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EDITORIAL

The Editor regrets the late despatch of this Journal.

In his Presidential Address David Sox explores some aspects of Quaker involvement with the natural world given the increasing urgency of safeguarding the environment and meeting the challenge of climate change.

Jonathan Harlow presents a fascinating account of the military and intelligence career of Captain George Bishop before his Quaker convincement in the early 1650’s.

In the absence of relevant Quaker records Hugh Torrens demonstrates, by careful research and study of alternative sources, what can properly be established from a considerable confusion of information. He also draws attention to a lost figure in the Quaker contribution to scientific enquiry. For reader convenience the Editor has retained Hugh Torrens’ referencing within the text.

The Editor welcomes articles or short items for consideration in future JOURNALS. He is willing to read drafts and advise where appropriate. He would like to include annotated Quaker historical documents, of reasonable length i.e. not too long, from contributors who have the expertise and enthusiasm to prepare them.

Contributors are advised to use the MHRA (Modern Humanities Research Association) STYLE GUIDE in the preparation of material. This is available from Subscription Department, Maney Publishing, Hudson Road, Leeds LS9 7DL (e-mail: maney@maney.co.uk) or
online at MHRA’s website (www.mhra.org.uk).

The Editor’s decision is final as regards publication or revision.

The Editor intends to have the 2009 issue of J.F.H.S. available in early 2010.

Howard F Gregg
QUAKERS AND THE NATURAL ORDER

The historian John Gascoigne once observed that 'a disproportionate number of British naturalists were Quaker.' From the outset I have placed limits on my subject; if I didn't we would be here all night.

In the first place I do not find some figures that interesting or noteworthy. So I do not pretend to have fully covered all the possibilities. Also I have centred my interest to flora and fauna, but realize that Quakers also have been involved with geology and other aspects of natural history.

We have reached an unparalleled period regarding the natural world; approaching the point of irreversible damage to the resources of nature. Scientists estimate that if destructive human activities continue at their present rates half the species of plants and animals on the earth could be gone by the end of the century.

Added to that, is the fact that our plant simply cannot sustain more increases of human population. When I was born in 1936 there were roughly 2 billion people. Now there are 6.2 billion with the numbers rising. If the multiplication of that basis had been rhinoceroses or something like caterpillars, we would be scared stupid.

One could go on endlessly with horrific statistics, but I will stop there. I don't want to overly depress you. Thomas Friedman in The New York Times has said that our generation has entered a phase that no previous generation has ever experienced: the Noah phase with more and more species threatened with extinction by the Flood that is today's juggernaut. We may be the first generation in human history that literally has to act like Noah to save the last pairs of species. Unlike the original Noah story, however, we are the ones causing the Flood.

One of the horrible ironies of the threatened extinction of species comes at a time when we are both discovering new creatures as well as learning much more about the inner workings of others.

I heartily recommend the March 2008 issue of National Geographic on this point. An article entitled Minds of Their Own tells us that animals are smarter than you think-frighteningly so at a time we are obliterating their habitats. The elephant retains long memories and social ties and possesses a sense of self despite the fact that its original habitat is vanishing. The orangutan shows cognitive complexity and flexibility and maintains cultural traditions in the wild. The African
gray parrot counts, knows colours, shapes and sizes as well as having a basic grasp of the concept of zero. Longwool sheep recognize individual faces and remember them long term. Border collies retain an ever growing vocabulary that rivals a toddler’s and the bonobo makes tools at the level of early humans.¹

I volunteer at Kew Gardens and often am in charge of visitors in the Palm House. We have a magnificent Jade Vine with flowers of blue resembling ceramics. A few weeks ago I was showing it to a group of Filipinos and was glad to tell them that its natural habitat was their country. Several said they had never seen it in the Philippines. Pursued on that point I had to relate the sad truth that due to deforestation it was unlikely that they would ever see the vine. I wanted to add but didn’t that was the price paid for destroying forests to sell wood to China which ironically has destroyed many of its own forests.

The Oxford English Dictionary gives a definition of naturalism as a theory denying that an event or object has a supernatural significance; the doctrine that scientific laws are adequate to account for all phenomena. With this definition a naturalist studies natural as opposed to spiritual matters. However, there are also other meanings which include the spiritual dimension of naturalism as well and it is there where our interest lies.⁴

1988 Britain Yearly Meeting said that ‘as a Religious Society of Friends we see stewardship of God’s creation as a major concern. The environmental crisis is at root a spiritual and religious crisis; we are called to look again at the real purpose of being on this planet.’⁵

Harvard Professor Edward O. Wilson, a respected biologist, was raised a Southern Baptist in Alabama. In his extraordinary book The Creation he asks: ‘why is it that a large majority of practicing Christians have hesitated to make protection of the creation an important part of their magisterium?’ Twenty years earlier another American, historian Lynn White, in Science magazine placed the blame for the ecological crisis on the Christian tradition.⁷ White said that Christianity was the most anthropomorphic religion man has seen and it had no time for ecology.

Fundamentalist Christians went even further, opposing environmentalist concerns on the ground that the apocalypse was about to arrive any day so why be involved with ecology? More importantly to them Genesis clearly shows that man was given dominion over the created order by God: be fruitful and multiply meant just that.

But mercifully as the environmental crisis deepened so had our understanding of man’s role in preserving God’s creation. As Wilson
writes: 'The pauperization of Earth's flora and fauna was an acceptable price until recent centuries, when Nature seemed all but infinite and an enemy to explorers and pioneers... Now the fate of the creation is the fate of humanity.'

Furthermore now there are biblical scholars who argue that the Genesis passages dealing with the Creation have been falsely interpreted—in particular the dominion God gave man over nature. Dominion came to imply exploitation. The intention was that man should be God's steward on earth which demanded a responsibility to care for the natural world.

Aside from that it should be noted that there is no biblical injunction against slavery but Christianity itself contained the elements which ultimately abolished slavery. Similarly there has always been within Quakerism a desire to respect animals as sentient creatures.

Properly we begin our survey of Quaker voices with George Fox, the first Quaker. William Penn described him as 'a divine and a naturalist.' By his own admission Fox first considered practicing physic as he put it. Delightful word physic, time honoured for the art of healing and still retained by the Chelsea Physic Garden.

In 1648 Fox wrote: 'The Creation was opened to me, and it showed me how all things had their names given them according to their nature and virtue. And it was at a stand in my mind whether I should practice physic for the good of mankind, seeing the nature and virtues of the creatures were so opened to me by the Lord.'

'Their names given them according to their nature and virtue.' This, of course, echoes Adam's naming of the creatures in Genesis. If there be a deeper meaning it must be an injunction for man to know and understand them for they come from the same hand of God as we. We are fellow creations.

Often Fox waxes poetically about creation and the creatures: 'Wait all in the light for the wisdom by which all things were made, with it to use all the Lord's creatures to his glory (and none to stumble one another about the creatures for that is not from the light) for which end they were created, and with the wisdom by which they were made, ye may be kept out of the misuse of them, in the image of God that ye may come to see, that the "earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof" and the earth may come to yield her increase and to enjoy her sabbaths.'

George Fox's concern for the created order often went some distance. He believed that animals had a covenant with God and cited Hosea 2. 18 for this: 'Then I will make a covenant on behalf of Israel with the wild beasts, the birds of the air, and the things that
creep on the earth, and I will break bow and sword and weapons of war and sweep them off the earth, so that all living creatures may lie down without fear. This follows the covenant made between God and Noah and his sons: 'I now make my covenant with you and your descendants after you, and every living creature that is with you, all birds and cattle, all the wild animals with you on earth, all that come out of the ark.

I will make my covenant with you never again shall all living creatures be destroyed by the waters of the flood.'

Fox condemned hunting and hawking and many early Friends also objected to other such sports: bull and bear-baiting; cock-throwing and cock fighting.

Best known for his tireless efforts to outlaw the slave trade, Thomas Clarkson published in 1806 a three-volume _Portrait of Quakerism_. According to observers like Howard Brinton it remains the best and most complete account of the character and practice of the Society of Friends in the eighteenth century.

In Section III of his Portrait Clarkson wrote: 'The word Benevolence, when applied to the character of the Quakers, includes also a tender feeling towards the brute-creation. It has frequently been observed by those who are acquainted with the Quakers, that all animals belonging to them are treated with a tender consideration, and are not permitted to be abused.'

Clarkson continued: 'Quakers consider animals not as mere machines to be used at discretion, but in the sublime light of the creatures of God...’ Laudable words. Let's only hope that Friends today still measure up to Clarkson's praise in some measure.

Over in America as they had regarding slavery and the treatment of Native Americans Quakers stood apart from their contemporary religionists with their view of the natural world. Aside from George Fox, the Society of Friends has had some extraordinary individuals who have led the way in a variety of concerns. Reginald Reynolds had one particularly in mind when he said: 'The inspired person can generally succeed in dragging the Society after him.' John Woolman (1720-1772) was the quintessential Quaker and has also been called the Quaker St. Francis. No Quaker has been more quoted by animal concern groups.

Woolman was raised on a farm on the banks of Rancocas Creek near Mount Holly in New Jersey where his father farmed and greatly respected varieties of creatures. While still a youth Woolman wrote that he was convinced in his mind that 'true religion consisted in an inward life wherein the heart doth love and reverence God the Creator and learn to exercise true justice and goodness, not only
toward all men but also toward the brute creatures...to say we love God as unseen and at the same time exercise cruelty toward the least creature moving by his life, or by life derived from him, was a contradiction in itself..." 18

What a remarkable profession. Later in life Woolman not only championed Native Americans and was an anti-slavery pioneer but he also noted the oppression of oxen and horses which were often over-worked and Woolman walked to York rather than use the flying coaches which frequently oppressed and killed the horses used.

In A Plea for the Poor Woolman said:

Oxen and horses are often seen at work when, through heat and too much labour, their eyes and the emotion of their bodies manifest that they are oppressed. Their loads in wagons are frequently so heavy that when weary with hauling it far, their drivers find occasion in going up hills or through mire to raise their spirits by whipping to get forward. Many poor people are so thronged in their business that it is difficult for them to provide shelter suitable for their animals in great storms. 19

Some Friends have suggested that animal welfare should not have much significance; efforts should go solely to human endeavours. Woolman’s life brilliantly refutes that argument: it isn’t a matter of either human concern or animal concern. It isn’t either or but rather both.

In 1772 Woolman took his anti-slavery campaign to England. Even on board the ship he was moved by the suffering of fowls accompanying passengers.

Just before he sailed Woolman had written: ‘The produce of the earth is a gift of our gracious Creator to the inhabitants, and to impoverish the earth now to support outward greatness appears to be an injury to the succeeding age.’ 20 What a forward-looking insight that was- and voiced in 1772.

Regarding animal welfare Woolman had like-minded friends: Joshua Evans, John Churchman and Anthony Benezet among them. And all three protested against the slave trade and poor treatment of Native Americans as well. Like Woolman Evans wore clothes of undyed materials and once proclaimed: ‘I consider that life was sweet in all living creatures and taking it away becomes a very tender point with me. The creatures were given, or as I take it, rather lent to us to be governed in the great Creator’s fear.’ 21

As his name indicates Benezet was originally a French Huguenot. At age 14 he became a Quaker and in time a notable champion of
Black slaves. Also Benezet loved animals and had many pets. Once he declared: I often find more pleasure and instruction from the animal creation than human.\textsuperscript{22}

Churchman was steadfast in his anxiety over a growing worldliness among Friends and actively supported Woolman's anti-slavery campaign as well as attacking the poor treatment of livestock.

Anne Adams and Jean Hardy writing for Quaker Green Action in their admirable anthology of 'Friends' writings on that of God in all creation' say that 'the remarkable thing we noticed, in compiling this anthology, is that there is a huge gap in Quaker writing about the earth between the seventeenth and the late twentieth centuries (apart from the remarkable John Woolman...).\textsuperscript{23}

But as Rex Ambler points out, all Christian groups during this long period were preoccupied with humanity: the earth was the domain of secular science only. This analysis of Quaker writing is flawed, however. It fails to mention two Quaker naturalists who have probably had a greater influence on non-Quaker naturalists than any others: father and son, John and William Bartram. Also absent are several Friends associated with the Bartrams.

John Bartram was born in 1699 in a farming area just outside Philadelphia and died the year after the signing of the Declaration of Independence. He is now recognized as the first American botanist, and in the opinion of the great Linnaeus, the creator of binomial nomenclature for plants and animals, Bartram was 'the greatest contemporary natural botanist in the world.'\textsuperscript{24} said Linnaeus. Hardly a figure to be overlooked in any Quaker anthology.

So, how did this simple Pennsylvania farm boy arrive at such a position? There is an account which says that he was first attracted to botany when he overturned a daisy with his plow and fell to musing upon the symmetry of its structure.

John Bartram said to himself: 'What a shame that thee shouldst have employed so many years in tilling the earth and destroying so many flowers and plants without being acquainted with their structure and their uses?'\textsuperscript{25}

Well, he certainly did something about that. Desirous of learning more about plants, he went to Philadelphia and purchased such books as he needed and began to become a self-made botanist. This was over the objections of his wife who thought that he was wasting his time.

He also began to correspond with Peter Collinson, the English Quaker naturalist who was already well connected with botanists who established the Chelsea Physic Garden which had been founded in 1673. Bartram was especially interested in medicinal plants and
supplied the garden with many American specimens which you can still see today.

Bartram was also close to Benjamin Franklin and the two founded the American Philosophical Society. In honour of Franklin he named a beautiful flowering tree in his honour—the *Franklinia alatamaha*.\(^ {26} \)

Apparently he and his son were the first white men to see the tree and subsequently they saved it from extinction in the wild by bringing its seed back to Pennsylvania.

In a garden near Philadelphia—which still exists—the Bartrams cultivated some 200 species many of which were rapidly disappearing with the destruction of the wilderness by settlers.

William, John Bartram’s son lived from 1739 to 1823 and was known as Billy the Flower-hunter by the Seminole Indians. Early in his life, Billy displayed a talent for drawing natural objects and was taught printing by Benjamin Franklin.

Billy became America’s first great travelling naturalist. Predating Lewis and Clark as well as Audubon, he went into the wilderness by horseback, by canoe, and on foot botanizing his way across the whole of the southern wilderness—from the barrier Islands of Georgia to the bayous of the Mississippi River.

After four years of rattling around the backwoods of British America, he emerged with his saddlebags full of plants heretofore only known to Indians and his sketchbooks bulging with pictures of exotic animals. He wrote his *Travels* which remains a classic: albeit one largely known to naturalists. Like Woolman’s *Journal* it fared better in England than America, and its images greatly influenced Coleridge and Wordsworth in their poetry.\(^ {27} \)

William Bartram explored nature with his emotions as well as his senses. He was westruck by gargantuan trees, terrified by battling alligators, and grieved by a pitiful bear cub whose mother had been killed by a hunter: the orphan bear, Bartram recorded, ‘approached the dead body, smelled and pawed it, and appearing in agony fell to weeping and looking upwards, then toward us, and cried like a child.’\(^ {28} \) This is Quaker empathy at its best.

Such sensitivity to the suffering animals was rare in frontier America. As a Quaker Bartram like Woolman saw every living thing as part of a divinely ordained whole. Bartram’s writings on occasion remind one of Francis of Assisi. He became a voice of nature hymning the praises of an all-creative God.

In one excerpt from his travels he wrote after viewing some of the marvels of primeval forests in Florida: ‘Ye vigilant and faithful servants of the Most High. Ye who worship the Creator morning, noon and eve, in simplicity of heart. I haste to join the universal
anthem. My heart and voice unite with yours, in sincere homage to the great Creator, the universal Sovereign.

And although I am sensible, that my service cannot increase or diminish thy glory, yet it is pleasing to thy servant to be permitted to sound thy praise; for, O sovereign Lord—we know that thou alone art perfect, and worthy to be worshipped.29

Again in northern Florida, he mused: We observed the tops of the trees so close to one another for many miles together, that there is no seeing which way the clouds drive nor which way the wind sets, and it seems almost as if the sun had never shone on the ground since the creation.30

Again like Woolman, William Bartram was a bit of a prophet and could see future disaster with the ruthless destruction of the environment. On one occasion, returning to an area in Florida he had earlier visited with his father to witness senseless destruction of forests and clearing of land with no aim for future growth he declared: 'Man is cruel. Hypocritical, a dissembler, his dissimulation exceeds that of any being we are acquainted with, for he resembles dissimulation itself.'31

Bartram also wrote some perceptive remarks concerning animals: 'I am of the opinion that the creatures commonly called brutes possess higher qualifications, and more exalted ideas, than our traditional mystery-mongers are willing to allow them.'32

Connected with the Bartrams were a group of Friends I will just mention in passing. Peter Collinson (1694-1768). With Collinson we enter an Anglo-American era of botanical exploration with a veritable Quaker network of naturalists developing. Collinson's contacts were so many that he was known as the 'pollinating bee'. When Sir Hans Sloane gave his great collections to the nation (the nucleus of the future British Museum) Collinson helped with the arranging of some 120,000 articles.33

As Collinson was pivotal to John Bartram; so was John Fothergill (1712-1780) for William Bartram. In 1762, he acquired the thirty-acre Upton Park in Essex where he established a garden which rivalled Kew Gardens. Fothergill made it financially possible for William Bartram to make his celebrated travels.

Collinson and Fothergill appear on the botanists' panel of the Quaker Tapestry and so does Sydney Parkinson (1745-1771). The Scots Quaker Parkinson was the remarkable botanical artist on board Captain Cook's first epic voyage to the South Pacific. Like William Bartram he was a keen observer of nature and remarkably he produced nearly a thousand botanical drawings before his untimely death from dysentery and malaria on his voyage. Parkinson was only
26 years old.

Also like Bartram Parkinson wrote a journal and one entry in particular is evocative of Bartram: 'The land on both sides...affords a most dismal prospect being made up chiefly of barren rocks and tremendous precipices...How amazingly diversified are the works of the Deity within the narrow limits of this globe we inhabit, which, compared with the vast aggregate of systems that compose the universe, appears but a dark speck in the creation. A curiosity, perhaps, equal to Solomon's, though accompanied with less wisdom than was possessed by the Royal Philosopher, induced some of us to quit our native land, to investigate the heavenly bodies minutely in distant regions, as well as to trace the signatures of the Supreme Power and Intelligence throughout several species of animals, and different genera of plants in the vegetable system...'

In 1891 Friends formed an Anti-Vivisection Association which later became the Animal Welfare and Anti-Vivisection Society and in 1978 Quaker Concern for Animals. Quaker Green Concern now Quaker Green Action was later in development, formed in 1986. It is a gathering point for Quakers concerned with the global ecological crisis. Also there have always been a goodly number of Friends who maintain vegetarian and even vegan life styles.

In our day we have a battery of Friends who have become concerned for the environment and are vocal in their concern and action. One Friend, Rex Ambler, who lectured in theology at Birmingham University wrote an article in 1990 which has had a widespread effect on Friend's attitudes.

The piece was in *Friends' Quarterly* and was entitled *Befriending the Earth: a Theological Challenge*. From the very beginning Ambler starts right into the debate: 'Up till now we have been able to take the environment more or less for granted...Our attitude to the environment has been shaped by a long history of industrial development for which the environment has been little more than a material resource, and one that, it was supposed we were fully entitled to exploit as much as much as our needs required...What is worse, our religious tradition, which might have been expected to challenge this assumption, has in fact gone along with it and offered little by way of an alternative. The realm of nature has hardly been the subject of religious concern.'

Good strong stuff and long overdue. Again as Reginald Reynolds said: 'The inspired person can generally succeed in dragging the Society after him.'

Like Gerald Priestland I regard myself as an ecumenical Quaker, a member of a lay society or a contemplative order within the greater
Over the centuries Quakers have been able to prod fellow religionists in certain directions and this often solely by example. John Woolman and like-minded Friends were anti-slavery pioneers before there was an abolitionist movement.

The Quaker peace testimony has influenced many outside our small community. But as Margaret Mead once commented: ‘Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever does.’

And now there are Quakers who see that we face the greatest challenge ever—the very future of our planet. The destruction of environments for financial gain is not new. As Woolman wisely warned more than 200 years ago ‘impoverishing the earth now to support outward greatness appears to be an injury to the succeeding age.’

Even though today he is recognized as a Green prophet Woolman would never have dreamed that man would go as far as he has in destroying so much in our increasing power over nature.

But Woolman would recognize how difficult it is to get people concerned enough to make important changes in their life styles. Sometimes you think that even those who call themselves religious will have to see the melting ice come down the Thames and Hudson rivers.

As before in their history Quakers need to be led by the Spirit. We recognize God within us and within creation so Quakers can start with ourselves rather than wait for movements and authorities above and outside us. We believe that the kingdom of God can come through us and our response to the Light and Truth.

 Appropriately the last advice and query in Quaker Faith and Practice, number 42 is as follows: ‘We do not own the world, and its riches are not ours to dispose of at will. Show a loving consideration for all creatures, and seek to maintain the beauty and variety of the world. Work to ensure that our increasing power over nature is used responsibly, with reverence for life. Rejoice in the splendour of God’s continuing creation.’

David Sox
Presidential Address given at
Britain Yearly Meeting on 25 May 2008
QUAKERS AND THE NATURAL ORDER

NOTES and REFERENCES
5. 1988 Britain Yearly Meeting papers.
9. See ‘Thou shalt not covet the earth’ in *The Economist*, 21 December 1996; also see section 2 of *The Creation Was Open to Me* compiled by Anne Adams and Jean Hendry, Quaker Green Action, 1996.
11. Physic originally meant ‘pertaining to things natural as distinct from the metaphysical’.
12. *Journal of George Fox*, p.27.
26. Several years ago Sir Christopher Booth and I planted a *Franklin alatamaha* near William Penn’s grave at Jordans.


32. Ibid, p.lvi.


35. The Friends Vegetarian Society was set up in 1902.


CAPTAIN BISHOP OF THE [?]:
THE MILITARY CAREER OF
GEORGE BISHOP

George Bishop was a leading Quaker from 1654 to his death in 1668. Although he is not known to have essayed oral ministry, he was a prolific pamphleteer, and for some time maintained at Bristol the sort of secretariat and information centre for which his previous career had well qualified him. For it is generally accepted that he was the Captain George Bishop who had been responsible for counter-intelligence and security surveillance under the Republic until being forced into retirement in 1653.

Bishop’s transition to Quakerism is well documented, not least in reports to his successor, Secretary Thurloe. By November 1654 Burroughs and Howgill were writing to Margaret Fell about meetings in ‘Captain Bishop’s house’ in Bristol, and next year Fox met him ‘with his sword by his syde’. All these links make the identification certain, as does Bishop’s own later testimony.

Bishop’s formal appointment to his central intelligence role dates from 1650, but Aylmer notes that he was already reporting to the Council of State in May 1649. In fact the record goes back a little earlier still: in May the Council was acknowledging a previous report; in April they had instructed him to apprehend some suspect persons; and in March they had appointed him to a commission of enquiry into the management of the Forest of Dean. This was the beginning of the relationship: the Council of State was itself a new body in a newly fashioned Republic and it was still inclined to call him Robert. But although he was based in Bristol, his position was recognised as going beyond the duties of a regimental officer: just after appointing him as Secretary of the Committee for Examinations on £200 a year, the Council was considering ‘what has been expended by him in carrying out some public services and what shall be paid him’. It is then a reasonable inference that Captain Bishop was operating at least semi-officially as an intelligence officer from the inauguration of the Republic in 1649 if not before.

But questions remain about the path which led to this position. There has been doubt about his origins, which is readily cleared up. But what he was doing between leaving Bristol in 1643 and taking up his post in 1650 is more of a mystery. When did he become Captain, in what unit and what service had he seen? Making fuller use of Bishop’s own memoir and with a little new evidence, this article sketches a solution which seems to make sense of all that is known.
Origins

When Aylmer wrote *The State’s Servants*, he was still toying with alternative George Bishops. But in the first sentence of his *Manifesto*, Bishop claims Bristol as his native city. So we can eliminate the Wiltshire lad who became a stationer in London. That leaves two Bristol George Bishops, both apprenticed in the 1630s. Both these qualify as having been, in Bishop’s own words. ‘very young when the differences began between the late King and the Parliament’, so resolving Aylmer’s uncertainty over Bishop’s life in the 1630s. Given his later role as purveyor of beer to the troops in Ireland, we may with some confidence prefer the one who was apprenticed to his father Thomas Bishop brewer in 1631 and gained the freedom of the city on that score in 1649 over the other who was apprenticed pewterer in 1634. A normal seven year apprenticeship would have concluded in 1638, but Bishop was very likely still in his teens.

Bishop’s memoir goes to say that he sided with Parliament, left the city in July 1643 when it was taken by Rupert and returned again when the city was retaken by Parliament. He gives no indication of what he was doing in the interim. We may presume that he went to London along with the other refugees. Aylmer wondered if he may have been the George Bishop who was in partnership with the stationer and publisher Robert White. But this sounds more likely to be the Wiltshire stationer referred to above. White’s partner edited *Parliament’s Post* in Late 1645, when our Bishop, according to his own account, had re-entered Bristol. And for what it is worth, the rather crude triumphalist prose of *Parliament’s Post* seems different from our George Bishop’s tone.

Naseby

The first publication attributed to the military George Bishop is his report on the battle of Naseby. It is by ‘GB a gentleman in the Army’ on the title page, and subscribed George Bishop, but without rank. This would be consistent with his having been a Lieutenant or Ensign, as these ranks were not generally used as titles outside the military context whereas Captain was, then as now. Moreover, Captain was the lowest rank over which the Houses of Parliament had concerned themselves in the setting up of the New Model: below this level, Fairfax was allowed to make or approve appointments on his own. So Bishop may have been a junior officer, although unmentioned in the official lists. ‘Gentleman’ might also be consistent with his being a civilian attached to, or as we might say embedded in, the Parliamentary force. But his account is directed to Lieutenant Colonel Roe, Scoutmaster General for the City of London,
implying a place within the military intelligence network, even at this stage.

Bishop's account is an overview of the battle which includes the initial disposition of Fairfax's force. This does not agree with Streeter's tableau in Josiah Sprigge's Anglia Rediviva, but that does not make it inauthentic.\(^{21}\) The narrative does not suggest that the writer was personally engaged in the battle. Bishop refers to the gallantry of 'the officers' in the third person. He heard Fairfax speak to the wounded Skippon and eventually helped the latter to a house and to dress his wounds. This would not be an appropriate action for a young officer with troops under him unless detailed to it by a superior. He also conversed with Skippon in a manner respectful enough but suggesting some acquaintance; and his next paragraph, from 'our Headquarters' gives a quick account of the concentration of Parliamentary forces upon Leicester, which is not the sort of intelligence likely to be available to a junior regimental officer.\(^{22}\)

Taken altogether, the indications suggest an intelligence officer on the staff of Skippon, who was the General of Foot, or possibly even of Fairfax.\(^{23}\) After this battle, Skippon himself remained hors de combat for some time, but his regiment took part in the siege of Bristol in September. A place in the general staff however would be rather more consistent with Bishop's having 'returned again when the city was retaken by the Parliament' – a rather bloodless phrase if Bishop had been engaged in the storming of it.\(^{24}\)

**Bristol**

By 1646, Bishop seems more closely involved with Skippon and his garrison at Bristol. His memoir states that when Skippon was governor of Bristol 'I was in command under him, my very loving friend'.\(^{25}\) This is confirmed in a new item of evidence. In June 1657, one Hugh Davy claimed the ex-servicesman's right of setting up business without being a freeman from the Mayor & Aldermen of Bristol and cited a certificate of Bishop's of 30 April 1655 testifying that Davy had been 'under my command and in the regiment of Maj Genn Skippon the Governor of Bristol the 12 February 1645 [ie 1646 NS] to the 26th day of September 1646'.\(^{26}\) In neither certificate nor memoir does Bishop give his rank, but the company was the basic unit of management out of battle, so his 'in command' should imply Captain at least. By this time then Bishop was a regimental officer. If he had been so at Naseby, it is easy to suppose that Skippon, no longer a field commander with official staff, had found a regimental post to keep a useful aide by him.

The dating of Davy's certificate is interesting. We cannot tell
whether it describes the term of his service or only of Bishop's knowledge of it. But an end in September 1646 coincides with Skippon's leaving Bristol in order to attend the obsequies of his old commander and patron, the Earl of Essex. If Bishop was by way of an aide and staff officer to Skippon he might have accompanied him, and perhaps remained with him through much of 1647, when Skippon was first governor of Newcastle, and then re-engaged as a field commander in time to act as a mediator in the early stages of the confrontation between the Army and the Parliament.

Skippon's regiment was also posted to Newcastle early in 1647. But by 1648, Skippon himself was back in London directing counter-insurgency measures. Given that, before the second Civil War, Bristol was being reported as a hotbed of 'malignancy', Skippon might have been glad to have Bishop returned to, or remaining in, Bristol. This seems at any rate to make a plausible link between Bishop's role in 1645 and 1646 and his subsequent emergence in the state security service.

I should also surmise that Bishop was one of those involved in the petition from Bristol to Parliament and to Fairfax, in September 1647, which presented the Army-Leveller programme of that time rather than anything dear to Bristol interests, and the similarly radical one of 1648, which claimed to be from the same source. The wording of the first carefully avoids claiming that the petitioners were freemen of Bristol, and two of the four men who presented the second petition were Army officers in Bristol. Bishop, officer and Bristolian though not yet freeman, fits the profile well. He was already proclaiming his radical views in another forum.

**Putney**

There is no other mention of Bishop in the official records until the autumn of 1647, when the Council of the Army met at Putney. On 29th October there was a famous discussion about the franchise and property: A Captain Bishop intervened to suggest that they should listen to a letter from the preacher John Saltmarsh in case 'God doe manifest anything by him'. On November 1st there was an even more momentous debate on how far God permitted or enjoined the Army to strike against the King and the Lords – a prelude in effect to Pride's Purge. Bishop's contribution here was uncompromising: they could not preserve the Kingdom and the Man of Blood, its king. Captain Bishop was also on the list of those who signed a declaration that they had never intended to oppose the sending propositions to the King.

This Captain Bishop is never given a first name in the Clarke
papers but is generally taken to be George. His stance at Putney is clear. But what was his standing? The Council of the Army consisted of ‘those general officers of the Army (who have concurred with the Army...) with two commissioned officers and two soldiers to be chosen from each regiment.’ Skippon himself was present, though apparently silent. No Captain Bishop is listed in any capacity, but Skippon’s regiment is thought by Firth to have been represented only by a single officer, Major Cobbett. It would seem open therefore to suppose that Bishop may have attended as Skippon’s aide or as the other commissioned agitator from his regiment, or as both, with confusion between the roles standing in the way of his clear identification in either.

**Contacts**

But we should not press the association with Skippon too far. Bishop claimed that he had himself been responsible for securing the Governorship of Bristol for Colonel Fleetwood, and deprecated Fleetwood’s being superseded by Skippon. He had further endeavoured to get Fleetwood elected as MP for Bristol in January 1646 and had remonstrated with Skippon over the election in which Fleetwood was not returned. Fleetwood was already notorious as a supporter of religious Independents and sectaries, and was to become a member of the Wallingford House group who attempted in 1659 to revive the old Republic.

These representations imply that George Bishop had the ear of those in high places, apart from Skippon. This impression is reinforced by his account of his labours to mitigate the post-war compositions imposed on some Bristol notables. He pleaded their case with Fairfax himself (who had agreed the terms of surrender on which the Bristol men hoped to rely), with Cromwell and other generals and with the central committees for sequestration and composition, and to Parliament. Now it is certain that the Bristol malignants were very slowly and lightly dealt with, and that Alderman Hooke especially received a mysterious pardon. Possibly Bishop claimed too much for his own efforts, but the picture which one gets, albeit distressingly short on dates, is scarcely that of a routine regimental officer. It is however consistent with his being the sort of man who would be communicating directly with the Council of State in 1649.
Conclusions

My overall reconstruction therefore runs like this. When Bishop left Bristol in 1643, he went to London and engaged himself in the Parliamentary cause, not as a soldier but as a collector and analyst of information, and became an agent of the Scoutmaster General of London. Skippon, who had strong links with the London militia, took Bishop on his staff when he was made General of Foot in the New Model Army, probably with some military rank below that of Captain. When Skippon found himself at Bristol, he took the opportunity to keep Bishop by promoting him to a Captaincy in his own regiment. But Bishop remained essentially an intelligence officer, known as such to those in high command. In the time of the second Civil War, he made a natural transition to counter-intelligence and national security.

Bishop attended the Putney meetings of the Council of the Army either as the second commissioned agitator for Skippon’s regiment or as aide to Skippon – or both. So by the time he was actually appointed as Secretary under the Commonwealth, he had recommended himself by a combination of active intelligence work, zeal for the cause of religious republican radicalism and personal acquaintance with the Army leadership. The sword which George Fox remarked upon may never have been drawn in anger, but the pen had been active for a decade before he turned Quaker publicist.

Jonathan Harlow

A revised version of the article appeared in The Regional Historian No 10 (Spring 2009) pp 10-14.

FOOTNOTES

1 The West answering to the North (1657, Thomason E.900/3) shows him in this capacity.
2 Possibly because Bishop was too ideologically motivated for an increasingly pragmatic regime, or perhaps because he was simply reckoned less competent, various kinds of work were re-assigned to Scott or Thurloe until Bishop resigned: J Peacey ‘Commonwealth England: A Propaganda State?’ History 91.2 (2006), 176-199, p.178. It would be constructive dismissal today.
GEORGE BISHOP

5 A Manifesto Declaring what George Bishop hath been to the City of Bristol np 1665 (Wing/B2999) p.16.


7 Calendar of State Papers Domestic (CSPD) 1649/50 149; 75, 3 April 1649; 19 May 1649; 3 April 1649; 54, 26 March 1649.

8 CSPD 1650 443, 26 November 1650.

9 He is not to be found in any military or regimental histories. There was a Captain George Bishop in Ludlow's regiment but this was not engaged at Naseby (see below) and this officer seems to have been with his regiment in Ireland in the early 50s when Bishop was at Whitehall: Aylmer State's Servants p.273. Bishop is not among the names considered for captaincies in the New Model Army in 1645, let alone appointed so: Ian Gentles 'Choosing of Officers for the New Model Army' Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 57 (1994) 264-285. Maryan Feola George Bishop: Seventeenth-century Soldier turned Quaker (York, William Sessions 1996) has very little to say about his soldiering.

10 Manifesto p.1.

11 Aylmer State's Servants p.272.


13 Ibid.


15 Bristol Record Office (BRO) 04352/5 Register of Apprentices 1626-1640 f. 192; BRO F/Au/1/23 Mayor's Audit Books 1648/9 f. 276.

16 Manifesto p.1.

17 Aylmer State's Servants 272-3.


19 A More Particular and Exact Relation of the Victory London, 1645 (Thomason E.288/38). That it was published by R Coate renders it unlikely that the author was part owner of a publishing business.


21 Streeter (if he can be believed, as Ian Gentles qualifies in The Civil Wars ed J Kenyon & J Ohlmeyer, Oxford, OUP 1998, p.142) has Waller’s and Pickering’s regiments by Skippon’s on the left of the infantry front line and Pride, Hammond and Rainborough as the
second line; while Bishop (p1) has Pride, Hammond & Rainborough alongside Skippon. But his account is far more compact than Sprigge's and he may have elided the initial disposition into the critical part of the action where these second line regiments pitched in to support Skippon's stand against the Royalist infantry.

22 More Particular Relation p.3.

23 'Staff seems a sadly neglected area of investigation. Even the interesting article 'Command & Control' by David Blackmore (English Civil War Times 57, pp 19-25, unfortunately cropped of its references) does not deal with the immediate entourage of a general in battle. But we can tell that apart from life-guards, there would be a trumpeter and a standard bearer – with backups perhaps, and a handful of men, up to at least to the rank of ensign, for running messages.


26 BRO 04471/1 Book of Orders, Memorials & Transactions of the Mayor and Aldermen 1653-1660 f##.

27 For Skippon between 1645 and 1649, see Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB).

28 House of Lords Journal vol 8 (1802) 22nd and 26th January 1646/7; ibid vol 9 27th May 1647.

29 The Designes and Propositions of the Lord Inchequin ... the proceedings of the Royalists at Bristol, etc London 1648 (Thomason E.441/2); CSPD 1648 pp54-56 (1 May 1648).

30 Two Petitions of divers Freeman of England, inhabitants in the city of Bristol – signed with many thousand hands. London 1647 Thomason, E. 405/23 dated 'Sept 4'); A Letter from sixteen gentlemen of Kent ... And also the Remonstrance and Petition of divers honest inhabitants of the City of Bristol London 1648 (Thomason E.477/1 dated '16 Dec').

31 Major Samuel Clark who did not become a freeman of Bristol till 1652; and Captain Norris who was in the garrison: H Nott & E Ralph (eds) The Deposition Books of Bristol II 1650-1654 (Bristol Record Society XIII, 1947) p.49. The other two were James Powell, a Councillor since 1646 and to be City Chamberlain in 1651 and a Mr Robert Stapleton, whom I have unable to trace.

32 The Clarke Papers ed C Firth (reprinted London, RHS 1992) I p.340. John Saltmarsh was Fairfax's chaplain, a champion of religious liberty who just after this was to remonstrate with Cromwell over the suppression of the Levellers.

33 Clarke Papers I 383.
Nearly all the signatories below the rank of Major are listed as agitators on pp 436-439. The exceptions, apart from Bishop, are Capt Cox, who may have been from the London trained bands (I p 153) and Capt Disney.

Cited in M Kishlansky *The Rise of the New Model Army* p.342 n 87.

In view of Bishop’s advocacy, see below, we may note that the second agitator from Fleetwood’s regiment is also nameless.

In view of Bishop’s advocacy, see below, we may note that the second agitator from Fleetwood’s regiment is also nameless.

Indeed, Bishop, with Thomas Speed, addressed a letter to him and two other members of this group in 1658 on behalf of some Baptists condemned in Nevis. British Library, Stowe MS 189 f 64.

He was still pursuing the business when he got to Whitehall ‘in the nature of a Secretary of State’ (p.16) ie late 1650, but at this stage his access to the corridors of power is no surprise.

ANOTHER QUAKER "LUNATICK":
THE WORCESTER ORIGINS OF
JONATHAN STOKES, JUNIOR
(1754-1831), PHYSICIAN, BOTANIST,
GEOLOGIST AND YOUNGEST
MEMBER OF THE
LUNAR SOCIETY (FROM 1783).

INTRODUCTION

This paper discusses an inadequately known eighteenth
century scientist, whose origins and Quaker connections
have been quite forgotten. As a result his Worcester birth and
date of birth, are both confused in his entry in the new *Oxford
Dictionary of National Biography* 2004 (hereafter ODNB). Similarly he
gets no mention in analyses of Quakers, or of Quaker scientists, like
Geoffrey Cantor's recent survey (Cantor 2005).

JONATHAN STOKES' ORIGINS AND GRAVESTONE

Jonathan Stokes's origins were shrouded in mystery. His ancestry,
and date of birth, have defeated all those who have worked either on
him or on the Lunar Society. A source now at Derby Public Library
clearly originated the claim that he had Derbyshire origins. This three
volume MSS *Derbyshire Biography* dated 1853, was gathered by
William Bateman (1787-1835) and Stephen Glover (c. 1794-1869 –
ODNB for both). It records that Stokes "was born at Chesterfield, or
Dronfield" [where he was to marry in 1784] (Derby Public Library,
MSS 3296, vol. 3, 213). The German botanist George August Pritzel
(1815-1874) next recorded that Chesterfield and 1755 were Stokes's
place and date of birth (Pritzel 1872-1877, 307). The English botanist
James Eustace Bagnall (1830-1918) was perhaps the first to claim in
print in English that Chesterfield was his birthplace (1901, 70-71).
More recently Lunar Society historians, Robert Schofield (1963, 223)
have agreed, either that "Stokes was born at Chesterfield in 1755", or
according to Jenny Uglow (2002, 584), at least in that year. The new
ODNB entry (by the late Joan Lane) is more circumspect, stating that

Jonathan Stokes (1755?-1831), physician, the son of Jonathan Stokes (d.
1807?) was probably born at Chesterfield, Derbyshire [although] his family
had originated in Worcester, where his father was a nurseryman [and where]
Stokes was living in 1775 (Lane 2004). But Stokes’s Worcester-based notices only recorded that he had once “resided in Worcester” (Berrow’s Worcester Journal, (hereafter BWJ), 12 May 1831, 3, col. 1; Hastings 1834, 87 & Lees 1867, lxxxix). A Derbyshire appeal for Stokes information (Derbyshire Times, 31 December 1937, 18, cols 6-7) apparently drew no response. The first indication that Stokes was not born at Chesterfield or in 1755 came from a Chesterfield history. This recorded that his monumental inscription had read “In memory of Jonathan Stokes M.D., who was born in the city of Worcester, 4 November [recte October] 1754, died in this parish the 20th [recte 30th] April 1831” (Wallace), 1839, 111). The local printer of this anonymous work, first issued in about 18 parts from 1837, was Thomas Ford of the Irongate, “but a clergyman (believed to be the Rev. R Wallace) was the author, who based his work on [Rev. George] Hall’s history of 1823”, (Derbyshire Times, 7 February 1941, cutting pasted to front fly in Chesterfield Library copy). Robert Wallace (1791-1850, see ODNB) was Unitarian minister of Elder Yard, Chesterfield from 1815 to 1840. This was the religious persuasion of Jonathan Stokes, after he left, or was disowned by Quakers. Wallace had also been a schoolmaster there until 1831. The ending of this task could clearly have given him time to produce his anonymous 1837-1839 History. The Stokes’s family gravestones, once just outside the south-east corner of St Mary’s church, no longer survive in place. Their former locations, according to another transcript, were recorded, after 1930’s local road improvements necessitated their removal. Jonathan’s gravestone (no. 589) had read, according to this; “Jonathan and Thomas Stokes (born in the city of Worcester), born 4th November 1754, date of death 20th April 1831” (Parish Church Graves Register, 1933), and map (1934 – A 3194, both Chesterfield Public Library). This stone must survive, among the hundreds of stones now stacked vertically, but invisibly, around the perimeter of the graveyard. At least all records are definite about Stokes’s birthplace, if neither are accurate about his dates, or of the wholly mysterious Thomas Stokes recorded in one. Some misinformation is clear, since Stokes is now known to have been born on 4 October 1754 and to have died on 30 April 1831 (and been buried 9 May - see Derbyshire Courier (Chesterfield), 7 May, 3, col. 3, Derbyshire Mercury, 11 May, 3, col. 2 & BWJ, 12 May 1831). Similarly erroneous dates were recorded of other Chesterfield gravestones, for Stokes’s wife and eldest son. The former was aged 91, not 94 (Derbyshire Courier, 17 August 1844, 3, col. 6), and the year of death of Dr. Jonathan Rogers Stokes (1785-1818) was not 1819 (compare Derby Mercury, 24 December 1818, 3, col. 1, with [Wallace] 1839, 112).
JONATHAN STOKES’S WORCESTER QUAKER ORIGINS

Armed with this information, the mystery was solved in Monthly Meeting of Worcestershire Register of Births 1660-1793, Marriages 1663-1792 and Burials 1666-1776 of the People called Quakers in and near the city of Worcester (Public Record Office – hereafter PRO – RG 6/808 (formerly 664), 36). The following entry, “Jonathan, the son of Jonathan and Rebecca Stoakes [sic] born the 4th of 10th month [October] 1754”, is confirmed in the copy Digest of Worcester Births preserved at Friends House Library, London. With this a search could start for Stokes’s ancestry.

But hopes of finding any record of his parents’ marriage proved illusory, even after the discovery of the allegation for their marriage licence. This dated 31 January 1753, read

Appeared personally, Jonathan Stokes [Jonathan’s father] of the parish of St. Nicholas, in Worcester, Glover and John Stokes [his grandfather] of the same parish, Clerk and alleged that there is a Marriage intended to be solemnized between him, the said Jonathan Stokes aged 29 years, a Batchelor and Rebecca Alien of the Tything of Whistones [or Whitstone] in the parish of Claines, aged 28 years, a Spinster, her Father and Mother [being] dead and she at her own disposal... they severally made Oath and prayed Licence for the said Parties to be married in the Parish church of Claines, or the Chapel of St. Oswald’s Hospital, near the city of Worcester (Worcestershire Record Office – hereafter WRO).

The Marriage Bond (also WRO) only names St. Oswald’s Hospital as their intended venue. Since this marriage was not a Quaker one, a first question is why Jonathan Stokes senior’s apparently Quaker parents were intending their marriage should be before a priest, and thus face disownment (Milligan & Thomas 1999, paras 50 & 61). A second is why were they taking oaths, which Quakers then refused, instead of affirming. These must show that at least one parent was not then a Quaker.

On 30 January 1753 another surviving document was drawn up, previous to this marriage. Details of this are recorded in the draft “Abstract of title to estates at Cannock, co. Staffordshire, Worcester and Chesterfield, co. Derbyshire, commencing with the settlement, dated 30 January 1753, upon the marriage of Jonathan Stokes [senior] of Worcester, glover, and Rebecca Allen of the same, spinster, daughter of Isaac Allen, late of Birmingham, gent. deceased” (Shakespeare Centre Library and Records Office – hereafter SCLRO – ER 4/545, Stratford-on-Avon). This long document traces title through three generations to 1840, and includes some draft, uncatalogued, notes and a family tree concerning the descent of these estates from the children of Isaac Allen to, Jonathan Stokes junior’s surviving son, John Allen Stokes
(1786-1858). These documents, at least, explain the later Stokes family connections with Chesterfield. An updated, eighteenth century, map of their 28 acre Cannock property, named here at Walk Mill on the road from Cannock to Great Wyrley, "in the Liberties of Cannock and Wyrley", also survives (William Salt Library 115/3/41, Stafford).

Sadly the registers of both the places named for this intended marriage (Claines, in WRO, or St Oswald’s Hospital, in Worcester Cathedral archives) were then badly kept and no such marriage, which must certainly have taken place early in 1753, was entered at either. The set of BWJ held in Worcester Library is equally incomplete. The then current standard of record keeping of registers in the Churches and Chapels of Worcester, was clearly appalling. The Stratford-on-Avon documentation noted above (SCLRO ER 4/545) confirms this, recording that this marriage had been in 1753 but that this "entry [was even in 1840] not to be found".

It is no wonder that Philip Yorke (1699-1764), first earl of Hardwicke, should have seen the need to promote, later in 1753, what became known as Lord Hardwicke’s Marriage Act to prevent clandestine marriages (see ODNB), and to better regulate their record keeping. This would not, of course, have applied to marriages in which both parties were Quaker (Milligan & Thomas 1999, para 59). But this Act only came into force on 25 March 1754. One can at least see why, from this Stokes example, this Act should have declared that any relevant "marriage was [now to be] null and void, unless an entry was recorded in a parish register, and signed by the bride, and groom, at least two witnesses and the officiating clergyman" (Stone 1990, 124).

The other major problem facing the historian of Worcester Quakers is the surviving eighteenth and nineteenth century records of the Monthly Meeting there, from at least 1722 to 1840. Apart from their registers, which had had to be deposited earlier, these became flood victims which "badly damaged documents by water leaking into the safe, circa 1913". Some of these damaged records are now preserved at WRO (898.2, BA 1204, parcel 3 and BA 5583, received 1951 and 1971) but these are now both illegible and unavailable (Poole & Whistlecroft 2000, 7, 13, & 109-110). A further deposit (WRO 898.2 BA, 5570/4/ii) comprises "Extracts from Monthly Minutes now beyond repair 1722-1773". This loss has already thwarted the search for the history of William Gunn’s Charity, and does now for the Stokes’s Quaker connections.
GRANDFATHER REV. JOHN STOKES (c. 1697-1783)

The Stokes family had come from Dudley in today’s Black Country to Worcester. John Stokes arrived there in 1720 to act as assistant minister to Rev. Chewning Blackmore (1663-1737- see ODNB) at the Angel Street Nonconformist (then Congregational) Church, Worcester. In about 1722 Stokes married Penelope Hand (c.1695-1780 – BWJ, 23 March 1780, 3), daughter of the previous assistant there, Jonathan Hand, and soon Stokes commenced as schoolmaster, and kept his school in the present chapel, till from injuries to the building he was obliged to remove the school elsewhere. He never would be ordained, but continued to assist Mr. Blackmore and others till an unhappy disagreement caused him to remove from Worcester. His refusing ordination was the reason that prevented his becoming pastor. He lived to the advanced age of 86, and died at his son’s home, at the Rhyd, [south of Worcester] now the seat of the Lechmeres (Noake 1861, 116, copied by Urwick 1897, 92-93 & 213).

When John Stokes left Worcester, he had become minister, by 1764, “to a small congregation at Ledbury, but for some years before his death resided in Worcester or its vicinity” (Noake 1861, 118). After Ledbury, he moved to Rhydd [Ridd] Green, east of Great Malvern, 6 miles south of Worcester. An intriguing notice written later by his grandson, Jonathan junior, shows he here became, late in life, a commercial florist or market gardener, with his eldest unmarried daughter; at “Riddgreen garden on stratified red clay, cultivated by J[ohn] and his daughter Penelope Stokes, florists” (Stokes 1830, cxxiv).

The death here of the “Rev. Mr John Stokes, on Sunday last” in August 1783, aged 85, was reported, and that “his great abilities and excellent character, as a minister of the gospel, and an instructor of youth, procured him great respect” (BWJ, 4 September 1783, 3, col. 4). His will dated 14 May 1770, proved 24 September 1783, of “the parish of Hanley Castle”, survives in PRO, among Prerogative Court of Canterbury (hereafter PCC) wills (PROB 11/1108). It left his Summer House in Sansome Fields Garden, Worcester and his two houses in Powick to his son Jonathan senior. It also mentions his daughter Penelope, his son-in-law Yerrow Arrowsmith senior and his four grandchildren, our Jonathan Stokes junior (to whom he left all his books) and Mary, Samuel and Yerrow Arrowsmith junior. In a codicil added 1 June 1782, he asked that “five pounds be given to the Worcester Infirmary to ye poor of ye Congregation of Protestant Dissenters to which I now belong”. His wife Penelope had died before him, in March 1780; “on Thursday last, Mrs Stokes, late of this city, aged 85” (BWJ, 23 March 1780, 3).
JOHN STOKES’ SIX CHILDREN

The Angel Street Congregational baptismal registers have major gaps from 1736-1743, 1748-1758 and 1760-1777 so records of John Stokes’s family and children are incomplete. But five children as recorded in these, without the parents being named, who must be his and his wife Penelope senior’s. These are

1) Jonathan [senior], bapt 8 August 1723,
2) Elizabeth, bapt 24 September 1728,
3) Mary, bapt 3 March 1730,
4) Joseph, bapt 22 January 1736,
5) Ann, bapt 28 March 1736, (see Urwick 1877, and Registers at WRO)

The sixth, named only in John Stokes’s will, was his eldest, market-gardening, daughter, Penelope junior, who had escaped registration. She was born circa 1725, since she died in October 1787 aged 62 (BWJ, 11 October 1787, 3 col. 4). She was buried 14 October 1787 (Register of St Martin’s, Worcester – WRO). In her will, dated 7 October 1787, she, “a spinster late of Leopard in the parish of St Martin”, left “to my nephew Dr. [Jonathan] Stokes [junior] the sum of £20” (will in WRO).

Another daughter, Mary Stokes (1730-?) married Yerrow Arrowsmith (1715-1781) of Ledbury, at Colwall, Herefordshire on 24 January 1750 (see Fletcher 1894, 434-435 & Fletcher MSS, Shrewsbury Public Library, vol. 3, ff. 173-191). According to their marriage settlement, dated 16 January 1750, Yerrow Arrowsmith was then a merchant in Ledbury and, on their marriage, was to sell properties at Ledbury, Bosbury and Leominster, while John Stokes [Mary’s father, then] Gentleman of St. Nicholas, Worcester was to pay in £1,000 (Fletcher MSS, Shrewsbury Public Library, vol. 1). The Stratford documents record that Yerrow was in 1753, also a distiller at Ledbury (SCLRO ER 4/545). Mary’s brother, Jonathan Stokes senior (1723-1788, is again named in this marriage settlement as a glover of Worcester. Mary and Yerrow Arrowsmith had three children, 1) Yerrow junior, 2) Samuel and 3) Mary junior. The first two attended James Fell’s Boys’ School in Worcester, while Mary junior later married John Bourne Ford then of Newton, co. Montgomery, at Claines on 7 November 1789 (he had been baptised in Birmingham on 7 December 1762 – see International Genealogical Index – hereafter IGI).

It was clearly this new Arrowsmith connection which brought John Stokes, and his daughter Penelope, to live at Rydd Green, after 1764. Here Yerrow senior, “Esquire”, died on 11 May 1781 (BWJ, 17 May 1781, 3, col. 4). In his will, proved in PCC, 27 June 1781 (PRO, PROB 11/1078), he devised his properties to his children and directed his
trustees to sell his lands in Ridd Green and Hanley Castle and to pay, out of the proceeds, £1,500 to his daughter Mary. But his will was then left unadministered by his executors, Jonathan and Penelope Stokes, and administration had to be much later granted to Samuel Buxton of Grays Inn, London on 26 April 1825.

JONATHAN STOKES SENIOR (1723-1728)

The eldest son, Jonathan Stokes senior, christened 8 August 1723, was father of 'our' Jonathan Stokes junior, youngest member of the Lunar Society. Jonathan senior was admitted a Worcester Freeman in 1745: "27 May 1745, Jonathan Stokes admitted and sworn a citizen as an apprentice to Benjamin Beesley, Glover" (Book of Freemen Admitted to the City of Worcester 1723-1757, Worcester City Archives, A15, p. 441, WRO). Jonathan is one of many Worcester glovers listed in 1747, of St Nicholas parish (Worcester Poll Book, 1747, 24, Worcester City Library and Eighteenth Century Collections Online). By the end of the eighteenth century 4,000 Glovers were said to be employed in Worcester (Victoria County History, 1906, vol. 2, 304), but the trade greatly suffered, after 1825, when importation of foreign gloves was allowed (Hull 1834, 57-60).

It seems likely that this Benjamin Beesley, whose will "of Worcester" was proved on 8 April 1754 (PRO, PCC, PROB 11/807), was then a member of Worcester Quakers. He must surely be the same man who married Ruth Dickson on 17 September 1724 in a Quaker marriage at Bristol (IGI). But Jonathan senior was probably not then a Quaker, because he was prepared to swear. Friends seem generally to have been recorded in these Worcester Admission books as making affirmations, "being of the people called Quakers". But perhaps the connection with Beesley and the Quakers is what led one or other of the Stokes towards Quakers? But which ones, and for how long, remain unsolved questions, because of the destruction of relevant Worcester Minutes. The Quaker Worcester glover Thomas Beesley (c. 1724-1797), who might even be Benjamin's son, later had strong connections with Coalbrookdale Quakers (Labouchere 1993, 359). He married, Mary née Reynolds (c. 1743-1808) in 1786 (BWJ, 2 March 1786, 3, col. 4, also Greg 1905, 35-36, 173-176). The name Beesley often appears in Worcester Quaker registers, but we should be reluctant to make connections without conclusive proof; a number of families in this Worcester meeting had members with the same names, but they were not all members of the Society of Friends.
JONATHAN SENIOR'S WIFE REBECCA, NÉE ALLEN (c. 1723-1800)

Jonathan senior married Rebecca Allen in 1753, as noted above. His wife, who came from Stafford, is better known, as this notice, certainly provided by her only son, Jonathan junior, appeared in 1800.

died May 1 at home of her son in Chesterfield aged 77, Mrs Rebecca Stokes, widow of Mr S. of Worcester, and second daughter of late Isaac Allen, Esq. of Stafford. She was an attentive reader of this [Gentleman's] Magazine from its first institution, and her occasional contributions are marked with the initials of her name ([Stokes] 1800).

Rebecca Allen was born about 1723. Her father was Isaac Allen of Birmingham and Stafford. He, as “Mr. Isaack Allen of St. Martin’s parish in Birmingham”, married “Mrs Rebecka Dancer of Stafford” at Kingswinford, Staffordshire on 4 November 1719 (Register at Staffordshire Record Office, hereafter SRO). She was clearly the daughter of John and Marie Danser, baptised on 28 September 1690 at St. Mary, Stafford (IGI). Isaac died intestate, but according to his 1733 letters of administration, which allowed for the education of their three young daughters, Mary, Rebecca and Anna, he had died in March 1733 (papers at Lichfield Record Office). His wife was here named as his executrix and, according to the attached inventory, his goods and chattels were valued at £437. It is also clear from Stratford records (SCLRO ER 4/545) that Allen was owner of considerable property at Cannock, Stafford, Worcester, and Chesterfield and Newbold, both in Derbyshire, which then descended to the Stokes family. These records also confirm that Rebecca’s only surviving, younger, sister Ann(a) Alien (c. 1727-1801 - see Staffordshire Advertiser, 16 May 1801, 4, col. 5, and her will, PRO, PCC PROB 11/1359, proved 25 June 1801) had married John Southwell (c.1724-1797 - see Staffordshire Advertiser, 25 November 1797, 4, col. I) on 13 January 1762. They had no issue but he was headmaster of the free Grammar School in Stafford from 1749 to 1780 (Horne 1930, 43 & 70). Education was clearly an important priority for both the Allen and Stokes families.

JONATHAN STOKES SENIOR’S WORCESTER NURSERY

Apart from his work in gloving, Jonathan senior also carried on a market-gardening nursery and florist’s business in Worcester, just as his father and sister had, probably before him, at nearly Rhydd Green. This is first confirmed by this 1770 notice.

Whereas between the 16th and 17th of this Instant the Gardens of Jonathan Stokes [senior], in Sansome-Fields [Worcester], and of Mr.
Benjamin Karver, in the Tything, were robbed; of the former were taken a Bed-Quilt, and a Pair of Stockings... Whoever will hand over the Offender or Offenders, so that he or she may be brought to Justice, shall receive a Guinea Reward of either of the above Persons (BWJ, 24 May 1770, 3, col. 1).

In an assessment dated 22 April 1773 towards a Levy for the Relief of the Poor in St. Nicholas Parish (WRO, 850, BA 3696/5) Jonathan Stokes’s Summer House in Sansome Fields was levied at 5 shillings. The previous two levied here were his two neighbours, schoolmaster James Fell (see below) and Charles Trubshaw Withers (1720-1804 – see BWJ, 27 September 1804, 3 col. 4 & Covins 1989, 1-10). Both of these properties are marked, and named, on the 1779 map of Worcester made by George Young.¹

Sansome Place is where Worcester’s present Quaker meeting house had been opened in 1701 (Leech 2002, 1), but there is no evidence that any of the Gardens were owned by the Stokes family. From at least 1757, the lessee of this Bishopric land, part of the manor of Whiston’s, was the well-to-do Worcester weaver and glover Charles Trubshaw Withers, later knighted, in Worcester in 1788. Withers lived at Sansome House – a fine view of which was published by Nash (1782, vol. 2, opposite p. cxvi), near the meeting house. Withers developed this area, between 1757 and 1787, to create the famous Sansome Fields Walk, “the principal promenade in Worcester” with gravelled walks and “embowing” elms (Britton 1814, 136-138). Withers was also much involved in the establishment of the Worcester Infirmary (McMenemey 1947, 49 & 120) from 1747. A painting in the Worcester City Art Gallery of “Worcester from the East” made in the mid-eighteenth century, shows a distant view of what Sansome Fields must have looked like during this transformation. The Doharty map of 1741 and George Young’s of 1779 both show the extent of the estate. Withers’s lease passed to Thomas Blayney (1762-1838) in 1804. Only the Summer House was owned by the Stokes family (see John Stokes’s will of 1783).

At some stage, and certainly by 1775 (see below), Jonathan junior had joined this nursery business with his father Jonathan senior. The son later referred to their joint garden as “Sansom Fields Garden in Worcester, on silicious sand gravel, cultivated by Jonathan Stokes [senior] florist and his son [Jonathan junior]” (Stokes 1830, cxxiv). This demonstrates that he and his glover father had here continued the market-gardening tradition of Jonathan junior’s grandfather. Their garden was on, or near, the site of the present Quaker meeting house in Worcester (Leech 2002, 1). But neither of these early Stokes’s nursery businesses are noticed by Harvey (1974, 103) who only
Figure 1. The Sansome Fields Walk area as shown on George Young’s plan of 1779. Fell’s Boarding School and Withers’s Sansome House residence are both clearly marked.
records the two others, of James Biggs and Thomas Hammond, in Worcester, named in the *Universal British Directory* of 1793-1798, after Stokes senior had died and Jonathan junior had left the area. The historian of Sansome Fields area of Worcester equally fails to mention any Stokes nursery here (Covins 1989).

We know little more of Jonathan senior. He, and his sister Penelope, were involved in “leasing a messuage and land at Handley Castle” (clearly from the Arrowsmith connection) on 6 December 1782 (Birmingham City Archives, Bickley papers, MS 3069/Acc. 1920-020/288237). The register of Quaker Monthly Meeting births, marriages and deaths, for Worcestershire 1660-1793, makes no further mention of him. His supposed date of death 1807 (Lane 2004), is also wrong, as his wife was widowed by 1800. In fact, “Mr. Jonathan Stokes of Sansome Fields, in this city” had died on 6 April 1788 (BWJ, 10 April 1788, 3, col. 3). He was buried 10 April 1788 at St Martin’s church, Worcester (register WRO). According to SCLRO ER 4/545, the “letters of administration of his effects [were] granted to his son Dr. Jonathan Stokes on 4 March 1789”.

**JONATHAN STOKES JUNIOR (1754-1831)**

His birth as “Jonathan, son of Jonathan and Rebecca Stoakes [sic] on ye 4th of 10th mon[th] 1754” is recorded in the Register “of the people called Quakers in and near the city of Worcester” (PRO RG 6/808 [olim 664], 36). It gives no more detail. There is no indication which of his parents were then members of the Society of Friends, or ‘in unity’, although this may simply be because the registering Friend left this out. The Quaker custom of eschewing the pagan names of some months by numbering them all, with the national changeover in 1752 to New Style dating, might perhaps still then have confused some, but it seems certain that Stokes was born on 4 October 1754 in Worcester, and that his Chesterfield gravestone was slightly inaccurate. Stratford records wrongly claim instead that this date was that of his unperformed baptism!

**JONATHAN JUNIOR’S EDUCATION AT JAMES FELL’S WORCESTER QUAKER SCHOOL, CIRCA 1764-1766**

Jonathan Stokes junior’s connections with Quakers continued at school in Worcester. A Friend called James Fell (c. 1707-1788), assisted by his wife Grace (died 1768), ran the local Quaker Boys School, attended by Jonathan junior. Fell had come to Worcester, from Glastonbury, Somerset, in 1742 to open this school (Collier 1949, 118-119 & Labouchere 1988, 272; 1993, 368). We do not know exactly
where it was first located in its early days, but it was almost certainly in the parish of St Nicholas (since Fell then had goods distrained there). Later he brought property opposite the gate of the present meeting house in Sansome Place (Leech 2002, 2), as shown on Young's map of 1779 (Figure 1). This school was well known in its day (and is listed by [Tuke] 1843, 70-71, amongst the Quaker Boys Schools between 1760-1780), but it seems to have sunk quickly, and almost without trace, after 1768. This is sad, considering the number of important Friends who were taught there, as the following list of scholars at Fell's school in circa 1764-1766² (see Atkinson 1933, 248) demonstrates [additions to this are given in square brackets here].

1) James Stone, Grindon Court, Herefordshire
2) Thomas Tanner, Shiplot [Sidcot], Somersetshire [presumed ancestor of the paper manufacturing family, Milligan 2007, 429]
3) Richard Vaux, London, Middlesex
4) Richard Naylings, Leominster, Herefordshire
5) Joseph Hillear, Osentry, Worcestershire
6) James Motley, Morton [near Thornbury], Gloucestershire [1752-1788, see Dictionary of Quaker Biography (hereafter DQB – TSS at Friends House, London) & James 1980, 2]. His grandson Thomas (1808-1891) became a noted civil engineer, but his own son Thomas senior (1784-?) went bankrupt in 1820 and was disowned by Quakers]
7) Samuel Freeth, Coventry, Warwickshire
8) William Blew, Bromyard, Herefordshire
9) Thomas Corbyn, Eymore, Worcestershire [only son of Thomas (1710/11-1791), Worcester-born pharmaceutical chemist [Milligan 2007, 117-118]
10) Ambrose Lloyd [1754-1787], Birmingham, Warwickshire [Banker, Lloyd 1975]
11) Thomas Beavington [1754-1837], Ross, Herefordshire [Tanner, the compiler of this List, see Atkinson 1933, 248 (who wrongly called Fell, Joseph) & Labouchere 1993, 77. His father William (1722-1809) is in DQB. His relative Timothy (1726-1802), is another Worcester glover listed by Milligan 2007, 48]
12) John Miller, Jamaica, Westmoreland
13) William Young (1754-?), Leominster, Herefordshire [son of William Young (1718/19-1808) – see DQB & Labouchere 1993, 77, a younger brother of the map maker (of Figure & Note 1)]
14) John Allen, Bradford, Wiltshire
15 Jacob Young, Earthcot, Gloucestershire
16) Richard Corbyn, Eymore, Worcestershire [a relative of 9) above]
17) John Fowler, Horton, Staffordshire
18) Samuel Darby [1755-1796], Coalbrookdale, Shropshire
   [Ironfounder – Milligan 2007, 141-2 & Labouchere 1993, 365,
   younger son of ironmaster Abraham Darby II. He entered Fell’s
   school on 23 July 1766 (Atkinson 1933, 248)]
19) Thomas Hunley, Netherton, Worcestershire
20) Charles King, Bristol, Somersetshire
21) Walter Berry, Taunton Somersetshire
22) Thomas Slarey [Slaney?], Tenb [u] ry, Worcestershire
23) Sil [a] s James, Swanse [Swansea], Glamorganshire
24) Joshua Chorley, Leek, Staffordshire
25) Richard Woodmass, London, Middlesex
26) William Rathbone [IV 1757-1809], Liverpool, Lancashire
   [Mercantile Merchant – see DQB; Nottingham 1992, 15-22 &
   Milligan 2007, 354]
27) Robert Clibborn, Dublin, Ireland
28) Henry Deaves, Dublin, Ireland
29) Robert Fowler [1755-1825], Melksham, Wiltshire [Wine & Spirits
   merchant – A Memoir of his life was published 1833 (Norwich:
   Wilkin & Fletcher), see Milligan 2007, 180 & Labouchere 1933,
   370]
30) Edward Chorley, Leek, Staffordshire [a relative of 24) above]
31) Ye[error] Arrowsmith [junior], Ridd Green, Worcestershire [see
   above re Arrowsmith family, son of Mary née Stokes, Jonathan
   senior’s sister, who married in 1750]
32) Henry Fry [1756-1817], Bristol, Somersetshire [eldest son of the
   founder, Joseph (1728-1787) of the firm of cocoa manufacturers in
   Bristol, see ODNB, Milligan 2007, 188 & Townend 1970, 1053]
33) Josh[ua] Shelton, Pershore, Worcestershire
34) Charles Tompson, East Indies
35) James Hale, Bristol, Somersetshire
36) James Miller, Jamaica, Westmoreland [a relative of 12) above]
37) Edmund Fry [1757-1835], Bristol, Somersetshire [Typefounder,
   see ODNB & Milligan 2007, 188; brother of Henry 32) above]
38) Samuel Arrowsmith, Ridd Green, Worcestershire [brother of
   Yerrow, 31) above]
39) George Abney, Birmingham, Warwickshire
40) Jacob Frampton, Bristol, Somersetshire
DAY SCHOLARS
41) John Nott [?Mott], Worcester
42) John Burlingham [1753-1828], Worcester [Glover, see Burlingham 1991 & Milligan 2007, 80]
43) Thomas [Ford] Hill [1753-1795], Worcester [son of George, Worcester glover. He abandoned business for literature and antiquities and travelled widely on the Continent, see ODNB, he also corresponded with Jonathan Stokes junior]
44) James Turner, Worcestershire
45) William Trehern, Worcestershire
46) James Gammon, Worcestershire
47) Thomas Hill, Worcester [see Atkinson 1933, 248. There were then many families of Quaker Hills, at Worcester]
48) Edward Green, Worcester
49) Samuel Bradley, Worcester [1756-1767], [John Bradley (1737-1797), the Worcester glover listed by Milligan 2007, 60, was his eldest brother—and probably Thomas (1751-1813), the Worcestershire-born schoolmaster, see Note 1, and later the physician of ODNB, was another]
50) Edward Reding, Worcester
51) John Yeates, Worcester
52) Thomas Ashton, Worcester
53) Jonathan Stokes [1754-1831 junior], Worcestershire [subject of this paper]
54) John Rose, St Johns
55) Richard Skinner, Worcester
56) Samuel Overton, Worcester
57) Richard Crump, Worcester

OTHERS
a) Half Boarders
58) Thomas Hill, Worcester [see also 43) and 47) above]
b) The Usher [Deputy Schoolmaster]
59) William [Manwaring] Hollifear [or Hoolefear (c. 1741-1816), Worcester (He later matriculated at Oxford University, where he graduated B.A. in 1774. He became a Church of England minister, serving, by 1782, as curate at Croome D’Abitot and Croome Hill, Worcestershire, see Ransome 1968, 90-91. He was a botanist, like Jonathan Stokes, who recorded how Hollefear had collected the plants of Worcestershire to which his name is attached]
in [Withering and Stokes] Botanical Arrangement, vol.1 [1787] p.xi at Severn Stoke and Crome, when curate [there]. The cultivator of Crome garden [Croome d’Abitot, Worcestershire], George William Coventry, [sixth] Earl of Coventry [(1722-1809) then] appointed him to the vicarage of Wolvey in Leicestershire [now Warwickshire], when relinquishing the study of nature and, presenting me with his herbarium, he gave himself up wholly to parochial duties (Stokes 1830, cxvii).

Here Hollehear proved a devoted minister (Gentleman’s Magazine, 86 (1), 281, 1816). But Stokes’s own herbarium is now sadly lost (Kent & Allen 1984, 251-2).

c) no place mentioned – so it not clear if these were pupils or teachers (see Atkinson 1933, 248)

60) James Bullock and 61) Adam Bullock

Any full list of Fell’s school pupils, over earlier and later years, would include all the children of ironmaster Abraham Darby II (1711-1763), of Coalbrookdale (see ODNB). As a result there are several references to Fell and his school in the diaries of Darby’s wife Abiah (1716-1793), and 1767 (Labouchere 1988) and those of their daughter-in-law, Deborah Darby, née Barnard (1754-1810), between 1762 and 1764 (Labouchere 1993). A Fell school book which belonged to Abraham Darby III (1750-1789, see ODNB & Milligan 2007, 139), is a fascinating survival from the school before 1764 (now preserved at Ironbridge Gorge Museum).

Other well known figures above, apart from Jonathan Stokes, who as a day boy could have walked from his close-by Summer House, include William Rathbone IV of Liverpool, the Frys of Bristol and Thomas Ford Hill. Another Quaker member of the Lunar Society, Samuel Galton junior (1753-1832) of Birmingham (see Smith 1967), was also briefly at James Fell’s school in 1760-1761 (Pearson 1914, vol. 1, 43), before he moved on to Warrington Academy in 1768 (Turner 1957, 65). Galton was the father of Mary Anne Schimmelpenninck (1778-1856) whose Autobiography contains the fascinating glimpse of Jonathan Stokes; “profoundly scientific and eminently absent” Hankin 1860, 31), which first enabled him to be identified as a member of the Lunar Society (Schofield 1963, 223). Another earlier Quaker pupil here was John Player (1725-1808 – Torrens 2003, x-xii), farmer of Stoke Gifford and Tockington near Bristol. He was a pioneer in both vaccination and geology, and noted in his diary how “on 9 September 1789 [he had] visited Grace and Sarah, two
daughters of my old master James Fell”, after Fell’s death (Diaries at Gloucestershire Record Office, D 5090). This shows that Player was another Fell pupil. This Player connection is confirmed by the receipt, signed by James and Grace Fell, for his brother James Player’s boarding and schooling with Fell in 1744-1745 (Friends House Library, London, Portfolio 36/100). John Player’s diaries only start in 1763 and his Fell schooling was at least two decades earlier.

Galton’s move to Warrington in 1768 must have been one sad result of the death of Grace Fell, James’ wife, in December 1768. She had played a vital part in the running of the school. Some pupils only stayed for a very short time after this, and, as Fell grew older and later became senile, the school declined rapidly as parents became dissatisfied with standards, after Fell’s death. These included the later physician George Logan (1753-1821) of Pennsylvania, in North America. He had been sent to finish his education in England at the age of 14 in 1768 at Fell’s school. Logan’s biographer recorded how by then

James Fell was a sullen misanthrope... George was especially unlucky in his teachers. James Fell had conducted the Friends School in Worcester for a quarter of a century [1742-1767], quite to the satisfaction of his Quaker employers. But when George [Logan] came under his tutelage, he was an embittered, bewildered man, stunned by the loss of his wife (Tolles 1953, 11-13).

James Fell had several children, including daughters Molly and Peggy (Labouchere 1988, 272; 1993, 16) and Sarah (c. 1738-1811). After the death of his wife Grace in December 1768, James moved to Charlbury, Oxfordshire to live with his daughter Sarah who later married William Squire (c. 1722-1784), a Charlbury maltster, at Worcester on 2 January 1783 (BWJ, 9 January 1783), but she sadly died soon afterwards (see DQB). Charlbury was then another centre for both Quakers and Gloving (Hey 2001, 63-76). James Fell himself died at Charlbury in December 1788. His long obituary notice recorded how he was

one of the people called Quakers, who for many years was Master of an eminent Boarding School in this city and as such was not without his peculiarities... He experienced much of the imbecilities incident to old age (particularly to men of genius) and a state of second childhood formed a striking contrast to that active exertion which so conspicuously marked the [earlier] vigour of his mental faculties (BWJ, 11 December 1788, 3, col. 4).

His will was proved on 8 July 1789 (PCC, PRO, PROB 11/1181).
JONATHAN STOKES JUNIOR'S EARLIEST WORK ON BOTANY

From his Botanical Commentaries (1830) we have already seen how Stokes inherited an interest in market gardening and thus botany, while working in Sansome Fields Garden, Worcester, with his florist father, Jonathan senior. Stokes's published botanical work yields further clues to his early days in Worcester. For example he had found "Scandix cerefolium near Worcester, growing in considerable plenty in the hedge on the south-east side of the Bristol road, just beyond the turnpike, in May 1775" (Lees 1831, 437 & Lees 1867, lxxxix). Other records date from this year, like "Chaerophyllum sativum in profusion on the sides of the Tewkesbury Road, just beyond the turnpike, first noticed by Dr. Stokes in 1775", or record significant locations like "Apium graveolens in Sansom Fields" (Hastings 1834, 158).

Unfortunately, the seventeenth and eighteenth century Monthly Meeting records for Worcester meeting were destroyed by water early last century, and so there seems no extant record which would give details of any potential admissions or subsequent disownments of Worcester Friends, like the Stokes's, for the period in question. But, as we shall see, the greater number of the known early associates of Jonathan Stokes junior were members of the Society of Friends. The first such association came when "Jonathan Stokes junior" was one of the many witnesses to the Quaker marriage of his Worcester glover school-friend John Burlingham (1753-1828) on 28 November 1777, to a sister of Samuel Bradley, another Fell pupil above. The certificate survives in family possession (I was sent a copy by Annette Leech, who obtained it from the late Richard Burlingham – see Burlingham 1991, 12).

The next such association is demonstrated in 1778 when, that spring, Stokes visited London. He wrote at length of his experiences there in a letter to the Quaker botanist William Curtis (1746-1799 – Curtis 1941, 32). His letter reads

Sansom Fields, Worcester, Thursday evening – May 21 1778 – the day which your Lectures begin for the success of which you have my sincerest wishes.

The pleasure which I received from the agreeable society in Grace Church Street, [London, where Curtis lived], during my stay in the great City will not suffer me to be any longer silent... When I tell you that on the morning after my arrival in Sansome Fields I found markes of the Jaundice in my face, with that excessive languor & disinclination to motion which you know is its constant attendant, your wonder will cease at me... Your letter to Mr. Heaton [sic – William Aiton (1731-1793, gardener at Kew 1759-1793, see ODNB] procured me the most
obliging reception. He was so obliging as to conduct me all over the Garden which is an elegant & noble collection of plants which does equal honour to the taste & skill of its Director. As I trust you will not suffer another summer to pass away without seeing it, I shall say nothing more of its contents, than that Mr. H. was so obliging as to fill my Botany Box with specimens of most of the more curious plants which were in blossom. You will be particularly pleased I think with the disposition of the Arboretum which is the design of Mr. H. It is almost needless to say that I found Mr Heaton to be an accurate & intelligent observer & found that he happily unites the manner of the English Country Gentlemen & the Man of Science. To add to my pleasure I was agreeably surprised to find him an advocate of a certain system of botanical nomenclature [clearly the new Linnean System, see Allen 1994, 34-37] which has only to lament that it has found the Botanists of London amongst the foremost of its opponents, amidst a crowd of amateurs who study Botany because it is fashionable, & condemn a performance which they have heard condemned. Forgive this digression & attribute it to a friendly partiality, which may have blinded my eyes though it cannot Mr. Heaton's. I left Kew & Mr. Heaton not without a degree of Reluctance. I pursued my walk after dinner to Richmond along the side of the Thames & the Pleasure Gardens of Kew & Richmond which do honour to the taste of the King. [After Hampton Court Palace] I walked through Eton to Slough, 12 miles, where I slept & the next morning got into one of the stages [coaches] to Oxford. The Physic Garden there is but the ruins of one, neglected & deserted & consisting of a number of plants which owe their existence to their hardiness & the Severity of the Seasons being incapable to destroy them. I found however a considerable number of plants which I was unacquainted with, specimens of [which] I extorted from an ignorant & conceited Gardener (as unenlightened as its Professor). The next day I arrived in Sansome Fields where I had the pleasure of finding my father and mother both well. (letter in Curtis archives, Hampshire County Museum Service, Winchester).

Stokes corrected Aiton's name by 1830, when he published his notes on Gardens and Persons, including Kew and the Aitons' various botanical publications (Stokes 1830, cxvii-cxviii). Here Stokes noted that his introduction to Aiton had then come via an earlier letter from Curtis. The Oxford garden was that then run by the Sherardian professor of botany, Humphrey Sibthorp (17137-1797), famous for having given only "one lecture, which was not a notable success", while holding his chair (see ODNB, sub John Sibthorp). Clearly Sibthorp's activities in Oxford Physic Garden were of similar quality...
As we have seen, Stokes and his glover father continued the market-gardening tradition of his grandfather (Stokes 1830, cxxiv). This activity is clearly how Jonathan junior was introduced to the serious study of botany, on which his reputation now mainly rests (Lane 2004). In 1780 Jonathan Stokes junior was admitted, like his father, a Freeman of Worcester (see List of Worcester Freemen 1740-1818, Worcester Local History Centre). Stokes’ earliest properly ‘scientific’ work in botany also dates from this time. This was the printed catalogue of the *Collection of hot house and green house plants, late the property of John Fothergill M.D. sold at auction on 20 August 1781* (copy in Banks Library, British Library, B. 95 (4)). John Fothergill (1712-1780) was another Quaker, an enthusiastic gardener at Upton in Essex (see *ODNB* & Stokes 1830, cxxviii). Stokes later recorded how this “collection... was sold by auction. It was thrown into lots by Lee [the auctioneer], the numbers corresponding to those of the manuscript catalogue of Fothergill’s garden in my possession, drawn up by me at the request of Fothergill’s executors” (Stokes 1830, cxiv-cxv).

**STOKES’ LATER LIFE**

Jonathan junior moved from Worcester to study medicine at Edinburgh University late in 1778, aged 34. As a dissenter, English Universities were still closed to him. Here in 1779, he “communicated to the Medical Society there the result of Dr. [William] Withering’s experience in the use of [the Foxglove in treating Digitalis]”. He then became one of the four annual presidents of this Royal Medical Society there in 1781-1782 (Gray 1952, 45 & 316). On 31 March 1782, “Jonathan Stokes of Worcester” became the first-named of the founders of the new student Natural History Society of Edinburgh, to which he soon read a paper “on the Nomenclature of Fossils” (Anon. 1803, 25 & 46). His Edinburgh M.D. degree was awarded in 1782, with a thesis on “De Aere dephlogisticato” (Anon. 1846, 261; A---1832, 265 recorded that he had also earlier studied medicine at Leyden). He had started in medical practice at Stourbridge by June 1783, although he is still listed as “of Worcester” in the list of subscribers to Sheldon (1784). While at Stourbridge he joined the “Lunaticks” (Schofield 1963, 223-226). But the mystery remains of why he was never elected a Fellow of the Royal Society, as were so many of his fellow “Lunaticks” (Miller 1999, 192-193). But this is another story.

Finally Jonathan junior married Ann Rogers (1753-1844 – see *Derbyshire Courier*, 17 August 1844, 3, col. 6), in an Anglican service, outside the Society of Friends, on 10 June 1784. She was the eldest
daughter of the late Dr. John Rogers, of Bolton, Lancashire, who flourished there from 1752 to 1764, and Ann, née Yates (1730-1820 – see Derby Mercury, 19 April 1810, 3, col. 2). Ann Rogers was baptised there on 14 September 1753 (IGI – not elsewhere on 1 April 1755, as stated by Lane 2004). Their marriage was by licence at Dronfield, Derbyshire (Marriage Allegation, Lichfield Record Office, Bk/6. 7). We can thus be sure Jonathan junior was, by now excluded from Quakers. But the connections of these Rogers sisters with Quakers continued. Ann’s younger sister Charlotte (1760-?) next married, on 9 September 1789, also at Dronfield, John Zachary (IGI), who was soon described by the poet Anna Seward (1742-1809 – see ODNB) as “a man of considerable estate and acknowledged merit. Gentle, benevolent, intelligent; it is of little moment that Mr Zachary has but one arm, and is a Quaker” (Seward, 1811, vol. 2, 359).

Their four known Stokes children were thereafter baptised in dissenting Unitarian chapels, like those in the High Street, Shrewsbury, also attended by the Darwin family, as was John Allen Stokes (1786-1858 – born at Shrewsbury on 20 October 1786 – Evans 1903, 26). He later became a land and road surveyor, and was their only child who stayed in Worcestershire. His younger brother Joseph Southwell Stokes (1789-?), clearly the black sheep of the family, was born on 10 February 1789, and baptised in the New Presbyterian, or Unitarian, meeting house, Kidderminster (IGI). By November 1794, the Stokes’s had settled at Chesterfield (Gentleman’s Magazine, 64 (2), 1009, 1794). For a characteristic description of Jonathan’s life here, see Phillips (1829, 233-238). For clues to Joseph’s subsequently even more extraordinary “career” here, see Derbyshire Times, 15 November 1935, 6, cols 2-3.

Jonathan Stokes always retained his dissenting attitudes, as Anna Seward’s many letters make clear; “Dr. Stokes’ political sentiments have been injurious to his interests” (in 1796 – Seward 1811, vol 4, 268), or that he “is a worthy and ingenious man, but a dissenter, and consequently a democrat” (in the dangerous year of 1793 – Seward 1811, vol. 4, 268). Stokes was honoured by obituaries in the main Unitarian magazines, which recorded how “he was attached both by education and by principle, to the Dissenting interest, but had nothing of the Sectarian in his character” (Monthly Repository, new series 5, 498, 1831), or that “the religious doctrines he professed were those of Unitarians” (A---- 1832). This last notice did at least confirm that Worcestershire was “his native county”.

H.S. Torrens
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NOTES

1. George Young (1750-1820), maker of this map, was another Quaker. He was born in Shrewbury in 1750 and had settled in Worcester by 1775. Here he became progressively a land surveyor, schoolmaster, and civil engineer (Torrens 1983, 149). From 1783 he ran the Quaker boarding school for boys in the old Worcester Infirmary buildings in Silver Street, with the probable brother of a fellow Fell pupil, Thomas Bradley (1751-1813), but who gave up teaching about 1786 to become a physician (see ODNB). Young now got into financial difficulties and was soon disowned by the Society of Friends (Leech 2002, 3). He died on 25 January 1820 (Salopian Journal, 2 February 1820, 2, col. 4 & Chambers 1820, 523).

2. This is taken from a copy of the “List of Boys at School at Worcester, ca. 1764, probably made by Thos. Beavington (1754-1837), his parents then living at Ross. Copy made by Harold W. Atkinson, West View, Eastbury Avenue, Northwood, Middx from the original in his possession 20/2/1914. Spelling as in original, a few marked (?) are difficult to read” (From a transcript held in the Society of Friends Library, Friends House, London, portfolio 34/42).
RECENT PUBLICATIONS


This book represents a magnificent achievement and labour of love by the former librarian at the Library of the Religious Society of Friends, London. It is modestly offered as a first attempt which lays the groundwork for others. While this is true, one should not underestimate the scholarship and information that this work puts at the disposal of the reader. Friends and other will alike turn to this volume for years to come as a source and model for their own studies. It is, for a start, far more than a biographical dictionary, containing as it does analytical indexes and appendices full of valuable additional information; and the whole is illustrated with over fifty pages of black and white images, mainly portraits.

This is no slim paperback to be slipped into a pocket or handbag. There are over 2,800 biographies occupying 482 pages of text, printed in double columns on A4 paper. And, as Ted Milligan reminds us, there could have been more had he had more time and knowledge, even without straying beyond the strict confines of ‘Quakers in Commerce and Industry’, but any disappointment at an occasional omission should be compensated by the riches to be found here. Whether used for reference or browsing, this is a good read and takes one back into Quaker history in the best way possible – through its people. The alphabetical arrangement of names brings home the strength of the family in Quaker life and business, and the meticulously documented relationships serve as a reminder that for Quakers more than many other groups, genealogy and history are closely linked. The expected families, of course, are here in strength: Cadburys, Frys and Rowntrees, Barclays and Lloyds are among the more obvious of household names, along with Clarks’ shoes, Cash’s silk ribbons (and name tapes), Reckitt’s starch, Bryant & May’s matches, Horniman’s tea, Carr’s biscuits and Ransome’s agricultural machinery (including lawnmowers). All serve to remind the reader of the important contribution of Quakers to modern life. Here are leaders of the industrial revolution – the Darbys, pioneer ironmasters and builders of the first iron bridge; the Fieldens, cotton spinners of Todmorden (though the most famous of them, John Fielden, became a Unitarian Methodist); and the Backhouses who as bankers and coal-
owners played a central part in developing the Durham coalfield. The railway connection is strong: not only the Peases of Darlington, woollen manufacturers, coal-owners and railway entrepreneurs of Stockton and Darlington fame, but also George Bradshaw who devised and printed his eponymous *Railway Guide*, and Thomas Edmondson, inventor of the printed railway ticket in a form that survived until 1960. Another familiar name to spring from the page, not widely associated with the Quakers, is that of Francis Frith, photographer and photographic printer. Many names are regionally significant or are better known within the Society of Friends, and it would be invidious to single any one out, except possibly William Sessions of York, printer, stationer, bookseller and publisher. Amid this wealth of biographical information it can be difficult to remember that *most* leaders of commerce and industry in the nineteenth century were *not* Quakers, though their influence may have been disproportionate to their numbers.

All this alone would have made a very useful publication; but there is much more. Whilst this book will appeal to those on the inside of Quakerism, it is clearly intended also for readers outside the Quaker tradition or those within it who are unfamiliar with its special historical characteristics. An introductory few pages provide a clear and concise history of developments within the Society of Friends during the period covered and an extensive glossary at the end explains in some detail the vocabulary of Quakerism from 'Acknowledged Ministers' to 'Yearly Meetings'. An appendix also explains the ambiguities of the Quaker Calendars, especially before, during and after the transition from the Julian to Gregorian calendars in March 1751/2 and September 1752. Next, one appendix takes the unfamiliar reader through the various editions of the Book of Discipline, from 'The Christian and brotherly advices' of 1738 to the revision of 'Church Government' in 1917; and one summarises the Queries and General Advices adopted by the London Yearly Meeting in 1791, 1833 and 1860. The regional and area structure of the Society of Friends, with dates, is the subject of an appendix listing all quarterly and monthly meetings, while a further appendix sets out morning and afternoon attendances at Meeting on the occasion of the Census of Religious Worship, 30 March 1851. The book concludes with a very good bibliography which will form the starting point for anyone wanting to read further in Quaker history.

The analytical indexes will be welcomed by economic and local historians alike. The first index names by occupation: a column and a half of bankers; two columns of flour dealers, merchants and millers; two and a half columns of drapers; and four and half of grocers.
There is one calamanco maker, to the sound of whose occupation Ted Milligan is particularly attracted (it refers to a kind of woollen cloth), one Lepidoptera dealer and, more prosaically, one undertaker. The second index lists names by place, so that the local historian can easily look up businessmen who were Quakers in the locality: Benjamin Gilbert Gilkes, brewer, is the single entry for Nailsworth in Gloucestershire, who when ‘out of business’ in 1839 became superintendent of Sidcot School. Manchester has almost two columns of entries and London has over six. The number of entries in part reflects the spread of urban and industrial society and in part the geographical strengths of Quakerism. A third index lists schools attended. Though the longest entries are for Friends’ schools, Ackworth leading the list, there are others: Albert Leopold Reckitt (‘the man who saved Dettol’) went to Rugby. Very few women made their marks in commerce and industry during the period – Alice Clark, who entered the family shoe manufacturing business in 1893, is a rare exception – so it is not surprising that there are no entries for The Mount School. It is stranger, and therefore more interesting, that there are also no entries for Friends’ School, Croydon after it had moved to Saffron Walden in 1879, suggesting that by this generation Quakers were making their marks in industry and commerce only after the age of fifty. Great Ayton is also missing, but that was a lowly agricultural school for the offspring of disowned Quakers, so perhaps this absence is to be expected. Another form of education important within the historical structure of local Quaker Meetings was apprenticeship, so Ted Milligan has helpfully constructed an index of apprentices by master where he is known and by location where he is not. Additionally, using research on York furnished by Shelia Wright, there is a more detailed list of York apprentices. Finally an appendix gives for 1872 the directors and other officials of that important Quaker commercial institution, the Friends Provident.

Despite the diffidence shown by Ted Milligan in his Prologue and Epilogue, the only need for the adjective ‘modest’ about his achievement is the price. This is excellent value in every respect. But since the author writes as though he is expecting criticism for errors and omissions, I will not disappoint him: here is one. In celebrating the life of William Alien (1770-1843), pharmaceutical chemist and philanthropist, his connection with Joseph Lancaster and the British and Foreign Schools Society, and his agricultural colony and school farm at Lindfield, are acknowledged but there is no mention of the link between the two interests – his decision to join a largely Quaker partnership in 1813 to keep Robert Owen in charge of the village and cotton spinning mills at New Lanark. Allen, it could be argued, is
being seen within too narrow a Quaker context. Perhaps the nature of the sources means that approach is inevitable for most entries. The dictionary in the end is not so much about men involved in commerce and industry who were Quakers, as about Quakers who were involved in commerce and industry.

Edward Royle
University of York


For anyone familiar with the Friends Ambulance Unit in the First World War, this volume is something to cherish. For the rest of us it acts as a healthy introduction to the subject. Almost all of the material is primary source and I am glad that Sessions so presented it: that gives a charm and import to the production. How many books these days are allowed this format?

Margaret Hill is the daughter of Francis (Frank) Henry Newman and has kept his materials in good order. Frank was born 18 November 1896 in Kettering; the son of Joseph Henry and Elizabeth Lucy née Geary. Joseph was trained as a school teacher and was also a member of the Congregational Church. He regularly preached at several non-conformist chapels near where he lived.

By the age of 18, Frank’s religious convictions led him to become a Conscientious Objector and in 1915 he joined the newly formed Friends Ambulance Unit. Quakers sometimes forget that the unit was composed of several groups not connected to the Society of Friends. Frank’s interests led him to serve as a medical orderly to which he was well suited with his experience with X-rays and general photography. The latter interest can be seen in the many illustrations in Margaret Hill’s book.

Frank’s diaries began in 1916, a few months after he had joined nine young men from Wellingborough, Northamptonshire to serve in the Friends Ambulance Unit. Members were supplied with food and accommodation but were unpaid—they were expected to buy their own uniforms, a notable expense. What surprises those unacquainted with conscientious objection is the discipline to which the unit was subjected. Aside from the day-to-day activities the orderlies had duties which made them feel like charladies. Only after protesting were they allowed to help with medical dressings. There is no doubt the orderlies suffered prejudices against them as noncombatants.
We do not know many of Frank’s feelings from his diaries, but as Margaret Hill says: ‘when he does have something to record he often does it with a single very poignant word. At the outset of his second period in hospital Frank says he “feels done up” and the next day he feels “rotten”...After being supplied with gasmasks they wore them during a walk on the beach and the experience could only be described as “Misery”’.

I found the book fascinating and the time-worn phrase ‘speaks for itself’ is particularly appropriate here. This is the strength of the format. The weakness is that the reader needs a bit more guidance as to what is happening in the world away from Frank’s diaries.

David Sax


Yealand Manor School was the brainchild of Elfrida Vipont Foulds, Margery Wilson and Christine Sutherland, influential Quaker mothers from Manchester. Wary of Chamberlain’s “Peace in Our Time” of 1938, they felt that, should war and evacuation prove inevitable, it would be desirable to keep the younger children of Manchester Friends together. To this end Overseers of Hardshaw East Monthly Meeting entered protracted negotiations, and a large Quaker guesthouse in peaceful Lancashire countryside was made available for the duration of hostilities.

The guests’ departure in late August, 1939, signalled the school’s opening. Toddlers of nursery age could be accepted if their mothers stayed with them. Over-elevens could join established Quaker boarding schools in safe locations. This left forty to fifty children, sometimes refugees, but mostly from Manchester, and later also from Liverpool, Leeds, Bristol and London, to experience the loving care, small classes and Quaker ways awaiting them. No child was turned away through lack of funds. Not all were Quaker. Five years on, at its closure, almost two hundred pupils, mostly boarders, had passed through the school.

Susan Vipont Hartshorne, a former Yealander and niece of Elfrida Vipont Foulds, the headmistress, writes discerningly of this lively, co-educational community. At the start accommodation had to be suitably modified and classroom furniture acquired. Musical instruments were borrowed, and gifts of books for a library arrived. A broad curriculum was offered, and the children were encouraged to think for themselves. Problems of cramped conditions, a volunteer
staff (all named in an appendix), wartime departures and, in some cases, war-traumatised arrivals, are rightly acknowledged. The author introduces Yealanders through numerous black and white snapshots. Coloured photographs of Yealand Manor, the Old School House and nearby Friends' Meeting House enhance the volume's A5 covers and invite attention to the text.

Everyone's contribution was considered of equal importance. Visiting parents helped where they could. Fresh vegetables and a varied diet were provided by Jim Jackson and Mary Meyer, gardener and housekeeper respectively. Health problems were few, apart from a whooping cough epidemic surmounted by Annie Holt as matron. Elfrida's story-telling gifts were used in teaching Scripture. Muriel Putz took English, History and Mathematics, as well as being Bursar. Geography fell to Jim Goynes, a conscientious objector exempted to work in education. He helped Frank Burgess with Craftwork, exhibited termly alongside Art and Needlework. Margery Wilson offered French, Nature Study – the surrounding countryside a bonus – and Art. A love of music was instilled by the Percivals, and a promising orchestra took shape. Drama productions, mime and puppetry were Glyn Richards' domain. In 1944 school inspectors commented favourably on sound instruction and very creditable attainment, good news for the Executive Committee's monthly report to Overseers.

Changing seasons called for different ventures – picnics, treasure hunts, swimming or blackberrying, sledging and Christmas entertainment. There were memorable teas with the Robsons of Silverdale and kittens to fondle on visits to Elizabeth Brockbank, wise counsellor when school and guesthouse interests were at odds. Daily walks were the norm, evening badger watches a special treat. Great hilarity was guaranteed by Freddie, a ventriloquist's dummy, and Donald Duck and Charlie Chaplin films. More serious were trips to Wordsworth's Grasmere cottage and to Halle concerts at Morecombe. A good experience was welcoming prisoners of war to the school with happy cries of "Tutti fratelli".

Quaker values were an integral part of the Yealand experience. Daily assemblies included a meaningful silence, also known through sharing Yealand Friends' weekly Meeting for Worship. "A recurring theme of the strength and courage of peace and gentleness" was noted of a pageant devised by Elfrida, performed by the children and reviewed by the Lancaster Guardian. "The full development of God's gifts is only possible under true discipline", wrote Elfrida. "Self discipline is the goal...". Rules were few. The School Council was ahead of its time. Corporal punishment, the staff believed, was
"incompatible with the spirit of Quakerism".

Susan Vipont Hartshorne has consulted former Yealanders and papers of Elfrida Vipont Foulds, Monthly Meeting Overseers and the Lancashire Records Office and has been amply rewarded in her findings. She captures the essence of a resourceful community, economically run, whose young charges had freedom to grow in confidence, concern for others and openness to Goodness, Beauty and Truth. Well-written and attractively produced, "The Story of Yealand Manor School" will enthuse and delight all who applaud Elfrida's timeless vision, "Education for Adventure", as a grounding for life.

Stella Luce

NOTES AND QUERIES


This brief study of the library of the Quaker scientist John Dalton provides information that was not available to his earlier biographers, based on a study of the 1844 sale catalogue of his effects (with the typical level of entry 'Entick's English Dictionary, and nine other school books' being unhelpful) and a Manchester Courier report of the books bought by the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society. The 490 books, pamphlets and journals the authors have been able to identify range widely over the sciences. They include also six Quaker books and a selection of travel books. The Library was more considerable than this, there were for example sixty-five volumes of tracts whose contents are known.

David J. Hall

Thomas Edmondson (1792-1851)

Geoffrey Skelsey's article" 'Please show all tickets!' the long legacy of Thomas Edmondson" in Back Track January 2008 sets out the history of the pre-printed railway ticket and Edmondson's crucial contribution to its development.

David J. Hall

Though Dawson Turner (1775-1855) Norfolk antiquary, collector and banker, was not a Friend he had some important and long-standing connexions with Friends that are referred to in this collection of essays. He succeeded his father as a partner in the Yarmouth and Suffolk Bank in 1796, the other partners being four Gurneys (Hudson, a noted collector too, was disowned in 1804) joined by the Friend John Brightwen circa 1815. Turner had extensive dealings with the London Quaker booksellers and publishers John and Arthur Arch. They published his four volume work on seaweeds and supplied him with fine and expensive books. A long letter from John Arch is published here.

David J. Hall

The New Forest Shakers

England’s Lost Eden – Adventures in a Victorian Utopia by Philip Hoare (2005) is an account of an obscure and extraordinary sect. Known as the New Forest Shakers they were alternatively the Girlingites, the Children of God, Bible Christians (though not the only sect called that) or the Walworth Jumpers. Their messiah Mary Ann Girling claimed an affinity with the early Quakers and was probably influenced by other Bible Christians (originally a group of Primitive Methodists), the Peculiar People later known as the Plumstead Peculiars and more certainly the main Shaker movement. Mary Ann rejected the direct comparison with the Shakers saying at one point “She and her friends were more like the Quakers.”

Friends may have had very little in common with the New Forest Shakers but there are various references to them in the study. Hoare writes about the 1874 Broadlands Conference which was attended by Robert Pearsall and Hannah Smith as well as other Friends. The Howitts are mentioned. Later Laurence Housman used elements of the New Forest Shakers’ history in his fiction and there are a number of references to him in the book. Housman illustrated George Meredith’s poem ‘Jump-to-Glory Jane’ based on Mary Ann Girling.

David J. Hall
RESEARCH COMPLETED


This thesis reconstructs the life of Thomas Speed (1623-1703), a Bristol Quaker merchant, constituting the first full-length study of any Bristol Quaker or Bristol merchant in this period. It links his personal experiences with his early conversion to, and later distancing from, Quakerism.

The thesis supplies a new reading of the civic history which led up to the establishment of Quakerism in Bristol. The influential work of David Sacks on the role of the Society of Merchant Venturers is contested. The outstanding success of Quakerism in Bristol is for the first time recognised as needing explanation. The explanation is found in a combination of the factors which operated in favour of Quakerism elsewhere but with two special features, not previously identified. One was the erosion of Bristol's parish ministry in the period after the Civil War, largely through the policies pursued by the Corporation. The other was the kinship between a group of radicals who came to the fore under the Republic and then furnished the local leadership which protected the Quaker missionaries and their converts from official and popular hostility. One of these radicals was Thomas Speed, who is here re-instated as a leading figure in the first decade of Bristol Quakerism. His life also illustrates the re-assimilation of Quakers into the wider body of religious dissent which was an important factor in the survival and prosperity of the Bristol Quakers.

The thesis also builds a picture of Speed's trading activity over forty years, based on intensive use of the Merchant Venturers' Wharfage records and of Speed's previously neglected Ledger for the 1680s. It finds that his accounts were designed to help him keep track of obligations, not to measure, still less to maximise, profits. His business was driven more by family needs and circumstances than by market opportunities. The commercial culture in which he participated was based on the values of honesty and friendship rather than religious ideology or impersonal contract.
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