The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society

VOLUME 53 NUMBER 4 1975

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY
FRIENDS HOUSE · EUSTON ROAD · LONDON NW1 2BJ
also obtainable at Friends Book Store :
302 Arch Street, Philadelphia 6, Pa., U.S.A.

Contents

Friends' Historical Society

Annual Membership Subscriptions: (Personal) £2.00 ($5.00); (Institutional) £3.00 ($8.00).
Subscriptions should be paid to the Secretary, Friends' Historical Society, c/o The Library, Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ.

Vol. 53 No. 4 1975

THE JOURNAL

OF THE

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Publishing Office: Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ

Communications should be addressed to the Editors at Friends House

Editorial

THIS number of the *Journal* completes volume 53, which began with the issue for 1972, and it contains the title-page and index covering the four years.

During this period the following four supplements to the *Journal* have appeared, issued on subscription to members of the Historical Society and on general sale (see priced list of Supplements on page iii of the cover).

Supplement 32. John Woolman in England, 1772. *Henry J. Cadbury*
33. John Perrot. *Kenneth L. Carroll*
34. "The Other Branch": London Yearly Meeting and the Hicksites. *Edwin B. Bronner*
35. Alexander Cowan Wilson, 1866–1955. *Stephen Wilson*

It is a hard fact that the annual subscription to the Historical Society over the same period has had to be increased. The Historical Society depends on its members. For a body which began life in the early years of this century with a minimum annual subscription of 5s. it is obvious that only by careful husbandry and reliance on firm support (financial and otherwise) from members and friends, have the objects it has aimed at been achieved. The subscription stayed at 5s. for forty-five years through two world wars. Then it was doubled to 10s. (50p), and doubled again during the currency of this volume.

It is of great importance that research into Quaker history should be continuously carried on and the results made available to others. Friends are encouraged to bring forward the results of their work and their findings, not necessarily with a view to publication in the *Journal*, but for sharing with others and making them available in some form, perhaps with other work and historical records in the Library at Friends House—the storehouse for Quaker research.

On 2 May 1975 the Historical Society met jointly with the Society for the Social History of Medicine at Friends House, when David Richards gave a paper on "The Fox family: two hundred years' contribution to medicine and dentistry". The regular meeting was held at Friends House, 4 July, when Patrick C. Lipscomb of Louisiana State University gave a talk on his researches, entitled "The Society of Friends and the organisation of the British movement for the abolition of the slave trade, 1782 to 1792".

The Society's Presidential Address for 1975 was delivered on 31 October by J. Ormerod Greenwood, under the title "The road to Manchester: tension in Quaker thinking in the 1880s".

Stephen Wilson gave an address on 6 February 1976 recounting the discussions and considerations which led, after a decade and a half of enquiry and bargaining to the move of Friends' central offices in London from Devonshire House to Endsleigh Gardens fronting on to Euston Road. This paper is printed in this issue, but not, we hastily add, as a cautionary tale.

As well as the usual features reporting on historical research, archives and notes and queries, the number contains Kenneth L. Carroll's paper "Sackcloth and ashes", in which he discusses spectacular aspects of early Friends' testimonies for their faith and against persecution. Kenneth Carroll finds that these occurrences were exceptional after 1662, and one suspects that they were uncommon before that time, achieving maximum effect because of the interest of anti-Quaker publicists.

Violet Rowe traces the history of some events in the history of the short-lived meeting at Flamstead End, Cheshunt, not far from the Hertfordshire and Middlesex border, where the meeting house was severely damaged by

a mob during the persecutions in 1683—an event which provided the origin of a story which Daniel Defoe told Lord Harley more than twenty years later.

Henry Frederick Smith's collegiate school at Darlington in the 1820s is not unknown to readers of the *Journal.* Extracts from Thomas Whitwell's schoolboy diary were printed in 1927, and there have been other articles. The *Bellford Gazette* was a school newspaper written by Jacob Bell and Robert Lawson Ford in September 1826 when both were at the school, and the paper itself has survived in the latter's family in impeccable condition to this day, and is here briefly described.

The founding of the *Morning Star* in 1856, the first London daily newspaper designed to promote the acceptance in Britain of pacifist principles, was a project to which Joseph Sturge devoted much of his energy towards the end of his life, during the closing months of the Crimean War. This forms the major portion of the final article in which Stephen Frick of Earlham College surveys aspects of Sturge's career devoted to the cause of peace.

Christopher J. Holdsworth has agreed to serve as editor of the *Journal* in succession to Alfred Braithwaite.

Alfred William Braithwaite (1901-1975)

A BRIEF announcement in our last issue recorded the death on 19 March 1975 of Alfred Braithwaite, editor of the *Journal* since 1959. The *Journal* has been fortunate that among his many concerns Alfred Braithwaite found time to carry forward through the third quarter of this century the Braithwaite contribution to Quaker historical studies. Alfred Braithwaite's presidential address to the Historical Society in 1956 was appropriately concerned with a lawyer—"Thomas Rudyard: early Friends' 'Oracle of Law' ". His legal training and knowledge enabled him at various times to shed new light on some obscure corners of Quaker history as well as to bring a disciplined approach to topics of enquiry and a persuasive presentation of results.

As editor since 1959 his sensitive assistance to authors who contemplated writing on themes of Quaker interest has been highly regarded. To be successful the *Journal* requires a full flow of articles and papers submitted for consideration, and writers have appreciated his wise counsel and enlightening encouragement, which played an essential part in our attempt to secure a balanced periodical reflecting the many shades of interest which readers find in Quaker history.

Twice Alfred and Millior Braithwaite visited the United States; on the second occasion Alfred delivered an address on the Penn-Meade trial at the Spring Meeting of the Friends Historical Association in 1971.

A fuller account of his life and service appeared in the *Friend*, 4 April 1975, pp. 345–6. This was largely reproduced in the testimony from Hampstead Monthly Meeting, transmitted to Yearly Meeting, and printed in *Quaker work in 1975*, pp. 189–90, from which we quote the final paragraph.

> The public has often been puzzled how the Society has been able to survive without a paid ministry to give it continuing stability. The Society has its own spiritual strength, but it owes more than is sometimes recognised to the devoted work of those who, like Alfred Braithwaite, have from a busy and successful career made time and opportunity available to nurture the structure at its various levels, to give the Society the image it possesses. His life has been an inspiration for which we are grateful.

"From Devonshire House to Endsleigh Gardens"

Based on a talk given by Stephen Wilson, at Friends House on 9 February 1976 to mark the Fiftieth Anniversary of its Occupation.

MEETING for Sufferings last met at Devonshire House on the fourth day of twelfth month 1925; immediately thereafter the Central Offices moved to temporary accommodation in the Penn Club, occupying Friends House on 9 January 1926; Meeting for Sufferings first met in Friends House in May 1926, and Yearly Meeting followed in 1927. So ended the Quaker association with Devonshire House which had begun immediately after the Great Fire of 1666.

Throughout the Society there had been a strong sentimental attachment to Devonshire House, with its associations with George Fox, William Penn and other Quaker worthies. For a few, that attachment was very deep, and they could see no reason to disturb the existing arrangements. Allied to this attitude was the view that plain living contributed to high thinking, and the plainer the living at Devonshire House, the better for the Society. But a majority appears to have felt that some re-development was becoming increasingly necessary.

The majority, however, was divided. On the one hand were those who felt that the right place for any development was Devonshire House itself, in view of the associations it already had and its convenience to those who worked in the City or who normally used Liverpool Street station. Opposed to them were those who thought the time had come to follow other religious and charitable bodies in a move westwards away from the City where residential and communal life was rapidly disappearing.

Cutting across both those attitudes was the problem of finance. Devonshire House was a valuable site, and redevelopment there would require a substantial outlay of fresh money. To sell Devonshire House would produce a capital sum which should go some way to finance a new

building on a less expensive site. But if a move were agreed there were those who thought that the new site should be settled before Devonshire House was sold, whereas there were others—perhaps more cautious—who felt it unwise to think of a new site till the sale of Devonshire House had been arranged.

But little progress could be made with the financial implications without the co-operation of Six Weeks Meeting, who held the freehold of one-sixth of the site, and held a lease of another sixth from Bethlem Hospital, which, with its frontage to Bishopsgate, was the more valuable part. The site as a whole was hardly a viable unit until the Bethlem lease had been acquired and the freeholds amalgamated. It would be unfair to suggest that Six Weeks Meeting was unco-operative, but they were able to give an impression that they would be glad to assist when they were satisfied with the proposals.

But looming above and behind these cross-currents was a major question whether a large meeting house suitable and adequate for the holding of Yearly Meeting should be included in any scheme. On the one hand the view was held that any large meeting house would only be effectively used for a few days during the year, and for the greater part would be lying fallow, incurring both capital charges and the running expenses of heating and cleaning; it would therefore be sensible for the Society to hire a large hall for the holding of Yearly Meeting, and the Central Offices could accordingly be kept in improved accommodation at Devonshire House, or housed on a small and compact site elsewhere. On the other hand there was a widespread feeling that Yearly Meeting should be held on Friends' own premises, in close association with their Central Offices, and that it would be undignified for them to be dependent on others for what was their most significant corporate activity.

To this medley of argument was added in 1923 the problem of whether it was right that the Society should build on what had been regarded as an open space in perpetuity; and moreover whether the Society should build on what some regarded as too pretentious a scale.

The one point on which there seems to have been a consensus of opinion throughout was that whatever the form of development there should be a commercial or office

block to provide a regular rental income for the general work of the Society.

Few if any of these various points of view were consciously in mind when Meeting for Sufferings in February 1911 minuted that "the Devonshire House premises do not at present give satisfactory accommodation for the work of our Society", and appointed forty Friends as a Special Premises Committee "to consider the matter in all its aspects". Over the next few years the membership was subject to constant change as individuals resigned, retired or died, and of those originally appointed only seven were serving when the committee was laid down in 1928. In making appointments Meeting for Sufferings bore in mind the need for representation from all Quarterly Meetings, but the large size of the Committee coupled with the fact that views and attitudes were crystallising and shifting, made it a feeble instrument for any effective action. The differences of view were reflected in Meeting for Sufferings and in Yearly Meeting, and although Yearly Meeting on more than one occasion expressed a preference for a large meeting house to form part of any scheme, they placed the responsibility for decision on Meeting for Sufferings, who in turn looked for a recommendation from the Special Premises Committee. The balance of forces was thus complete, and although there was the interruption of the war, more than a decade elapsed before a solution began to emerge. In the circumstances it is hardly surprising that what action was taken in making soundings about property transactions fell to a small and largely self-appointed sub-committee. As these soundings had to start on a confidential basis, there tended to be doubts on the part of the main Committee and of Meeting for Sufferings about what the sub-committee was up to. The appointment of J. Edward Hodgkin to the sub-committee in 1921 and the recruitment of Stanley Forward as secretary shortly thereafter was the stimulus to greater activity.

Such in general terms was the atmosphere prevailing in the Society during the twelve years to 1923.

The Special Premises Committee had been appointed in February 1911, and four months later took the view that "In any changes it is needful to provide for a large room suitable for Yearly Meeting and rooms for all associations and committees on the *same* premises".

DEVONSHIRE HOUSE SURVEY

The following twelve months were taken up with a survey of the Devonshire Houses premises and this became available in the middle of 1912.

The site comprised
Two large meeting houses, built in 1793
An Institute
A Library
5 Committee rooms
21 other rooms occupied by
Recording Clerk (3) Home Mission Committee (3) Tract Association (2) Friends' Foreign Mission Association (8) First Day School Association (3) Temperance Union (2)
4 strong rooms

In addition, the site contained a hotel, a warehouse, and ten shops let on tenancies expiring in 1918, and producing a gross rental income of £4,300.

The site was at the corner of Bishopsgate and Houndsditch, and the meeting houses were approached through a tunnel forty yeards long from Bishopsgate. In the accommodation occupied by the Central Offices, heating was by coal fires; all the rooms were dull, gloomy and ill-ventilated; the ceilings were low; some of the rooms were noisy; some were up steep stairs; the office of the Recording Clerk had light only from a skylight and a reflector at one end; and the ground layout made the packing and distribution of literature awkward and difficult. At times of Meeting for Sufferings there was great pressure on the committee rooms and staff were frequently evicted from their own rooms. At times of Yearly Meeting there was greater pressure, and in particular the lavatory accommodation was quite inadequate. It was considered that at least 14 additional rooms would be required as offices.

The capital expenditure incurred by the Society on the whole site was £80,000 of which half had been raised on mortgage. A current valuation gave a figure of £137,000 but as the leases did not expire till 1918, the site could not be disposed of advantageously till the leases had nearly run out, and it therefore seemed that removal could not be contemplated for some years. In the meantime, Six Weeks Meeting had with some reluctance agreed that if the Society were to sell the site, they would be prepared to co-operate.

Following this survey, the Committee considered the possibility of taking over Westminster Meeting House in St. Martin's Lane. In October 1912 it was clear that this was unsuitable, and ideas then turned towards finding some suitable accommodation for holding Yearly Meeting apart from Devonshire House. A few members visited fourteen public halls in the London area, and reported that while several would be suitable, they felt that either the Central Hall in Westminster or the newly built Methodist Hall in Kingsway would offer all the facilities that were needed. Thereupon the Committee in January 1913 recommended that

1 The Society should acquire the property of Six Weeks Meeting.
2 The whole of the Devonshire House site should be rebuilt in stages over the following five years, to give a fair sized meeting room, and a series of committee and other rooms to suit the needs of the Society. The remainder should be utilised for building "a first class office block of modern offices fitted with electric lifts and all the latest improvements".
3 A large meeting house such as would be needed for holding Yearly Meeting should *not* be included. "It is clear that some thousands of pounds can be saved annually by this course, and we believe that this money will be of far greater use in the furtherance of the work of the Society and the advancement of the Kingdom of God than if invested in buildings which would be unused during the greater part of the year."

These recommendations had a very mixed reception from Meeting for Sufferings whose conclusion was that there was not sufficient unanimity to send forward any definite recommendation to Yearly Meeting, who should be informed that the matter was still receiving consideration.

Notwithstanding the attempt of Meeting for Sufferings to defer the problem, Yearly Meeting in May 1913 took note of a minute from Essex and Suffolk Quarterly Meeting complaining that Devonshire House might no longer be available for holding Yearly Meeting in future, and referred the whole matter back to Meeting for Sufferings with authority to settle.

The Committee adhered to their view that the Devonshire House site should be re-developed without a large meeting house, and employed William Dunn (a partner in the firm of Dunn, Watson and Curtis Green) to advise them on the scheme they had in mind. Dunn reported in December 1913

and commented adversely on the restrictions of the site, but as requested put forward a phased programme of building which initially would provide accommodation for the Central Offices and ultimately for an office block. The capital cost would be £58,000, but in view of the loss of space there would be a reduction of rental income of £1,400. As an aside, the report mentioned that it would be possible to provide a large hall to seat 1,200 people, and in conversation the architect estimated the additional cost at £6,000 with a much heavier loss of rental income.

This is the only reference traced to a professional opinion about the practicality of a large new meeting house at Devonshire House; it was clearly not fully considered, and did nothing to shake the informed lay views on the Committee that any satisfactory development of the site would preclude a large meeting house.

Early in 1914 the sub-committee by a majority (which included Isaac Sharp, the Recording Clerk, and W. F. Wells, who had been the Clerk of Six Weeks Meeting for the preceding 45 years) favoured Dunn's proposal for re-development of the site, without a large meeting house, but two members—Thomas Newman and Henry Harris—objected strongly, arguing that Dunn had made it clear that the light and air which could be provided would never be satisfactory and that "any building on the site would lack cheerfulness". The full Committee was inclined to agree with Newman and Harris, and felt that it would be right to look for other sites; but as the crucial question remained whether a large meeting house should be provided referred the whole matter to Meeting for Sufferings who in turn passed it to Yearly Meeting, who in May 1914 recorded that "after careful consideration" they felt that "a large meeting house should form a part of any scheme which may be adopted", but rather ambiguously gave Meeting for Sufferings full powers to act "as regards retaining, developing or selling the whole or any part of the Devonshire House premises, and also as to buying, leasing or mortgaging property elsewhere".

The Committee took this as meaning that a fresh site should be sought, and invited the sub-committee to "consider sites large enough in area to provide in addition to offices etc. a large meeting house, some room for garden ground, and for future development".

Thus in the summer of 1914 and after three years of cogitation and argument the Committee was back at its earlier position that there should be a unified building, but with the qualification that it should not be on the Devonshire House site.

After examining and rejecting sites in Belsize Park and Islington the sub-committee on 30 July recorded "their opinion that a Gower Street site would afford the most desirable position for the Society's offices and for the Yearly Meeting Hall".

The outbreak of war reduced the sense of urgency and although a site in Smith Square and several in Bloomsbury were mentioned, no action was taken till March 1915 when "It was deemed desirable that information should be obtained as to the likelihood of obtaining from various Friends the promise of financial help to the amount of about £50,000 as a capital sum towards the purchase of the site and the commencement of building". Thomas Newman undertook to make soundings, but before the next meeting in November 1915 he had died, and it was agreed that as there was then little chance of raising £50,000 it was unnecessary to proceed further at that juncture.

Bloomsbury Properties

Around this time the Committee associated with itself P. F. Tuckett, the surveyor to Six Weeks Meeting and an estate agent, and who put before them a number of different sites in Bloomsbury where the long leases of buildings on the Bedford estate were beginning to fall in, and where London University had not yet fully established itself. A few were examined, but the only one which seemed to offer possibilities was in Keppel Street. Tentative negotiations in 1918 were broken off when it was not possible to bridge the gap between an offer of £20,000 and the asking price of £29,000. The site was on that part of Keppel Street which was subsequently closed, and is now occupied by the Senate House.

With the end of the war no progress had been made, and in May 1919 Yearly Meeting minuted that "considering the urgency of the subject we encourage Meeting for Sufferings to call a Conference of all Friends interested". To this suggestion the Committee replied in January 1920 that they did not think it would serve a useful purpose to hold a

Conference without a definite scheme to put before it. This reply was not surprising as at the time it was given there was nothing whatever to report; Six Weeks Meeting was doing nothing about the freeholds; no steps had been taken to sell or re-develop Devonshire House; there was no prospect of a new site; the only positive factor was that the tenancies of the hotel and shops at Devonshire House were being continued on a year-to-year basis at reducing rents, and that about £10,000 had been promised by a few Friends towards the cost of a new building.

Immediately after this discouraging reply the Committee became aware that the War Office were holding for sale a long lease of the Theosophical College in Tavistock Square—premises which had been used for the storage of military equipment during the war. The initial reaction was that a leasehold property was unsuitable, but on second thoughts and after a report by Fred Rowntree it was felt that for an expenditure of £38,000 the building could be adapted for the use of the Society. The attraction was that it was in the Bloomsbury area, it had three large halls one of which could be used for Yearly Meeting, there was ample office space, and there was a garden. In March 1920 the Committee made a tentative offer of £60,000 for the lease and of £28,000 for the freehold.

Meanwhile Tuckett had made it known that Devonshire House would be for sale at a price of around £250,000, and a prospective purchaser came forward thinking in terms of £240,000 provided a substantial part would remain outstanding on mortgage.

With these negotiations in a fluid state, no positive report could be made to Meeting for Sufferings, and Yearly Meeting in May 1920 remained silent.

By the end of 1920 it was assumed that in the absence of any reply from the War Office, the negotiation for the Theosophical College had collapsed, and it was clear that the prospective purchaser of Devonshire House was no longer interested. The possibility of acquiring the Passmore Edwards Hall (now the Mary Ward Settlement) was considered but quickly rejected, mainly because the Committee was reluctant to become involved in negotiations for a new site until there was a firmer prospect of a sale of Devonshire House, and this would not be likely till the

interest of Six Weeks Meeting had been cleared up. In April 1921 the Committee reported that it seemed unlikely that an early offer for Devonshire House would be submitted, nor could any offer at present be made for a new site. On this, Yearly Meeting in May 1921 expressed uneasiness that there was no prospect of any action, and hoped that the Committee might have a fuller report to make before long. This was a stimulus for pressure on Six Weeks Meeting, and negotiations began about the time of the accidental death in November 1921 of W. F. Wells and resulted three years later in the amalgamation of the freeholds at a cost of £39,000.

But although the Committee looked without enthusiasm at a building on the Embankment (the site now occupied by Cable and Wireless) they remained apprehensive about involvement in a new site, and as Tuckett was making no progress in the sale of Devonshire House, its disposal was offered to seven estate agents dealing with City property, with an asking price in the neighbourhood of £300,000. Early in 1922 several tentative offers at much below that figure were quickly rejected, and with something approaching despair, and in the hope of getting a free hand, the Committee proposed in April 1922 that "Yearly Meeting should now be asked to alter their view that a large meeting house should necessarily form part of any scheme". In May Yearly Meeting also had before them a minute from Warwick, Leicester and Staffordshire Quarterly Meeting that no arrangements should be made to part with any of the Devonshire House property without a further direct expression of opinion by Yearly Meeting. The agreement of Yearly Meeting was that "in leaving Meeting for Sufferings with power to deal with these premises as may seem best to them, and while not absolutely binding them, we desire that in any new premises that may be secured the question of the provision of a meeting house large enough to hold the sessions of Yearly Meeting will be carefully considered".

This re-iterated the indication given by Yearly Meeting eight years previously that a large meeting house should be provided, and as it was generally accepted that this was impractical at Devonshire House, was a clear pointer to a new site.

Shortly after the 1922 Yearly Meeting, Joseph Cheal, a member of the Committee, was made privately aware that

the War Office might be prepared to re-open the negotiations which had lapsed two years previously with a view to selling the lease of the Theosophical College for £60,000 and that a possible price for the freehold was £32,000. After some opening gambits, the Committee authorized a bid of £60,000 for the lease and the freehold of "premises that would provide ample accommodation for offices allowing for expansion, a large hall which with some alteration would be quite suitable for holding Yearly Meeting, a good open space, and plenty of light and air, and in a position that is easily accessible". By the end of 1922 Cheal was involved in a complicated negotiation with the War Office as lessee and the Bedford Trustees as lessor, the latter making it a condition that the purchase should include six houses which lay between the College and Tavistock Square. Cheal increased his offer by stages to a final offer of £60,000 for the lease and £42,000 for the freehold (including the houses), the offer for the lease being conditional on acquisition of the freehold. In January 1923, the Bedford Trustees rejected the offer for the freehold, whereupon the Committee agreed to try a personal appeal to the Duke of Bedford and if that failed would proceed no further. T. Edmund Harvey advised that an appeal would have little success and the whole project was dropped.[1]

While the negotiations with the Bedford Trustees and the War Office were reaching their climax, the Committee became aware that Endsleigh Gardens would be for sale, and Stanley Forward was asked to find out the terms on which an option might be granted; on 1 February 1923 he reported that an option was out of the question, but as the

[1] As the Society nearly acquired the Theosophical College, the following information may have interest. Under the guidance of Annie Besant, the Theosophical Society obtained from the Bedford Trustees in 1912 a lease of a large area behind the houses on the east side of Tavistock Square, and with ready access to substantial funds in India, proposed to build an imposing headquarters and college; the building was designed by Sir Edwin Lutyens in the style of the Hampstead Garden Suburb; work started in 1914, but in 1917 when half built was abandoned and requisitioned by the War Office, who offered it to the Society of Friends in 1920. The negotiation lapsed when it was found that the War Office had no clear title to dispose of the lease; the legal position was not clarified until 1922 when the negotiation was resumed, but collapsed early in 1923. Shortly thereafter the property was acquired by the British Medical Association, who completed the building, and in the 1930s extended it to the front of Tavistock Square.

site seemed to have possibilities, and as the Theosophical College was now unlikely, Hubert Lidbetter was invited to provide a rough plan to show how the site might be used.

ENDSLEIGH GARDENS

Shortly after the Napoleonic Wars the Fitzroy family had laid out some of their estates in north London as building sites, and among them were the houses on the south and west sides of Endsleigh Gardens. In 1920 when the 99 year leases were about to expire, the estates were sold by the family, and the single purchaser of the houses around Endsleigh Gardens was Sir Alfred Butt, a theatrical impresario and property developer (who was later involved with J. H. Thomas in a Budget leak). In 1921 and 1922 he re-sold the houses in small lots, with conveyances containing a reservation that "No right of access, user, light, air or otherwise over the pleasure grounds in Endsleigh Gardens are conferred by the sale". By this means he secured the enclosure of three acres, 250 yards in length and 60 yards in depth, fronting the Euston Road, free from any restrictions. He offered it for £50,000 to the St. Pancras Borough Council, but notwithstanding pressure from most of the amenity societies in London, the Council did not feel that the expenditure of so large a sum on the provision of an open space in that neighbourhood would be justified. Butt thereupon put the site on the market early in 1923.[1]

On 13 March 1923 Hubert Lidbetter reported that a hall could be provided on the site to seat 1,340 persons at a cost of £117,000. On this things moved rapidly though confidentially. Stanley Forward was authorized to try to acquire half the site or the whole, and if the whole and a portion subsequently were disposed of, it should be a condition that the building would not be for the sale of alcohol, or used for a garage or contain machinery; and Knight, Frank and Rutley were commissioned to sell Devonshire House by auction at a reserve of £225,000. By early April, Butt had agreed to sell the whole site for £45,000 (although the contract had not been signed and completion was not

[1] A similar transaction took place around the same time in the enclosure of Mornington Crescent, on which the Black Cat Factory—now called New London House—was subsequently erected.

effected till early in 1924); tentative agreement had been reached with the London County Council that as a condition for consent to building, a strip ten yards in depth would be surrendered for the ultimate widening of Euston Road; and four Quaker architects were invited to submit plans for a new building.

At the beginning of April the Committee had made a neutral report to Meeting for Sufferings saying only that during the past year offers had been made for two sites, and in one case plans had been prepared to give an idea how the site might be used; beyond this nothing definite could be said. At the same time the Committee were apprehensive that they "were likely to be criticised in some quarters if we build on land likely to make an excellent open space". To ease their consciences, an approach was made to the Metropolitan Gardens Association with the suggestion that they should purchase half the site consisting of the two end portions for about £15,000, and develop them as gardens. An approach was also made to the London, Midland & Scottish Railway, which was seeking additional office accommodation, about the possibility of their participation in the building.

On 3 May 1923 Devonshire House was put up at auction, but the bidding was sluggish, and as it did not reach the reserve price the property was withdrawn.

During the session of Yearly Meeting at the end of May 1923 the Committee made a supplementary report that notwithstanding the failure of the auction, there was reason to expect that an offer for Devonshire House would shortly be forthcoming which the Committee would be likely to accept. The report continued that they had made an offer for Endsleigh Gardens which had been accepted, and that the contract was being negotiated by solicitors. This was the first intimation that Quakers as a body had of the precise site that had been selected, and although there was some comment about the loss of an open space, there had been no time for opposition to develop and the supplementary report was accepted by Yearly Meeting under the general assumption that the sale of Devonshire House was imminent and that Endsleigh Gardens had been finally settled.

At this point—end May 1923—the idea was that the new building would be in the centre of the Gardens, but

although the Committee had appointed Curtis Green[1] to advise them on the instructions to the architects, those instructions could not be finalized until the precise location of the building in the Gardens had been settled.

By the end of July 1923 the LMS Railway had made it clear that they were not interested in participation; no reply had been received from the Metropolitan Gardens Association to the suggestion that they should acquire the two end portions; but an offer to pay £30,000 for the eastern half had been received from a syndicate who proposed to build an hotel, and would give an undertaking that no application would be made for a licence to sell alcohol. The Committee agreed to accept this offer, which had the effect of reducing the cost of the site to £15,000; it meant abandoning any idea of centering the building, which would go to the western end; but it would allow a small garden in the middle. These decisions enabled the instructions to be finalized, and they were issued on 14 August 1923, the proposals to be returned within twelve weeks.

The instructions may be summarized as follows:

The building at the western end of Endsleigh Gardens should be simple and dignified, consisting of a basement, ground floor, and not more than three floors above; it should be mainly of brick, with Portland stone as necessary.

The accommodation required was:

A large meeting house to seat 1400–1600; it was important that a speaker from every part of the hall could be heard

A small meeting house to seat 200–250

An Institute and a Reference Library, each of 1,500 sq. ft.

The Central Offices with at least five separate or partitioned rooms with a total area of 1,250 sq. ft. should be conveniently placed for easy access to the meeting houses

The Association Offices, of about 10,000 sq. ft. should be divisible into suites of single or double rooms

At least 10 committee rooms were required with a total area of 3,000 sq. ft.; of these, 2 should be of 500 sq. ft. and 2 of 300 sq. ft. The rooms should be within easy access of the small meeting house, and the architects were specially asked to bear in mind that some Friends did not like too many steps

A caretaker's flat

Four strong rooms were required with a total area of 1,500 sq. ft.

[1] Curtis Green was a distinguished architect who had been a junior member of the firm advising on the re-development of Devonshire House in 1913. His later works included the Dorchester Hotel, the Thamesside extension of New Scotland Yard, and the Cambridge University Press (Bentley House) in Euston Road.

with direct access from one to the Central Offices and from another to the Library

Lavatory and cloakroom accommodation should be on a liberal scale

Central heating must be provided but it should be recalled that the large meeting house would only be used occasionally, and the small meeting house three or four times a month, and therefore separate boilers should be considered

The meeting houses, and so far as possible the committee rooms, should not have windows on Euston Road, in view of the noise

It was essential to make provision for a Meeting House Yard where Friends could congregate after meetings. The Yard at Devonshire House gave a rough example of what was wanted (although with 3,600 sq. ft. it was not enough) and about half should be under cover

As the whole site provided more accommodation than that outlined above, the architects were instructed to provide offices which could be let to provide an income; they should have a separate entrance, staircase and lifts of their own, but so arranged that they could be absorbed by the Society for further extensions.

Such was the specification given to the architects, who in spite of complaint that time was too short, produced their outline plans under code initials. Curtis Green reported that the plan submitted by BY was in his opinion the best solution of the problem. "The design," he said, "in both plan and elevation is direct, simple and straightforward. It is modern in feeling and yet pleasantly reminiscent of the eighteenth century. The principal entrance in the Euston Road is emphasized by a colonnade of the Doric order of considerable dignity, and the use of such a portico has a precedent in the facade of the Friends' Meeting House at Manchester, a work of scholarship and charm."

On 20 November 1923 the sub-committee considered Curtis Green's report and the plans of BY and agreed to recommend the appointment of the author. A week later at the full Committee BY was identified as Hubert Lidbetter and his formal appointment made.

At the end of 1923 bright ideas proliferated; Edmund Harvey urged the provision of extensive basements for storage in the event of war; a loading bay for handling goods was suggested; there were proposals for a smoking room and for a staff common room; the Recording Clerk wanted the Central Offices on the south of the building; it

was suggested that the Institute should be on the ground floor and the Library on the first; the location of the women's lavatories gave rise to much anxious thought; there were conflicting ideas about the size and nature of the tea room; a proposal was made for a safe deposit; Meeting for Sufferings insisted that there should be provision for a bookshop, but as a shop with large windows facing Euston Road could not be provided without spoiling the elevation, it was settled that it should be located in the north east corner with a separate entrance. Another major change made at this time was to slope the sides of the large meeting house by raising the level of the outer seats by 21 inches (with a corresponding rise in the floor level of the building) and dropping the centre by a similar amount.

These and many other detailed matters were settled generally in discussion between the architect, Edward Hodgkin the clerk of the sub-committee, Robert Penney the clerk of the main Committee, and Stanley Forward. At the beginning of 1924 it seemed that all major hurdles had been surmounted; negotiations seemed well advanced for the sale of Devonshire House; the contract had been signed and £3,000 deposit paid by the hotel syndicate (now called the de la Voye group) for the eastern end; and all major points on the style and layout of the new building settled. But troubles were looming; an advertising firm had erected a hoarding around the site, and an acrimonious dispute arose with them about liquor advertisements and with the LCC who claimed that they were entitled to the rent as the hoarding was on land to be surrendered to them, and this dispute got entangled with an undertaking required from the de la Voye group about the building line they would establish. The site behind the hoarding was rapidly becoming a jungle and the Committee incurred some odium by refusing permission to the War Office to use it for tent pitching exercises, and to the Caledonian Christian Club to lay out a temporary tennis court. Trouble also developed with the auctioneers for the commission they claimed for their abortive effort to sell Devonshire House.

But very much more serious was the fact that early in March 1924 the prospective purchasers of Devonshire House withdrew, giving as the reason "the difficulties of the general business and political situation and other causes". Opposition

to the Endsleigh Gardens scheme had been simmering within the Society, but the failure of the sale was the signal for the opposition to burst through and give opportunity for the whole matter to be re-opened. At Meeting for Sufferings on 14 March 1924 Joseph Bevan Braithwaite regarded the failure as a "providential occurrence"; several Friends thought that the Committee had not been following divine guidance, although John William Graham argued that it was a mistake to confuse divine guidance with the broken word of the purchaser. It was not clear what solution the opponents of the scheme were proposing. Meeting for Sufferings was not in unity and it was agreed that the issue would have to go to Yearly Meeting due to be held in a few weeks' time at Llandrindod Wells.

With the issue in the balance it was clear to the Committee that they could take no final decision, but on 18 March they authorized the architect to proceed with plans and quantities to the point of being able to invite tenders.

During March and April 1924 *The Friend* printed sixteen letters in opposition to the scheme; one complained of "this palatial edifice"; another said it was no time to spend money when there were difficulties about filling the Yearly Meeting quota. There were five letters in support, including two which were anonymous.

At Yearly Meeting the matter was introduced by Edward S. Reynolds (the Clerk of Meeting for Sufferings) who gave a résumé of past history and urged that the time was right to go forward at Endsleigh Gardens. According to the account of the discussion in *The Friend* there were thirty speakers, of whom twenty-one were in favour and nine were opposed or wished deferment of a decision.

The minute of Yearly Meeting in 1924 was:

> After prolonged discussion this meeting concludes that in spite of many treasured associations with Devonshire House we should not be wise to attempt any scheme of re-building on that site. We endorse the proposals of the (Special Premises) Committee and re-affirm the opinion expressed in previous years that a large meeting house must ultimately be included in the scheme.

This was the final signal to go ahead, and on 5 June 1924 sixteen builders were invited to submit tenders; within three weeks tenders were received varying from £149,260 to £177,753, the lowest being that of Grace

and Marsh, a Croydon firm with Quaker connections.[1]

Meeting for Sufferings accepted this tender on 15 July 1924; the building contract was signed forthwith and work started immediately. The question of a foundation stone was seriously considered, but after discussion the Committee concluded "to make no such arrangements, not favouring such an idea".

With the building work launched the attention of the Committee turned to other matters. They proposed that as the building was started in the tercentenary of the birth of George Fox, it would be appropriate to mark some association with him, and accordingly suggested Swarthmoor Hall. Thereupon a vigorous correspondence developed in *The Friend* which towards the end of 1924 printed some fifty letters with suggestions which included Friends Central House, the Headquarters of the Society of Friends, Quaker Hall, the George Fox Memorial Hall, and Endsleigh Chambers. But the weight of opinion seemed to be for "Friends House", and this was determined by Meeting for Sufferings, to be followed where appropriate with a sub-title: "Central Premises of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)".

Shortly after the decision of Yearly Meeting to proceed, an Appeal Sub-Committee was appointed with Barrow Cadbury as treasurer. To the £10,000 which had been promised or contributed nine years previously, personal approaches to a few Friends had brought this to £32,000, and in April 1925 an appeal was made to every Quaker family to raise this to £60,000. A year later Barrow Cadbury was able to inform Yearly Meeting that the target had been reached with a surplus of £63.

It was possible to fix this target with some precision as negotiations had been re-opened late in 1924 for the sale of Devonshire House to the same purchaser who had reneged earlier in the year; agreement had been reached on a price of £185,000, with the purchaser giving an indemnity to the Society against any claim the auctioneers might sustain (the claim was pressed but rejected by the Court). A contract for sale to London and Northern Estates Ltd. was signed in March 1925 providing for completion in October, and for

[1] The firm was that of Augustine Neave Grace (1875–1953) builder and contractor; at Sidcot 1887–1890; married (i) Margaret Sarah Morland, (ii) Monica Kathleen Marriage.

vacant possession at the end of the year.[1] After the contract the Committee was engaged in some troublesome negotiations on dilapidations with those whose tenancies were terminated, and subsequently with the sale of the old furniture at Devonshire House which realized £117.

The contract with the de la Voye group had been signed early in 1924; it provided for the sale to them of 36,000 sq. ft. at the eastern end of Endsleigh Gardens for the erection of an hotel; the price was to be £30,000, a deposit of 10 per cent was paid and in default of completion by 1 September 1924 the deposit would be forfeited. In spite of pressure from Stanley Forward and the Society's solicitors the group were unable or unwilling to complete, and in February 1926 the contract was terminated and the deposit forfeited. Thereupon the Committee invited other offers, and by the end of 1926 10,000 sq. ft. at the eastern end had been sold to Nettlefolds for 25s. a foot; 9,000 sq. ft. to the LCC for the Weights and Measures department for £1 a foot; and a similar price was paid by the GPO for 13,000 sq. ft. Thus in place of the hotel offer of £30,000 for 36,000 sq. ft. the Society had sold 32,000 sq. ft. for £34,500. Moreover a surplus of 4,000 sq. ft. had emerged, and it was agreed that this should be used to increase the size of the garden in the middle by one-third.

These ancillary and troublesome property transactions were the inevitable accompaniment of the decision to move to new quarters, and required the attention and endorsement of the Committee. Meanwhile the work on the new building proceeded relatively smoothly. Changes of plan were severely discouraged, but among the matters referred to the Committee were the lighting problems (particularly in the large meeting house) where there were rapid technological developments; the provision of internal telephones and electric clocks; the layout of the cloakrooms; the style of the gates at the main entrance and to the garden; the nature of the floor coverings; the partitions and shelving in the administrative offices; the ventilation of the strong rooms; and the transfer of some of the benches from Devonshire House to the new small meeting house.

[1] In the later 1920s the new owners demolished Devonshire House and erected a tall office block known as Stone House; it is still flanked by the shabby and antiquated property restricting the light and air which had deterred the Society in 1914 from re-developing the site.

The builders concentrated first on the administrative block, which with a number of loose ends, was completed by the end of 1925. Later, the General Strike was an excuse for some delay, but the small meeting house was available for use in the summer of 1926. The large meeting house was completed in the spring of 1927 and available for Yearly Meeting in May. The office block, known as Drayton House, was not completed till a year later.

Final Report

Throughout, the main burden of ordering equipment and furnishings, arranging accommodation, and organizing the move had fallen on Stanley Forward, who was specially congratulated by Edward Hodgkin in presenting the final report of the Special Premises Committee in May 1928. Friends House and Drayton House he said had been completed; the buildings on the eastern end of Endsleigh Gardens had the approval of the architect and were in general conformity with Friends House, although differing in height; it had been hoped to let Drayton House as a whole to a single tenant, but none had been forthcoming, and it was now proposed to let it off in suites. He continued to give the financial outcome:

Expenditure		£
Builders' contract		163,315
Site, fees, legal charges, interest and removal costs		21,506
Furniture and fittings		6,441
		191,262[1]
At that time this expenditure had been financed mainly by Sale of Devonshire House	185,000	
Less loans paid off	57,654	
		127,346
Appeal raised		60,848
		188,194

[1] At 1976 prices at least £1½ million.

In addition a number of gifts had been made, including the fountain in the yard by the Peckover family and the furnishings in the Institute by Irish Friends.

The Special Premises Committee was laid down by Meeting for Sufferings in May 1928, but a few members continued as the nucleus of the Drayton House Committee to deal with the lettings, originally at an average rental of 6s. 8d. per foot. The whole building had been fully let by 1931.

Three points may be made in conclusion.

First, it is perhaps surprising that in view of the hesitations and conflicts half a century ago, Friends House ever got built at all; it owes much to the drive and energy of Edward Hodgkin and Stanley Forward, and the skill of Hubert Lidbetter. The story may contain some lessons on procedure should the Society be faced with a similar property transaction in future.

Secondly—the public outcry at what the Society had done in building on an open space led to the appointment of the Royal Commission on London Squares, which reported in 1928 that of 460 enclosures varying from mere strips in front of houses to large squares, half appeared to be in private ownership and subject only to such rights over them as might be included in the leases of the surrounding houses. To prevent what had happened at Endsleigh Gardens and at Mornington Crescent, the Commission recommended that steps be taken to ensure that all similar enclosures should be permanently preserved as open spaces, and the LCC took statutory powers accordingly. But in various quarters the action of the Society is still recalled with disfavour.

Thirdly—before 1925 Euston Road had been a seedy run-down thoroughfare. St. Pancras Church was the only building of any distinction between Regent's Park and King's Cross. Friends House, designed by Hubert Lidbetter, for which he received the medal of the Royal Institute of British Architects for the best building put up in London in 1926, did much to raise the tone of the neighbourhood; and to a far greater extent than was anticipated fifty years ago, it has made a notable contribution to the religious, cultural, social and political life of the metropolis.

Note on Sources:

Minutes and papers of the Special Premises Committee (Friends House Library)
Proceedings of London Yearly Meeting (*printed*)
The Friend
Minutes of St. Pancras Borough Council (Swiss Cottage Library)
Report of the Royal Commission on London Squares, 1928 (*printed*. H.M.S.O.)
Information about the Theosophical College kindly supplied by the Bedford Estates Office.

STEPHEN WILSON

Sackcloth and Ashes and other Signs and Wonders

I

ALTHOUGH "going naked as a sign" appeared among Quakers before the end of 1652, there are no known cases of Friends at so early a date going in sackcloth and ashes. Such a form of prophetic expression, however, was bound to appear as Quakers studied the Bible intensely, seeking to understand how prophets made known their message. To some degree, early Friends were influenced by the messages of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Jonah, all of which connected the wearing of sackcloth with repentance.[1] The major impetus for the wearing of sackcloth and ashes, however, undoubtedly came from Revelation. Revelation 11:31 must have been the chief inspiration for this practice: "And I have two witnesses, whom I shall appoint to prophesy, dressed in sackcloth . . ."[2] Early Quaker belief that the resumption of prophecy was already taking place, when coupled with their apocalyptic expectations, made this passage a "natural" for them.

On 5 May 1655, Sarah Goldsmith appeared in Bristol wearing sackcloth and "earth" upon her head. Beginning about 4 a.m. she walked to every gate of the city, through every street, and then about nine o'clock she came and stood at the High Cross "in the view of Town and Market as a sign against the pride of Bristol . . . [claiming that] It was in obedience to the light in her conscience".[3] Sarah Goldsmith had found very difficult this command to "put on a Coat of Sackcloth of hair next [to] her [body], to

[1] Cf. Isaiah 3:24; 15:3; 20:2; 22:12; 37:1–2; 50:3; Jeremiah 4:8; 6:26; 49:3; Ezekiel 7:18; 27:31; Jonah 3:5–6, 8.

[2] Revelation 11:3, from the *New English Bible*. Concerning the influence of the Book of Revelation on Puritans and Quakers, see Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *Studies in Christian Enthusiasm* (Pendle Hill, 1948), p. 45; Hugh Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England* (New Haven, 1964), p. 182. Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* (London, 1972), pp. 76, 187, 259.

3 Richard Blome, *The Fanatick History, or An Exact Relation and Account of the Old Anabaptists, and New Quakers* (London, 1660), p. 221.

uncover her head, and without any other clothes upon her, except shoes on her feet". Although it was "very crosse to her own will" she had cheerfully prepared her garment, "being in a manner of a Coat down to the Ground". Two Friends accompanied her during her walk, and one of them stood with her at the High Cross. There, Anne Gannicliffe, who had not accompanied Sarah, came upon her and announced publicly—after quoting from Isaiah—that Sarah Goldsmith "is a sign & a wonder to you this day". As a result, Sarah, Anne, and Margaret Wood (who had accompanied Sarah at the cross) were sent to Bridewell.[1]

Two Quakers are known to have gone in sackcloth in 1655, Richard Sale at Derby, and Martha Simmonds at Colchester. Richard Sale (d. 1658) himself wrote in a letter dated 25 October to George Fox, depicting the rather elaborate "sign" that he had been called to enact:

> I was made by the command (of the Lord) to take a letherne girdle, and to binde the sackclouth to my loines, and to take sum sweete flowers in my right hand, and sum stingking weeds in my left hand, ashes strowed upon my head, bearefoote and bearlegged, which did astonish all that ware out of the life, and those that ware friends in the towne ware exseedly brooken and brought downe but as I passed thorow the streets the heathens did set there dogs at mee, but the Creaturs ware subjectted by the power soe that I had no harme, glorye glorye to God for ever more, for I thorow the obedience I found the yooke to be easie and the burthen light, and it was my meate and drink to doe the will of God and the docktrin that was made manyfest to me.[2]

Martha Simmonds (1624?–1665) was the sister of Giles Calvert and the wife of Thomas Simmonds—both of whom were well-known printers of Quaker books. Martha was soon to become one of James Nayler's chief abettors.[3] A 16 December 1655 letter, written from Colchester Castle, reports that "Shee was moved to walke in sack cloth barefoote with

[1] George Bishop (*et al*), *The Cry of Blood* (London, 1656), pp. 98–99, 102; Cf. Joseph Besse, *Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers* (London, 1753), I, 41. Anne Cannicliffe (d. 1673 "An Antient Friend") was the wife of Nicholas Gannicliffe, shoemaker (d. 1662); see *Jnl. F.H.S.*, 9 (1912), 104.

[2] Friends House Library, Swarthmore MSS IV, 211 (Tr. III, 289).

[3] Kenneth L. Carroll, "Martha Simmonds, a Quaker enigma", *Jnl. F.H.S.*, 53 (1972), 31–52.

her hayre sprred & ashes upon her head, in the Toune, in the frosty weather, to the astonishment of many".[1]

In 1656 Thomas Murford [Morford], a native of Bristol, appeared in that city in sackcloth and ashes and, like Martha Simmonds, went barefoot. His purpose was to mourn for the city and to warn the people "to let the Lord's people alone, as they would answer [for] it at the day of Judgment, and not to persecute or imprison his Saints".[2] When he was brought before the mayor, Murford's hat was removed from his head, thereby scattering the ashes on his head. He then told the mayor that "the Lord of hosts would stain the glory and crown of all his pride, and strip him naked and bare".[3]

Several cases of Quakers going about in sackcloth and ashes are simply dated as being in "Oliver's days". William Simpson, who frequently went naked as a sign, likewise was to be found in sackcloth "in the days of Oliver and his Parliament".[4] Dewance Morey also reported that she had been made to go through London's streets in sackcloth "with dust upon my head, and a Rod in my hand for a sign unto thee; proclaiming that dreadful and terrible Famine that is swiftly coming on upon thee from the God of Life".[5]

Undoubtedly there were some other examples of such signs. *The Image of Jealousie* (1660) noted that sackcloth and coat of skin are "comely" in time of poverty, but where more has been given it should be appreciated and used.[6] It was in this very year that Elizabeth Harris, who was the founder of Quakerism in the Chesapeake Bay area and perhaps the "mother of American Quakerism",[7] and who travelled to Venice in 1658,[8] was moved to go about in sackcloth and ashes in London. A letter from John Stubbs to George Fox reports Elizabeth Harris' activities and points

1 Henry J. Cadbury (ed.), *Letters to William Dewsbury and Others* (London, 1948), p. 41 (Letter XVIII). *Journal*, Supplement 22.

2 Bishop, *The Cry of Blood*, pp. 85–86.

3 Blome, *Fanatick History*, p. 220.

4 George Fox's testimony in *A Short Relation Concerning the Life and Death of that man of God and faithful Minister of Jesus Christ, William Simpson* (London, 1671), p. 13.

5 Dewance Morey, *A true and faithful Warning from the Lord God, sounded through me, a poor despised Earthen Vessel, unto all the Inhabitants of England, who are yet in their sins* [n.p., n.d.] p. 5.

6 *The Image of Jealousie Sought Out* (London, 1660), pp. 7–8.

7 Kenneth L. Carroll, "Elizabeth Harris", *Quaker History*, 57 (1968), 96–111.

8 Swarthmore MSS III, 7 (Tr. IV, 197).

out that some Quakers were opposed to her testimony—so that she was troubled and desired Fox's judgment on this matter:

> Here is Elizabeth Harris [who] sometymes goes forth to steeple houses in sackcloath, and Shee hath much peace in this Service, there was some [that] seemed rather to be ag[ains]t it, which troubled [her] for a lit[t]le. She spoke to me with many teares about it severall weeks agoe, and I said I thought I might write to thee about it, And she desired I might, after She had been at Cambridge, it came to her She must goe to Manchester the first month, And So She would be glad to have a line or two from thee about it before she goes as soon as can be, the tyme drawes neare of her passing.[1]

No answer from George Fox is known to be extant, although it seems rather certain (given his general attitude toward signs) that he would have been favourably inclined towards her continuing in such behaviour when it was demanded of her by the Spirit.

By 1661–1662 the testimony of going about in sackcloth and ashes *as a sign*, like that of going naked, appears to have reached its high point—both in numbers and in geographical setting. The first known appearances of this phenomenon across the Atlantic made themselves manifest in New England in 1661. Katharine Chatham (who later married John Chamberlaine) was whipped and banished from Boston after appearing there in sackcloth "as a Sign of the Indignation of the Lord coming upon you".[2] In 1662 Daniel Baker (who may have gone naked as a sign in 1660) appeared in Gibraltar in sackcloth, while on his way back from Malta to England. Like Jonah he had resisted the divine command, but eventually he was forced to appear in sackcloth to call the people to repentance, in spite of the danger to his own life.[3]

One or more cases occurred in Kendal in 1664–1665, according to Fox's Journal, for he writes that

> There are many prisoners [for tithes] at Kendal . . . Others are in Kendal prison, who were moved of the Lord to speak to the

[1] Friends House Library, London, Crosfield MSS VII. A 1664 date has mistakenly been placed on the outside of this letter, but a reference to the *Battledoore* suggests a 1660 date.

[2] George Bishop, New England judged. 2nd part, 1667, p. 104 (1703 edition, pp. 420–421).

[3] William C. Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, Second Edition, revised by Henry J. Cadbury (Cambridge, 1955), pp. 432–433.

> priests, one to go in sackcloth, and with ashes upon her head. Others have been moved to go in sackcloth, as a lamentation for the miserable estate of this nation . . .[1]

In 1665 an interesting example of this same prophetic approach was also seen across the English Channel in France, where a Quaker woman appeared in the Protestant church in Dieppe before some "thousands" of people who were met together there:

> having set herself in the most conspicuous place, just over against him that preached, before the service was finished, she stood up, with the maid that was with her, who taking off a mantle and hood she was covered with, she appeared cloathed in sack cloth, and her hair hanging down, sprinkled with ashes: thus she turned herself round several times, that all the people might see her. This sight struck both the preacher and auditory with no small consternation; and the preacher's wife afterwards telling somebody how this sight had affected her, said, "This is of deeper reach than I can comprehend." The said women having stood thus a while, fell both down upon their knees, and prayed, and then went out of the meeting, many following them, and distributed some books.[2]

These two women were then arrested, imprisoned for a time, and finally were transported to England.

After 1665 this type of "prophetic" performance became increasingly rare, although it was still considered to be an acceptable act. Several very significant and interesting cases did occur in the early 1670s—especially those of Anne Wright in Ireland and England (1670) and Robert Barclay in Aberdeen (1672). Anne Wright, of County Kildare in Ireland, entered St. Patrick's Cathedral in Dublin on 17 April 1670, at the "time of their singing and common prayer". Dressed in "black sackcloth of hair, and ashes upon her head", she told the assembled congregation that theirs was not the form of worship God delighted in. No one lifted a hand against her, but they asked her to leave in peace, with some of them saying "she was a mad woman, and some one thing and some another".[3] In June of that year she went

[1] Fox, *Journal*, Bicentenary Edition (London, 1902), II, 55.

[2] William Sewel, *The History of the Rise, Increase, and Progress of the Christian People Called Quakers* (London, 1798), II, 205.

[3] Mary Leadbeater, *Biographical Notices of Members of the Society of Friends, who were Resident in Ireland* (London, 1823), p. 57. Anne Wright, daughter of John Howgill of London, was the wife of William Wright of Barnhill near Castledermot, County Kildare. She had become a convinced Friend only a short time before 1670.

through the streets of Cork in sackcloth and ashes and also reproved the mayor of Cork for persecuting Quakers.[1] Finally, after gaining her husband's consent, she travelled to London, and on 24 September she walked in sackcloth and ashes from Aldgate to Ludgate, later reporting to her husband that no one harmed her, for there was "so little disturbance when I spoke. They stood about me; and, when the words were ended, they parted and let me go."[2] On 15 October she very suddenly presented herself before the King who was walking with some of his court. Her sackcloth at first had been covered by her riding habit, which she quickly threw off to her "little maid". She then gave the King a paper, written by herself, calling upon him to be tender-hearted towards the Quakers. After reading the paper, Charles II and his attendants walked away.[3] Anne Wright, according to her husband's testimony, had wrestled with herself for weeks over these "calls" before going on such a "duty". She also had felt the necessity of obtaining the permission of her non-Quaker husband in order to carry out these commands. Shortly after completing these London appearances, and filled with the peace that obedience brought, she returned home to Ireland and died there on 1 December 1670.[4]

Robert Barclay (1648–1690) experienced a "call" in 1672 to make known "A Seasonable Warning and Serious Exhortation to, and Expostulation with the Inhabitants of Aberdeen" in Scotland, He, too, resisted this command. Barclay's account is particularly clear concerning his reluctance to perform this task:

> Therefore was I commanded of the Lord God, to pass through your Streets covered with Sack-cloth and Ashes, calling you to Repentance, that you might yet more be awakened, and Alarm'd to take notice of the Lord's Voice unto you . . . And the Command of the Lord concerning this thing came unto me that very Morning, as I awakened, and the Burden thereof was very Great, yes, seemed almost insupportable unto me (for such a thing, until that very moment, had never entered me before, not in the most remote Consideration.) And some, whom I called to declare to them this thing, can bear witness, how great was the Agony of

1 *Ibid.*, pp. 58–59. John Exham (1629?–1721) of Charleville in Ireland also travelled in sackcloth through Cork in 1698.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 67.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 68–71.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 75. Cf. pp. 56–62 for her inner struggles and her desire for her husband's permission.

> my Spirit, how I besought the Lord with tears, that this Cup might pass away from me! Yes, how the Pillars of my Tabernacle, were shaken, and how exceedingly this was the end and tendency of my Testimony, to call you to Repentance by this signal and singular Step, which I, as to my own Will and Inclination, was as unwilling to be found in, as the worst and wickedest of you can be averse from receiving, or laying it to heart.[1]

Following Barclay's 1672 appearance there seem to have been very few cases of Quakers appearing in sackcloth and ashes. One non-Quaker who paraded in sackcloth through London, Westminster, and Southwark in 1685 was testified against by Quakers, who wanted it to be clearly understood that this Solomon Hornoul did not belong to their Society.[2] The latest case I have uncovered was that of John Pemberton, well-known American Quaker who in 1784 appeared in Londonderry in Ireland, wearing sackcloth in the tradition of the earliest Quaker prophets. Although he had visited Londonderry several times before, he had felt a concern to return there once more,

> and laying it weightily before several Elders of the province of Ulster, and receiving their concurrence, he accordingly performed about the 20th 4 mo., 1784, accompanied by our ancient friend, James Christy, in the following manner. It being the time of their Assizes, and on a market day, he passed thro' the principal streets of the City, clothed in sackcloth, without any molestation from the Inhabitants, and expressed himself nearly in the following manner, "Repent! repent! Oh! all ye inhabitants of Londonderry! and of this land, while the Lord's mercies are continued to you." A number of people gathering about him at one of the Gates of the City, after repeating the foregoing words, he expressed that it was a great cross to him as a man to appear as he did, in so singular a manner, but he believed it was required of him to be a Sign to this people, and, if the highly favoured people of this [?city] did not humble themselves, and manifest greater gratitude to the Great Author of all blessings, and live in greater humility and devotedness, and in His fear, it was easy with Him to permit trials to overtake them, as He permitted trials and chastizements to overtake the inhabitants of his native land for their sins and ingratitude, for great favors had been conferred on them as well as on this land.[3]

1 Robert Barclay, *Truth Triumphant* (London, 1692), pp. 105–106.

2 *A true Account of one Solomon Hornoul, That lately went in sackcloth, through part of London, Westminster, and Southwark, &c.* (London, 1685). This one-page item is found in Broadsides A. 24, Friends House Library, London.

3 "Occurrences for the Progress of Truth", *Jnl. F.H.S.*, 2 (1905), 135.

II

Although going naked and appearing in sackcloth and ashes were the most frequent ways in which Quakers (in response to the prophetic spirit) acted out their messages, these two were by no means the only manifestations of Quaker signs and wonders. There was, in fact, a much richer range of expression than has ever before been noted. Very much like going naked and appearing in sackcloth and ashes, these other manifestations appeared primarily in the 1650s and early 1660s—although some were still to be met with nearly a generation after the founding of the Quaker movement.

George Fox, the founder of the Society of Friends, had some "drawings" in the direction of signs and wonders. In 1651, even before his Pendle Hill experience,[1] Fox removed his shoes and went—in stockinged feet—through Lichfield, proclaiming "Woe unto the bloody city of Lichfield".[2] Sometime in the next year (1652) Fox passed along one of Kendal's streets throwing pieces of silver among the people before he spoke (at a time when his "life was offered up amongst them"). Fox's message here was one of condemnation, as he proclaimed that "the mighty day of the Lord was coming upon all deceitful merchandise and ways".[3] Fox, like the ancient prophets, was calling people to repentance (which had really been an essential part of his message prior to 1652). As late as 1670 Fox was still seen performing a sign (it would seem) when he was without sight or hearing for some length of time, telling Friends that he "should be as a sign to such as would not see, and such as would not hear the Truth".[4]

In addition to containing accounts of several developments which appear to be signs on Fox's part, his Journal also notes a number of such expressions by other early Friends. Thomas Aldam, for instance, appeared before Oliver Cromwell in 1655, seeking an order to release Quakers

1 Fox was active in his preaching as early as 1647. Cf. Braithwaite, *Beginnings*, pp. 42ff.

2 George Fox, *Journal* (Cambridge, 1952), edited by John L. Nickalls, pp. 71–72. Was he influenced by Isaiah 20:2–4?

3 *Ibid.*, p. 121. Could Revelation 18:11–17 have been in his mind here?

4 *Ibid.*, p. 570. Could Ezekiel's behaviour have influenced Fox here? Cf. Bernhard W. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, second edition (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966), p. 366.

from Prison. When this order was not obtained, Thomas took his cap off his head, tore it into pieces before Cromwell, and then told Cromwell "so should his kingdom be rent from him".[1] This same Friend, on another occasion, also went seven months without a hat "in obedience to the Command of God . . . [so that he] was a wonder and a sign to all who were covered, and not [ruled by] Justice".[2]

Elizabeth Adams [d. 1689] was "moved to go to the Parliament that was envious against Friends" and to break a pitcher at the door of Parliament, telling them that soon so should they also be broken into pieces.[3] A similar sort of sign appeared across the Atlantic a few years later, in 1663, when Thomas Newhouse appeared in the Boston church or "meetinghouse", spoke for a time, then took two glass bottles in his hands and dashed "them to pieces, saying to this effect, That so they should be dasht in pieces".[4]

Still another form of the prophetic signs which manifested themselves among early Quakers was the blacking of the face. William Simpson (who had often appeared both naked and in sackcloth and ashes), according to George Fox, "was made oftentimes to colour his face black, and [proclaim that] so black they should be and appear so to people, for all their great profession".[5] A similar expression was found on the American side of the Atlantic in 1677, when Margaret Brewster of Barbados went into some New England churches "with her Face all made Black, for a Sign of what was

1 *Ibid.*, p. 355. Cf. Thomas Aldam, Jr., *A Short Testimony Concerning that Faithful Servant of the Lord Thomas Aldam of Warnsworth in the County of York* (London, 1690), p. 10, where Aldam's son says that this action was a "sign" to Cromwell "that the Government should be rent from him; and such as were not covered with the Spirit of the Lord".

2 Aldam, *A Short Testimony*, p. 10, records the episode which gave rise to this act. Thomas Aldam's hat had been taken by Philip Prince, a lawyer, whom Judge Windham would not reprove for taking it.

3 Fox, *Journal*, pp. 355–356. Cf. Swarthmore MSS, III, 118 (Tr. IV, 5), which gives Elizabeth Adams' name. One is reminded of Jeremiah's breaking of a flask.

4 Bishop, *New England Judged*, 2nd part, 1667, p. 113 (1703 edn., pp. 431–432). Cf. Richard P. Hallowell, *The Quaker Invasion of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1887), p. 96, concerning the incorrect report that Sarah Gibbons and Dorothy Waugh broke bottles in 1658 "as a sign" of John Norton's emptiness.

5 Fox's testimony in *A Short relation concerning . . . William Simpson*, p. 13. Cf. Fox, *Journal*, p. 407, for an account of Simpson's wearing "hair sackcloth" and putting "smut" upon his face.

coming upon them". As they had persecuted the Quakers, so now would they be punished.[1]

Several Quaker signs dealt with light rather than darkness or blackness. Elizabeth Adams, already noted above for her pitcher-breaking episode, went on horseback carrying a torch through Canterbury in 1660, riding "up and downe the City with it burning in her hand with a friend before her about the middle of the day". After being questioned by the mayor, Elizabeth Adams was sent to prison, but her companion was freed.[2] Richard Sale, a former constable near Chester (who had gone in sackcloth in 1655) on a "lecture day" in 1657 was "required" by the Lord to be a "signe",

> to take a lighted candle in my hand & to passe into the streets of the same, and to say behould yee despisers and wonder; for the Lord is working a work in your dayes though a man declare it unto you; yet you will not believe it; for a signe is not unto those that believe, but unto you which believe not; and they shall say unto thee what art thou mad to come into the streets at midday with a lighted candle, & thou shall say unto them, what use is all your Candle light worship for now who are in the night of apostasie, now the light of the sonn of god is come, which hath given his people an understandinge to disserne between things that differ, and the temple now is witnessed which needeth not the light, neither of sune mo[o]ne or Candle, for the lord god and the Lambe is the light there of.[3]

In 1660, shortly before the Restoration of Charles II to the throne of England, Robert Huntington (d. 1708) entered a "steeple house" at Brough (near Carlisle) with a white sheet draped about himself and a "halter" around his neck. His purpose had been to show the Presbyterians and Independents there "that the surplice was to be introduced again, and that some of them should not escape the halter". William Sewel later wrote that (although people at the time said that this act was "mad") "time showed it a presage of the impending disaster of the cruel persecutors: for when

[1] Bishop, *New England Judged*, 1703, p. 491. Cf. John Whiting, *Truth and Innocency Defended, Against Falsehood and Envy* (London, 1702), p. 103.

[2] Swarthmore MSS, IV, 272 (Tr. I, 420). This letter from William Caton to George Fox is dated 16 November 1660, Cf. John W. Graham, "Early Friends and the historical imagination", *Bulletin of Friends Historical Association*, 15 (1926), 9.

[3] Swarthmore MSS, IV, 114 (Tr. III, 287). This letter is dated 11 March 1657, from Richard Sale to Margaret Fell.

King Charles had ascended the throne, his most fierce enemies were dispatched out of the way".[1]

Still another sign was performed in 1659 by Robert Widders, one of Fox's earliest converts and later one of his companions in his American travels in 1671–1673. When Sir George Booth rose in arms in Cheshire, Widders rode among Booth's army "with a Twig in his Hand, and told them, The Lord with his Rod of Iron would break them to pieces". Although his horse was taken from him, Widders escaped any suffering. A few days later Booth's army was "all broken to pieces, and scattered".[2]

One of the most striking of these "signs and wonders" is that which Thomas Ibbitts [Ibbotts] performed in 1666, only a short time before the outbreak of the Great Fire of London. Sometime before his arrival in London he had received a vision which made known to him that London would receive a judgment by fire and would be laid waste. He explained to London Quakers, after his arrival there, that he had delayed coming to London and declaring his message, as commanded, "until he felt (as he expressed it) the fire in his own bosom". He arrived in London on 31 August and, upon alighting from his horse, unbuttoned his "clothes in so loose a manner, as if they had been put on in haste just out of bed". In this manner he went through the city on 31 August and 1 September, proclaiming a judgment by fire on London. The Great Fire broke out on Sunday, 2 September 1666. Needless to say, Ibbitts was suspected of having had a hand in the "fyreing of London".[3] Two other Friends had experienced even earlier visions of a great fire and destruction in London. Daniel Baker (in his 1659 *Certain Warning for a Naked Heart*) and Humphrey Smith (in his 1660 *Vision* which he saw Concerning London) both made known that they foresaw such a development.[4]

There are several other occurrences, all taking place in

1 Sewel, *History*, I, 475. Cf. Fox, *Camb. Journal*, ii. 2 where this is said to have taken place in Carlisle.

2 Robert Widders, *The Life & Death, Travels and Sufferings of Robert Widders* (London, 1688), p. 28.

3 See quotations from Hardy's "Notes and Extracts from the Sessions Rolls, 1581–1698" (Hertford, 1905), I, 179, 180, 188 given in Fox, *Camb. Journal*, ii, 398.

4 Walter George Bell, *The Great Fire of London in 1666* (London, 1923), p. 18.

1659, that one is tempted to include among Quaker signs and wonders, even though the accounts (all recorded in anti-Quaker documents) do not apply that designation to them. In the summer of 1659 a woman Quaker was reported to have brought her needlework into a Colchester church "and fell to work and singing while the minister was officiating".[1] Similar cases were reported as happening in London at the very same time. A Quaker was reported to have entered Dr. Gell's church in London one Sunday, carrying "an old Dublet . . ., and sat upon the Communion Table mending it, while the Dr. was preaching, the Parishioners forbidding him".[2] At almost the same period Solomon Eules [Eccles?] entered the Reverend "Edm. Calamies pulpit in church time, sitting down upon the such cushon . . . with his feet upon the seat (where the Priest, when he hath told out his lies, doth sit down) sowing a pocket, so that the People lost their song, &c".[3] A lack of Quaker materials renders as conjecture any attempt to explain the meaning, purpose, and significance of this type of behaviour.

It seems certain that this catalogue of signs and wonders, even when added to the many accounts of going naked and appearing in sackcloth and ashes, probably does not exhaust the full scope of the many prophetic signs that early Quakers felt called upon to enact. Yet it does show that the manifestations were rich in number, varied in expression, and particularly heavy from 1652 to 1661 or 1662 (when the controversy over John Perrot[4] and his strange teachings made people take a second look at inclinations of this sort). Some few cases of most of these various types continued beyond 1662, but they were the exception rather than the rule.

KENNETH L. CARROLL

[1] Thomas Underhill, *Hell Broke Loose: Or an History of the Quakers Both Old and New* (London, 1660), p. 32.

[2] Richard Blome, *Questions Propounded to George Whitehead and George Fox, who disputed by turnes against one University-Man in Cambr., Aug. 29, 1659* (London, 1659), p. 7.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[4] Kenneth L. Carroll, *John Perrot: Early Quaker Schismatic* (London, 1971).

The Meeting House at Flamstead End Hertfordshire

DANIEL DEFOE, reporting to Robert Harley in 1704 on political feeling in various parts of England, wrote of Hertfordshire,

> The Gentlemen of the Royston Club settle all the affairs of the country and carry all before them, though they behave with something more modesty . . . than in former days . . . They have built a large handsome square room . . . Here Justice — and the then club resolved the pulling down the Quakers' meeting [house] at Hertford in 1683, for which the proprietor afterwards sued him and recovered sufficient damages to rebuild the house.[1]

The minutes of Hertford Quarterly and Monthly meetings[2] have no mention of the destruction of Hertford Meeting House at this time, though it is true that from October 1683 to May 1686 Friends assembled for Quarterly and Monthly meetings at the houses of two of their Hertford members, and the meeting house, like many others at the time, appears to have been closed.[3] When Hertford Meeting House was used again, it was nearly a year before Friends decided to undertake repairs to the building, and then there was no mention of the cost.[4] It seems hardly likely therefore that the meeting house had been extensively damaged. But there was substance in Defoe's account if one looks at the history of a neighbouring meeting house, that at Flamstead End.[5]

[1] Historical Manuscripts Commission, 15th report, appendix, pt. iv: [29] Portland MSS, vol. 4 (1897), 153–154.

Defoe acted as a sort of secret service agent to Harley. The manuscripts show that he wanted a kind of MI5 to be set up, under cover of a Ministry with an innocuous name.

For what little is known of the Royston Club, see Alfred Kingston, *History of Royston* (1906), 159.

[2] Hertfordshire County Record Office, Q 83.

[3] Herts C.R.O. Q 83, pp. 3–30.

[4] Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 39.

[5] A series of letters from Enfield Monthly Meeting to Hertford Quarterly or Monthly Meeting is at Hertfordshire County Record Office (Q 123). The Enfield M.M. accounts for the period are at Friends House Library, London, in "Enfield Monthly Meeting Papers, 1689–1723" (henceforth referred to as Enfield Papers). Enfield M.M. does not seem to have kept minutes at the time.

Flamstead End was a hamlet a mile or two away from the centre of the little town of Cheshunt, about six miles from Hertford and about three from Enfield. The rent of the meeting house was £11 in the 1680s. It had an orchard and arable land adjoining.[1] Before 1683 it was quite a large meeting. 73 Friends were convicted for attending unlawful conventicles there in that year, of whom about a half came from Hertfordshire, and the rest from Essex, Middlesex or London.[2] The boundary between Hertfordshire and Middlesex ran about two miles south of Flamstead End, and since such local services as there were at the time, including the care of the poor, were organized on a county basis, Flamstead End was fruitful soil for a demarcation dispute. Enfield Monthly Meeting had been called on to decide in 1675 whether it should be connected to the quarterly meeting at London or to that at Hertford, and if one understands aright a somewhat incoherent minute of a later date, decided to keep both options open.

> It was remembered that at the first establishing this meeting it [wa]s granted that if anything fell amongst us here which this meeting be [un]willing or see it [in]conveniant to determine of ourselves, but rather to have referred to a quarterly meeting; in such a caise, and on such ocation, if it falls out on that part of this meeting that belongs to Meddlesex, that then one or two Friends of that part of this Meeting belonging to Hartfordshire are to goe along with Meddlesex Friend[s] to the quarterly meeting at London and lay the matter before Friends there, and so likwis if the ocation hapen amongst any of the Hartfordshire Friends belonging to this Meeting that then on[e] or two of Midlesex accompany them to the Quarterly Meeting at Hartford, and there to lay the matter before Friends.[3]

In practice, however, Enfield Friends were represented at London and Middlesex Quarterly Meeting, and did not attend at Hertford until 1687.[4]

An attack on Flamstead End Meeting House is first mentioned in a letter from Enfield Monthly Meeting read at

[1] Enfield Papers, pp. 5, 8, 9.

[2] *Hertford County Records. 1. Notes and extracts from the Sessions rolls 1581–1698.* By W. J. Hardy (1905), vol. 1, p. 331. To judge from the money collected for the poor and other purposes, Flamstead End meeting had more members than Winchmore Hill, South Mimms and Barnet in 1675. Enfield Papers, p. 2.

[3] Enfield Papers, p. 59.

[4] London Quarterly Meeting minutes 1690–1701 (Friends House Library, London) *passim*; and Herts C.R.O. Q 83 *passim*.

the quarterly meeting at Hertford in May 1686. Hertford Meeting House had been re-opened that day, after an interval of two and a half years. Part of the money contributed by Irish Quakers for the relief of English Friends had been allocated to Hertford Quarterly Meeting. Enfield Friends had heard of this, and now reminded Hertford Meeting of

> sum poore Friends towards the [out]scirts of your county, which with there neighbours from Waltham Abbey and Enfield make up the Meeting at Flamsted End in Cheshunt, where hath formerly bin great sufferings.[1]

A more exact account was later sent by Enfield Friends to Meeting for Sufferings. One Sunday in 1682 Justices Maddox and Fox had arrived and, at their direction, forms, galleries, benches, windows and doors were broken in pieces, and demolition of the walls begun. On the following Sunday they came again, ordered the doors, which in the interval had been repaired, to be again broken, and burnt; this set fire to the chimney-piece of the house, "to the consternation of the neighbourhood".[2] Enfield Friends suggested that before the relief fund from Ireland was spent, they should be consulted, but Hertford Friends took no action on this[3]—it was only three months since they had decided to repair their own meeting house, and they almost certainly knew that Enfield Meeting also had received part of the money from Ireland, and in fact more than had Hertford.[4]

More than a year later Enfield Friends wrote again, and with some asperity. They pointed out that they had paid the rent of Flamstead End Meeting House for a long time, "which you should a don" (as Flamstead End was in Hertfordshire and not Middlesex). For many years too they had kept the Meeting from sinking, "as certainly else it had donn those sevear times of suffering laitly over", and now, having to repair the meeting house, "which was much damnified in the late tymes of persecution, wee find it will cost above twenty pounds".[5] The Enfield clerk, Thomas

[1] Herts C.R.O. Q 123/1.

[2] Joseph Besse, *Sufferings* (1753) i, 252.

[3] Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 30.

[4] Hertford received £10 (Herts C.R.O. Q 83, pp. 19, 26) while Enfield received £11 15s. (Enfield Papers, p. 6).

[5] Herts C.R.O. Q 123/2. Their accounts (Enfield Papers, pp. 6–9) in fact record a total expenditure of £18 5s. on repairs.

Hart, and a Friend from Flamstead End, Samuel Goodacre, came to Hertford to support their cause. The matter was referred to the next quarterly meeting.[1] George Fox himself attended this latter meeting, and it was agreed that a collection should be taken at Hertford, Ware and Hitchin meetings to assist in the repair of Flamstead End Meeting House.[2]

A month later, at Hertford *Monthly* Meeting, there was a new development.

> It was agreed to that in consideration Commissioners are to meete by order from the King in this county shortly, that may give releife to such as have sustained damage by goods taken away and Meeting places ruined, that the collection which was agreed upon formerly for Flamsted End Meeting place be deferred for som time to see what is the issue of that Commission.

The Commissioners referred to are clearly the Judges of Assize, sitting with Justices of the county as Commissioners of the Peace, whose *nisi prius* cases included a large proportion dealing with damage to property. Hertford Friends had decided that those responsible for the damage to Flamstead End Meeting House should be taken to law. There was no mention of a similar use of legal means to obtain compensation for damage to Hertford Meeting House.[3]

In a notably sensible and forthright letter Enfield Friends opposed resort to law. They wrote:

> . . . upon your apprehension that relief would be obtained by the Commissioners or prosecuting the Justices, you had deferred it [the collection of money for repairs], the which we think you should not have done, for if any relief be gained thereby, tis Friends in your county that are in a capacity to gaine it, and not us of Middlesex, of whom your Commissioners can take noe notice.[4] Neither doe we think they have any power to deal with

[1] Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 40. The clerk minuted that the matter was referred to the next *monthly* meeting, but this must have been a slip, for it did not come up at the next monthly meeting; it was dealt with at the next quarterly meeting.

[2] Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 43.

[3] Herts C.R.O. Q 83, pp. 44, 45. At the next quarterly meeting Friends spelt out more clearly how redress should be obtained. "Its the opinion of the Meeting that the Friend or Friends that hath the leese of the Meeting House made unto them do send unto the Justices that were active in the said business and first to know of them whether they will repaire the damages don by them in a fair way; and if not consenting soe to end it, or then that he be arested and compeled to do it."

[4] Middlesex was grouped with London for Assize purposes. J. S. Cockburn, *History of English assizes 1558–1714* (1972), 23.

> Justices or others who in a riotous manner made spoyle under noe pretence of law, but in a willful rage and malice . . . but the spoyle they then made was under £10 value . . . If you lay itt before them and shew them their unlawful dealings it may be well, but to sue them at law we can not advise you, being not so sutable to our Christian principle. However we leave it to your wisdom of God to proceed as you shall therein judge meet.[1]

One can only agree with Enfield Friends that it was hardly likely that the magistrates, sitting with the Judges of Assize, would condemn and mulct for damages two of their own number. And the fees and other costs involved in bringing the case might well swallow up the greater part of the £10—legal fees, then as now, were prohibitive.[2]

Hertford Quarterly Meeting met three days after the Enfield letter was written, and wisely accepted, at least in part, the advice it had been given.

> It is agreed that Samuel Goodacre and William Bates make application to the Justices that damnified Flamsted End Meeting House, and to know of them whether they will make satisfaction for the dammages so done, in a fair way. And if refused, then Friends of this Meeting engage to bear the charges they shall be at in the further prosecution therof.[3]

So runs the minute. It was also decided to organize the collection formerly agreed upon, and later deferred, and at the next quarterly meeting £4 6s. was brought in from Hertford and Ware meetings, "towards the charge of rebuilding Flamsted End Meeting House".[4] Goodacre and Bates were members of the Flamstead End Meeting, but one or both had been attending Hertford Quarterly Meeting since the question of the repair of their own meeting house was raised there.[5]

Remarkable to relate, the Justice chiefly responsible did

1 Herts C.R.O. Q 123/3.
2 Cockburn, *op. cit.*, 135.
3 Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 46.
4 Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 47.
5 There were two Friends, father and son, called William Bates. This is probably the father, described once as silkweaver, but later as a labourer (*Hertfordshire County Records. Sessions books 1658–1700*, pp. 222, 363). Samuel Goodacre is also described as a labourer (*ibid.*, p. 363), but Hertford Friends collected to help him when his shop was destroyed (Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 136). He fostered poor children whom Enfield Friends supported, and rented the orchard adjoining the Flamstead End Meeting House. Both were prominent members of Enfield Monthly Meeting. (Enfield Papers, *passim*.)

pay compensation for the wrong he had done. Not the whole £10, certainly, but £7. It was not Goodacre and Bates, however, who secured the payment. A letter from Enfield Friends acknowledged the receipt of £4, "out of £7", states the Hertford minute, "recovered by some Friends means here" (i.e. Hertford). Enfield Friends understandably enquired what was to happen to the remaining £3.[1] In a letter later that month they named the Justice concerned. "You acquaint us it was the sense of your Meeting that the three pound, part of the seven pound received of Justice Madox towards the spoyle don at Flamsted End Meeting House, should not be disposed without our concurrance first".[2]

Sir Benjamin Maddox was a wealthy landowner who lived only a mile or two away from Flamstead End Meeting House.[3] He was responsible for several warrants in 1682 and 1683 authorizing the seizure of Friends' property for the "crime" of attending a Quaker meeting for worship.[4] In one case at least, there must have been sympathy for his victim, for when the constables at Ware seized a gelding belonging to Thomas Burr, the maltster at whose house George Fox sometimes stayed, no one would buy the horse.[5] It would not have been out of character for Maddox to have led the attack on the meeting house near his home.

Unfortunately for Enfield Friends, the remaining three pounds out of the seven recovered from Maddox were disposed of without reference to them, and they were indignant. The Hertford defence was a lame one—the three pounds had been paid out on behalf of "a poore Friend formerly under sufferings by the priest".[6] Enfield Friends expostulated that "if you doe but reflect upon the great charge our Meeting has bin hitherto at to support a Meeting, and releve the necessatyes of Friends in your countie, you cannot but with us judge it most seasonable we should have

[1] Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 48.
[2] Herts C.R.O. 123/4.
[3] He acquired valuable estates in Kent and Essex by his marriage in 1664 to the daughter of Sir William Glasscock, a master in Chancery (Herts C.R.O. Deed no. 79932X).
[4] Enfield Papers, p. 40.
[5] *Hertford County Records. 1. Notes and extracts from the Sessions rolls 1581–1698, op. cit.*, p. 343.
[6] Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 49.

the whole mony, had it been many times more".[1] Hertford Friends blamed Enfield Meeting for not writing back quickly enough about the money from Maddox, and in their minute named the person responsible for disposing of the £3. "It being left in Henry Stout's hands, to whom we refer you for further satisfaction, he not being present at this meeting."[2] Henry Stout was the able and wealthy maltster who played an important part in the life of Hertford Meeting,[3] but Enfield Friends were very annoyed at being referred to him for satisfaction. "It is your businesse", they told Hertford in no uncertain terms, "to judge and regulate the matter, and not to refer us to any perticuler of your members . . . we have not heard nor known the like, that any perticuler person in unity with Friends presume to act of his own will soe contrary to the sense of the Meeting".[4] One supposes that Stout, and not the two humble Flamstead End Friends, had approached Justice Maddox, that thus the compensation paid came to be in his hands, and he felt a certain freedom to dispose of it. Hertford had appealed to Enfield Friends to let the matter fall, "and that ther be no further controversy about it",[5] which Enfield Friends generously did. But the matter was not allowed to drop altogether: five months later a Hertford Monthly Meeting minute records, very unusually, for then as now, Quaker meetings did not proceed by means of majority decisions, "It is the opinion of the major part of this Meeting, that Henry Stout having disposed of a certain three pounds formerly in controversy, did it according to Order."[6]

During this dispute about the three pounds, Hertford Friends had agreed to pay £2 a year towards the rent of Flamstead End Meeting House.[7] Only fifteen months later they discussed whether they should continue to do this,[8] but for some years they continued to contribute, though

1 Herts C.R.O. Q 123/4.
2 Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 51.
3 V. A. Rowe, *The first Hertford Quakers*, 1970, *passim*.
4 Herts C.R.O. Q 123/4.
5 Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 51.
6 Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 56.
7 Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 52.
8 Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 64.

the Enfield clerk often noted that the money arrived late.[1] Their last payment was made in April 1696,[2] and Enfield Friends could not persuade them to contribute again. London and Middlesex Quarterly Meeting intervened on Enfield's behalf, the dispute was finally referred to Yearly Meeting, and mediators were appointed.[3] Hertfordshire Friends got their way in 1702; they paid the arrears, £10, "and soe they are free of the former engagement; and its left to there freedom to contribute as they please in a brotherly way".[4] There was some later correspondence about some Flamstead End Quakers who were poor, and had to be supported by one or other or both of the two monthly meetings.[5] There was still a Friends' Meeting at Flamstead End in 1708,[6] but in the following year Enfield Friends informed Hertford Monthly Meeting that they would no longer be concerned with the rent or other charges of Flamstead End Meeting House. They thought fit to tell Hertford Friends of this "before we gave the landlord warning or otherwise dispose of the house and goods".[7] No action was taken by Hertford, so presumably Friends ceased to meet at Flamstead End. Enfield's decision is very understandable. The monthly meeting reported in 1710 that Enfield Meeting House itself was so out of repair that it was unfit to meet there in winter. It had been decided to build a new meeting house on the old site, and this would cost £160.[8] Obviously the monthly meeting's resources would be stretched to the limit.

Defoe was describing events which had occurred twenty

[1] Enfield Papers, pp. 11 *et al.* The Enfield treasurer was Thomas Hart. See Herts C.R.O. Q 83, p. 59, in which Samuel Goodacre brought to Hertford Monthly Meeting a letter signed by Hart and requesting the money. He was told, "This Meeting intends to pay next Quarterly Meeting." The proportions paid by Hertford, Ware and Hitchin varied, but usually Hertford paid about 16 or 18 shillings, Ware 14s. and Hitchin 8 or 10s.

[2] Enfield Papers, p. 25.

[3] London Quarterly Meeting minutes 1690–1701 and 1701–1713. Hertford Friends explained their wish to terminate the agreement by the failure of various monthly meetings to attend quarterly meeting, so that the whole burden of the 40s. contribution fell on one or two local meetings. Herts C.R.O. Q 83, pp. 108–133.

[4] Enfield Papers, p. 35.

[5] Herts C.R.O. Q 83, pp. 113–138.

[6] William Urwick, *Nonconformity in Herts* (1884), 512.

[7] Herts C.R.O. Q 123/15.

[8] Enfield Papers, p. 178.

years before. He was writing also from Bury St. Edmunds or Cambridge,[1] not from Hertford or Enfield, where possibly he might have obtained a more correct version of the incidents he related. His account fits much better the attack on Flamstead End Meeting House than anything known about the Hertford building. Flamstead End was a less populous and more secluded area than the centre of Hertford, where Justice Maddox and his fellow rowdies would have courted unwelcome publicity. As Hertford Friends did contemplate legal action, and as Justice Maddox in the end paid damages, one can understand how the version of the story that Defoe heard came to circulate. There are tantalizing gaps in the story—one would give much to know what happened at the interview between "some Friends here" and Maddox—but the main outlines are clear, and it is beyond reasonable doubt that it was Flamstead End, not Hertford, which was the victim of the lawless attack that Defoe had heard about.

VIOLET A. ROWE

[1] This is clear from the manuscript of Defoe's letter, British Library, Portland MSS, Harley Papers, Deposit 29/224, f.49.

Joseph Sturge and the Crimean War. 2.
The Founding of *The Morning Star*

EARLY in 1855, Joseph Sturge wrote to George Wilson concerning "the arrangements for the paper".[1] The inquiry was just a passing reference to a projected daily newspaper devoted to the peace cause which had been discussed casually, from time to time, by Wilson and Richard Cobden. By midsummer, plans for this, the first London daily ever to support the ideal of peace, were to become Sturge's major pre-occupation. For the first six months of 1855, however, he had remained relatively uninvolved in the project, and continued to search for a way to make his anti-war views effective.

During this period, one's impression is that Sturge was often restrained from direct action by his co-workers in the cause. For example, as early as September, 1854, Sturge had wanted to call a conference on the war, presumably to be modelled on the Peace Congresses. Bright discouraged the enterprise, advising him "that it may be best to rest quiet at present".[2]

In January, 1855, the Manchester supporters of John Bright and Thomas Milner Gibson[3] planned to hold a *soirée* in their honour. To Sturge, this seemed to be the opportunity for a public demonstration on behalf of peace. He wrote to George Wilson to inquire whether the *soirée*

> might be the occasion of a little more general gathering of the Friends of the Peace Cause? at which some resolutions might be passed stating what terms the Meeting thought England & France should

[1] Sturge to Wilson, January 12, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library. George Wilson (1808–1870) of Manchester, chairman Anti-Corn Law League, active in movement for parliamentary reform; *D.N.B.*

[2] Bright to Sturge, September 4, 1854, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43723.

[3] Thomas Milner Gibson (1806–1884) was also M.P. for Manchester; *D.N.B.*

be willing to accept as conditions of Peace with Russia as I expect most unreasonable ones will be required.[1]

Sturge also wrote to Richard Cobden with the same proposal. Cobden replied that he did not see "how the *soirée* to Gibson and Bright at Manchester can be made into a Peace Congress Meeting". He felt that there was "hardly strength enough amongst our friends to give it that character" and that the best that could be hoped for was that the affair would give the "*appearance* at least of considerable support for the peace cause in Manchester".[2] Most of those who attended the *soirée* would go simply to honour the two M.P.s and certainly not to affirm peace principles. Sturge withdrew the request in favour of a private meeting to be held the morning after the *soirée*.[3] A meeting was held on January 27, but it is not known what was there decided.[4]

In January, the cause of peace received what Sturge considered to be a serious setback. Ever since the first rumblings of war, Sturge and the other proponents of peace had had great faith in the pacific intentions of the prime minister, Lord Aberdeen. Even as the war progressed and Aberdeen sent more and more troops to the Crimea, those in the peace movement remained convinced that it was the prime minister's intention to make peace as quickly as possible, and that he was kept from doing so because of the hawkish mood of the people and the pro-war views of the majority of his cabinet. In January, lacking the confidence of the British people and his own ministers, Aberdeen was forced to resign. Palmerston, the worst possible man in the eyes of the peace band, became prime minister. Sturge wrote to Samuel Rhoads of Philadelphia:

We had the greatest hope of Lord Aberdeen in regard to peace and had he remained in office a few weeks longer, there was a fair prospect

[1] Sturge to Wilson, January 3, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library.

[2] Cobden to Sturge, January 5, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722. Cobden's reticence is understandable considering that two months earlier John Bright had been burnt in effigy by his constituents, specifically for his stand on the war.

[3] Sturge to Wilson, January 6, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library. The *soirée* was originally scheduled to be held on Friday, January 19, but the date was changed to January 28.

[4] Sturge to Wilson, January 25, 1855, *ibid.*

of its being attained, but now I fear we shall have a terrible slaughter again ere long at Sebastopol.[1]

It was Sturge's opinion, too, that the possibility of peace became more remote when, a few weeks after the fall of Aberdeen, Nicholas I of Russia died. For over a year the British press had vilified Nicholas; and in the popular mind it was not so much the Russian people as their Emperor who was responsible for the war. One might have thought, therefore, that the death of Nicholas would have removed an obstacle standing in the way of peace. Sturge thought differently. The day after the event he wrote to Wilson concerning "this remarkable Providence the death of the Czar". His attitude remained consistent with the impression he had formed as a member of the deputation to St. Petersburg in February, 1854. He wrote:

I am by no means certain that the Death of Nicholas will facilitate Peace for I have long been persuaded that he was more anxious for it than most of his subjects if he could see how to attain it without any sacrifice of what he thought was due to the honour of his country.[2]

Other supporters of peace in Manchester took the death of Nicholas and the accession of his son, Alexander II, as an opportunity to present to Palmerston a memorial, urging that there be an immediate armistice based on the "four points".[3] Palmerston replied politely to the petition, but

[1] Sturge to Rhoads, February, 1855, in Henry Richard, *Memoirs of Joseph Sturge*, London, 1864 (hereafter cited as *Memoirs*), p. 489. Samuel Rhoads (*c.* 1806–1868) was a Philadelphia Quaker who had been active in the anti-slavery movement. Whether or not Sturge exaggerated the probability of peace, he was not mistaken in Aberdeen, who had consistently sought a peaceful settlement to the conflict. By his own later admission, Aberdeen sometimes followed weakly behind, instead of leading, public opinion. Nonetheless, he never abandoned himself to jingoism in order to maintain his political position. Since August, 1854, he had worked actively for a peace treaty centred around the well-known "four points": (1) that there should be a European rather than a Russian protectorate in the principalities; (2) that the navigation channels at the mouth of the Danube should be improved; (3) that the Straits Convention of 1841 should be revised to maintain the balance of power; (4) that Russia should abandon her claims to any official right of protection over Christians in the Turkish Empire. Nicholas had accepted the "four points" in principle as early as November, 1854, so Sturge's hopes for peace were not merely wishful thinking.

[2] Sturge to Wilson, March 3, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library.

[3] See note 1 above.

there was no armistice, and Sturge's fears proved justified. The war had still a year to run.[1]

Early in February, Sturge looked to London for something to do, but Cobden wrote "I do not know what you could do in town for the good cause at present".[2] Sturge found a temporary project nearer home. On behalf of the Rev. Arthur O'Neil, he arranged a series of anti-war lectures in the environs of Birmingham. Between February 19 and April 20, O'Neil spoke also in neighbouring towns like Worcester, Wolverhampton, and Coventry, where, according to Henry Richard, he was listened to "with respect and favour".[3] Richard was unduly optimistic, for Sebastopol was still in Russian hands and the war fever still raged in England. Although there were a number of public meetings and private caucuses on behalf of peace that spring, the end of the war was not in sight.[4] In March, Sturge wrote of being so discouraged by the state of affairs "as not to see our way to [do] more in the Peace Cause especially as R. Cobden had so strong an opinion that nothing could be done".[5] Bright wrote likewise, "I see no chance of peace".[6]

For some time Sturge had considered that a way out of the conflict might be to secure the mediation of a neutral power, but by May this scheme had come to nothing. As Bright had pointed out, the problem would be to find an impartial arbitrator.[7] The Americans were for a while cast as the peacemakers, but Cobden finally ruled them out as having no moral authority in England. He felt that it was the impression in London that the United States would

[1] *The British Friend*, XIII (April, 1855), p. 97; *Herald of Peace*, n.s. LVIII (April, 1855), p. 194.

[2] Cobden to Sturge, February 2, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722.

[3] *Herald of Peace*, n.s. LIX (May, 1855), p. 205 and LX (June, 1855), p. 211.

[4] A detailed list of the public meetings arranged by Sturge is found in *Herald of Peace*, n.s. LIX (May, 1855), p. 205. The correspondence between Cobden, Bright, Wilson and Sturge indicates that there were a number of small, private gatherings to discuss the prospects for peace, but it would appear that little came out of these meetings—except, of course, that they would have boosted the morale of the peace faction.

[5] Sturge to Wilson, March 23, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library.

[6] Bright to Sturge, April 24, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43723.

[7] Bright to Sturge, December 28, 1854, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43723.

itself wage a war where it could do so with advantage and impunity, "where the party attacked is not able to offer a very dangerous resistance".[1]

May 22 found Sturge at another poorly-attended annual meeting of the Peace Society, where he took part in (unrecorded) "animated conversation" and was among those who made "important suggestions".[2] Immediately afterwards, he attended London Yearly Meeting, but there is no record of what, if anything, he said there.[3]

It was in July that Joseph Sturge began to be seriously involved in the plans for a peace newspaper. Concerning this project, Henry Richard tells us that at first Sturge "displayed unwonted repugnance to take the matter in hand".[4] It will be clear, however, that, once committed, Sturge did not spare himself until the plans were realized. It is not too much to say that without Sturge the *Morning* and *Evening Star* would never have been published.

* * *

Richard Cobden seems to have originated the idea of a daily peace newspaper. As early as December, 1853, he had mentioned it, in passing, in a letter to Sturge:

> By the way, what an advantage it would be if the newspaper stamp was abolished and we could have a daily paper circulating 30 or 40,000—advocating peace and constantly keeping before the public the evils of past wars, and the terrible consequences of future hostilities. I am quite sure, if there were no stamp, that a paper pledged to the Peace Conference views, and *free on other questions*, might have a very large circulation. It is only by a ***daily*** paper that we can really influence public opinion.[5]

[1] Cobden to Sturge, May 17, 1855, *ibid.*, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722. See also Cobden to Sturge, February 21, 1855, *ibid.*; Sturge to Wilson, April 14, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library.

[2] *Herald of Peace*, n.s. LX (June, 1855), 214–215.

[3] Yearly Meeting was held May 23–June 2. See *The Friend*, XIII (June, 1855), 99–103; *The British Friend*, XIII (June, 1855), 129–142.

[4] *Memoirs*, p. 520.

[5] Cobden to Sturge, December 14, 1853, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 50131. The *Herald of Peace* had been publishing for forty years, but it failed to satisfy Cobden in that (1) it was a monthly, (2) it dealt exclusively with peace matters, and (3) its extreme views would always keep it from having mass circulation. Concerning the newspaper project, Cobden wrote Richard that "nothing of the kind will answer our purpose until we can get rid of the stamp". Cobden to Richard, September 22, 1854, Cobden Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43657. As for the newspaper stamp, this "tax on knowledge" was finally abolished in 1855 and it became possible to publish the *Morning* and *Evening Star* for one penny. Before publication, it was decided that the paper would represent the general political opinions of Cobden and Bright, not simply their pacifist beliefs.

A few months later, shortly after the outbreak of the Crimean war, Cobden returned to the subject. After noting that the *Morning Chronicle* was up for sale, he expressed the wish that there were "a London Daily paper to advocate the principles of the Peace Congresses. I have no doubt we could support such a paper well, if we could get rid of the stamp".[1] Joseph Sturge's first (surviving) word on the subject was in a letter to George Wilson, in January, 1855.[2] He made his first concrete suggestion a month later, namely, that Bright, Cobden and Wilson should be the directors of such a paper if it were started.[3] On March 29 he wrote to Cobden concerning Edward Collins, as a prospective editor for this still-highly hypothetical newspaper. Cobden agreed with him "that Collins would be one of the best men that could be found".[4]

Further correspondence shows that Sturge's interest in the project continued to develop,[5] and from July, 1855, onward it is evident that he was firmly committed to it. In July, Cobden wrote that he was going to discuss the possibility of a peace paper with Henry Richard and James Bell.[6] Like Sturge, he believed that "it would be very desirable to have Richard's pen at work in a London paper".[7]

Sturge, in turn, wrote to Wilson to ask if there were "no chance of an able paper being brought out daily at 1*d.* representing the opinions of the 'Manchester party'."[8]

Cobden continued to be enthusiastic. In July, he was "sure that in a few months there will be an excellent opening

[1] Cobden to Sturge, April 24, 1854, *ibid.*, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722. Cobden's certainty here contrasts with his vacillation late in 1855, when, but for the determination of Sturge, the newspaper project might well have fallen through.

[2] See p. 335, note 1.

[3] Cobden to Sturge, February 16, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722.

[4] Cobden to Sturge, March 29, 1855, *ibid.* Edward Francis Collins (1807–1872), one time private secretary to Joseph Hume, M.P.; editor of the *Hull Advertiser*, 1842–1866; a Roman Catholic.

[5] e.g. Cobden to Sturge, May 15, 1855, *ibid.*

[6] James Bell (1818–1872), M.P. for Guildford, 1852–1857.

[7] Cobden to Sturge, July 6, 1855, *ibid.* Note that although it was agreed that Richard would benefit the new paper, it would also be the policy of those who promoted the project that under no circumstances should the paper become a daily version of the *Herald of Peace*.

[8] Sturge to Wilson, July 7, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library.

for such a paper".[1] He was convinced not only of the desirability, but also of the practicability of establishing this newspaper, and by the end of the month Henry Richard, too, was well into the project.[2]

Search for Financial Support

A meeting was arranged for August 4, to consolidate the plans,[3] and Sturge reported afterward to Wilson:

> At Richard Cobden's request I went to London on Friday night [August 3] respecting the question of a penny daily paper and met him and Jno. Bright and J. Bell and H. Richard the next morning when we went pretty fully into the subject. Jno. Bright . . . said he expected to be in Manchester about Thursday and would see some of you about it . . . .[4]

A few days after the meeting, Cobden suggested to Sturge that £5,000 would be sufficient capital to begin the enterprise; and that, as far as the paper's management was concerned, he (Cobden), Bright and Wilson should act as "a sort of Trustees", to guarantee the political soundness of what was published. What political principles would the new paper avow? According to Cobden, they "could hardly be more simply defined than by making use of the past votes and proceedings of Bright and myself in the House and the Country as an illustration of what views the paper should support".[5]

Sturge travelled to Manchester, probably on August 20,[6] where he and Wilson pursued a number of practical matters concerning the policy, management, and financing of the proposed paper. After he had returned to Birmingham,

[1] Cobden to Sturge, July 10, 1855, Cobden Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43656.

[2] Cobden to Sturge, July 28, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722. Henry Richard writes in the *Memoirs* that Sturge wrote many letters to him concerning plans for the paper. I have not been able to locate any of these letters. Richard discusses the founding of the *Morning* and *Evening Star* very briefly in the *Memoirs*, pp. 519–521.

[3] Cobden to Sturge, August 1, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722.

[4] Sturge to Wilson, August 6, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library.

[5] Cobden to Sturge (copy), August 8, 1855, Cobden Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43656.

[6] Sturge to Wilson, August 19, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library. Sturge implies that he will be leaving for Manchester the following morning.

Sturge sent a memorandum to Wilson which embodied the understanding the two men had come to. The following had been decided:

1. Cobden, Bright and Wilson would have "a preponderance of pecuniary investment" in the paper.
2. £2,000 toward the capital needed to found the paper would be placed at the disposal of Cobden and Bright.
3. The chief objects of the new paper would be to oppose the Crimean war, to advocate, in future, a policy of British non-intervention in the affairs of foreign states, and to promote the settlement of international disputes by arbitration.
4. The paper would, in general, represent the political opinions of Cobden and Bright, "as known by their votes and speeches in the House of Commons".
5. Wilson, Bright and Cobden would have a veto concerning what the paper should and should not advocate.
6. In case the venture should fail, the subscribers would suffer only the loss of their original investment.
7. Should the paper succeed, (*a*) two-fifths of the profits would be at the disposal of Cobden and Bright, for them to apply to whatever "public objects" they wished, and (*b*) the original subscribers would have their principal returned to them, with interest.[1]

Two days later, Sturge again wrote to Wilson to say that, although John Bright's views on education might mean that one or two possible supporters might not subscribe, he nevertheless believed that £500 could be raised in Manchester. He intended to return to that city in a few days to visit potential contributors, since he thought it "best to make a personal call upon nearly all I apply to".[2]

On September 1, Sturge could report subscriptions of £250 each from Robert Charleton and George Thomas of Bristol.[3] At the same time, he urged that the paper should appear as soon as possible and suggested that a "competent and suitable person" be sent to New York to look into a

[1] Sturge to Wilson, August 22, 1855, *ibid.* John Bright made the modifications that (*a*) the paper would support the views which he and Cobden expressed in *and* out of Parliament, and (*b*) while he, Cobden and Wilson would share in directing the paper's policy, all money raised by Sturge should be advanced to the paper in Wilson's name only. (See Bright to Sturge, August 23, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43723.)

[2] Sturge to Wilson, August 25, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library. Bright supported secular schools.

[3] George Thomas (1791–1869) was a Quaker philanthropist, particularly active in the temperance movement. (See *Annual Monitor, 1871*, pp. 125–131.) Robert Charleton (1809–1872); *D.N.B.* See *J.F.H.S.*, 52 (1969), 78–96.

printing press.[1] Cobden was satisfied that Sturge had a clear picture of what was ahead.[2]

On September 6, Sturge wrote that he had received subscriptions of £100 each from the sisters of James Bell. His friend George Thompson, co-owner of the *Empire*, had been to see him concerning that journal's financial difficulties. Sturge did not feel competent to give Thompson any advice, but suggested that Wilson might want to consider the possibility of taking over the *Empire's* premises to use for the new paper.[3] On the 10th, Sturge wrote of a probable £200 subscription from a donor who would prefer to remain anonymous. He also said that he was ready to come to Manchester, in order to relieve Wilson of the delicate task of applying to local associates for contributions.[4]

As an indication of the earnestness with which the associates were now pursuing the project, we see that on September 12, Bright and Wilson took time off from their respective affairs to travel to London to inquire about a printing press there.[5] But in spite of the enthusiasm of Sturge, Cobden, Bright and Wilson, there are reminders that the public was still as warlike as ever, and that it would not be easy for any newspaper to change the direction of public opinion. Cobden, who was perhaps the least steadfast of the associates as far as the paper was concerned, wrote to Sturge just after the battle of Sebastopol (September 8–9). It seems that Sturge had expressed doubts "whether the success of the allies at Sebastopol [would] not diminish the chances of peace". Cobden felt that while this might not be the case as far as the politicians were concerned, the people were still hungry for war. While he praised Sturge's "never-tiring energy in collecting so much money", he said that it was just as well that the paper could not come out

[1] Sturge to Wilson, September 1, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library. Sturge thought it possible that the paper might even be brought out on November 1. If his hopes for early publication were unduly optimistic, it can at least be said that it was his constant pushing which kept the plans moving.

[2] Cobden to Sturge, September 4, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722.

[3] Sturge to Wilson ("private"), September 6, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library.

[4] Sturge to Wilson, September 10, 1855, *ibid.*

[5] Bright to Sturge, September 12, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43723.

immediately. Cobden, himself, declined to undertake anything publicly in behalf of peace because, he said, "the people are stark staring mad just for the moment and it were folly to treat them as rational beings until the fit is over—they would only 'turn and rend' us".[1]

Cobden did well to praise his friend's efforts in raising money for the paper. In one week, Sturge noted that he had been on "a begging trip as far as Bradford" and that he intended to go to Darlington and Manchester. Largely as a result of his travels, the subscription fund now had £1,800 "as good as promised".[2] A week later, Sturge wrote that the Darlington trip had been fully as successful as he had hoped it would be.[3]

Money continued to come in from members of the Society of Friends. Edward Backhouse[4] subscribed £150 and Joseph[5] and Henry Pease[6] each sent £100. As well as raising funds, Sturge involved himself with plans for the management of the paper. He noted, after a trip to Manchester, that S. P. Robinson,[7] Henry Bradford and Henry Rawson[8] would probably be associated with Wilson in carrying on the paper. Sturge still favoured Collins as editor.[9] He believed it to be important that the editor be a man with an emotional commitment to the cause of peace, who would not undertake the job simply as a matter of business. Sturge felt that Collins was such a man, and that John Hamilton would answer as second editor. "I fear thou wilt think I am too particular on this point", he wrote to

[1] Cobden to Sturge ("private"), September 15, 1855, *ibid.*, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722.

[2] Sturge to Wilson, September 17, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library.

[3] Sturge to Wilson, September 23, 1855, *ibid.*

[4] Edward Backhouse (1808–1879) of Sunderland; *Annual Monitor*, 1880, pp. 21–25; *D.N.B.*

[5] Joseph Pease (1799–1872) of Darlington; *Annual Monitor*, 1873, pp. 101–110; *D.N.B.*

[6] Henry Pease (1807–1881) *D.N.B.*; accompanied Joseph Sturge to St. Petersburg, 1854.

[7] Smith Phillips Robinson (1808–1885), Anti-Corn Law Leaguer; worked for Cobden's election in the West Riding, 1847.

[8] Henry Rawson (*d.* 1879), Manchester stock broker and chairman of the Manchester Stock Exchange, 1847–49 and 1861–69.

[9] Sturge to Cobden, September 27, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722.

Wilson, "but I consider it to be a vital one in fairly carrying out the object we all have in view".[1]

Cobden did not share Sturge's opinion about the importance of the editor. He felt that the true guarantee of the paper's orthodoxy would be the "trusteeship" of himself, Bright and Wilson. It would even be better, he said, if the editor "were not too eager and enthusiastic an advocate of our principles". Certainly the paper would fail if an attempt were made "to convert it into a daily *Herald of Peace*". Cobden told Sturge that for the new paper to reach the desired circulation of 30,000 copies daily, it would be necessary "to *manage* the peace question in its columns with some of the 'wisdom of the serpent'." Although "not one word should be admitted into its columns to sanction this or any other war", wrote Cobden, "it may be necessary to temporise a little as to the times and circumstances where and how the peace policy shall be advocated".[2]

This playing down of the editor's role seems to have alarmed Sturge. Shortly after he received Cobden's latter, he wrote to ask Wilson to keep the position of editor open until they had had a chance to talk the matter over together. He noted that he had written to John Bright, to say that he intended to confer with Wilson about a prospective editor.[3]

Bright wrote to Sturge that he would not be able to join him and Wilson in Manchester to discuss the problem, but that, in any event, it was "premature" to decide who the editor should be. Bright echoed Cobden, saying that he was not sure that it was "desirable that the editor should hold the abstract peace principle" and that "the paper must not be a Daily *Herald of Peace*—there requires wisdom as well as zeal in the attempt to write people into common

[1] Sturge to Wilson, September 28, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library. John Hamilton (1821?–1860), was joint proprietor of *The Empire* with George Thompson and edited the *Morning* and *Evening Star* to 1860.

[2] Cobden to Sturge, September 30, 1855, Cobden Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43656. In time, Cobden came to feel that the paper was too obviously reflecting his and Bright's views; see John Morley, *The Life of Richard Cobden*, Jubilee edition; London, 1896, ii, 385.

[3] Sturge to Wilson ("private"), October 1, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library.

sense".[1] Sturge seems to have bowed to the judgment of Bright and Cobden, for when he next wrote to Wilson (about plans for circulating the paper in the country), he asked merely that he should be informed once the choice of editor had been made.[2]

In a letter of October 13, Sturge stressed the importance of bringing the paper out as soon as possible. To expedite early publication (in which effort he was supported by his remaining friends in the peace cause), he suggested that the American printing press should not be used.[3] About a week later he reiterated his concern, but added that failure must not be risked for want of considering the difficulties involved in publication. Sturge also made it clear that he did not want to encourage subscribers who would not easily be able to absorb their loss should the newspaper fail—that is to say, he believed that no one should subscribe to the venture just in the hope that it would turn out to be a good investment.[4]

On the other hand, Bright told Sturge that he believed no one should be disqualified from subscribing simply because he happened to be ruled by the profit motive.

[1] Bright to Sturge, October 2, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43723. The fact is that Bright himself, was never committed to the "abstract peace principle". For his comments on the subject, see *Mr. John Bright and the Peace Society* (London [1887?], p. 9.

[2] Sturge to Wilson, October 8, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library. Sturge had discussed the problem of circulation with John Ellis (1789–1862), chairman of the Midland Railway. In this letter, Sturge also says that he does not think that "public feelings is in half so bad a state as Richard Cobden seems to suppose".

[3] Sturge to Wilson, October 13, 1855, *ibid*. Sturge also discussed the possibility of anti-war lectures in Lancashire and Yorkshire, and the idea of friends in London to circulate, among the merchants and bankers, a memorial on behalf of ending the war. The *Herald of Peace*, n.s. LXIV (October, 1855), p. 265, contains a letter from "Pacificus" advocating a peace paper which would appear more frequently than the *Herald*. In the *Herald of Peace*, n.s. LXV (November, 1855), p. 72, it is reported: "We have received several letters in reference to the suggestion of 'Pacificus' in our last number, as to the more frequent appearance of *The Herald*. They have been, generally, in support of that suggestion, and have been extremely satisfactory and encouiaging to us. We hope to have the gratification before long of announcing to our readers, that though this particular proposal may not be carried into effect, some other means will be taken for making a wider use of the press in advocacy of peace principles".

[4] Sturge to Wilson, October 22, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library.

Bright wanted all the subscribers he could get, probably in view of his discouraging observation toward the end of October that the Manchester people were "rather lukewarm" about the paper.[1] Bright also reported that difficulties with the paper would cause Wilson to suspend plans for publication. This was a blow to Sturge, who immediately wrote to Wilson to arrange an early meeting to discuss the problems.[2] The "difficulties" were apparently financial ones. Sturge remained convinced that enough money could be raised to launch the paper, and told Wilson so.[3] Helped along by Cobden (now in a more confident frame of mind than after Sebastopol), plans for the paper proceeded.[4]

Sturge attended a meeting with Wilson and Bright in Manchester on November 10.[5] On returning to Birmingham, he wrote a confidential letter to Wilson, saying that he had sent a list of the subscribers to Gregg and Thomasson, and that he had asked both men "if they could spare £500".[6] He said that he favoured a suggestion made by Henry Rawson, now Wilson's equal in the project, that all the subscribers be required to put up cash, adding that he doubted that many could be induced to part with more than half of their pledge at the outset. At least, Sturge promised, all the money which he personally raised would be available whenever it was wanted, and he asked Wilson to arrange for a bank where the subscription money could be deposited. He hoped that the first issue of the new paper might come out on January 1, 1856, perhaps under the editorship of W. T. Haly,[7] with Collins and Hamilton

[1] Bright to Sturge, October 26, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43723. Sturge never said that a desire for profit should disqualify any potential subscriber, but implied strongly that it should not be the main motive of anyone who wished to support the paper.

[2] Sturge to Wilson, October 27, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library.

[3] Sturge to Wilson, November 5, 1855, *ibid.*

[4] Cobden to Sturge, November 3, 1855, Cobden Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43656.

[5] Sturge to Wilson, November 8, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library. Arrangements for the meeting were made in this letter.

[6] Thomas Thomasson (1808–1876), manufacturer, financial supporter of the Anti-Corn Law movement; *D.N.B.* Gregg declined to subscribe. See Sturge to Wilson, November 21, 1855, *ibid.*

[7] William Taylor Haly of London; author of *The Opinions of Sir R. Peel* . . . (London, 1843).

as assistant editors. Sturge's attitude toward the paper was, at this time, more than usually encouraging; and his hopes for peace were bright. Above all, he felt the need for action. "The tide is I think setting the right way", he wrote, "if we make the most of it".[1]

Writing to Sturge, John Bright seconded his friend's optimism. His opinion was that "a section, if not a majority" of the Government wanted peace.[2] Cobden continued to be hopeful, too. He encouraged Sturge in planning for early publication, noting that the *Press*, "said to be Disraeli's", had had "some excellent peace matter" in its most recent issue.[3]

Cobden also conferred with Sturge *"in strict confidence"* about Henry Rawson, who had come to share with George Wilson the responsibility of planning for the paper. Cobden felt obliged to say that Rawson was "a selfish, money-loving chap [who would] not put £500 any where without looking well after it".[4] Not that Cobden felt that this was a serious disadvantage, it was just that he agreed with Sturge in not wanting anyone to invest in the paper merely to make money. As for editing the paper, Cobden preferred the likes of Haly "ten times before any body in Manchester".[5] Sturge agreed that Haly might make a good editor, although he still hoped that a place might be found for Hamilton.[6]

By the beginning of December, 1855, it looked as though the paper would be adequately financed, mostly as a result of Joseph Sturge's tireless canvassing for funds. A tally which Bright sent Sturge showed:

[1] Sturge to Wilson ("private"), November 12, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library.

[2] Bright to Sturge, November 20, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43723.

[3] Cobden to Sturge, November 21, 1855, Cobden Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43656. The "peace matter" to which Cobden referred was in the *Press* of Saturday, November 17, 1855.

[4] Cobden to Sturge ("private"), November 22, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722.

[5] Cobden to Sturge ("strictly confidential"), December 2, 1855, *ibid.*

[6] Sturge to Wilson, November 28, 1855, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library.

	£
Thy [Sturge's] subscription including what we have already got here	3,000
H. Rawson	500
Our further subscription	1,000
	4,500
I think M. Gibson is likely to do something and we expect to make up another	500
	£5,000.[1]

Choice of Editor

There was no problem with money, but there were difficulties about who the editor should be. Bright wanted the choice left entirely to Wilson and Rawson and was against taking money from Haly. He said that Haly represented a group which held unacceptable political principles.[2] Sturge could not contribute to the discussion at this point because he had fallen seriously ill.[3] For several weeks he was unable to work, but by December 20, in spite of Cobden's feeling that he was making a mistake "in commencing brain work so early", Sturge was again corresponding with his associates.[4]

It has not been possible to locate anything written by Sturge at this time, but there are several letters to him from Bright and Cobden which indicate the main concern of the principals in the newspaper project.

According to Bright, there had arisen a "strange misunderstanding" as to who should manage and edit the proposed paper. Bright tried to make his own position clear to Sturge: Haly might be a suitable editor, but it would be disastrous to entrust the business management to him. The financial end of things should be left to Wilson and Rawson, who were "men of the soundest political principles". Bright disagreed with Cobden in that he saw no problem in having

[1] Bright to Sturge, December 4, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43723.

[2] Bright to Charles Sturge, December 7, 1855, *ibid.*

[3] Sturge probably became ill around December 1. The first mention of his illness is in Bright's letter to Joseph's brother, Charles Sturge.

[4] Cobden to Sturge, December 20, 1855, *ibid.*, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722.

the paper's ostensible proprietors in Manchester; but he and Cobden had resolved this difference of opinion. "Cobden is quite willing to adopt this plan", Bright told Sturge, "and I have no confidence in any other".[1]

A few days later, Bright responded to a request from Sturge that the latter be allowed to send Bright's letter along to Cobden, saying that he had no objection to this being done. Sturge had also suggested that Bright and Cobden sign some sort of memorandum, detailing their involvement in the newspaper. Bright saw no reason to do this, because, as he told Sturge, he conceived of his and Cobden's function as nothing more than "referees in case of difference of opinion among the proprietors or managers".[2]

There followed a rather strange letter to Sturge from Cobden, in which Cobden confessed that he had felt uneasy about the proposed newspaper from the start. He blurted out his misgivings:

> I don't see where we are to find a market for our peace views to the extent required to sustain the paper. People seem pretty nearly as mad as ever for the war, and I don't see the chance of peace if any thing like the terms put forth in the *Post* are insisted on.[3]

Cobden's behaviour was unexpected, considering that five weeks earlier he had been pressing for the paper to appear as soon as possible.[4]

The following day, however, Cobden sent Sturge another letter which indicated that he had cooled down;[5] but it was to the discouraged and discouraging letter that Sturge,

[1] Bright to Sturge, December 22, 1855, *ibid.*, British Museum, Add. MS. 43723. It is probable that Cobden would have given way in financial matters to Bright. Bright was a successful cotton spinner, Cobden a failure who had to give up his business in 1847. It is probable, too, that Joseph Sturge would not give nearly the weight to Cobden's business advice which he gave to his political opinions.

[2] Bright to Sturge, December 25, 1855, *ibid.*

[3] Cobden to Sturge, December 27, 1855, Cobden Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43656. The *Morning Post*, which supported Palmerston, had always been one of the most warlike dailies in London. At the time Cobden wrote this letter, it had been talking in terms of a Russia "stripped and ruined" (December 19), whose ambitions would be "in perpetuity limited" (December 20).

[4] See Cobden to Sturge, November 21, 1855, Cobden Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43656. See also Cobden to Sturge, November 7, 1855, *ibid.* Remember, too, that the original idea for having such a newspaper was Cobden's.

[5] Cobden to Sturge, December 28, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722.

convalescing in Torquay, replied. Sturge's tone was conciliatory. He admitted to Cobden that he, too, had had "great doubts" that the newspaper would succeed, but that he could not agree that "the people are as mad as ever for the war". Sturge suggested (for the problem of Manchester *vs.* London management seemed still to have been a sore point) that henceforth Cobden communicate directly with Bright, rather than continue to use himself (Sturge) as a middle man. In any event, Cobden's nominee Haly would be one of the editors, and this would have made more acceptable to Cobden the fact that the ostensible owners of the paper would reside in Manchester.[1] The whole problem was easily resolved when it was made clear that Bright, Wilson and Rawson did not object to Haly personally, but that they just did not want him to be financially involved in the paper that he was going to edit.[2]

By the new year, Bright felt that there could be no further difficulty about raising funds. He suggested to Sturge that there be no more canvassing, because the more subscribers there were, the greater the chance of some "unpleasantness" occurring.[3]

On January 3, 1856, Sturge wrote to Wilson that he and his brother Charles were about to put their £300 and Robert Charleton's £250 into Henry Rawson's account at the London and Westminster Bank. Sturge had also written to all the subscribers whom he had canvassed, calling in their pledges.[4]

Cobden's flashes of pessimism notwithstanding, the paper was definitely to be published. No exact date had been set for the first issue, nor had a name been chosen. The

[1] Sturge to Cobden, December 29, 1855, *ibid.* There is also a copy in Cobden Papers 53, West Sussex County Record Office, Chichester.

[2] Bright to Sturge, December 28, 1855, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43723.

[3] Bright to Sturge, December 31, 1855, *ibid.* Thomasson had subscribed £100 and there had been an offer of a contribution from Sir Arthur Hallam Elton. (Sir Arthur Elton, baronet (1818–1883), M.P. for Bath, 1857–1859; author of *Poems of Past Years*, 1856, and the novels *Below the Surface*, 1857, and *Herbert Chauncey*, 1860.)

[4] Sturge to Wilson, January 3, 1856, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library. As a result of his illness, Sturge had not corresponded with Wilson since November 25. He apologized for his neglect; Sturge to Wilson, January 5, 1856, *ibid.* John Morley erroneously describes Joseph Sturge as "a principal subscriber" to the *Morning Star* fund. See *The Life of Richard Cobden*, London, 1896, ii, 173, n. 8.

format had been decided upon, however. The new paper would be "precisely the size of the *Globe*".[1]

Sturge wanted the first issue to appear on March 1, and an official announcement to that effect published immediately. Rumours about the paper had begun to circulate, and Sturge wanted the public to be given correct information about the venture. There was, moreover, a new complication. One of the primary aims in founding the new paper had been to take a stand against the Crimean war. At this time, it looked as though the war would be over shortly, because the Russians had just given tentative assent to the peace terms presented by the Allies. Would this hurt the chances of the new paper? Sturge thought not. "Should our present hopes of Peace be realized", he wrote to Wilson, "it will not I think lessen the importance of having such a paper while it will probably increase its chance of success". Perhaps Sturge agreed with Cobden more than he was prepared to admit, that it would have been difficult to launch the new enterprise while the war fever was running high.[2]

Sturge felt that a name should be chosen for the paper (the *National* was tentatively suggested) in order that publicity might proceed. The time was ripe, he wrote Wilson, for the new paper to do good work in the cause of peace:

> If the news of Peace is confirmed should we not take steps forthwith to promote an arbitration treaty between the different powers of Europe for the settlement of all future differences?[3]

To begin promoting the paper, he wanted a proof copy sent to all those who contributed money toward its founding.[4]

The *Morning Star* Appears

The paper had been well launched, the first edition of the *Morning Star* (and the afternoon edition, the *Evening*

[1] Bright to Sturge, January 14, 1856, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43723. Both the *Globe* and the *Morning Star* were approximately 18in × 25in.

[2] Sturge to Wilson, January 17, 1856, Wilson Papers, Manchester Central Library. Although the fighting continued for a time, Russia had indicated agreement with the Allies' terms on January 16. Sturge was informed of the good news when his brother interrupted him in the middle of a letter to George Wilson, in order to show him a telegraphic message to this effect. See Sturge to Wilson, January 18, 1856, *ibid.*

[3] Sturge to Wilson, *ibid.*

[4] Sturge to Wilson, January 21, 1856, *ibid.*

Star) were to appear on Monday, March 17. Cobden wrote to Sturge: "You ought to be proud of your work. It is the most successful effort in the cause of peace & intelligent progress which even you have ever made".[1] Having been largely responsible for raising the money which made the enterprise possible, Joseph Sturge, characteristically, did not intrude himself further in the plans. He had agreed that Wilson and Rawson should be in charge of all business decisions, and that Cobden and Bright should act as unofficial referees in case differences of opinion should arise among the principals. Satisfied with these arrangements, he turned to other matters.

On January 23, the powers named Paris as the place where the peace negotiations would be held. Sturge's concern had been to see the war finished as quickly as possible. For the next few months he would be occupied with the problem of securing a lasting peace.

* * *

Even before the first issue of the *Morning Star* appeared, Joseph Sturge and his friend Henry Richard set out for Paris to see whether they could induce the powers assembled there to include an arbitration clause in the treaty of peace. In this they were successful, largely through the good offices of Lord Clarendon.[2] Upon returning to England, Sturge became interested in another project connected with the Crimean war. The British navy, in the course of hostilities, had bombarded the coast of Finland, killing a number of Finns and destroying the means of livelihood of many more. Having heard rumours of the plight of these non-combatants, Sturge decided to investigate the situation at first-hand. With Thomas Harvey of Leeds he visited Finland, and what they found so distressed them that they founded a committee for Finnish relief. The committee raised the impressive sum of £9,000, which it forwarded to the suffering fishermen.[3]

[1] Cobden to Sturge, March 19, 1856, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722.

[2] For the story of their trials and tribulations—and ultimate success—see Stephen Frick, "Henry Richard and the Treaty of Paris of 1856", *National Library of Wales Journal*, XVII (1972), 299–313.

[3] *Memoirs*, pp. 503–518; see also Joseph Sturge and Thomas Harvey, *Report of a visit to Finland in the autumn of 1856*, Birmingham, 1856, and Sarah G. Harvey, *Memorials of Thomas Harvey*, 1886, pp. 21–24, where likewise is printed Whittier's "The conquest of Finland".

In 1858, upon the death of Charles Hindley, Joseph Sturge was elected president of the Peace Society. He himself had but a short time to live. He died in 1859, and the story of his death and funeral service (which was treated as an occasion for public mourning in Birmingham) is affecting to read.[1]

Although the *Morning Star* remained in business for thirteen years, it never managed to do very well. As James Grant noted, the *Morning Star* never managed to sell 15,000 copies daily, let alone the "30 or 40,000" copies which Cobden felt necessary if the venture was to succeed.[2] This was at a time when the *Telegraph* and the *Standard* were each selling upward of 120,000 copies per day. When the *Morning Star* ceased publication in 1869, its total losses were estimated at over £80,000.[3]

Afterword

How best can one sum up Joseph Sturge's achievements during the war? We have seen how Sturge, in the best tradition of Quaker pacifism, had resisted not only the temptation to support the war, but the more subtle one of not supporting, yet saying nothing against the conflict. While his colleagues in the Peace Society were defecting from that organization *en masse*, Sturge became involved in the founding of the world's first peace daily; and it is certain that without his having canvassed for funds, and his constant bolstering of the sagging morale of his co-workers in the endeavour, the *Morning Star* would never have seen the light of day.

[1] *Memoirs*, pp. 567–572. In view of the treatment Sturge received during the war at the hands of his fellow townsmen, it is interesting to read some of the eulogies written after his death. Some examples are: Peter Sibree, *Memorial of Joseph Sturge and the Inauguration of His Monument* [Birmingham?, 1862]; William Wilkinson, *Lines in Memory of Joseph Sturge, the Birmingham Philanthropist, Who Died May 14th, 1859.* [Birmingham?, 1859]; and J. A. James, *Christian Philanthropy as Exemplified in the Life and Character of the late Joseph Sturge* (London, 1859).

[2] B.M., Add. MS. 50131 (Cobden to Sturge, 14 Dec. 1853).

[3] James Grant, *The Newspaper Press*, London, 1871, 1.376–79. Grant's view was that the paper failed because of its unpatriotic policies and its "peace-at-any-price" attitude. A more sympathetic consideration of the *Morning Star* may be found in H. R. Fox Bourne, *English Newspapers*, London, 1887, ii, 238–239 and 271–272. (Two errors in Grant's account should be noted: (1) John Bright did not raise £4,500 on behalf of the paper, Joseph Sturge did; (2) the *Morning Star* stopped publishing in 1869, not 1870.)

At the conclusion of hostilities, Sturge travelled to Paris where, along with Henry Richard, he painstakingly applied to the powers for the insertion of an arbitration clause in the treaty. Their success was, as Beales says, "a landmark in the history of Peace in so far as it was the first clause of its kind to be inserted in a multilateral treaty".[1]

Yet a mere recital of the facts concerning Sturge's anti-war activities does not adequately convey the nature of his accomplishment. His actual achievements were commendable; but even more commendable was his courage under attack, his equanimity in a potentially soul-destroying situation. He was functioning positively at a time when, according to the *Herald of Peace*

> we [the pacifists] cannot open a newspaper, we can scarcely listen to a sermon or speech, without finding ourselves assailed with the bitterest opprobrium, our views misrepresented, our motives impugned, and principles and maxims inculcated which in our conscience we believe to be revolting to reason, injurious to the best interests of mankind, and utterly dishonouring to our common Christianity.[2]

What was it that enabled Joseph Sturge to retain his balance in those trying times? Perhaps it was the very simplicity of his peace views (some may think of him as a bit doctrinaire) which saved him from the bitterness and despair which were visited upon his more famous friends, Richard Cobden and John Bright. Consider what happened to them as a result of the Crimean war.

Cobden, for whatever reason, acted equivocally on several occasions, refused to confront the war machine directly, and failed to support Sturge fully when the latter was searching for a practical way to express opposition to the conflict. With regard to the *Morning Star*, Cobden's initial enthusiasm for the venture gave way to feelings of despair.

Public opinion, which had destroyed Aberdeen and raised Palmerston to power, was from the first directed against the peace men. Joseph Sturge, buoyed up by an absolute and uncomplicated commitment to the anti-war ethic, was relatively undaunted by the violence which

[1] A. C. F. Beales, *The History of Peace*, London, 1931, p. 100.
[2] "Dr. Morrison on War", *Herald of Peace*, n.s. LXVI (December, 1855), p. 284.

surrounded him. Richard Cobden, whose views were more complex than Sturge's and seemingly more contradictory (possibly a result of holding public office), was dismayed by public opinion, fell a victim to its pressures, and was thereby rendered a less effective advocate of the principles which he professed. Eventually Cobden became downright defeatist about the possibility of influencing public opinion on behalf of peace during a war.[1]

And what of John Bright? What was the fate of the author of the "Angel of Death" speech and many of the most telling orations against war ever delivered in the Commons? He was broken, even before the signing of the Treaty of Paris, completely shattered by his experience of the war. The symptoms, as described by Trevelyan, were "great physical weakness, frequent severe headaches and inability to do mental work". As a result of the war, Bright suffered a crippling nervous breakdown which lasted a year.[2] I suggest that Bright's difficulties arose from a certain ambivalence in his pacifism, an ambivalence which was only revealed in his later years. Whereas Joseph Sturge was committed to (and drew strength from) the view that all war, no matter what its motive, was wrong, John Bright, in spite of the fact that he, too, was a Quaker, did not share this belief. In 1887 he made the following statement:

> I have been asked this on several occasions, "What do you think about the doctrine of the Peace Society, or of your own Religious Body in their opposition to all war?" . . . I have never troubled myself very much about that abstract principle . . . I believe that without touching upon that abstract principle at all, it is conceivable that . . . there is probably not a single war in which we [need] have been engaged from the time of William III . . . .I do not discuss the abstract principle, I say that if you will tell me a war, I will tell you my opinion about it.[3]

Certainly there are many variables and I would like to avoid simplistic psychologizing, but some sort of conclusion is in order. Enough to say that there is here evidence that one's equanimity and effectiveness in supporting a cause

[1] See his speech on the American civil war, given at Rochdale, October 29, 1862, in John Bright and J. E. Thorold Rogers, *Speeches on Questions of Public Policy by Richard Cobden, M.P.* (London, 1870, Vol. II, pp. 314–315.

[2] G. M. Trevelyan, *The Life of John Bright*, London, 1913, pp. 254–258.

[3] *Mr. John Bright and the Peace Society*, London [1887?], p. 9.

vary inversely with the complexity of one's support of that cause.

* * *

The mass defections from the Peace Society at the outbreak of the war indicated that the Society's self-congratulations, as expressed at all of the Peace Congresses from 1848 through 1853, were not in the least merited. Yet even after the debacle of 1854, the Society limped along. The movement had suffered an eclipse, but gradually, during the 1860s, began to recover. Today the original Peace Society is nearly defunct, but its descendants are many and thriving. The few triumphs which the movement enjoyed during the dark days of the Crimean war contributed to its survival; and those triumphs were largely the result of the efforts of a few men such as Joseph Sturge.

Shortly before the end of the war, Richard Cobden wrote to Joseph Sturge a prophetic letter in which he predicted that

> if peace should be concluded it will be found that this has been one of the most *resultless* wars ever known. Every thing for which every body thought he was fighting will be unattained. The Turk will be a dying man, the Poles worse off by the hundreds of thousands, dragged into the Russian army and half of them killed—the Circassians and Hungarians just where they were and Austria more firmly fastened on the back of the Italians than ever.[1]

This view has been substantially vindicated. W. E. Mosse points out that the attempt of the powers meeting at Paris to construct a treaty which would "maintain the independence and integrity of the Turkish empire" was doomed from the start. From the very signing of the treaty, Napoleon III let it be known that he would seek a *rapprochement* with Russia, and within three years he was at war with Austria, one of his "allies". Turkey, of course, continued to decay for decades.[2]

In 1871, Earl Granville made the startling disclosure in the Lords that Palmerston had expected that the Crimean settlement would contain Russia only for seven, at the

[1] Cobden to Sturge, January 21, 1856, Sturge Papers, British Museum, Add. MS. 43722.

[2] W. E. Mosse, *The Rise and Fall of the Crimean System, 1855–1871*, London, 1963.

most ten, years.[1] And Henry Richard pointed out that *The Times*, in 1861, contradicted its own wartime utterances completely when, speaking of the Crimean war, it said: "It is with no small reluctance we admit a gigantic effort, and an infinite sacrifice, to have been made in vain".[2]

Had Joseph Sturge known that posterity would come to agree with him, that the Crimean war would be seen as unnecessary and ineffectual, he might have been able to bear with even more equanimity the relentless censure of his countrymen. Because he had no such assurance, his achievement can be considered so much the greater.

STEPHEN FRICK

[1] *Hansard*, cciv, cc. 247f. and Russell to Granville, November 22, 1870, Public Record Office, Gifts and Deposits, 29/79; cited in Mosse, *op. cit.*, p. 3, nn. 1 and 2 (see also pp. 202–207).

[2] *Memoirs*, p. 496.

"The Bellford Gazette", Darlington, 1826

IN 1826 Jacob Bell (1810–1859),[1] son of John and Elizabeth Bell of Westminster, and Robert Lawson Ford (1809–1878) son of John and Mary (Lawson) Ford of Lancaster, were, together with some other Friends' sons, at Henry Frederick Smith's school at Darlington.[2] The school seems to have had a good literary tradition, and the diary of schoolboy Thomas Whitwell (for extracts see *Jnl. F.H.S.* 24 (1927), 21–27) mentions "The Phoenix", which appeared 3 xii 1827 "a magazine to which every member of the Debating Society is expected to send an original piece; it comes out once a month, and the members take it in turn to write it". Amy Wallis of Darlington reports having seen other similar manuscripts.

Jacob Bell and Robert Lawson Ford edited and wrote a school newspaper called *The Bellford Gazette* which appeared every Tuesday in September 1826, making four weekly issues, each of four pages of manuscript (251 × 203 mm; double columns). The newspaper includes school news, local (and particularly local Friends') news, the weather, poetry, and an editorial. It is most professionally produced. The writing is good, and not so minuscule as the hands in the Brontë children's productions with which this might be compared. One may perhaps guess that the drawings are the work of Jacob Bell, who had no little artistic interest, although one cannot rule out the possibility of them being done by Robert Lawson Ford, in whose family similar talent is displayed.

The name of the paper is an allusion to its "printers"—Ford & Bell, Darlington. The punning device of a bell with

[1] *Dictionary of National Biography*; *Jnl. F.H.S.*, 22 (1925), 87–88.

[2] Henry Frederick Smith (d. 1862) kept school in Darlington 1817–1827. See *Jnl. F.H.S.*, 19 (1922) 105–107, 20 (1923) 25, 22 (1925) 87, 24 (1927) 27–30, 26 (1929) 29–31, and references. The school, described as a "collegiate school" providing a good education "without the exposure of university life", is said to have been carried on by H. F. Smith's wife Selfe (Pease) Smith from 1827 until 1831, when the availability of the York schools led to its discontinuance. Further information on the career of H. F. Smith is still to seek.

the inscription "FORD" makes up the centrepiece of the (imitation) newspaper stamp for Four Pence which appears on each of the four issues. The final issue has a coloured bell about to be lowered over a fashionable figure with cocked hat, spectacles and closed umbrella, while the motto beneath reads "Extinctus amabitur idem". Each issue has the banner headline: "Whilst the press is free England shall be so too".

Notwithstanding the short life of the *Gazette*, the first number opened bravely enough, albeit with a sidelong glance at a short-lived predecessor:

> To the Public. The editors of this publication take this early opportunity of craving the indulgence & patronage of the public on behalf of the arduous undertaking which they have now taken in hand. Indeed from the favourable manner in which a former work of this kind was received they have no reason to expect anything less than the most generous treatment. They have only to hope that the present work will not meet with so speedy a termination as the last,—that instead of sinking into oblivion in the course of a few weeks & thus blasting the hopes & expectations of those under whose patronage it was carried on—the present publication may (through the indefatigable exertions of its proprietors & the generosity of the public) still remain to enlighten the minds of the illiterate, convey useful information to those among whom it will be circulated & that it may increase in merit & reputation as it gains experience.
>
> (No. 1, pp. 1–2)

This preliminary announcement continues for some paragraphs, and is finally signed:

> by the devoted servants of the public—Ford & Bell. P.S. Scandal, profanity & libels are considered beneath the dignity of this paper.
>
> (No. 1, p. 2)

One item of news in the first issue concerned the Darlington Debating Society, which resumed its sittings on August 26 "after its long adjournment", covering the summer holiday. Indeed, reports of the weekly Saturday meetings of the Debating Society form one of the major items in the *Gazette*. No. 2 reports the debate on September 9 on the subject "Is a man who comes into a foreign land & unconsciously offends its laws amenable to those laws?" "The Reverent [spelling was not impeccable with Bell or Ford] James

Cumming & Owen Flintoff[1] Esqr." were orator and respondent respectively.

Orator W. Bainbridge and respondent N. Lloyd led the next debate on a motion that "the condition of a condemned criminal is more pitiable than that of the shipwrecked mariner", which is reported in No. 3. In the final issue of the *Gazette* W. Nevins[2] and Mr. Hornor argued whether "the life of a soldier is happier than that of a sailor". The result is not recorded, "The want of room makes us conclude our report here"; but the report had found space to give some of William Nevins's description of the perils which attended the life of a sailor in his own words:

> "Sometimes *Sir*" said he, "the boats are so overloaded *Sir* as to sink by the way, or the crew are so distressed *Sir* for want of provisions as to be obliged to eat one another. In consequence of these hardships *Sir* diseases break out among them, & carry off numbers *Sir* leaving the remainder in a deplorably emaciated condition."
>
> (No. 4, p. 4)

The first issue shows that school activities had begun immediately after the end of the summer holiday:

> Miscellany: The Darlington Crickett Club has again commenced playing. Last Saturday the members met on their ground, & a short but vigorous game ensued; after which the gentlemen amused themselves in various gymnastic exercises & many displayed their bodily strength & agility to great advantage in wrestling &c.
>
> (No. 1, p. 3)

Physical education was well supported at the school, and there is a diagram of a frame set up for exercises:

> Gymnastics: The stupendous machine which is now erected in the court yard has engaged the attention of the neighbourhood for some time. It is upwards of 23 feet high & nearly 20 feet broad. The Gentlemen have experienced great pleasure in climbing

[1] Owen Flintoff, son of John and Ann Flintoff, Hunslet Lane, Leeds; born 13 vii 1811; married Ann Alder of Finchley; M.A. (Trinity College, Cambridge) 1838; barrister-at-law; chief justice, Sierra Leone, 15 x 1840; drowned at the Gambia, 12 iii 1841. S. B. Foster, *Wilson of High Wray*, 1890, p. 177.

[2] William Nevins, son of John Jowitt and Hannah (Birkbeck) Nevins, of Leeds; born 18 x 1811; married Caroline Anne Willis, dau. of John Willis, 1841; rector of Minningsby, Lincs, 1843–1878. S. B. Foster, *Wilson of High Wray*, 1890, p. 175.

> the ropes &c. We have endeavoured to give some idea of it by a plate [illustration 47×60 mm].
>
> (No. 4, p. 3)

Leaving aside the facetious reports of local happenings which would require unravelling and probably some intimate local knowledge to sort them out satisfactorily, the first number contains examples of the general and of the local news reported:

> On Sunday the 27th August a luminous ball of fire was seen descending with great rapidity towards the earth in a direction from East to West . . . It was at first thought to be a bengal light, but was afterwards found to have been a very beautiful meteor as it was seen at Glasgow & other places at the same time, viz. a little before nine o'clock in the evening.
>
> (No. 1, pp. 3–4)

> Deaths: On 14th inst. Nathan Robson[1] of this town after an illness of some months.
>
> (No. 1, p. 4)

The following announcement appears in No. 3:

> Spectacles, Spy Glasses, &c.
>
> As it has lately been the fashion to wear these "useful appendages to imperfect vision" we take the liberty of informing the public that such articles may be obtained at Thompson's, High Row, Darlington, where also may be had umbrellas & parasols of various kinds for screening the countenance not only from wind sun & rain, but also from public observation.[2]
>
> (No. 3, p. 1)

Even during the short life of *The Bellford Gazette* other literary activity was taking place at the school. No. 3 draws attention to a rival weekly paper "The Paul Pry", and also to a proposed monthly:

> We also understand that a Monthly Magazine, is likely soon to set afloat among the literate of Darlington Academy. The tendency of this publication will be to promote learning & improvement & we sincerely desire its success & prosperity, & we doubt not that it will be attended with ultimate benefit.
>
> We have since heard that it is to be called the "Portfolio".
>
> (No. 3, p. 1)

[1] See *Jnl. F.H.S.*, 19 (1922), 105–106.

[2] It would appear that this is the shop of James Thompson, silversmith and clock and watchmaker, and his brother Joseph Thompson "a cunning artizan and a skilfull workman in brass and the frail metals", although both brothers had died a little before this date.

In conclusion, if circumstantial evidence were still needed of the identity of the Darlington Academy where *The Bellford Gazette* was produced, one need look only to the last page of No. 4 (dated 26 September) for the announcement of the birthday of Henry Frederick Smith (27 September):

> We are happy to announce that tomorrow will be the birthday of the Governor of the establishment, & the neighbourhood are in anxious expectation of a *fine* day.
>
> (No. 4, p. 4)

The paper is in an admirable state of preservation, having remained in the possession of the Ford family since it was written, just short of 150 years ago. The late Eleanor M. Ford of Leeds presented it to the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds, in 1974, and there it is now preserved as Leeds University MS. 357.

It may be permissible to guess that Eleanor Ford's grandfather, Thomas Pease (1816–1884) may have been among the original readers of the paper which was the joint "journalistic" production of her husband Gervase Lawson Ford's grandfather; that is, if the manuscript memoir of Thomas Pease described in *Jnl. F.H.S.* 25 (1928) 84–85 is correct in saying that Thomas Pease first went to the Darlington school in 1822, and not in 1827 (as one might be led to surmise from the entry for 20 ix 1827 in Thomas Whitwell's schoolboy diary, "A boy named T. Pease from Leeds has come" (*Jnl. F.H.S.* 24 (1927) 24).

A medal recently given to the Brotherton Library among other historical relics from the Ford family of Adel has connections with H. F. Smith. On one side there is a man with a book in his hand seated at a table on which is a globe; on the other side—within a border of laurel leaves and the name H F SMITH, there is inscribed '1st Prize for Essay on War, 1826'. The most likely suggestion for its origin seems to be that it was a medal presented to Robert Lawson Ford for an essay at the school.

I am grateful for the assistance of Amy E. Wallis of Darlington with references and helping to identify the people mentioned in this paper.

R. S. MORTIMER

Historical research for university degrees in the United Kingdom. List no. 36. Part II—Theses in progress, 1975. (University of London Institute of Historical Research, May 1975.)

Included are the following (among others):

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Quakers of the 17th and 18th centuries. Mrs. Helen Forde. (Mr. R. H. Evans.) Leicester Ph.D. (1249).

Quakerism in Lancashire and Cheshire, 1650–1750. J. H. Hodson. (Professor G. S. Holmes and Dr. J. D. Marshall.) Lancaster Ph.D. (1345).

The life of Thomas Goldney, 1696–1768. Peggy K. Stembridge. (Dr. J. A. Cannon.) Bristol Ph.D. (1651).

The sociology of an established sect: the Society of Friends in the 20th century. J. Charlesworth. (Dr. J. D. Walsh.) Oxford D.Phil. (2611).

* * *

List of doctoral dissertations in history in progress or recently completed in the United States, May 1970–May 1973. Compiled by John T. Appleby. American Historical Association, Washington, D.C. 1974.

Included are the following, besides a good many works on the early history of Pennsylvania, for which enquirers are referred to the List:

The Early Quaker Literature of Defense. Mary G. Foley Bitterman, Bryn Mawr, May 1971 (22).

The Friends Ambulance Unit in China during World War II and the Civil War. Cynthia Letts Adcock, Bryn Mawr. (2081).

Quakers in Rochester, Massachusetts, during the 18th century. Carol Hagglund, Massachusetts (3883).

* * *

Retrospective index to theses of Great Britain and Ireland, 1716–1950. Vol. 1: Social sciences and humanities. Roger R. Bilboul, editor. A.B.C. Clio Press, 1975.

This volume includes half a column of theses accepted at universities in the British Isles between 1915 and 1950, here entered under the heading *FRIENDS, Society of*. Entries also appear under

the headings: *Barclay, R., Ford, J., Jones, R. M., Kelsall, J.*, and *Pennington, I.*

* * *

Recent issues of *Dissertation Abstracts International. A.—The humanities and social sciences*, include abstracts of the following theses:

STEELE, Betty Jean. Quaker characters in selected American novels, 1823–1899. (Ph.D. Duke University, 1974. 169 pages. Order No. 75–2427. vol. 35, Feb. 1975, p. 5365–A.)

BROWN, E. Leonard. Quaker migration to "Miami country", 1798–1861. (Ph.D. Michigan State University, 1974. vol. 35, March 1975, p. 6028–A.)

ADCOCK, Cynthia Letts. Revolutionary faithfulness: the Quaker search for a peaceable kingdom in China, 1939–1951. (Bryn Mawr College, 1974. 335 pages. Order No. 75–13,939. vol. 36, July 1975, p. 468–A.)

WEBB, Jane Knowles. The American Friends Service Committee: a Quaker experiment in social change and organizational innovation—a study in value conflict. (Ph.D. Boston College, 1973. 364 pages. Order No. 75–20,710. vol. 36, September 1975, p. 1863.)

BITTLE, William George. James Nayler: a study in seventeenth-century Quakerism. (Ph.D. Kent State University, 1975. vol. 36, March 1976, p. 6250–A.)

* * *

In the *Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain Research register*. List no. 4: Autumn 1975, the following items are noted as having been completed:

Quaker Meeting Houses. J. W. Dent. (Newcastle 5th year dissertation.) 1955.

19th-century housing reform: George Cadbury and Bournville. D. J. Owen. (Newcastle 5th year dissertation.) 1962.

Some Quaker meeting-houses in North Yorkshire. J. O. Tarren. (Newcastle 5th year dissertation.) 1955.

Work is in progress on:

The Clarks and the development of Street, 1885–1940. S. C. Robertson.

Reports on Archives

THE Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts list of *Accessions to repositories and Reports added to the National Register of Archives*, 1972 (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1974. 68p) includes the following additions to manuscript collections in various institutions which may interest workers on Quaker history.

British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD.

Sir Edward Burnett Tyler: MS notebooks about his life by Lady Tyler, covering 1857–1917.

Durham University Library, Palace Green, Durham, DH1 3RN.

John Bright (1813–89): 9 letters to John Henderson in Durham, mainly concerning the Durham city parliamentary election 1843.

House of Lords Record Office, London, SW1A 0PW.

Robert Spence Watson, President of the National Liberal Federation: photocopies of letters and papers, including letters from John Morley, 1st Viscount Morley, 1861–1907 (600 docs.).

National Library of Ireland Manuscripts Department, Kildare Street, Dublin, 2.

Itemized bill of Joseph Grubb for purchase of Waterford glass, 1804.

Public Record Office of Northern Ireland, 66 Balmoral Avenue, Belfast, BT9 6NT.

Richardson family of Bessbrook, co. Armagh: family and business papers, 1845–71.

Best family papers, 19th–20th cent.

Bessbrook Spinning Company: additional records.

Famine Relief Commission, correspondence for Coleraine district, co. Londonderry, 1845–47.

Bedfordshire Record Office, County Hall, Bedford.

Society of Friends: Luton Monthly Meeting, etc., 17th-20th cent.

Bristol Archives Office, Council House, Bristol, BS1 5TR.

Clement family, memoranda books, journals, domestic accounts, genealogical notes and corresp., 1692–1937.

Cumberland and Carlisle Record Office, The Castle, Carlisle, CA3 8UR.

Carrs' Biscuits, accounts, recipe books and papers, 1841–1956/7.

Glasgow City Archives, PO Box 27, City Chambers, Glasgow, C2 1DU.

Edinburgh Two Monthly Meeting (Society of Friends), register (including Glasgow) 1788–1965.

Herefordshire Record Office, The Old Barracks, Harold Street, Hereford, HR1 2QX.

Newman family of Leominster, papers and notebooks, biographical material and compilations about Society of Friends in West Midlands, material concerning Sir George Newman, including material for his autobiography.

Oxfordshire Record Office, County Hall, Oxford, OX1 1ND.

Society of Friends, Banbury Monthly Meeting (additional) 20th cent.

Ipswich and East Suffolk Record Office, County Hall, Ipswich, IP4 2JS.

Society of Friends (additional), plans of estates 1854.

Wiltshire Record Office, County Hall, Trowbridge, BA14 8JG.

Goldney of Chippenham: Sheldon, map late 17th cent; survey, Chippenham 1728, Bradenstoke 1772; estate and personal papers 19th–20th cent.

The List of Reports added to the National Register of Archives includes the following items:

16343 E. & J. Richardson Ltd. (tanners). *Newcastle upon Tyne City Archives Office.*

16356 Howard League Library. *Warwick Univ. Libr.* and *Soc. of Friends Libr.*

16398 York: Friends' Sabbath & Adult Schools. *York City Libr.*

16415 Berkshire & Oxfordshire Quarterly Meeting of the Society of Friends. *Berks RO.*

16558 Richard Cadbury: pacifist scrapbook. *Worcs. RO.*

16598 Liverpool Peace Society. *Liverpool RO.*

* * *

The 1973 list of *Accessions* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1975. 95p) reports the following:

Bedfordshire Record Office, County Hall, Bedford, MK42 9AP.

Society of Friends (addnl.): Bedfordshire Quarterly Meeting, incl. records of Monthly Meetings at Markyate, Dunstable and Luton 1676–1814, Pulloxhill afterwards Ampthill 1712–97, Stotfold and Clifton afterwards Langford 1718–46; Bedfordshire General Meeting, incl. records of Monthly Meetings at Albans 1703–1865, Sherrington 1705–84, Hogstyend, Hogstyend and Sherrington, Leighton Upperside, and Leighton Luton and Leighton 1707–1884; records of Preparative Meetings at Ampthill 1859–75, Hogstyend (Woburn Sands) 1787–1810, and Luton 1793–1821.

Birmingham Public Libraries, Reference Library, Birmingham, B3 3HQ.

Cadbury family of Bournville: photographs, glass negatives, letters, diaries, personal papers incl. some of George and Dame Elizabeth Cadbury, 19th–20th cent.

Bristol Archives Office, Council House, Bristol, BS1 5TH.

J. P. Sturge, surveyors (addnl.): maps, surveys, deeds, sale particulars, Land Steward's reports and accounts, 1672–1889.

Buckinghamshire Record Office, County Offices, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire, HP20 1UA.

Society of Friends: Buckinghamshire Quarterly Meeting 1655–1843, incl. minutes from 1669, Elders' minutes from 1763 and Sufferings books; Hunger Hill afterwards Upperside Monthly Meeting 1669–1857, incl. minutes, Sufferings book 1792–1856 and accounts 1689–1850; Buckingham Monthly Meeting (formerly Biddlesden otherwise Whittlebury otherwise Chackmore) 1678–1822, incl. minutes and Sufferings book for 1793.

Cornwall Record Office, County Hall, Truro, TR1 3AY.

Stephens of Ashfield (Budock): ropewalk and ship chandlery papers 1821–46, Quaker records and family papers and corresp. from 1651.

Monmouthshire Record Office, County Hall, Newport, Monmouthshire, NP 5XJ.

Capel Hanbury of Pontypool: estate papers in Caldicot and Undy 1758–59.

Newcastle upon Tyne City Archives Office, 7 Saville Place, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 8DQ.

E. & J. Richardson Ltd. (tanners), Newcastle upon Tyne: business records and family papers 1854–1958.

Sheffield City Libraries, Department of Local History and Archives, Central Library, Surrey Street, Sheffield, S1 1XZ.

John Girdom of Sheffield and Handsworth Woodhouse, tanner: executors' accounts and papers relating to local Quaker families 1779–97.

Somerset Record Office, Obridge Road, Taunton, TA2 7PU.

Society of Friends (addnl.): minutes of the Western Division of Somerset Monthly Meeting 1676–1952, Bristol and Somerset Quarterly Meeting 1859–1936, and Bridgwater Monthly Preparatory Meeting 1900–54; sufferings, 1794–1856.

Surrey Record Office, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, KT1 2DN.

Robinson family of Horley and Saddlescombe (Sussex) and related Charman and Elgar families of Reigate: deeds and personal papers, some of Quaker interest, 18th–20th cent.

Worcestershire Record Office, Shirehall, Worcester, WR1 1TR.

Society of Friends: minute books and papers of the Worcestershire and Shropshire Monthly Meeting 1882–1962; record of premises of the Evesham Monthly Meeting 1763–1896.

Yorkshire: North Riding Record Office, County Hall, Northallerton, DL7 8SG.

Guisborough Monthly Meeting of the Society of Friends: records 1700–1962.

Coventry City Record Office, 9 Hay Lane, Coventry, CV1 5RF.

J. & J. Cash Ltd., ribbon weavers: minute books . . . other papers of the firm and the Cash family 1836–1970.

Dorset Record Office, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ.
Society of Friends: Dorset and Hants Quarterly Meeting and subordinate meetings, minutes 1659–1940, accounts 19th cent; copy registers for Dorset, Hants, Wilts 1648–1836, and Painswick (Glos.) 1647–1811; deeds and estate documents, Dorset, Hants, Somerset, Wilts and Channel Islands 17th–20th cent; misc. papers 1658–1960; journals of the Clarance family of Essex and London 1805–25.
Durham County Record Office, County Hall, Durham, DH1 5UL.
Society of Friends, Sunderland: Durham Quarterly Meeting minutes 1808–18; Sunderland Preparative Meeting minutes, accounts, resident lists, epistles, charity papers, 1701–1967.
Gloucestershire Records Office, Shire Hall, Gloucester, GL1 2TG.
Society of Friends: Glos and Wilts Quarterly Meeting minutes 1733–68.
Guildford Muniment Room, Castle Arch, Guildford, GU1 3SX.
Society of Friends, Godalming (addnl.): minute book 1957–63.
Lancashire Record Office, Sessions House, Lancaster Road, Preston, PR1 2RE.
Society of Friends, Bolton: Todmorden Preparative Meeting minutes 1801–67, Bolton Preparative Meeting minutes 1829–57, Bolton Friends' Adult School minutes 1894–1916.
Greater London Record Office, London Section, County Hall, London, SE1 7PB.
Truman, Hanbury, Buxton & Co. Ltd., brewers: deeds 17th–20th cent., rest, gyle and cash books, trade and loan ledgers, rentals and papers, 18th–20th cent.

The List of Reports added to the National Register of Archives includes the following items:

17069 Lancashire Society of Friends: deeds and papers. *Lancs RO.*
17118 Yorks WR: Society of Friends. *Enquiries to Brotherton L., Leeds.*
17139 Miss R. M. Irwin (Quaker): diaries *Lancs RO.*
17289 Clement and Chandler family papers. *Bristol AO.*
17291 J. P. Sturge & Sons (surveyors): business records, maps and plans (various counties). *Bristol AO.*

* * *

The 1974 list of *Accessions* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1976. £1.70), reports the following:

Hull University Library, The University, Hull HU6 7RX.
Society of Friends, Pickering and Hull Monthly Meeting: minutes, sufferings, epistles, plans, 1660–1950.
British Library of Political and Economic Science, Houghton Street, Aldwych, London WC2A 2AE.
Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament: records *c* 1959–69.
National Peace Council: records, 20th cent.
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom: records, 20th cent.

Rhodes House Library, Oxford OX1 3RG.

C. R. Buxton (1875–1942): political papers (4 boxes), colonial papers (3 boxes).

Public Record Office of Ireland, Four Courts, Dublin 7.

Society of Friends: registers of births, burials and marriages, Dublin and other meetings, 1773–1943 (1047).

Scottish Record Office, H.M. General Register House, Edinburgh EH1 3YY.

Society of Friends: North of Scotland Monthly Meeting, 1931–65. Christie Miller muniments 1753–1965.

Modern Records Centre, University of Warwick Library, Coventry CV4 7AL.

Howard League for Penal Reform: 9 notebooks of Secretaries of the Howard Association, 1895–1905; minutes, 1927–55; file on the League of Nations.

National Council for the Abolition of the Death Penalty: minutes, 1923–48; balance sheets, annual reports, etc.

Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, St. Anthony's Hall, York YO1 2PW.

Retreat hospital papers (Quaker establishment), 1796–1899.

Bristol Record Office, Council House, College Green, Bristol BS1 5TR.

Goldney and Speed families: Small St. deeds 1562–1708.

Cumbria Record Office, County Hall, Kendal LA9 4RQ.

John Gough of Kendal: meteorological journal 1815–16.

County Record Office, Shirehall, Worcester WR1 1TR.

Society of Friends: Bewdley Preparative Meeting minutes 1875–99.

Lancashire Record Office, Bow Lane, Preston PR1 8ND.

Society of Friends, Marsden Meeting (addnl.): minute book 1962–66.

Suffolk Record Office, Bury St. Edmunds Branch, Schoolhall Street, Bury St. Edmunds IP33 1RX.

Society of Friends: Bury Preparative Meeting minute books, 1862–1919; records of Bury Monthly Meeting and its predecessors up to its dissolution in 1881, and of Sudbury Preparative Meeting, 1666–1912.

Tyne and Wear County Record Office, 7 Saville Place, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 8DQ.

Spence Watson family of Gateshead: letters 1868–1907.

The List of Reports includes:

18251 Sunderland Society of Friends. *Durham RO.*

18500 Sheffield Society of Friends. *Sheffield Central L.*

18528 Lancashire Cotton Districts Relief Fund, Leeds. *Brotherton L., Leeds.*

18684 John Bright: collections containing corresp. *Manchester Central L.*

* * *

The List of Reports for 1971 to 1972 is to be found in the *Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts: Report of the Secretary to*

the Commissioners, 1971–1972 (London: H.M.S.O., 1972). It includes:
14940 Tuke Papers. *Borthwick Inst., York.*
15337 Marsden Society of Friends. *Lancs. RO.*
15338 Preston Society of Friends. *Lancs. RO.*
15589 Crofton E. Gane. *Bristol AO.*
15754 Stotfold Society of Friends. *Beds. RO.*
15832 Datchworth Green Friends Meeting. *Herts. RO.*
15920 Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. *L.S.E. Library.*

* * *

List & Index Society, special series, vol. 7: "Rough register" of acquisitions of the Department of Manuscripts, British Library, 1961–1965 (Distributed to subscribers, 1974) includes the two following items:

Additional MSS. 50849 M. Declaration of allegiance to Charles II by George Fox, Quaker; late 17th cent. copy. Presented by Nahum M. Sarna, The Library of the Jewish Seminary of America. October 14, 1961 (p. 26).
Additional MS. 52524. Letters (183) from Bernard Barton, the Quaker poet (1784–1849) to John Wodderspoon of Ipswich; 1843–1849. Supplementary to Add. MS. 37032. Purchased, 12 December 1964, from Bernard Quaritch Ltd. (p. 134).

* * *

A handlist of parish register transcripts in the Borthwick Institute of Historical Research (*University of York*). Compiled by the late Norah K. M. Gurney. (Borthwick texts and calendars: Records of the Northern Province, 3.) 1976.

This volume notices the following burial records:

Ayresome, near Middlesbrough. Society of Friends' burial ground. 1865–1869, 1871–1874, 1890–1893, 1895–1897.
Borrowby. Society of Friends' burial ground (parish of Leake). 1866, 1874, 1895.
Handsworth Woodhouse. Society of Friends' burial ground (parish of Handsworth). 1865–1868.
Osmotherley. Society of Friends' burial ground. 1869, 1891, 1893, 1896, 1897.
Yarm. Society of Friends' burial ground. 1866, 1872.

Notes and Queries

John Bunyan

"John Bunyan and nonconformity in the midlands and East Anglia", by Richard L. Greaves (*The Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society*, vol. 1, no. 7, April 1976, pp. 186–196) gives useful sources and references covering Bunyan's controversies with Friends.

* * *

"The organizational response of nonconformity to repression and indulgence: the case of Bedfordshire", by Richard L. Greaves, professor of history in the Florida State University, Tallahassee, appears in *Church history*, vol. 44, no. 4 (Dec. 1975), pp. 472–484. The article touches on the part played by George Whitehead and Friends in securing the passage of the Declaration in which John Bunyan's name was included.

Peter Ceely

Peter Ceely of St. Ives, merchant, and (during the first Dutch war of 1651–1654) owner of a privateer, makes brief appearances in James Whetter's *Cornwall in the 17th century* (Lodenek Press, Padstow, 1974), bringing to notice the magistrate concerned in the arrest of George Fox, Edward Pyott and William Salt on their preaching tour of the far west of England.

The same book also mentions Thomas Gwin (source given as Thomas Gwin's autobiography, Mss. Vol. 74, "Quaker Central Library, London"), and John Kenton, a Quaker, of Newport (1688), p. 113.

Nehemiah Champion

The connection between Thomas Newcomen and Nehemiah Champion of Bristol (1649–1722) and his son, of the same name (1678–1747), is touched upon in a paper by J. S. Allen "The 1715 and other Newcomen engines at Whitehaven, Cumberland" (*Transactions of the Newcomen Society*, vol. 45 (1972–1973), pp. 237–268).

John Dalton

"John Dalton in Edinburgh", by Elizabeth C. Patterson, concerns the visit of Dr. Dalton to attend the annual meeting of the British Association in 1834. It appears in *Memoirs and proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society*, vol. 116 (1973–1974), pp. 5-19.

Abraham Darby (1678-1717)

"The burial place of Abraham Darby I", by Winifred E. Hotton (*Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society*, vol., 59, pt. 2, 1971/1972, pp. 124–126) identifies Broseley and 8 iii 1717 as the correct location and date for the burial of the first Abraham Darby of Coalbrookdale.

Dickinson, of Kingsweston

Somerset archaeology and natural history, vol. 118 (1974), p. 50, includes a summary of manuscript holdings in the Somerset Record Office in the

collections of correspondence of Caleb Dickinson (merchant, of Bristol, son of Caleb Dickinson of Monks, Wiltshire) in the Dickinson of Kingsweston collection. Caleb Dickinson married in Bristol meeting 12 viii 1738 Sarah Prankard (b. 1720), daughter of Graffin Prankard. The manuscript collection also includes business papers of Graffin Prankard, merchant, who died 30 vi 1756 of Augustine's parish, and was buried 4 vii 1756 in Friends' burial ground at Redcliffe Pit, Bristol.

Also included in the collection are accounts of William Alloway, merchant, of Minehead and Bridgwater, trading with Ireland, 1683–1704. He may have had connections with the Friend family of that name at Minehead.

Arthur Stanley Eddington

"Verifying the theory of relativity", by S. Chandrasekhar, F.R.S. (*Notes and records of the Royal Society of London*, vol. 30, no. 2, Jan. 1976, pp. 249–260) an article reprinted from the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, recounts from conversation with Sir Arthur Eddington the events preceding the deferment of his military service in 1917 so that he would lead one of the expeditions being planned to prove Einstein's predictions with regard to the gravitational deflection of light. [pp. 250–51]

Thomas Ellwood

A discussion of the influence of Thomas Ellwood on the work of John Milton appears at the beginning of the introduction to *A Variorum commentary on the poems of John Milton*, vol. 4 (*Paradise Regained*. Routledge, 1975).

Isabella Ormston Ford

(1855-1924)

Melville E. Currell in her *Political Woman* (Croom Helm, London, 1974. £4.50) has the following passage (p. 10) about Isabella Ford.

After dealing with Margaret Bondfield, and Mary McArthur and her work for women's trade unions, the paragraph concludes:

"Miss Isabella Ford, a Quaker, came from a Yorkshire family well known for its Radical sympathies. With her sister, Miss Ford was instrumental in improving women's conditions in the clothing industries of Leeds, and helped women there to organize into a trade union. Miss Ford was also active in the suffrage movement but was later to refuse invitations to stand for Parliament."

* * *

Isabella Ford is noticed as one of the speakers at a public meeting held in connection with the Manningham Mills strike, December 1890–April 1891 (see paper by Cyril Pearce in the University of Hull Occasional papers in economic and social history series, no. 7, price £2.75).

The Misses Ford subscribed £80 towards the funds of the strikers.

Isabella and her sister Bessie were associated later with the Leeds I.L.P.

Thomas Fox, of Bedale

In 1775 some Bedale boys were playing one Sunday by the river, and one fell in and was drowned. The subsequent events are told in verse in the words of

Robert Hird, 1768–1841, shoemaker, of Bedale, in *Hird's Annals of Bedale*, edited by Lesley Lewis (North Yorkshire County Record Office publications no. 2) [1975], pp. 96–97

"Christopher Johnson tumbled in,
We quickly ran away.
His brother in the tree had been,
No longer near did stay.
Our tidings spread throughout the town,
The alarm'd quick did run;
The water soon they plung'd into,
But far below he'd gone.
He was found near a bed of reeds,
By Thomas Fox I'm sure,
And they did take him home with speed,
In hope, him to restore.
Resussitations means did fail,
No spark of life was found.
His widow'd mother did bewail
Her darling son, now drown'd."

Robert Hird's note on Thomas Fox who recovered the body reads: "Thomas Fox and family mov'd from Emgate [in Bedale] to York in the year 1780. That year he bought wheat in Bedale market for 3s 6d per bushel. Fox was a great genius. A Quaker by profession and by trade a whitesmith, he occupied in Emgate the house below the pump, consisting of a range of 3 low rooms. That nearest to where the pump stands was hardware shop, the centre was dwelling house, and the lowest was his workshop. He had an excellent business in which he had great demand for his portable gold balance."

York Monthly Meeting records at Clifford Street Meeting House reveal that "Thomas Fox who hath for some years resided in York" applied and was admitted into membership, 6 iii 1783 (York MM minutes, vol. 6, 1777-1793, pp. 120, 121). The births and deaths of three children of Thomas Fox, whitesmith, and Mary his wife are recorded: Mary (1783-1784), George (1785–1786) and another George (19 ix–30 xii 1787). In 1803 Thomas Fox Senr. and Junr. and their apprentice Wm. Martin removed into Thirsk Monthly Meeting (York MM minutes, vol. 7, 1793-1815, p. 197; 3 viii 1803). Three years later, Thomas Fox Junr. came back into York Monthly Meeting alone (*ibid.*, p. 258; 6 viii 1806).

Samuel Haughton (1821-1897)

The career of Samuel Haughton, professor of geology in the University of Dublin, is mentioned in the study by Victor L. Hilts, "A guide to Francis Galton's *English men of science*" (*Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, new series, vol. 65, pt. 5, 1975).

Galton's book was based on answers to a questionnaire addressed to eminent scientists a hundred years ago, and Samuel Haughton's replies included a note on his independence of mind. He said that he "was baptised, being born of Quaker parents, at my own request aet. 13 and chose my clergyman's life in preference to a good living in commerce". [p. 52]

In his preliminary discussion of Galton's findings, Professor Hilts comments: "Unitarians, Quakers and Moravians, in particular, were all more

prevalent among the parents than among the scientists." Also, "some of the sons of nonconformist parents may have found religion less of a living issue than did their parents; and therefore, more as a matter of convenience than conversion, they may have come to terms with the contemporary religious landscape". [p. 10]

THOMAS HODGKIN

"The RGS archives, a handlist compiled by Christine Kelly. Part 1" (*Geographical journal*, vol. 141, pt. 1 (March 1975), pp. 99-107) mentions 60 letters by Thomas Hodgkin for the period 1852-1862, in the correspondence files of the Royal Geographical Society. In the same collection are more than 200 letters of Francis Galton.

CHARLES LAMB

The new Cornell edition of *The letters of Charles and Mary Anne Lamb* (vol. 1—Letters of Charles Lamb, 1796-1801), edited by Edwin W. Marrs, again brings to notice Charles Lamb's acquaintance with the Lloyds and the literary circle in which they moved.

A letter to Coleridge in 1797 runs: "Tell Lloyd I have had thoughts of turning Quaker, and have been reading, or am rather just beginning to read, a most capital book, good thoughts in good language, William Penn's 'No Cross, no Crown'; I like it immensely. Unluckily I went to one of his meetings, tell him, in St. John Street . . ." Lamb goes on to recount the unfortunate story of his visit to Peel Meeting, St. John's Street, Clerkenwell.

The week before, Lamb was telling Coleridge of his appreciation of John Woolman, and quoted him in the letter.

A sentence in the editor's introduction (p. xxvi) states that John Lamb, father of Charles (*c.* 1725-1799), "joined a Society of Friends" at one time.

LUCY FRYER MORLAND

"At intervals of perhaps three months comes a morning when the school-room door is suddenly opened and a loud voice gives a good-morning . . . Rising from her desk, the Head shakes hands with the largest woman I have ever seen. This is Miss Morland, sister of the Mayor of Croydon, and herself a formidable member of the Education Committee. Her family . . . take most seriously their civic responsibilities."

With these descriptive phrases, the writer Helen Corke introduces her readers to Lucy Fryer Morland "one of the few women [of her generation] with a college education" and to her brother, Harold John Morland (later mayor of Croydon, and clerk of London Yearly Meeting in the 1920s), children of Charles Coleby and Jane (Fryer) Morland who were married at Brighouse 22 x 1862. (Helen Corke, *In our infancy*, Cambridge University Press, 1975, pp. 128–129.)

HENRY OWEN OF LLWYNDU

A footnote (p. 290, note 2) of *A calendar of the Merioneth Quarter Sessions rolls*, vol. 1, 1733–1765, edited by Keith Williams - Jones (Merioneth County Council, 1965) states that the commission of the peace for 1792 includes the

name of the Quaker Henry Owen of Llwyndu (National Library of Wales, Wynnstay Box W, no. 34).

Ransomes

Ransomes of Ipswich: a history of the firm and guide to its records, by D. R. Grace and D. C. Phillips (University of Reading Institute of Agricultural History, 1975) contains an inventory of the archives of the firm (which started in Norwich, and with Gurney financial support for the founder, Robert Ransome [born 1753] son of the Quaker schoolmaster at Wells, Norfolk). For the past couple of hundred years the firm has been in the forefront of the British agricultural machinery business. There are some good photographs, and an outline family tree for Ransomes directly associated with the business.

David Ricardo

"On David Ricardo (1772–1823)", by Professor A. Heertje, of the University of Amsterdam (*Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, vol. 24, 1975, pp. 73–81) has a brief notice of Ricardo's marriage in 1793 to Priscilla, daughter of Edward Wilkinson. Priscilla (Wilkinson) Ricardo was disowned on marriage, but seems to have continued attending meeting. Births of all their children were entered (as 'Not in Membership') in Friends' registers.

Thomas Rudyard

Among Alfred Braithwaite's historical papers was an annotated copy of his *Thomas Rudyard* (*Jnl. F.H.S.*, supplement no. 27, 1956), which included, among other items, typescript extracts sent to Alfred Braithwaite by A. Day Bradley of Hastings on Hudson, New York, 10706, in 1973 concerning Thomas Rudyard in America. The extracts come from *Documents relative to the colonial history of the State of New York*, ed. J. R. Broadhead (Albany, N.Y., 1853), vols. 3 and 4; *Calendar of British historical manuscripts, 1664–1776, in the office of the Secretary of State (New York State)*, ed. E. B. O'Callaghan (Albany, 1866); *Archives of the State of New Jersey*, 1st series, vol. 1: 1631–1687, ed. W. A. Whitehead (Newark, N.J., 1880); and *Notes from East Jersey under the proprietary government*, by W. A. Whitehead (New Jersey Hist. Society, 1846), pp. 123–125.

These extracts have been presented to Friends House Library by Millior Braithwaite.

Laurence Sterne

Laurence Sterne: the early & middle years, by Arthur H. Cash (London, Methuen, 1975) includes brief notes on Friends in the parish of Halifax where Sterne went to school, and at Sutton-on-the-Forest, where he was vicar from 1741 to 1744.

R. L. Stevenson

Roger J. Swearingen, in his index and finding list to "The prose writings of Robert Louis Stevenson", appearing in *Studies in Scottish literature* (part 2 being in vol. 11, no. 4, April 1974 of the *Studies*), has a note (p. 244) concerning Stevenson's project in 1880 for a study of William Penn "probably never written, Unpublished". Stevenson was inspired by

finding a copy of *Fruits of Solitude* on a San Francisco bookstall, and he went so far as to obtain William Hepworth Dixon's biography of Penn, and Penn's *Select Works* (1771). Other references by Stevenson to William Penn are indicated in Professor Swearingen's note.

Tangye Brothers

"Some notes on the Tangye family", by J. Francis Parker (*Transactions of the Newcomen Society*, vol. 45 (1972–1973), pp. 191–204) is the précis of a paper presented to the Midlands branch of the Newcomen Society, 3 October 1973. It brings together information on the sons of Joseph and Anne Tangye, the five of whom built the great engineering business in Birmingham in the second half of last century—James (1825–1913), Joseph (1826–1902), Edward (1832–1909), Richard (1833–1906) and George (1835–1920).

John Richardson Wigham

The work of John Richardson Wigham (1829–1906) in the field of lighthouse lighting is touched upon in *Lighthouses: their architecture, history and archaeology*, by D. R. Hague and R. Christie (Gomer Press, 1975).

George Wilson

"A Quaker in seventeenth-century Virginia: four remonstrances by George Wilson", by Warren M. Billings (Department of History, University of New Orleans) prints four papers, of which the originals are at Friends House Library, by George Wilson, a prisoner in 1661 and 1662, in which latter year he died. (*William and Mary quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. 33, no. 1, Jan. 1976, pp. 127–140.)

Gerrard Winstanley

A study—"Digger no millenarian: the revolutionizing of Gerrard Winstanley", by George Juretic (*Journal of the history of ideas*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 263–280, 1975), sees Winstanley's social radicalism as "intelligbile only by seeing him as a product of two virtually distinct phases: a pre-Digger and a Digger period".

Aberdeen

Aberdeen Council letters. Transcribed and edited for the town council of Aberdeen by Louise B. Taylor, vol. 3–6 (Oxford University Press, 1952–1961) include some matter concerning Friends, and their sufferings.

Vol. 3, p. 275 has a newsletter report of Nayler's entry into Bristol, 1656, and his subsequent journey to London to be examined.

Vol. 4, pp. 366–367, 13 Dec. 1668, has a letter desiring the temporary release from prison of "ane poore boy called John Forbes a quaker in prison whom I know to be called by his urgent affairs to the countrey".

Vol. 5 and 6 cover the years 1670–1681, and include letters concerning the meetings and imprisonment of Friends. In one instance (2 March 1670) the town clerk complains that the Friends taken up at meeting and directed to disturb the inhabitants no more, "They being sua dismist did imediately goe back to ther said meeting notwithstanding of the former comands put upon them to

forbear", so Friends were apprehended again.

In June 1672 Friends were reported to have bought a burial ground, "ane piece of ground within the towne which before wes ane kaill yeard for being ane distinct buriall place to them and have built great high stone dykes about the same for the said effect And have buried severall persons therin Also they doe hyre houses and possess the same for ther publict meetings this being a great prejudice to the upholding the fabrick of our Kirk".

The editor uses Alexander Skene's account of the Aberdeen sufferings (at Friends House Library) and says that she cannot account for the cessation of persecution in November 1679. One document (vol. 6, p. 70, 3 April 1677) authorizes the "magistrats of Aberdein or any of them to sett at libertie Alexander Symrell mariner [who had been arrested at a Friends' meeting] out of their Tolbooth wher he is, by reason he is goeing as pylat upon a ship thence overseas he always finding cation to re-enter the prison within twentie four hours efter his returne". The next document is the bond provided by a merchant of Aberdeen to let Alexander proceed on his voyage.

Australian Immigration

William Fry, brother-in-law of Elizabeth Fry the prison reformer, manager of the Guardian Penitentiary Society, who was instrumental in sending out twelve free women (the "Twelve Apostles") to Australia in 1822, is one of the people mentioned in " 'Without natural protectors': female immigration to Australia, 1832–36" by A. J. Hammerton of La Trobe University (*Historical studies*, Melbourne, vol. 16, no. 65, Oct. 1975, pp. 539–566).

Bakewell F.M.H.

The Friends' Meeting House at Bakewell in Derbyshire is quite a large building, and manifestly too large for its present congregation.

White's *History, gazetteer and directory of the county of Derby* (1857) tells us that it was built in 1853, and that it will seat 400. The Religious Census in 1851 established that there were only 184 attendances in the morning and afternoon for the whole of Derbyshire. Can any reason be given for this overlarge meeting house?

I am doing research into nonconformity in Derbyshire from 1850 to 1918 for an M.A. degree. Quakers did not play a large part in Derbyshire at this period (there were only six meetings in 1851) but I am anxious to do justice to them. If anyone knows of any original papers in unexpected places I would be glad to hear of them.

David A. Barton (Hillcrest, Bent Lane, Darley Hillside, Matlock, Derby. DE4 2HN)

Bedfordshire

The "Bedfordshire ecclesiastical census, 1851", edited by D. W. Bushby, appears as part of volume 54 of the *Publications of the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society*, 1975. Friends at Ampthill, Leighton Buzzard and Luton are mentioned. At Leighton Buzzard 31 attended morning meeting, 22 in the evening (accommodation for 182

worshippers); at Luton, 70 morning, 49 afternoon (sittings: about 220); at Dunstable Street, Ampthill, 23 morning, 14 afternoon (sittings: 220).

Botanists

British botanical and horticultural literature before 1800, by Blanche Henrey (Oxford University Press, 3 vols. 1975. £75) includes numerous references to Dr. Fothergill, J. C. Lettsom, Peter Collinson and their circles of scientific friends on both sides of the Atlantic in the eighteenth century. The volumes of text are handsomely illustrated with reproductions of plates and facsimile title-pages.

From the Braithwaite Manuscripts at Friends House Library, the author quotes minutes of Leinster Provincial Meeting and of Dublin Half-Year's Meeting in 1705 to show that Friends were interested in the utility of plants: "all Friends are desired as they have occasion to make gardens to make them plain or rather plant or set such profitable things as may be of service". [vol. 2, pp. 310–311]

This is particularly illustrated in the work of William Curtis (of the *Flora Londinensis*). Curtis made a careful study of indigenous plants, and cultivated many species that were of economic value in his botanic garden.

Cheltenham Spa

"The Gloucestershire spas: an eighteenth-century parallel", by Bryan Little, the eighth essay in the centenary volume of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society entitled *Essays in Bristol and Gloucestershire history*, edited by Patrick McGarth and John Cannon, 1976, deals with the Bristol Hotwells and with Cheltenham. Friends were concerned in both developments. The Bristol Hotwell was leased in 1695 to Charles Jones and Thomas Callowhill and the stage was set for its development.

Twenty years later, in 1716, the qualities of the spring in Cheltenham were first noticed. The land there belonged to "William Mason, a local Quaker who had been in business as a hosier". William Mason himself did little to publicize the well. His daughter and heiress, Elizabeth Mason, married Captain Henry Skillicorne, a master mariner, "probably in Bristol, in 1731". This marriage does not appear in Bristol Friends' registers, although there is a burial record 18 xi 1732, for an unnamed infant of Henry Skillycorn, of James parish, Bristol. No further Bristol Friends' records have been traced. Henry Skillicorne settled in Cheltenham in 1738 and engaged himself in successfully developing the spa right up to the time of his death in 1763 at the age of 84. A memorial tablet was erected in St Mary's, Cheltenham.

Darlington

Influence, opinion and political idioms in reformed England: case studies from the north-east, 1832–74; by T. J. Nossiter, Department of Government, London School of Economics and Political Science (Harvester Press, 1975), includes an unsympathetic detailed portrait of the Pease and Quaker influence in Darlington politics in the middle of the 19th century. The title of chapter 8:

"Industrial influence in the towns: the company of the saints, Darlington, 1832–74", seems to set the tone. The author states "it is the sanctimony of those secular saints, the quaker industrialists, which gives its history a special flavour". Perhaps the flavour might have been different had Dr. Nossiter had the benefit of access to the Pease papers.

Derbyshire Friends

The church in Derbyshire in 1823–4: the parochial visitation of the Rev. Samuel Butler, archdeacon of Derby. Edited by M. R. Austin (Derbyshire Archaeological Society, Record series. vol. 5), 1974, mentions Friends specifically among dissenters in Chesterfield, Derby and Dronfield (pp. 62, 75, 83). There is no mention of Friends in the less populous rural parishes.

Dublin

Archivum Hibernicum, 32, 1974, contains an article by Nuala Burke "A hidden church?", sub-titled "The structure of catholic Dublin in the mid-eighteenth century". In discussing prejudice in the city the author has the following:

"The assignment of the Quaker meeting house in New Row to the Calced Carmelites . . . seems to have been accepted locally by Catholics and non-Catholics alike until a visitor to the community from the continent protested that the use of such a building for Catholic services would give scandal to religious superiors—presumably those on the continent — at which the Carmelites moved to new premises." [p. 90]

Engineers

A biographical index of British engineers in the 19th century. Compiled by S. Peter Bell (Garland reference library of social science, vol. 5), 1975, gives references to some 3,500 obituary notices of engineers in twenty of the main engineering journals of the 19th century.

Under each name is given date of birth (when known) and death, descriptive epithet or title of the person, and journal, volume and page reference for the obituaries traced.

There are several Fowlers and Peases, and William Watson Hewitson (1815–1863) locomotive manufacturer.

Exeter

Exeter in the seventeenth century: tax and rate assessments, 1602–1699 (Devon & Cornwall Record Society New series, vol. 2), edited by W. G. Hoskins, has entry (p. 100) in Trinity parish poor rate of 1699, for "*The Quakers house* & garden 2d".

Greer Manuscripts

Facsimiles of letters from emigrants in America in the 1770s (John McDonnell, Quaker settler at Wilmington, N.C., and Thomas Wright, Quaker settler at Plumstead, Penna.) to Thomas Greer at Dungannon, co. Tyrone, appear in the Northern Ireland Public Record Office Education facsimiles 121–140: *18th century emigration*, 1972.

Irish Banks

The emergence of the Irish banking system, 1820–1845, by G. L. Barrow (Gill and Macmillan, 1975) includes a

preliminary section on the Banking scene in 1820, and gives a brief paragraph outlining the history of the Pike's bank in Cork (from 1740, but successor to a bank which the Hoares founded in Cork in 1680) which went on until Joseph Pike died in 1826.

Kendal

The position held by Friends in the town of Kendal during the eighteenth century is sketched by J. D. Marshall (editor of William Stout's *Autobiography*, Manchester, 1967) in his *Kendal 1661–1801, the growth of the modern town*. Published to mark the Kendal charter year by Cumberland & Westmorland Archaeological Society and the Curwen Trust, 1975.

Lancashire Diarists

J. J. Bagley, *Lancashire diarists* (Phillimore, 1975) casts its net wide. It includes a chapter on George Fox and William Stout of Lancaster, quoting from Fox's *Journal* and William Stout's *Autobiography*.

Criticism is disarmed when the author begins, "George Fox was neither a Lancashire man nor a diarist". We hope that this volume will lead some to seek out complete texts, happily still available in modern editions.

Leeds, Carlton Hill

Northern History, volume 10, 1975, includes an essay by Asa Briggs entitled "Local and regional in Northern sound broadcasting" in which he touches on the move of the B.B.C. in Leeds in 1933 to the premises in Woodhouse Lane, where "The studios, control room and other offices in what had been the old Society of Friends' Meeting House, offered facilities, particularly for brass bands and for certain kinds of drama superior to those in Manchester". [p. 178]

Professor Arthur Taylor in an article on the progress of the teaching of history at Leeds university states [p. 154] that the diary of A. J. Grant on 27 November 1910 records that "When Joshua Rowntree spoke on St. Paul at the Friends' Meeting House, Grant had 'never heard a more stirring address' ". Professor Grant himself sometimes gave lectures in the series of evening lectures which formed part of Leeds Friends' winter programme at this period.

Lincoln, 1903

Victorian Lincoln, by Sir Francis Hill (Cambridge University Press, 1974) gives details of attendance of adult worshippers at the Friends' meeting in 1903.

The figures are taken from the *Lincoln leader and county advertiser*, 14 March 1903: morning—10 men, 21 women; evening—23 men, 22 women; a total of 76 attendances for the day

London

Mid-Georgian London. A topographical and social survey of central and western London about 1750, by Hugh Phillips (Collins, 1964) mentions the old Savoy Meeting House in the Strand nearly opposite Exeter Change (pp. 159, 290). A valuable feature of the volume is the notes on the occupation of the houses (details obtained from the contemporary rate books). Names of occupants may be traced through the index.

Newham, London

"From the Tower to Barking", a chapter in *London in the country—the growth of suburbia* (Hamish Hamilton, 1975) by Guy R. Williams, includes a couple of paragraphs on the "small colony of reasonably wealthy Quakers who had bought or built houses in and around Upton Lane". The colony began with Dr. John Fothergill and his botanical garden (1762). It continued with the Gurneys and the Frys (at Ham House and Plashet House), and the Listers at Upton House, where Joseph Lister, later Lord Lister was born in 1827.

Neath Abbey Ironworks

The Newcomen Society visited the Neath Abbey ironworks in the course of its Summer meeting in Cardiff, 1973. The report in the Society's *Transactions*, vol. 45, p. 184 mentions the leasing of the ironworks site to the Falmouth Quaker Fox family in 1792, and the subsequent developments in which Cornish names figure prominently for the next century.

Newry Election, 1868

All four Quaker electors in Newry at the 1868 Parliamentary election voted for the Liberal candidate, as did the large majority of the Catholic voters. The main Protestant denominations saw their members voting strongly Conservative. These facts are brought out in a table from election poll books printed on p. 111 of *The origins of Ulster Unionism* by Peter Gibbon (Manchester University Press, 1975).

Nonconformity in Politics

Nonconformity in modern British politics, by Stephen Koss, professor of history, Columbia University (London and Sydney, Batsford, 1975) covers roughly the first forty years of this century. "A relatively brief episode", "a dispiriting story" are a couple of the final phrases at the end of the final chapter, titled "Lazarus Unraised". An appendix provides a survey of the general election candidates from 1900 to 1935, indicating party affiliation and nonconformist allegiance. Only in 1906 did the number of nonconformist MPs elected exceed 150.

Norfolk

A bibliography of Norfolk history. Compiled and edited by Elizabeth Darroch and Barry Taylor (University of East Anglia, 1975) has references to Friends in the county, and also some entries concerning Elizabeth Fry. The names of Eddington, Gurney, and Opie are noticed.

North Carolina

The Colonial records of North Carolina [*Second series*] issued by the Division of Archives and History, Department of Cultural Resources at Raleigh, N.C., include various documents and illuminating editorial comment concerning Friends in the colony during the late 17th and early 18th century. Friends were influential on occasion out of all proportion to their numbers, and not only because of the governorship of John Archdale (1694). Four volumes in the series have been issued up to 1974, covering years up to 1708.

Norwich

"The Quakers with their meeting in Goat Lane were dominated by the Gurney clan", so writes C. B. Jewson in his book *The Jacobin city, a portrait of Norwich in its reaction to the French revolution, 1788–1802* (Blackie, 1975). The author has used an array of manuscript and printed sources to good effect. He touches on the Gurney excursions into politics, and notes that their whig sympathies did not always overcome a reluctance to engage in political controversy. Charles Jewson sums up "Apart from the Gurney family Norwich Quakers did not at this period appear much in the public eye". "There was always a hearing for a gifted preacher", as at the time of the visit of William Savery in 1798, which had such influence on the life of Elizabeth Fry.

Philadelphia

The part played by the Society of Friends in dealing with poverty in Philadelphia in the first century of its existence is dealt with by Gary B. Nash of the Department of History, University of California in his paper "Poverty and poor relief in pre-revolutionary Philadelphia" (*William and Mary quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. 33, no. 1, Jan. 1976, pp. 3–30).

* * *

The papers of Robert Morris, 1781–1784, E. James Ferguson, editor (University of Pittsburgh Press), vol. 1 includes a letter from Robert Morris, superintendent of finance during the war of the American revolution, to prominent Philadelphia Friends, 23 July 1781, essaying to persuade them to raise money for a fund for relief of refugees from the Carolinas and Georgia.

Morris had a plan for a lottery to bring in funds for the project —as he wrote "making thereby a joint appeal to interest and Pity. But, as the members of your Society are not enclined to Lotteries, I cannot expect they will become adventurers; tho' they certainly will not omit to seize an occasion for exercising those mild and benevolent Principles by which they are actuated". [p. 375]

The Friends in their reply enumerated some of their previous recent relief efforts, and then proceeded to point to the war and the oppressive laws enacted in Pennsylvania which had brought about a great change in the circumstances of many members of the Society, "so that there are divers instances of many families in City and Country who are already nearly stripped of their substance". They felt that their efforts for the time being should be concentrated on relieving distress among their own members, so that their own poor would not become a charge on state funds. They had already sent "something considerable as a relief" to Friends in the Carolinas "who we apprehend are reduced to great straits". [p. 411]

Philadelphia Printing

Benjamin Franklin's Philadelphia printing, 1728–1766: a descriptive bibliography, by C. William Miller (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 102, 1974) includes a full survey of the output of the Franklin press, from the time

(1728) when he helped to complete the first Philadelphia edition of Sewel's *History* until the 1760s, from which period we may quote John Woolman's *Considerations on keeping negroes. Part Second*, 1762. A good many Quaker books are included in Franklin's publications, and there are some also, which the editor has had to reject from the Franklin press canon on maturer consideration of the full bibliographical and historical evidence. These corrections to earlier authorities are listed in a separate section.

Plainness, 1745

Gerald Cragg's edition of *The Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion* (which forms volume 2 of the Oxford edition of the *Works of John Wesley*, Clarendon Press, 1975) reproduces some passages concerning Friends.

John Wesley deals with "the plain language", pointing out that it is really the use of a particular form, and goes on: "Either do not pretend to 'plain speech' at all, or be *uniformly plain*". (p. 255)

Wesley charges Friends with inconsistency in their attitude to dress. "For instance: this woman is too strict a Quaker to lay out a *shilling* in a *necklace*. Very well; but she is not too strict to lay out *fourscore* guineas in a repeating *watch*. Another would not for the world wear any *lace*, no, not even an *edging* round her cap. But she will wear point—and sees no harm in it at all, though it should be of twelve times the price."

The Quakers, Wesley writes, "will not touch a coloured *ribbon*, but will cover themselves with a *stiff silk* from head to foot. They cannot bear *purple*, but make no scruple at all of being clothed in *fine linen*; yea, to such a degree that the 'linen of the Quakers' is grown almost into a proverb". (p. 256)

Can anyone identify Wesley's "daughter to one of the Quakers in London" who was "married in apparel suitable to her diamond buckle, which cost a hundred guineas"? (p. 257)

Politics, 1906–1914

Radicalism against war, 1906–1914: the advocacy of peace and retrenchment, by A. J. Anthony Morris (Longman, 1972) quotes from material in Friends House Library and elsewhere concerning T. Edmund Harvey, J. A. Pease and the Rowntrees.

Pool Bank

A short history of the manor and parish of Witherslack to 1850, by G. P. Jones (Cumberland & Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society. Tract series, no. 18. 1971) includes information about Quakers.

Friends were centred at Pool Bank in the far northern corner of the district. Thomas Pearson was fined in 1672 for holding a conventicle in his house there. George Fox stayed there on his way to and from Swarthmoor. Friends seem to have continued in this district right through the eighteenth century, or at least until 1786 when Thomas Thompson, "one of the people called Quakers", was witness in a dispute over timber.

Another Quaker family, this time towards the southern end of the manor, was that of Rowland Crosfield (d. 1707) and the Haws, descended from Crosfield's daughter, Mary Haw at Town End.

Index

F.B.G. = Friends' burial ground F.M.H. = Friends' meeting house

THE JOURNAL

OF THE

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOLUME 53

1972-75

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

INVICTA PRESS

HEADLEY BROTHERS LTD
109 Kingsway London WC2B 6PX
and Ashford Kent

Contents

CONTENTS

Supplements to the Journal of Friends' Historical Society

1, 3, 5. FIRST PUBLISHERS OF TRUTH. Ed. N. Penney. 1907. Copies of these three parts only available, at £2 each part.

7. THOMAS POLE, M.D. (1753–1829). By E. T. Wedmore. 1908. 53 pp., £2.00.

8–11. EXTRACTS FROM STATE PAPERS relating to Friends, 1654–1762. Ed. by N. Penney. 1910–13. 4 parts. 365 pp., £5.00.

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

15. QUAKER LANGUAGE. By T. Edmund Harvey. 1928. 50p.

16–17. PEN PICTURES OF LONDON YEARLY MEETING, 1789–1833. Ed. Norman Penney. 1930. 227 pp., £7.00.

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

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

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

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

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

26. JAMES NAYLER, A FRESH APPROACH. By Geoffrey F. Nuttall, D.D. 1954. £1.00.

27. THOMAS RUDYARD, EARLY FRIENDS' "ORACLE OF LAW". By Alfred W. Braithwaite. 1956. £1.00.

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

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

31. GEORGE FOX AND THE PUREFEYS. By T. Joseph Pickvance. 1970. £1.00.

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

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

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

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

Back issues of the *Journal* may be obtained: price £1 each issue from 1970 onwards; £2 each issue before that date.

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 NW1 2BJ.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY HEADLEY BROTHERS LTD
109 KINGSWAY LONDON WC2B 6PX AND ASHFORD KENT