

*The
Journal of the
Friends Historical
Society*

Volume 59 Number 1

CONTENTS

page	
1	Editorial
3	300 Years of Friends' School, Saffron Walden - A Four - Site Saga <i>Farrand Radley</i>
19	The Quakers and the Religious Identity of Major-General John Lambert <i>David Farr</i>
40	Hannah Lightfoot: Quaker Queen? <i>David Sox</i>
47	Robert Willan MD FRS (1757 - 1812): Dermatologist of the Millenium <i>Christopher C Booth</i>
55	Germes of Good: The Growth of Quakerism in Australia <i>Charles Stevenson</i>
67	The Rowntree Family and the Schreiner Riots <i>Metford Robson</i>
83	Pilgrimage: Dorothy Richardson (1873 - 1957) and Quakers <i>Eva Tucker</i>
88	Recent Publications
105	Notes and Queries
111	Errata

FRIENDS HISTORICAL SOCIETY

<i>President:</i>	2001 Christine Trevett 2002 Rosemary Moore
<i>Clerk:</i>	Patrica R Sparks
<i>Membership Secretary</i>	Malcolm J. Thomas
<i>Treasurer:</i>	Christopher Denman 2002 Brian Hawkins
<i>Eiditor of the Journal</i>	<i>Howard F. Gregg</i>

Annual membership Subscription due 1st January (personal, Meetings and Quaker Institutions in Great Britain and Ireland) £8 US \$16 (Overseas Institutions) £13 US \$26. Subscriptions should be paid to the Membership Secretary, FHS, c/o the Library, Friends House, 173 Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ. Orders for single numbers and back issues should be sent to FHS at the same address.

THE JOURNAL OF THE FRIENDS HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Communications should be addressed to the Editor of the *Journal*
c/o 44 Seymour Road, London SW18 5JA, U.K.

EDITORIAL

The Editor apologises for the long and frustrating delay in the appearance of *J.F.H.S. Volume 59, Number 1*. I apologise to both contributors and readers. With regret, circumstances have made it difficult for me to finalise the proofs on several occasions. This was especially so in 2001 when the Clerkship of Monthly Meeting required my considerable attention. I hope that the 2001 issue will be available before the end of this year.

Some members joined the Friends of the Wellcome Library & Centre for the History of Medicine in a joint meeting, held at the Wellcome Library, on 22 January 2002. Sir Christopher Booth spoke about the Quaker contribution to medicine, and David Sox on 'The Bartrams: Quaker "physicians" and flower hunters'. The meeting proved a happy and enjoyable occasion. Both speakers contribute to this issue.

This issue covers a wide range of Quaker history in both chronology and subject.

Farrand Radley's Presidential Address, now appearing in the tercentenary year, gives an affectionate and concise history of the development of the School on its four sites, with some interesting asides to add colour to the narrative.

David Farr, who has now spoken to the Society, presents a fascinating examination of a key, if neglected, figure at the centre of

events in the 1650s, with some important links to Quakers.

David Sox provides a carefully measured account of a controversial figure at the edge of eighteenth-century Quaker history.

Through the good offices of Alastair Heron, and the kindness of Sir Christopher Booth, the life and career of a major figure in British medical history can be celebrated in these pages.

Charles Stevenson takes us overseas with a broad overview and careful analysis of the development of Quakerism in Australia and the difficulties it encountered in taking root.

The perils of Quaker witness in a time of national controversy is explored, through a splendid blend of family and local records, in Metford Robson's account of what happened in Scarborough in March 1900.

Eva Tucker considers how experience of Quakerism informed the work of a major, if perhaps neglected, writer of the last century.

The Editor welcomes articles or short items for consideration for inclusion in the 2002 *Journal*, without which there will be no *Journal*! Contributors are advised to use the *MHRA* (Modern Humanities Research Association) *Style Book* in preparation of material, which is available from W.S Marney and Son Ltd., Hudson Road, Leeds LS9 7DL. The Editor's decision is final as regards publication or revision.

Please note the 20 September 2003 in your diaries for marking the centenary of the founding of the Friends Historical Society.

Howard F Gregg

300 YEARS OF THE FRIENDS' SCHOOL, SAFFRON WALDEN - A FOUR-SITE SAGA

A four-site saga? Galsworthy is perhaps not quite what he was in 1967 when I first used this title to give my Presidential to the Friends' School, Saffron Walden Old Scholars' Association, but those four sites are still there all right - Clerkenwell 1702, Islington Road 1786, Croydon 1825 and Saffron Walden 1879. And when it came to planning an Appeal for a Tercentenary in 2002 and I was on the Committee for it, I had a head start when it came to drafting its objects. So I suggested: 'to commemorate 300 years of the oldest continuously surviving community in the British Isles providing a Quaker education'. And they agreed, very kindly.

But before we actually get there, we must answer a few questions. Exactly what was started in 1702 to justify a 300th in 2002? If, as first described, it was a 'workhouse', did it also qualify as a School sufficiently for the whole complex over the years to justify the description given to it by David W. Bolam in his book for the 250th in 1952, 'Unbroken Community'¹? And if so, is there any other current Quaker establishment under whatsoever title that has actually existed without any gap between its sites for 300 years or more, here or anywhere else in the World? And lastly, was there in 1702, and is there now, such a thing as a Quaker education?

Perhaps I ought, first of all, to state my family connections with all this. My grandfather Alexander Radley married a Farrand, originally a French name meaning just Smith - the *maréchal ferrant* (in charge of horses (or mares), the Merovingian *mariscalk*, using *fer*, iron, i.e. farrier, blacksmith). Some came over with the Huguenots but my lot definitely escorted the Conqueror! And one, John, a baker, got married at Peel Meeting House in 1720 where the Clerkenwell boys went on Sundays. Joseph Farrand, 'last and patten maker', accepted the discharge to his care from Clerkenwell of Edward Sweatman in 1781. There were 6 Farrands at Islington Road and 2 Radleys, one of whom, Mary Ann, had, according to the Admission Register, 'hardly learned anything 16 months ago when she came to School' - a good academic start for the family! There were 18 Farrands and 10 Radleys (including Joseph, later Head of Lisburn in Ulster) at Croydon. A Farrand, Isabella, taught at Saffron Walden before, sadly, ending up at The Retreat, and at Walden again my father John Charles was the first (1883-9) to take London Matric and was a Junior Master 1891-4;

and yours truly (1927-33) was in the First Sixth Form to take Higher School Certificate. My cousin Philip, later Head of Ackworth, was arrested at Walden as a Student Master in 1916 for being a CO, and always claimed to have been the first Quaker to spend a night in the Tower since William Penn. And my father came back for an Old Scholars Whitsun Weekend in 1914 and met my mother Helen Louise Howell, who taught Music and had done so before that at Ayton. Not for nothing did a law firm recently write to me as 'Messrs H.A. Farr & Radley'.

QUAKER EDUCATION UP TO 1702

George Fox in 1668² was 'much exercised with schoolmasters and schoolmistresses', warning them 'to teach their children sobriety in the fear of the Lord, that they might not be nursed and trained up in lightness, vanity and wantonness'. And having given attention to the problems of marriage satisfactorily he passed out of London 'into the countries' again and came to Waltham (Abbey) where he 'established a school(for teaching boys)' and 'ordered a women's school to be set up in Shacklewell' (in Hackney) 'to instruct young lasses and maidens in whatsoever things were civil and useful in the creation'. This had gone by 1677, alas, and the boys' lasted not more than ten more years after moving to Edmonton in 1679³. But it taught two sons of Isaac Penington, one of Robert Barclay, and a grandson of Margaret Fell. The Master, Christopher Taylor, left for Pennsylvania, as did his successor George Keith, who although a founder of the Penn Charter School there in 1689 blotted his copybook and was finally disowned both in Philadelphia and Britain. So that was the end of Fox's personal contribution, though it came after an early start by George Whitehead in 1653 and at least two schools run by Friends in prisons, at Stafford and Ilchester, for their comrades there.

London Yearly Meeting in 1690⁴ was warning Friends 'not to send their children to the World's schools to corrupt them by learning Heathen Authors and the names of their gods. Schoolmasters and Schoolmistresses (where they are capable) should take care that they train them in the language of Truth and the plainness that becomes the Truth'. Leonard Kenworthy, the American savant, asked us in 1983⁵ to 'imagine a small group of people, many of them illiterate, starting schools in a century where education was considered a monopoly of the rich and powerful. Yet the Quakers did just that'.

And by 1691 there were 27 day schools in England, 3 in each of Scotland and Ireland, with a published Yearly Meeting list of 15 boarding schools, 'scholes kept by Friends'; and one of these was Penketh which must be examined with care, since it affects the

Walden claim to unique continuous survival, along with other contenders opened before 1702.

Penketh was a Preparative Meeting boarding school in 1688, one of its later pupils being John Bright. But in 1834⁶ it was replaced by an entirely distinct foundation under the joint management of Hardshaw East and West Monthly Meetings, which lasted until 1934 when it fell foul of the Depression, though its Old Scholars' Association lasted until 2000. *Penketh* therefore cannot defeat Walden, and nor can '*Stramongate*' in Kendal, to which my father brought me as a child, as to *Penketh*, as he was on the Committee of both. Opened in 1698 it too died from the Depression, in 1932, prompting that most moving entry in the OSA magazine '*The Old Stramonian*'⁷; 'our school is to close, the oldest of its kind. We believe that her passing will be regretted by a wider company than ours which has known her from the inside. In the end, the school went down fighting; the school tradition taught the school at least - to play the game.'

Lancaster was around by 1700⁸, operating for long in the wings of the Meeting House until selling out to a non-Friend body in 1969; this at least had the decency to name it the George Fox School, though it fails now to provide a Quaker education. Another non-competitor is *Sidcot*, although it apparently stole a march on Walden by announcing its Tercentenary in 1999. But this was only a *foundation* as a Monthly Meeting School under William Jenkins, which closed when he retired in 1728. There was then a gap of more than half a century before John Benwell opened a private school there from c.1784 to 1805, and the Headmaster in 1994 has confirmed that the school 'ceased to exist at *Sidcot* for some years! Although re-founded in 1808 as a Quarterly Meeting School it thus loses out to Walden on continuity, much as I regret this personally since I suppose I can legitimately claim to have founded it all myself. As a Student Master there in 1935 I played a part in Evelyn Roberts' '*A Sidcot Pageant*'⁹: I was William Jenkins.

But this is where the New World on the opposite side of the Herring Pond comes in triumphantly, since the official list of United States boarding schools (now totalling 73) compiled by the Executive Director of the Friends Council on Education in Philadelphia, Kaye M. Edstene, traces two already operating before 1702 and still doing so. William Penn had followed in Fox's footsteps as a thinker on education; 'Let my children be husbandmen and housewives; it is healthy, honest and of good example'.

Good education, paraphrases Paul A. Lacey of Earlham College, writing in 1998¹⁰, is to be found in the study of nature and natural

things, and its methods should begin where nature does and follow at her pace: children should learn things before they learn languages. And this was the motivation for the William Penn Charter School, Pennsylvania, of 1689¹¹, which, along with Abington Friends School Pennsylvania of 1697¹², still flourishes and caused Walden to issue the caveat that its claim to be the oldest continuously surviving community was valid only in the British Isles!

QUAKER 'COMMITTEE' & 'MEETING' BOARDING SCHOOLS
CLOSED

Founded - 17th century	1702	18th and 19th century
<i>YM List (1691) - 15</i>		<i>Leeds (1756-1838)</i>
<i>Long-Term Pre-1702</i>		<i>Gildersome(1772-1815)</i>
Penketh I (1688-1834)		<i>Mountmellick (Ire)(1786-1921)</i>
Stramongate (1698-1932)		<i>Ipswich (1790-1800)</i>
Sidcot I (1699-1728)	Clerkenwell (1702)	<i>Wigton (1815-1984)</i>
Lancaster (1700-1969)		<i>Rawdon (1832-1921)</i>
	Islington Rd (1786)	<i>Penketh II (1834-1934)</i>
	Croydon (1825)	<i>Brookfield (Ire)(1836-1921)</i>
		<i>Ayton (1841-1997)</i>
		<i>Newton-in-Bowland</i>
		<i>(-1844;1868-1911)</i>

SURVIVING

<u>USA</u>		Lisburn (Ire)(1774)
William Penn Charter (1689)		Ackworth (1779)
Abington (1697)		The Mount (1784-1814:1831)
		Newtown (Ire)(1798)
		Sidcot II (1808)
	Saffron Walden	Bootham (1823)
	(1879)	Sibford (1842)
		Leighton Park (1890)
In 2000 - USA 73	GB 7 - Ireland 2	

(Source : Friends House, London, Library Guide 7 - Quaker Schools in Great Britain and Ireland).

CLERKENWELL 1702 - THE FIRST OF THE FOUR SITES

The key name here in John Bellers (1654-1725), cloth merchant and active Quaker, who was made a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1718

(eight years after his son!). Beck and Ball¹³ got him right first time; he was 'one of those who never see a wrong without wanting to smite it down - whose minds are ever engaged in shaping schemes for the regeneration of humanity - schemes alas! too often incapable of being realised'.

Ruth Fry published copious extracts from his writings in 1935¹⁴, followed by George Clarke (in full) in 1987¹⁵ at a remarkable launch attended by representatives of the major European embassies who were given copies in ultimate satisfaction of Bellers' Will. He certainly smote: anticipating the European Union, the National Health Service and fair Parliamentary elections he had turned his mind to a scheme providing 'Profit for the Rich, a plentiful Living for the Poor and a good Education for Youth'. These were his 'Proposals for Raising a Colledge of Industry of all useful Trades and Husbandry', 1695 with a second (and definitive) edition in 1696.

He had already had experience of working for the poor in Bristol and now sought a wider field, presenting the Proposals (1696 version) to London Yearly Meeting on 29 May 1697. They were recommended 'to the further consideration and amendment of the Morning Meeting and our Meeting for Sufferings' and on 19 June 1699 finally 'approved'.

London & Middlesex Quarterly Meeting were entrusted with implementing the project and after being gazumped for one site and rejecting 'a vinegar house to lett in Islington' they found a 'hous in Clerkenwell' which was felt on 18 August 1701 to be a 'very proper and convienient hous'. A lease was signed on 5 March by John Bellers, Merchant, and John Hopes, Cornfactor, from the executors of Sir Thomas Rowe, who had latterly from 1686 till his death in 1696 run 'The College of Infants', in part of it, of obvious endearment to Bellers. It had been a Workhouse of the 'Corporation for the Better Relief of the Poor in the County of Middlesex' under 1662 legislation, but the actual date of building remains conjectural. Hitchcock¹⁶ goes for 1662: Bolam¹⁷ for 'forty years before' 1702: Braithwaite¹⁷ 1663: and the Victoria History¹⁸ 1666. But it was paid for by local parishioners to accommodate 600 paupers and a County House of Correction (which he was desperate not to replicate), but had been closed in 1672 as too expensive. No contemporary pictures are available but C.Brightwen Rowntree, the Walden Headmaster 1922-34, did a drawing of the courtyard round what was, writes Hitchcock¹⁶, 'a commodious and airy building, ideally suited to the use to which it was put', i.e. at the minimum to house the 'Antient Friends' and teach the children trades, which would help them to be apprenticed and provide saleable articles; all in one community.

THE NATURE OF THE COMMUNITY : WORKHOUSE OR SCHOOL?

The 2002 Appeal is clear : Walden was about to celebrate 300 years of a *Community*, and this term was chosen with some care should any challenge be raised that the establishment at Clerkenwell, at least at the outset, did not fall under the description of a *School* in the terms of the 200th anniversary booklet written, in 1902¹⁹, by James Backhouse Crosfield, Clerk to the School Committee. He had categorically quoted that on 27 July 1702 'two women aged 83 and 75 "were come in from the Bull meeting" and "John Staploe gives account one boy from the Peele is come in"', so that this may be regarded as the date of the commencement of the original School'.

Campbell Stewart echoed this in 1957²⁰: 'this school (i.e. Walden) had its beginning in 1702, a very oblique result of the remarkable suggestion of John Bellers. It was St James Workhouse in Clerkenwell, London, refuge for a few old and infirm people and a boarding school for some young children'.

Yet the actual title of the community at its beginnings was undoubtedly a *Workhouse*. The wording of the note in the margin of the Minutes of 26 December 1701²¹ of the 'Meeting for the business of the poore' appointed by the Quarterly Meeting referring to the 'Hous in Clerkingwell' is simply 'Worke Hous'. The Steward from 1711 to 1737, the writer of '*Richard Hutton's Complaints Book*' just refers habitually to the 'house' but had the management committee of thirty meet at 'the workhouse of the people called Quakers at Clerkenwell'.

By 1739 however the historian Maitland²³ distinguished between the 'Quaker Workhouse, being both an Hospital and Workhouse' and the 'Quakers School' (belonging to it), and in 1746 one Timothy Bevan, an apothecary, of Plough Court Pharmacy writing 'with the full support of the Committee', calls his book '*An Account of the Rise, Pregress and Present State of the School and Work-house maintained by the people called Quakers in Clerkenwell*'. This shift continued moreover and a Committee Minute of 2 December 1772 simply refers to 'the Charity called the Quakers School and Workhouse situate in Clerkenwell'. And every boy on leaving after 1778 was given a paper, '*Advice on quitting the Friend's School and Workhouse at Clerkenwell, London*'.

This would have pleased Bellers, who never liked 'Workhouse' and already in 1718 in '*An Epistle to the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex*' felt it 'necessary to change its name from a Work-House, to either an Hospital or a College, but rather the latter : because some Parents will not put their Children to so Contemptible a Place of Education as a Work-house or an Hospital. The first sounding too

much like a Bridewell and the second like an Almshouse, whereas a College bespeaks a more Liberal Education'. This is one he lost, I fear.

WAS THE EDUCATION 'QUAKER'?

Bellers, like Penn, had practical views on education: 'beyond Reading and Writing a multitude of Scholars is not so useful to the Public as some think'. Yet Clarke¹⁵ feels that 'his proposals regarding education were the most serious attempts made during the late 17th and early 18th centuries to provide for a full and caring education for all children, rich and poor'.

The children went to Meeting at Peel, built in 1721 and when demolished by enemy action in World War II the oldest in London. There was a schoolmaster and a schoolmistress to teach the three Rs in two-hour periods, and the Committee reported on 1 January 1707/8 for example, that 'the children have a suitable education'. Bolam¹ is clear: 'the fundamental aim of all teaching was religious. Both the technique and the aims were the same as those of the contemporary charity schools except that the catechisms used set forth a distinctive Quaker interpretation of life'. The mainstay was Robert Barclay's, but the Committee member, John Freame, a founder of Barclays Bank, supplied material like this: Q: 'What saith the Apostle of the Righteous undergoing Tribulation?' A: 'We must through much Tribulation enter into the Kingdom of God. Yea, and that all that will live Godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer Persecution'. This must have spoken closely to the condition of children with parents under duress or in jail. And this was clinched by a Committee Order of 25 December 1709,¹ 'for the benefit of the Family and the advancement of Piety and Godliness therein, that after the boys are dressed at the direction of the Steward they read as many chapters in the Bible as he shall see meet. The same also to be observed in the evenings, and as often as may be, to be called together to wait upon and Worship God'.

CLERKENWELL ASSESSED

Bellers as a social economist was highly regarded by Karl Marx. His '*Capital*' of 1867 sees him as a 'veritable phenomenon in the history of political economy', and this must have received a greater world-wide circulation than any Quaker work as such. The contemporary Russian academic Tatyana A. Pavlova²³, who attended the Clarke launch as a Quaker, equally pays tribute but gives the reason for his lack of recognition in his lifetime and his 'assignation to oblivion until Marx'. This was his 'tragedy in attempting to fuse

two incompatible things, maximum advantage for the rich and welfare for the poor'. He did not 'think in terms of undermining the pillars of the existing set-up', but gave him credit however for his pedagogic ideas, which were 'more democratic and humanistic than those of the contemporary philosopher John Locke'.

Kenworthy⁵ regretted that his experiment in a 'radical approach to education' was short-lived, and Clarke¹⁵ finds the Workhouse in both name and application a 'pale shadow of Bellers' all-embracing concept'. It was Ruth Fry's¹⁴ view in 1935 that in Bellars' first scheme, children were to be educated in the college, a simple book education being combined with training in handicrafts. His later editions omit mention of children and the place becomes a labour colony'.

The Board of Education Report on its 1905 inspection of Walden, quoted by Stewart,²⁰ states that it was originally a Workhouse School for poor London children, but in this form it does not seem to have been very successful'. And Hubbard,³ although stating definitely that it is the 'oldest Friends' boarding school', felt that 'at no time during its first century did the workhouse have much influence on the general course of Quaker education and no other school (under the workhouse or any other title) was founded in imitation. The workhouse was one effort to solve the problem of poor children's education within the Society, but at no time did it reach more than a small proportion of these'.

Hard words indeed: but Hitchcock¹⁶ is positive: 'Bellers was not alone. He was part of a much wider intellectual movement in the 1690s and 1700s, and neither he, nor his contemporaries, failed to use their ideas as the basis for practical experiments'. Moreover Stewart²⁰ praises 'the minority of schools founded 1695-1725¹ for 'playing a vital part in the educational history of the Society in keeping alive the spirit of an earlier enthusiasm during the period of decline around the 1720s'. This was caricatured in a cartoon of the day showing a Quaker leaning on two sticks just marked 'Sinless Perfection' and 'Infallibility': the caption was 'Quakerism Drooping'.

And perhaps the strongest tribute of all came from one who was benefiting most from this droop. In 1744, John Wesley, who was enjoying the kind of popular favour which Fox had the century before, is quoted by Maitland²² as regretting that time did not allow a visit to the Quakers' Workhouse, but that it was said 'to be the best to take a plan from of any in London'.

THE CLERKENWELL SITE AFTER 1786

Health was not the governing factor in the Committee's decision to find a new home, as it would be for the next two moves. It was simply the Antient Friends, who were by now inhibiting the development of the children and who after a spell at Plaistow and back finally left altogether in 1811. The topographer Malcolm²⁴ wrote in 1803 of the 'ruins of the Quakers' Workhouse' which had 'fallen into decay many years past, and what remains is let to poor occupants at very low rents'. It was in fact pulled down in 1805 and the site became a series of prisons.

There had been a Bridewell nearby since 1616, hived off from the parent House of Correction in Blackfriars (St Bride's Well), a concept which Bellers found particularly abhorrent, and this was replaced progressively by a New Prison in 1775, a 'New' New Prison in 1818, and the Middlesex House of Detention from 1845 to 1877. This last building was crammed into the area in such a way that some Irish Fenian prisoners nearly escaped after the outer wall was blown up in 1867; the ringleader Michael Barrett was the last to be publicly executed in this country. A commemorative plaque is still there.

All was cleared for the new London School Board School, named after Hugh Myddelton (creator of the New River of 1616, a pioneer supplier of water to London) which opened in 1892 and spawned an Infants next door. But in 1981 it started sharing with the (Further Education) Kingsway Princeton College, (Sans Walk Site) which got into debt : and everything above ground moved out by 1998, when a property company started turning it into luxury flats. But the dungeons had been taken over for School staff rooms and photographic darkrooms and the like and were latterly organised as a great tourist attraction - the 'House of Detention 1616-1990 - London's Underground Prison'.

John Bellers couldn't complain : at least it had been *called* a College!

ISLINGTON ROAD 1786-1825

You would think that this means the Road to Islington. But the best contemporary map-maker, John Rocque in 1744-6, shows *two* parallel roads (St John Street and Goswell Road) with the name, also given to the Pentonville Road as well! Moreover, once you get to The Angel going North, it all changes again. And it was never in Islington anyway - only Clerkenwell, part of Finsbury until it became the London Borough of Islington. And although documents such as the School Report of 1817 give *Islington Road*, both Crosfield and Bolam in 1902 and 1952 just put Islington on their title pages, and then go on

in text to add the Road! And without question the site was the Islington Road Estate, on Hermitage Fields, and owned by the Worshipful Company of Brewers, from which the community took over the remaining 148 years of a lease in 1786.

But it was an academic area without doubt - near the 1613 Dame Alice Owen Boys' School, whose site became the Crown and Woolpack Pub at 394 St John Street, now closed, but where Lenin plotted his mischief in 1905. In 1840 it moved to the north of the New River which was not culverted until 1862. The Girl's school started in 1886 when our Islington Road School had left, but in their time all could enjoy an uninterrupted view of the River. Both Dame Alices moved out in 1976 to Potters Bar and the Girls (blitzed in 1940 and rebuilt in 1963) is now the Dame Alice Owen Building of the City and Islington College (Further Education).

The building was beautiful, with a bay window in the Robert Adam style which later graced all Barnsbury. Malcolm the topographer in 1803²⁴ said it 'had the appearance of a villa, surrounded as it is by pleasure grounds, gardens and trees'. And don't forget that it was right in the Spa area of Sadler's and other Wells, and only round the corner from the old Workhouse. And it was here that emancipation took place, both from the Antient Friends (only seven left by then) and the name of Workhouse. For in 1811 it became the 'Friends' School, under the care of the Quarterly Meeting of London & Middlesex'. Even the local maps changed from 'Quaker Workhouse' to 'Friends Schools'.

It hadn't moved there for health reasons, as was to motivate it twice later, and Malcolm had gone on to note that 'the cielings (sic) were remarkably high, and the windows large, consequently the rooms are perfectly dry and well aired'. But Cromwell in 1828²⁵, after it had gone, begged to differ. 'The ceilings of all the rooms are not remarkable for their height: and it is a fact that the Society have been induced to remove the institution to Croydon, in Surrey, partly, at least, on account of the dampness of the lower apartments, and their fears for the health of those who occupied them. This removal took place at Midsummer, 1825; since when the structure has been deserted'.

And the Committee gave a building lease to one Christopher Cockerton, who pulled it down and constructed a labyrinth of streets and slums - now, no doubt, worth a million pounds each. The rent sustained Croydon and when the 148 years were up to 1934 there was a windfall that enabled the school at Walden to build an Assembly Hall and to get the Old Scholar architect Paul Manger to turn the old Lecture Hall into a Library. And if you go back to the Islington Road

now you will find a Friend Street on the old site. How attentive! Only a pity that he happened to be one George Friend, who ran the Finsbury Dispensary for the poor on the corner there. At least he was in the right stream...

CROYDON - 1825-1879

The Committee took over another beautiful house here, this time almost as old, 1708, as the date we all started. But they had learned : on 19.1.1824 they minuted that 'it is desirable that the rooms in the wings (i.e. the new additions) be not less than 13 feet in height and those of the dormitories no less than 12 feet'. The splendid glass negatives taken before it left in 1879 by Bedford Lemere, President of the Old Scholars Association and architectural photographer to Queen Victoria, show the spaciousness of it all, with that beautiful long garden stretching out apparently into infinity.

My uncle Alfred Alexander Radley was there before emigrating to Canada and becoming President of their Methodist Conference. 'I speak', he wrote to me, 'of my experience as a child during five years (1867-72) in a boarding school under the control of the Society of Friends. Games were encouraged. Cricket, football, shinny, paperchase and others. Nature study was stimulated by long walks into the country and the collecting of specimens; plants, butterflies, shells, birds' eggs. Budding literary genius found its opportunity in the "Select Society" to which the older boys were admitted on the approval of the Teachers' Meeting. All of which was good.

But over against this, put the fact that we had no organised physical drill or athletics; anything like the Boy Scouts or Cadets would have been frowned upon; dramatics were taboo, as also was the singing of secular songs (and even hymns for a while); no music, vocal or instrumental, was taught or even allowed; novels were absolutely forbidden; theatre-going and public entertainment (except lectures) were not to be thought of and anything like games of chance, such as cards etc., were equally regarded'.

The school shared in a motley collection of educational establishments at Croydon, from the Military Seminary of the East India Company through a Dame School, a 'School of Industry' (very much up our street), a Ragged School sponsored by Lord Shaftesbury, and the Warehousemen and Clerk's School similarly by the 1st Earl Russell.²⁶

But eventually the local illness struck again - this time typhoid-hence another move in 1879. After a series of lesser schools in the building came the solid preparatory St Anselms's in 1904 which

pulled down the wings but left the 1708 core and added a Memorial Hall for WWI. And then in September 1940 it all went, along with the Head's house and the Friend's Meeting House; providentially the school had been evacuated.

The Germans had dropped a landmine captured at Dunkirk from the British stores, and out of respect for its origins it refused to explode on landing; but on removal it did, though luckily no-one was hurt. The only survival was the 1708 front gate, which had allowed the blast to whistle through it. And its most likely craftsman, Thomas Robinson, who had worked at St Paul's Cathedral, had already designed two masterpieces in the neighbourhood at Carshalton Park and Beddington. Both were exported to the USA in the 1900s but from the replica of the latter, insisted on as part of the deal, we can compare a trick in its tracery, a U motif, with one of ours, thus clinching its origin by Robinson, described by the expert Raymond Lister as 'representing the greatest achievement of pure English blacksmithery'.

The gate had been carefully guarded during the War by Ernest Allen, a Croydon Friend living in the country, but when it came to reinstatement the London Borough of Croydon had pre-empted this by building its new high-rise municipal headquarters on our site! And the Meeting House couldn't accommodate it either owing to a road-widening scheme involving the delightfully re-designated Friends Road. So it ended up at Walden, with a plaque now on it recalling its 1976 reopening by Duncan Fairn, the Clerk of London and Middlesex General Meeting, in the presence of two former Clerks of London Yearly Meeting, Redford Crosfield Harris and Godfrey Mace, an Old Scholar, and the acknowledged pioneer in the tracing of these four sites, George Edwards. Some wags put up a token resistance to Duncan's actual opening, but Friendly Persuasion overcame all.

SAFFRON WALDEN 1879-

George Fox's contemporary, the diplomat known for his successful mediation, Sir William Temple Bt (1628-99), wrote : 'The spirit of saffron is of all others the noblest and yet the most innocent virtue. I have known it restore a man out of the very agonies of death when left by physicians as wholly desperate'.

And saffron has always been with the School. There is a Saffron Hill in Clerkenwell and the very name of Croydon is supposed to be of Saxon origin, with Sanderstead as the valley where the wild saffron grows. And Chipping Walden was saffronised in the mid-14th

century with cultivation until the mid-18th and extra wealth to add to the wool trade. For it remains one of the most expensive materials: a whole field to make a pound's weight, since only the stamens are used for the yellow colour : the Old Scholars Association badge of the 30s got it wrong, with the crocus all in yellow, but the current Appeal has learned and its petals are now correctly purple...

But when Croydon became too unhealthy with typhoid and even a death from rheumatic fever the Committee explored Alton and Chelmsford before Walden, though none of them was within the purlieu of London and Middlesex Quarterly Meeting, the owner. But in 1876 came an irresistible offer from a Walden Friend, the banker and former Mayor, George Stacey Gibson, of a site there - and free too! 'It is beautifully situated ... on an open breezy hill above the town, near the railway station and within a very easy distance of the Meeting House'. And what clinched it after the Croydon experience was that it had 'a good supply of water from a deep artesian well'.

It was breezy all right, and early photos show it in splendid isolation, with nothing even remotely near it. The architect was the Leicester Friend, Edward Burgess (1847-1929), that is to say a Friend until he fell foul of Westminster Meeting. He built the School in 1879, the local Grammar School in 1881 and a Training College in 1884. But Pevsner, the latter-day guru, in his inimitable 'Buildings of England' series²⁸, didn't think much of them : 'the three educational buildings are of red brick, in a Tudor style, and have little to recommend them architecturally'. Ah well - at least the 1863-6 Hospital in the town was 'Gothic, symmetrical, red brick' - and the architect? None other than William Beck, of Beck and Ball . . .

Croydon had bequeathed the 1872 clock which had graced the garden front, and it is now proudly seen from the School walk, the Avenue, in the view immortalised in the Quaker Tapestry depicting all the Friends' Schools of its day. There came also the Barometer, one in a group given to all the Friends' Schools in 1871 by the first Quaker Member of Parliament, Joseph Pease. But the real treasure remains the 1787 clock; made two years before the French Revolution, it came from the Islington Road.

The Old Scholars' Association, of which my grandfather Alexander Radley had been a founder member in 1869, took the lion's share in the Bicentenary Appeal of 1902, for which the Clerk of the School Committee James Backhouse Crosfield wrote his commemorative booklet¹⁹. The tangible result was the Swimming Pool, now the main target of the 2002 Appeal for refurbishment. It is of some sorrow to me that there is no possibility financially of restoring one of its main pleasures, the diving board, since officialdom proclaimed long ago

that the depth was too shallow. But no-one ever had any accident of any kind and we are still deprived of that most magnificent sight - a weighty Friend doing a Honeypot off the top board and splashing nearly every one near!

The unique magazine '*Past and Present*'²⁹, the only one ever to cover *all* the Friends' Schools, carried an article by Albert G. Linney (of Stramongate) in 1907 commenting that the 'premises are splendid, though I am told that if anyone wants to benefit the School there is still lacking a forge, an art room, and a separate hospital'. The art room came in 1921 when Fred Rowntree built one over the new Boys teaching block. The Old Scholars Association furnished the two convalescent wards in Burgess' 1913 Sanitorium, now the flourishing Gibson House, for Infants and Juniors. But we still await the forge, which would have given me, Farrand, the *maréchal ferrant*, the blacksmith, a unique chance to shine.

The Committee Minute had referred to the Meeting House, and one of the extra things for which we thank the donor of our site was that he enlarged the 1791 building to allow of the School's participation en bloc every Sunday morning. And in the First World War it became a canteen for the troops, who also took over the School entirely for a few months in 1915. The Committee were advised to put in a large bill for damages in the expectation that they would get half : they submitted what they considered to be a strictly fair estimate, and got it in full.

For the subsequent history of the School as a going concern over the hundred years 1879-1979 one must consult the former Head John C. Woods' work³⁰, with its unique selection of Committee activities reporting on the School life. And for the progressive unfolding of the buildings and amenities the Old Scholars' Association Archivist Roger M. Buss has now prepared for the forthcoming book on the whole three hundred years, to be edited by the Old Scholar Hilary Halter, a fascinating illustrated account which is highly commended and, what's more, relieves me of the need to write it all down again here. But one charming detail stands out as typical of the care shown over all this time for human, even Quaker values. When Burgess was called back, even in his 70s, to make additions he built a new spur housing the boys' music practice cubicles. They were far enough away from the main block to be *almost* sound-proofed.

QUAKER EDUCATION NOW - HOW DOES SAFFRON WALDEN STAND?

Does the school still 'provide a Quaker education' and thus justify the Appeal wording in every respect, if I have indeed satisfactorily

addressed the claim to be 'the oldest continuously surviving community' doing just that in the British Isles?

The Old Scholar John R. Reader, who became Head of Ayton, delivered the Swarthmore Lecture in 1979 on 'Of Schools and Schoolmasters'.³¹ 'The point has been made that Friends have not produced a distinctive philosophy of education throughout their history and that they are divided in their views today. They have always been clear, however, about the spirit in which education should be practised even if they have fallen short at times in the way they have expressed it'.

Britain Yearly Meeting is now actively concerned with establishing Quaker Values in Education and the former Head, Sarah Evans, was a speaker at a recent Conference. She had already in the Annual Report of 1994 declared that 'At the heart of the school's aims is to see that of God in every one', and London & Middlesex General Meeting minuted in 1996 that 'despite a minority of Friends on the staff and among the scholars or residents it maintains a distinctive Quaker ethos which all who become involved recognise. There is a palpably happy atmosphere and a determination that everyone within its environment should be treated equally : it is seen to be essentially Quaker'.

I have always nursed my private definition of education as e-ducation, the art of extracting ducats, or cash, out of parents. And if you look at an old wall board at Walden you may indeed wonder why parents still allow it. For it bore the names of (boy) Senior Scholars (including my father) and Athletic Champions from 1885 on - until 1910, that is, when it just said 'Co-education', drew a line, and ended. So with no more studies and no more sport, why should they?

Farrand Radley

Presidential Address given as a Magic Lantern Lecture during Britain Yearly Meeting, 28 May 2000

NOTES AND REFERENCES

- ¹ David W. Bolam *Unbroken Community, the Story of the Friends' School Saffron Walden 1702-1952* (Cambridge Heffers, 1952)
- ² John L. Nickalls (ed.) *The Journal of George Fox*, LYM 1986 (reprint)
- ³ D.G.B. Hubbard *Early Quaker Education 1650-1780*, (London University M.A. Thesis, 1939)
- ⁴ Friends House Library: Records, various, where not specifically mentioned
- ⁵ Leonard Kenworthy *Quaker Education Source Book* (Quaker Publications, Pennsylvania, 1983)

- ⁶ Joseph Spence Hodgson *A History of Penketh School 1834-1907* (Penketh OSA; Headley Bros, 1907)
- ⁷ *Journal of the Old Boys and Old Girls of Stramongate School, Kendal 1698-1932*
- ⁸ Ralph H. S. Randles *History of Friends School Lancaster* (1983)
- ⁹ Evelyn Roberts *A Sidcot Pageant*, (Dent, 1935)
- ¹⁰ Paul A. Lacey *Growing into Goodness: Essays on Quaker Education*, (Pendle Hill, 1998)
- ¹¹ William Penn Charter School, Pennsylvania . . . *better than riches, a Tricentennial History - 1698-1989*
- ¹² Abington Friends School, Pennsylvania. *On this same Ground, Voices from 300 Years* (1977)
- ¹³ William Beck & T. Frederick Ball. *The London Friends Meetings* (F Bowyer Kitto, 1869)
- ¹⁴ A. Ruth Fry *John Bellers 1654-1725 Quaker Economist & Social Reformer. His Writings Reprinted with a Memoir* (Cassell, 1935)
- ¹⁵ George Clarke *John Bellers : His Life Times and Writings* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987)
- ¹⁶ Timothy V. Hitchcock (ed.) *Richard Hutton's Complaints Book 1711-1737* (London Record Office, 1987)
- ¹⁷ William C. Braithwaite *The Second Period of Quakerism* (Macmillan, 1919)
- ¹⁸ The Victoria History of the Counties of England : Middlesex II, (Constable and Son, 1911); p.94; reprinted 1970, Dawsons of Pall Mall for the University of London : Institute of Historical Research
- ¹⁹ James Backhouse Crosfield *Saffron Walden School : A Sketch of 200 Years* (FSSW, 1902)
- ²⁰ W. A. Campbell Stewart *Quakers and Education* (London : Epworth Press, 1957)
- ²¹ *Standing Minute Book of the Committee of the Quaker Workhouse at Clerkenwell 1701-1792*. Friends' School Saffron Walden Archive, Essex Record Office, Chelmsford
- ²² William Maitland FRS *The History of London from its Foundations by the Romans to the Present Time* (London : Samuel Richardson, 1739)
- ²³ Tatyana A. Pavlova *John Bellers and the English Socio-Economic Thought in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century* (Moscow : Nauk Academy, 1979)
- ²⁴ James Peller Malcolm *Londinium Redivivum, An Ancient History and Modern Description of London* (London : J. Nichols & Son, 1802)
- ²⁵ T. Cromwell *History and Description of the Parish of Clerkenwell* (1828)
- ²⁶ Patricia Stone *Ragged, British, Quaker, Soldier (19th Century Croydon Schools)* (AMCD Publishers Ltd. Purley, Surrey 1992.)
- ²⁷ Raymond Lister *Decorative Iron Work in Great Britain* (Bell, 1957)
- ²⁸ Nikolaus Pevsner *The Buildings of England : Essex* (Penguin Books, 1954)
- ²⁹ *Past and Present : A Journal for Scholars, Old and Young, of Friends Schools*, 15 July 1907
- ³⁰ John C. Woods *Friends' School, A Hundred Years at Saffron Walden 1879-1979* (FSSW 1979)
- ³¹ John R. Reader *Of Schools and Schoolmasters* (Swarthmore Lecture 1979)

THE QUAKERS AND THE RELIGIOUS IDENTITY OF MAJOR-GENERAL JOHN LAMBERT

Although Major-General John Lambert presented Cromwell with the Protectorate in December 1653, and remained a central political figure until the Restoration, much of what motivated his actions has eluded retrieval. In particular a central question, the nature of Lambert's religious stance, has yet to be addressed in any detail. Part of the reason for this is the perceived limited nature of the source material. For Lambert there is no one extensive body of material to turn to and certainly not one that reflects his importance in the 1650s. Despite, or perhaps because of, his time in power and twenty-four year imprisonment after 1660 there are no memoirs, diary, collection of letters or even a will. We are therefore necessarily reliant on the information that can be retrieved from a variety of other sources. There is little in Lambert's own words that sheds light on his religious beliefs while contemporaries differed widely in their assessments of the nature of his stance.¹ Denounced as holding views ranging from Catholicism to Quakerism some took the ambiguities in Lambert's actions and comments to be evidence of his disregard of religion. Described as a "Saint", "man of God" an "Anabaptist", whilst others saw Lambert as the hope of Catholics, Mordaunt was one who struggled to detect any religious belief in him claiming that "Lambert, if anything, is a Catholic".² That Lambert had no religion was a frequent claim. To the Swedish delegation Lambert had "pretty well no religion" though he wished to appear as a man of "great piety, and as very anxious for the liberty of religion against the papists".³ Yet it is precisely the confusion and inability to categorise Lambert, alongside a lack of clear evidence from Lambert himself that, whilst making a reconstruction of his religious position difficult, can possibly be interpreted as reflection of his outlook. Trying to pin a label on Lambert ignores the context of the forces that shaped him and as such risks distorting the complexity of Lambert's views by trying to impose an easy solution. An examination of Lambert's relationship with Quakerism in particular can, however, help us in attempting to reconstruct his probable religious outlook. Furthermore the confusion as to Lambert's actual stance and his links with radicals, especially the Quakers, was to have a real impact in 1659-60, contributing directly to the Restoration.

I

Little can be retrieved with regard to Lambert's early religious leanings.⁴ As a twenty-two year old taking up arms for Parliament he appears to have shared the godly perceptions of some of his close kinsmen and army colleagues.⁵ Commenting in Parliament in 1659 on the origins of the war Lambert outlined what he saw as the religious difference between the two sides.

For the King, it is plain that Papists, prelates and delinquents, all such as had places or titles, pluralists of honour or profit, and generally all debauched people, ran with that stream. For the Parliament's party, an honest, sober, grave people, that groaned under oppressions, thirsted after grace, the reformed party of the nation, that owned their country's service, that had no by-ends, and expected no advantage from King or from the court.

He further stated that

I will not ask who had the justice of the cause. I will not judge it myself, when God himself seems to have determined the cause. I observed once, from a minister, that the Parliament had got the prayers of a fanatic people, which had got together an army, fit for God Almighty to do miracles with....⁶

Although this speech must be considered within its political context there can be no doubt that it was to be Lambert's time as part of the army, both the Northern Association and the New Model, that was crucial in the development of his political and religious views and the foundation of his relationship with Quakerism.

Professor Gentles' work has re-established the importance of religion as a factor in the army and its influence on the men who served. In a wider sense what his work has also shown is how a shared experience and loyalty grew up amongst many who served.⁷ The importance of the shared experience of army service in terms of religion was knowledge and first hand experience of diverse views. Part of the reason for the dramatic reports of the religious radicalism of the army in such works as Thomas Edwards' *Gangraena* came from ignorance of its activities and the daily life of a soldier.⁸ This fostered in the army a sense of alienation from the rest of the population and consequently hardened the bond between soldiers of diverse backgrounds and religious views. This was the atmosphere Lambert was subjected to from the age of twenty-two. The result of such an experience, without a first hand testament, is of course impossible to

quantify. Yet given Lambert's continued service and relationship with men of diverse opinions he appears to have accepted the religious nature of the army. Indeed in 1647 Lambert and his officers included in their regimental return of grievances a direct attack on Edwards' book.⁹ Lambert may not have shared the religious views of soldiers who were seen by some as radicals in the 1640s, and were later to become Quakers, such as James Nayler, John Hodgson, Amor Stoddart, Mark Grime and Robert Lilburne, but his outlook was tolerant enough to allow him to work closely with them, as well as establishing good personal relationships with some of them. The experience of army service must have had some impact on such men's religious development.¹⁰ In turn Lambert's close and open relationship with these men had an impact on how he himself was perceived but would also, probably, have influenced his response to Quakerism.

II

John Hodgson, like Lambert a native of Yorkshire, served as a captain and surgeon under him. When Hodgson arrived at a Quaker position is unclear but by the 1650s the nature of his beliefs were known to Lambert and others. Yet Lambert and Hodgson were clearly still on very good terms in the 1650s. Indeed Hodgson wrote one letter to Lambert appealing on the behalf of a fellow Quaker soldier, Captain Siddall, who was also under Lambert's command. Hodgson suggested to Lambert that Siddall was being hounded directly because of his Quaker beliefs. As well as suggesting an open relationship between the two officers Hodgson would be unlikely to have done this if he knew Lambert was unfavourable to Quakers.¹¹ This coupled with Hodgson's obvious admiration of his commander helps us in shaping a general picture of Lambert's own religion. If Hodgson could speak in such terms concerning Lambert and receive his protection and, in his words, "love & Moneys", it suggests that Lambert did not disapprove of his, or others, Quaker leanings.¹²

As with Hodgson Lambert came into contact with Captain Adam Baynes through their shared service in the Northern Association army. Baynes came to be one of Lambert's closest agents as well as a friend. Lambert would not be shocked by Baynes' views as they had known each other a long time and appear to have had a close relationship which presumably, given what we know of both men's inquiring minds, included the discussion of such issues. Baynes certainly consulted Lambert's wife, Frances, with regard to "devotiones" and some of their other correspondence implies wider reference to religious issues.¹³ Like Lambert Baynes' religious

position was regarded with suspicion by contemporaries. His own mother had serious misgivings about his religious beliefs and Baynes was actually accused of atheism by his uncle.¹⁴ Baynes was regarded by some contemporaries, and by most historians, as having no religion and close links to various Quakers. Professor Gentles has noted that by 1655 Baynes was listed as one of those "loving to the friends."¹⁵ The Quakers Baynes was in "friendly" contact with included men who Lambert also had numerous contact with, Captains John Hodgson, Amor Stoddart and John Leavens.¹⁶ Baynes was certainly regarded by the "Quakers" as more sympathetic to them than most local magistrates".¹⁷ In Parliament he responded to a call that all Quakers should be whipped home as vagrants by stating that he "had discourse with Quakers..." and that "I move to clear them, and make them innocent persons..."¹⁸

How far Baynes' religion did actually reflect on Lambert is however difficult to quantify. Professor Hirst was certainly of the opinion that there was some correlation of religious views between the two men. He has outlined the Presbyterian opposition to Baynes in Leeds and stated that

Baynes is best known to history as a follower of the ungodly Lambert, and as a Harrington republican opposed to a lordly interest in the Parliament of 1659; and there is some evidence to suggest he shared the undoctinaire religious views of his patron.¹⁹

Lambert clearly believed that Baynes' views would be seen by many as a reflection of his own, and was aware of the link contemporaries made between Baynes' opinions and of his own position. One of Lambert's agents William Walker informed Baynes that

It is spoken here that some thinge hath passed from you at London (I meane wch they call herisy or blasphemie) of the same nature that was for wch you was blamed here and that you did frequently discourse or speke offensivly of such things as tender judgements could not well digest To heare wch the Maior Generall He as sure you was exceedingly troubled & answered surely you would nether wrong your selfe nor him soe much...²⁰

What can be said at the very least is that if Lambert did not share Baynes' religious leanings he did not sufficiently object to them to dismiss him from the army, remove him as his agent or put an end to

their close personal relationship. Indeed, far from alienating Baynes, Lambert specifically encouraged his marriage to one of his own kin. However Lambert was well aware of the political danger to him posed by his close links with men such as Baynes. Writing to Baynes he asked if he would

walke tenderly humbly & sutable to yor professions as a lover & seeker of peace...you may doe well (nay ought) to make it a caution to walke wisely, & so as those who are not so freindly as ye ought to bee may have their mouths stopped, & in doeinge so you shall vindicate yor selfe & mee who in some measure, must beare part of that dislike & blame you drawne upon yor selfe...²²

As with Hodgson and Baynes another religious radical Lambert was associated with was another fellow Yorkshireman John Webster, who had also served in the Northern Army. John Webster was born in Thornton, Craven. In 1634 Webster was curate of Kildwick-in-Craven, formerly the base of Roger Brearley and close to Lambert's estate. Here he was converted by Brearley's followers. Webster was also noted to actually preach in Grindleton itself "out of good will butt Receiveth noe profit there".²³ The religious influences of the Craven area in Yorkshire, particularly Grindletonianism, on both Webster and Lambert have been commented on by Marchant.

It was of the essence of this type of religion that it was completely tolerant of all opinions, and its influence may be seen in the life of John Lambert...who maintained the cause of religious freedom during the Commonwealth.²⁴

From Grindletonianism Webster moved closer to Quaker views.

John Webster had some influence on those who became Quakers and was closely associated with another religious radical, William Erbery, whose works were also said to have influenced Quakers.²⁵ Erbery himself had been with Lambert's regiment in 1647, although it is possible that he was with them for longer.²⁶ Lambert's approval of Erbery is further suggested by his encouragement to the antinomian Elizabeth Avery to attend his preaching in Oxford.²⁸ At this time Lambert was governor of the town and although he was probably not present at Erbery and Kiffin's famous debate with some of the Oxford Presbyterians the "chairman" was Lambert's close political ally and deputy, Lieutenant-Colonel Mark Grime, who was later to join the Quakers.²⁹ Lambert's relationship with such men as Erbery and Webster in the 1640s probably helped to shape his own

outlook and his reaction to the Quaker movement in the 1650s.

Lambert's known reading matter in the 1640s and 1650s, such as Giles Randall and the German mystic Jacob Boehme, both who have been seen to have influenced Quakers, must also have had some impact on how he viewed the movement.³⁰ Lambert appears to have owned a copy of the 1647 edition of Boehme's *XL Questions Concerning the Soule* which concerned the light of the soul in its freedom.³¹ The Randall work was his 1648 translation of *Theologia Germanica* which had been attacked as unorthodox being the "breviary of certain communities of Waldenses and of other groups of dubious orthodoxy". Calvin rejected the work because it was opposed to institutionalism. In the context of the 1648 edition Randall had previously been brought before the Star Chamber for preaching "anabaptism", "familism" and "antinomianism".³² Clearly there was much besides that Lambert read that we are not in a position to recover. His reading, although not necessarily a reflection of his outlook, alongside his relationship with such men as Baynes and Hodgson, does suggest his general openness to those with views that others saw as extreme and not deserving of any kind of toleration. It is likely that Lambert received his copy of *Theological Germanica* during the campaign against Charles II in Scotland in 1651. At that time we also know he was reading Juan de Valdes whose work Samuel Rutherford had claimed, in 1648, was one of the "poysonable" sources of "Familisme, Antinomianisme and Enthusiasme".³³ Such reading also provides more context for some of the army declarations of the early 1650s. One from May 1653, signed by Lambert, again clearly equated the army with the work of Christ in the most strident terms and made plain the necessity of intervention in government if there was any deviation from the path of the army's cause.³⁴

In 1653 John Webster dedicated one of his most important works, *Academiarum Examen*, to Lambert.³⁵ Lambert was noted as having approved this work in manuscript. In his dedication to Lambert, Webster plainly saw Lambert as an instrument of religious toleration.

...That seeing divine Providence hath made you (with the rest of those faithfull and gallant men of the Army) signally instrumental, both in redeeming the English Liberty, almost drowned in the deluge of Tyranny and self interest, and also unmanacling the simple and pure truth of the Gospel, from the chains and fetters of cold and dead Formality, and of restrictive and compulsary Power, two of the greatest blessings our Nation ever yet enjoyed, I hope the same Providence will also direct you

to be assistant to continue the same, against all the bitterness and cruelty of those, who, having obtained liberty for themselves, care not though others be bound up and persecuted. And moreover guide you to set to your hand and endeavour for the purging and reforming of Academies, and the Advancement of Learning, which hitherto hath been little promoted or look'd into. And I am more imboldened in this confidence, having experimental knowledge and trial, not onely of your Honours Abilities that way, but also of your sincere affection and unparalleled love to Learning, and to all those that are lover and promoters thereof;...³⁶

In *Academiarum Examen* Webster called for the reform of the universities to provide for the better expression of religion. In direct relation to such an idea Lambert played a central role in the establishment of Durham College which elicited some Quaker support in the area for its "pronouncedly utilitarian tendencies".³⁷ Webster's relationship with Lambert was such that in November 1657 he appealed to the Major-General for help in a prosecution that had been brought against him. Elmer commented with regard to Webster that "by 1653 he was a vociferous opponent of state-supported religion, be it episcopal, presbyterian, or independent, and an equally committed advocate of comprehensive religious toleration".³⁸ Lambert's endorsement, and political actions in the 1650s, suggest that he agreed with this. Part of the reason for such a stance in the 1650s must have been due to his time as part of the army and serving with men such as Webster, Hodgson and Baynes. Although he may not have gone as far as they, in terms of their positions by the 1650s, his own position had clearly evolved. The evidence of his continuing relationship with them during the 1650s is in itself testimony to that. Unlike the men Webster attacked, Lambert, having secured his own liberty, appears to have been genuinely willing to extend it to others.

III

In 1673 whilst he was imprisoned on St. Nicholas Island, Plymouth, Lambert was visited by the Quaker Myles Halhead who questioned him with regard to why he had permitted Quakers to be persecuted during the 1650s.

Then John answered and said, "Friend, I would have you to know that some of us never made nor consented to laws to persecute you, nor none of your friends, for persecution we ever

were against....Although you and your friends suffered persecution, and some hardships in that time, your cause therein is never the worse for that...³⁹

Lambert's answer to Halhead rings true. Lambert's willingness to extend toleration is clear from two documents that are central expressions of his, and some of the army officers', thinking. In the Heads of the Proposals of 1647, constructed by Ireton and Lambert, the main points dealing with religion were in clauses XI to XIII. The Heads outlined that all coercive power, authority and jurisdiction should be taken from bishops, that no one should be forced to use the Book of Common Prayer, take the Covenant or attend the state church and that there would be no penalties for attending services elsewhere. Another method of maintenance, other than tithes, was also to be introduced⁴⁰

More significantly in December 1653 Lambert presented Cromwell with the title of Lord Protector. The Protectorate was based on Lambert's written constitution the Instrument of Government. The Instrument was even more "liberal" in its religious clauses than the 1647 Heads. Again no one was to be compelled by penalties to attend services and tithes were to be replaced by another method of maintenances. The Instrument reflects the toleration that was the mark of Lambert's personal relationships with men such as Hodgson and Baynes. Clause XXXVII was the central religious expression of the Instrument. It stated that

such as profess faith in God by Jesus Christ (though differing in judgement from the doctrine, worship or discipline publicly held forth) shall not be restrained from, but shall be protected in, the profession of the faith and exercise of their religion; so as they abuse not this liberty to the civil injury of others and to the actual disturbance of the public peace on their parts: provided this liberty be not extended to Popery or Prelacy, nor to such as, under the profession of Christ, hold forth and practice licentiousness.

It might be no coincidence that clause XXXVII of Lambert's Instrument mirrors very closely Webster's statement in *The Saints Guide* of 1653.

the civill Magistrate hath not any positive power to punish any man, or restrain any for their light, judgement, conscience, opinion or way of worship, if so be they act or speak nothing that is distractive or destructive to the civill power or tending to the

breach of the peace, or to injure one another.⁴¹

Indeed it is possible that the two men discussed the Instrument, either in London or Yorkshire. The tone of Webster's dedication to *Academiarum Examen*, dated 21 October 1653, might suggest some foreknowledge of the establishment of the Protectorate through Lambert's military coup in December 1653.⁴² However the test of clause XXXVII, and Lambert's idea of settlement, came with the case of, probably, the leading Quaker of the 1650s, James Nayler.

IV

Nayler was the same age as Lambert and was also from the West Riding of Yorkshire. His home town of Dewsbury was close to Woodkirk where John Webster had come under the influence of Brearley. Nayler's Quakerism seems to have developed out of the same religious influences in the area.⁴³ Nayer was known to Lambert from their time together in Parliament's armies. Nayler had first fought under Fairfax in the north and then directly under Lambert. Indeed Nayler undertook the important work of being Lambert's quarter-master. Significantly Nayler was the quarter-master to Lambert's own troop. That Lambert was prepared to appoint him as quarter-master to his own troop suggests the possibility that he was also regimental quarter-master.⁴⁴ He accompanied Lambert during the invasion of Scotland. Here Lambert would have had further notice of Nayler through his preaching. A soldier who had served under Lambert commented he was more afraid of the "qualing" effect that Nayler's preaching had on him than the Scots at Dunbar. Whilst in Edinburgh Lambert requisitioned the East Kirk, and, as Bittle suggests, it is very possible that Nayler was one of Lambert's soldiers who took advantage of it.⁴⁵ Their knowledge of each other, apparent in Lambert's defence of Nayler, is confirmed by Nayler's appeal to Adam Baynes that indicates, as Professor Hirst has pointed out, "extensive previous contacts".⁴⁶ Although he had left the army Nayler's link with Lambert was specifically referred to in a petition of early 1653 to the Parliament, Cromwell and Lambert from the Westmorland Friends.

... our dear brother James Nayler lies in prison in Appleby, who served the Parliament under the command of Major General Lambert between eight and nine years, as we believe some of the Army can witness...⁴⁷

Dr. Gaunt has seen the debates on Nayler in Parliament in two phases. He argues that "Fleetwood and Lambert, having said

surprisingly little during the early debates, were active when the constitutional issues were discussed".⁴⁸ Yet it was not that Lambert was uninterested in the religious issue but that he believed that the right approach was to make sure tht the requisite constitutional context was in place to support the religious state he desired. For Lambert the constitutional issues, especially the jurisdiction of Parliament , crucially underpinned the religious issues. The political framework of Lambert's Instrument was the safeguard for a tolerant religious approach. By defending his concept of the constitution he was also defending his idea of the religion set out in it.

When he came to address the issue of Nayler before Parliament Lambert stated that

It is a matter of sadness to many men's hearts, and sadness also to mine, especially in regard of his relation sometime to me. He was two years my quarter-master, and a very useful person. We parted with with him great regret. He was a man of a very unblameable life and conversation, a member of a very sweet society of an independent church.

Lambert was willing for action to be taken against Nayler if he was found to have blasphemed.

How he comes (by pride or otherwise) to be puffed up to this opinion I cannot determine. But this may be a warning to us all, to work out our salvation with fear and trembling. I shall be as ready to give my testimony against him as anybody, if it appear to be blasphemy.⁴⁹

Yet he was anxious that the proper proceedings were adhered to in considering the case. With such an approach Nayler should not have been found guilty of blasphemy. As Professor Damrosch has argued "Nayler's testimony, though guarded at times, should have convinced any fair-minded observer that he clearly distinguished between himself and Christ".⁵⁰ Unfortunately for Lambert, but more particularly for Nayler, the proceedings concerning his actions were anything but approached in a balanced manner. Lambert's aid to Nayler also involved speaking with petitioners in his favour and proposing that the second half of Nayler's punishment should be postponed so that he could be treated by physicians. Yet it also appears as if Lambert had tried to see Nayler in prison. His care can be seen compared to the vindictive approach of Members of Parliament such as Luke Robinson.⁵¹

Adam Baynes, who by this stage was Member of Parliament for Leeds, outlined more openly Lambert's wish to have the Nayler case dealt with according to the law then in operation.

However others look upon Nayler, I look upon him as a man, an Englishman. I would have him so tried as to bring in a bill of attainder against him, or leave him to the law. It is below you to honour him with a trial here; but if it must be otherwise, let him be called to the bar, and proceed judicially against him, less the precedent be of dangerous and ill consequence to other persons, whose lot it may be, in other cases.

Given Lambert's admonishment of Baynes' statements in Parliament concerning Algernon Sydney it is very unlikely that Baynes would have made these statements with his patron present without his support. They can be taken as a general reflection of Lambert's opinion, especially in relation to his concerns with regard to the actions of future Parliaments.⁵² Another close associate of Lambert, Colonel Sydenham, who Wilson and Merli have seen as a representative of his in parliament, commented that

If Nayler be a blasphemer, all generation of them are so, and he and all the rest must undergo the same punishment. The opinions they hold, do border so near a glorious truth, that I cannot pass my judgement that it is blasphemy, I shall choose rather to live in another nation, than where a man shall be condemned for an offence done, by a subsequent law...⁵³

Baynes directly made the point "for the Instrument of Government says, all shall be protected that profess faith in Jesus Christ, which I suppose, this man does...".⁵⁴ Those who opposed Nayler also saw his case in the context of Lambert's Instrument. Major-General Skippon argued that "Quakers, Ranters, Levellers, Socinians, and all sorts" bolstered themselves under articles thirty-seven and thirty-eight of the Instrument. Major-General Goffe stated that he would "not entertain an irreverent thought of The Instrument of Government. I shall spend my blood for it. Yet if it hold out anything to protect such persons I would have it burnt on the fire".⁵⁵

The debate concerning another set of petitioners on Nayler's behalf suggests, in part, how far Lambert's position could be interpreted by some as supportive of Nayler. Lambert stated that

I know none of the petitioners, but I perceive they are very honest men, and faithful to the interest all along. We ought not to

forejudge the petition. I believe they are far from favouring of the Quakers.⁵⁶

In response to the petitioners desire to remit the remainder of Nayler's punishment Downing exclaimed whether

...any man call this liberty of conscience, a permission to commit such high blasphemy and impiety. Are these your honest men, that petition for a horrid blasphemer, an imposter, and a seducer?

Downing, whose military experience had been limited to a spell as scoutmaster-general in Scotland in 1650, proclaimed that if ten thousand petitioners arrived at the door he would die upon the place. Probably rankled by Downing's manner Lambert's reply hints at a possible link with the petitioners he had previously denied any knowledge of.

It is not the number of petitioners that should work with you. I speak not of the person before you; but of the petitioners. I know few of them, but I understand them to be very honest, godly persons, who, I am confident, disown the crime; yet think themselves obliged to bear their testimony for their liberty & c.⁵⁷

Unfortunately there is no record of who these thirty petitioners were. The only one recorded was Joshua Sprigg. Lambert may have been aware of Sprigg as a former army chaplain or through John Webster. In 1654 Sprigg had, with two others, penned the dedication to Webster's *The Judgement Set, and the Bookes Opened*, thus presumably like Lambert having contact with Webster to consult his work in manuscript.⁵⁸

The essence of the Nayler case for Lambert was that he did not want Parliament to have unlimited judicial power. He was worried that future Parliaments might prosecute those who had acted in the name of past Parliaments.⁵⁹ Nevertheless his pronouncements in relation to Nayler should be placed in the context of the eagerness of the bulk of Members of Parliaments to see the destruction of Nayler and the Quaker movement. Such a public stance clearly shaped many contemporaries' views of Lambert who was already seen as the symbol of army rule and all that that was judged to entail. The debates concerning the offer of the crown to Cromwell that followed from the Nayler crisis reinforced Lambert's position as a symbol of army rule. Although his personal role in influencing Cromwell to

decline the title of king was important the introduction of the Humble Petition and Advice marked the eclipse of Lambert by moderates and civilians and forced him to consider alliances with more radical groups. Indeed Thomas Hobbes saw Lambert's part in the Nayler dispute as part of such a process.

Lambert, a great favourite of the army, endeavoured to save him, partly because he had been his soldier, and partly to curry favour with the sectaries of the army; for he was now no more in the Protector's favour, but meditating how he might succeed him in his power.⁶⁰

IV

In the political crisis of 1659-60 it was widely believed that Lambert's regiment was rife with Quakers and such belief was clearly reflected in perceptions of Lambert's own position.⁶¹ More importantly the belief in the radical religious nature of Lambert's support, with its implied threat of social revolution, contributed to the apathy in the face of Monck and the return of Charles II.

The perception of Lambert's troops as a radical force was in part true. The actions of Lambert's army in crushing Sir George Booth's Cheshire rising, who had declared that the gentry had been subjected to "the meanest and most fanatick Spirits of the Nation", reinforced the picture of a radical army.⁶² During the campaign against Booth a local minister noted how Lambert's soldiers espoused the Quakers' cause and kept their hats on in church.⁶³ The Quakers were taking up positions in civil and military affairs aided by the change of rule in London. John Hodgson who had left the army in 1657, re-enlisted in 1659. Quaker support for Lambert also went as far as to organise support for him in parliamentary elections.⁶⁴ The Quakers before the Restoration were not averse to political action and Lambert was seen by many of them as the most favourable of those in power. Indeed in May 1659 it was the "English Armie" that Edward Burrough believed would do great work by the sword.⁶⁵ Professor Cole saw Quakerism as "a movement of protest against the suppression of the 'good old cause'".⁶⁶ It is no wonder that for many Lambert was equated with the cause of the Quakers in this period and that some thought that through them he would seek to emerge as the new Protector. In his poem *Iter Boreale* Robert Wild wrote

Drunk with their Cheshire triumphs straight they had
New lights upreared, and new resolves they take,
A single person once again to make.

Who shall he be? Oh! Lambert, without rub,
 The fittest de'il to be Beelzebub.
 He, the fierce fiend cast out of the House before,
 Returned and threw the House now out of door;
 A legion then he raised of armed sprites,
 Elves, goblins, fairies, Quakers, and New Lights,⁶⁷

The problem for Lambert was that the increasingly radical shift in the nature of his support base within the army brought a greater reaction against him and ensured his political defeat. His relationship with Quakers and other religious radicals was not a direct reflection of his own religious stance. He saw them as no substantial threat to his main priority, the establishment of a civil government based around the concepts that had been evident in his Instrument.

By 1659-60 Lambert had been pushed to the political fringes. Lambert's main remaining constituency lay with groups, such as the Quakers, that were diametrically opposed to the nation's traditional elite. As Reay has shown the Quaker movement contributed significantly to an intense reaction in 1659-60.⁶⁸ Given his individual link with such men as Hodgson and Nayler it is no wonder that many of them saw him as the most favourable of the possible governors. Perhaps he was more aware than some of his contemporaries that the movement was not "the dregs of the common people" but had a substantial following among the "middling sort"?⁶⁹ The comments concerning Lambert and Sir Henry Vane forming an alliance were part of the same trend. Vane was also seen as favourable to the Quakers.⁷⁰ Whether their concept of Senatorial rule would have included the Quakers as Baynes' one time associate Samuel Duncon called for is unclear.⁷¹ Such however was the splintering within the groups that had over a decade earlier defeated the king that Monck was the public face of many who, horrified by the religious radicalism of Lambert's forces, saw the Restoration of monarchy as the necessary protection of their interests. Even the Baptist Colonel William Packer, who had served alongside Lambert, could comment that "before ye Quakers should have there liberty hee woulde draw his sworde to bring in Kinge Charles".⁷² More significantly Lambert's old commander and friend Sir Thomas Fairfax helped pave the way for Monck in securing control of Yorkshire with the gentry rising under him to prevent an alliance between Lambert and the Quakers.⁷³ Lambert could only prevent reaction by establishing a military dictatorship that would be dependent on its more radical supporters. Such a realisation is suggested by some of his comments in Parliament. In the context of the crisis of 1658-60 such a stance

appeared to be justified and Lambert does appear to have seen the choice as a stark one "between light and darkness".⁷⁴ Yet it had been the very threat of this since 1657 that had been a central spur to that reaction.

Lambert's religious position was essentially derived from his political stance. In the context of the seventeenth century they were not two distinct identities but part of an overall outlook. Lambert believed that the right political framework would provide the necessary protection for, and against, many of perceived radical views. Lambert appears to have increasingly been forced to countenance a limited ruling oligarchy and limits on parliament because of his experiences in the late 1640s and the late 1650s. His actions on behalf of his Catholic and Cavalier kin suggest that this does not appear to have also encompassed a social revolution.⁷⁵ Yet such was his public persona that his actions during the crisis of 1659-60 could only but mark him in the eyes of the traditional gentry as the antithesis of their England.

Although it was said Lambert "neither had the spirit of prayer nor preaching",⁷⁶ part of the mist surrounding the nature of Lambert's faith was, and is, due to the source material. No will, no diary and his own measured and ambiguous statements makes any reconstruction very difficult. Yet that mist was a very deliberate part of his character for Lambert had a broad religious outlook. This is reflected in the diverse contemporary accounts of his religion. Lambert seems to have willingly accepted a diversity of beliefs. Such an approach would, in part, explain his relationships with the Quaker Hodgson, the godless Baynes and Catholic John Belasye. Their beliefs did not effect Lambert's political or personal relationship with them. Dr. David Smith in reconstructing the Earl of Dorset's religion quoted Sir Thomas Browne.

I could never divide my selfe from any man upon the difference of an opinion or be angry with his judgement for not agreeing with mee in that, for which perhaps within a few dayes I should dissent my selfe.⁷⁷

This "attitude" seems just as applicable to Lambert. Yet while it can be argued that Lambert had a similar "ecumenical outlook" to Smith's Earl of Dorset the fact that Lambert's "toleration" went further stems from the differing influences to which both men had been subjected. Dorset "reached maturity in the England of Elizabeth I and James". Lambert turned thirty in 1649. Lambert's religion was

shaped by the bonds of kinship that could allow him to cooperate with Catholics like Belasyse but it also developed through the shared experience of war and political upheaval in the broad church of parliament's armies. Such a stance was also in danger of being interpreted in terms of hypocrisy and ambition charges that, as Trotsky was to find in the 1920s, were not easily dispelled. John Price, one of Monck's chaplains wrote of Lambert, "I never heard that he listed himself in any religious faction but being a Latitudinarian to all, he might with less opposition have ruled the most."⁷⁸

Lambert's faith was not the sort of religion that formed a separate or isolated part of his persona or the driving dominant force in his life. It was but only part of his overall approach. As such it allowed him to believe that limited toleration of Quakers would not threaten his perception of political settlement. Yet such a stance alienated the bulk of the traditional political nation who had increasingly reemerged under the Protectorate and by Lambert's fall in 1657 were, for the first time since the late 1640s, confident of reasserting themselves. In such a context the political radicalism forced upon Lambert by his isolation, coupled with the explosion of Quakerism, were both central features of why many ultimately welcomed the return of the Stuarts.

David Farr

NOTES

- ¹ From the Lambert letters that survive, scattered through various collections, it is clear that in some printed versions Lambert's religious phases have been edited out. These omissions are mainly Lambert's comments on Parliament's victory through God's favour or providence. For example see the difference between, Bodleian Library, Dep. c. 164 fol.434 and *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Thirteenth Report, Portland MSS*, (London, 1891), 1, p.474.
- ² *Calendar of Clarendon State Papers*, 5 vols., (Oxford, 1869-1932), IV, p.222. This is from Bodleian Library, Clarendon Mss 61 fols. 116-7; Bodl. Lib., Clarendon Mss 68 fol. 167v; *Cal. Clar. S.P.*, IV, p.631; Bodl. Lib., Clarendon Mss 65 f. 206; *Cal. Clar. S.P.*, IV, p.408; Bodl. Lib., Clarendon Mss 66 f. 75; *Cal. Clar. S.P.*, IV, p.424; *Cal. Clar. S.P.*, IV, p.671, *H.M.C. 5th Report*, (London, 1876), p.181; British Library (hereafter B.L.), E457(12), *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, No.19, (1-8 Aug. 1648), no pagination; B.L., E419(9), *A Paire of Spectacles for the Citie*, (1647), p.5.
- ³ M. Roberts, 'Swedish Diplomats at Cromwell's Court, 1655-1656. The missions of Peter Julius Coyet and Christer Blonde', *Camden Society*, 4th series, 36, (London, 1988), p.70.
- ⁴ D. Farr, 'The Education of Major-General John Lambert', *Cromwelliana*, (2000), pp.8-23.
- ⁵ D. Farr, 'The Shaping of John Lambert's Allegiance and the Outbreak of the Civil War', *Northern History*, 36:2, (2000), pp.247-66

- ⁶ J.T.Rutt, (ed.), *Thomas Burton's Diary*, 4 vols., (London, 1828), III, pp.185-90
- ⁷ I. Gentles, *The New Model Army in England, Ireland and Scotland, 1645-53*, (Oxford, 1992).
- ⁸ T.Edwards, *Gangraena*, (1646).
- ⁹ Worcester College, Clarke Mss XLI fol.123-5
- ¹⁰ For Quakers and the army see, B.Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution*, (London, 1985), p.18.
- ¹¹ B.L., Add. Mss 21423 fol.58.
- ¹² For a fuller consideration of Hodgson and reference to Siddall see, D.Farr, 'John Hodgson. Soldier, Surgeon, Agitator and Quaker?', *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, 58, no.3, (1999), pp.220-34.
- ¹³ B.L., Add. Mss 21426 fol.175, 178. Frances also appears to have been on good terms with the Quaker Captain John Leavens, see B.L. Add. Mss 21419 fol. 253 Frances was described by Aaron Guerdon as a women of 'a large Soule, and as full of the Spirit as any I ever met with; I professe I never knew a women more endowed with those Heavenly blessings of love, meaknesse, gentlenesse, patience and long suffering; nay even with all things that may speake her every way deserving the name of a Saint;', see A.Guerdon, *A Most Learned, Conscientious, And Devout-Exercise; Held Forth The Last Lords-Day, At Sir Peter Temples, In Lincolnes Inne-Fields; By Lieut-Generall Cromwell. As It Was Faithfully Taken In Characters*, (1649).
- ¹⁴ B.L., Add. Mss 21419 fols.102-3; 21426 fol.229. The specific reference to atheism should be seen in the seventeenth century context of "ungodly" which fits closely with many contemporary impressions of both Baynes and Lambert.
- ¹⁵ I.Gentles, 'The Debentures Market and Military Purchases of Crown Land, 1649-1660', London, Ph.D, 1969, p.124; *Cal. S.P. Domestic*, 1655-6, p.64.
- ¹⁶ B.L., Add. Mss 21417-26 passim. For Stoddart generally see, H.Barbour and A.O.Roberts, (eds.), *Early Quaker Writings 1650-1700*, (Michigan, 1973), p.611.
- ¹⁷ G.E.Aylmer, *The State's Servants: The civil service of the English Republic 1649-1660*, (London, 1973), p.234.
- ¹⁸ *Burton's Diary*, IV p.338, 442; Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Leeds City Archives, B36. Two versions of Baynes' will survive. However they tell us very little as they contain no religious prologue whatsoever and just deal with his worldly estate.
- ¹⁹ D.Hirst, 'The Fracturing of the Cromwellian Alliance: Leeds and Adam Baynes', *English Historical Review*, 108, (October, 1993), p.877.
- ²⁰ B.L., Add. Mss 21426 fol.354.
- ²¹ B.L., Add Mss 21419 fol.206; W.H.Chippendall, 'The Baynes Family of Sellet Hall in Whittington', *Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, n.s., 28, (1928).
- ²² B.L., Add. Mss 21426 fol.189.
- ²³ Lambeth Library Mss Comm.XII a/18fol.187.
- ²⁴ R.Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York 1560-1642*, (London, 1960), pp.289-90.
- ²⁵ P.Elmer, *The Library of Dr. John Webster: The Making of a Seventeenth Century Radical*, *Medical History Supplement* no.6, (London, 1986), p.31; R.L.Greaves and R.Zaller, (eds.), *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth*

Century, 3 vols., (Brighton, 1982-84), II; Reay, *Quakers*, p.16-17. It was to be Erbery's daughter Dorcas that alleged that James Nayler had raised her from the dead.

- ²⁶ A.Laurence, *Parliamentary Army Chaplains 1642-51*, (London, 1990), pp.124-5; Public Record Office (hereafter P.R.O.), E121/4/no.30.
- ²⁷ W.Erbery, *Armies Defence*, (London, 1648).
- ²⁸ For an examination of the case of Elizabeth Avery and her relationship with Lambert see, D.Farr, 'The Military and Political Career of John Lambert, 1619-57', Cambridge PhD, 1996, pp.179-82.
- ²⁹ For Grime as a Quaker see Reay, *Quakers*, pp.88, 90; For Grime's political link with Lambert and his role in the army petitioning campaign and presentation with Robert Lilburne, another close colleague of Lambert's and also later a Quaker, of *A New Found Stratagem Framed in the Old Forge of Machivilisme*, (1647), see A.Woolrych, *Soldiers and Statesmen. The General Council of the Army and its Debates, 1647-8*, (1987) pp.37, 40, 83; D.Farr, 'Lambert', pp.229-30.
- ³⁰ B.Reay, *Quakers*, p.16.
- ³¹ J. Boehme, *XL Questions Concerning the Soule*, (1647); A copy of the book signed by Lambert is now in Cambridge University Library, Syn.7.64.145 no.1. Although Lambert's signature is clear on the first, now loose, page within the book, before the title page, there are unfortunately no notes in his, or any, hand within the actual text. However bound after that work is *The Clavis, or Key. or, An Exposition of some principall Words, and Matters. How God is to be considered, Without Nature, and Creature*, which on its first four pages has some notes in a very neat seventeenth century hand; A.Weeks, *Boehme: An intellectual biography of the seventeenth-century philosopher and mystic*, (London, 1991).
- ³² *Theologia Germanica*, (London, 1950); R.M. Jones, *Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, (London, 1914); C.Kirchberger, *A Catalogue of Bodleian Manuscripts Relating to Mystical Theology*, (1949); Bodleian Library, Rawlinson Mss C610.
- ³³ Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, p.238.
- ³⁴ Clarke Mss 25 fol.48-51.
- ³⁵ The dedication also reflects Lambert's prominent position amongst the leaders of the Protectorate.
- ³⁶ J.Webster, *Academiarum Examen*, (1653), dedication.
- ³⁷ C.Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform 1626-1660*, (London,1975), pp.233, 238.
- ³⁸ Elmer, 'Webster', p.4; W.Self Weeks, 'John Webster, Author of "The Displaying of Supposed Witchcraft"', *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society*, 39, (1921), pp.55-107; W.Self Weeks, 'Further Information about Dr. John Webster', *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society*, 48, (1932), pp.30-59.
- ³⁹ Myles Halhead, *A book of some of the sufferings*, (London, 1690), pp.24-5. Halhead states that he visited Lambert on the instructions of "the Word of the Lord". It is possible that given Halhead's northern roots and his tour through Yorkshire in 1653 that they may have had some knowledge of each other, although Halhead would naturally be aware of Lambert. For a short biography of Halhead see, R.S.Ferguson, *Early Cumberland and Westmoorland Friends*,

(London, 1871), pp.55-60. For Lambert during his imprisonment, 1660-84, see D.Farr, 'New Information with regard to the imprisonment of Major-General John Lambert, 1662-84', *Cromwelliana*, (1998), pp.44-56; D.Farr, 'John Blackwell and Daniel Cox: further notes on their activities in Restoration England and British North America', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, (1999), pp.227-33.

- ⁴⁰ S.R.Gardiner, (ed.), *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-60*, (Oxford, 1958), 316-26. For Quaker opposition to tithes see, B.Reay, 'Quaker Opposition to Tithes 1652-1660', *Past and Present*, 86, (1980); M.James, 'The Political Importance of the Tithes Controversy in the English Revolution, 1640-1660', *History*, 26, (1941).

- ⁴¹ J.Webster, *The Saints Guide*, (1653).

- ⁴² Although Lambert was clearly the principal drafter of the Instrument he did not construct it in isolation. The exact nature of its composition remains blurred. Lambert was preparing the Instrument from mid-October at the latest. Whilst at Wimbledon he was noted as having been visited by some of the northern gentry, although at some point he left for Yorkshire, returning to London on 19 November. Webster appears to have been in London from 23 June to 12 October at the latest. C.H.Firth, (ed.), *Ludlow's Memoirs*, 2 vols., (Oxford, 1894), I, 369; A.Woolrych, *Commonwealth to Protectorate*, (Oxford, 1982), pp.353-4; D.Farr, 'Lambert', pp.269-72.

- ⁴³ Lambert's sole biographer in 1938 unfortunately failed to grasp the significance of Nayler or the Nayler case, W. H. Dawson, *Cromwell's Understudy, The Life and Times of General John Lambert* (London, 1938). For Dawson's incomprehension of Nayler, apart from referring to him as John, see his comment that, "At the time of his amazing hallucinations Naylor (as spelt in extract) was unquestionably a typical mental case. Had he lived to-day he would have been promptly handed over to a skilled psychiatrist, instead of being fiendishly tortured. Later the poor fellow recovered his reason, probably knowing little about the pranks he played." W.H.Dawson, 'Cromwell and the Jews', *Quarterly Review*, 268, no.522, (Oct., 1934), p.270.

- ⁴⁴ B.L., Add Mss 21427 fol.100; E.Fogelklou, *James Nayler. The Rebel Saint 1618-1660*, (London, 1931), pp.42-3.

- ⁴⁵ W.G.Bittle, *James Nayler 1618-1660. The Quaker Indicted by Parliament*, (York, 1986), p.6; D.Laing, (ed.), *A Diary of Public Transactions and other occurrences, chiefly in Scotland, from January 1650 to June 1667*, (Edinburgh, 1836), pp.68-9.

- ⁴⁶ D.Hirst, 'The Fracturing of the Cromwellian Alliance', p.877.

- ⁴⁷ H.Barbour & A.O.Roberts, (eds.), *Early Quaker Writings 1650-1700*, (Michigan, 1973), pp.386-88, quotation from p.388.

- ⁴⁸ P.Gaunt, 'The Councils of the Protectorate, From December 1653 to September 1658', London PhD, 1969, p.199.

- ⁴⁹ For Lambert's terms of expression here refer to James Nayler, *A Caution to all who shall be found Persecutors*, (1653), "Did ever any strive against God and prosper? He will break you with a rod of iron and dash you in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be wise, take heed, fear and tremble before the Lord, lest his wrath kindle against you, and you be consumed in his anger...".

- ⁵⁰ L.Damrosch, *The Sorrows of the Quaker Jesus, James Nayler and the Puritan Crackdown on the Free Spirit*, (London, 1996), p.190.

- 51 *Burton's Diary*, I, pp.181-2. Robinson's stance was illustrative of the divisions caused by the Nayler dispute. Although fervent in his desire to see Nayler punished Robinson was firmly alongside Lambert during the Humble Petition and Advice debates in opposition to kingship.
- 52 B.L., Add Mss 21426 fols.3, 189.
- 53 *Burton's Diary*, I, p.86; T.A.Wilson and F.J.Merli, 'Nayler's Case and the Dilemma of the Protectorate', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, 10, no.1, (1956), pp.53-4.
- 54 *Burton's Diary*, I, p.59.
- 55 *Burton's Diary*, I, pp.49-50, 61, 63, 108-110.
- 56 *Burton's Diary*, I, p.215.
- 57 *Burton's Diary*, I, p.217-8.
- 58 *Burton's Diary*, I, p.216; B.L., E805(13), John Webster, *The Judgement Set, and the Bookes Opened*, (1654); Bittle, *Nayler*, pp.136-37.
- 59 *Burton's Diary*, I, p.281.
- 60 F.Tonnes, (ed.), *Behemoth of the The Long Parliament by T.Hobbes*, 2nd edition, (London, 1969), p.187.
- 61 Reay, *Quakers*, p.89.
- 62 Reay, *Quakers*, p.94.
- 63 M.H.Lee, (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, (London, 1882), p.69.
- 64 The candidates they supported were seen as as sympathetic in their opposition to tithes. Reay, *Quakers*, p.38. Also see J.Morrill, *Cheshire 1630-60: County Governement and Society during the English Revolution*, (Oxford, 1974), p.298 for John Bradshaw. Such support reinforces the other evidence of Lambert's ambivalent attitude to tithes. As an army commander he refused attempts to use his troops as tithe collectors. R.Ashton, *Counter-Revolution. The Second Civil War and its Origins, 1646-8*, (London, 1994), p.252.
- 65 Reay, *Quakers*, p.42.
- 66 W.A.Cole, 'The Quakers and the English Revolution', in T.Aston, (ed.), *Crisis in Europe*, (London, 1970), p.348.
- 67 Robert Wild, *Iter Boreale*, (1660), lines 172-193.
- 68 J.F.McGregor and B.Reay, *Radical Religion in the English Revolution*, (Oxford, 1984), p.163; B.Reay, 'The Quakers, 1659 and the Restoration of Monarchy', *History*, 63, (1978).
- 69 Reay, *Quakers*, p.25.
- 70 For Vane and the Quakers as well as his alliance with Lambert see, B.L., E2109(1), *Metamorphosis Anglorum*, (1660), pp.61-65; E1923(2), *The Mystery of the Good Old Cause Briefly Unfolded*, (1660), p.35; E1080(15), *The True Character of the Education, Inclinations and Several Dispositions of all and every one of those Bloody and Barbarous Persons, who Sate as Judges upon the Life of our late Dread Sovereign King Charles I of ever Blessed Memory*, (1660), p.6; J.F.Maclear, 'Quakerism and the end of the Interregnum: A chapter in the domestication of radical Puritanism', *Church History*, 19, (1950), no.4, pp.240-70; A.Woolrych, 'Introduction' in *Complete Prose Works of John Milton: VII (1659-1660)*, (New Haven, 1980), pp.110, 120-1; L von Ranke, *A History of England Principally in the Seventeenth Century*, 6 vols., (Oxford, 1875), III, p.261; J.H.Adamson and H.F.Folland, *Sir Harry Vane : His Life and Times 1613-1662*, (London, 1973),

p.401; V.A. Rowe, *Sir Henry Vane the Younger*, (London, 1970), pp.223-4; W.A.Cole, 'The Quakers and Politics, 1652-1660', Cambridge PhD, 1955, pp.156-7, 160, 193.

- ⁷¹ Duncon appears to have become connected to Baynes through his role as a collector of the assessment in Suffolk. Their relationship appears to have broken down due to Duncon's belief that Baynes had defrauded him, see B.L., Add. Mss 21418 fol.328; 21419 fol. 40; 21420 fols. 32, 74; P.R.O., C6/153/49, C6/133/218; S.Duncon, *Several Proposals*, (1659), postscript.
- ⁷² N.Smith, *George Fox. The Journal*, (London, 1998), p,267.
- ⁷³ Reay, *Quakers*, p.98; A.H.Woolrych, 'Yorkshire and the Restoration', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 39, (1956-8); H.M.C. *Fifth Report*, (1876), 193-4.
- ⁷⁴ *Burton's Diary*, I, p.319; Damrosch, *Quaker Jesus*, pp.220-1.
- ⁷⁵ D.Farr, 'Kin, cash, Catholics and Cavaliers: the role of kinship in the financial management of Major-General John Lambert', *Historical Research*, 74, no.183, (2001), pp.44-62.
- ⁷⁶ H.C.Jones, 'The Correspondance of Henry Cromwell, 1655-59, and other papers from the British Museum Lansdowne Mss 821-823', M.Litt. thesis, Lancaster University, 1969 p. 293, Lansdowne Mss 821 No.115, fol.212-13.
- ⁷⁷ D.L.Smith. 'Catholic, Anglican or Puritan? Edward Sackville, Fourth Earl of Dorset and the Ambiguities of Religion in Early Stuart England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th series, II, (1992), p.120.
- ⁷⁸ John Price, *The Mystery and Method of his Majesty's Happy Restauration laid open to the publick view*, (London, 1660).

HANNAH LIGHTFOOT: QUAKER QUEEN?

Mary L. Pendered begins her 1910 biography of Hannah Lightfoot with these words: 'Dimly outlined in a twilight haze of mystery that at once enchants and stimulates imagination, we have the love story of Hannah Lightfoot, shadowy heroine of a romance so vague and elusive as to seem, at first sight, evolved out of moonshine; yet withal so real as to have disturbed the minds of four generations so real as to have set currents of doubt and conjecture vibrating about a throne.'¹

And the currents continue to vibrate: in 1997 a Channel Four documentary of Hannah's supposed son, George Rex, created a stir in the press; last year Hannah's 'granddaughter's 'tomb was discovered in a Welsh parish churchyard, and following that a couple of articles of 'new light on an old tale' appeared in *The Friend* eliciting a number of letters to the editor which further stirred the moonshine.²

Hannah Lightfoot, rumoured over many years to be the mistress-or-even-wife of George, Prince of Wales (afterward George III) was born on 12th October 1730, in the parish of St John's Wapping, to Matthew Lightfoot, shoemaker or cordwainer, and Mary, his wife, *née* Wheeler. Her father died of asthma in 1732 or 1733, and her younger and only brother in 1733. Apparently she was subsequently adopted by her uncle, Henry Wheeler (1704-1758), a respected linendraper at St James's Market.

While living with her uncle, Hannah, a noted beauty, attracted the attention of passersby at St James's Market including the young Prince of Wales. However, on 11th December 1753, Hannah married Isaac Axford (sometimes referred to as a grocer) of the parish of St Martin's Ludgate, at the chapel of the unfrocked priest, Alexander Keith at Mayfair Chapel (often referred to as 'Keith's Chapel') near Hyde Park Corner where 'knots were tied in the easiest and loosest manner possible.'³ Mr Keith who owned the Mayfair Chapel and one also at Fleet prison, was excommunicated in 1733. From the moment of her marriage to Axford, Hannah appears to have disappeared.

The most reliable and undisputed records concerning Hannah Lightfoot are those of Westminster Monthly Meeting of which she and her family were members. On 1st January 1755, it was reported to Westminster Monthly Meeting that Hannah Lightfoot, a member, had been 'married by a priest, and absconded from her husband.' According to the following report given to Monthly Meeting, 3rd

September 1755, the marriage but not abscondence was confirmed by her mother. On 7th January 1756, it was reported by Monthly Meeting that Hannah was 'not to be found or spoken with.' Notice of disownment for marriage by a priest with a non-Friend was entered on 3rd March 1756.⁴ Interestingly, Hannah's husband's name never appears on the Westminster Monthly Meeting records. and there are no more Quaker records for Hannah Lightfoot.

Isaac Axford remarried in December 1759: either he believed that Hannah was dead, or his first marriage was invalid. He did not die until 1816. The Act for Preventing Clandestine Marriages was passed in June 1753. As Arthur Lloyd-Taylor has suggested: 'It is just possible that the Lightfoot-Axford marriage was considered invalid through the passing of the new act.'⁵

A reference in *The Citizen* (24 Feb. 1776) implies that Hannah died a little before her mother whose death was in May 1760. We are now firmly in what Mary Pendered calls 'those mists and mists of fiction which have gathered about the Fair Quaker.'⁶ To her credit, Pendered does an effective job of 'distangling from her thicket of briars the Sleeping Beauty of the 18th century.'⁷ However, I give a warning to any reader of her opus: Mary Pendered utilizes 355 pages to present her case and often the reader feels that he is drowning in pursuit of substantial material.

However, in her preface, Pendered says that the main reason she wrote her book was because she had seen two letters written by Hannah Lightfoot to her mother and a sampler worked by her at school. Unfortunately the owners of the letters (handed down directly from Hannah's mother) refused to allow them to be made public. But from them, Pendered well remembers that 'Hannah Lightfoot was anything but chaste of soul' and was convinced that the letters' frequent allusions to 'a Person' or 'the Person' indicated the Prince of Wales, later King George III.⁸

Another biography, *The Lovely Quaker* by John Lindsay (London, 1939) basically ploughs through the same material as Mary Pendered's work, but is marred by Lindsay's persistent attempt to establish George Rex as the legitimate successor to George III.⁹

The earliest allusion to an affair between Hannah Lightfoot and Prince George seems to have been in the *Public Advertiser* (7th Sept. 1770) where she is referred to as 'the Fair Quaker'.¹⁰ Other early accounts speak of her as 'Miss Hannah Lightfoot,' and it is not until 1821 in the *Monthly Magazine* that Isaac Axford is named as the person she married with the reason being that it was to forestall a morganatic marriage between her and the prince.¹¹

In the stories which followed, it was stated that through the intervention of Elizabeth Chudleigh (1720-1788), the courtesan and bigamist who became the Duchess of Kingston, the Prince of Wales persuaded Hannah to leave her home and go through the form of marriage with Axford. Elizabeth Chudleigh was said to be the agent for their relationship, and some versions of the story have Prince George marrying Hannah and keeping her at a private residence such as the one in Peckham. Any number of children were attributed to the liaison.¹²

It is in 1866 that the Hannah Lightfoot-Prince George story re-appeared in sensational manner with the Ryves and Ryves v. the Attorney General case. Mrs Lavinia Ryves (1797-1871) took up her mother's claim to be an illegitimate daughter of the Duke of Cumberland, brother of George III. Mrs Ryves's mother, Mrs Olivia Serres (1772-1834) had herself re-christened as Princess Olive, daughter of the Duke and his first wife, Olive. She claimed that an alleged will of George III left her, as his brother's daughter, £15,000. In 1823 the claim had been found to be baseless. Despite this Mrs Ryves resurrected the issue and among other matters, produced documents declaring that a marriage ceremony between Hannah Lightfoot and the Prince of Wales took place in different months in 1759 and at two different places: on 17th April at Kew Chapel and on 27th May at their residence in Peckham. A jury repudiated Mrs Ryves's claim, but she maintained those documents had been authenticated by the leading handwriting expert of the day and were later hidden away at Somerset House.

The marriage documents are now available for public view at the Public Records Office at Kew and I have seen them. With the Westminster Monthly Meeting records, those at Kew are the most intriguing documents remaining in the Hannah Lightfoot saga. In the certificate for the Kew Chapel ceremony, Prince George signs his name as George Princeps; at the residence in Peckham as George Guelph (the name often given as the surname of the House of Hanover). In both certificates the officiating clergyman was Dr James Wilmot, eminent Oxford divine and a close friend of the royal family as well as the uncle of the aforementioned 'Princess Olive'!¹³

Among the witnesses is William Pitt, the 1st Earl of Chatham. I was told at Kew that a handwriting expert thinks that all of the signatures appear to be genuine. There are two other documents at Kew. One is from Dr Wilmot explaining the reason for there being a second marriage ceremony: 'I hereby certify that George Prince of Wales married Hannah Wheeler alias *Lightfoot*, 17th April 1759 but from finding the latter to be her right name I solemnized the union of the

said parties a second time 27th May 1759 as the certificates affixed to this paper will confirm'. Apparently Dr Wilmot had entered Hannah's mother's and uncle's surname in the parish records instead of Lightfoot.

Also at Kew is a will of Hannah Lightfoot dated 7th July 1762 from Hampstead. In it Hannah signs her name as Hannah Regina! She bequeathed 'whatever property' belonged to the 'dear offspring' of her 'ill fated marriage.' She commended her two sons and daughter to 'the kind protection of their Royal Father, my Husband, His Majesty George the Third.' Needless to say all of these documents at Kew have been highly questioned.

However, the plot thickens with an unusual theft at St Anne's Church, Kew (the successor to Kew Chapel) on 22nd February 1845. An iron strongbox containing the parish records was stolen and later found in the Thames but with all the records missing. Arthur Lloyd-Taylor (from a long-time family connected with St Anne's) insists his grandfather, Henry Taylor, engaged two local men through the desire of 'the Royal Family' to break into the church's robing room and remove the chest. Among the parish records was also a large bible which had been presented to the church by George III.¹⁴

At another church; this one in Wales, St Peter's, Caramarthen, work in the chancel recently uncovered the grave of Charlotte Augustine Catharine Dalton thought to be the grand-daughter of Hannah and Prince George. The vicar says that if the royal descent is correct it would explain why a magnificent pipe organ made for George III came to the church which has no other royal connections.¹⁵

Over the years there have been many suggested as descended from the Hannah-Prince George union; the most celebrated of these has been George Rex. Rex became marshal of the vice admiralty court at the Cape of Good Hope in 1797. David Olive, one of George Rex's descendants living in South Africa, appeared in a 1997 television documentary by Channel 4. This brought the Hannah Lightfoot tale to a great audience.¹⁶ However, two years earlier-and completely unnoted in the programme Professor Ian R. Christie was able to trace back George Rex's authentic pedigree as far back as his paternal grandfather and the parents of the grandfather's wife. Christie showed that George Rex's surname was not a Latin pun as assumed by George Rex's champions but a true family name. His father was John Rex, a London distiller, and Christie concluded that 'There is not a scrap of real evidence to connect him with the King.'¹⁷

Like a hardy perennial, the story of the fair Quaker and the prince regularly crops up, and a curious further addition was presented in *The History of the Island of Antigua* (1894-1899 by Vere Langton Oliver,



Reputed Portrait of Hannah Lightfoot
by Joshua Reynolds at Knole

where was published the Last Will and Testament of Robert Pearne dated 26th January 1757. Pearne left 'Mrs Hannah Axford (formerly Miss Hannah Lightfoot, niece to the late John Jefferyes, watchmaker in Holborn)', the yearly sum of £40 during the term of her natural life. The will appeared to indicate that Hannah was still alive after her supposed disappearance following her marriage to Isaac Axford. However, attempts to find Robert Pearne in registers and rate-books have been fruitless though Quaker records at Friends House indicate Jefferyes as having married Rebecca Wheeler in 1734.¹⁸

Another peculiar touch to the Hannah Lightfoot story is the existence at Knole of an oil on canvas (75x62 cms.), a portrait by Sir Joshua Reynolds entitled *Miss Axford, reputedly Hannah Lightfoot, the Fair Quaker*. It is not known when Reynolds executed the work, but it was acquired by the 3rd Duke of Dorset before 1778. J. Bridgman in his *History and Topographical Sketch of Knole* (1817) said of the portrait: 'This is the Fair Quaker noticed by His Majesty when Prince of Wales.'¹⁹ The sitter is half-length to right in white satin dress edged with lace and decorated with pink bows and white lace headdress. However, in his notes on the painting, Alistair Laing appears to doubt that this is a portrait of Hannah Lightfoot.²⁰ To this viewer, Laing does not present a very convincing case for his verdict.

Aside from the possible connection between Hannah and the prince, George III had at least two other associations with the Society of Friends. In 1772 the American artist, Benjamin West (1738-1820) who was raised a Quaker and certainly presented himself as such, was appointed the historical painter to the King and the two had a long and close relationship.²¹ In 1761 George III asked the Quaker export merchant, David Barclay, to be his host at Barclay's Cheapside home where he and Queen Charlotte watched the Lord Mayor's procession. The King let it be known that he understood Quaker scruples and he did not expect any of the family to kneel when presented and the Quaker men kept their hats on.

The full story of Hannah Lightfoot may never be known, however, what has thus far surfaced is sufficient-and romantic enough- to say that there must have been some connection between the Fair Quaker and her prince: no need for further legends at all.

David Sox

NOTES AND REFERENCES

- ¹ Pendered, Mary L., *The Fair Quaker Hannah Lightfoot and Her Relations with George III* (London: 1910), p. xv.
- ² Channel 4, 'The Legend of George Rex', 5 July 1997; *The Sunday Telegraph*, 20 June 1997, p. 20. Also see *The Listener*, 14 June 1973, p. 804; *The Western Mail* (Wales), 8 Sept. 2000 and correspondence from the vicar's warden; *The Friend*, 3 Nov., 10 Nov., 1 Dec. 2000 and 2 Feb 2001
- ³ Lloyd-Taylor, Arthur, *The Taylors of Kew*, private publication, 1973; pp. 6-7.
- ⁴ Westminster Monthly Meeting minutes at Friends House Library, London.
- ⁵ Lloyd-Taylor, p. 7.
- ⁶ Pendered, p. xv.
- ⁷ Ibid.
- ⁸ Pendered, pp. xvii-xviii.
- ⁹ Lindsay, John, *The Lovely Quaker*, (London, 1939).
- ¹⁰ See Pendered, pp. 143 and 254.
- ¹¹ See Pendered, pp. 114, 263, 307. In his article on George III in the DNB, Vol. V11, p. 1052, Walter Hepworth refers to *Monthly Magazine* as 'vile'. The most recent and authoritative biography of George III is: Hibbert, Christopher, *George III: a Personal History* (London: 1998) On pages 29n and 30n, Hibbert mentions Hannah Lightfoot and supports Christie's ideas later discussed in this article.
- ¹² See Pendered's chapters xvii and xviii for extensive claims.
- ¹³ Wilmot was also a Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford and from 1782, rector of Barton-on-the-Heath parish in Warwickshire. Lloyd-Taylor (*op.cit.*, p. 7) says that Mrs Olive Serres later claimed in 1817 that the then late Dr Wilmot was not her uncle but in fact her grandfather. This was despite the fact that he was a batchelor!
- ¹⁴ See Lloyd-Taylor, *op.cit.* and Bloomfield, David, *Kew Past* (London: 1994), p. 87.
- ¹⁵ *The Western Mail* (Wales), 8 Sept. 2000.
- ¹⁶ The documentary mentioned in note 2 was produced on location in South Africa by British Pathe.
- ¹⁷ Professor Christie noted Horace Bleackley's references in *Notes and Queries*, 10 S. ix, 11 Jan. 1908; 10 S. ix 15 Feb. 1908 and 10 S. ix, 4 April 1908.
- ¹⁸ The only place where this volume appears to be available is the London Library.
- ¹⁹ Bridgman, J., *History and Topographical Sketch of Knole*, 1817.
- ²⁰ Alistair Laing in KNO. p. 257 from the National Trust Archive, listed under Sir Joshua Reynolds.
- ²¹ Sox, David, *Quakers and the Arts: Plain & Fancy* (York: 2000). See chapter 2.

ROBERT WILLAN MD FRS (1757-1812): DERMATOLOGIST OF THE MILLENNIUM

Paper read to the joint meeting of Sections of Dermatology and the History of Medicine at the Royal Society of Medicine, 25 February 1999, to select a Dermatologist of the Millennium. Robert Willan was the winning candidate. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1999; 92:313-318.

Robert Willan was born in 1757 at a stone-built farmhouse near Sedbergh, then in Yorkshire, called The Hill. It had belonged to the family for six generations.¹ The Willans were Quakers who attended Meeting nearby in the lovely meeting house at Briggflatts, which dates from 1675. In many records - *the Dictionary of National Biography*, *Munk's Roll of the College of Physicians* and other publications^{2 3} - Robert Willan's father has been supposed to have been an MD of Edinburgh who wrote "An Essay on the King's Evil,"⁴ published from Scarborough in 1746. This however, is erroneous for the Robert Willan who wrote that book can be positively identified as a bachelor who, after graduation in Edinburgh in 1745, worked first as a physician in Scarborough (where he wrote his book), then became a schoolmaster in Philadelphia and ultimately died there in 1770.¹

Robert Willan's lineage, however, shows that although his father was indeed another of the many Robert Willans in his family, he was not an MD.¹ Soon after his marriage to Ann Weatherald in 1745 he put a datestone on the building at The Hill, with the initials of himself and his wife - R and AW 1748. Not, as supposed, an MD but a local medical practitioner, he was described by the Friends when he died in 1777 as a 'man-midwife'. He is said to have enjoyed an extensive practice; his character, however, was apparently not flawless for in 1758 his Monthly Meeting drew up a paper on their disunity with him on account of his 'drinking to excess and breaking word'.¹

His son and youngest child, Robert the future dermatologist, was educated at nearby Sedbergh School, an ancient foundation that dates from 1525. The old schoolhouse where Willan studied is now the school library. At Sedbergh, Willan is said to have become an accomplished scholar, even exceeding his master, Dr Bateman, in Latin and Greek.

Like other Quakers, Willan was barred from the universities of Oxford or Cambridge and therefore, following the example of other dissenters such as John Fothergill, he went to the medical school of the University of Edinburgh, where he matriculated in 1777, the year of his father's death. There he came under the influence of several important teachers.⁵ The first was Professor John Hope, who held the chair of botany. A pupil of Bernard de Jussieu in Paris, it was he who introduced the new classification of Linnaeus to Edinburgh. Willan would also have been influenced by the greatest Edinburgh teacher of medicine of that era, William Cullen. Cullen had attempted to arrange human diseases by the method that Linnaeus had successfully employed in the classification of plants and the animal kingdom. It was Linnaeus who introduced the binomial system, in which the first name was the genus, the second the species. Thus we have *Digitalis purpurea*, *Home sapiens*, *Salmo truttus* (or *thymalis* for a grayling, since it smells of thyme when freshly caught). Following Linnaeus, Cullen described classes, orders, genera, species and varieties of human disease. It was an attempt that equalled in complexity the nosology of Boissier de Sauvages in Montpellier.⁶ At that time, however, knowledge of disease was insufficiently developed to permit such a classification and Cullen's nosology, although used until well into the nineteenth century, did not endure.

A further influence on the young Willan as a medical student may have been Andrew Duncan, who worked at the Public Dispensary in Edinburgh. In his records of his medical cases, published in 1777, Duncan complained that there was no satisfactory distinction of cutaneous diseases and he considered it would be of great consequence if 'distinct genera could be formed, especially if proper marks could be discovered according to the causes from which they proceed...'

Willan graduated MD in June 1779 with a thesis entitled *De Jecinoris Inflammatione* which was published in Edinburgh. Aged 23, he then went down to London to seek the help of Dr John Fothergill, family friend, fellow Quaker and alumnus of Sedbergh School and Edinburgh graduate. Fothergill urged him to settle in the capital but sadly his death from prostatic obstruction at Christmas that year deprived William of his patron.⁷ Willan, hearing soon afterwards of the death of an elderly relative in Darlington, decided instead to start a practice in the north in 1781. Here he became interested in the waters of a small spa at Croft, near Darlington, and he wrote a book to extol its virtues.⁸ He recommended the waters, as was the custom of the time, for all manner of diseases but he seems, even at this early stage of his career, to have evinced a particular interest in skin

diseases, 'Why are the nations of the north', he asked, 'and especially this kingdom, more liable to cutaneous affections?'.

By early 1783, however, Willan had decided once more to seek his fortune in the capital. On this occasion, he was much helped by John Forthergill's formidable sister Ann, who had been the doctor's housekeeper,⁹ and by John Coakley Lettsom, who had founded the first General Dispensary at Aldersgate more than a decade earlier. Through Lettsom's influence Willan was at once appointed physician to the newly founded Carey Street Dispensary, of which Lettsom, now well established in the capital, was a governor.

The dispensaries attracted the benevolent support of the great and the good from their first foundation. Whilst the first President of Lettsom's Aldersgate Dispensary, founded more than ten years earlier, was the Earl of Darmouth, the Earl of Sandwich occupied the same position at Carey Street. He had been a tolerably incompetent First Lord of the Admiralty in Lord North's administration until its fall in 1782. Popularly known as Jemmy Twitcher, after Macheath's Judas in the *Beggar's Opera*¹⁰, one can only hope that he did better for Willan's Dispensary than he had for the Royal Navy.

Willan in 1783 joined the staff of the Carey Street Dispensary which he was to serve for 20 years. His practice there must have provided him with a dermatological goldmine - proximity, filth, squalor and the lack of baths or bathing leading to all manner of conditions beyond the ever-present itch. Willan, through his work at the Dispensary was, like Lettsom, familiar with the grinding poverty of his patients. He wrote:

It is perfectly true that persons of the lowest classes do not put clean sheets on their beds three times a year; that even when no sheets are used they never wash nor scour their coverlets, nor renew them until they are no longer tenable; their curtains, if unfortunately there should be any, are never cleaned but suffered to continue in the same state till they fall to pieces; lastly, from three to eight individuals of different ages and different sexes often sleep in the same bed - at the same time - there being in general but one room and one bed for each family...¹¹

By 1790, after 7 years at the Dispensary, it seems that Willan, who by now would clearly have had considerable experience of cutaneous diseases, decided to attempt a Linnaen-based classification. It was an idea that no doubt owed much to his mentors in Edinburgh, but Willan recognised that cutaneous disease, being entirely visible, lent itself particularly to an arrangement similar to that of Linnaeus for plants, which were classified according to the appearance of their

parts. He was now encouraged, probably by Lettsom, to submit his work to the Medical Society of London, the intellectual forum for the increasing number of London doctors who were dissidents, often graduates of the University of Edinburgh, and who were debarred from bastions of privilege such as the Royal College of Physicians. It was they, like Lettsom and Willan, who staffed the increasing number of London dispensaries. They occupied a lowly position in the medical hierarchy of the day. Unlike the distinguished French dermatologist, Baron Alibert, senior physician at the Hôpital Saint Louis in Paris and royal physician,¹² Willan never served on the staff of a famed hospital. Nor as a Quaker would he ever have accepted a national honour or have been, like Alibert, among the great who might have been considered as candidates for the post of royal physician.

It was presumably Lettsom who ensured that the John Fothergill Gold Medal of the Medical Society was bestowed on Robert Willan in 1790 for his studies of cutaneous disease. The Society was so impressed by Willan's presentation that they encouraged him to publish his work. It was not easy, however, to find a publisher and Willan wrote later that 'The publication has been delayed much beyond the Author's intention, in consequence of the difficulties experienced in a subject entirely new'.¹³ He clearly recognised the novelty of what he was doing.

By 1797, living in Red Lion Square, Willan had defined seven different orders of skin disease. He now published his work in three parts, in paper covers.¹⁴ Unfortunately, few of these volumes survive to this day. Part I, dated 1798, dealt with his first order, the papulae. It also included a list of Willan's seven different orders. It was at once translated into German and published at Breslau. Part II appeared in 1801 and was concerned with scaly diseases. Part III followed in the year of Trafalgar and comprised Willan's third order, the rashes.

By now Willan, responding to criticism, had increased his order to eight, the papulae and the bullae being separated. As an example of Willan's different genera, the squamae included four - *Lepra*, *Psoriasis*, *Pityriasis* and *Ichthyosis*. These were subdivided into different species. *Pityriasis* the genus (following Linnaeus' binomial system) included three species - *capitis*, *rubra* and *versicolor*. Willan's arrangement was a remarkably complete classification of cutaneous diseases that in many ways we recognise today.

Clearly the paper-covered tracts were not entirely satisfactory as separate publications and Willan in 1808 published his *Cutaneous Diseases*, Vol I,¹⁵ an authoritative account of the first four of his orders - the papulae, squamae, exanthemata and bullae. This was a noble

quarto volume, liberally illustrated with plates made from water-colour drawings.

There is limited evidence in Willan's method of practice. A letter from Willan to Lettsom, however, dated 12 January 1810, and written from his home in Bloomsbury Square, is preserved in the Wellcome collections. It shows that he might be sent a drawing of a particular skin condition and he would reply giving his opinion: 'As far as I can judge by your drawing which is on a reduced scale', wrote Willan, 'the complaint is the Lichenose eruption succeeding in some persons to the use of Mercury either internally or externally'.

Willan had always intended to publish a second volume of his *Cutaneous Diseases* dealing with the remaining four of his orders, the pustulae, vesiculae, tubercula and maculae. Unfortunately, the work was not completed in his lifetime. In late 1811, he had a haemoptysis while attending a patient. Thought to have tuberculosis, he went to Madeira in search of a milder climate but died at Funchal on 7 April 1812, at the age of 55. His tombstone is preserved to this day against the wall of the churchyard.¹⁵

After Willan's death, his casebooks, notes and manuscripts passed into the hands of his future son-in-law, Ashby Smith, who had been present at his death in Madeira. Ashby Smith edited and published in 1814 *A Practical Treatise on Porrigo or Scalded Head, and on Impetigo*, by the late Robert Willan.¹⁶ This was the only work ready for the press that Willan left.

It was, however, to be Thomas Bateman who ensured Willan's dermatological immortality. Bateman, a fellow Yorkshireman who had been born in Whitby in 1778, graduated in Edinburgh in 1801. He became a pupil of Willan at the Carey Street Dispensary when he removed to London in the same year. He went on to succeed Willan as Physician to the Dispensary in 1804.

Bateman was, as Beswick has put it, almost fanatically devoted to Robert Willan. After his death he at once bought the copyright of the books as well as purchasing all the drawings and engravings that Willan had amassed. In 1813 he published his *Synopsis of Cutaneous Disease according to the arrangement of Dr Willan* with coloured plates.¹⁷ The book was a comfortable octavo that might fit into an early nineteenth century pocket, but it lacked the quality of the plates in Willan's Part I of 1808. The book's only illustration was a conglomerate of different skin lesions. Nevertheless, it was to achieve remarkable success, going through five editions before Bateman's premature death in 1821 and achieving an eleventh edition as late as 1850.

In addition to his own work, which throughout all its editions

acknowledged its indebtedness to Willan, Bateman succeeded in completing Willan's *Cutaneous Diseases*. In 1817 he brought out Willan's promised Part II, in a handsome quarto edition that matched Part I of 1808.¹⁸ The work dealt with the four orders that Willan had been unable himself to complete - the pustulae, vesiculae, tubercula and maculae. It included plates made from Willan's own collection of water-colour drawings; many of the originals are now preserved in a splendidly bound volume in the Library of the Royal College of Physicians. In some instances they are inscribed with comments made in Willan's characteristically crabbed hand.

Willan's posthumous reputation is attested by the many editions of Bateman's work and the translations in at least five different languages, all of which gave credit to Willan's classification. In France, Baron Alibert had his own system but Willan's classification was introduced to Paris by a Swiss physician, Dr Biett, who was *médecin adjoint* at the Hôpital St Louis, a position he owed to his chief, the influential Professor Alibert. Biett made a visit to England some time after Waterloo and returned *entièrement converti au système du médecin anglais Willan* which he considered *plus claire, plus facile et plus nouvelle*. He went on to abandon the classification of his teacher Alibert and developed a new system *qui était celle de Willan conjugée et augmentée*.¹² This was to be widely accepted in France.

As to his personal life, Willan married Mary, the widow of a Dr Scott, in 1800, and they lived in Bloomsbury Square, where there is a plaque to his memory on the house, now the Bloomsbury Hotel. He was a man of many interests. He wrote on vaccination, smallpox and its history; he recorded unusual and informative cases of all sorts; he was interested in hygiene and the public health, the design of chimneys and garden stoves, the cure of alcoholism and chlorosis; and he joined Lettsom and other eminent London physicians in planning a Fever Hospital, following the precepts laid down in Chester by his fellow Dalesman, Dr John Haygarth, who had also been a pupil at Sedbergh School. He published a *History of the Ministry of Jesus Christ* and wrote on the ancient words used in 'The mountainous district of the West Riding of Yorkshire'. Some of these, such as brant, cowp, mappen, roogle or wrydden will be lost on all but the most accomplished scholars of north country dialect.² He retained throughout his life his love of classical tongues and called his horses after heroes of the distant past. He wrote in 1803 to his elder brother Richard, a life-long bachelor living at the family home at The Hill, 'My old horse Achilles is well nigh demolished and young Telamachus seems very thin and tottering'.²

At his death the *Gentleman's Magazine* recorded that:

In addition to his great merits as a physician, and as an accurate and classical writer, he was one of the most amiable of men, a sincere friend, a good husband and an affectionate father. He was in truth a model of the perfect human character; a benevolent and skilful Physician, a correct and sound philosopher, and a truly virtuous man.¹⁹

That modest Quaker, Robert Willan, would have no doubt been embarrassed by such eulogies; nor would he have ever imagined that he might be nominated for the title 'Dermatologist of the Millennium'. But as the individual who first brought order into what had been a clinical subject of extraordinary confusion and uncertainty, whose influence was to be felt far beyond his native land and whose work has endured, he fully merits that distinction. Dermatology in his native land has, until recently, recognised his contribution by printing his portrait on the cover page of *The British Journal of Dermatology* each month. The members of the Dermatology Section of the Royal Society of Medicine have erected a glass screen with an engraved portrait in the Library. At the Royal College of Physicians, where, as an Edinburgh alumnus he was never more than a licentiate, there is a Willan Room. The Willans are also remembered in that remote area of the north from which he hailed. The tombstone of his elder brother Richard, with whom from London he maintained a lively correspondence, stands against the wall of Sedbergh Church. He had left the Friends on amicable terms some years before his death in 1820 and was the last Willan to live at The Hill. And on a wall of that ancient farmhouse near Sedbergh, where Robert Willan was born two years before the capture of Quebec, there is another memorial plaque placed by his greatest admirers, the dermatologists of today.

Christopher C Booth
MD FRCP

This paper is published here with the permission of Sir Christopher Booth and the Edition of the *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* where it appeared in June 1999, Volume 92, pages 313 - 18. The Edition of *JFHS* thanks Alastair Heron for bringing the article to his attention.

REFERENCES:

- ¹ Booth, CC. Robert Willan and his kinsmen. *Med History* 1981; **25**: 181-96.
- ² Booth, CC. Robert Willan, M.D., F.R.S., F.S.A. *Br J Dermatol* 1968; **80**: 459-67
- ³ Corner, BC, Booth, CC. *Chain of Friendship. Selected letters of Dr John Fothergill of London, 1735-1786*. Cambridge, Mass: Bellknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971: 126, 149, 339.
- ⁴ Willan, R. *An Essay on the King's Evil*. London: J & P Knapton, 1746.
- ⁵ Hare, PJ. A note on Robert Willan's Edinburgh days. *Br J Dermatol* 1973; **88**: 615-7.
- ⁶ Boisser de Sauvages F. *Nosologica methodica sistens morborum classes, juxta Sydenhami mentem et Botanicorum Ordinem*. Amsterdam: Fratum de Tourne, 1768.
- ⁷ Fox, RH. *Dr John Fothergill and his Friends*. London: Macmillan, 1919.
- ⁸ Willan, R. *Experiments and Observations on the Sulphurous Waters of Croft and Harrowgate*. London: J. Johnson, 1786.
- ⁹ Booth, CC. Ann Fothergill. The Mistress of Harpur Street. *Proc Am Pil Soc* 1978; **122**: 340-54
- ¹⁰ Martelli, G. *Jeremy Twitcher. A life of John Montagu, 4th Earl of Sandwich 1718-1782*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1962.
- ¹¹ George, MD. *London Life in the XVIIIth Century*. London: Keegan Paul, Trench, Turner, 1930: 86-7
- ¹² Balteau J, Barroux M, Prevost M, eds. Elibert, Jean-Louis-Marie. *Distionnaire de Biographie Francaise*, Vol 1. Paris: Librairie de Letouzey et Ane, 1933: 1510-15
- ¹³ Willan, R. *On Cutaneous Diseases*. London: J. Johnson, 1808.
- ¹⁴ Beswick, TSL. The solution of a ninety-year-old mystery. *J Hist Med Allied Sci* 1957; **12**: 349-65.
- ¹⁵ MacCormac, H. At the Public Dispensary with Willan and Bateman. *Br J Dermatol* 1933; **45**: 35-8.
- ¹⁶ Smith, A. Ed. *A Practical Treatise on Porrigo or Scalded Head, and on the Impetigo, the Humid or Running Tetters, by the late Robert Willan*. London: E Cox & Son, 1814.
- ¹⁷ Bateman, T. *A Practical Synopsis of Cutaneous Diseases, According to the Arrangement of Robert Willan*. London: Longmans, 1813.
- ¹⁸ Bateman, T. *Delineations of Cutaneous Disease, Exhibiting the Characteristic Appearances of the Principal Genera and Species, Compromised in the Classification of the late Dr Willan*. London: Longmans, 1817.
- ¹⁹ *Gentleman's Magazine* 1812; **82**, part 1:595.

GERMS OF GOOD¹

The Growth of Quakerism in Australia

“Choose a clerk and give him a twopenny minute book.” This is all that is necessary to establish a Friends Meeting, announced Violet Hodgkin when reporting to Meeting for Sufferings in 1910 on her religious visit to Australia.² If Quakerism was so simple why did it not flourish in Australia? With a shortage of priests and church buildings, local pioneering men and women in the vast interior could have fulfilled many priestly functions, especially in a colonial culture where improvisation was necessary for survival. Some parishes were huge, up to one hundred square miles. In the 20th century it is difficult to imagine the reality of the roughness of early 19th century tracks, the immensity of wide, unbridged rivers, sometimes flooded plains, or heat searing above 40 degrees Celsius in summer. Violet Hodgkin continues:

In the back blocks of the Colonies, in some lonely farmhouse far away in the bush, there, all the conditions are on our side. How barren it would be to go to such a place and say, ‘You must wait for your service till a church is built. Wait until you can get money to pay a clergyman, to hire a room, to build an organ.’ No, the living message needed by these lonely souls is our message ... In the humblest circumstances, right in the heart of our daily needs, the true Church is waiting for our worship, the Sacrament of Life is offered to us”.³

In contrast to Violet Hodgkin’s zeal, Friends in Australia wrote, in their many epistles, about their small numbers and their inadequacy: “Where two or three are gathered in my name ...” became a sentiment repeated so often it became a cliché, somewhat tedious to the modern reader. “Numbers don’t count” and “We do not proselytise” were other similar attitudes.

The purpose of this article is to argue that the general Australian population was not interested in Friends, that the large number of nineteenth century public Meetings for Worship throughout the settled areas in court houses, school rooms and elsewhere; and the dissemination of tracts, did nothing to attract anyone to take up

membership in the Society of Friends. The main recruitment has always been from seekers after truth whose individual search has led them "to come home" as so many describe their experience of discovering the Society of Friends.

The mainstream churches were strong in Australia. Every township had a separate church and congregation for Anglicans, Catholics, Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists. This provided a community focus for large numbers of people. Side by side with this church affiliation were the secularists with their love of leisure induced by a sunny climate. Observance was no match for outdoor activities, especially football. The leisure seekers did not want the quiet, contemplative Society of Friends any more than the self-sufficient church congregations.

Most Quaker Meetings were small, and isolated one from the other, to British eyes unbelievably isolated from one another. Why was Melbourne Meeting, numerically big by any Quaker standard, the main disseminator of the inadequacy syndrome? The real reason for this attitude of insufficiency may well have been the severance from the vitality of Friends Meetings in England, where neighbouring Meetings were close. Unlike many English towns where one could not go out shopping without meeting another Friend, this would be a most unusual occurrence in Australia. Each colonial Australian Meeting was at least seven hundred miles distant.⁴ Moreover, within the capital cities themselves distance was still a difficulty, hindering opportunities for combining together. Apart from separation by distance there was also the limited means of all but a handful of Friends.

Quakerism in Australia was the result of individual and personal migration, rather than migration to further the Society of Friends. Germany Yearly Meeting, as an example, had the advantage, when it was founded of having had a well known Quaker presence in service work beforehand. The beginnings of Australian Quakerism were totally unlike the migration to the North American British colonies; there were no groups of Friends, or whole families of Friends coming to Australia en masse, no Quaker founded a colony like Pennsylvania, and no "Fathers or Mothers of the Church" (as one might describe seasoned Friends) already in Australia to receive the newcomer.

Melbourne Friends wrote to Meeting for Sufferings

one of the greatest disadvantages under which we are placed, is the general character of those who immigrate to our shores, being chiefly the young, or those who have no fixed purpose to induce them to settle amongst us.⁵

Many of the migrating Friends were nominal Friends, by "birthright", some young men's conduct, on arrival, causing worry and even distress. And one knows by the present day situation in Australia – not so much in Britain – that most children of Friends drift away from the Society. Indeed, it was rare indeed for children of Friends living *up country* to remain in the Society, especially after marriage to some-one of another religious persuasion. They preferred to attach themselves to more active Christian bodies. There was the isolated Quaker who came to Australia unwillingly, by forced transportation as a convict. One's heart goes out to a young Friend, William Reilly whose address was from Iron Gang No. 5, Baulkhan Hills, outside Sydney in the Census muster of 1828. (What was his 'crime', one wonders).⁶

From 1832, for six years, James Backhouse, and his travelling companion, George Washington Walker, visited Australia under a religious concern. They visited every penitentiary in Van Diemen's Land, and conducted house to house visitation throughout the island. They then travelled extensively through New South Wales. They promoted temperance, circulated tracts, and advocated humane relationships with the Aboriginal population.

Backhouse drew Friends together. The first Friends Meeting in Australasia was held in Backhouse's sitting room in Hobart Town – on 12 February 1832. A Meeting for business, under the guidance of Backhouse was soon established, and also, a little later, Van Diemen's Land Yearly Meeting, eventually incorporating the small Meeting in Sydney, and Eleanor Glifton – a lone Friend at Australind in Western Australia. Men and women who were to contribute enormously to the Society were convinced through the influence of Backhouse – the Probsting and the Mather families being the most notable, as well as several convicts such as Abraham Davy. Hobart was to remain a steady and solid Quaker Meeting. Backhouse also founded the infant Meetings of Sydney and Adelaide. More than any other Friend in Australian Quaker history, Backhouse achieved much for the Society of Friends. He was indeed the founding father of Australian Quakerism. Yet, it could not be claimed that even Backhouse fulfilled Violet Hodgkin's premise of attracting men and women to his faith that was supposed to be so suitable for the Australian outback situation.

There was a sprinkling of well concerned Friends in Australia. These were the noble Friends who persevered in maintaining a Quaker Meeting, almost without exception confined to a capital city. Among these were Alfred and Deborah Sayce who commenced

regular Meetings in their Little Bourke Street home in Melbourne, from July 1843. There was also Joseph and Hannah May of Mount Barker in South Australia and Rachel Hopkins in Brisbane. One cannot forget the other unnamed Friends who faithfully kept a Meeting going. One must likewise acknowledge those faithful Friends remote from any Meeting such as Algernon Wallis on the goldfields at Rokewood who kept contact with Friends by reading *the British Friend* and by having family readings on Sundays.⁷

There is always an exception to my generalisation. As far as casual migration is concerned South Australia is perhaps the exception. The colony attracted Friends because it was to be democratic, with equal rights and equal privileges. There was to be freedom of religion, no religious disabilities – and no convict labour. The colony was to be based on scientific “systematic colonisation”, which meant planned colonisation, unlike the haphazard colonization of New South Wales, and particularly the Swan River Colony in Western Australia. Indeed, this systematic colonisation was inspired by Edward Gibbon Wakefield, a cousin to Elizabeth Fry, brought up by his Quaker grandmother. Wakefield was in every way the antidote to Violet Hodgkin’s *Book of Quaker Saints!* Whilst serving a sentence in Newgate for eloping with a school girl, his “compassion for the victims of human savagery”⁸ led him to make use of his forced leisure by writing a series of newspaper articles entitled “A Letter from Sydney” in which he outlined what a planned colony should be like. The first Quaker migrants to Adelaide spoke of South Australia becoming a second Pennsylvania. Indeed there were fifty or sixty Friends within four years of the colony’s foundation (in 1836).⁹ British Friends at the 1839 Yearly Meeting subscribed enough money to send a prefabricated Meeting House to the Colony. The building still stands and is the oldest place of worship in South Australia still in its original state.

There are however two reasons why South Australia never became a “second Pennsylvania”. Foremost was the bankruptcy of the leading Friend in the community, John Barton Hack. Some Friends who had purchased land from him returned to England. The other reason was the financial depression of 1842 which persuaded would-be Quaker migrants, those who had purchased land in readiness, (but cautiously waiting to see how the initial years progressed), to abandon migration altogether.

There was a large influx of Friends to Victoria once gold was discovered in 1851. In the gold rush decade about 400 Friends went to Victoria.¹⁰ Many of these were young and transient. Almost without exception they were young men, in their early twenties. Very

few women Friends migrated during the gold rushes – about one to every ten men. Although gold was the attraction there were more immediate reasons: health, was significant, travel and adventure lured many including the well-known former Friend, William Howitt. An escape from poverty was especially a reason for Irish Friends who, roughly, made up one third of the Quaker population in Victoria. Other Friends came to set up business in the thriving capital of Melbourne.

After the gold rushes the migration of Friends to Australia was spasmodic. However, because Meetings had been settled in each capital city¹¹ there was a Friends Meeting ready to embrace the new arrival, and to offer contact if that newly arrived Friend should settle inland. Equally important, there was a Meeting to welcome the seeker.

Increasingly, certainly after the first world war, a high proportion of Australian Meetings consisted of convinced Friends.

There were also the rare occasions of persons completely isolated applying for membership. There is the unique example of Ballarat. Although there were about fifteen Friends resident in Ballarat, they believed that the time was not right to establish a Meeting. However, three men each in their thirties who knew nothing about the Society except what they had read and what they remembered from boyhood contacts¹² publicly announced themselves as the Society of Friends, hired a room in the Temperance Hall, and advertised their meetings in the *Ballarat Star*, regularly meeting from Easter Sunday 1867. Dissatisfied with “modes of worship as practiced by other denominations”¹³ and “grieved at the money-seeking ways of the ministers”, these “poor, uneducated but respectable” men were unaware that Friends in fact existed in Ballarat.

Astonished by the advertisement, Melbourne Meeting was immediately informed of the situation and sent a deputation to visit Ballarat in “Gospel love”. The deputation reported that these persons “expressed in a feeling manner their gratification of our visit to them” and that they were earnest seekers after truth.¹⁴

Ballarat was unique. Numbers in Australia always remained small. Friends are claimed to have been 0.015 per cent of the Australian population in 1910¹⁵ and despite the indefatigable Quaker enthusiasts Meetings remained small.

I now wish to discuss the impact of three outstanding individuals of these indefatigable Quaker enthusiasts: Joseph James Neave, Robert Lindsey, and Alfred Allen.

Neave was always on the move. He possessed a vigorous spirit. He visited Friends, former Friends, and even old scholars of Friends

Schools however remote, leaving behind a trail of happy memories. He held public Meetings for Worship in churches en route. He held several in the remote but magnificently beautiful Jamieson area where he believed several Meetings might be established, so interested were the local people. However, no such thing ever eventuated, even with the newspaper publicity which Neave was given. For instance, not far from Jamieson, at Mansfield in 1878, in a state of excitement because of the bushranger Ned Kelly's activities, some town youths, out for fun, tried to disrupt the Quaker silence of Neave's public meeting in that town. The editor of the paper decided to give these town hooligans a dressing down in his paper, but Neave spoke in their defence. Wherever he went, Neave witnessed the Quaker insights in which he believed so intensely. He loved adventure. En route from Bright to Omeo, visiting outlying Friends in each centre, he was forced "to sleep in the arms of a snow gum" on the Bogong High Plains from which he contemplated the opening session of the 1879 London Yearly Meeting.¹⁶ Certainly, isolated Friends were greatly cheered by Neave's face to face interest in their welfare, but there is no evidence that even one person was convinced through all Neave's strenuous activity. Although for years after one met those "though they had forgotten the name, yet remembered the "man" or "the sermon he preached in our church¹⁷."

Robert Lindsey, likewise held public meetings and distributed tracts wherever he went. He was in Ballarat three days after the Eureka uprising of the miners, having been stopped by troopers en route and searched for arms and ammunition. Martial law had been declared in the town. Lindsey was in the streets handing out peace pamphlets *Unlawfulness of wars and fightings*. "We should have had these a fortnight ago" said one. "You should have brought a thousand", said a disappointed man when the tracts had all been handed out.¹⁸ Lindsey's visit to Australia was well worthwhile. The wisdom of such an experienced Friend in their midst was of incalculable value. Within the Society Lindsey's efforts were important. He persuaded Friends in Mount Barker in the Adelaide Hills to build a Meeting House. He supported Friends in Melbourne to establish regular business meetings, even though he confided that they were "like bullocks unaccustomed to the yoke".¹⁹ But from the view point of Violet Hodgkin that Quaker Meetings were the answer to the Australian condition, there is no record to support achievement by Lindsey in settlers adopting this "living message needed by these lonely souls".

The one Quaker enthusiast who did have some measure of success in the 1860s (in leading people to Friends) was Alfred Allen. As a

youth he had left the Quaker faith of his mother and joined the Congregational Church in Pitt Street in Sydney. Whilst studying for the ministry his mother lent him *Barclays's Apology* saying it might be helpful. The *Apology* hit Allen with enormous intensity. "Most of my old friends deserted me" wrote Allen, "and from many a pulpit I was denounced as a dangerous infidel feigning to believe the Scriptures." Allen was an individualist, enthusiastically taking up Quakerism much to the consternation of the complacent local Friends Meeting, a rather inward-looking and small group that London Yearly Meeting would not officially recognise until 1887.²⁰ It was claimed that no other Friends Meeting had possibly had as chequered a career as Sydney. They tried to disown Allen in 1868. No common man, Alfred Allen eventually became a Liberal member of the New South Wales parliament, serving as Whip to the Parkes administration. At the age of 22 "he gathered round him a group of earnest young men for Bible study on Quaker lines." He established a second Meeting in Sydney, in Pitt Street. Eventually a party of these young men "who had come among Friends largely through his influence" left for Queensland where Allen tried to start a Friends settlement in the Buderim area. The settlement itself was far from successful, but Allen had drawn more people into the Society of Friends than anyone else.²¹

Allen, like George Fox, was not easily intimidated. When seven Anglican bishops descended upon Sydney for the opening of St. Andrews Cathedral, the greatest gathering of Anglicans yet seen in the Colony, (a public holiday was declared) Alfred Allen published a pamphlet "*Romanism, Ritualism, and formalism not Christianity*" criticising the biblical grounds for consecrating buildings. He was arrested on the Archbishop's orders when he tried to hand him one of these pamphlets at the ceremonial procession of the bishops. (He was released almost immediately after).²²

However, Allen's drive and public preachings attracted many to Friends. He wrote:

On first day afternoons I preached in Hyde Park to large crowds of hearers and Quakerism and the Quakers soon became the subject of conversation in many homes. In a short time the Meeting House on first day morning was filled and many convinced of Friends principles made application to the Devonshire Street Meeting for membership.

Regrettably, "each applicant was rejected and assured that I was a disturber of the peace," wrote Allen.²³ Sydney Meeting was frequently visited in this period by both Melbourne and Hobart Friends anxious to

breathe new and progressive life into the Meeting. Only in later years was Allen appreciated by Friends. Indeed the various generations of the Allen family have contributed enormously to the Society of Friends not only in Sydney, but in Australia as a whole.

It was quietly, without any dashing about the countryside, that Irene Glasson seventy years later, in the 1930s, drew more men and women into the Society of Friends than any other known member in Australia. As State President of the Young Women's Christian Association in Adelaide she would say in YWCA business meetings "Let's see what the *Book of Discipline* has to say", when difficult questions arose. This fascinated YWCA workers to find out what this *Book of Discipline* was. Irene Glasson also referred to Friends in discussion groups. Ultimately eight Friends claimed to have joined Friends through her influence.

From 1961 an Extension Committee advertised in national Australian newspapers and magazines and received hundreds of enquiries. The number of people who joined Friends as a result has never been calculated.

Quakers were publicly condemned during the first world war, even in newspaper editorials, for their attitude to war. On the other hand, in the early 1920s the Friends' War Victims Relief Committee received almost daily newspaper coverage as the campaign to raise money for stricken Europe gained public favour and momentum. There is no evidence that all this publicity, whether adverse or favourable, did more than create public consciousness of Friends.

Violet Hodgkin truly understood Quakers and honoured its ways. She had one year of excitement in Australia, with its repeated surprises of travel. We are now writing about no one defining moment, but about the broad highway of the decades, trying to raise life out of bald records. The minute books of two Monthly (from 1964 Regional) Meetings have been examined – Melbourne and Adelaide. They reveal that there is a steady procession of acceptances into membership by conviction. A table has been prepared mindful that a bare statistical number is a chilling reduction of each individual search for a meaningful faith.

Yet, what about that quip to Meeting for Sufferings? Violet Hodgkin's premise for establishing a meeting required something more: enthusiasm of which she herself possessed a huge amount, as well as sense in knowing how to keep Friends together.

If Friends were to award honours it should surely go to those faithful and unnamed Friends who drew other Friends together in fellowship, maintaining an unassuming pastoral interest in the membership and so giving purpose and enthusiasm to the group.

Numbers beget numbers.- This was probably the reason why Hobart always remained a significant area of Quakerism in Australia. Contrary

to Violet Hodgkin's dictum, a lively meeting will attract others and maintain momentum, stimulating a right feeling of sociability amongst the membership. This always seems to have been the case in Hobart where a solid group of Friends existed – to the extent that the city of Hobart undoubtedly possesses the greatest number of Quakers percentagewise to the general population. Hobart also initiated activities which provided outlets for information and work within the Society. Hobart Friends founded the Friends' School in 1887. This meant a steady number of Friends moving to Hobart either to join the teaching staff, as students, or families of Friends moving to Hobart for their children's Quaker education. Some of the school community were drawn into membership of the Society.

Although Quakerism was ideally suited for the Australian outback, it was never taken up. The hundreds of people who attended public Quaker meetings throughout the land, although curious, even approving, never felt led to join the Society of Friends.

Far more significant in the Australian experience has been Convincement: a steady procession of individuals, seekers after truth, who, after a long search, have found their home in the Society of Friends; and if not their home, then an anchorage in their on-going search. These seekers always come by self-motivation. Violet Hodgkin spoke while still in the blush of excitement: "Choose a clerk and give him a twopenny minute book" certainly; but the function of a Friends meeting is more: to be a community sensitive to "the promptings of love and truth".

There were pulses in Australia that the visitor could not discern in one year's observation. From 1902 a General Meeting (an annual residential week) encouraged and enlarged Friends from right across the continent. Annual Young Friends camps were held – the first was at Lawson in New South Wales in 1909 – which did much to strengthen the younger members of the Society in Australia. The General Meeting created the framework for much future activity. More significant was the peace movement. London Yearly Meeting sent to Australia five Young Friends²⁴ to work full-time for the Quaker-originated Australian Freedom League which vigorously opposed the compulsory clauses of the 1909 Defence Act...

The message of this study is that one does not know the sea by riding on the crest of one wave. There were intangible undercurrents at work which a casual visitor, bisecting the whole sweep of time in one quick year, could never discern.

Charles Stevenson

The following table is based on the reading of the minutes of two Australian Regional Meetings. This should be representative of all seven Regional Meetings in Australia. (There are no records for Attenders, some of whom remained so for many years.)

CONVINCEMENTS		MIGRATION		Total membership in Australia*	
Decade	South Australia	Victoria	South Australia	Victoria	
1860s	5	7	91**	68**	350
1870s	1	13	2	22	276
1880s	15	7	19	30	310
1890s	6	14	2	8	517
1900s	5	7	nil	12	504
1910s	15	24	5	20	552
1920s	12	29	11	7	654
1930s	6	11	3	5	683
1940s	15	18	3	10	632
1950s	12	25	11	23	711
1960s	34	19	11	19	824

*This total Membership in Australia by decade is estimated. It excludes Attenders and members of other Yearly Meetings residing in Australia. It is not clear whether Sydney is included in the totals prior to 1887.

** These numbers are inflated because many Friends only transferred their membership after 1861 when London Yearly Meeting officially recognised their Australian Meetings

Table of Friends known to have come to Victoria in the gold rush decade 1851-60, excluding the thirty adults already residing in the Colony

Marital status	male	female
Married (presumably before arrival)	46	42
Known to have married in the Colony	19	7
Single (but if married not specified)	171	12
TOTAL	236	61
Adults: 297, plus 93 children: equals 390		

NOTES AND REFERENCES

- ¹ The title is taken from the Epistle of Iowa Women Friends to Australia, 1873: "... As we have contemplated you in your far off isles, your little meetings widely separated from each other, and thought of lone individuals seldom meeting with any large body of Friends the prayer has arisen that you may in your several localities indeed be germs of good that shall expand into comely and beautiful branches in the garden of the Lord..."
- ² Violet Hodgkin had visited Friends in Australia and New Zealand together with her parents, Thomas and Lucy Hodgkin, and her brother, Lloyd. *The Australian Friend* Fourth Mo 23, 1910, p. 352.
- ³ *Ibid.*
- ⁴ There were two exceptions: Adelaide and Mount Barker, Melbourne and Ballarat.
- ⁵ Letter to Meeting for Sufferings 30 Jan. 1856, Melbourne Monthly Meeting records.
- ⁶ M.R. Sainty and K.A. Johnson, Eds., *Census of New South Wales, Nov. 1828*, Library of Australian History, Sydney 1980, p. 314. It is possible that William Reilly who was transported in 1817 was mentally defective, perhaps alcoholic. On the other hand he may have been recidivist, for he seems to have been transported again in 1836. It is impossible to know without records.
- ⁷ Correspondence 1864 in Melbourne Regional Meeting archives.
- ⁸ C.M.H. Clark, *A History of Australia Vol. III*, Melbourne University Press, 1973, p. 43.
- ⁹ London Yearly Meeting claimed that there were many more Friends in South Australia, giving a precise figure of 112, but the Recording Clerk of the day was confused between what geographically constituted South Australia (thinking that Melbourne was the spot) and what was the named position of South Australia, midway along the southern coastline.
- ¹⁰ Compiled from various list of members held in Victoria Regional Meeting archives.
- ¹¹ There was no Meeting in Perth until 1930.
- ¹² Biographies written by Deputation from Meeting for Sufferings 1874-75.
- ¹³ Walter Robson's Diary (manuscript) 30 Dec 1867 and 20 Jan 1868.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 2 June 1867.
- ¹⁵ Bobbie Oliver, *Peacemongers, Conscientious Objectors to Military Service in Australia 1911-1945*, Fremantle Arts Centre Press, 1997, p. 19.
- ¹⁶ *The Friend* (London) 1879, pp. 248-9.
- ¹⁷ *London Yearly Meeting Proceedings 1914: Testimonies Concerning Deceased Friends*, p. 32.
- ¹⁸ *Traveller Under Concern. The Quaker Journals of Frederick Mackie on his Tour of the Australasian Colonies 1852-55*. University of Tasmania 1973, 5th Twelfth Mo 1854, p. 253.
- ¹⁹ Diary of Robert Lindsey, unpublished.
- ²⁰ The Meetings of Hobart, Melbourne and Adelaide were officially recognised by London Yearly Meeting in 1861.

- ²¹ Testimony of Sydney Monthly Meeting regarding Alfred Allen, 28 May 1918. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 7 August 1917.
- ²² *Brief Sketch of My Life*, by Alfred Allen, unpublished.
- ²³ *Ibid.* (The minute books of Sydney Monthly Meeting have not been available to ascertain the number of applicants of which Allen alludes).
- ²⁴ John Percy Fletcher, Arthur Watts, John Walsh Barry, Alfred Brown and Herbert Corder.

THE ROWNTREE FAMILY AND THE SCHREINER RIOTS

This is the story of how a close-knit Quaker family tried valiantly to present an alternative view to the jingoism sweeping the country in connection with the Boer War at the turn of the nineteenth century. However, before relating the tale of the rioting that occurred in Scarborough during the night of Monday, 12 March 1900, it may be useful to say something about the family background, their business activities, their social conscience and the religious faith that underpinned it, for without this information it is perhaps difficult to understand the venom they faced as a result of their actions.

QUAKER AND FARMING ROOTS

Although, it is recorded that a Francis Rowntree of Stokesley was convinced by John Whitehead between 1650 and 1660, there are no records of a continuing Quaker link and the later Quaker Rowntrees are all descended from William (1727-1798) who joined Friends about 1750 and his wife Hannah ((1734-1801), who settled at a farm known as Riseborough, near Pickering, shortly after they married.¹

William was of Yeoman stock, but he was clearly beginning to rise in the world and in his will he made mention of several properties in Pickering and divided nearly £3000 amongst his children and grandchildren. In addition to this, when William's son, also William (1768-1832), left Riseborough for Settrington, near Malton, the removal included 36 wagon loads of furniture and fittings, together with sheep, pigs, cattle and horses. It must have been a truly impressive sight.²

Throughout the 19th century, the nearby town of Scarborough was growing rapidly, firstly as a centre of the fishing industry with a small, though fashionable Spa and then with the coming of the railway in 1845, as the hugely successful 'Queen of Watering Places', catering for a much wider public. The five Rowntree sons were clearly 'upwardly mobile' and through a network of Quaker apprenticeships, the eldest son, John (1757-1827), eventually became a grocer in Scarborough (which fact is central to this narrative), while another William (1806-1901), the son of Joseph (1774-1811), was the founder of a highly successful drapers and furniture store in the town. This bore his name for well over 100 years. In passing, it is perhaps worth mentioning that the more famous York branch of the

family is in fact a cadet branch of the Scarborough Rowntrees, as John's son Joseph (1801-1859) moved from Scarborough to York and subsequently founded the grocery business at The Pavement, which was the cradle of the world famous Cocoa works.³

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS AND POLITICS

Throughout this period, the widespread branches of the family maintained the closest ties, both through their business and their Quaker activities. To illustrate this, Henry Isaac Rowntree (1838-1883) of York, writing in a delightful tongue-in-cheek fashion to Claude (1882-1959), the newly born son of his *third* cousin Allan (1853-1940) in Scarborough on 13 April 1882, vividly described the family characteristics, which are so important to this narrative.⁴

Dear Claude,

Please excuse my not writing before. Well, how does thou like this world as far as thou has seen it? On the whole thou will find a good deal that is nice in it. What does thou think to thy father and mother? I was pleased with thee for selecting them as thy parents and thought it did credit to thy judgement. From thy mother thou will inherit sweetness and light, from thy father numerous other qualities, whilst as a Rowntree thou will doubtless come in for a full share of the family gifts and graces.

As thou are but young yet, I will tell thee in confidence what very possibly thou might not hear from outsiders, that some of the more striking of these are Humility, Self-abnegation, a willingness to be guided by others, Reticence, Suavity of manner, and an entire absence of a critical or satirical spirit. Seeing then, dear child, that thou has all these advantages, see that thou walk worthy of them, especially do not keep thy mother awake at nights. Hate alcoholism, Tory-ism, Priest-craft and all other concrete forms of sin....

Accept the united love of my wife and myself and believe me, dear Claude to be now and ever (unless thou turned Tory),

Thy affectionate cousin

H.I. Rowntree

From this, it can be seen that the Rowntrees were almost to a man liberal in thought and politics. It was therefore not surprising that the Boer War raised questions in their minds that needed an active response.

THE BOER WAR: A UNITED RESPONSE.

Hope Hay Hewison, in *Hedge of Wild Almonds*,⁵ has vividly described the divisions among British Friends resulting from the patriotic excesses that were created by the Boer War, but from the beginning, the Rowntrees (and almost inevitably, Scarborough Friends as a whole) appear to have been wholeheartedly on the side of peace and reconciliation. Indeed, it is no wonder that this was the case, as the list of members for 1902⁶ indicates, that of the 132 members of the Meeting, no less than 27 were members of the Rowntree family. A further 8 were closely related to them and when Margaret T Metford came from Geneva to marry James Henry Rowntree in 1902, she was surprised⁷ to find that she had joined no less than 7 other 'Mrs Rowntrees' in the Meeting. In this connection, it is perhaps worth noting that at the turn of the century-at least in Scarborough Meeting if not elsewhere-Friends testimony on titles appeared to be largely relegated to their business meetings and in day to day conversation and correspondence she would frequently have been 'Mrs (James Henry) Rowntree⁸'. This surprising acceptance of 'the world's ways' was also reflected in their unthinking attitude towards the place of women in society, who as a result, played virtually no direct part in the forthcoming narrative.

Samuel Cronwright-Schreiner was a British born resident in South Africa and as such was invited by those on the side of peace, to come to England to try to put the record straight with regard to the causes of the war. His London supporters felt strongly that his voice should be heard in as many places as possible and a South African Conciliation Committee was formed in Scarborough⁹ to promote this. Joshua Rowntree (1844-1915) was its president. At this point it is perhaps pertinent to say that this greatly loved Friend had been Liberal MP for the town from 1886-1892 and was still dedicated to its welfare, having deep sympathy for the poor and the oppressed. He was also a valiant worker for peace and shortly after the events related in this narrative, he visited South Africa 'under concern', to obtain greater knowledge of the effects of the war.¹⁰

UNFRIENDLY WELCOME

It is important to point out that although Samuel Cronwright was British born, he added the same name Schreiner to his own when he married Olive Schreiner, daughter of a Swiss German student from Basel. The public therefore assumed from his foreign sounding name,

that he was a Boer. As result of this, he had already had extremely hostile receptions in York and elsewhere and so the auguries were therefore not good for a quieter one in Scarborough. His travelling companion was the economist and anti-war activist. John. A. Hobson.¹¹

The two men arrived in Scarborough during the afternoon of Monday, 12 March and were met by Joshua Rowntree and Richard Cross, a solicitor and prominent member of the Meeting and several other members of the committee. The station was filled with people who were obviously very unfriendly. Frank Rowntree of York was also on the same train and for some reason the crowd thought he was Cronwright-Schreiner. They therefore followed him out of the station booing and hooting, while the welcoming group took the opportunity to get their guests into a cab and to the home of Richard Cross, where they were to sleep.¹²

Arrangements had been made for Cronwright-Schreiner and Hobson to speak on the Tuesday evening at a public lecture at the Old Town Hall on 'The conditions for obtaining a durable peace in South Africa'. As a preliminary to this, there was to be a private 'At Home' at John Rowntree's Café in Westborough on the Monday evening, from 8.30pm to 10.30pm.¹³ To set the scene, it is perhaps of interest to remember that the venue was one of some distinction. Frederick Rowntree, the Architect of the Friends Meeting House and of several local Rowntree residences, was for a time a partner of George Walton in Glasgow, who had also done work in the same city for Charles Rennie Mackintosh, the now world famous exponent of the Art Nouveau style. As a result of this, George Walton had been invited to design the café entrance and interiors and it consequently formed a very fashionable adjunct of John Rowntree's Grocery Shop.¹⁴ A short distance up the street, William Rowntree & Sons drapers and furniture store dominated the scene and was equally fashionable.

However, details of the 'At Home' must have been leaked and as early as 7.00pm groups of people began to assemble in Westborough in the vicinity of the Café. Long before 8.00pm the crowd was of such dimensions that a large body of police was brought in to keep order and to form a cordon round the entrance to the café. The reporter from the weekly *Scarborough Mercury*¹⁵ reported that the crowd mostly consisted of young men who sang 'Soldiers of the Queen', 'Rule Britannia', and 'God save the Queen'. In between, they cheered the army and 'various other celebrities with which this war has tended to familiarise the men in the street'.

When the speakers arrived, they were greeted with shouts of derision. Someone then came along with a Union Jack and there was prolonged uproar. The police tried to keep the crowd clear of the café. Somebody flung a stone at the windows and 'the crashing of glass heralded several hours of smashing and wrecking'¹⁶, the crowd cheering and applauding as each pane of glass was shattered. The chairman of the Watch Committee joined the Chief Constable and they decided together that the promoters of the meeting should be warned of the danger that might accrue if they persisted in holding it.

A CROWD OUT OF CONTROL

Inside the Restaurant, about 35 'ladies and gentlemen' were present.¹⁷ Some tried to ignore what was happening outside and quietly drank tea or coffee. Others were too uneasy to do so. Every moment it was becoming more evident that the crowd outside were becoming more violent and in due course the Chairman of the Watch Committee and the Chief Constable entered the premises and advised Joshua Rowntree that it would not be possible to hold the crowd at bay much longer unless the lights were turned off and the company left the building.

At first there was reluctance to abandon the meeting and miss the opportunity to hear two powerful speakers. The members of the Conciliation Committee went to the first floor to discuss the situation. Joshua Rowntree said that it had been his opinion that the meeting should be held and that the preservation of order should have been left to the authorities.¹⁸ However, it now appeared that the onus of responsibility rested with the committee, as the authorities had advised that matters were beyond their control. He felt that the situation was extremely humiliating and had never thought that such happenings could occur in Scarborough. The matter was then put to the committee and they decided that in view of the dangers, both the 'At Home' and the Public Meeting would have to be abandoned. The lights were then turned off as suggested and those assembled left the building by a side entrance. Most had merely to run a gauntlet of jeers, but some found themselves the objects of physical violence and were knocked down in the street. Joshua Rowntree met a 'well dressed' young man who smashed his hat in and called him "Judas".¹⁹ He subsequently had to shelter in a hotel, but eventually was able to make his way home. Cronwright-Schreiner was however not recognised by the crowd and escaped with the aid of Marion Rowntree to the home of Richard Cross.²⁰ Several members of the committee met there to review the situation and the Chief Constable

also came to advise Richard Cross that his visitors must leave the town early the next morning.

MOUNTED POLICE

Meanwhile, the crowd was so incensed that it continued in its attempts to wreck the café. An imaginative entrepreneur sold stones at six for a penny. Time and again, the crowd pushed its way to the front of the building and time and again the police pushed them back. Two policemen received severe wounds from flying stones and this state of affairs continued until about 11.00pm. At this point, it was decided that half a dozen of the constables would be provided with horses hired from 'Mr Robinson's stud in Westborough' and these created a sensation by riding through the crowd several times. However, a number of people then proceeded to throw stones at the police. As a result of this, some of them were quite badly hurt and they had to be withdrawn. The crowd, having determined that it was impossible to inflict any further damage on the café, then moved up to John Rowntree & Sons Grocers shop and then to W Rowntree & Sons store and broke all the windows that were not protected by shutters, with considerable damage to the goods exposed for sale. The reporter from the *Scarborough Mercury* wrote 'One almost felt appalled at the thought of this fine building—one of the most handsome in the provinces, being at the mercy of a crowd who seemed to have lost self-control'.²¹ He might have added the damage to the beautifully fitted out café was in its way much more tragic, although he was of course not aware of the future reverence that would be accorded to the Art Nouveau style.

TROOPS CALLED OUT

It had now become apparent that a desperate situation required desperate measures. The military authorities at the local barracks were contacted by Mayor and the Chairman of the Watch Committee and shortly afterwards eighty soldiers made their way to the police station, where they were held in readiness. It was then determined that they should 'extend lines' and march to the periphery of the trouble. At this point it was decided to read the Riot Act if the crowd had not dispersed, but it was still hoped that such drastic measures would not be necessary. However, the crowd, instead of making a show of resistance, used the opportunity to demonstrate its support of the Army, Queen and Country by singing 'Soldiers of the Queen' once again and cheering enthusiastically.²²

The soldiers, lead by the Deputy Mayor and the Town Clerk, then marched on to the heart of the demonstration in Westborough, where the Rowntree shops were located. The column halted and the crowd signalled its reappearance by yet another full voiced rendering of 'Soldiers of the Queen'.²³ The Officer in charge, a Captain Fell then used the opportunity to ask the crowd to disperse. "You have sung 'Soldiers of the Queen' and I only wish that you would now let my men go home to bed." It was now 1.30am but the streets still took some time to clear.²⁴

A VENDETTA

Unfortunately, one section of the crowd still wanted to teach the Rowntrees a lesson and they proceeded to the homes of Joshua, and Allan Rowntree, broke their windows and did much other damage. The apprentices who slept over the grocers shop were in some danger, but John Watson Rowntree stayed behind to ensure their safety. When he too arrived home, he found his house had been subjected to a great deal of damage as the rioters had broken down a wall in order to obtain bricks to use as missiles. William and Mary Rowntree, who had reached the then remarkable ages of 93 and 87, had for obvious reasons not attended the At Home. Their son, James Henry Rowntree, who lived with them, had also been unable to do so as he was in bed with influenza.²⁵ However, this did not save them from the wrath of the crowd, as they were clearly prime representatives of the largest Quaker undertaking in the town. The front door was broken open, the gas lamp over it was then smashed and a fusillade of stones followed. However, William and Mary were reportedly sleeping at the rear of the house and due to age (and deafness?) did not hear a thing. The local reporter present at the scene wrote, 'Too much cannot be said in condemnation of the tactics of a mob which might have resulted very seriously for the venerable couple, *whom even the rioters, when in their saner frame of mind must respect and revere*'.²⁶ Indeed, despite the events of the night, when William Rowntree died the following year, the Tory *Scarborough Gazette*²⁷ recorded his good works in a full-page eulogy which vied in length and superlatives with that of Queen Victoria, in the same issue of that paper!

As with most events of this nature, there are variations in the story. Writing his reminiscences in the winter of 1935/6, George Rowntree (1855-1940) says that Mary Rowntree had just given William a cup of hot milk when she heard the sound of broken glass from the other side of the house. He also recollects that while his brother John Watson Rowntree was coming home from the Café, his sister-in-law

Priscilla, had to hold a counterpane over the bed of her invalid son to ward off stones, which broke the window, a jug and a basin. His version of the closing moments of the riot suggests that Captain Fell finally persuaded the crowd to go home by inviting them to sing 'God Save the Queen'.²⁸ He does not however indicate whether they took up his invitation!

At the same time as all this was going on, George was chairing another meeting in the town, which was being addressed by General Booth. He records:

The next morning, I took the General to the station to see him off by train. As the train began to move, a certain Hull solicitor put his head out of the window and shouted, "Rowntree, I am glad of what happened last night. You deserve it." Three Salvation Army young women replied, 'we don't know who you are, but you are no gentleman.'²⁹

AFTERMATH

The day after was, of course, involved with clearing up and counting the cost, a good part of which was covered by insurance. The fashionable and artistic café was indeed in a sorry mess, with lead work to the stained glass windows twisted and broken into all sorts of fantastic shapes. The decorators had been at work for the previous fortnight painting the internal woodwork a 'pure white,' but it had suffered a great deal of damage and its appearance on the Tuesday morning was anything but artistic.. Further up the road at the Grocers shop, a great deal of damage had been done as a result of glass being scattered over the stock and among other things, twenty-seven bottles of fruits, exhibited in the window, had been smashed. There was not so much damage at William Rowntree's Store, but nine of the very large plate glass windows to the shop front were broken, together with fourteen other subsidiary windows.³⁰ In present day terms, the total reported cost of the damage to the Rowntree properties sounds trivial, but it would certainly be equivalent to a five-figure sum in today's money.

The full-page report in the *Scarborough Mercury* of 16 March included large line drawings showing the condition of John Rowntree's Grocers shop and café and W Rowntree & Sons emporium, with the windows dramatically boarded up or smashed. There were apparently rumours of further rioting and almost the entire police force was placed on duty in Westborough, the main shopping street and Newborough, its sister street. Some youths attempted to unfurl flags and banners, but these were confiscated.

Towards evening the military marched into town once again, but there was never any likelihood that their services would be needed. On the whole, it appeared that the authorities had done their best throughout a most difficult twenty-four hours and the fact there was no reported looting is evidence of this.

A QUIET DEPARTURE

In the meantime, Cronwright-Schreiner and Hobson, who had spent the night at the home of Richard Cross, were quietly taken in a cab to join the York train, which was specially stopped for them at Ganton Station, a few miles outside the town. They must have had a rather disturbed night as George Rowntree, in a letter to a sympathiser,³¹ records that about midnight, a small part of the crowd, trying to find the house of William Stickney Rowntree, rang the door of the wrong house—that of Richard Cross. Their spokesman was surprised to find his wife fully dressed at such a late hour, but asked where Mr 'Skreener'(!) was. She replied that she had not gone to the meeting but that she understood that he had left the café and gone somewhere quite safe. She then wished them goodnight, closed the door and joined Cronwright Schreiner, Hobson and her husband in the Sitting Room. The three had all been safely in the house for over two hours. George Rowntree remarks dryly that if the crowd had decided to go to his home—"Riseborough," they might perhaps have had a somewhat warmer reception from his guest—General Booth!

It is not often appreciated how ignorant of world affairs many people were at the time. Another member of the Meeting, Edward Wallis, was accosted by 'a country woman' who said "Well you know I am sorry for them Rowntrees, but what could they expect, whatever did they bring an Afghan(!) down here for." A Mr Barker also remarked to George Rowntree 'with much earnestness that he was delighted for all the damage we had received and only wished more had been done and that Schreiner had been killed.'³²

While most people settled down and soon forgot the momentous happenings of March 12, other did not. Exactly two years later, a clearly disturbed person sent an anonymous postcard³³ to

Rowntree and Sons, reading:

TRAITORS
MARCH 12 1900
PRO BOERS
NOT FORGOTTEN
BOYCOTTED

The lettering was underlined many times and adjacent to it there was a drawing of a gallows on which dangled three stick figures labelled 'WS', 'A' and 'JH'—William Stickney, Allan and James Henry Rowntree, the three brothers and remaining business partners, following the death of their father in 1901.

More than 70 years after the event, it was still the subject of dispute. In 1974, a Mrs Norah Close recollected that in 1900 she lived in the schoolhouse at Scalby, four miles out of the town. She re-called that "a small body of men were creeping—that is the only word for it—past our front gate and up a lonely lane."³⁴ The village reportedly learned later that it had been Cronwright-Schreiner and his party escaping from Scarborough to take refuge at 'Wrea Head,' which was the home of John Edward Ellis and Maria Ellis (née Rowntree). While this makes a plausible and rather exciting story, there is far too much evidence that the truth was more prosaic.

EVENTS ELSEWHERE

After these traumatic events, normality returned bit by bit. However, meetings at Croydon, Halifax, Leeds and elsewhere were cancelled and trouble was reported in other cities. On the Tuesday evening the matter was raised by Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman in the House of Commons when he enquired whether the Government intended to ascertain the extent to which the disturbances had been organised and to take steps to see that they were not repeated. Meanwhile, in Scarborough the law had to take its course where arrests had been made. The *Scarborough Gazette*³⁵ reported that a Mr H J Richards was charged at the Magistrates Court with kicking in a window belonging to John Rowntree & Sons and amazingly, William Stickney Rowntree was 'in the Chair'. George Rowntree on behalf of Messrs Rowntree said that there was no desire on the part of the firm to press charges, as the defendant had been clearly under the influence of drink and was not a party to the riotous proceedings. The bench however felt that it had to uphold the law and the defendant was fined 15s 6d including costs and the cost of the damage. The incident however indicated an attitude of fairness and tolerance on the part of the Rowntrees that was commendable.

A RECONCILING GESTURE

So far as the law was concerned, the Riot (Damages) Act of 1886 allowed tradesmen whose premises were attacked to claim compensation from the County Police Rate³⁶ and it was generally assumed that this course would be pursued. However, the Rowntree

family was of a different calibre and on 21 March, just over a week after the riots, Joshua Rowntree drafted an address 'To the inhabitants of Scarborough' on behalf of those who might have made such a claim. This was then printed and distributed round the town³⁷ and is so remarkable that it merits quoting in full:

Fellow Townsmen.

It is our desire that the sores arising from the recent visit of Mr Cronwright-Schreiner to Scarborough may speedily be healed. As one contribution to this end, we wish to state that it is not our intention to make any claim against the Borough Fund³⁸ for property damaged or destroyed during the riot which occurred on the night of the 'Reception' given by one of our number.

The loss of property, though not light to some of us, is as nothing compared with the peril to which some of those dearer to us than life were that night exposed; or with the loss of free speech won for us by brave men and women of old.

We respectfully submit to our fellow townsmen of all creeds and parties, that the wrecking of buildings and especially midnight assaults on the homes of women, children and aged persons are acts of cruel lawlessness, which nothing can justify.

Enquiries made seem to show that the violence was chiefly the result of the delusion that the visitor to our town, a Colonial fellow-subject of British blood, who had come to lecture on 'The conditions of a durable peace in South Africa' was a Boer, whose life might fairly be taken; and that it was encouraged by some who ought to know better. Edmund Burke's entreaty to his fellows, 'so to be patriots as not to forget to be gentlemen' seems still to be needed.

We are at one in desiring the honour and greatness of our country; we are intensely anxious for the good name of the British Empire amongst the nations of the earth. But we hold that the fostering of prejudice and enmity, even against our foes, is in the long run hurtful to ourselves and that injustice to strangers never leads to justice to our own people.

Our convictions on some great questions are, we know, different from those of our fellow countrymen; but for these convictions we must render our account not to men but to God.

If we are wrong, resort to lynch law will not set us right; whilst it inflicts serious injury on the whole community.

We desire to acknowledge with sincere thanks many expressions of support and sympathy from both strangers and friends. History often has to reverse the popular verdicts of the day and we believe it will reverse the verdict of violence, which has been given against us.—Yours truly,

William Rowntree
Joshua Rowntree
W.S. Rowntree
James H. Rowntree

Allan Rowntree
John Watson Rowntree
George Rowntree
William Smith.

Fine words, but who was William Smith and why did he also suffer damage to his property? The list of members for 1902 indicates that he too was a Friend, although perhaps a more abrasive one than the other signatories. In addition to this, his background was less 'well-to-do', as his father was a Lancashire miner. His mother however, came from an old Quaker family. He had arrived in Scarborough sometime before 1890 as an inspector for the NSPCC, but by 1900 he was the editor and publisher of the *Scarborough Advertiser*. This was roughly equivalent to a modern free newspaper. He often used it as a vehicle for regular publication of his controversial views and for writing scathing attacks on the supposed squandering of ratepayers money by Scarborough town councillors—who consequently disliked him ³⁹

A MERCILESS PARODY

'Advertiser Smith'—as he was generally known in the town—made the mistake of adopting a pro-Boer stance in his paper and when he wrote that the rioters had behaved like 'degraded savages',⁴⁰ it was almost inevitable that there would be some sort of riposte. In due course, this came in form of a merciless 12-page parody on *The House that Jack Built*, which was published anonymously.

The cover entitled *The House where Smiff Dwelt*, shows a bearded spirit (clearly a ghostly Joshua Rowntree!) emerging from a steaming cup of Rowntrees elect cocoa and holding a halo over a kneeling 'Smiff,' while the poem,⁴¹ supposedly composed by a certain 'A. De-Grey Dedsavage' and dedicated to 'my fellow degraded savages,' backs up the thesis that Smith and his accomplices were sanctimonious and out of touch with the real world. In support of this, Smith is shown as a small bearded revolutionary (actually a bit

like Keir Hardie, of whom more anon!) holding a copy of his paper inscribed 'the Gospel according to Smiff.' A text floats behind him, reading—'Lord, I thank thee I am not as other men,' while the poem concludes with advertisements on behalf of Smith, 'Local Helper of the Lord.'

WIDER REACTIONS

Searches through the Minutes of Scarborough Preparative Meeting for the Spring of 1900 reveal little and it must therefore be assumed that the Meeting was not a formal supporter of the Conciliation Committee. However, Minute 7 of 15 April 1900⁴² records the receipt of Minutes from Southport and Bradford Preparative Meetings and gratefully acknowledges 'these expressions of kindly feeling and Christian sympathy towards those of our members who were sufferers through the regrettable incidents of a few weeks ago.' About 150 letters of sympathy were also received by the Rowntree family from every corner of the country, many of them from the leading Friends and others of the day. Keir Hardie wrote somewhat melodramatically from Glasgow:

Pardon a stranger for expressing his sympathy with you in the dastardly outrage to which you have been subjected at the hands of the easily mislead mob. Having experienced, on a small scale, somewhat similar treatment. I feel sure that your uppermost feeling is not anger but pity for the misguided people who only see an enemy in those who save them from participation in the great crime now being perpetrated, which can only bring sorrow to the nation. I have often tried to picture the scene outside the judgement hall in Jerusalem when the maddened multitude..... wildly shouted 'Not this man but Barabbas,' but I never dreamt of having to endure the horror of having the scene re-enacted before my eyes and can only pray as he did, 'Father forgive them for they know not what they do'.⁴³

CONCLUSION

It is perhaps worthwhile to ask why it was that the Rowntree family was the subject of so much venom. Certainly, their success in business gave them the freedom to spend time on activities of their own choosing, but their strong principles and social conscience could on occasion lead to unpopularity. In particular, Joshua Rowntree, who was a successful solicitor, had come to an agreement with his partner that he should reserve a certain amount of his time for social

and allied work.⁴⁴ This enabled him to serve as an Member of Parliament, together with his brother-in-law and closest friend, John Edward Ellis, while in addition to his work as a Justice of the Peace, he had also been Mayor. Two other Rowntree signatories were subsequently Mayors and throughout a good part of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries there were always Rowntrees on the Town Council. In addition to this, they were Justices of the Peace, Magistrates, Poor Law Commissioners and Directors of the Gas and Water Companies. They were also involved with countless other voluntary endeavours, working for the improvement of the town.⁴⁵

In view of all this worthy activity, the events of 12 March 1900 must have come to some as a wonderful opportunity to 'have a go' at members of a family who sometimes seemed 'holier than thou,' or simply to settle old scores. For others, there may have been a more straightforward political clash. In support of this, a letter writer in the *Scarborough Mercury*⁴⁶ observed that the riots 'appeared to be a remnant of that bitter feeling that has been shown against the victims of the disturbance from time to time by a section of their political opponents, who consider they have old scars to wipe out.' Indeed, writing almost exactly 100 years after these momentous events, it is perhaps true that the Rowntrees may have exercised a degree of power and perhaps, paternalism that would not be acceptable today. Their hearts were however in the right place and they clearly understood that they were responding to an event of the most profound significance to the future history of Southern Africa. For this we must give thanks.

Metford Robson

NOTES AND REFERENCES

A good deal of the following information was readily available to the author from manuscripts, books and cuttings in the possession of his family. He does however appreciate that if time had permitted, his reseaches might have benefited from greater reference to official sources.

¹ C Brightwen Rowntree, *The Rowntrees of Riseborough* (The Sessions Book Trust, 1986), p vii. First published 1940 and updated by E Margaret Sessions in 1979, 1982 and 1986.

² Ditto, p. ix

³ Ditto, p. 2/A2

⁴ Ditto, p. x

- ⁵ Hope Hay Hewison, *Hedge of Wild Almonds* (James Currey, London 1989), Chapter 8, British 'Quakers and the Public Debate' and Chapter 9, 'The Quaker Debate,' pp117-123.
- ⁶ List of Members for Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting, 1902.
- ⁷ Memory of A Esther Robson (1904–), last surviving grandchild of William Rowntree (1806–1901).
- ⁸ According to AER (daughter of Margaret T Rowntree).
- ⁹ *Scarborough Mercury* 16 March 1900, p. 5
- ¹⁰ S E Robson, *Joshua Rowntree* (George Allen & Unwin 1916), Chapter vii, pp. 117–123.
- ¹¹ Hope Hay Hewison, *Hedge of Wild Almonds*, Chapter 8, p.117
- ¹² George Rowntree, *Reminiscences* (Published privately), 1936), p. 41.
- ¹³ *Scarborough Mercury*, 16 March 1900, p.5.
- ¹⁴ Nikolaus Pevsner, *Studies in Art, Architecture and Design* (1968),p. 178 (Re-printed from the *RIBA Journal*, 3rd Series XLVI, 1939).
- ¹⁵ *Scarborough Mercury* 16 March 1900, p.5.
- ¹⁶ Ditto.
- ¹⁷ Ditto.
- ¹⁸ Ditto.
- ¹⁹ George Rowntree, *Reminiscences*, p. 45.
- ²⁰ Information from undated unsigned typescript letter to an unknown recipient, but references clearly indicate that it was from George Rowntree.
- ²¹ *Scarborough Mercury*, 16 March 1900, p. 5.
- ²² *Scarborough Mercury*, 16 March 1900, p. 5 and cutting from *Scarborough Gazette*, undated, but clearly March 1900.
- ²³ *Scarborough Mercury*, 16 March 1900, p.5.
- ²⁴ George Rowntree, *Reminiscences*, p. 46.
- ²⁵ According to A. Esther Robson (daughter of James Henry Rowntree).
- ²⁶ *Scarborough Mercury*, 16 March 1900, p. 5. *author's*. This warm-hearted comment is of special interest to the author, as it refers to his great grandparents, while their son James Henry Rowntree was his grandfather.
- ²⁷ *Scarborough Gazette*, 31 January 1901.
- ²⁸ George Rowntree, *Reminiscences*, p. 46.
- ²⁹ Ditto, p. 47.
- ³⁰ *Scarborough Mercury*, 16 March 1900, p. 5.
- ³¹ Typescript letter from George Rowntree, as referred to in ²⁰ Rumour had it, incorrectly, that Cronwright-Schreiner and Hobson were spirited out of the town in a Rowntree's furniture van.
- ³² Ditto.
- ³³ Postcard written in black ink with a script pen, date stamped 12.3.02.
- ³⁴ Newspaper cutting from *Scarborough Evening News*, 5 March 1974.
- ³⁵ Cutting from *Scarborough Gazette*, undated, but clearly March 1900.
- ³⁶ Ditto. The reporter notes with regret that any claim from the County Police Rate would also impose a burden on the North Riding ratepayers.
- ³⁷ Several copies of the original address are extant.
- ³⁸ The relationship of the 'Borough Fund' to the 'County Police Rate,' as clearly defined in the *Scarborough Gazette*,³⁶ is not clear. Perhaps the signatories were

referring to a Borough allocation within the Police Rate?

- 39 Undated Letter from W G Whincup of Builth Wells, grandson of 'Advertiser Smith,' in response to an article in the *Scarborough Evening News* of 5 March 1974.
- 40 Ditto.
- 41 *The House where Smiff Dwelt* (publisher/author unknown) 1900. Several copies are probably extant.
- 42 Minute Book of Scarborough Preparative Meeting, 1885–1904. Ref DQR 10/6, Brynmor Jones Library, University of Hull.
- 43 George Rowntree, *Reminiscences*, p. 48.
- 44 S E Robson. *Joshua Rowntree* (George Allen & Unwin 1916), Chapter 2, p. 33.
- 45 Information from various sources in The Scarborough Room, Scarborough Public Library and 'Whose Who in Yorkshire' 1912.
- 46 Newspaper cutting from the *Scarborough Mercury*, 25 March 1900.

PILGRIMAGE: DOROTHY RICHARDSON (1873 - 1957) AND QUAKERS

Dorothy Richardson's groundbreaking autobiographical novel *PILGRIMAGE*¹ is one of the landmarks of modernist writing. Few fictional heroines can be identified as closely with their author as Miriam Henderson with Dorothy Richardson. In what she preferred to call a pool rather than a stream of consciousness she sought the active soul in crystallisations of inner and outer experience, snapping each moment like a camera taking itself, trying for and sometimes achieving , cosmic clicks, those rare moments when seeker and sought are one. The pilgrimage is circular - the moment at which the thirteen volumes² of the novel end is also the point of time at which she began writing. *PILGRIMAGE* spans the years from about 1890 to 1912 though Dorothy Richardson was working on it for most of her long life, the distance between what she was writing about and the time of writing becoming greater and greater. She found her leitmotif in her first published book *QUAKERS PAST AND PRESENT*³. Herself something of a freelance mystic, she was drawn to Quakers because, as she says in her introduction:

To the present writer George Fox appeals not only by the inherent strength of his mystical genius, not only because amongst his fellows in the mystical family he is, characteristically, the practical Western layman, the market place witness for the spiritual consciousness in every man, but also because he is essentially the English mystic.....he stands for liberty, for trust and toleration in a day of unchallenged religious and civil antagonisms and authoritarianisms. He stands for love, for the essential harmony of the creation in a day when warfare was the unquestioned and "divinely appointed" method of settling international differences and litigation and debate the accepted steersmen of private relationships...This reality that we ignorantly worship, the mystics have declared to us as goodness, beauty and truth. Fox called it God in man, the seed, the divine light.....

It was her Russian-Jewish emigré friend Benjamin Grad⁴ whom she loved but felt unable to marry, who introduced her to Quakers. In

1896 he took her to the London Meeting House in St.Martin's Lane attended by many distinguished members of the Society of Friends: J.Bevan Braithwaite, Edmund Harvey, Frederic Taylor, Silvanus Thompson FRS, Anne Warner Marsh - a Philadelphia Friend - and Mary Jane Fox. Though the people at the meeting struck Dorothy as truly religious - she was particularly impressed by the status of equality accorded to women - this chance visit remained an isolated occasion for the time being. It was not until about six years later in 1902, after an affair with H.G.Wells ⁵ ended disastrously in a miscarriage and took her to the verge of a nervous breakdown, that she made contact with Quakers again. Again it was through the unfailing friendship of Benjamin Grad that she was introduced to the Penroses ⁶, a Sussex Quaker farming family.

They lived at Mount Pleasant, Windmill Hill ⁷, Herstmonceux. (Mount Pleasant stood on Windmill Hill until 1967 when it came down to make room for a housing estate.) The family had originated in Cornwall, moved to Ireland in the 17th century when they became Quakers, went from Ireland to Norfolk, then to London and from London to Sussex where they ran a flourishing market garden. There were eight children, six boys and two girls. At the time Dorothy Richardson joined the family, three of the six brothers - George, Robert ⁸ and Arthur ⁹ were unmarried and living at home. The younger girl had died, the elder Sara Eliza ¹⁰ was also unmarried and living at home. She was a capable, all-round sort of woman, had done missionary work in London and ran a school for local children in Herstmonceux known as SCHOOL HOUSE. She was also fond of music, a fondness that was not quite in keeping with the strict Quaker practice of those days. The penultimate volume of *PILGRIMAGE: DIMPLE HILL* contains the best account I know of in fiction of Quaker faith and practice.

Of the brothers, Robert, fourteen years older than Dorothy, was the one to whom she was most immediately drawn. Arthur, only four years older, was a less dominating figure than his brother. He married Maud Kitson in 1914 and continued living at Mount Pleasant running the nursery garden. He also continued the warmth and welcome of the Quaker household. It was this warmth that was most important to Dorothy who longed to be part of a family. Though she had been born, the brightest of four sisters, into a well-to-do family, her father went bankrupt and her mother committed suicide before Dorothy was twenty. She had had to survive on her wits: as teacher, governess, dentist's receptionist, reviewer, translator and essayist. It is difficult today to gauge the courage of a girl of seventeen in 1890, brought up to the good life, who took herself off by herself to teach

in Germany. She survived, but she never recovered from the social disorientation.

The Penroses placed trust and confidence in her right from the start so that what were to have been a few weeks' recuperation turned into a three year stay. With them she was released from the hurly-burly of London life (which she loved when she was in top form) with its intellectual, professional, emotional and sexual demands. Here, in the tranquillity of the Sussex Downs, she gained an insight into the principles and proportions of Quaker life. The family gave her small jobs to do and encouraged her to think of herself as one of them. It was a healing relief to be staying with a family of all whom liked and respected each other, whose way of life, though far from opulent or adventurous, ran smoothly without financial threat. Geared to the farming year, they did not torture themselves with questions about the meaning or origin of life, they drew their strength from a closely knit Quaker community. Dorothy Richardson flourished in the serene rhythm of their days, gradually finding her way into it:

She was ready to raise her head. Inexperienced in this form of grace before meat she raised first her head to discover whether the other heads were still bent and found them all, as if with one consent, recovering the upright. As if here, too, as in every human activity, there seemed to be, was, a concrete spiritual rhythm...everybody had emerged from the silence luminous...but within the depths of the lamplight, moving at the heart of its still radiance, was the core of the shared mystery; far away within the visible being of light.¹¹

She went with the family to the Herstmonceux Meeting House with its small well kept garden which had been the Quaker burial ground. Built in 1734, it stands on Bedlam Green, so called after the asylum which was once there. Persecution of members of the Society of Friends had died down. In 1723 nineteen Sussex Quakers had signed an Affirmation at Lewes Quarter Session and were no longer imprisoned for refusing to take an oath. George Fox had first visited Sussex in 1655, and the first recorded Quaker Meeting took place at Beeston in 1662. By the close of the seventeenth century Herstmonceux had begun to be the focal point of Quaker activity in that part of the country.

Dorothy Richardson had been brought up in the Anglican Church though she had never felt completely at home in it. In the Quaker Meeting she felt less of an outsider than she had ever done in Church:

The room was utterly still. Half-way through the drawing of a deep releasing breath, she was obliged to hamper the automatic movements of her limbs that with one accord were set on rearranging themselves. Stealthily, her body straightened to sit upright, her head moved to relax the supporting muscles of the neck and came to rest a little bent... Even a beginning of concentration held an irresistible power. The next breath drew itself so deeply that she could prevent its outgoing from becoming a long, audible sigh only by holding and releasing it very gradually. It left her poised between the inner and the outer worlds, still aware of her surroundings and their strangeness and of herself as an alien element brought in by the sympathetic understanding of the Quaker enterprise... To remain always centred, operating one's life, operating even its wildest enthusiasms from where everything fell into proportion and clear focus. To remain always in possession of a power that was not one's own and that yet one's inmost being immediately recognised as its centre... be still and know. Still in mind as well as body. Not meditating for meditation implies thought. Tranquil, intense concentration that reveals first its own difficulty, the many obstacles and one's weakness and leads presently to contemplation, recognition... Reaching down once more into the featureless inner twilight, she found the outdoor world obtruding, assailing her ears with mid-morning chirrupings, the sudden chackle of a scared thrush in flight across a garden, sounds from distant farms and meadows. External contemplation, divorced from sympathetic imagination, had closed the pathway to recovery of the state whence a fresh beginning would be possible. Each effort to be still brought the outdoor world to mind. After all, it was her first Sunday... Who was she, that she should expect to find herself all at once in the presence of God?¹²

The outer eye continues its explorations sharpened by the concentrated attention of the gathering, nor do thoughts turn entirely inwards. The moment the silence is interrupted by words she feels something snap. For her, the verbal ministry of Meeting usually struck a discordant note.

Dorothy Richardson emerged from her association with the Penroses a fully fledged writer. They had considered her a Quaker in all but name but she never took the decisive step of joining the Religious Society of Friends. As a writer, she held herself intact in a perceptive state of mind in order to transmute into experimental fictional form everything that had happened to her. She was a seeker

and often she was as surprised as others by the form her writing took. When she was writing she travelled *down to that centre where everything is seen in perspective, serenely*.¹³ Throughout her far from carefree life she never allowed her sensibilities to be blunted, her sense of wonder remained undiminished. Her friend John Cowper Powys, to whom *DIMPLE HILL* is dedicated, put his finger on the pulse of her writing when he says:

Dorothy Richardson is our first pioneer in a completely new direction. What she has done has never been done before. She has drawn her inspiration...from the abyss of the feminine subconscious. Thus in estimating the ultimate value of her *PILGRIMAGE*, the task of appreciative criticism itself becomes an experiment in spiritual metempsychosis.¹³

Quakers had set Dorothy Richardson free to find and fulfil herself as a writer. In the end her writing remained her church.

Eva Tucker

NOTES

1. *PILGRIMAGE*: Virago Modern Classics 1979 ((Paperback).
2. First Editions: *Pointed Roofs* (1915) Duckworth
Backwater (1916) Duckworth
Honeycomb (1917) Duckworth
The Tunnel (1919) Duckworth
Interim (1919) Duckworth
Deadlock (1921) Duckworth
Revolving Lights (1923) Duckworth
The Trap (1925) Duckworth
Oberland (1927) Duckworth
Dawn's Left Hand (1931) Duckworth
Clear Horizon (1935) J.M. Dent & Cresset Press
 Collected Editions: *PILGRIMAGE* (including *Dimple Hill*) 4 vols 1938, J.M. Dent & Cresset Press; A. Knopf, New York.
PILGRIMAGE (including *March Moonlight*) 4 vols 1967, J.M. Dent; A. Knopf, New York.
3. *QUAKERS PAST AND PRESENT* (1914) Constable
4. Michael Shatov of *PILGRIMAGE*
5. Hypo Wilson of *PILGRIMAGE*
6. The Roscorlas of *PILGRIMAGE: Dimple Hill*
7. *Dimple Hill* of *PILGRIMAGE*
8. Richard of *Dimple Hill*
9. Alfred of *Dimple Hill*
10. Mary Rachel of *Dimple Hill*
11. *Dimple Hill*, (Virago Modern Classics), p. 469.
12. *March Moonlight* (Virago Modern Classics, Vol. 4), p. 619.
13. J.C. Powys, *Dorothy Richardson* (Village Press 1931), p. 8.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

In Fox's Footsteps, a journey through three centuries. By David and Anthea Boulton, Dales Historical Monographs, 1998.

In Fox's Footsteps, as the cover states, is about three journeys: George Fox's journey from Pendle Hill, Lancashire to Swarthmoor Hall, Cumbria, in 1652; the authors' attempts to retrace that journey in 1994, and an intellectual journey from 1652 to the present day in which David and Anthea Boulton interestingly discuss the relevance of George Fox's ideas for people living in the twentieth century.

The authors make clear at the outset that the book 'is not an academic treatise', nevertheless they reveal a sound understanding of recent Quaker historiography and the book would be a useful starting point for Friends wishing to know something about the Society's early history; as the authors state, 'we have made use of recent "revisionist" research into Quaker history . . . Quaker readers who have derived pleasure and inspiration from a more traditional telling of the tale may not always welcome our reinterpretations and revised emphases' (p. 1). During the re-telling of Fox's journey the authors discuss the radicalism of early Friends, not only in terms of their religious ideas but also their social and political beliefs, for example the refusal to follow social customs, denoting respect to 'superiors', and, in 1659, Fox's extreme proposals for a new order. They also lucidly explain some of the main early Quaker beliefs and how these upset prevailing ideas, for example the notion of the inner light, Quaker attitudes to the bible, and their view of 'hireling', or paid ministry.

The Boultons' own journey has several points of interest, not least the vivid descriptions of the many topographical changes and continuities since the seventeenth century. Some of the passages describing the natural environment are beautifully written and very evocative. Related to this, the photographs included in the middle of the book are very useful, especially for those who may have little knowledge of the areas described. One slight criticism of this part of the book stems from some of the more personal anecdotes related by the authors, which do not always seem terribly relevant, or of sufficient interest for the reader to warrant inclusion, one example being the description of the car (pp. 12-13). Also, the casual references to Fox, such as 'our George', though in keeping with the overall style, occasionally jar and detract from the book.

The final chapter provides a fascinating discussion of the relevance of Fox's ideas to the modern world; the authors suggest for example, that 'Fox can speak from his own condition to ours. . . because his intense and profound dissatisfaction with his own world bred the spirit of enquiry which produced the humanist Enlightenment and our culture of diversity and pluralism' (p.213). The essential change has been the move

from a world where 'truth' and authority stemmed from external agencies, such as the church and state, to one based more on subjective, individual experience, the latter of course being the central message of George Fox and early Quakerism.

Caroline Leachman

David Boulton, *Gerrard Winstanley and the Republic of Heaven*. Foreword by Michael Foot. Dent: Dales Historical Monographs, 1999. £9.00.

Specialist students of early Quakerism have plenty of material available on the contemporaries of George Fox and his companions, but it has been difficult to know what to recommend to general readers. The Aporia Press has performed an admirable service in recent years by publishing selections of the works of several of these characters, but a fair degree of background knowledge is still needed.

Gerrard Winstanley is one of the most interesting of this group, both as an early exponent of communistic principles and, to Quakers, as a contemporary of Fox with some very similar ideas. David Boulton's admirable small book performs a much needed service for Friends and others looking for an introduction to Winstanley, in that it is well-researched, well-written, and assumes a minimum of previous knowledge. Boulton gives a useful brief introduction to the revolutionary situation from which both Winstanley and Fox emerged, together with an account of what is known of Winstanley's early life. Details of Winstanley's 1648 publications are welcome, as the Aporia edition (*Gerrard Winstanley: Selected Writings* ed. Andrew Hopton. London: Aporia 1989), includes only pamphlets written at the height of the Digger movement in 1649-50.

The main part of Boulton's book consists of the history of Winstanley's Digger colony at St George's Hill near Walton-on-Thames in 1649-50, interspersed with extracts from Winstanley's writings. To Winstanley, the Parliamentary victory was but the first stage of the revolution, for the poor people were still in economic bondage. God had intended the earth to provide a livelihood for everyone, and the occupation and planting of common land at St George's Hill, backed up by Winstanley's ability as a publicist, was to be a public sign to Parliament and to the country of what still needed to be done. Most *JFHS* readers are probably familiar with the outline of these events, but the full story of Winstanley's tussles with local churchmen and gentry, and complications caused by invading Ranters, is well worth reading.

After the collapse of the colony Winstanley continued to publish his ideas for the ideal commonwealth, but the English revolution had already moved on, and his later life is obscure. Boulton has traced his return to respectability as country gentleman and churchwarden, and his

death in 1676 as a Quaker, by which time the Quakers themselves were no longer revolutionaries. The only known earlier meeting between Winstanley and Quakers occurred in 1654, when he talked with Edward Burrough and Francis Howgill in London soon after the beginning of their mission to that city but the absence of any sequel suggests that George Fox and Margaret Fell disapproved of this contact.

Boulton thinks it likely that Winstanley did have some influence on Quakers in their very early stages, citing as evidence similarities in both style and content between Quaker and Digger publications, and the fact that Winstanley's works predate any Quaker publications. It is true that Fox probably did read Winstanley's pamphlets, but it is questionable whether he was seriously influenced by them. The Quaker movement had existed in the Midlands for some six or eight years before the *annus mirabilis* of 1652, and there are indications that Fox's ideas were crystallising at the same time as Winstanley's, that is, in 1647-48. The public activity of both began in 1649, Winstanley attacking landed property with his Digger colony, while Fox in Nottingham attacked the parish ministry and its teachings with such vigour that he was arrested and imprisoned. As Boulton rightly says, while the ideas of Winstanley and Fox overlapped, each had his distinctive emphases. Quakers would have no truck with the established church, but only their wilder elements inveighed against the institution of private property, and it is probable that this bias was established at the outset of Fox's preaching career, rather than, as Boulton suggests, a compromise with his well-to-do supporters.

Boulton's last chapter goes beyond the bounds of pure history and considers the lasting influence of Winstanley and others who have proclaimed the earth as a common treasury. The Diggers colony failed, but the dream survives.

Rosemary Moore

The Quakers in English Society 1655-1725 by Adrian Davies. Clarendon Press, Oxford 2000. Pp.xvi,262.

The title of this book is misleading though that should not detract from the interest of its content. Adrian Davies has based his monograph on his thesis about the Quakers in Essex 1655-1725 and this remains the dominant element in his text. While he certainly does not deal solely with Essex the bulk of the detailed evidence used is derived from that county. Numerous (eighty or so) papers and books published after the completion of his thesis have been used and are cited in the full and valuable bibliography. This demonstrates the lively continuing study of seventeenth century English dissent and the author uses comparisons

between Friends and other dissenters as well as some from minority groups in contemporary culture. The terminal date on the title is also unhelpful, any reader hoping to learn much about the first quarter of the eighteenth century, nominally over one third of the book's scope, will be disappointed. There are some references to the eighteenth century and the statistical tables about literacy rates, occupations and the urban and rural distribution of Friends, all covering Essex, do cover the whole period of the title but generally the text is far fuller on the period to 1690.

The main theme of the book is the relationship between the Quakers and wider society and it contends that Friends were less isolated from contemporary society than suggested in earlier studies. It is thus an examination of the social consequences of religious belief. Essex was chosen as the basis of the study because of the abundance of extant records and in the hope of providing new insight since the emphasis of earlier detailed studies had tended to be on the North West of England. Considerable attention is given to the challenges posed by Friends to the established church through behaviour in church, non-payment of tithe, marriage and burial and to English society in general by plain dress, behaviour and language especially the refusal to take oaths. All this covers well-known ground with illustrations from Essex records. It is useful to have the basic picture reinforced or qualified by the detailed study of such matters as wills and behaviour at the death bed. Throughout his book Adrian Davies approaches his subject imaginatively and sections such as that dealing with body language, posture and deportment benefit from modern work in other disciplines.

Davies argues that the primary aim of Friends' discipline was to restore Friends to righteous participation in the Society and not to maintain its reputation. He claims that Friends were more tolerant in Essex than elsewhere of those who had erred, readily accepting the return of contrite members. He does not see the causes of Quaker decline towards the end of his period and afterwards in the increasingly rigorous application of the discipline. In Essex as a whole Quaker population reached a peak (in the period covered by this book) in the decades 1675-84 and 1695-1704 with the final decade 1715-24 showing a marked fall in numbers. This is thought untypical and may be influenced by the considerable Quaker population in Colchester which seems to affect other aspects of Essex Quaker history. Davies sees decline as connected with the pattern of assimilation into local society and of accommodation with civic authority as the authorities on their part came to accept the sincerity of Friends.

There is a useful discussion of Quaker literature, literacy and education. Well chosen examples illustrate the fear of the Quaker publishing enterprise held by the clergy and other dissenters. The

evidence for the ownership or use of Quaker literature by individual Friends is patchy and what is produced here will help in building up a more coherent national picture. Literacy amongst Friends in Essex was high compared with that of the entire population of the country and that of Quaker women especially so. There are interesting comments on Quaker schoolteachers in Essex.

Davies is particularly interested in the antecedents of Essex Quakerism, suggesting that in some areas the growth of Quakerism was strengthened by an earlier underlying tradition of dissent. There is evidence earlier in the seventeenth century of members of congregations wearing hats in church to demonstrate disapproval of elements of the service though this cannot be directly connected with Quaker views on hat honour.

In conclusion the author argues for a later start 'to the second period of Quakerism' than others had previously suggested, choosing the 1670s rather than 1660 or 1667. This is followed in his view by a fifty year period of adjustment to society and integration within it, providing the underlying circumstances for continuing decline in membership. Some quoted evidence from York supports him in this. Here he takes issue with Richard Vann's *The Social Development of English Quakerism. 1655-1755* (Cambridge, Mass. 1969) where the picture is of a developing and greater separation from broader society because of standardisation in behaviour and a drive for uniformity amongst Friends. This leads Davies to begin to question some of the general assumptions of recent historians about the evolution of religious sects. Davies's study in depth of primary Essex Friends after their initial heady years is of great interest and points to the need for more local studies to support a new consideration of the development and survival of English Quakerism. Without them it is difficult to say just how exceptional Essex was and how much our earlier conclusions must be qualified by Adrian Davies's work here.

David J. Hall

Hidden in plain sight Quaker Women's Writings 1650-1700

A volume on Quaker women's writings from the second half of the seventeenth century. These women and their writings have been unknown to contemporary Quakers. However, Friends House Library was extremely helpful to the researcher (Rosemary Radford Ruether) when she spent the spring of 1986 on sabbatical leave in London researching these religious writings.

The book is a Pendle Hill Publication and the four editors: Mary Garman, Judith Applegate, Margaret Benefield and Dortha Meredith - all American.

The time at which these writings came to birth was a time when sub-cultures could emerge - the first movement of Feminist Theology, and of course, the area about which we are particularly interested, the Society of Friends; particularly formed by the part women had to play. The first prophetic mode was that of the Baptists but it is said a more disciplined order from the 1660s, the Religious Society of Friends.

The 'prophets' were aristocratic, middle- and working-class, cultivated, dissenting, religious groups. (I shall never, ever forget Jonathan Dales's Swarthmore Lecture about our call to 'dissent', for I went to Manchester afterwards to talk to him about it).

These Quaker women, our forebears, were known and thought of themselves as 'prophets'. As according to their times, their inspirations came from the Bible. They preached a God of wrath, although convinced war was wrong. Their ideas about God were according to their age - going often to prison for their faithfulness to what they believed. 'Judgement' was part of their concept of God. (I might add, not mine).

The paradox - which also I find - the choice to 'belong' and be encompassed in God's love and compassion, bringing a good life and comfort, does not remain so. Maybe because one is involved in the struggles to bring others to a better life, but also because one is human and suffers the 'slings and arrows of outrageous fortune' in many ways, and like these women we now consider, constantly need to renew ourselves and turn to the Light. Their lives were far from easy, and I wonder how I would survive under such conditions. However, I don't think our times are easy either and our circumstances quite different.

The women, whose writings are given in this volume, might have been THE FORGOTTEN WOMEN but the researchers make a plea for them to be read, brought forward and recognised.

A large portion of *'Hidden in Plain Sight'* is given to long testimonies and makes very challenging reading. For example there are writings by Sarah Jones, Mary Penington, Margaret Fell, Esther Biddle and Rebecca Travers. In the former parts of the book space is given to words about more recent writers - but they are paying tribute to early Quaker women and it may encourage the reader to know something of this.

In 1689 Quaker Women sent to Parliament '7,000 names of the Handmaids and Daughters of the Lord'. The author of the introduction to those collected petitions was MARY FORSTER.

This book, *Hidden in Plain Sight*, stresses that there are strong links with the Feminist Movements of the 1960s and 1970s. Rosemary Redford Ruether argues for links with humanist scholars and early Quaker women, who might be seen as the forerunners of early modern feminism.

Our early Quaker forebears were prominent because they showed leadership that other traditions had not enjoyed. One invincible truth which all of them may have found hard to say, because they paid so

much attention to the Scriptures, is that of George Fox, 'If there were no scriptures, Christ is sufficient'. Perhaps their times in prison helped them to affirm that truth.

Anne Ord

The Murrays of Murray Hill by Charles Monaghan (Brooklyn, N.Y., Urban History Press, 1998;166 pages; \$25.).

Until they were discarded, among the most highly favoured- and socially acceptable- telephone prefixes for Manhattan was Murray Hill. Murray Hill-the area south of Grand Central Station from Madison Avenue over to Park Avenue-included some of New York's 'best' addresses. Very few would know that Murray Hill owes its origins to a Quaker merchant family, the Murrays whose house, Inclenberg, was there.

Charles Monaghan says that he intended 'to rescue from historical obscurity a merchant family that played an important role in New York City in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century.' But more particularly Monaghan wanted to focus our attention on the life of the family's eldest child, Lindley Murray, who became the largest-selling author in the world during the first four decades of the nineteenth century.

In *Chambers Biographical Dictionary* we read in a small entry that Murray was 'an American grammarian, born in 1745 at Swatara Creek, Pennsylvania. He practiced law, made a fortune in New York during the War of Independence and then, *for health reasons* (my emphasis) retired to England and bought an estate near York. . . .' For long, due to Murray's own *Memoirs* my underlining was assumed to be the reason that Murray spent the last half of his life in Yorkshire. But as any Yorkshire man knows, you do not choose the county as a place of retirement for health reasons! The truth which Monaghan established-and the most interesting element of his book-is revelatory.

However, there is a basic problem with this book which more clearly focusing on the most interesting element, the life of Lindley Murray, would have avoided. As it stands, there is far too much repetition as the author goes back and forth to other members of the family. The organisation therefore becomes clumsy and disjointed. Perhaps this was the fault of the publisher who wished that the book fit the category of New York family history.

This a pity as Lindley Murray's story is the one thread which holds it together and attracts our attention. Here is both a remarkably achieving and almost tragic tale at the same time: a life sacrificed for his family; more specifically for his father, Robert. Robert Murray rose from an

immigrant miller in the second half of the eighteenth century to become one of New York's leading merchants. For Quakers it is a familiar story, but this time the setting is not Philadelphia but New York. As with the better known Philadelphia Quaker merchant-aristocrats, there is the conflict between money and morals, a matter Monaghan could have more fully developed.

Robert Murray was raised a Presbyterian, but when he married the Quaker Mary Lindley he abandoned his Scots-Irish heritage and joined the Society of Friends. After a short time in North Carolina (with Quaker Lindley links) the family settled in New York. As Monaghan writes: 'It was a shrewd choice. New York was on the verge of taking its place as one of the premier cities of the British Empire.' From 1754 to 1759 the custom value of English manufactures rose from £87,499 to £483,952, and Robert Murray took advantage of the situation. Among his businesses was a substantial shipping tonnage; by 1764, four vessels and a strategically located wharf.

Young Lindley was raised into a sophisticated household which was accustomed to international travellers. Though Robert was a member of the New York Meeting for Sufferings, he sent his son not as expected to the William Penn Charter School in Philadelphia but a newer establishment founded by Benjamin Franklin where Lindley was exposed to the fashionable Enlightenment ideas of the eighteenth century. The drudgery of the counting house never appealed to him and against his father's wishes 'the budding intellectual was striving to become a man of his age, a man of the Enlightenment.' In 1767, Lindley began a legal practice in New York and married Hannah Dobson, a Friend from Flushing, Long Island.

The couple moved briefly to England but returned in 1771 as events gathered momentum toward the approaching break of the colonies from England. A year before the fateful 1776 an episode occurred which affected the future cause of Lindley's life. One of his father's ships, the *Beulah* (named for Lindley's sister), tried to break the American blockade of goods from the mother country. The affair was worsened by a cover-up which was later exposed and gave a clear impression that the Murrays were against the patriot cause. The *Beulah* was ordered out of the New York harbour; under cover of darkness the ship's two tons of goods were unloaded off Staten Island.

Monaghan makes a good case for the Murrays' political neutrality. Quaker resistance to involvement in war was coupled with Whiggish sentiments. Though by all rights it should have been his father who was forced to leave New York, it was Lindley who became the sacrificial lamb to bear the brunt of public anger over his father's actions.

Lindley's exile from New York first meant that he decided to settle in

Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. A logical choice as the Moravians who founded Bethlehem like the Quakers were pacifists, and due to their convictions were also suspected as loyalists. Lindley and his family were extremely happy there, but pressure continued against those who were suspected of having supplied the British war effort. Many loyalists saw their businesses and lands confiscated by the new regime.

To protect his family an arrangement was made with the political authorities that Lindley would be sent into exile abroad. And so on 1st December 1784 on a Murray ship, the *Betsy*, Lindley left America forever and settled in York. Why York? Aside from its Quaker connections, Lindley wanted to avoid the squabbling and recriminating life of American loyalist exiles in London who spent much of their time trying to obtain compensation from the British government for property they had lost in America. To his credit, Lindley Murray never applied for relief.

Recording these events in their correct manner is the chief strength of Monaghan's volume. Murray's own *Memoirs* were not written until 1806-1809, three decades after 1776. As Monaghan says: 'His refusal to discuss the American Revolution is the central absurdity of his *Memoirs*.' But it is understandable why. By this time Lindley had become a very important writer of the textbooks which came to affect tens of millions of pupils, many of them in America. Not only did he want to protect his family's reputation in America, but also his own as a mentor for American youth.

At age 41, driven from his homeland, Lindley Murray's most important years were at a comfortable home in Holdgate, just outside York. Like his father and his brother John, Lindley became a force in moves to abolish slavery. His books were many: numerous grammar and exercise texts which, until the advent of Noah Webster, were the most widely used in America. But it was his anthology, the *English Reader*, which was his most successful production. More than 5,000,000 copies were sold in America before the Civil War. Importantly as Monaghan states. Through its selections, the book helped create an intellectual climate that led to wide acceptance in the North of anti-slavery ideas.' Abraham Lincoln certainly thought so. He said that the *English Reader* was 'the best school book ever put in the hands of the American youth.' Ironically, this is despite the fact that the text does not contain a single selection by an American author!

Though he was plagued by ill health for much of his life (and something of a hypochondriac) Lindley Murray died in York at age 81. He was buried at Friend's burial ground at Bishophill in York as was John Woolman (who also wrote children's primers). I can not resist two small corrections: Monaghan calls Woolman 'the famed American Quaker missionary. . .' Missionary is a highly inappropriate appellation

for Woolman. On page 96 Monaghan mentions 'Newbern, North Carolina, a Quaker stronghold.' The spelling is New Bern and it was never known for many-if any-Quakers. He must be thinking of New Garden (Greensboro) which always has had a sizeable Quaker population.

Despite the previously noted difficulties with its format, *The Murrays of Murray Hill*, especially with its story of the remarkable Lindley Murray, makes fascinating reading.

David Sox

QUAKERS AND THE ARTS 'Plain and Fancy'

David Sox

Sessions Book Trust, York, England in association with Friends United Press, Richmond, Indiana, U.S.A. £12.00

Although this is an 'Anglo-American' perspective, to the English reader it will appear as a definitely American book. None-the-less it extends the knowledge of Quakers and the Arts, albeit perhaps focused more on the written word and painting than on music and drama, and the painters are mainly American, as also are the poets. It is interesting to observe that whilst the early American artists had generally distanced themselves from Quakers before achieving fame, those from modern times (particularly from the theatre) have embraced the Society with little or no close experience of Quakers except, perhaps, having attended a Quaker School.

A problem with the early American artists as recorded in this book is the plethora of names. They have to be sorted: take Benjamin West, who succeeded Joshua Reynolds as President of the Royal Academy; there are lots of other Wests (not artistic in any particular way). Later on, to name but a few, lots of Pearsalls and Logans and Frys (Roger Fry was one of the 37 nieces and nephews to benefit under the will of the well known chocolateer). It is also surprising how many American placenames (well, perhaps not so surprising) echo English ones, at time necessitating checking back to see which country one is in. This helter skelter of names and places give an impression that the book might have been written in an enthusiastic hurry.

Benjamin West, Edward Hicks, James Fenimore Cooper, Walt Whitman and John Greenleaf Whittier have biographical chapters to themselves. The Leaveners, the Quaker Festival Choir and Orchestra, the *Gates of Greenham*, the Tapestry and the Quaker Fellowship of the Arts receive mention, as do Joan Baez, Judi Dench, Sheila Hancock, Paul Eddington, Ben Kingsley and Henry Scott Tuke (this is when the English start coming in). This encourages further exploration of the book's subjects.

There had been 'intimations of art' since the early days, although, presumably, not recognised as such. Margaret Fell herself penned an elegy in 1669 - *A Few Lines concerning Josiah Coale*, who had been martyred the year before for preaching the radical religion, and George Fox himself recalls singing for joy, and singing did occur in some Meetings for Worship, although, surely, it could not be recognised as Art.

We are reminded of Elizabeth Fry's hesitation about the traditional policy of the Society of Friends toward Music: "My observation of human nature and the different things that affect it frequently leads me to regret that we as a Society so wholly give up delighting the ear by sound. Surely He who formed the ear and the heart would not have given these tastes and powers without some purpose for them." - perhaps a nostalgic backward glance at her own liberal childhood at Earlham Hall.

Wordsworth in his preface to the *Lyrical Ballads* writes "Poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings: its takes its origin from emotion reflected in tranquillity" To poetry, add the other Arts. The awakening drifted into Quaker life during the latter part of the eighteenth century, at a time when the only pictures, if indeed any, gracing the walls of the Quaker home were Benjamin West's "Penn's Treaty with the Indians", the terrible plan of the slave ship developed by Thomas Clarkson, and, curiously, the plan for Ackworth School in Yorkshire, England. Although not recording that 'The Peacable Kingdom of the Branch' might also have been found in some houses, David Sox intrigues us with the story of the many versions of the original picture by Richard Westall painted by Edward Hicks (with the original grapevine replaced by a watery one, see p35 for the explanation).

In 113 pages of text the author provides a wealth of pleasant and informative reading. But there is a puzzling version of Whittier's lovely verses from the *Brewing of Soma*, 'Dear Lord and Father of Mankind' in the form of a hymn quoted from the Hymnal of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., Greenwich, Conn.1940, no.435, which is a mishmash of at least two poems.

The footnotes are listed at the end of the book, which is a great aid to uninterrupted reading. The index is inadequate, merely showing the names of those mentioned in the book. A compensation is the many illustrations featured throughout.

Patricia R.Sparks

Memoirs of SENATOR JAMES G. DOUGLAS
Concerned Citizen, Edited by J. Anthony Gaughan
University College Dublin Press. £24.99

James G. Douglas (1887-1954) was a committed Irish nationalist and a committed Quaker. His *Memoirs* are fairly short and do not go much further than 1923 but shed intriguing light on the vital years of 1916-1923 since he was a "man close to the centre of much that was going on; a secondary, but strategically placed, actor in the delicate, dramatic and dangerous infancy of Irish independence." (Brian Farrell, Foreword) In his carefully researched and sympathetic 45 pages long Introduction the Editor J. Anthony Gaughan (priest of the archdiocese of Dublin) gives us an insight into Douglas' later years also.

James Douglas was born in Dublin into a "fairly strict" Quaker business-family and was "imbued by the Quaker ethic of honesty, service and hard work." (Ed.) He too became a, successful, businessman but his deepest interest always veered towards Anglo-Irish politics. In his youth he was a Home Ruler but the experience of the Easter Rising convinced him that "Home Rule could never satisfy Irish national aspirations." Being "by training and conviction a pacifist" he believed the Rising "to be an act of folly." However the execution of the nationalist leaders changed his disapproval into sympathy: "Before long I became a convert to the ideals of Sinn Féin but still opposed to a policy of the further use of force." In 1917 he became involved in an attempt to reconcile Sinn Féin and the Irish Parliamentary Party and in the preparation for an Irish Convention. However the information came "that the Ulster unionists were determined to prevent any settlement other than on their own terms and that consequently the Convention was largely a waste of time." The American committee for Relief in Ireland was formed in 1921 with strong Quaker representation. Acting under the name of the Irish White Cross it supplied very considerable but strictly non-political, non-sectarian aid with Douglas as its honorary treasurer and honorary organising secretary. "In that work he not only displayed moral and physical courage, but his knowledge of business and his resourceful mind helped to add to the fund and ensured that the moneys were put to the best practical use." (Tribute to Senator J.G.D.1954) This work brought him into contact with Michael Collins and the two men formed a working relationship based on mutual respect and trust. Collins wanted him to be the chairman of the committee which prepared drafts of the first Irish constitution but Douglas, feeling unqualified, decided to be a member only. At one stage of their relevant discussions "both agreed, albeit for different reasons, that the proposed constitution should not authorise capital punishment" (Ed.) The *Memoirs* gives us a short but convincing glance of how, by the power of his personality and by the

power of silence, Collins dominated the negotiation with the British government. He briefly stated his case and then completely refused to be drawn into argument. "By 1922 Douglas clearly enjoyed the Irish leader's fullest confidence" and Collins' assassination touched him very deeply. Part of his "Encomium" reads: "I have rarely met a man who made you love and respect him, almost whether you wanted to or not, like Michael Collins - his enthusiasm and energy were contagious - you felt you wanted to work for Ireland, and in the way he wanted you to work."

Douglas was elected Senator in 1922 and he acted with "characteristic dedication to duty and considerable expertise." (Ed.) Towards the end of the civil war, in April 1923, de Valera from his hiding-place sent for Douglas, - a pro-Treaty Senator! to discuss a possible settlement with the Cosgrave government. In spite of the obvious dangers, Douglas went without hesitation and, on de Valera's request, had several, - unfruitful, - encounters with Cosgrave. The last pages of the *Memoirs* are taken up with Douglas' concern about the partition and with its resulting economic problems. He organised a meeting with Belfast-businessmen and "it was quite obvious that most, if not all, would like to see some arrangement which would allow free trade over the whole of Ireland." However, in no time, the *Belfast Newsletter* attacked the men who came to the meeting and threatened to name them all if any further meetings were held. Everyone saw that "it would be useless" to continue and so the *Memoirs* end.

Brian Farrell remembers James Douglas as "Well known in the early stages of the State, he faded in the collective memory". It is timely therefore that Anthony Gaughan in his outstanding work re-establishes the measure of the man who made a lasting contribution to the foundation of the Irish State.

Marie Andreanszky

"Two Weeks in May 1945" by Clifford Barnard. Sandbostel Concentration Camp and the Friends Ambulance Unit. Quaker Home Service. £10. Pages 132.

The Friends Ambulance Unit will be known to readers of these pages from recent reviews of *"Pacifists in Action"*, the world-wide experiences of FAU members in the Second World War, and Grigor McClelland's *"Embers of War"*, letters from a Quaker Relief Worker in war-torn Germany. Fifty-five years on, time is necessarily running out for the approximately 1300 young men and women conscientious objectors (there were never many more than 800 at any time in the Unit) who found the FAU was the right place for them as pacifists in a world at total war, so first hand accounts of their experiences must be drawing to a close.

Clifford Barnard was eighteen when he joined the FAU in 1943 and after training was one of fifty-five members who came to Europe in December 1944 to do Relief Work under the auspices of the British Red Cross and the Civil Affairs Branch of the Army, later to become Military Government. On 2nd May 1945, hot on the heels of the uncovering of Sandbostel Concentration Camp by the advancing Army, which was still being resisted by the German Army, he entered the Camp as part of the small Number 2 FAU Section. They were confronted with a scene which would have taxed Danté or Hieronymus Bosch to describe. The Camp was not an extermination camp, in that it had no gas ovens, but eight thousand largely civilian prisoners of many nationalities were confined in conditions which gave them little chance of survival if liberation had not arrived. Typhus, typhoid and tuberculosis were widespread, the barely living were mixed with the dead and initially deaths continued at probably one hundred and fifty a day.

Such appalling scenes became familiar to a shocked world from the news films of the time and have also been thoroughly documented. This book relies on contemporary letters, diaries, memoirs, articles and reports including extracts from the HMSO publication *"The Medical History of the Second World War"* and *"Report on Sandbostel"* from *"One Young Man and Total War from Normandy to Concentration Camp: a Doctor's letters home"* by Captain Robert Barer M.C., R.A.M.C." There is also a German History of the Camp.

The main response to a catastrophe of this magnitude had, in the circumstances of the time to come from the Army, who were on the spot in the numbers and with access to the resources needed. These were enormous and some are carefully documented in this book.

Against this background the life saving work of the handful of FAU men was dedicated to the point of exhaustion, and sometimes dangerous (although the author writes with expected modesty), but necessarily small in relation to the whole. However, the book is a further contribution to the honourable history of Quaker war relief work and the recent David Irving libel trial has been a reminder that these horrors cannot be too well recorded while living witnesses survive.

A unique feature of the book is correspondence from German women who as girls were drafted in to help in the Camp and responded to a newspaper advertisement by the author in 1997. They confirm in detail the appalling conditions and give their reactions to the traumatic experience. Traumatic it was for all involved and the author records how he, horrified, stunned and angry, momentarily contemplated leaving the FAU to join the Army, in spite of his beliefs firmly rooted in a Christian, Quaker, pacifist upbringing. Even after all these years perhaps, as the author hints, writing this book has been a necessary catharsis for him.

Duncan Jones

Living Threads. Making the Quaker Tapestry. By Jennie Levin
Quaker Tapestry at Kendal 1998. Pp.64. £7.99.

Stitchwork to illustrate scenes from Quaker history was a novel idea in 1981. Ann Wynn-Wilson had the vision to develop and drive it forward, willing the Quaker Tapestry into vibrant and compelling life. Its 77 crewel-embroidered panels celebrate the insights and experience of Friends from their starting point in 1652. The evolution of this unique community project has been well-researched by Jennie Levin for her aptly-titled and absorbing "Living Threads". She charts the Tapestry's progress through its first fifteen years and acclaims the far-sighted volunteers who saw it through in faith,

The scheme's potential for promoting fellowship among its helpers was perceived by Quaker Home Service, alert to the spiritual health of Friends. Their grant of £1,000 enabled Ann Wynn-Wilson to have suitable fabric woven, choose 120 rich colours for the embroidery and present a finished panel to Friends' Yearly Meeting at Warwick in 1982. Here a committee and secretary came forward, and the Quaker Tapestry Newsletter was set in motion. By the following year 404 suggestions for the panels had been received as interest grew at home and overseas.

Research had to be accurate. A broken tower of Lichfield Cathedral, as known in the seventeenth century, and a ship's rigging from the same period are among countless details scrupulously checked before cartoons went forward. Unity of design was essential: 14 artists contributed. Panels were divided into three, title above, main thrust in the centre and additional detail below, this sometimes adapted from children's drawings. Lettering followed agreed spacing. The title panel and the last were linked by spiral designs to suggest the spiritual energy of Friends in their worldwide organisation. Local themes were covered, too. For a book dedicated to Ann Wynn-Wilson it is fitting that, of her many designs, one that she also embroidered and found spiritually helpful should be selected for the cover.

Simple stitches were ordained to meet beginners' needs and yet allow the skilled to be creative. Unpicking did not mar the sturdy cloth. The "Quaker stitch" devised for the lettering was new even to the Royal College of Needlework. Over time embroidery groups were set up and experts emerged, self-financing workshops were held and there were several Tapestry holidays at home and abroad. The text gives details, dates and venues and notes a growing community spirit.

The Tapestry reached exhibition standard. Copyright over the panels' reproduction for money-making cards and calendars had to be secured. Charity status achieved this by 1986 and allowed for exhibitions to be held in any part of the world, "extending knowledge of Quakerism within and beyond the Religious Society of Friends". The first showing of

all the panels was in Aberdeen during the Yearly Meeting there in 1989. In 1990 they were seen at London's Festival Hall and in Bayeux, and there was the first performance of "Talking Threads", reflecting the work in drama. Panels graced the House of Commons and went all over Britain and Ireland and to Quaker colleges in the United States in 100 exhibitions. Catalogues, guides and a Tapestry book were published. Outreach was exceeding expectation. It was time for the Quaker Tapestry Collection to have a permanent centre, and this was opened at Kendal in 1994.

"Living Threads" served "Kendal's treasure" well, a rewarding and rounded account, rich in anecdote and detail, straightforwardly relaxed in style. There are close-ups of stitches and design and photographs of Tapestry devotees, whose stories speak for all involved in its production and display. Their combined skills are hugely impressive - fundraising, publishing and tapestry-conservation to list a few. 4,000 Friends in 15 countries helped to create a meaningful representation of the Quaker heritage. The author is discerning of its impact on their lives. In the telling words of J.R. Wilkes, "It is in the act of remembering that people establish their identity and find their meaning". *

Jennie Levin writes from the heart to give *"Living Threads"* its immediate and wide appeal and the Quaker Tapestry her warm and moving tribute.

Stella Luce

*From *"The Friends' Quarterly"* of 1982 and quoted by Margaret H. Simpson in *"The Quaker Tapestry"*, an article appearing in *"The Friends' Quarterly"* of April, 1986.

Faith in Action
Quaker Social Testimony
by Jonathan Dale and others
QHS, April 2000 £10
ISBN 0 85245 320 5

This book is in two parts. The first is an extended essay by Jonathan Dale building on his 1996 Swarthmore Lecture in which he explores the Quaker understanding of testimony. The second half is a collection of recent Quaker writings suggesting that Quakers as a whole support the arguments presented.

Jonathan attempts to define a testimony. It would have helped if he had been more explicit in doing so. The book tries not to offend but as a result it is necessary to struggle to find its conclusions. So, Jonathan does not explicitly reject the view that a testimony must have withstood the

test of time and seasoned use before it can be recognised as such, but he does so in practice. However, this is only apparent because he accepts that Quakers have an, as yet unnamed, testimony to the Earth as creation that is now in the course of development.

This is welcome and puts testimony in the context of our history. Early Friends bore testimony, but did not have the experience of history. Eventually the best suggestion as to the nature of testimony I could find is that it “describes a witness to the living truth within the human heart as it is acted out in everyday life”.

The trouble with this is that the key element of this definition, the faith that gives rise to the action, is given scant attention in this book. Social testimony, it is argued, is demonstrative, political, affirmative, dissenting, and evolutionary. However Jonathan is unable to differentiate social testimony, which he sees as faith in action, from testimony which by corollary he would seem to see as faith. So all our testimonies appear to be social, whether they be on peace, truth, simplicity, equality, community, creation or economic values (the last two definitely not appearing in all lexicons yet). Further, he considers all require action. Jonathan explicitly states that being is not enough, doing is all. He continues with a quite explicit rejection that spirituality is paramount.

Here the view presented appears to be quite at odds with Quaker history. Early Quakers were driven by faith. They did live their testimony. Our first generation are perhaps the only Quakers of whom we can be sure of this. Equally we can be sure that those who sat through many hours in meeting, waiting on the Light did not put their spirituality second, it was the motivation and purpose of their lives. Is restoration of our testimonies to be at the price of this aspect of Quaker life?

Clearly many in the Society today would not agree. Rex Ambler, who is much quoted in the book for his writings on theology and ecology, has since 1996 been responsible for the Experiment with Light, which marks a definite return to our early spiritual roots. Alastair Heron has questioned over the last few years whether we are a religious society or a friendly society. Most would still argue the former, and those who do not (as it seems Jonathan Dale might) must justify in that case what distinct contribution the Quaker aspect of their work adds over that of any political pressure group, an issue this books fails to address, let alone resolve.

Why ultimately was I so disappointed by this book, when at its core it presented so much with which I wanted to agree? I think there are two reasons. Whilst much of the book is argued with obvious passion some aspects lack true conviction. It is easier to live in a council estate, without a fridge and car and to wear clothes until worn out when this is a choice.

Secondly, this is ultimately a depressingly materialistic book. If our faith is to be defined by our abstinence, as this book would appear to argue, then it is a secular not a spiritual pursuit.

This book reflects the spirit of current Quaker dilemmas. Some argue our task is to rediscover our faith. Others our action. But we live in our present and can only change our future. Maybe we need to discover that. Then we can live in faith, which is action in itself.

Richard Murphy

NOTES AND QUERIES

Bristol & Gloucestershire Archaeological Society

Gloucestershire Record Series, Volume 13

Bishop Benson's Survey of the Diocese of Gloucester 1735-1750

Edited by John Fendley. 2000, pp.xx, 204

"The edited text presents the content of all the six manuscripts of Benson's survey that are known to have survived. Letters in bold-face indicate those manuscripts.

- A G.D.R. 285B(1), dating from 1735
- B G.D.R. 285B(3), dating from 1735-8
- C G.D.R. 397, dating from 1743 and later
- D G.D.R. 381A, dating from 1750
- E Gloucester Cathedral Library MS.52, dating from 1751
- F G.D.R. 393, dating from 1751.

The edited text is based on D, and shows the significant variants in the other alternations made to them and to D."

GLOUCESTERSHIRE MEETINGS 1735-50

This survey would have been from the reports of parish officers in response to questions from Thomas Benson (1689-1752) bishop of Gloucester from 1735.

Friends' meetings seem to have been picked up in reports of the following parishes:

p.26 Didmarton & Oldbury

32 Pucklechurch

35 Chipping Sodbury

49 Thornbury (and a school)

58 Horsley [this parish is about a mile south of Nailsworth]

Minchinhampton

60 Painswick

67 Tetbury

- 90 Gloucester "A silent meeting"
- 94 Cheltenham
- 98 Tewkesbury
- 108 Stoke Orchard
- 113 Chipping Campden [I suppose Broad Campden, in Butler 1999]
- 142 Stow on the Wold
- 149 Cirencester

There is a fair sprinkling of Friends in the other parishes' returns. Note Henry Blandford (p.27), Mrs Vandewall (p.130) and Quaker lords of the manor (same page), and the Bellers patrons at Coln St Aldwyn (p.158).

	Dissenters	FOREST DEANERY	[source when <u>not</u> D is indicated]
page			
11	1.16	Newent	A Presbyterians 6. Quakers 1.
21	1.31.1	Alvington	A Papists 1. Presbyterians 1. Quakers 1.
22		HAWKESBURY DEANERY	
22	2.1	Alderley	A Anabaptists 3. Quakers 3. C (Anabaptists 3. Quakers 3 deleted) Anabaptists 1
23	2.3	Bitton	. . . Quakers 1.
26	2.9	Didmarton & Oldbury	Anabaptists 5. Quakers 9, meeting.
27	2.10	Dodington	A Absenters some. ²
	n.2 -	At the swearing-in at the episcopal visitation of 1744 Henry Blandford affirmed as a Quaker. G.D.R.C3/13.	
28	2.12	Frampton Cotterell	Presbyterians 1. Quakers 1. A Quakers 5. Absenters 1. C . . . Quakers 1.
30	2.14	Horton	A Papists 16. . . Quakers 4. C . . . Quakers 2 <u>deleted</u> .
	2.15	Iron Acton	Presbyterians 6. Anabaptists 2 Quakers 2
31	2.16	Marshfield	. . . Quakers 2. A Presbyterians 200. Quakers 2.
32	2.17	Pucklechurch	A Quakers: meeting. 'Number of Quakers not specified'
34	2.19	Siston	Anabaptists 10. Quakers 5. A Anabaptists 10. Quakers 5. Absenters some.

- | | | | |
|----|--------|------------------|---|
| 35 | 2.20.1 | Chipping Sodbury | Anabaptists 40, meeting.
Quakers 30, meeting.
A . . . Quakers 40, meeting.
Absenters some. |
| 38 | 2.26 | Wapley | Quakers 6.
A Quakers 4. Absenters some.
C Quakers 5 overwriting 4. |
| 39 | 2.29 | Yate | Presbyterians 15. Quakers [a]
family.
A Quakers 5. Absenters some. . . |

DURSLEY DEANERY

- | | | | |
|----|------|-------------------|---|
| 42 | 3.4 | Coaley | Presbyterians 9. |
| 46 | 3.10 | Newington Bagpath | A Presbyterians 9. Quakers 1.
A Presbyterians 7. Anabaptists 3.
Quakers 2.
C Presbyterians 7. Anabaptists 3.
Quakers 2 <u>all deleted</u> . |
| 47 | 3.12 | Rockhampton | A Presbyterian 2. Quakers 2.
C Presbyterian 2. (Quakers 2
<u>deleted</u>). |
| 49 | 3.15 | Thornbury | Papists 1. Presbyterians 40,
meeting. Quakers 30,
meeting (C and school <u>deleted</u>).
A Papists 1. Presbyterians 40.
Quakers 50, meeting
school. Absenters 30 masters and
mistresses of families. |

STONEHOUSE DEANERY

- | | | | |
|------|------|----------------|--|
| 52 | 4.1 | Avening | Presbyterians 50, meeting.
Anabaptists 6. Quakers 20. |
| 53 | 4.2 | Bisley | Presbyterians 70, meeting.
Quakers 1 family. |
| 58 | 4.13 | Horsley | . . . Quakers 30 families, meeting.
A . . . Quakers 150, meeting.
Absenters some. (21 Presbyterians,
64 Anabaptists, 30 Quakers.
A great cloath[in]g place <u>added</u> .)
C . . . Quakers 30 families (150
<u>deleted</u>), meeting. |
| 4.14 | | Minchinhampton | Presbyterians 70. Anabaptists 17.
Quakers 40. A . . . Quakers 40,
meeting. |

60	4.16	Nympsfeld	Anabaptists 3. Quakers 3.
	4.17	Painswick	Independents 100, meeting. Anabaptists 15., Quaker 4 families, meeting., A . . . Quakers 50, meeting house. . . .
67	4.26	Tetbury	. . . Quakers 22, meeting A . . . Quakers 22, <u>an overwriting</u> , meeting house.
	4.28	Woodchester	Presbyterians 4, Anabaptists 2, Quakers 5.

GLOUCESTER DEANERY

68	5.2	Ashleworth	Quakers 2., A Independents 2. Quakers 3, C Independents 2 <u>deleted</u> . Quakers 2 <u>overwriting</u> 3. Quakers 5.
70	5.5	Churchdown	
90	5.37	City of Gloucester	. . . Quakers 20. A silent meeting.

WINCHCOMBE DEANERY

91	6.1	Ashchurch	26 Sabbatarians and a meeting on Saturdays, Quakers 1. A Independents 26. Quakers 2. Sabbatarians 24, meeting house. C 26 Sabbatarians. . . Quakers 1 <u>overwriting</u> 2. . . . Quakers 2.
	6.2	Badgeworth	. . . Quakers 2.
94	6.6	Cheltenham	. . . Quakers 30, meeting.
99	6.15	Tewkesbury	. . . Quakers 50, meeting. A . . . Quakers 50, meeting. . . .
102	6.20	Winchcombe	Papists 1 family. Quakers (C 1 <u>overwriting</u> 2) 1. A Papists 15. Quakers 4. A woman teaches school but scholars are all of the church. [<u>i.e.</u> the woman was a dissenter but her pupils were Anglican]

DEERHURST PECULIAR

104	7.2	Deerhurst	A Presbyterians 6. Quakers 1. C Presbyterians 6. (Quakers 1 <u>deleted</u> .)
107	7.7	Tirley	Anabaptists 1. Quakers 1. A . . . Quakers 3.

BISHOP'S CLEEVE PECULIAR

108	8.1.1	Stoke Orchard	Sabbatarians 1. Quakers have a burying place., A Anabaptists 15.
-----	-------	---------------	---

Quakers 1. Small meeting from other places in a small thatched house. . . . C Small meeting of Quakers from other places in a poor thatched house deleted; Quakers have a burying place. One Sabbatarian.

CAMPDEN DEANERY

112. 10.6 Bourton-on-the-Hill A . . . Quakers 2. C Anabaptists 1. (Quakers 1 deleted).
- 114 10.8 Chipping Campden Independents 15, meeting. Quakers 3, meeting. A Anabaptists 10, meeting deleted. Independents 15. Quakers 3, meeting.
- 117 10.15 Ebrington Quakers 3 C Presbyterians 1 deleted. Quakers (deleted 4) 3.
- 122 10.25 Shenington Quakers 1 family A Quakers 15. C Quakers 1 family overwriting 2 families.
- 123 10.28 Todenham Quakers [a] family. A Quakers 4 C Quakers (4 deleted) [a] family.

STOW DEANERY

- 130 12.6 Bourton-on-the-Water Anabaptists 200 and meeting. Quakers Mrs. Vandewall. C . . . Quakers Mrs. (Vandeville deleted) Vanewall. A and B A Quaker is lord of the manor, lives at Kensington C Quaker lord of the manor who lives at Kensington. His name is Partherick [Partridge] deleted. . . . Mrs. Vandewall deleted. . . .
- 131 12.6 Broadwell A Presbyterians 2. Quakers 1. C . . . Quakers 1 deleted.
- 138 12.17 Oddington Anabaptists 10. Quakers 2 families. C . . . Quakers 2 (overwriting 1) families. . . .
- 142 12.26 Stow-on-the-Wold . . . Quakers 2 families, meeting. A . . . Quakers 15, meeting. . . . C . . . Quakers 15 deleted; 2 families, meeting.
- 143 12.29 Lower Swell Anabaptists 2 families. Quakers 1. A Anabaptists 15. Quakers 1.

CIRENCESTER DEANERY

- 149 13.7 Cirencester . . . Quakers 100, meeting. . . .
 A . . . Quakers 100, meeting. . . .
- 154 13.18 Harnhill Quakers 3.
- 157 13.25 South Cerney Anabaptists 4. Quakers 4.
 A Anabaptists 4. Quakers 4.
 Absenters 10.

FAIRFORD DEANERY

- 158 14.1 Coln St. Aldwyn Patron: Messrs Ingram and Elliot,
 Quakers, lessees of dean and
 chapter. B Mr. Fettiplace . . .
 Bellers . . .
 C Thomas Church, Fettiplace and
 Theo. Bellers . . .
- 161 14.5 Fairford C Quakers 3 deleted.
- 162 14.8 Lechlade Quakers 2.
 A Quakers 2.
 D . . . Quakers 1 overwriting 2.

Russell S. Mortimeerr

'Women's Speaking Justified'

Kate Peters contributes a paper to *Studies in Church History*, volume 34, *Gender and Christian Religion*, 1998, entitled "'Women's Speaking Justified": women and discipline in the early Quaker movement, 1652-56'. She writes that the paper 'is an examination of gender dynamics in the very early Quaker movement' and argues that the public position of Friends on the spiritual equality of women was coupled with the development of strategies to control their public role.

Bernard Barton

In his article "Constable and the 'Woodbridge wits'" in *The Burlington Magazine*, September 1999. Professor F.G. Notehelfer discusses Barton as one of three early collectors of the painter John Constable's work.

Bernard Barton's bookplate

In *The Bookplate Journal* v12 no1 March 1994, pp. 41-4 John Blatchley writes about Bernard Barton (1784-1849), the Quaker poet, and his bookplate. The bookplate was based on that of his father John Barton. Together with his love of poetry and pictures it may have given Friends an unfavourable impression of Bernard's worldliness.

David J. Hall

ERRATA
VOL. 58 NUMBER 3

Editorial

Page 205 line 9 - William R. Aitkin should read William R. Aitken.

Thomas Bevill Peacock, Quaker Physician

Geoffrey O. Storey

Contents and page 276 - Geoffrey A. Storey should read Geoffrey O. Storey.

Supplements to the Journal of Friends Historical Society

21. AN ORATOR'S LIBRARY. John Bright's books. Presidential address 1936 by J. Travis Mills. 1946. 24pp., 50p
22. LETTERS TO WILLIAM DEWSBURY AND OTHERS. Edited by Henry J. Cadbury. 1948. 68pp. £3.00
24. THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY OF EARLY FRIENDS, Presidential address by Frederick B. Tolles, 1952. £1.00
28. PATTERNS OF INFLUENCE IN ANGLO-AMERICAN QUAKERISM. By Thomas E. Drake. 1958. £1.00
29. SOME QUAKER PORTRAITS, CERTAIN AND UNCERTAIN. By John Nickalls. 1958. Illustrated. £1.00
32. JOHN WOOLMAN IN ENGLAND, 1772. By Henry J. Cadbury. 1971. £2.00
33. JOHN PERROT. By Kenneth L. Carroll. 1971. £2.00
34. "THE OTHER BRANCH": LONDON Y.M. AND THE HICKSITES, 1827-1912. By Edwin B. Bronner. 1975. £1.25
35. ALEXANDER COWAN WILSON, 1866-1955. By Stephen Wilson. 1974. £1.00
- FHS, Occasional Series No. 1 MANCHESTER, MANCHESTER AND MANCHESTER AGAIN: from 'SOUND DOCTRINE' to 'A FREE MINISTRY'. By Roger C. Wilson. 1990. Members £2.00, Non-Members £3.00.

Back issues of the *Journal* may be obtained for £2.00 each issue plus postage.

Journals and Supplements Wanted

FHS would be glad to receive unwanted copies of back issues of the *Journal* and of the Supplements. Address to FHS, c/o The Library, Friends House, London NW1 2BJ.

ISSN No. 0071 9587

E. & E. Plumridge Ltd, Linton Cambridge