

*The
Journal of the
Friends' Historical
Society*

Volume 57 Number 1

CONTENTS

Page

- 1 Research Note on Judge Thomas Fell (1598–1658). *Richard G. Bailey.*
- 5 Some Incidents in Early Worcester Quakerism. *C.D. Gilbert.*
- 13 “Thy Real Friend George Skeffington”: Quaker and Salmon Fishing Pioneer in Eighteenth-Century Newfoundland. *Hans Rollmann.*
- 21 Convincement and Disillusionment: Printer William Bradford and the Keithian Controversy in Colonial Philadelphia. *David L. Johns.*
- 33 The Carroll Family: A Cork Quaker Business Dynasty. *Richard S. Harrison.*
- 52 Dress and Deportment of Monmouthshire Friends c. 1655–1850. *Richard Allen.*
- 57 Further Thoughts on Leeds Friends and the Beaconite Controversy. *Mark A. Ellison.*
- 74 ‘The Ancient Way’: the Conservative Tradition in Nineteenth Century British Quakerism. *Edward H. Milligan.*
- 102 Recent Publications.
- 110 Notes and Queries.

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

President: 1994 Jean E. Mortimer 1996 Maurice J. Wigham
 1995 Thomas C. Kennedy 1997 H. Larry Ingle

Clerk: Howard F. Gregg

Treasurer: Jon E. North

Editor of the Journal: Gerald A.J. Hodgett

Annual Membership Subscriptions due 1st January (Personal) £5 US \$10 (U.K. Institutional) £8 (Overseas Institutions) \$20. Subscriptions should be paid to the Treasurer and Membership Secretary, FHS, 32 Bolehill Road, Bolehill, Wirksworth, Derbyshire, DE4 4GQ. Orders for single issues and back numbers should be sent to FHS c/o The Library, Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ

THE JOURNAL OF THE FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Communications should be addressed to the Editor of the *Journal*
c/o The Library, Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ.

RESEARCH NOTE ON JUDGE THOMAS FELL (1598-1658)

Over the years Judge Thomas Fell has received due recognition for his generous and weighty but calculated support of early Quakers. Never a Quaker himself he interceded on behalf of Quakers at critical moments in the evolution of the fledgeling movement.

The Puritan Judge's connection to Quakerism is better known than his remarkable biography. Scion of an ancient Lancastrian family, he was a student at Gray's Inn and was called to the bar in 1631. Elected to the Long Parliament as a recruiter for Lancaster in 1645 he later sat in the Rump Parliament.¹ He was made serjeant at law in the duchy of Lancaster 3 August 1649 and the same year became attorney and serjeant in the county palatine of Lancaster. He was appointed vice-chancellor of the duchy and county palatine of Lancaster² in December 1649 and was re-appointed to the same position in 1651. Fell was made a bencher of Gray's Inn in 1650 and subsequently became judge of the assize on the Chester and North Wales circuit, a position shared with John Bradshawe.

It is surprising that one of Judge Fell's most important achievements has escaped notice not only in his wife's brief account of his life in her

letter to Lord Ancram³ but in the *Dictionary of National Biography*⁴ and the unpublished *Dictionary of Quaker Biography*⁵ We are informed, in lists of the chancellors of the duchy of Lancaster⁶, that Judge Fell held the office of chancellor from 28 February 1654 until the time of his death in 1658.

The duchy's officers were overwhelmingly parliamentarian in allegiance⁷ so its officials were less vulnerable to attack by the Long Parliament. But the duchy did represent a fusion of the Crown with the Dukedom of Lancaster which associated its jurisdiction 'with the exercise of royal prerogative.'⁸ Prerogative jurisdiction was abolished in 1641.⁹

The jurisdiction of the duchy was abolished 10 October 1653; that of the county palatine continued until 1 January 1654.¹⁰ This was all part of a post-war parliamentary 'campaign for law reform' which abolished numerous royal offices and courts.¹¹ However, both jurisdictions were soon restored by the Protector who brought the period of post-war reform to an end,¹² possibly in an effort to ensure more effective justice through 'restoration of the regional tribunals.'¹³ The duchy court at Westminster was restored by a Protector's Ordinance in June 1654, although the restrictions imposed by the 'Star Chamber' act of 1641 continued to apply.¹⁴

As the representative in turn of Royal, Parliamentary and Protectorate authority the chancellor was a high-ranking official and important statesman in the land.¹⁵ At least until the duchy lost its prerogative jurisdiction the chancellorship of the duchy 'ranked above the Exchequer in formal precedence.'¹⁶ Often the chancellor was a privy counsellor¹⁷ and usually sat as an M.P. for the county of Lancashire or for one of the boroughs therein. Fell had all the credentials. A practical lawyer, he was well disposed to the Parliament and the Protector.¹⁸ As early as 1648, when Royalist forces were gathering in Scotland under the leadership of the Duke of Hamilton, Parliament appointed Judge Fell a commissioner for the safety of the county and sent him (along with Colonel Ashton and Major Brooke) into Lancashire in advance of the parliamentary army in order to preserve the parliamentary cause in that strategic part of the country.¹⁹ Well inclined towards reformed religion, he also demonstrated great concern for liberty and toleration, as exemplified by his defence of George Fox at the Lancashire Sessions in 1652 when he used his authority to trounce opponents of liberty of conscience in his jurisdiction.²⁰

As Chancellor Judge Fell was the chief administrative officer in the duchy, he would have presided over the duchy council and the duchy court at Westminster. When in London the chancellor would have

resided at Duchy-house in the Strand, the official residence of the chancellor.²¹

There was a significant cash value attached to the office of chancellor. In 1618 the office of chancellor was valued at £8,000.²² Aylmer drew a link between the value of the office and the desire of other royal officers to secure the position: ‘The value of the Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster can be inferred from Lord Newburgh’s agreement to transfer to it from the Chancellorship of the Exchequer in 1629; the reversion to it was also eagerly sought after.’²³ Fell’s salary, largely to cover costs while performing governmental duties in London, would have been substantial by seventeenth-century standards. He drew further income from duchy seal fees which he received until July 1658.²⁴ Fees ‘paid at every stage in litigation and in all other legal proceedings’ were the ‘most important single source of income’ for the officers of the duchy.²⁵

Tenure of the office was usually held through appointment by the King, the Protector or by an Act of Parliament. There were two types of tenure: for life without the possibility of removal (short of invoking statutory provisions) or ‘at pleasure’ which meant the office could be revoked or renewed. Sometimes there was an added proviso ‘during good behaviour’ which meant the chancellor could be dismissed for incompetence or misbehaviour.²⁶ The latter proviso was rare during the Interregnum. One example was the tenure of John Bradshawe after he resumed the chancellorship following the death of Judge Fell in 1658.²⁷

Bradshawe was first made chancellor of the duchy 28 July 1649 by an Act of Parliament, just after he had presided at the trial of Charles I. He had successive tenures until 17 September 1653. He then shared the office with Fell until 28 February 1654. Thereafter Fell held the office alone.²⁸ He probably received his appointment from the Protector. It is not certain why Fell displaced Bradshawe and was given sole jurisdiction but the record is clear that there were no provisos attached to his tenure which, after June 1654, would have carried the added legal responsibilities of the duchy court at Westminster.

Judge Fell held one of the highest, most influential and most lucrative offices in the Kingdom. As chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster he stood in a distinguished lineage that included Sir Thomas More and Sir Robert Cecil. When considering his role in the history of early Quakerism the power and influence of such an important statesman cannot be underestimated.

Richard G. Bailey
(Queen’s U. Kingston, Ont.)

4 RESEARCH NOTE ON JUDGE THOMAS FELL

NOTES AND REFERENCES

- ¹ D. Brunton and D.H. Penington, *Members of the Long Parliament* (London, 1954), 231, 20-27.
- ² The two offices were joined in the mid-fifteenth century.
- ³ 'Margaret Fox to Lord Ancram,' 31 November 1684, A.R. Barclay MSS. 105.
- ⁴ Entry by A.C. Bickley.
- ⁵ Typescript, Library of the Religious Society of Friends, London.
- ⁶ Edward Baines, *The History of the County Palatine and Duchy of Lancaster* (London, 1868), I, 51; R. Somerville's more recent *Office-Holders in the Duchy and County Palatine of Lancaster from 1603* (London, 1972), xix, 2; and E.B. Fryde, D.E. Greenway, S. Porter, and I. Roy, eds. *Handbook of British Chronology* (London, 1986), 150.
- ⁷ G.E. Aylmer, *The King's Servants* (London, 1974), 405-406.
- ⁸ Ibid., 33.
- ⁹ Ibid., 407-408.
- ¹⁰ Somerville, *Office-Holders*, 2.
- ¹¹ G.E. Aylmer, *The State's Servants* (London, 1973), 44, 322.
- ¹² Ibid., 47, 327. 'No full study has been made of the reform movement in the 1640s and 50s ... Nor is it clear how far the pre-war system was consciously being restored under the Protectorate,' (Aylmer, *King's Servants*, 436).
- ¹³ D. Hirst, *Authority and Conflict: England, 1603-1658* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986), 34.
- ¹⁴ Aylmer, *King's Servants*, 436.
- ¹⁵ R. Somerville, *History of the Duchy of Lancaster* (London, 1972), I, 115-17.
- ¹⁶ Aylmer, *King's Servants*, 408, 113. The legal and financial aspects of the duchy were independent of the Exchequer, although in 1642 there was a proposal to amalgamate the financial side of the duchy with the Exchequer in an effort to centralize royal finances (Ibid., 142, 152, 196). G.E. Aylmer's *The King's Servants* and *The State's Servants* provide an excellent description of the shifts in office-holding in the 1640s and 50s.
- ¹⁷ He was an *ex-officio* member of the privy council under Charles I (Aylmer, *King's Servants*, 21, 476).
- ¹⁸ Somerville, I, 325.
- ¹⁹ Baines, op. cit., I, 228.
- ²⁰ *Journal of George Fox*, ed N. Penney (Cambridge, 1911).
- ²¹ Duchy-house was also used by the parliamentary accounts committee between 1650 and 1658 (Aylmer, *State's Servants*, 105).
- ²² Somerville, *Office-Holders*, xvii.
- ²³ Aylmer, *King's Servants*, 211.
- ²⁴ Somerville, *Office-Holders*, 95, 2.
- ²⁵ Aylmer, *King's Servants*, 174. Total fee income for the duchy in the 1630s was between £7,500 and £10,000 (Ibid., 245).
- ²⁶ Somerville, *Office-Holders*, xxiii.
- ²⁷ Ibid., 2.
- ²⁸ Ibid., 2 and Fryde, op. cit., 150.

SOME INCIDENTS IN EARLY WORCESTER QUAKERISM

The earliest visits by Quakers to the city of Worcester were those of the Yorkshiremen Thomas Goodaire and Richard Farnsworth in 1655. Edward Bourne, the Worcester doctor who later (in 1685) described the growth of Quakerism in the city, wrote, ‘The first we know of who published [truth] in Worcester... were Thomas Goodaire and Richard Farnsworth. Richard Farnsworth had the first meeting in Worcester... Thomas Goodaire was then a prisoner in Worcester Castle prison for speaking to Richard Baxter at his place of worship in Kidderminster. Richard came to see him and appointed a meeting [at Widow Drew’s house], which was the first meeting we know of...’¹ This seems to have been in April or May 1655.

Though the house is no longer in existence, we know where ‘widow Drew’s house’ was. Sarah Drew lived in a house abutting on Dark Alley (which once ran from the cloisters of the Cathedral down to the River Severn). It was in the parish of St. Michael in Bedwardine and had belonged to a former Rector of St. Michael’s, Nathaniel Marston.² In her will of 5 March 1665/6 Sarah left ‘the residue of my goods and chattels, edifice and edifices... unto my dear and loving friend Nicholas Blackmore.’ (Blackmore [d.1670] was also a Quaker). Her inventory, taken on 29 January 1666/7, totals £85.4.2.³ From Edward Bourne we learn that others present at the meeting at her house included Robert Smith, baker, Elizabeth Careless and Bourne himself.

Soon after this, but also in 1655, George Fox, perhaps the greatest figure in the early history of Quakerism, himself visited Worcester. In Edward Bourne’s words, ‘He... had a good meeting the evening after he came to the town. Some contentious professors of religion, when the meeting was over, endeavoured to occasion a dispute and to raise contention in the street... the next day he had a dispute with one Clement Writer, who would have G.F. and Friends confirm their doctrine by miracles. [This dispute] was at Sarah Drew’s house, who was a widow woman and one who received Friends in the beginning.’ George Fox makes no mention of the dispute with Writer in his Journal⁴ but among the Swarthmore MSS. is a copy of a letter he sent to Writer referring to their dispute.⁵

Who was Clement Writer?⁶ Baptised at All Saints, Worcester on 13 December 1586, he was the son of John Writer, baker, and his wife

6 SOME INCIDENTS IN EARLY WORCESTER QUAKERISM

Ursula (née Worfield). Clement Writer was a clothier. Very little is known about his life. In 1629 he sent a petition to the corporation about ‘the Shambles next to the [Pump] in Baxter St.’⁷ His will shows that he owned property in Baxter St. and in the suburb of St. John’s. In the 1630s Clement Writer was involved in a lawsuit with his uncle George Worfield and petitioned the Long Parliament about this in 1640 and again in 1646, when he sent in ‘The Sad Case of Clement Writer, who hath waited for relief... since the 4th of December 1640.’ He was petitioning the Lord Protector about the case in 1656. Writer died in 1662.

For his religious views we have to rely on the testimony of men who disliked him. The Presbyterian Thomas Edwards wrote in his *Gangraena* of 1647 that about 1638 Writer ‘fell off from the communion of our churches to Independency and Brownism; from that he fell to Anabaptism and Arminianism and to Mortalism, holding the soul mortal. After that he fell to be a Seeker and is now an antiscipturalist, questionist, sceptic and, I fear, an atheist.’⁸ He was by 1646 ‘an arch-heretic and fearful apostate, an old wolf and a subtle man, who goes about corrupting and ventilating his errors.’ In c.1664 Richard Baxter⁹ wrote ‘About the same time [?1653] I fell into troublesome acquaintance with one Clement Writer of Worcester, an ancient man that had long seemed a forward professor in religiousness and of good conversation, but was now perverted into I know not what. A Seeker he professed to be but I easily perceived he was either a juggling Papist or an infidel, but I more suspected the latter.’ Clement Writer wrote in his published works for what he called ‘the middle sort and plain-hearted people’ and said that ‘if any divine right remains now in England, it is in the people of England.’¹⁰

Baxter tells us that in conversation with him Writer argued that ‘no man is bound to believe in Christ who doth not see confirming miracles himself with his own eyes,’ and it is clear that Writer took the same line with him as he did with George Fox. He describes Writer’s *The Ius Divinum of Presbytery* (1646; second edition 1655) as ‘a scornful book against the ministry’ and he admits that his own book *The Unreasonableness of Infidelity* (1655) was written ‘by the provocation of this apostate.’ Although Clement Writer is not named in the work, one section discusses ‘whether the miraculous works of Christ and his disciples ‘do oblige those to believe who never saw them?’ Baxter attacks ‘those apostates in England that go under the name of Sceptics and Seekers,’ and says that it was ‘a... private conference with some

miserable men who maintained the negative' that led him to introduce the above subject to the ministers of the Worcestershire Association for debate.

In 1657 Writer produced *Fides Divina* in which he sought to prove the unreliability of the scriptures because of the possibility of errors of transcription or translation. Baxter replied with *A Second Sheet for the Ministry* (1657) and this was followed by Writer's *An Apologetical Narration* (1658), written in vindication of himself against the criticisms of Richard Baxter. The tone of this work is pessimistic. Writer says that it is not possible to 'call back the light of the glorious gospel of Christ when it is withdrawn by God, as now apparently it is, the times and seasons for these things being solely in his own power and dispose' and that, as 'This Babylonish darkness is like to continue,' the religious must tolerate one another, pray and wait.¹¹ These gloomy sentiments may owe something to the writings of the famous Seeker William Erbery (d.1654). Despite what Baxter says, there can be little doubt that Writer too saw himself as a Seeker, since, in Baxter's words, 'These taught that our Scripture was uncertain; that present miracles are necessary to faith... and that the true church... was lost for which they are now seeking...'¹²

Clement Writer's call for 'confirming miracles' in his dispute with Fox can not only be seen as typical of the approach taken by the Seekers, but as a challenge which at least some Quakers (in Worcester and elsewhere) thought they could, and should, meet. Though their approach probably always represented a minority viewpoint, the division of Quaker opinion over this highlights what has been called a 'struggle in infant Quakerism.'¹³

It is now widely accepted that Quakerism before 1660 was very different from what it later became and indeed now is.¹⁴ As Christopher Hill has written, 'the whole early Quaker movement was far closer to the Ranters in spirit than its leaders later liked to recall'¹⁵ (the Ranters were the most outrageous and amoral of the radical groups of the 1650s). Furthermore, though in retrospect George Fox came to be seen as the Founding Father of Quakerism, in the 1650s it was James Nayler¹⁶ who was most often seen as the leader of the sect, and it is arguable that it is in Nayler that the Ranter element in Quakerism was at its strongest.

In Exeter gaol in 1656, a year expected by many to usher in the Millennium, James Nayler, as many people believed, raised from the dead Dorcas Erbery, the daughter of the Seeker William Erbery.¹⁷ In so doing he was, as he saw it, playing the role of St. Peter in Acts 9.40, who raised Dorcas, also called Tabitha. Later that year Nayler made a

8 SOME INCIDENTS IN EARLY WORCESTER QUAKERISM

triumphal entry into Bristol on a donkey (with his enthusiastic followers strewing palm branches before him) in the manner of Christ's entry into Jerusalem. The punishment imposed by Parliament for this blasphemy undoubtedly shortened Nayler's life (he died in 1660). These acts of Nayler have been ascribed with some plausibility to the Ranter spirit in early Quakerism. However, Dr. G.F. Nuttall¹⁸ has persuasively argued that they may more accurately be seen as reflecting the beliefs of Familism (which was often said to have given birth to Ranterism), and it is likely that Nayler's behaviour owed something to the Familist belief that it was possible to be totally inhabited by Christ or other figures of the apostolic or pre-apostolic age.

However this may be, the 'raising' of Dorcas Erbery was not an isolated case. In this same year of 1656 some Quakers travelled to Colchester in the confident expectation of the resurrection of their fellow Quaker James Parnell who had died in the prison there.¹⁹ And we shall shortly consider the case which occurred near Worcester in 1657. It would be wrong to consider these anticipated or attempted resurrections as reflecting beliefs held solely by a "lunatic fringe" of Quakerism. The actual situation was much more complicated. The attitude of the early Quakers to miracles was inconsistent and ambivalent. There was a widespread expectation, on the part of Quakers and non-Quakers, that the new movement should establish its claims by miracles. So Quakers frequently claimed miraculous cures, though they generally refused to attempt miracles which were demanded of them. One hundred and fifty miraculous cures were attributed to George Fox alone,²⁰ and Fox was certainly influenced by Familist beliefs - he several times refers to himself in the years 1650-54 as 'the son of God.'²² Yet he was always more cautious and more of a realist than Nayler, and the fate of Nayler had a sobering effect on him. He told Writer in 1655 that the demand for confirming miracles was an unreasonable one. In 1659 he wrote, 'Many prayed by the spirit and spake by the spirit that did not show miracles at the tempter's command, though among believers there are miracles in the spirit which are signs and wonders to the world...'²² His hardening attitude to attempted resurrections is shown by his reaction to the Worcester case of 1657, to which we shall now turn.

This strange incident, which involved at least some members of the Quaker group in Worcester, is reported most fully in (an admittedly hostile account) the 'Mercurius Politicus' (of 26 February - 5 March 1657 : the account is dated February 28): '... one Susanna Pearson, having formerly been a pretended lover of, and a zealous contender for Christ, scriptures, ordinances, ministers, members etc... She hath since proved an apostate from, and been (as I may say) half mad against, each

of the former; and at length she embarked among that idle sect called the Quakers. Her wonted practice for these late months... was this, to wag from one assembly to another, requiring the ministers then and there preaching to prove their call by miracles, as the apostles did, and to show what grounds they had to preach... and did witness against them and would often bid them to come down... There was in this city one William Pool, an apprentice to George Knight... both Quakers; the young man was aged about 23 years and Friday the 20 of February he went forth of his master's house about evening into the garden and (as 'tis reported), being asked where he had been, he said he had been with Christ; Christ had him by the hand and he had appointed and must be gone again to him.

'But, being gone, he came not again nor was he heard of till Sunday following, February 22, and then it was found he had stripped himself, laid his clothes by the waterside and drowned himself... [he] was buried in the parish of Claines by four of the clock on Monday morning... about six or seven hours after he was buried the said Mrs. Pearson and other Quakers went to the grave, digged up the young man, opened the shroud and laid the corpse upon the ground, rubbed his face and breast with her hand (and some say laid her face on his face and her hands upon his hands) and commanded him to rise. But he not moving, she kneeled down and prayed over him and so commanded him, in the name of the living God, to arise and walk. This being done and he not obeying, she caused him to be put in the grave again and hence departed, having only this excuse left her, that he had not yet been dead four days...'²³ Thomas Willan of Kendal sent Margaret Fell (later Mrs. George Fox) an account of the case, based on the newspaper account. George Fox endorsed the letter 'mad whimsy,' but it is not clear when he did so.²⁴

'And some say laid her face on his face and her hands upon his hands.' This sentence shows that Susan(na) may have seen herself as playing the part of Elisha when he restored to life the son of the Shunamite woman (2 Kings, 4:34-5). However, perhaps the most significant words are that William Pool had not 'yet been dead four days.' This is clearly a reference to John 11:17ff. - Christ's raising of Lazarus - and suggests that Susan(na) Pearson, like Nayler on his entry into Bristol, aspired to a Christlike role on this occasion (as does the command to William Pool to 'arise and walk') but felt that she should have waited four days, the period for which Lazarus had been dead before Christ raised him.

It is interesting that Richard Baxter mentions both Susan(na) Pearson and James Nayler, in that order, in a passage of his autobiography, which is anyway very revealing about his attitude to the early Quakers:²⁵ '... The Quakers, who were but the Ranters turned from

10 SOME INCIDENTS IN EARLY WORCESTER QUAKERISM

horrid profaneness and blasphemy to a life of extreme austerity on the other side. Their doctrines were mostly the same with the Ranters... divers of them went naked through the chief towns and cities of the land as a prophetic act. Some of them have famished and drowned themselves in melancholy, and others undertaken by the power of the Spirit to raise them (as Susan Pearson did at Claines near Worcester, where they took a man out of his grave that had made away himself, and commanded him to arise and live, but to their shame). Their chief leader James Nayler acted the part of Christ at Bristol...'.

Nothing else is known about the unfortunate William Pool. However, there are a number of references to Susan Pearson in Quaker records.²⁶ She was several times fined and imprisoned (for short periods) in both Worcester and Evesham (with Worcester the most important Quaker centre in the county)²⁷ in the late 1650s and early 1660s. Perhaps the most interesting reference to her is in a list of 20 Quakers named in an order made by the Assize judges at Worcester and dated 16 July 1662.²⁸ The 20 Quakers were convicted of assembling for a religious meeting at the house of Robert Smith, baker, in Worcester and were each fined £5. In the list are Thomas Pearson, gentleman, and his wife Susan. It is virtually certain that Susan Pearson, wife of Thomas, is the lady involved in the William Pool case. At the trial of the Quakers she said, when asked to plead, 'Whose ox or whose ass have I taken, or who have I defrauded? If I have taken aught from any man, I will restore him fourfold.'²⁹

In the parish register of St. Helen's church, Worcester is an entry for 15 March 1640/1 : '[baptised] Susanna filia Thomas Peirson.' Susan(na) Pearson, junior, was also a Quaker. She is reported in 1663-4 as a Quaker in Bristol and in 1664-5 as a 'dispenser of Quaker books in Worcester.'³⁰ In 1669 both mother and daughter signed the marriage certificate when George Fox married Margaret Fell.³¹

The William Pool case is important in the history of Quakerism, both nationally and locally. It illustrates the euphoric spirit and confidence that are such a marked feature of what may be called the "apostolic" age of Quakerism. In local terms it illustrates the dilemma of a group within the Worcester Quaker community who were led by the logic of their own challenge to the orthodox ministers of the area (and were also perhaps goaded by the criticisms of Clement Writer) into rashly attempting the resurrection of a young Quaker suicide.

C.D. Gilbert

SOME INCIDENTS IN EARLY WORCESTER QUAKERISM 11

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Abbreviations

C.S.P.D.	=	<i>Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series.</i>
D.N.B.	=	<i>Dictionary of National Biography.</i>
H.W.R.O.	=	Hereford and Worcester Record Office (at Worcester).
W.H.S.	=	Worcestershire Historical Society.

- ¹ *The First Publishers of Truth* (ed. N. Penney, *JFHS*, supp. no. 4 (1907), 27ff. It was not Richard Baxter whom Goodaire interrupted at Kidderminster, but his assistant Richard Sergeant.
- ² See Howard E. Collier, 'The Worcester Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends 1655-1949' (1949), 20-21 (there is a typescript copy of this unpublished work at H.W.R.O. [B.A. 2208]).
- ³ Sarah Drew's will and inventory are at H.W.R.O. (B.A. 3585; Ref.0.008). On Nathaniel Marston see Philip Styles, *Studies in 17th Century West Midlands History* (1968), 217-18.
- ⁴ *The Journal of George Fox* (ed. J. Nickalls, 1975), 225.
- ⁵ LSF, Swarthmore MSS VII, 16.
- ⁶ On Clement Writer see D.N.B. His will is P.C.C.30 Laud (1662).
- ⁷ 'Chamber Order Book of the City of Worcester 1602-1650' (ed. S. Bond for W.H.S.), 234 (under 27 October 1629).
- ⁸ Thomas Edwards, *Gangraena* (1647), 81-82.
- ⁹ *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (ed. M. Sylvester, 1696), I, 116 (henceforth *Rel. Baxt.*). That the year they met was 1653 is shown by a passage in Writer's *Apologetical Narration* (1658), 42, where he refers to 'a small conference [Baxter] had with me five years since.'
- ¹⁰ For these quotations see Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* (1975 ed.), 265 and Writer's *Apologetical Narration*, 79.
- ¹¹ Hill, 265-66; Writer, *Apologetical Narration*, 8.
- ¹² *Rel. Baxt.* I, 76.
- ¹³ G.F. Nuttall, James Nayler: a fresh approach *Jnl. Friends' Hist. Soc.*, supp. no. 26 (1954), 20ff. The quotation is from p.20.
- ¹⁴ See e.g. Barry Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (1985).
- ¹⁵ Hill, 232. For the Ranters see Hill, chs. 9 and 10.
- ¹⁶ On James Nayler see D.N.B. and Nuttall, op. cit.
- ¹⁷ For the argument that Dorcas was William Erbery's daughter, not his widow, see W.C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (2nd ed. 1955), 247n.2. The irony of the daughter of a leading Seeker and sceptic being raised from the dead will not have been lost on Nayler.
- ¹⁸ Nuttall, op. cit.
- ¹⁹ H.J. Cadbury, *George Fox's Book of Miracles* (1948), 20; Barry Reay, op. cit., 37.
- ²⁰ Cadbury, op. cit., ix and 36ff. Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (1971), 149-50.
- ²¹ *Jnl. Friends' Hist. Soc.* vol. 55, no. 8 (1989), 265ff.
- ²² Cadbury, op. cit., 26-7.
- ²³ Cadbury, 13-25; for other (less detailed) accounts see T. Underhill, *Hell Broke Loose* (1660), 34-35; Richard Baxter, *Reasons of the Christian Religion* (1667), 426; Baxter, *Certainty of the World of Spirits* (1691), 175; *A Sad Caveat to All Quakers...* (1657). Baxter repeatedly states that William Pool had gone without food for some time

12 SOME INCIDENTS IN EARLY WORCESTER QUAKERISM

before his suicide, and this seems a reflection of the widespread belief that many Quakers had killed themselves after fasting. For examples of 'Christlike' fasting by Quakers and others see Nuttall, op. cit., 9-10. George Knight, Pool's employer, was a clothier who lived in Forest St. near the Northgate or Foregate.

²⁴ LSF., Swarthmore MSS. I,217.

²⁵ Rel. Baxt. I,77. The reference to the practice of walking naked through towns is principally to the activities of the Quaker William Simpson.

²⁶ Joseph Besse, *The Sufferings of the Quakers* (1753), I,53; II, 61,66.

²⁷ A.W. Brown, *Evesham Friends in the Olden Time* (1885).

²⁸ P.R.O. : ASS. 2/1, f.80.

²⁹ See 'Miscellany II' (W.H.S.), 104, and the pamphlet 'A Cry against Opposition and Cruelty' (H.W.R.O., B.A. 8720/2 [ii]).

³⁰ C.S.P.D. 1664-65, 42; Besse II, 637; *Extracts from State Papers* (ed. N. Penney) *Jnl. Friends' Hist. Soc.*, supplement no. 9 (1913).

³¹ Ibid.

“THY REAL FRIEND GEORGE SKEFFINGTON:” QUAKER AND SALMON FISHING PIONEER IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY NEWFOUNDLAND

George Skeffington, a cooper from Ringwood, Hampshire, arrived in Newfoundland shortly before or at the turn of the eighteenth century.¹ When he appeared at a Quaker meeting in Philadelphia in 1700 and requested ‘a Certificate from us to friends, where he may have occasion to travel,’ the minutes identify him as ‘George Skeffington late of Newfoundland’ who had ‘been travelling upon the service of Truth in these parts.’² That he settled in Bonavista, then an active commercial centre in Newfoundland’s Bonavista Bay, was no accident. His fellow Ringwood compatriot Samuel Shambler lived there as well,³ and the Trinity Bay communities of Bay de Verde and Trinity had become centres of early Quaker mercantile activity from the West Country, as the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century names Jefferey, Taverner and White indicate. Before that, the female Quaker missionaries Esther Biddle and Mary Fisher had visited Newfoundland as early as the 1650s.⁴ Esther Biddle, a visionary, who at one time visted King Louis XIV of France, went, according to George Fox, in 1656 for the first time ‘to the new founde lande’;⁵ In the same year intelligence from Lisbon to Secretary of State John Thurloe speaks of ‘an English shipp come in here from Newfoundland. The master hath beene on board of us. There is not, they say, one person in the shipp, officer or marriner, but are all Quakers.’⁶ A letter of the Puritan divine Richard Blinman from Feryland on Newfoundland’s Southern Shore in 1659 confirms a subsequent trip of Esther Biddle and Mary Fisher, the future wife of the Baptist Quaker convert William Bayley, a merchant from Poole engaged in trade to Newfoundland and the West Indies. The preaching of these two women in St. John’s was successful enough to convert ‘2 or 3 masters of ships’ and initiate counter measures by the rest, including the invitation to Blinman to come to St. John’s, which according to his letter to Governor John Winthrop Jr. he was prepared to do.⁷ Newfoundland remained also on the list of support-worthy Quaker missionary endeavours in England. On 25 February 1660 a

14 “THY REAL FRIEND GEORGE SKEFFINGTON”

collection was recommended for Quaker missionary activities at the annual meeting in Skipton, which listed Newfoundland among the countries where such activity was taking place.⁸ Little if anything is known about the religious life of these early Friends in Newfoundland. They appear in the colonial records only when they touched military or economic history. So it is also with George Skeffington, one of the most prominent among them. The traces he left in the extant archival sources do not permit one to write a full biography, but they invite, nevertheless, a sketch fuller than those previously drawn.⁹

Colonial documents record Skeffington's name first in 1705, when the French under Auger de Subercase sought to suppress the English settlements and fortifications, which had sprung up since Iberville's 1696 raid on St. John's. In the spring of 1705 de Subercase laid siege to St. John's, and the experienced Testard de Montigny, with the support of Abenaki Indians, pressed on to take the English settlements in Conception Bay and Trinity Bay.¹⁰ George Skeffington was at the time an agent for the London merchant house of James Campbell in Bonavista. Whether he acted on his Quaker convictions or followed the insight that armed opposition was futile is not certain, but he sought to secure relief from the invading troops by paying them a ransom of £450. The agreement, which was later interpreted as a lack of patriotism, stipulated that the French ‘desist from Hostility during the remainder of that ffishing Season.’ But the troops returned and, according to Skeffington's testimony,

committed several barbarrity's in Trinity bay, killing 9 men there calling them out one by one, of ye house th[a]t they were kept in, & killing th[e]m as they came out, att Buena vsta they kill'd 9 men & 2 children...¹¹

The Quaker himself was transported with his confrere Arthur Jefferey and several others to Placentia and from there to France. At Dinant he met Colin Campbell, a brother of his employer and himself an agent in St. John's.¹²

It may well be that Campbell secured Skeffington's release, for in March of 1706 he was back in England, where he took sides in the quarrel between the garrison commander of St. John's, Thomas Lloyd, and Lieutenant-Colonel John Moody, who had successfully defended the fort against the French. Skeffington like other ‘Northern planters ... especially those of Bonavista’ preferred Moody over Lloyd for the assistance he had received from him and wished to see him as Newfoundland's commander in chief.¹³

The depositions of 1705/6 testify also to an activity of Skeffington's which would occupy him for a considerable time in Newfoundland, the salmon fishery. The extent of this fishery can be gauged from the damage reports of the day. Among the nearly £2000 of damages sustained in Bonavista through the French raids were '4 salmon ffishery[s] with all Necessarys belonging there to, such as salt, sains, Boats &c vallued at 160 -.'¹⁴ It is possible that the reference of Commander Roope on the state of the Newfoundland Fishery in 1705, which speaks of 'a noble salmon fishery' at Green's Pond and Salmon Cove, had in mind these Bonavista-based operations.¹⁵ The degree of Skeffington's own involvement, whether he was in a partnership with Campbell or merely supervised his operations, can no longer be determined. It is possible that the West Country native had some experience with salmon fishing. Daniel Defoe is a witness of West Country salmon fishing by trap during the early part of the eighteenth century.¹⁶

A later business relationship with the St. John's merchant William Keen, a New Englander who entered the annals of Newfoundland legal history as an agitator for a local system of justice and one of its first magistrates, furnishes more details. In 1718, Skeffington, then a cooper in Indian Bay, entered into agreement with Keen, which aimed at the expansion of his salmon fishery. He had in mind a fishery in the rivers to the north and west of Bonavista, where the Atlantic salmon spawned and hatched and could be caught during its migration to the spawning pools.¹⁷ In a letter of 1719 to William Keen, Skeffington indicates the procedure. The salmon fisherman 'stops the river so yt the salmon can not get up,' and then 'drawing [them] with nets or otherwise' in the pools below the weirs.¹⁸ This operation required considerable personnel and equipment. In a petition of 1720 to the King, Skeffington indicated that he had 'at very great Expence and Labour near fforty miles up the Country cleared Lands of the wood, and the said Rives or Brooks of rocks and stones and other obstructions, built houses, stages, flatts, works and other Conveniences for catching and Curing salmon in said Brooks or Rivers.'¹⁹ A middling dealer like Skeffington, who in 1708 was listed as having '6 servants, 1 boat, 1 skiff, 1 traine fatt, 250 quintals of fish ..., and 1½ tunns of traine oyle,'²⁰ required outside capital to undertake a sizeable fishery. William Keen had this capital. According to the agreement and the letters exchanged between Bonavista and St. John's, Keen advanced £120 in supplies, delivered through the Bonavista merchant Isaac Bonovrier. Under the terms of the contract, costs and profits for the Salmon fishery in Gander Bay near Cape Freels were shared equally by the two partners, with Keen being

16 “THY REAL FRIEND GEORGE SKEFFINGTON”

responsible for the marketing of the fish and Skeffington with the operations themselves. But counter claims by two other Bonavista residents, Samuel Shambler and William Knight, complicated matters. Keen attempted first to force an uninhibited fishery through an order from Commodore Scott but was later required to take Shambler and Knight into a temporary business arrangement, which Skeffington may have helped to arrange. When profits did not materialise in 1719 as expected and Skeffington later went into partnership with Shambler and possibly Bonovrier to the exclusion of Keen, who had lost his investment of £120, the St. John's business man complained cautiously - so as not to endanger any future involvement - to the Board of Trade and Plantations. But the half-heartedness of his petition and the successful request of Skeffington before the board make it uncertain that Keen ever recovered his losses.²¹ In fact Keen's complaint may have been occasioned by Skeffington's attempt to establish a monopoly for the salmon fishery in the region.²² The Council of Trade and Plantations decided that Skeffington's pioneer effort and commercial promise did not interfere with the existing acts on the fishery and granted him a 21-year salmon fishing monopoly with timber rights 'in the Places called Fresh Water Bay [the Gambo River], Ragged Harbour [Pinsest; a part of Musgrave Harbour], Gander Bay [probably the area of Gander Bay South, known as Georges Point] & Dog Creek [a river, which flows into Dog Bay, west of Gander Bay and just south of Horwood] between Cape Bonavista & Cape John...' The only obligation was that he remain six miles from the sea shore and thus not interfere with the cod fishery.²³

The venture now became quite successful. Commodore Percy reported back to Whitehall that in 1720 Skeffington remained unmolested by settlers and natives and employed 30 servants in the salmon fishery, which that year yielded an export of 530 tierces to Italy and Bilbao, Spain, at a gain of £927.²⁴ Subsequent years, however, saw several disruptions. In 1721 Beothuk Indians were reported to have killed some of Skeffington's workers and destroyed dams and robbed him of nets and provisions.²⁵ He complained again in 1724 about interference by natives, who had killed yet another of his men. The point of conflict was a red ochre location in a fishing area frequented by the Indians twice a year. The Quaker made no special effort to extend pacific relations to the natives of Newfoundland and in this regard hardly distinguished himself from other white settlers. He resolved that 'if the Gover[n]m[en]t would allow him two boats with 6 men each, he would engage to keep the country always clear of the Indians.'²⁶

By now he also was no longer the only Newfoundland engaged in the salmon fishery. John Masters, a Silly Cove (Winterton) native, and Phillip Watson had established a salmon fishery at Grand Salmonier, Little Salmonier, Colinet and Biscay Bay, where they employed 16 men and produced 180 tierces, all of which were shipped directly from Newfoundland to foreign markets, presumably in the Mediterranean.²⁷ In 1725 a disturbance was caused this time not by the Beothuks but by Joseph Randall from Poole, who interfered with Skeffington's salmon fishery. The two perpetrators acting on the instigation of Randall, when apprehended, received in St. John's '10 and five lashes respectively with a catt of nine tails on the bare back at each of the Admiralls rooms in the harbour.'²⁸ In 1727 a further salmon fishing competitor is mentioned. This time the fishery was operated by the controversial Lt.-Governor Samuel Gledhill at Placentia.²⁹ It is not certain what eventually led Skeffington to dispose of his business. But by 1729 he had sold his interest in the salmon fishery.³⁰

No additional information is available about this Salmon fishing pioneer, whether he left Newfoundland for England or - as the several subsequently named George Skeffingtons in the Bonavista area suggest - married and stayed in Newfoundland. Also the extent and nature of his involvement in Quaker missionary activities remains uncertain in light of the lay character of Quaker religiosity and its lack of institutional expressions. The Philadelphia minutes which spoke of him as 'having been travelling upon the services of Truth in these parts,'³¹ indicate that his Quaker faith was no nominal matter. His Quaker habits were obvious to Friends and outsiders alike. To the colonial administrators in London he was known as 'George Skeffington and of the people called Quakers.'³² And all extant business correspondence with William Keen addressed the associate in Quaker idiom as 'Friend Keen' and ends with greetings such as 'thy Reale friend Geo[rge] Skeffington.'

The Quaker presence in Newfoundland did not vanish with George Skeffington of Bonavista. The harbour with the greatest Quaker merchant concentration during the eighteenth century was Trinity, where the Taverner, Jefferey, White, Vallis, and Rolles families came from Poole and West Country Quaker stock and were in many ways related by marriage.³³ The extent of their overt religious commitment and practice is difficult to determine because of the non-institutional and lay character of Quaker piety. There is little doubt, however, that the Anglican clergyman in eighteenth-century Trinity, Reverend James Balfour, perceived their economic and social power in ominous and their ecclesiastical allegiance in adversarial terms.³⁴

Another outport with a considerable Quaker presence was Placentia, where the Harrisson, Penney, and Neave families belonged to the Religious Society of Friends, and the Irish Quaker merchant house of Strangman, Courtenay and Ridgway as well as the Jacob, Penrose and Harvey families engaged in the Waterford-Newfoundland provisions trade.³⁵ Here also a cultural activity made itself felt and the connection with English Friends was maintained. In 1772, for example, London Quakers sent devotional and religious classics to a library in Placentia and initiated the private distribution of Quaker religious literature shipped to Placentia via the Poole merchant Moses Neave.³⁶ During the British American hostilities of the 1770s and 1780s and the resulting trade embargo with America, English Friends also petitioned the king to permit access for Nantucket and other New England fishermen to the rich Newfoundland fishing grounds.³⁷

While Quakers had a significant personal and economic presence in some Newfoundland communities during the eighteenth century, they never initiated a concerted missionary effort to solidify and enlarge their institutional religious presence on the island, presumably because of their tentative and dual residence, in Newfoundland and England or Ireland. Thus members of Quaker families who remained in Newfoundland became gradually absorbed by their religious competitors, who - especially after the toleration of dissenters in the outgoing eighteenth century - expressed their religious allegiance in more permanent social and institutional forms.

Hans Rollmann
(Memorial U. of Newfld.)

NOTES AND REFERENCES

- ¹ On the Ringwood origin of the Skeffington family, see Gordon Handcock, *So longe as there comes noe women: Origins of English Settlement in Newfoundland* (St. John's: Breakwater, 1989), 204.
- ² Philadelphia Monthly Meeting Minutes, in *Pennsylvania Genealogical Society Publications*, vol. 6 (1917), 73, quoted in James Bowden, *The History of the Society of Friends in America*, vol. 2: *Pennsylvania and New Jersey* (London: W. & F.G. Cash, 1854), 231-2.
- ³ On the Shambler family from Ringwood see Handcock (note 1), 46, 110, 204.
- ⁴ The most comprehensive study of Esther Biddle is Lydia L. Rickman, 'Esther Biddle and Her Mission to Louis XIV,' *Jnl. Friends Historical Society* 47 (1955), 38-45. The 1659 stay with Mary Fisher in St. John's has eluded all historians. A 1658 collection may have furnished the funds for Esther Biddle and Mary Fisher. It records one pound and 10 shilling for Esther Biddle and 2 pounds and 4 shilling and 6 dimes for Mary Fisher's return from Barbados. None of the historians, including Bowden, who prints the account in his *History*, 1: 60, furnishes a reliable chronology for the

elusive women preachers. On Mary Fisher see especially James Bowden, *The History of the Society of Friends in America* (London: Charles Gilpin, 1850), 1: 30-41; William C. Braithwaite and Henry J. Cadbury, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (Cambridge: University Press, 1955), 288-94 and 421-8.

- ⁵ George Fox, *The Journal of George Fox*, edited by Norman Penney (Cambridge: University Press, 1911), 2: 334. See also Frederick B. Tolles, *Quakers and the Atlantic Culture* (New York: Macmillan, 1960), 138-139.
- ⁶ E. Mountagu to Secretary of State John Thurloe, 16 Sept. 1656, Aboard the Nasebye, in the Bay of Wyers, in the River of Lisbone; in Thomas Birch (edit.), *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, 7 vols. (London: Printed for the Executor of F. Gyles, 1742), 5: 422.
- ⁷ Richard Blinman to John Winthrop Jr., Ferryland, 22 August 1659; John Winthrop Jr Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.
- ⁸ *Letters, &c., of Early Friends; Illustrative of the History of the Society, from Nearly Its Origin, to About the Period of George Fox's Decease: With Documents Respecting Its Early Discipline, Also Epistles of Counsel and Exhortation, &c.* (London: Harvey & Darton, 1841), 292.
- ⁹ For previous literature on Skeffington see Michael Godfrey, ‘Newfoundland salmon pioneer,’ *Fish Trades Gazette*, 7 January 1967; Carson I.A. Ritchie, ‘Skeffington, George,’ *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969), vol. 2, 609; Henry J. Cadbury, ‘Mr. Skeffington,’ in his *Friendly Heritage: Letters from the Quaker Past* (Silvermine, 1972), 81-3; C. Grant Head, *Eighteenth Century Newfoundland: A Geographer's Perspective*, The Carleton Library, vol. 90, (Toronto: McClelland and Steward, 1979), 75-6.
- ¹⁰ Louis Dechene, “Testard de Montigny,” *DCB*, 2, 625-7.
- ¹¹ “Memorandum of Mr. Roop[e] with the Names of such English prisoners as had been taken by the French at Newfoundland,” in C.O. 194/3, fol. 459 [144]; summary in *CSP, Colonial*, 1706, 83, no. 194. See also “A particular Accompt of the Losses Sustained by James Campbell of London Merch/t in Newfoundland,” in C.O. 194/4, fol. 458-61 [1706].
- ¹² “A particular Accompt of the Losses Sustained by James Campbell of London Merch/t in Newfoundland,” in C.O. 194/4, fol. 458. On Colin Campbell, see *DCB*, 3, 117-8.
- ¹³ Deposition of George Skeffington regarding Lieut. Moody, taken by Richard Holford, London 21 March 1705/6, in C.O. 194/3, fol. 505; see also Skeffington’s signature under memorial thanking Lieut. Moody and his soldiers for their defence against the French (no date on document in C.O. 194/3, fol. 476; for the dating see document on 21 March 1705; the memorial was read on 28 March 1706). On Lloyd and Moody, see *DCB*, 2, 438-9, 486-7.
- ¹⁴ “A particular Accompt of the Losses Sustained by James Campbell of London Merch/t in Newfoundland,” in C.O. 194/4, fol. 458.
- ¹⁵ “Memorial from M/r Roop relating to the State of the English Trade & Fishing in Newfoundland,” received 11 January 1706, C.O. 194/3, fol. 308 [93ii].
- ¹⁶ Anthony Netboy, *The Atlantic Salmon: A Vanishing Species?* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968), 171-2.
- ¹⁷ On Keen see the biographical article of Keith Matthews in *DCB*, 3, 323-4.
- ¹⁸ George Skeffington to William Keen, C.O. 194/7, fol. 60.
- ¹⁹ Petition of George Skiffington to the King, C.O. 194/6, fol. 332 [76]; summary in *CSP, Colonial*, 1720, 363, no. 574.
- ²⁰ Census of 1708, in C.O. 194/4, fol. 267.

20 “THY REAL FRIEND GEORGE SKEFFINGTON”

- ²¹ Articles of Agreement of George Skeffington and William Keen, 8 Sept. 1718, C.O. 194/7, fol. 63; cf. *CSP*, Colonial, 1720, 224, no. 335vii. George Skeffington to William Keen, Bonavista, 29 Sept. 1718, C.O. 194/7, fol. 57; George Skeffington to William Keen, Bonavista, 23 March 1719, C.O. 194/7, fol. 59; George Skeffington to William Keen, Bonavista, 25 March 1719, C.O. 194/7, fol. 55-6; George Skeffington to William Keen, Gander Bay, 9 April 1719, C.O. 194/7, fol. 58; cf. *CSP*, Colonial, 1720, 223, no. 335i-v.
- ²² Petition of George Skeffington to the King, C.O. 194/6, fol. 332; summary in *CSP*, Colonial, 1720, 363, no. 574.
- ²³ Board of Trade to Secretary Cragg, 8 April 1720, C.O. 195/7, fol. 10, 11, 35-38; summary in *CSP*, Colonial, 1720, 6 April 1720, 21-22, no. 38. I am grateful to Mr. Robert H. Cuff for identifying the places mentioned in this document.
- ²⁴ Commodore Percy to Council of Trade and Plantations, C.O. 194/7, fol. 11; summary in *CSP*, Colonial, 1720, 13 October 1720, 72, no. 260.
- ²⁵ Replies to Heads of Enquiry relating to the Fishery and Trade of Newfoundland, C.O. 194/7, fol. 116, no. 51; summary in *CSP*, Colonial, 12 Nov. 1722, 163, no. 337 (51).
- ²⁶ “Commodore Bouler’s Answers to Heads of Enquiry relating to the Fishery at Newfoundland,” C.O. 194/7, fol. 246v, no. 51; summary in *CSP*, Colonial, 9 Oct. 1724, 226, no. 373 (li).
- ²⁷ Commodore Bouler to Heads of Enquiry relating to the Fishery at Newfoundland, C.O. 194/7, fol. 240, 246v, no. 51; summary in *CSP*, Colonial, 9 Oct. 1724, 226, no. 373 (li).
- ²⁸ Commodore Bouler to Heads of Enquiry, 10 Oct. 1725, C.O. 194/8, fol. 14, no. 51; summary *CSP*, Colonial, 10 Oct. 1725, 457, no. 757 (li).
- ²⁹ Commodore St. Lo to CTP, 30 Sept. 1727, C.O. 194/8, fol. 141, 51; summary *CSP*, Colonial, 30 Sept. 1727, 365, no. 721 (li).
- ³⁰ C.O. 194/8, fol. 277; summary in *CSP*, Colonial, 14 Oct. 1729, 509, no. 940 (li).
- ³¹ See note 2.
- ³² Deposition of George Skeffington regarding Lieut. Moody, taken by Richard Holford, London 21 March 1705/6, in C.O. 194/3, fol. 505.
- ³³ Gordon Handcock, “A Biographical Profile of 18th and Early 19th Century Merchant Families and Entrepreneurs in Trinity, Trinity Bay” (manuscript).
- ³⁴ Balfour, in a letter of 27 October 1774 to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts speaks of the Trinity-Poole merchant Samuel White as ‘a rich Miser Quaker, of above two hundred thousand Pounds, principal Fortune; but no friend to our common cause.’ U.S.P.G. Letters, Series B, vol. 6, fol. 200.
- ³⁵ John J. Mannion, ‘The Waterford Merchants and the Irish-Newfoundland provisions trade, 1770-1820, ‘*Négoce et industrie en France et en Irlande aux XVIIIe et XIXe siècles: actes du Colloque Franco-Irlandais d’Histoire* (Paris : Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, (1980), 27-43.
- ³⁶ London Yearly Meeting, Meeting for Sufferings minutes, vol. 33 (Feb. 1772); Minutes of Meeting for Sufferings, vol. 33, 1771-1775, 14 Feb. 1772, pp.43 & 45-6.
- ³⁷ Minutes of Meeting for Sufferings, vol. 34, 1775-1777, 24 Feb. 1775 and 27 Feb. 1775, pp.18 & 21 (see also 3, 13, 15 March 1775). I am grateful to Archivist Rosamund Cummings of the Library of the Religious Society of Friends for supplying these and other early records.

CONVINCEMENT AND DISILLUSIONMENT: PRINTER WILLIAM BRADFORD AND THE KEITHIAN CONTROVERSY IN COLONIAL PHILADELPHIA

William Bradford (1663-1752) is one of the earliest, most colourful, and yet most elusive figures within the history of American printing. Only a handful of Bradford papers exists and according to Alexander J. Wall, Jr.'s estimates, as many as two thirds of his potential press work has disappeared.¹ The quality of his work is not noteworthy, so filled with errors some of it may be considered deplorable: broken type, inconsistent inking, and numerous pagination errors. A review of the literature reveals that no monographic works focused on Bradford exist; all treatments of him are, to the best of my knowledge, limited to articles, chapters, and addresses; none has ventured to compile a full-length biography.

However, several scholars have maintained a curious fascination with Bradford which has resulted in a relatively clear picture of his life and work in the colonies from his arrival in 1685 and, to a lesser degree, his apprenticeship in England. Bradford's significance is related to his pioneering efforts advancing his trade in the colonies, being the first printer in Philadelphia and, later, New York and, still later, Perth Amboy, New Jersey. He apprenticed a number of men who became important figures in American printing, namely, John Peter Zenger, Henry DeForeest, James Parker, and his own son, Andrew Bradford. His press produced a number of the colonies' "firsts."²

Due in part to an apparent propensity toward contentiousness, and perhaps to a more significant degree, due to his vocal and critical departure from the group which he originally intended to serve in Philadelphia, namely the Religious Society of Friends, Bradford's career was punctuated by controversy and litigation.

This paper will contribute to the study of William Bradford by examining his relationship to the Religious Society of Friends and how that relationship was affected by his association with George Keith, a Quaker who became increasingly schismatic and vocal with his dissatisfaction with the Religious Society. Although Bradford's

difficulty with the Quakers began as early as his first American imprint, it did not assume its devastating proportions until he was firmly committed to Keith and the cause of the so-called "Keithian controversy."³

BRADFORD'S EARLY RELATIONSHIP TO THE RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

Although earlier there appears to have been some question as to Bradford's place and date of birth, there now seems to be little doubt that it was 20 May, 1663 at Barwell, Leicestershire, England. His tombstone inscription of 1660 is contradicted by Bradford's own assertion of the 1663 date in his 1739 *American Almanac*. Barwell Parish Church baptismal records note his 30 May, 1663 baptism which corrects a previous claim that he was born in Barnwell, a small village in Northamptonshire. His father, William, was a husbandman of good standing and a member of the Church of England. He died in 1667 when his son William was four years old.⁴

Bradford's first extended exposure to the Quakers was no doubt during his apprenticeship with Andrew Sowle (d.1695) at Devonshire New Buildings, without Bishopsgate, London. Sowle functioned as the principal printer and bookseller for the Religious Society of Friends in London. Between 1680 and 1749, Sowle's press produced more than 650 imprints for Friends, including a 1736 edition of Robert Barclay's *Apology for the True Christian Divinity*, and a John Pennington title which denounced both George Keith and Bradford as 'apostate.'⁵

Andrew operated the printing shop for only 11 years before giving responsibility to his daughter Tace. When Tace married in 1706, Andrew's widow, Jane, continued printing until her death in 1711. Tace resumed leadership of the operation until 1749.⁶

There is no indication when Bradford began working with Sowle, but it would not likely have been before 1680 since it does not appear Sowle printed before this date.⁷ It is certain, however, that he left Sowle's shop in 1685 when he and his new wife, Andrew's daughter, Elizabeth Sowle, sailed to Philadelphia.

There has been some speculation regarding whether there was a Bradford printing prior to his arrival in Pennsylvania. A Grolier Club catalogue for a 1893 "Bradford Exhibition" lists one title printed in England allegedly by Bradford, William Penn's folio, "The FRAME of the / GOVERNMENT / of the / Province of Pennsilvania / in / AMERICA: / Together with certain / LAWS / Agreed upon in England / BY THE / GOVERNOUR / AND / Divers FREE-MEN of the aforesaid / Province. [n.p.] Printed in the Year MDCLXXXII." The

catalogue writers suggest that Bradford printed the title "... privately ... on one of his master's (Sowle) presses."⁸ Given the nature of the printing operation and the fact that Sowle's press was probably located in an old house⁹ it is nearly impossible to substantiate an argument for a "secret" printing.

The argument is based upon a quotation in John William Wallace's 'Address Delivered at the Two Hundredth Birthday of Mr. William Bradford,' in which Bradford on examination before the Governor and Council of Pennsylvania answered the question, 'By whose order did you print it [the Frame of Government or Charter] in England?' by stating, 'By Governor Penn's.' Wall, however, casts doubt upon the credibility of Wallace's work.¹⁰ Whether Sowle's philosophy of apprenticeship would have allowed for an apprentice to produce such a major work alone is uncertain. Since Sowle was well acquainted with Penn, as well as George Fox, it is quite probable that the work was printed by him, but without his imprint. Bronner and Fraser argue for a Sowlean printing since the letter "R" in "AMERICA" on the title page is the identical sort used in an Andrew Sowle printing of William Penn's 'A Particular / ACCOUNT / of the Late and Present / Great Sufferings / AND / OPPRESSIONS / of the People called / QUAKERS / etc.' [see the word "OPPRESSIONS" on the title page].¹¹ In addition, had Sowle actually permitted Bradford to print a title as early as 1682, then the question may be raised, why are there no further Bradford printings until the Philadelphia imprint of 1685?

Therefore, the "you" which the Grolier Club catalogue emphasises by italics may well have been understood by Bradford and the Governor and Council to be second person plural, that is, referring to Bradford and his teacher, Andrew Sowle.

Bradford was, no doubt, familiar with the Penn work as he most certainly was with a number of other Quaker writings printed by Sowle between 1680 and 1685. Perhaps it was a combination of exposure to the Friends' works he assisted in printing, the visits from Quaker leaders such as Penn and Fox to the printing shop, his conversations with Sowle, and his interest in Sowle's daughter, Elizabeth, which caused him to leave the Church of England and unite with the Religious Society of Friends. In any case, he and Elizabeth were married 28 April, 1685 in Devonshire House Monthly Meeting.¹² By this date Bradford was a "convinced Friend."

Existing evidence suggests that contrary to a number of earlier claims, Bradford did not travel to the colonies on the *Welcome*.¹³ Dixon claimed that Bradford accompanied Penn to the colonies in 1682, and Isaiah Thomas notes that his wife followed him in 1683.¹⁴ Biographical

essays in both *Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography* (1891) and the *Dictionary of National Biography* (1921-1922) mirror the Dixon and Thomas accounts. *The Dictionary of American Biography* (1943) rightly questions this previous assumption. Thomas' account is preposterous due to the records for William and Elizabeth's marriage, and Dixon's account seems to have been written without examining George Fox's letter introducing Bradford to key colonists whom Bradford would have had the opportunity to meet on a previous journey if he had accompanied Penn in 1682.¹⁵

The Bradfords united with Philadelphia Friends by November 1685. Fox's letter of introduction and the letter of transfer from the Devonshire House Monthly Meeting were both dated 6th month, 1685 suggesting they left London early that summer.¹⁶

Nearly 50 years had passed since Steven Daye established the first press in the colonies. According to Stillwell, Daye began printing in Cambridge, Mass. in 1639, quite possibly in the home of Harvard College president, Dunster.¹⁷ The second press may have been William Nuthead's in St. Mary's City, Maryland in early 1685.¹⁸ Whether Bradford's press was the colonies' second or third it certainly marked the beginning of printing in Philadelphia.

BRADFORD'S FIRST IMPRINTS

Working rather quickly, Bradford set up his press at either Burlington, Chester, or Kensington¹⁹ and by 28 December, 1685 he had printed his first title, 'Kalendarium Pennsilvaniense, / or, / America's Messenger. / Being an / Almanack / For the Year of Grace, 1686. / Wherein is contained both the English & Forreign / Account, the Motions of the Planets through the Signs . . . By Samuel Atkins. / Student in the Mathamaticks and Astrology. / . . . / Printed and Sold by William Bradford, at Philadelphia in Pennsilvania, 1685, [8vo, (20) leaves]. Bradford included a note to the colonies:

Hereby understand that after great Charge and Trouble, I have brought the great Art and Mystery of Printing into this part of America, believing it may be of great service to you in several respects ...²⁰

Much to Bradford's surprise, within two weeks he was called before the Pennsylvania Council and ordered to blot out the title "Lord" in the name "Lord Penn" from all copies of the *Kalendarium* and to print nothing ' . . . but what shall have Lycence from ye Councill.'²¹ McDonald rightly notes that Bradford's publication was the first

occurrence of a book printed within the Council's jurisdiction. Their action was based upon a 1662 Act of Parliament stating that English printing had to be carefully supervised. It followed then that since the Council was a Quaker hegemony it would insist that published works meet with the approval of the Religious Society of Friends.²²

Such strict supervision over printing was not uncommon among Friends in England. Apparently Quakers censored regularly to assure their doctrines were not misstated. A 1674 minute reads,

Agreed that hereafter A.S. [Andrew Sowle?], B.C., nor no other print any booke but what is first read and approved of in this meeting, & that the Tytle of each booke y^t is approved of & ordered to be printed be entered in this booke & that A.S. & B.C. & all other who print for friends receive their bookes of E.H. [i.e., Ellis Hookes, the Recording Clerk].²³

Even Fox's writings were not uncritically given the meeting's imprimatur: '9 iv. 1677 - A paper of G. ff's read and ordered to be laid by till G. ff be spoken with about it.'²⁴

In 1687 Bradford was required by the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting to '... show what may concern friends or Truth before printing to the Quarterly Meeting of Philadelphia, and if it require speed then to the monthly meeting where it may belong.'²⁵ The following year he was paid £4 to collect and destroy all copies of the Daniel Leeds *Almanac* he had just printed because it contained several 'light and frivolous' paragraphs which Friends found offensive.²⁶ Bradford was brought before Governor Blackwell on 9 April, 1689 for printing the Charter of Pennsylvania for a Provincial Council member, Joseph Growdon, against an earlier vote of the Council not to permit the Charter's publication.

Through these difficulties Bradford must have become disenchanted with the Religious Society of Friends. It is somewhat unfair to argue that Bradford's commitment to Quakerism was due primarily to his attraction to Elizabeth Sowle and, knowing that "marrying out of meeting" was prohibited, he adopted her faith. The conflict with leaders in Philadelphia was real enough and it frustrated his youthful idealism. He would later write that '... the Quakers are become my most inveterate Enemies, and all my relations in England (being Quakers) are offended with me to the highest degree ...'²⁷ With this disappointment and disillusionment perhaps it was inevitable that Bradford would be attracted to another convinced Quaker turned critic of Quakerism, George Keith.

*GEORGE KEITH AND WILLIAM BRADFORD'S
ROLE IN THE KEITHIAN CONTROVERSY*

Former Presbyterian George Keith (1638-1716) was among the most theologically articulate of the first generation of Quaker converts. He studied philosophy, theology, and mathematics at the University of Aberdeen (M.A., 1685) where he befriended fellow student Robert Barclay who also became a "convinced" Friend in the 1660's. Keith, Barclay, and Penn were significant figures in Quakerism's early formal, systematic theological development, more significant even than Fox whose writings, important though they are, were more pastoral and experimental.

The account Keith gives regarding his convincement to Quakerism is nearly identical to that of Barclay's and Fox's.

It lay upon me from the Lord to depart from these teachers who could not point me to the living knowledge of God where I could not find it; and I came and heard men and women who were taught of God who pointed me to the true principle; and though some of them could not read a letter yet I found them wiser than all the teachers I ever formerly had been under.²⁸

Keith's early writings such as 'Immediate Revelation not Ceased' (Amsterdam, 1668), 'Benefit, Advantage and Glory of Silent Meetings' (Aberdeen, 1670), 'The Universal Free Grace of the Gospell Asserted' (Amsterdam, 1671), and 'Quakerism no Popery' (Aberdeen, 1675) outlined doctrines which later were more fully developed by Penn and Barclay.

His enthusiasm for the Religious Society of Friends and his intellectual ability provided him the opportunity to travel to Holland and Germany with William Penn, George Fox, and Robert Barclay, visiting potential Quaker converts. It also resulted in three imprisonments.²⁹ While in England, Keith publicly debated the theological positions of the Baptists, the Congregationalists, and the Anglicans.

In 1685, at the invitation of Barclay and Penn, Keith surveyed a boundary between East and West Jersey. He remained in the colonies as a travelling Friends minister and, in 1688, as a schoolmaster in Philadelphia. Keith presented a document to the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting and later to the Meeting of Ministers in 1690 entitled, "Gospel Order and Discipline Improved." Discussion concerning the paper was postponed time and again while it was referred to other committees and readers.³⁰ Frost has noted that some writers dated Keith's disenchantment with the Religious Society of Friends with the cool reception given to his reforms.³¹ In any case, it is during this period that Keith's writings clearly attack Quaker understandings of faith.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a detailed discussion of the theological issues which George Keith raised.³² However, it should be noted that the essence of his critique was that in spiritualizing Christian theology Quakers had, *ipso facto*, dismissed the physical dimension of faith, most importantly, the historical Jesus.³³ The issues of this controversy are still crucial in contemporary Quaker theological discussion. In order to respond to this “error,” Keith argued for a detailed and structured Discipline wherein adult members and children by an “age of discretion” should subscribe to a confession of faith. Such a “confession” might have been accepted in part had Keith not reacted so severely to Friends’ hesitancy. Barclay’s, ‘A / CATECHISM / AND / CONFESSION OF FAITH’ was published without incident in 1673, and Fox’s, ‘Canons and Institutions’ existed in rudimentary form as early as 1668.

Bradford’s association with Keith can be traced conclusively to 1689, although one may speculate that the two met earlier at Philadelphia Monthly or Quarterly Meeting (no extant evidence substantiates this speculation, however).³⁴ In 1689, Bradford printed a title for Keith, *The / Presbyterian and Independent / Visible Churches / in New-England / and elsewhere, / Brought to the Test, and examined according to the Doctrine of the holy Scriptures, / . . .* He printed two titles for Keith in 1690 before the controversy became heated: *The Pretended / Antidote / Proved Poyson: / Or, The true Principles of the Christian / & Protestant Religion Defended, / . . .* and *A Refutation of the Three Opposers of Truth by Plain Evidence of the Holy Scriptures, . . .*

There is no indication that Bradford printed for Keith in 1691; however, he printed at least 12 titles in 1692.³⁵ It is difficult to clearly identify those titles which are schismatic in this early period since both parties, the Quaker majority and Keith’s “Christian Quakers” as they were later called, understood themselves as representing normative Quakerism. As the controversy continued little hope of reconciliation existed as both groups became more rigorously entrenched in their own line of reasoning.

The Quaker political figures in Philadelphia were faced with a difficult situation. Although Bradford supported Keith and printed his materials, he offered to print those who opposed Keith as well. He had argued before Governor Blackwell in 1689 when charged with printing the Charter of Pennsylvania,

. . . [printing] is my employ, my trade, my calling, and that by which I get my living, to print; and if I may not print such things as come to my hand which are

innocent, I cannot live . . . If I print one thing to-day, and the contrary party bring me another tomorrow, to contradict it, I cannot say that I shall not print it.

Therefore, it seems Bradford was willing to use his press for all parties in the Keithian controversy based upon an early “free press” idealism. He printed a notice in a 1693 Keith pamphlet which read,

The Printer's Advertisement. That notwithstanding the various Reports spread concerning my refusing to Print for those that are George Keith's Opposers, These are to signife, that if John Delavall or any other of his Brethern have any thing to print, I am most willing to do it for them, not that I want to beg their work, I need it not, but to leave them without Excuse, that if they be in any way wronged or falsely charged by what is published in print to the World, they may have equal privilege to Vindicate themselves as Publickly; though I have little cause to make this offer to them, considering their many Abuses to me.
W.B.³⁶

The Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, however, refused to permit Bradford to print for both parties.³⁷

One of the 1692 imprints, a broadside [printed without Bradford's name], *An Appeal from the Twenty-eight Judges To The Spirit of Truth & true Judgment In all Faithful Friends, called Quakers, that meet at this Yearly Meeting at Burlington, the 7 month, 1692*, was so critical Keith and Bradford were taken into custody. Keith was found guilty but released. Bradford, charged with failing to provide an imprint and for sedition, escaped a lengthy trial due in part to his own curious defense³⁸ and due to a jurymen dropping the confiscated evidence, a chase containing the type for the broadside.

Rather than silence Keith and Bradford, the pamphlets became more fierce. Bradford printed at least four titles in 1693, three of which reflect the intensifying of the controversy: *A Challenge to Caleb Pusey, and a Check to his Lyes and Forgeries, &c. With a Postscript by Daniel Leeds; The Judgement given by Twenty Eight Quakers against George Keith and his Friends; With Answers to the said Judgment, Declaring those Twenty Eight Quakers to be No Christians . . . ; New England's Spirit of Persecution / Transmitted To / Pennsylvania, / And the Pretended Quaker found Persecuting the True / Christian-Quaker, . . .*³⁹

CONCLUSIONS

Bradford cancelled his contract to print for the Philadelphia Quakers on 29 April, 1692 and thus was at liberty to accept the offer to relocate to New York for an annual subsidy equal to that given by the Quakers and the promise to print official governmental materials.⁴⁰

George Keith was “disowned” by both Philadelphia and London Yearly Meetings. He returned to England in 1693, joined the Church of England, was ordained a priest in 1702, and travelled to the colonies to reconvert the Quakers. He died in 1716 while serving as a priest of an English parish.

William Bradford continued to print for Keith producing at least one title in 1702, four titles in 1703, and four more titles in 1704.⁴¹ He joined the Church of England in 1703 and became a Vestryman of Trinity Church. He printed for New York and New Jersey (and later assisted his son, Andrew, in re-establishing a Bradford press in Philadelphia), and maintained a degree of contempt for the Quakers.⁴²

A former apprentice, James Parker, paid high tribute to his teacher following his death in New York on 23 May, 1752;

[Bradford was] a man of great Sobriety and Industry; a real Friend to the Poor and Needy; and kind and affable to all . . . his Temperance was exceedingly conspicuous, and he was almost a Stranger to sickness all his Life.⁴³

After tending to a number of preliminary considerations, I have discussed William Bradford's relationship to the Religious Society of Friends and charted its path from his apprenticeship with Andrew Sowle to his renunciation of Quakerism, which was hurried, through his association with George Keith. Although the literature concerning Bradford is not extensive it adequately highlights many of his essential characteristics. It is hoped that this paper will contribute to a more complete understanding of Bradford by its prolonged examination of his interaction with the Society of Friends.

David L. Johns
(Malone Coll., Canton, Ohio)

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ Alexander J. Wall, ‘William Bradford, Colonial Printer: A Tercentenary Review,’ *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 73 (October 1963), 381. According to Wall, 1,016 imprints are known conclusively to be Bradford's. Of these, 900 are extant with approximately 1,800 copies located in libraries in eastern United States, California, and England.

² Philadelphia's first press (1685), New York's first lawbook (1694), first proceedings of an American legislature (New York, 1695), first New York currency (1709), first copperplate of New York city (1730), first New York newspaper (1725), partner in the colonies' first papermill (1690). Concerning this papermill see, Eastwood Wire Corporation's, *An Historie for Young & Old About the Beginnings of Paper-Making, Including the Founders, in America, with Histories of their lives & illustrations, with Especial Reference to William Rittenhouse* (Bellville, NJ: Eastwood Wire Corporation, 1930).

30 CONVINCEMENT AND DISILLUSIONMENT

- ³ The Keithian schism represents the first major division within American Quakerism. See Isaac Sharpless, 'The Keith Controversy,' in *The Quakers in the American Colonies*, Rufus M. Jones (New York: Russell & Russell, 1962), 443-5.
- ⁴ Ms. Burial records, Barwell Parish Church (Barwell, Leicestershire, England).
- ⁵ John Pennington, AN / APOSTATE / EXPOSED: / or / George Keith / Contradicting himself and his / Brother BRADFORD. / WHEREIN //Their Testimony to the Christian / Faith of the People called Qua- / kers, is opposed to G.K.'s late / Pamphlet, Stiled, Gross Error / and Hypocriste detected. London, Printed and Sold by T. Sowle, near the Meetinghouse in White-Hart-Court in Grace-Church Street, 1695.
- ⁶ R.S. Mortimer, 'Biographical Notices of Printers and Publishers of Friends' Books Up to 1750,' *Journal of Documentation* 3 (1947/48): 121-2. Tace used the imprint, "the assigns of J. Sowle," from 1711 to 1739, and she used her name and occasionally also Luke Hinde's name from 1739 until her death in 1749.
- ⁷ Anna Littleboy suggests that Sowle began printing without an imprint as early as 1670, but no conclusive evidence exists prior to 1680. See, *A History of the Friends' Reference Library with Notes on Early Printers and Printing in the Society of Friends* (London: Offices of the Society of Friends, 1921).
- ⁸ Grolier Club, *The Bradford Exhibit* (New York, 1893), 7.
- ⁹ Mortimer, 121.
- ¹⁰ Wall, 361.
- ¹¹ Edwin B. Bronner and David Fraser, *The Papers of William Penn* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), vol. 5, *William Penn's Published Writings, 1660-1726: An Interpretive Bibliography*, 282-4. A facsimile of each title page is available for examination, p. 254 [A Particular Account] and p. 282 [The Frame of the Government].
- ¹² Ms. Register Book of Marriage, Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex (General Register Office, Somerset House, London now P.R.O.).
- ¹³ See Michael Tepper, ed., *New World Immigrants: A Consolidation of Ship Passenger Lists and Associated Data from Periodical Literature*, vol. 1 (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1980), 257-8; 319-20.
- ¹⁴ William Hepworth Dixon, *History of William Penn* (London, 1851), 226; Isaiah Thomas, *History of Printing* vol. 1 (Albany, 1974), 208.
- ¹⁵ Tepper notes that there was a William Bradford of Sussex County who appears in public records as early as January 1682. This Bradford, a surveyor, may have misled biographers concerned with the printer, Bradford. Tepper, 319-20.
- ¹⁶ The letter of transfer is dated more specifically, 12, 6th month, 1685. Minutes of the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, 4, 11th month, 1685. For a copy of Fox's letter of introduction see, *The Historical Magazine and notes and queries concerning the antiquities, history and biography of America* 4 (February 1860) : 52.
- ¹⁷ Margaret Bingham Stillwell, *Incunabula and Americana, 1450-1800: A Key to Bibliographical Study* 2nd ed. (Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1961), 152.
- ¹⁸ Lawrence C. Wroth, 'The St. Mary's City Press: A New Chronology of American Printing,' *The Colophon* (Winter 1936): 333-57. See also, Stillwell, 157.
- ¹⁹ Joseph Sabin, *Bibliotheca Americana*, vol. 2, 399.
- ²⁰ The *Kalendarium*, "the printer to the readers."
- ²¹ Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania, January 9, 1685/86, I, 165.
- ²² Gerald D. McDonald, 'William Bradford's Book Trade and John Bowne, Long Island Quaker, as His Book Agent, 1686-1691,' chap. in Wilmarth S. Lewis, ed., *Essays Honoring Lawrence C. Wroth* (Portland, ME: Anthoensen Press, 1951), 209.

- ²³ Littleboy, 2.
- ²⁴ Littleboy, 3.
- ²⁵ Minutes of the Monthly Meeting of Philadelphia, 5, 10th month, 1687.
- ²⁶ Incidentally, Bradford continued to print for Leeds; see, Daniel Leeds, 'News of a trumpet sounding in the wilderness, or, The Quakers ancient testimony revived, examined and compared with itself, and also with their new doctrine. Whereby the ignorant may learn wisdom, and the wise advance in their understandings. Printed and Sold by William Bradford at the Bible, 1697.'
- ²⁷ Bradford to John Chamberlayne, 12 September, 1709. This letter is printed in its entirety in Beverly McAnear, 'William Bradford and the Book of Common Prayer,' *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 43 (Second Quarter, 1949): 103-107.
- ²⁸ George Keith, 'Immediate Revelation not Ceased,' 84. Quoted in Sharpless, 445.
- ²⁹ 1664, 1667, and 1675. See *Dictionary of Religious Biography*, 1977 ed., s.v. "George Keith," and *Dictionary of Christianity in America*, 1990 ed., s.v. "George Keith."
- ³⁰ See 'Extracts from the Minutes of the Meeting of Ministers,' in J. William Frost, *The Keithian Controversy in Early Pennsylvania*. (Norwood, PA: Norwood Editions, 1980), 137-149.
- ³¹ Frost, v.
- ³² For a detailed discussion of these issues consult, Frost and Sharpless. See also Hugh Barbour and J. William Frost, *The Quakers*, Denominations in America, no. 3 (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988), 79-81; and Jon Butler, 'Gospel Order Improved: The Keithian Schism and the Exercise of Authority in Pennsylvania,' *William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd ser. 31 (1974) : 431-45. A rather exhaustive bibliography of Keith's writings and works discussing the Keithian controversy is contained in, Friends Historical Library of Swarthmore College, *Catalog of the Book and Serials Collections of the Friends Historical Library* vol. 4 (Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1982), 108-115.
- ³³ Due to a misunderstanding, Keith was also accused of teaching the transmigration of souls. He had provided a number of suggestions for a Francis Mercurius van Helmont manuscript which was published anonymously in 1684, 'Two Hundred Queries moderately propounded concerning the Doctrine of the Revolution of Humane Souls and its conformity to the Truth of Christianity.' To these charges he responded in 1691 with his, 'Truth and Innocency / DEFENDED / AGAINST / Calumny and Defamation, / In a late Report spread abroad concerning the / REVOLUTION / OF / Humane Souls. / With a further Clearing of the Truth, by a / plain Explication of my Sence, etc.' For a copy of this document see, Frost, 33-52.
- ³⁴ Discouraged with his difficulties in Philadelphia, Bradford received a certificate of removal in 1689 and sent his family back to London; Sowle, nearing retirement, had apparently offered his business to him (Bradford to Chamberlayne, in McAnear, 104). However, Friends in Philadelphia offered him a £40 per annum subsidy and convinced him to stay and send for his family. Wall, 364-5.
- ³⁵ For complete titles of the 1692 imprints see, Sabin, vol. 9, 404-6, 409, 412-14.
- ³⁶ George Keith, 'The Heresie and Hatred which was falsely Charged upon the Innocent Justly returned upon the Guilty,' 1693, 23. Also printed in, William S. Reese, 'The Bradford Imprints,' *New York Historical Society Quarterly* 63 (1979), 58.
- ³⁷ Frost, xiv.

32 CONVINCEMENT AND DISILLUSIONMENT

- ³⁸ Bradford argued that the jury not only had to prove he printed the broadside but that the content was in fact seditious. See Wallace, 55, and Wall, 366.
- ³⁹ It should be noted that Keith utilized printers other than Bradford and, consequently, his annual publications are not limited to the Bradford imprints.
- ⁴⁰ A bibliography of Bradford's first year of printing in New York is available in, Douglas C. McMurtrie and Wilberforce Eames, *New York Printing MDCXCIII* (Chicago: The John Calhoun Club, 1928).
- ⁴¹ Sabin, vol. 9, 403-14. By 1703 Bradford was also the printer for New Jersey.
- ⁴² He even felt that his disfavour with the Quakers was in part the reason for his nominal success as a printer in the colonies. Bradford to Chamberlayne, in McAnear, 105.
- ⁴³ *Post-Boy*, May 25, 1752. Also printed in *Dictionary of American Biography* 1943 ed., s.v., "William Bradford."

THE CARROLL FAMILY: A CORK QUAKER BUSINESS DYNASTY

I

INTRODUCTORY

The Carroll family had been in Cork since the mid-eighteenth century. They derived from Ulster where their immediate ancestor had been Thomas Carroll, Lt.-Col. of ‘Carroll’s Dragoons,’ who fought and was killed at the Battle of the Boyne, fighting on the side of King James II. His two grandsons both married Quakers, Thomas marrying Sarah Greer of Liscurran and Edward marrying Sarah Bell, of Trummery, Ballinderry, Co. Antrim.¹ Edward Carroll’s son, John Carroll (1740-1819) of Hyde Park and Sydney Place Cork married Sarah Corfield. He had been educated at the private Quaker school of Ballitore where he was registered in 1767.² Another of his brothers, Isaac Carroll (1745-1816) also lived in Cork and they were both to be in partnership there for long periods as timber merchants. He married Anna Fisher of Youghal in 1783.

The timber yard of Isaac and John Carroll was located at Devonshire’s Marsh, part of the land purchase completed by the Quaker family of that name in the northern part of Cork. The area was also later to be known as Leitrim. The Carroll name is perpetuated in ‘Carroll’s Quay.’ Isaac Carroll’s property of a cellar and three yards there was valued at £30 in 1793, under the ‘Minister’s Money’ provisions, a variety of tithe which Quakers refused to pay.³ The brothers sold ‘American oak, Dantzick dram and Arundel timber, plaster of Paris and tiles etc.’ and preferred to accept banknotes, for which they would allow the ‘utmost discount.’ They also sold tar and turpentine and staves of different sorts.⁴ At various times the products they offered for sale included hops and tobacco.⁵ Of particular interest in view of the later shipping interests of the family, and also on account of Cork’s developing ship-building concerns, they might also be noted as selling ‘mill, ship and boat timbers.’⁶ Large sales of hogshead and barrel staves might remind us of Cork’s important place in the West Indies and cross-Atlantic provisions trade.

The partnership between Isaac and John Carroll would appear to have been displaced by 1807 by a new arrangement between Isaac and

his son Edward but with ongoing mutual use of the deal-yard at Leitrim by John Carroll and his sons Joshua and Thomas. Joshua Carroll in 1805 married Sarah Haughton, daughter of John Barcroft Haughton, of Cleve Hill and an iron-merchant of North Main Street. His entrance into business might reasonably be considered to follow on this and on the receipt of his wife's dowry. Thomas Carroll did not marry until 1816 when he married Mary Hatton. Their business in typical merchant fashion may be assumed to have concentrated on timber but with subsidiary areas of import and export. Thomas Carroll & Co. looked after imports from North America and Joshua & Thomas Carroll the timber imports from Memel and the Baltic.⁷ Such territorial arrangements were common ways of organizing business. Small, divided family partnerships were occasionally a device designed as a protection against any excessive claims that might be advanced by creditors and might lead to bankruptcy.⁸

A review of advertisements as they appeared in the *Cork Advertiser* 1807 suggests that Thomas Carroll received at least six deliveries from North America. A delivery at the beginning of the year involved Philadelphia barrel staves, Quebec staves, Montreal and New York pot and pearl ashes.⁹ Like most of Cork's trade the North American trade was carried on in American-owned vessels. The *Ospray* brought in cotton wool, staves and pot ashes.¹⁰ Another delivery involved 871 barrels of 'American superfine flour.'¹¹ The *Foxwell* landed from New York, 65,000 pipe, hogshead and barrel staves as well as 57 bales of Georgia and 30 bales of West India cotton wool.¹² The New York vessel *Integrity* arrived in September; small deliveries of Montreal pot ashes were received by both Thomas Carroll & Co. and by Lecky & Mark, another well-known Cork Quaker firm.¹³ A delivery in October was in the Charleston vessel the *Amphritrite* and supplied rice, mahogany, cedar, and Sea Island and Upland Cotton wool and also staves.¹⁴ All such imports were offered for auction, sometime in Isaac Carroll's Yard. Such vessels on their return voyages would be advertised by Thomas Carroll as offering freight and passenger facilities.¹⁵

Joshua & Thomas Carroll imported timber from Memel and from Dramen (Norway). In some cases a delivery of timber would involve two vessels, often part of a convoy.¹⁶ Such Baltic deliveries were usually in Scandinavian vessels. Timber imports were to decline during the Napoleonic Wars but the closure of the Baltic ports by Napoleon was to encourage trade with North America and specifically with Canada. Some typical Carroll imports and exports might be noted for 1808, when oak timber, pot ashes, 9,684 staves and pine planks were imported

from Quebec, in the *John*.¹⁷ In the same year they exported to London 203 firkins of butter.¹⁸ The better-lasting and preserved Cork butters were preferred for the West Indies markets. The export of Cork butter to London had been supposedly not common since it was there in competition with cheaper and inferior products.¹⁹ The export to London was eventually to increase.

Cork's trade was to a large degree carried on in foreign-owned vessels, but her own registered tonnage of shipping increased, by 78 per cent between 1799-1824.²⁰ There is a strong possibility that one or more ships were operated by the Carrolls between Cork and Dublin and even that those were involved in the West Indies trade. W.J. Barry who might be regarded as a reliable historical authority states that ships designed for the West Indies trade were built in Cork for the Carrolls.²¹ Whilst the direct import of sugar to Cork from the West Indies is known to have survived until the 1860s it seems that the Carroll family were unlikely to have been engaged in the trade after the early nineteenth century. Contemporary evidence for their import of sugar is not extant. Certainly around 1800 'Carroll's & Co.' were noted in Dublin as employed in the West Indies trade, and the assumption is that the firm is identical with Carrolls & Co. of Cork.²² The *Heart of Oak*, six years old and Cork-built and registered, owned by Thomas Carroll & Co., was certainly surveyed in Dublin in 1810. On the other hand it was equally likely to have been employed in the coastal trade, to bring down goods to Cork that might be used for export to America and other places. For the same year the *Industry*, of 64 tons also Cork-built and the *Swift*, Plymouth-built were particularised as engaged in a coastal and English trade centred on Plymouth, Shoreham and London, from which it might be concluded that the export of Irish provisions was the central operation engaged in. The development of an export of provisions to markets in South-east England would, again be consistent with the practice of H.D. & H. or even with that of the Waterford-based Nevins and other Irish Quaker families.²³

Some discussion of the business of Harvey, Deaves and Harvey [H.D. & H.], provides suggestive contextual parallels to the Carrolls' own operations. The two firms also at various times shared informal, personal and other linkages. The two businesses were similar in their emphasis on timber exports, had brokerage and other dealings in shipping and on some occasions shared cargo space.²⁴ Ebenezer Deaves, one of the partners in H.D. & H. died in 1809 at the relatively young age of 44 years. His wife Sarah, the sister of Reuben Harvey, inherited £30,000 clear of stock in the firm.^{25,26} Ebenezer Deaves' two sons Reuben Harvey Deaves and Thomas Deaves were as yet two young to

take a part in the business. The trustees appointed were Joseph Massy Harvey, John Lecky and Joshua Carroll and the proposed reorganisation of the firm involved its separation into a 'home' and a 'foreign' department; the home department, including provisions, butter and corn with commission and with the profits from the West Indies ventures was offered to a young William Harvey of Youghal, the nephew of Reuben Harvey. A figure of £1,500-£2,000 was suggested as the yearly profits, possibly of the home section.²⁷

The standing and business success of the Carroll brothers is clear in the appointment of Joshua Carroll in 1813 to the Cork Harbour Commissioners. Other Cork Quakers also appointed were Thomas Harvey, Reuben Harvey and John Lecky.²⁸ Family changes among the Carrolls included the removal of Edward to England and the death of Isaac Carroll in 1816. John Carroll sen. died at age 80 years in 1819; presumably he had not been very active in business affairs for some time. The trustees of his will were his sons Joshua and Thomas Carroll and also John Lecky.²⁹ Reorganisation was prompted by questions of inheritance and also by the dramatic period of depression in Cork's business consequent on the ending of the Napoleonic Wars.³⁰ These factors are probably reflected in the disappearance from *Lloyd's Register* of ships long owned by the Carrolls³¹ as merchants generally were driven to find new types of profitable business. The ships *Heart of Oak*, *Industry*, and *Swift*, appeared for the last time in *Lloyd's Register* in 1818 but a new purchase, a bigger vessel of 145 tons, the Cork-built *Earl Talbot*, now makes its appearance. Successive years record its usual routes as being to St. Ubes near Lisbon, a centre for salt-production, to Trinidad (1821) and to Quebec (1822). None of these routes should necessarily be regarded as mutually exclusive.³²

A specific link between the Carrolls and H.D. & H. is to be noted in 1822. In discharge of their trusteeship Joshua Carroll and John Lecky and Joseph Massey Harvey made over property to Thomas Harvey Deaves and Reuben Deaves. The transaction recognised their entrance into their earthly inheritance. They paid £4,000 to the trustees in discharge of a mortgage arrangement entered into by the trustees with Reuben Harvey in 1816. The land and property involved a large area of Lavitt's Island in the 'South-east quarter of Cork.' The trustees were entitled to this sum of money by virtue of their expenditure in erecting buildings and improvements.³³

II

One area into which Joshua Carroll was projected derived from family alliances. His father-in-law John Barcroft Haughton's business touched on an axis of milling interests devolving at various times on the Grubb, Haughton, Shaw, and Power families, all Quaker. John Barcroft Haughton's business itself was based on the import of hardware and metal from England, Wales and the Baltic countries and he had set up the firm in 1779.³⁴ Profits from this, or conceivably as a result of business obligations incurred to him, had been invested in 1798 in a large mill and lands at Kilnap. The practice of buying and then letting mills for investment purposes was a common practice.³⁵ The Kilnap Mills were for a short period let to the Lurgan Friend Archibald Christy Shaw who was married to Helena Haughton and was therefore another son-in-law of John Barcroft Haughton and, necessarily, the brother-in-law of Sarah Carroll the wife of Joshua Carroll.³⁶

The period of business and agricultural depression following the Napoleonic Wars hit in particular the southern part of the country and resulted in the failure of several banks.³⁷ The crisis also led to numerous bankruptcies a few of which were among Friends. One of these was the bankruptcy of John B. Haughton³⁸ which led to his disownment by the Cork Monthly Meeting.³⁹ Another bankruptcy had been that of his son-in-law Archibald Christy Shaw.⁴⁰ Contemporary opinion severely regarded bankruptcy but Quakers carried their sense of the 'Golden Rule' into the area of disciplinary procedure. If a party did not show a proper sense of responsibility or show intention and possibility of repaying his creditors he ran the risk of disciplinary penalty. This did not preclude the efforts of other Quakers to help him and J.B. Haughton's bankruptcy inevitably involved family members, co-religionists and others. The assignees appointed were Thomas Samuel Grubb (who was married to his daughter Elizabeth Haughton) and the non-Quaker Isaac Bell, a shipping agent and coal merchant. The initial auction of the bankrupt's property did not result in the sale of the Kilnap Mills which were readvertised.⁴¹ Joshua Carroll as his son-in-law and in the role of practical counsellor was brought in to assist and provided the £850 sterling to purchase the premises and attached land.^{42,43}

There had been few investment opportunities outside of property which was generally a safe place for capital to be invested. Thomas Carroll who lived at Leitrim Street, in 1823 advertised for letting, the family house and demesne of 'Hyde Park' on the Middle Glanmire Road, and also a new built house near to it.⁴⁴ The granting of mortgages formed an important part of the investment procedures of a merchant: it also served an important function in raising funds for current

expenditure for those whose capital was locked up in buildings or in stock.⁴⁵ The safety of such investments could be threatened by falls in the value of property.

However, in the wake of the so-called 'joint stock mania' (1824-5) wider investment possibilities began to open up. Friends were frequently advised by 'Ireland Yearly Meeting' against unwise speculations.⁴⁶ Such investments as were made tended to be in 'utilities' and infrastructural development. Several Friend-promoted and managed companies were supported in Cork. Thomas Carroll was on the provisional committee of the 'Cork and Limerick Railway Company.'⁴⁷ Joshua and Thomas Carroll in 1823 had each one share of £250 in the 'National Insurance Company' but none in the younger 'Patriotic Company.'⁴⁸ Their cousins Edward and James Carroll were among the Cork Quakers who supported that promotion which had as an advantage lower share-unit prices. Edward Carroll owned 10 shares and James Carroll owned five.⁴⁹ Both of the companies were initiated and effectively controlled by Dublin-based Quaker interests and the Patriotic's maritime and freight policies were promoted by special arrangement through the St. George Steam Packet Co. (St. G.S.P. Co.).⁵⁰ The taking on of insurance agencies could also generate supplementary income for a merchant. Quakers were popular for such agencies, being well enough capitalised to meet legal conditions for having them, having a presumed probity and wide commercial contacts. In Cork, Quaker-held agencies were at various times to include the Patriotic (John Lecky), the Imperial (James Doyle), The West of England (Thomas Harvey) and The Friends Provident (William Martin).^{51 52 53} Joshua & Thomas Carroll do not seem to have had an agency but the local proprietor's supervisory body of the Atlas Fire Insurance Company included Quaker Jacob Mark and Joshua Carroll.⁵⁴ The Atlas was, incidentally, in 1823/24, after the Royal Exchange, the second biggest fire insurance company in Cork with 26.55 per cent of all the property insured.⁵⁵ Joshua Carroll might also be noted amongst the promoters of the Cork Annuity Company designed to provide annuities for the widows of its members. His uncle and other Cork Quakers had been among the promoters of the Clonmel Annuity Company.⁵⁶

The decade 1820-30 marks several new departures in the Carroll business and in the business interests of Cork Quaker merchants generally. The coming of the steam-ship posed both a threat and a challenge. Cork business interests set out to ensure that they would control the direct wholesale import business and steam routes from England. The pioneering company was the St. G.S.P. Co., a venture based on a triple alliance between Cork Quaker and other Cork

interests, with other capital and initiative supplied by Dublin and English Quaker interests. There is no evidence that Thomas or Joshua Carroll had initial interests in it. They did however certainly support the totally Cork-owned and based company owning the steam-ship *Superb*. This promotion was set up in 1826 for the Cork-Bristol run. The promotion ran in direct opposition to the St. G.S.P. Co. It perhaps reflected some anxiety about the widespread management structure of their rivals, that Cork might be neglected. It attracted a different range of Quaker and Cork capital. Out of its 47 proprietors Joseph & Thomas Carroll, Joseph Harris & Brothers, Ebenezer Pike, and H.D. & H., were Quakers.⁵⁷ After a brief flurry of competition between the two concerns the *Superb* was bought out by the larger company and presumably the proprietors were awarded share capital in it.

A second area in which restructuring became apparent in the Carroll's firm related to their timber importing policy. It seems that wherever possible they were determined to bring in timber in their own vessels and this was revealed in the increasing number of ships owned by them that were registered with Lloyd's. For the year 1825 no Carroll listings occur and the *Earl Talbot* had been sold, but come 1826 the three vessels *Gaspee* [150 tons], *Nelson Packet* [127 tons] and *Irio* [306 tons] appear in the list. Of these the *Irio* and the *Gaspee* served the Quebec timber trade and the *Nelson Packet* served a route between Cork and London.^{58,59} The purchase from Deaves Brothers in 1826 of the *Volunteer* used on the Quebec run made a further addition to their increasing shipping stock.⁶⁰ The nature of their trade with London is not very clear but perhaps involved the export of provisions. The scale of the trade was sufficient to cause more than minor ripples when the Cork Quaker George Carr, brother-in-law of James Carroll, was declared bankrupt in 1829. The losses entailed sums of £1,600 due to 'Carroll & Deaves' and of £8,000 due to 'Carrolls of London'.⁶¹

The import of timber, frequently brought in on Canadian-owned boats and regular traders, remained central to the business of Joshua & Thomas Carroll. Canadian-built boats were also frequently sold and disposed of in Cork by the Carrolls who, like the Deaves, operated what appears to have been a ship-brokerage. Because of the displacement of markets for Cork produced goods in North America, outward trade was to be increasingly supplemented by the carriage of emigrant passengers. On occasion H.D. & H., and J. & T. Carroll co-operated to arrange such emigrant passages, not only to Canada but also to New York and Amboy.⁶² Both J. & T. Carroll and Deaves were in 1830 still involved in the traditional importation of American flaxseed but also increasingly sending back passengers.⁶³ Reuben Harvey died 20 Twelfth-month 1830

and in that year the H.D. & H. was already trading under the style of 'Deaves Brothers.' Their wholesale timber yard was in King Street.⁶⁴

III

Joshua Carroll died 10 Second-month 1831 and his brother Thomas died in the following year 4 Eighth-month 1832.^{65,66} The death of this, the last of the partners having occurred, Joshua's sons John and Barcroft H. Carroll set up a new partnership. Advertising in '31 Eight-month 1832' to the 'old established timber, deal and slate yards at Leitrim Street,' they requested payment of all accounts due.⁶⁷ Thomas's sons Joshua (1820-1885) and Joseph Hatton Carroll (1820 -) went their own ways. In the reformed business an increasing use was to be made of shipping agents, in particular of J. McAuliffe. Such agents, of whom there are ever more appearing in contemporary trade directories, among other matters undertook the booking of passengers for the outward run of ships.⁶⁸ The provision of space for emigrants now formed an essential part of mercantile strategies. Deaves Brothers were also using the McAuliffe agency. Their ship, the *Try Again*, known as a regular trader of 500 tons 'old measure,' and built 1826 was advertised in 1832 by the McAuliffe agency as preparing to sail for New York. The ship had carried out 100 emigrants in February,⁶⁹ and by April a total of 1,800 emigrants had left Cork direct for various North American destinations. Both Deaves and Carrolls and their agents also occasionally organised the auction of ships that had brought in timber thus ensuring an even higher return on their investment.⁷⁰ The *Champlain*, a barque of 300 tons was to remain a 'regular trader' on the Quebec route, and had been auctioned by Carrolls as a result of what were discreetly termed 'peculiar circumstances,' after bringing in its cargo.⁷¹

Advertisements by J. & B. Carroll in 1833 indicate that the ships they used went out on two runs to Quebec each year. The winter cargoes of Carrolls and of other firms were usually completed by January⁷² and their summer cargoes generally arrived in, during July and August. These were often brought in on the regular traders such as the *Champlain* and the *Governor Douglas* from Quebec.⁷³ Between them the two boats mentioned in the advertisement in the *Cork Constitution* brought in 800 tons of red and yellow pine, oak and hardwood and 8,000 'bright spruce deals;' of those it was noted that 5,000 were 'reserved for country customers.' The firm in the next few years was advertising agencies for timber throughout the county in Mallow, Charleville, Kanturk and Clonakilty.⁷⁴

The tonnage of Cork-registered ships between 1825 and 1835 rose steadily by 30.13 per cent.⁷⁵ There had long been regular well established lines of 'constant traders' operating between Cork and Bristol and between Cork and other places.⁷⁶ The rising tonnage reflected an increasing desire by Cork merchants to own their own ships, to make their way against English competition and to control imports. Merchants sometimes owned their ships on a share basis. In the case of Quakers, ownership was often on the basis of internal family partnerships or shared with other and usually Quaker merchants whose track record would be best known. The shareholdings could provide a profitable possession and be transferable. The process of purchase seems to have been advancing for the Deaves Brothers since 1830, when they owned, for the Jamaica run, the schooner *Apollo* [83 tons] and probably for the North America timber trade, the *Brilliant* [146 tons] and the *John Campbell* [343 tons].⁷⁷ A residual West Indies trade survived, and Deaves Bros. continued importing sugars direct from there.⁷⁸

John Carroll and Barcroft Carroll had still some investment in the St. G.S.P. Co., as indicated by the appearance of their names at a proprietor's meeting in 1835. The names of Thomas and Reuben H. Deaves appear in the same context.⁷⁹ It may be that the Carrolls still found such an investment profitable rather than to sink all of their money into their own shipping. The meeting of proprietors had been summoned as a result of murmurings among some Cork citizens about the service being offered. A weekly committee was as a result set up to deal with complaints. The murmurings soon arose to outright opposition and the brief emergence of a rival Cork-based company. The St. G.S.P. Co. responded with an appeal based on the fact of £60,000 of Cork money invested in it and pointed out that its shareholdings yielded an 8 per cent dividend. Barcroft and John Carroll were noted as present at the St. G.S.P. Co. meeting that launched the appeal.⁸⁰ Its rival was not a success and was bought out by the St. G.S.P. Co.

Although Cork's trade with the Baltic was ended, some timber was brought in from there via Halifax at the 'colonial duty'.⁸¹ This would explain the inclusion of 'Memel' timber in Carroll imports from Quebec and the Maritimes but most timber was brought in from Canada or from the United States via St. John's, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. In 1835 there were 15 Cork-owned ships engaged in the North American timber trade and it was estimated that each supported perhaps 18 men and their families who with their ships were based at Passage West. At a meeting of the timber merchants called that year, Reuben Deaves stated that his firm had recently spent £1,000 on repairs

to one ship. The meeting had been called as a result of fears that proposed new legislation aimed at reopening direct Baltic timber imports would undermine Cork shipping interests by permitting easy access to continental shipping. A subsidiary reason for the meeting was the offhand way in which Daniel Callaghan M.P. had dealt with their protest.⁸² Other merchants and tradesmen thought differently and 1,000 of them signed a petition in favour of the proposed changes.⁸³

Irish timber duties were different from those of England but this advantage was undermined by the increasing use of steamships by both Irish and English interests.⁸⁴ The steam trade was contributory to a depression in the value of warehousing since the large merchant no longer had calls on space and the retailer could order direct from England. Cork tonnage had increased at the expense of the Welsh-owned corn, timber and colliery vessels. The Deaves fleet had been reduced c. 1836 by changes in the nature of the shipping trade. The sale of their 19-year old schooner the *Apollo* was probably prompted by its age, a need to purchase new shipping stock and a recognition that the West Indies trade was for them effectively at an end.⁸⁵

Investment in railways proved some attraction in 1836. Such investment might have been seen by a firm such as Carrolls' as advantageous to timber sales. The promotion of the 'Cork & Passage Railway' in 1836 attracted about 6.20 per cent of direct investment by Cork Quaker interests. Barcroft Haughton Carroll purchased 10 shares in the company, as did Alfred Greer his brother-in-law. The 20 shares purchased by them amounted to a total amount of £1,000.⁸⁶ The time had been ripe for investment but a sudden change in the 'economic climate' postponed the building of the railway and in its later incarnation, Quaker investment was not an obvious feature.

The 1840s would seem to signal larger investment by John and Barcroft H. Carroll in shipping of their own specifically for the North American timber trade. One of their shipping investments was in the *Henry Duncan* which was built by John Jardine of Richibuto, New Brunswick, Canada 1840, rigged as barque and originally registered at Miramichi. The vessel was used on the Cork-New Orleans run, and nearly certainly designed to capitalize on the passenger trade out. Ownership was divided between the three Carroll brothers with John Carroll having 32 shares, William Carroll 16 shares and Barcroft Haughton Carroll 16 shares.⁸⁷ The decade was generally to be a depressed one, overshadowed by the 'Great Hunger' 1845-8. It had already been heralded by a period of general industrial and business decline in Cork and the widespread closure and disuse of grain and flour mills.⁸⁸

The Carrolls had probably found little special advantage in having any longer shareholdings in the St. G.S.P. Co. and redeployed their resources in their own shipping stock. Having their ears to the ground they had probably early anticipated the possible demise of the St. G.S.P. Co. The one known and probably the last surviving list of its shareholders shows holdings only by William Carroll who had 5 shares of £100 each. Their father's cousin James Carroll was not so fortunate for he had shares in both the British & American Steam Packet Co. and in the St. G.S.P. Co. Only before the crisis in the company James Beale had offered him a favourable rate for his shares. The sudden depression in their price meant that not only were the shares a loss to him but that he was, like the other unfortunate shareholders, subject to constant calls for further capital. Investment money from surpluses might have been better employed in long or short-term bills that yielded a higher and more reliable interest so he supposed. Losses on shares in the two companies amounted to £392. 10s which he wryly commented would have made 'a small fortune for his four daughters.'⁸⁹

IV

The death of Sarah Carroll, the widow of Joshua Carroll, occurred in 1844. From a Quaker perspective it was observed that Barcroft Carroll began to be less frequently present at Meetings for Worship and in addition with William to be wearing heavy mourning contrary to the principles of Friends.⁹⁰ He had further been noted in the same year in the *Cork Constitution* when he sought to be registered for electoral purposes and for which purpose his brother-in-law Alfred Greer, also a Quaker and owner of an extensive paper-manufactory near Blarney, made a requisite affirmation.⁹¹ It was not of course against Friends' principles to vote but the reference is worth noting in the context of Barcroft H. Carroll's later political ambitions. He was later to be identified with Cork Conservative politics. It was perhaps rather unkindly alleged that whilst John Carroll had been known to wear heavy mourning before, his failure to do so this time was less through an allegiance to Friends' principles than from an attachment to his purse.⁹² William Carroll, the other brother, had been disunited 9 Fifth-month 1844 for marrying his first cousin Eliza Grubb of Cahir, thus going against Friends' rules which forbade marriage in that degree of consanguinity. The penalty of disunity was additionally merited by their both being married by a priest of the 'church by law established.'⁹³

The three Carroll brothers, with Ebenezer Pike, were the trustees for the will of their mother. Ebenezer Pike, their co-religionist, was a wealthy shipowner who in 1844 was putting together a rescue package

to save what could be saved out of the St. G.S.P. Co., in order to set up the Cork Steam Ship Company in its place. The information does not exist to quantify the amounts of land or other property involved in the administration of the will. Much complicated legal business devolved on the trustees. Several legal cases became necessary to obtain payment and possession and to clear up their mother's affairs. Such cases frequently stretched a long way back and led to increasing debt for the debtor as well as further trouble for the other parties concerned. One such case going back to Joshua Carroll in 1824 and involving a sum of £2,150 by then amounted to a debt of £3,005.2.9. The arbitration of the case brought in several cross-cases resulting in a compromise settlement.⁹⁴ A case in 1850 involved the Carrolls *ex parte* in Chancery proceedings relative to the Hackett distillery concerns at Midleton.⁹⁵

Some considerable properties were owned and let by different members of the Carroll family in Anne's Parish. In the same parish, even bigger tracts of land had formed the basis of the Quaker Penrose family's investments since the beginning of the nineteenth century. Some of the house and business property owned by the Carrolls was also clearly part of consistent investment strategies. Much of their property was based in the area known as 'Dring's Marsh' and around the Glanmire Road and some of it had descended to Joshua and Joseph Hatton Carroll, the sons of Thomas Carroll. Other portions were in possession of Barcroft H. and John Carroll deriving from their father or his widow Sarah. A further significant property was that of 'Mrs. Carroll' of Water Street. This was a dockyard, possibly the original ship-repair yard of the Carroll family and now let out to Anthony G. Robinson whose iron ship-building company was already established.^{96,97} The house, offices and dock-yard were valued at £115. The Cork Steam Ship Company rented offices and a timber yard valued at £90 from John and Barcroft Carroll. Robert Honan, a butter firm, rented offices, a yard, a kiln, corn and butter stores, all valued at £130 from Barcroft Haughton Carroll. A series of eight small houses were owned by the two brothers at Rockgrove Terrace, Strand Road. Their total valuation amounted to £9.10s.⁹⁸ A new house had been built there in 1834 when an advertisement noted also a corn store to be let at Pine Street.⁹⁹ John Carroll owned property with a valuation of £192 and Barcroft H. Carroll in his own name and jointly with John Carroll property with a valuation of perhaps £250 in the Anne's Parish (Shandon) district.¹⁰⁰ In Sarah Carroll's name of course was additionally the dock-yard.

V

Cork registered shipping tonnage continued to increase. Total registered tonnage, at 149,465 tons for the triennial period 1846-48, showed a 77.38 per cent increase over the previous triennial period.¹⁰¹ *Lloyd's Register* for 1847 showed 75 Cork registered ships exclusive of Kinsale and Youghal. John & Barcroft H. Carroll must have increased their shipping stock. Possible short-term ownership and quick resale of their shipping stock may have been a way to augment their profits and avoid losses by deterioration. The names of their older ships are no longer mentioned and the suspicion is that they owned more ships than are actually recorded in *Lloyd's*. The two ships recorded for them there in 1847 are the *John Francis*, a barque of 362 tons built at Montreal in 1826 and the *Bridgetown* [599 tons], built at Nova Scotia in 1836 and used on the Cork-New Orleans route. Deaves Bros. were, like other Cork merchants, going through a difficult time partially caused by widespread recession in England, accentuated in Ireland by the catastrophic Famine. Stock in shipping was at an all time low. The Deaves in 1847 owned the *Kingston* [130 tons] built New Brunswick 1836 for the Cork-Quebec run and the *Manchester* [740 tons] built in Quebec in 1845 and serving a Liverpool- Quebec route.

Business success, an increased alienation from the Society in which he had been raised, and conceivably a wish to identify more with his commercial and Protestant peer group were in 1849 to bring Barcroft H. Carroll to the attention of the Cork Monthly Meeting.¹⁰² Although he 'agreeably' received his visitors from the Monthly Meeting it was clear that he had little intention of attending Meetings for Worship anymore and on 1 Seventh-month 1850 he was disunited.¹⁰³ His brother-in-law Alfred Greer was disunited for a similar matter of non-attendance and was also to join the 'Established Church,' although members of his family remained on the books.¹⁰⁴

Commercial need and a willingness by John Carroll and Barcroft H. Carroll to take on further positions of responsibility in Cork city life emerged in 1850. The shipowners had frequently met in connection with the 'Merchant Seaman's Fund.' When a new apparent threat appeared against Cork shipping interests it was a natural arena to launch a proper Shipowners Society to look after their interests. The perceived threat was partially consequent on the realisation that Cork shipping was in competition with foreign shipping which was seen as unfairly favoured by the structure of charges imposed by the Cork Harbour Commissioners. It was seen as unjust that Cork shipping by paying dues in their own harbour should be subsidising the foreigner. A further complicating factor was that new legislation for a docks and harbour at

Cork was seen to be subsidised by Cobh interests which would not need to use them whereas the foreigner would. John Carroll was seen as a leading figure in the new society although he preferred to be available in an advisory capacity. The chairman of the inaugural meeting was Ebenezer Pike who was also like him a member of the Cork Harbour Commissioners.¹⁰⁵

Following the 'Great Famine' the country entered a period of greater prosperity that was favourable to the building trade. Cork merchant dynasties such as the Suttons, not Quakers, were building up fleets of their own and based on specific trades such as timber, tea, grain and coal. Ships were being built even bigger, but Cork tonnage for the triennial period 1852-54 at 149,516 showed little dramatic increase over the preceding triennial period.¹⁰⁶ Lloyd's *Register* (1856-57) records the Carroll family as owning two ships, the *Julia* [998 tons], Quebec-built in 1851, and the *Lord Raglan* [1,886 tons], Quebec-built 1854, both of which were for the Liverpool - Quebec run. For Carrolls an advantage was seen in bringing in timber via Liverpool, probably to take advantage of greater availability of the material there, possibly to pick up new markets there and also to get ahead of English-based shipping interests and control imports to Cork. Conceivably the immigrant traffic centred on Liverpool provided a commercial prospect. Some Quaker houses such as Richardson Brothers & Co. of Belfast had branch houses in Liverpool. Moves to establish a Liverpool-based shipping line was promoted by Richardson interests in 1849. Their 'Liverpool & Philadelphia Steam Ship Company' was inaugurated there in 1850 and the line provided superior, comfortable and cheap accommodation for emigrants.¹⁰⁷

Barcroft H. Carroll made a first and last attempt at a more explicit political involvement in 1858 when he stood as a Conservative candidate in a Cork election.¹⁰⁸ This marked a decisive break from some traditional Quaker attitudes. Some Cork Quakers even before that had felt able to make a qualified approach to political activism and in England a number of Quaker M.P.s had made their appearance. The first Irish Quaker M.P. was not to be elected until 1865 when Jonathan Pim was voted in for Dublin City as a Liberal candidate. Barcroft H. Carroll had as his platform a liberal conservatism and made a good showing at the polls but was not elected.

John and Barcroft Carroll now effectively fade out of active Cork commerce. Some of their trade was stated to have been directed to the East Indies. Be that as it may, it has not proved possible to locate any corroborative evidence to tell us what trade it was. The last ships that they owned were described as the *Sultan* of 812 tons and the *Lord Raglan*

which Anderson describes as 'East India' men.¹⁰⁹ The auction of their ship the *British Lion* [599 tons] was reported in the *Cork Examiner* of 20 April 1866 when the fall off in the building trade and consequent recession in the timber business was blamed for a complete absence of bidding. John Carroll died in 1869 at the Albermarle Hotel, Piccadilly, London. He left a sum of in the region of £70,000.¹¹⁰ The will was eventually to be administered in conjunction with that of his son Joshua Hargrave Carroll who died in 1872.¹¹¹ It has not proved possible to locate details of the death of Barcroft H. Carroll and although permission might have been granted to him to be buried in the Friends Burial Ground there is no record that he was. Joshua Carroll, a son of Thomas Carroll did not die until 1885 and his name remained on the book of members of the Society.¹¹²

Richard S. Harrison

NOTES AND REFERENCES

I record here my appreciation for access to the facilities of the Dublin Friends Historical Library and thanks to Mary Shackleton, its Curator who in so many kindly ways has encouraged me. I express also a particular debt of gratitude to my friends Kieran Burke (Cork City Library), and Tim Cadogan (Cork County Library) who in quiet efficient ways have dealt with my often large and urgent requests. The assistance of the librarians and other staff at Trinity College (Dublin), The National Library of Ireland and at University College (Cork) has been much appreciated and I express my thanks to them here. A very special thank-you goes to Gerald Hodgett (London) who so kindly undertook to research on my behalf, copies of *Lloyd's Register of Shipping* from the years 1810-30 in the British Library.

CONVENTION. The Quaker 'plain language' has been retained in all Quaker contexts.

¹ John O'Hart, *Irish Pedigrees, or the Origin and Stem of the Irish Nation*, (Dublin, 1887). Information on the Cork Quaker community, its background and status will be found in Richard S. Harrison, *Cork City Quakers: A Brief History 1655-1939* (Cork, 1991) *passim*.

² Mary Leadbeater, *The Leadbeater Papers*, (London, 1862) vol. 1, Appendix. 'Ballitore School List.'

³ M.V. Conlon, 'Valuation Lists of Minister's Money, St. Anne's (Shandon Parish), 1793-1853', in *Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society*, [hereafter, *JCHAS*] XLVII, (1942), 87-111.

⁴ *New Cork Evening Post*, 12 January 1797.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 6 July 1797.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 31 July 1797.

⁷ This pattern is clear for example, from the advertising in the *Cork Advertiser* [hereafter, *C.A.*] 1807.

⁸ John Mannion, 'The Nevins Family 1800-40' in *Decies Old Waterford Society* XXXXVII (1988), 14.

- ⁹ C.A. 20 January 1807.
- ¹⁰ Ibid., 21 March 1807.
- ¹¹ Ibid., 20 June 1807.
- ¹² Ibid., 10, 15 August 1807.
- ¹³ Ibid., 6 September 1807.
- ¹⁴ Ibid., 31 October 1807.
- ¹⁵ Ibid., 10 August 1807.
- ¹⁶ Information extracted from the C.A. for 1807.
- ¹⁷ *Cork Mercantile Chronicle* [hereafter, CMC], 3 October 1808.
- ¹⁸ Ibid.
- ¹⁹ J. Mannion, 'The Waterford Merchants and the Irish Newfoundland Provisions Trade 1770-1820' in L.M. Cullen et P. Butel, *Négoce et Industrie en France et en Irlande aux XVIII^e et XIX^e Siècles*, (Paris, 1980); see also William O'Sullivan, *Economic History of Cork City to 1800* (Cork, 1937), 271.
- ²⁰ *Thom's Directory* (Dublin, 1846), Shipping Statistics.
- ²¹ W.J. Barry, 'History of Port of Cork Steam Navigation' in *JCHAS*, XXIII, (1917), 5.
- ²² Foster papers (P.R.O.N.I.) D 207/31/19. For this reference I am grateful to Dr. David Dickson (T.C.D.).
- ²³ *Lloyd's Register*, [hereafter, L.R.], 1810 see also above n. 11 *passim*.
- ²⁴ CMC, 4 May 1810 (for exports on 28 April 1810) H.D. & H. and other merchants shared the vessel *Hope*, the Carrolls re-exporting to London 40 caskets of potashes.
- ²⁵ 'Journal of Margaret Harvey, 1809' in *Journal of Friends Historical Society*, [hereafter JFHS] XXIV (1927), 12.
- ²⁶ CMC, 30 January 1809.
- ²⁷ William Harvey to Thomas Pim, 9 Ninth-month 1810 (D.F.H.L.) Pim Letters MSS. Box 61, Letter 35.
- ²⁸ *An Act for Revising an Act... for better Regulation of the Butter Trade of the City of Cork*, 53 George III c.70 (1813).
- ²⁹ Trustees mentioned in Indenture of Lease. J. Carroll, Barcroft H. Carroll and William Carroll to Archibald C. Shaw. September 1845 (Registry of Deeds, Dublin [hereafter RDD] 1845, 14, 115.
- ³⁰ T. Crofton Croker, *Researches in the South of Ireland* (London, 1824), 203-4.
- ³¹ L.R. 1818.
- ³² Ibid., 1818, 1821, 1822.
- ³³ Indenture of release and reassignment, a) John Lecky, Joshua Carroll, Joseph M. Harvey/ b) Reuben Harvey/ c) Reuben Deaves and Thomas H. Deaves, 10 July 1822 (R.D.D.) 775, 496, 525, 431. The lease mentioned for 1816 refers back to an indenture of lease of 1765 between Nathaniel Lavitt and Reuben Harvey snr.
- ³⁴ *Haughton Centenary Brochure* (Cork, 1989) (*sic*).
- ³⁵ L.M. Cullen, 'Eighteenth-century Flour Milling in Ireland' in *Irish Economic and Social History*, IV, (1977), 19 and *Leadbeater Papers*, 80-1, 87-8.
- ³⁶ Reference to Archibald C. Shaw in memorial of indented deed of conveyance, 25 August 1823 a) Thomas S. Grubb, Isaac Bell/ b) John B. Haughton/ c) Joshua Carroll (R.D.D.) 786, 111, 531, 646.
- ³⁷ L.M. Cullen, *An Economic History of Ireland since 1660*, (London, 1981).
- ³⁸ *Cork Constitution* [hereafter, CC], 17 January 1823.
- ³⁹ Alphabetical List 1815. (DFHL), MM VIII M.5 additional manuscript note.
- ⁴⁰ *Southern Reporter* [hereafter, SR], 6 November 1821.

- ⁴¹ CC 30 April 1823.
- ⁴² See above n. 36.
- ⁴³ Deed of release, Joshua Carroll, Richard Grubb, Thomas S. Grubb, John Haughton (Carlow)/James and John Haughton, 30 August, 1823 (R.D.D.) 786, 111, 531, 647.
- ⁴⁴ SR, 21 June 1823.
- ⁴⁵ Indented deed of reassignment, Joshua Carroll and Thomas Carroll to William J. Shaw, 16 July 1823 (R.D.D.) 783, 180, 529, 915.
- ⁴⁶ See, for example Dublin Yearly Meeting Advice (1817), in *Rules and Discipline of the Yearly Meeting of Friends in Ireland with Advices issued and adopted therein* (Dublin, 1841), 259.
- ⁴⁷ CC 16 February 1823.
- ⁴⁸ *Articles of Agreement of the National Assurance Company of Ireland* (Dublin, 1823) (Royal Irish Academy) Hal. (Reports) 1283.
- ⁴⁹ Patriotic Insurance Company, Deed of Settlement, 2 September 1824 (in possession of the Sun Alliance Assurance Company, Dublin).
- ⁵⁰ John Lecky (Youghal) to Joseph R. Pim (Dublin) 23 Eighth-month 1822 (DFHL) Lecky Letters, 237 b. See also, Anonymous, 'Irish Friends and Early Steam Navigation' in *JFHS XVII*, 4 (1920), 107-8.
- ⁵¹ Imperial Insurance Co. (Fire) Minutes 18 April 1821, (32) 25 April 1821 (34) (Guildhall, London) ms 12, 160, A19; also, Imperial Insurance Co. (Life) Minutes, April 1821, 52 (Guildhall London) Ms 12, 160 B.
- ⁵² CC 30 December 1837.
- ⁵³ 'Thirteenth Report of the Friends Provident Institute' in *British Friend*, Vol. 5, Fourth-month 1847.
- ⁵⁴ CMC 14 March 1817 Robert Carr was also noted. He was not a Quaker but was possibly a relative of George Carr who was, and is frequently noted in association with Quaker businessmen. Edward Daly of Patrick St., a non-Quaker, was the Atlas agent in Cork.
- ⁵⁵ *Seventeenth Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Revenue arising in Ireland* (British Parliamentary Papers) 1828 (8) XV.1 Appendix 69a Return of all persons or companies to whom licenses to make insurances in Ireland have been granted... securities taken and sums accounted for the five successive years ended 5 January 1823-27.
- ⁵⁶ CC 11 March 1825 and *General Half-Yearly Meeting of the Clonmel Annuity Company* 1 Seventh-month 1788.
- ⁵⁷ SR 9 March 1826.
- ⁵⁸ LR 1826.
- ⁵⁹ The *Nelson Packet* was probably built at Knight's Yard and launched 18 June 1826, for which see, Colman O'Mahony, 'Shipbuilding and Repairing in Nineteenth Century Cork' in *JCHAS*, XCIV (1989), 75.
- ⁶⁰ LR, 1826.
- ⁶¹ 6 Eighth-month 1829 (DFHL) MM VIII A 8. Refers to the cases of George Carr and of Joseph, Samuel and Eustace Harris. See also William Newsom (Cork) to Joseph Newsom (Limerick), 12 Sixth-month 1829 (DFHL) Newsom Letters.
- ⁶² SR 25 April 1826.
- ⁶³ CC 6 February, 6 March 1830.
- ⁶⁴ Ibid., 2 April 1830 and Reuben Deaves is, e.g. mentioned as a Cork Harbour Commissioner 10 May 1843 (Cork Harbour Commissioners) vol. VII (1843-7).

- ⁶⁵ James Carroll to Edward Carroll, 26 Eight-month 1831 (DFHL) Carroll Letters. Unclassified. (I am at present preparing an account of the life of James Carroll based on these letters. They are sewn together in an apparently random manner, and in connection with the account I have prepared a chronological abstract of them which will in course be deposited in the Dublin Friends Historical Library).
- ⁶⁶ Obituary of Thomas Carroll in CMC 6 August 1832. I am grateful to Tim Cadogan (Cork County Library) for drawing my attention to this item.
- ⁶⁷ CC 4 September 1832.
- ⁶⁸ The *Cork Directory* 1820-2 listed nine ship's brokers.
- ⁶⁹ CC 7 February 1832.
- ⁷⁰ Ibid., 26 April 1832.
- ⁷¹ Ibid., 12 February, 3 March 1831. The advertisement appeared two days after the death of Joshua Carroll.
- ⁷² CC 5 January 1833.
- ⁷³ Ibid., 25 August 1833.
- ⁷⁴ Ibid., 3 May 1836.
- ⁷⁵ *Thom's Directory*, (Dublin, 1847), 208.
- ⁷⁶ Will West's *Cork Directory* 1818-9 lists such regular packets on the Cork-Bristol run. The 'Black Ball Line' initiated by the Liverpool Quaker James Cropper was an example of a regular line New York-Liverpool.
- ⁷⁷ LR 1830.
- ⁷⁸ SR 4 May 1826. Advertisement for sugars imported by H.D.H. & Co.
- ⁷⁹ CC 19 May 1835.
- ⁸⁰ Ibid., 2 June 1835.
- ⁸¹ Samuel Lewis, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ireland* (London, 1837).
- ⁸² CC 13 August 1835.
- ⁸³ Ibid., 8 September 1835.
- ⁸⁴ Ibid., 5 May 1835, see also Lewis: *Topographical Dictionary*.
- ⁸⁵ CC 3 January 1837.
- ⁸⁶ Subscription Contract of the Cork & Passage Railway, 28 November 1836 (House of Lords Record Office). For an account of the railway line see Colman O'Mahony, *The Maritime Gateway to Cork* (Cork, 1986) 76-80.
- ⁸⁷ Registration mentioned in letter to Pádraig ó Maidín, 'shipping file' (Cork County Library).
- ⁸⁸ James S. Donnelly jnr., *The Land and the People of Nineteenth Century Cork* (London, 1975), 34.
- ⁸⁹ James Carroll to Edward Carroll 22 Fourth-month, 24 Fourth-month 1843, (DFHL) Carroll Letters. Unclassified.
- ⁹⁰ James Carroll to Edward Carroll, 8 Fourth-month 1844 (DFHL), Port. 3b, 64.
- ⁹¹ Burgess Revision Court for the Glanmire Ward. When Barcroft H. Carroll's name was objected to by the Liberals his name, on the affirmation of Alfred Greer, was allowed stand as a resident householder. See CC 24 October 1844. For further Greer references see Colman O'Mahony, 'Bygone Industries of Dripsey and Blarney' in *JCHAS LXXXIX*, 248 (1984), 183-4.
- ⁹² James Carroll to Edward Carroll 8 Fourth-month 1844, op. cit.
- ⁹³ 5 Tenth-month 1843, 9 Fifth-month 1844 (DFHL) MM VIII A 10.
- ⁹⁴ *Irish Equity Reports* 1848-9, vol xl (Dublin, 1849), 200-13.
- ⁹⁵ CE, 2 September 1850. For Hackett family see John O'Brien, 'The Hacketts: A Glimpse of Entrepreneurial Life in Cork 1800-70' in *JCHAS XC*, 248, (1985), 150-7.

- ⁹⁶ Griffiths, *General Valuation of Ireland* (Dublin, 1851-3) Cork City, Anne's Parish (Shandon).
- ⁹⁷ O'Mahony, 'Shipbuilding,' 81.
- ⁹⁸ Griffiths, *Valuation*.
- ⁹⁹ CC, 16 September 1834.
- ¹⁰⁰ Griffiths, *Valuation*.
- ¹⁰¹ Abstract Register of Births. Cork Monthly Meeting (DFHL).
- ¹⁰² *Thom's Directory* (Dublin, 1860), Statistics, Triennial tonnages.
- ¹⁰³ 6 Ninth-month 1849.
- ¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 17 First-month, 1 Seventh-month 1850 (DFHL) MM VIII A, 10.
- ¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 10 Second-month 1848.
- ¹⁰⁶ Minutes, 14 July 1843 (Cork Harbour Commissioners) and see CC, 1 January 1850.
- ¹⁰⁷ *Thom's Directory* (Dublin, 1860), Triennial tonnages, also, *LR* 1856-7.
- ¹⁰⁸ *JFHS* XVII, 4 (1920), 111 and *LR*, 1856-7.
- ¹⁰⁹ CC 14 April 1859.
- ¹¹⁰ E.B. Anderson, *Sailing Ships of Ireland* (Dublin, 1951), chapter on 'East India Men' *passim*. For account of the 1860s depression, see James S. Donnelly jnr., 'The Irish Agricultural Depression of 1859-64' in *Irish Economic and Social History* III (1976), 33-54 *passim*.
- ¹¹¹ Auction of the 'British Lion' see CC, 20 April 1866.
- ¹¹² 'Abstracts of Wills and Administrations Cork and Kerry 1858-1900' in T. Casey, (ed.) *O'Kief, Coshe, Mange, Slieve Louher and Upper Blackwater* (Birmingham: Alabama, 1966), vol. XI.

DRESS AND DEPORTMENT OF MONMOUTHSHIRE FRIENDS

c.1655-1850

The Quakers, as everybody knows, differ, more than even many foreigners do, from their own countrymen. They adopt a singular mode of language. Their domestic customs are peculiar... They are distinguished from all the other islanders by their dress. The differences are great and small.¹

From the early years of the Society, Welsh Friends frowned upon extravagance and high living, sternly adhering to the pronouncement of the 1689 Yearly Meeting of Welsh Friends in Breconshire to be ‘plaine and desent in your habitts that you may be a good example to families and neighbours.’² Friends were also fully aware that if they veered from this regulation they risked admonition and/or public disgrace by being disowned by the Society. They were further warned to be correct in their manners of speech by being told to be ‘holy and unblameable’ in their conversation, ‘as becomes the gospel of Jesus Christ.’³ In July 1726 John James from Llanfrechfa parish, confessed his own guilt at his ‘ill language.’ In his contrition he is recorded as saying ‘I am sorry for it in reality, and I am grieved that my tongue should utter such words. It was in passion I spoke ‘em and not in malice... I wish I had not given way to them.’ He further asked for forgiveness from God and his fellow Friends.⁴ This article will briefly examine some of the aspects of the Quaker code of discipline as it related to plainness and swearing in the county of Monmouthshire.⁵

Friends’ rejection of extravagance and other kinds of opulence, and especially their preferences for knee breeches, white bibs and traditional wide brimmed hats clearly set them apart from the rest of Monmouthshire society.⁶ Their strict rules on dress were also stringently observed by Friends’ children who attended Quaker schools. The minutes of the Monthly Meeting in 1809 specified those articles of clothing that were need for schoolchildren attending Sidcot School:

For Boys

2 Coats, 2 waistcoats (not washing ones)
2 pair of breeches
2 Hats

For Girls

One cloth Cloak, 2 bonnets, 2 gowns (not printed ones of such as will require frequent washing)

For Boys	For Girls
2 pair of shoes	1 pair of stays. 2 skirts (not cotton) 2 under petticoats
3 Shirts (not calico)	3 shifts (not calico)
3 pair of stockings	3 check aprons with bibs or for little girls 3 Tea cloths or Pinefores
3 pocket Hfs.	3 Pocket hfs.
	3 Capes
	2 Neck Hfs. or for little girls
	2 Tippets
	3 Tuckers
	3 Night capes
	2 Pockets
	3 Pairs of Stockings
	2 Pair of Shoes
	1 Pair of Mitts. ⁷

Monmouthshire Friends adhered closely to the Society's wishes in their answers to the Yearly Monthly Meeting queries on plainness and also in their purchase of materials which were plain and free from embellishment. A further example of this tendency can be observed in the purchase of drab poplin by Mary Lewis of Trosnant in 1808 for the Society's poor and needy.⁸ There were, however, some Friends who did not keep exactly to the letter of the Quaker regulations on dress. In 1692 the inventory accompanying the will of John Jones, a doctor from Llanfrechfa, mentioned rings and signets to the value of £2.⁹ In 1709 Samuel Lewis, a yeoman from Llanfihangel Ystern Llywern, bequeathed to his son, Edmund Lewis, a fine array of clothes, some of which were adorned with silver buttons and silver buckles.¹⁰ Again in 1770 in reply to the Yearly Meeting enquiries on plainness the answer was not at all encouraging as the Quarterly Meeting stated 'to our sorrow some take too much liberty in speech, behaviour and apparell.'¹¹ John Beadles, of the Pant, went even further. In 1683 he entered his own family pedigree at the Herald's Visitation.¹²

Friends' houses contained little in the way of decoration, for there were normally no pictures or portraits. By an examination of the wills of Friends doubt is cast on the extent to which some Friends fully observed the tenet of 'plainness' in their homes. In a cross-section of 100 Monmouthshire Quaker wills and administrations examined throughout the period under study, items such as clocks, watches, silver and gold plate or jewellery are noted as well as clothing ranging from a few

shillings to a several pounds. In 1674 the will of Edward Webley, a tanner of Shirenewton, indicated that he left thirty pewter dishes, £5 in clothes and four brass kettles.¹³ His widow Grace, who died five years later, also left an abundance of superfluous materials including 6 silver spoons, a clock and £8 in clothes.¹⁴ The will of the Quaker doctor, John Jones of Llanfrechfa, made a note of his silver plate and £21 in gold as well as a further £8 in clothes.¹⁵ While in 1707 the inventory of John Harris, another Quaker physician from Christchurch, mentioned among his personal property a watch valued at £7 and a looking glass worth 5 shillings.¹⁶

Although there are such examples of Friends failing to observe the requirements of the Society on simplicity there was no widespread abuse of this regulation. Coupled with Friends' frugality in dress and in decoration was their use of addressing people by the terms 'thee' and 'thou' and these actions further contributed to their social peculiarity. This can be highlighted in the correspondence between Friends or business associates.¹⁷ Even as late as 1854 Friends were still careful to observe this custom when dealing with Church Wardens over tithes.¹⁸ Even so by the end of the late eighteenth century and especially in the nineteenth century, some Welsh Friends were prepared to accept slight modifications in their customs and dress.¹⁹ In one instance one Welsh Friend even allowed his natural sense of humour take precedence over his stern demeanour. The Quaker, who was unnamed, had asked his travelling companion to aid the Bible Society by denoting some money towards the fund. The traveller, known only by the letter G, enquired why the Quaker requested subscriptions to a book that Friends did not believe in. The Quaker's indignation being aroused requested the passenger to prove his assertion by quoting a 'single instance' of unbelief. The man replied 'why, there is that foolish story of a little boy's killing a giant, by hitting him with a stone on the forehead.' The Quaker retorted 'thy epithet proves thy own unbelief: but really if the Philistine's forehead was as soft as thine, I see nothing miraculous in the effort.'²⁰

In conjunction with their adherence to 'plainness' of dress and conversation, Monmouthshire Friends also kept strictly to the Gospel commandment of Matthew 5 verses 34-37 of not swearing.²¹ Prior to the Affirmation Act of 1697, it is questionable how Monmouthshire Friends conducted the execution of probates in Ecclesiastical Courts without swearing. In her study of Derbyshire Friends, Helen Forde has attempted to solve this problem. She suggests that Friends appointed relatives or neighbours, who were not Quakers, to act as their executors thereby preventing fellow Friends, who were named as the executors in

the wills, from contravening the Quaker code of conduct.²² In the Monmouthshire wills, Friends are normally named as executors, but since there are no admonitions in the minutes of the Quarterly Meetings before 1697²³ for acting contrary to the rules of swearing, it could well be argued that surrogates were used. In 1669, for instance, David Jones, a yeoman of St. Brides, named Lewis Harry as his executor but the will was attested to by David Price 'surrogate'.²⁴ Similarly, in 1667 the will of John Thomas, a yeoman from Goldcliffe, has clearly nominated two non-Quakers to act as executors instead of his Quaker relatives.²⁵ In 1692 Margaret Morgan, a widow from Llangibby, called upon Margaret Walters, a fellow Quaker, to act as her executor. Yet the will was attested to by the surrogate, J. Francklyn.²⁶

Individual Friends also made impassioned pleas to fellow Quakers to desist from swearing and also tried to encourage neighbours to follow their lead. In December 1730, for example, Evan Bevan, an elder of the Pont-y-Moel Meeting, proposed that his tract against *Profane swearing and cursing and taking ye Lords holy name in vain* be printed. It was later agreed by the Meeting that it should be inserted in the *Gloster Journal* in 1734.²⁷ Friends, furthermore, by rigorously applying the scriptural tenet of swearing to oaths spoken in court, prevented themselves from taking an active part in civil, municipal or political life. In a Quarterly Meeting minute entered for December 1750, Friends' stance against the swearing of oaths or affirmations in ecclesiastical courts was strongly re-advocated and supported by a minute from the Meeting for Sufferings of 1746 which stated 'a Friend ought to be accepted in the said courts without oath or affirmation.' The minute went on to comment, however, that Friends were allowed by Council to give an affirmation in all cases 'where an oath is or shall be hereafter required.'²⁸

Therefore Monmouthshire Friends, as has been illustrated, attempted to keep strictly to the rules of the Society on matters that concerned plainness and swearing. Where there were breaches in this code of conduct the individual was normally admonished by the local society. Yet, there are examples in this county where the rules of the Society were not closely observed and the individuals concerned appear to have escaped censure. These examples should be treated with caution, however, as the Friends involved constitute only a small fraction of the Society during the period under study.

Richard Allen

NOTES AND REFERENCES

- ¹ Thomas Clarkson, *A Portraiture of Quakerism* (3 vols., 2nd ed., London, 1807), vol. I., ii-iii.
- ² Glamorgan Record Office (hereafter G.R.O.), D/DSF/2. Welsh Yearly Meeting held at William Aubrey's house in Breconshire, 1689, 492.
- ³ Ibid.
- ⁴ Ibid., D/DSF/352 (no pagination), Monthly Meeting minutes dated 6/5/1726.
- ⁵ In 1974 the county of Monmouthshire reverted to the ancient Welsh title of Gwent.
- ⁶ G.R.O., D/DSF/2. Welsh Yearly Meeting held at Haverfordwest, 1715; 569; *Christian Brotherly Advices*, commonly referred to as the *Book of Extracts* (London, 1738), 185-6.
- ⁷ Ibid., D/DSF/356 (no pagination): Monthly Meeting minutes dated 12/7/1809.
- ⁸ Gwent Record Office (hereafter Gw.R.O.), D/2200/20. Letter from John Cash of Coventry to Mary Lewis of Trosnant dated Coventry 27/6/1808.
- ⁹ National Library of Wales (hereafter N.L.W.), LL/1692. The will of John Jones of Llanfrechfa, 27 May 1692.
- ¹⁰ Ibid., LL/1709. The will of Samuel Lewis of Llanfigangel-Ystern-Llywern, 11 October 1709.
- ¹¹ G.R.O., D/DSF/327 (no pagination): Quarterly Meeting minutes dated 6/6/1770. 3rd query.
- ¹² J.A. Bradney, *Registrum Antiquum de Llanfihangel Ystern Llewern 1685-1812* (London, 1920), 2.
- ¹³ N.L.W., LL/1674/103. Will of Edward Webley of Shirenewton.
- ¹⁴ Ibid., LL/1679/182. Will of Grace Webley of Shirenewton.
- ¹⁵ Ibid., LL/1692. The will of John Jones of Llanfrechfa, 27 May 1692.
- ¹⁶ Ibid., LL/20 November 1707. Will of John Harris of Christchurch.
- ¹⁷ Gw.R.O., D/220/17. Letter from Richard Reynolds of Ketley, co. Salop, to James Lewis of Pontypool dated 7/7/1788; N.L.W., Maybery II MSS.2800. Letter from Richard Summers Harford of Ebbw Vale Ironworks to Walter Powell of Brecon dated 15/1/1818.
- ¹⁸ *The Cambrian*, Saturday, 18 June, 1854, 3.
- ¹⁹ *The Neath Gazette*, 12 March 1864. According to an account of the wedding of Neath of Mary Eliza Richardson and Henry Habberley Price Junior in 1864 'the dresses of the ladies of the bridal party were chaste and elegant, but not gaudy. The bride was dressed in a white silk bonnet and lace fall, and bore in her hand a beautiful bouquet...'; see also M.F. Williams, 'The Society of Friends in Glamorgan 1654-1900' (University of Wales, M.A., 1950), 141-2.
- ²⁰ *The Cambrian*, Saturday, 15 February 1812, 3.
- ²¹ G.R.O., D/DSF/351 (no pagination), Monthly Meeting minutes dated 3/1/1714. Joshua Phillips was admonished by Friends for his 'bad conversation,' but by recognising his own faults he was allowed to remain a member of the Monmouthshire Society.
- ²² Helen Forde, 'Derbyshire Quakers 1650-1761' (Ph.D. Thesis, Leicester, 1977), 145-51.
- ²³ After 1697 wills are generally acknowledged by the Quaker executor in the following manner: 'I am a dissenter commonly called a Quaker.'
- ²⁴ N.L.W., LL/1669/176. The will of David Jones of St. Brides.
- ²⁵ Ibid., LL/1677/92. The will of John Thomas of Goldcliffe.
- ²⁶ Ibid., LL/April 1692. The will of Margaret Morgan of Llangibby.
- ²⁷ G.R.O., D/DSF 352, minutes dated 2/10/1730 and 4/7/1734.
- ²⁸ Ibid., D/DSF 356, minutes dated 9/1/1749-50 and 31/10/1750.

FURTHER THOUGHTS ON LEEDS FRIENDS AND THE BEACONITE CONTROVERSY

In 1836 a paper published within Brighouse Monthly Meeting began: ‘It will be known to most persons that a separation has taken place in Manchester, among this body.’¹ This ‘separation,’ known as the Beacon controversy, erupted with the publication of a book, *A Beacon to the Society of Friends*, by Manchester evangelical minister Isaac Crewdson in 1835. The resultant conflict polarized largely between conservative and evangelical Friends had implications for Quakerism nationally and, indeed, a national committee was established by London Yearly Meeting to investigate the source of disquiet in Manchester. A full account of the Yearly Meeting’s Committee’s work in Manchester, and its implications across the country, has yet to be published. Jean Mortimer, through the use of the Preparatory and Monthly Meeting minutes of Carlton Hill, has laid the foundation for a study of the controversy’s impact in Leeds.²

It has been said that the Beaconite schism generally, ‘was not so serious as has been thought and.. the verdict of history will be that in the final event it did not matter.’³ It is true that London Yearly Meeting remained intact and that Quakerism survived, as Mollie Grubb says, but the separation was serious for those individuals concerned and mattered very much to families torn apart by disagreement. For the Society of Friends too, it was important. When it is considered that such a small body of around 14,000 members suffered a loss of over two percent in a matter of weeks, the schism was significant. To those 300 or so Friends who were lost initially, must be added a steady trickle of young Quakers who either resigned or were disowned in later years because of the legacy they had inherited. At a time when the number of Friends were falling in real terms, such losses, often of talented individuals, were a heavy blow to early Victorian Quakerism.

Such was the case in Leeds, the largest constituent part of Brighouse Monthly Meeting. In the aftermath of the schism Brighouse Monthly Meeting, and especially Leeds, lost a number of disowned Friends and experienced a steady trickle of related resignations. The debate was followed keenly in Brighouse with a high profile, in a proliferation of pamphlets by interested parties and in publications like *The Christian Advocate*, facilitating an awareness of the debate’s inconsistencies and

irregularities. This debate had been brought closer to home for Brighouse as a result of some of the direct links which existed between the two large northern Meetings of Manchester and Leeds. There were, of course, strong family links. Most notably, though, Joseph Tatham, a Leeds Friend and Elder, was appointed to the list of Quaker worthies who comprised Yearly Meeting's investigative committee. Tatham's involvement in the scrutiny of evangelical ideas would have been observed closely by his own Meeting of Ministers and Elders.

Prior to the *Beacon* schism Brighouse had been receptive to evangelical belief. This was evidenced by their adoption of a book by American evangelical Quaker, Elisha Bates, in 1828 as representing their own views.⁴ Again in March 1834, less than a year before the *Beacon* affair erupted, the Monthly Meeting recorded that Bates' book explained their religious principles.⁵ The *Beacon* schism, however, precipitated a crisis in the Meeting, for whilst Brighouse had been receptive to some evangelical influences the views of the most fervent evangelicals within the Meeting did not sit happily with traditional Quaker principles like Friends' distrust of sacraments and sacerdotal sentiment. Events in Manchester and the public support of Crewdson by Elisha Bates forced evangelicals to examine their consciences and their position in the Meeting. Most stayed within the Society but a handful of the most active either resigned or were disowned. The struggles of these Friends provide an insight into the spiritual questions which prevailed within Meeting at the time.

Among Brighouse Quakers, we are concerned principally with the views and experiences of schoolmaster Joseph Tatham, woolstapler John Jowitt Jr., and Maria Arthington school teacher, minister and wife of brewer Robert. The involvement of these three influential Friends was diverse. Joseph Tatham represented Brighouse as an appointed examiner of *A Beacon*. We can see that he had definite views of his role. The Jowitt family was closely involved from the outset, writing to the committee on their first Manchester visit to urge a conciliatory approach.⁶ Jowitt family ties with the Crewdsons and the involvement of his own son ensured continued interest by father and minister Robert. He retained a high profile with contributions to the Yearly Meeting debates of 1836 and 1837. When members of the Yearly Meeting's Committee stayed at the Jowitt family home in Leeds at the end of December 1835, in order that they could attend the local Meeting for Ministers and Elders,⁷ they did not find unity; one minister, Maria Arthington, had decided already not to attend her appointed office.

The extent of Tatham's involvement at Manchester is difficult for us to ascertain. No private papers referring to him survive, and he was one

of the few committee members not recorded as expressing an opinion on the issues facing them. That he had strong views generally there is no doubt. His *Considerations on the Holy Spirit* show him to have much in common with *A Beacon* with its emphasis on the necessary use of Scripture and of prayer to promote the work of the Spirit of Christ.⁸ Nor does Tatham use unscriptural language. But it is his views on Christian discipline which have a more direct bearing on the problem of Tatham's involvement or, as it seems, non-involvement in the *Beacon* issue.

He had a good deal of sympathy for evangelicalism but his examination of *A Beacon* was coloured by an allegiance to traditional Quaker views regarding discipline and 'waiting on the Lord.' Tatham may have disagreed with the way the Yearly Meeting's Committee conducted the Beacon affair but he stayed within the Society. His theology was rooted in Quaker principles and, despite evangelical leanings, he felt more comfortable worshipping within Quaker Meeting.

In a lengthy discourse Tatham outlined what he believed to be the necessary qualifications for Friends contributing to the exercise of Christian discipline in the Society.⁹ Qualifications were important as discipline had been seen from the earliest times as a vital component in the promotion of the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of God was itself a requisite, especially for those who sought to engender it in others.

Many amongst us, it is to be feared, are lamentably insensible of their insufficiency of themselves for this work, and therefore they feel not the necessity of waiting for the influence of that power which alone can qualify them for such service.

Tatham believed it was possible, with help, to identify the suitability of oneself and others for disciplinary work because the route to the Kingdom of God had been well mapped with recognisable landmarks. Those Friends who had an incomplete knowledge of the Kingdom of God should not fully participate in Meetings for Discipline. Tatham was emphatic that Friends active in the support of the discipline of the Society should be 'men of upright hearts and clean hands, rightly prepared for the service they undertake; if such an ability is not always present, they should, wait in humility to have their own spirits brought into a holy subjection to the spirit of Christ...'

Prophetically, Tatham warned that if an individual, ill-prepared for contributing to the Meeting, should exercise his acquired or natural abilities, then it would serve only to, ‘“darken council,” and bring

death over the Meeting.' In a similar vein, Tatham recounted the views of Minister and Elder Charles Marshall whose Heavenly Father showed him 'that in the sensual wisdom stands the strife, and out of that ground arise the exaltedness, haste, rashness, schisms, rents and sects, & co.' We may see the Leeds Elder's silence in Manchester as an indication that he believed discipline was being discharged by his committee in an atmosphere not conducive to healing division. It can be imagined that, in the spirit of his own guidance, Tatham had little truck with some of the private views expressed by his committee colleagues during their examination.

J.J. Gurney had chosen, for the time being, to overlook a belated realisation of the 'unsoundness' of 'the anti-Beacon tide.' He wondered instead if it would not be 'politic to cut (the pro-Beacons) off,' even though the Society would 'be left in an awful condition without them... and that it will require much steadiness to maintain... scriptural Quakerism against a tide which would go far to overturn it.'¹⁰ Clerk Samuel Tuke, heartily 'sick of religious controversy',¹¹ commented after the secession was complete that 'if our Lancashire committee have done wrong, let them (the Beaconites) suffer for it.'¹² Much later, Edward Ash confessed that the committee's precipitory actions had been a cause of secessions and conflicts in many parts of the country.¹³ How would Joseph Tatham have related these views to his own Meeting for Ministry and Oversight? This was hardly the inculcation of mutual charity for which Robert Jowitt sought.

In Leeds, well-prepared or not, Tatham's fellow minister Maria Arthington seized the opportunity of conflict across the Pennines to launch a crusade for the salvation of Friends. This religious crisis culminated in her disownment from Brighouse Monthly Meeting: her husband Robert remained an active Friend. With a campaign against authority and unscriptural Quakerism Arthington emerged as the leading local exponent of Beaconism in the Brighouse area recommending Crewdson's book, 'to the candid and serious perusal of every Friend...', believing it to be the best book ever in Quakerism and of infinite benefit to the Society.¹⁴ The extreme views expressed in her pamphlets became another thorn in the side of conservative and moderate opinion.

Arthington's contempt for traditional Quaker practice is revealed in her long held 'opinion that the constitution of our Society is radically wrong...' She called into question the practice of automatic birthright membership, and attacked the status of ministers. She believed them unable to understand, teach or preach a clear view of the gospel dispensation and the doctrines of the Saviour owing to a preoccupation in business. In an unequivocal call for a more professional ministry she

went on to say that those who are unsuccessful in business bring discredit on the Church. With such a lack of commitment it was small wonder there were so few missionaries, she thought.

The vigorous debates generated by the *Beacon* controversy were a golden opportunity for Arthington. Some timidity still showed in the anonymity of her work, though it is unlikely that her identity remained concealed for long. It will comfort many, she said, that ‘a more evangelical day is dawning, and that we shall experience a revival of religion amongst us.’ Arthington had drawn sufficient comfort by January 1836 to anticipate some direction to the ‘revival’ with a much longer pamphlet bearing her name. Though she was ‘aware that all who treat in any degree upon faith and doctrine are subjected to censure from one source or another,’¹⁵ her address assumed a more public leadership:- ‘It is known to many of you that I am not an indifferent observer of what is passing around us in the religious world.’

She moved to an openly partisan position in response to anti-*Beacon* writers, ‘who think they are doing God a service by disparaging the scriptures; who even think them a “dead letter.” Ah! that these did but know that the deadness is in themselves.’

In the face of an anti-*Beacon* tide which had gained further impetus with the publication of Henry Martin’s *The Truth Vindicated*, to which Arthington here refers, she felt it necessary to chart more clearly the path to salvation lest Friends mistakenly repeat the error of the conservative reaction. Arthington was unsparing in her denunciation of this school of thought and clear in speculating about their likely fate. God knew that the motives behind the vocal elements in conservative circles were born from sensual wisdom and that there could be no hope for them if they remained unconverted by divine grace. The anti-*Beaconite* could have no conception of the Kingdom of heaven, ‘until new motives and new affections are implanted in the soul...’ Arthington wondered what the final condition would be of those, ‘who have not only refused the offer of mercy for themselves, but who, “handling the word of God deceitfully,” have perverted the way of truth, and have kept others from laying hold of the alone means of reconciliation?’

Yet her work was full of practical and positive advice aimed at younger Friends especially to draw them towards evangelicalism and away from the dangerous heresies which Crewdson believed had led to Hicksism. Advice dwelt on the heartfelt faith for Christ’s offering of body and blood necessary to deliver us from our natural and condemned state. Faith, with the aid of the Holy Spirit, was necessary to come to a realisation of scriptural truth and the promises therein. Prayer would give the help of faith and the spirit. In her earlier work she called on

Friends to bend their knees in humility both morning and night.¹⁶ It was these simple steps which Arthington believed some had ignored, leading them to err in their religious views by seeking a conformity to the doctrines of Christ without being possessed of the requisite faith.

For many Quakers, the invective of Arthington's pamphlets was an invidious attack on established Quaker principles; her vitriol was anathema to conservative Friends. Even for some with evangelical tendencies, Arthington's extremism realised an innate horror of ritual and mechanistic religion. But the high profile of her argument could not be ignored easily; many Friends were led to a painful re-examination of their religious principles.

By June 1836 persuasion had given way to a more rebellious gesture as Arthington resigned her ministry, an office normally held for life.¹⁷ Records reveal that by the previous June she had ceased already to take part in the proceedings of Brighouse's Quarterly Meetings for Ministry and Oversight.¹⁸ It may be that Arthington had seen the writing on the wall in Manchester as the evangelicals' relationship with the Yearly Meeting's Committee and their own local authority deteriorated, especially after April 1836 when the visiting Quakers revived previously discarded scriptural objections to *A Beacon*. Arthington certainly pre-empted the resignation of some in Manchester by many months. By removing herself from an acknowledged status with the Monthly Meeting Arthington obtained greater freedom to speak her mind.

Maria Arthington's official and, now, unofficial ministry served to exacerbate the uncertainty in the hearts of local Friends. Were the Society's principles correct; did they lead to salvation? Such questions became more pressing when the *Beacon* separation in Manchester eventually came in November/December 1836. Whatever the theological outlook of local Friends, the national separation was the realisation of their worst fears. Bradford evangelical Minister Esther Seeböhm recorded in her diary in December:

It is indeed a day of deep humiliation to the members of this society; the whole head is sick, the whole heart faint... 'Heal us, Emanuel!'¹⁹

But for many evangelicals the solution to the Society's difficulties lay more immediately in their own hands. For those evangelicals who sympathized with, or had seceded with, Crewdson the foundation principle of justification was to lead to expressions of faith which conflicted with traditional Quaker practice regarding the sacraments. For the schismatics this course, however, painful, was the only route to

truth and freedom. Relatively unencumbered by established peculiarities the self-styled Evangelical Friends blazed a path for others to follow. The alternative Quakers held Yearly Meetings in London, published a journal, and began building a meeting place which more resembled a chapel with its communion table. Its cost of several thousand pounds and seating capacity of 600 reflected their belief, albeit to prove mistaken, in belonging to a growing concern. With a characteristic sense of urgency Evangelical Friends began the promotion of Water Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The relevance of these practices became the most tangible focal point around which Friends now began to argue. Now that so many related events had been brought to bear on these questions, together with an evangelical revival generally, they assumed a profile unprecedented in the Society.

Brighouse Friends, especially, had a reason to be troubled. As we have seen already, Brighouse Monthly Meeting adopted the thoughts of evangelical Elisha Bates in 1828 as representing their own views. Five hundred copies were purchased shortly after this time:-

... with a view to there being presented to serious inquirers after our religious principles, or to be occasionally handed to persons to whom it might be thought desirable to communicate information respecting the religious principles and practices of our Society.²⁰

In the book, written in 1825, Bates upheld traditional views on the ordinances. However, in 1836 he changed his mind and became baptised. His reasons were set out in an open letter to the Society published in September and printed, amongst other provincial towns experiencing the Beaconite influence, in Leeds.

I am... desirous of correcting in my own works, everything which may appear to demand it. To mislead... one single inquiring, or unsuspecting mind, would be a circumstance greatly to be lamented.²¹

Until the book, of which Brighouse still had many copies, could be either revised or superseded Bates believed it should be suspended. Many Friends in Brighouse did not know where they or the Society stood.

Bates admitted to them that over the centuries baptism had been corrupted from that practiced by the primitive church, but he no longer saw it as an inheritance of an outdated superfluous observance. Bates had undergone a conversion which had led him to re-appraise his earlier thoughts on justification. An increased awareness that Christ had died for him made baptism not only a desirable option, but an essential requirement.

As a powerful supporter of Crewdson, Bates argued the case of the Evangelical Friends in a journal whose publication he had transferred to England from Ohio. His *Miscellaneous Repository* raised further the profile of the changing theological scene. Bates had had no intention of leaving the Society of Friends but on his return to Ohio, Short Creek Monthly Meeting maintained the criticism levelled at him by English Quakerism;²² he was forced into resignation in February 1837.

Young Friends in Brighouse needed examples for living. Writing in May 1836 on the night before his wedding in Kendal, our third Friend John Jowitt Jr. related his conversion experience:

Here when sorrow drove me to the Throne of Grace, deeply conscious of my sins, I found pardon and peace in the Gospel. Oh, how well I remember... when the first gleam of light shot across my mind that if I only and simply and merely from my heart DID BELIEVE, I was justified by faith, and might have peace with GOD.²³

Peace would only come by giving practical expression to new perspectives. At some time between his conversion and February 1837 John Jowitt Jr. and five like-minded Leeds Friends became baptised. The overseers of Leeds Meeting felt that 'however painful the circumstances,' they must report to the Monthly Meeting, 'that a few of their members have embraced the Doctrine of Water Baptism and submitted to that ceremony.'²⁴

The report implied that the Preparatory Meeting in Leeds had known of the baptisms for some time. The overseers may have feared that the knowledge would set in motion a train of recrimination as in Manchester and Kendal. In the first instance, though, their confession suggested that Quakerism's hierarchical structure could be ineffective. The Monthly Meeting did not know what to do with the knowledge and turned to Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting. The next step would have been to seek advice at the impending Yearly Meeting in London but the Quarterly Meeting declined to make this move, preferring instead to pass this problem back through the Monthly Meeting to the overseers of Leeds Preparatory Meeting.²⁵ Effectively, the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings refused to take the matter onto their books, and local Quaker leaders in Leeds were forced back onto their own initiative. It was not that Quakers felt disinclined to shoulder responsibility; they genuinely felt they had insufficient official guidance to exercise care or discipline; indeed, they did not know which of the two was appropriate or if they need be mutually exclusive. A three month gap followed in the minutes of the Preparatory and Monthly Meetings. With Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting unprepared to commit itself, Brighouse Friends would have

looked toward the general proceedings of Yearly Meeting to see if any light were shone their way.

In contrast to Yorkshire, Westmorland Quarterly Meeting had addressed the similar, if larger, problem of its Monthly Meeting and appealed to Yearly Meeting. Their queries inspired debate on 27 May on cases of members having received the Lord's Supper and Water Baptism. Did, 'an individual partaking of either of these rites render(s) himself amenable to the discipline of the Society; and if so, what course... to pursue?'²⁶ There was much argument and no clear indication. This was the reaction of Isaac Wilson of Westmorland who, 'could find no rule to authorise them to bring the case on the minutes of the Monthly Meeting.' These were not cases of delinquency. In a clear reference to Brighouse Monthly Meeting, he said:-

The same circumstances had occurred in the largest Monthly Meeting in Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting... the judgement come to was, that Friends must now be left to proceed as they thought best... yet when they did so they were reflected upon.

Wilson did not like to see those reflected upon who had endeavoured, 'to act up to the spirit of the discipline,' and tried to do their duty; he reminded Friends that those who had submitted to rites did so in the belief that it was their Christian duty under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

In spite of strong arguments that Monthly Meetings should deal with individuals uniformly, the collective judgement of Yearly Meeting decided not to accept it. The clerk, Samuel Tuke of York Meeting and also clerk of the visiting committee in Manchester, 'thought that the absence of written rules should not prevent overseers from dealing with any member... nothing should prevent their bringing the matter before the Monthly Meeting.' The Christian care of the overseers was the Monthly Meeting's discipline. After three hours of discussion it was the judgement of the Meeting that the proposition be sent back to Westmorland without being recorded in the minutes. Isaac Wilson complained that Friends had been 'lashed unsparingly.'

On the following Tuesday, in response to a proposition that Westmorland were in need of assistance, that Meeting narrowly escaped the fate of Manchester. With evident relief one Friend rejoiced, 'that Westmorland Friends were not likely to be punished by the appointment of a Yearly Meeting's Committee.' Commonsense saw that if disciplinary proceedings, and ultimately disownment, were taken to their logical conclusion:

It would have led to (and he spoke it reverently) our Saviour himself, and his apostles and disciples, if now on earth, being considered as 'disorderly walkers'... unfit to be members of the Society of Friends, because they had submitted to Water Baptism and partaken of the Supper of bread and wine.

At that the Meeting was called violently to order by the clerk.

For those Monthly Meetings looking for a lead on discipline from the May Meetings there was little illumination. They were left fumbling in search of answers to difficult questions largely without antecedent. Yearly Meeting Epistles at this time, offered little practical guidance to local Meetings beyond prescribing the authority of Scripture.

Brighouse concluded eventually its Leeds Preparatory Meeting overseers unequal to shouldering the whole burden and took the case on to the Monthly Meeting books by naming names in July. The deviant members emerged as John Jowitt Jr., his wife Deborah, Rachel Jr. and Elizabeth Jowitt, Margaret Tennant and Maria Arthington. The Meeting maintained 'its firm adherence to the well known views which our society has always upheld on the Spirituality of Christian Baptism,'²⁷ but a further two months elapsed before any sort of policy became apparent. A committee was appointed in September comprising Joseph Tatham, manufacturers Benjamin Seebohm, Newman Cash and William Harding.²⁸ Tatham's inclusion is especially interesting. This time, his principles may have been able to persuade Friends to 'wait' on a decision. This would help to explain the longer than usual delays in bringing the errant Friends to account or otherwise. The evangelical Seebohm would have been receptive to such counsel having seen for himself, over the summer, the damage done in Lancashire.²⁹

The committee's decisions, after a three months delay, seemed tailored to the individual. Margaret Tennant had in any case gone to live in Tottenham; Friends there were requested to visit her. She sent her resignation to Leeds.³⁰ John Jowitt Jr. was seen as the key to the rest of the Jowitts, who were not discussed until the following month, and the longest report was concentrated on him. The Brighouse committee believed that he had 'acted under an apprehension of duty founded on what he conceived to be the doctrine of Scripture upon the point,' but, 'earnestly recommended to him a serious reconsideration of his conduct and the sentiment which led thereto.'³¹

A report in the same month on Maria Arthington did not share the same hopes of reformation; this was hardly surprising in view of her lengthy and public avowals. The committee found, 'her views so little harmonizing with those of the Society of which she is a member,' and recommended her disownment the following month. On the face of it, it did not look as though Arthington was to be afforded the same choices

as Jowitt, but it is more likely that Leeds Friends had had far longer with Arthington to arrive at the conclusion that she simply was not going to change her mind. The decision to view submission to the ordinances as a case of delinquency was not, as we have seen, a straightforward recourse to the Society's rules of discipline, it was more a reflection of how local Quakers felt the importance of, 'maintaining inviolate the testimonies which our Society has always upheld on the spirituality of the Gospel dispensation.'³² Maria Arthington had established herself as too vocal an opponent. She came in for particular scrutiny after her short-lived intention to appeal to the Quarterly Meeting against Brighouse's decision became public knowledge.³³ J.J. Gurney, now in America, was kept well informed of some of these practical consequences. A correspondent alluded to two or three Monthly Meetings which, after waiting for some time, had proceeded against members. In reference to Arthington it was stated that:-

Such persons who set forth conscience for (*sic*) adopting the outward rite seem to me too much to forget that the religious society to which they wd (*sic*) still clung, also had a conscience in this matter of faith, and therefore it seems incumbent on them and honest too (having been the first to break the pale of our faith) to resign their membership.³⁴

The Jowitts, who were to cling to the Society for a few months more, had been recommended to consider their conduct and sentiments. It was surely a forlorn hope that their baptism had been no more than a gesture or a form of registration. Yet it is unlikely that Friends who wished to remain connected with the Society, as the Jowitts apparently did, would want to become associated with any other body. Mistakes could be rectified. It was reported in August 1840 that Ann Lees of Huddersfield, after attending the Established Church, 'identified herself with that body by undergoing the ceremony of sprinkling... without having given the subject a proper consideration; and said that were it not done she thought that she would not now do it.'³⁵ She was not disowned. A preferable alternative for the Leeds Friends, sincerely desirous of sealing their commitment to Christ, would have been a baptism by Crewdson. The journal of the Evangelical Friends, the *Inquirer*, recorded that the first public baptisms performed by them did not take place until 25 January 1838; it did state, however, that previously some had been baptised more privately.³⁶ Such was the experience of Maria Hack in June 1837, who found that Crewdson's execution of the rite retained elements of 'Friends' religious opportunities.³⁷ It is probable that the Leeds Friends would have found such a ceremony more

congenial than that offered by the Church of England whose practice of the sacrament at this time could be very insensitive.

Whatever the circumstances under which Leeds Friends were baptized, developments were to underline their deepening religious fervour. Brighouse Monthly Meeting minutes in February 1838 recorded that the four Jowitts had received the Lord's Supper. Friends reacted with characteristic suspicion believing the ritual to be, 'inconsistent with the spirituality of the Christian dispensation, in which Friends believe "no shadows have any place."'³⁸ But a revised belief in the Atonement had led the Jowitts to new interpretations of the Lord's Supper with less spiritual, livelier and more visual representative reminders of the ultimate sacrifice. To add to Brighouse's problems another Jowitt, Susannah, became baptized in the same month.³⁹ An April report on the Jowitt's submission to the Lord's Supper recorded that they had found 'satisfaction.'⁴⁰ But again, the Jowitts had a chance to return to the fold. A decision to disown them was delayed until July. Then, with deep regret, the text of disownment of the five Jowitts recounted that they had effectively withdrawn themselves from religious fellowship with the Society and could, therefore, no longer be considered members.⁴¹

Their fate produced reaction outside the Monthly Meeting minutes. At the 1837 Yearly Meeting John Jowitt Jr.'s father, Robert, made a plea for even-handedness, anxious that those who believed it was their duty to:-

uphold the Society in its present views... should not be spoken of as entertaining unscriptural views of the Gospel dispensation... On the other hand those Friends who... were anxious to bring every opinion to a scriptural test, and were convinced that certain views which the Society held were not binding upon Christians... should not be spoken of with bitterness, and as wishing to subvert the Society.⁴²

Anxiety did not prevent this prosperous woolstapler from publishing the results of his own deliberations on baptism in 1837, which brought him down on one side of the debate.⁴³ It is likely he felt moved to defend the spiritual views of baptism soon after it became an issue in the Monthly Meeting from February. It must have been difficult for Robert Jowitt to side against the evangelicals as he sympathized with so many of their aims. For example, at 1839 Yearly Meeting Jowitt could be heard arguing against the retention of birthright membership.⁴⁴ In advancing the peculiar views of Friends on baptism Jowitt repeated much of what Bates had said 12 years earlier, though some of the arguments were better developed and more concerned with refuting the belief of some

evangelicals that baptism was a necessary and saving act. It was painful for Robert Jowitt to view the baptism of his son and business partner as deluded.

The controversy facing Friends also generated interest outside the Society in Leeds. A long pamphlet by 'Bereus' appeared in 1838, 'for it is notorious that there are amongst you some who are relinquishing the doctrines and liberty of your spiritual religion, and voluntarily subjecting themselves to the bondage of "weak and beggarly elements..."'⁴⁵ The author's pseudonym was a parody of the use by Friends, particularly the evangelicals, of the Macedonians of Berea who were commended for their diligent search of the truth, 'for they received the message with great eagerness and examined the scriptures each day to see if what Paul said was true.' (Acts XVII, II). Though Bereus was not a member of the Society he shared the traditional spiritual views of Friends as regards baptism and wanted to defend them. By 1838 however, there was little to add to the debate and Bereus' conclusions offered nothing fundamentally new.

The great weight of opinion for and against the ordinances had affected the Monthly Meeting on all sides. For all who considered these issues in the wake of Beaconism they entailed a disturbing re-appraisal of Quakerism's first principles. The great delay in disowning the Jowitts was partly as a result of 'waiting on the Lord.' Yet for Friends like Tatham and Seebohm with known evangelical sympathies it was also a sign of Brighouse's reluctance to proceed against Friends whom they knew were doing what they saw as their Christian duty. There was no convincing Friends like the Jowitts that the terms of their renewal could be fulfilled spiritually; the external pull of the evangelical revival was too strong. In clinging to membership for so long, the Jowitts were exceptional. They had not the intention to resign and the Meeting felt disinclined to disown them out of hand. It is likely that, by courting a disciplinary decision, they wished to bring the debate about evangelical worship to a head.

The fate of these Friends is a well documented result of a schism which promoted the belief that Quaker modes of worship were no longer appropriate to a conversion experience. This trend of thought, of which the secession was a significant, if not an original, part, can be seen reflected in figures relating to resignations and disownments. Figures show that for this Meeting the Beacon controversy was a serious matter. The resignation of Maria Nevins of Leeds in February 1831 was the first resignation the Monthly Meeting had experienced since 1814. There followed one more in 1831, two in 1832, four in 1833, one in 1835, two in 1836, three in 1837, seven in 1838, three in 1839 and seven in 1840.⁴⁶

A steady trickle continued after this date but such numbers were not to be seen again until the decline of Quaker evangelicalism in Leeds in the early 1890s. The great majority of resignations in the 1830s were for avowed religious reasons or were from people whose surnames marked them out as being sympathetic to those who had been baptised. For example, Susannah Arthington of Leeds resigned in October 1836 feeling it, 'her duty to attend upon the regular preaching of the Gospel and that feeling of comfort and benefit.'⁴⁷ John and Mary Jowitt of Leeds sent in the resignation of themselves and their six children in July 1838.⁴⁸ The Monthly Meeting refused to accept the resignation of the children who were considered too young to make a responsible judgement. There were 23 resignations between 1835, the year of the *Beacon's* circulation, and 1840. The resignations were confined initially to Leeds but spread to Bradford in 1838 and 1840. No other Meetings in Brighouse were affected. Overall, 16 resignations occurred in Leeds and seven in Bradford.

A steady trickle of resignations was to continue in later years as the children of those affected by the 1830s reached maturity and left the Society. For example Jane Arthington, who was baptised in 1844 and resigned in 1850, had regularly attended the Independents up to resignation.⁴⁹ Maria Esther Jowitt, who also resigned in that year, had for some time believed in baptism and the Lord's supper before being baptised recently by the Congregationalists believing the outward ordinances to be, 'of Divine appointment'.⁵⁰ There were 34 disownments by Brighouse Monthly Meeting between 1835 and 1840, representing a peak not seen before or after in the nineteenth century. Not all were connected specifically with evangelicalism. Many were expulsions for marrying non-members and cases of delinquency, the reasons behind an increase of which is hard to explain. What is clear, though, is that membership growth in Brighouse Monthly Meeting suffered a significant reversal in the wake of Beaconism, with a steady increase in membership suddenly faltering in 1836 and not really recovering its losses until ten years later.

Looking specifically at Leeds Preparatory Meeting the significance of these losses can be seen quite clearly. The number of resignations together with disownments related to religious disaffection, totalled 23 exits between 1835 and 1840 inclusive. This may appear to be a very small number but actually represents about five per cent of the average membership in the Leeds area in 1839-1840. The percentage loss of active Friends was actually a good deal higher when it is considered that membership totals included children and non-attenders. As active evangelicals, the Friends that were lost were often quite talented. For

example, Brighouse Monthly Meeting Minutes reflect that Quaker First Day school provision, exclusively an evangelical concern, collapsed as a result of the loss of its teachers. The school room, much enlarged at the end of the eighteenth century, stood empty for several years. This loss was keenly felt by evangelicals when they remembered that as recently as 1830 there existed only five such schools in England.⁵¹ In his recollections of this period J.H. Barber, then an apprenticed architect in Leeds, lamented this loss of teaching talent:- ‘... when the Crewdson split came, it took away Friends not a few good people, like the Jowitts of Leeds, whom the society sorely missed...’⁵²

The story did not end with those who left the Society. Evangelical Friends like Barber who retained Quaker membership were racked initially with doubt and indecision when considering the correct expression of their intensely held beliefs. They had heard the ministry of Maria Arthington and seen the outcome of Quaker oversight in various Meetings. One such Friend, Joseph Sewell, was an apprentice miller in Kirkstall, Leeds, 18 years old at the time of the Jowitts’ disownment in 1838. He felt that Friends, ‘appeared to be lacking in vitality, to be living on a past reputation rather than fitting themselves for usefulness in the present.’⁵³ He did not see the Society being able to fulfil his growing needs as a believer, and moved to the opinion that Water Baptism was essential to a Christian confession. It took a deal of counsel from Robert Jowitt and Benjamin Seebohm, reflected in anxious letters to his father, to reinforce traditional beliefs. Delay did settle Sewell’s mind as to the soundness of Friends’ views. In 1842 he wrote to a cousin in similar difficulties:-

How well I can remember the conflict that passed in my own mind when, just before I had intended to be baptised, I (saw) that I was only walking in my own wisdom, and whilst pretending to be acting in obedience to the Divine will, I was in fact walking after my own will. Oh, if I may give thee counsel, it will be to lie low at thy Saviour’s feet, till He altogether make darkness light before thee and crooked places straight.⁵⁴

The *Beacon* controversy, then, had a notable impact on Leeds Friends and Brighouse Monthly Meeting. Membership of the Meeting fell significantly. Following Bates’ recommendations, established policy towards potential members was undermined. Family and friends were divided. Not least of all, with the loss of young and fervent talent, the growth of Quaker evangelicalism in Brighouse Monthly Meeting was for a time arrested as a result of Beaconism.

Mark A. Ellison

72 FURTHER THOUGHTS ON LEEDS FRIENDS

NOTES AND REFERENCES

- ¹ Paper headed 'Society of Friends,' (Bradford, 1836).
- ² J.E. Mortimer, 'Leeds Friends and the Beaconite Controversy,' *J.H.F.S.*, vol. 54, no. 2 (1977).
- ³ M. Grubb, 'The Beacon Separation,' *J.H.F.S.*, vol. 55, no. 6 (1984) 190-198, 191.
- ⁴ Elisha Bates, *The Doctrines of Friends*, (Leeds, 1829).
- ⁵ Brotherton Library (Univ. of Leeds), Carlton Hill MSS R6, Brighouse M.Mtg Minutes, 148-149, (21/3/1834).
- ⁶ LSF, Gurney MSS, III 591, (Jane Gurney to J.J. Gurney, 19/6/1835).
- ⁷ Ibid., III 602, (J.J. Gurney to his children, 29/10/1835).
- ⁸ J. Tatham, Considerations etc. on the Holy Spirit, (Leeds, 1830).
- ⁹ J. Tatham, *The Ground of Christian Discipline briefly explained*, (Leeds, 1824).
- ¹⁰ LSF Gurney MSS, III 604, (J.J. Gurney to E. Fry, 7/4/1836).
- ¹¹ Samuel Tuke - *His life work and thoughts* ed. C. Tyler (1900), 128.
- ¹² Ibid., 130, (To a Friend -3/1837).
- ¹³ Edward Ash, *The Friend*, vol. 10, no. 117, 208.
- ¹⁴ *A Few Remarks addressed to the Society of Friends, on the Subject of a Revival of religion amongst them. By a member.* (Leeds, 1835), 3.
- ¹⁵ *A Few Remarks on the Leading Principles of Christian faith, addressed to the Society of Friends, in Leeds.* (January, 1836), Introduction.
- ¹⁶ Arthington, *A Few Remarks*, (1835), 2.
- ¹⁷ Broth. Library, Carl Hill MSS R6, Brighouse M.Mtg. Minutes, 276.
- ¹⁸ Ibid., G4, Brighouse M.Mtg for Ministry and Oversight.
- ¹⁹ *Private Memoirs of B. and E. Seebohm*, (1937) 120.
- ²⁰ Broth. Library, Carl Hill MSS R6, Brighouse M.Mtg Minutes, 148-149, (21/3/1834).
- ²¹ Elisha Bates, *Reasons for receiving the Ordinance of Christian Baptism to which are added some observations on the Lord's Supper.* (2nd ed. 1836), 2. The article also appeared in Bristol, Manchester, Liverpool and Kendal.
- ²² *Correspondence between Eliza Bates and others on the subject of his having been baptised.* (1836).
- ²³ *Reminiscences of John Jowitt Jr.* by his children. Printed for private circulation, (Gloucester, 1889), 19.
- ²⁴ Broth. Library, Carl.Hill MSS R7, Brighouse M.Mtg. Minutes, 9. (17/2/1837).
- ²⁵ Ibid., 15, (21/4/1837).
- ²⁶ *The Proceedings of Yearly Meeting* (1837), 31.
- ²⁷ Broth. Library, Carl.Hill MSS R7, Brighouse M.Mtg. Minutes, 32, (21/7/1837).
- ²⁸ Ibid., 39, (15/9/1837).
- ²⁹ Private memoirs, 122.
- ³⁰ Broth. Library, Carl.Hill MSS R7, Brighouse M.Mtg. Minutes, 103, (15/6/1838).
- ³¹ Ibid., 8/12/1837, 56-57.
- ³² Ibid., 5/1/1838, 63-64.
- ³³ LSF Gurney MSS, II 249, (To J.J. From Samuel Gurney, 13/4/1838).
- ³⁴ Ibid., I 10, (Letter dates 13/4/1838).
- ³⁵ Broth. Library, Carl.Hill MSS R7, Brighouse M.Mtg. Minutes, 237, (21/8/1840).
- ³⁶ *The Inquirer*, vol. 2, 74.

- ³⁷ 'The baptism of Maria Hack,' *J.H.F.S.* vol. 46, (1954), 67-77, 72.
- ³⁸ Broth. Library, Carl.Hill MSS R7, Brighouse M.Mtg. Minutes, 87, (20/4/1838).
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, 74 (9/2/1838).
- ⁴⁰ R7, Brighouse M.Mtg. Minutes, 87, (20/4/1838).
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 9 August 1838, 115.
- ⁴² *Proceedings*, (1837), 63.
- ⁴³ R. Jowitt, *Thoughts on Water Baptism*, (Leeds, 1837).
- ⁴⁴ *A Quaker Journal: Being the Diary and Reminiscences of William Lucas of Hitchin*, 1804-1861, ed. G.E. Bryant and G.P. Baker (2 vols. 1934), vol. 1, 167.
- ⁴⁵ Bereus, *A defence of the Friends' Doctrine of Baptism, with brief remarks on the Lord's Supper*. (Leeds, 1838).
- ⁴⁶ Broth. Library, Carl.Hill MSS M1-M2, Brighouse M.Mtg. Membership books, (1810-1854).
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, R6, Brighouse M.Mtg. Minutes, 303, (-/9/1836).
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, R7, Brighouse M.Mtg. Minutes, 111, (27/7/1838).
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, R9, Brighouse M.Mtg. Minutes, 277-278, (13/12/1850).
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 248, (16/8/1850).
- ⁵¹ E. Isichei, *Victorian Quakers*, 259.
- ⁵² *James Henry Barber - A Memoir*, ed. H.M. Doncaster (2 vols, 1903). Vol. 1, 325.
- ⁵³ Joseph S. Sewell. *A Quaker Memoir*, ed. Edith Sewell (1902), 13.
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 17.

‘THE ANCIENT WAY’: THE CONSERVATIVE TRADITION IN NINETEENTH CENTURY BRITISH QUAKERISM

‘I have wanted to write to thee and let thee know how heavily some of us are going along with the head bowed down because of the oppression, as we are wont to believe, of the enemy, who has, it appears to some amongst us, taken his seat in the Church.’¹

These striking words are from a letter written by John G. Sargent (then of Cockermouth but known to posterity as of Fritchley) to his friend Thomas Drewry of Fleetwood.² He was aged nearly 48 and was writing from London on the 2nd of 6th month 1861, the Yearly Meeting having closed the previous day. The letter continues: ‘Well, they have done what they listed and are permitted to work, and having wrought according to the mind that is in them, they have brought forth the fruits so incompatible with Truth’s dictates in the spirit of his humble self-denying followers (as we believe), so that we are a poor and afflicted remnant who cannot join with them.’³

‘The oppression, as we are wont to believe, of the enemy.’ Who, we may ask, is the enemy ‘who has taken his seat in the Church’; who are ‘they’? ‘They’ are those within London Yearly Meeting who, ‘having wrought according to the mind that is in them,’ had in the course of that Yearly Meeting secured its approval to a thoroughgoing revision of the book of discipline, a revision, moreover, which for the first time included a section entitled ‘Christian doctrine,’ a section which was to remain for the next 60 years. But this revision was but the culmination of what had been a bad decade for the ‘poor and afflicted remnant.’ In 1850 ‘the enemy’ - ‘they’ - had agreed that gravestones might be erected in our burial grounds, a step which, the afflicted remnant feared, might exalt the creature; in 1854 ‘they’ had conceded that the payment of inappropriate tithes should not be a disownable offence; in 1855 ‘they’ had, after 16 hours of deliberation, acknowledged the wrong yearly meeting in Ohio, receiving the Gurneyite rather than the Wilburite epistle; in 1856 and the years following ‘they’ had brought the Yearly Meeting to the point where it was ready to ask Parliament to legislate so that those ‘professing with Friends,’ though not in membership might be

married according to our usages; in 1860 ‘they’ had made a thorough revision of the queries, abandoned many of the written answers and utterly dispensing with the fourth query on ‘plainness of speech, behaviour and apparel’; and now ‘they’ had made a radical revision of discipline.⁴

One further indignity was to come. On the 25th of 6th month 1862 John G. Sargent wrote from Cockermouth, again to Thomas Drewry: ‘A trying time at our Quarterly Meeting yesterday... The tabular statement of statistics it appears, is to be an annual production, with which I have no unity. These are the fruits of the natural will in my view, not productive of good or life in our meetings, and take the place of higher matter which, owing to their not more fully coming unto or under the Power, is so much excluded, and our meetings become tedious, and they find they must hurry through the business, and thus we depart from the substance to the shadow.’⁵

If the 1850s had been a bad decade for the conservatives we must next ask who they were. How far were they a cohesive group? What were they concerned to conserve? Or was it just that they were opposed to any change? Is there a distinction between a conservative and a traditionalist? Or, shall we say, between conservation and preservation? And were there important Quaker insights in danger of being lost and in need of conservation? These are important questions and, even if they cannot all be readily answered at this stage, we must begin to clear the ground.

THE GROWTH OF EVANGELICALISM

We cannot look at the mid-nineteenth century Quaker scene without examining the word ‘evangelical’ and trying to adopt a working definition. It is used in its broad sense, as meaning ‘in accordance with the gospel’ in, for instance, London Yearly Meeting’s epistle for 1855: ‘pure, evangelical worship stands neither in forms nor in the formal disuse of forms; and may be without words as well as with them, but must be in spirit and in truth.’⁶ But for our present purpose it is used in its narrower sense so that evangelicals are defined as those who place great stress on correctness of belief as an essential of Christian discipleship, who emphasize the importance of the doctrine of justification by faith, who preach a substitutionary theory of the atonement, and whose prime authority is to be found in the Bible. It should, however, be made clear that evangelicals were not necessarily literalists in their attitude to the scriptures.

Some extracts from a few of the 40 letters of resignation received by Hardshaw East Monthly Meeting in eleventh and twelfth months 1836

will perhaps illustrate the point.

The doctrine of the 'Inward Light' as held by the Society, I am fully persuaded tends to the introduction of another Gospel than that of the Lord Jesus Christ (William Boulton).

On the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith alone, the early writers of the Society are lamentably unsound (Joseph and Anna Crewdson).

I can no longer remain in unity with a Society that encourages the doctrine of an universal saving light, said to be given to every man (John Atkinson Ransome). ...impressed with the necessity of that Society openly avowing the paramount authority of Holy Scripture, from which naturally follow the grand and essential doctrines of the atonement and justification by faith (Alfred Binyon).

The doctrines of Quakerism, as set forth in many of the writings of the early Friends, and as evidenced in the preaching which is generally approved in the Society, have long appeared to me, to be fundamentally at variance with the grand doctrines of salvation by Jesus Christ, as revealed in the Holy Scripture (Mary Maskell).

...the fixed determination there appears to be in the Society, not only in this Meeting, but in other parts of the kingdom, to silence such Ministers as, in their religious communications, give to the greater doctrine of Justification by Faith that importance which I conceive belongs to it (Thomas Simpson).

I do also believe, after mutual deliberation, that the secondary position which you assign to the Holy Scriptures, as a rule of faith and practice, together with the doctrine of the inward light, as maintained by the Society, are errors of a deeply delusive nature (John Butterworth).

The doctrine of the light within, which has always been the leading principle of Quakerism, we believe to be at variance with Holy Scripture, and entirely a delusion (five members of the Thorp family).

The doctrine of justification by faith, that doctrine which lies at the root of vital religion, is, by many of our accredited writers, and by many of our Ministers at the present time, either not held, or so perverted as not to be the Gospel of Jesus (Isaac and Hannah Neild).⁷

The conservatives with whom we have to deal regarded themselves as orthodox in their Christianity. When in 1800 Hannah Barnard questioned whether God had in fact ordered the slaughter of the Amalakites, the conservatives had no doubt that such speculation tended to undermine the authority of scripture, for they had no doubt as to its authority, though they would later differ from the evangelicals as to its primacy. When the Yearly Meeting of 1815 confirmed the disownment of Thomas Foster the conservatives did not dissent from that judgement,

for the circulation of publications of the Unitarian Tract Society presupposed a disbelief in the divinity of Christ and they were fully convinced of his divinity. When in 1827 and 1828 the repercussions of the Hicksite secession were felt this side the Atlantic the conservatives did not doubt the unsoundness of the Hicksites. They were not men and women preoccupied with doctrine, as the evangelicals were, but they did have a core of doctrine - or at least of unquestioned presuppositions - which they shared with the evangelicals.

Though there were earlier hints of divergent opinion, it is in the 1830s that they became unavoidable issues. At the very start of the decade came the Committee on a General Visit - 61 Friends appointed by Yearly Meeting 1830 with a further 21 added the next year. Not until 1834 was the task completed and the committee laid down. The committee was not, of course, confined to evangelicals - there were arch-conservatives like John Barclay and middle-of-the-road traditionalists like William Allen (who was clerk) and Samuel Tuke. But the committee did include some forceful evangelicals - William Boulton, Isaac Crewdson, William Dillworth Crewdson, Joseph John Gurney, Samuel Lloyd, John Wilkinson (five of these six, incidentally, had resigned their membership before the decade was out).⁸

Members of the Committee on a General Visit were in the midst of their labours, visiting quarterly and monthly meetings as well as individual meetings, when, on the 19th of eight month 1831 there landed at Liverpool an American ministering Friend. His name - which was to become much better known in later years - was John Wilbur. It was his first visit to Europe; he was 57 years of age and he had been recorded a minister by his monthly meeting as long ago as 1812. It was the 17th of second month 1833 before he set sail for home, and the 18 months of his extensive travels have a profound significance not only in relation to British (and perhaps also Irish) Quakerism, but also in relation to America.⁹

But let us return to the Committee on a General Visit. It informed the Yearly Meeting of 1832 that ‘in the course of the visit the Queries and the General Advices have been often brought under notice’ and it suggested ‘that a few alterations in the former and a revision of the latter would in their judgement be attended with advantage.’¹⁰ Concurrently, Meeting for Sufferings informed Yearly Meeting that the *Book of extracts* (1802 with an 1822 supplement) was out of print.¹¹ Yearly Meeting therefore instructed quarterly meetings to appoint representatives to a conference on the whole subject, to be held in the autumn. The Committee on a General Visit was asked to report to that conference as far as the queries and general advice were concerned.

The conference met at Devonshire House in eleventh month 1832. Its importance - and that of the Yearly Meeting of 1833 which completed and authorised the revised Discipline - can scarcely be over-emphasized. As far as the general advices were concerned, they were transformed from the severely practical text of 1791 (when they were first introduced) into a theological essay intended to promote evangelical orthodoxy. It is worth comparing the opening sentences of each:

1790 Friends are advised - To make their wills, and settle their outward affairs, in time of health. To observe due moderation in the furniture of their houses, and to avoid superfluity in their manner of living. To attend to the limitations of truth in the pursuit after wealth.

1833 Take heed, dear Friends, we intreat you, to the convictions of the Holy Spirit, who leads, through unfeigned repentance and living faith in the Son of God, to reconciliation with our Heavenly Father, and to the blessed hope of eternal life, purchased for us by the one offering of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.¹²

We are indeed in a different world.

Joseph John Gurney,¹³ writing to Jonathan Hutchinson¹⁴ of Gedney, describes the autumn 1832 conference: 'We were about 80 in number, & I think *every sitting* was begun & ended in the feeling of solemnity. The whole was concluded by a meeting for worship last fourth day morning at Gracechurch Street. The *Conservative* principle was very prevalent amongst us. Nevertheless some important alterations & improvements, especially in the shape of addition were made in the Book. *Entre nous*, we had some very interesting theological discussion in consequence of something which our dear friend John Wilkinson¹⁵ uttered - & which occasioned alarm in some minds, under the idea that it was not consistent with our good old doctrine of the *light within*. I was fearful of the consequence; but all ended very *peacefully*; & I think we were brought into very comforting unity.'¹⁶

And after the Yearly Meeting of 1833 J.J. Gurney wrote again to Jonathan Hutchinson that 'the grand work of the revised & enlarged book of the law, was surmounted with less difficulty than we could have anticipated... & the various discussions into which some of these matters led us were conducted peaceably & with scarcely any exception appeared to me to terminate rightly - may I not say, according to the mind of Truth.'¹⁷ Samuel Lloyd¹⁸ of Birmingham, writing two years later - and on the eve of another momentous Yearly Meeting - looked back to the occasion in more vehement mood: 'Not to see danger under

present circumstances is indeed extraordinary... No danger! When it is remembered with what difficulty the introduction of sound views was attended in the new Edition of the Book of Extracts, and how obviously preferable to many were the mystical views of Gospel Truth then broached.¹⁹

“Sound views,” were, above all, introduced into the 1833 book, which was entitled *Rules of discipline* by the inclusion of four extracts ‘from approved documents of the Society, issued at different periods, and declaratory of its views, in preference to some of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith.’²⁰ But these, while an approved part of the book, were not within the main body of the text, but subjoined to the preface. Was this a compromise to meet those who, while unhappy at the inclusion of the extracts at all, were a trifle less unhappy than they would have been at their inclusion (as was to happen in 1861) within the main body of the text?

Joseph John Gurney, in his letter to Jonathan Hutchinson after the 1833 Yearly Meeting, has some significant words: ‘Notwithstanding this rather flourishing account as thou wilt be ready to call it, it has been a time of deep & painful exercise to many, chiefly in consequence of the more apparent prevalence of somewhat different views of divine Truth. We have thou knowest always been accustomed to watchmen at opposite gates, & I believe thou, with myself, hast at times rejoiced in a Providential provision so well suited to our need. But this sort of thing, may if not watched, sometimes go too far - & produce a *diverging* rather too palpable to be welcome. Surmises & alarm, on either side, have prevailed too much - I believe unreasonably - yet probably there may have been on both sides some reason for fear.’²¹

In January 1835 a ‘diverging too palpable to be welcome’ appeared in the shape of the Manchester Friend Isaac Crewdson’s²² *A Beacon to the Society of Friends*. J.J. Gurney noted in his journal that the book contained many ‘painful innuendoes, touching in various degrees on our well-known views of the spirituality of the Gospel of Christ. Indeed, it is my deliberate judgement that the work has an undesirable tendency to undermine the precious doctrine of the immediate teaching, guidance and government of the Holy Spirit.’²³ Isaac Crewdson, his brother-in-law William Boulton²⁴ and their followers were assertive and vocal, and it is not surprising that disunity arose in Hardshaw East Monthly Meeting of Ministers & Elders and in the monthly meeting itself.

J.J. Gurney was one of a committee - a well-balanced committee of 13 - appointed by Yearly Meeting 1835 to assist Hardshaw East Monthly Meeting.²⁵ This is not the place to traverse yet again the work of that committee, but Edward Grubb, in saying that its proceedings ‘were

badly mismanaged, almost from the first,' may have underestimated the complexity of the situation which faced it.²⁶ If the end result was that there were resignations from nearly 50 Friends it may be regrettable, but the committee can hardly be blamed for opening the eyes of those Friends to the fact that they individually held certain beliefs which ran clean counter to the Society's corporate witness.²⁷ The committee was not concerned, as some later committees were, with the rooting out of what they perceived as heresy, but it would surely have been evading its duty had it not made clear, perhaps particularly to Isaac Crewdson and William Boulton, that their vocal ministry and forcibly expressed convictions out of meeting were causing grave disunity in the meeting just because they were out of harmony with fundamental Quaker conviction.

J.J. Gurney has in many, though far from all, Quaker circles enjoyed for a century and a half a singularly bad press. The quotation from his journal about the *Beacon* makes clear that it is untrue to say, as has not infrequently been said, that he was in fundamental agreement with Isaac Crewdson. The fact that he urged the use of the mind ('we shall never thrive upon ignorance')²⁸ was of course distasteful to those who believed that worship demanded the stilling of the mind, the *tabula rasa* on which the hand of God might write. Perhaps, however, his wealth and lifestyle were almost as much offence as his theology. Other Friends, of course, were wealthy, but perhaps not so many ministering Friends or, if they were, it was not so blatantly obvious. Or can it be that suspicions arose from the very fact that he could express himself so lucidly, so fluently? - there have been other instances when these gifts have, so far from being universally persuasive, left at least some among the auditors vaguely convinced that there must be a catch in it somewhere. However it may be, J.J. Gurney's name was to be, in America even more than Britain, a symbol of strife.

The 1837 Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders which liberated, but did not unite in liberating, J.J. Gurney for religious service in America illustrates the extent of conservative objection, Sarah Lynes Grubb acknowledging his abilities and great desire for doing good but expressing her conviction that he had many baptisms and testings yet to go through.²⁹

THE CONSERVATIVE REACTION

The 1830s, then, saw the conservatives allied not only against the ultra-evangelicals (as evidenced, for instance, in the Beaconites) but also against those of the middle party, as instanced in J.J. Gurney. In 1843 the very fact that two periodicals were established demonstrates the gulf

between evangelicals, for whom *The Friend* did good service, and conservatives, catered for by the Glasgow-edited *The British Friend*. From 1846 the latter had on the title-page of its annual volume the text from Jeremiah ‘Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein.’³⁰ From 1861 it was to stand at the head of each monthly issue.

The Friends who had been foremost in maintaining a conservative witness during these years were taken by death in a way that the survivors found desolating: Thomas Shillitoe died in 1836, John Barclay two years later (at the early age of 41); Daniel Wheeler died in 1840, George Jones and John Grubb in 1841, Sarah Lynes Grubb in 1842, Abram Rawlinson Barclay in 1845 (aged 51), Ann Jones in 1846, George Crosfield the following year, and John Harrison in 1852.³¹

But a new generation was in fact gathering forces even if, at this stage, they did not themselves know it. Thomas Drewry had been born in 1812, John G. Sargent the following year, William Irving about 1815, Charles Thompson in 1819, Joseph Armfield in 1821, William Graham in 1823, and Daniel Pickard in 1828.³²

A further conservative of the older generation, Lydia Ann Barclay,³³ lived on until 1855 - being only 55 years old at the time of her death. Two years earlier she had journeyed from Aberdeen to Manchester to meet John Wilbur, who returned on a ministerial visit in 1853. It was a visit very different from the former. He had been at the centre of a controversy within New England Yearly Meeting in 1845 and was a member of the smaller or conservative Yearly Meeting at the time of separation that year, being disowned by the monthly meeting of the Yearly Meeting with whom we correspond so that the Meeting for Sufferings in London felt it necessary to warn British Friends against receiving him. Nevertheless, many individual Friends did receive him.³⁴ Thus at Manchester ‘many Friends of the foremost rank gathered around us, and shook hands very cordially, some of them inviting us to their homes’ and even at Devonshire House itself a ‘great number of Friends of both sexes, gathered round us, with smiling countenances, giving us their hands in a manner which gave testimony of their unity of feeling.’³⁵

At Tottenham, home of the evangelical Forsters,³⁶ the welcome was not universal: John Wilbur had appeared in the ministry at the midweek meeting, and at the close ‘Paul Bevan said, “the person present who had intruded himself upon the meeting was not a member of our Society.” Dr. Edward May, a minister, said “he did not think that which had been offered in that meeting was any intrusion,” and a Friend who sat back

said, "he agreed with E.M. that there had been no intrusion; for that he had good unity with what had been said." ³⁷

Of the individual visits two deserve mention, apart from his old friend and valued correspondent Lydia Ann Barclay. At Manchester 'a young man from Leeds, by the name of Daniel Pickard, called to see us, who said that when he heard of my coming again to England, it warmed his heart within him - and expressed a strong desire for us to come to Leeds.'³⁸ Daniel Pickard was now 25 years old: later, when Wilbur came to Leeds, he was to take the American 'to see an aged minister by the name of Mary Wright, of about 98 years. She is valiant in support of the doctrines of early Friends, and in full possession of her mental powers; and holds out to be a living minister.'³⁹ And then, while in Ireland, Wilbur and his son went by rail from Dublin to Moate 'where our dear friend John G. Sargent met us, and took us five miles further, to his residence at Hall, and staying there over seventh day, we went with them to their meeting at Moate, where I largely bore witness to the apostasies.'⁴⁰ These were two encounters which were to have a profound effect on the conservative tradition in English Quakers.

WILLIAM HODGSON; THE MEETINGS FOR CONFERENCE

The Friend who served as catalyst to this younger generation of conservatives was an American Friend who, by his correspondence, brought them together in the 1850s and, by his personality, drove them into two camps in the 1860s. His name was William Hodgson. He was born in Sheffield in 1804, the son of a former Unitarian minister who had been convinced by the ministry of the Philadelphia Friend Thomas Scattergood, and of a mother who was a member of a prominent Sheffield Friends' family. Through his maternal grandmother he was first cousin to the Forsters of Tottenham and during his apprenticeship in London he saw much of his cousins Josiah, William and Robert, the last being almost a brother to him. In the early 1820s William Hodgson's parents emigrated to Philadelphia and in 1827 William joined them, arriving shortly before the close of that momentous Yearly Meeting which was to divide orthodox from Hicksite for upwards of a century.⁴¹

William Hodgson was among the many Philadelphia Friends who were uneasy with the ministry of J.J. Gurney during his extended 1837-9 visit to North America, and during the 1840s and 1850s he became increasingly critical of those in Philadelphia Yearly meeting whom he described as 'the middle party.' By the 1850s the Yearly Meeting, while still predominantly conservative and Wilburite (especially in Arch

Street and the Northern District meetings) had a strong evangelical and Gurneyite element, centred particularly in Twelfth Street meeting. The ‘middle party,’ perhaps recognising that both conservative and evangelical had something to contribute to the whole, and almost certainly fearful of the consequences of a further separation a mere 30 years after the Hicksite split, were, however, seen by William Hodgson as temporising and lacking in principle. As he became more and more preoccupied with the preservation of the purity of ancient Quakerism (or what he understood as ancient Quakerism) he became obsessional - at times almost paranoid - about threats to that purity.

Hodgson, and those few he gathered round him, saw the relevance of Leviticus 5: 2 -‘Or if a soul touch any unclean thing, whether it be a carcass or an unclean beast, or a carcase of unclean cattle, or the carcase of unclean creeping things, and if it be hidden from him; he also shall be unclean and guilty.’ Thus Philadelphia Yearly Meeting became unclean and guilty because its monthly meetings issued certificates of removal to monthly meetings belonging to her fellow-orthodox but predominantly Gurneyite sister Yearly Meeting of Indiana. Ohio (Conservative) Yearly Meeting became unclean because it was recognised by the now tainted Philadelphia. New England (Conservative) became unclean because it exchanged epistles with the now unclean Ohio (Conservative).⁴²

The only logical solution was a narrow circle of those who had touched no unclean thing. William Hodgson withdrew to form, with a small number of others, the ‘General Meeting for Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, etc.’; it first met in this capacity in fifth month 1861, almost concurrently with London Yearly Meeting’s radical revision of the discipline. It is generally known as Falsington General Meeting. It must be seen as a gathering of primitive, rather than conservative, Friends and it was in correspondence with New York Yearly Meeting at Poplar Ridge and small groups of primitives who broke away from Ohio and New England conservative Yearly Meetings.⁴³

‘We are a poor and afflicted remnant.’ The concept and, indeed, the existence of the ‘living remnant’ has an honourable tradition. Going back to the eighth century BC we can see in Isaiah, Israel’s essential traditions being continued not, alas, by the whole people, but by the remnant, small and feeble though it might outwardly seem to be.⁴⁴

It was in this spirit that, at the close of Yearly Meeting 1862, a few disaffected Friends met to mourn together over the lost state of Israel. As a result, 17 Friends gathered at Joseph Armfield’s house in London on the 17th of tenth month for a ‘meeting for conference.’ These meetings for conference took place two or three times each year for seven years, the last being held in tenth month 1869.⁴⁵ The attendance at times

reached 30. The group found unity and strength in reading and answering the queries of 1802; the meeting in fourth month 1864 went through the manuscript of Daniel Pickard's *Expostulation on behalf of the truth*; but, as the years went by, it became increasingly difficult to maintain a sense of unity in a group which shared a common distress but did not share a common perception of the remedy.

The perplexities echo those of the sixteenth-century puritans. There were those then who, convinced that the Elizabethan settlement had not gone far enough in purifying the church of abuses, felt they must 'utterlie flee such like disorders & wickednes'⁴⁶ and therefore withdrew from the national church. Most Elizabethan puritans, however, saw their task as to reform the church from within. So was it here. The spiritual authority of London Yearly Meeting, it was generally agreed, had lapsed. But had it lapsed beyond recall? The absolutists were convinced that they should touch no unclean thing and should withdraw entirely from meetings for discipline of the lapsed body. But the moderates were not so sure.

And, in a bombarding series of letters from Philadelphia, William Hodgson presented the absolutist stand. Thus, to Thomas Drewry, Ninth month 14th 1862: 'From all accounts that we receive, it appears that the state of things in the nominal Society in England becomes worse instead of better... for it is very clear that the *train is off the track* - that the body has, in its capacity as a body, departed from the ground of our profession - from the essential characteristics and platform of true Quakerism - and that it has, as a body, lost all authority which it once had from its Holy Head.'⁴⁷

Again, on Eleventh month 25th that year, commenting on the first meeting for conference: 'Surely you must have had among you some weak counsellors and some unfaithful ones, as *we* had at our first gatherings in Bucks County, from whom the church had to shake herself free... There will, I apprehend, be no safety or satisfaction to the truly faithful among you, in taking half-way measures; and I really hope that when you meet again, this may be seen and felt... You would far better be a very small body compacted to the pure life of truth and fellowship with Christ and in Him with one another, than a numerous body of mere literal professors of the truth and half-way walkers, bound together (out of the pure life) by a fallacious semblance of the true unity.'⁴⁸

And, nearly a year later, Eleventh month 3rd 1863: '...your true course I believe would be, to look at the schismatic position which London Yearly Meeting has already taken, not to what it may in future take; and to declare openly, that inasmuch as it has uniformly

encouraged this schism in doctrine and practice from the first, and sanctioned the position of those emerged therein... you can no longer have any unity with it in its defection from the ancient ground, and must stand aloof from any further subordination to it or association with it.’⁴⁹

A couple of months later, on First month 6th 1864, he was writing to John G. Sargent: ‘You have already held three or four meetings, yet what has been the result? You seem to stick just where you commenced, and the consequence is that no standard has been upheld - no flag unfurled - for that cause which is above all causes, in the view of the true and faithful Friend. It has appeared to me as if there were a leaven among some of those who meet with you (I know not whom), the tendency of which is to keep you back from meeting the heresy of our day to its face, and to be willing to *mince* matters, and live on a false hope that things will either grow better, so that you can again unite with those who have countenanced schism, or else grow worse, so that you may have some stronger ground or dissent than now exists. My dear friend, I am convinced that it is a great delusion of the enemy.’⁵⁰

And, finally, again to John G. Sargent, 18 months later, on Ninth month 21st 1866: ‘In regard to your Conference Meetings... I am renewedly confirmed in the belief, which I have so frequently expressed that I almost fear you are tired of hearing me say it, that you cannot as a body increase in strength or clearness, as long as you continue to recognize that lapsed body as “the Society of Friends” ... The very question which was raised in your meeting, last spring or winter, whether Friends ought to rise whilst the preachers of that body are engaged in what they call supplication, shows the entanglement of your position very clearly. How can any of you faithfully do anything to sanction or countenance such spurious ministry as prevails among them? How could any among you conscientiously do anything to lead your children, or others, to believe that you were uniting with such ministry?... They are seceders, and persistently engaged in promoting secession and defection; and how can any among you, knowing this fact, be satisfied to wink at it, and connive at their assumption of a standing and authority which the Head of the church never gave them, or which, if some of them once had, they have surely lost, through their departure from the path cast up for this people to walk in?’⁵¹

TOWARDS THE FRITCHLEY SEPARATION

How many of those who attended the meeting for conference in fourth month 1868 appreciated that it heralded the parting of the ways? It was that conference which liberated John G. Sargent and Louisa E.

Gilkes, with Matilda Rickman⁵² as companion, for religious service in America. True, it was an implicit rather than an explicit liberation for, while the minute when their concern was laid before the meeting records that ‘much unity was expressed,’ the minute the following day is almost laconically cautious: ‘We have at this time again had under our serious consideration the concern of our dear Friends, and we feel that we can offer no obstruction to the prosecution of the service they believe to be required at their hands.’⁵³

Commenting on the occasion, Daniel Pickard wrote: ‘As a Conference we did not feel justified in granting them *written* credentials, as certificates of unity.’⁵⁴ Nevertheless, the meeting for conference was subtly turning into a meeting for discipline for, even if no certificate was granted, a minute was recorded. It is pertinent to compare this occasion with the meeting for conference in eighth month 1866 when Louisa Gilkes, Matilda Rickman and Daniel Pickard opened their ‘prospect of going into parts of Wales &c,’ a prospect which met with ‘deep & cordial concurrence’ but where, as Daniel Pickard recorded, ‘At the particular request of A.F. no minute was made on the subject, or given to us: which may have been for the best.’⁵⁵

The American visit of 1868 is the ‘overture and beginners please’ to separation. The trio were met by William Hodgson who ensured that they saw only the narrowing circle of sound “primitive” Friends. This pained those who were conservative but deemed by Hodgson not to have gone far enough. Daniel Pickard wrote that ‘A long serious communication came unexpectedly to hand last week also from a friend named Joshua Maule of Ohio - expressive of the sorrow & pain which has been felt by himself & others there, at the *partial* visit paid by our three Friends from England among the small bodies in that Country, & of their giving so decided a preference to the company of those who are in correspondence with the General Meeting held at Fallsington.’[sic]⁵⁶

With William Hodgson guiding them, how could it have been otherwise? With William Hodgson in person and not simply as a correspondent, any lingering doubts the trio might have had about their future could be doubts no longer. Daniel Pickard wrote in his journal under the date 9th month 14th 1868: ‘We have been brought under some concern of late from an apprehension lest our dear Friends who have lately returned from America should be acting with undue zeal to promote a separation in the Society in this country.’⁵⁷ Compare this with sentences from a couple of letters from William Hodgson to Thomas Drewry. First, in relation to *partial* visiting, Hodgson had written on sixth month 19th 1868: ‘...if I mistake not, our English Friends also were comforted in finding themselves among true Friends,

whom they could greet as brethren and sisters in the true unity.⁵⁸ And, on eighth month 10th (after they had set out on the voyage home): ‘And I may say further, that if I am not greatly mistaken, they go home more fully prepared to do the Lord’s will in an open and clear testimony against the lapsed body which *calls itself* the Society.⁵⁹

William Hodgson was correct in his prediction. But John G. Sargent did not find, perhaps, so many as he hoped who were prepared to come out from Babylon. On the 28th of first month 1869 Sargent wrote to Hodgson: ‘Those who now meet or sit apart from the old organized meetings are only *seven*; one at Birmingham, one at Bakewell (and attenders sometimes) and five at Fritchley.⁶⁰ But, nevertheless, the previous day had seen the establishment of a regular meeting for discipline and this body, known for just under a century as Fritchley Monthly Meeting, began to record minutes from fifth month 1869, when 16 Friends signed the minute book,⁶¹ seven being members of the Sargent family. The group, naturally enough, included the other two who had shared the American visit, Louisa Gilkes and Matilda Rickman - but Friends like Joseph Armfield, Daniel Pickard and Charles Thompson remained outside. Thomas Drewry later became a member of Fritchley Monthly Meeting but, as is often the case between those who see clearly a purist absolutism and those who will not take things to their logical conclusion (as the absolutists see it) there was often suspicion.

Two illustrations may suffice. On the 1st of second month 1872 J.G. Sargent laid before Fritchley Monthly Meeting a concern ‘to visit in the love of the Gospel as way may open, some of those of the old organization in their families, who are alive to the state of the Society, but are lingering on and mingling with them in worship and discipline.’⁶² He and his wife were liberated. They arrived in London on the 8th and visited Joseph Armfield, who had been so active in and hospitable to the meetings for conference. The Sargents then went to Tottenham and returned to London on the 9th: ‘Our first call was a return to Joseph Armfield’s under a feeling of necessity in obedience and for peace. Here, I had, what were indeed, to me, hard words to utter, but my peace consisted in not withholding what was required of me to utter, “His words were smoother than butter, yet war was in his heart; his words were softer than oil, yet were they as a drawn sword”; cautioning him against warring against the camp of the little ones of the Lord: left in peace.’⁶³ Then on the 28th of second month the Sargents were in Leeds: ‘first called at Samuel Evans,’ where we were cordially received; then to Daniel Pickard’s; no willingness to receive a visit.⁶⁴

They had completed their extensive tour about the end of third month. In those two months they record visits to over 170 Friends in Britain and Ireland. Others beside Daniel Pickard refused visits or were like Thomas Chapman of Enniscorthy, where 'not sufficient openness was manifested to make way for a time with him.'⁶⁵ Or there was Richard Brockbank who 'was in the spirit of contest as to our being wrong in separating from such as themselves, but it seemed best to relieve our minds on this head and bear his rebuts. He stood in the reasoning of man in opposition to us.'⁶⁶ Some of those among whom J.G. Sargent relieved his mind were undoubtedly open (Henry T. Wake of Cockermouth, for example, who became a member of Fritchley later) but others were not ('relieved my mind but was not refreshed.') Nevertheless, it is a valuable list of names of Friends who, even if they were not, in the event, open, at least might have been open. And might some of them have been more open to a personality not so uncompromising?

One Friend deserves special mention. On the 20th of third month the Sargents arrived in Limerick 'and soon found the way to Joshua Jacob's. He received us pleasantly and showed openness, his wife also. We had a sitting with him and his wife, and afterwards with a young man, not a member, who is drawing to Friends' views: an open opportunity and it has seemed good we came here.'⁶⁷ The 31-year-old Joshua Jacob was more than 'mingling with them in worship and discipline' for he had that very year become clerk of Limerick Monthly Meeting, an office he continued to hold until 1879, when he emigrated to America, where he died in 1883 at the age of 42. In some Macaulayean verses written in 1877 James N. Richardson pictures Joshua Jacob visiting Ulster Quarterly Meeting at a time when it was in conflict over the introduction of music in Brookfield School, Moira, County Down:

Never a feast biennial,
Never a conclave day,
That Jors Jacobus comes not
To uphold the Ancient Way
And now his soul is heavy
With new and bitter wrong,
For from the lips of Quakri
Hath poured the voice of song!⁶⁸

But an affectionate picture cannot disguise Joshua Jacob's extremism:

His corslet is of grey,
 And he, by dint of shoes and hose
 Upholds the Ancient Way.
 But even his own party think
 The matter overdone;
 Men cannot fight with pike and stave
 In days of needle-gun.⁶⁹

CONSERVATIVES AND MODERNISTS

The meeting for conference in second month 1864 had been in Manchester. While it was discussing with Daniel Pickard his detailed analysis of the sorry changes made in the 1861 revision of *Discipline*, other protests against evangelical orthodoxy were gaining ground in that city. The movement we associate with the opening of the Manchester Friends Institute in 1858, with the daring lectures there in the 1860s, and with London Yearly Meeting's committee of 1870-2 over the Manchester Difficulty is a movement associated with the name of David Duncan.⁷⁰ If we sometimes see him as a hero of modernism, it is but fair also to recognise that he could be obsessional. Here is a Manchester Friend writing of him in 1864:

J[ohn] P[ease] had also an interview with D. Duncan the next day respecting D.D.'s views (of which thou most likely knowest something), but I suppose the said interview was very unsatisfactory to J. Pease, & that D.D. thinks he had the better of J.P. N.B. It is no use having any arguments on religion with such a one as D.D.; he would argue on and on, to any extent, like others who have been like him in views. Yet I was glad to hear J. Pease had been to him; for D.D. boasted some time before to cousin John H. that no one dared to take him to task.⁷¹

This is not the place to follow in detail the events in Manchester during the 1860s, culminating as they did with the appointment by Yearly Meeting 1870 of a committee to restore unity - a committee of strictly evangelical orthodoxy which secured the disownment of David Duncan on 12 July 1871, an event made more tragic on account of his death very shortly afterwards, at the early age of 47.⁷²

His followers, the ‘Manchester Institute’ Friends, represent a third strand in nineteenth-century Quakerism, alongside the conservative and the evangelical, a strand that we may (if we appreciate the fact that any label is unsatisfactory) call ‘modernist.’ And we need to see how the conservatives looked at the modernists. In first month 1870, when the Manchester Difficulty had been for some time under the care of a

Quarterly Meeting committee, but before it had come under the notice of the Yearly Meeting, Daniel Pickard was a visitor at Lancashire & Cheshire Quarterly Meeting at Manchester:

1st mo. 20th. At the Quarterly Meeting at Manchester... James Owen⁷³ there and much to offer on the prophecies and history of Christ - pretty clear; satisfactory & edifying so far - deficient however in & almost void of the present ministration of Christ - viz Christ in Spirit. Some of those who have imbibed sceptical views spoke against it in the Men's Meeting - also Thomas Drewry - but he on account of the defect above named...

1st mo. 21st. Lodged the night by William Irwin's of Sale, & after doing some business that morning joined him to dine at the Friends Institute; here we met with C[harles] T[hompson] & D[avid] D[uncan] & William Simpson - the latter owned his *disbelief* in the Divine paternity of the holy body and person of our Lord Jesus Christ. I felt sad at heart, but love towards him - believing that others older have been the means of unsettling him in this precious fundamental of Christian faith.⁷⁴

William Simpson⁷⁵ was then 24 years of age - 20 years younger than David Duncan - and he was among those who resigned after David Duncan's disownment.⁷⁶ Those who left - and, indeed, some of those who stayed - worshipped at the Memorial Hall, close to the meeting house at Mount Street which they had left. Towards the close of 1871 they founded the short-lived periodical *The Manchester Friend*. *The British Friend* declared roundly that this journal and its advocates belonged to 'the Synagogue of Satan' and it was with dignity that *The Manchester Friend* responded: 'We think that our little movement in the nineteenth century, is identical in aim, with that of Fox, Barclay, and Penn, in the seventeenth; but we do not regard either the one or the other as finalities.'⁷⁷

It is perhaps too simplistic to say that the followers of John Grant Sargent represented the protest of the theological right wing against evangelical orthodoxy and those of David Duncan and his followers to the left. But it is at least of interest, and perhaps significance, that the 1860s should see these two streams, one culminating in the establishment of Fritchley Monthly Meeting in 1869 (and subsequently Fritchley General Meeting) and the other culminating in the disownment of David Duncan, the resignation of a number of other Friends, and the setting up of the (albeit short-lived) Memorial Hall meeting.

Protests from opposite viewpoints? Perhaps. Watchmen at opposite gates? Very likely. Yet it is fascinating to find the conservative Mary Hodgson (she who had written in 1864 about David Duncan's

argumentativeness) writing in sympathy with the Duncan party and, when in Manchester, attending the Memorial Hall meeting rather than Mount Street. Towards the close of 1871 she wrote: ‘And once or so in 6 weeks I go over to Manchester to sit with Friends who attend the Memorial Hall... The... sittings are very peaceful - as yet there has been little said in outward ministry but very short prayer or addresses, and of these perhaps only one during a meeting.’⁷⁸

Three months earlier she had written to a friend of evangelical orthodoxy: ‘I note thy remark that thou wants “no other belief than that of thy forefathers.” We, Mamma included, consider that the whole Society of Friends, with little exception (and that exception considered heterodox by the rest), has *forsaken* the faith of its forefathers, and gone back to that from which they called it.’⁷⁹

It is always dangerous to speculate, but that letter was written a month after David Duncan’s disownment and it is tempting to conjecture how far the visit of the Yearly Meeting’s Committee has made her aware of the narrowness of the orthodox Friends, for she went on: ‘I feel that if I went to J.B. Braithwaite or Isaac Brown, with a statement as to my views of some theological tenets, I should be told that my notions were “inconsistent with my position as a member”.’⁸⁰ She emphasised her point with the news that ‘many who still frequent the old, have deep sympathy with the new... ...we believe in *Early* Quakerism and the grand old fundamental doctrine it proclaimed, and *cannot see* why modern Friends should want us to leave them, however much *they* have departed from G. Fox and R. Barclay, with many others perhaps even less “evangelical.”’⁸¹

The conservative Mary Hodgson, despite her predilections for the modernist meeting at the Memorial Hall, remained a loyal member of London Yearly Meeting until her death, at the age of 51, in 1886. She was niece to William Hodgson of Philadelphia though, as she was born eight years ago after he had emigrated to America, she had never met him. After a time teaching in Friend families she took up painting and was an associate of the Manchester Academy of Fine Arts (and her charming engravings grace Henry Thompson’s 1879 *History of Ackworth School*). Her younger brother, Joseph Spence Hodgson, did not, however, join her at the Memorial Hall meetings.⁸²

When she did not go to Manchester, Mary Hodgson worshipped at Ashton-on-Mersey (Sale, as she usually describes it), a meeting which had been opened in 1860. ‘No one preaches at Sale save Charles Thompson’ she wrote towards the close of 1871, ‘but I fear... that they will deprive us of his ever good counsel if possible.’⁸³

Charles Thompson was now 52 years old. He had recently been appointed a city magistrate in Manchester, where he was in business, and he was not long retired from the City Council after a decade of service. He was regular in attendance at Yearly Meeting and a very vocally conservative voice there. But he undoubtedly wore his conservatism with a difference, for he had taken a position of some prominence at a meeting in June 1871 addressed by Charles Voysey. That was not a name lightly to be uttered at that time, for on 11 February that very year the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had supported the 1869 decision of the chancellor's court of the diocese of York, confirming that court's sentence of deprivation, on ground of heresy, of his Anglican orders. It had been in 1864, the year in which Voysey became vicar of Heelaugh, near Tadcaster, after a time of curacy there, that he published a sermon, *Is every statement in the Bible about our heavenly father strictly true?* and this and later writings and teaching had been seen as a threat to Anglican orthodoxy.

Charles Voysey was thus a notorious figure when he delivered a lecture in Manchester, the object of which, Manchester overseers declared 'was evidently to destroy faith in the Divine authority of Scripture, and in the deity and atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ.'⁸⁴ The substance of this lecture appeared in the newspapers and the overseers reported to Hardshaw East Monthly Meeting in November 1871 'that at the conclusion of this lecture C. Thompson seconded a vote of thanks to the lecturer, that this act had given much pain to a great many Friends, and that the overseers and others had earnestly laboured with him to endeavour to induce him to make a public acknowledgement of his error, but that they had been unable to prevail upon him to do so.'⁸⁵

Charles Thompson made it clear to the monthly meeting that he did not share Charles Voysey's opinions and that he had responded to the chairman's request not because he approved of the matter of the lecture but because it had been lucidly set forth. Charles Voysey had stayed with David Duncan (who had been in the chair) and this had been the precipitating cause of Duncan's disownment. Almost concurrently, in London, Edward Trusted Bennett (a Reigate Friend and former clerk and registering officer of Dorking Horsham & Guildford Monthly Meeting) was serving on 'Charles Voysey's Committee' - an act sufficient to secure his disownment, a disownment confirmed on appeal by London Yearly Meeting 1873, 'the last great heresy hunt in London Yearly Meeting' as John William Graham was later to describe it.⁸⁶

Charles Thompson may not have shared Charles Voysey's views, but the very fact that he was at the meeting demonstrates that not all

conservatives had that fear of modernism so eloquently expressed in the editorial of *The British Friend*. On the other hand, when the Yearly Meeting’s committee which had been appointed to restore unity in Hardshaw East Monthly Meeting presented to Lancashire & Cheshire Quarterly Meeting in fourth month 1872 its ‘Declaration of some fundamental principles of Christian truth,’ Charles Thompson’s fellow-conservative, William Irwin, ‘maintained that every word of the declaration was consistent with what he knew of the writings of early Friends,’⁸⁷ though Charles Elcock was brave enough to object to the words in the address ‘We disavow all spirituality which is divorced from faith in Jesus of Nazareth’ as contrary to the fundamental doctrine of Quakerism.⁸⁸ When it came to Yearly Meeting 1872, Daniel Pickard objected to the ‘Declaration’ as too Calvinistic and Joseph Armfield and William Graham also registered protests to a document which was, in the event, printed in the minutes but not adopted.⁸⁹

CONSERVATIVES AND THE MISSION MOVEMENT

Meanwhile, interest in home mission work was increasing. The Bedford Institute First-day School & Home Mission had been established in 1865 and successful American initiatives in ‘General Meetings’ (not, it must be emphasised, to be confused with the modern use of the phrase by British Friends) for outreaching evangelistic work were seen as worthy of emulation. Dublin Yearly Meeting 1874 appointed a committee which sponsored a General meeting that June at Grange, attracting some 5,000 people to some 25 meetings in the course of a week. The following year London Yearly Meeting appointed a like committee, which served for the next eight years. This is not the place to amplify on the movement⁹⁰ but the unease expressed in Yearly Meeting by William Graham and Joseph Armfield reflected, perhaps, a growing sense that, for some evangelicals, the salvation of souls was so supremely important that any Quaker insights or practices which stood in the way must be sacrificed. The introduction of congregational singing in meetings for worship was a case of point and Richard Brockbank pertinently asked in Yearly Meeting ‘whether the committee was at liberty to override the feelings of Friends living in those neighbourhoods... and to introduce practices which had never been sanctioned by the Yearly Meeting.’⁹¹

The appointment of the Yearly Meeting’s Home Mission Committee in 1882 and the support of full-time home missionaries, as well as the introduction of emotional conversion appeals at mission meetings, increased unease. For example, Western Quarterly Meeting in its triennial report to Yearly Meeting 1885 wrote of meetings ‘adapted to

the altered circumstances arising from the admission into membership of large numbers of fresh converts.⁹² Indeed, in Hereford & Radnor Monthly Meeting alone there had been 99 admissions by convincement during the triennium, and in a decade the membership of the monthly meeting had increased from 90 to 255.⁹³ The triennial report spoke of 'the shadow of members disunited from us' and Joseph Armfield in Yearly Meeting 'wished to inquire whether the instances reported in Western Quarterly Meeting of disuniting on account of non-attendance at meeting included any who were faithful according to their lights to our principles, and felt that in consequence of practices which had been introduced into those meetings they could no longer go there.'⁹⁴

In this connection, it is tempting to speculate about Joseph Ashby Fardon, a minister who had been recorded by Alton Southampton & Poole Monthly Meeting and who in 1880 transferred to Hereford & Radnor Monthly Meeting, having settled at Leominster. That monthly meeting in 1883 removed him from the position of minister, but he was to be recorded once more on his removal shortly afterwards to East Cornwall Monthly Meeting.⁹⁵

Revivalist practices and changed forms of worship were developing in the middle west of America. When Western Yearly Meeting gathered at Plainfield, Indiana, in ninth month 1877 it was presented with two sets of answers to the queries, both purporting to come from Plainfield Quarterly Meeting. When Barnabas Hobbs, the Yearly Meeting clerk, minuted the decision to accept those from the revivalist or 'progressive' quarterly meeting, 'a venerable Friend of eighty-two, Robert Hodson, rose and in broken accents said that he "felt he and his party had no rights nor privileges left in this body, and he invited all, young and old, who wished with him to maintain Friends' principles in their purity, to withdraw with him to another place where they might form a Yearly Meeting".' Ninety Friends, or thereabouts, put on their hats and left the Meeting; and as they went out, an American minister, with certificates from another Yearly Meeting, sang at the top of his voice,

See the mighty host advancing,
Satan leading on:

murmuring to the British Friend next to him, 'I thought they should hear one more hymn before they went out.'⁹⁶

London Yearly Meeting 1878 received, as might be expected, two epistles both purporting to come from Western Yearly Meeting. Charles Thompson, Joseph Armfield, William Graham and Daniel Pickard expressed their sympathies with the conservatives - as might be

expected. Walter Robson (he was the British Friend who had been present) said that ‘several of the Friends who had separated had borne the burden and heat of the day for very many years past.’ And Friends as varied as Alfred W. Bennett and J. Tirnbeck Grace added their voices of sympathy. In all the circumstances we may, perhaps, wonder how realistic it was of the Yearly Meeting to ask Meeting for Sufferings to write to the conservative body ‘a few lines of loving encouragement to... re-unite themselves with those who have so long associated with them in Christian fellowship.’⁹⁷

Alfred W. Bennett was brother to Edward Trusted Bennett, whose disownment by Dorking Horsham & Guildford Monthly Meeting in 1873 has already been touched on. The monthly meeting’s decision was on the advice of a committee comprising Joseph Crosfield, Francis Frith and Thomas W. Marsh. Joseph Crosfield, though a son of devoted conservatives who had befriended John Wilbur, was a firm evangelical.⁹⁸ The presence of Francis Frith and Thomas W. Marsh is ironic. In 1877 Frith was to publish a highly critical pamphlet, *Evangelicalism* and in 1884 he was to be co-author of *A reasonable faith*, a book which was to shock the evangelically-orientated Yearly Meeting.⁹⁹

As for T.W. Marsh, an obituary recalled: ‘He had not had, as far as was known, any strongly-marked or vivid experiences in the spiritual life. He seems to have grown into what one of his friends calls “a profound silent reverence for the unseen Guide of our life,” accompanied by the most scrupulous integrity and self-control in the smallest as well as the greatest things.’¹⁰⁰ Thomas W. Marsh was perhaps a conservative of the old school (indeed, John Sargent had visited him on his 1872 round of those who still ‘lingered on’ in the larger body) but Francis Frith, together with his friend William Pollard, represented, perhaps, conservatism worn with a difference. Pollard, who had written in the *Friends quarterly examiner* in 1879 against congregational singing in meetings for worship, published in 1887 *Old fashioned Quakerism*, a companion piece in its critical approach to Francis Frith’s *Evangelicalism* of ten years earlier.¹⁰¹

Let us return to that Western Yearly Meeting, Indiana, of 1877. In 1913 Walter Robson, recalling that dramatic event when the conservatives walked out, wrote: ‘The day after this scene in the Yearly meeting, I ventured to address the body, in open session, on the value of unity, and reminded Friends that in God’s sight the scruples of these “Wilburite Separatists,” as they called them, were as precious as ours. I was warmly thanked afterwards by some Friends, but J.H. Douglas, D.B. Updegraff, and a few other “progressive” leaders were very severe, telling me I was “encouraging a spirit they wanted to crush,”

and that all *they* did was by Divine command, and therefore must be right.' And, looking back with the perspective of 35 years, Robson added: 'That word "*crush*" explains much of the spirit of Separation in the U.S.A.'¹⁰²

At the outset of this paper the question was raised how far the conservatives were a cohesive group. The evidence suggests that they were not. It is possible to discern three groups, who may be described as the purists, the preservationists, and the conservationists - though having said this it is again necessary to recognise the inadequacy of all labels. The purists are represented by William Hodgson and John G. Sargent, taking a view of 'Be ye separate' and 'Be not unequally yoked with non-believers': It may be argued that in some ways they were as exclusive and excluding as the extreme evangelicals. For example, when a quarterly meeting committee came to visit the Sargents in tenth month 1868 JGS wrote to William Hodgson that 'Four in the six wore no appearance of Friends,'¹⁰³ a judgement as outward and dismissive in relation to the plain dress as many an evangelical one in relation to correct belief. Nevertheless, the witness of the purists is an important one, and we must recognise that the Fritchley tradition is kept alive for a century insights which had been too largely neglected within London Yearly Meeting. The purist Friends were indeed a living remnant.

The preservationists, too, kept alive important truths but were often unable to appreciate that tradition is not everything and that the Holy Spirit is ever active and leading us into fresh understandings and new insights. But it is not always easy, at the time, to distinguish between what are essentials and what are not. The plain dress and the plain language, the introduction of gravestones, the intended laying down of the Morning Meeting¹⁰⁴ - these were, we may now think, none of them questions worth going to the stake for. But were the preservationists not right when they saw innovations in worship as potentially undermining London Yearly Meeting's fundamental convictions?

The purists, by their purism, caused separation and yet further separation.¹⁰⁵ The preservationists, maintaining all that was best in Quakerism's eighteenth-century tradition, also tended to maintain outmoded 'peculiarities' and also a distrust of the intellect, so that there was insufficient nourishment of the mind to sustain the spirit. It is the third group, the conservationists, to whom perhaps we owe most - men and women like Thomas W. Marsh, Anne Warner Marsh, William Pollard and Francis Frith, who, seeing what was best in the old, yet looked forward to the new.

Eighteenth-century Friends put their emphasis on Christ within, the hope of glory, and nineteenth-century conservatives maintained this

emphasis. Nineteenth-century evangelicals put their emphasis on the Christ of history and his atoning sacrifice. Edward Grubb may perhaps stand for the bringing together of these two emphases and his 1914 Swarthmore Lecture, *The historic and the inward Christ*, symbolizes that synthesis. He was among a new generation of conservationists, with an aggressively evangelical father and staunchly conservative grandparents. He and those likeminded saw the need for reconciliation between separated branches of the Society. They were zealous for the feeding of the intellect while never denying the insufficiency of the mind alone. They were concerned for the social witness of the gospel. Many who thought during the latter half of the nineteenth century that they were treading a lonely road were to discover at the great conference at Manchester in November 1895 that they were far from being alone. It was indeed the beginning of a new chapter. If it was the beginning of ‘the modern way’ then those who had upheld ‘the ancient way’ deserve our gratitude for their witness - a witness which carried the best of the eighteenth century into the twentieth.

Edward H. Milligan

NOTES AND REFERENCES

LSF indicates a document in the Library of the Society of Friends, London.

- ¹ *Selections from the diary and correspondence of John G. Sargent*, 1885, 104 [hereafter, Sargent].
- ² Thomas Drewry (1812-1898).
- ³ Sargent, loc. cit.
- ⁴ For comments from a conservative viewpoint on these matters see *The British Friend* editorial observations on the relevant Yearly Meetings.
- ⁵ Sargent, 115-6. Conservatives pointed to the fact that David numbered the people (2 Samuel 18:1) thus causing God’s anger and David’s consequent remorse (2 Samuel 24:10).
- ⁶ London Yearly Meeting, *Epistles*, ed. James Bowden, 1860, vol. 2, 383-4.
- ⁷ *The crisis of the Quaker contest in Manchester*, 1837, appendix, 8, 17, 19, 27, 30, 33-34, 40-41, 46, 58.
- ⁸ For members of the committee see London YM MS minutes vol. 23, 411-413, 451; vol. 24, 164.
- ⁹ For an account of the places and people visited see *Journal of the life of John Wilbur*, 1859, 76-166 [hereafter, Wilbur].
- ¹⁰ London YM MS minutes vol. 24, 164.
- ¹¹ Ibid., 166. See also ‘How we got our book of discipline: the story to 1863’ by David J. Hall, in *Friends quarterly*, vol. 25, 1988, 32-9.
- ¹² For an admirable account of the advices and queries see ‘Friends’ queries and general advices’ by Richard E. Stagg, in *J. Friends. Hist. Soc.*, vol. 49, 1961, 209-35, 249-69, 279: the text of the 1791 and 1833 advices is given at pp. 222, 226-7.
- ¹³ Joseph John Gurney (1788-1847).

- ¹⁴ Jonathan Hutchinson (1760-1835).
- ¹⁵ John Wilkinson (1783?-1846).
- ¹⁶ Letter of 18 xi 1832 (LSF, Gurney MSS 3/569, [2]-[3]).
- ¹⁷ Letter of 9 vi 1833 (LSF, Gurney MSS 3/573, [1]).
- ¹⁸ Samuel Lloyd (1768-1849).
- ¹⁹ Samuel Lloyd, *Copy of a letter addressed to a Friend*, dated The Farm, 5mo 9, 1835, lithographed (LSF, Box 105).
- ²⁰ *Rules of discipline*, 1834, vii: the documents were extracts from George Fox's letter to the governor of Barbadoes, 1671; a statement of Christian Doctrine, 1693; minutes of London YM 1829; and London YM epistle 1830.
- ²¹ Letter of 9 vi 1833 (LSF, Gurney MSS 3/573, [2]).
- ²² Isaac Crewdson (1780-1844).
- ²³ Joseph John Gurney, MS journal.
- ²⁴ William Boulton (fl. 1827-1836).
- ²⁵ The members of the committee were William Allen, Edward Ash, Peter Bedford, Barnard Dickinson, Josiah Forster, William Forster, J.J. Gurney, Joseph Marriage, Edward Pease, George Richardson, George Stacey, Joseph Tatham, Samuel Tuke (London YM MS Minutes, vol. 24, 515-16).
- ²⁶ Edward Grubb, *Separations, their causes and effects: studies in nineteenth century Quakerism*, 1914, 55 [hereafter, Grubb, *Separations*]. The problems in Manchester meeting, personal as well as doctrinal, which the Yearly Meeting's Committee had to face are much more fully grasped in Roger C. Wilson, *Manchester, Manchester, and Manchester again: from 'sound doctrine' to 'a free ministry'*, 1990, 11-17 [hereafter, Wilson, *Manchester*], where credit is given to the 'patient statesmanship' of the committee which 'skilfully eased the Beaconite cavalry into withdrawing from what could have been a national field of battle.'
- ²⁷ See, for example, the extracts from letters of resignation printed *supra*.
- ²⁸ Joseph John Gurney, *Memoirs*, ed. J.B. Braithwaite, 1854, vol. 1, 440; 2nd ed. 1855, vol. 1, 424; entry for 1831.
- ²⁹ For an account of the deliberations of London YM of Ministers & Elders see *Proceedings of the Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends, held in London*, 1837, 10-11: this (illicit) report first appeared in *The Patriot*, a contemporary newspaper.
- ³⁰ Jeremiah 6:16. For a brief account of the early days of *The Friend* and *The British Friend*, see 'The launch of *The Friend*, 1843: two celebrations or one' by Vanessa Morton, in *The Friend*, vol. 151, 7-8.
- ³¹ For particulars of these Friends see *Dictionary of Quaker Biography* (LSF unpub.).
- ³² William Irwin (1815?-1876), printer, Manchester; Charles Thompson (1819-1903), business man and city councillor, Manchester; Joseph Armfield (1821-1894), London; William Graham (1823-1911), Birmingham; Daniel Pickard (1828-1905), Leeds. Of particular relevance to future studies, the recent thesis on D. Pickard by Mark Ellison.
- ³³ Lydia Ann Barclay (1799-1855).
- ³⁴ See Wilbur, 511-551 for an account of the people and places visited.
- ³⁵ Wilbur, 511, 526.
- ³⁶ Josiah, Robert and Mary Forster.
- ³⁷ Wilbur, 526. Paul Bevan (1783-1868), Tottenham; Edward May (1820?-1864), physician, Tottenham.
- ³⁸ Wilbur, 513.
- ³⁹ Wilbur, 537. Mary Wright (1755-1859).
- ⁴⁰ Wilbur, 547. Sargent farmed at Hall, near Moate, Co. Westmeath, from 1852 to 1854.

- ⁴¹ For William Hodgson (1804-1878) see especially *Selections from the correspondence of William Hodgson, with memoirs of his life*, 1886 [hereafter, Hodgson, *Correspondence*].
- ⁴² For a full description of these pseudo-diplomatic recognitions and breaks in recognition see William Hodgson, *The Society of Friends in the nineteenth century*, 2 vols., 1875-6 [hereafter, Hodgson, *History*].
- ⁴³ Hodgson, *History*, vol. 2, 281-312.
- ⁴⁴ See Isaiah 7:3; cf. also Ezekiel 6:8.
- ⁴⁵ Meetings as recorded in Sargent were on 17.x.1862 to x.1869, Sargent, 118, 122-3, 129, 133, 136, 138, 140, 142, 147, 165, 167-8, 171, 172-3.
- ⁴⁶ Quoted in Hugh Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England*, 1964, 15: the phrase comes from the covenant of Robert Browne's congregation in Norwich, 1580, as quoted in Champlin Burrage, *The early English dissenters*, 1912, vol. 1, 98.
- ⁴⁷ Hodgson, *Correspondence*, 301-302.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid., 310.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid., 315.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid., 317.
- ⁵¹ Ibid., 320-21.
- ⁵² Louisa E. Gilkes (1814-1881); Matilda Rickman (1799-1882).
- ⁵³ Sargent, 148.
- ⁵⁴ Daniel Pickard, MS Journal 1867-9 (LSF, Temp.MSS 56/3/2, fol. 25).
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., 1866-7 (LSF, Temp.MSS 56/3/1, fol. 14 verso-15). Cf. entry at fol. 12, recording the consideration of the concern at Brighouse MM 10 viii 1866 when 'after a considerable discussion in which Josiah Forster took the chief part the meeting concluded not to recognise the offering.'
- ⁵⁶ Ibid., 1867-9 (LSF, Temp.MSS 56/3/2, fol. 40).
- ⁵⁷ Ibid., 1867-9 (LSF, Temp.MSS 56/3/2, fol. 39 verso).
- ⁵⁸ Hodgson, *Correspondence*, 350.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid., 351.
- ⁶⁰ Sargent, 168.
- ⁶¹ For a reproduction of this entry, see Walter Lowndes, *The Quakers of Fritchley*, 1863-1980, 1980, 15, with enlargement at p.138.
- ⁶² Sargent, 186.
- ⁶³ Sargent, 187-188: quotation from Psalm 55:21. It is, perhaps, worth noting that in 1875 J.G. Sargent's son Philip married Joseph Armfield's daughter Julia Ann: Joseph Armfield wrote to her 31 i 1875 avering that the 'tendency of those who have united with that community [Fritchley] has been to withdraw themselves from spheres of wider and greater influence, and to assume a repellent demeanour towards others,' adding that 'Surely such is not the fruit of the Spirit, nor evidence of its fuller influence in the heart' (*Annual Monitor*, 1895, 8).
- ⁶⁴ Sargent, 195.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid., 199.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid., 198.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid., 200.
- ⁶⁸ James N. Richardson, *The Quakri at Lurgan and at Grange*, 1899, 92-93.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid., 77.
- ⁷⁰ David Duncan (1825?-1871).
- ⁷¹ Mary Hodgson to Elizabeth Green 7 iii 1864 (LSF, Port. A/58, [5-6]). Elizabeth Green (1815-1881), the wife of Joshua Green of Stansted Mountfitchet, Essex, was a daughter of Thomas and Elizabeth Robson of Darlington, Sunderland and Liverpool: Elizabeth Robson, a notable and much-travelled minister, had been in America at the time of the Hicksite separation.

- ⁷² For a full consideration of the subject see 'Authority or experience: John Wilhelm Rowntree and the dilemma of 19th century British Quakerism' by Richenda C. Scott, in *J. Friends. Hist. Soc.*, vol. 49, 1960, 75-95, esp. 76-81; Wilson, *Manchester*, 19-26; 'Heresy-hunting among Victorian Quakers: the Manchester difficulty, 1861-73' by Thomas C. Kennedy, in *Victorian Studies*, vol. 34, 1991, 227-53.
- ⁷³ James Owen (1822-1871) of Iowa YM, a recorded minister, presented to London YM 1869 certificates from Rocksylvania MM 25 vi 1868, Honey Creek QM 4 viii 1868, and Iowa YM of Ministers & Elders 5-12 ix 1868 (LYM, *Proc.*, 1869, p. 3, 1870 p. 3). He presented his returning minute to Iowa YM 6.ix.1870, his death being reported to that meeting the following year (*Iowa YM Minutes*, 1870, p. 10; 1871, p. 7).
- ⁷⁴ Daniel Pickard, MS journal 1870-1 (LSF, Temp.MSS 56/3/3, fol. 1 verso-2).
- ⁷⁵ William Simpson (1845-1914).
- ⁷⁶ For reference to the resignations see Scott, op. cit., 80: 'Eleven members, including some of the most hopeful and intelligent of the young men and women, resigned in protest and two others a year later.' The obituary of William Simpson (*Ackworth Old Scholars Assoc. rep.* 33, 1914, 113) describes his resignation as being 'at a time when a number of earnest-minded Friends in Manchester left it [the Society] for greater freedom of thought.'
- ⁷⁷ *The Manchester Friend*, vol. 1, 1872, 18. The phrase 'the synagogue of Satan' does not appear to be in the editorial in *The British Friend* vol. 30, 1872, 14-15.
- ⁷⁸ Mary Hodgson to Elizabeth Green, xii 1871 (LSF, Port. A/60 [5-6]).
- ⁷⁹ Mary Hodgson to Elizabeth Green, 27 viii 1871 (LSF, Port. A/59, [5]).
- ⁸⁰ Ibid., [6].
- ⁸¹ Ibid., [9].
- ⁸² See letter of Mary Hodgson, xii 1871: 'Joseph has not been to the Memorial Hall meeting at all.' (LSF, Port. A/60).
- ⁸³ Mary Hodgson to Elizabeth Green, xii 1871 (LSF, Port. A/60 [6]).
- ⁸⁴ A full report of the MM held 9 Nov. 1871 is printed in *Manchester Friend*, vol. 1, 1871, 8-11.
- ⁸⁵ At the November MM a Committee of six friends was appointed to visit Charles Thompson (who was present at the MM) and report. The report was received Jan. 1872 MM: for the discussion, which resulted in the matter being dropped, see *Manchester Friend*, vol. 1, 1872, 27.
- ⁸⁶ Edward Trusted Bennett (1831-1908). For an account of his involvement with Voysey see 'Francis Frith' by Beryl Williams, and 'In reason's ear' by Edward H. Milligan, in *Friends quarterly*, vol. 23, 1964, 364-370, 389-396, esp. 366-367, 393-394.
- ⁸⁷ The MM discussion is reported in *The Manchester Friend*, vol. 1, 1872, 93-5: quotation at p. 94.
- ⁸⁸ Ibid., 94.
- ⁸⁹ *The Manchester Friend*, vol. 1, 109; reference to these contributions does not appear to be in the reports of YM in *The Friend*, ns vol. 12, 1872, 132-4, or *The British Friend*, vol. 30, 144-146.
- ⁹⁰ For an admirable account of general meetings see 'The Committee on General Meetings' by Malcolm J. Thomas, in *A Quaker miscellany for Edward H. Milligan*, 1985, 133-143.
- ⁹¹ *The British Friend*, vol. 33, (1875).
- ⁹² London Yearly Meeting, *Extracts from the minutes and proceedings*, 1885, 45 [hereafter, LYM, *Proc.*].
- ⁹³ LYM, *Proc.*, 1885, 48. For a brief survey of the effects of mission work in Hereford & Radnor MM at that time see Harriet M. Newman, *Henry Stanley Newman*, 1917, 15-17.

- ⁹⁴ LYM, *Proc.* 1885, 48; *The Friend*, ns vol. 25, 1885, 141.
- ⁹⁵ Joseph Ashby Fardon (1812-1876).
- ⁹⁶ Edward Grubb, *Separations*, 1914, 150-151, reprinting (and identifying Walter Robson as the author of) an article entitled ‘An American separation, by an eye-witness’ in *The British Friend*, ns vol. 22, 1913, 287-8 (quotation at p. 288). Walter Robson (1842-1929) was a nephew of Elizabeth Green (see note 71). Stanley Pumphrey was also at Western YM in 1877. There were eight visiting Friends, with credentials, from other American YMs: S. Elizabeth Malleson (New York YM); John Henry Douglas, Robert W. Douglas, Daniel Hill, Eliza Hodson, Robert Knight (Indiana YM); Luther B. Gordon, John F. Hanson (Iowa YM) (*Western YM, Minutes*, p. 7). The presence of David Updegraff does not appear to be minuted.
- ⁹⁷ London YM began 22 v 1878, the Western YM epistle being considered that afternoon (LYM, *Proc.* p. 5 where the quotation may be found). For reports of that session see *The Friend*, ns vol. 18, 126-9; *The British Friend*, vol. 36, 127-131. A report from a committee appointed on 22 v 1878 was received by LYM 28 v 1878 (LYM, *Proc.*, p. 14) and the following day a further discussion took place in relation to the appointment of a deputation to Western YM (*ibid.* p. 22).
- ⁹⁸ Joseph Crosfield (1821-1879), tea merchant, Reigate. His parents, George and Margaret Crosfield, were of Warrington.
- ⁹⁹ Francis Frith (1822-1898), photographer, Reigate.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Annual Monitor*, 1903, 62; Thomas W. Marsh (1833-1902).
- ¹⁰¹ William Pollard (1828-1893).
- ¹⁰² Quoted in Grubb, 151-152.
- ¹⁰³ Sargent, 165.
- ¹⁰⁴ The Morning Meeting of Ministering Friends (later, of Ministers & Elders) had been established in or before 1673, from which year minutes are recorded. By the early nineteenth century it had outlived its usefulness and it was proposed in the 1861 revision of discipline that it be laid down. This was seen by conservative Friends as a major issue and the Morning Meeting was, in the event, continued, meeting only quarterly. It was laid down in 1901.
- ¹⁰⁵ Fritchley General Meeting, for example, suffered a separation in the 1890s when primitive Fritchley Friends, feeling that the main body had departed from purist ideals, withdrew to form Bournbrook General Meeting. This separation is touched on, but not fully examined, in Lowndes, op. cit.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

New Light on George Fox and Early Quakerism : The Making and Unmaking of a God. By Richard Bailey. The Edwin Mellen Press, San Francisco, 1992. Pp. xviii + 340. £39.95.

The author of this book was awarded an M.Phil. in 1986 by the University of Waterloo for a thesis on the followers of Melchior Hoffman in the Netherlands. The work under review was a doctoral thesis under Professor J.F.H. New, who writes a commendatory forward. It begins with a return to the supposition that study of early Quakerism within the long mystical tradition, as in the books of Rufus Jones, and study of it in relation to the contemporary Puritan context, as in my own writings, are mutually exclusive and antagonistic. This supposition was shared by a number of Friends in the 1940s (though not by Rufus Jones), but was soon perceived to be a misunderstanding. There is room and to spare for both kinds of study, and for others too, including Richard Bailey's, if only it were better executed. But Bailey writes dismissively of others throughout. Rufus Jones 'was no closer to the real Fox than Barclay' (p. 239, n. 54; 'along with Janney, Jones and Cadbury,' 'Braithwaite's conclusion was tainted by anachronistic assessments' (p. 177, n. 1); Neave Brayshaw, H.G. Wood, Lewis Benson, Maurice Creasey all fall under the axe. To write as if everyone is wrong but little Tommy may feel fine, but does not advance the argument.

Bailey claims that, by what 'we may call' the 'doctrine of celestial inhabitation' (a 'term' used to avoid any misinterpretation', seemingly invented *ad rem*), we see Fox 'casting himself ... as a magus, avatar, ... a new incarnation' (p. 19). One looks in vain for any definition or elucidation of this combination, from various cultures, of titles each of which might be thought ludicrously inappropriate to use of Fox. 'Fox's doctrine of celestial inhabitation was the hub of his entire world of thought' (p. 77). 'Deification was a natural corollary to christopresentism' (p. 81). Bailey proceeds to present Fox as one who 'reserved for himself the pre-eminent status of avatar' and 'expected, even demanded, the respect (even adoration) that came with ... his avatarial status' (pp. 115, 117). James Nayler's 'messianic' entry into Bristol is to be seen in the light of this. It was Nayler's 'bid for the leadership' (p. 137), his 'bid to seize the reigns [*sic!*] of power' as 'an avatar in his own right'; Fox's claims for himself dictated the choreography' (p. 174). Fox 'was very badly burned by Nayler, badly enough to back off from his avatar claims' (p. 181); and the remainder of the book shows us a Fox in 'retreat.' Even so, Fox 'did not alter or refine his belief in the graphic corporeal presence of the celestial flesh of Christ' (p. 186). 'Firm in his views,' he became 'like a solitary soldier ... increasingly out of step' (p. 248) and eventually 'somewhat aloof' (p. 268).

In the early 1650s notions of what Dr. Bailey calls celestial inhabitation, or something like it, are to be found among those known as Ranters. Since Friends were often called Ranters but repudiated the charge and opposed Ranter claims, some comparative analysis, based on the verbal and written disputes between the two groups, would be illuminating and might be expected, but is not provided. Was it Fox's unremitting insistence on ethical standards, at once expounding and balancing the 'celestial

inhabitation,' that made the difference? We hear nothing of this, or of the Fox who could refer to 'Christ my Saviour' (C.J., i.2) and be 'in ye love of God to y^m all y^t had persecuted mee' (C.J., i.58). It is in fact a curiously partial, almost an unreligious, Fox who appears here. An 'avatar,' one must suppose, would feel no need to pray? Yet Penn, who was not given to exaggeration, says of Fox that 'above all, he excelled in prayer.' Again, Dr. Bailey presents both Fox and Nayler as much concerned with status. Yet Penn, alongside reverential language in acknowledgement of Fox's leadership, says that he 'held his place ... with great meekness, and a most engaging humility and moderation,' while phrases such as 'mind to keep low' and 'it is the humble and not the high spirits that are taught of God' are, equally, characteristic of Nayler's spirituality from the beginning.¹

These are matters of judgement. What is not, and is hard to excuse, is the writer's perpetual carelessness. Thomas Aldham, John Kilkam, Anne Cargill, Abiezer Cope, Worcester, H.L. Doncaster, even Underhill (for Underwood) may be no more than slips, but Macaulay throughout, nudas veritas, lex gentiles look more like illiteracy; neither Fenny Drayton nor Grindleton was a town; Lady Claypole's name was not Anne. What is worse is that in a passage (pp. 117-118) which is central to the argument, taken from Penney's edition of Fox's *Journal*, there are more than a dozen minor depravations of the text. Since the writer is engaged throughout with early Quaker manuscripts and the cavalier treatment of them by later Quakers, this is incomprehensible.

Cf. my 'The Letters of James Nayler' in *The Lamb's War* (Festschrift for Hugh Barbour, 1992), p. 142.

Geoffrey F. Nuttall

Mary Howitt : Another Lost Victorian Writer. By Joy Dunicliff. Excalibur Press of London, 1992. Pp. viii + 264. £8.95.

Mary Howitt was a prolific woman writer in the nineteenth century, producing poetry, translations, fiction, journalism and writing for children on a considerable scale. Her husband William was an equally prolific writer and it is sometimes difficult to tell their work apart. How far though is Mary really a 'lost Victorian writer' and who is the 'author' supposed to equate with her? Neither point is satisfactorily addressed here. Her own literary reputation is probably justly ranked as minor though she is of historical interest because of her contribution to the growing trend of female authorship. Her literary friendships were of some importance and the Howitts could claim some credit for the rise of Mrs. Gaskell. Mary and William left the Society of Friends in 1848 and experimented with spiritualism for some years while Mary joined the Roman Catholic church six years before her death in 1888.

Joy Dunicliff writes in some detail about the family background of Mary Howitt (born Botham) in Uttoxeter. There is invariably a good deal of material too about William and their children. Valuable use is made of very extensive quotation from Mary's letters and papers, poems and other publications. The picture of two Victorian writers, earning their livings by turning their hands to almost any sort of paid writing consistent with their principles and of their considerable and varied trials and tribulations is a useful one to balance against the more substantial studies of the great nineteenth-century writers.

The author's grasp of Quakerism in the nineteenth century is not strong but despite their very firm commitment to liberal and reform causes, particularly in their journalism, the Howitts are not most notable as Friends. Joy Dunicliff appears not to have been well served by her publisher. The book would have been much better for careful editing and proof-reading and the reproduction of the illustrations leaves a good deal to be desired.

David J. Hall

Deborah Derby. By Rachel Labouchere. William Sessions Ltd., York, 1993. £6.50 + £1.55 p&p.

"Read me" invites the cover of this book, taken from a watercolour by Mary Grierson, with the Iron Bridge of Coalbrookdale portrayed on a mug holding flowers and fruit, and enhanced with a microscopic view of Sunniside, the Darby family home.

Much research has preceded this account by Rachel Labouchere of the life of Deborah Derby - of whom she is a direct descendant. And a very reader-friendly book it is, with a family tree, a selected list of personalities mentioned with tiny biographies, and helpful indexing of places visited by Deborah in England, Scotland, Wales, America and Ireland. Maps and illustrations illuminate the text of this book of some 438 pages.

Deborah Darby, born Deborah Barnard in 1754, the daughter of John and Hannah Barnard (Quakers) of Upperthorpe near Sheffield, married Samuel Derby, son of Abraham Darby II and Abiah Darby, in 1777. Two of their four children survived, the others dying in infancy. Samuel and Edmund were among the children inoculated against smallpox in those early days of immunisation. It is not suggested that the marriage was in any way odd, but Deborah and Samuel spent considerable periods apart. Deborah appears to be travelling almost incessantly, journeying at all times of the year and in all weathers, requiring strength of body as well as fortitude of spirit. Samuel had business in London and suffered from recurrent illness. Deborah's travelling in the Ministry took her all over the country, to Ireland three times, and from 1793-1796 she journeyed in America.

Alas, Deborah was not a particularly interesting diarist, her notes on the American journey reading rather like a gazetteer - did NOTHING amusing happen, wasn't the scenery beautiful? One can but wonder at the courage of Quaker women in those days: Deborah rode since childhood, and there are references to phaetons and other vehicles. She was accompanied on her journeys, her most constant companion being Rebecca Young. The War of Independence had finished ten years prior to her visit, which had but one object 'The saving of souls... to follow the pathway through life which led to the Heavenly Kingdom.' Rachel Labouchere includes some earthy touches, however: their stores on the outward journey included a bottle of brandy, with extra corks, and on the return - because of uncertain drinking water - they carried 5 dozen of port, 10 dozen Taunton Ale, 2 gallons of brandy and some peppermint water, and rum for the sailors. One might venture that the result of Rachel Labouchere's research has an interest which would not have been recognised by Deborah. Also recorded is the rather tender tradition of the deer, said to have been given to Deborah when she left America and the ancestors of the herd in the little Deer Park at Sunniside, banished at the beginning of the Second World War. Deborah and Rebecca arrived back in mid-July 1796, and in September Samuel died at Bilston. He had been "inclined" to go thither with S. Proud.

On 21 September, she set off for York, and continued her travelling ministry, (including two visits to Ireland) until the end of 1809, when she became confined to the house. She died on 14 February 1809 at the age of 56. 'Her voice was sweet and harmonious... and in her air and aspect dignity was mingled with sweetness...' Read this book, and after a couple of months, read it again. You will be much rewarded.

Patricia R. Sparks

'A Wealth of Happiness and Many Bitter Trials': (The Journals of Sir Alfred Edward Pease) A Restless Man. By Joseph Gurney Pease. William Sessions Ltd., The Ebor Press, York, 1992.

Pp. xx + 363. Illus. £14.95 + £1.90 p&p.

The title is an apt choice and indicative of the rich promise of the book. The long life of Alfred Edward Pease, 1857-1939, saw a bewildering series of changes and experiences which his Journals allow us to share with a character of courage, integrity and resilience.

Born into a well established Quaker business dynasty in the north-east of England Alfred grew up in a style and standard of living far beyond Quaker ideals of simplicity. The family had already made a distinct contribution to the region, notably with the Stockton-Darlington Railway and the development of Middlesborough. It was a measure of the family's influence that a Pease man sat in every House of Commons between 1865 and 1910, Alfred amongst them. Their complex business empire is well set out in the Introduction and the records illustrate the difficulties of overseeing a disparate group of concerns where sound business decisions might conflict with family or community considerations. Alfred's father's diaries add much useful detail in these matters. Central to these ventures was the Counting House, the family bank, where Alfred was made a partner early in his career, a decision which gave him no satisfaction at all. The collapse of the Bank in 1902, due to both family and business complications, had a traumatic effect on the family, powerfully documented here. Alfred survived to continue later an effective role in local affairs and to manage successfully the affairs of the owners of the Middlesborough Estate, though he had little pride in what his family had built there.

His brief career as a Liberal M.P. produces some interesting material on the Home Rule crisis of 1886 and his friendships with Rosebery and Grey.

Africa was to become a major interest in his life in the varied guises of explorer, Resident Magistrate in South Africa, businessman and hunter, the latter role seeing him organise a lion shoot for Theodore Roosevelt in 1909. These aspects are well covered in the Journal extracts and supported by illustrations and maps.

Glimpses of his Quaker faith are movingly given at various points in the book though he resigned his membership during the First World War and later became an Anglican. However he told the Archbishop of York in 1918 'how in the main I held by my Quaker views...'

Married three times, his family life, with its joys and sorrows and its uneasy relation to business, provides a constant counterpoint to the excitement, controversy and demands made by his public career. Not the least paradox of this book is that of a man with a weak heart for whom, despite accidents, riding to hounds remained a life-long passion, who rode in a steeplechase in his seventieth year.

In making available material of value to the social and economic historian and in his successful evocation of a past era, Joseph Gurney Pease has produced a enjoyable and absorbing book.

Howard F. Gregg

Friends Service Centre 1942 to 1949 : Beginnings. By Joyce Millington. Sessions Book Trust, York, 1993. Pp. viii + 40. Illus. £3.00 + 55p. p&p.

'Beginnings' is explained in the sub-title of this account: 'Pioneering Quaker Social Work in Liverpool.' Friends Service Centre began in 1942 under Friends Relief Service and its early history is conveniently outlined in the Foreward, an extract from Roger Wilson's "Quaker Relief," and in a brief paragraph in Pat Starkey's pamphlet, "I Will Not Fight" (reviewed in *JFHS*, vol. 56, no. 4, p. 335). Its value was recognised in an independent report of 1944, for which Eryl Hall Williams was partially responsible, and Liverpool Preparative Meeting took over responsibility for the Centre in early 1945. Part of its activities was the case-work used by the Liverpool Pacifist Service Unit and it is here that Joyce Millington sees the centre as playing its part in the beginnings of post-war social work.

Joyce Millington's account begins with her arrival at the Centre in August 1945 'for a brief respite from teaching.' Her account is personal in two ways. The booklet is based on Joyce and her colleagues' memories of the Centre since no records, minutes or reports appear to have survived. The Centre proved decisive for Joyce since she stayed there until its closure in 1949 and, in August 1948, married its Fieldwork Organiser, Tom Millington, in whose memory the booklet is compiled.

Joyce concisely describes the role of the Centre as providing 'help and support for some families and individuals in the neighbourhood.' How this was pursued is clearly and vividly set out in chapters which detail the premises, the workers, the assorted clients, finances and the daily routine. Even the cats have a chapter to themselves! Estimates of the effectiveness of the team's work and contrasts with modern social service practice make thoughtful reading. With all its problems the experience, both within its historical context and wider social issues, has been well worth the effort of recording.

Howard F. Gregg

A Page of History in Relief : Quaker Relief, 1944-1946. By Eryl Hall Williams. Sessions Book Trust, York, 1993. Pp. viii + 124. Illus. £5.00 + 75p. p&p.

Like several recent publications already reviewed in this *Journal* this is an invaluable first-hand account of taking part in one aspect of an important phase of Quaker relief work at the end of the Second World War. Eryl Hall Williams gives 'a personal account'

of Quaker Relief Team 100 (RT100/FRS), formed in the autumn of 1944 and its work, largely in defeated Germany, from spring 1945 to the summer of 1946. The team was involved in two main areas of work. Firstly, the team's contribution to the relief operation mounted in the terrible aftermath of the discovery of Belsen concentration camp. The tension this experience caused for Professor Williams between the horror of what he saw and his deeply felt pacifism is movingly and honestly expressed. Mistaken for a sanitary team they were moved to Sulingen in May 1945 from where they were sent to Brunswick, for their second and longer assignment.

This was being responsible for a camp for Polish refugees (Displaced Persons), its population exceeding 2,000 for much of their time there. The sheer challenge of this work in an ever changing and far from certain situation is vividly conveyed with the frustrations, the dangers, the demands and the achievement seen. The measure of working in the difficulties of an unstable post-war context is well expressed in the author's recollection, about August 1945, 'that the Germans hated us, the Poles disliked us, and by now we were by no means sure that we liked ourselves.' The occasional concert, visit to a ski resort or the Folk and Dance Festival attended in April 1946 clearly stand out as the welcome respite from so many pressures. The team's effective witness was recognised in notices of thanks placed in two British newspapers by 'grateful D.P.s - their friends' in the summer of 1946.

In recording 'it as it was' Professor Williams gives a chronological account based on diaries, letters and other materials, well supported with photographs and personal recollections of others. Nine appendices illuminate different parts of the main story. This publication is a welcome addition to the printed record of the dedication, courage and goodwill of those who undertook Quaker witness in such overwhelming areas of need.

Howard F. Gregg

Records of Conscience : Three Autobiographical Narratives by Conscientious Objectors 1665 to 1685. Edited by Professor Peter Brock. William Sessions Ltd., York, 1993. £6.00 + 75p. p&p.

Peter Brock points out that during this period of 200 years before the introduction of universal military service conscientious objectors rarely wrote about their experiences. This was partly because their involvement with the military was usually brief or, as in America, because it was often possible to arrange a legal way of escape. Hence the value and interest of these narratives.

Richard Seller was a Friend and long-shore fisherman from Kilnsea, Yorkshire. He was taken by the press gang and hauled on board the flagship *Royal Prince*. Since he refused to do the King's work, he would not accept the ship's rations. He said his warfare was spiritual and that he dared not fight with carnal weapons.

He was constantly and brutally beaten and lay in irons for a fortnight, deprived of food and water, though he was sometimes kindly treated by the crew. He was condemned to death and ordered to be hanged at the yard-arm. Although pitifully weak, he was able eventually to stand up and say that he was not concerned with his body because he was at peace with God and all men. The Admiral finally set him free, probably because of his obvious sincerity and the fact that no evidence was offered against him.

The other two narratives, in contrast, seem rather less dramatic. John Smith of Dartmouth, Massachusetts, who had become a Friend, endured sufferings both in the militia and, following impressment, in the Royal Navy. He suffered imprisonment for not paying a fine for refusing military service and was ordered to sail on a vessel to Boston where he was again imprisoned. After his release he sailed for England where he was taken on board a man of war and asked to fight against the French. He refused and was roughly handled and beaten about the head, but was finally allowed to leave the ship.

John Wesley Pratt, a follower of William Lloyd Garrison, was, it seems, the only Garrisonian pacifist to be inducted into the Union army against his will. The narrative is written in the form of a letter to Garrison and is based on official correspondence about Pratt and a spirited dialogue between him and military officers about his refusal of military service.

All three narratives illustrate the same firm determination to adhere to principle and seem to have had a happy ending.

Cecil Evans

The Quakers of Melksham 1669-1950. By Harold Fassnidge. Bradford on Avon Friends. Pp. 186. Illus. £4.50.

Friends out of their affectionate attachment to their particular meeting write a history of that meeting. The title of Harold Fassnidge's book seems to focus on one town, but his canvas is intentionally wider; perhaps that wider context could have justified a larger format and a longer book incorporating the considerable material in the eight appendices, material gathered from County and Quaker records.

The early chapters give a brief, cogent description of George Fox, the rise of the Quaker movement, its organisation and its testimonies, and Friends' endurance under persecution. The chapter on the Melksham/Pickwick school shows the steps taken to remedy for poorer Friends their exclusion from the local church grammar school, and points out the distances which boys might travel at a tender age to enter a school of their parents' choice.

The major chapter "Weighty Friends" illustrates the vital support given to Melksham meeting by those families whose character and social position could protect and buttress the whole, and whose connections linked them into the great family web of the Society - the Beavens, Ruttys and Fowlers. We learn of the vigorous and innovative activities of those families in the ministry, in medicine, and in invention.

The changes brought about by the industrial revolution meant in Melksham so severe a decline in membership that not even the self-denying efforts of Norman Penney, sent by the Home Missions Committee in 1892, could prevent its closure in 1914.

The illustrations in this book by Jane Townesend are charming line-drawings; there are also reproductions of some fine photographs and drawings, by courtesy of Friends Library and of the University of Reading. I should have welcomed, in addition, a map of the county to show the less-well-known places which are mentioned in Appendix B.

Kathleen L. Cottrell

The York Retreat (in the light of the Quaker Way). By Kathleen Anne Stewart. William Sessions Ltd., 1992. £5.00 + 75p. p&p.

The publication of this paper is opportune, first for the obvious reason that it has been printed in 1992, the year accepted as the bicentennial year of the founding of the York Retreat, and secondly because it appears at a time when there is much discussion, and not least within the Religious Society of Friends, about the future provision of health services. Stuart C. Haywood in generously acknowledging these points in his Foreword calls the book 'a welcome challenge.'

This is not a history of the York Retreat but rather a study of medical ethics within the Society. Kathleen Stewart considers whether the principles upon which the establishment and its regime were founded accorded with the beliefs of early Quakerism or whether it was the evolution of Quaker faith which by the end of the eighteenth century made possible the foundation of the Retreat.

To set the background to her book she offers a résumé of Samuel Tuke's Description of the Retreat and of some nine other books and papers on the subject of Mental Illness with reference to the Retreat. Some of these are Quaker, some of non-Quaker authorship; some are American, some are English. There is, therefore, a wide range of view. One appreciates that Kathleen Stewart's purpose is to endeavour to modify the extremes of that range.

An interesting chapter is included in which the Archives of the York Retreat are much drawn upon for a description of the environment, staffing and treatment in the asylum. Would it have been possible from Case Books and Reports to have had a fuller view of the doctors who practised at the Retreat and their increasing fund of experience?

There is one comment which I found surprising. In writing of the 'century gap between the ideas of George Fox and the founding of the Retreat in 1796' I think that Kathleen Stewart may undervalue seventeenth-century Quakers and the steps taken then, though in a personal and local way rather than through an institution, to care for those groups which George Fox asked Friends to be 'tender of.' Women's Meetings' Minutes and Weekly Committee Minutes might offer a fully picture.

Some intriguing questions are raised in this thesis, and although the Afterword suggests that 'there is no final truth,' we are encouraged to further reading by a considerable bibliography of archival and published sources.

Kathleen L. Cottrell

NOTES AND QUERIES

CO. TIPPERARY FRIENDS

Thomas P. Power, in *Land, politics and society in eighteenth century Tipperary* (Clarendon Press, 1993), covers Quaker activities in the textile and milling industries, and the family and trading connections which underpinned their success in places like Clonmel. The author has used, to good effect, the Fennell, Grubb and Jacob papers in Dublin, and the Gurney correspondence at Friends House Library, London.

Russell S. Mortimer

CHARLES LESLIE

Charles Leslie (1650-1722) will be known to historians of Friends as an anti-Quaker writer but as a controversial non-juring cleric he wrote prolifically against Roman Catholics, Jews, Presbyterians, deists and Socinians (forerunners of the Unitarian church). Many of his works were anonymous or pseudonymous and he was often described as the author of the *Snake in the Grass* on other title-pages, this being his best known anti-Quaker work. Now in the 'Edinburgh Bibliographical Society's Transactions' (vol. VI part 1 1990), F.J.M. Blom has unravelled much of his complex bibliography. Blom identifies 85 titles by Leslie (including some collections of previously published works) of which ten were specifically directed against Friends. He also lists works incorrectly attributed to Leslie. Though a number of the anti-Quaker works were reprinted none went into as many printings as Leslie's most popular works. Blom confirms the value of Smith's *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana*, 1873, which lists all ten titles with one version not noted by Blom and the answers by Friends where these were published. In addition Smith includes Leslie's *Essay concerning the Divine Right of Tythes* which was answered by two Friends and some of the anti-Socinian tracts.

David J. Hall

THE QUAKER PRESS

A Collection of essays *Censorship and the Control of Print in England and France 1600-1910* (edited by Robin Myers and Michael Harris, Winchester, 1992) contains a contribution by David J. Hall 'The fiery Tryal of their Infallible Examination': self-control in the regulation of Quaker publishing in England from the 1670s to the mid 19th. century. The title comes from Bugg's criticism of the Morning Meeting.

D.J.H.

Full details of Quaker materials on microfilm may be obtained from World Microfilms, 2-6 Foscote Mews, London W9 2HH.

Plain Country Friends (The Quakers of Wooldale, High Flatts and Midhope) by David Bower and John Knight, pp. viii + 207, £10.00, has been reprinted.

George Hope's Biography of John Bellers (1654-1725) is again in print. Available from Friends Book Centre at £10.00 or from the Ebor Press, York at £11.15 (p&p paid).

The Quaker Family History Society has now been established and has issued *Quaker Connections* Number 1, March 1994. We wish the new Society well. Dr. Margaret Bennett, 486 Lea Bridge Road, Leyton, London E10 7DU has played a leading role in its establishment.

G.A.J.H.

Supplements to the Journal of Friends' Historical Society

20. SWARTHMORE DOCUMENTS IN AMERICA. Ed. Henry J. Cadbury. 1940. £1.50.
21. AN ORATOR'S LIBRARY. John Bright's books. Presidential address 1936 by J. Travis Mills. 1946. 24pp., 50p.
22. LETTERS TO WILLIAM DEWSBURY AND OTHERS. Edited by Henry J. Cadbury. 1948. 68pp., £3.00.
23. SLAVERY AND "THE WOMAN QUESTION". Lucretia Mott's Diary. 1840. By F.B. Tolles. 1952. £2.00, cloth £3.00.
24. THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY OF 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, Non-Members £3.

Back issues of the *Journal* may be obtained: price £2.00 each issue.

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