The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society

Volume 57 Number 2

CONTENTS

Annual Membership Subscriptions due 1st January (Personal and Quaker meetings in Britain and Ireland) £5 US $10 (U.K. Institutional) £8 (Overseas Institutions) $20. Subscriptions should be paid to the Treasurer and Membership Secretary, FHS, 169 Conway Crescent, Perivale, Greenford, Middlesex, UB6 8JE. Orders for single numbers and back issues should be sent to FHS c/o The Library, Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ

Volume 57 Number 2 1995

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.

REFLECTIONS ON WILLIAM PENN'S PREFACE TO GEORGE FOX'S *JOURNAL*

In some quarters at present it is the fashion to show antipathy to George Fox as self-important, and to play down his *Journal* as selective and doctored history. This is unfair, as well as ill-considered. Fox's *Journal* makes no claim to be a history of early Quakerism. It is a genuine journal, with a journal's self-centredness. The history was left to William Penn, who in his preface first carefully sets it in a long perspective and then, from 'intimate knowledge' of both Fox and the 'ensuing annals', gives prominence to each, but still with critical balance.

The *Journal* does not stand alone, either in genre or in content. For comparability in genre there are the journals written by other Friends, together with numerous autobiographical *Sufferings and Passages.* For reliability what is in the *Journal* can be checked against hundreds of contemporary letters, in the main not from or to Fox but between other Friends, and also against scores of contemporary printed tracts written by these other Friends as well as by Fox himself.[1] Furthermore Fox was a compulsive autobiographer, and from the *Short Journal* edited by Norman Penney to the *Narrative Papers* edited by Henry J. Cadbury numerous pieces are extant with which the *Journal* may be compared.

William Charles Braithwaite's acquaintance with these documents was unrivalled, but what lies behind *The Beginnings of Quakerism* is their coherence: without this, his comprehensive and convincing narrative would not have been possible.

Study of Fox's *Journal* raises many unanswered questions. Did he depend on a memory both capacious and retentive? Did he keep some sort of diary, to which he could later refer? We do not know. Were the innumerable intercalations in the manuscript of the *Journal* inserted at Fox's direction, perhaps when what he had dictated was read over to him, or are they independent additions by the scribe? Probably they are of both kinds. When, and why, or how, did the missing opening pages of the manuscript become detached? The extent and purposes of the alterations, omissions and additions made by the editor throughout the manuscript is a fascinating subject in itself; a systematic study of it would almost certainly be illuminating. It is natural to wonder if the opening pages, for which we have to depend on the first printed edition, owe more than a little to the editor, Thomas Ellwood; but any attempt to identify and detach Ellwoodian phraseology in these pages runs into the sand. All this is tantalising, but it is not the kind of thing which historians are unaccustomed to working with; it does not lead then to abandon the text as unreliable.

Of course Fox was a visionary, with the seer's psychic and intuitive powers, a 'sensitive', with the enthusiast's tendency to extravagance in speech and sometimes in action, a charismatic, who attracted both devotion and antagonism. None of this is edited out of the *Journal* either by himself or by Ellwood, though Ellwood often softens its extremer expressions and manifestations. Nor is it concealed by Penn, who, while observing (in what for Penn is strong language) that Fox's 'very presence expressed a religious majesty' and noting both his power of discernment and his 'authority... over evil', readily acknowledges the opposition he met with, and also his 'uncouth' lack of elegance and the at times broken and abrupt manner in which he spoke: at first this was unwelcome to Penn's 'nice ears', but 'I have many times been overcome in myself' by it, Penn confesses, till at last it 'engaged my soul'. And of course Fox was a natural leader, and knew it. So did Penn, who does not hesitate to call Fox 'God's blessed instrument', 'clothed... with a divine preference', 'the first and chief elder in this age'. Even then, Penn takes care not to exaggerate. Fox was never the only leader. Before concentrating on Fox Penn lists by name as many as nineteen other Friends of 'the first and great convincement'; and he ends his preface to the *Journal* with a plea to the reader to 'behold the blessed man *and men* [my italics] that were sent of God in this excellent work and service'.

Penn was not of this first generation, for he was not convinced till 1667; but he writes as if he were. At first affecting detachment, he writes of 'the people of God called Quakers', who 'were changed men before they went about to change others', in the third person plural. But he cannot keep it up and 'they' becomes 'we': 'we drew near to the Lord'; 'we were in travail'; 'we did not think our selves at our own disposal'; 'I cannot forget the humility and chaste zeal of that day'. This is the familiar language of enthusiasm. Its date - the early 1690s, after Fox's death but before the publication of his *Journal* - is the point to note. In a remarkable way, so quietly as almost to escape notice, Penn's preface establishes a continuity between the sixteen-fifties, the 'sixties and the 'nineties. Nor in this respect does the passage stand alone. Consider the following:-

> In the same year 1652 in the Government of Oliver Cromwell, the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Go thy ways to Swarthmore, where my lambs and babes and children of light will be gathered together to wait upon my name; I will feed them with the finest of the wheat, and with honey out of the rock; and with the dew of heaven I will refresh them, that they may grow as plants of my right hand planting, that above all the families of the earth I may rejoice to do them good.

The writer, Miles Halhead, was 'a plain sensible man' from the North, without a trace of Penn's culture or cultivation. What besides its tone his *Sufferings and Passages,* from which the passage comes, has in common with Penn's preface is its date. It was published in 1690.

Enthusiasm is attended by its own perils: 'oh, how easy is mercy to be abused': 'mercies should not be temptations; yet we often make them so' (Cromwell); 'the greatest and best gifts... from God are accompanied with the chiefest and worst temptations' (Nayler). Especially is this the case when the stopper of persecutions has been removed and excitement wells up without restraint. The earliest Quakerism could hardly avoid some overspill of what has been called the ranter swell. As one watches Nayler on his messianic ride into Bristol or listens to Muggleton claiming to be one of the two witnesses to whom power would be given (Revelation xi), one senses the pressure on a Fox or a Cromwell, each with his sense of vocation to leadership, to become *exalté.* Fox was human and at times succumbed, but never for long, and his resolution steadied others. Justice Hotham's saying, as Fox records it, that 'if God had not raised uppe this principle of light & life of ours ye nation had been overspread with rantisme' rings true.

It was also an age when meaning was constantly sought and found in

names and anagrams and puns. When 'all things were new' (Fox) in what Dewsbury in 1688 could still call 'a new world', the appeal of the 'new name which no man knoweth' that was to be given (Revelation ii) was irresistible. 'Give forth by me', runs a statement in 1659 from one of the Boston martyrs, 'who am known to men by the name of Marmaduke Stevenson but have a new name given me, which the world knows not of, written in the book of life'. Why did Nayler sometimes reverse his initials and write them N.J.? Was it in order to evade a hostile writer's reference to 'the other J.N., Jesus of Nazareth, that came in his Father's name'? But on occasion Fox also reverses his initials. Was it in part a sign that Friends were, as Penn calls them, 'turners of the world upside down'? But when Fox signs a letter F.G., he adds, like Marmaduke Stevenson, 'who is of the world called George Fox who A new name hath which the world knowes not'. The reference to Revelation ii is unmistakable. It will not have been lost on Cromwell, to whom the letter was addressed. Cromwell also was changing his signature at this time, to match the reality of something new: 'I called not myself to this place', he insists; he accepted it as from God; but would the world understand?

What Fox passes over as Nayler's Bristol 'disturbans' finds no place in Penn's preface. Why should it? It was not to his purpose in commending the *Journal*. He knew about it, of course. Nayler he puts at the head of his list of those of 'the first and great convincement', naming before him only Farnworth. The Ranters he also mentions, describing them as those who became 'exalted above measure' and 'ran out in their own imaginations' (phrases traceable to Nayler and Fox respectively). But Penn's interest was not, as is the modern historian's, in the Nayler who was tried for blasphemy but in the Nayler who came through, with his spirit purified and his faith strengthened; just as it was not in the Fox whom the modern historian finds hard and unrelenting but in the Fox whom he knew, 'as ready to forgive, as unapt to take or give an offence', and who came through, to reconciliation.

It is in fact revealing to note the contexts where Penn's language repeats Nayler's emphases and phraseology. When for instance Penn exhorts his brethren in the ministry, 'let us be careful neither to out-go our Guide, nor yet loiter behind him', and continues with a reminder that 'it is possible for one that hath received the word of the Lord, to miss in the division and application of it', both the warning and the admission are pure Nayler; and when, further on, Penn writes 'We shall watch always for good, and not for evil', he is virtually taking the words out of Nayler's mouth. To find Nayler's message in the preface to a book by Fox may seem surprising. One thing it indicates is that Penn

perceived no significant discrepancy between what Fox and what Nayler stood for. Sometimes this is clearly the case. When Penn claims of Friends that on principle 'they did not only refuse to be revenged for injuries done them... but they did freely forgive' and later adds that in practice Friends 'did not only show any disposition to revenge, when it was at any time in their power, but forgave their cruel enemies' - the alembic of the peace testimony, commonly overlooked by secular historians - he could have supported the assertion from both Fox and Nayler indifferently. Silently but tellingly the coherence and unity of early Quakerism are again confirmed.

Geoffrey F. Nuttall

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1] For a minuscule pilot study in this direction, see my 'The Dating of George Fox's Journey from Launceston to London in the Autumn of 1656', in *Friends' Quarterly Examiner,* no.318 (1946), pp.117-21.

THE PURITAN AND THE QUAKERESS: THOMAS HALL AND JANE HIGGS

The earliest focus of Quakerism in the county of Worcestershire [1] seems to have been Chadwick, a hamlet in the large parish of Bromsgrove. It was at Chadwick (now more often called Chadwich) that the two Quakers who may be regarded as the 'First Publishers of Truth' in Worcestershire, the Yorkshiremen Richard Farnsworth[2] and Thomas Goodaire, held a debate on 21 February 1654/5 with two members of the Worcestershire Association of ministers, Henry Oasland of Bewdley and Andrew Tristram of Clent.[3] The Quakers later claimed that they had won this 'great battle'. The fact that the debate took place here indicates that Quakerism had taken a firm hold in Chadwick and the district around it.

The names of some of the early Quakers in Chadwick and nearby are known. Richard Baxter states that[4] '[The Quakers] sent many papers of queries to divers ministers about us, ...I wrote an answer and gave them as many more questions to answer, entitling it "The Quakers' Catechism"...'. In this work of 1655 Baxter names, among other Quakers, Jane Higgs (of Chadwick), Thomas Chandler (of Chadwick) and Edward Newey (of Rednal in King's Norton). King's Norton was a curacy within Bromsgrove parish where the minister was the Presbyterian Thomas Hall, of whom more will be said later. The Quakers' tactics were not merely to question ministers by sending them 'papers' but actually to question and challenge them during the services they conducted. There is no doubt that they regarded Richard Baxter, the acknowledged leader of the Worcestershire Association, as their leading foe. To them he was "the great Rabbi" and "the chief priest" of the county. On Sunday 25 March 1655 a service in Kidderminster church taken by Baxter's assistant Richard Sergeant (the "Great Rabbi" was absent ill) was interrupted by Thomas Goodaire, who loudly asked 'How are the ministers of Christ and the ministers of Antichrist to be known asunder?' On 7 May 1655 Baxter himself was 'spoken to', while preaching at St. Swithun's, Worcester, by both Farnsworth and Goodaire.[5]

Thomas Hall[6], curate of King's Norton, was born in Worcester in 1610, and educated at the King's School there and at Oxford. In 1629 he became Master of the Grammar School at King's Norton, curate of the

chapelry of Wythall in 1632, of the chapel at Moseley in 1635 and finally curate of King's Norton in 1640 under his brother John Hall, Vicar of Bromsgrove (d.1652). Despite the fact that he was Worcestershire-born, Hall's main ecclesiastical connexions were with the county of Warwickshire[7], particularly with the town of Birmingham where he was a Lecturer (preacher) by the 1650s.[8] Hall did not join the Worcestershire Association but in 1654 helped to form the Kenilworth (Presbyterian) classis in Warwickshire. Baxter later wrote of Thomas Hall: 'At King's Norton was silenced Mr. Tho:Hall, an ancient divine known by his many writings, of a quick spirit, a godly, upright man and the only Presbyterian whom I knew in that county'.[9] Despite their differences, there was, it seems, a mutual respect between the two men, and they were united in their opposition both to unlearned lay preachers and also to the radical sects, most notably the Quakers.[10]

It is not clear why Chadwick developed as the first Worcestershire centre of Quakerism, but its geographical position must have been a factor. Quakerism was to a large extent a Northern movement in origin[11] and it entered Worcestershire, it would seem, from the North East. Chadwick, in the North East of the county, was close to the county's borders with Staffordshire and Warwickshire (from which it was only a few miles distant). The manor of Chadwick belonged to Christ Church, Oxford which had by 1618 sublet it to one Anthony Cole.[12] Chadwick may possibly exhibit an example of that weak manorial control which, in the view of some historians, permitted the emergence of dissent.[13] On the other hand, the growth of Quakerism there may be largely due to the presence of Anthony Cole. In 1655 George Fox, the greatest figure in early Quakerism, stayed in Chadwick at the house of Anthony Cole (?Chadwick Manor House). He had a 'brave, serviceable meeting at Chadwick on the side of a hill, for the house could not hold the people, they were so many...'.[14] The Bromsgrove parish register records that 'Anthony Cole of Chadwick was buried twice 6th September 1661, first by the Quakers and after in the churchyard'.[15] In 1666 George Robinson of Bishop's Cleeve, Gloucestershire, yeoman, was accused of being 'present at an assembly or coventicle in Chadwich in the parish of Bromsgrove under colour or pretence of an exercise of religion, in other manner then is allowed by the liturgie or practice of the Church of England...'.[16] In 1689 'The edifice conteyninge about three bayes of buildings scytuate in Chadwich in the parish of Bromsgrove... adjoyninge to the lands of Anthony Dowbridge'[17] was certified as a Quaker Meeting House (a subsidy list of 1690 lists Anthony Dowbridge as a Quaker).[18] In 1778

Chadwick had about 480 inhabitants and 80 houses[19] and by this date it was the focus point of a large Quaker district.

Jane Hicks or Higgs of Chadwick appears to have been the person of that name who was baptised at Bromsgrove on 4 October 1627, the daughter of Daniel Higgs. In 1618 this Daniel Higgs is recorded as paying rent of 1s 4d. a year for 'certain freehold lands called Callow Brook containing 12 acres'. In 1628 Daniel Higgs, yeoman, Nicholas Newey, labourer, and John Newey, yeoman, made recognizances for the appearance of Nicholas Newey at Quarter Sessions.[20] It may be significant that both in 1628 and in 1655 a Higgs[21] was associated with a member or members of the Newey family. If the above identification is correct, Jane Higgs was 28 years of age when she 'spoke to' the Rev.Thomas Hall in King's Norton Church of 7 September 1656.

This incident is referred to in a MS. 'Life' of Thomas Hall, perhaps written by the Rev.John Reynolds and possibly based on a (now lost) MS. by Hall himself.[22]

'One of these Quakers interrupting him in his publick ministry was bound over to the Sessions; there this Jane Higs (a comon disturber of ministers in publick) accused Mr.H. 1) of cruelty in persecuting the saints called Quakers. To wch he answered yt all Quakers were not saints, for the devil is a Quaker, he believes and trembles.[23] 2) She accused him of lying, in yt he said he would grease her hands if they were so stiff yt she could not curtely[24] *(sic)* without greazing; yet never did it. To wch he replied yt the stiffnes was not in the hands but in the proud heart, and therefore he conceived that cudgel-oyle was fittest for this cure'.

There is a Quarter Sessions document which relates to this actual incident (it belongs to the proceedings for Michaelmas 1656):[25]

> Worcester shire Ss : The informacons of Thomas Bennett, Edward Hobbis and Joseph Tomlinson taken before mee the 7th day of September 1656 against Jane Heeke for disturbinge Thomas Hall, minister of Kinges Norton, in the time of devine servis.
>
> Thomas Bennett, Edward Hobbis and Joseph Tomlinson made oath that upon the 7th day of September they did heare and see the said Jane Heekes make a disturbance in the parish church of Kingesnorton by interruptinge Mr. Thomas Hall in his sermone by questioninge his doctrine to the disturbance of the sayd Mr. Hall and the whole congregacon *Tho: Milwarde*

Thomas Milward had been the Bishop's Bailiff at nearby Alvechurch and one of the leading Parliamentarians in the County in the Civil War of 1642-46. Thomas Hall had clearly acted quickly in getting three members of his congregation to swear an information before a local

Justice of the Peace on the very day of the incident. What Jane Higgs actually said to Thomas Hall on 7 September 1656 must remain a matter of conjecture. The accusations reported in the 'Life' do not really amount to the 'questioning' of his 'doctrine' mentioned in the Quarter Sessions document, and are likely to have been made over a period of time. At any rate, Hall seems to have felt, among all his Quaker opponents, particularly threatened by Jane Higgs. In the Early Fine Printing Section in Birmingham Reference Library is a copy of Baxter's *The Quakers' Catechism* which once belonged to Thomas Hall.[26] When, at the beginning of the section headed 'An Answer to the Quakers' Queries', Baxter mentions Jane Higgs, Hall has noted in the margin: Jane Heekes my antagon(ist) in prson [?prison].

We know that Jane Higgs was imprisoned at Worcester for interrupting Thomas Hall in September 1656. In Besse's *Sufferings of the Quakers,* the source of this information, we also find, under the year 1658, that 'Jane Higgs, being several times concerned to bear her testimony to the truth to the people assembled at their place of public worship in Bromsgrove, was committed to Worcester prison. She was also four several times set in the stocks, one of those times a whole night and part of two days'. In January 1660/1 she is one of 47 persons listed as being in the county gaol at Worcester.[27] Of her subsequent life nothing is known. Her opponent Thomas Hall was ejected from his living at King's Norton in 1662 and died there on 13 April 1665. He left a library of books to the town of Birmingham and a smaller library to King's Norton.

C.D. Gilbert

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Abbreviations

D.N.B.	=	Dictionary of National Biography.
D.W.L.	=	Dr. Williams's Library, Gordon Square, London.
H.W.R.O.	=	Hereford and Worcester Record Office (at Worcester).
T.B.A.S.	=	Transactions of the Birmingham Archaeological Society.
V.C.H.	=	Victoria County History.
W.H.S.	=	Worcestershire Historical Society.

1 On the coming of Quakerism to Worcestershire see *The First Publishers of Truth* (ed. N. Penny, 1907), 274-85 (based on a MS. account by the Worcester Quaker Dr. Edward Bourne).

2 On this debate see F.J. Powicke, *A Life of the Reverend Richard Baxter* (1924), p.249 (henceforth Powicke).

3 Ibid.

[4] *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (ed. M.Sylvester, 1696) I,i, 116-180.24 (henceforth *Rel.Baxt.).*
[5] On all this see Powicke, 246f.
[6] On Thomas Hall see F.J. Powicke in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* vol. 8 (1924), 166-90 (henceforth 'B.J.R.L.'); Helen Goodger, 'King's Norton' (1990), 62-64; W.S. Brassington in T.B.A.S. (1887), 10f.
[7] Hall's Warwickshire friends Thomas Dugard, Vicar of Barford, and John Trapp, Headmaster of Stratford Grammar School, had been his near contemporaries at King's School, Worcester. On Hall and Warwickshire generally see Ann Hughes, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire 1620-1660* (1987). See also Michael Craze, *The King's School, Worcester* (1972), 64-6, 74-5.
[8] T.B.A.S. (1887), 15.
[9] *Rel. Baxt.* III, 93.
[10] See, in particular, Hall's *The Pulpit Guarded* (1650), occasioned by a dispute at Henley-in-Arden, Warwickshire, against five lay preachers.
[11] See e.g. Hugh Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England* (1964), ch.III; Barry Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (1985), ch.I.
[12] V.C.H. Worcestershire II, 176; III, 23-24; Chadwick Court Rolls.
[13] See e.g. Margaret Spufford, *Contrasting Communities* (1981), 298 f.; Alan Everitt in Joan Thirsk (ed.), *Land, Church and People* (1980), 178f.
[14] *First Publishers of Truth*; cf. George Fox's *Journal* (1911 Cambridge edition) I,196.
[15] 'Notes and Queries for Bromsgrove' I,88 (henceforth N. & Q.)
[16] H.W.R.O., Ref.110: 108/89.
[17] Ibid., 110: 69/13. Dowbridge was probably the lessee of the manor by this date.
[18] N. & Q. I, 91.
[19] N. & Q. I, 72.
[20] H.W.R.O., Ref.110: 54/26; 'Quarter Sessions Records' (W.H.S., ed. J.W. Willis Bund), 446, where Daniel Higgs is wrongly given as a 'husbandman'.
[21] The Higgs family seems to have been a fairly important yeoman family from the Middle Ages onwards. See 'Bromsgrove Court Rolls 1494-1504' (W.H.S.1963), index s.v. Heekes.
[22] D.W.L., Baxter Treatises vol.IX, nos.293-99: 'A Briefe Narrative of the Life and Death of Mr. Thomas Hall, late Pastor of King's Norton in Worcestershire...'. It was edited by John Reynolds, ejected minister of Wolverhampton, and possibly written by him. For the problems posed by the MS. see F.J. Powicke in B.J.R.L. 8(1924), 167-9.
[23] This is a reference to the Epistle of James 2.19: '...the devils also believe and tremble', and to the convulsions which gave the 'Quakers' their name.
[24] The MS. has 'curtely' but this probably arises from a misreading of 'curtesy' (i.e. 'courtesy'). The Quakers refused to acknowledge their social superiors by the traditional actions of removing hats (in men) or curtsying (in women).
[25] H.W.R.O., Ref. 110:93/45.
[26] Birmingham Reference Library, Early and Fine Printing Collection, 094/1655/C.27 (no.121654). It is part of the Thomas Hall Library.
[27] Joseph Besse, *The Suffering of the Quakers* (1753) II, 60-61.

REACTIONS TO PERSECUTION IN PRIMITIVE QUAKERISM

The persecution of Quakers did not end with the passing of the Toleration Act, but, in respect of their witness on oaths, and even more with respect to tithes, continued into the next century. Quakers developed several strategies for minimising the effects of persecution. They encouraged one another with thoughts of the dire fate awaiting persecutors. They gave maximum publicity to persecution, while trying to present a positive image of Quakerism, in order to enlist public sympathy. They built up a strong organisation for discipline and mutual support. They lobbied for changes to the law, and used the law to have particular acts of persecution declared unlawful. Finally, they developed their theological ideas, so that suffering came to be seen as part of the experience of salvation. This paper will look at the origins of these reactions to persecution in the early years of the movement.

The causes of the hostility to Quakers, which accompanied the undoubted success of their mission, may be briefly summarised. Firstly, there was alarm at their doctrine, which led to several trials for blasphemy. Then, Quakers took direct action on matters that had long been a matter of concern to radical groups. Parish ministers whose services were disrupted and tithes unpaid became very angry, and used dubious methods to collect what they thought to be their due. Magistrates were enraged by Quakers who would not remove their hats, and addressed them as 'thou', thereby challenging their authority.[1] Often both ministers and magistrates failed to restrain, or even encouraged, hooligan elements who turned upon people who were different and were thought to be easy game.[2] Thirdly, especially after the imposition in 1655 of the Oath of Abjuration, which Quakers would not take, Quakerism came to the notice of the national authorities as a potentially subversive movement, possibly linked with Jesuits.[3] Quakers were the targets when the laws on vagrancy and on interrupting church services were tightened, and in consequence there was an increasing number of clashes with authorities.[4]

Whether they were the objects of what, according to the law of the land, was legitimate prosecution or whether they were the victims of spite or of hooligans, to Quakers it all appeared as persecution, the activity of AntiChrist, or the great Beast of Revelations. The earliest Quaker message was a call to repent for the Day of the Lord was actually arriving. Their first reaction when they met with opposition was to

deliver fierce warnings of coming doom. Elizabeth Hooton, imprisoned with George Fox in Derby in 1650 wrote to the mayor, 'The day cometh that shall burn thee seathe the Lord... friend if the love of God was in you you would love the truth and hear the truth spoke and not preson unjustly.'[5] Francis Howgil, imprisoned in Kendal in 1654, wrote a pamphlet entitled *A Woe against the Magistrates, Priests, and People of Kendal... which may warn all the persecuting Cities and Towns in the North, and everywhere, to Repent and fear the Lord.* it begins, 'The Word of the Lord came unto me, saying, write and declare against that bloody town of Kendal.'[6] The same attitude was still evident up to the end of the decade in a number of similar denunciations of specified people and places.[7]

Apocalyptic imagery faded away after the Restoration, but long before then Quakers had passed from merely threatening disaster to finding actual examples of it. As was normal at that time, they believed in the active intervention of God to punish evildoers.[8] Persecution might even be a sign that they themselves had sinned. In Norwich in 1655 a leading Quaker, Christopher Atkinson, was found to be having a sexual relationship with the maidservant of another Quaker, and Friends ascribed their recent persecution to the fact that they had tolerated the 'defiled thing' within their 'camp'.[9] It was not until the Protectorate fell in April 1659 that Quakers found a clear case of the intervention of the Lord on behalf of his people. The Protectorate had persecuted the Children of Light, and it had fallen, and the governments that succeeded were warned not to go down the same path.[10] It was about this time that Friends began to collect 'Examples', the name given to instances of persecutors coming to a bad end. The first collection was published in 1659 in a pamphlet by Edward Billing. He had found 42 Examples, and he appended a further list provided by his friend Humphrey Smith, 'that he was an eye-witness of'.[11] The practice of collecting such Examples continued until 1701.

The second method used by Quakers to reduce the effects of persecution was to seek public sympathy. Those in trouble with the law frequently published their own accounts of their trials, which usually contained a description of the circumstances of their alleged crimes and of their arrest, together with copies of legal documents and correspondence with the authorities, accounts of what was said at their trials, and finally a record of what happened afterwards. Many of the authors had fought for Parliament, and pointed this out in no uncertain terms.[12] Some pamphlets of this type, especially the earlier ones, were straightforward factual accounts, but as the Quaker mission proceeded, and mistreatment of Quakers became more common, the emphasis

changed. The style became less confrontational. Writers attempted to enlist the sympathy of their readers by their descriptions of violent acts and unjust processes of law. This is the beginning of what came to be called Quaker Sufferings literature. It forms a separate section in Joseph Smith's *Catalogue of Quaker Books,* entitled 'Sufferings of Friends for Testimony of the Truth'.[13] The first true example of the genre was probably Richard Hubberthorne's description of the beating-up of two women preachers at Oxford, *A True Testimony of the Zeal of Oxford Professors and University Men,* written in June 1654. An even more shocking event, to Quakers, was the death in April 1656, from maltreatment in prison, of the young James Parnel, who has often been called the first Quaker martyr. The inquest on his death found that he had died from wilful self-neglect, and Friends were quick to answer this accusation in a pamphlet which described the horrible conditions in which he had been held.[14]

The Sufferings literature rapidly increased in volume. In 1655 there is the first record, in a letter to Margaret Fell, of an attempt to collect information on all cases of sufferings of Friends, and the next year this was published.[15] Other collected accounts followed.[16] Before long there were more deaths, from bad prison conditions, mistreatment by gaolers, or attacks by members of the public. A broadside of 1659 lists all fatal cases with the details picked out in red; there were twenty-six.[17]

As well as their publicity value, these collection of records also enabled Friends to target relief where it was needed, which leads to their third method for minimising the effects of persecution. A system of local and regional meetings was built up in the North from 1654, and was extended in 1656 and 1657 to all parts of the country where Quakers were strong. One function of these meetings was to provide a network for the care and support of Friends in trouble. A check was kept on Friends whose goods were confiscated for tithe or who were imprisoned, their families were looked after, and the prisoners visited.[18] This organisation was damaged in the persecution of the early Restoration years, and was afterwards re-formed on the advice of George Fox.

The fourth strategy was use of the law. In the early years there were a number of appeals directly to the Protector, and to Parliament when one was sitting, but the later Protectorate Parliaments did not favour radical sectarians, and Cromwell, although he supported liberty of conscience, would not countenance public disorder.[19] There was a further spate of such appeals in 1659, but their usefulness depended on the attitude of

the government of the day. Friends found other ways of using the legal system.

Especially in the North, in the early days, some justices and other influential persons became allied to the Quakers, and would bend the law a little in their favour. Fox received such support when charged with blasphemy in 1652 and in 1653.[20] A less well known but interesting example is the case of Robert Widder in 1655-56. He had not paid his tithes and was proceeded against by being declared an outlaw, which made it possible for the aggrieved minister to apply for seizure of his goods. Advice was sought from Friends and sympathisers with legal knowledge, and with their help a means of setting aside the outlawry was found.[21]

Most of the sufferings pamphlets attacked the legality of what was done, and some Friends had acquired considerable legal experience by the time the Meeting for Sufferings was set up in 1676. This survives to the present day as the national executive committee of English, Welsh, and Scottish Friends, but its original remit was to deal with the legal problems of Quakers.[22] There was however doubt among some Friends of the time as to whether it was right to use the law in this way; if the Lord wished them to be saved from suffering he would save them himself.[23]

This leads to the final weapon used against persecution, the theological explanation of their sufferings that Quakers developed. By 1655, if not before, Quakers were realising that the Kingdom of God, although it was to an extent present within them, was not immediately coming in fulness, and there was going to be a time of severe trial. Fox wrote that year:

> Brethren everywhere that are imprisoned for the Truth, give yourselves up to it... and the power of the Lord will carry you over all the Persecutions... For since the Beginning hath the Persecution got up... For as the Apostles and true Christians suffered... so ye do... So the Power, and Life, and Wisdom of the Lord God Almighty keep you, and preserve you... that ye may witness every one of you a Crown of Life Eternal.[24]

Quakers do not seem to have been greatly concerned as to why the elect should suffer, but they noted the facts, that Christ had suffered and had given warning that his followers must expect similar treatment. During the 1650s the primitive Quaker faith and the Quaker experience of persecution reinforced each other. The process of becoming a Quaker was often in two parts. First there would be a convincement of sin, a long and painful process, in which people came to realise that they

were outside the church, separated from God, and must turn to the light of Christ which was at least potentially present in everyone. This would be followed by a transformation of life, and it was not expected to be pleasant. One typical Quaker wrote that he felt 'the Lord... raise a swift witness in me, that the waies of man were evill continually, and that self must be denied, and a cross to it must be borne; and so the life of Christ Jesus was manifest unto me...'.[25] References to bearing the cross become more frequent towards the end of the decade, as persecution worsened. Suffering came to be understood as a privilege, and evidence of election. A letter from Burrough about his imprisonment at Kingston gives an example: 'I have noe cause of trouble in itt, but rather of joy and peace, knowing yt itt shall be for the furtherance of ye gospell... my name is assuredly written in ye Lamb's book of life.'[26]

The same pattern was repeated frequently. If Friends felt that the Lord was calling them to a certain course of action, then danger must not turn them aside, but was rather to be welcomed. One example must suffice. Humphrey Smith was a parish minister who was called, 'contrary to my strong will', to leave his work, family, and possessions, 'to be exposed to want, hardships, revilings, imprisonments, whippings, stonings and all manner of cruel tortour.'[27] He and several others were accused of public preaching, unlawful travelling, and refusal to remove their hats, and were imprisoned for a year at Winchester in revoltingly insanitary conditions. He wrote:

> And this I say plainly to you, that your long tyranny will never weary out the patience we have received, neither can you inflict more punishment than the Lord hath enabled us to bear... for selfe we have denied, and we have given up our bodies and souls a living sacrifice unto God, to do or suffer his will. And he that kills the body we fear not, much less those that can but whip or imprison for a few months, neither can you disturb their rest whom the Lord hath crowned who rejoice, being counted worthy to suffer for his sake... yea there is none can make them afraid with all their threats, unrighteous laws, bonds... long unjust imprisonments, or death itself.[28]

The question has to be asked whether Friends actually went out of their way to seek a form of martyrdom. There was a contemporary accusation that they deliberately exposed themselves to abuse and suffering in order to appear more like ministers of Christ, and this they denied.[29] Certainly they were uncompromising. There are records from the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century of Friends recording their refusal of tithe, not allowing others to pay their tithe for them, and following up members of their meeting who were thought to be weak in this witness.[30]

Quakers sometimes put themselves into situations that would inevitably lead to trouble. A Quaker who went to a church service was most indignant at being turned out and beaten when, as he said, he had 'stood there peaceably'. What he had done was to keep his hat on when the priest was praying.[31] In New England there was a more serious confrontation. The authorities tried to stamp out Quakerism with floggings, brandings, and imprisonments. Finally a law was passed banishing Quakers under pain of death if they returned. Quakers repeatedly entered the colony in defiance of this law, and four people were hanged before the newly restored Charles II intervened. Here it seems that deliberate martyrdom was sought, although the Friends concerned were sure that they were called by God to this witness. Mary Dyer, before being hanged, said, 'I came in Obedience to the will of God... desiring you to Repeal your unrighteous Lawes of Banishment upon pain of Death.'[32]

It remains to consider whether John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments,* and possible actual memories of martyrs, increased the willingness of Quakers to suffer. Knowledge of martyrdom must have been part of their inheritance. It is quite likely that the style of Sufferings tracts was influenced by memories of the *Book of Martyrs.* There is however no evidence that individual Quakers in the 1650s accepted suffering because they felt themselves to be in the martyrs' tradition. The examples they referred to were invariably biblical. Quakers were too conscious of the new beginning, and too sure that they alone constituted the true church, to be much concerned about what had gone before.

Richard Baxter seems to have been the first to raise with Quakers the question of the Marian martyrs, which he did in his dispute with Nayler concerning the nature of the ministry. He wrote: 'Are not the Ministers whom these men despise of the same calling, practice, as those were that suffered death in the flames in queen Maryes dayes... did they not preach from pulpits, and take tythes or money for their due maintenance...?' Nayler replied: 'I say it was for denying the Popish way of worship, according to their measure of light, that these men suffered... though the fulnesse of the light was not then come, but this is no ground to uphold the rest of their popish inventions contrary to Gospel worship.'[33] Under pressure in controversy, Quakers admitted somewhat grudgingly that God had indeed had his faithful witnesses in all ages. Fox wrote: 'Luther and Calvin, something there was stirring in them, Luther was true in his place, but it was but a little... neither... Luther, not Calvin was in the very life... the Apostles were in.'[34] Unambiguously favourable references to John Foxe's book and the

earlier martyrs were not made till 1659, and then in two pamphlets where the main reference was not to the sixteenth century but to an earlier time, to Wyclif and Hus, who had not supported tithes.[35]

So by the time of the Restoration Quakers were well placed, both in their theology and their experience, to withstand the events of the years which followed, when 400 died in prison and several thousand were crippled in health or ruined in fortune. They were, perhaps, rather marginal martyrs, for while individuals accepted their suffering as God's will, and as evidence of their salvation, the organised Quaker movement was at the same time fighting the persecution vigorously and to some extent successfully.[36] Quakers were also rather ambivalent about their martyrology, for in the changed atmosphere of the eighteenth century it was not thought appropriate to publish accounts of what was now past, and so the Sufferings pamphlets were forgotten, and the great mass of manuscript records remained in store till it was finally printed in 1753.[37] By then it was history.

Rosemary Moore

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1 Examples of the antogonism of ministers and magistrates to Quakers can be found in any account of Quaker Sufferings. See for instance Norman Penney, ed., *Extracts from State Papers relating to Friends,*(London, 1913), 37-93.

2 A startling example of hooliganism in this period is the attack on a Quaker meeting with incendiary devices constructed by the local apothecary, described in Anon., *Cains Offspring demonstrated,* (London, 1659), 1.

3 The earliest example of an attempt to link Quakers with Jesuits seems to be that in Thomas Weld, *A Further Discovery of that Generation of Men called Quakers,* (Gateshead, 1654).

4 Norman Penney, ed., *First Publishers of Truth,* (London, 1907), appendix by William C. Braithwaite, 'Penal Laws affecting Early Friends in England', 345-352. See for instance Edward Burrough, *A Standard Lifted Up,* (London, 1658), 13, for Quaker attitude to the law.

5 London, Friends House Library, MS Swarthmore Collection [hereafter Sw.], ii.43.

6 Francis Howgil and James Nayler, *A Woe against the Magistrates, Priests and People of Kendal,* (London, 1654), 1.

7 e.g. Henry Gill, *Warning to Godalming,* (London, 1658) and George Fox, *To the People of Uxbridge,* (London, 1659).

8 Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic,* (London, 1971), ch.4, 'Providence', 78-112.

9 Arthur J. Eddington, 'The First Fifty Years of Quakers in Norwich' (typescript 1932), 14-22 & Appendix B, 270-272. The context makes it clear that 'defiled thing' is a reference to Josh. 7, though neither the AV nor the Geneva Bible uses this phrase.

10 Pamphlets expressing this viewpoint include the anonymous *Copie of a Paper presented to Parliament* and *To the Parliament of England who are in Place to do Justice*, and William Morris, *To the Supreme Authority of the Commonwealth*, (all London, 1659).

11 Edward Billing, *Word of Reproof and Advice to my Fellow-Soldiers*, undated but apparently 1659 from internal evidence. The Examples are appended to the main pamphlet, 79-84. A reconstruction of a collection of Examples attributed to George Fox has been attempted by Henry J. Cadbury in his *Narrative Papers of George Fox*, (Richmond, Indiana, 1972), 209-231.

12 e.g. Thomas Salthouse and Robert Wastfield, *A True Testimony of Faithfull Witnesses Recorded*, (London, 1657), 40, 'Most of us... are men that have... conscientously engaged for the Commonwealth interest... some of us in places of Trust and Concernment...'

13 Joseph Smith, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Friends Books*, 2 vols., (London, 1867), vol.ii, 644-686. I am grateful to Dr. Geoffrey F. Nuttall for permission to consult his unpublished survey of this literature, 'Record and Testimony: Quaker Persecution Literature 1650-1700', (1982).

14 Thomas Shortland and others, *The Lamb's Defence against Lies*, (London, 1656).

15 Sw. iv. 162, Geoffrey F. Nuttall, 'Early Quaker Letters', (typescript in main Quaker libraries, 1952), [hereafter EQL], no.169, Gervase Benson and Anthony Pearson to Margaret Fell, 1 Aug. 1655. This was followed by the published book of Gervase Benson and others, *The Cry of the Oppressed*, (London, 1656).

16 There was a document issued in Hampshire in 1659, summarised in William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, (Cambridge, 2nd ed. 1955), [hereafter *BQ*], 315, and also in A.R. Barclay, ed., *Letters of Early Friends*, (London, 1841), 283. Two 1657 epistles of Fox, Sw.ii. 88 & 89, refer to the collection of sufferings records, and this was followed by the publication, with an introduction by Richard Hubberthorne, of *The Record of Suffering for Tithe in England*, (London, 1658).

17 Anon., *To the Parliament of England now sitting at Westminster*, (London, 1659).

18 *BQ* 311-315, includes summaries of early documents describing organisation.

19 John Camm and Francis Howgil were the first to have an interview with Cromwell, in the spring of 1654 (*BQ*, 156 gives all MS references).

20 See George Fox and James Nayler, *Saul's Errand to Damascus*, (London, 1653), and comments in *BQ* 107-109, 118-119, and by John Punshon, *Portrait in Grey* (London 1984), 57.

21 The reasons for the use of this process, and its working in practice, are explained by Alfred W. Braithwaite, 'Early Tithe Prosecutions - Friends as Outlaws', *JFHS* 49 (1959-60), 148-156. The letters concerning this case are, in chronological order, Sw.iv. 41, 29, 30, 102, i.63, iv.101, and i.380, (EQL 221-225, 240, 246). See also Benson, *Cry of the Oppressed*, 23f.

22 William C. Braithwaite, *The Second Period of Quakerism*, (Cambridge, 2nd ed.1955), [hereafter *SPQ*], 282-285. Craig Horle, *Quakers and the English Legal System*, (Philadelphia, 1988), deals fully with the legal activities of Friends during the Restoration period.

23 Isaac Penington and William Dewsbury both took this view, according to *SPQ*, 284.

24 George Fox, *Epistles*, no.92, in *The Works of George Fox*, collected edn. vol.7, (Philadelphia, 1831).

25 John Higgins, *To All Inhabitants of the Earth*, (London, 1658), 2.

26 Sw.iii.18, 25 Aug. 1657.

27 Humphrey Smith, *Man driven out of Earth and Darkness*, (London, 1658), 5.

[28] Humphrey Smith, *The Sounding Voyce of the Dread of Gods Mighty Power,* (London, 1658), 7. Also in *The Fruits of Unrighteousness and Injustice,* (London, 1658), 53.

[29] George Whitehead, John Whitehead, and George Fox the Younger, *A Brief Discovery of the Dangerous Principles of John Horne and Thomas Moore jnr,* (London, 1659), 30, answering Horne and Moore, *A Brief Discovery of the People called Quakers,* (London, 1659).

[30] Nicholas Morgan, 'The Social and Political Relations of the Lancaster Quaker Community, 1688-1740', in Michael Mullett, ed., *Early Lancaster Friends,* (Lancaster, 1978), 27-31.

[31] Edward Bourne, *The Truth of God Cleared,* (London, 1657), 12.

[32] Francis Howgil, *The Heart of New England Hardened,* (London, 1659). Edward Burrough, *A Declaration of the Sad and Great Persecution and Martyrdom of the People of God,* (London, 1660), 28 for Mary Dyer's last words, and George Bishop, *New England Judged,* (London, 1661).

[33] James Nayler, *Answer to a Book called the Quakers Catechism,* (London, 1655), 44.

[34] George Fox, *The Papists Strength,* (London, 1658), 52.

[35] John Crook, *Tithes No Property nor Lawful Maintenance,* (London, 1659), 5. There is a similar passage on Wyclif and Hus in the anonymous pamphlet ascribed to Isaac Penington, *A Brief Account of Some Reasons why Quakers cannot do Things,* (London, about 1659-60). Crook and Penington knew each other well and came from a different background from the earliest Quakers; there may be a link between these pamphlets.

[36] See Horle, *Quakers and the English Legal System.*

[37] Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers,* 2 vols. (London, 1753).

SOME UNPUBLISHED QUAKER TRACTS (MARGARET EVERARD, fl. 1699-1704)

Margaret Everard is a somewhat shadowy figure in the annals of early Friends. We can find no record of her marriage to John Everard, nor an entry for her death in the registers of burials. The only possible reference to her, as the wife of John Everard, is in the births digest of Cambridge & Huntingdon Quarterly Meeting, where the birth, on eighth of the third month [May] 1693, is recorded of Ann Everard, daughter of John and Margaret. The child was born at (St) Ives, but the parents residence is given as Cotton, Suffolk. The supplement to the burials register records the death of Anne Everit, aged 'abt. 1yr', on the thirty-first of the fifth month [July] 1694, at Ives. The names and residence of the parents are the same as in the births register. There is no mention of Margaret in the records of the London & Middlesex meetings, and the records of Huntingdon Monthly Meeting do not survive for the period that the Everards were active. The village of Cotton, in Suffolk, is five miles north of Stowmarket. There is no record of a meeting of Friends there; the nearest meeting would probably be Mendlesham which, from 1667 to 1793, was within the compass of Bury Monthly Meeting. The records of Bury Monthly Meeting do not survive for this period, so it is impossible to confirm or deny that the parents of Ann Everard were, in fact, the same John and Margaret to whom this article refers.

It seems clear that Margaret Everard was well-known to Friends, not only as the wife of a minister, but also as an adherent of George Keith. John Everard, who was born in Patham Mary Magdalen, Norfolk, was convinced by Richard Hubberthorne and a minister by the time he was 20, about 1665. His testimony makes no mention of his marriage, and no record of it can be found in the digest registers for Norfolk & Norwich Quarterly Meeting, or London & Middlesex Quarterly Meeting. However, John Tomkins, in a letter written in London, 4th of 4th month [June], 1700, tells Sir John Rodes in Chesterfield '...even in Huntingdonshere that G.K. [George Keith] boasts of the great Conversion, J. Everad says, but 4 who was in unity with ffrds, who have gone to Steeplehouse, his wife and R.B. [Robert Bridgman] two of them.'[1] In a previous letter, dated London, 18th of 9th month [November], 1698, John Tomkins states that '...poor Marget Everad was

to much perswaded into an Indulgence towards G.K. insomuch that she is hurt by him, but not so much but there is good hope of her Recovery.'[2] From these references we can probably infer that Margaret Everard, if not born a Friend, was convinced, and married a leading minister, only to be drawn away by the preaching of George Keith.

Margaret's only claim to fame is her published tract *An Epistle of Margaret Everard to the people called Quakers... .*[3] Published in 1699 this is a defence of her behaviour in following the teachings of George Keith, after his disownment by London Yearly Meeting in 1695, not so much for his doctrine as for his behaviour with regard to Friends in Pennsylvania.[4]

However, after Keith had entered the Established Church, she seems to have become disillusioned with his teaching, and almost a virulent opponent. Two unpublished tracts, apparently signed by Margaret Everard, have recently come to light in the manuscript collections in the Library at Friends House.[5] There are two copies of each, clearly made to be circulated to members of the Society of Friends. One is an effort to dissociate Margaret from the actions of George Keith, and an affirmation of her acceptance of the tenets of Friends. The other is a personal appeal from Margaret to George Keith to change his ways and rejoin the Society.

These tracts are now transcribed below, examples of fine rhetoric in defence of the principles and beliefs of early Friends.

Although the Keithian controversy caused a major split in the Society of Friends little work has been done on the supporters of the protaganists in the dispute. It is hoped that this will be the first of several articles on the background of those involved.

TRACT 1

Dated ye 24th of the 6th mo 1704 London

Dear Friends -
As I have caused the Truth to be Evill spoken of by my backsliding, and have done the people of God much hurt thereby so I am Constrained from an Inward Conviction of spirit to make this my Publick Confession and lett the world know that for the same I have often mourned in secret and repented before the Lord that I was led astray and prevailed upon by ye specious pretences of more sound Doctrine to take part with men of corrupt minds against the sufficiency of ye divine light of Christ ye True light that lightneth every man that cometh into ye world and against my dearest friends whom I loved as my own life to set stumbling blocks in ye way of ye weak and to follow the shallow grose and carnall apprehensions of those men who are for the Generallity of them no more than Naturall men, and want ye inner life and power of Religion therefore that which hath wounded my soul & pearced mee more deeply has been my

Compliance with men of violence contention and envious spirits, whose Ears hath been swift to hear Evill of a people more Righteous then themselves, what I did in this matter was not for any by or sinester End, but more from a mistake in Judgment then any design I had to carry on, yea none knows but God alone my sorrow in that day, and though I have been for a time as a sheep straid from my Heavenly Fathers fold, yet I feel there is a turning in my soul again to ye flock of his companions, and an earnest cry begotten in me that I may yett travill for those that hath in any measure sustained hurt by my turning aside, which I hope will be a land mark to prevent others running aground, for I shall Rejoyce more in their safety then blush at my own Repentance it being abundance less shame to Confess then to Commit an error, let not any say that ye crosses of ye world or any other doscontent hath thrust out a glozeing & fained recantation, but know its not ye Praise of men I seek after, not their persecutions I flee from, I bless God I can expose my selfe to all ye Harsh Censures of men, only from ye pure minded & upright in heart I beg assistance at ye Throne of Grace and an Interest in their Prayers and as they find mee so to Receive mee

M.E.

And Friends, whereas I have writte a paper, some few thoughts on ye Benefits of Christ's outward Death and Suffering for my own private meditations wch. G.K. happened to see very much urged ye Publishing that paper, for it was not my designe as there mentioned to have it sent abroad in Publick, & though I did at Last Comply thereto yett it was not without Much Reluctoncy and unwillingness believing I should thereby suffer for it as I have since sufficiently done and must acknowledg and confess that what I then writt was very weak & shallow. But there was some truth in ye foregoing Paper but no where Sufficiently Expressed but to pass by as to ye Doctrinall part at present, and to doe my Friends Right whom I have Represented as Short in those weighty matters I have written what follows & do in ye humillity of my soul desire their forgiveness in anything wherein I have Injured them, Either by word or writing and perticularly for reflecting on ffriends in ye Ministry who because of ye mistakes of some perticular persons hath been branded with Heresy Error & falsehood to ye world that thereby their work & service for ye truth might be less regarded & their ministry not take that good effect upon ye hearts of ye people as otherwise it would, and as to ye Doctrine of faith in Christ Crucified, In all that is necessary to salvation; upon long Consideration and sound Judgment I freely conffess the People of God Called Quakers more truly believe and walk answerably thereto, then those that make a great outcry and noise about it, though many sincere souls amongst them cannot make such nice speculate Distinctions as many of ye Letter Learned can, yet can testifie by their own Experience that Christ is ye vine and they are the Branches by ye Sap and Nourishment they daily feel to flow from him.

TRACT 2

The 8th mo. 1704

G.K.
I have given my self the trouble once more for all to lett ye understand that I am now going to the people called Quakers, having clearly seen in the divine light of

God's spirit, that many grand points of doctrine with which they were charged by the Adversarys as false to be much more true and sound then I did believe, or that thou Represented to mee & therefore am fully sattisfied and fixed in my Resolutions of fixing with them as formerly, and therefore advise thee not to speake word more after this time, to mee in any Respect (Except thou repent) for I am Resolved never to speak word to thee after this time and shall take the Liberty since it hath been my hard lot to be a sufferer by thee to deal plainly with thee as an Enemy and the worst that ever I mett with, but in Love to thy soul I cannot but call upon thee, to Returne from whence thou art fallen and repent Ere it be too late before the things belonging to thy peace be wholly hid from thine Eyes, but if thou wilt goe on in thy Stifneckedness, and goe on in thy gainsaying and Rebellion, I shall be clear, for by the assistance of God's Grace I am Resolved to be plaine, I and mine have cause to wish wee had never seen thee, as also some more may whose inward tents or habitations have been Ruined and destroyed by thee, but some I hope that are not too far gone, will in Gods due time come to see thee as I doe, to be a deceiver and a devouring woolf in sheeps cloathing one that hath first Ravened from the life and power of God in thy owne heart, and then Lucifer like, drawn others after thee, yett I believe not so many as thou makes a noyse of, I heard thou should say, thou brought over fifty to thee in Huntington shire, but that is like ye rest, I do really believe 8 or so is the most, and hardly so many thast was Reale Friends, Oh the Misery of all is, that it was my hard case, and my Childrens to be deceived, made a prey of, and led from God, to feed upon husks, shaddows without substance, and notion without life, oh George, wilt thou goe on deceiving and being deceived, it is sad to backslide from the truth, but far worse to abide and continue therein, but more terrible then all, to sin against Light, I fear it's Interest, the fleece, and not the flock thou seeks after, Oh for shame Repent and turne from the Evill of thy wayes, for thy sun is near setting thy moon is in the waine, and the Evening of thy day hastens on apace, and thou art near the dawne of Eternity, then woe from God to thee --- better thou had never been born, Oh come into the spirit of love (if thou can) before it be too late, if not: dwell in the wrath, if thou like it so well, I must confess, I believe it is in that principle thou dwellest most, out of which thy Malice and Envye proceeds, from ye Bottomless Pitt of darkness, and thither both thou and thy works must goe at last for an Eternall Lodging, and abide, Except thou Repent woth speed, and had I gone on a little longer (for ought I know) it might have been my Portion too, but Blessed be my Compassionate God that hath opened mine Eyes, to see the Devill and his Instruments and thee to be one of ye subtilest, Lucifer was an Angell of Light or Son of the morning, and thou was once counted a Child of Light but whether it was so or no thou art far Enough from it now, well I have done with thee and all such as thou art, Yet before thou goe take this along with thee, thou Subtilest of Satan's Brood, how did thou beguile Mee and mine, by thy Crafty Insinuations, and specious pretences of more sounder Doctrine (To witt) of Salvation by Christ, Whereas thy Knowledge thereof is Carnall and outward, and but little if any of the true life and power of Religeon, so that had I Kept to the light within, then had I seen what it were thou aimed at, but it was otherwayes suffered for a great tryall to come upon mee, That so I might see my owne weakness, and the wiles of Satan, and truly I cannot forget the fear and dread that fell upon mee and seized my soul when I first became acquainted with thee, a very sad Omen of what followed after, thou knew what complaint I made to thee, that I was then in persute of, was

not according to the will of God, my fears were many, and sorrows began to multiply upon mee, then I Run to thee whom I may truely say proved but a blind Guide to mee, to lead mee the further out of the way, Oh the sad moan in a great deale of soul melting sorrow, I told thee I was afraid it would lead too much outward I should loose thereby the sence of the inward life and that I could not part with life in mee, but must waite dayly for it, and I told thee I did believe God to be Essentially and Substantially to dwell in man and thou subtilly answered, thou was of the same mind, that thou waited for it every day to strengthen, suppor and comfort thee, and wert further Encouraging mee to speak in Meetings where thee was, when as it was like to mee as with them of old, who required an Hebrew song, I was Entring into a Strang Land, and thereupon could not, I answered thee that the path thou led mee in Carried me from it, and yet thou subtilly bad mee doe it, now I know Infallably thy Principles carried me from it, and that thou Philistine like put out mine Eyes, and made mee grinde at thy mill, oh how sorrowfull was I at that day, the bitter complaint that I made then to thee (a Phisician of no value) my soul hath still in Remembrance and under the sad consequence my soul mourns bitterly to this day, that I should forsake God, the living fountaine in my soul to look to Christ without, thou thyself could not tell where, only in Heaven but in what part thou knew not nor where to Direct my mind to the Object of faith and well after all I came to a sort of a rest and peace at times, but it was a false rest and peace, it had as the signes of a wrong peace attending it, for it was never long without Doubts so that I often made my moan to men better then thy self, as they may remember the many heart breakings for fear I was wrong, and if Right how was I cast down in the sence of some I had led out of the way, so that the sorrows I have gone through no tongue can Express, Miserable Comforters were yee all, you Cry peace, peace, but not that which God speaks to his people, Oh how hott and passionate was I against my friends, and against their Principles, I must Confess I have been unsettled, and complained to many, Insomuch some have thought I would goe back again, some Reported I was madd, but some of the Ministers were very tender of mee, for which I pray God reward them, but some againe to my certain knowledge said that if I went from the Church it would be because the Ministers did not settle upon mee an Estate as upon thee and some others, but this is all false they would have given, and done more then I was willing to Receive, that some (if occasion require) can testifie, well I thank them for their love and tenderness to mee and mine, and now I must tell thee it is no such thing that I seek. I need not any thing from any I have enough food and Raiment, and content with Godliness is to mee greater gaine then all the treasures of this world, but as Certainly as the serpent beguiled Eve under the same specious pretences, did thou beguile mee, your Golden Baite of greater life and salvation then ever I knew, was that whereby I was ensnared, and led astray, for had thou told mee what the consequence would have been, and that thou would have turned at last to be a dead lifeless Envious formall Preist, and continued a persecuter to thy lifes end, thou should have gone for mee, It was the worst dayes worke that Ever the Church made to Espouse gratifie and encourage thy proud, Envious, Conceited minde, to tell thee plainly I never heard any of the Church of England, or any other party as I Remember like thee in the Pulpit, I have heard some other of thy friends say, they had Rather hear any body then thou, and I belive thee to be one of the worst, Ah poor man thou thinks thy Selfe a great man, but I must tell thee thou art a dismall Preacher, in comparison of some I

know, and as for Religion, Piety, and Charity, thou art not worthy to Stoop downe and Untye their Shoes, nor indeed I never knew any Church minister as thou art to Compare with, oh George Set thy own house in order before thou Endeavorest to Rectifie others, I mean both inward and outward, and consider with mee what hath been the Effects of our going out from God in our selves, how pride Envye lightness deriding hypocrisie lying Slandering and the Like abound in and amongst many of the few thou brags of, I see not where I come it so abound as in thy own family, I must confess what I have Seen in thy family gave mee a Clearer sight of the Effects of thy turning from the Inward to the outward, then any thing else I know, some more have seen it and complained of it to mee, But it's thought it will not be allwayes day with thee, but that thou mayest yett come back, and thy Pride come downe, God in his Mercy bring thee downe in a true sence, from one that wisheth thee well and pittys thy blindness, better (in the state thou art in) then thou thy self can M. Everard.

Rosamund Cummings.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1 S.F. Locker Lampson: *A Quaker Post-Bag,* London 1910, 163-64.

2 Ibid, 145.

3 Library of the Religious Society of Friends London, Tract Vol. 35/11.

4 Charles P. Keith; *Chronicles of Pennsylvania,* ([1917], Freeport NY, 1969), I, 235, 'G. Keith disowned by London Yearly Meeting 1695, 'not for doctrine but for his unbearable temper and carriage'. For a fuller discussion of the Keithian Controversy, see E.W. Kirby; *George Keith, (1638-1716),* New York 1942, and J. William Frost; *The Keithian Controversy in Early Pennsylvania,* Norwood, Pa., 1980. Also *JFHS,* 57, 1, 21-32.

5 Library of the Religious Society of Friends, Temp Mss 918/1-4.

JOHN ARCHDALE'S QUAKERISM

It is quite surprising that so little research has been done on the life and work of John Archdale. Other than Henry Hood's somewhat flawed monograph on the public career of Archdale,[1] practically nothing has appeared in print since the rather brief account in the 1901 *Supplement* to the *Dictionary of National Biography.*[2] The present article, however, deals primarily with an aspect of Archdale's life which neither of the above really treated - John Archdale's relationship to the Society of Friends.

John Archdale was probably born in Buckinghamshire where he was baptised in 1642, when he was perhaps already several years old.[3] He was the son of Thomas Archdale and the grandson of Richard Archdale (who has acquired the manors of Loakes and Temple Wycombe in Buckinghamshire).[4] John Archdale married Elizabeth Booth of Nottinghamshire in 1659 and had several children by her: Mary (*c.* 1660-1739), Thomas (1661-), and Ann.[5] While his children were yet young, Archdale travelled to America with his brother-in-law Ferdinando Gorges[6] who claimed the proprietorship of Maine. John, who acted as agent for Gorges in late 1664 and 1665, returned to England toward the end of 1665, after having served as Colonel in the Maine militia.[7]

John Archdale's wife Elizabeth and his son Thomas died sometime before December 1673 when he married Anne [Dobson] Carey, a widow who already had a son Thomas by her previous marriage.[8] Subsequently John Archdale and Anne had a son also named Thomas (1675-1711), and a daughter (who married Richard Rook).[9] John Archdale, during all of this time, was a loyal member of the Church of England. Sometime in the late 1670s (after the baptism of his daughter Elizabeth in 1676, it would seem) Archdale's religious pilgrimage began, taking him from Anglicanism to Quakerism. Isaac Milles, a High Church vicar of the parish church at Wycombe from 1673 to 1681, tells a story about a 'Mr. Archdale' who can only have been John Archdale. According to this account Archdale had lived a somewhat loose or careless life until he was 'sobered' by Milles' preaching 'or otherwise'. Soon he declared himself a Quaker, which led Milles to request that Archdale permit the Church of England a 'rehearing'. Thus after some reluctance on Archdale's part, there followed several days of discussion on this matter.[10]

Although Archdale's initial interest in Quakerism may have been

awakened by George Fox,[11] perhaps during Fox's 1678 activities in south Buckinghamshire,[12] Archdale was further influenced by the writings of Dr. Henry More (1614-1687), the widely-known and read Cambridge Platonist. More's writings were so much in vogue that Mr. Chiswell, an eminent bookseller, declared that 'for twenty years together,' after the 1660 return of Charles II, the *Mystery of Godliness* and More's other writings 'ruled all the Booksellers in London.'[13]

Archdale, in his on-going discussion with Milles, held that 'no man of the Church of England had asserted so plainly and so advantageously the notion of Friends concerning the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and the light within, as the doctor had.' Milles' response was that he hoped that Dr. More had nowhere expressed 'so erroneous and groundless a notion.' After consulting with a neighbouring Anglican vicar, Milles then spoke to the learned Henry Dodwell (who was in the process of completing his *Book of Schisms,* which was designed to convince Dissenters of the wickedness of schism and the importance of the sacraments for salvation). Dodwell agreed to write a letter to his friend Dr. More, requesting him to send a letter to Archdale in which More might refute the Quaker belief by giving a true description of the 'light within.' Eventually there came a reply from More, enclosing an unsealed letter to Archdale. After Dodwell, Milles, and his friend the Reverend Timothy Borage read over More's letter to Archdale several times, the three decided that it would be best to keep its contents to themselves rather than pass it on, fearing that it would do more to confirm Archdale's Quakerism than to reclaim him for the Church of England.[14]

Milles discovered quite early in their exchanges that Archdale was 'fixed and settled in the enthusiastical [outlook] and Practices of the people called Quakers' and that 'Reason and Argument had very little influence upon him.' Yet, at the same time, Milles reported his discourses had a good effect upon Archdale's family (who were always present with him), so that they continued as 'steady Conformists to the Church.'[15] Those family members that Milles had in mind were Anne [Carey] Archdale and her children by her previous marriage. Archdale's two daughters by his first marriage followed him into the Society of Friends, while those children by his second wife retained their mother's attachment to Anglicanism.

The exact time of Archdale's 1678 convincement is unknown, but it was probably some time before his attendance at a Quaker wedding in Chipping Wycombe late in 1678.[16] He rapidly became intergrated into the Buckinghamshire Quaker community. His local meeting at Wycombe was one of a number of preparative meetings which formed

Hunger Hill (later called Upperside) Monthly Meeting. This later body contained a number of important or weighty Friends, including such outstanding leaders as Thomas Ellwood, John Bellers, Isaac Penington, and William Penn. Although Archdale was a man of great social and economic status, as well as a person of ability, he never became one of the chief figures in either Wycombe Meeting or Hunger Hill Monthly Meeting. Yet, from time to time beginning in 1679, the Monthly Meeting felt free to call upon him to perform certain tasks - small to begin with but of greater significance in later years. In 1679 he laid out ten shillings for the 'service of Truth', receiving repayment in May of that year.[17] Also in 1679 he was one of those who signed a certificate for John Heywood.[18] In 1680 Archdale not only provided one of the signatures on the certificate for Samuel Jennings and his family but was also one of the three Friends named to make inquiry into Joyce Olliffe's 'clearness' as she sought a certificate to carry with her to New Jersey.[19] In 1681-1682 he, along with other Friends of the monthly meeting (gathered at the home of Thomas Ellwood) signed certificates of clearness for Elizabeth Robsort and Sarah Warne.[20] Likewise, in 1682, the monthly meeting appointed him to investigate a 'rumour that cast aspersion on Friends.'[21]

In 1678 Archdale bought John, lord Berkeley's share of the proprietorship of the Carolinas, vesting the title in the name of his three-year old son Thomas. Perhaps it was John's recent public embracing of Quakerism which made it seem wise (at the time) to have Thomas, a non-Quaker, become the 'owner'. Early in 1682 John Archdale began to make plans to visit the Carolinas, so that on the twenty-ninth of the third month [May] he notified his monthly meeting of his intention to leave soon and requested a certificate for himself and his daughter Ann[22] - thus following a developing Quaker practice, recommended when one was going to be away from home for a time. Ann lived with him at Loakes and was thus of the same monthly meeting, while Mary (the older daughter) appears to have been living in London at this time and may have received a separate certificate from Devonshire House Monthly Meeting.[23]

Archdale's arrival in the Carolinas, accompanied by his daughters Ann and Mary, occurred in the late autumn of 1683 - a year and a half after his decision to make the journey. Very little information concerning this period of his life exists, but one letter which throws some light on his Quakerism, Quaker activities, and his political accomplishments has survived. His letter to George Fox,[24] dated 25th of 1st Month [March], 1686 and requiring three months for delivery, tells a number of things about Archdale, his religion, and his Quaker

activities: 1) Archdale had a warm, personal feeling for Fox; 2) he had written to Fox earlier but had received no reply; 3) he had managed to bring about peace between the Tuscarooras and other Indians and hoped to leave the country 'at peace with all the Indians & one another'; 4) his wish was that the Carolinas had been visited more frequently by Friends, but the 'im[m]ediate sense & growth of the divine seed is encouragement' to all those who witness it. Most important of all, however, is his cry from the heart:

> I wish all that had knowne itt had been faithful, then had the day broken forth in its splendor as itt begann. I am sure God foresakes none but the unfaithfull: who by disobedience are cutt of[f], whereas the obedient come to be grafted into the true stock through the growth of the holy seed in their minds and hearts. O that my spiritt were th[or]roughly purged & established by the power which is the rock of ages, the foundation of all generations. But blessed bee God I possess more than I have deserved, & desire patiently to waite for the accomplishment of his inward worke of regeneration, which is a word easily writt or expressed but hardly attained. What I writt unto thee in my former [letter] I cannot butt againe repeat, which is a desire to be had in remembrance by thee haveing a faith in the power that was in thee in this last age of the world first preached, & convinced mee in the beginning & separated me from my fathers house, the sense of which love I desire may for ever dwell upon my spirit & in the end bring forth the true fruit of regeneration.[25]

A postscript to the letter asks that Archdale's love be given to George Keith, George Whitehead, and William Mead, three outstanding leaders of Quakerism at this time. It is surprising not to find here the names of his two neighbours (and fellow members of his monthly meeting) William Penn and Thomas Ellwood. he may have thought Penn was still in Pennsylvania, but Ellwood - at whose house the monthly meeting was held - was certainly in England.

Archdale and his daughters returned to England in 1686, and in 1687 he was asked to take on several tasks for Friends. Meeting for Sufferings, which acted for London Yearly Meeting between its annual gatherings, in 1687 discussed the sufferings of Carolina Friends resulting from their refusal to serve in the militia. John Archdale reported that he had made some efforts to get Quakers there relieved. Richard Mew, John Edridge, and Walter Bentall were asked to accompany Archdale to speak with the Proprietors at their next meeting.[26] His monthly meeting also appointed Archdale and William Kidder to visit Andrew Brothers.[27]

By 1687 the two Archdale sisters must have been contemplating marriage, so that they asked Carolina Quakers for a certificate of clearness, which was forthcoming on the 4th of the 1st Month [March] 1687/8 - reporting that Mary and Ann Archdale 'During all their time of

Residence hear [*sic*] did behave them selves Soberly and Moddestly and have left a good Report behind them and that they are soe fare as we know Clear from any Ingagement or Intanglements as with Respect to Marriage to any person in these partes.'[28] The first one to be married was Ann who, along with Emanuel Lowe, made known their intentions to her monthly meeting on the 11th of 4th month [June], 1688.[29] Emanuel Lowe, citizen and 'fishmonger' of London, produced a certificate from Devonshire House Monthly Meeting and the consent of his mother, while she produced the Carolina certificate.[30] They presented their intentions again on the 2nd of 5th Month, at which time consent was given for them to marry.[31] The wedding itself took place at Chipping Wycombe on the 12th of 5th Month [July], 1688.[32] The marriage was attended by John Archdale, his wife Anne, his daughter Mary, the younger half-brother and half-sister, and the Carey [Cary] step-brother and step-sisters.[33] Sometime after 1691 the Lowes and their two children emigrated to North Carolina where they became active Quakers, although Emanuel was later dealt with by North Carolina Friends for participating in the 'Cary Rebellion.'[34]

Mary Archdale, the older of the two sisters, was not married until 1691. She and John Danson (Citizen and 'Draper' of Aldersgate Street in London) proposed their intentions of marriage to Devonshire House Monthly Meeting on the 4th of the 9th Month [November] and the matter was then referred to the London Two Weeks meeting.[35] She had produced a certificate from Friends at Hunger Hill Monthly Meeting and another one from her father, giving his consent. Permission was granted by the Two Weeks Meeting, so that the marriage took place on the 17th of 10th Month [December], 1691, under the care of Devonshire House Monthly Meeting.[36] Whether or not John and Anne Archdale were present at the wedding is uncertain (for their names are not listed in the copy of the marriage certificate, unless under the '&C' heading), although there were a number of Archdales, Careys, and Gorges in attendance.[37] John and Mary Archdale Danson remained in London, where they and their children were members of Peel Monthly Meeting.[38]

In 1692 John Archdale was appointed with 28 other Friends (including his son-in-law John Danson) to lobby Parliament on a bill to exempt Quakers from oaths.[39] This appears to have been Archdale's last Quaker appointment before his second visit to the Carolinas. Before he was to leave on that journey, however, he did two things to help his fellow Quakers at Wycombe. On 20 April, 1693, he signed over to Nicholas Larcum, for Quaker use, the meeting house and cottage in Wycombe - on a 99 year lease, with an annual rent of twenty shillings.

On August 13, 1693, he also provided two strips of land, one on the east side and one on the west, to enlarge the Friends burial ground.[40]

Although his appointment as governor of the Carolinas came on August 31, 1694, it was not until January 1695 that he began his voyage, taking with him his 20-year old son Thomas (in whose name the Archdale portion of the proprietorship had been lodged). Archdale started his American travels in Maine and slowly made his way southward by land, stopping in almost all the colonies between that point and Annapolis, Maryland. Hood suggests that his purpose must have been to meet other colonial officials and to discuss mutual problems with them.[41] Probably he also met with Quakers in many of these places, especially in Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, but no mention of Archdale's visit is found in Quaker records for those areas at that period. This, however, is not surprising - for he was not a 'Public Friend' travelling in the ministry. This silence is really less puzzling than the total lack of any mention of him in the minutes of his own quarterly meeting for his whole Quaker career!

Finally Archdale arrived in North Carolina on 25 June, 1695, staying in the Albemarle section for six weeks. This was an area where Quakerism had been introduced in 1673 by William Edmundson and George Fox. In the intervening years the Quaker community had continued to grow, especially in the Perquimans and Pasquotank areas. Archdale's daughter and son-in-law, the Lowes, had already settled in this area, as had Quaker Thomas Harvey (who had been acting as deputy-governor for some months).[42] Here in Albemarle, it would seem, Archdale had a great deal of contact with his fellow Quakers. Upon his departure from Albemarle he left Thomas Harvey in charge of affairs in this northern area.

From Albemarle Archdale went on to Charleston in South Carolina, where a small number of Friends had been living since the mid-1670s.[43] By the 1690s Mary Cross (formerly Mary Fisher), who had visited the 'Great Turk', was resident in Charleston. A small Quaker meeting was in existence at the time of Archdale's arrival, and South Carolina Friends must have been caught up in the excitement of his return to Charleston after his long stay in England. While he was resident in the Carolinas this second time several English Friends travelling in the ministry visited both North and South Carolina, including Robert Barrow, Robert Wardell, and James Dickinson. Dickinson, in his *Journal,* reported that after going through Virginia into Carolina '[we] there met with Governor Archdale, who travelled through Carolina with us. We had good service in that Wilderness Country, and found a tender People who were glad to be visited'.[44]

The Carolina proprietors not only appointed Archdale as governor but also as 'Admirall, Captain-Generall & Commander in chief.' Although the military appointments, Archdale said, were conferred on him contrary to his desire, he soon appointed Joseph Blake as Lieutenant General and Vice Admiral, with the hope that this might prevent 'many vicious & unnecessary wars, especially with the native Indians & various nations.'[45]

During this second period of Archdale's activity in South Carolina, he as governor, succeeded in having a law passed which freed Quakers from serving in the militia. Friends, having 'allways been in all other civil matters... obedient to government' would not be required to bear arms.[46] This achievement must have brought real satisfaction to him, as well as joy to brethren in South Carolina. Other efforts, called for by the proprietors and in harmony with his own Quaker principles, included re-establishment of peace among the Indians and the development of peaceful relations with the Spanish in Florida. The latter was accomplished in part through correspondence with the Spanish governor in St.Augustine and in part by returning to St.Augustine four Spanish speaking Christian Indians of the Yamassi tribe captured by Carolina Indians who had intended to sell them as slaves.[47] The Spanish governor, Don Laureano de Torres y Callas, soon responded in kind by sending on to Charleston Robert Barrow (a Friend travelling in the ministry) and the family of Jonathan Dickenson, all of whom had been shipwrecked on the Florida coast while going by ship from Jamaica to Pennsylvania. These Quakers, after falling into the hands of canabalistic Florida Indians, had been rescued by the Spanish, taken to Don Laureano, and then delivered to South Carolina.[48] When John Archdale some years later described this development, which actually took place after Archdale's departure for England,[49] he mistakenly identified the rescued Quakers as Robert Barrow and *Edward* Wardell. Robert Wardell, whom Archdale had remembered as travelling with Barrow earlier, had died in Jamaica on April 22, 1696 - four months before Barrow and the Dickenson family set sail from Port Royal, Jamaica, for Pennsylvania.[50]

While Archdale was still in the Carolinas his son Thomas, upon reaching maturity, returned home[51] and soon thereafter - against his father's wishes - sold his share of the proprietorship to his cousin Joseph Blake (who had been serving as Deputy Governor of South Carolina under John Archdale).[52] Thus John Archdale ceased to be a proprietor (acting for his son), and his nephew assumed that position as a result of his purchase from Thomas Archdale, as well as succeeding his uncle as governor. Blake, although a Presbyterian, seems to have been

favourably inclined towards Quakers, as indicated by his treatment of the Dickensons and Robert Barrow.[53]

John Archdale, after a brief visit with his daughter and family in Albemarle, returned to England in late 1696. He does not appear to have been active in Quaker business affairs in the period following his return to London and Loakes, probably only attending meetings for worship. In 1698 he allowed himself to be nominated for election to Parliament, put forward by the 'Church Party' in opposition to Lord Wharton's nominee. After being elected in July 1698 he discovered that he had been misled into believing that his declaration or affirmation - rather than an oath - would be sufficient to qualify him to take his seat. Upon his refusal to swear, the seat was declared vacant, a fresh writ of election was issued, and his son Thomas Archdale was elected in January 1699 to fill the seat. A non-Quaker, Thomas found no difficulty in taking the required oath.[54]

Shortly after John Archdale's abortive entrance into English political life, he performed his final two appointed tasks for Quakers. On January 1, 1699/1700 he was one of 31 signers of a letter from his monthly meeting, asking for contributions to aid two Friends who had lost practically everything they owned in a fire.[55] This was his last service on behalf of his monthly meeting. Two years later Archdale (with 18 other Friends including William Penn and Daniel Quare, the well-known clock maker), was appointed to sign a Quaker address to the Queen. This address was then to be presented to the Queen by 10 or 12 of the signers.[56] This was his final appointment by Meetings for Sufferings.

The last entries in Quaker records dealing with John Archdale appeared in 1704 and 1705, after he had submitted to baptism yet another time (even though he had been baptized as a child and then known the baptism of the spirit when he became a Quaker). Archdale was baptized by John More on the twelth of the seventh Month [September] 1704 about three o'clock in the afternoon - at Hudsons in Henly Parish by Upton. He later recorded that, before his baptism, he had declared that

> my understanding hath bin opened by the spi[rit] of God to see that the ordinances cal[le]d bap[tism] & the supper Longe Cryed against in the christian dispensation as Isaiah cryed ag[ain]st the legall [requirements?] yett were by reason of their pollution only suspended; & that this suspension is now over & there will be a true reunion of the form with the power of God againe; & ther[e]fore I substantially retaine the spirituality of the doctrine declared by Fr[ien]ds in the new Coven[an]t state; & by faith I believe this reunion of the power with the forme as certainly as the union of my spr[rit] is to the body: and I

doe further declare that I doe & can freely hold Comunion with the people cal[le]d Quakers as having witnessed and doe still witness the power of God among them even as was among the first reformers ag[ain]st Popery; & ther[e]fore am not baptised into a sect or party but into the name of Fa[ther], Son & holy spi[rit] as this spi[rit] of God is universally diffused through the body of the creation, calling all of us to a sincere & hearty repentance from dead workes to Serve the Living God.[57]

On 2 October 1704, a letter from Thomas Haynes was read at Second Day Morning Meeting - telling how Archdale had allowed himself to be baptized by 'one John Moore [More] a Whymsicall Man.' Archdale had already been spoken to, but it was reported that he remained 'High in his Notions.' Therefore Richard Claridge and George Whitehead were appointed to let him know that Friends could not receive his preaching and also to advise Friends not to receive his message or him.[58] A week later, on the ninth, Benjamin Bealing was ordered to seek out John Archdale and deliver Friends' letter to him by the next morning at the latest.[59] Two days later, on the eleventh, Archdale (as requested by the letter from Richard Claridge and George Whitehead) met with John Butcher, William Bingley, George Oldner, and Whitehead. At this meeting Archdale 'affirmed the suspen[sion] only of the ordinance & they affirmed their total abnogation [of it] & I declar[e]d mine was a baptism of repentance as to myselfe & a testimony of the need of it to & a testimony of the introduction of truth by it to all nations.'[60] On 16 October 1704, a letter about Archdale (drawn up by George Whitehead) was read by the Morning Meeting and copies were ordered to be sent to Worcestershire and other places as occasion might require.[61]

Three months later, on 11 January 1704/5, two papers by Archdale were read at Morning Meeting with the judgment that they 'no ways tends to Friends satisfaction, but the contrary.' Therefore he was advised 'in Humility [to] Endeavour to give friends Satisfaction for his outgoings.' If, however, he might be 'disposed to offer anything to this Meeting's Satisfaction upon Notice to them given they may give him another meet[ing].' On the same day John Butcher, William Bingley, and John Field were asked to write to Friends at High Wycombe to know whether or not the monthly meeting to which he belonged had dealt with Archdale for his 'outgoings' or how he 'Stands Relating to them.'[62]

The minutes of Upperside [Hunger Hill] Monthly Meeting are strangely silent on this matter - with no mention of Archdale or any dealing with him. At first one wonders if his ownership of the

meetinghouse was a factor, but Friends' lease of that building and the cottage still had almost 90 years to run! The minutes of the Quarterly Meeting also have no references to this matter or anything else connected with Archdale (for his name does not appear anytime after his convincement). Quaker records, as far as I have been able to ascertain, never mention him again after the beginning of 1705. Strange as it may seem, it is possible that both Archdale and Friends went their own ways without further conflict or discussion.

Before long Archdale himself had something new to occupy his attention, this time purchasing Sir William Berkeley's share of the Carolinas in 1705 - thus becoming one of the Lords Proprietary for a second time and playing an active part in the Proprietary Board. In 1707, goaded perhaps by attacks on some of his earlier activities and positions (especially his opposition to the establishment of a state church in the Carolinas), he wrote *A New Description of that Fertile and Pleasant Province of Carolina.*[63] In this work he speaks quite favourably of William Penn and the Pennsylvania experience of not having an established church, of Robert Barrow and Robert [mistakenly called Edward] Wardell as 'publick Friends, Men of great Zeal, Piety, and Integrity,' and his own opposition to the establishment of the Church of England in the Carolinas.[64]

On 22 October 1708, Archdale sold his share in the Carolina Proprietorship to his Quaker son-in-law and daughter John and Mary Danson of London. Danson soon took his place among the Lords Proprietary of the Palatine Court and remained active until his own death early in the 1720s (thus giving the Carolinas a second Quaker Proprietor).

Archdale himself seems to have retired to the High Wycombe area with little or no activity outside that area during his remaining years. He died in the summer of 1717, with burial taking place on 4 July. It was not in the Quaker burial ground which he had helped enlarge with two gifts of land in 1693; rather, through the powerful influence of his staunchly Anglican widow he was placed in the family vault in the chancel of the High Wycombe parish church. No stone marker was erected in his memory (unlike that for his son Thomas who had died in 1711).[65] As if to heighten the indignity, John Archdale's last name in the parish register is spelled *Arsdell.*[66] Could this be a case where the parish church struck back nearly 40 years after his defection to Quakerism? Or was it by pure chance?

Kenneth L. Carroll

Presidential Address delivered during Yearly Meeting on 28 July 1993.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1] Henry G.Hood, Jr., *The Public Career of John Archdale, 1642-1717* (Greensboro: North Carolina Friends Historical Society and the Quaker Collection of Guilford College, 1976). See also William S. Powell (ed.), *Dictionary of North Carolina Biography* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press), 38-9.

[2] Sidney Lee (ed.), *Dictionary of National Biography, Supplement* (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1901), I, 56-57.

[3] In this period baptisms were frequently some months or years after births.

[4] *DNB, Supplement,* I, 56.

[5] Everton Parish Register, Nottinghamshire, (as found in the I.G.I.).

[6] Ferdinando Gorges married Mary Archdale in 1660 at St.Brides Church, London.

[7] Henry Blackwood Archdale, *Memoirs of the Archdales, with the Descent of Some Allied Families* (Enniskillen: William Trimble, 1925), 82.

[8] Ibid., 82. Anne [Dobson] Carey also seems to have had a daughter Annabella (who married Thomas Ligor, an executor of Anne's will) and another Alicia Maria (who married Richard Rook after the death of his wife Elizabeth Archdale Rook).

[9] Ibid., 82.

[10] T. Milles, *An Account of the Life and Conversation of the Reverend and Worthy Isaac Milles, Late Rector of Highcleer in Hampshire* (London: W. and J. Innys, 1721), 54. Milles was especially concerned, for Archdale was the 'chief gentleman' in his parish.

[11] Cf. Archdale's epistle to George Fox, found in A.R. Barclay Mss, LXVIII, in the Library of the Society of Friends, London, with a printed copy located in the *Journal of Friends Historical Society,* XXXVII (1940), 16-18.

[12] John L. Nickalls (ed.), *The Journal of George Fox* (London: Religious Society of Friends, 1975), 730.

[13] Sidney Lee (ed.), *Dictionary of National Biography* (London, 1894), XXXVIII, 423. The full title of More's work is *An Explanation of the Grand Mystery of Godliness: or a True and Faithful Representation of the Everlasting Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* (1660).

[14] Milles, op.cit., 56-57.

[15] Ibid., 54.

[16] Cf. Upperside Monthly Meeting Marriages, 1664-1769, p.65. This volume is now in the Public Records Office, Chancery Lane, London, and is identified as P.R.O. No:1338.

[17] Beatrice Saxon Snell (ed.), *The Minute Book of the Monthly Meeting of the Society of Friends for the Upperside of Buckinghamshire, 1669-1690* (High Wycombe: Records Branch of the Buckinghamshire Archeological Society, 1973), 69.

[18] Ibid., 70.

[19] Ibid., 83, 93.

[20] Ibid., 96, 102.

[21] Ibid., 103.

[22] Ibid., 106.

[23] No minutes for either the men's or women's Devonshire House Monthly Meeting exist for this period.

[24] A.R. Barclay Mss, LXVIII, cited earlier in note 11.

[25] Ibid., LXVIII.

[26] Meeting for Sufferings Minutes, VI (1687-1688), 89. These manuscript records are at L.S.F., London.

[27] Snell, *The Minute Book, 1669-1690,* 200.
[28] Gibson Mss, III, 19, found in L.S.F., London. This certificate, from the Quarterly Meeting held at Henry White's home, was signed by 24 Friends, 14 men and ten women.
[29] Snell, *The Minute Book, 1669-1690,* 203.
[30] Minutes of Women Friends, Upperside Monthly Meeting, for the 11th of 4th Month, 1688. This manuscript volume is found in the Buckinghamshire County Record Office, Aylesbury.
[31] Snell, *The Minute Book, 1669-1690,* 205.
[32] Marriage Register Digest for Buckinghamshire Quarterly Meeting, L.S.F., London.
[33] Upperside Monthly Meeting Marriages, 1664-1769 (PRO No:1338), 122.
[34] Stephen B. Weeks, *Southern Quakers and Slavery* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1896) 166.
[35] Marriage Register Digest for Buckinghamshire Quarterly Meeting, L.S.F., London.
[36] Marriage Register Digest for London and Middlesex Quarterly Meeting, L.S.F., London.
[37] Devonshire House Monthly Meeting Marriages, 1666-1707, p.63. This manuscript volume is at the Public Records Office, Chancery Lane, London (PRO No:974). Archdale does not appear to have witnessed any post-1688 weddings.
[38] London and Middlesex Quarterly Meeting Birth and Burial Digests [L.S.F., London] show five children born to the Dansons: John (1692-1707), Barbara (1695-1726), Daniel (1696-), Jotham (1698/9-), and Mary (1700/01-1723). At least two other relatives of John Archdale were Friends. His sister Elizabeth (*c.*1645-1698) was buried in Checker Alley, Bunhill Fields. A more distant relative, Mary Archdale of Houndsditch (daughter of Thomas Archdale, yeoman, late of High Wycomb, deceased) and Isaiah Row of London were married under the care of Devonshire House Monthly Meeting in 1705. If John Archdale or any other Archdales were present they did not sign the certificate as witnesses.
[39] Meeting for Sufferings Minutes, VIII (1691-1693), 169.
[40] Cf. the notes of George P. Jarvis, 'Archdale Mss,' found in Temp Mss Box 53-6, 102, L.S.F., London. Jarvis at one time had hoped to write a biography of Archdale.
[41] Hood, op.cit., 9.
[42] Ibid., 9.
[43] William Fuller and his family and Thomas Thurston, all formerly of Maryland, were present quite early as were other Friends coming from England and the West Indies.
[44] James Dickinson, *A Journal of the Life, Travels, and Labour of Love in the Work of the Ministry of that Worthy Elder, and Faithful Servant of Jesus Christ, James Dickinson* (London: T. Sowle Raylton, 1745), 116.
[45] Archdale Mss 14, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Cf.Ms.6.
[46] Henry Blackwood Archdale, *Memoirs of the Archdales,* 81.
[47] John Archdale, *A New Description,* 21-22. (See n. 63 below).
[48] Jonathan Dickenson, *God's Protecting Providence, Man's Surest help and Defense, in Times of greatest Difficulty, and most eminent Danger, evidenced in the remarkable Deliverance of Robert Barrow* [etc], London: Mary Hinde, 5th edition, n.d. 43-98.
[50] Ibid., 1; Cf. 'Robert Wardell' in the Dictionary of Quaker Biography (found in typescript) in L.S.F., London, and in the Quaker Collection, Haverford College Library.

[51] He had reached Ireland by September 1696. Cf. *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial, 1696-1697,* No:197 (dated 10 September 1696).

[52] Hood, op.cit., 81.

[53] Cf. Dickenson, op.cit., 83-84, reports that, on 24 December 1696, Governor Blake sent Barrow to the home of Margaret Bammers (an 'Antient Friend') to be nursed. From there, about the beginning of the 12th Month [February] 1696/7, he was taken to Charleston and lodged at the home of Mary [Fisher, Bayley] Cross who nursed him until the Dickensons and Barrow sailed to Philadelphia.

[54] Henry Blackwood Archdale, *Memoirs of the Archdales,* 82. Hood, op.cit., 28, mistakenly identifies this Thomas as John's brother Thomas (who had died in 1676, thereby opening the way for John to take over the family estate at Loakes).

[55] Upperside Monthly Meeting of Friends, men's minutes, II (1690-1715), for 1st of 11th Month [January], 1699/1700. These manuscript minutes are on deposit at the Buckinghamshire County Records Office, Aylesbury. This is the last reference to Archdale in these records.

[56] Meeting for Sufferings Minutes, XV (1700-1702), 311.

[57] Archdale Mss, 14 (Library of Congress).

[58] Second Day Morning Meeting Minutes, III (1700-1711), 185 [2nd day of 8th month, 1704]. These manuscripts are at L.S.F., London.

[59] Ibid., III, 185 [9th of 8th month, 1704].

[60] Archdale Mss, 14 (Library of Congress).

[61] Second Day Morning Meeting Minutes, III, 185 [16th day of 8th Month, 1704]. It seems likely that Archdale had made known his views either by letter or preaching in Worcestershire.

[62] Ibid., III [11th of 11th Month, 1704].

[63] John Archdale, *A New Description of that Fertile and Pleasant Province of Carolina with a Brief Account of its Discovery and Settling and the Government thereof to this Time, with several Remarkable Passages of Divine Providence during my Time* (London: John Wyat, 1707).

[64] Ibid., 22, 25 and 23-31.

[65] Thomas Archdale's tablet, once on the wall, is said to have been placed in the floor. The chancel floor is now covered with carpet, so that the marker cannot be seen today.

[66] See the original High Wycombe Parish Register, now on deposit at the Buckinghamshire County Records Office, Aylesbury.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF LONDON WOMEN'S YEARLY MEETING; A TRANSATLANTIC CONCERN

The reformation of the Religious Society of Friends, which began in the American colonies in the 1750s and later spread to Great Britain is now recognized as an important milestone in Quaker history. The reforming ministers on both sides of the Atlantic began their work with the intention of rooting out the corrupting effects of wealth and power and returning Quakerism to its original simplicity. From their efforts, however, and in response to their preaching, came an unexpected result. As American historian Jack Marietta has pointed out to us, Friends turned their attention to philanthropic labours and in the process gave birth to the major social testimonies for which the Religious Society of Friends is best known today; the concern against slavery and for racial justice, and justice for Native Americans, the concern for prisoners and the mentally ill. Organizations dealing with these issues were formed in the second half of the eighteenth century in the United States and England.[1]

It is sometimes assumed today that a social testimony to the equality of women has been part of the Religious Society of Friends from its beginning. While George Fox, Margaret Fell, and other early leaders stressed the spiritual equality of women, it was not until the nineteenth century that this belief was translated by Quaker women, primarily in the United States, into leadership in a movement for women's rights in the larger society. However some of the seeds of the concern for the granting equal status to women within the Society of Friends can be traced to this same time of reformation.

The reformers' chief object was clearly the spiritual reawakening of the society. One method to reach this goal was to strengthen the discipline throughout. Many more Friends were disowned for 'disorderly walking' and for marrying out, than had been the case before. There was also further emphasis on temperance and on the testimonies. Thus we find Susanna Morris, a 71-year old minister from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, on her third trip to England, rebuking English Friends in 1752 for their 'too frequent use of strong drink and tobacco,' and for their justification of defensive war.[2]

Another method for strengthening the discipline was the establishment of business meetings along the lines that George Fox has suggested 80 years earlier. This involved a complete system of both men's and women's business meetings on the preparative, monthly, quarterly and yearly meeting level as well as select meetings for ministers and elders. Mary Peisley of Ireland, travelling in North Carolina in 1753, was much troubled that the Quarterly Meeting was not 'select,' i.e. exclusive of non members.[3]

As meetings began to examine themselves in response to yearly meeting queries initiated by the reformers, it came to light that the women's business meetings were by no means uniformly established, especially in Great Britain. Why this was so is open to speculation. The resistance to women's meetings which came to a head during the John Story/John Wilkinson separation many have expressed a more widespread fear of women's assuming power. Particularly objectionable to some was the concept that a young couple wishing to be married should appear before the women's as well as the men's meeting for consent. As William Rogers, an apologist for the separatists, explained, some Friends while content to allow women to hold separate meetings to take care of the poor, 'became less affected to such Meetings, lest instead of being Servants to the Poor for Truth's Sake, and taking the weight and burthen of that Care from the Men, they should become *Rulers over both Men and Women.*'[4]

While in areas not affected by the Wilkinson/Story controversy, women's monthly meetings were established in the seventeenth century, with especially strong ones in Lancaster, Yorkshire, Lincoln, and Nottingham. London itself lagged behind the rest of the country. In 1755, London Quarterly Meeting queried its monthly meetings about the existence of separate women's meetings. Of six London monthly meetings responding, Southwark had never had a women's meeting; Westminster reported they were not in the practice of it, Gracechurch Street answered that they had once had a women's meeting but it had dwindled, and Devonshire House said it had set up such a meeting in 1753, in response to a recommendation of the Yearly Meeting. Only Ratcliff said it had always had a women's meeting, which was still flourishing.[5]

It may be that the existence of two strong women's charitable meetings, the Box and Two Weeks Meetings, both established to serve the poor, made London Friends feel further women's meetings were unnecessary. In 1748, when the lack of women's monthly meetings in the city was first raised at London Quarterly Meeting, in response to a concern from Lydia Lancaster of Lancashire Quarterly Meeting, the

Two Weeks Meeting was asked to assume the role and devote one meeting a month to dealing with such matters of women's discipline as clearing couples for marriage. It may also be that the fact that women's monthly meetings were given little role to play, with all the final decisions on discipline and marriage made by the men's meetings, caused the women's meetings to languish as was apparently the case with Gracechurch Street.[6]

One also wonders, however, if the fear of women's power, so general in the rest of society in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, did not play a role, especially in urban centres where Quaker men in business rubbed shoulders with men 'of the world,' and may have been influenced by their attitudes. Neither Quaker men nor women were freed from popular assumptions about women, and a false perception that Quaker women had been the extremists who had brought persecution down on the early Friends may have played a role.[7]

In the American colonies, women's monthly meetings appear to have been set up along with men's meetings in the areas covered by New England Yearly Meeting, New York Yearly Meeting, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, Baltimore Yearly Meeting, Virginia and North Carolina Yearly Meetings. In the frontier atmosphere of the new country, where all hands were needed, many of the small women's meetings began to take more responsibility than they were originally intended to do. Thus we see the women of Bucks County Quarter in Pennsylvania disciplining women members entirely in the women's meetings with no referrals to the men's meeting. This was also the case in Cane Creek Monthly, North Carolina, while in Blackwater Monthly Meeting in Blackwater, Virginia, the women had final authority in marriages.[8]

The establishment of women's yearly meetings both in Great Britain and in the American colonies was, however, not uniform. While Maryland had a women's yearly meeting in 1677, Ireland in 1679, Philadelphia in 1681, New York in 1729, Wales in 1749, several lagged behind. It was apparently as a result of the efforts of the reformers that a women's yearly meeting was established in Viginia and North Carolina in 1763, and New England in 1764. London strangely enough continued without such a meeting until 1784. Despite appeals from constituent quarterly meetings, the men's yearly meeting opposed the development of a regular constituted women's yearly meeting on the grounds it would divide authority. When the meeting was finally established, it was the result of a virtual campaign on the part of both British and American reformers who laboured for it from 1746 to 1784.[9]

The opposition to a women's yearly meeting in England apparently developed around the end of the seventeenth century. Up until then women Friends had regularly gathered in London at yearly meeting times and had addressed epistles to women Friends throughout the country and overseas. In 1697, the women ministers held a meeting during the men's yearly meeting and the next year they met with the yearly meeting of ministers. In 1700, they were meeting on Saturday, as did the men, to decide which of the city meetings they would attend during yearly meeting sessions. But at this point the men's yearly meeting announced that it had never given permission for the women to meet and that hereafter those ministers wishing to speak must leave their names at the men's meeting. Furthermore, they were adjured to keep quiet:

> There being several women Friends in and about this city that have a public testimony for the Truth and have sometimes met on the Seventh-day, this meeting, having considered the same, do declare that they do not understand that ever this meeting gave direction for the setting up of said meeting; neither do they judge there is any necessity for it or service in the continuance thereof; and therefore do advise that when any public approved women Friends have a concern of service upon them to go to any particular public meeting in or about this city, they may leave their names at the Chamber, that Friends may have notice thereof; and such may, as much as may be, have an opportunity to clear themselves, and yet be careful not to interfere with their brethren in their public mixed meetings. [10]

Later in the same yearly meeting they returned to the subject:

> This meeting finding it a hurt to truth for women Friends to take up too much time, as some do, in our public meetings, when several public and serviceable men Friends are present and are by them prevented in their serving, it's therefore advised that the women Friends should be tenderly cautioned against taking up too much time in our mixed public meetings.[11]

How the British Quaker women felt about the suppression of their earlier meeting is unknown. Although women apparently continued to come up to London at yearly meeting time, to meet and to write epistles, they were not considered a meeting of record, and there are no minutes of this informal women's yearly meeting until 1759. However, in the minute book of the Box Meeting (1748-1760) is a paper dated Second Month 1746 and apparently written by Lydia Lancaster and signed by six prominent women ministers from different counties, giving some 'hint' of the value of having a national women's meeting, in order to halt the decline in women's meetings and to provide youth with a good example.[12]

> Now we desire it may be duly considered, how far a National Meeting for the Women, attended by two or more from each County (where there is a Quarterly Meeting held) of solid well concerned-women to attend such Meeting or Meetings, held at the same time & place where the Mens is, whereby they might be assisted & advised by them upon Occasion, how far it might Contribute to retrieve the present Loss, and assist the whole, & if upon a solid and due consideration it appear the most likely to prove effectual: We hope our Men Friends will not reject it but give us due Assistance therein.[13]

The women assured the men that it was not their intention to assume any authority that was not already intended and expected of them by the discipline, and observed that if such a meeting would cause too great a trouble and expense, then perhaps after it was properly established it could meet only every other year.[14]

There is no record of a response to this paper, but interest in the establishing of a national meeting spread and became a concern of a group of transatlantic travelling ministers currently at work in Great Britain. Among these were two Americans, John Pemberton and his brother-in-law, William Brown, both of whom became involved in the effort to establish such a meeting. In 1753, William Brown appeared at York Quarterly Meeting and proposed the establishment of a women's yearly meeting such as was held in Philadelphia. The women of York agreed and decided to submit the proposal to the women who met informally at the time of London Yearly Meeting.[15]

At this meeting held 12-6-1753 a committee was asked to write a proposal to take to the men's meeting, and two days later, it was accepted and signed by 28 women:[16]

> Dear Friends
> It is with thankful hearts we have to testify our unanimous Concurrence with the pious Zeal, and faithful Concern of Soul, manifested by our dear Sisters, in divers Counties of this Nation, for a needful reformation & Regulation in our Discipline, humbly hoping with them, that the Establishing an Annual Women's Meeting may be of great advantage in the furtherance thereof, wherein the Affairs of the Church, which properly come under our Notice, and particularly related to our own Sex, to whose Care the Education of the Youth in a great Measure falls, may be managed in the Wisdom of Truth, and beautiful Gospel Order, which becomes our high and holy Profession; and we conceive by the help of such a meeting, Quarterly and Monthly Meetings would be Strengthened and Encouraged in their faithful Endeavors, for the Promotion of this Great and honourable Work....[17]

Seven of the women present were then delegated to take the minute into the men's meeting. Two of the seven were American ministers, Susanna Morris and Phebe Dodge of Long Island. A third, Sophia

Hume, the granddaughter of Mary Fisher, was born in Charlestown, South Carolina, and was currently living in England. They were accompanied by Mary Peisley of Ireland, and Mary Weston, Catherine Payton, and Doris Hunter of England. All but the last had travelled in the ministry in the American colonies.

Samuel Neale, a minister from Ireland, who was later briefly married to Mary Peisley, gave an account of the event in his journal:

> In this Yearly Meeting, a proposition came from the Women's Meeting, for the establishment of a Yearly Meeting upon the same foundation as the men's, with representatives from the Quarterly Meeting annually to attend it. It was brought in by Susanna Morris, Sophia Hume, Mary Weston, Mary Peisley, Catherine Payton, and another. I well remember the salutation of Susanna Morris, when they entered the meeting house; and she concluded with a short pathetic and living testimony, which had great reach over the meeting. The proposition, I had no doubt, was from the motion of Truth.[18]

William Brown also appeared in defence of the minute at this Yearly Meeting and was awarded "heavy blows" for his pains, according to Mary Weston.[19] Despite these efforts of the reformers, the Yearly Meeting did not act upon the proposal until next year. Samuel Fothergill, himself in sympathy with reform, is supposed to have said, 'I see it, but not now; I behold it, but not nigh!' In 1754, instead of establishing a women's yearly meeting, the yearly meeting sent an epistle to all subordinate meetings, urging them to set up women's meetings for discipline. This minute was repeated in 1755, and had the effect of causing additional women's monthly meeting to be set up in London, and in motivating the men's monthly meeting in Bristol to ask the women to meet at the same time each month as they did.[20]

John Churchman, an American reformer, had come to the yearly meeting with two changes he wished to see made: the creation of a national meeting of ministers and elders to precede the yearly meeting, and the establishment of the women's yearly meeting. Both would have brought London into conformity with practices in Philadelphia. Writing in his journal he expressed his disappointment in the yearly meeting and its outcome:

> ...divers weighty matters being therein proposed for consideration from several of the counties, which centred rather to benefit, though in the management of the affairs, there appeared in some a disposition to oppose what they thought to be new, notwithstanding the same things appeared very expedient to others, who, from their prospect thereof, might urge their sentiments rather too strongly.[21]

In 1765, the women of the informal women's London yearly meeting tried again. They minuted their decision that a proposal be made by some of their number to address all the women's quarterly meetings with an epistle asking them to send an account of the state of their women's meetings to the next annual gathering. Five women were given the task of taking this proposal to the men's yearly meeting, 'for their concurrence,' and thereafter to draft the epistle. The men, however, did not concur, but said they felt the matter was too weighty and must be held over another year. The women waited, but in 1766 the men turned down the proposal and prepared a minute to be read to the women, signed by 58 Friends, among them Samuel Neale:

> It appeareth to this committee, that the Womens Meeting held annually in London at the time of the Yearly Meeting does not consist of Women Friends regularly deputed from any other meeting and that the forming of such a meeting has appeared to our predecessors, as it does to us a matter of great difficulty.
> As therefore the meeting of a number of women Friends and of suitable ability, to carry on so weighty and important a work appears to us very doubtful and uncertain, & cannot but subject the few who are qualified to assist in this work to great inconveniency - it is therefore our unanimous opinion that the present is not the proper season for complying with the said proposal.[22]

The women minuted that they received this negative response with 'becoming deference' and agreed that the weight of the concern must now be left on the shoulders of the men.

Learning of this disappointment suffered by their British counterparts, Philadelphia Women's Yearly Meeting in 1766 sent a minute to the Philadelphia Men's Yearly Meeting complaining that their annual epistle was not distributed to quarterly and monthly meetings in England, due to the lack of a women's yearly meeting, and suggesting that the yearly meeting as a whole propose to the Friends in London that 'the women may be favored with the same privilege we are in this respect.'[23]

The men's yearly meeting appointed three men, John Churchman, Isaac Child, and Thomas Milhouse to deliver their message to the women:

> ...that they truly sympathized with the present circumstances of our Friends in England, and that they had appointed a committee to consider the affairs, who upon solidly deliberating they agreed to report what their sense and judgment that Friends here should abide under the weight of the concern and exercise, until a more convenient time offered to move thereon, especially as they had been informed that Friends in England had lately endeavored to bring about such a work, without the desired effect.[24]

The Philadelphia women did not record how they received this message, but it is clear that they did not abandon their hope for the establishment of a women's meeting in England. Worsening relations between Great Britain and the American colonies slowed the stream of American ministers visiting England. Only one woman, Sarah Morris, made the trip between 1760 and 1782. But following the end of the American Revolution, a burst of reforming ministers arrived in England, 13 between 1781 and 1784, many of them apparently intent on addressing the long vexing question of the women's yearly meeting.[25]

Two of the travelling ministers, William Matthews and John Pemberton, both of Philadelphia, raised the concern in the Lancashire Women's Quarterly Meeting on behalf of their Philadelphia Yearly Meeting sisters. The Lancashire women in response sent a minute to the influential London Two Week Meeting of Women Friends which was read on the 8th of 12th month, 1783.

> Dear Friends,
> We feel ourselves engaged to address you in this way in concurrence with the united desire of our much esteemed Friends John Pemberton and William Matthews, (from America) who in the course of their Religious labours with us, when gathered at this place last Quarter, amoungst many other important remarks (evidently under the influence of Divine Love) they closely impressed us to request the circulation of those epistles you are favoured with from our Sisters on their side of the Water, that copies of them might be sent to each Quarterly Meeting in the nation, as our Women Friends there expected they had been addressing the society of our sex at large, till of late time they were informed their epistles were confirmed within the compass of a few, which had so much discouraged their minds as to cause them to apprehend they should be at liberty to drop their salutary correspondence, which consideration hath afforded divers of us who have been favoured to hear them read at your Quarterly Meeting, and have felt a mutual desire that our Friends in distant parts might have the like privilege, which we trust will come under the proper notice of rightly concerned minds, amoungst you, and prevail *with such* to unite and concur with the above request, that so as Children of our Father we may be made instrumental in building one another up in every good work - In the Love of the Gospel we affectionately Salute you, and remain your Friends,
> Signed on behalf of our Womens Quarterly Meeting held at Lancaster the 1st of 10th month, 1783. Margaret Kendal, Clerk.[26]

This minute was sent by the Two Weeks Meeting to the 1784 women's meeting along with three similar statements from the quarterly meetings of women Friends at Hertford, York, and Kendal, all of which meetings Matthews and Pemberton had attended. At the London gathering were a large number of American ministers: Rebecca Jones, Mehetabel Jenkins, Patience Brayton, Rebecca Wright, William

Matthews, John Pemberton, Samuel Emlen, Robert Valentine, George Dillwyn, Nicholas Waln, and Thomas Ross. William Matthews and Robert Valentine attended the women's meeting, and according to his journal, William Matthews spoke for the creation of the women's yearly meeting. Rebecca Jones also addressed the women, urging them to take action to secure the privilege of having a meeting of their own. A committee of nine English Friends: Esther Tuke, Elizabeth Gibson, Alice Rigge, Christiana Hustler, Mercy Ransom, Martha Routh, Tabitha Middleton, Susanna Row, and Sarah Corbyn, were appointed to take a proposal for a women's meeting to the men's meeting, to be accompanied by Rebecca Jones, Mehetabel Jenkins and Rebecca Wright.[27]

The women entered the men's meeting with Esther Tuke of York at their head. There is a tradition that John Gurney Bevan, a prominent Friend, said 'What is thy petition, Queen Esther? and it shall be granted thee; what is thy request? and it shall be performed.' The women, however, had to argue long and hard for their meeting. There was still a strong sentiment that power could not be shared. One Friend is supposed to have said that it would be preposterous to have one body with two heads, to which Rebecca Jones retorted, 'There is but one Head to the body which is the Church, even Jesus Christ, and in Him male and female are one.' Alice Rigge spoke well for the women's meeting, according to Rebecca Jones, and 'Martha Routh silenced David Barclay; he surrendered very unwillingly.'[28]

At the adjournment of the sessions, the men Friends asked the women to hold an adjourned session in the evening to receive their conclusion. Four men, all friends of the measure, were appointed to take the minute to the women. They were Robert Valentine, William Matthews, Samuel Neale and William Tuke. The message they brought was positive, although guarded:

> This Meeting, after a solid and deliberate consideration of the proposition brought in from the Meeting of Women Friends held annually in this City, agrees that the said Meeting be at liberty to correspond in writing with the Quarterly Meetings of Women Friends, to receive accounts from them, and issue such advice as in the wisdom of Truth from time to time may appear necessary and conducive to their mutual edification.
>
> For this purpose it will be expedient that the said Meeting be a meeting of record, and be denominated, 'The Yearly Meeting of Women Friends in London,'; yet such Meeting is not to be so far considered a meeting of discipline as to make rules, nor yet alter the present Queries, without the concurrence of this Meeting.[29]

Samuel Neale wrote a friend in America to describe the event. 'This was the *third* time it was before the meeting, and I was at each and I now saw the desire of my heart crowned; and carried over all opposition by its being established.' William Matthews recorded in his journal, 'Thus a work was brought about, which many had heretofore laboured for, and that not by the wisdom of the wise, not strength of argument of the eloquent, but in a way the Lord was pleased to cast up.' Rebecca Wright, Martha Routh and Patience Brayton also recorded the event in their journals. John Pemberton, visiting in Ireland, had been unable to attend this yearly meeting, although he had been present in 1753, when the subject was first raised. He wrote to a friend that he regretted not being there 'to join in promoting it.'[30]

Others were not as pleased. An anonymous letter, printed in the *Memorials of Rebecca Jones* though not apparently addressed to her, reveals the sentiments of an opposer:

> 'The most remarkable occurrence this time was, that the women have obtained a point which they have long thirsted after - that is, a Yearly Meeting, regularly established by representatives from the Quarterly meetings. So thou may, at some future meeting, be a member of this female Parliament, who, if they take it into their heads, may recollect that they may, like Solomon's crown, be placed above the head....
> I was no favorer of this measure, well knowing that POWER is a dangerous tool in some hands, who, if one gives them an inch, will take an ell. And so strong was my prejudice against it that, though most of the solid part of the men (and all the women to be sure) seemed to favor it under a right influence, yet I felt it not. Thus I have however obtained a teachable lesson of the strength and danger of prejudice, as well as to learn condescension to such as are entitled to it - for to set my own judgment and feeling in opposition to my superior, would be a presumption that I should not pardon myself for.'[31]

Although the Women's Yearly Meeting had been set up without any powers, the men continued to fear it. In 1787, Joseph Woods wrote to William Matthews that 'The Women Friends held long Meetings and appear very willing to be invested with greater power, but it was somewhat limited by the prudence of the men.' In 1793, Anna Price attended the Women's Meeting and was deputized with Martha Routh to inform the Men's Meeting of their deliberations. Although several men, especially Samuel Emlen of America, spoke encouragingly about the women's work, Price and Routh were followed out of the meeting by a critic:[32]

> ...a certain young man who was fearful we should be too much set up, and convey too much encouragement to Women's Meetings. He spoke to M.R. who

> was a match for him. I said nothing, but was painfully sensible that the life which was in Christ and may also be in us, was not so in dominion in the Men's Meeting as I thought we had witnessed it. Deep inward wailing and conflict of spirit was much maintained by many through our various meetings, but painful is the jealousy of Men Friends.[33]

Having played a role in the creation of the London Women's Yearly Meeting Rebecca Jones afterwards kept up a correspondence with Christiana Hustler, Esther Tuke, and Martha Routh. Writing to Mary Bevan, also active in the yearly meeting, she urged the London women to make an independent decision in the case of Hannah Barnard, a New York Friend who had travelled in the ministry in England and Ireland and had been accused of heresy. Rebecca Jones may have agreed with the accusation but she was eager that the women make up their own minds:

> I am much of thy sentiment respecting Hannah Barnard's case. I do hope the right thing will be done and that your women's Yearly Meeting will be owned by the presence of the great Head of the Church, which is composed of females as well as males, who alike have need to move under a sense of their own weakness.[34]

In 1790, the men's meeting further recognized the women's meeting by drawing up a minute on its representative character with the stipulation that no Quarterly Meeting was to send more women to the women's meeting than men to the men's meeting. However, there was no relaxation of the rule that the women were to have no part in making rules of discipline. It was often restated in the women's meeting that it was not 'a legislative body.' And while the women of other yearly meetings, such as Philadelphia, were equally represented on many of their yearly meeting committees, and for years protested their exclusion from the discipline, sending up a stream of protests and suggestions and demanding eventually equal representation on the Meeting for Sufferings, the women of London Yearly Meeting apparently did not do so. As a result, Mary Jane Godlee, who wrote the chapter on the women's meeting in the history of London Yearly Meeting published in 1919, concludes that 'little real business was transacted' for many years.[35]

In 1873, when the London Yearly Meeting decided to hold a conference on the state of the Society, it refused to allow women to attend, according to several correspondents who wrote in the pages of *The Friend.* One such correspondent Hannah Priestman Bright Clark,

wrote that she hoped this action would lead to a discussion of the position of women in the Society of Friends. Clark mentioned the notion that Quaker women had a tradition of equality, and pointed out that this was not true in meetings for business:

> Many are already painfully conscious of the unreality of their meetings for discipline, since the little business they do has been for the most part already done for them in the men's meetings, and they have no voice in the management of affairs. It is needless for them to answer the Queries, as in the men's meetings the Queries are answered for all.[36]

While few Quaker women attended the meaningless meetings for business, this author suggested, the same women flocked to the meetings of the Good Templars of England [a temperance society] where they were given an equal share in the business. A woman wrote in the same issue that she hesitated to promote the attendance of her daughters at the Quaker business meetings, when so little happens that 'interests and instructs.'[37]

In 1884, the Quarterly Meeting of Bristol and Somerset sent up a minute suggesting a change in the role of women in the yearly meeting allowing them to be eligible for Meeting for Sufferings, and that some subjects of business be brought to the women's meeting. There was no apparent result from this action and in 1895, the same quarterly meeting raised the problem again. In 1896, Yearly Meeting agreed that 'in the future Women Friends be recognized as forming a constituent part of our Meetings for Church affairs equally with their brethren, and that they be eligible for appointment as members of the Meeting for Sufferings'. Finally, in 1908, the two meetings joined.[38]

Women in some of the American yearly meetings began to work for full equality in the discipline and in Meeting for Sufferings, (renamed representative meeting) as early as 1836, and achieved it in most yearly meetings beginning in 1877. Some of the strongest of these, however, preferred to maintain their separate women's yearly meetings longer, into the 1920s. This was based on the fear that if men and women met together, women would obey the still current mores and remain silent, thus not making their full contribution to the Society. As one Quaker woman, a member of a pastoral meeting that had merged, observed, 'Much has been gained, no doubt, in the joint meeting, but has all been gained that should have been gained, and has, perhaps something been lost?'[39]

One of the women who struggled for the equality of women within the Religious Society of Friends was the American abolitionist and

Women's Rights leader Lucretia Mott, who began as early as 1836 to protest the fact that men still made the final decisions in cases of discipline, even in her liberal, Hicksite meeting. Yet when challenged by radical Abby Kelley Foster, also a Quaker, who believed all meetings should be open to both men and women, she defended the women's separate meetings as having served an important role in the Religious Society of Friends.

> Will not the ground thou assumes, oblige thee to withdraw from the Society of Friends? as all their meetings for discipline are with closed doors, not only against the world's people, but men against women, and women against men.
> And yet their meetings of women, imperfect as they are, have had their use, in bringing our sex forward, exercising their talents, and preparing them for united action with men, as soon as we can convince them that it is both our right and our duty.[40]

Modern students of Quaker history, such as Mary Maples Dunn, president of Smith College, have pointed out that the Quaker business meetings for women in fact gave women what they most needed, a room of their own. Within the confines of the separate meeting, many women learned to keep accounts, to write epistles, to draft minutes, and to lobby their male counterparts, all capacities which served them in good stead when they began to move into the reform movements of the nineteenth century.

Unfortunately, the view that women's business meetings were of little interest had been widespread, and has prevented a thorough and systematic study of them. It is time more attention is paid. Phyllis Mack in her new book *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth Century England* has made a promising start in her reading of such seventeenth century women's minutes as are currently available, but much remains to be done.

A belief in the spiritual equality of women has been one of the strengths of the Quaker movement, and one of its contributions to the larger society. As interest grows in the history of women, more and more students are looking to early Quaker records for information on the Quaker pioneers. It is to be hoped that after years of neglect, the history of Quaker women's role in the church will receive the attention it justly deserves.

Margaret Hope Bacon

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1] Jack Marietta, *Reformation of American Quakerism, 1748-1783,* 99; Among such institutions: the Friendly Association for Regaining and Preserving Peace with the Indians by Pacific Measures, 1757; the Pennsylvania Society for the Abolition of Slavery, the Relief of Negroes Unlawfully held in Bondage, and the Elevation of the African Race, 1775; the Philadelphia Society for the Alleviation of the Miseries of the Public Prisons, 1787; the York Retreat, 1796.

[2] Susanna Morris, Memoirs, typescript in possession of author, 80, 88.

[3] Mary Peisley Neale, *Lives of Samuel and Mary Neale,* 342.

[4] William Rogers, *The Christian-Quaker,* 65.

[5] William Beck and T. Frederick Ball, *London Friends' Meetings,* 353-55.

[6] Box Meeting Minutes 1748-1760, 26-10-1748. This minute book appears to contain minutes of the Box Meeting, the Two Weeks Meeting, the women's quarterly meeting, and some minutes of the group which met during yearly meeting.

[7] Phyllis Mack, *Visionary Women,* 203-205.

[8] Marietta, *Reformation* 28; Margaret H. Bacon, *Mothers of Feminism: The Story of Quaker Women in America,* 44.

[9] Mary Jane Godlee, 'The Women's Yearly Meeting' in *London Yearly Meeting during 250 Years,* 111. Arnold Lloyd, *Quaker Social History,* 118. William Braithwaite, *Second Period of Quakerism,* 287.

[10] J.S. Rowntree, *Meetings on Ministry and Oversight,* No.2, 16. Braithwaite, *Second Period,* 287.

[11] Morning Meeting Minutes 6th of 11th mo. 1700.

[12] Insert in Front of Box Meeting Minute Book, 1748-1760. 'Considerations upon the service of the Discipline of the Church in general & the loss sustained by the want of extending the same amongst the women in particular.' Signed Lydia Lancaster, Margaret Raines, May Drummond, Mary Townsend, Alice Thistlewaite, Elizabeth Avery, Hannah Harris. I am obliged to Gil Skidmore for bringing this manuscript to my attention.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] John Pemberton, *Life of John Pemberton,* 32; Godlee, 102.

[16] Box Meeting Minutes, 12-6-1753 and 14-6-1753.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Samuel Neale, *Lives of Samuel and Mary Neale,* 36.

[19] Mary Weston to Israel Pemberton, jr. 23-5-1752, as in 'Egoism and Altruism in Quaker Abolition,' Jack Marietta, *Quaker History,* 82, Spring, 1993.

[20] *Memorials of Rebecca Jones,* 64; Beck and Ball, Ibid; Minutes of Bristol Women's Monthly Meeting, 22-7-1755. Between this date and 1785 the Bristol women's minutes reveal a concern to play a larger role in disciplining female members and in marriages.

[21] John Churchman, *An Account of the Gospel Labours and Christian Experiences of a Faithful Minister of Christ, John Churchman,* 179.

[22] Women's Minutes, London Yearly Meeting, 21st of 5th month, 1766.

[23] Philadelphia Women's Yearly Meeting Minutes, 1766.

[24] Ibid.

[25] 'Ministering Friends of America who have visited foreign parts on Truth's Service,' mms. list, Quaker Collection, Haverford College Library.

[26] Minutes, London Yearly Meeting for Women, 31st of 5th month, 1783.

[27] 'Journal of William Matthews', *Friends Miscellany,* VII, 274. Rufus M. Jones, *Later Periods of Quakerism*, 115; Minutes, London Yearly Meeting of Women Friends, 5th of 6th month, 1784.

[28] Rufus Jones, Ibid. 115; Rebecca Jones, Ibid. 65.

[29] Minutes, London Yearly Meeting, 1784.

[30] *Friends Miscellany,* III, 71-72; William Matthews in *Friends Miscellany* VII, 274; 'Some Account of Rebecca Wright's Travels in Great Britain and Ireland,' mms, Quaker Collection, Haverford College; *Memoir of the Life, Travels and Religious Experience of Martha Routh, written by herself and compiled from her own narrative,* 44; 'The Life of Patience Brayton,' *Friends Library,* X 461; John Pemberton, *The Life and Travels of John Pemberton,* 171.

[31] *Memorials of Rebecca Jones,* 66.

[32] Godlee, *London Yearly Meeting,* 112.

[33] *Friends Quarterly Examiner,* 1894, 195.

[34] *Memorial of Rebecca Jones,* 296.

[35] Godlee, 115.

[36] *The Friend,* Eighth Month, 1, 1873.

[37] *The Friend,* Ninth Month, 1, 1873.

[38] Godlee, 119-120.

[39] Mary Grove Chawner, *The American Friend,* (Ninth Month, 1912) 610.

[40] Lucretia Mott to Abby Kelley. Abby Kelley Foster Papers, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Massachusetts.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION IN REVOLUTIONARY FRANCE

The French Revolution, with the *levée-en-masse,* introduced the idea of universal military service as an instrument of the modern nation-state. For the first time in history thousands of young men were now drafted into the French army to fight a series of wars against neighboring states intent on restoring the *ancien régime.* Casualties rose on an unprecedented scale. Alongside the fervent patriotism of wide sections of the populace there existed, especially in the countryside, extensive incidence of desertion from the Revolutionary armies and other forms of - usually passive - resistance to conscription. Recent studies of these *réfractaires,* however, make little, if any, mention of conscientious objection to military service.[1] This silence is puzzling since, as the footnotes to this article show, there already exists a modest literature, in French as well as in English, on the subject of conscientious objection in France during the Revolutionary period; and, moreover, leading figures among both Girondins and Jacobins were directly involved in the problem. The two groups from which at this date objectors derived, both of them small, were the Quakers and the Mennonites (then known in France as Anabaptists). The present article reviews the attitude of successive Revolutionary governments to religious conscientious objection and the efforts of the two sects to gain exemption from military service for their young conscripts along with a more considerate attitude on the part of local authorities.

French Quakers were confined to Languedoc, centering in and around the village of Congénies. But shortly before the Revolution an American Quaker whaler from Nantucket, William Rotch, had settled with family and assistants in Dunkirk in order to carry on, with the support of the French authorities, a business that had been largely ruined during the War of Independence. Rotch set up a meeting for worship in that town with English as the usual language of ministry. In 1785, the year in which the Rotch group arrived in France, a young Protestant nobleman and ex-officer, Jean de Marcillac Le Cointe,[2] whose reading about Quakerism had led to his conversion to that faith and abandonment of an army career as inconsistent with the views of the Society of Friends on war, made contact with the Congénies group. He soon became their spokesman. The origins of the Congénies Quakers are unclear; an offshoot of the *inspirés* around the mid-1730s, at the beginning they had had no direct contact with Friends elsewhere. Their

worship and beliefs, however, largely coincided with those held by the latter. As a result of Marcillac's efforts, formal affiliation to the Society of Friends in London was completed by 1789.

Before that date Quakers in France had not been much troubled by the military question. In the 1780s approximately 100 Quaker families were then resident in the Congénies area; according to a contemporary English Quaker report,[3] 'they mostly follow mechanic employments, some husbandry.' 'They do not bear arms but hire substitutes when drawn for the militia'. even though this practice contradicted the discipline of both British and American Friends they refrained, at this date at any rate, from censuring their French coreligionists, thus showing more understanding for the difficulties of continental Friends than was usual, since hiring a substitute or even paying a fine in lieu of bearing arms, if persisted in, normally led to the disownment of the delinquent member of the Society. As for the Quakers in Dunkirk, Rotch before settling there had applied for, and been granted by a government anxious to accommodate this kind of immigrant, not merely 'full and free enjoyment of our religion' but also 'entire exemption from military requisitions of every kind.'[4]

The situation changed of course as the revolution gained momentum and the danger of foreign intervention against it mounted, with increasing pressure to mobilize the country's manpower in expectation of war. Marcillac, now an M.D. practising in Paris and specializing in the cure of gout, with his accustomed energy and the assistance of William Rotch and his son Benjamin, set about obtaining guarantees from the new government that their young men would not be forced into the armed forces: since the establishment of a National Guard in mid-1790, a veiled threat of military compulsion at some future date had threatened. They sought the same kind of exemption, at the least, as the *ancien régime* had given their Society. Quakers were fortunate in enjoying in this period widespread respect among France's advanced thinkers. Voltaire, among others, had adhered to the notion of 'the good Quaker' and praised Quaker Pennsylvania as the kind of quasi-Utopian commonwealth to which humankind should aspire.[5] ' "Quaker and Pennsylvania" had become bywords in France, representing... a more or less vaguely conceived ideal.'[6] This view, however remote from reality, was shared by many of the leading Girondin intellectuals and politicians prominent in the National Assembly of 1789-91.

Marcillac, therefore, set about winning, in particular, the support of the Girondins for his project. He was already acquainted with Jacques-Pierre Brissot de Warville, a leading member of the group, while Brissot himself had often been in close contact with the Quakers since his first

visit to London in 1779. He collaborated with them in connection with his activities as an abolitionist. Indeed the *Société des Amis des Noirs,* in which Brissot held a key position, drew its inspiration in part from Quaker efforts to end slavery.[7] During his visit to the United States in 1788 Brissot had gone out of his way to talk to members of the Society of Friends; among others he met that active and ardent Quaker pacifist - 'the good' - Warner Mifflin, and he also conversed with President Washington himself on the subject of Quaker beliefs and their role in the Revolutionary War (about whose 'pacific neutrality' Brissot incidentally was rather critical).[8] Though a deist with strong anticlerical views, Brissot regarded Quakerism very sympathetically.[9] Moreover, in theory at least he almost accepted their pacifism. At any rate he believed that universal peace would arrive if humanity as a whole followed 'these wise men' in resolving 'never to take [up] arms or contribute to the expences of any war'. Though himself 'convinced of the sacred and divine principle which authorises resistance to oppression', he believed as strongly in the Quakers' right to refuse miliary service. While he knew about their objection to paying fines in lieu of serving with weapons and their willingness to suffer repeated distraint of property rather than comply with this alternative, he did not see this as an obstacle to granting them exemption in France. 'It would be very easy,' he wrote, 'to reconcile the wants of the state, and the duty of the citizen, with the religious principles of the Quakers. You might subject them only to pacific taxes, and require them to pay a larger proportion of them.'[10]

In a postscript to his *New Travels* added in 1790, Brissot argues cogently that, in reality, the spirit now leading French revolutionaries to approve an armed defence of liberty was virtually identical with the spirit that had animated the Society of Friends in refusing to bear arms for whatever cause. He wrote:

> If the old government had an interest in inviting Quakers to France, this interest is doubled since the Revolution. The spirit of that Society agrees with the spirit of French liberty in the following particulars:
>
> That Society has made great establishments without effusion of blood; the National Assembly has renounced the idea of conquest, which is almost universally the cause of war. That Society practises universal tolerance; the Assembly ordains it. The Society observes simplicity of worship; the Assembly leads to it. The Society practises good morals, which are the strongest supports of a free government; the political regeneration of France, which the Assembly is about to consummate, conducts necessarily to a regeneration of morals.
>
> If the French are armed from North to South, it is for liberty, it is for the terror of despotism, it is to obey the commands of God; for God has willed that man should be free, since he has endowed him with reason; he has willed that he

should use all efforts to defend himself from that tyranny which defaces the only image of Deity in man, his virtues and his talents.

But notwithstanding this ardour in the French to arm themselves in so holy a cause; they do not less respect the religious opinions of the Quakers, which forbid them to spill the blood of their enemies. This error of their humanity is so charming, that it is almost as good as a truth. We are all striving for the same object, universal fraternity; the Quakers by gentleness, we by resistance. Their means are those of a society, ours those of a powerful nation.[11]

The Quakers' decision, taken in the second half of 1790, to petition the legislature *inter alia* for military exemption for members of the Society in case of conscription seems to have originated with Marcillac. But Brissot was consulted at every step in the procedure. Marcillac already knew of course that Brissot took an extremely favourable view of the Quakers' noncombatancy. Thus, writing to a prominent London Quaker, the publisher James Phillips,[12] Marcillac in his letter, dated 9 January 1791,[13] spoke of conversations he had held with Brissot 'and some other good patriots,' all of them Girondin members of the National Assembly 'well disposed' toward the Quakers. They included Jean-Paul Rabaut Saint-Etienne, who came from a Protestant background, and the *abbé* Henri Gregoire, who had become the constitutional bishop of Blois, and was later to write about Quakers - as well as Mennonites - in his pioneering history of religious sectarianism.[14] These French well-wishers advised Marcillac 'that the success [of his petition] would much depend on the zeal and the address with which the President [of the Assembly] should present it.' Therefore, they urged, the Quakers should defer presentation of the petition for 'a couple of weeks when it was said Mirabeau would be chosen President: and as he [too] is well disposed towards us and a great friend of Rabaut, Grégoire, Warville etc., he will have pleasure in seconding the application with that energy and eloquence which has hitherto enabled him to combat all his rivals with success.' 'It is to be hoped', thus Marcillac concludes his account, 'that in this day of returning liberty to France we shall be treated with even more consideration [than before 1789], if the Lord is pleased to favour us in the undertaking.'

Furnished with authorization from the Congénies Quakers to act as 'Député extraordinaire des Amis de France à l'Assemblée Nationale' and accompanied by the Rotches, father and son, Marcillac appeared on 10 February 1791 before the National Assembly where Mirabeau had now embarked on his fifteen-day stint as President of that body.[15] The night before, some minor alterations had been made in the text of the petition Marcillac had composed. This was done at the request of the

Rotches who, however, on account of their ignorance of the French language had difficulty in getting all the changes made that they would have liked: 'the time was so short', wrote William Rotch, 'that we were obliged to let it pass with much fewer amendments than we wished.'

On the day itself the Assembly chamber was packed. Deputies attended in large numbers and every place was taken in the galleries for the public so that many "spectators" had to be turned away. However, it seems to have been mainly 'the novelty of the object' that attracted so many people rather than interest in the Quaker religion. On entering the Assembly chamber the three Quakers, according to an old custom of the Society of Friends, had kept their hats on.[16] They had also refused to wear national cockades, though pressed to do so; and they persisted in their refusal even after being told that it was 'required by law, to prevent distinction', and that their safety might be endangered through mob violence generated by their failure to conform on this point. None the less, despite such nonconformity which was probably attributed to the harmless peculiarities of their sect, the Quakers were given a good reception by the Assembly; at one point of the proceedings an unidentified duputy had whispered to Benjamin Rotch, 'I rejoice to see something of your principles brought before this Assembly.' Brissot, who had been asked by the Quaker delegation to give a last look at their text just before entering the Assembly chamber, stood all the time at Marcillac's 'elbow', as he read the Petition to the gathered Assemblymen, so as 'to correct him [William Rotch reports] in his emphasis, which [Brissot] frequently did, unperceived, I believe except by us.' After the reading was concluded, the President Mirabeau read his answer, upon which he politely invited the three Quakers to stay for the rest of the sitting.[17]

The main thrust of the Quakers' petition[18] was directed toward gaining military exemption for their members. But it also included a request for exemption from taking civic oaths and for permission to use the simple forms of registering births, marriages, and deaths that were customary in their Society.[19] Appeal was made to freedom of conscience and to the principle of religious toleration which recent French legislation had exhibited, thereby setting an example to the nations. 'We hope that sooner or later they will follow it.' Among the Friends' dearest principles, the petitioners stated, was that of nonviolence, for the sake of which they had endured severe persecution. This principle prevented them from taking up arms and killing their fellow men 'for any reason whatsoever': a principle which, they believed, 'was in accordance with the holy scriptures', for Christ had told his followers not to render evil

for evil but to do good even to enemies. Britain and the United States had both freed Quakers from bearing arms 'without regarding them on that account as useless members of society.' Therefore Frenchmen, show generosity, the petitioners urged. 'You have sworn never to imbrue your hands with blood for the sake of conquest. This resolve brings you, and indeed the whole world, closer to universal peace. Thus you surely cannot view with hostility those who, by their example, hasten its arrival. In Pennsylvania [Quakers] have already shown that huge structures may be erected and maintained without military preparations and without shedding human blood.'[20] The petitioners concluded by reviewing the various material advantages which they believed would accrue to France - 'a country indeed dear to us' - if the Assembly encouraged their Society by granting it what had been requested.[21]

In his response Mirabeau expressed his admiration for the Quakers' principles considered 'as a philanthropic system'; and he asked their delegates to have full confidence in legislators representing a France now in the process of regeneration and anxious for the maintenance of international peace and the rights of man. Nevertheless, with respect to their pacifism he told the delegates he entertained serious reservations. Though 'doubtless in theory a beautiful principle' doing credit to their humanity, in practice he thought it did not look so fine.

> Don't you think the defence of yourselves and your neighbours to be a religious duty also? Otherwise you would surely be overwhelmed by tyrants! Since we have gained liberty for you as well as for ourselves, why would you refuse to preserve it?
>
> If your brethren in Pennsylvania had been settled nearer its savage inhabitants, would they have allowed their wives, children, and old people to be slaughtered rather than resist? And aren't stupid tyrants and ferocious conquerors equally savages?...
>
> Whenever I meet a Quaker I intend to say to him: My brother, if you possess the right to be free, you have also an obligation to prevent anyone from making you a slave. Loving your neighbour, you must not allow a tyrant to destroy him: to do so would be the same to kill him yourself. Do you desire peace? Well then, it is surely weakness that calls forth war. A general readiness to resist would procure universal peace.[22]

The Quaker delegates' labours were not concluded when the sitting ended and they had returned to their hotel. They quickly realized that they must seize the opportunity resulting from the good impression that they appeared to have made at the Assembly and do some further lobbying among influential members of that body. Among those they visited only Talleyrand proved entirely unreceptive. 'After endeavouring to

impress him with the foundation of our Petition,' writes William Rotch, 'he made no reply, but let us pass silently away.' On the other hand General de Lafayette, despite his military rank, promised his support for the Quakers in the course of a dinner-party to which he had invited them. Among those visited it was the Girondin Rabaut who showed most understanding for Quaker nonviolence. He regarded this tenet, he told the three Friends, as "pure Christianity". Without committing himself personally to their position he summarized it as follows: 'If an assassin comes to take my life, and I conscientiously refrain from taking his to save it, I may trust to some interposition for my deliverance. If however, no interposition appearing, I still refrain from precipitating a soul unprepared into Eternity, and he is suffered to effect his purpose on me, I may hope to find mercy for myself.' Marcillac and the two Rotches also organized a series of soirées at the hotel where the latter were staying. These gatherings were attended chiefly by Girondins: there Quaker doctrines were expounded and 'religious subjects' discussed until late into the night.[23]

The Assembly had in fact taken no decision whether or not to grant the Quakers petitioners' requests, merely ordering that the Quaker Petition and Mirabeau's reply should be printed at the Assembly's expense while at the same time transmitting the Petition to the *Comité de Constitution* for examination.[24] No further action in the matter is recorded; the Quakers' requests remained unanswered.[25]

Thus the outcome of Quaker efforts had proved ambiguous. No assurance of military exemption of any kind had been gained, although the current legislators had indeed displayed - in general terms - their goodwill toward the Quakers and toward their peaceable principles, too. A note of dissatisfaction, combined with restrained optimism concerning the present situation, emerged in a letter Marcillac sent to Phillips in London at the beginning of May. 'Although,' he wrote, 'I believe the spirit of general toleration has so far prevailed as not to oblige us at present to bear arms, nor to take an oath, nevertheless it is their intention not to consider us as active citizens in Languedoc and Dunkirk, and I protest always against that, whilst I consider it the duty of every citizen to contribute to the maintenance of his country with his pecuniary means and intellectual faculties.'[26]

In 1792 compulsion was employed in connection with the National Guard, which had been established two years earlier, but "passive" citizens were excluded from this draft. The position of the Quakers with regard to military requirements remained as unclear after the presentation of their Petition as it had been before. After the outbreak of war with Austria on 20 April 1792 and the subsequent declaration on 11

July that the Fatherland was in danger, the situation began steadily to worsen. Marcillac wrote despondingly to London Friends about 'divers trials, which in our weak state we have found painful and grievous, the civic oath, the obligation imposed by the National Assembly to mount guard personally and to arm.' French Friends, including himself, had not felt able in good conscience to comply with 'these trying requisitions'. 'I [have] had,' he wrote, 'several times opportunity of testifying in public that our refusal to bear arms was not in disobedience to the laws of the [state], but in obedience to the heavenly principles of our Master and Saviour Jesus Christ.'[27] An even more pessimistic report came next month from the pen of a Congénies Quaker writing to a London Quaker:

> This nation is in a desperate condition... The authorities seize upon, indiscriminately, from the body of citizens a large number of men between the ages of 16 and 50. And we, too, shall not be exempt from the ballot. Judge, dear friend, in what a sad state we find ourselves and what a trial we are having to undergo. While one law ordains that all citizens without exception must mount guard within the confines of their district, another requires everyone, the young as well as the old, to wear the cockade; and anyone in our area who doesn't do this may expect to be roughly handled.[28]

In practice the Congénies Quakers seem to have reached a compromise with the local authorities in respect of the now compulsory National Guard. If called upon to do their spell of duty they served - but not with a lethal weapon. By mutual agreement they went armed merely with a wooden truncheon.[29]

Meanwhile Brissot and the other Girondins, who continued to be extremely influential in the Legislative Assembly and for a time in its successor the National Convention, too, had become enthusiastic supporters of war against the enemies of the Revolution, which they regarded as a crusade for liberty. In the course of 1793, however, Brissot and most of his Girondin colleagues fell victim to the Terror, organized by the Jacobins to eliminate not only adherents of the *ancien régime* or centerists of various kinds but their political rivals on the left as well.

By this date indeed the Dunkirk Quakers, after experiencing difficulties as a result of their refusal to illuminate their windows in celebration of French victories, had left the country for good. The Rotches sailed for England shortly before France declared war against the latter on 1 February 1793. In addition, in this tense atmosphere a promising scheme, devised by Marcillac with the support of English Quakers, to establish at Chambord a school for the training of poor

children in trades and crafts, had collapsed - in large part because of Quaker insistence that any pupils, who were also Friends, should be guaranteed *inter alia* exemptions from military service.[30] And in 1795 Marcillac himself left for the United States; when he returned to France in 1798 he had ceased to be a Quaker. Henceforward, the peasant boys of Congénies, and the simple Quaker villagers their parents, were left to face alone, as best they could, the *levée-en-masse* and the military demands of successive revolutionary administrations and finally of the Napoleonic Empire. For most of this period France was at war with Britain while America was far away: thus Quakers abroad could be of little use in helping French Quakers respond to the military question.

The "legend" of the Good Quaker, we have seen, was common to many French intellectuals at that time, and especially to those on the political left. Revolutionary politicians, including of course the Jacobins, knew about the Quaker Petition of February 1791 asking for exemption from military service[31] and were thus already acquainted with this aspect of the Quaker faith. However, it was not the Quakers but the Mennonites who, in 1793, became briefly the objects of the Jacobins' interest. So these Mennonites, when receiving from the latter a measure of toleration for their noncombatancy, may in fact have been benefiting from the vogue which the peaceable Quakers enjoyed among French revolutionaries generally.[32]

The Mennonites settled in France under the *ancien régime* were an offshoot of the anabaptist Swiss Brethren, who had emerged in Zürich around 1525. Calling themselves "defenceless Christians" and, like their Swiss predecessors, proponents of the principle of *Wehrlosigkeit* (nonresistance), these sectaries refused steadfastly to bear arms though, unlike the Quakers, they were prepared either to pay commutation money in exchange for military extemption or, if it came to the worst, to undertake noncombatant duties in militia or army. In fact before 1789, in Alsace where most of them lived their military obligations had been light, as they were too in that period in the two small enclaves formed by the principality of Salm and the county of Montbéliard.[33]

With the outbreak of revolution the situation altered for Mennonites in France, as we have seen it did too for the French Quakers. At first, however, the government assured Mennonites that in case of a military draft - for example for the National Guard - their religiously motivated objection to bearing arms would be respected, as it had been in the past, in exchange for a monetary payment. But once war had broken out, and young Frenchmen began to be conscripted - and killed - then attitudes toward the Mennonites began to change, at any rate at the local level.

There tolerance - or indifference - sometimes gave way to open or veiled hostility. In the district of St-Hippolyte, for example, the authorities described the Mennonites' objection to bearing arms as a 'dangerous' principle. If followed by others (which they appeared to think quite likely), it would leave this frontier area open to attack by the enemy. They accused the Mennonites of 'ill will and hatred of the Revolution.' 'When the Fatherland is in danger, all citizens who are not public functionaries ought to render service in person.'[34] The fact that the Mennonites, who still spoke only German, also rejected civic oaths as unchristian, wore beards then widely regarded as a remant of barbarism, and followed a different form of worship from that of their fellow citizens, all added to the suspicion with which the average Frenchmen regarded them, at any rate in times of war when such peculiarities emphasized the sectarians' othernesses.[35]

In the summer of 1793 the Committee of Public Safety took under consideration the Mennonites' claim for military exemption. The Committee's deliberations had been prompted by pressure exerted on the National Convention from concerned subordinate bodies like the Council General of Doubs; it was now asked to hand down some authoritative ruling in the matter. In addition, the Mennonites had appointed a delegation, which sought from the highest authority in the land a confirmation of their military exemption now being contested at a lower level. The initiative in sending a delegation to Paris seems to have originated with Mennonite congregations in the freshly annexed territories of Montbéliard and Salm.

Mennonites in the (former) principality of Salm had recently been encouraged by the warmth of feeling displayed toward them by a three-man delegation sent in March 1793 by the Committee of Public Safety to inspect the newly acquired area. 'Good and brave men', was how one of the three inspectors, Goupilleau de Montaigu, described these rural sectaries; indeed he had become convinced there were 'no better people on the face of the earth' than they were. And he compared them favourably to the Quakers, whom he also greatly admired. Back in Paris Goupilleau promoted the Mennonites' cause with the Committee of Public Safety, and his efforts on their behalf appear in some way to have been coordinated with the lobbying of the Mennonite delegation which had arrived in the capital at the beginning of August.[36] The Petition, which the latter brought with them and presented - in a French translation - to the Convention on 8 August, asked that Mennonite conscripts be allowed to pay a sum of money in place of serving in person. It cited in support the fact that Mennonites had already been allowed to do this in the American Republic: a good precedent

considering the prestige enjoyed by the latter in Revolutionary France.

The matter was referred for a decision to the Committee of Public Safety. And on 19 August 1793 this body issued what was indeed not formally a decree, but simply a recommendation, in effect brief guidelines directed to local authorities, concerning the proper procedure to be adopted in dealing with drafted Mennonites. Among those signing, or confirming, this document we find the names of such prominent Jacobins as Robespierre, Carnot, Couthon, Hérault de Séchelles, and St. Just. 'We have observed the simple hearts of these people', states their *arrêté,* 'and believing a good government ought to employ all kinds of virtue for the public good we ask you to treat the Anabaptists with a mildness that matches their character, to prevent them from being harrassed in any way, and finally to allow them to serve in such branches of the armed forces as they may agree to, like the pioneers or the teamsters, or even to allow them to pay money in lieu of serving personally.'[37]

Historians have expressed surprise at finding 'totalitarian democrats' like Robespierre and proponents of conscription like Carnot approving a document such as this, which clearly 'created a privilege' for one particular group of citizens, and thus undermining the principle of equality to which the Jacobins adhered with such tenacity.[38] 'Conscientious objection,' writes a military historian, 'was tolerated... probably because it was marginal, rather than out of a libertarian concern' on the part of the men who signed.[39] True, but it is clear the latter were impelled to bend in favour of the Mennonites and make an exception in their case to the Jacobins' cherished egalitarianism not primarily on account of the marginality of the Mennonites but because these people seemed now to incarnate other principles to which the Jacobins were also devoted. They exemplified an idyll of rustic virtue and an Eden of lost simplicity; and contemplation of this delightful prospect won the heart of even a Robespierre or a St. Just.

For the time being, then, the Mennonites' fears were laid to rest. Their young men would not be required to fight; henceforward they could serve their country in some more-or-less acceptable fashion. (Payment of commutation money was indeed the way of escape that they preferred.) Nevertheless matters did not go altogether smoothly, despite this official act of grace on the part of the central Revolutionary government. The authorities on the spot, civilian as well as military, showed a tendency to ignore the monetary alternative to noncombatant army service offered by the Committee of Public Safety; efforts were sometimes made either to push the Mennonite draftees into the pioneer

corps or enrol them as teamsters alongside the troops, even when this was against their wishes.[40] We learn, too, of denunciations lodged against the Mennonites by private individuals; it was alleged, for example, that they were not truly nonviolent since some were known to have fired shots at thieves stealing fruit from their orchards. Voices were raised demanding that, on account of their attitude to military service, they should be deprived of active citizenship.[41] However, it was not until after the fall of Robespierre in July 1794 and the installation in power of the Directory in August 1795 that the central government withdrew explicitly any possibility for Mennonite conscripts to escape army service by means of a monetary payment: henceforward, it was now decreed, 'they will be assigned to sapper or pioneer battalions - service which can in no way offend their religious opinions.'[42]

The Jacobins' grant of exemption of August 1793 represents the apex of the French Mennonites' struggle to be free of the yoke of conscription. Half a century later its printed text, the pages now yellow with age, still remained a treasured possession of elderly Mennonites of the Salm congregation,[43] even though the younger generation of French Mennonites had by now abandoned the traditional nonresistance and were ready to bear arms alongside other conscripts. But in fact, as Séguy writes, after 1798 'the privilege conceded by the Convention has disappeared... Jacobin egalitarian logic has swept it away, thus undoing with one stroke of the pen the timid act framed by the sentimentality rather than the legal judgment of the men of the Convention (*la sentimentalité peu juridique des conventionnels*).'[44]

Under Directory, Consulate, and Empire the fate of both Quaker and Mennonite pacifism became increasingly precarious as the government's manpower requirements rose. The Mennonites indeed had some claim to special treatment within the ranks of the army; the Quakers, though, had none. While the army usually assigned the Mennonite boys to a formally noncombatant branch, even though that might entail handling military equipment,[45] Quaker conscripts were not so fortunate. Nevertheless, they appear to have been successful in avoiding, somehow or other, the use of their weapons to kill. Friends in France could report to their brethren in London in 1815 after the war was over: 'Not one of our members has to blush for having done violence to any.'[46] Such determination, they felt, did not merit the censure which their conscripts might otherwise have deserved.

The French Revolution evoked from France's new rulers a much wider measure of consideration for conscientious objectors than was again to occur in that country until in 1962 General Charles de Gaulle succeeded in overriding an unfriendly parliament and legalizing

conscientious objection, this time on a broader base then the Revolutionary legislators had contemplated around 170 years earlier. In the 1960s, we may note, numbers at first did not greatly exceed those in the Revolutionary period.[47]

We have already seen the difference between the treatment of Mennonites in 1793 and the response made to the Quaker request for military exemption two and a half years before. The reason for this lay not in any difference in outlook between Girondins and Jacobins, for their attitude on this question was roughly the same, but in the more uncompromising stance toward military requirements taken up by the Quakers. At any rate in theory, they stood for unconditional exemption of their conscripted members. What, despite their belief in war as an effective instrument for defending a free republic and for extending liberty to the rest of humankind, had prompted both Girondins and Jacobins to look benevolently at the noncombatancy of the two peace sects in their midst was a feeling that these sectaries reflected, as it were, the reverse side of their own libertarian belligerency; that these people were already practising brotherhood, the idea of *fraternité* which was still only an aspiration for the revolutionaries themselves; and moreover that they had realized in advance the goal, common to all progressive men and women, of an ultimately peaceful world. The revolutionaries (in their own opinion at any rate) were pacifists at heart; they had been compelled to fight as a result of the otherwise ineradicable warlikeness of the foes of freedom. Quakers in France, and even more the Mennonites in that country, were indeed fortunate in appearing as the heroes of one of the "legends" of the French Enlightenment. But before long legend gave place to reality; young Mennonites and Quakers now found themselves on the battlefields where the Napoleonic armies fought with the rest of Europe. Only one essential characteristic differentiated them from other Frenchmen in uniform: they would not kill.

Peter Brock

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1] Michel Auvray, *Objecteurs, insoumis, déserteurs: Histoire des réfractaires en France* (Paris, 1983); Alan Forrest, *Conscripts and Deserters: The Army and French Society during the Revolution and Empire* (New York and Oxford, 1989). Auvray covers the period between 1789 and 1815 on pages 65-94. On page 5 Forrest writes: 'The *objecteur,* the man of conscience, emerged in the nineteenth century... In the period that concerns us, those rejecting military obligation would seem to have acted from more prosaic motives... In the hundreds of despositions made to tribunals and the numerous interrogations that accompanied the trials of deserters and *insoumis* there is nothing

to suggest a resistance rooted in a principled opposition to war'. That last sentence is, I am sure, true; one has to look elsewhere for evidence of such principled war resistance. Subsequently Forrest, without mentioning the Quakers, does devote six lines (on page 54) to the 'conscientious objection to war' of 'certain religious groups' like the Alsace Mennonites. He refers, too, to the authorities of Colmar district assigning the latter early in 1796 to work as army teamsters in lieu of bearing arms. For the background problem of religious pacifism and conscientious objection to military service, see in particular Peter Brock, *Pacifism in Europe to 1914* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1972).

[2] Henry van Etten, *Chronique de la vie Quaker française 1745-1945: Deux siècles de vie religieuse* (second edn. Paris, 1947) 45, 46. See also his article 'Les Quakers et la Révolution française', *Revue internationale d'histoire politique et constitutionelle,* N.S.6 (1956), 285.

[3] Library of the Religious Society of Friends (London), MS vol. 314 (France MSS), no.78: 'Note describing the usages of Friends in the south of France, n.d.' Though it is undated, a reference to Marcillac as a former 'captain of horse [who] being convinced of the unlawfulness of arms quitted the Service' indicates that the note was composed in the second half of the 1780s and reflects the pre-Revolutionary situation. The number of persons then belonging to the Congénies Quaker group is estimated here as between 250 and 280.

[4] Quoted in Margaret E. Hirst, *The Quakers in Peace and War: An Account of Their Peace Principles and Practices* (London, 1923), 466.

[5] See especially the excellent monograph by Edith Philips, *The Good Quaker in French Legend* (Philadelphia, 1932). Chap. V (133-65) is entitled: 'Quaker Ideas and the French Revolution'.

[6] Ibid., 133.

[7] See Lenore Loft, 'Quakers, Brissot and Eighteenth-Century Abolitionists', *The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society,* 55 (1989), 277-89.

[8] J.-P. Brissot de Warville, *New Travels in the United States of America performed in 1788* (London, 1792; reprinted as Brissot de Warville *On America,* vol. I [New York, 1970]), 189-93, 414-16.

[9] Cf Philips, *Good Quaker,* 200: 'Quakerism seemed to the Deists to be the form which popular religion ought to take. They recognized that the masses needed more than an intellectual concept of God, and here, in Quakerism, was a 'natural' religion ready made.' In his discussion of Quaker nonviolence Brissot remarks: 'Reason is the only weapon they use'; *New Travels,* 418.

[10] Brissot, *New Travels,* 417. I am not sure, however, if Brissot's proposal here would have satisfied the stricter Quakers, who objected in principle to any requirements exacted in exchange for exemption from any act they regarded as in itself wrong. Thus, the suggested 'larger proportion' of an otherwise innocuous tax would seem to be unacceptable according to such - perhaps excessively sensitive - consciences.

[11] Ibid., 418-20.

[12] Philips was also a personal friend of Brissot and one of the founders of the Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade in 1787. Writing to Brissot at the end of 1790 he had pointed out to the latter that the new government was being unfair to the French Quakers in making active citizenship dependent on readiness to bear arms. See James C. Dybikowski, 'Edmond Philip Bridel's Translations of Quaker Writings for French Quakers', *Quaker History* 77 (1988), 111, 116. Bridel had been a schoolmate of Brissot's but later moved to London where he became a teacher and writer of elementary-school textbooks. See ibid., 110.

[13] I have cited from the contemporary translation in Friends Library (London), MS vol. 314 (France MSS), no.58. Van Etten, *Chronique,* has printed the French original on pages 69-72.

[14] *Histoire des sectes religieuses* (Paris). This work went through three editions: 2 vols., 1810; 2 vols., 1814; and 6 vols., 1828-45. Grégoire died in 1831.

[15] Several of the friendly deputies consulted earlier had suggested to Marcillac that he should present Mirabeau beforehand with an outline of Quaker beliefs in French. It is not clear if this was actually done, though Marcillac, in his letter to Phillips, had expressed his intention of doing so and of sending Mirabeau as well several of William Penn's writings recently translated into French. See Dybikowski, 'E.P. Bridel', 116-9.

[16] Van Etten, *Chronique,* 78.

[17] William Rotch, *Memorandum written by William Rotch in the Eightieth Year of His Age* (Boston and New York, 1916), 52-56.

[18] Its full French text, together with that of Mirabeau's response, has been printed at least four times: *Procès-verbal de l'Assemblée Nationale, imprimé par son ordre: Douzième livraison* (Paris), vol. 46, no.558, 12-20 ('Du Jeudi 10 Février 1791, au soir'); *Pétition respectueuse des amis de la Société chrétienne, appelés Quakers, prononcée à l'Assemblée Nationale le Jeudi 10 Février 1791)* (À Paris, chez Baudouin, Imprimeur de l'Assemblée Nationale...), 7pp., Van Etten, *Chronique,* 72-78; and Jeanne-Henriette Louis, 'William Rotch, Quaker américain et les Anabaptistes-Mennonites de Salm, avocats de la liberté interieure pendant la Révolution française,' *Revue de littérature comparée* 63, (1989), 588-92. The Friends Library (London) possesses copies of early printings in pamphlet form of English translations of the two documents; see Box 33 and Box 179. Rotch, *Memorandum* also includes translations of the two documents; see 70-81. (The name of the translator is not given.) It is interesting to note also that the petition, at any rate as printed, omits the aristocratic 'de' from Marcillac's signature. See also Louis, 'La pétition presentée par Jean de Marcillac, et William et Benjamin Rotch, a l'Assemblée Nationale le 10 Février 1791', in Elise Marienstras, ed., *L'Amérique et la France: Deux révolutions* (Paris, 1990), 205-10.

[19] *Pétition respectueuse,* 3,4. I have checked my translation with several of the previous ones.

[20] Ibid., 2,3.

[21] Ibid., 4,5.

[22] Ibid., 5-7.

[23] Rotch, *Memorandum,* 56-59; Van Etten, *Chronique,* 79,80.

[24] 'L'Assemblée a ordonné l'impression de l'Adresse et de la réponse, et renvoyé au Comité de Constitution l'examen de la Pétition'. This concluding sentence of the account published in the Assembly's *Procès-verbal,* ibid., 20, was not included in the printed pamphlet, whose text has formed the basis of subsequent reprints. Thus the Assembly's recommendation that the matter be considered by the *Comité de Constitution* has escaped the attention of later researchers.

[25] A search was most kindly made on my behalf in the Archives de France (Paris) to discover if in fact the *Comité de Constitution* took any action on the Quakers' Petition. Unfortunately nothing was discovered. (See letter from Yves Beauvalot for the Directeur Général, dated 28 February 1994). The relevant documentation may have been lost. But it seems more likely, since the National Assembly was dissolved at the end of September 1791, that the *Comité* had not yet got round to considering the Petition.

[26] Letter dated 1 May 1791 (English Translation), LSF, MS vol.314 (France MSS), no.61.

[27] Letter dated 16 July 1792 to Robert Grubb and Mary Dudley, ibid., no.70. (Extracts in Van Etten, *Chronique,* 80,81.)

[28] Louis-Antoine Majolier to John Eliot, letter dated 18 August 1792, ibid., no.72. In the letter cited above (in note 27), Marcillac reports his arrest in Paris for not wearing 'the national cockade'; he felt himself lucky in obtaining a speedy release.

[29] Edmond Jaulmes, *Les Quakers français: Étude historique* (Nîmes 1898), 41.

[30] Brock, *The Quaker Peace Testimony 1660 to 1914* (York, England, 1990), 226.

[31] See, for example, the document dated 3 August 1793, cited by Charles Mathiot, *Recherches historiques sur les Anabaptistes de l'ancienne principauté de Montbéliard, d'Alsace et du territoire de Belfort* (1922). I have used the edition of 1969, with Roger Boigeol as co-author, published at Flavion (Belgium); see p.141.

[32] This is suggested as a possibility by Louis, 'William Rotch', 588. If such were indeed the case, it was certainly paradoxical, as she points out, that the Quaker Petition had proved fruitless, whereas the more obscure Mennonites were now to gain their objective, at any rate partially - 'thanks to the analogy established between them and the Quakers'.

[33] In Montbéliard indeed no militia service seems to have been demanded from anyone; see Mathiot, *Recherches,* 137, n. 196.

[34] Document dated 16 November 1792 requiring the enrolment in the National Guard of a local Mennonite farmer Peter Eicher; reprinted from the Archives du Doubs by Mathiot, *Recherches,* 138-40. Unexpectedly, on appeal this decision was overturned next year by the Council General of Doubs, which based its position in part on the favourable hearing granted the Quakers' similar stance by the National Assembly in February 1791. The Council General also took into consideration 'the quiet, secluded, and tranquil life of the Anabaptists [i.e., Mennonites], their special aptitude for agricultural work as well as for fruit-growing, their promptness in paying taxes, and the impossibility of their ever becoming disturbers of the peace.' See ibid., 140, 141.

[35] Jean Séguy, *Les assemblées anabaptistes-Mennonites de France* (Paris and The Hague, 1977), chap. 5, especially its documentary appendices. See also his brief account, *Les Mennonites dans la Révolution française* (Montbéliard, 1989).

[36] Séguy, *Les assemblées,* 359-61.

[37] Ibid., 361, 392, 393. Though from its first printing the date of the *arrêté* is given as 18 August, the correct date is almost certainly one day later. See Mathiot, *Recherches,* 142 n. 201; Séguy, *Les assemblées,* 414, n. 71.

[38] Séguy, 362; Brock, *Freedom from Violence: Sectarian Nonresistance from the Middle Ages to the Great War* (Toronto, 1991), 145.

[39] Michel L. Martin in Charles C. Moskos and John Whiteclay Chambers II, eds., *The New Conscientious Objection: From Sacred to Secular Resistance* (New York and Oxford, 1993), 82.

[40] Séguy, *Les assemblées,* 394-7.

[41] Mathiot, *Recherches,* 144, 146, 147, 150.

[42] Letter from the Ministry of War, dated 28 December 1798; cited in full in Séguy, *Les assemblées,* 398. See also ibid., 363.

[43] Alfred Michiels, *Les Anabaptistes des Vosges,* Paris, 1860, 17. Claude Jérôme, 'Les Anabaptistes-Mennonites de Salm aux XVIIIe et XIXe siècles', *L'Essor* 46, no.91 (April 1976): 18, col. 2, gives a reproduction of the original leaflet containing the text of the *arrêté.*

[44] Séguy, *Les assemblées,* 363.

[45] In fact Mennonites usually did not raise strong objections to this - provided only they were not required actually to bear arms and participate in killing.

[46] Cited in Hirst, *Quakers,* 470. Michiels, *Anabaptistes,* 18, 19, relates how on one occasion a Mennonite in the baggage train of Napoleon's army campaigning against the Prussians saved his life during a skirmish by calling out in German: 'Don't shoot at me, for my religion forbids me to defend myself.' The 'enemy' immediately recognized that he was a Mennonite and did not fire; the lad was then taken prisoner peaceably. Three months later the Prussians, familiar with Mennonite noncombatancy from the settlements of that industrious sect in the Vistula basin, let him go.

[47] M.L. Martin, ibid., n. 39, p.84: 'there were fewer than one hundred COs between 1945 and 1955, their number reached more than two hundred in the early 1960s.'

AN ANGRY GOD OR A REASONABLE FAITH: THE BRITISH SOCIETY OF FRIENDS, 1873-1888

> [It] seems at least tolerably certain that the Society of Friends must soon either cease to exist as a separate Christian sect, or put itself in harmony with the forces of Liberal opinion around it. - *The Manchester Friend,* 15 August 1873.

Late in 1872 the *Manchester Friend,* purporting 'to represent the Liberal party' in London Yearly Meeting, published a series of articles by Thomas H. Speakman (1827-1904), an American Hicksite, setting out Speakman's explanation for the continuing numerical decline of British Quakerism.[1] Speakman cited recent developments in London Yearly Meeting, including the disownment of two 'progressive' Friends, David Duncan and Edward Trusted Bennett[2], to validate his contention that British Friends had gone over to 'narrow-minded bigotry and sectarian intolerance.' Such uncomplimentary phraseology was thinly-veiled cipher for the evangelical wing of British Friends which, as Speakman saw it, was undermining the entire Society through its blind resistance to modern ideas and liberal thought. He was scarcely less critical of Britain's small but assertive body of Conservative Friends who, as Speakman believed, responded to the modern world by clinging with a death grip to outworn ideas and forms that were even less relevant than narrow evangelicalism. Thus, in Speakman's opinion, British Quakerism was an unhealthy combination of 'popular theology' drawn from the Evangelical churches and 'morbid conservatism' which turned local meetings for worship into tribal rituals consisting largely of empty silence. Speakman pictured Quaker ministers and elders, regardless of their theological stance, as persons of middle age or beyond who inevitably addressed younger Friends, especially those who expressed the slightest interest in 'the advancing intelligence of the age,' as if their very time of life was essentially evil, implying that spiritual understanding could only be acquired by those who had 'gotten over' the temptations of youth.[3]

Twentieth century Quaker historiography has generally supported

Speakman's characterization of Victorian Friends. There has also been a tendency, following the interpretation originally sketched by John Wilhelm Rowntree in the early twentieth century and more fully developed by Richenda Scott, to depict the free-thinking Manchester Friends Speakman was defending, especially their leader David Duncan, as forerunners of and spiritual soul-mates to the makers of the 'Quaker Renaissance' which transformed British Quakerism during the 1890s and early twentieth century. Duncan's disownment in 1871 has been portrayed as a particularly poignant and tragic illustration of the sort of narrow intolerance practiced by the rigidly evangelical faction which dominated London Yearly Meeting.[4]

Still, despite disturbing indications of righteous complacency or uncharitable bigotry among Duncan's evangelical foes,[5] the 'Manchester Difficulty' was more than an exercise in narrow-minded intolerance. All manner of Friends, staunch evangelicals, hidebound Conservatives and some identified as 'moderates'[6] believed, not without cause, that the ardent and aggressive Duncan and his followers were not only 'unsound' but effectively unChristian in their theological position, moving rapidly and unapologetically towards Unitarianism. The idea that the Quaker reformers of the 1890s would have been comfortable with David Duncan's theology is highly questionable and while the Duncan affair may be useful in revealing what views were *not* acceptable among the majority of British Friends in about 1870, but it is of small value in providing insight into the actual beliefs and practices of the 15,000 members of London Yearly Meeting. Not does it help to delineate, except in the most general way, battle lines in the theological struggle that gripped British Quakerism during the 1870s and 1880s.

Recently this question of belief has commanded the attention of a number of Quaker historians who, using various sorts of contemporary evidence, either for the first time or from a fresh perspective, have attempted to discover some spiritual consensus among mid– to late nineteenth century British Friends. While much of this work has been enlightening, the sometimes contradictory conclusions which have emerged also raise a number of new questions about the theological propensities of late Victorian Quakers.

Edwin Bronner's recent essay accepts the standard "liberal" view first advanced by Rufus M. Jones and generally adhered to by Elizabeth Isichei and others that a 'strong evangelical emphasis was the dominant force in British Quakerism,' but Bronner also makes the point that the real precursors to the late-Victorian purveyors of modern thought and liberal theology were not the Manchester rebels of the 1860s, but

moderate evangelicals 'who realized that London Yearly Meeting needed to change if it was to reverse the decline in numbers and regain the spiritual power which had been present in an earlier time.' Bronner sees the challenge to evangelical fundamentalism as slow and largely uncoordinated but cites certain events such as the establishment of *The Friends Quarterly Examiner* in 1867 as key developments in the gradual movement toward a more liberal consensus among late nineteenth century British Quakers.[7]

The work of the late Roger Wilson, especially his 1988 Presidential Address to the Friends Historical Society, *Manchester, Manchester and Manchester Again,* summarizes the evolution of Quaker religious and social thought between the *Beacon* controversy of the 1830s and the Manchester Conference of 1895, as seen from the perspective of one who regarded the triumph of liberal theology in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as necessary and efficacious. Wilson believed that Victorian Quakerism was in dire need of change since the compromise adopted by British Friends in the aftermath of the radically evangelical Beaconite schism was, in essence, 'a rejection of thought in the life of the Society.'[8] This was the tacit agreement, adopted to avoid another serious row, which Duncan and his followers, spoiling for a fight, failed to observe. Wilson obviously viewed the Duncanite difficulty as a watershed for nineteenth-century Quakerism in the sense that the disownment of David Duncan was clearly a Pyrrhic victory for the evangelical faction which hastened its eventual decline. In his opinion, this deterioration was immediately reflected in the refusal of Yearly Meeting to endorse a 'Declaration of Some Fundamental Principles of Christian Truth' promulgated by the Yearly Meeting Committee which had recommended Duncan's dismissal and almost certainly written by its leader, Joseph Bevan Braithwaite, the most prominent evangelical Friend of his time. This defeat, Wilson concluded, 'indicated that the evangelical stream could no longer count on carrying the theological sense of Yearly Meeting.' Thus, he saw this incident as the beginning of the end of evangelical domination in London Yearly Meeting, an illustration of growing resistance to the evangelical 'presentation of Quakerism as if its life were encapsulated year by year in its Y. M. Epistles.'[9]

An interesting counterpoint to Wilson is provided in an essay by Mollie Grubb which infers that the annual General Epistles do, in fact, 'most accurately reflect changes in [Quaker] religious thought' during the nineteenth century. Grubb argues that, far from demonstrating that evangelicalism was 'almost universally accepted by the Society,' the Epistles, from the time of the *Beacon* Controversy until about 1870,

'reveal an almost desperate desire to find refuge from the traumatic years of the early part of the century in a return to the principles and practices of early Friends.' Only after 1870, she notes, do the Epistles begin to reflect 'the austere and earnest piety of late Victorian England.'[10]

On the one hand, Mollie Grubb's conclusions concerning the unwillingness or inability of mid-Victorian evangelical Friends to impose a rigorous evangelical doctrine on the annual 'pastoral letter' to Friends supports Wilson's judgment that (until the Duncanites) Victorian Friends of all persuasions bent over backwards to avoid theological conflicts.[11] At the same time, however, Grubb's systematic analysis of nineteenth-century Epistles also implies that the state of belief among mid-Victorian Friends was far more complicated, and evangelicals far less dominant, than Bronner, Wilson and most others since Rufus Jones have indicated. But Grubb's conclusions also present difficulties. The annual Epistles were drafted through a procedure that was idiosyncratic even by Quaker standards.[12] To accept the full implications of Mollie Grubb's thesis, one would have to agree that between 1837 and about 1870, the epistles not only lacked evangelical content but also most accurately reflected the drift of religious thought in London Yearly Meeting. Existing anecdotal evidence is not conclusive as regards the general standard of belief among Friends.[13] Still, whether or not evangelical influence was as dominant as has been generally supposed in the period prior to the 1870s, it certainly can be demonstrated that during that decade and the next, evangelical Friends in Britain made repeated efforts to secure the support of London Yearly Meeting for a standardized doctrinal statement incorporating the chief tenets of evangelical theology. One purpose of this paper is to demonstration why those efforts were unsuccessful.

Boyd Hilton's estimate that the Age of Atonement in Britain ended about 1870 somewhat misses the mark for Quakerism,[14] if only because evangelical fervour arrived late among English Friends and made a tardy exit as well. Still, it was from about 1870 that Quaker evangelicals began openly to demonstrate their serious concern about the inroads of liberal theology. The ugly resolution of the Manchester Difficultly was the first fruit of this concern but certainly not its final expression. The suppression of the Manchester schism did not halt or even significantly slow liberal Quaker attacks on the ideas of the Age of Atonement. In one form or another, these assaults continued and seriously sapped the energy of ageing evangelical leaders who felt compelled to respond to them. For example, even before J.B. Braithwaite's attempt to gain Yearly Meeting endorsement for 'Declaration of Some Fundamental

Principles of Christian Truth,' Braithwaite had set out, apparently for private circulation, his *Thoughts on the Atonement,* perhaps with a view to adding these to a growing canon of 'sound' Quaker doctrine. For lawyer Braithwaite, the Atonement represented not simply the literal blood sacrifice of 'one altogether innocent' in propitiation for the sins of humanity but also a necessary revelation of God's wrath. Because Divine law had been violated through human sinfulness, Divine justice demanded that the atonement for such transgressions be accompanied by the shedding of blood, 'without which there was no remission.' This was not, Braithwaite contended, God's revenge but rather the 'active manifestation of that holiness wholly consistent with His Love....'[15]

The timing of this document is of interest, especially in light of Mollie Grubb's conclusion that it was exactly at this time that the yearly epistles become demonstrably more evangelical in tone and content. J.B. Braithwaite's *Thoughts on the Atonement* not only appeared in close proximity to the smashing of the Duncanite rebellion, but also about the time when, following the death in 1870 of Josiah Forster (who had been known as the 'Knight of the yearly epistle'), Braithwaite began, more or less independently, to exercise what Edward Milligan has called a 'tenacious grip' on the drafting of the annual General Epistle.[16] The Epistle of 1872, for instance, contains language on the Atonement which parallels or paraphrases Braithwaite's *Thoughts* set out six weeks earlier.[17] By 1879 the tendency toward strongly evangelical language had proceeded to the point of the epistle's rejection of 'any principle of spiritual light... inherent in the mind or heart of man' and pronouncement that Scripture was the only 'authentic record of the Truth of God'. This apparent repudiation of the traditional spiritual authority of the Inward Light and insistence upon Biblical inerrancy was followed by an admonition to beware of the snares of ' "advanced science" or "higher culture"... [pervading] so much of the popular reading of the present day.'[18]

The epistles of the 1880s follow a similar pattern. Indeed, that of 1881 not only saw the wrath of God as an integral part of the New as well as the Old Testament but also recalled nearly word for word the famous post-Beaconite Epistle of 1836, asserting that there was no appeal from the Scriptures 'to any other authority whatsoever' and 'that whatsoever any say or do contrary to the Scriptures, though under the profession of the immediate guidance of the Spirit, is to be accounted a mere delusion.'[19]

Such passages seem less indicative of a growing evangelical consensus among Friends than of a desperate, and ultimately unavailing, effort, orchestrated by J.B. Braithwaite and his allies, to construct an

unimpeachable doctrinal breastwork against the encroachment of "modern thought". Manifestations of the apostasy that evangelical Friends feared so deeply were not limited to the 'popular reading' of the day; they could be detected in the summaries of Quaker conferences, the articles in Quaker periodicals and the personal interaction within local meetings. A Conference called in 1873 to consider 'the State of the Society' has been characterized as equivocal, meandering and even 'waterlogged.' But even amidst the waffling and drift there was, in the view of one participant, an increased striving against 'timid submission to the power of routine and custom.'[20]

These sentiments were expressed by William Pollard (1828-1893) of Manchester to protest against what he called the 'sharply defined masses of dogmatic teaching' portending a 'gradual doctrinal drifting of the Society towards Evangelicalism.'[21] Pollard was also a leader in resisting efforts to introduce Bible reading into Quaker meetings for worship. In 1874 his Monthly Meeting, Hardshaw East, which two years earlier had disowned David Duncan, addressed a Minute to Yearly Meeting cautioning against the reading of Scripture in Friends' meetings, lest such practice 'weaken our testimony to the spirituality and simplicity of true worship, and the right authority of Gospel ministry.'[22]

As the text of yearly epistles became increasingly dogmatic and 'Protestant', William Pollard's attacks on evangelical, and, in his view, unQuakerly practices expanded. One who joined Pollard in this endeavour was Francis Frith (1822-1898), a retired Liverpool merchant and one of the pioneers of Victorian photography.[23] In 1877 Frith published a pamphlet which aggressively sought confrontation between what the author defined as two 'utterly opposed... perfectly irreconcilable' beliefs. 'Will you have Quakerism or Evangelicalism?', Frith asked: 'They are not both right. Unless the former has been throughout an utter delusion and mistake, the latter is so to a very serious extent.'[24]

In addition to such outspoken opposition, there is evidence of a underlying if silent anti-evangelical strain among Friends. In 1897 the distinguished Quaker jurist, Sir Edward Fry (1827-1918) recorded his spiritual principles 'from the watchtower of old age,' revealing his long-standing sense of alienation from many of his co-religionists of an evangelical stripe:

> it is no wonder that my religious life has been a solitary one: that I have often felt as if no one quite understood my... thoughts... I was unable to enter into the religious combinations of those by whom I have been surrounded.[25]

Attacks on evangelical doctrine and its promulgation within the Society were also apparent in a growing sense of alienation from evangelical ministry, especially among younger Friends, considerable numbers of whom were for the first time being exposed to higher education. At about the time Frith published his anti-evangelical pamphlet, Caleb Rickman Kemp, among the most earnest and active of evangelical ministers, confided to his 'Journal' a' concern about 'the want of unity with my doctrinal teaching' in the meeting where he ministered. Some Friends, Kemp noted, had vigorously objected to his insistence on denying the possibility of salvation to those 'without the household of faith.' Although deeply troubled by this 'divergence,' Kemp still believed that 'the Society at large' supported his view of the necessity for a conversion experience to ensure salvation and he was particularly relieved to discover that J.B. Braithwaite, a '*wise counsellor*... who walked with God', was 'with me in doctrinal truth.'[26] Another example of open confrontation between young Friends and elder evangelical ministers is recorded by Edward Vipont Brown, a medical student at the University of London, who recounted how he and his contemporaries chafed under the ministry of Henry Hipsley, sometimes joined by J.B. Braithwaite, at Holloway Meeting in north London. Brown recalled being admonished there for refusing to believe in the fires of hell. 'It was not Quakerism that we listened to in Holloway meeting,' Brown concluded. During Yearly Meeting in 1880, Hipsley deplored the growing tendency among younger Friends to ignore the fires of hell which, in his view, reflected the spread of 'infidelity' among better educated Quaker youth.[27]

Despite such admonitions, complaints and objections continued to trouble evangelical ministers. Shortly before Hipsley's statement at Yearly Meeting, the *Friends Quarterly Examiner,* which had just published a series of articles incorporating strong criticism of evangelical tendencies among Friends, noted the desirability of Quakerism bringing 'the inward principles upon which its outward actions are professedly based... more conspicuously... into view.'[28] Much has been made of the influence during this crucial period of *A Reasonable Faith* (1884) by 'Three Friends' (Frith, Pollard and William Edward Turner) and of Edward Worsdell's *The Gospel of Divine Help* (1886) in moving London Yearly Meeting toward a liberal consensus - and rightly so.[29] These two brief expositions of liberal theology clearly, intelligently, and not unkindly, captured at least the intellectual high ground from evangelical forces and seemed to validate many of the "progressive" theological principles upon which twentieth century British Quakerism was to be based. Both books, especially the more widely read *A Reasonable Faith,*

provided young Quakers with both support for their theological position and ammunition for their arguments against evangelicals, but the ideas embodied in these seminal works were not startlingly new doctrines which suddenly swept away a generation hitherto unenlightened or unaware. Rather they were part of a more general trend, addressing an audience that was prepared for and receptive to the message they propagated.

Thus, by the mid-1880s the lines were distinctly drawn for the struggle to determine the spiritual direction of British Quakerism. One of the most important issues upon which that struggle was fought was the question of "extension" or Home Missions. The first round of this contest began in 1875 with the appointment of a Committee on General Meetings. General Meeting was a Quaker euphemism for the sort of revival which had become popular among Midwestern Friends in post-Civil War America. In addition to an abundance of emotional sermonizing, such events inevitably included such unQuakerly innovations as Bible reading and hymnsinging. They were intended to provide British Quakerism with the same sort of spiritual outreach through which Revivalist Friends in America had garnered a considerable harvest of convincements.[30] By 1879 the General Meetings Committee, including such evangelical stalwarts as J.B. Braithwaite and Caleb Kemp, reported 'that numbers of people have been truly converted' through such General Meetings as had been held, but many of these newly rescued believers had either joined other denominations or 'gone back to the world' because of the lack of sustained Quaker ministry.[31]

In response to such pleas, the original Committee was eventually replaced by a smaller Home Mission Committee composed of the evangelical core of the previous body. Among the stated objectives of the new Committee was the provision of monetary and other support which would permit those 'having the gift of ministry' to devote themselves full time to evangelistic work on behalf of the Society. The first mission workers labouring under the supervision of the Home Mission Committee enjoyed sufficient success to justify an expansion of their numbers, but these were never as large as the enthusiasm of their evangelical supporters. On the other hand, there were Friends who questioned whether the separate identity of their religious Society was not in danger of being subordinated to the vision of an aggressive minority bent on dragging Quakerism into a welter of undistinguished and undistinguishable evangelical sects and justifying its continued existence, not on the spiritual insights of early Friends, but in the assumption of a leading role in the struggle to hold back the main

currents of modern religious and scientific thought. Opponents of the new thrust of Home Mission activities perceived an ominous determination to build up a new form of Quaker ministry, waiting not upon the Light but upon the fashions and fancies of a religious tradition alien to Friends. As Home Mission work expanded, it became 'a fruitful source of friction' within London Yearly meeting.[32]

The chief concern of those opposed to the thrust of Home Mission activities was that they would result in the establishment of a professional Quaker pastorate in the American revivalist mould.[33] These critics believed that such a development denied their Society's historical rejection of hireling ministers while simultaneously presenting its message as a warmed-over version of mainstream evangelical Protestantism. This opposition, manifesting itself with growing size and confidence in successive Yearly Meetings,[34] was centered upon well-educated younger people who envisioned a modern Society of Friends able to incorporate the most up-to-date discoveries of science and history into a living faith precisely because it did not require adherence to sort of dogmatic creed that evangelicals demanded.[35] During the late 1880s the debate over the direction of Home Missions merged with the question of dogma to produce a decisive moment for British Quakerism, its rejection of the Richmond Declaration of Faith.

The Richmond Declaration had its origin in a crisis among American Friends precipitated by the radical or 'holiness' faction which not only welcomed a professional Quaker clergy but also sought to abolish traditional Quaker prohibitions against 'water Baptism' and the physical partaking of the lord's supper.[36] The challenge of this Ordinance or 'water party' to the leadership of the revivalist evangelicals who dominated Midwestern and Western American Yearly Meetings was met by an international Conference of Orthodox Yearly Meetings, including Dublin and London.[37] Held at Richmond, Indiana, stronghold of Midwestern Quakerism, in September 1887, these proceedings, although not free from controversy, had the desired unifying effect. While refraining from condemnation of any particular group, the Conference upheld traditional Quaker rejection of outward sacraments. Its crowning act was the decision to issue a Declaration of Faith, setting out the corpus of Quaker beliefs in the hope that this would halt the prevailing tendency towards dissension, division and, ultimately, perhaps even disintegration.

Seeking both weighty authority and broad consensus, the Conference turned to Joseph Bevan Braithwaite, one of the London delegates, to frame the statement. Swiftly and almost singlehandedly,[38] Braithwaite produced what he described as 'simply a gathering up from existing

authenticated documents of the testimony of Friends... to the fullness which is in Christ.' J.B.B. held that, far from being a novelty, such 'declaratory statements of Christian doctrine' had been issued even by the first generation of Friends.[39] A century later Quaker historians have attested to the validity of Braithwaite's view, characterizing his Declaration as 'a clear, scripturally based statement of belief... far more traditional... than its critics often allow' or as 'a monument to the impact of evangelical thought in the Society.'[40] Recently, one American Friend called the Declaration 'a valiant effort to bring unity among the then largest segment of Friends in America...', containing much that could be affirmed 'on sound historical grounds.'[41] Contemporary critics were, however, likely to see it in a more partisan, less generous spirit. In his *Latter periods of Quakerism* Rufus M. Jones, who became the leading American spokesman for the New Theology, recalled the statement as 'a relic of the past...' which 'made no effort to interpret Christianity to this age... [and] reflected no sign of the prevailing intellectual difficulties over questions of science and history.' In England the distinguished Quaker historian Thomas Hodgkin called it a 'goody, goody, determined to be orthodox, vapid and diffuse confession of Faith.'[42]

The Richmond Declaration was endorsed by most American Yearly Meetings,[43] but when J.B. Braithwaite brought his "creed," as critics immediately termed it, back to Britain for certification, he stirred up a nest of opposition which would eventually prove to be a decisive factor in the overthrowing of the evangelical oligarchy which had controlled at least the machinery of London Yearly Meeting for half a century.

Late in 1887, John William Graham, B.A., London, M.A., Cambridge, and at age 28, newly appointed tutor at Dalton Hall, Manchester, expressed concern to his parents about Braithwaite's 'trying to give us a *creed.*'

> It would be a grievous calamity and would split the Society if carried; but *everybody* is against it, including Evangelicals such as W.S. Lean and J.B. Hodgkin, so I think there is not much fear. Still, the Y. M. should be strengthened by genuine Friends going up... It will mean a presidential defeat when Bevan returns.[44]

Opposition to the Richmond Declaration was most obvious and vociferous among well-educated younger Friends like Graham and young Roger Fry, then a student at Cambridge, who expressed the opinion that 'the creed... would be a death blow to Quakerism in its present form...'[45] Certainly, the younger generation have subsequently been given considerable credit for finally convincing London Yearly

Meeting of the document's unacceptability. But it may be that a developing Quaker mythology, partly self-constructed, has given these younger people more celebrity and acclaim for the decisiveness of their contributions than they deserve, at least in so far as they have been depicted as leaders of a beleaguered minority rousing the forces of progress for a do or die struggle against evangelical reaction. In fact, resistance to the adoption of any sort of credo appears to have been broadly based from the beginning and to have included many older and at least moderately evangelical Friends.[46]

The fate of the Richmond Declaration in Britain was decided by London Yearly Meeting in late May 1888 in a day-long session during which, according to one participant, '[n]ot one bitter or unkind word was uttered.'[47] John W. Graham provided his sister with a lively and detailed description of the proceedings.

> The Creed Debate was a glorious success, and my mind is immensely relieved and really quite jolly! There were, on my own counting, 1100 people of both sexes, crowding every seat & aisle & doorway of the large Meeting House.

The debate lasted for five hours and over 60 individuals 'made definite speeches,' including Graham himself, who spoke for

> about 10 mins... and felt intensely relieved & much backed up by feeling the sympathy of all the younger people in the galleries round. My voice seemed to fill the Meeting easily... At intervals the Clerk [Joseph Storrs Fry] stopped the men and asked some lady to speak. On the whole the women speakers helped us; & their presence certainly did. The minute was most satisfactory. It gave no shadow of sanction to the document & said why - (1) We had never decided before the deputation went [to Richmond] that we wanted a creed. (2) We are not allowed to change this. (3) Many Friends object to its contents.[48]

Graham's exultation at his personal success and that of the Cause can obviously be contrasted with Joseph Bevan Braithwaite's disappointment and chagrin at the result:

> there were some[,] to me, very *painful* exhibitions, from *W.S. Lean,* Jno. W. Graham, Edwd Grubb & some others, yet we were helped through better than might have been expected. The prejudice has been stimulated in a high degree against a "creed"; the Declaration is printed in the body of our proceedings, but no judgment is made upon it.[49]

A judgment had of course been made and it changed the British Society of Friends forever. The Angry God of the Age of Atonement

had been ushered out of the Large Meeting Room at Devonshire House and been replaced by a kinder, gentler but infinitely more elusive Deity. The process by which this transformation took place was more gradual and less traumatic than has sometimes previously been depicted. It was natural rather than revolutionary, a product of changing social and educational standards among Friends, not of startling theological innovations. By the same token, the picture of an isolated and embattled youthful minority swaying their elders through the eloquence of their words and the depth of their sincerity also needs to be modified. The young women and men who opposed the Richmond Declaration may have been on shaky historical ground, but they were on the winning side, and, for the most part, they would continue to be in so far as the theological and social drift of British Quakerism was concerned. The tone of some British Quaker meetings may have remained strongly evangelical well into the twentieth century, but the successful struggle of liberal Friends against the imposition of a pastoral system, the expanding influence of 'modern thought' as illustrated by Manchester Conference of 1895 and the outspoken leadership of younger Friends such as John Wilhelm Rowntree, Edward Grubb, W.C. Braithwaite and others gave liberal Friends increasing assurance that they were not only in tune with the times, but with the future of British Quakerism as well.

Thomas C. Kennedy

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1] Speakman's articles were published between October 1872 and December 1873. By that time the membership of London Yearly Meeting had slowly begun to increase after reaching its low point of less than 14,000 members during the mid-1860s. Also see Edwin B. Bronner, *'The Other Branch': London Yearly Meeting and the Hicksites, 1827-1912* (London 1975), 32-33.

[2] The latest and most detailed discussion of the Duncan affair is Thomas C. Kennedy, 'Heresy-Hunting Among Victorian Quakers: the Manchester Difficulty, 1861-1873,' *Victorian Studies,* 34/2 (winter 1991), 227–53; for the E.T. Bennett case, see Edward H. Milligan, ' 'In Reason's Ear': Some Quaker and Anglican Perplexities', *Friends Quarterly,* 23 (1984), 384-96.

[3] *Manchester Friend,* I/12, 15 Nov. 1872, 186. Speakman was not being entirely fair for this concern had not gone unnoticed among British Quakers. In 1868 the Yearly Meeting Epistle on Meetings for Discipline suggested that older Friends 'look all around and see if any... younger friends... in the freshness of religious feeling, may not perform much of the needed service.' See *Minutes and Proceedings of the Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1868,* (hereinafter *MPYMF,* with year), 40-1.

[4] A copy of the outline for J.W. Rowntree's projected history of Quakerism in the Rufus M. Jones Papers at Haverford College includes an entire chapter on the

Manchester schism and David Duncan's role in it. Also see Richenda C. Scott, 'Authority or Experience: John Wilhelm Rowntree and the Dilemma of Nineteenth Century British Quakerism', *Journal of the Friends Historical Society 49* (1960), 75-95. Rufus Jones did not even mention Duncan or the difficulty in Hardshaw East Monthly Meeting in his semi-official history of *The Latter Periods of Quakerism* (1921).

[5] See, for example, Mary Hodgson's wrenching commentary to Elizabeth Green on Joseph Bevan Braithwaite's arrogantly uncharitable conduct as the dominant member of the Yearly Meeting Committee that recommended David Duncan be disowned by Hardshaw East Monthly Meeting, 12 August and 15 November 1871, Portfolio A 59 and 60, Library of the Society of Friends, London [hereafter LSF], and Braithwaite's privately enthusiastic response to Duncan's untimely death in his 'Journals and Commentaries [1865-76]', 197-201, MS Box 9.1 (6), LSF. Also see Kennedy, 'Heresy-Hunting', 242-51 *passim.*

[6] See Edwin B. Bronner, 'Moderates in London Yearly Meeting, 1857-1873: Precursors of Quaker Liberals', *Church History* 59 (Sept. 1990), 356-71.

[7] Bronner, 'Moderates', 357, 364.

[8] Roger C. Wilson, 'Friends in the Nineteenth Century,' *Friends Quarterly,* 23/8 (October 1984), 356.

[9] Roger C. Wilson, *Manchester, Manchester, and Manchester Again,* Presidential Address to the Friends Historical Society, 12 November 1988 (London 1990), 26, 29.

[10] Mollie Grubb, 'Tensions in the Religious Society of Friends in England in the Nineteenth Century', *The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society,* Volume 56/1 (1990), 2, 10. Edwin Bronner takes issue with Mollie Grubb on the grounds of her failure either to appreciate evangelical use of early Friends to support Scriptural authority or to distinguish between the evangelical usage of Holy Spirit in the sense of a conversion experience and the traditional Quaker use of 'Inward Light' as consistent and universal Divine Indwelling. Unpublished comments seen by courtesy of Professor Bronner.

[11] There was a small group of Conservative Friends in Fritchley Meeting who, in 1870, protesting against evangelical tendencies in London Yearly Meeting, followed John G. Sargent in a separation which lasted well into the twentieth century.

[12] For a discussion of the appointment and composition of the so-called Large Committee which drafted the Epistle and was, in practice, very small, see Edward H. Milligan, 'To Friends Everywhere': Reflections on the Epistle in the Life of London Yearly Meeting', *Friends Quarterly,* 22/11 (July 1982), 724-36.

[13] The handwritten 'Reflections' of Laura Jane Moore (1870-1955) would seem to support both points of view. Moore described the uncle and aunt who raised her as 'Friends of the prevalent type of the time, a mixture of old-fashioned Quakerism, inherited through generations from the time of George Fox, and then modern evangelicalism of the later years of the Evangelical Revival...'[5]. I am grateful to Henry Ecroyd for making this material available to me.

[14] Boyd Hilton, *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought, 1795-1865* (Oxford 1988).

[15] J.B. Braithwaite, 'Thoughts on the Atonement', 11 April 1872, lithographic copy of handwritten original, MS Port. 8/126, LSF. An expanded version of these 'Thoughts' was published nearly 20 years later in the *Friends Quarterly Examiner,* 24 (1890), 103-120.

[16] Milligan, 'To Friends Everywhere', 730-31.

[17] The Epistle, for example, quotes Hebrews (ix, 22): 'without shedding of blood, there is no remission.' *MPYMF, 1872,* 26-31.

[18] *MPYMF, 1879,* 39-41 and Grubb, 'Tensions', 12.

[19] *MPYMF, 1881,* 36.

[20] Wilson, *Manchester,* 28-29; Bronner, 'Moderates', 370-71; and William Pollard, 'The Recent Friends Conference in London,' pamphlet in Box 414/22, LSF. Pollard's reflections on the conference were also published in *The Friends Quarterly Examiner* in 1874.

[21] William Pollard, 'Thoughts for the Next Yearly Meeting', *FQE,* 5 (1871), 293 and *MF,* I/7, 15 June 1872, 109-110. Pollard believed that he brought a healing influence to Mount Street Meeting in the uneasy aftermath of the Duncanite division. See Pollard's entry in 'Dictionary of Quaker Biography', LSF and Wilson, *Manchester,* 30.

[22] Pollard, 'Recent Friends Conference', 10 and Minute 3, 15-16 April 1874, Minutes, Lancashire and Cheshire Quarterly Meeting, Lancashire Record Office (LRO), Preston. Pollard was the head of the committee which recommended this minute. See Wilson, *Manchester,* 30.

[23] See Beryl Williams, 'Francis Frith (1822-1898)', *The Friends' Quarterly,* 23/8 (October 1984), 364-70. For Frith's work as a photographer, see Bill Jay, *Victorian Cameraman: Francis Frith's Views of Rural England, 1850-1898* (Newton Abbott 1973).

[24] Francis Frith, *'Evangelicalism' From the Stand Point of the Society of Friends* (London 1877), 8, 27-8.

[25] Sir Edward Fry and Agnes Fry, *A Memoir of the Right Honorable Sir Edward Fry...* (London 1921), 165, 167.

[26] Caleb R. Kemp, 'Journals', IV, 31 Dec. 1876, 107-08, 16 Jan. 1877, 112-14 and 18 Feb. 1877, 116, MS Vol S7, LSF.

[27] E.V. Brown, 'The Renaissance of Quakerism,' *FQ,* 5/14 (Oct. 1951), 202-03. Also see Roger Wilson, 'Friends in the Nineteenth Century', *FQ,* 23/8 (Oct 1984), 359.

[28] *FQE,* January 1880, 1. William C. Westlake (1822-1887), listed by Bronner among the 'active moderates,' was editor of the *FQE* at this time.

[29] See the special centenary issue of *The Friends Quarterly* (1984) which was entirely devoted to a discussion of these works and their impact on British Friends over the past century.

[30] See Malcolm J. Thomas, 'The Committee on General Meetings, 1875-83' in *A Quaker Miscellany for Edward H. Milligan,* edited by David Blamires, Jeremy Greenwood and Alexander Kerr (Manchester 1985), 133-43 and Thomas D. Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism, Orthodox Friends, 1800-1907* (Bloomington, Ind. 1988), 74-97.

[31] Quoted in Thomas, 'General Meetings', 138.

[32] See Minutes, Friends Home Mission Committee (FHMC), 1882-1884, LSF; Roger Wilson, 'The Road to Manchester 1895', in *Seeking the Light: Essays in Quaker History in Honor of Edwin B. Bronner,* edited by J. William Frost and John M. Moore (Wallingford and Haverford, Pa. 1986), 146; and Edward Grubb, *Quakerism in England* (London 1901), 15.

[33] In 1886 six Home Mission workers were receiving support; by 1892 their numbers had grown to 42 and their annual subsidy to £3,500. See *Is There Not a Cause?: The Society of Friends and the late Home Mission Conference* (London 1893), 29. This anonymous pamphlet, which was extremely critical of Home Mission activities, was probably written by John W. Graham.

[34] See, for example, reports of Yearly Meeting debates on Home Missions by John W. Graham to his parents, 26 May 1887 and 29 May 1888, Box 7, John William Graham Papers (JWGP), John Rylands Library (JRL), University of Manchester.

[35] Younger Friends who were most prominent in their opposition to the evangelical influence on the Home Mission Committee included two of J.B. Braithwaite's sons, J.B. Jr., a stockbroker and William Charles who practiced law in his father's chambers. Others were Silvanus P. Thompson, a physicist, teacher and future member of the Royal Society, E. Vipont Brown, a physician in Manchester, and his brother Alfred, as well as John William Graham, Alfred Neave Brayshaw, Edward Grubb and J. Rendel Harris. Each of the latter three were university educated or affiliated. See E. Vipont Brown, 'The Renaissance of Quakerism', *Friends Quarterly,* 1951, 204-06.

[36] The justification for supporting such 'Ordinances' was that these sacraments had Scriptural sanction. For the Ordinance controversy among American Friends, see Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism,* 130-37.

[37] Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, then dominated by Wilburite (Conservative) Friends, was not officially represented, but some Gurneyite (evangelical) members attended. No Hicksites were invited.

[38] A committee of 12 was appointed to draft the declaration, but J.B. Braithwaite, assisted by James E. Rhoads, President of Bryn Mawr College, and James Carey Thomas of Baltimore Yearly Meeting, did most of the work. It seems clear that the Declaration was largely written before the Conference began; it probably owed something to the document produced by J.B.B. and other members of the Visitors' Committee in the wake of the David Duncan affair. See Allen Jay, *Autobiography* (Philadelphia [1912]), 361-62.

[39] J. Bevan Braithwaite, 'Notes on the Richmond Conference, 1887', *FQE,* 22 (1888), 272-88, see especially 280, 285. H. Larry Ingle's provocative essay 'On the Folly of Seeking the Quaker Holy Grail', *Quaker Religious Thought,* 25/1 May 1991), 26n.1 notes various creedal statements published by George Fox: 'each one as time went on sounding more and more orthodox.'

[40] Punshon, *Portrait in Grey,* 203 and Hamm, *Transformation of American Quakerism,* 137.

[41] Wilmer A. Cooper in *Quaker Religious Thought* no.78 25/4 (July 1992), 43. Also see Mark Minnear, *Richmond 1887: A Quaker Drama Unfolds* (Richmond 1987).

[42] Jones, *Latter Periods,* II, 931; Hodgkin is quoted by Hope Hay Hewison, 'Human Progress and the Inward Light', *The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* 56/2 (1991), 137.

[43] Ohio, Iowa and Western Yearly Meetings rejected it for varying and sometimes contradictory reasons; Philadelphia (Orthodox) would not even consider it.

[44] J.W. Graham to parents, 5 Nov. and 4 Dec. 1887, Box 7, J.W.G.P., JRL, Manchester. William Scarnell Lean (1833-1908), principal of Flounders Institute, 1870-1899 is listed as an 'active moderate' by Bronner, 'Moderates in L.Y.M.', 367; Jonathan Backhouse Hodgkin (1843-1926) was an influential evangelical minister and author, often associated with J.B. Braithwaite.

[45] Roger Fry to father [Sir Edward Fry], 6 May 1888, Temp. MSS. 587/1-2, LSF. Also see Fry to mother, 18 March 1888, ibid.

[46] W.S. Lean and Jonathan Backhouse Hodgkin are noted above. Also see Richard Westlake, 'The Richmond Conference', *FQE* 22 (1888), 148-49, an extremely critical article by the editor of the *Friends Quarterly Examiner* and Joseph Rowntree's *Memorandum on the Declaration of Christian Doctrine issued by the Richmond Conference,*

1887 (York: Privately printed, 1888), a point by point refutation of the 'Declaration' printed at the author's expense (and in a financially troubled time for his chocolate firm).

47 Edward Grubb, *Quakerism in England,* 8.

48 J.W. Graham to Agnes [Graham], 31 May 1888, Box 7, JWGP, JRL, Manchester.

49 J.B. Braithwaite, 'Journals, 1883-1890', 21 June 1988, 289, LSF. Roger Wilson believed that Braithwaite and his evangelical allies were relatively unperturbed by the rejection of the Richmond Declaration because they were still confident of their influence over the majority of the membership in London Yearly Meeting. See Wilson, 'The Road to Manchester', 147.

THE MANCHESTER CONFERENCE AND A MEMOIR OF SILVANUS P. THOMPSON.

MANCHESTER 1895.

FOURTH DAY, ELEVENTH MONTH. 13TH.

This was the occasion of one of the busiest days in a very busy conference, lasting three days. This year, 1995, the Society of Friends in Britain is remembering the centenary of this event. To use the nineteenth-century Quaker language for the date may make it seem a long time ago, firmly set in an out-moded tradition, and consequently irrelevant to the present day. This is far from the truth. In fact, it was set in the middle of the 'Quaker Renaissance' and the topics discussed could well form the agenda for a modern day conference:-e.g. on this 'Fourth Day'

(a) (morning and afternoon) 'The Attitude of the Society of Friends to Social Questions'.

(b) (evening) 'The Attitude of the Society of Friends to Modern Thought'.

Topics which were considered in the other sessions included:

'Has Quakerism a Message to the World To-day?'

'The More Effectual Presentation of Spiritual Truths.'

'The Vitalising of our Meetings for Worship.'

It is clear that London Yearly Meeting had decided to have a wide ranging look at the current state of the Society of Friends and to consider possible ways forward for the future. It had undertaken the task at the suggestion of the Friends Home Mission Committee, meeting in February 1895. The relevant Minute of the Committee includes the following:

> We have had laid before us in an interesting way the comparative ignorance and misconceptions which exist around us, as to the Society of Friends, and the importance of concerted action in the endeavour to dissipate the mistaken views to some extent current... The needs of the thoughtful and educated young people of our society have been adverted to, as well as those who are disposed to think that they obtain more religious help in other Societies than our own...

This Minute, except for a little difference of language, might well have

been written today. The circumstances have changed over 100 years, but the considerations of 1895 are by no means irrelevant to 1995.

This article will be restricted to the session on the evening of Wednesday, November 13th; followed by a memoir of one of those who contributed an important paper at that session. This is Silvanus P. Thompson, a distinguished scientist, who has always been better known outside the Society than in it.

THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS AND MODERN THOUGHT.

The second half of the nineteenth century had experienced large changes in thought in particular in the realms of religion and of science. This had been a matter of considerable concern for the various religious denominations. For example, in 1860, seven distinguished members of the Church of England issued a publication called 'Essays and Reviews' which was "liberal" in tone and the essayists asked for freedom of thought in biblical research and dogmatic interpretations. This work aroused strong feelings (including a protest signed by 11,000 clergymen).

Friends were rather later in publishing a critical approach on similar lines. Then there appeared:

(a) in 1884; *A Reasonable Faith,* by 'Three Friends' (the three were well-known Friends, but preferred to remain anonymous at first.)

(b) in 1887, *The Gospel of Divine Help,* by Edward Worsdell. The author was very concerned about the way Friends were drifting away from the Society. He tells of many 'who drifted reluctantly into Unitarianism or Agnosticism, largely through failing to distinguish between the teaching of Christ and the assertions of theologians. And I know of a much larger number who, while retaining their faith in Christ, are sorely perplexed by much which they suppose they are, as Christians, bound to believe.' Traditionalists of Christian faith within the Society of Friends were naturally worried that such thinking might be undermining their roots and threatening their certainties.

During the same period there had been new scientific discoveries and changes in thinking. The greatest impact had been from ideas of evolution, following Darwin's publications (1859 and onwards) which threatened the traditional religious teaching on the creation and the nature of humankind. Also, there had been developments in physical science, which appeared to be questioning the solidity and the permanence of the material world. The culmination of this was the

publication in 1895 (the very same year as the Manchester Conference) of the discovery of radioactivity and of X-Rays.

Such developments in religion and science were part of the reason for the conference and, in particular, for the inclusion of the session on 'Modern Thought'. In this session the three key addresses were by J. Rendel Harris, Silvanus P. Thompson, and John William Graham. They were all among the younger members taking an active part in the conference, about 40 years of age. Rendel Harris was already a theologian and biblical scholar of repute who held the post of Professor of Theology at Leyden University and later became the first Director of Studies at Woodbrooke. Two quotations will serve to illustrate his approach to bible study and to the relation between science and religion:-

(a) We have been told in these meetings that the Scriptures are the ultimate test of truth; if that un-Quakerly proposition be true, the criticism of them is gross impertinence; but the internal discords of all Scripture, and of all explanation of Scripture, ought to be enough to convince us that there is no infallibility in the house, not a drop!

(b) The theory of the detachment of science and religion from one another has never been a working theory of the universe; the two areas must overlap and blend, or we are lost... We must not pretend that science has nothing to do with the Bible or theology. The theory of compartments is a hopeless one.

As we shall see, such ideas caused distress to many Friends in the meeting.

John William Graham was also a bible scholar. While his address was less provocative than that of Rendel Harris, he left no doubt that Quakers should welcome the conclusions of modern thought applied to the Bible. He compared the scholarly work on the Bible with the 'process of restoration of an ancient church, covered formerly with a uniform coat of speckless and infallible whitewash... after restoration we can understand its history and what it has undergone over the years.' 'The old building, with all its rugged edges, its patched up gaps and its evident repairs, is before us in many styles of architecture... We really know it now and for the first time... All this George Fox and Robert Barclay would have welcomed.' In conclusion, however, he takes pains to reassure 'any fearful ones' (i.e. the traditionalists of his day) with the words of Jesus: 'Think not I come to destroy the law and the prophets. I come not to destroy, but to fulfil'.

(The address by Silvanus Thompson came between those of Rendel Harris and John William Graham, but consideration of this is deferred until the second part of this article.

There was no time for discussion before the end of this long session of the Conference. However, there were a few closing remarks by Friends, which were recorded in the *Proceedings*. They show the tension which had grown in The Society of Friends arising from 'Modern Thought'. However, one at least speaks for those Friends who recognised and were ready for the change:-

(1) I heartily support the proposal [that there was no time for profitable discussion]... on the understanding that many of us don't agree with many of the things that have been said.
(2) I believe the last point must be emphasised, or many of us will go home exceedingly burdened. If all these things go forth to the public as the views of the Society of Friends, the position will be exceedingly serious...

but also:

(3) Many of us feel that never in our lives have we so appreciated the privilege of being Quakers as tonight.
(4) Many of us feel that there is widespread sympathy with these papers read tonight, especially amongst our younger Friends.

SILVANUS P. THOMPSON (1851-1916)

The paper which Silvanus Thompson gave at the Manchester Conference was entitled: 'Can a Scientific Man be a Sincere Friend?' This paper serves as a good introduction to his thinking. He was a scientist of international repute, but the paper also shows how deep and scholarly was his knowledge of the history and thought of Christianity and of religion generally. While he was pungently critical of how, under ecclesiastical influence, Christianity had developed away from the original Christian gospel, he remained a fully committed Christian.

Naturally, he gave an affirmative answer to the question posed in his title; though, in fact, he was not so categorical as Rendel Harris about the blending of the realms of science and religion. Still, he was very clear about the methods of scientific thought and the way in which it could and should be applied to religion. 'The truly scientific attitude of mind,' he said, 'may be very well expressed by borrowing the apostolic phrase: "Prove [i.e. 'test'] all things; hold fast that which is good." he speaks of 'the touchstone of experiment', which should be applied to all statements of fact; their truth should not be accepted solely on past authority, however respected. Medieval science, which he had studied closely, contained many errors passed down and accepted 'on authority'

by succeeding generations. He gives one amusing example, which is worth quoting:- 'We find in the writing of Plutarch that if a magnet be rubbed with garlic or touched with a diamond, it loses its power of attracting iron, until such time as it is restored by being dipped in the blood of a he-goat. We all know now that the statement, though repeated again and again in medieval books on physics, us utterly false.' This is typical of his approach to his scientific work; he was a great teacher and a fine experimenter. What follows is a brief record and assessment of his life and work.

There have been only two biographical accounts of him. The really important definitive one is *Life and Letters of Silvanus Thompson,* written by his widow and his daughter, Helen; the latter was also a physicist and so was particularly qualified to assess his scientific work. This book gives a vivid and arresting portrait of him in all his activities and interests. The other is a small booklet, by Prof. James Grieg, *Silvanus P. Thompson, Teacher,* which was commissioned by the Science Museum and published in 1979.

EDUCATION AND EARLY TEACHING POSTS (1851-1885)

Silvanus Thompson came of a Quaker family and was educated at Bootham School, where his father was a teacher. He trained as a teacher at the Flounders Institute, a Quaker Training College and returned for some years to Bootham. This could not provide enough to satisfy his scientific ability so, after a year's study and research in London, he accepted a post at University College Bristol as a Lecturer in Physics. He stayed there for nine years, becoming a Professor and continuing research in Electricity and Magnetism. He found the working conditions increasingly inadequate, so when the post of Principal of Finsbury Technical College was advertised, he applied and was appointed at the early age of 34.

FINSBURY TECHNICAL COLLEGE (1885-1916)

For a University Professor to take a post at a Technical College would have been thought by many to be a come-down. Silvanus Thompson thought differently. He was a great educator and the provision of a first class education for technical students who were going straight into industry was a project close to his heart. The course of study was aimed exclusively at equipping students for a practical career in science or

engineering. He firmly resisted any suggestion that his brighter students should be entered for external academic examinations... In a Report to the Governors of the College, presented five years after his appointment, he described uncompromisingly the principles on which the College was working:-

> The course of instruction is thoroughly practical... The College exists to give a *training,* not to enable persons to cram for examinations; the College does not undertake to prepare any person to pass any examinations whatsoever...

He is referring here to *external examinations.* The College set its own examinations, which were taken seriously, and for which hard work and commitment were demanded. Consequently, the acquisition of a Finsbury Certificate was something respected in the industrial world. Finsbury students were likely to get good posts and one would find them in senior positions on the Continent as well as in Britain.

It was the personality of Silvanus Thompson which obtained this success. He required high standards of work; he demanded and received loyalty to the College. It is significant that there was a strong and vital Old Students Association.

SCIENTIFIC WORK AND PUBLICATIONS

The 31 years he spent at Finsbury College were the productive years of his scientific life. His great ability lay on the experimental side of science and in communication of this to others. Although he was not primarily a theoretical research scientist, he was always close to the latest advances. For example, in February 1895 (the same year as the Manchester Conference) he observed the radiation which was being given off by uranium compounds. This radiation was observed simultaneously, but independently, by Becquerel in France. The latter was the first to publish his results, so Silvanus Thompson could not be credited with the discovery of radioactivity. In the same year, he was involved in the investigation of X-Rays, just discovered by Röntgen. In 1897 the Röntgen Society was formed, of which Silvanus Thompson was the first President. (Celebrations of Röntgen are due to take place this year, 1995, and memories of Silvanus Thompson will be revived).

He became widely known and respected for his contributions to the practical development of electricity and magnetism. He was President of the Institute of Electrical Engineers and his memory is still very much alive in their headquarters in London. He had many other contacts in the

area of electrical engineering; for example, he was a consultant to the Hampstead Battery Company, and his house was one of the first which this company lit by electricity.

He was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1891 and the Society's obituary notice contains this comment:

> Since 1878, his papers on scientific subjects are very numerous... These papers, of which 166 may be regarded as important, are mainly on light and electricity.

He published a number of scientific books. He wrote biographies of Faraday and of Kelvin; of his textbooks the most notable was *Dynamo-electric Machinery,* which ran into many editions and became the standard reference book on the subject. Sir Ernest Rutherford comments: 'I can well recall the strong impression left on me by the exceedingly clear, simple and logical statement of the essentials of a complex subject.' In fact, simplicity and clarity were the characteristics of all his writings. Probably the best known of all his books is *Calculus made Easy,* developed from his lectures to Finsbury students and written with characteristic wit. His introduction is a joy to read. The appeal of this book is such that it was still being published in 1979.

SILVANUS THOMPSON AND THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

The above account is by no means inclusive of all his scientific activities and his public involvements, so it is not surprising that he found little time for active work among Friends. He was, however, a dedicated Friend throughout his life. He had a deep knowledge of Quakerism and its Christian roots and was one of those in the forefront of the 'Quaker Renaissance'. He made a friendship with Edward Grubb in his early Bristol days, a friendship which remained close throughout their lives. He joined Westminster Meeting in 1885 and was appointed an Elder in 1889. Although his ministry in Meeting was much valued, he was not a 'Recorded Minister' until 1903. This apparent delay is probably because many more traditional Friends felt that he was unsound in Quaker doctrine. For example, one phrase which he used at the Manchester Conference and on other occasions, namely the importance of 'honest, sacred doubt', may have caused anxiety. John William Graham, in his obituary notice says:

> He was a sound and earnest Friend, a weighty and valued minister. He had some torch-bearing to do and some accusation of heresy to suffer under in a period happily gone by; that needed courage and faithfulness.

Silvanus Thompson was unswerving in his opposition to all war, as inconsistent with the teaching and spirit of Christ. He was strongly critical of the Boer War and of the acquiescence towards it: e.g. 'Few clergy have glimpsed even yet the elementary truth... of the teachings of Jesus Christ, that *all revenge is wrong*... And that a warrior, who is capable of the barbaric deed of devastating a whole province - whether from the Tyne to the Humber or from the Vaal to the Orange River -whether he be called William of Normandy or Kitchener of Khartoum, [is wrong.] Where is the orthodox clergyman who has... dared to characterise his exploit as an inhuman crime?'

The contribution he made to Friends was more through his personality than through a multiplicity of writings. In 1907 he gave the Swarthmore Lecture on 'The Quest for Truth', a title which epitomises both his scientific and his religious ethos. The only other Quaker publication as a book was *A Not Impossible Religion.* This was published in 1918, after his death, but the title is his own. It contains a number of essays and addresses, which still have an appeal; especially to those who, while not wishing to abandon their religious faith, find that it is not satisfied by traditional Christian doctrines.

Apart from the Manchester Conference address, there are two notable public addresses:

(a) 'Christ in Modern Life'. This was the subject chosen by the Society of Friends, to be delivered in various cities of northern England in 1905, when the Yearly Meeting was held in Leeds (the first time for 200 years out of London). Silvanus was asked to give the address in Liverpool.

(b) 'Agnosticism and Christianity', delivered in Birmingham in 1908.

Both of these addresses are readable and enlightening.

He was apt to finish his addresses with a peroration, which might appear wordy to modern ears; however, part of that which ended his Manchester address is worth quoting, for it provides a good illustration of his dedication and devotion to Friends:

> Being Friends, we are, to the unspeakable gain of our souls, preserved alike from those diseased word-battlings which afflict so many honest... but less enlightened Christians, and from the torturing fear that science may one day undermine our faith... We have learnt that... a man's religion is not that which he professes, but that which he lives.

Silvanus Thompson was a man of varied abilities and interests, beyond what has been possible to relate in this memoir. To appreciate his qualities fully, it is really necessary to read the *Life and Letters,* by his widow and daughter.

Among these abilities were: a knowledge of foreign languages (he could lecture to Italian engineers in their own language); and a considerable artistic skill with pen and water-colour. His library was extensive and very wide in interest. Many of his books, including some rare old ones, are housed in the London headquarters of the Institute of Electrical Engineers. One of the greatest impressions he makes is his sense of enjoyment in everything he did, together with his great sense of fun. He was a member of our Society, whom Friends should know better. They would value him for the *quality* of everything he did or touched; for his integrity and clarity of vision and for his sense of humour.

David Murray-Rust

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

John Wilhelm Rowntree 1868-1905 and the beginnings of modern Quakerism. By Stephen Allott. Sessions Book Trust, York, 1994. Pp. xiv + 138. £7.00.

Stephen Allott's concise and appealing account of John Wilhelm Rowntree makes very considerable use of quotations. It is well-illustrated.

Rowntree was one of the most influential Friends of his day and made a great contribution to the Society despite his involvement in business, his chronic ill-health and his sadly early death at the age of 36. Allott provides a valuable addition to the studies of British Quakerism in the crucial period around the beginning of this century. It is timely background to the consideration of the impact of the Manchester conference of 1895.

Rowntree will now be known to Friends not so much as a pioneer in writing Quaker history as for being part of it. He had hoped to make a major new historical study and gathered a collection of Quaker literature in preparation for this, later to pass to the Woodbrooke Library. His lectures on the rise of Quakerism in Yorkshire in his *Essays and Addresses* form his main published historical contribution. They went beyond narrative to exhortation and explained his vision for the Society of Friends. History for him was not a matter of satisfying academic curiosity but of tracing the evolution of contemporary Quakerism and explaining the relevance of the past to the questions of the day. The Rowntree series of Quaker histories built on his vision, effectively as his memorial. His deep friendship with Rufus Jones led to Jones's major contribution to the series alongside W.C. Braithwaite's important volumes.

Much of that history of Friends is now being rethought and Rowntree's importance is probably more as a prophet than as a catalyst to historical study. His plea for the tolerance of intellectual doubt was a major stimulus to the Manchester conference. Out of that came the development of Summer schools building on the Adult School movement to which he had been wholeheartedly committed. Then to meet the need for further education in Quakerism and in a Quaker residential context came Woodbrooke, the idea developed by George Cadbury but springing from the desire by Rowntree and his friends to nuture gifts of ministry and to sustain British Quakerism in its non-pastoral form. While fuller studies of the period are still needed Stephen Allott's book is to be welcomed for bringing Rowntree's name back before a wider audience than will probably see a more substantial academic study.

David J. Hall

The Peace of Europe, the Fruits of Solitude and other writings. By William Penn. Edited by Edwin B. Bronner. J.M. Dent, London, 1993. Pp. xxxiv + 322. £6.99.

This collection comprising ten of Penn's most important published works first appeared in the invaluable Everyman Library in 1915. Since then it has been the most

accessible edition of Penn's works other than *No Cross No Crown*, the best known of his writings. The new Everyman edition has the bonus of an all too brief eleven-page introduction by Edwin Bronner.

Bronner reminds us quite rightly that Penn is held in higher regard in the United States than in Britain. Perhaps the accessibility of this collection may help redress the balance. Penn should be seen as more than a trans-Atlantic political figure. His essay, included here, *Towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe* is topical and practical. Here there are also some of the reflective works which should appeal to the more general reader as much as the rapidly written polemical works at which Penn excelled. *Some Fruits of Solitude* and the related texts offer maxims of guidance through life.

David J. Hall

The Largest Amount of Good: Quaker Relief in Ireland 1654-1921. By Helen E. Hatton. McGill-Queen's University Press, Kingston & Montreal, 1993. Pp. 367.

This book is largely based upon a doctoral thesis (produced some years ago) dealing with Quaker relief in famine-stricken Ireland in the 1840s. The author has since added a brief section dealing with Irish Quaker relief in the pre-famine period (1654-1840).

The real contribution of this volume is to be found in the section dealing with Irish Quaker relief during the famine years. The author carefully calendars the Quaker efforts - the millions of dollars/pounds gathered (largely from America but with heroic and sacrificial gifts from Irish and British Friends). Food and clothing also arrived in great amounts, all meticulously accounted for and distributed by a greatly overworked Irish Quaker committee (which worked closely with British Friends). Page after page of statistics and cases leave one almost overwhelmed by the scope of the outpouring of aid. Yet it was too little and too late to keep a million Irish from dying from starvation and disease. The writer quotes from first-hand accounts, giving such a graphic picture of the almost unbelievable suffering and widespread death that one is still tremendously moved by the situation a century and a half later. No wonder that one 1847 observer wrote 'Our wonder was not that people died, but that people lived!'

Readers of the *JFHS* will be especially interested in the differences between Quaker and other relief efforts. Unlike evangelical religious groups, Quakers made no attempt to use their aid to convert the recipients. Unlike the British government, Quakers did not insist on a show of destitution. They gave assistance on an impartial basis, frequently working through priests and curates (in those areas where such cooperation was possible). They also lobbied officials, seeking to change the harsh policies and inefficient machinery of the British government. Today, therefore, it is the Quakers who are remembered for feeding the starving and not the British government or the evangelicals! The account of one 1847 observer helps us understand the ongoing affection for Quakers and their efforts: '...the scenes I have witnessed, when some box of warm clothing was opened and the naked starving women and children would drop upon their knees, clasp their emaciated fingers and bless the gifts that the blessed Quakers had sent them.'

The author, a Canadian professor of history, should have limited her book to the famine period, not attempting the pre-1840s introduction - where her limited

knowledge of Quaker history leads to a number of glowing errors: (1) The earliest Quakers never called *themselves* 'The First Publishers of Truth' [p.15], (2) evangelical American Quakers never called themselves Hicksites after 1828 [p.23], (3) Friends travelling in the ministry were not *sent* to other meetings [pp.66-67], (4) the author appears on p.67 to be unaware of pre-twentieth century women's meetings. A number of other errors of fact or interpretation might be pointed out if desired. Equally disturbing is the lack of proofing and updating the bibliographical material before the 1993 publication of a manuscript largely done years before as a thesis. The 'taught teach' on p.73 probably can be traced to a computer error. The Dublin Friends centre formerly on Eustace Street was never called Friends House (x, introduction) and was removed to Swanbrook House on Bloomfield Avenue long before this 1993 work still lists it as being on Eustace Street [p.330]. Friends House in London is on Euston *Road* rather than Euston *Street* [p.331]. It also seems a bit odd for a historian to cite Edmundson as quoted by Richardson rather than from Edmundson's own 1715 *Journal*!

Kenneth L. Carroll

John Bellows of Gloucester: 1831-1901, A Many-Sided Man. By Kate Charity. William Sessions Ltd., York 1993. Pp.130. £7.50.

Written by his granddaughter and published by the great-nephew of his friend, Frederick Sessions, this tribute to John Bellows reveals him as more than a weighty Friend, and more than a successful business man. Moreover, he not only had his own printing and publishing house, but also a fluent and gifted pen. This account of his life, based largely on his memoirs and letters, shows the wide range of his interests and achievements - as a lexicographer producing the first pocket dictionary in French and English, as an archaeologist particularly associated with the Birdlip grave group and the Roman wall remains in Gloucester, as the inventor of an ingenious wages calculator, and as an indefatigable traveller, returning to report to Friends on missions accomplished and to record, often magically, the sights and sounds of places that were much further away than they are today:- the country around Metz, Bulgaria, Norway, Russia, the South Caucasus and, lastly, America where he was awarded an honorary degree at Harvard.

He had an ongoing friendship with Oliver Wendell Holmes by correspondence, and with Tolstoy in person. His wife Elizabeth, née Earnshaw, bore him nine surviving children and ably looked after home and family during his travels. She accompanied him to Harvard and edited his letters and memoirs after his death.

The book has an appendix by the Archaeological Director of the Gloucester Museum, Malcolm S. Watkins, evaluating the work of John Bellows in relation to the archaeological standards of the period.

John Bellows himself also needs to be seen against the background of his own times. He was 28 years old in 1859 when the *Origin of Species* was published, and when Higher Criticism of the Bible emerged from Germany. For the next 40 years the Society of Friends, with others, was coming to terms with the changes in scientific and religious thinking, and with both new attitudes towards social problems at home and the role of Empire abroad. From the disownment of David Duncan in 1871 for 'modern views' it moved to the Manchester Conference in 1895 where, under the guidance of its own

scholars and the inspiration of John Wilhelm Rowntree, it committed itself to going forward.

There is helpful reference in the book to the fearless divergence of John Bellows on occasion from his fellows. The chapter on *The Boer War* is a sensitive account of his painful, public dispute with Frederick Sessions on the subject. But Frederick Sessions was not alone. There were many Friends of stature and standing outside as well as within the Society, including the author's other grandfather, George Cadbury, who were openly critical of British policy towards the Boers.

One must recognise and respect the limitations of a book that is primarily a personal tribute, but it would have been good to see more of John Bellows among his Quaker peers. Though sometimes he would have had to be seen in a very small minority, he would not have been diminished.

Hope Hewison

A Testimony to the Grace of God as shown in the Life of James Nayler. By Dorothy Nimmo. William Sessions Ltd., York, 1993. £2.50 + 50p p&p.

In this very readable booklet Dorothy Nimmo succeeds in capturing effectively the manifestation of the grace of God as shown in the life of James Nayler. The medium of poetry that she employs throughout is particularly successful in depicting that rare and delicate spirit Nayler later became. By also choosing material from George Fox's early life and contrasting this with a similar period in Nayler's life the author cleverly brings out the delicacy of his spirit comparing it with the more robust style of Fox. The selection of incidents from Nayler's life guides one through his development from rough diamond to polished gem.

The style of poetry used by Dorothy Nimmo throughout is tense and compact. It varies from being turgid to highly smooth and polished: thus reflecting the highly enigmatic character of Nayler.

The author's use of exam-type questions and guidance in answering at the beginning and end of this work I found rather successful as she leads the reader very sympathetically to his or her own conclusions about James Nayler's life. The poetic language throughout is very powerful. In conclusion this work presents the complex nature of its subject in an easily understandable form.

Roger T. Jarvis

Protestant Dissent and Controversy in Ireland 1660-1714. By Phil Kilroy. Cork University Press. Pp.300. £27.50.

Dr. Kilroy's study explores the origins of an important aspect of modern Irish history in the growth and survival of four Dissenting traditions. He has used a rich variety of manuscript sources, for Church, Government and the Dissenting groups to pursue his theme. These include materials in the Quaker Libraries in London and Dublin. Starting

with the Reformation he shows that efforts to establish a State Church in Ireland had failed before the Civil Wars, when it was suppressed. Between 1642 and 1660 Scottish Presbyterianism was refounded in Ulster and English Presbyterians, Independents and Quakers established themselves in Ireland. There were 30 Quaker Meetings in Ireland in 1660. At the Restoration, the Anglican Church of Ireland was again revived as the State Church but the 'sects' it refused to accept as churches survived a period of persecution and pressure to become, by 1714, firmly established as part of the Protestant community in Ireland. All these remained however minority groups in a majority Catholic population.

Dr. Kilroy adopts a two-fold approach to the exploration of his theme. He first explores each of the four Dissenting groups chosen, concentrating on theology, organisation, worship and regional strength to illuminate the process of how each rooted themselves in Ireland. Secondly he examines the crucial and creative role of controversy for each group in the clarification and development of belief, structure and discipline. This is undertaken from three active exercises in controversy: that within each group; that between each group; that with the Anglican Church in Ireland. Finally relations between each group and successive English governments and Irish executives are detailed. The Scottish Presbyterians with their considerable strength in the north of Ireland, their refusal to compromise with Anglicanism, and rebellion in Scotland in the reign of Charles II incurred the closest attention and hostility of Government and State Church. English Presbyterians and Independents were not large in number in Ireland and had some hope of a better relationship with the State Church. Incurring considerable hostility for both their religious radicalism and theological nonconformity Quakers, despite some extreme examples of early witness, quickly settled into a distinctive and stable group, upheld by well defined organisation and discipline, and making an important contribution to the economic life of the country. Their wealth and commercial success aroused the envy of some of their critics, but helped make them acceptable to government, as they were not politically active in the general sense of that term. In his valuable and scholarly synthesis of early Quakerism in Ireland, Dr. Kilroy has drawn on the work of several modern historians of this theme, including Isabel Grubb, John M. Douglas, Kenneth Carroll, Richard S. Harrison and David Eversley. The relation of Quakers to the broader theme and the participants involved gives a deeper perspective to their historical and spiritual significance.

Sadly, the lack of modern studies in detail of the Church of Ireland and the Roman Catholic Church in this period prevents Dr. Kilroy, as he usefully notes, from a full overview of his theme. A lack of maps is to be regretted for these would have been helpful for denominational locations and growth. However, this remains a stimulating and worthwhile book providing much insight and giving much to think about.

Howard F. Gregg

New Light on George Fox, 1624-1691. Ed. Michael Mullett. William Sessions, York, 1994. £12.50.

We live in a time in which our Society has an ambivalent attitude to leadership, so perhaps it is not surprising to find a volume of essays which concentrates on Fox whilst at the same time resisting any tendency to hagiography. Richard Bailey's title, *The Making and Unmaking of a God,* illustrates this paradox.

The essays are a selection from the papers given at the 1991 conference at the University of Lancaster which marked the tercentenary of the death of George Fox. Many of the pieces are exhilarating, especially where they deal with the early years of Quakerism in the 1650s, those years which have been subsequently rewritten and reinterpreted, not least by Fox himself. Christopher Hill suggests that the acceptance of the peace principle marked the end of this epoch, as Quakers gave up the radical expectation of the immediate establishment of Christ's kingdom on earth. He also asks how far Fox was the leader before 1661, pointing out that he outlived the other early leaders.

Larry Ingle is in search of the 'real' George Fox and deals with the question of where the money came from which financed his activities, as well as suggesting that Fox was not very likeable, being 'a prig who took himself seriously'. Other writers look, for example, at the Nayler episode, at slavery, and at Fox's use of metaphor. Overall what is highlighted is the picture of an enthusiastic millenarian group struggling to make sense of its religious experience in a difficult political situation. Surprisingly, no author notes the similarities to the New Testament church and the similar resolution of difficulties through the development of theology and organisation.

In his introduction, Michael Mullett looks at the writing of Quaker history, showing how Fox has been interpreted according to the needs and interests of the times of the historians. Thomas Hamm then looks at the politics of Quaker historiography in the nineteenth century. 'If' he says, 'all history is political, or at least all acts of doing history are, it is no surpise that an examination of Quaker historical writing shows that concerns of ecclesiastical polity and politics have shaped it... Friends have written to preserve, protect and defend, not just the memory of those who had gone before, but also their own visions, accepted or heterodox, of what Quakerism was.'

With this in mind, it is interesting to pursue the question of what vision of Quakerism is presented in this volume. What vision is being defended? Perhaps primarily it is an academic vision, of Quakerism as a proper subject of study in universities. This can be worthwhile but also has its dangers, for academic values and Quaker values are not the same: the academic thrives by overturning tradition, the Quaker by living it. The claim in the preface is that contributions were sought to reflect some of the variety of strengths in the conference. There is a variety of viewpoints as an academic might see it, but the contributors are overwhelmingly male (all but one) and mostly North American. This is reflected in the pieces. There is a handful of references to Margaret Fell and a few other women, but through most of this book one would hardly guess that there were any women Quakers, let alone that they had any influence on Fox or on Quaker history. In this respect at least, this volume has a flawed vision.

Janet Scott

NOTES AND QUERIES

LEEDS UNIVERSITY MANUSCRIPT 1308
Album of silhouettes by Maria (Jowitt) Arthington (1795-1863)
wife of Robert Arthington, brewer, of Hunslet

50 silhouettes (head and shoulders) measuring up to 3.2 ins. x 2 ins. cut by Maria Jowitt, later Maria Arthington. The subjects are named by the artist, and are dated between 1810 and 1820. They are in a leather-bound gilt-edged album with brass clasp and furnishings, measuring 6 ins. x 4.5 ins. x 1.5 ins. The profiles are numbered 1-50; the majority face to the Left; the numbers facing Right are 3, 6, 11, 13, 14, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 50.

The subjects consist of 38 members of the Society of Friends (Quakers) in Leeds and the West Riding of Yorkshire, a handful of Quaker ministers visiting Leeds from other parts, including Joseph Lancaster the educationist and Stephen Grellet and Willett Hicks from America. 'Mr Josh Page, Sheepscarr 1810' may be a Sheepscar resident, or perhaps manager of the Jowitt works there. Among the Leeds Quakers there are representatives of the prominent families of Arthington, Birchall, Nevins and Whitelock, and William West the chemist who was, later on, the first lecturer in chemistry in the infant Leeds Medical School, and Fellow of the Royal Society.

Alphabetical List of Subjects
(dates of execution, when given, appear within quotation marks)

7 Arthington, James (1752-1833) Leeds, linendraper '13 xi 1819' born 9 ii 1752, son of Robert & Phebe; married (i) Susanna Wright, dau. of Joseph & Mary Wright, of Lofthouse, Harewood parish, 3 iv 1778 at Clifford (Susanna died 18 iii 1783, aged 28); married (ii) Sarah Whitelock, 9 xi 1797 at Leeds. James died 24 iv 1833, yeoman, of Hunslet Lane.

6 Arthington, Sarah (Whitelock) (1753-1830) '1819' born 22 x 1753, dau. of William & Martha Whitelock of Sheepscar; married James Arthington, 9 xi 1797 at Leeds; died 9 vi 1830, Carr House, nr. Leeds.

35 Birchall, Alfred (1791-1853) born 10 xii 1791, son of Samuel & Anna; married Mary Compton junior, 15 vii 1817 at Devonshire House, London; removed to Manchester in 1840; died 13 x 1853.

32 Birchall, Edwin (1789-1877) born 31 viii 1789, son of Samuel & Anna; married Eliza(beth), dau. of William Harding, 30 viii 1816 at Dublin. Edwin was disowned in 1851 (business difficulties), and reinstated in 1860. he died 18 vii 1877.

33 Birchall, Elizabeth (Harding) (d.1867) 'given to me by herself' Daughter of William Harding; married Edwin Birchall [no.32], 30 viii 1816 at Dublin; died 12 xi 1867, at Bradford, aged 73 years.

30 Birchall, Maria (Atkinson) (d.1820) '1820' Daughter of Joseph & Elizabeth Atkinson; married Samuel Jowitt Birchall [no.31] 29 v 1817 at Manchester; died 27 iv 1820, Leeds, aged 27 years.

34 Birchall, Mary (Compton) (d.1829) '1820' Mary Compton junior married Alfred Birchall [no.35], 15 vii 1817 at Devonshire House, London; died 30 ix 1829, Leeds, aged 34 years.

31 Birchall, Samuel Jowitt (1788-1854) woolstapler 'Sheepscarr ix 1814' born 28 ii 1788, son of Samuel & Anna; married (i) Maria Atkinson [no.30]; married (ii) Sophia Jane Dearman, 15 ii 1827 at Peckham (she died in 1837). At the 1851 Census he resided at Springfield House, Leeds; he was father of Edward, the architect of the Carlton Hill Meeting House of the 1860s; d. 8 i 1854.

15 Bottomley, John (1759-1820) Penistone, clothier 'xii 1817' born 21 vii 1759, son of John & Martha, of Woodend, Kirkburton parish; married Phebe Heigh, of Bankside, 27 v 1805 at Highflatts. John died at Richard Dickinson's house at Highflatts, 17 i 1820, having felt unwell after meeting.

50 Brady, Hannah (Wilson) wife of Jarvis Brady, Leeds, draper (1787-1856) born 1 vii 1787, dau. of James (worsted manufacturer) & Elizabeth Wilson of Rawdon; married Jarvis Brady (1791-1858), 24 x 1816 at Hull. Hannah Brady died 20 ix 1856 at Hedingley.

19 Broadhead, John (1761-1830) Leeds, Grocer '11 xi 1819' born 8 iii 1761, son of John (clothier) & Sarah (Greaves); married Hannah Knowles, 12 xi 1784 at Wooldale (she died 11 viii 1837, 74 years). John died 2 ii 1830; an Overseer.

14 Casson, Isabel 'iv 1820 of Hull, a minister' Perhaps Isabel (Richardson) Casson, born 4 iii 1777 at Whitby, dau. of Henry & Hannah (Priestman) Richardson; recorded Minister, York, 1812; married Henry Casson (d.1826), 14 i 1824 at Pickering; died 26 xi 1857, at Hull.

5 Crewdson, Esther later, wife of William Boulton (1784-1863) born 26 iv 1784, dau. of Thomas & Cicely (Dillworth) Crewdson of Kendal; sister of Isaac [no.4]; moved to Leeds 15 ix 1815, and to Hardshaw East in 1824; married William Boulton, 25 iv 1833 at Manchester; died 14 viii 1863.

4 Crewdson, Isaac (1780-1855) Manchester '1815 Author of... *The Beacon*' Married Elizabeth Jowitt (1779-1855). See *Dictionary of National Biography.*

28 Cudworth, John (1786-1861) Leeds, tea-dealer born 5 iii 1786, son of Abraham (stuff manufacturer) & Mary, of Painthorp, Sandal; married Rachel Nevins, 22 viii 1816 at Leeds; died 25 iii 1861.

29 Cudworth, Rachel (Nevins) (1784-1854) born 13 iii 1784, dau. of Pim [no.38] & Elizabeth (Jowitt) Nevins (d.1802); married John Cudworth [no.28] 22 viii 1816 at Leeds; died 17 v 1854.

16 Dudley, Mary (Stokes) (1750-1823) Quaker minister Daughter of Joseph & Mary Stokes of Bristol; died 24 ix 1823, at Camberwell.

46 Eveleigh, Samuel (d.1857) Manchester, hat manufacturer '1815' Samuel Eveleigh of Southwark, married 16 ix 1813, Maria (dau. of Samuel & Anna) Birchall (born 29 iv 1786, died 21 xii 1867 at Prestwich). Samuel died 19 ii 1857, Oak Hill, Prestwich, Manchester.

37 Firth, Joseph (1756-1822) Toothill, Brighouse born 13 i 1756; married Sarah Briscoe, 1 xi 1781 at Leeds; he died 13 i 1822, yeoman, at Toothill. Brother of Robert [no.41].

41 Firth, Robert (1760-1828) Huddersfield 'M J vii 1812' Son of Thomas & Mary Firth of Huddersfield; married Mary Dyson, 5 vii 1788 at Halifax (she died 1806, 54 years) [marriage certificate in the Carlton Hill Archives J 45C/8]; Robert died 1 i 1828 at Huddersfield.

36 Firth, Sarah (Briscoe) (1753-1818) 'Toothill, 1812' born 24 xii 1753, dau. of Samuel & Elizabeth Briscoe of Leeds; married Joseph Firth, 1 xi 1781 at Leeds; died i 1818 at Toothill.

26 Fox, Samuel (1781-1868) Nottingham 'Saml. Fox of Nottingham, 22 xii 1814' born 24 xi 1781, son of William & Mary, of Nottingham; grocer; died 6 viii 1868 at Nottingham.

2 Grellet, Stephen (1773-1855) Quaker minister '1812' Born in France; emigrated to U.S.A. Travelling in Yorkshire in 1812.

9 Grimshaw, Hannah (Burleigh) (1769-1849) 'the confectioner' born 21 ii 1769, dau. of John (grocer) & Hannah Burleigh of Leeds; married at Bradford 12 ix 1791 (being then resident in Clayton, Bradford) to Jonathan Grimshaw (1769-98) of Leeds. In 1813 she was a confectioner in the Lowerheadrow. In 1837 she removed to Pontefract, where she died 16 viii 1849.

49 Harris, Charles (1782-1847) Bradford, banker 'xii 1819' born 7 iii 1782 in London, son of Richard & Jane (Peckover) Harris; banker at the 'Bradford Old Bank'; died 17 i 1847.

48 Harris, Sarah (1785-1873) Bradford, Quaker minister '1819' born 9 vii 1785; sister of Charles [no.49]; died 7 iii 1873. See photograph in H.R. Hodgson's *Society of Friends in Bradford* (1926), at p.52.

17 Hicks, Willett (c.1766-1845) 'of America' Son of Silas & Rachel (Seaman); of New York; born in Long Island; disowned (1829-30) by Orthodox Friends with his wife (Mary Matlack who died 18 ix 1831, aged 56); a Hicksite; died 10 iv 1845, New York.

40 Horsfall, Betsy later, wife of Thomas Firth (1790-1864) born 26 v 1790, dau. of John & Mary Horsfall of Huddersfield; moved to Leeds; married Thomas Firth (drysalter, Huddersfield, 1789 - 3 iii 1869) 14 x 1819 at Leeds [marriage certificate in the Carlton Hill Archives J 45C/9]; she died 13 x 1864, and was buried at Paddock, Huddersfield.

47 Hustler, Sarah (1765-1817) Bradford Quaker minister '1817' born 26 ii 1765, dau. of John & Christiana Hustler; died 26 x 1817 at Maryport.

10 Jones, Ann (Burgess) (1774-1846) Stockport Quaker minister dau. of Joseph & Sarah Jones, Grooby Lodge, Leicester; married George Jones (1765-1841), draper, Stockport, 16 vi 1815 at Leicester; died 1846.

42 Jowitt, Benjamin (1788-1867) '1811' born 21 vii 1788, son of Benjamin & Ann (Arthington), of Little Woodhouse; cousin of Maria; he moved to near Pontefract; died at Carlton, near Pontefract, in 1867.

22 Jowitt, Rachel (Crewdson) (1782-1856) born 23/24 iii 1782, dau. of Thomas & Cicely Crewdson of Kendal; married Robert Jowitt [no.23], 8 ii 1810 at Kendal; she died 27 xi 1856, in Leeds.

23 Jowitt, Robert (1784-1862) of Carlton House, Woodhouse Lane 'M A xi 1819' born 24 vi 1784, son of John (woolstapler) & Susanna, of Leeds; married Rachel Crewdson, 8 ii 1810; died 19 xii 1862, of Carlton House, gentleman.

27 Kirkham, John (1766-1827) Earls Colne Quaker minister 'M J, Leeds 30 viii 1814' born 28 viii 1766, son of John & Susanna, Earls Colne; died 2 xi 1827, Earls Colne.

13 Lancaster, Joseph (1778-1838) '10 x 1810 The first likeness I ever attempted to cut' educationist. See *Dictionary of National Biography.*

8 Marriott, Mary (Wright) (1760-1832) born 25 ix 1760, dau. of Joseph & Mary Wright, of Lofthouse, Harewood parish; married William Marriott, 8 ix 1792 at Bradford. She died 23 i 1832, of Clare Green (Marsden Monthly Meeting), relict of William (cotton spinner); she was buried 29 i 1832, in Leeds.

39 Nevins, Maria (born 1793) born 23 viii 1793, dau. of Pim (d.1834) & Elizabeth (Jowitt, died 1802) Nevins, of Larchfield, Leeds; she resigned from the Society, 25 ii 1831.

38 Nevins, Pim (d.1834) woolstapler, of Larchfield, Leeds '1812' son of Thomas & Rachel, of co.Kildare, Ireland (both deceased), married Elizabeth Jowitt, 6 i 1780, at Gildersome; he died, merchant, of Larchfield nr. Leeds, 12 xi 1834, aged 78 years.

44 Page, Mr Joseph 'Sheepscarr 1810'

11 Payne, Richard Ecroyd (1791-1870) Leeds, Solicitor '1820' born 18 xii 1791, son of William & Barbara (Arthington), of Frickley; came to Leeds, 28 xi 1816; practised as a solicitor - the firm Payne, Eddison & Ford (now Ford & Warren); died 2 xii 1870, at Leeds.

43 Pease, Sarah (Jowitt) afterwards Aldam (1787-1824) born 15 x 1787, dau. of Joseph & Grace (Firth) Jowitt; married William Pease, stuff merchant, 21 ix 1808, at Leeds. William Pease, succeeding to a country estate, adopted the name Aldam; he died in 1855. Sarah died 20 xi 1824, aged 36, and was buried at Warmsworth.

18 Rowntree, Rachel later, wife of Samuel Priestman (1800-1837) born 4 ii 1800, dau. of William (farmer) & Rachel Rowntree of Thornton Riseborough, Yorkshire; married Samuel Priestman (son of Joshua, miller, & Hannah Priestman of Thornton), corn miller, Kirkstall (1800-1872), 2 vii 1823 at Pickering. Rachel died 17 iv 1837 at Kirkstall, and within a few years Samuel returned to the east of Yorkshire.

1 Shillitoe, Thomas (1754-1836) Quaker minister '1816' See *Dictionary of National Biography*.

12 Stephenson, Isaac (1765-1830) Stockton, miller Quaker minister Son of Isaac & Elizabeth Stephenson of Bridlington; married Hannah Masterman (1766-1852) dau. of James & Hannah, of Kirbymoorside, 7 vi 1798, at Kirbymoorside; removed to Manchester in 1826; died 20 v 1830, aged 64, at Dungannon when on a ministerial visit to Ireland.

3 Tatham, Joseph (1767-1843) Leeds, schoolmaster '1818' Son of John Tatham, of Wray, Lancs. Proprietor of the school at the meeting house in Water Lane from 1802-1838. See J.E. Mortimer: *Joseph Tatham's School, Leeds* (Thoresby Society, 1991).

24 Walker, John (1791-1862) born 21 x 1791, son of Joseph (merchant, tobacconist) & Sarah (Armistead) Walker, of Leeds; married Hannah Whitelock, dau. of Isaac (1743-89) & Hannah (Arthington; 1755-1840) Whitelock, 13 viii 1818 at Halifax; removed to Pontefract, 15 x 1824; died 17 xii 1862 at Exeter.

20 West, Jane (Bracher) (1792-1860) '1820' Jane Bracher, dau. of Thomas & Ann, of Wincanton, married William West [no.21] (1792-1851), 20 x 1817, at Sherborne, Dorset. After William's death, she removed (1855) to London (Devonshire House Monthly Meeting); she died in 1860, 67 years of age.

21 West, William (1792-1851) chemist, F.R.S. born in Wandsworth; moved to Leeds from Gracechurch Street, London, 1816; married Jane Bracher, 20 x 1817, at Sherborne; chemist and druggist; member of national and local scientific societies and the British Association for the Advancement of Science, town councillor for Hunslet Ward 1844-50; died at his home, in Hunslet, 10 ix 1851. See Poggendorf; and R.V. Taylor: *Leeds worthies* (1865), pp.451-3.

45 Whitelock, Hannah (Arthington) (1755-1840) '1819' born 26 iv 1755, dau. of Robert & Phebe Arthington; married Isaac Whitelock (1742-1789) 1 ix 1785, at Leeds; living in 1813 in Park Place, Leeds [information from M.W. Beresford]; removed to Pontefract, i 1825; died 31 viii 1840, at York.

25 Whitelock, Hannah 'Mrs John Walker' (1788-1864) '1819' born 17 iv 1788, dau. of Isaac (1742-1789) & Hannah (Arthington; 1755-1840 [no.45]) Whitelock of Sheepscar; married John Walker of Leeds [no.24], 13 viii 1818 at Halifax; removed to Pontefract, 15 x 1824; Hannah Walker, widow of John Walker late of Exeter, and formerly of Leeds, died 8 x 1864 at Thornbury, Gloucestershire.

Russell S. Mortimer

EVESHAM FRIENDS AT THE POLLS

Dr. John D. Grainger's 'Religion as a voting determinant: the case of Evesham 1832-1868' *(Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society,* 3rd series, vol.14, 1994, pp.203-211) is firmly based on poll-books and records of voting in a small town in the middle of England between the first and second Reform Acts.

Nearly half of the 931 men on the registers of electors during the period voted only once or twice or not at all (236 once, over 60 never). The 488 who voted more than twice at elections over the 36-year period are the men particularly studied, and their religious affiliations are brought to the fore - not the other possible influences on voting behaviour, such as occupation or wealth.

From the Worcestershire Monthly Meeting list of members (Hereford & Worcester Record Office BA 1304/4), 11 Friends have been identified, of whom 9 voted three times or more during the period.

The conclusions of Dr. Grainger are given below:
p.207

'Having identified such individual voters by their religion as is possible, it is now possible to consider their voting records. The most decisive opinion was clearly held by the Quaker group. Of the nine men who voted more than three times, every man voted Whig or Liberal, every time. Not one Quaker vote ever went to a Tory or a Conservative. (Nor, as it happens, did the two who voted less than thrice change this pattern). It is true that they were a tight-knit group in other ways, in that four of the men were ironmongers, one was a blacksmith, and a sixth an iron or coal merchant, while three of the ironmongers were members of the Burlingham family, and this network of interests might be thought to be as significant as their religion. The other Quakers, however, added variety, one was a surgeon, others an upholsterer, a parchment maker, and a chemist. This is, thus, a fairly heterogeneous group after all, and it would seem clear enough that in this case it was religion which was a major determinant in their voting behaviour.'

It is useful to have a solid study covering a significant period in an identifiable location against which to measure the largely anecdotal evidence of Quaker political allegiance in this country, as revealed at the hustings and the polls over the last three centuries.

R.S.M.

THE POTATO FAMINE AND IRISH FRIENDS

'As so often in later disasters all over the world, it would be left to the Quakers to be the pioneers of effective practical relief, unencumbered by theory or politics.' (Austin Bourke: *'The visitation of God?' the potato and the great Irish famine.* Lilliput Press, 1993, p.177).

R.S.M.

THE FAMILY OF LOVE

Christopher W. Marsh's *The Family of Love in English Society, 1550-1630* (Cambridge, 1994) deals chiefly with the period to 1610 but it has some references to Friends. In the 1680s Familists described themselves as a 'sort of refined Quakers'. Marsh feels that Friends 'seem to have absorbed much of the illuminating theology of the Familists' though there is no clear line of descent. He thinks that many early Friends may have read the work of the Dutch mystic Hendrick Niclaes, reprinted in the 1650s.

D.J.H.

Proposals for papers on any aspect of Quaker History are invited for the eleventh biennial meeting of the Conference of Quaker Historians and Archivists. The meeting will be at Oakwood School in Poughkeepsie, New York, June 21–23, 1996. Send a one-page abstract to Charles L. Cherry, Department of English, Villanova University, Villanova, PA 19085. Deadline is December 31, 1995.

The Quaker Collection of Haverford College announces the availability of three $1500 Gest Fellowships for one month of research using Quaker Collection materials to study a topic that explores the connections and relationships between various ways of expressing religious belief in the world. The fellowships, which are available for pre- or post-graduate study, may be used for any one month period between June 1, 1996 and January 31 1997. Application deadline February 1, 1996. Contact: Ann W. Upton, Quaker Collection, Haverford College, Haverford, PA 19041.

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 plus postage.

Journals and Supplements Wanted

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

ISSN No. 0071 9587

E & E Plumridge Ltd, Linton, Cambridge