fox and others preached to them through an interpreter any friendly response was taken as evidence of an indigenous similar religious insight. Friends were extremely curious for this reason about the religion of the Indians. They pressed them into admitting some kind of inward prompting and interpreted their response as confirming the Quaker doctrine. Inevitably they did not wait for the groping approach of the Indians themselves but soon preached to them the full Christian content of Quakerism. Yet they cherished all the evidence they could secure to confirm their theory of a witness within the Indians' own hearts. This prompted the publication of *A True Account of the Dying Words of Ochanickon, an Indian King* (London, 1682) as reported from Burlington, New Jersey. John Richardson records that some Indians he met in Pennsylvania " smote their hands on their breasts " saying, " the good man here (meaning in their Hearts) told them what I said was all good."[1]

Summarizing the response of Indians to the special Quaker teaching, the late Rayner Kelsey wrote :

> The reference to the readiness with which the Indians assented to the doctrine of the Inward Light is mentioned many times by early Friends from the time of Fox's discourse with the Indians during his sojourn in America. The doctrine seemed to tally so well with the spiritual conceptions of the natives and their apprehension of the promptings of conscience that they seem readily to have attained what seemed to be common ground with Friends.[2]

I think one might well describe the tallying as the other way round. How far Friends inspired in the Indians the very theological emphasis which they later quote from them is I

[1] *Account of the Life of John Richardson*, 1783, pp. 138-9.
[2] R. W. Kelsey, *Friends and the Indians*, 1917, p. 29.

suspect indicated by a " Speech delivered by an Indian chief, in reply to a sermon, preached by a Swedish missionary, in order to convert the Indians to the Christian religion," stressing original sin and the need for a mediator. It is a strong plea for the validity of natural religion over against revealed religion, embarrassing to any ecclesiastical claimant of the necessity for salvation of written revelation. Though we are told that the speech was made at an Indian treaty held at Conestoga in Pennsylvania in or about the year 1710 and subsequently published in Sweden by the missionary, in Latin, together with his own sermon, its theological tenor and the fact that it was printed in English in Philadelphia makes me suspect its genuineness.[1]

More authentic is the " Account of a Visit lately made to the People called Quakers in Philadelphia, by Papoonahal, an Indian Chief and several other Indians chiefly of the Minisink Tribe, with the substance of their conferences on that occasion," 1761. It was composed apparently by Anthony Benezet who was present and was circulated in manuscript. It appears in his recent biography.[2] It was, however, also published in London in the very year of its occurrence[3] and may perhaps have had an influence in wider circles. There can be no doubt that the Quaker exploitation of the American Indian as confirming the Friends' own theory of man had its effect on the growth of the Romantic conception of the " Noble Savage ", especially in circles where the " Good Quaker " himself was becoming something of a legend.

Various other examples could be given from early Quaker sources of the theological views of the Indians as agreeing with the Quaker views.[4] Their moral standards including hospitality and religious toleration have also been attested by Friends eager to show that natural religion may be not inferior to revealed religion. Of special interest today is

[1] Robert Proud, *The History of Pennsylvania*, ii, 1798, 313-15. I have not traced its earlier publication, cf. Mayhew's claim of response to his theology from Indians of Martha's Vineyard.

[2] *Friend Anthony Benezet*, by George S. Brookes, 1939, pp. 479-92.

[3] See Smith, *op. cit.* II, 462. It was also published in 1803 at Stanford, New York, by D. Lawrence. Brookes was evidently unaware of these earlier publications, as of several of the extant manuscript copies.

[4] I mention, because it was first published lately, " John Farmer's First American Journey 1711-1714 ", *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, 53, 1944, pp. 79-95.

the Quaker claim of the pacific character of the Indians. They enjoyed no such reputation in general, and when badly treated they retaliated in kind; but Friends were glad to prove the harmlessness of an Indian when fairly treated. Friends acted on the assumption too, and collectively and individually they demonstrated their own immunity from harm. The Pennsylvania experience of the disarmed state is the best known example, but it is not the only one. It has also been controverted by those who believe that the Indians could not have been trusted. I will not say that the critics of the Quaker policy are arguing the universality of original sin, or the Quakers arguing universal grace. The Friends, however, believed that they had both practical vindication for their own pacific policy and experiential confirmation of something of God in the non-Christian savage to which their own conduct answered.

This is not the time to debate the old problems: Was the Quaker policy successful? Were the Delaware Indians less warlike than most Indians? Was not the view of the non-Friends more accurate that the only safe Indian was a dead one? One could refer to some interesting recent publications.[1] Anthropologists and historians still tend to substantiate much in the Quaker estimate of the American Indian.

More revelant are the present-day problems in relation to the Quaker doctrine. One hears again and again the charge that certain peoples or persons can understand no language except force. This mostly means that the person who makes the charge knows himself no other language and does not trust it if he does know it. The Quaker doctrine of that of God remains a standing challenge to such pessimism. It still calls on us to vindicate it by acting ourselves so as to answer, that is, to correspond, to the witness of God in others, even in others of whom it is the fashion of our contemporaries to despair. Of course we are still in danger of merely wishful thinking, but we have an opportunity also to illustrate and confirm the Quaker doctrine by logic and experience.

[1] Frank C. Speck, "The Delaware Indians as Women: Were the Original Pennsylvanians Politically Emasculated?" *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, LXX, 1946, 377-87. Ella Cara Deloria, "Dakota Treatment of Murderers," *Proceedings of American Philosophical Society*, vol. 88, 1944, pp. 368-371.

Allegations against George Fox by ministers in North Lancashire

"AND Justice Sawrey & Justice Thompson of Lancaster graunted foorth a warrant for mee: but Judge fell comeinge home they did not serve it upon mee: hee was out of ye country all this time y[t] I was thus abused & cruelly used."[1] The document printed below[2] is the ground on which the warrant was based. This should be read in the light of the position in October 1652. Fox had stirred the country around Furness and, shaken and bruised after severe handling at Ulverston and Walney Island, had just returned to Swarthmoor. The homecoming of Thomas Fell prevented the serving of the warrant, but nonetheless George Fox went to Lancaster sessions with the Judge, and appeared at a meeting of the justices on the hearing of the warrant. "And there appeared against mee 40 preists: & they chused one preist Marshall of Lancaster to bee there orator: for two preists sonns & a preist had sworne against mee y[t] I had spoaken Blasphemy."[3] Eight pages in the Cambridge *Journal*[4] are devoted to the examination, Fox's parting address and Judge Fell's demonstration of errors in the warrant, which was accordingly withdrawn.

To the Justicees of Peace for the Hundred of Loynsedall with in the Countie of Lancaster.

Wee thought good to signifie to your worshipps that one George Foxe hath beene lately in these parts and hath uttered severall blasphemies which are unfitting

[1] *Journal of George Fox* (Camb.), I, 61.

[2] Lancashire County Record Office. Document QSB–1; dated 5th October, 1652. The charges against Fox based on this sheet of allegations should be compared with those in the Lancashire petition to the Council of State, printed on p. 2 of *Saul's Errand to Damascus*, and Fox's detailed answers in the same pamphlet; See also *Short Journal*, 283-4.

[3] *Journal of George Fox* (Camb.), I, 62. With the incomplete evidence to hand it is premature to pronounce between the reading given here and the "two priests and a schoolmaster" of the *Short Journal* (*The Short Journal and Itinerary Journals of George Fox*, ed. Norman Penney, 1925, p. 26). It will be seen that one mentioned, Michael Altham, was a schoolmaster.

[4] *Ibid.*, 63-71.

to bee mentioned and therefore our desire is that you would bee pleased to heare what severall witnesses can attest against him and so proceede with this offender as the Law in such case hath provided, and wee shall bee perpetually oblidged to you.

William Marshall[1]
Tho. Whitehead[2]
Will. Moore
James Schoolecrofte[3]
John Jaques[4]

Wee thought good to give you a narrative of such things as will bee made out against him.

1. He did affirme that he had the divinitie essentially in him.
2. That both Baptisme and the lords supper were unlawfull.
3. He did dissuade men from readinge the Scripture tellinge them that it was carnall.

Michaell Altham[5]

Sworne

[1] William Marshall, M.D., vicar of Lancaster. *Journal of George Fox* (Camb.), I, 412 ; *Short Journal*, 283 ; A. G. Matthews, *Calamy Revised* (1934), 341.

[2] Thomas Whitehead, M.A., rector of Halton, d. 1679 (correct *Journal of George Fox* (Camb.), I, 409). B.A. from St. John's College, Cambridge, 1631-2 ; M.A. 1635 ; rector of Hatlon from *c.* 1644 until 1660 ? Ejected from Halton or Dalton. Licensed teacher (Presbyterian) at Kendal and Nether Kellet, 1672. Died at Kellet, buried at Bolton-le-Sands, 10 Feb. 1679. Matthews, *op. cit.*, 526 ; Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, pt. 1, vol. 4, p. 392.

[3] James Schoolcrofte, of Caton. This document provides his forename. Schoolcrofte's sons Augustine (baptized 1633, Lancaster) and Richard (bapt. 1636) were admitted at Cambridge (1654) ; the former alone passed B.A., perhaps Richard left Cambridge on his father's early death. *Journal of George Fox* (Camb.), I, 412 ; Venn, *op. cit.*, pt. 1, vol. 4, p. 30.

[4] John Jaques, vicar of Bolton-le-Sands, 1644-1660. d. 1683. A Presbyterian, but conformed. *Journal of George Fox* (Camb.), I, 412 ; *Short Journal*, 283 ; Matthews, *op. cit.*, 295.

[5] Michael Altham. Schoolmaster at Lancaster, 1652 (Weld, *The Perfect Pharise*, 1653, p. 3). Perhaps of Christ's College, Cambridge ; b. Settle ; educated at Giggleswick school ; matriculated 1649 ; vicar of Over Kellet, 1655 ; rector of Eastwick, Herts., 1664, and Latton, Essex, 1681 ; d. 1705. Venn, *op. cit.*, pt. 1, vol. 1, p. 26.

1. That he was equall with god.
2. That god taught deceit.
3. That Scriptures were Antichrist.
4. That he was the Judge of the world.
5. That he was as upright as Christ.

William Smyth, Jur[1]
Nathanael Atkinson[2] Sworne
Taken in open Sessions at Lancaster 5 Oct. 1652 before us Geo. Toulnson[3]
Make 2 warrants against him John Sawrey[4]

The transcript of the document was kindly furnished by Mr. R. Sharpe France the archivist of the Lancashire County Record Office at Preston. A photo-facsimile of the original is in the Library at Friends House.

RUSSELL S. MORTIMER

[1] William Smyth junior. Probably the "Smithe" of Cambridge *Journal*, I, 63, 64.

[2] Nathanael Atkinson. Probably the "Atkinson" of Cambridge *Journal*, I, 64.

[3] George Toulnson. d. 1655. *Journal of George Fox* (Camb.), I, 411-2.

[4] John Sawrey. *Ibid.*, p. 408; *Short Journal*, 282.

Norfolk Friends' Care of Their Poor, 1700-1850[1]

By MURIEL F. LLOYD PRICHARD, M.A.

I

SIR FREDERICK MORTON EDEN in Volume I of *The State of the Poor*[2] quoted Dr. Lettsom who said of the Quakers: "the time may come, when a wise legislator may descend to inquire . . . by what polity, without emolument from Government, they have become the only people on earth free from poverty;—by what economy they have thus prevented beggary and want among any of their members, while the nation groans under taxes for the Poor."[3] Eden, however, was sceptical. He commented: "The singular economy and good management which are to be found among Quakers, are highly deserving of general imitation; it may, however, be doubted whether the accounts which are usually given respecting the Poor, that are to be found among this respectable order, are altogether correct." He proceeded to show that the Quakers pay much attention to the moral conduct of their members, "and considering, with great propriety, the want of industry, frugality and economy (those instances of misconduct which most generally lead to poverty) as the least pardonable moral delinquencies, they rarely fail to check their weaker brethren in their first deviations into idleness and extravagence, by admonitions of singular earnestness

[1] Part of a thesis on *The treatment of poverty in Norfolk from* 1700 *to* 1850, *with a survey of the work of voluntary organizations*, to be presented for the Ph.D. degree at Cambridge University. The author's thanks are due to the late Arthur J. Eddington who, at a critical time in his last illness, took much trouble in selecting required volumes from the archives at Norwich Meeting House, to Doris Eddington, Samuel Peel, Thomas Copeman and Mary Alexander, to Norfolk Quarterly Meeting, and to Lynn Friends, to Alec F. Jolliffe for help with transport, to John Nickalls and Muriel Hicks, Friends' Reference Library, London, and to Miss Chrystal, Librarian, Newnham College for giving space in safes for manuscripts over a long period.

[2] Eden, F. M., *The State of the Poor*, 1797, I, pp. 588-89.

[3] Lettsom, J. C., *Memoirs of John Fothergill*, 1786, p. 100.

and weight. If after such warning, the delinquents are incorrigible, and, continuing to be profligate, become also poor, they are then looked upon as irreclaimable offenders, unworthy of being any longer regarded as Friends ; and so, in the phraseology of the Society are *read out*, i.e. are expelled." Eden invited society at large "to emulate the policy of this prudent sect."

The advice which Eden gave is typical of that of the average writer of his time on the poor law. Yet writers on Quaker history like Auguste Jorns and William C. Braithwaite find nothing strange about his comment. Jorns states merely that Eden found specially noteworthy[1] the absence of poor Quakers supported at public expense but Braithwaite says : "The maintenance by Friends of their own poor won the admiration of Eden, the historian of the poor laws."[2] That Eden was not admiring is confirmed in his second volume (which apparently neither saw) where he wrote tersely : "Very few poor are to be found among the Quakers ; the reason of which seems to be (as a Quaker observed) that as soon as a member becomes idle, drunken or otherwise depraved, he is expelled from the Society."[3] It is true that by the time he got to Bristol, Eden was better informed and was able (though part of the information given is incorrect) to describe in a later part of the same volume, how the Society of Friends dealt with its own poor in that city,[4] but he did not trouble to correct the impression made in earlier pages.

The evidence presented herewith shows that Eden's statement was inadequate and misleading. It will be useful also in throwing more light on the Society's policy with regard to the poor because, hitherto, for the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries at any rate, it has been viewed from the angle of the Yearly Meeting in London with an occasional glance at handy examples afforded by Quarterly or Monthly Meetings in the provinces. The story will, moreover, illuminate the course of the Society of Friends

[1] Jorns, A., *Studien über die Sozialpolitik der Quäker*, 1912. Translated and published in the United States as *The Quakers as Pioneers in Social Work*, 1931. References are to the latter edition and in the above, to p. 58.

[2] Braithwaite, W. C., *The Second Period of Quakerism*, 1919, p. 566.

[3] Eden, *op. cit.*, II, p. 9.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 203.

in Norfolk and incidentally, draw in something of the economic and social history of the county from 1700 to 1850.

* * * *

FOUNDATIONS

Modern writers on the social teachings of the Protestant churches have called attention to the emphasis which leaders like Luther, Zwingli, Calvin and Oecolampadius laid upon the right development of individual character as the means to the abolition of social evils and R. H. Tawney says of Puritanism: "Nor would it be difficult to find notable representatives of the Puritan spirit, in whom the personal austerity, which was the noblest aspect of the new ideal, was combined with a profound consciousness of social solidarity, which was the noblest aspect of that which it displaced. Firmin, the philanthropist and Bellers the Quaker . . . were pioneers of Poor Law reform . . . The general climate and character of a country are not altered, however, by the fact that here and there it has peaks which rise into an ampler air. The distinctive note of Puritan teaching was different. It was individual responsibility, not social obligation. Training its pupils to the mastery of others through the mastery of self, it prized as a crown of glory the qualities which arm the spiritual athlete for his solitary contest with a hostile world and dismissed concern with the social order as the prop of weaklings and the Capua of the soul."[1] Such a generalization does not do justice to the concern which the Society of Friends had for its poor, for, from its early beginnings, it is clear that Quakers hoped by their loving care for each other, which was to find one expression in material aid to the needy, to return in spirit to the state of grace of the primitive Christian community.

Thus George Fox addressed his followers: "And in all your Meetings, lett Notice be given to the generall Meetings of all the Poore, and when you have heard that there is many more poore belongs to one Meeting than to another, and that Meeting thereby burthened and oppressed, let the Rest of the Meetings assist and helpe them, so that you may ease one another and helpe to bear one anothers burthens, and so fulfill the law of Christ, and so see that nothing be lacking, according to the Apostles words, Mark,

[1] Tawney, R. H., *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, 1926, pp. 272-73.

nothing lacking, then all is well. For the Jews outward though they were as the stars of Heaven and as the sand of the sea, yet there was not to be a Beggar amongst them, according to the Law of God. And amongst the Christians in the first Ages, there was a Mens-Meeting sett up at Jerusalem, to see that nothing was lacking . . . and this continued so long as they lived in the life, power and spirit of God . . . So there is not to be a beggar now amongst the Christians, according to the Law of Jesus."[1] The writings of Fox, "To the Protector and Parliament of England" (1658), and "To the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England" (1659), were addressed to the government on the necessity of remedying the evils of poverty, but the Society of Friends itself was to set the example by action. The earliest monthly meeting set up at Swarthmore in 1653 was established to care for the poor, and meetings at Skipton and Durham in 1659 gave the same advice as Fox.[2] By 1663, Richard Hubberthorne was able to say: "Neither is there a beggar amongst us who are truly of us in the obedience of truth."[3]

In Norfolk, an early meeting is announced by George Fox in a letter, 17 Nov. 1662. "Dear Friends, I would have you tell one another of a meeting that is to be at Samuel Pikes in Hingham, upon the next fifth day come fortnight, which will be the fourth day of the tenth month, which meeting is to be about outward things, concerning the poor widows and fatherless children and prisoners . . . all feeling each others condition as his own . . . where two of every meeting will meet you the same day about the eleventh hour when all may know how everything is . . . that nothing be wanted among you . . . and nothing being wanted then all is well, for such a meeting there is in every county, which is a grace to truth and an honour to God."[4]

[1] *Sundry Ancient Epistles*, 1662-1698, p. 5. "A General Paper concerning divers particulars" (G.F.).

[2] See *Epistles from the Yearly Meeting of Friends*, 1858, vol. I.

[3] Hubberthorne, R., *A collection of . . . Several Books and Writings*, 1663, p. 219. Hubberthorne was one of the first Quakers to visit Norwich and was imprisoned there. See Whitehead, G., *The Christian Progress of that ancient servant and minister of Jesus Christ, George Whitehead*, 1725, p. 24.

[4] As quoted in Eddington, A. J., *The first fifty years of Quakerism in Norwich* (Friends' Historical Society), 1932, p. 221.

Quarterly Meeting Responsibility

Right up to 1850, when the Norfolk and Norwich Quarterly Meeting was united with the Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire Quarterly Meetings, it was customary in Norfolk, as elsewhere, for the county's quarterly meeting to supervise the monthly and particular meetings in the matter of relieving the poor and to return satisfactory answer to the Yearly Meeting which sent from London an annual query. The monthly meeting kept watch on its particular meetings and replied to the periodic query sent from quarterly meeting; it also noted and reported on the collections made and used by the particular meetings and carried the surplus, if any, to the quarterly meeting, or, when a particular meeting was in need, supplied it from the other meetings.[1] Very early, as will be seen, the disbursements of Quarterly Meeting exceeded its receipts and repeated requests were made to monthly meetings for additional collections.

The work in Norfolk of relieving the poor was extensive. The greater part of the business of each monthly meeting[2] and a very large part of that of Quarterly Meeting were taken up with the concern, and some fifty manuscript volumes preserved in the Norwich Meeting House bear witness to it.

Resources: 1. Collections

It is not possible to give a precise account of the financial transactions of each meeting because vital changes made necessary by the decay of meetings, were brought about in the areas of the monthly meetings and their constituent meetings. Thus, whereas in 1719, seven monthly meetings representing eighteen particular meetings, reported to Quarterly Meeting, by 1839, only one remained, namely, Norwich which had the other monthly meetings joined to it with their constituents where they existed. The change

[1] The method was described for the benefit of the monthly meetings in a minute of Quarterly Meeting, 23.iv.1719. All references to Quarterly Meeting will be to Norfolk.

[2] The minutes of each monthly meeting were usually headed with some such statement as the following, taken from early meetings of Norwich: "At the Monthly Meeting in Norwich . . . met to consider of the poore etc."

was effected as follows. In 1719, meetings which had, hitherto, for Quarterly Meeting purposes been listed separately, were grouped in divisions (each division making a monthly meeting area): (1) Lammas, North Walsham and Banningham; (2) Mattishall, Wymondham, Ellingham (Hingham) and Thetford; (3) Upwell, Lynn and Stoke; (4) Tasburgh, Tivetshall and Diss; (5) Holt, Wells and Fakenham; (6) Yarmouth; (7) Norwich. From 1708, Norwich sent in merely an account of its collections. In 1728, Yarmouth was joined to Norwich and from 1748, both Norwich and Yarmouth made no report at all for some years. In 1762, Yarmouth became part of the Lammas and North Walsham group and in 1791, the meetings were presented simply as (1) Lynn; (2) Wymondham; (3) Tivetshall; (4) Holt; (5) Lammas. In 1801, Lammas (with North Walsham) joined Norwich which re-appeared in the accounts to receive payments on their behalf and Yarmouth became a separate group with Beccles and Pakefield joined to it. Lynn and Holt were joined in 1804 and Wymondham and Tivetshall in 1813. In 1818, Norwich appeared in the list, recording its own collections and disbursements. In 1828, Wymondham was joined to Norwich and Yarmouth followed in 1839 and from 1840, no record of any disbursements was made for any meeting but Norwich.

A general picture of the financial position can, however, be drawn, for each Quarterly Meeting recorded the collections of the monthly meetings and their additional collections, the amounts they brought in and its own disbursements. The monthly meeting accounts are more detailed, covering not only money collected and spent but names of contributors and pensioners, forms of relief and other allied matters.

Leaving Norwich out of consideration because for years that city sent in to Quarterly Meeting merely an account of its collections, the monthly meetings collected on an average in the first half of the eighteenth century, £56 a year and took into Quarterly Meeting about £7 a year. Quarterly Meeting disbursements averaged £17 a year, to meet which additional collections were made. For the next fifty years, collections made £80 a year, the amounts taken in to Quarterly Meeting remained the same but Quarterly

Meeting spent over £100 a year and additional collections increased in number and amount. In the early years of the nineteenth century, before Norwich came into the accounts, the meetings collected about £100 a year but brought in only small sums to Quarterly Meeting until 1813 when they stopped the practice altogether and the disbursements of Quarterly Meeting increased to between £200 and £250 a year. Additional collections could not meet the increased expenditure which was increasingly made up by income from legacies. From the late 1820's, the meetings usually made no collections and Quarterly Meeting expenditure of £30 to £60 a year was made from interest on legacies.

At Quarterly Meeting 29.iii.1720, it was agreed that Friends should collect for the relief of the poor by subscription and lists of subscribers were several times inspected until in 1818, it was agreed that there should be an annual inspection. Quarterly Meeting frequently exhorted monthly meetings, as on 26.xii.1764, " to stir up such of their Members as are capable to a more liberal collection," but from the beginning of the eighteenth century, monthly meetings were turning to Quarterly Meeting for help. The need of some persisted over a long period. Thus, Lynn remained in difficulties from 1735 to 1765, when its debt was paid off by a contribution from a legacy. From 1745 to 1772, Wymondham made increasing appeals for help and likewise, Tivetshall from 1765. From 1779, Lammas and Holt depended on the Quarterly Meeting and in 1801, Yarmouth sent in requests for special support.

On occasion, Norwich Monthly Meeting, though it did not contribute to the Quarterly Meeting, made application to it for assistance and received special contributions for the first twenty years of the eighteenth century. Thereafter, Norwich remained independent until 1818. From 1720 to 1750, its expenditure averaged £55 a year. From 1750, repeated appeals were made within the Monthly Meeting for increased subscriptions but arrears increased and persisted to the end of the century. Additional subscriptions were raised, and interest on legacies helped to meet expenditure which increased from £188 for 1799 to 1800 to £207 for 1801 to 1802. After 1818, Norwich received help from the Quarterly Meeting and for some years,

its disbursements were over £100 a year. From 1832, there is no record of collections and, on an average, £60 a year was disbursed which was met from Quarterly Meeting.

Resources: 2. Endowments

Particularly in the latter half of the eighteenth century, legacies were an important source of revenue, both for Quarterly and Monthly Meetings.

An estate which was of particular service was that of Thomas Buckingham, first mention of which was made in Lynn Monthly Meeting in 1712, when trustees were appointed to treat with his widow to give her security for the rents thereof during her life. Afterwards, the profits from the estate which consisted of lands in Lynn and neighbourhood were to be distributed to poor Friends of Lynn, Stoke, Upwell, Downham, Hilgay and Wells and the surplus was to be brought to Quarterly Meeting, which for some years from 1716, benefited by amounts varying from £7 to £25 a year which were distributed to meetings which had not already benefited. In 1735, Quarterly Meeting reported that "the charge of the poor of several of the meetings Intitled to that charity are so much increased that there is no possibility at present for any of the produce of the estate to be sent . . . as usual." In 1754, Lynn Monthly Meeting reported that the estate was in debt and one of the persons whose relief had been met from it, was paid 2s. a week from the common collection. In 1764, an enquiry was ordered and two years later, Quarterly Meeting issued a report which noted several deficiencies. It stated that land at Downham which was let for £3 a year for 3 acres at the time of the devise, now let for £2 and was called 2 acres and 2 roods. It observed further: "On this land, there are many good timbers, both Oak and Ash which do not appear to have been abused; but we think an account should be kept of their number and that Friends land should be dool'd out which cannot now be exactly ascertained. The estate at Islington in Marshland is a pretty little Farm but not well managed; the present tenant has no lease; he is an old man having lived there about 50 years at the present rent of £29 a year, but we think it would be best to let him

continue the rest of his time at the old rent but afterwards to lett it with proper covenants at £35 a year or more which it very well deserves . . . The 14 acres in St. Mary's in Marshland is very fine Pasture land and now for the first time let at £12 a year, but it well deserves 20s. an acre or more, which we apprehend the lands round about are lett for ; we are of opinion that it would be best to lett the same on lease and to restrict the tenant to spend the hay on the premises ; of which it has this year and probably often been defrauded." The rest of the report noted 9 acres near Lynn South Gates let at 30s. an acre on which much had been spent, 18 acres let at £14 6s. a year for which the rent could be raised, and houses in South Lynn which were capable of improvement at a cost of £30 to £40.

The income from the estate gradually moved upwards and Quarterly Meeting reported in 1839 that rents which originally amounted to £93 11s. had risen to £233 6s. 6d. a year.

Other estates of use to Quarterly Meeting and valued in 1839 were as follows : (1) an estate at Thursford (1720) left for " the clothing and putting out poor children of Quakers " brought in £10 a year ; (2) an estate at Roydon left by Richard Wainforth (1740) for " Honest, Industrious poor people called Quakers " produced £24 a year ; (3) an estate at Alburgh left by Jonathan Corbyn (1759) for " the relief of poor, aged, impotent Friends and prisoners suffering on account of the Truth " realized £12 a year ; (4) a legacy made by John Jackson (1822) for apprenticing brought in about £11 a year (and Quarterly Meeting's funds for this purpose were on occasion added to by collections and money from gifts, as had been advised by George Fox).[1]

Monthly Meetings also enjoyed income from legacies and gifts made at different times. Thus Norwich benefited by a request made in 1719 by Samuel Robbins, the money from which could be applied to the general purposes of the Meeting on condition of " their putting out to prentice a Friends boy or girl every year and to give with the said apprentice £8." In 1839, the income amounted to £60 a

[1] Dates in brackets refer to the year when the bequest was first referred to in the Quarterly Meeting Minutes and not necessarily to the date when the bequest was made. The latter cannot be accurately stated without further information.

year. In 1749, Elizabeth Langwade left over £500 for the use of poor Friends and the income was applied accordingly until 1828 when the bonds were sold to pay the meeting's debts. Empson's estate (left apparently about 1700) for poor Friends yielded £14 a year in 1839, and John Wagstaffe's estate used from 1809 for the same purpose produced about £9 a year. Small legacies for the poor were left under the wills of members of the Gurney family and other Friends and these were not invested but immediately distributed. Wymondham possessed an estate left by John Verdon (and first mentioned in the minutes of 1783) which was worth £3 5s. a year in 1839 and the Meeting also had a legacy left by John Jackson which produced £7 10s. a year at the same date. Both of these were for poor Friends. In 1844, Rosamund Lane left £100 invested in 3% Consols for the benefit of poor people attending Wymondham Meeting.

Though a committee was appointed by Quarterly Meeting in 1719 to inspect the estates, for some years there was no proper account of them and when in 1786, Meeting for Sufferings called on Norfolk to report on the charitable donations belonging to the Society so that it might "lay a state thereof before the Persons appointed by Act of Parliament to receive the same," Quarterly Meeting was not able to do so and commented that "the time limited by Act of Parliament was so near elapsed that it was not practicable to proceed further had it even been deemed necessary." It is of interest to note that the work *An account of the different charities belonging to the poor of Norfolk, abridged from the returns under Gilbert's Act to the House of Commons* 1786*; and from the Terriers in the office of the lord Bishop of Norwich*, published in 1811 from the pen of Zachary Clark, who was a representative from Lynn Monthly Meeting to the Quarterly Meeting from 1784 (but not in 1786) does not contain any account of Quaker charities. Nor are they described in the Charity Commissioners' Reports for Norfolk of 1833, 1834 and 1835. From 1786, Monthly Meetings were asked to present them for audit by a committee of Quarterly Meeting, but evidently it was not faithfully done, for again in 1823, it was proposed that a committee should be set up to examine the estates left by Friends and accounts were more scrupulously kept, and in 1839 a valuation was made.

Administration

Weekly Allowances

In administering to the relief of the poor, meetings depended on overseers specially appointed and this was the case with women's meetings also, for these were, in the view of George Fox, particularly called upon "to see and enquire into the necessity of all poor Friends."[1] On occasion, a Monthly Meeting handed over a special case to women Friends, e.g. Norwich 21.i.1758: "This meeting being acquainted that Rose Hill requires still further assistance; and the men Friends not being so proper Judges what may be necessary in her deplorable circumstances, our women Friends are requested to administer whatever further may be wanting and this meeting will order the expense thereby incurred to be repaid them."

The disbursements of Quarterly Meeting were usually made in lump sums paid to the Monthly Meetings, but sometimes the name of the person to be relieved appears. Thus, in 1718, 5 guineas were sent to Thetford "for the relief of Daniel Woolnos case who hath a child that was cut of the stone" and in 1723, after his death, an appeal was circularized on behalf of his invalid children. From 1736 until 1740 when he died, Samuel Derry of Wymondham, confined in Bethel in Norwich was the charge of Quarterly Meeting since it was too great for his own meeting, and such cases as these were taken care of there or in the Norwich Hospital until the Retreat at York was founded at the end of the eighteenth century when they were transferred there at lower cost.

Monthly meeting accounts habitually give the names of recipients of poor relief and other details.

In each meeting it was usual to pay needy Friends a weekly allowance similar to parish relief. Thus, North Walsham 13.ix.1779 recorded disbursements for the quarter to Widow Ramsdale, Widow Boulton, Widow Bateman, Wm. Barber. From 1799 to 1800, Norwich had 15 pensioners to whom sums were paid weekly varying from 3s. to 7s.

[1] See Fox, G., *A Collection of many Select and Christian Epistles*, 1698, p. 6.

Fuel

Fuel was frequently provided, e.g. Lynn recorded 7.v.1701 : " Paid Thos Buckingham ten shillings that was due to him for coals and carriage for old Mary at Downham," and 4.viii.1703 " Thos Gill and John Brown are desired by this meeting to procure the Widow Hunter a new supply of Turfs for her firing for the ensuing year."

Burial

The cost of burying poor Friends and the care of the sick were a constant burden. Norwich 25.vi.1757 ordered " that the overseers of the poor do in future, allow 12s. for a coffin and 6s. for a shroud in which any poor Friend shall be buried." References to smallpox are frequent. North Walsham 3.xii.1713 reported : " Given to John Ames several times to support him after he recovered of the small pox 10s. " The same meeting, 13.ix.1779, allowed a sum of £3 1s. 8d. to Wm. Crotch for " maidservant in time of illness and funeral charges."

Physic

Norwich Monthly Meeting was very cautious over bills and noted 4.x.1727 : " Wm Massey brought to this meeting 2 bills from Eliz Snell, one for Physic and attendance during Eliz Southgates illness and the other for Physic and attendance upon Alice Fincham and her daughter and the said bills were considered of in this meeting and it is ordered that the overseers pay her £2 5s. 6d. being the amount of her bill for Eliz Southgate, it appearing that this meeting gave her order to take care of her, but to inform her that we will not pay the other bill, nor no bills which she may have on account of our poor Friends unless she has particular order from this meeting." Again, 24.xi.1769 : " The overseers report that they visited Mary Bateman and find that she has contracted with a person to learn to make Mantuas and that through illness and some casualties is unable to support herself ; the case is referred to . . . our Women Friends and what may be necessary to provide for her this meeting will supply under their direction during the continuance of her contract ; but recommend that none under the notice of this meeting do presume to enter into engagements which they are not capable to satisfy,

without the consent and approbation of Friends." Presumably, consent was obtained for the following case, 6.x.1772 : " The overseers are desired to pay John Gurney £1 8s. disburst by him for Board of John Golder at Yarmouth, whilst he bathed in the sea by the advice of the Doctors consulted for the complaint in his neck."

Loans

Sometimes, money was lent to Friends. Norwich noted 8.vi.1713 : " Joseph Brown returned the 20s. borrowed of this meeting 14.xi.1709 of which this meeting returned him 5s. by John Parker."

Rent

Often the rent of houses was paid or poor Friends were allowed to occupy part of a meeting house. Lynn Monthly Meeting, having noted 4.v.1698 " a complaint made against Wm Richardson (of Hilgay) and his wife for disorderly walking," advised their lodger, the widow Jacques, 7.v.1701, to remove to Friends' house at Downham, where she might live rent free " but to be serviceable to Friends there as her capacity will enable and permit her." Again, 11.ii.1735 : " This meeting agrees that Thos Borinskell go into the tenement belonging to the meeting house at Upwell to save the charge of his rent in another house " and in 1758, Susan Inglin's rent at Downham was paid for half a year as she was unwell.

Houses

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, Norwich meeting provided houses to accommodate four poor Friends and recorded 8.xi.1703 : " Isaac Sewell did then bring in an account of £29 16s. 6d. collected towards defraying the charge of the building of the poor houses and yet wants £5 11s. 9d. more to make up the deficiency." Norwich was very cautious on the subject of rents and minuted 10.i.1715 : " Ordered that the overseers from time to time take care to get of poor Friends for whom this meeting pays rent, the receipts that such Friends take of the owners of their houses, in order that . . . the Monthly Meeting may know their money is appropriated to the same use for which it is given " and, 3.vii.1728, asked the overseers " to visit Nath Cornish and to advise him to get a less house, for it is

the opinion of this meeting that one of a less rent may answer their necesities." Sometimes, poor Friends agreed to assign the house they possessed to the meeting in return for help, as did Isaac Reynolds who gave his house to Norwich meeting and received an income of 3s. a week from 1774.

Occasionally, particular purchases are noted. North Walsham minuted 3.xii.1713: "Paid to Nick House for a pair of brichis for Francis Kirk 3s. 6d." 5.iii.1717: "Given to Eliz Mason towards shiften for four chaldron 5s." 22.ix.1736: "Given to Mary Bransby towards buying her a horse 8s." Norwich, 11.vii.1805 agreed that "if the twistering mill Thomas Lucas hath looked upon, be thought a pennyworth, with its appurtenances at £6, Friends are willing to give him £3 10s. towards the buying of it . . . Edmund Cobb and Peregrine Tizack are desired to assist him in the matter." Sometimes goods were lent, as in the case of Sarah Hitchin, for whom Norwich purchased household goods in 1754 as follows:

"1.	A bed and all belonging to it	£4	10	0
2.	Iron-pot, washing-keller, bellows, firepan and tongs, frying-pan, saucepan, 2 chairs and a candelstick		10	0
3.	A pair of drawers, warming pan and table		10	6
4.	Iron stove 5s. Fender and poker 1s. 10d.		6	10
5.	Trundles, swifts and blacks		5	3
6.	A pail 2s. 2d., lamp and 2 stools 2s.		4	2
7.	Earthen ware 3s., wooden cup etc. 6d.		3	6
8.	Setting up the stove		2	6
		£6	14	9

the said goods to remain with her at the discretion of this meeting."

But for exercising great care, the Society would at times have been defrauded. Norwich reported 1.ii.1774: "It being represented that Joshua Smith and Charlotta Smith, children of Thos Smith, late a member of the Peel Monthly Meeting in London are now in this city and in great danger of ruin; John Gurney, John Bonsell and Samuel Williams

are desired to take the needful care for them," and 12.iii.1774: "The Friends appointed . . . concerning Joshua and Charlotta Smith report, that they had procured her a proper service amongst Friends and provided her with such clothing as appeared requisite; but since, finding that her conduct hath been very disorderly and that she hath associated with evil company; and being acquainted also, that she had formed a design to take away the clothes provided for her and go suddenly off to London in a clandestine manner; the Friends therefore took the precaution to secure the major part of the said clothing, and at the same time expostulated with her and administered advice suitable to her situation." She escaped to London, however, and Peel Meeting was asked to deal with her and the clothes "as reserved by the Friends" were put into the hands of the Women's Meeting.

To be concluded

Western Circular Yearly Meeting, 1720-1786

OUTLINE statements of the organization of the Society of Friends usually show clearly the relation between, and respective functions of, the yearly meetings, central committees, quarterly meetings, monthly meetings and particular meetings, but rarely is more than passing notice given to the general meetings. When mentioned, they appear often only as forerunners of the national meetings. It is easy to account for this. The local general meetings, and the yearly meetings after them, were unevenly spread over the country; they were never a typical manifestation of Quaker activity and do not fit into a hierarchical pattern beloved of archivist-historians. The meetings left no records to form archive *fonds* in the national collections[1] and had largely died out long before the late nineteenth century when the new school of Quaker history was taking shape.

Material for the history of these meetings is scattered in local minute books, spread through a century and a half of the records at Friends House, and is to be found in the journals of ministering Friends from William Edmundson to Catharine Phillips. Working from these sources, this essay attempts to present a brief account of the yearly meeting which circulated among various towns of seven western counties between 1720 and 1786.

The late Alfred Neave Brayshaw introduced an account of the general meetings of the Midlands[2] by pointing out that "the eighteenth century was not so destitute of attempts to spread a knowledge of Quakerism as is often supposed." The desire to evangelize was doubtless a moving force in the establishment of the local yearly meetings at the close of the seventeenth century, but they also had an aim and a service, perhaps more lasting in effect, to knit more closely

[1] An exception is Bristol Yearly Meeting. At one period this meeting exercised some disciplinary functions and the records are preserved at Bristol.

[2] *The First Century of Quakerism in the Midlands*, in "Handbook of the Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends, 1908, Birmingham," p. 55.

together Friends widely scattered in country areas. Bristol Friends had this service among Friends in mind when they proposed in 1694 to establish a yearly meeting in that city " to be holden for ye Worshiping of God, both in a generall way and alsoe yet more perticularly for freinds amongst & by themselves, as alsoe yet more perticularly for all those of our freinds & Brethren that have a publick Testimony, who many of them being so Remote from London can hardly Reach it, and so Consequently are deprived of those good Oppertunityes & Comfortable Seasons that others Nearer do frequently Enjoye."[1]

Out of this yearly meeting after an interval of twenty-five years, grew the Western Counties' Circular Yearly Meeting. In considering the work of the meeting these three aspects of activity—evangelism, promotion of solidarity and provision of ministerial opportunity—must be borne in mind.

It is difficult to draw conclusions about the spread of Friends' principles through the service of the meetings. Without active after-care any initial progress toward conversion would fade, and it probably rested wholly with local Friends to follow up contacts. Thus, however lively the impression made at the meetings themselves, the practice of holding meetings in places where few Friends could follow up the work yielded little result. Evidence on this matter is largely still to seek. Wiltshire Friends were concerned on the point, and in 1726 the quarterly meeting was " of Opinion that the proposition of appointing Friends at the Quarterly Meeting preceeding where the said Yearly Meeting is to be held, to make prudent Enquiry what Reception the Testimony of Friends had among the People may be very Convenient and of good Service."[2] Opportunity came to the county in the following year when the meeting was held at Marlborough. The summer quarterly meeting instructed the committee in charge of arrangements also to enquire how Friends' testimonies were received.[3] It was not until eighteen months had elapsed

[1] Draft of letter from Bristol Men's Meeting to the counties, August 20, 1694, in " Proceedings of the Bristol Yearly Meeting " (preserved at the Friars M.H., Bristol, vol. E2), p. 1 ; quoted by Brayshaw, *loc. cit.*, p. 56.

[2] Lavington, July 4, 1726 ; Wilts Q.M. minutes, Vol. 3, p. 523.

[3] Bradford, July 3, 1727 ; *op. cit.*, p. 535.

that the quarterly meeting received report from Marlborough Friends "that the Testimonys of Friends were generally well accepted by the people."[1]

Some such phrase usually occurs in the reports the county representatives gave to their home quarterly meetings on return from each yearly meeting. In 1725 Somerset Friends reported the Wotton-under-Edge meeting "very larg and much people frequented it, Yett notwithstanding 'twas held in much Unity, and great Sobriety appear'd among the people."[2] The next year John Fry told Wiltshire Friends that Hereford had been attended by several eminent ministers, "and that there were many considerable persons not of our profession, who gave very great attention to the testimonies there delivered and behaved very civilly."[3]

Evidence of permanent progress is difficult to assess. Wiltshire's withdrawal from the circuit in 1734 may be in part due to Friends' sense that little extension work was being achieved, but it can hardly be an accident that in 1738 Somerset Quarterly Meeting was proposing to establish a monthly or weekly meeting at Bruton, little more than a year after the circular meeting had been held there.[4]

Among Friends themselves the meetings had a unifying influence which enabled a scattered membership to maintain a corporate life during a period when visitation by travelling ministers was steadily diminishing, and when the isolation of distance had not receded before the revolution in transport of the nineteenth century. The journals of leading ministers of the period bear witness to the regularity of their attendance,[5] and, as we learn from the late Arthur Eddington's presidential address to this society (1946), socially, the meetings were occasions for Friends over wide areas to renew acquaintances and make new ones. The attendance at the meetings doubtless varied, but large gatherings of over a thousand were

[1] Calne, April 7, 1729; *op. cit.*, p. 557.

[2] Somerset Q.M. minutes, Vol. C, p. 112.

[3] Wilts Q.M. minutes, Vol. 3, p. 527.

[4] Glastonbury, January 4, 1738; Somerset Q.M. minutes, Vol. C, p. 265.

[5] For instance, Catharine Phillips notes in her *Memoirs* (1797) nineteen of the meetings between 1749 and 1785.

common, and provision was frequently made for halls for overflow meetings. The *Gentleman's Magazine* reported of the Stratford meeting in 1763 that there were 6,000 assembled, and " near 50 couples were publicly married."[1]

A basic attendance was secured when at the summer or early autumn quarterly meeting in each county representatives were appointed to attend the ensuing circular meeting. Friends not on the appointment were likewise encouraged to be present. Having regard to the hundreds of miles sometimes involved, attendance by one or more of those appointed was very regular. Rarely did more than one county fail to be represented at any meeting. Bristol Yearly Meeting, with its fixed place and time of holding, was not always attended from every constituent county,[2] and the calibre of the appointed representatives was not always satisfactory, as the following minute of that meeting plainly shows: " it is the advice of this meeting that for time to come friends in their severall countys do not put the office of attending yearly meetings on persons whose business calls them there, but that the meetings would make a choice of Such as are fit for it."[3] Much less therefore was the peripatetic circular meeting able to count on adequate representation from counties at a distance. In 1724 Somerset appointed eight Friends to attend the meeting at Bodmin, but " neither of them attended; which neglect this meeting resents, And desires that for the future they will be more carefull to attend when appointed."[4] Twenty years later, again Cornwall—Redruth in 1745—Somerset noted without comment: " The Circular Yearly Meeting being not attended according to appointment we can have no account thereof."[5] Perhaps Friends in Somerset had come to accept what Wiltshire had anticipated from the first. When the Circular Yearly Meeting was mooted in 1719 and 1720,

[1] Quoted in *Journal F.H.S.*, Vol. 13, p. 69. The meeting would appear to have been exceptionally large, or the estimated attendance generous.

[2] As early as 1698 Cornwall sent an epistle but no representative; Bristol Y.M. Minutes and Epistles (preserved at the Friars M.H., Bristol, Vol. E1), p. 37.

[3] May 4, 1697; *loc. cit.*, p. 34.

[4] Somerset Q.M. minutes, Vol. C, pp. 96 and 98.

[5] *Loc. cit.*, p. 363.

Lavington M.M. stated they did "Like ye Proposition so farr as it may advance ye Intrest of Truth, but aprehending ye great distance we are from Cornwall, we Suppose it would be of more Service to us to have a Yearly Meeting in Somersetshire and ys County Successively."[1] On mature consideration the Quarterly Meeting at Calne in April 1720 agreed to the proposals for a circular meeting "provided it be held in Somerset, Wilts, Devon or Glocester."[2] In the event the meeting was established on no such restricted basis. None of the Wiltshire representatives attended at Bodmin in 1724, and when Cornwall's turn came round again in 1731, the quarterly meeting merely desired "any Friends that are free" to attend.[3] This difficulty of distance may have been a contributory cause of Wiltshire's dissatisfaction and withdrawal from the meeting in 1734, for it is noteworthy that the county remained a member of Bristol Yearly Meeting, held nearer home.

As for detailed arrangements, the constituent counties took their turns in providing hospitality for the yearly meeting. In 1720 Bristol Yearly Meeting approved the proposal for a circular meeting, to commence at Bradford-on-Avon that year if London Yearly Meeting allowed it. The place and time of holding subsequent meetings was to be agreed upon at the close of the Bradford meeting. This procedure was followed in the early years. At Worcester in 1723 the place was fixed for Bodmin in the following year, the time to be agreed upon at Bristol Yearly Meeting. Somerset representatives were directed to bespeak the 1725 meeting in Somerset if no other county asked, and were sent likewise to each following meeting, until in 1727 they went to Marlborough with directions to solicit for Somerset the 1728 meeting "as in course it fall." Later (and the meeting of 1728 is a case in point) the appointment of the meeting was left until the spring and arrangements were announced at Bristol Yearly Meeting and notified to the quarterly meetings in a postscript to the Bristol yearly epistle. When Bristol Yearly Meeting was laid down for

[1] Corsham, January 4, 1720; Wilts Q.M. minutes, Vol. 3, p. 333.

[2] Calne, April 4, 1720; *loc. cit.*, p. 341. Compare the Dorset and Hampshire (Ringwood) yearly meeting, which met from 1708 until 1796.

[3] *Loc. cit.*, p. 586.

discipline and the epistle discontinued, appointment was made by the hosts to inform the other counties of the time and place of holding, by letter or through representatives at Bristol Yearly Meeting.

With a meeting within the county in prospect, the quarterly meeting concerned took timely steps to appoint a committee or to ask monthly meetings to suggest possible places within their compass. Having been successful in securing the yearly meeting for the county for 1728, Somerset Friends at their winter quarterly meeting appointed a committee to select a place suitable for holding the meeting and to report. The meeting chose Wells and asked certain Friends to seek accommodation there. At the spring meeting the committee reported that their search had been ineffectual, and so Taunton was chosen for a second time. The difficulty at Wells was almost certainly the unwillingness of the town authorities to allow the use of any hall, for when next the circular meeting met in Somerset, the arrangements committee in search of a suitable place was asked to "enquire (if they think proper) whether such a Meeting would be allowed of, by persons presiding in such places."[1] Changed attitudes in the authorities are indicated as the century wore on. Wells presented no difficulty in 1743, for a hall was readily obtained and the meetings were "Large and the People very Sober."[2] In 1764 the meetings were held in Crewkerne market house and Friends made a special appointment "to acknowledge to the Earl Paulett the kindness we have received for the Use of the Markett house and otherwise."[3]

When town and market halls were available for use the costs of housing the meetings were likely to be small. Somerset Friends had a bill of £7 os. 1d. before them for the fitting up of the Crewkerne hall, and the seating and accommodation of Ilchester town hall cost £11 in 1750. At Bruton in 1736 the place chosen needed more seating and fittings, but this was accomplished at a charge of less than £30. In many places however no suitable halls were

[1] October 8, 1735; Somerset Q.M. minutes, Vol. C, p. 232.

[2] December 14, 1743; *loc. cit.*, p. 345.

[3] Chard, September 19, 1764; Somerset Q.M. minutes, Vol. D, p. 107. Some of the registration certificates taken out when these halls were used for meetings, survive (e.g. for Minchinhampton and Wotton-under-Edge, see *Journal F.H.S.*, Vol. 36, p. 59).

available, and when Friends had to build a booth the cost ranged above £50. Wincanton bills in 1770 amounted to £57 11s.; Bridgwater in 1776, £56 and Frome in 1783, £64 2s. This aspect of meeting arrangements is fully dealt with by Alfred Brown in his *Evesham Friends of the Olden Time* (1885), who quotes accounts for some of the midland counties. Among the charges there revealed was a sum for defraying the inn charges of ministers. This practice would appear from a Wiltshire minute[1] to have been the customary thing on behalf of those who came from without the compass of the constituent counties. The accommodation of attenders at the meetings was regularly overseen by local Friends specially appointed. An early notice of this comes from Frenchay (West Gloucester) Monthly Meeting in the motion for the appointment of "some proper persons" to attend at Tetbury "in order to observe that Friends in their several Inns and Quarters keep a proper Decorum in their Conduct and behaviour, that so no just offence be given to any that are not of our Society."[2] At each meeting the committee in charge of arrangements had a general care for the smooth running, and reported back to the quarterly meeting giving account of the proceedings and expenses incurred. The bills were paid from the quarterly meeting stock, by a proportionate subscription from each monthy meeting stock, or by a special collection as seemed most convenient.

The spirit in which these meetings were held can best be illustrated perhaps not by quotation from the quarterly meeting minutes, concerned as they were with arrangements, financial questions and general decorum, but by dipping into the journals of the attending ministering Friends. One such, Benjamin Holme, a seasoned minister, records of 1728, "having some Drawings to be at the Yearly-meeting for the Western Counties, which was at Taunton in Somersetshire, I went there; the Meeting began on the 1st of the Seventh Month, and ended on the 3d of the same, in which Time Friends had five publick Meetings, and the Lord was graciously pleased to appear in his Love to the comforting of his People, and many that came there, that

[1] Chippenham, April 4, 1727; Wiltshire Q.M. minutes, Vol. 3, p. 531.

[2] July 3, 1732; Frenchay M.M. minute book, Vol. 2, p. 121; preserved at the Friars M.H., Bristol.

were not of our Society, shew'd forth a great deal of Sobriety and good Behaviour in our Meetings."[1]

The year that Benjamin Holme found at Swansea his last bodily resting place, John Griffith and Joshua Toft were among the ranks of travelling Friends. The former recites in his Journal: "The yearly-meetings for the westerly counties being to be held at Coventry, we went thither, in order to attend the same, which began on first-day, the sixth of the sixth month, 1749. The meetings were held in a large town-hall; conveniency being made therein by friends for the purpose; so that one room, which was called the hall, would contain, by computation, not less than a thousand people; and another under the same, roofed, it was supposed would contain above five hundred. We had a pretty large meeting-house besides. There, I think, one or more were all filled at one time. There was indeed a great collection of friends from many parts, and very great flockings in of others, amongst whom there was considerable openness, and their behaviour in general was becoming. The gospel was preached with power, clearness, and good demonstration. I found myself much excused from public service, which I accounted a favour; having greatly to rejoice in the exaltation of truth's testimony, through well qualified instruments, of whom there were a considerable number present, whom I greatly preferred . . . The meeting ended on third-day, to the comfort of friends, and, as far as appeared, to the general satisfaction of others; whose attention to what was delivered, and behaviour to friends in general, was to their honour, and the reputation of the city of Coventry."[2]

The course of the meetings did not run smoothly throughout the period of the existence of the yearly meeting. In 1733 Friends were considering whether, with the completion of the second circuit in Herefordshire that year, the meeting should drop. Wiltshire and Somerset at their summer quarterly meetings appear to have favoured discontinuance. The course of consultations at the Kington meeting was reported in writing to Wiltshire Friends as Henry Sanger was unable to attend the quarterly meeting at Calne on

[1] A collection of the epistles and works of Benjamin Holme (1754), pp. 66-67.

[2] Griffith's *Journal* (1779), pp. 177-78.

September 17. "The counties that were present except two were of the opinion that it (*i.e.* the yearly meeting) had had its Service for the present, but if all did agree to have it another round they were content, but John Galton gave Account that their County of Somerset was not Free, and said Samuel Hopwood did say at their Quarterly Meeting that Cornwall was of the same mind, so that nothing was concluded on whilst I was with them, but I was told they met again and some that was not belonging to the Seven Counties did perswade and some did agree to write to the Seven Counties to prevail with them to continue it."[1] Somerset minutes show that consideration at Kington had been postponed until the ensuing Bristol Yearly Meeting, and in the meantime a committee wrote to all the counties on the subject. Somerset Friends, from being advocates of discontinuance, turned at their spring meeting, and gave answer to this overture: "Our agreement is, to leave the determination of the Affair to you, not desiring its dissolution; and if it should be continued, this Meeting thinks it may be advisable (if possible) to appoint it in places where such Meetings have not been before."[2] Wiltshire is silent on the subject, but notes the receipt of an epistle from the Exeter meeting in 1734,[3] and for that county the chapter closes with a minute at Calne, April 7, 1735: "This Meeting thinks proper to discontinue the Minute at present respecting the joyning in with the other Counties relating to the circular Yearly Meeting."[4] The way was thus cleared for the accession of Warwickshire to the meeting, and the gathering was held at Rugby in that year.

From the list of places[5] it will be noted that the declension of Wiltshire should have placed Somerset in the position of host for 1734, but that spring Somerset made no offer to entertain the meeting. Devon stepped into the breach, and Warwickshire, the newcomers, followed

[1] Letter dated Warminster, September 14, 1733; copy in Wilts Q.M. minutes, Vol. 3, p. 624.

[2] Somerset Q.M. minutes, Vol. C, p. 214; see also *ibid.*, pp. 209, 211.

[3] Presumably inviting the county to continue in the yearly meeting.

[4] Wilts Q.M. minutes, Vol. 4, p. 8; see also p. 4, Chippenham, September 16, 1734.

[5] p. 43.

in 1735; both these counties preceded Somerset in the new rota.

Further doubts of the fruitfulness of the meetings were voiced at various times before the final closure in 1786. For instance, after the meeting at Exeter in 1762, the matter was referred to the counties. Somerset Friends "generally approve of the continuance of such Meetings,"[1] and their view was echoed by all the other counties except Devonshire, which missed the next two turns. In 1786, for the third time in fourteen years the meeting was held at Gloucester and some falling off in the attendance of non-Friends was admitted. No arrangements were made for another yearly meeting. The great silence which descends, unbroken by voice of protest from the constituent counties, and the fact that before the close of the century all these peripatetic yearly meetings had ceased, indicates clearly that their service was over.

The reasons for this may be sought in various quarters. Developing as a suitable outlet for gospel ministry to the people of the county, the meetings ceased to have some of their effectiveness as the Society slipped back into a position of worthy quiescence. The upthrust of Methodism in the middle of the century had robbed Friends of any shreds of radical appeal which might have remained, if only in reflection from their early past. Few signs appear of revival fervour, and the ranks of travelling Friends were thinning too fast as the century wore on for adequate follow-up work to be done by an educated ministry. Without such activity few of the sober audiences at the annual meetings could really be won. Accordingly the groundwork of evangelism was largely wasted.

Secondarily the meetings had been established for the comfort and refreshment of the local ministers, and to provide opportunities for travelling Friends to express their message. This object does not appear to have been happily achieved towards the end of the century, and the journals of concerned ministers express sorrow at the low state of the ministry even in the great gatherings.

In its third aspect the Circular Yearly Meeting probably continued throughout its existence to provide a well-used social opportunity for Friends from scattered country

[1] Somerset Q.M. minutes, Vol. D, p. 88; Glastonbury, March 16, 1763.

districts, and this may have been the guiding consideration which encouraged Friends to continue to hold the meetings nearly to the end of the century. In this sphere the discontinuance of the meetings did leave a gap, only to be filled fifty years later, when the advent of railways made London an easily accessible centre.

The following list of dates of commencement and places of holding the meetings corrects and completes the details given in Brown's *Evesham Friends*, pp. 155-168 :

1720	Sept. 11	Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts.
1721	Sept. 10	Taunton, Som.
1722	Sept. 9	Exeter, Devon.
1723	Sept. 1	Worcester.
1724	Sept. 6	Bodmin, Cornwall.
1725	Sept. 5	Wotton-under-Edge, Glos.
1726	Sept. 11	Hereford.
1727	Sept. 10	Marlborough, Wilts.
1728	Sept. 1	Taunton, Som.
1729	Aug. 31	Barnstaple, Devon.
1730	Aug. 30	Kidderminster, Worcs.
1731	Sept. 5	Bodmin, Cornwall.
1732	Sept. 3	Tetbury, Glos.
1733	Aug. 26	Kington, Herefs.
1734	Sept. 1	Exeter, Devon.
1735	Aug. 31	Rugby, Warws.
1736	Aug. 29	Bruton, Som.
1737	Aug. 28	Tenbury, Worcs.
1738	Sept. 3	Launceston, Cornwall.
1739	Aug. 26	Gloucester.
1740	Aug. 17	Ledbury, Herefs.
1741	Sept. 6	Exeter, Devon.
1742	Aug. 29	Atherstone, Warws.
1743	Aug. 28	Wells, Som.
1744	Sept. 2	Worcester.
1745	Sept. 1	Redruth, Cornwall.
1746	Aug. 31	Minchinhampton, Glos.
1747	Aug. 30	Leominster, Herefs.
1748	Aug. 28	Plymouth, Devon.
1749	Aug. 27	Coventry, Warws.
1750	Aug. 26	Ilchester, Som.
1751	Sept. 1	Bromsgrove, Worcs.
1752	Aug. 2	Truro, Cornwall.
1753	Aug. 26	Coleford, Glos.
1754	Sept. 8	Hereford.
1755	Sept. 7	Tiverton, Devon.
1756	Sept. 5	Warwick.
1757	Sept. 4	Dulverton, Som.
1758	Sept. 10	Kidderminster, Worcs.
1759	Sept. 2	St. Ives, Cornwall.
1760	Sept. 14	Wotton-under-Edge, Glos.
1761	Sept. 6	Bromyard, Herefs.
1762	Sept. 5	Exeter, Devon.
1763	Sept. 4	Stratford-upon-Avon, Warws.
1764	Sept. 16	Crewkerne, Som.

1765	Sept. 1	Stourbridge, Worcs.
1766	Aug. 31	Bodmin, Cornwall.
1767	Sept. 6	Tetbury, Glos.
1768		Ross, Herefs.
1769	Sept. 10	Rugby, Warws.
1770	Sept. 16	Wincanton, Som.
1771	Sept. 15	Evesham, Worcs.
1772	Aug. 16	Helston, Cornwall.
1773	Sept. 19	Gloucester.
1774	Sept. 11	Kington, Herefs.
1775	Sept. 10	Coleshill, Warws.
1776	Sept. 15	Bridgwater, Som.
1777	Sept. 14	Bewdley, Worcs.
1778	Sept. 13	Launceston, Cornwall.
1779	Sept. 19	Gloucester.
1780	Sept. 24	Hereford.
1781	Sept. 16	South Molton, Devon.
1782	Sept. 15	Tamworth, Warws.
1783	Sept. 7	Frome, Som.
1784	Sept. 12	Shipston-on-Stour, Worcs.
1785	Aug. 7	Truro, Cornwall.
1786	Sept. 10	Gloucester.

RUSSELL S. MORTIMER

Quakers' Mount at Bannister Green, Felsted, Essex

IN 1922 the late Charlotte Fell Smith drew my attention to a local tradition among the inhabitants of Bannister Green, Felsted, which designated a certain large mound (shown on the Ordnance Survey map as a possible barrow or burial mound) as the Quakers' Mount.[1] Knowing that seventeenth and eighteenth century parish registers sometimes have notes of Friends' burials, especially in connection with affidavits of burial in woollen, I suggested that the Felsted register might throw light on the tradition. Accordingly, we spent some time inspecting the register, the vicar allowing us to do this at Charlotte Fell Smith's house, which adjoined the vicarage.

We found that entries for Friends began in 1678 with the burial of James Belsham " at the Quakers burying place in Felsted," and continued until 1732. Of the total of thirty-three entries most are entered simply as " amongst the Quakers." Five however are more specific, two stating that burial took place at the " Quakers' Hill," two at the " Quakers' Mount," and one (1732) speaks simply of " the Hill." These entries amply confirmed the local traditional name, and explained the old coffin handles dug up on the site which the Bannister Green blacksmith had shown the vicar some years before.

In Friends' registers there are thirty-eight entries for burials at Felsted from 1657 to 1732, but none of these indicate the position of the burial ground. Twenty-one of these entries are earlier than 1678, and of the remaining seventeen, eight only are included among the thirty-three in the parish register, and the last coincides (except for a discrepancy of two days in the date) with the latest in the parish register, 1732. This means that the parish record includes twenty-five burials omitted from Friends' registers. The mound is only about thirty yards in diameter, and with sixty-three people buried there by 1732 it was obviously

[1] The mound is about one hundred yards distant from the old Felsted meeting house (built in 1687), situated in the hamlet of Bannister Green, a part of Felsted parish, though more than a mile from Felsted village.

time to find another plot, and after that time interments apparently took place at Stebbing Meeting House a few miles away.

At the suggestion of the British Council of Archæology, in 1946, Felsted School Historical Society carried out excavations with the object of determining whether the mound was a barrow. The discoveries were limited to "secondary interments at a depth of 2½ to 5 feet," and a number of seventeenth and eighteenth century iron coffin handles and nails. In the tithe map of 1844 the mound is called a mill mound, the field Mill Field, and the adjacent cottage Mill Cottage. The Society is inclined to regard the original object of the mound to be the provision of a base for a windmill, but as it was in use as a burial place from 1657 to 1732 it seems unlikely that a mill existed there after the first date.

The earliest Felsted burial recorded in Friends' registers is that of Elizabeth Childe, daughter of William Childe, 28.ii.1657. William Childe was the Friend who provided the site for the meeting house, and it seems likely that when his daughter died she was buried at the mound—a convenient site on his own land, and a spot presenting difficulties for tillage—and that he allowed the same place to be used soon afterwards (28.v.1657) when Anne, daughter of Samuel Skillingham, a landless man died. In any case this not infrequently was the origin of the early Friends' burial grounds before the erection of meeting houses with burial grounds attached.

Below are given extracts from Felsted parish register for the burials at Bannister Green which are not recorded in Friends' registers. The typical form of entry is shown in the second record: "Rebecca Bretton buried amongst the Quakers, & affidavit brought ye Seventh day of June to me yt she was buried in Woollen. Tho. Woodrooffe." A later entry reads: "1703, Sept. 8, Affidavit was made yt John Child a little Crooked Quaker was buried in Woollen." According to Friends' registers, "John Childe of Felsted, son of Sarah Childe, was buried at Felsted, 7.vii.1703", the day before the affidavit was taken to the vicar. In 1704 there are two entries; "Aug. ye 3d Affidavit made of ye Wid: Smith a quaker, being buried in woollen," and "Dec. 30 Affidavit made yt Sarah ye Wife of Robert

Tilbrooke was Buried, a Quaker." Although Friends' registers record seven burials at Felsted in the interval, no further parish register entry of a Quaker burial appears until 1732,[1] and this time there is no mention of an affidavit.

Friends Burials at Bannister Green, Felsted, unrecorded in Friends Registers at Friends House, extracted from Felsted parish register.

1678 James Belsham was buried at the Quakers burying place in ffelsted the 23d of September & Affidavit made.

1679 June ye — Rebecca Bretton buried amongst the Quakers & affidavit brought ye Seventh day of June to me yt she was buried in Woollen. Tho. Woodrooffe.

1679 June ye —. Mary Larke of Much Waltham was buried at ffelsteed amongst the Quakers & affidavit brought ye 16 of June to me Tho. Woodrooffe.

1679 August ye —. Samuell Ramsey was buried amongst ye quakers, & affidavit that he was buried in Woollen brought to me ye 21. Tho. Woodroofe.

1679 Jan. ye —. Isaac Cornwell of Much Leez Parish[2] was buried amongst the Quakers at ffelsteed, & Affidavit brought yt he was buried in Woollen. Tho: Woodroofe.

1680 Dec. ye 28. Joshua Dawson was buried in woollen.
It. Sarah Dawson buried in Woollen.
Jan. ye 10th. Simon Bayley of Braintree was buried in Woollen.
These three buried amongst ye Quakers.

1681 May —. Ledee Joslin ye wife of Robert Joslin of Rayne buried at ffelsted among ye Quakers, & Affidavit brought on ye 15th day.

1681 August ye —. John Smith buried among ye Quakers in Woollen & Affidavit brought on ye 10th day.

1681 Jan. —. William Smith buried in Woollen amongst ye Quakers.

1681 Jan. —. Sarah Newman buried in Woollen amongst ye Quakers.

1682 Octob. ye 25. Margaret Bridge Buried in Woollen amongst ye Quakers.

1684 Decembr. the 22th. The Widow Chandler was buried in Woollen among the Quakers.

1685 July the 5th. Samuell Skillingham buried in Woollen among the Quakers.

[1] James Quilter; May 22, 1732. Apparently the Act for burial in woollen, first passed in 1660, and reinforced in 1678 (when the Felsted vicar began to record Friends' burials), had fallen into desuetude, although it remained on the statute book until 1814. Its object had been to help the woollen trade which suffered from competition by linen.

[2] Great Leighs.

1686 Aprill. Elizabeth Petchee buried in Woollen among the Quakers.

1688 May the 22. Affidavit was brought that Thomas Child was buried in Woollen among the Quakers.[1]

1690 May the 8th. John Emson buried in Woollen amongst ye Quakers.

1693 Jan. 2. John Webb of Braintree buried in woollen amongst the Quakers.

1694 Febr. 21. Affidavit made that Joseph Chandler was buried in Woollen amongst the Quakers.

1695 May 6. Affidavit made that Thomas Webb of ye Parish of Braintree was buried in Woollen (sci :) in ye Quakers Hill.

1695 March 14. Affidavit made that Katharine Wilbie was buried in Woollen:—Buried at ye Quakers Mount.

1696 April 23d. Jephthah Childs was buried in Woolen at the Quakers Hill.

1698 July 21. Mary ffoster Buried in Woollen at ye Quakers Mount.

1704 Aug. ye 3d. Affidavit made of ye Wid: Smith a Quaker, being buried in woollen.

C. BRIGHTWEN ROWNTREE

[1] Probably the same Thomas Childe, son of John, buried 11.iii.1688 according to Friends registers.

Quakerism in Friedrichstadt, 1663-1724

The following summary is based on a study and translation of the Friedrichstadt minute books in the Library at Friends House, kindly made by

ANNA CORDER

APART from scattered notices in the journals of travelling Friends little is known of the meetings in Germany which were united on the formation of Amsterdam Yearly Meeting in 1696. This study attempts to fill in the outline for one such group and is largely written in the words of the quarterly and monthly meeting minutes of Friends in the north-west centred on Friedrichstadt in Schleswig-Holstein where a meeting existed for about sixty years.[1]

Friedrichstadt an der Eider itself was not old. Situated at the confluence of the Treene and the Eider, about fifteen miles up-river from the North Sea coast, some eighty miles from Hamburg, it had been founded in 1621 under Duke Frederick III of Schleswig-Holstein-Gottorp by emigrating Arminian Dutch Remonstrants. Travellers thither would come by water from Brunsbüttel, and the comparative ease of sea communications kept alive the original connection of the town (and indeed the whole of this marshy Hansa coast) with the Netherlands. It is not surprising therefore to find most of the Friends had Dutch names and that the meeting minutes were kept in that language.

How Friends started holding meetings in Friedrichstadt is told in these words: "In the spring of 1663 the first Friend who witnessed of the Truth came, and with his son began first-day and fellowship meetings, waiting in silence upon God." After three years their faith was rewarded and "they were gathered three of them together," and a year later "the meeting had been augmented with a few Friends." In 1670 the first Friends from England came "who visited us in the love of God, and in the service of the gospel they declared the Truth, namely

[1] See also the account in W. Hubben, *Die Quäker in der deutschen Vergangenheit* (1929), 102-105.

G.K., F.S. and S.C.,[1] upon which the Truth of God found more entrance in the hearts of some." With the encouragement of William Penn, Friends decided in 1671 to meet morning and afternoon on first-days.

In 1677 when the meeting numbered ten adults, and on the heels of their resolve to "meet monthly on the fifth day, the last week of the month to talk over and arrange things which Friends have in common and concerning the meeting, thereto encouraged by the esteemed G. Fox," "the decision was made to build a meeting place." Before winter the timber had been prepared, and in the spring the building was begun, and the structure completed by seventh month, 1678. "The builder thereof was our dear Friend Hendrik Simons. It cost 2,200 gulden, and Friends each voluntarily contributed to it, and had given besides what they had laid up, namely 1,000 gulden." On the house they borrowed 1,200 gulden from David Louerens at 5 per cent. "In 1682 our dear Friend Wouter Onterloo out of love for the Truth, gave towards it 200 gulden."

The house was probably made of wood, but most likely it had a stone foundation, for the accounts mention payment to a mason and the minutes note a cellar. In 1698 it was insured against fire for 1,200 marks. Not only was it used for meetings, but also as a dwelling and storehouse. Like contemporary Dutch houses the attics were a feature of the place, and "at first Friends decided to reserve the use of the attics and the place under the roof," but later an entry in the Receipts Book notes "Attic rent from a stranger who kept oats there during the winter, 13 gulden."

Meetings were held on the ground floor, and when they were in progress silence was required from Friends renting the upper rooms (the exact number of these is not clear, but at one time front and back rooms were let to different persons). At one time "the living house with attics and garden was let for the sum of 50 gulden, the tenant agreeing to scrub the passage after the meeting alternate weeks or whenever required, and to be a good tenant and

[1] William Ames had visited the town on his continental journey, 1657-58; see W. I. Hull, *The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam*, 1655-1665 (1938), 45. The three Friends mentioned are probably George Keith, perhaps Frances (Swinton) Sonnemans, and Steven Crisp. Crisp was at Friedrichstadt in the summer of 1670; see C. Fell Smith, *Steven Crisp and his correspondents*, 1657-1692 (1892), xxxii.

not sprinkle sand on the floor." One tenant, Antje Jans, received 6 gulden for acting as doorkeeper and caretaker.

How rural the surroundings were may be guessed by the complaints that "Dirk Bauman flings the dung of the cows against the fence of the garden belonging to Friends." After twenty years, when a spiral staircase was inserted, leading up from the kitchen, an alcove bed put in and drainage pipes provided, a door was made leading into this garden and to the "field for bleaching." In 1697, just about this time, Friends bought a piece of land for 182 gulden, for what purpose does not appear. Not for burials certainly, for twelve years later Friends were being recommended to procure a burial ground—interments apparently taking place at the Remonstrant cemetery.

So far as is known this was the only meeting house in north Germany. It later came into possession of English Friends, and according to Professor Schumacher the building was destroyed by the Danes in 1850. Members of the Friends Ambulance Unit failed to find any trace of it there in 1946. Friends sold the property in 1860,[1] but an eighteenth century plan still shows where the "Quaker Saal" once stood.

Considering the opposition to Friends, and their small numbers, one wonders that they built a meeting house. At one time, however, there were sixty members, trusting to enlarge their circle; and too, the town was a centre for Friends who from Bremen, Hamburg and Lübeck met for quarterly meetings. The business transacted was considerable. Care was taken of poor Friends and orphans, of the religious education of children, oversight of marriages and the needs of sufferers at home and abroad. Collections were made for suffering Friends abroad. Correspondence was kept up with England and Amsterdam, and among the letters, copies of Fox's epistles survive.

Visits to Friedrichstadt were probably noted events for Friends, but few details survive. An account is given in Thomas Story's *Journal* of Peter the Great's attendance at meeting when he was in the town.[2] Story relates in detail his own visit, and the private and public meetings arranged for him.[3] He tells how the public, from the magistrates,

[1] *London Yearly Meeting Proceedings*, 1873, 43.
[2] 1712; related by Jacob Hagen; T. Story, *Journal* (1747), 494-5.
[3] Aug. 18-31, 1715; *op. cit.*, 495-500.

chief inhabitants, priests and teachers downwards attended, though largely out of curiosity. In 1715 Thomas Story seemed well satisfied, but after much persecution Friends' life on the continent was in reality on the way to extinction. Gradually monthly meetings fell into abeyance, and in 1725 the last Friend (save for a few older members) left Friedrichstadt and went to live at Amsterdam.

Though in comparison with Danzig, Emden and Hamburg, Friedrichstadt suffered little from heavy persecution, Friends there were nevertheless constantly called before the burgomaster and council, and "told that, unlike the Remonstrants, Lutherans and Catholics, they had no privilege granted them to exercise their religion," but "had stolen in from other places." In 1673 the Duke issued a mandate ordering Friends to leave the town. They were charged with allowing women to preach, "drawing to themselves persons from other religions, truly scandalizing the entire community, and not appearing to be afraid" of any authority. Apart from clerical opposition by the Lutheran pastors, one of the main reasons for the townsfolk's displeasure was Friends' persistence in opening their shops at Christmas and New Year, "so-called feast days." Convicted for this, fines went unpaid and Friends suffered distraint of goods rather than betray their testimony.

After many such proceedings "Friends thought it would be advisable to present themselves before the court, so that it might become acquainted with Friends." Accordingly, on December 19, 1692, Friends Pauwels, Onterloo and de Veer set off for Schleswig. "On the evening of the same day at four o'clock they were received by the Chancellor." At the friendly reception "a simple address to the princely court of Schleswig-Holstein was handed in," but there is no evidence of a reply. Three years later, on the accession of a new Duke, Friends declared: "We the people of the Lord who are called Quakers recognize Frederick our Duke of Schleswig-Holstein[1] as

[1] Frederick IV, son of Christian Albert (d. 1694) and grandson of Frederick III (d. 1659). Frederick IV was killed at Klissow (1702) and his brother, Christian Augustus of Holstein-Euten, Bishop of Lübeck acted as regent until 1718 for Charles Frederick (son of Frederick IV and Hedwig Sophia, daughter of Charles XI of Sweden) who married Anna, daughter of Peter the Great. Their son, Czar Peter III renounced his rights in the Duchies.

our liege sovereign, and promise to be faithful to him." Ten years pass, and after more trouble and threats a petition was sent to the regent Christian August. Upon this Hedwig Sophia and Christian August issued a declaration, dated Hamburg, June 10, 1706, favouring Friends and commanding the burgomaster and council "to stop arbitrary punishment, to treat them well, and to allow them to use their freedom and privileges; that you leave them unmolested, return them their distrained goods and refund them the costs." "Notwithstanding this princely decree to the magistrates here in Friedrichstadt," Friends complain, "the Bailiff Warning has not ceased to trouble us, and fine us." In 1711 they were summoned to appear at the town hall.

In 1724 on like occasion Friends were again called before the magistrate, and when "asked how many Friends we were—we said, over twenty. We were asked if we had a privilege—we said, no." Here the record ends abruptly, and nothing would be known but for the succeeding notes of the Daun von Bockholt family describing how Friends one by one left the town, some for America, some for Holland, some joining the Mennonites and the Lutherans, finally leaving behind only a few old people who remained Friends until death.

After reading of the persecution and tribulation of Friends in Friedrichstadt one is left with the impression that opposition from the authorities did not cause the end of Quakerism there. Once only are the minutes concerned with outward difficulties; more often Friends were exercised to see so few outsiders join them and their own weak spiritual state. From this evidence it seems certain that the decline of Quakerism was due to the fact that the people of Friedrichstadt in particular, and Germany and the Netherlands in general, were not ready to accept the Quaker faith. It may be that now, 250 years later, in this century we may see the full fruition of a continental Quakerism where the seventeenth century could only plant the seed.

Bulgarian Relief Work in the Seventies

UNTIL 1870 various Christian Slavs of the Balkans, such as Bulgars and Serbs, were under the spiritual jurisdiction of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople. In that year, pressed by the Russian government, the Sultan of Turkey, of whose empire they were subjects, recognized the Balkan Slavs as a separate religious community, having a Slav patriarch named the Exarch.

The encouragement this gave to the Bulgars led to an insurrection in April 1876. This was suppressed by the Turks with the accompaniment of fearful atrocities in which sixty or seventy villages were burnt and many thousands of men, women and children massacred in the districts around Tatar Bazarjik in the Maritza valley between Philippopolis and Sofia. After joint demands upon the Sultan by Britain and Russia had been rejected, Russia made war upon Turkey and finally, at the Treaty of Berlin (1878), secured the autonomy of an extended Bulgarian principality within the Turkish empire.

Meanwhile, as the news of the atrocities began to trickle through to England in the summer of 1876, various sections of the community, and among them Friends, were expressing their anxiety about the oppressed races of south-east Europe. John Bright led a deputation to the Foreign Office to urge that England should not uphold, by lack of action, the authority of the Porte, but instead that she should promote a policy of reconciliation between the Sultan and the subject peoples in revolt.

On 1 Sept., 1876 a letter from J. Edmund Clark of York was published in *The Friend*. He wrote: "Are we not bound by the ties of humanity, as well as the duties enforced on us by our religious belief to succour those who are in such distress," and proceeded to point out that despite the difficulties of language, official opposition and risk to life, Friends' former success in France and well-known stand against war would open the hearts of the English to subscribe money and the Turks to admit the workers to this fresh service.

On 18 Sept. in response to a widely expressed desire, a Meeting for Sufferings was especially convened

for the purpose of considering " whether any duty devolves on Friends in reference to the sufferers by war in Servia and Bulgaria." Hesitating to launch out in relief work so soon after the French venture had ended, the Meeting appointed a committee of eleven[1] " to obtain and diffuse information of the subject among Friends, and to advise as to the most reliable channels for distribution. They are also left at liberty to invite subscriptions, to be distributed through such channels as they may consider the most satisfactory."

The first meeting of the committee was held on the day of its appointment, and Gates Darton and Henry Mennell were asked to draw up and distribute to Friends a brief appeal for funds. The committee early received an offer of assistance from James Long, who came with wide experience of the work in France behind him. He was backed by funds raised by a northern relief committee organized in Manchester. Friends however decided to wait. The minute runs : " This committee, while gratefully acknowledging James Long's offer of service, deems it best on the present occasion not to decide on any course of future action but to wait to see what response their appeal meets with from Friends." Nonetheless, should sufficient funds be forthcoming, they would like Long to visit the distressed area to secure co-ordination of the various relief activities.

These other funds were outlined in *The Friend* of 2 October. The chief organizations were :

1. The Bosnian, Herzegovinian and Bulgarian Fugitives and Orphans Relief Fund, which was dealing with refugees on their arrival in Slavonia and Croatia. This work was in the hands of two ladies, Pauline Irby and Priscilla Johnston. They were later at work on the Dalmatian border at Knin. In September 1877 they estimated that more than 250,000 fugitives had crossed the Bosnian and Herzegovinian frontiers into Austria, Servia and Montenegro. Of these, thousands of old people had perished from disease and hunger. The numbers were, however, kept up by new arrivals. These two women were seasoned relief workers,

[1] Stafford Allen, William Allen, Joseph Armfield, William Beck, T. Gates Darton (who acted as clerk), Gray Hester, Henry T. Mennell, C. C. Morland, Edmund Pace, Edmund Sturge, George Sturge.

" to whom thirty miles in a springless cart is nothing of a day's journey." In marked contrast to James Long, they sent vivid reports at frequent intervals to *The Friend* and *The British Friend*. Though they had no official connection with the Society, Friends supported their work to the extent of several thousand pounds by individual gifts and grants from the War Victims Fund.

2. The American evangelical missions in European Turkey had issued an appeal for funds to be administered by the missionaries in their several localities.

3. A journalist in Philippopolis had formed a relief committee consisting of the vice-consuls of several European countries.

4. The Lord Mayor of London had set up a Mansion House Fund which hoped to work through the English consular agencies.

5. Lastly, Lady Strangford was on her way to Bulgaria to direct relief work without a committee.

By early October the response to the appeal was sufficiently large for the War Victims Committee to accept Long's suggestion that he should act as its delegate in Bulgaria, upon his assurance that relief would be given on the same principles as had been adopted by Friends in France six years before. These may be summarized as the assistance of non-combatants according to need, without any regard for creed or race; and the provision of work at reasonable wages so as to avoid the demoralizing effect of almsgiving. The British and French Ministers provided him with full credentials and letters of recommendation, and he left England on 14 October. On arriving in Paris, he telegraphed to the Alsatian refugees living in the settlement of wooden dwellings named La Cité d'Alsace at Belfort, which they had themselves built under the supervision of James Long during his previous relief work.[1] Upon reaching Belfort he found that twenty-five master carpenters had volunteered to accompany him to Bulgaria, and of these he selected six, travelling with them via Vienna to Constantinople.

The speed with which James Long began work was

[1] See *They Chose the Star*, by the present writer, p. 21.

remarkable. He secured a Firman, conferring protection and giving permission to cut timber from the nearest state forest, together with the right to use one locomotive and a steam saw-mill. In addition he was granted free rail transport for men and materials and exemption from customs dues. He rapidly collected a team of workers. Besides the six master carpenters from Alsace, he secured as volunteers a French civil engineer, a railway contractor, a forest inspector and an army surgeon, all formerly in government service at Constantinople. In addition several Bulgarian dragomen served as interpreters. He arranged a concerted scheme of action with the other relief agencies, and after surveying the area of distress, decided to concentrate his efforts in the region of Tatar Bazarjik. Within a month of his leaving England, he was able to report that his organization was already in action. By western standards this would be rapid, but at a time of high political tension in the Balkans such a pace was astounding, and most welcome in view of the approach of winter.

Long's main object was to erect wooden huts or barracks on the sites of the destroyed villages around Tatar Bazarjik as quickly as possible in order to shelter the homeless people. The timber for these dwellings was cut from the forest of Belova situated at the head of the railway running from Constantinople up the valley of the River Maritza, and there the steam saw-mill was erected. The villagers were responsible for transporting the timber from the railway station at Tatar Bazarjik to their former homes, which they accomplished by means of "arabas" or native bullock cart. The Alsatian carpenters proved to be patient and skilful in superintending and instructing the Bulgarian peasants in the work of construction. Some hundreds of men and women were employed for several months at reasonable wages, thus distributing money to the needy whilst fostering feelings of self-respect through the undertaking of socially creative work.

At the end of 1876, after less than two months work, 200 dwellings and 7 schools had been completed, and houses were being erected at the rate of 60 each week. By May 1877 more than 4,750 persons, composing at least 600 families, had been rehoused in dwellings better than those ever before inhabited by the Bulgarian peasant. The

following statistics give some idea of the scope and type of the reconstruction :

18,000 days' work by labourers.
77,000 days' work by carpenters.
8,000 journeys made by arabas and similar vehicles.
80,000 planks sawn.
10,500 beams and rafters cut and squared.
85,000 bricks laid.
118,000 roofing tiles laid.

An interesting record of this extensive building work is contained in *The Graphic* of 17 Feb., 1877, which includes sketches of the dwellings drawn by an artist who attended one of the opening ceremonies, together with the following description :

" The structures certainly show no signs of having been so rapidly run up, but are solidly built, and may with ordinary care last for generations. The buildings at Venis Keni consist of a quadrangle of commodious dwellings constructed in wood, some 50 in number, with a school, playground and teacher's house in front, and cow-houses in the rear . . . The inhabitants will no longer be allowed to house their cattle along with themselves as was their former custom. The houses were inaugurated by the Archimandrite or head of the Bulgarian church ; the service concluding by an address from Mr. Long who presided. The ground on which the several villages have been built has been purchased in perpetuity and duly registered by Mr. Long, whilst a placard is placed on each establishment in Turkish and in Bulgarian stating that the buildings are erected by the benevolence of Great Britain and France combined, and are under the protection of the State. The contrast of these clean dwellings to the dirty hovels which the people inhabited before being made homeless is very great."

William Jones comments further on the provision of separate cow-houses by saying that the Bulgarian peasant had in the past had good reason for not considering his cattle, pigs and other livestock safe, unless they were all huddled into the same dwelling as himself ; but " Thanks to these new buildings, habits of decency will be introduced into these remote mountain villages."

From supplies bought and collected in many parts of Britain, 14,000 sacks of maize, vetches, barley and beans had been distributed by May 1877 to some 9,500 families, and 2,500 families had been supplied with clothing material and blankets. Warm and substantial articles of clothing were greatly appreciated, though a number of the gifts were referred to as being entirely unsuitable. Cloth for making into garments was welcomed, and dark grey blankets were the most prized, in view of the bitter weather and the fact that all the population slept on the ground. In addition to these emergency measures, James Long made one of his principal objects the building of 22 schools. In 4 other villages he established schools in existing premises, and in all 26 made arrangements for elementary teaching to some thousands of children hitherto illiterate.

On the eve of James Long's departure, the committee had decided to look for a suitable colleague to join him in Bulgaria, but his initial success caused them to delay for a time. Within a few months, however, they became anxious on account of the inadequacy of reports from the relief field, due to Long's heavy pressure of work and the difficulty of communications. In November two of his telegrams were so jumbled on arrival as to be meaningless; and in December he stated that he had been without correspondence for a month. The committee was concerned too lest the funds should be benefiting the Turkish authorities, rather than the victims of the atrocities. They therefore approached two of their seasoned 1870 commissioners as to the possibility of their visiting Bulgaria. Thomas Whitwell of Stockton-on-Tees, who was first approached, had only just returned from a business visit to America, and had reluctantly to refuse; but William Jones of Middlesbrough accepted service. He reached Tatar Bazarjik on 3 Feb. and, during the ten days which he spent with Long, was able to satisfy himself that the committee's fears were groundless and that a very worthwhile task was being carried through in face of grave difficulty.

In accomplishing this work during an exceptionally severe winter, and despite much local jealousy and hostility, James Long had seriously impaired his health, though he steadfastly refused to abandon the task. "The first glance

at his worn and emaciated figure at once revealed his suffering condition," wrote William Jones, and added that Long worked nightly on accounts and plans till 4 or 5 a.m., being ready for work again after only two or three hours' sleep. One of Long's rare letters written at this period gives a fuller picture of the strain to which he subjected himself in order to forward the reconstruction :

" I have only just reached this letter after 47 hours' incessant work, 25 of which have been spent on horseback. The circuit of my operations extends now over 90 miles of roadless country, at 10 different points of which I have artisans and labourers (almost entirely indigenes), both male and female, to the number of some hundreds to direct and control. Notwithstanding that my staff are indefatigable in their efforts, I cannot rest satisfied without taking cognisance personally of all that is to be undertaken and of all that has been accomplished. Thank God my strength seems always equal to the occasion though at times wearied and wayworn enough. I cannot quit my post—my lair is the mountains, beneath the shelter of the first hovel that presents itself, at several thousand feet above sea-level and at a temperature frequently of 70 degrees below freezing point."

Throughout James Long treated Mussulmans, Bulgarians and Israelites alike, distributing relief solely according to the degree of misery and misfortune. This attitude was for many months wholly misunderstood, and one of his greatest difficulties was the open or latent opposition of the Turkish authorities who had at the very outset appeared well-disposed. This was largely because the Turks wished it thought that they had repaired everything without external help ; though in fact they had done nothing effective for the area round Tatar Bazarjik, partly on account of the apathy of the Bulgarians themselves. These also took some time before being convinced that Long's real purpose was not that of inducing them to abandon the religion of their ancestors. Once satisfied on this point, they assumed that he would always defend their interests, right or wrong, against the Turk. To prove his impartiality, he included in his reconstruction programme the rebuilding of some burnt houses in Palanka, a purely Turkish village, the dwellings being officially opened by the Naib or chief of the Mussulman

church. Clothing and seeds were similarly distributed to needy Mussulman peasants. The task of holding the balance between Turk and Bulgarian, Greek and Armenian, Jew and Christian, Gipsy pagan and Gipsy Mussulman, had indeed required tremendous tact, but by the spring of 1877, Long was able to report a sudden change from suspicion to appreciation of his relief policy in all quarters. The Turks were at last convinced of the reality of the scheme, and no longer held back from accepting relief. Many petitions to rebuild came in and the work resumed the intense activity of the initial period. Within two months of William Jones' departure, work in six new villages, together with five further schools had been undertaken. Although no precise examples are available of racial opposition to the relief work, it had certainly been intense, for Long ends this report : " Thank God I shall soon *live down*, at least here, the calumny and malice that have hitherto threatened to paralyse my efforts."

In the planning of relief the inadequacy of local communications was a serious problem, not only during the winter when frost and snow isolated many of the villages, but at all seasons. Roads existed only between the largest towns ; the tracks in the mountains were rocky and dangerous ; and in the plains there were frequent quagmires. Those administering the work travelled long distances on horseback over rough paths and insecure wooden bridges. For the official opening ceremony at each village, however, more elaborate arrangements were necessary since the Archimandrite was no horseman, and yet his personal blessing of the dwellings was essential, as it was, in the eyes of the peasants, tantamount to a comprehensive insurance policy. Consequently a number of perilous journeys had to be taken by hill paths in a little carriage pulled by three spirited ponies abreast, and driven by a fatalistic old Turk with a hook in place of one hand. William Jones records the following frightening episode :

" On one occasion the conveyance, with four of us in it, slid down the frozen face of a slope, pushing along the three ponies down the incline towards the precipice at the bottom, the driver meantime pulling them back almost upon their haunches. Before reaching the abyss, the Turk, with marvellous skill, gave his three ponies such a sharp slew

round, that he succeeded in landing them safely on the wooden bridge crossing the adjoining ravine at a sharp angle, and which had no parapets or side rails to it. The centrifugal force of this action flung the outer pony over the edge of the bridge, and left him dangling in his rope harness above the boiling torrent which roared far below . . . The old Turk dismounted, searched under his seat for a large knife, which he stuck between his teeth, stood over the spot where the pony was swinging in the air, and after taking a careful survey of the situation, deliberately cut the ropes, and let the animal fall into the torrent below. I saw the rapid current roll the poor brute over and over, showing the shining plates on his hoofs now and then in the air. (Ponies in Bulgaria are usually shod with a flat plate, in the same way as bullocks, a most unsafe plan during frost and snow.) . . . The Turk now returned to his seat and drove the other two ponies across the bridge. There he stopped, and we all four sat in perfect silence. After a while, to my utter amazement . . . we heard a faint whinnying sound at a considerable distance down the stream . . . In a little while the marvellous little creature, looking like a drowned rat, came trotting towards us, apparently no worse for the rough usage he had undergone . . . Strange to say, we were all so absorbed in our driver's proceedings, that the whole affair was conducted with the silence and decorum of a Friends' meeting."

Throughout the country brigandage was rife. With no bank nearer than Constantinople (2 days' journey away), Long had to keep a considerable sum of money for wages in the house at Tatar Bazarjik. At first he hired armed policemen to guard the house, but in turn found them all trying to rob him, as they were seldom and badly paid by the authorities. After he had lodged several complaints, the Turkish Commandant allowed him the only trustworthy person available, a Turkish soldier, who guarded the head-quarters with fixed bayonet, perhaps to the prejudice of Friends' peace testimony and his protestations against military oppression.

James Long persisted, despite all these obstacles, in his efforts to reconstruct the distressed region. He emphasized that the existing poverty was avoidable, since the soil was fertile, the climate normally temperate, and wood and water

plentiful. The country was however given no opportunity to recover, for Russia declared war on Turkey in April, 1877, and many thousands fled from the path of the contending armies, creating utter chaos, with refugees perishing of famine and cold in large numbers. A panic-stricken mob came from the north into Tatar Bazarjik, stampeded to the station, took possession of a train of empty carriages and stolidly refused to be dislodged. The train was at last compelled to start on its two-day journey to Constantinople. William Jones records that Long was able to secure a place in the last van, and how during the night he saw frozen corpses dropping from the roofs of the carriages into the snow at the side of the track.

So at last, worn-out and ill, he returned temporarily to England. On 7 May, 1877, he met the committee in London, and they reported to Yearly Meeting that his week's rest on the voyage from Constantinople to Marseilles had greatly improved his health, though he still suffered from lameness. The six carpenters of Alsace returned to Belfort at this period, and they received promotion in recognition of their services. A Friend informed the Yearly Meeting that one of these carpenters had brought back with him a Bulgarian orphan, "probably the only survivor from the massacre at Batak." The Russo-Turkish war continued until January, 1878. Nonetheless Long had returned to Bulgaria before August, 1877, for at the beginning of that month T. Gates Darton wrote to him there, expressing Meeting for Sufferings' complete confidence in his discretion, but at the same time urging him to avoid even the appearance of favouring one of the parties, "so that no political aspect whatever should be given to our action."

From this point the record is incomplete. The committee minutes become brief and unrevealing, and most of the available fragmentary details are contained in occasional paragraphs in Friends' journals. In September, 1877, Long was actively engaged in assisting refugees of all classes, travelling from place to place, and living in a carriage that had been placed at his disposal.

With the final rout of the Turkish armies at the turn of the year, the Russians advanced upon Adrianople, and *The Times* of 24 Jan., 1878, reported: "From accounts received from Tatar Bazarjik it is feared that the new

schools and playgrounds have been destroyed by the Turkish troops in their retreat from the Balkans."

The lack of contact between James Long and the committee which had worried Friends at the outset of the work, now became acute. Many relief committees must at different periods have felt out of touch with their field representatives, but one doubts if matters ever reached a more serious state than is revealed in the following minute of 3 May, 1878: "In the absence of any information from James Long, from whom no communication has been received for upwards of 3 months, it is concluded to endeavour to obtain information from the Foreign Office as to his whereabouts." Later in the month, however, James Long wrote to say that the newly-erected buildings had for the most part been saved, though many had been used to quarter troops.

In view of the military developments it is hardly surprising that Yearly Meeting in 1878 was informed that the committee had not appealed for more funds nor sought to extend the work, as Friends were deterred by the speed of military movements during the later period of the struggle, and by the uncertainty which still continued in the whole area. The committee was kept in being in case any opening for further work should arise, and was not finally laid down until Meeting for Sufferings on 7 March, 1879.

As in France, 1870, this Bulgarian relief work was administered without any full-time secretary in London. During the early stages the committee met thrice monthly, and one or other of the members attended at Devonshire House almost daily to acknowledge remittances and deal with current business. It was a task which Friends had been reluctant to take up in view of its complexities and of the activity of other bodies, which, however, assumed that the Society would be taking part, and urged Friends forward in a way which has since been repeated.

The total sum spent by James Long in Bulgaria is not known, but it may be broadly estimated at £30,000, of which Friends contributed about £6,000. The balance of the money came from the relief funds raised in the northern cities.

By May, 1877, Friends had raised about £6,750 of which only £500 was in hand. Yearly Meeting was informed

that Long had still a balance from the subscriptions sent by these other funds, and "there seems no present need to ask Friends for further contributions." In view of his satisfactory financial position on the one hand and the serious disturbances in the Tatar Bazarjik area on the other, the committee diverted the final balances to the Misses Irby and Johnston for their work in Dalmatia.

The last news of James Long is contained in an account in *The Friend* of August, 1878, concerning a deputation from the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, including Edmund Sturge, T. G. Alexander and James Long, which presented a memorial at the Congress of Berlin for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade. In this document emphasis was laid on the slave-trading which continued within the Turkish empire. The delegates stated with regret that no impression had been made upon the official representatives interviewed. They reported, however, receiving a warm welcome from the Crown Prince and Princess,[1] who discussed with them the subjects of war, slavery and liberty of conscience.

WILLIAM K. SESSIONS

[1] Afterwards Frederick III, German Emperor (d. 1888), he had married (1858) Victoria Adelaide Mary Louisa, Princess Royal.

Quaker Education

IN the course of the past five years the Reference Library at Friends House has been enriched by two detailed studies of Quaker education presented for master's degrees in English universities. The first production in order of time was Dorothy G. B. Hubbard's *Early Quaker education, c.* 1650-1780 (University of London, M.A. in Education, 1940, pp. v, 338, typescript), which covers the first half of the period included in L. John Stroud's later thesis *The history of Quaker education in England*, 1647-1903 (University of Leeds, M.Ed., 1944, pp. v, 208, typescript). By the kindness of the author we have also seen a third dissertation, entitled *A critical estimate of the educational theory and practice of the Society of Friends as seen in their schools in England* (1947, pp. ii, 583; xx, typescript), presented by W. A. Campbell Stewart for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of London. This study covers the whole period of Friends' educational activity in monumental fashion.

It is not often that dissertations on the same subject are produced within so short a space of time, but the multitude of facts and local instances collected by Dorothy Hubbard, the clarity of systematic approach in John Stroud's work, and Campbell Stewart's detailed survey of school development in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries give each a value of its own.

All three writers unite in marking down the close of the eighth decade of the eighteenth century as a turning point in Friends' educational activities, conveniently dated by the foundation of Ackworth school. With some pardonable over-simplification, the earlier period is regarded by John Stroud as one of primarily local activity, while from 1779 education became largely a national concern. His first four chapters give a short general survey of the rise and organization of the Society of Friends, a broad survey of the developments in the first half-century, and the later period from about 1695 to the middle of the next century, and a study of early provision for the education of the poor, covering Bellers' schemes and the Workhouse schools. The chapter on the formation of schools for the children

of Friends " not in affluence " is the key to the modern period. It commences with the abortive Meeting for Sufferings report in 1760 and leads on to the foundation of Ackworth and the later schools, with steadily widening curriculum and provision for moral training and leisure activities. The sixth and seventh chapters are devoted to Bootham, the Mount, and Leighton Park, schools serving wealthier Friends in the nineteenth century, and to the industrial and agricultural schools established during that period for the children of non-members. The final summary chapter is preceded by a survey of Friends and adult education, devoted to a summary of early Friends' attitude to the universities, teacher-training, apprenticeship and the Quaker settlement movement, culminating in the establishment of Woodbrooke. The bibliography reveals that reliance has had to be placed on secondary authorities for a large amount of the work, and this, rather than typing errors, probably accounts for uncertainties in emphasis, some confusion of names,[1] and for mis-statements.[2] Nonetheless the author has well brought out the interplay of Friends' ideals and the English environment, and has illustrated with pertinent examples the main guiding forces in educational development during the first two and a half centuries of the Society's history.

Dorothy Hubbard's study covers the first half of this period. The bibliography and the wealth of quotation show how wide is the field to be covered among Friends' manuscripts alone before any satisfactory picture of an aspect of Friends' activity can be obtained. The author sets out " to trace the part taken by Quaker schools and teachers, from the birth of the Society to the founding of Ackworth, in " the general history of the Society. The first chapter on Friends' educational background is followed by a chronological sequence of studies of the earliest schools, early educational policy, the legal struggle for liberty to teach, and the eighteenth century decline. Two chapters on curricula provide illuminating evidence of Friends' reactions to " heathenish books " as well as their readiness to experiment. The final chapters deal with the education of the poor and apprenticeship, education overseas, and the foundation of

[1] *e.g.* Keigh for Keith ; Anderson for Anderdon on p. 19.

[2] *e.g.* The statement that James Logan was an Edinburgh graduate probably arises from a mis-reading of Knight's *History of Sidcot school*, p. 6.

Ackworth. The author attributes the survival of the Society of Friends through the nineteenth century to the revival at the close of the eighteenth which found expression in the foundation of Ackworth and other schools.

The great strength of the third of these dissertations lies in the full treatment Campbell Stewart accords to conditions and development after the foundation of Ackworth, more than 400 pages being devoted to this later period. He commences with a short introduction emphasising the fundamentally independent origin and status of the schools with which he is concerned. The first chapter sets the scene for the first half of the work with an outline of contemporary thought and the political and economic aspects of Puritan belief. This precedes an account of "Quaker beliefs"—perhaps an ill-chosen heading for the passages on the main tenets and characteristics, rounded off by an assessment of Quakerism's political and economic fruits. The two chapters which follow deal with the principles which guided educational enterprise in the first period. Beginning with their suspicion of intellectualism (due, the author thinks, to fear that it might interfere with the direct action of the inner light as much as to the reaction from the emphasis that others placed on it) he shows how the attitude of Friends to the standard curriculum changed—where they did not reject the classical discipline, the variations introduced by their own Latin teachers—the ready acceptance of commercial subjects and the utilitarian outlook which showed most clearly in the education of the poor, as well as the impact of contemporary forces pointing them to experiment. The fourth chapter is concerned with Friends' educational achievement from 1668 to 1779, from the foundation of the Waltham Abbey and Shacklewell schools to that of Ackworth. Next, the chronological account is carried forward into the modern period, and this section serves as prelude to the main contribution to knowledge which this thesis represents. This is embodied in the chapters on "Aspects of the educational provision in Quaker schools during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries," which are based on official reports and personal accounts. The chapters are divided conveniently under the headings of cost, staffing, curriculum, school government, punishment, guarded education and co-education. This section leads on to a similarly-planned

chapter on the schools since 1918, and a general survey in the Conclusion. The arrangement of the bibliography leaves something to be desired, but the chief blemish on the work is a lack of coherent design within the earlier chapters. There is also a certain obscurity of expression which might prevent the general reader from appreciating the true merit of the work. The author has perhaps by the ramifications of his subject been lured into hasty statement[1] which meticulous care alone could have avoided.

These three works show clearly how much farther early Friends went than even the educational reformers of the Commonwealth. The main aim of those men had been limited to the establishment of reading schools for stamping out illiteracy and placing into all men's hands the Bible, the way of salvation. In the grammar no less than in the elementary schools the reformers envisaged great changes, and wished to introduce new subjects into the curriculum, to widen the fields to include the sciences and useful arts. Here progress had been difficult among the established schools, but Friends, sitting loose from tradition, had greater boldness and freedom in planning a curriculum both elementary and secondary, of scope as wide as life itself. The dissenters as a whole probably distrusted education when not related explicitly to religion, and it is all the more noteworthy (however small we may think the result) that Penn should take the desires of children as the starting point in education, and that Fox should declare for teaching "all things useful in creation."

Not all Friends were so broad in opinion; John Bellers, in proposing a school in his college of industry, noted "beyond Reading and Writing, further Learning will not be so useful to most among us as among other people, whilst many of them expect to get their Living by it, as Priests, Lawyers, &c." This utilitarian doctrine, born from economic motives and applied above by Bellers to the poor, was advanced by merchants, manufacturers and the urban middle class generally in a demand for better technical education—a demand which was to grow stronger with the gradual breakdown of the apprenticeship system. This class was one of the seats of the strength of Quakerism from

[1] *e.g.* No evidence is given for the statement on p. 50 that Winstanley became a Quaker.

the beginning, and it is not surprising therefore to trace through Dorothy Hubbard's pages how soon after meeting house premises were obtained, schools were established teaching languages, commerce, technology, navigation and the natural sciences.

Many of the early efforts to found schools were short-lived and spasmodic, but this is attributable to lethargy and insufficient interest rather than to the Ranterism with which Friends were charged more than once. They never believed that God would educate his people without their effort, and the contempt expressed of contemporary academic learning arose because the universities made in the main neither scholars nor good men.

The eighteenth century stagnation of the Society has sometimes been laid at the door of the second generation of schoolmasters—the products of the apprenticeship system, lacking this university training, and content to aim at a sheltered education of modest level. It is interesting to speculate whether, if Friends had had paid ministry, or for some other reason a higher academy had been necessary, the course of the Society's development would have been different, and Friends in that century would have been blessed with a dissenting academy breeding philosophers and scientists alert and ready to mould and direct the inventions of the infant industrial revolution into fruitful and yet happier channels—a labour worthy of the vision of Fox and Penn.

These theses which are before us are in effect surveys of the education of Friends by Friends, and so such a consideration falls outside their scope, yet all point the way for a more interesting and correspondingly difficult assessment of the influence of Friends in the wider sphere of British educational development since the close of the eighteenth century.

RUSSELL S. MORTIMER

Recent Publications

The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience. By Geoffrey F. Nuttall, D.D. Oxford, Blackwell, 1946. Pp. xii, 192. 15s.

In this valuable volume the author gives a balanced view of the place in seventeenth century Puritanism taken by the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and shows the teachings thereupon of the principal religious groups. He quotes from a large number of the religious writers of that day and has made extensive use of early Quaker literature. The book provides a comprehensive account of the doctrinal background of Quakerism and of the spiritual climate in which it arose. Dr. Nuttall shows clearly the connection between early Friends and those in the Puritan movement who were nearest to them. He finds a closer affinity between Quakerism and the more radical Puritans and less with the sixteenth century spiritual reformers in Germany than our historians hitherto have done. This is a notable addition to Quaker historical and expository writing, by a Congregationalist. The author is lecturer in Church History at New College, London.

Gulielma: wife of William Penn. By L. V. Hodgkin. London, Longmans, Green, 1947. Pp. xx, 227. 15s.

In this volume Violet Holdsworth assembles in readable form all the known facts about William Penn's first wife and has contrived a delicately woven fabric of original journals and letters which can be read with interest and pleasure.

In her introduction the author tells how originally she planned to re-tell the tales of the Penns and Peningtons in a new "book of Quaker saints", for an adult audience. The vestigial remains of this plan survive in the division of the book into six approximately equal sections of biography, centred respectively round Mary (Lady Springett), Isaac (Penington), Thomas (Ellwood), Gulielma (Springett), William (Penn), and Guli Penn. In this way the life of the heroine is traced through the doings of her family circle from the wartime winter of 1643 when she first saw light, to her death in that other winter fifty years later, when her husband was under the cloud which had covered him since the flight of James and his province was still in jeopardy.

Even with Henry J. Cadbury's welcome discoveries (given at large in the appendixes to this volume) the documentary material on Gulielma is so slight that the author has wisely approached this "woman of ten thousand" through her circle of family friends.

Although by virtue of this system it is only after eighty pages that officially we come to Gulielma, one never feels that the title is a misrepresentation.

Well-chosen illustrations (the one of Jordans burial ground indirectly resulting in the correction of a century-old error in grave markings) add to the attractiveness of this pleasing book. From it all, it is clear how little direct knowledge we have of the friend who was with Penn in the height of his endeavour and at the nadir of his political fortunes.

Quaker profiles. By Sir George Newman. London, Bannisdale Press, 1946. Pp. 134. 7s. 6d.

Comprises ten studies of George Fox, William Penn, Thomas Hodgkin, and other Friends, mainly reprinted from the *Friends' Quarterly Examiner*.

The Valiant Sixty. By Ernest E. Taylor. London, Bannisdale Press, 1947. Pp. 128. 7s. 6d.

Purists may quibble over the title Ernest Taylor has chosen for this product of his ripe experience and research, but none can fail to appreciate the happy way he has selected from sources to describe some aspects of the beginnings of Quakerism in the high dales of Yorkshire and across the border in Lancashire and Westmorland.

After a description of the coming of Fox to that country and the gathering of the first workers, the author proceeds to give a list of the sixty-six (twelve of them women)—accounted the "first publishers"—who were raised up "and sent abroad out of the North Countries." In describing the economic and social status of these early Friends, the author shows how they were mostly men of the middle sort, yeomen and husbandmen in the villages, craftsmen and shopkeepers in the country towns, "many of them of good capacity, substance and account among men." The information is conveniently tabulated on p. 43 where the men are classed as follows: Gentlemen 2; Yeomen 13; Husbandmen 17; Wage earners 1; Millers 1; Craftsmen and Shopkeepers 8; Schoolmasters 4; Soldiers 2; Other professions 2; Not ascertained 4.

The next chapter is devoted to a more extended study of the labours of Francis Howgill and Edward Burrough as representing the rest. The chapter "Worship and work" tells the story of the circle of Friends who met at Brigflatts near Sedbergh, and the final chapter gives a similar summary for the Craven district of Yorkshire.

There is a full index, and the work is pleasantly produced. It

is useful for the general reader to have these facts brought together in handy form, and will encourage the student to go back to the original sources.

Vida de William Penn. By Agostinho da Silva. Lisbon, 1946. Pp. 116.

A simply written popular Portuguese biography of Penn in the background of his time. There are no acknowledged sources and dates are few and far between. Among the curious errors produced we note Chess for Chester, and Lill for Callowhill. The "portrait in armour" is reproduced as cover illustration.

IN the course of each year various articles in learned and local journals come to hand, and it is earnestly desired that Friends would bring to the notice of the Editor any relevant material which might be overlooked. Among those received at Friends' Reference Library during the past year mention may be made of H. G. Tibbutt's *John Crook*, 1617-1699: *a Bedfordshire Quaker* (Publications of the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society, vol. 25 (1947), pp. 110-128) kindly sent by its author. This sketch supplements A. C. Bickley's short account of Crook in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and gives as connected an account of his life as can now be gleaned from records. It includes anecdotes not previously recorded, and introduces many of the Friends who visited Beckerings Park in the early years. The work is well documented and includes a full bibliography of Crook's works based on Joseph Smith's *Descriptive Catalogue*, and the British Museum catalogue.

James Lomax has sent a copy of his article, *The Early Organization of the Quakers in Nottinghamshire* (Reprinted from *The Thoroton Transactions*, vol. 48 (1944), pp. 12, 2 plates). For this brief study of the first 150 years of Friends' work in Nottinghamshire the author has used the meeting records to good purpose, and introduces sufficient concrete examples effectively to demonstrate his points. The line-map is useful.

The publications of the Essex Record Office are always worth seeing, and any work from one on the staff is deserving of notice. Felix Hull, Assistant Archivist in that Office has used the Visitation Books of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex Jurisdiction in Essex covering the years 1662-1689 as basis for an interesting survey of *Early Friends in Central and Northern Essex* (in *The Essex review*, vol. 56 (April 1947), pp. 64-72). The work is necessarily incomplete as representing one side only of the picture, but the facts here collected provide interesting reading and valuable material for the study of

Essex Quakerism. The copy at Friends House Library is supplemented by a map in MS. both the gift of the author. Local civil and ecclesiastical records have been neglected by Friends, but on occasion they provide a valuable check on details in Besse's *Sufferings*, as well as much new material.

FRIENDS are frequently mentioned in volumes which never normally come to the notice of the Friends' Historical Society, and here local members may be of assistance in giving information concerning books and what they contain.

To this point there is an example in R. C. Latham's edition of *Bristol charters*, 1509-1899 (Bristol Record Society's Publications. vol. 12, 1947). In the course of a valuable introduction on Restoration local politics there is a note (p. 54, note 7) how the corporation raised money in 1685 and 1686 by electing eleven Friends to the Council and fining them heavily for refusing the oaths of office. In fact the note should be corrected, for not all those elected were Friends—but some belonged to other dissenting bodies.

A history of the English Baptists, by Alfred Charles Underwood (London, Kingsgate Press, 1947, pp. 286. 12s. 6d.) provides various references to Friends, and one we have not previously met. In commenting (p. 132) on the good work of the London meeting of ministers which was established in 1714 and met at the Hanover Coffee House, the author states: "It declined a request from the Baptists of Burton, Northamptonshire, to send a learned minister to state the Baptist case in a public disputation with the Quakers. It advised both parties to seek 'other methods which will be less offensive, and more informing to those who are in search of the truth.'"

Biographical notices of printers and publishers of Friends' books up to 1750: a supplement to Plomer's "Dictionary": by R. S. Mortimer. (In *The Journal of Documentation*, vol. 3, no. 2 (September, 1947), pp. 107-125; Aslib (Association of Special Libraries and Information Bureaux), London. 7s. 6d. or $1.75.)

This article comprises a list of almost three hundred entries (excluding cross references) of names or initials which appear in the imprints on Friends' books during the first century of their activity.

The notices are intended to supplement the Bibliographical Society's series of *Dictionaries* of printers and publishers, by H. R. Plomer, hence the alphabetical rather than chronological arrangement, and (in place of repetition) the references to that work for further information. In the main, notes are confined to imprint changes, the dates at which each appear, and some short indication of the main type of work each person undertook. The value of the list for those interested in the history of printing is clear from the fact that over eighty of the names are not in Plomer, and additional information of significance has been provided for sixty

more. The value to Friends is not only for these new facts brought to light, but in the provision of a catalogue from the evidence of imprints of all the avowed Friends' printers and publishers of the period. There is a useful index for provincial publishers.

An error which should not be allowed to go uncorrected is the attribution to Penn of *The Spiritual Bee*, of which the edition of 1667 is quoted (*vide* Smith's *Catalogue*, vol. 2, p. 282). This was almost certainly written by Nicholas Horsman the Oxford divine, and is not a Friends' item—although the *Extracts from the Spiritual Bee*, with preface by Luke Howard, published by William Phillips in 1823, can be so distinguished.

The wide field to be covered and the incompleteness of present information is obvious from the nature of the notes. Moreover, the names given here are but a sample of the whole number of persons concerned with the production and sale of Friends' books (*e.g.* of the forty-four names given in the list of *Dispersers of Quaker Books* (1664?), printed in *Extracts from State Papers*, Supplements 8 to 11 of this Journal, edited by Norman Penney, pp. 228-29, only two appear in this list). Nevertheless this article provides basic material for any extended survey of Friends' printers which may be undertaken.

Antinomianism in the period of English history, 1640-1660. By Gertrud Hühns. (University of London, Ph.D. thesis, 1947, pp. ii, 226, 15, typescript.)

This thesis is concerned with the political influence of a search for spiritual truth. The author finds the dominant characteristic of antinomianism in assertion of the absolute significance of human behaviour.

From an account of European developments in antinomianism to the time of Calvin, the author proceeds with studies of early seventeenth century thought in England, the rapid growth of antinomianism in the Parliamentary armies, the reaction at the close of the war, and the Millenarian development. Next comes a chapter entitled "Dissolution and end: the Quakers" (pp. 176-192), which is followed by a final chapter on New England, and the conclusion.

The chapter on Friends shows familiarity with contemporary literature and secondary sources. Points of similarity and difference between Friends and the antinomians are well brought out —as, the parallel beliefs in enlightment and rebirth; Fox's decision to preach Truth rather than be a physician to heal bodies—the author contends that if an antinomian he would have tried both. In giving extended treatment to James Nayler (spelt Naylor) the author points out the similarity of the effect of the Nayler episode in Quakerism to that of the Fifth Monarchy fiasco in the country at large—both hastening the establishment of tradition and strengthening the forces of law and order. The alteration to quietism in the attitude of Nayler himself is well brought out—from the militant attitude that having seen the light he could not be silent, to the quietistic acceptance, and commiseration with

persecutors—the " heart blind " who cannot discern the way. The Wilkinson-Story controversy is seen as the final fling of the irresponsibles, when Friends were finding the unity of the will of God in the unanimity of the organized meeting.

The author's touch sometimes fails because variations and changes in Quaker thought which occurred even within the first decade of the movement are not always appreciated. Thus the survey of Friends' attitude to government is incomplete : their view was not wholly negative, acquiescent because government was needed to suppress evil-doing, but reaching out through Audland's phrase : " godly Magistrates I own, and honor in the Lord " (*Schoolmaster disciplin'd*, 1) to active support of good government.

The work would benefit from improved planning and is marred by infelicities of expression.

The first Triple Alliance : the letters of Christopher Lindenov, Danish Envoy to London, 1668-1672. Translated and edited with an historical introduction by Waldemar Westergaard. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1947. Pp. lxxviii, 528. $6.

SOME material for Friends' history scattered in British archives has been collected in *Extracts from State Papers*, edited by Norman Penney. Yet more is available in the calendar series issued by the Public Record Office, but even in foreign archives some information is to be found. Some of this has come to light in the publication this year of Lindenov's letters from the Danish Rigsarkiv. There are references to Friends' obstinacy in meeting despite the Conventicle Acts, but the chief interest is to be found in the news of Penn's imprisonment in December, 1668, for the authorship of *The Sandy Foundation Shaken*, and how, when he was taken " another and different piece of writing containing six or seven remarkable propositions against the English church fell out of his pockets " (p. xxxvi).

Some salient extracts follow :

Lindenov to the Danish Chancery
London, December 10, 1668

p. 54 . . . Sir William Penn, son of one of the lords of the admiralty, has had printed during these days a quite ungodly and blasphemous *scriptum*, in which he questions the Holy Trinity. For this the printer has been put in irons and in prison, while he, the author of the book, has gone into retirement. The Quakers and fanatics have for some time been quite insolent, particularly in Newcastle . . .

Lindenov to the Danish Chancery
London, December 14, 1668

p. 56 . . . William Penn, who is the author of the blasphemous *scriptum* against the Holy Spirit as well as the Holy Trinity, was seized yesterday and put in prison.
(warrant Dec. 12. Calendar S.P.D. 1668-69, 98)

Lindenov to the Danish Chancery
London, December 22, 1668

p. 60 . . . At the time that William Penn was put in prison for impious authorship, another and different piece of writing[1] containing six or seven remarkable propositions against the English church fell out of his pockets; and it has been resolved in council that he is to be closely examined concerning these papers . . .

[1] Penn's first work was *Truth Exalted*, the second *The Sandy Foundation Shaken*, both printed in 1668. The latter caused his imprisonment in the Tower. See Pepys, VIII, 227n.

Periodicals Exchanged

Receipt of the following periodicals is gratefully acknowledged :—

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

Index

Passed for Press 8.xii.47

SUPPLEMENTS TO THE JOURNAL OF FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

1-5. FIRST PUBLISHERS OF TRUTH. The seventeenth century narratives of the spreading of Quakerism. Out of print.

6. JOHN AP JOHN and early Friends in Wales. Out of print.

7. THOMAS POLE, M.D. (1753-1829). Out of print.

8-11. EXTRACTS FROM STATE PAPERS relating to Friends, 1654-1672. Important collection from the Public Record Office. 365 pp., 7s. 6d., post 6d.

12. ELIZABETH HOOTON (1600-1672), First Quaker woman preacher and a pioneer of Quakerism in America. 95 pp., illus., 2s. 3d., post 4d.

13. TORTOLA. By Charles F. Jenkins. Out of print.

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

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

16-17. PEN PICTURES OF LONDON YEARLY MEETING, 1789-1833. Edited by Norman Penney, F.S.A. Discipline, relations with American Quakerism, philanthropic enterprise, social life. 227 pp., two parts, price 10s., post 6d.

18. PSYCHICAL EXPERIENCES OF QUAKER MINISTERS. By John William Graham. Out of print.

19. THE LONDON (QUAKER) LEAD COMPANY 1692-1905. By Arthur Raistrick, M.Sc. The Social Policy and work of the company. 1938. 152 pp., illus., 6s., post 5d., price to members 4s. 6d.

20. THE SWARTHMORE DOCUMENTS IN AMERICA. Edited by Henry J. Cadbury, Ph.D. 1940. 90 pp. Texts, or reference if previously printed, of 35 seventeenth century MSS., originally in the Swarthmore Hall collection. 5s., post 2½d.

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

Objections

OVER-RULED!

I may not be
able to pay my
premiums

*

I cannot foresee
the future

*

I may want
different benefits

*

A good many people hesitate to take out a life policy because they cannot see ahead. They are afraid that circumstances may change. Their income may go down ! They may not be able to pay the premiums ! For such people the Friends' Provident and Century Life Office has devised a Ten Year Option Policy, the elastic nature of which provides a happy solution for the men whose requirements for the future cannot be foretold. Write for our leaflet in which this Option Policy is fully explained and practical examples given.

All other classes of Insurance, including House Purchase, Hire Purchase, Usual Contingency Risks and Continuous Disability are dealt with by the Century Insurance Company Limited (the whole of whose share capital is held by the Friends' Provident and Century Life Office).

THE FRIENDS' PROVIDENT AND CENTURY INSURANCE OFFICES

Aggregate Funds exceed £25,000,000

HEAD OFFICES :

7 Leadenhall St., London, E.C.3 18 Charlotte Sq., Edinburgh, 2