

The Journal
of the
Friends' Historical
Society

VOLUME 50

NUMBER 1

SPRING 1962

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

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

also obtainable at Friends Book Store :

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

Price 5s. Yearly 10s.

Contents

	PAGE
Editorial	I
The Friends' Meeting House. <i>Hubert Lidbetter</i> (Book Notice)	3
Shadows of Boston Gallows. <i>Henry J. Cadbury</i> ..	4
Accounts	8
The Grave of William Penn. <i>Jack Caudle</i>	9
George Fox to Margaret Fox: More Swarthmore Documents in America. <i>Henry J. Cadbury</i>	14
Some Quaker Firms of the Nineteenth Century: II. <i>William H. Marwick</i>	17
Recent Publications	36 and 43
Imprisonment upon a Praemunire: George Fox's Last Trial. <i>Alfred W. Braithwaite</i>	37
A "Guarded" Education, and "Evangelical" Christianity: Two letters from John Eliot Hodgkin, 1907	44
Notes and Queries	48

Friends' Historical Society

President: 1961—Maurice A. Creasey
1962—Margaret M. Harvey

Chairman: Elfrida Vipont Foulds

Secretary: Edward H. Milligan

Joint Alfred W. Braithwaite and
Editors: Russell S. Mortimer

The Membership Subscription is 10s. per annum (£10 Life Membership). Subscriptions should be paid to the Secretary, c/o The Library, Friends House, Euston Road, London N.W.1.

Vol. 50

No. 1

Spring, 1962

THE JOURNAL
OF THE
FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

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

Communications should be addressed to the Editors at
Friends House.

Editorial

MAURICE CREASEY'S Presidential Address to the Friends' Historical Society for 1961 was delivered at Friends House last October. It has been printed under the title "Inward and Outward: a study of early Quaker language" and will be in members' hands by the time they read these words. Additional copies are on sale at the published price of 3s. 6d. Margaret Harvey's Presidential Address for 1962, is entitled "Four Quaker rebels"; the date for its delivery has been fixed at October 4th next.

On Thursday evening, 1st March, 1962, the spring meeting of the Society was largely occupied by readings of three delightful essays by the late Roger Clark (1871-1961) who through his long and active life was a firm friend to many movements for educational and social advancement, and active in cultural and historical institutions and societies in Street, in Somerset, and in the West of England at large. He was also a devoted member of the Friends' Historical Society. The old Meeting House property at Claverham, Somerset, which was one of his special interests, was at one time held under the supervision of the Friends' Historical Society, although the supervision is now, more suitably, undertaken by the Quarterly Meeting.

Ten years ago, Friends commemorated events in the North-West of England, about Swarthmoor and elsewhere, which marked the early development in 1652 of the movement which is known today as the Society of Friends. A

decade later, 1962 sees us moving into a more sombre period when looking back over the span of three hundred years, for the Quaker Act (St. 13 and 14 Car. II, cap. 1) heralded nearly a quarter of a century of persecution which lasted into the reign of James II. But 1662 is an important date in other religious fields too. The Church of England, restored after the Interregnum, revised the Book of Common Prayer in 1662; and the Act of Uniformity, with the ejection of the non-conforming ministers from their livings, marked the beginning of organized continuous life of the free churches outside the established church.

As part of the commemoration of these events, Geoffrey F. Nuttall has edited a checklist of works dealing with the period. It is published as *The Beginnings of Nonconformity, 1660-1665* (obtainable from Dr. Williams's Library, Gordon Square, London, price £1), and includes an appendix listing the Quaker and anti-Quaker items for the years covered.

The Friends' Historical Society is most grateful to Geoffrey Nuttall for his counsel and advice which it has been able to call on during the last ten years when he has been chairman of the Executive Committee. The new chairman is Elfrida Vipont Foulds. Geoffrey Nuttall, we are glad to say, is remaining a member of the Committee.

Among the articles included in this number are two from Henry J. Cadbury, including a further instalment of "Swarthmore Documents in America" (a second addition to the collection since the original volume published as Supplement no. 20 to this *Journal* in 1940). Also of American interest is Jack Caudle's discussion of the site of William Penn's grave at Jordans; the plan reprinted, and the author's account, makes it difficult to avoid the conclusion that the present position of the headstone does not mark the Founder's grave.

William H. Marwick continues his account of 19th-century Quaker firms (see *Journal*, vol. 48 (1958), pp. 239-259) with a study of the commercial and industrial activities of the families of Pease, Backhouse, Priestman, Christy, Edmundson and Pim.

Two letters from J. Eliot Hodgkin to Theodore Compton, now in the University Library, Leeds, throw interesting

light on the continued existence of the old "traditional Quakerism" during the Evangelical period of last century (even though, in this case, the writer does not seem to have continued in membership), and illustrate rebellion against guarded education.

The Friends' Meeting House

The Friends' Meeting House: an historical survey of the places of worship of the Society of Friends (Quakers), from the days of their founder George Fox, in the 17th century, to the present day. By Hubert Lidbetter, F.R.I.B.A., pp. xvi, 84; 72 plates, 47 plans and elevations. York, William Sessions Limited. 1961. 35s.

"This is not a book written particularly for Friends or Architects, but it is hoped that it may be of interest to all who are either architecturally or friendly inclined—or both, or even to those who are neither. It is merely a record of what Sir John Summerson has called 'buildings of endearing simplicity.' "

Hubert Lidbetter, having disarmed criticism by this opening paragraph, proceeds to give us what is the best of all books, one written by an expert who not only knows but loves his subject. The illustrations, both photographs and plans, are delightful in themselves, and are admirably designed to bring out the points made. This is a book to be turned to again and again, for information and pleasure.

In this *Journal*, perhaps we may be forgiven for pointing out two historical errors. Hubert Lidbetter refers (p. 6) to "the meeting in the Gracechurch Street Tavern at 'The Bull and Mouth,' " but this is a confusion between two London meeting houses. The Gracechurch Street Meeting House was built on the *site* of the White Hart Inn, which had been destroyed in the Great Fire. The 'Bull and Mouth' was in Aldersgate, and was originally part of a large house of which the other part had been made into an inn.

Similarly, on page 37, it is not correct to say that the first *Westminster* Meeting House was at 12 St. Martin's Lane, opposite the present meeting house. Meetings had previously been held at other places in Westminster, particularly at the "Little Almonry", near the Abbey.

(These particulars have been kindly supplied by George W. Edwards.)

Shadows of Boston Gallows

MANY of us in America, in connection with the Tercentenary in 1961 of the first known General Meeting of Friends in New England, have been hearing or reading again about those early days. Though the extant minutes begin only later, this is certainly the Yearly Meeting of the longest continuous history. The year 1661 marks also the last of the Quaker hangings. They were stopped partly by local public opinion, partly by royal prohibition from Old England, though other forms of persecution continued, as it did in England. Mary Hoxie Jones in her new book, *The Standard of the Lord Lifted Up*,¹ has given the high lights of the history down to 1700. I may therefore, while the memory is fresh, present as footnotes a few bits of information, quite new to me, though easily accessible, which I have gleaned of late—too late to be used otherwise.

They have come chiefly from two sources. One is the Journals of later Friends, mostly collected in fourteen volumes in *Friends Library*,² and now conveniently indexed by Pendle Hill. The other is the registers of marriages and of births and deaths of Rhode Island Monthly Meeting. A few weeks after Fox's visit in 1672 two books were bought for this purpose³ and entries made, some of them for the preceding thirty years. They have been re-arranged and transposed to modern and non-Quaker calendar and printed by at least two removes (I hope accurately) in James N. Arnold's *Vital Records of Rhode Island*.⁴ For example, they include the deaths at Boston of the four Friends hanged, though the date given for the first two is 20th October, 1659, the date of their sentence, instead of 27th October, when they were executed. This error could easily have been made by misreading the primary printed source, George Bishop's *New*

¹ *The Standard of the Lord Lifted Up*. A history of Friends in New England from 1656-1700, commemorating the first Yearly Meeting held in 1661. By Mary Hoxie Jones. Foreword by Henry J. Cadbury. Privately printed under the auspices of New England Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1961, xiv, 161, map.

² Philadelphia: printed by Joseph Rakestraw, 1837-1850.

³ *Bulletin of Friends Historical Society*, i, 1906, p. 56.

⁴ Vol. 7, *Friends and Ministers*, Providence, R.I., 1895.

England Judged, 1661. Evidently these registers have not been employed to the extent to which English records of the same sort have been used by Norman Penney and other Quaker historical editors. The addenda here given deal with echoes of the Boston martyrs or survivors of the like persecution.

John Taylor's Journal is often quoted where he describes having met Mary Dyer at Shelter Island shortly before her execution: "She was a comely woman and a grave matron, and even shined in the image of God." Now John Richardson's Journal supplies for another of the four martyrs a somewhat different testimonial, perhaps less to our taste. Once as a lad, when he was arguing with his anti-Quaker stepfather, Richardson mentioned these martyrs, and his mother to his surprise reported that

she lived a servant with Edward Wilberforce an honest Quaker in Skipton where Marmaduke Stephenson was a day laborer about the time he had his call to go to New England. . . . She said he was such a man as she never knew, for his very countenance was a terror to them, and he had a great check upon all the family: if at any time any of the servants had been wild, or any way out of the Truth, if they did but see him, or hear him coming, they were struck with fear and were all quiet and still. And if but one of the children came into the house where he labored, and he would not have it to come, these were his words, "Go thy way" or "go home lest I whip thee," and they were subject and quiet.

Evidently this testimonial "had some reach" on the poor boy's unfriendly step-parent.

Sometimes the echoes are far removed in time and place, as when in 1797 William Savery in the Channel Island of Jersey found several descendants of Mary Dyer living there, including an elderly "grand-daughter." We had known that in 1740 the Massachusetts legislature wished to make amends to such descendants as could be found,¹ and we are told (perhaps by Thomas Shillitoe) that her grandson, Samuel Dyer, was living then on her former farm at Newport.² Joan Vokins, at a Friends' meeting in Boston in 1680, says, "There was a lawyer that had a hand in the suffering of our Friends that were put to death, and he was very solid all the while." Thomas Chalkley on the other hand in 1698 was greeted in Boston with the remark, "Oh what pity it was that

¹ *Friends Intelligencer*, 29.iv.1945, vol. 102, p. 69.

² *Journal F.H.S.*, xiv (1917), 43.

all of your Society (MS: 'all the Quakers') were not hanged with the other four."

Prior to the hanging of Friends the extreme punishment in Boston had been cropping an ear. Forty years later at Chuckatuck, Virginia, Thomas Story says he met "our ancient Friend, John Copeland," and found he was "one of the first of those who had their ears cut . . . in New England for the testimony of Truth, in the first publishing thereof . . . and at my request he showed me his right ear."

Of the many Friends in prison and sentenced to execution but released in 1661 we have scattered information. Wenlock Christison would have been the next to die. As Rufus Jones says, he "had sat in the shadow of Boston gallows." He turns up later a respected and well-provided citizen and Friend on the eastern shore of Maryland. Another, Elizabeth Hooton of Skegby, an early convert of George Fox, is well known. After repeated later visits to Boston she travelled with Fox to the West Indies and died "like a lamb" in Jamaica.

Many other names either of Quaker missionaries or of converts can be partly traced. Some unhappily "lost their condition" as Fox would say, and became apostates or worse. Some died untimely. Several of them apparently drowned in American waters, thus reversing the proverb to read: "he that's born to be drowned will never be hanged." Others lived on as faithful workers, and, again in Fox's words, "died in the Truth." Joseph¹ and Jane Nicholson were one of the few English couples who travelled together in the ministry while having a family. One can trace their travels by the dated register of births already mentioned, for their children's birthplaces are successively England, Salem, Barbados, Martinique, Rhode Island. Robert Malins of Bandon, Ireland, and Ann Clayton, of Swarthmoor Hall, had come to America in the same party as Marmaduke Stephenson. From the record of Rhode Island marriages we learn that each of them married into the Newport Quaker family of Easton, one to Patience Easton in 1674, the other to Governor Nicholas Easton in 1671.

We learn from the Death Registers that Alice Cowland died in 1666, Nicholas Davis was drowned in 1672, Ann Bull, *née* Clayton, widow of two Rhode Island governors, died in

¹ See his letters to Margaret Fell, Nuttall, *Early Quaker letters*, no. 520, 536, and M. R. Brailsford, *Quaker Women*, Chap. 7.

1708, aged 80 years. Katharine Scott, wife of Richard Scott and sister of Anne Hutchinson, and perhaps the first Quaker of Rhode Island, died 2nd May, 1687, aged 70. Her daughters, Mary and Patience, remarkable women, married Friends in the early 60's and long predeceased her.

Perhaps the longest to survive was Daniel Gould, a fellow prisoner with the first Friends hanged. Forty years later he was entrusted with the task of collecting for publication all the papers from them that he could find. These were published about 1700: *A Brief Narrative*, etc. In 1704 Thomas Story, according to his Journal, visited him, "an ancient Friend of the primitive sort, beaten gold, well refined, having been persecuted in times past by the Presbyterians and Independents of New England and now confined by lameness and other infirmities of age." According to the register he died at Newport, 26th March, 1716, aged near 90 years. In the same year on 16th December, died Edward Wanton of Scituate, aged about 87 years. The register records: "He was among the first who embraced Friends' principles in New England, was a sheriff in Boston when Mary Dyer was hanged, and convinced while under the gallows with her, and afterwards became a minister in the Society and suffered much for the testimony of Truth."

Particular interest attaches to George Rofe and his two companions. He writes that it was they who had called the General Meeting in Rhode Island of 1661. They had travelled in a fourteen-foot canoe from Chesapeake Bay where a few years later George was drowned. In fact they were capsized and nearly drowned as they approached Rhode Island. I believe I have identified the other two correctly as Robert Stage and Robert Hodgson and have connected the former with a sufferer in Maryland.¹ His name is given also as Stake, Stack and perhaps Stoake. The latter "was one of the famous Quaker Argonauts who sailed to America on the ship *Woodhouse* in 1657." Now I have further word about each. Henry Fell wrote in 1666 from Barbados to Margaret Fell,² "I suppose thee have heard of J. P. [John Perrot's] death at Jamaica before this time. Here is one R. Stacke now in the island who came hither lately from Virginia. His work is like the former and [his] end will be the same." This is an

¹ *Friends Intelligencer*, 22.viii, 1953, vol. 110, p. 455.

Barbados, 20.iv.1666, Thirnbeck MSS. 4, *Journal F.H.S.*, ix (1912), 95.

The Grave of William Penn

Some Problems of History

IN the course of every year thousands of visitors, from all walks of life and from all parts of the world, make their way to Jordans, Bucks., with its charming Meeting House, built 1688, and simple Quaker burial ground where William Penn, most of his family and the Peningtons and Ellwoods lie buried in a truly sylvan setting. Because of this width of contact between Quakerism and the outside world, Jordans is unique.

When the present writer became Warden of the Meeting House in 1957, the thing which struck him was the sparsity of evidence that the group of 12 headstones in the Old graveyard mark the actual spot where the bodies were interred. Many Friends will know that between 1766 and 1850 grave-stones were definitely, as well as "officially," taboo in Quaker grounds, and existing ones were removed. The present stones at Jordans were set up in 1862-3, and an inquiry into the reasons for their being placed in their present position has led the writer on a far more complex, adventurous and interesting journey than he could have imagined.

In M.M. minutes for July, 1862, we read:

The subject of placing gravestones over such of the graves at Jordans, whose identity has been ascertained, has been before us at this time. This Meeting appoints John Huntley, Daniel Norris and Richard Littleboy to confer together thereon, and to report to this Meeting as to the best course to be pursued.

Except for "the Minute is continued," it is not until June, 1863, that we hear anything more, when we read: "Report is made that the Gravestones are placed in the Jordans Burial Ground. The Minute is continued in order that a slight alteration may be made in two of them." So much for this committee reporting to M.M. "as to the best course to be pursued!"

The minute "is continued" for a few more months, after which nothing more is heard of it. It was not until 1895 that, at the instigation of a local Congregational minister, anything in the way of "slight alteration" to the stones was carried out, when the stone marked John Pennington was replaced

by John Penn, Mary Frame by Margaret Frame (it should be Freame) and Joseph Rule's date altered from 1765 to 1770. William Penn's first wife's stone bore the wrong date till 1952, when, after fruitless agitation for years by Arthur Hayward, Henry J. Cadbury, with difficulty, managed to get our M.M. to admit that it was wrong.¹

The writer believes, however, that a bigger muddle still was made when those stones were set up. He has reluctantly—very reluctantly—come to the conclusion that William Penn was not buried in the spot marked by the stone, but a few feet West of this, though exactly where he would not care to say.

His suspicions were first aroused by a visit of one of the Steevens family, who are descended from the Butterfields. Though still very sympathetic, the Steevens were disowned in Victorian times for marrying out. A Miss Steevens in 1911 gave to Devonshire House the Diary of Rebekah Butterfield on which so much Jordans history is based. Of Prince Butterfield we shall hear in a moment. My visitor told me that when a young man he visited Jordans with a great-uncle who said to him "William Penn isn't really buried under that stone, he's buried out there," pointing to the two sizeable flattish humps about half-way across the ground.

Words occurring in W. H. Summers: *Memories of Jordans and the Chalfonts* (1895), p. 257, are, the writer feels, significant: "the belief [is] still prevalent in the neighbourhood, that William Penn's stone was put on the wrong grave."

Throughout the nineteenth century there were no Quakers living in the district, no regular Meeting for Worship, no telephones, no railway, no tarmac roads or fast cars. Also the grounds were very unkempt. All sorts of things could have happened in that age, which was an uncritical one anyway. Howard Jenkins, in his *Family of William Penn* (1899), page 64, says that the stones were set up by the Founder's great-grandson, and there is other evidence, did space permit, to support this. Certainly, judging by minutes already quoted, it does not seem that Monthly Meeting had much to do with the actual putting of them up.

¹ Readers may care to compare the woodcut in Maria Webb's *Penns and Peningtons* with illustrations in later works, e.g. J. W. Graham's *William Penn* and L. V. Hodgkin's *Gulielma*.

Richard Littleboy, M.M. Clerk, writing 19 years later, does not sound happy about it. He says:

For more than a century a rough plan of the graveyard was the only available clue to the spot where the remains of William Penn and his family were laid. Guided by this plan, about 20 years ago, small headstones were placed over existing mounds, but it is more than doubtful whether they indicate in each case the exact spot of interment.¹

Which hardly ties up with "whose identity has been ascertained" of the M.M. minutes.

The "rough plan" mentioned by Richard Littleboy is, the writer believes, the one that is in the scrapbook of a Jordans member, Elizabeth Sparkes, hereafter referred to as the Sparkes plan. The earliest owner I have so far traced is the late Joshua Lamb of Sibford, who had it in 1936, probably because such things interested him. The reasons for believing that this is the plan referred to are these:

1. Wilson Armistead, to be referred to later, mentions a plan being kept at Jordans Meeting House.

2. The plan is certainly "rough." It is hopelessly out of proportion.

3. The *relationship* of the graves to each other is approximately the same as the present stones.

4. It was, the writer believes, drawn between the years 1812 and 1823. Unfortunately space does not permit going into reasons for this belief.

5. John Penn is shown as John Pennington.

6. Most important of all, Margaret (Margaret Freame) is written in in such a way that it could easily be mistaken for Mary.

Accompanying the Sparkes plan is a written document of which the following is an extract:

"Memorandums of the late B. Anderson of Penn relating to Jordans Meeting House etc.

Some particulars relative to Jordans burial ground from my old School-Fellow—Ady Bellamy, who was in possession of the writings, and Prince Butterfield of Seer Green, an old man who attends the Meeting and his Father before him who have kept a register of many curious particulars; the said P. Butterfield attended me to the Meeting and also the Burial Ground Jany 20—1798."

"No. 1. The grave of the great Wm. Penn. (See the Plan)."

¹ *The Remains of William Penn* by George L. Harrison (Philadelphia 1882), 42.

Adey Bellamy, Rev. Benjamin Anderson¹ and Prince Butterfield are all figures whose history has proved interesting and relevant, but space forbids. Space also prevents dwelling more fully on the "Memorandums" and Plan, obviously written and drawn from an original. What, exactly was this original like?

In Wilson Armistead's *Select Miscellanies*, published 1851, Vol. 6, is a section² on Jordans deserving of more notice than it has received. In it we read: "The following fragment . . . written by one of the vicars of Penn . . . is still preserved in the register of that place and presents a curious record of the occupiers of some of the graves." Alas! neither the present writer nor the present Vicar of Penn have been able to find the original of this "fragment" and it is feared lost. However, there is a plan shown in *Select Miscellanies*, which it seems reasonable to assume is a sufficiently exact copy. It is a far more likely one for a clergyman to have drawn than the Sparkes plan and I believe the Sparkes plan to be merely an orientation of it. The notes explaining the Armistead plan, shown below, are in small print and are obviously copied verbatim from the original Anderson "Memorandums." Unfortunately, I have had to condense them here.

	1	2	3	4	
The Road	5	6	7	8	9
	10	11	12	13	14
					The Meeting House

- "No. 1. Letitia, daughter of William Penn.
 2. Springett, son of William Penn.
 3. Margarett Freame, and her son Thomas, in the same grave, daughter of William Penn.
 4. John Penn, son of William.
 5. The great William Penn, with his second wife, upon his leaden coffin. Prince Butterfield

¹ There is a stone to Benjamin Anderson in the floor of Penn Parish Church, five miles from Jordans.

² This also appeared in a periodical some years earlier (see news cutting in Friends House Library, Spriggs MSS 1/15).

remembers his second wife [Hannah Penn] being buried, and seeing the leaden coffin of William, whose head lies contrary to the rest, with his feet to the north.

6. Gulielma, first wife of William Penn.
7. Isaac Pennington's wife.
8. Isaac Pennington, who married the mother to William Penn's first wife.
9. Joseph Rule.

Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, William Penn's younger children. Seven graves from the hedge, in a line above William Penn lies Thomas Ellwood."

The Armistead plan gives one some idea of the relationship of the graves to each other, also their position North and South, but not East and West. The plan in fact leaves one with the impression that the exact position of some of the graves was only vaguely known by Prince Butterfield.

In the case of William Penn and Thomas Ellwood, on the other hand, there appears to have been no uncertainty. "Seven graves from the hedge, in a line above William Penn, lies Thomas Ellwood." This is staggering, for, while the present state of the ground makes it difficult to say exactly where "seven graves" might be, it certainly would not bring Thomas Ellwood's grave where the present stone is—or William Penn's! In the case of Penn's grave, there is nothing on the Sparkes plan to contradict the evidence in *Select Miscellanies*. Ellwood's grave is not shown on the Anderson sketch, used by Armistead, itself, and this probably accounts for the person who drew the Sparkes plan placing it, in misunderstanding, in a position which does not tally with Anderson's written evidence. A point is that it was Penn, not Ellwood, who has been the focus of interest at Jordans, to visitors anyway.

From whence, however, came the notion of placing the stones in the neat but unlikely-looking group we see today? The writer believes the answer is to be found in Hepworth Dixon's *Life of William Penn*, published in 1851, the same year as *Select Miscellanies*. On page 436 will be found a drawing showing the graves marked as at present. With it is an account of a visit to Jordans by Dixon with Penn's great-grandson. They found a hopeless mess and it seems obvious from the account that they had not been there before

and did not know which grave was William's. What the present writer believes happened was that they were handed the Sparkes plan by the caretaker, a farm-labourer's wife, and seeing five lines in a row drawn on it, counted five graves across and assumed, in error, it was Penn's.

This Dixon plan does, however, seem to have misled future generations, including the producers of a little 1853 guide to Jordans, as well as whoever set up those stones. The plain fact is that this does not square with the Hannah Penn-Prince Butterfield-Benjamin Anderson link with William Penn's interment, as given in *Select Miscellanies*, which is the only one having the stamp of authenticity.

JACK CAUDLE.

George Fox to Margaret Fox

More Swarthmore Documents in America

ATTENTION was called in this *Journal* in 1914 to five letters of George Fox to his wife, from Worcester and London, 1673-4.¹ They were printed *verbatim* and *litteratim*, with one exception. That was a holgraph manuscript formerly owned by Sir Joseph Cockfield Dimsdale and then recently sold at auction to "a gentleman residing in Philadelphia." Requests to copy it or photograph it were declined.² It has now been traced to the Autograph Collection of Simon Gratz of Philadelphia, which contained some 66,000 items, and came after his death in 1925 to the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, with whose permission it is now transcribed and published.

Since it was once at Swarthmore Hall, re-read and endorsed by George Fox, it should have been included in the volume *The Swarthmore Documents in America*, Supplement No. 20 to this *Journal*, 1940, with thirty-five such documents, or with the two papers later published in this *Journal* as nos. xxxvi, xxxvii.³ It is part of a series of letters from George to Margaret

¹ *Jnl. F.H.S.*, xi, pp. 97-103, 157-158.

² *Ibid.*, p. 103, the sale of Walter V. Daniell of London, November, 1913. It had been advertised and sold at Christie's 9th April, 1913. See *The Friend* (London), 53 (1913), p. 265.

³ Vol. 40, 1948, pp. 25-31.

Fox in this period mentioned in the *Annual Catalogue of George Fox's Papers*, several of them like this having been included in the *Great Journal* (J). This was 17, 80 F. Like other originals, part of it had been crossed through, perhaps in order to be omitted in printing.

XXXVIII

GEORGE FOX to MARGARET FOX. *London, 7.v.1674.*

der hart to whom is my love & to all the childeren & thomas
& all the rest of friends in the trouth & if thou findeth it lieth
upon thee thou may goe over to the wimenes meeting in
west mor land¹ j recvd thy letter & I would not have you to
take up or brow mony in the contary for mee to pay mee j
had rather doe it my selvef but what you can make of your
corne or yong beace² to wardes it you may let mee know
when it is don & then i can order it but i would have you to
pay them at london that which you have promesed ther or any
wher else according to your time & word what ever j doe or is
for mee i have been ver besy this time & I was at Kingshon³
2 nightes & the ar well & next 5 day⁴ i set forord to wooster
& i canot right fully of that as yet soe in hast my love to you
all for I am fiting for my jorny and things are prety well
blesed be the lord jarat robardes⁵ is to goe to the counsell the
next 6 day & after you may her more london gff mo:5
day 7: 1674.

[Address in same hand] this for : m : ff Swarthmore

[Endorsement by George Fox, partly trimmed off] - - - london
1674 7mo woster

[Endorsed in 19th-century hand] Geo Fox to his Wife, written
in London 9th mo. 5. 1674

[Endorsed by Simon Gratz in pencil] A.L.S. With his usual
signature "G.ff." George Fox (1624-1691) Founder of the
Society of Friends. Visited the colonies of Md., N.J., and New
England. See Appleton.

¹ The next eight lines of print, from "j recvd thy letter . . ." up to ". . . & the ar well", contain matter which in the letter has been crossed through with a single line.

² Beasts?

³ Kingston-on-Thames, at the home of John and Margaret (Fell) Rous.

⁴ 9.v.1674. See Edward Haistwell's letter of 15.v.1674, printed in the *Journal*, Cambridge edition, ii, 289-90.

⁵ Gerard Roberts.

XXXIX

It may be appropriate in this connexion to mention another paper in the same collection which is also in Fox's handwriting.¹ It also is endorsed in pencil by Simon Gratz: "Handwriting of George Fox 1624-1691 the founder of the Society of Friends." A less modern but not contemporary hand has endorsed it on the back in ink: "[Le]tter from Geo. Fox to Margt. Fox in 1673 [his] own handwriting." The recto shows that it is cut out of a larger page than was known to the endorser. The top and both sides have been trimmed off. It measures about $2\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{2}$ inches.

Suspecting that it was rather a general epistle, perhaps printed, I consulted Lewis Benson who has a partial concordance to much of Fox's writing, and we were soon convinced that this was part of a holograph original of no. 295 in Fox's *Epistles* (Ed. 1698, p. 327; ed. 1831, vol. 8, p. 45). The printed date coincides with that of the endorsement, 1673, but the printed address is merely "Friends." The manuscript Annual Catalogue, 12, 14 F; 17, 43 F, indicates that copies of this Epistle existed on pages 91 and 136 in the large MS. folio N into which many of what we call Swarthmore MSS. (especially vol. vii) had been copied.² This fragment may be part of an original MS. of the same kind. The original endorsement if any and the address were lost in trimming. If it was addressed to Margaret Fox, the editor of the *Epistles* changed it, as he did with Epistle 31.

In order to indicate the relation of its text to the printed epistle, the last half of that is presented below with the words and letters of the mutilated manuscript's lines in italics. I suspect the editor of the *Epistles* added the words "right" (line 3) and "word" (line 4).

. . . So that knowledge and familiarity is as grass
that withers; but the Word of the Lord
endureth for ever & the right knowledge of one another is
this, to *know one another in that Word which was in the*
beginning before man fell
for man *liveth not by bread alone* but by every word
that *proceedeth out of the mouth* of God. This is the
fresh & heavenly food from above & above all the husks that the
swineherd feedeth his swine with in the unrepented state.

HENRY J. CADBURY.

¹ Autograph Collection of Simon Gratz, case 8, box 9. There is no evidence that it came from the Dimsdale MSS.

² See *Annual Catalogue of George Fox's Papers*, 1939, p. 3.

Some Quaker Firms of the Nineteenth Century: II

THIS article is designed to supplement that which appeared in the *Journal* for Autumn, 1958 (vol. 48, pp. 239-59). The present selection deals with the firms of Peases, Backhouses, Priestmans, Christys, Edmundsons and Pims. It comprises a family firm which developed into one of the greatest in North of England heavy industry, with a note on a closely associated "country bank"; three typical Yorkshire textile businesses, all in the hands of members of one family; one of Scots-Irish extraction, which has attained repute in its own specialized field; and two of Dublin origin which became subsidiaries of large British combines.

PEASES

The beginnings of the Pease business may be attributed to Edward Pease (1711-85), son of Joseph Pease, yeoman, descended from William Pease of Fishlake, Yorkshire, reputed to have come from Essex in the sixteenth century. He established in 1746 a business as woollen weaver and dealer in Darlington, and in 1760 took over the wool-combing business of his uncle Thomas Couldwell. His eldest son Joseph (1737-1808) continued the business, assuming his sons as partners, as Joseph Pease and Sons, "wool combers, buyers and weavers," and engaged, like many such enterprises, in private banking. The bank received mainly small deposits, on which, between 1765 and 1799, it usually paid 4½ per cent. It had over 100 clients, including such local Friends as Thomas Richardson, Henry Robson, and Jonathan Backhouse, who married Ann, Edward's daughter, and subsequently himself founded a local bank.¹

These activities were carried on by Joseph's sons, Edward (1767-1858) and Joseph (1772-1846), of Feetham, a founder of the Peace Society. Edward, who entered the firm as an apprentice at the age of 14 "and served his time in all depart-

¹ A. Raistrick, *Quakers in science and industry* (1950), 80, 330; P. H. Emden, *Quakers in commerce* (1940), 42-60; J. Foster, *Pease of Darlington* (1891); information from Amy E. Wallis.

ments," acquired, at the age of about 50, when "already withdrawn from taking an active part in the family business," greater fame as a pioneer of railways. He countered a proposal for a Stockton-Darlington Canal (1816) by advocating a horse tramway. Eventually a Private Railway Act was passed in April, 1825, and as a result of an interview with George Stephenson (1825) he became a keen supporter of the locomotive. He had "seen that traction by steam locomotives had been proved at the collieries to be economical." Along with his cousin Thomas Richardson (1771-1853) and other Friends, he was a principal shareholder in the Stockton and Darlington Railway; the Quaker banking house of Overend Gurney, of which Richardson was a founder, advanced a loan of £20,000.¹ In spite of occasional financial embarrassments, which Edward relieved "from his own pocket," the line "declared quiet Quaker dividends."²

Edward also entered into partnership with the Stephensons in Robert Stephenson & Co., "engine builders, millwrights, etc," Newcastle (June, 1825), holding four shares of £400—two-fifths of the total. "It was thanks to this happy partnership of capital with natural talent that the two men became identified with the successful introduction of railways . . . each owed much to the other, and neither failed to admit the debt.³ A less happy account of the relationship is given by L. T. C. Rolt in his recent somewhat debunking study of the Stephensons, partly in connection with another company of the same partners, Geo. Stephenson & Co., railway surveyors and contractors (1825). "Geo. Stephenson's shrewd Quaker partners were determined to exploit his talents to the full, and did not scruple to play upon his own weaknesses to that end." He even complains that Robert's "implacable Quaker partners" unjustifiably "rebuked him for neglecting his business" by taking time off for courting. Rolt, who seems not to like Quakers much, also features James Cropper, well-known anti-slavery advocate, who was a director of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, as a jealous and unscrupulous opponent of the Stephensons.

¹ Amy Wallis, "Darlington" (*Jnl. F.H.S.*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 55-69, 1956); *Diaries of Edward Pease* (1907); L. T. C. Rolt, *George and Robert Stephenson* (1960); *Dictionary of National Biography*, xliv, 178.

² J. H. Clapham, *The economic history of modern Britain*, 2nd edition (1930), i, 385.

³ J. G. H. Warren, *A century of locomotive building* (1923), 49 ff.

“That disastrous organization to which Stephenson had been committed by his Quaker partners” ended by 1833.¹

Of Edward it is noted that in his youth he was fond of shooting and fishing—a taste inherited by his descendants—but abandoned these pursuits after his marriage. He was “anti-clerical” and “stood for toleration and peace,” being active in the Peace Society. He sought to dissuade his son from entering political life, but afterwards accepted the situation. His diaries were edited by his great-grandson Sir Alfred (1907). “He was a sagacious just and kindly Quaker, rigid in principle, but humblest of Quaker saints; . . . he with his sons made south Durham.”²

Of his five sons, Joseph (1799-1872) and Henry (1807-81) were also actively interested in the promotion of railways. Joseph was the first Quaker M.P. in modern times, representing South Durham as a Liberal, 1832-41. Unlike John Bright, he belonged to the Whig section of the Party, and at first favoured agricultural protection, though later converted to free trade. He inherited his father’s interests in R. Stephenson & Co., which was reconstructed in 1845. He established export of coal from Stockton (1826), acquired shares in the Shildon Colliery (1828), leased collieries at St. Helen’s, Bishop Auckland from Sir Charles Musgrave (1830), and South Durham Colliery from Lord Eldon. He had a factory for making fire-clay bricks. The firm, in which his sons and his brother Henry were partners, became known as Pease and Partners (1884) combining the coal, iron and other interests. He retired in 1870, when he was employing some 10,000 men.³

Joseph was the real founder of Middlesbrough. An estate company was promoted in 1829, when with his father, his kinsman, Thomas Richardson, and other Friends, he bought 500 acres of “bleak salt marshes” from William Chilton of Billingham. The company was registered in 1854 as “Owners of Middlesbrough Estate” and became a public company in 1929, when the board was entirely composed of Peases. A railway was opened in 1831, the first cargo of coal loaded in 1832, and a steamship service to London started

¹ L. T. C. Rolt, *op. cit.*, 154, 206-7, 211, 223-24, 232-33.

² *Diaries of Edward Pease*; J. T. Mills, *John Bright and the Quakers*, i, 329-30.

³ *D.N.B.*, xliv, 179; J. S. Jeans, *Pioneers of the Cleveland iron trade* (1875), ch. vii; *Memoir of Jos. Pease* (*Northern Echo*, 9th February, 1872).

in 1834. The first dock was opened in 1842, and the Tees Commission established in 1853, when a line to Guisborough was opened, completing rail connection between the Cleveland iron mines and Durham coalfield. In the same year Middlesbrough was "incorporated as a borough"; its population rose from 150 in 1831 to 5,500 in 1841 and 75,500 in 1891. In 1847 a Meeting was "settled."¹

The rise of the Cleveland iron industry was thus promoted. Joseph took a lease of Cleveland ironstone from the Earl of Zetland (1852); the ironstone mines were carried on as J. W. Pease & Co. Among other pioneers was Isaac Wilson of Kendal, a cousin of Edward Pease, who founded the Tees Ironworks in 1844. Wilson's son-in-law Joseph Beaumont Pease (1833-73) grandson of Joseph Pease of Feetham, became a partner. Less successful was the Middlesbrough Pottery, which Wilson founded; it was carried on by his sons, though largely owned by the Peases. It was closed as unprofitable in 1882.²

Henry Pease (1807-81), brother of Joseph, also sat in Parliament 1857-65, and was first mayor of Darlington (1867). Besides carrying on the woollen manufacture (Henry Pease & Co., worsted spinners and manufacturers, Northgate, High and Low Mills), he initiated the Barnard Castle and Tebay line (1854) across Stainmore, "the backbone of England" (1,374 feet). He was chairman of the South Durham Iron works. He sought to develop the small fishing village of Saltburn as a holiday resort (1858). He was one of the deputation who interviewed the Tsar in an effort to avert the Crimean War.³

The bank was definitely constituted in 1820, and was the "sole possession" of Joseph for fifty years. It had no note issue, and was banker to the Derwent and Consett iron companies and the Great North of England Railway.⁴

John Pease (1797-1868) the eldest brother, though a "capable and successful business man," submitted to the "over-mastering claims of spiritual service . . . for nearly

¹ Sir H. G. Reid, *Middlesbrough; Diaries of Edward Pease*, 377-78; *Fortunes made in business* (1884), 333-79.

² J. S. Jeans, *op. cit.*; *Diaries of Edward Pease*, 194.

³ *D.N.B.*, xliv, 179; W. Fordyce, *History and antiquities . . . of Durham* (1857), i. 180.

⁴ P. W. Matthews, *History of Barclays Bank* (1926), 208-11; Maberly Phillips, *A history of banks in Northumberland* (1894), 346-49.

half a century he was one of the most distinguished of Quaker preachers."¹

John W. Steel, the local historian, who called Darlington "the English Philadelphia," says that the Peases and other Friends "developed the vast coal treasures of south Durham and the almost inexhaustible ore deposits of Cleveland." Then one-seventieth of the population of Darlington, Friends still (1876) "constituted the purse and governing bodies of the town"; of nine mayors, seven were Friends.²

Of another banking concern, Hodgkin Barnett Pease Spence & Co., Newcastle, which linked several Quaker families, John William Pease (1836-1901), grandson of Joseph Pease of Feetham, was a founding partner; he was also a director of the North Eastern Railway. This bank was in 1903 absorbed in Lloyds Bank, also of Quaker origin, when his son John William Beaumont Pease (1869-1950), afterwards Lord Wardington, became a director, and later chairman (1922-45).³ Another of the family, William Edward Pease (1865-1926), was Conservative M.P., for Darlington 1923-26, director of Cleveland Building and Engineering Co., which built the Zambesi Bridge over Victoria Falls, of Consett Iron Co., and of several collieries.⁴

Joseph Whitwell Pease (1828-1903) son of Joseph, sat in Parliament 1865-1903, and became the first Quaker to be created a baronet (1882). He was a director of the family bank and coal and iron enterprises, chairman of the North Eastern Railway (1894)—in which the Stockton and Darlington was absorbed in 1863—and president of the Peace Society.⁵ A brother, Edward (1834-80), managed the woollen business until he retired in ill-health; he became known as a horse breeder and horticulturist on his estate at Bewdley.

Sir Joseph as a parliamentarian was active as an opponent of capital punishment and of the opium trade. It is recorded in local Minutes that he and others of the family were relied on to voice in the legislature such Quaker concerns. The family were also strong supporters of the British and Foreign

¹ J. T. Mills, *op. cit.*

² J. W. Steel, "Friendly" sketches (1876), 92-4.

³ Phillips, *op. cit.*, 284-6; *History of Lloyd's Bank.*

⁴ *Who's who*; *The Times*, 25th January, 1926.

⁵ *D.N.B.*, 2nd Supp., iii, 90; Emden, *op. cit.*, 56-7; *The Times*, 24th June, 1903.

School Society, which provided the only non-sectarian schools before the Education Acts of 1870; the teachers were trained at Borough Road College, London. The Peases founded schools under its auspices at all their collieries, and collaborated in maintaining reading rooms, mechanics' institutes, etc. Members of the family continue to serve on the committee of the local Teachers' Training College.¹

The bank, known from 1870 as J. and J. W. Pease, in which Sir Joseph's sons Alfred and Joseph Albert were partners with him, fell into difficulties, and suspended payment in July, 1903. These were brought to a head by an unsuccessful lawsuit, arising from the estate of Beatrice, Countess of Portsmouth,² a daughter of Edward Pease (1834-80) which cost the bank a large sum. Their origin was attributed to advances made to the iron trade during the great depression of the 'seventies, which "removed realized assets." The bank owed nearly a quarter of a million to the North Eastern Railway, of which Sir Joseph was chairman; but owing to advances made by the "great Quaker connection of private Friends," including Edward B. Mounsey and Joseph Fryer, this was reduced by half. The assets were transferred to Barclay's Bank. Owing to "the confusion into which the affairs of the bank had fallen," Sir Joseph and his sons vacated their directorships in Pease and Partners; the dividend was, however, maintained at 8 per cent.³

This firm, which owned collieries, iron mines, foundries and quarries, had become a limited company in August, 1892, and was reorganized in October 1898. It acquired the South Durham Coal Company's collieries in 1903, and subsequently other collieries and ironworks; the capital was over four million pounds.⁴ Henry Fell Pease (1838-96), son of Henry, was a partner in these enterprises and a director of Tees Valley Railway Co.; he was mayor of Darlington, and M.P. for Cleveland 1885-96.⁵

A noted figure outside the family was David Dale (1829-1906), a grand-nephew of his namesake of New Lanark. His

¹ Information from Amy Wallis.

² Beatrice Mary Pease (1856-1935), married (1885) Newton Wallop, 6th earl of Portsmouth.

³ P. H. Emden, *op. cit.*, 57-58; *The Times*, 1902-3 *passim*; *D.N.B.*; Matthews, *op. cit.*, 208-11.

⁴ Stock Exchange year book.

⁵ *The Friend*, 11th December, 1896.

father died in the service of the East India Company shortly after his birth, and his mother took up her abode in Darlington, where she became acquainted with the Peases and joined Friends. David at an early age became a partner in a locomotive works near Darlington, and manager of a local railway, eventually in 1864 managing director of Consett Iron Co., established in 1840, mainly by Friends. In 1872 he was assumed a partner in Pease and Partners and in J. W. Pease & Co. He attained fame as a pioneer of industrial arbitration, being founder in 1869 of the North of England Manufactured Iron Trade Board. Brought up as a Friend, he married in 1853 Ann Backhouse Robson, grand-daughter of Jonathan Backhouse and widow of Henry Whitwell, nephew of Edward Pease, accidentally killed in Madrid in 1848. He resigned his membership of the Society of Friends in the late 'eighties. He was created a baronet in 1895, and succeeded Sir Joseph Pease as chairman of Pease and Partners in 1903¹

Alfred Edward Pease (1857-1939), eldest son of Sir Joseph, succeeded as second baronet. He was an M.P. 1885-1902, resigning owing to the failure of the Bank. After this he became a magistrate in the Transvaal, and author of reminiscences (*Elections and Recollections*); he edited the diaries of his great-grandfather. He was known as a big game hunter. In *Ex umbris* (1900) he recalls with affection the Quakerism of his youth; the *Friend* obituary says; "he appreciated deeply the Quaker character." Though confessing himself "an unworthy member whose walk has not been always consistent," he remained in the Society until 1914, when, "having undertaken military duties" he, with his sons, resigned after the outbreak of war. He was politically a follower of Rosebery; he advocated Irish Home Rule, opposed Chamberlain's South Africa policy, but once the Boer War was declared, felt bound to support it. He upheld the "Whig view of representation" voiced by Burke, opposed payment of members, and finally left the Liberal Party in 1909, owing to disagreement with Lloyd George's social legislation.²

Arthur Pease (1837-98), third son of Joseph (1799-1872, M.P.) sat in the Commons, 1880-85 and 1895-98, and was

¹ *D.N.B.*, 2nd Supp., i, 461; H. Pease, *Memoir of Sir David Dale*; Jeans, *op. cit.*, 196-215.

² A. E. Pease, *Ex umbris; Elections and recollections; The Friend*, 12th May, 1939.

chairman of Durham County Council. He was "a devoted Quaker minister" and held many offices in the Society.¹

The family, hitherto Liberal, divided on the Home Rule issue. Joseph Albert Pease (1860-1943), second son of Sir Joseph, was a Liberal M.P. from 1892, held Cabinet office in the Asquith Government, and was created Lord Gainford in 1916. He was vice-chairman of Pease and Partners and director of colliery companies. He was later Chairman of the B.B.C. He was a distinguished sportsman, playing football, polo, cricket and golf, and a Master of Hounds. Though he actively supported the 1914-18 war as one of defence against aggression, he retained his membership of the Society, as his family have done.² His cousin Herbert Pike Pease (1867-1949) was a prominent Unionist, serving as Party Whip; he became in 1923 Lord Daryngton, and was a director of Pease & Partners and of Stephenson & Co. He was active in the Church of England, becoming an Ecclesiastical Commissioner and President of the Church Army.³ His elder brother Arthur Francis (1866-1927) became chairman of Pease and Partners, director of Lloyds Bank and of the London and North Eastern Railway, chairman of Normanby Iron Co. and of the Middlesbrough Estates, high sheriff and chairman of Durham County Council. He became a baronet in 1920. His son Richard Arthur (1890-) became a director of Pease and Partners.⁴

John Francis Pease (1863-1935), second son of Henry, was a director of local companies and a J.P.; he was actively interested in Adult Schools, and was an early member of Friends' Industrial and Social Order Council.⁵ His elder brother Edward Lloyd Pease (1861-1934) was chairman of an engineering firm and director of an iron company; he served as an Elder.⁶

Pease and Partners was liquidated under nationalization on 21st December, 1955, but resumed activities in the conduct of Normanby Iron Works and Cleveland Building and Engineering Co. with Sir Richard A. Pease, Bt., as chairman. The former was also liquidated in 1959, but the latter, with

¹ *The Friend*, 1898; information from Amy Wallis.

² *Who's who*; *The Friend*, 26th February, 1943.

³ *Who's who*.

⁴ *Who's who*; *The Times*, 24th November, 1927.

⁵ *The Friend*, 21st June, 1935.

⁶ *The Friend*, 23rd March, 1934.

the Middlesbrough Estate Co. survives as a mainly Pease concern.¹

BACKHOUSES

The Backhouses are closely akin to the Peases, in family, business and religious relations. James Backhouse (1721-98), grandson of James (d. 1697) an early Sufferer for Truth, came from Lancaster to Darlington in 1745 and engaged in flax dressing and worsted manufacture; he was Clerk of Durham Q.M. for about 40 years.² He also undertook private banking from 1774. His son, Jonathan (1747-1826), relinquished textiles and concentrated on finance. The bank had considerable note issue, and "became one of the most stable influences in the finance of northern business," opening branches in Durham, Sunderland and elsewhere early in the nineteenth century. It survived an attempt by the Earl of Darlington to break it by organizing a "run" on its reserves (1819).³

His son, Jonathan Backhouse II (1779-1842), though at first a supporter of the navigation project, "loyally accepted the decision" in favour of rail, and became a chief promoter and director of the Stockton & Darlington Railway.⁴ Edward (1808-79), son of Edward (1781-1860) and nephew of Jonathan II, was a partner in the bank, and author of *Early Church History* and other works.⁵ John Church Backhouse (1811-58), a grandson of Jonathan I, was senior partner till his death.⁶ He was succeeded by Edmund (1824-1906), son of Jonathan II. He was Liberal M.P. for Darlington, 1868-80.⁷ Alfred, brother of Edward, was a partner in the bank, and high sheriff of Durham.⁸

James Edward Backhouse (1845-97) also a partner, retired in 1896 when the bank was merged in Barclays.⁹ Edward Backhouse Mounsey (1840-1911), nephew of Edward,

¹ Stock Exchange year book; *The Directory of directors*.

² Amy Wallis, "Darlington" (*Jnl. F.H.S.*, vol. 48, pp. 55-69); Raistrick, *op. cit.*, 79-80, 330; J. Foster, *The Descendants of John Backhouse* (1894).

³ Phillips, *op. cit.*, 134-54; Matthews, *op. cit.*, 198-207; Fordyce, *op. cit.*, ii, 202-3. (William Harry Vane, 3rd earl of Darlington, 1st duke of Cleveland, 1766-1842).

⁴ *Ibid.*; *Diaries of Edward Pease*, 84.

⁵ *D.N.B.*, ii, 320.

⁶ Phillips, *op. cit.*; *Annual monitor*, 1860.

⁷ *The Times*, 8th June, 1906; *The Friend*, 6th July, 1906.

⁸ Amy Wallis, "Darlington" (*Jnl. F.H.S.*, vol. 48, pp. 55-69).

⁹ Matthews, *op. cit.*, 198-207.

was a partner in Backhouses from 1874, and a director of Barclays after the amalgamation. He was chairman of the local Hospital, and clerk of Durham Q.M. and of the Yearly Meeting of Elders.¹ Jonathan Edmund Backhouse (1869-1918), son of Edmund (1824-1906 M.P.), also became a director of Barclays and was created a baronet in 1901. He "married out," and two of his sons, not in membership, attained distinction in the rather un-Quakerly sphere of the Navy, becoming admirals.²

Edward Backhouse (1876-1922), son of James Edward, and descended through his mother from Robert Barclay, was a stalwart of the peace testimony; he married Lucy, daughter of E. B. Mounsey. He resigned his post in the bank in 1916, and as a conscientious objector accepted employment in a Co-operative Bakery in Bermondsey. He stood as independent anti-war candidate for Stockton in March, 1917, and at the time of his sudden and premature death was the adopted Labour candidate for Bedford. He served as an elder, clerk of Durham Q.M., secretary of the Peace Committee, and an organizer of the first All Friends' Conference. He was also chairman of the New Town Trust and active in the Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Adult School movement.³

PRIESTMANS

The Priestman family for over 300 years were yeomen in Thornton Dale, Vale of Pickering, Yorkshire, and latterly established a tannery. John Priestman (1805-66), after serving an apprenticeship in that trade with an uncle in York, at the age of 19 joined his brother-in-law James Ellis, "a rather jovial soul who owned an old corn mill in Bradford, a big square building, very grimy, with shuttered windows," the Old Soke Mill, re-named the Queen's Flour Mills; he still held by charter a monopoly of corn grinding and malt crushing for the township. Ellis retired in 1848, being preoccupied with Irish famine relief work.⁴ Priestman, who became a partner in 1837, had meantime introduced a few worsted

¹ *Annual monitor*, 1912; *The Times*, 10th January, 1911; *The Friend*, 3rd February, 1911.

² *Who's who*.

³ *The Friend*, 15th September, 1922.

⁴ H. R. Hodgson, *The Society of Friends in Bradford* (1926); *Old Businesses of Bradford*, no. 19 (*Telegraph and Argus*, 1927).

handlooms and, having become a teetotaller, abandoned the malting, and concentrated on spinning and weaving at New Ashfield Mills, established in 1844. Within twenty years he had well over 1,000 employees, and was noted for his philanthropic treatment, "weaning them from rough coarse habits." He became a town councillor in 1855 and a J.P. in 1864. He set up the first ragged school in Bradford, and he was a founder of the Friends' Provident Institution, with which his family retained a long connection.¹

The firm of John Priestman and Sons was continued by his sons, Frederick (1836-1934) and Edward (1838-1920) and became a limited company in 1892. Frederick survived until just after his 98th birthday, as the "grand old man" of Bradford. He expanded the business successfully, beginning exports to U.S.A. in the 'eighties; and left an estate of nearly £140,000. He was for 23 years chairman of Friends' Provident Institution; he was also a director of the Northern Counties Investment Trust, and a large shareholder in Isaac Holden & Sons. His wife Mabel (*née* Tuke) was the last recorded minister in Bradford. Having no family, he left large bequests to Friends' schools and committees, to the Bradford Royal Infirmary, and other charitable institutions. He was a town councillor for 18 years, chairman of the Gas and Electricity committees, mayor 1882-83, which he celebrated by giving 6,000 free breakfasts, a free concert and gala. He was made a Freeman of the city in 1926. "He displayed an interest in social welfare, typical of members of the Society of Friends"; a particular interest was an Institute for the Blind which he endowed, "the Frederick Priestman Home." He was "a picturesque figure, who preferred his old brougham on rides in the suburbs."²

His brother Edward who retired from the business about 1900, was active in the Y.M.C.A. and the temperance movement.³ The latter's son, George Edward Priestman (1863-1942) became a partner in 1893, and was later chairman and managing director; his son Ronald was also a director. George was Chairman of the Board of Bradford Infirmary, a

¹ *D.N.B.*, xlvi, 377; *The Friends' quarterly examiner*, 1867, 344-56; *B.B.C.*, 25th November, 1954; *Biographical Catalogue, London Friends' Institute* (1888), 527-32.

² *Yorkshire Observer*, 8th September, 1934 and 28th April, 1954; *The Friend*, 14th September, 1934.

³ *The Friend*, 3rd September, 1920.

J.P., a Freeman of the city (1934), a supporter of adult Schools, and a cricketer.¹

The firm was acquired in July, 1947, by John Emsley Ltd., a company floated to continue allied businesses in which John Emsley had been a chief shareholder.²

Howard Priestman (1865-1931), second son of Edward, was, for a time, manager of the spinning department of the factory, but set up as a consultant in 1908, and became in 1919 a technical adviser to the British Research Association.³ Another brother Bertram (1868-1951) achieved repute as an artist, and became a Royal Academician in 1923; he was an Elder of Hammersmith Meeting.⁴

Alfred Priestman (1831-1910), son of Joshua (a brother of John, 1805-66), started a woollen mill at Esholt in 1851; he removed to Valley Mills, Bradford, in 1858 and, in partnership with his elder brother John, founded Brick Lane Mills in 1865 at Manningham, Bradford. He was a member of the School Board and a Governor of Bradford Grammar School. He promoted the Bradford Coffee Tavern Co. He was a well-concerned member of the Society, commemorated in the *Annual monitor* as "a man of very strong principles; his advocacy especially of the causes of Temperance and Peace never wavered. . . . He was an ardent Liberal in politics."⁵

John Priestman (1828-1906) was a director of Friends' Provident Institution, a councillor and alderman, and "always kept open house at Manningham Lodge." He was a pioneer of free libraries. His wife, Henrietta Brady (1828-1918) was one of the first women Poor Law Guardians.⁶

Both brothers retired in 1889, when the business was divided between the sons of John. Henry Brady Priestman (1853-1920) the elder, after the style of H. B. Priestman & Co., took over the worsted spinning and dress goods manufacture. Arthur (1855-1918) continued the worsted manufacture as Alfred Priestman & Co. Henry was a director of Friends' Provident Institution from 1883, chairman 1908-

¹ *The Friend*, 1st May 1942; *Yorkshire Observer*, 21st April 1942.

² *Yorkshire Observer*, 18th July, 1947.

³ *Who's who*; *The Friend*, 8th January, 1932; *The Times*, 8th December, 1931.

⁴ *Who's who*; *The Friend*, 13th April, 1951.

⁵ *Yorkshire Observer*, 29th January, 1910; *Annual monitor*, 1911.

⁶ *The Friend*, 11th January, 1907; *Annual monitor*, 1919-20.

17. He left over £60,000. He was a councillor, alderman and J.P., leader of the Liberal group on the council, where he was confronted by his brother Arthur as Labour leader, until his retirement in 1913. He was a manager of the Royal Infirmary, at one time a cricketer and captain of a local club. He was an elder and minister and served as clerk of Yearly Meeting.¹

Arthur Priestman was an early member of the Independent Labour Party and won a seat for it on the council at a by-election in 1895, holding it until his retirement in ill-health in 1916; he became an alderman. He was actively associated with the Adult School and the Socialist Quaker Society. The *Pioneer*, the local Socialist organ, commended him for paying his workers more than the average wage of £1 a week, and spoke of his "friendly but all too modest and shy personality" and his "fund of sly humour"; he was "a man universally honoured for steadfastness, sober earnest judgment and unfailing courtliness."²

Alfred Tuke Priestman (1868-1921), son of Alfred, was a partner in the Brick Lane Mills, but became an architect and surveyor. He was chairman of the Adult School and of the Socialist Quaker Society; a Labour representative on the town council and an Esperantist.³

Arnold Priestman (1854-1925) abandoned business for art, and attained distinction as a landscape painter.⁴ His brother Walter (1855-1920) was a founder of the Bradford Adult School. He was associated from its inception in 1883 with the Abstainers and General Insurance Co., of which he became Chairman. He removed to Birmingham in 1885, and was Liberal candidate for the South Division in 1895.⁵

The *Yorkshire Observer* paid tribute to the family's "zeal for social service," citing the names of seven of the name, whose activities in public life have been depicted here.⁶

¹ *The Friend*, 3rd December, 1920; *Yorkshire Observer*, 23rd November, 1920; *The Times*, 14th January, 1921.

² *Bradford Pioneer*, 25th January, 1918; *The Friend*, 8th February, 1918; *Annual Monitor*, 1919-20; F. Brockway, *Socialism over sixty years* (1946), 60.

³ *The Friend*, 27th February, 1921; *Yorkshire Observer*, 28th February, 1921.

⁴ *The Friend*, 8th March, 1925; *The Times*, 7th March, 1925.

⁵ *The Friend*, 9th and 23rd April, 1920.

⁶ *Yorkshire Observer*, 23rd November, 1920.

CHRISTYS¹

Alexander Christie, an Aberdeen Friend (1642-1722) settled in 1680 in Moyallon, co. Down, where he became a pioneer of linen bleaching. His grandson John (1707-61) introduced that branch of enterprise at Ormiston, East Lothian. John married Mary (1711-83) daughter of William Miller of Craigentenny (1684-1757), of the noted dynasty of Edinburgh Quakers. John's fifth son, Miller Christie (1749-1820), was apprenticed in 1768 to William Miller, "Hatter, Burgess of Edinburgh" (grandson of the first William Miller, married to Euphemia Christie, daughter of John). In 1773 Miller Christie went to London and set up as a hatter in White Hart Court, off Gracechurch Street. He was admitted to the Company of Feltmakers, and for about 20 years was in partnership with Joseph Storrs. He removed in 1789 to Lombard Court, and soon opened a factory in Bermondsey.

Miller Christy (who adopted the "English" form of his surname) retired in 1804 and was succeeded by his eldest son Thomas (1776-1846), active in the anti-slavery agitation. Under his auspices the business of T. & J. Worsley, hat manufacturers, Stockport, from whom for some years he had obtained supplies, was acquired in 1826; he thus became partner in a private bank with which Worsleys were associated; this, however, was purchased in 1829 by the new Manchester & Liverpool District Banking Co. A factory was also opened in Gloucestershire, which operated till 1864.

Thomas Christy's younger brother, William Miller Christy (1778-1858), invented the Penny Receipt Stamp (1853). He became a partner in 1801, settled in Stockport 1826, and set up a cotton factory there (1833); he was a director of the London Joint Stock Bank from its formation in 1836; he retired in 1845. The latter's son Henry (1810-65) became a partner and managed the Stockport business. After a visit to the East, he introduced the Turkish towel, to producing which the Fairfield Mill, Droylsden, was devoted under the name of W. M. Christy & Sons. He succeeded his father as a director of the London Bank. He was noted as an ethnologist and archaeologist, devoting most of his later

¹ J. Christy-Miller, *Christy & Co. & the Company of Feltmakers; The Book of the Old Edinburgh Club*, vol. 22; *Romance of great businesses* (1926), ii. 47-57; P. H. Emden, *op. cit.* 60-61; *Burke's Landed Gentry; Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vi. 296.

years to travel and exploration, especially of prehistoric remains in the Dordogne; his archaeological collection was bequeathed to the British Museum. He took an active part in relief activities during the Irish Famine of the 'forties.

John Christy (1781-1873) third son of the founder, was also a partner until 1856, and Master of the Feltmakers' Company, 1825. Feltmaking machinery was introduced about 1860, through Henry's visit to the United States, and the firm became a limited company, Christy & Co., in July, 1887. Thomas Christy II (1801-77) eldest son of Thomas I, became a partner in 1822 and was in charge of the London office. His younger brother Samuel (1810-89), M.P. for Newcastle-under-Lyme, 1847-59, inherited the Craigentenny estate of his ancestors and adopted the surname of Christie-Miller. He was succeeded by his nephew Wakefield (1835-98), second son of Thomas II. Wakefield Christy's younger brother Stephen (1840-90) continued the business as a partner from 1866, and was succeeded by his son Hugh Archibald (1877-1946). Alfred Christy (1818-76) second son of John, and Joseph Fell Christy (1825-1911) and Edmund Christy (1827-1902) sons of W. M. Christy, were also partners, Joseph being chairman 1887-1911; he was succeeded in that position by Charles Wakefield Christie-Miller, second son of Wakefield. His brother, Sir Geoffry Christie-Miller (b. 1881), partner from 1905, managed the Stockport branch, and was Master of the Feltmakers' Company, 1954-55. The control of the business is now in the hands of the next generation of the family, of whom John Aylmer has also served as Master. Hall & Co. hatmakers since the seventeenth century was taken over in 1954. The Feltmakers' Company governed the handicraft till the early nineteenth century, when the factory system was substituted after the "Standing Room Strike" of 1834.

EDMUNDSONS

Joshua Edmundson, a descendant of William Edmundson, the pioneer of Irish Quakerism, conducted an ironmongery and hardware business in Capel Street, Dublin, in the early nineteenth century. He died on 26th January, 1848, a victim of the typhus epidemic which followed the Great Famine. Three years earlier he had taken as an apprentice John Richardson Wigham (1829-1906), then aged 15, brother of

Mary Wigham (1818-1906), whom he married in 1840, and son of John Wigham (1783-1864), generally described as "tertius," partner in the Paisley shawl and silk business, and prominent in Edinburgh Quakerism and public life. J. R. Wigham now became a partner in the Dublin business, where he was joined later by his cousin Joshua Edmundson (d. March, 1909) and his own brother Henry (1822-97). With the removal to Dublin in the late 'nineties of their sister Eliza (1820-99) a generations' old association of the family (originally from Northumberland) with Scotland was transferred to Ireland.

J. R. Wigham greatly extended and expanded the business, which became known as Edmundson's Furnishing and Engineering Co., comprising in 1894 an "iron foundry, a brass foundry, an electrical apparatus manufactory, and an engineering office." He founded in 1885 Edmundson's Electricity Corporation, whose headquarters were transferred to London (Great George Street, Westminster); it became a public company in 1897. In the early twentieth century, trade in "Wigham's Patent Lamps," buoys, beacons, etc.—e.g. contracts with the Austrian and Portuguese Governments, the Admiralty and the Crown Agents for Natal—is noted as "very profitable." A three-year instalment system of payment for furnishings is indicated.

J. R. Wigham attained repute as inventor of a new ("Baily") system of gas illumination for lighthouses (c. 1865), first experimented with at Howth for the Commissioners of Irish Lights; for this he obtained a patent. Later he developed the application of electric power for lighting. He was a director of Dublin Gas Co. (1866-1906), and vice-chairman of Dublin Tramways Co. (1891-1906). He served a term as president of Dublin Chamber of Commerce. He was on the Executive of the Liberal Union of Ireland, formed by Liberals opposed to Home Rule. His marriage in 1858 to Mary, daughter of Jonathan Pim, M.P., associated him with a leading Irish Quaker and business family. He twice declined a knighthood. He died on 6th November, 1906, in his 78th year.¹

His son, John Cuthbert Wigham (1869-1950) entered the firm in 1888, and became engineering manager when it was

¹ Information from John Wigham; *The Friend*, 23rd November and 7th December, 1906; J. R. Wigham, *Gas lights, oil lights, electric lights, as lighthouse illuminants* (Shipmasters' Society, London, 1895).

converted into a joint stock company. A new Board was constituted in 1908, and he was appointed assistant general manager, and in 1919 joint general manager. He retired from this and from the directorship of several associated companies (e.g. North of Scotland, Guernsey and Salisbury) in 1921, being retained in a consultant capacity for another year. He devoted his later years to the Society of Friends, travelled much abroad on Quaker concerns, took part in relief work in Russia and elsewhere, and was Chairman of the Friends Service Council from 1934 to 1943.¹

His elder brother, William Wigham (1865-1955) was also connected with the Dublin firm; he was Recording Clerk of Dublin Y.M. 1923-35, and well-known throughout the Society and in the public life of the city. A younger brother, Joseph Theodore Wigham (1874-1951) became in 1924 Professor of Pathology in the University of Dublin, he filled many offices in Ireland Y.M. and its subordinate meetings.²

Edmundsons had thenceforth no Quaker associations. The Capel Street premises were closed, and the capital of the Corporation was acquired in 1928 by the Greater London and Counties Trust, an American-controlled body. It was liquidated in 1948, when its assets were vested in the British Electricity Authority.³

PIMS

The Pims were descended from Richard Pim of Leicester, who migrated to Ireland in 1655. His grandson John settled in Mountrath, Queen's Co., and subsequent generations inter-married with the leading Irish Quaker families.⁴

The silk industry of Dublin was introduced by Huguenots about 1680; it had a fluctuating history, developing in the early eighteenth century, protected by import duties from 1705, but declining later. It was regulated by the Irish "Spitalfields Act" of 1780, under which the trade was controlled and wages fixed by the "Dublin Society" until about 1840. The Jacquard loom was gradually introduced in the early nineteenth century.⁵

¹ *The Friend*, 5th January, 1951.

² *The Friend*, 20th April, 1951 and 16th December, 1955.

³ J. H. Dunning, *American investment in British manufacturing industry* (1958), 40.

⁴ Burke, *Landed gentry of Ireland*; information from the family.

⁵ J. J. Webb, *Industrial Dublin* (1913); British Association handbook to Dublin (1908).

Thomas Pim (1771-1855), great-grandson of John, was the first of the family to be definitely associated with the industry, in which it was soon recognized as one of the four leading firms. The foundation of the firm of Pim Bros. at Grafton Street, Dublin, is assigned to the year 1841. Its scope was much extended under his son Jonathan Pim (1806-85), when it comprised "poplin manufacturers, cotton spinners, linen weavers, and flour millers." It became a limited company in 1877.¹ Jonathan was prominent in public life as M.P. for Dublin 1865-74, and author of *The Condition and prospects of Ireland* (1848), and *Ireland and the Imperial Parliament* (1871).² His brother Thomas Pim (1816-96) succeeded as chairman, and he and others of the firm were directors of the City Market Co., which he promoted in 1876. The linen mill was at Harold's Cross, Dublin, and poplin factory at William Street. Some of the family lived over the office until they moved to Monkstown House, co. Dublin. The headquarters was removed from Grafton Street to Great George's Street, formerly a barracks. At first the business was wholesale only; later the retail trade was engaged in, and there was a large export trade. The flour mills were conducted by one branch of the family. The Greenmount Linen Spinning Co., Belfast, was acquired, apparently in discharge of a bad debt, and some of the family served as directors. George Russell (Æ), the poet and co-operator, was for some time a clerk with the firm.

Thomas Pim (1831-1900) of Monkstown, son of Jonathan, was subsequently chairman, and was a J.P., a councillor of the Royal Dublin Society and the Irish Lights Board.³ His younger brother, Frederic William (1839-1925), was the most prominent member of the next generation, a director of several other companies as well as of the family one, and chairman of Dublin and S.E. Railway Co. He wrote *Private Bill Legislation* (1896) and *The Railways and the State* (1912).⁴ A third brother, Joseph Todhunter Pim (1842-1925), combined with directorships of the family firms a directorship of the Bank of Ireland, of which he was Governor 1910-12. A relative, Joshua Pim a Dublin merchant who was agent for

¹ Stock Exchange year book: *The Directory of directors*.

² F. Boase, *Modern English biography* (1892-1908), ii, 1339.

³ *The Times*, 19th January, 1900.

⁴ *The Times*, 16th February, 1925; *The Friend*, 13th February, 1925.

some country banks had served as Governor 1884-86.¹ Jonathan Hogg (1847-1930) son of William Hogg, a Dublin general merchant who had also become a director of the bank, as well as carrying his father's business, became a director of the Cork Bandon and South Coast Railway, and of the Bank of Ireland (Governor, 1900-2). He was a D.L. for Dublin, and became a Privy Councillor "but took little part in public affairs."² In 1900 the capital of Pim Bros. was over a quarter of a million pounds.

Most of the Pims, formerly Liberals, parted with Gladstone over Home Rule. Thomas and Frederic were on the executive of the Liberal Union of Ireland.³ Jonathan, a son of Thomas, however, held legal posts in the Asquith Government, and became a Justice of the King's Bench of Ireland.⁴

Henry Leopold Pim, son of Thomas, and his son Jonathan (d. 1958) were successively chairmen, and with a cousin Henry were the last of the family to be associated with the business, which in 1954 became a subsidiary of Great Universal Stores.⁵

CONCLUSION

The present "sample" is too small to afford scope for generalization, but as far as it goes tends to corroborate two points made in the previous article, the identification of Quaker firms with experiments in welfare activities, and the tendency for the Quaker connection to be attenuated or disappear as industry takes on a more large scale and impersonal character. There may also be noted the prominence of many Quaker business men in public, especially municipal service, and the not infrequent note attained by individuals in spheres not so commonly regarded as Quakerly, those of art and sport. Association with the Liberal Party is also common, until the Home Rule issue and the rise of the Labour movement cut across it.

WILLIAM H. MARWICK

¹ F. G. Hall, *The Bank of Ireland* (1949), 131, 503; *The Times*, 19th September, 1925.

² *Who's who*; Hall, *op. cit.*, 492.

³ F. W. Pim, *Society of Friends in Ireland and Home Rule* (1893).

⁴ *Who's who*.

⁵ Stock Exchange year book.

(I am much indebted to the following for information and loan of material: Amy E. Wallis, Darlington (Peases and Backhouses); Ronald M. Priestman, Ilkley and O. B. Stokes, Editor, *Telegraph and Argus*, Bradford (Priestmans); John Christie-Miller, Stockport (Christys); John Wigham, late of Edinburgh (Edmundsons); Ida Pim, Monkstown, Norah Pim, Dublin, Olive C. Goodbody, Dublin, and Muriel Hicks (Pims).)

Recent Publications

Rooted in Faith. Three Centuries of Nonconformity, 1662-1962. By F. G. Healey, Westminster College, Cambridge. Published for the Joint Commemoration Committee of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, the Congregational Union of England and Wales and the Presbyterian Church of England. London, Independent Press Limited. 1961. 9s. 6d.

This book has been prepared in connection with the Tercentenary of the "Great Ejection" of Nonconformist Ministers in 1662: its avowed design is "to review the religious significance of 1662" and "to expound that significance for all Christian Churches to-day." The scope of the book did not allow of any reference to Quakerism, but it will be valuable none the less to the Quaker historian, especially for its excellent summary of the state of religious feeling at the Restoration.

Learning and Living, 1790-1960. A study in the history of the English adult education movement. By J. F. C. Harrison. (*Studies in Social History.*) Routledge, 1961. 45s.

This general history of adult education draws largely on the author's researches into Yorkshire developments to illuminate the general and social movements in that field. Chapters trace the establishment and growth of mechanics' institutes in the early nineteenth century (Bradford Mechanics' Institute, 1832, was supported by "wealthy and influential Quakers, such as the Hustlers, Harrises, and Benjamin Seebohm"). There is a full account of adult schools illustrated by developments in the main Yorkshire towns in the middle of last century; and there is a particularly valuable description of Friends' Sabbath schools in York (1848), and the adult classes which flourished there from the 1850s onwards.

Imprisonment upon a Praemunire George Fox's Last Trial

THE account in Fox's *Journal* of the long drawn out legal proceedings in 1674 and 1675 which followed his arrest in Worcestershire, is not a very satisfactory one. Fox was by this time "a famous man," as one of the Justices at Worcester called him;¹ it is clear that there was something of a conflict between those who wished to apply the praemunire procedure against him in all its rigour, and those who were disposed to regard and treat him favourably. This made for intricacies in the proceedings, which it is not easy now to unravel.

A major enigma occurs at the end of the story, during Fox's habeas corpus appeal to the King's Bench. Thomas Corbett,² a Welsh Counsel, introduced to Fox by Richard Davies of Welshpool, and now pleading on Fox's behalf, suddenly produces the surprising argument that no one can be lawfully imprisoned on a praemunire. Before quoting the account of this in Fox's *Journal*, a minor enigma may be mentioned; what is the relation between this account and that in Richard Davies' *Life*,³ which is almost word for word the same? At first sight one might suppose that Davies had copied it from the *Journal*, but it seems strange that he should have done so without any acknowledgment, and on the whole it would appear more likely that it was Davies' account which was copied, Fox having this before him, in some memorandum form, when he was dictating this part of the *Journal*; the same memorandum would then have been subsequently incorporated also in the *Account of Richard Davies*. Stylistically, the passage reads more like Davies than Fox.

The narrative in the *Journal*⁴ is as follows:

We came to London on the 8th of the Twelfth month, at the latter end of the term called Hilary Term, and on the 11th I was brought before the four judges at the King's Bench.

¹ Fox *Journal*, ed. Nickalls, p. 675.

² For Thos. Corbett and his helpful relations with Friends, see the *Account of Richard Davies* (first published in 1710) *passim*, and note in *Cambridge Journal*, ii, p. 450. He practised in London as well as in Wales.

³ First edition, 1710, pp. 189ff.

⁴ Ed. Nickalls, pp. 704-5.

And Counsellor Corbett pleaded and said that they could not imprison any man upon a praemunire.

And Judge Hale, the Chief Justice,¹ said, "Mr. Corbett, you should have come sooner, at the beginning of the term, with this objection"

And Judge Wild² said, "Mr. Corbett, you go upon general terms, and if it be so, as you say, we have committed many errors in the Old Bailey and other courts, and we must have time to look in our books and consider the statutes."

And Counsellor Corbett affirmed again they could not imprison any man upon a praemunire.

But the judge said, "There is summons."

"Yes," said Corbett, "but summons is not imprisonment, for summons is in order to a trial." So it was deferred till the next day.

The next day they considered the errors of the indictment and meddled no more concerning my imprisonment. And they found errors enough to quash the sentence of praemunire against me.

The question that at once occurs to the modern reader is, How was it possible that this crucial point, as to the power to imprison, in the centuries-old praemunire law, could really be still in doubt? To answer this needs an historical excursus.

The praemunire procedure and penalties derive from certain fourteenth-century statutes, of which the most famous were those of Edward III in 1353, and of Richard II in 1392; they were designed to put a sufficient weapon in the hands of the Crown if interference by the Pope with English ecclesiastical affairs should be carried too far. This was thought especially necessary at the time, as the Papal Court had been removed to Avignon, and was very much in the pocket of the French King. Like other legal machinery in the Middle Ages, the primary object was to provide means of forcing any culprit to appear before the King and his Council: once there, there was no difficulty about dealing with him adequately.

The operation of the Statutes was at the discretion of

¹ For Sir Matthew Hale, see note in *Cambridge Journal*, ii, p. 449. Mgt. Fox's testimony to her husband, published with the *Ellwood Journal*, refers to this episode, and says, of Hale and his attitude to Fox: "A very honest tender man, and he knew they had imprisoned him but in envy." The wife of John Roberts, of Cirencester, was related to Hale.

² Sir William Wilde, formerly Recorder of London, was a member of the Bench at the Old Bailey who had sentenced John Crook and others to the praemunire penalties (including imprisonment) in 1662 (Besse, *Sufferings*, 1753, i, p. 372).

the Crown, and they were apparently very little used; the bringing of Appeals to the Papal Court, which was one of the principal abuses legislated against, continued; there was probably less danger involved in allowing this, after the return of the Curia to Rome. But the statutory provisions remained, and in course of time acquired a somewhat fictitious aura, being thought of as the traditional bulwark of the State in the age-long struggle against Papal pretensions, and they were astutely made use of by Henry VIII and his advisers in connection with his breach with Rome. The praemunire penalties were now attached by Statute to other actions closely or distantly related to asserting the supremacy of the Pope; for example, a dean and chapter who should refuse to elect a bishop nominated by the Crown were, and still are, liable to praemunire. The penalties listed in the old Statutes were now treated as constituting the punishment for the offender, rather than as the means of bringing him before the King's Courts. There seems to have been no case in which they were actually imposed: the threat was enough.

The Act of James I (1605) out of which the Quaker prosecutions arose, was a further development. It is headed "For the better discovering and repressing of Popish Recusants," and was enacted just after the Gunpowder Plot. One of its provisions was, that an oath of allegiance, in a prescribed form, might be tendered to any person, who would incur the praemunire penalties if he refused, after sufficient notice, to swear to it. The required form of oath, among other things, disclaimed, in set terms, the subversive doctrine that any action by the Pope could release one of the King's subjects from his allegiance.

There is no instance recorded of any Roman Catholic having been "discovered and repressed" under the Act, on any refusal to take the oath.¹ But on the Restoration of Charles II, the Oath of Allegiance was very widely tendered to those who were suspected of disaffection, and among others to Quakers. The Quakers all refused to take the Oath, not, as they were at pains to make clear, from any lack of acceptance of the subject-matter, but because their religious principles forbade them to swear. The news of this refusal

¹ See comments on this anomaly by both John Crook and Francis Howgill at their praemunire trials (Besse, i. 379, ii. 16). See also *First Publishers of Truth*, p. 355.

quickly spread among the judiciary, and almost at once it became the accepted practice for getting rid of a troublesome Quaker to tender him the Oath, in the certainty that he would refuse, on grounds of conscience alone, to take it, and so incur the penalties of a praemunire. The attitude is well expressed in a letter of Sir John Robinson to Lord Arlington's secretary in 1671:¹

They [the Quakers] are a besotted people, of two sorts, fools and knaves; of knaves some of them are rich men, and there's no other way to proceed against them but to indict them upon the Statute of Premunire and seize their estates and imprison them during the King's pleasure. If this rule was generally followed and kept close to, it would break them without any noise or tumult.

It was a gross perversion of justice, and there is evidence that some members of both the judiciary and the administration were not happy about it; but an exaggerated reverence² for the sanctity of the oath, combined with dislike of the Quakers, made it just tolerable to public opinion. There was apparently no thought whatever that the penalty of imprisonment was illegal under a praemunire. There had been little or nothing in the way of precedent, as we have seen; but Coke's *Institutes*, the great legal authority of the age, included "imprisonment at the King's pleasure" among the penalties. Few Friends employed lawyers to advise or represent them, and the correctness of this view had never been challenged. It must have come therefore as a bombshell to the crowded Court at Westminster Hall, in February, 1675, when Counsellor Corbett submitted, with complete confidence, that all praemunire imprisonments had been illegal.

CORBETT'S REASONS

On what did Corbett base this contrary opinion? The account in the *Journal* (and in Richard Davies) does not throw much light on this, and probably most of the Friends present had little understanding of the position. Fortunately we have Corbett's own statement of his views preserved in the

¹ *Extracts from State Papers*, p. 337 (Cal. S.P. Dom. 1671-2, p. 40).

² This appears especially from the wording of the "Quaker Act" of 1662, whose first-expressed purpose was to impose further penalties on those who asserted that oaths were contrary to the will of God.

first volume of the "Book of Cases" at Friends House.¹ Among a number of questions put to him by Friends, shortly after George Fox's release, was the following:

"Whether it be not illegal to imprison upon the refusing to take the oath of allegiance?"

To this Corbett replies:

As to the second query, I answer that notwithstanding the general opinion and practice hitherunto, that judgment of imprisonment ought to be given, and hath been given, in that case; yet I conceive it is not warranted by any law or statute; for that the Statute of 3 Jas. c. 4, which enjoins the taking of that oath, states that the parties refusing shall incur the pains and penalties mentioned in the Statute of Premunire made in the 16th year of King Richard the Second Chapter the 5th, the words of which are these vizt: "To be put out of the King's protection, their lands and tenements goods and chattels forfeited to the King, and to be attached by their bodies and brought before the King and his Council to answer a Process of Premunire facias to issue against them to bring them in to answer the contempt." Note that it hath not such words as the former Statute of Premunire made 27 Ed. 3rd. Stat. 1.c.1, which says of their bodies "Shall be imprisoned and ransomed at the King's will." And this exception against such imprisonment was taken by me and assigned for one of the errors upon such a judgment, given against George Fox at Worcester Quarter Sessions in Hilary Term last in the King's Bench; and after I had given my reasons against the judgment of imprisonment the Court doubted and said they must, if we insisted thereupon, take time to consider of it. But the judgment being reversed for another error which I had assigned, there was no occasion to insist further upon the said error in giving judgment of imprisonment.

In other words, Corbett is saying that the only penalties invoked by the Statute of James I for refusal to take the Oath, are those of forfeiture of property and the loss of the King's protection,² and that the provision for "attachment by their bodies" is for the purpose not of permanent imprisonment, but only of arrest pending trial, or, as it was called in the account of the King's Bench proceedings already quoted, of "summons."

Corbett received many congratulations after the hearing

¹ Pp. 16 and 17. These volumes consist for the most part of MS. copies of legal opinions obtained by Friends. I do not think this opinion of Corbett has previously been printed.

² This is sometimes called "outlawry" by modern writers; but as outlawry proper in the 17th century arose from a quite different legal procedure, also sometimes suffered by Friends, it is best to keep the two distinct.

from his fellow-lawyers, including one of the judges, who was probably relieved that the rightness or wrongness of Corbett's submission had not had to be decided.¹ Richard Davies, who had introduced Corbett to Fox, was naturally elated, and records triumphantly in his *Account* that "that trial put an end to all the Praemunires in the nation." This can only have been true temporarily; our records do suggest that Praemunire processes ceased for some years, but there was a general lull in prosecutions at the time, and this may have no special significance. It is noteworthy, however, that Walcott, a Counsellor who had been present at the King's Bench hearing, when appointed a Judge in North Wales two years later, refrained from applying the Praemunire procedure.² But with the revival of persecution in the early 'eighties, the Praemunire processes were also revived, and at the time of the General Pardon following James II's accession, we have records in Besse of Friends suffering imprisonment under Praemunire in many different parts of the country.

WAS CORBETT RIGHT OR WRONG?

It would indeed be the crowning irony if Friends, who suffered so grievously and unjustifiably under Statutes directed against those who should assert Papal supremacy, should also prove to have suffered illegally. But I think that if they had been put to it, the Judges would have been able to over-rule Corbett on this point. Corbett does not mention the concluding words of the Statute of Richard II: after the words he quotes, it continues:

or that process be made against them by praemunire facias, in manner as it is ordained in other statutes of provisors³ and other which do sue in any other court in derogation of the regalty of our lord the King.

This would appear to import into the Statute of Richard II the provisions of the Statute of Edward III, and so make the penalties laid down in that Statute also, part of

¹ It looks as though the purpose of Corbett's communication, during the adjournment, to two of the judges, Hale and Wilde (see Rd. Davies *Account*), was to suggest that the other "errors in the indictment" should be considered first.

² Rd. Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

³ "Provisors" were those appointed by the Pope to vacancies in English benefices; this was another potential abuse.

the praemunire penalties incurred, on the refusal of the Oath, under the Statute of James I. This must have been what Coke thought.

Any doubts expressed by the judges at Fox's trial do not seem to have been shared by the parliamentary draftsmen, for in an Act passed four years later,¹ where the praemunire penalties are again invoked, they are still imposed by reference to the Statute of Richard II only. And it should be noted that when Friends consulted another Counsel² in 1683, they were advised unequivocally "that on incurring penalty of a praemunire, the accused was to remain in prison during the King's pleasure," though no reasons were given for the opinion. It is therefore probable that Thomas Corbett was wrong and that Friends' imprisonments were legal, though unjustified. But there remains sufficient doubt to enable an interesting case to be made out if at some future date, for example, a dean and chapter should refuse to elect a bishop nominated by the Crown.

ALFRED W. BRAITHWAITE.

¹ Habeas Corpus Act, 1679.

² Joseph Tily, of Lincoln's Inn (Book of Cases I, p. 127).

Recent Publication

Guide to the Nottinghamshire County Records Office. Prepared for the Records Committee by P. A. Kennedy. (Notts. County Council, 1960.)

Official records of the County Council. Quarter sessions. B. Oaths (QSO), includes 6 rolls of "Oath rolls of Dissenting Ministers, Quakers and Papists, 1737-1811."

Family and estate deposits include that of Vere-Laurie of Carlton, among the documents of title relating to Carlton, Notts. are 10 documents *re* Quaker Meeting House (1725-1802).

Family papers of Crofts of Sutton-in-Ashfield, include miscellaneous testamentary and other papers of Emlyn Crofts, a Quaker, 1855-1890 (95 docs.).

Among the small deposits and individual items is that of J. Lomax, of Woodthorpe, Nottingham (DD. 17). List of Notts. and Derbs. Society of Friends Records, 1668-1950.

A "Guarded" Education, and "Evangelical" Christianity

Two Letters from John Eliot Hodgkin, 1907

TWO letters which recently came into the possession of Leeds University Library with the purchase of a set of Eliot Hodgkin's *Rariora* (3 vols., 1902) are worth recording for the ray of light they shed on the upbringing of children in a well-concerned Quaker family in the first half of the last century. They are the more frank and revealing, coming from a man of 77 who can recall youthful contacts and walks and essay clubs with his "oldest friend," of 91 years of age.

The writer, John Eliot Hodgkin (1829-1912), eldest son of John Hodgkin of Tottenham, barrister-at-law (1800-75), and Elizabeth (daughter of Luke, *F.R.S.*) Howard, was brother of Thomas Hodgkin the banker and historian, and of Mariabella, wife of Sir Edward Fry, and Elizabeth ("Bessie"), wife of Alfred Waterhouse, the architect. He was an art collector, and a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries. His interests were very wide, as is revealed in *Rariora*, in the calendar of his papers published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission (1897), and in the volume on English pottery of the seventeenth century which he published in 1891.

The recipient, whose copy of *Rariora* the University of Leeds has now acquired, was Theodore Compton (1816-1909), a well-known Winscombe Friend for half a century. In his early manhood in London, Theodore Compton was intimate with the Hodgkin family at Tottenham, and his diary named John Hodgkin as one of his three best friends at this period in secular and religious affairs. There is an account of his life in the *Annual monitor* for 1910. His lively mind, wide interests in literary, religious and scientific matters, and an outlook which led him to sit loose on orthodoxy (which is reported to have prevented his being placed on the Sidcot School committee), evidently made a lasting impression on at least one member of the Hodgkin household.

That there was a firm streak of independence in the

Compton family, has been brought to my attention by Edward Milligan. He points out that Theodore Compton's father Townsend (1778-1834) was a son of Thomas (1749-1817) and Mary Compton, and it was in their household that Hannah Barnard was so cordially made welcome during the proceedings against her in the Yearly Meeting of 1801. Thomas Compton also stood by his son-in-law John Foster at Yearly Meeting in 1816 during his appeal against disownment for advocating views which were supposedly unitarian.¹

There is a striking, and in some respects complementary, account of education in the Hodgkin family in the first chapter of Louise Creighton's *Life and letters of Thomas Hodgkin*, which fills out the account given in the first letter.

R.S.M.

The Woodlands, 278 Upper Richmond Road, Putney.

ix.10.07.

Dear Theodore Compton,

It was very pleasant to receive through Bessie² your kind remembrance and little commentary, and to find that perhaps our oldest friend is still well and happy. We have I think exchanged letters *once* since the days of our youth.

Bessie's remembrances, at any rate of the celebrated *Rasselas* competition seem to be more definite than mine, for she avers that I *wept* because you gave Tommy³ the prize. What astounding stuff he must have written! for although we were being well grounded in Classics, English literature was a sealed book to us. Ours was in many ways a curiously cramped education.

The fear that we should by any chance read any fiction, the endeavour—a very futile one, to keep us in a garden enclosed, the absurd view that the making broad our hats and our phylacteries would keep us apart from a sinful world—these were all part of a now happily departed phase of Quaker education. I do remember that I, always the black sheep who wanted to get out of the fold, liked *you* because in my small way I thought you were “in the world.” I mind me of your explaining to us, I think on a walk to Clay Hill⁴

¹ T. Compton, *Recollections of Spitalfields*, 1894, pp. 34-45.

² Elizabeth Waterhouse.

³ Thomas Hodgkin.

⁴ Clay Hill, Enfield.

what a pun was, and always thought you somehow connected with Theodore Hook, of whom I suppose you must have told us, we could never have heard of so worldly a person from any one within the fold. I have always wondered how my Father a man of such intelligence and power of mind *could* have imagined that such a constricted manner¹ of life was likely to form a preparation for a future² which had after all to be passed in contact with the dreadful "world". But the training seems to have answered in the case of the other three, who were *born* good. It was emphatically bad for me.

I have thought that you might conceivably like to see in what channels my tastes have run, and so, following Tom's good example, I am going to inflict on you, if you will allow me the pleasure of doing so, a copy of my most recent production, & am instructing my binder to forward you a set³ of my "Rariora" for your kind acceptance. I make no claim to literary ability. "Rasselas" showed that that was not to be my forte, but I have some little taste for *odd* things, as you will doubtless discover.

With my best wishes for the prolongation of your happy & peaceful life,

Believe me

Ever your affectionate

Young friend

JOHN ELIOT HODGKIN

The Woodlands, Upper Richmond Rd., Putney. ix. 22.1907

Dear Theodore Compton,

You will I trust pardon the delay in acknowledging your most welcome present. I spent last Sunday mainly in the perusal of portions of your three volumes, each of which had for me a separate interest. William Cookworthy⁴ (whose 2↓ signifies tin) I have in measure mastered. Clowes⁵ is of course stiffer reading, and set me on to cogitations about Swedenborg whose "Heaven & Hell" is the only treatise

¹ altered to: "that so constricted a manner."

² "life" deleted, and "future" substituted for it.

³ "copy" deleted, and "set" substituted for it.

⁴ T. Compton, *William Cookworthy* (1895).

⁵ T. Compton, *The life and correspondence of the Reverend John Clowes* (1874); 2nd edition (1882); 3rd edition (1898).

I have read. Controversial Theology and Exegesis have for many years been favourite subjects with me. I have been an avid reader of expositions of views of various tendencies. On the whole I have found that the particular faith of my fathers seems to have the most to recommend it. I mean the faith as expounded by Barclay, rather than that of the later "Evangelical" Friends. But the older I grow the more strongly do I feel that God does not judge us by our ability to receive any particular tenet, that R. Catholic, Unitarian, Quaker, Jew, Mohammedan, Buddhist, Brahman, are all partakers in His divine love, and that the cleverest and most pious man can only have the vaguest conception of the actual truth, and that we must be guided by a childlike faith in His mercy and love to us all. I pray to be guided to believe whatever God would have me believe, & feel inclined to adopt the spirit of Queen Elizabeth's creed about the Sacrament.

"Christ was the Word & spake it. He took the Bread
and brake it, and *what that Word doth make it,*
That I believe and take it."

I shall greatly enjoy the "Mendip Valley",¹ a book after my own topographical heart. "Country Contents" are beyond my opportunities, but I greatly appreciate their historians.

With renewed thanks
and kindest wishes
I am

Your affe. young friend
J. ELIOT HODGKIN

¹ T. Compton, *A Mendip Valley* (1892).

Notes and Queries

PENN'S GREAT CASE

A bibliographical note by Olive C. Goodbody and M. Pollard in *The Library: Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, 5th series, vol. 16, no. 2, June 1961, pp. 146-149, discusses the printing of the first edition of William Penn's *Great Case of Liberty of Conscience*, 1670, and traces the history of ornamental initials used in the work.

DANIEL DEFOE

Daniel Defoe, Citizen of the Modern World, by John Robert Moore (University of Chicago Press, 1958), includes some account of William Penn's attempt to intervene for Defoe (then in prison for publishing *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters*, satirizing the High Church party) with members of the government in the summer of 1703.

ABRAHAM DARBY

"Abraham Darby (I and II) and the Coal-Iron Industry" is the title of an article by R. A. Mott, D.Sc., in the *Transactions of the Newcomen Society*, vol. 31 (1961), pp. 49-93, which throws new light on the technical developments associated with the Darbys and the Coalbrookdale works. It seems probable that the Michael Harford mentioned on p. 61 was son of Margaret Harford (widow of John Harford, of Cork) and no connection with Charles Harford's family.

A second article by the same author (pp. 271-81) deals with "The Coalbrookdale Group Horsehay Works."

SCHISM BILL, 1714

"A question if the Quakers should be heard by their counsel against the Bill carried in the negative by six" (June 4th, 1714). The above extract comes from the papers of Sir Edward Knatchbull, baronet, M.P. for Kent, covering proceedings in the House of Commons, March-June, 1714, printed by A. N. Newman in the *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, vol. 34 (no. 90, November, 1961), p. 216.

THE BACKHOUSE MAP, 1773

An article on "Two eighteenth-century maps" by John Philipson in *Archæologia Aeliana* (Publications of the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne), 4th series, xxxix, p. 345-53, deals in part with John Backhouse's map of the northern quarterly meetings, particularly noting the relationship between the silk handkerchief printed map in the care of Newcastle Meeting and the map printed on paper. A portion of the printed map at Friends House is reproduced.

JAMES CROPPER

"James Cropper (1773-1840) and agricultural improvement in the early nineteenth century," a paper by Kenneth Charlton read to the Widnes Historical Society, 14th October, 1960, is printed in the *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, for 1960, vol. 112, pp. 65-78, and includes notice of his interest in the foundation of Penketh school (1834) with its agricultural bias.

Supplements to the Journal of Friends' Historical Society

7. THOMAS POLE, M.D. (1753-1829). By E. T. Wedmore. 1908. 53 pp., 2s. 3d., post 9d.
 - 8-11. EXTRACTS FROM STATE PAPERS relating to Friends, 1654-1672. Ed. N. Penney. 1910-13. 4 parts. 365 pp., 7s. 6d., post 1s. 6d.
 12. ELIZABETH HOOTON, First Quaker woman preacher (1600-1672). By Emily Manners. 1914. 95 pp., 2s. 3d., post 9d.
 13. TORTOLA. By C. F. Jenkins. 1923. 106 pp., 5s., post 9d.
 14. Record of the SUFFERINGS OF FRIENDS IN CORNWALL, 1655-1686. 1928. 152 pp., 7s. 6d., post 9d.
 15. QUAKER LANGUAGE. F.H.S. Presidential address by T. Edmund Harvey, 1928. 30 pp., 1s. 6d., post 3d.
 - 16-17. PEN PICTURES OF LONDON YEARLY MEETING, 1789-1833. Ed. Norman Penney. 1930. 227 pp., 10s., post 1s.
 21. AN ORATOR'S LIBRARY. John Bright's books. Presidential address 1936 by J. Travis Mills. 1946. 24 pp., 2s., post 3d.
 22. LETTERS TO WILLIAM DEWSBURY AND OTHERS. Edited by Henry J. Cadbury. 1948. 68 pp., 5s., post 3d.
 23. SLAVERY AND "THE WOMAN QUESTION." Lucretia Mott's Diary, 1840. By F. B. Tolles. 1952. 5s., cloth 7s. 6d., post 3d.
 24. THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY OF THE EARLY FRIENDS. Presidential address by Frederick B. Tolles, 1952. 2s. 6d., post 3d.
 25. JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER, The Quaker. By C. Marshall Taylor. 1954. 2s. 6d., post 3d.
 26. JAMES NAYLER, A FRESH APPROACH. By Geoffrey F. Nuttall, D.D. 1954. 1s. 6d., post 3d.
 27. THOMAS RUDYARD, EARLY FRIENDS' "ORACLE OF LAW." By Alfred W. Braithwaite. 1956. 1s. 6d., post 3d.
 28. PATTERNS OF INFLUENCE IN ANGLO-AMERICAN QUAKERISM. By Thomas E. Drake. 1958. 1s. 6d., post 3d.
 29. SOME QUAKER PORTRAITS, CERTAIN AND UNCERTAIN. By John Nickalls, 1958. Illustrated. 3s. 6d., post 4d.
 30. "INWARD AND OUTWARD." A study of Early Quaker Language. By Maurice A. Creasey. 1962. 3s. 6d., post 4d.
-

Journals and Supplements Wanted

F.H.S. would be glad to receive unwanted copies of back issues of the *Journal* and of the Supplements. Address to F.H.S., c/o The Library, Friends House, London, N.W.1.

CAREERS IN INSURANCE

In this modern age no prudent individual or business organization can afford to ignore the consequences of misfortune or disaster. The whole world has become increasingly conscious of the need for the protection which Insurance provides, and this large and prosperous industry is expanding rapidly.

OPPORTUNITY FOR A CAREER: High in the ranks of the leading Offices stands the FRIENDS' PROVIDENT & CENTURY INSURANCE OFFICES who, in recent years, have met an increasing share of this growing demand for Insurance. The organization continues to develop throughout the world, and there is ample opportunity for ambitious young men to find profitable and worth-while careers on the Staff of the Offices, at home and overseas.

TRAINING: Adequate training facilities are provided to assist in ultimate qualification for the most senior positions. Each man on entry is placed with regard to his particular ability and inclinations, and individual training is given either in London or at Branches in the main provincial cities.

EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS: The minimum standard is at least four passes in G.C.E. (O) (English Language, Mathematics and two other subjects), and trainees are recruited from men up to the age of 25 from Grammar and Public Schools and Universities.

PROSPECTS: There are many fine opportunities for advancement with the Offices, and those who make satisfactory progress can look forward to earning substantial salaries in responsible positions while still comparatively young.

Full details can be obtained from:

The Personnel Officer
THE FRIENDS' PROVIDENT & CENTURY INSURANCE
OFFICES

Pixham End, Dorking, Surrey