

**FRIENDS
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY**
c/o The Library
Friends House Euston Road
London NW1 2BJ

R. C. Wilson: *Manchester*

ERRATA

p10 para 1 line 2 for "division and
strife" read "divisions and strifes"

p10 para 1 line 5 for "difficulty" read
"discipline"

p10 para 4 for "Bradford" read
"Bedford"

p22 para 1 line 1 for "S.B. Edmundson"
read "J.B. Edmundson"

p23 para 1 line 9 for "1909" read
"1905"

p35 para 2 line 1 for "Sylvanus" read
"Silvanus"

p36 penultimate para, insert "he" before
"had"

p38 refs 46 and 47 transposed (Graham
is 46, Grubb 47)

MANCHESTER, MANCHESTER AND MANCHESTER AGAIN:
from 'SOUND DOCTRINE' TO 'A FREE MINISTRY' –
the theological travail of London Yearly
Meeting throughout the nineteenth century

By
ROGER C. WILSON

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

Price members £2 (\$5) non-members £3 (\$7)

This paper (now revised and expanded) was delivered as a Presidential Address to the Friends Historical Society at a meeting held at Friends House on 12 November 1988.

Friends Historical Society
Occasional Series No.1

© Friends Historical Society 1990

Obtainable from Friends Book Centre, Friends House,
Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ
Printed in Great Britain by E. & E. Plumridge Ltd.,
41 High Street, Linton, Cambridge, CB1 6HS

MANCHESTER, MANCHESTER AND MANCHESTER AGAIN:

from 'SOUND DOCTRINE' to 'A FREE MINISTRY' - the theological travail of London Yearly Meeting throughout the Nineteenth Century

A note on sources: *The Friend* (evangelically inclined) and *The British Friend* (Quietist, Orthodox, Conservative), both from 1843 onwards; Minutes of Hardshaw East Monthly Meeting, Manchester Preparative Meeting and some other contemporary papers, including some regarding the Manchester Institute, all in the Archive section of Manchester Public Library; *The Manchester Friend*, 1871/1873; Family letters of Isaac and Mary (Jowitt) Wilson of Kendal, in care of their close descendants, roughly sorted, to be placed in due course in the Cumbria Archive Department at Kendal.

A note on terminology: the non-evangelical element in the Society is variously designated 'Quietist', 'Orthodox', 'Conservative'. The terms refer to different historical contexts. 'Quietist' is appropriate to eighteenth century Quaker ethos as it continued into the early decades of the nineteenth century. By the 1830s the active evangelicals sometimes referred to themselves as 'the reforming party', so that it becomes appropriate to designate their active critics as 'Orthodox'. By the 1860s active 'Orthodoxy' had given way to a 'Conservative' remnant.

Three times in the nineteenth century carefully appointed Yearly Meeting committees found themselves as leading participants in dramatic occasions of tension between Quaker evangelicalism and its critics. On each occasion Manchester was the geographical focus.

The Beacon drama of 1835/6, associated with the name of Isaac Crewdson, led to a significant separation in the Society. It turned on the question whether in silent waiting or in vigorous doctrinal ministry lay the true character of Quaker worship.

Thirty-five years later, 1870/71, a younger generation of Friends in Manchester included a group who sustained the first substantial intellectual challenge to what was by that time the prevailing

evangelical tone of London Yearly Meeting. Joseph Bevan Braithwaite's uncompromising evangelical testimony won a Pyrrhic victory.

Twenty five years on in 1895 the Manchester Conference, associated retrospectively with John Wilhelm Rowntree, signalled the retreat of the evangelical stream in face of the constructive Christian vitality of critical thought in the service of a 'free ministry', and the march of the Society as we know it today set out.

The predominant strain of Quaker life at the beginning of the nineteenth century is commonly designated Quietist, indicating the comparative prevalence of a consciously sustained silence in meeting for worship. It was particularly resistant to ministry originating by reference to the Holy Scriptures, ministry dubbed 'instrumental' or 'creaturely' because it sprang from the printed word, not from the unimpeded inflowing of the Holy Spirit into the deliberately emptied mind. Ministry was made difficult. In referring to this strain I shall tend to use the term 'orthodox' rather than Quietist since some of those who belonged to the Quietist years were anything but silent. A phrase of Ann (Tuke) Alexander (1767-1849) in a *Dialogue on Worship* illustrates how desiccated this strain could be:

When we are called together for worship, ought not our thoughts to be so confined as scarcely to know that we think at all?¹

From early in the nineteenth century an evangelical strain began to wax vigorously in London Yearly Meeting. Mollie Grubb's paper is a valuable, lucid account of its first years.² Its roots lay in the Bible as *the* Word of God, and in a personal experience of original sin before God whose sense of infinite justice must be satisfied before pardon could be given. Sin, blood, punishment, atonement, salvation are terms always on the lips of evangelical Friends. They did indeed have a powerful experience of personal salvation which they felt compelled to share through an active ministry of 'sound doctrine'. In principle, faith was for them more important than works, though works kept breaking through. For instance, evangelical Friends worked heroically in the Irish Potato Famine. The Yearly Meeting Epistle of 1847 drew faith and works into unity in these words:

Within the last year, it has pleased the Almighty to visit the nation of Ireland with sore affliction... His creatures standing in awe before Him trembling and, it may be, dumb with astonishment... desire to be instructed by that which we have

seen and heard... it may be, that in the sufferings which He has permitted to befall some of His children, He desires not only to bless His chastening to their greatest benefit, both in this life and that which is to come, but to sanctify it to those that are about them. When the adversities of our neighbours, their poverty and distress, have the effect of softening our hearts... they are made a means of good to us, and we are prepared to feel the force of the words 'It is more blessed to give than to receive'.

However they explained it, the social witness of Friends through peace and war in the nineteenth century was a courageous, united, and sometimes unpopular commitment which held the evangelical and orthodox together.

It is not easy to trace the growth of Quaker evangelicalism through the organized life the Society in the early part of the nineteenth century. There were no regularly published Quaker periodicals until 1843, when *The Friend* (evangelically inclined) and *The British Friend* (orthodox) began monthly publication almost simultaneously. The masthead of *The British Friend*, published in Glasgow, was: Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way and walk therein (Jeremiah 6:16). What was happening has to be pieced together from letters, diaries, short-lived printed journals, newspapers, pamphlets and the like. Until well into the century preparative and monthly meeting minutes are for the most part remarkably uninformative except on matters of discipline, 'police memoranda, largely' (J.H. Barber, *Memoir*, vol.1, p.299).³ In any event, note-taking by individuals in meetings for church affairs at all levels was firmly discouraged until the 1840s on the ground that the written word, as record, tended, deliberately or by accident, to distort the sense of the occasion as a religiously experienced whole.

The traditional reluctance to take responsibility for recording the process of consideration (as distinct from formal minutes) is evidenced in two ways. The minutes themselves of Yearly Meeting were not made public until 1857. Before that, the only printed records emerging regularly from Yearly Meeting were the Annual Epistles, which tended to be lengthy evangelical tracts rather than lively reflections of Yearly Meeting exercises. At the personal level, almost all of the letters to the editors of the monthly journals were signed by pseudonyms or initials.

Some consideration must be given to what was happening in Yearly Meetings between about 1827 and 1836, the year of the Beaconite

secession. From about 1805 until the 1890s the heart of each Epistle was an evangelical tract, written round Biblical texts, half a dozen at first, rising to 35 or so later on. There is one exception, 1827, whose heart is a splendid orthodox affirmation:

Vital Christianity consists not in words but in power; and however important it is that we have a right apprehension of the doctrines of the gospel, this availeth not unless we are regenerated by the power of the Holy Spirit. We therefore tenderly entreat all to wait in humble faith for its quickening influence... It may often be slow in its progress, but it is certain in its effects; and amongst the blessed consequences which it produces, we come to have an establishment in Christ, resulting not from any speculative system of belief but from a heartfelt acquaintance with His power inwardly revealed to the soul.

How the Epistles were drafted at that time we do not know. Certainly not with the participation of the women who met in their own Yearly Meeting. But Richard Cockin, whose journal references⁴ year by year are a good guide to the temper of each Y.M., refers in 1827 to the powerful ministry of Sarah Lynes Grubb who, when she visited the men's Y.M., 'addressed those who were, by the power of their natural faculties, considering themselves qualified to transact the discipline established in the Society, and in a most emphatic manner she addressed those who were lighting the torch of reason to enable them to comprehend the truths of the Gospel. To this class she had, in an awful manner, to warn them of their danger'.

The particular target of Sarah Lynes Grubb on this occasion was Joseph John Gurney, the wealthy head of the Norwich family of which Elizabeth Fry was a younger member. He had himself, while a young man and before becoming an active Friend, studied seriously but informally at Oxford under the guidance of distinguished evangelical Anglicans. He had gifts as both scholar and writer. He was also a successful banker with a wide circle of friends outside the Society. It had taken courage to turn away from conventional secular dress in 1811 and declare himself 'a plain Quaker', dress, language and all. By the 1820s his own qualities as an active, devoted Friend, supported by his intellectual gifts and administrative experience, took him into informal but effective leadership of the evangelical stream. He personified the *active* ministry, emerging from Biblical scholarship into theological teaching, which appalled the orthodox stream of which Sarah Lynes Grubb was the most persistent and vociferous prophet. Moreover she and her associates disapproved of Gurney's life style and his easy association with people in the wider world.

This was not by any means the first time that Sarah Lynes Grubb's ministry in the men's Yearly Meeting caught the attention of Cockin. As far back in 1807 he notes that S.G. 'was livingly engaged to address various classes and growths in religious experience and was led preticularly [*sic*] to address those who were as the great men in the world querying in a very emphatic manner whether they were not more solicitous to have their heads stor'd [*sic*] with knowledge and their purses with money than they were to have their hearts replenished with heavenly treasure'.

Cockin goes on to report that Samuel Alexander was so moved that 'it was agreed to seperate [*sic*] under the favoured impression the Meeting was under rather than enter into any further business'.⁵

Cockin reports her again at length in 1814 and 1820. It was her ministry in 1836 that caused Luke Howard, a robust evangelical, to refer to her as 'actuated by a spirit from beneath'.⁶ She continued to address the men's Y.M. until about 1840. But the substance of her Yearly Meeting ministry appears only in the Epistle of 1827. Of her contribution the next year, 1828, there is a note in a letter from Isaac Wilson, of Kendal, writing from Yearly Meeting to his wife Mary. He comments somewhat sourly that Sarah Grubb addressed the men's meeting for 1½ hours, and he heard later that she had already spoken for 1½ hours in the women's meeting.

Isaac Wilson was a voluminous letter writer, and for the following few years Sarah Lynes Grubb and two other women Friends, Ann Jones of Stockport, and Elizabeth Robson of Liverpool, appear again and again in his letters as the dominant Friends from the orthodox stream, gadflies to the evangelicals - stinging but without any creative vision to enliven Quietist worship. Ann Jones and Elizabeth Robson, who also appear frequently in the Y.M. journals of George Richardson⁷ and Samuel Capper,⁸ were both recorded ministers of London Yearly Meeting. In the 1820s they had travelled extensively among American Friends,⁹ where they were as aggressively critical of the Hicksite strain as they now were of the evangelical strain in London.

The common feature of the Hicksites and the evangelicals was their belief in an active ministry, the very principle of which was offensive to Quietist Quakerism. Both women were frequent travellers in the ministry to neighbouring Manchester and they may well have been influential in stiffening that meeting's resistance to evangelical ministry in 1835/6.

A fourth Quietist critic who is continually in Isaac Wilson's comments - though in a vein of affectionate fun - was the equally free-

spoken but gentler Thomas Shillitoe who was particularly outraged by J.J. Gurney's wealthy life-style and the tendency of the evangelical leaders to consort with the world.

Isaac Wilson's letters are illuminating on the daily life of an active Kendal business man, a faithful evangelical Friend, not in any way distinguished except as a perceptive observer of the Quaker scene and of the parts played by his relatives. His and Isaac Crewdson's wives were sisters, and two of Wilson's own sisters were each the wife of former clerks of Yearly Meeting.

In 1831 Wilson was appointed a member of an existing 80-strong Y.M. Committee, charged in small groups to visit every meeting in the country, to assess the state of their religious life and how they were managing their affairs. When narrating, Wilson was an excellent raconteur. Here is a typical note about a meeting in Birmingham addressed by 'brother Crewdson' at considerable length and followed by a long rambling discussion 'since the clerk was not of first-rate quality', so that they drifted onto the subject of overseers, which was indeed a subject troubling Manchester meeting which was about to become restless under the oversight of a Crewdson family group. Wilson comments: '... the committee all think the overseers should be reconsidered frequently in order to see if advantage would not accrue from addition or change; 'what', he asks his wife, 'would some of our friends say to such advice?'.¹⁰ And of the next call at Shipston he writes: 'We have had one of the most comfortable opportunities which we have had since I joined the Committee, the men and women sit together in the preparative meeting.'

At Y.M. in 1832 Cockin was alarmed at the vehemence of Sarah Grubb's anti-evangelical ministry, but Isaac Wilson was more impressed by Shillitoe's anxiety at the growing association of prominent Friends with the outside world; for instance, 'he now heard Friends referred to as Gentlemen and Ladies.'

Cockin was an orthodox Friend from Yorkshire, troubled by evangelical ministry. Of the Y.M. in 1833 he reflected that he was '... impressed with the danger... of the Arch-deceiver gaining an entrance through two avenues... - (1), that of exhalting [*sic*] the letter of the Scripture... above the Spirit, and (2)... so much having been done for us by the Propiciatory [*sic*] Sacrifice of Christ as to lessen our reverent watchful dependance upon... the Holy Spirit'.

He also reports a tremendous discussion whether Sarah Grubb should be allowed to address a joint meeting and concludes that there was no

united sense of the meeting. 'I left this (Yearly) Meeting with depressed feelings'.¹¹

At about the same time Wilson writes to his wife that Mary Stacey (another evangelical cousin) 'appears to be hopeful as to the increase in the number of those who are willing to take scriptural views seriously though there are many who are rigidly adhering to the principle which has been found so dangerous in our Society...' And he adds his own comment: 'May we... endeavour to prove by our conduct and conversation... ever the doctrine of justification by faith, in the all sufficient atonement made by our blessed Saviour'. And then, interestingly, he goes on: 'I often feel afraid that I profess my belief in (the atonement) and that I have never sufficiently felt the sinfulness of the human heart, of my own heart, so as with that degree of earnestness to beg for the cleansing Blood of that great sacrifice as would ensure the reception of it to my own individual case, consistent with the promise "ask and ye shall receive it" '.

We enjoy Isaac Wilson the more as we glimpse the uncertainty familiar to us all as we wrestle with faith and words. It is all the more heart-warming when it slips guiltily out from the flood of conventional evangelical language with which Isaac usually opens his almost daily, very affectionate letters to his wife. Here is a sentence, in truth rather longer than usual, with a surprising conclusion that is not unique:

'I now resume my pen thinking a little time before breakfast may be spent suitably in writing to a beloved wife and in acknowledging her truly acceptable letter which was received yesterday, thy good wishes therein met with a hearty response in the breast of thy husband that we may indeed be endeavouring so to spend our days in doing the will of our Great Creator and Preserver as to be in a state of preparation through the adorable mercy of the Saviour who laid down his precious life as an offering for our sins, and through whose blood alone we can ever be pure, and fit to enter the Kingdom, that we may thus through faith producing acceptable works, but depending on the Saviour alone not on ourselves or anything we may have done or ever can do to be in a state to receive the sentence "come ye blessed of my Father" etc.' [sic].

He goes on to say that he thinks his family and Friends in Kendal will have a much freer day than he expects to have in Y.M.

Returning to the Y.M. of 1833, the Epistle of that year expressed the hope that 'we may seek an enlightened sense of the various delusions of our common enemy, to which we are all liable'. *Delusions* was to become the evangelical code word for orthodoxy.

The next three Yearly Meetings were increasingly fraught. 1834 began quietly enough with the report of the 80-strong 1830 travelling

committee (of which Isaac Wilson had been a member) on its four-year work. It reports 'the absence of division and strife in our meetings' but also that 'there are very few of our Monthly Meetings in which we did not find some sincerely concerned for the prosperity of Truth, administering the difficulty with clean hands'. It is not clear whether this reference to sincere concern for the prosperity of Truth and clean hands refers to theology or to business affairs, but probably the latter. For the only recommendations that the Committee makes are that Friends should try to live near meeting houses and that they should not move into urban areas in pursuit of wealth and its attendant financial temptations. Considering the tension that had been building up in Y.M. itself, why was this report so silent on theological orientation in the country at large? The Committee was formally discharged.

Capper's account of this Y.M. (1834),¹² goes on to report a sharp difference about the draft Epistle to Ireland Y.M. - should it recommend *always* reading the Scriptures in meeting or should this be left open, with either as might be specially required? Both Capper and Wilson report a terrific Jeremiad from Sarah Grubb, and Wilson comments on a long discourse from Elizabeth Robson - 'to me very tedious'.

He writes to Mary to say that he is surprised that the orthodox strain has not attacked 'the reforming party' but that maybe the volcano is slumbering. He finds himself thinking of 'two armies drawn up in battle'. He comments on his evangelical sister Wilkinson's account of what had been going on in the women's meeting, but thinks it may lack reliability 'sitting as she does to catch a mouse if anything comes out not exactly square with her views, and they we know are ultra'.

Then there was another sharp row about whether the injunction to read the Scriptures should or should not be included in the London Epistle - with William Allen and Peter Bradford (both orthodox) saying that it was unprofitable to go on saying it, and Wilson commenting to Mary that though they always say it, it does not seem to make much difference. However, 'after a hard trial we had our way'.

In subsequent letters from this same Y.M. Wilson returns to a crowded meeting place, an unpleasant Yearly Meeting with brother Crewdson under pressure.

Mollie Grubb's paper¹³ shows that two or three weeks later Gurney was writing to say with regret that while the Society seemed rapidly to be losing its members and strength, 'yet from time to time there is that to be felt and enjoyed among us which throws a hopeful gleam among us'.

So, from a Y.M. of confused gloom, hope, anger, self-righteousness, and real spiritual commitment, the Society moved on to the volcanic explosion precipitated by the publication of *A Beacon to the Society of Friends*, in January, 1835. Its author was Isaac Crewdson.

Isaac Crewdson was a prosperous business man, living along with numerous relatives, in Manchester. Their family roots were in Kendal. In the years before about 1826 Isaac in particular was outstandingly active in Hardshaw East Monthly Meeting affairs. Any committee or visitation required in the course of the Discipline was as likely as not to have him as a member. It is not known exactly when he was gathered into the evangelical fold, but since his executive appointments seem to diminish about 1826 this may have been the time when he began to feel a powerful call to the active ministry of 'sound doctrine'.

In April, 1828, an unattributed suggestion was made in Manchester Preparative Meeting that the meeting house in Mount Street should be enlarged or a new one built. The matter came to an adjourned P.M. in October 1828 when it was agreed that a new one should be built with seating for 600 on the ground floor. A planning committee of 14 was appointed. It included three Crewdsons, and Isaac's brother-in-law, William Boulton; Isaac was chairman. A month later it came back with a proposal for seating 1,500, which was accepted in principle with the addition of a committee room.

The detailed building and financial plans were approved in January, 1829, a mere ten weeks after the proposal was first considered in principle.

The accounts for the completion of the building, with total seating for up to 1,900, were presented just two years later. Of the total cost of £7,600, £7,000 had already been raised from 106 contributors. Isaac Crewdson was one of the largest contributors with £500, his brother Wilson £400, another brother and brother-in-law Boulton £200 each. (John Dalton gave £75). Between them the Crewdsons contributed about one fifth of the cost.

The total membership of London Y.M. was about 20,000 and declining. In seeking an explanation for this Manchester operation I find it irresistible to conclude that, provoked perhaps by the orthodox tone of the Epistle of 1827, by the ferocious attacks of Sarah Lynes Grubb, Ann Jones and Elizabeth Robson, and quite certainly horrified by the Hicksite advance in America, Crewdson's powerful sense of evangelical preaching mission led him to something akin to Fox's Pendle Hill 'vision of a great people to be gathered', driving him forward to persuade Manchester meeting to support him in fulfilling it.

The Preparative Meeting minutes after the opening of the meeting house seem to me to hint at management problems. The meeting may have begun to wonder whether it had a tiger by the tail or a white elephant.

Isaac Wilson's account of the 1834 Yearly Meeting makes it clear that by then Crewdson was a controversial Friend at the national level. So the members of Manchester meeting, sitting 1st day by 1st day, under the weight of his relentless doctrinal ministry, obviously knew at first hand all about the problem. What they cannot have expected was that they would be at the centre of the terrific row which burst out immediately on the publication of the *Beacon* in January, 1835.

The *Beacon* is a small polemical book built around a selection of near-Unitarian Hicksite quotations, themselves faithfully testifying to the authenticity of silence as the setting for worship. Crewdson blasts his selection of Hicksite quotations in powerful evangelical terms, drawing on the words and texts of the Holy Scriptures as the sole source of Truth, declaring that 'silence and stillness are valuable in their place; but where in Holy Writ does the Spirit teach Quietism, as the means of our redemption?'¹⁴ ...the Holy Spirit is set at naught and rejected in order to make way for this *delusive* notion of the "inward light"'.¹⁵

The publication provoked the Society into furious controversy, nationwide.

Manchester meeting may have been so used to Isaac Crewdson's ministry that they felt that there was no need for formal action on their part. The Preparative Meeting minutes are silent. The initiative in Manchester was taken by the powerful evangelical overseers, led by Elizabeth Crewdson and Esther Boulton, who wrote directly to the Monthly Meeting clerk on behalf of the 'reforming party'. 'Overseers of Manchester meeting,' they wrote, 'believing that our Society in many parts of the country and specially in this county is in great danger of suffering from the pernicious effects of party spirit arising from a real or supposed difference of sentiment on some points of Christian doctrine deem it their duty to submit to the M.M. the following proposition with a view to it being forwarded to the Quarterly Meeting, and if adopted by it to the Yearly Meeting' and they propose that 'the Yearly Meeting do take into consideration the present state of the Society in this respect with a view to adopt some efficient means for the restoration and establishment of that Christian unity which is at present endangered'.

Monthly Meeting records the receipt of the proposition and concludes its minute: 'After solid consideration... this meeting is not of the judgement that it would be best to adopt [the proposition].'

This is a Monthly Meeting minute, not Preparative Meeting, but Manchester was by far the largest constituent meeting. In effect, as becomes dramatically evident in the account of the decisive five-day Monthly Meeting eighteen months later,¹⁶ Manchester's sense of burden lay in the weight and aggressive exercise of Crewdson personalities as such; members were instinctively unwilling to allow the situation to be identified and handled in abstract theological terms. However, the matter was taken to the Quarterly Meeting the next day by another route. That meeting in its turn decided not to pass the problem to Y.M. but to appoint a committee of their own to help Hardshaw East on a matter of local disunity. A month later, when the Q.M. situation did emerge at Y.M., the clerk there also refused to allow the discussion to turn on doctrine,¹⁷ insisting that the issue was disunity in Hardshaw East, without specifying the cause.

After long consideration Y.M. decided to appoint a Visiting Committee which would take the matter out of the hands of the Quarterly Meeting. This was felt to be so delicate that the usual practice of appointment in open session was not followed. A nomination procedure was used which came out with a strong, well-balanced group of 13, including Friends from both streams and others who had not been prominent.

Over the next 17 months the committee visited Manchester eight times.¹⁸ They immediately perceived that the Manchester resistance to the Crewdson stream was not doctrinal but arose from dissatisfaction with the flood of Crewdson's ministry that deprived the meeting of time for silence. Though the committee was divided theologically they were united in disapproving of the Crewdson/Beacon temper of aggression and hoped to be able to reduce the tension by persuading him to withdraw the *Beacon* from circulation.

Crewdson refused, and at a meeting on December 24th, 1835, the committee decided that they must advise him to refrain from ministry and from attending meetings of ministers and elders.

The Wilson papers at Kendal convey the sense of domestic family desolation. Wilson's wife Mary came down to Manchester to hold sister Elizabeth Crewdson's shoulder. Her letters back to Isaac are deeply moving. The cloud spread beyond the family. Among the Wilson Kendal manuscripts there is a paper signed by 26 young men of the meeting and of the Crewdson afternoon Bible class, sent to Crewdson when they heard that the advice to keep silent was on the way, '... grateful for thy solicitude for the temporal and eternal interests... particularly of those in exposed situations,¹⁹ and acknowledge that the

uniform tendency of thy counsel to us, both in public and private, has been of *late*, as well as formerly, to promote practical piety...’ It finishes by speaking of ‘thy high service as a Minister and Advocate of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ’, and hopes that he will be able ‘to adopt that course which will be most conducive to thy own peace of mind’. They signed it ‘with much affection’.

This Crewdson gift for pastoral relationships takes the story back ten and twenty years when Isaac had been the Friend called upon by Hardshaw East in instance after instance of personal difficulty - drunkenness, financial trouble, immorality, applications for membership, disownment - and though no longer appointed in the same way it was still his gift for those who could share his experience of salvation. The depth of what he had to share is moving. The tragedy was his inability to discriminate about how to use it.

The advice to withdraw from ministry was given in January, 1836, and for some months Crewdson remained silent. But Yearly Meeting in May of that year was heavily engaged with a minute from Westmorland Quarterly Meeting, itself powerfully evangelical: ‘that the Society of Friends should put forth a declaration that in their estimation the Holy Scriptures are the paramount rule of faith and practice’. This, of course, did lead into a doctrinal debate but avoided putting it in a disciplinary setting regarding an individual, where the outcome would have had to be a clearcut ‘yes’ or ‘no’.

As it was, the discussion was long and heated. There is an excellent contemporary account of it by John Southall, printed in *the Journal of the Friends’ Historical Society*, in 1920. The exercise terminated with a minute which directed the sub-committee drafting the Epistle ‘to prepare a paragraph expressive of the high value of the Society for the Scriptures’. This was, needless to say, far short of the declaration asked for by Westmorland.

When the draft Epistle was presented it included some sentences which provided a subsequent foundation text for evangelical ministry for the rest of the century:

‘... it has ever been, and still is, the belief of the Society of Friends, that the Holy Scriptures... were given by inspiration of God... and there can be no appeal from them to any other authority whatsoever... [and] that whatsoever man says or does which is contrary to the Scriptures, though under profession of the immediate guidance of the Spirit, must be reckoned and accounted a mere delusion’.

Southall, who was there, says that the draft was a compromise which pleased neither Westmorland nor those of a different way of thinking,

but that 'many influential Friends who said that they did not approve of it, did not like to object'. In accordance with customary practice the Women's Meeting had not been consulted.²⁰

Crewdson's family roots were in Westmorland, and it may be that the vigour of the Kendal advocacy and the text of the Epistle encouraged him to resume his ministry later that summer. But Manchester meeting found it no more acceptable than before. The Visiting Committee recognised that Crewdson was not susceptible to their informal advice and therefore, with great reluctance, decided that they must pass the matter to Monthly Meeting since monthly meetings were responsible in the first instance for initiating disciplinary proceedings. But any formal disciplinary action taken by a monthly meeting would imply a 'charge' which would be used as the ground for appeal first to Quarterly, and then to Yearly Meeting.

Open appeals on doctrinal grounds were the last thing anybody except the Beaconites wanted. So in passing their own failure to the Monthly Meeting the Visiting Committee suggested that while Monthly Meeting should now move formally by minute, it should still stick to *advice* to refrain from ministry, since advice, however formal, could avoid a 'charge', giving Crewdson no ground for appeal.

Sure enough, he did reject the formal Monthly Meeting advice on the ground that behind it there must be a charge, whether stated or not. Monthly Meeting sensed that in verbal argument on fine points they were no match for Crewdson and his friends; they passed the point about 'charge' back to the Visiting Committee. Throughout, the Committee had been very clear that the issue was style, not content; so they could do no more than reiterate their advice and deny any charge, leaving Crewdson room to continue to reject the advice.

By October, however, the issue of advice on style merged with a different matter on which Manchester meeting, through Monthly Meeting, were prepared to take the initiative. They were dissatisfied with the exercise of the Crewdson overseers, and at the September Monthly Meeting they proposed that in principle the appointment of overseers should be revised, on the unstated ground that the long-standing Crewdson oversight was excessively burdensome.

Whether or not the revision of overseers should or should not proceed and, if so, on what grounds was the main item on the agenda of the October Monthly Meeting where it found its business merging into the equally inflammatory issue of the disciplinary status of the advice given Crewdson on ministry.

The upshot was a Monthly Meeting of fascinating complexity and tremendous tension that took eight long sessions from a Thursday morning to the following Tuesday evening, at the turn of October/November, 1836. The Visiting Committee were present in strength and participated both as a Yearly Meeting group and as honorary members of Hardshaw East Monthly Meeting.

There is a 250-page Hansard-like printed account of this M.M. - *The Crisis of the Quaker Contest*²¹ - commissioned by the evangelical group. It is eminently fair. But when, in considering oversight, the shorthand note-taking was noticed, there was a two-hour debate about its propriety or otherwise which degenerated into noisy bedlam. The shorthand writer breaks off in despair because 13 Friends were on their feet at the same time.²² The meeting regained its poise and returned to the substantive question of oversight; in the end the matter passed to a nominating committee who brought in new appointments later in the meeting.

Throughout the remaining days the focus was on advice. The Crewdsons and Boultons, supported by the other local evangelicals, strove to turn the issue to 'sound doctrine', the Visiting Committee and the body of Manchester Friends sticking to the point of style and silence as the ground for meeting unity.

In the course of the fifth day the Crewdsons (other than Wilson Crewdson) resigned - or seceded as they themselves put it later - along with about 50 others. The clerk, James Crosfield, resigned too - but not from the Society.

An extract from the M.M. minute accepting the first group of resignations reads: 'We cannot... accept that, as the ministry of the Word in our assemblies for public worship, which we do not believe to be exercised under the fresh and immediate putting forth of the Holy Head of the Church. Intimately connected with this view of the qualification, essential to the exercise of gospel ministry, is the practice of our Society, of silent waiting before the Lord, in meeting for divine worship. We do continue to regard this practice as most in accordance... with that communion with God, which is beyond all words'.

In a response to this minute the seceders make four points, the first three of which return to the absolute authority of the Bible. The fourth is very brief: 'the preaching of the gospel has been greatly discouraged in the Society'.

The most effective evangelical criticism of the spiritual inadequacy of orthodox Quietism is a single sentence from John Hadwen Cockbain's letter of resignation: 'I had all my life long been going about to establish

my own righteousness and had not submitted myself to the righteousness of God...'.²³

The Beacon row was a storm in a teacup, kept within those limits by the patient statesmanship of a Yearly Meeting committee whose members were theologically divided but who skilfully eased the Beaconite cavalry into withdrawing from what could have become a national field of battle had the Manchester conflict continued to the question of disownment. The Beaconite secession left the way open for a firm affirmation that for Friends 'silent waiting before the Lord... (is) most in accordance with that communion with God, which is beyond words'.

Samuel Tuke was the clerk of Yearly Meeting, 1836, and he was also a member of the Visiting Committee. He was a highly literate Friend in the non-militant orthodox stream, who may well have foreseen at the time of Y.M. that the outcome of the Beacon affair was going to require some weighty statement about the nature of meetings for worship that could be woven into whatever was the conclusion of the Beacon exercise. At any rate, when Y.M. in May, 1836, appointed the General Epistle Committee it gave it instructions also to prepare an Epistle of Counsel - not in itself an innovation. This Epistle of Counsel begins by addressing Friends who were not going to meeting at all and, without any evangelical overtones, goes on with a fine passage on meetings for worship, quite different in tone from the paragraph in the same year's General Epistle, based on the authority of the Scriptures and 'the dangers of the immediate guidance of the Spirit (which) must be accounted as mere delusion.'²⁴

'Draw nigh to God, and He will draw nigh to you... seldom fail to obtain that... divine refreshment... which comes immediately from God. Thus would our meetings... be made to overflow with thanksgiving and praise... for Him... who in His own time will satisfy the hungry soul with food convenient for it'.

This Epistle of Counsel - which was accepted in the final session of Y.M. immediately before the General Epistle itself - may have been Samuel Tuke's own declaration, providing a measure of protection for the unprogrammed meeting, a breakwater against the free-flowing evangelical ministry.

The mystical foundation of the meeting for worship and the dogmatic foundation of evangelical ministry were and are incompatible. Edward Grubb presents this beautifully in his 1923 Presidential paper.²⁵ But incompatible though the styles were and are, both were powerfully alive among Friends in the 1830s. The skill of the Beacon Committee

was effectively to have caught the sense of London Yearly Meeting by diverting into secession the threat of vigorous dogmatic verbal ministry, away from the established style of worship rooted in silence, while leaving room for the vitalising power of the outflow of personal evangelical experience.

The tension remained, but the sharp edges were softened by the death or resignation in the mid-1840s of all the dominant Friends at either end of the spectrum: J.J. Gurney, Luke Howard, John Wilkinson, Sarah Lynes Grubb, Elisabeth Robson, Ann Jones.

In the immediate aftermath of the Manchester secession the experience of Leeds, as recounted by Jean Mortimer, is illuminating.²⁶ The Jowitt/Crewdson family evangelical ties in Leeds were strong, but there Friends were able to live with theological difficulties unless and until the acceptance of baptism and other sacraments compelled separation or resignation.

Within the wider Society the tension between the two streams surfaced again and again throughout the next 60 years in an endless flow of discussions and letters in the Quaker periodicals about the use or non-use of the Bible, formally or informally, in the ministry of meetings for worship.

Before he died in 1836 Thomas Shillitoe declared that Gurney had spread a 'linsey-wolsey garment' over the Society. It is a term taken from Deuteronomy, where the injunction is not to mix incompatible threads in the same garment. What troubled Shillitoe was his perception that over the foundation of silent worship Gurney had spread a veil of conventional evangelical ministry which would carry the body of the Society into the world's standards of theology, comfort and social custom. This is what happened at the overt level in the middle years of the century.

Agnes Yates' delightful book *Putting the Clock Back*, published in 1939, gives a vividly rich picture of a Quaker home in Shaftesbury in the 1860s. In the middle 50s a census had shown that in two-thirds of the meetings in that Q.M. there was no ministry. By the 1860s the habitual silence was slowly giving way to not very intelligible evangelically inclined ministry; hell lurked unpredictably round the corners of what was essentially warm, affectionate family life.

But domestic life in local meetings was not the whole of contemporary Quakerism. The two monthly journals, launched in 1843, were running efficiently, jousting with each other rather than fighting. Between 1859 and 1862, Y.M. abolished disownment for marrying out, diminished the importance of the 'peculiarities' and

revised the Book of Discipline, all in relative harmony. What was equally significant was the unity of Friends in philanthropic service - the Irish Famine, the prominent support of the Peace Society, courageous opposition to the Crimean War, the testimonies against capital punishment and for temperance. Yet withal, the membership of the Society was declining into publicly honoured old age.

It was in the perception of this condition that an anonymously financed £100 prize competition was launched in 1859 for essays on why Quaker witness was becoming 'more and more feeble'. The donor nominated three non-Friend adjudicators. The prize was won by John Stephenson Rowntree, with *Quakerism: Past and Present*, a remarkable review of how the Society appeared to a 24 year-old grocery assistant in his father's shop. It concluded with a brief but imaginative view of the way forward in the eyes of a mildly evangelical young man. An equal first prize was awarded to a high Anglican priest, Thomas Hancock, whose *Peculium* is a beautifully written essay on why the Society should be allowed to die since its true work was done. In Hancock's judgement the Society had at no point contributed anything new but it had effectively brought back into the life of the whole Christian Church eternal elements of spiritual experience which the Church had forgotten. Its contemporary evangelical swing was into a dead end.

Theologically this was true but with hindsight the birth of the Friends First Day School Association, in 1847, was the most creative event of these years. And it was born of the Quaker evangelical vision that there was a religious experience to be shared with 'the poor and the ignorant' in the inner cities, giving the young men of the Society something to do in making the offer of literacy and Biblical instruction. By 1850 there were about 3,000 students in the schools, by 1870, 15,000, and by the 1880s over 40,000. It is a matter of regret that there has been no adequate study of the FFDSA, since without the impact of this dynamic outward-reaching concern initiated by the evangelical stream our religious Society might well have withered away - not that the students became members in any great numbers, but that in finding something stimulating to do as class leaders young Friends of both sexes found the way to wider spiritual horizons than anybody had foreseen.

About 1858 there was a quite different development. Friends in some of the rapidly growing cities were concerned for the welfare of the young men Friends who were coming in from rural homes to work in urban offices, living in lodgings.²⁷ They needed somewhere to meet other than pubs. The answer was Friends' Institutes - with reading, writing and lecture rooms, library provision, tea and coffee refreshment

rooms and lavatories. And in Manchester at any rate there was a special room for women.

They were comfortable Quaker clubs, with a leaning towards self-education in literature, science, history, and religion. In Manchester the Institute was opened in 1858 with an address by William Thistlethwaite who spoke of '... the benefits of continued study and self-culture... The end of all study is the discovery of truth'. It was a forward-looking address beginning with a declaration of faith in thoughtful change. After a break for tea there was a paper on the eclipse of the sun.

So far as I know the Manchester Friends Institute was the only one where a substantial number of younger members pushed the discovery of truth beyond the frontiers of 'sound doctrine', to the long-suffering horror of at least some of the ministers, elders and overseers of Manchester meeting. The tension made itself felt almost from the start in decisions about library books: the orthodox stream objected to the life of J.J. Gurney, but it was added because it was Quaker history, as was the life of John Wilbur, anathema to the evangelicals. But it was three years before the tension broke out in public, in 1860/61.²⁸

David Duncan was a convinced Friend in his late 30s, with a Scottish Presbyterian background and a lively mind. A lecture on George Fox by an evangelical Friend, Frederick Cooper, who was called away at short notice, had to be replaced. A member of the Lecture Committee asked Duncan if he would be willing to stand in. Duncan agreed, provided that his subject would be acceptable - a review of the recently published *Essays and Reviews*; this was a collection of papers by seven distinguished Anglicans, who included William Temple, then Headmaster of Rugby and subsequently Archbishop of Canterbury - and father of another Archbishop of Canterbury - and Benjamin Jowett, Master of Balliol. The papers were written for a sophisticated readership, but precipitated a hurley-burley of theological controversy, somewhat parallel to the rows precipitated by John Robinson 25 years ago, and the Bishop of Durham any time these days. Moreover *Essays and Reviews* was published at almost the same time as the *Origin of Species*. So Duncan's offer was bound to be controversial. The Lecture Committee was equally divided about the invitation, but the General Committee agreed to the proposal.

The lecture²⁹ is lucid but, if delivered as printed later in at least three editions, it must have been very hard listening indeed, and not only because of its length. It is far too closely argued to have been prepared in

a hurry. Duncan must have been looking for an occasion. Speaking and writing as a Friend, he found the essays exhilarating in that the Anglican authors, particularly William Temple, urged Christians to use their minds, and to remember that the Bible was written by men in their own time with divine inspiration but with their own human limitations. 'The Bible ...is placed lower than its author... as a reflection of the Divine rather than the reality... and should be limited to its proper sphere as an *instrument*.'

'The Gospel of our Saviour,' writes Duncan, 'is divine, but the *isms* are not divine... Christians are known as Calvinists and Lutherans and Quakers, and they speak and act as if Christ were divided. If the principle were more generally admitted that Christianity is a life rather than a formula, theology... would give place to religion'. The core of what he has to say to Friends comes in the prefatory note:... 'the testimony which these Anglicans bear [is] to an *Inward Guide* as superior to the Outward Testimony although in the main concurrent with it'.

The lecture went into three editions in the year of its delivery. It raised some controversy at Yearly Meeting, not all of it hostile; it received some notice in the Quaker periodicals. Since there must have been plenty of copies of the lectures about throughout the decade it is surprising that Duncan's outspoken repudiation of evangelical theology did not create an immediate storm.

For the present the immediate response in Manchester simmered rather than boiled. There was more trouble about what books should be in the Institute library and about the use of rooms for controversial discussions. The paper evidence is scrappy, but it points in the directions of elderly critics trying to avoid divisive rows. For about 1866 a special discussion was arranged 'designed to promote the harmonious working of the Institute'.³⁰ The record carries the names of 27 men and one woman who put their names to a resolution: 'that no verbal discussion on Biblical or theological questions shall take place at the lectures. Any member is free to read a written reply subsequently on giving the secretary notice, after which there shall again be no discussion'. Of the 27 signatories, 19 were among the 130 or so interviewed by the Y.M. Committee five years later; 13 of the 19 were then Ministers, Elders or Overseers, four were critical of the officers of the meeting, and one was a young Friend who subsequently resigned after the Duncan separation. So it is clear that in the mid-60s there was a cross-generational group among Manchester Friends trying to avoid confrontation in the setting of the Institute.

But not so in the Meeting. In 1867 a youngish Friend, S.B. Edmundson, who was both assistant clerk of Hardshaw East M.M. and an Overseer, had, in a private conversation with an Elder, expressed doubts about some of the miracles. The Elder was a member of Nominations Committee. By a long and complicated chain this hint at heresy in an office-holder led to high tension at Q.M. level which appointed a committee to look into the condition of Hardshaw East M.M.

The committee found itself at sixes and sevens, but, after two further Quarterly Meetings, reported that with one or two exceptions the M.M. was sound at heart. This so outraged some Manchester evangelicals that they raised the situation at Yearly Meeting in 1869. Early in the session William Thistlethwaite,³¹ the Friend who had addressed the opening of the Institute 11 years earlier and who was a member of the Q.M. Committee, said that he feared that the prevalence of division and strife was more dangerous than the fear of unsound doctrine. In reply he was told that until the axe was put to the root of the tree no permanent good could be effected. Other knowledgeable Lancashire Friends said that there was substantial unity in Manchester in disapproving unsound views, but that there was also a substantial body of sympathy for freedom of thought and that no good purpose would be served by pursuing the issue divisively. And, on the ground that the Q.M. Committee was in active existence, Y.M. agreed that courtesy precluded intervention.

But that winter the visit to Manchester of an ultra-evangelical travelling minister from America inflamed the situation to the point that in the spring of 1870 the Q.M. asked for and received Y.M. assistance. Rather than appoint a visiting committee in open Y.M. session, nomination was passed to the Epistle Committee of which, year by year, Joseph Bevan Braithwaite had been drafter in chief for 13 years. The Committee nominated 17 Friends, most of whom were prominent evangelicals. No effort seems to have been made to achieve balance.

This is where something must be said about Joseph Bevan Braithwaite, who, for the last half of the century, was the towering Friend in the evangelical stream and indeed in the Society itself.³¹ He was born in 1818 into a profoundly evangelical Kendal family; most of his siblings left the Society for doctrinal reasons. He himself found enough evangelical foundations among Friends in Yearly Meeting, in 1840, to be convinced that he should stay. And after the death of Gurney in 1847, Braithwaite edited his papers and steadily moved into

evangelical leadership. By profession he was a barrister with a rather desiccated legal mind and practice. He was David Livingstone's lawyer and friend. As a Friend he was an inexhaustible evangelical minister; a contemporary attributed to him 'the gift of continuance'. He had educated himself in by no means negligible Biblical and doctrinal scholarship, again of a rather desiccated order. This went with pastoral gifts of great depth and outreach, so that as the years passed he earned and was accorded an affectionate patriarchal stature. In an obituary notice in *The Friend* of 1909 Thomas Hodgkin who was not an evangelical headed the notice 'know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel'.

Three thumb-nail sketches may indicate his evangelicalism. In 1857 Yearly Meeting discussed and finally agreed that its minutes should be printed and made available to Friends generally. Braithwaite had just found himself drafter in chief on the Epistle Committee. He was against the publication of the minutes on the ground that they would distract Friends from attention to the Epistle, to him the heart of the whole Yearly Meeting exercise. He remained the effective drafter in chief of the Epistle for the next 30 years.

Roger Clark, who was a mine of Quaker lore, reported that on the first occasion when Joseph Bevan Braithwaite was not the key drafter, the printer sent the Epistle back, thinking there must be some mistake since it was distinctly different from what they had been accustomed to receive.

Towards the end of his life Braithwaite was asked by a daughter whether his views had been in any way affected by new theological ideas. 'My dear,' he said, 'my views on all these subjects were settled more than 60 years ago'.³²

It is easy to be irreverent at the desiccation of his theology. It is impossible in words to portray the warmth of his dedication to sharing with everybody the depth of his own experience of salvation as a sinner saved by the atonement of Christ from the justice of God offended. But the depth and power of this conviction made him a poor listener and diplomat.

So to Manchester meeting when seven members of the Y.M. Committee under the leadership of Braithwaite arrived in August, 1870. The local situation was lively and complex: the weighty evangelical stream had refrained uneasily from action against 'unsound doctrine' for the better part of ten years; among others there were those whose doctrines was 'sound' but who were tolerant for freedom of thought; and there were the radical critics of 'sound doctrine', the vitality of

whose search lay in the fellowship of the Institute.

Between the 19th and 26th of August, 1870, the Committee had 19 meetings with 132 local Friends, of whom 121 were in nine different groups, each with a somewhat different orientation. There is no evidence of how the membership of the groups was selected, but there is a full and fair account of the week's work in copybook writing in the Library.³³

The first group were the Elders and Overseers, full of anxiety. The second, of 17, were highly critical of the competence of the Elders and Overseers. The third, of 15, supported the officers of the meeting. The fourth, of 28 young men, felt that the Elders gave no room for thinking minds. The fifth, of 20, said the meeting was in a mess. Discussion of religious issues had to be in the Institute because the Elders had failed to provide for thinking minds in any other way. 'Ministry which dealt on love and heaven was tolerated, but if it referred to rewards and punishment, judgement or doctrinal questions, it gave offence'. The lobby was ablaze with criticism after meeting. But the Institute had at least kept the young men out of pubs.

The sixth meeting, of seven, had sympathy with freedom of thought; the seventh, of 12, placed the problem in the lack of any occasion when the generations could meet as persons. The eighth meeting was with 22 Ministers, Elders and Overseers towards the end of the week, and the last with 17 women Friends who were generally sympathetic with the young. In addition the Committee had long personal interviews with David Duncan, J.B. Edmondson and others.

The Committee must have heard a great deal that they did not like. There is no evidence how the Committee digested this material throughout the autumn, but in his diary J.B. Braithwaite notes that on a First Day in first month, 1871, he drafted a document, revised it on second day, and took it to Manchester on third day, commenting that he wishes that there were some place for more reference to the atonement. So maybe that, while Braithwaite was concerned for theology, other members of the Committee were pressing the point about the relationships within the meeting.

However that may be, this or an amended document was presented to the Monthly Meeting nine days later. It consists entirely of a declaration of 'sound doctrine'. There is no recognition whatsoever of the confusion in the state of personal relationships within the meeting, so clearly recorded in the detailed written accounts of the August interviews. The Monthly Meeting minuted dryly: 'The Yearly Meeting Committee has presented the accompanying communication'. But this

may conceal some disunity. For the document was printed in London three weeks later with an introductory note: '... circulation is not in a spirit of controversy but to encourage fellowship'. In this it was not successful and by April the Committee decided that the time for hoping for unity was over. David Duncan's theological delinquency must be brought to the notice of Monthly Meeting for disciplinary action. Monthly Meeting continued to be divided. 'It is concluded to place the case in the hands of the same committee (i.e. the Y.M. Committee) who are to report hereon to a future meeting'.

Then in June, before any further action was taken, Charles Voysey, an ordained Anglican priest who had moved into Unitarianism, addressed a public meeting in Manchester. He had stayed with Duncan, who, on being charged with complicity, declined to defend himself, declaring that his concern was to speak and act on behalf of all who wanted to *think*.

This clinched the matter. On July 11th the Y.M. Committee reported to Monthly Meeting: '... no benefit is likely to arise from further labour... the time has arrived when the case must be left to the decision of the Monthly Meeting'. The next day Hardshaw East 'after much deliberation' adopted a formal minute of separation, without the customary procedure of appointing visitors.

At almost the same time David Duncan died of smallpox. Braithwaite had expected that Duncan would appeal against the disownment. In his diary Braithwaite expressed his thankful relief and adds: 'How wonderful are the ways of providence'.³⁴

Eleven resignations were received at the August Monthly Meeting and were accepted in September. Neither M.M. nor Preparative Meeting minutes make any reference to the death of David Duncan. His wife's resignation was kept under consideration for some months and was then accepted without comment.

The disownment of Duncan cleared the way for the Committee to bring a report of their two years' work to Yearly Meeting in 1872. They asked to be laid down, presenting their 1,500-word *communication* for endorsement by the Meeting as a declaration of 'Sound Doctrine'. It is a tract built around 35 Biblical texts and seventeenth-century Quaker extracts. Friends were divided about the laying down, but J.S. Sewell caught the sense of the Meeting when he said that it was not necessary to endorse quotations from Scripture, and that - interesting though seventeenth-century quotations might be - he doubted their relevance, since the faith of the early Friends was not in doctrine but in the Lord

Jesus Christ. The document was not endorsed; it was printed as an appendix to the minutes. The Committee was laid down.

The Manchester Friends who resigned met, together with others, 30 to 40 strong, round the corner in Albert Square, Sunday by Sunday, for an hour's meeting followed by an hour's discussion. More interestingly from a historical point of view they published a monthly paper, *The Manchester Friend*, until the end of 1873. It is full of interesting material, including a blow by blow retrospective account of the row.

The disposal of the Manchester trouble at Y.M. 1872 was followed in 1873 by the disownment of Edward Bennett, for heresy. It occupied Y.M. for a whole day but was not significantly divisive. *The British Friend* which had thought well of Duncan in 1861 was outraged by the Unitarian associations of Duncan and Bennett in the 1870s. 'Reason must give way to revelation', it wrote.³⁵ In the Y.M. focus 'Sound Doctrine' seemed complacently well settled - at the level of an appendix.

Like the Beacon row, the Manchester Institute row was a storm in a teacup. But whereas in the Beacon affair the diplomacy of the Visiting Committee laid the foundation for a definitive rejection of doctrinal ministry as a regular practice in meeting for worship, the failure of the 1870 Committee to secure acceptance of its declaration indicated that the evangelical stream could no longer count on carrying the theological sense of Yearly Meeting. On the other hand what happened next is a tribute to the effectiveness of the evangelical vision over the previous 20 years in shifting the Society's view of itself from that of an inward-looking spiritual remnant into a conviction that there must be something to share with the outside world.

This grasp of the idea of 'extension' struggled into untidy birth in two national conferences in the autumns of 1872 and 1873. In 1872 two days were spent considering what forms of regulation or recognition, if any, should be given to 'certain descriptions of Christian work, carried on by our members in many places.' This curious circumlocution covered the schools of the Friends First Day Schools Association, started in 1847, now with over 15,000 students, most of them adults; and it also covered inner city mission meetings, evangelical in tone, with prayer, singing, addresses and the temperance pledge, but no silence. The issue was whether this extensive but quite unofficial field work by individuals and Quaker groups was a proper service for corporate endorsement or not.

The 15,000 First Day School students were led and taught by 1,200 young men and women, mostly Friends, who tended to find the

encounter much more stimulating than either evangelical ministry or the 'unconsecrated silence' of so many meetings. But the students did not end up in meeting. Why not?³⁶ And what support should Friends as a Y.M. give to those of their number who were quite certainly engaged in Christian service?

At one end of the spectrum there were the unshakably conservative, so committed to the meeting for worship gathered in silence that they were strongly against any formal recognition of this sort of verbal outreach. At the other end of the spectrum were the evangelical purists who wanted the outreach to be brought within the formal Y.M. structure, so that deviation from 'sound doctrine' could be brought within the exercise of the Discipline. Dissatisfaction with the rigidity of these Friends was well caught by the contribution of W.C. Westlake: 'our children are all doing it; should we stop it or encourage it?'; and he went on to speak of 'the elasticity of the Society', a splendid term picked up by Caroline Stephen in *Quaker Strongholds*,³⁷ and by Gulielma Crosfield³⁸ at the Manchester Conference of 1895. The meeting spread over two days of waterlogged verbal travail; half way through the second day *The Friend* reports that 'a Friend recommended brevity at some length'. In the end each of these extension exercises was to be allowed to hold its annual meeting at the time of Y.M., but not as part of the agenda. This gave them recognition and preserved them from doctrinal pressure, so that by 1890, when the schools were 40,000 strong, there was a corresponding core of middle-aged and young Quaker class leaders ready for fresh air when it blew through the Manchester Conference in 1895.

The second conference, called under the title 'The State of the Society', occupied 420 male Friends for three days in the autumn of 1873. There were six agenda headings: decline in attendance at mid-week meetings, diminished interest in Monthly and Quarterly meetings, relative decline in numbers, the extent of religious teaching and pastoral care, the action of the Society upon the world at large, and the religious instruction of our younger members. The agenda was circulated in advance. Two pre-conference reflections are indicative of thought in South Lancashire. In one of its last numbers *The Manchester Friend*³⁹ reflects on a series of local meetings held in Bolton a few days beforehand in preparation. The article is written from the Institute background, stressing the usefulness of local considerations of this kind which produces 'a level of commonsense and shrewdness on the position and prospects of Quakerism free from the oppressive conventionality... which is apt to overawe in a large and one-sided meeting'.

It discerned three streams of contemporary Quaker disposition which it expected would be manifest at the Conference: the 'Friends of the old school... are few in number, but there is still a certain dignity and power in their insistence of [*sic*] silence as the right basis of worship and the looking within for the manifestation of God in the heart. They are out of date and fashion... helpless in the strong life of the present'.

Then there are the main stream Friends, 'now active and predominant, who wish [to throw open the doors of Quakerism, and] by some means or any means to draw in large numbers of converts... Their strong desire... is to obtain some definiteness of creed... Silent meetings are a proof to them of hardness and impiety, and they advocate classes, officially recognized, wherein young Friends shall be instructed in "the truth". The Bible... and its public reading in our worship would be eagerly accepted by them... these preachers by doctrine, assertion, persuasion, threatening, may easily be wounding while they think they are supplying a need...

'The smallest portion of the meeting, which for distinction may be called the rational... under the influence of recent discoveries and hypotheses, held it was mentally impossible and morally wrong to rest satisfied with the old criteria of truth... Thoughtful people were repulsed by the growing inclination of Friends to draw hard lines of doctrine... for they knew there was the greatest uncertainty as to what constitutes religious truth, and in these days, observation and experience were the surest teachers of it'.

They go on to speak of themselves: 'It is not likely that the Conference will draw many of this last class, for their position is as yet too negative to induce them to seek conflict... waiting, not indifferent... not ready to think they have much to give... There is, perhaps, hardly a part of the old Quakerism that they have sufficient confidence in to battle for; but that it will have to serve as camping ground... for some time to come... It is the enthusiastic, those who believe in a brilliant future for the Society, who will gather in large numbers and shape its changes'.

How right they were - in their doubts about the immediate future and their confidence about the further future.

When this Conference on the State of the Society met a month later it was even more waterlogged than the Conference of the previous year which had at least managed to recognize the FFDSA. This time the 420 men wallowed for three days without finding any sense of direction. There were a considerable number of shortish comments about particular shortcomings - the burden of birthright membership,

excessive ministry, too little ministry, the boredom of Monthly Meetings, about which John Stephenson Rowntree coined an immortal phrase in pleading for the recognized importance of 'sanctified commonsense'.⁴⁰

From time to time J.B. Braithwaite ministered at great length on degeneracy and salvation, but with no new vision. Much the most persistent issue, emerging again and again whatever the agenda heading, was the role of the Bible in worship or at other times on First Days.

Interestingly enough in another pre-conference exercise Manchester Preparative Meeting foresaw that this was likely to be an issue, for it made a minute, most unusual and beyond the requirements of routine administration: 'It is the clear judgement of this meeting... [that there should be] no change in the mode of conducting our meetings for worship and this should be carried to the forthcoming conference by our representatives if required'.

Sure enough there was evangelical pressure for recognized and regular Biblical reading in morning worship. But the sense of the meeting led against this in principle, while it was united in agreeing that in some form Bible study would be appropriate at afternoon or evening meetings. Beyond that nothing emerged from the conference of any significant coherence.

Surprising as ever was the interest of the national press in what was going on among Friends: there was some resentment that the *Daily Telegraph* referred to the conference as the Society's "inquest on its own decease".

The Manchester Friend report of the pre-conference Bolton exercise was right in doubting whether much of positive *direction* would come from this State of the Society conference, but the young men were wrong in under-estimating the extent and depth of the resistance among the 420 appointed Q.M. representatives to the presentation of Quakerism as if its life were encapsulated year by year in its Y.M. Epistles. The detailed reports⁴¹ of the two conferences on the First Day schools, the mission meetings, and the state of the Society present a good deal of evidence of random seed waiting in individual Quaker minds for the warmth of spring. The rebirth of the Society at the Manchester Conference 23 years later was conceived in these two conferences, held in the aftermath of the Institute Duncan row.

Lest this account of major occasions gives the impression that the Society was pompously and talkatively out of self-control in its spiritual journey, here is a sketch of how a local meeting found its way through

its differences about Bible usage, and how easily individual Friends escape categorization. Richard Rutter (1826-1898) was a member of Newcastle-upon-Tyne meeting in middle life. The *Annual Monitor* of 1899 reports that in 1870 Newcastle was 'not agitated but gently swaying to and fro by a proposal to read the Bible in our meetings for worship. Most of the younger generation were in favour... but one or two of our oldest and most esteemed Friends... feared lest prearrangement... might interfere with the freedom and spirituality of worship... the matter was settled by withdrawal... as it would be selfish to press for a change that would be painful to their older brothers... On the next Sunday Richard Rutter... repeated with deep feeling the magnificent 53rd chapter of Isaiah'.

Ten years earlier Rutter had been baptised, offering his resignation which was not accepted. A year after the Bible recitation, in 1871, he was recorded a minister. In the 1882 Y.M. he was vigorous in disapproval of the proposal to establish a Home Mission Committee with authority to release Friends with stipendiary support for local service of a pastoral nature. And when it was accepted he never went back to Y.M.

In Hardshaw East, in January following the State of the Society Conference, M.M. appointed a sub-committee of four Friends, three of whom had had substantial encounters with Braithwaite and his 1870 Visiting Committee, together with William Pollard, recently arrived in Manchester. Their remit was to draw up a minute to be taken on to Q.M. and thence to Y.M. if possible. The minute ran: 'This meeting has noticed with much concern an increasing disposition on the part of many members of the Society of Friends to advocate the reading of the Scriptures, pre-arranged or otherwise, in our meetings for public worship; and while feeling the deep importance of right arrangements for communicating sound religious instruction is nevertheless of the clear judgement that the introduction of such readings into our meetings for public worship would weaken our testimony to the spirituality and simplicity of the worship and the right authority of the Gospel ministry'.

Through the rest of the 1870s the cross-talking went on - the evangelicals no less dogmatically doctrinal, the critics raising and defending doubts without any effective coherence of spiritual vision. Yet beyond the differences the idea of 'extension' took firmer hold. In the autumn of 1881 the Friends First Day Schools Association, now with 25,000 scholars, adults and children, united with the Peel Institute in holding a conference to press again for closer relationship with the

Society. Peel was an independent East London Quaker enterprise, vigorously combining religious mission with social philanthropy. It differed from the FFDSA in that its type of service needed a core of residential 'workers'. The conference was well attended by Friends who were active at the local level. It took a recommendation to Yearly Meeting in 1882 that somehow these 'extension' initiatives should be brought within the structure of the Y.M. The extent to which the Society was still captive to its institutional conservatism emerged when the inclusion of this recommendation on the Yearly Meeting agenda was challenged on the ground that it came from a source which was not - like a Quarterly Meeting - formally a part of the Society. However, the agenda difficulty was overcome and the consideration followed much the same lines as the conference of 1872.

But there were three new elements: an evangelical interest in residential support for ailing country meetings; possible modest financial support for resident workers; and a broader question of principle - whether 'extension' was now more properly a matter for monthly and quarterly meetings than for a central committee (with a hidden implication that a central committee would be dominated by elderly evangelical weight). The Yearly Meeting decision witnesses, on the one hand to the variety of perceptions about 'extension', and, on the other, to the strength of the evangelical 'establishment' as the only group who knew what they actually wanted to do. For the half-hearted decision of the Meeting was to establish a Yearly Meeting Home Mission Committee on a temporary basis with responsibility for raising its own finance. Its first members were virtually self-appointed and were re-appointed from time to time over the next ten years, by which time there were about 40 modestly paid 'workers' under concern, serving in rural areas and inner-city precincts. The FFDSA and Peel continued their independent existence but with increasing respect from Friends generally.

The formal establishment of the Home Service Committee and its subsequent field development sharpened the criticism of those who saw signs of movement towards the pastoral meetings of the Middle West of America. But these critics still had no coherent constructive response to offer. How this response developed over the next 15 years is the material of recent articles providing much detail.⁴² Here only a summary is needed.

The new horizon was opened up by the publication in 1884 of *A Reasonable Faith*,⁴³ a 100-page paperback, an easily readable, lucidly written, Biblically based liberal Christian treatise, offering a totally

different structure of religious thought from that of evangelicalism. It was written by three Friends - Francis Frith, William Pollard, and W.E. Turner - all of them recorded ministers. It was followed two years later by *The Gospel of Divine Help*, a more scholarly little book, by Edward Worsdell. These books, their content, their authors and their historical setting form the content of the *Friends Quarterly* of October, 1984. The books provide the theological base on which the spiritual heirs of the young men of Manchester were able to shape the future of the Society. Meanwhile the publication and wide circulation of *A Reasonable Faith* led to an evangelical cry at the Yearly Meeting of 1885 for some form of official repudiation, which was not forthcoming.

Not that the weight of the evangelical establishment disappeared abruptly. Laura Davy (Moore), had a widowed father of somewhat limited orthodox leanings; and Laura was brought up in the strong evangelical home of Sheffield relatives.⁴⁴ In 1885 at the age of 15 she was head girl in the top class at Ackworth. She enjoyed the relationships at school, the enthusiasm of Moody and Sankey hymn singing, and the sermons of Frederick Andrews. But she was shocked when Caroline Woodhead, her form mistress, was summarily dismissed because it had got about, quite correctly, that in a Scripture lesson she had said, in talking about Balaam, that his ass was *said* to have spoken! When Laura confided to a cousin that she had herself some doubts, the cousin's comment was: are you going to be as bad as Miss Woodhead?

Laura went on to the Mount where a sympathetic mistress, Susan O'Brien, gave her copies of *A Reasonable Faith* and Worsdell's *Gospel of Divine Help* to read in the holidays.

In 1887 a great conference in Richmond, Indiana, produced the 'Richmond Declaration'. This is a massive evangelical proclamation, built on about 130 Biblical texts. Its primary purpose was to provide the new, rapidly growing pastoral Friends meetings of the Middle West with a firm basis of 'sound doctrine' from which to extend their vigorous commitment to mission. J.B. Braithwaite was the leading London Friend invited to the conference and it was, indeed, he who drafted the Declaration. It is composed largely of extracts from London Yearly Meeting Epistles of which he had been drafter in chief over the previous 30 years.⁴⁵

In 1888 a crowded Yearly Meeting considered how to respond to the Declaration. The discussion took the whole of two sessions with over 50 contributors, the majority critical. The Clerk ruled that, in any event, acceptance was impossible, since there was no room for amendment. The minute noted receipt of the Declaration without comment on its

content. J.B.B. accepted the disappointment with good grace.⁴⁶

Within the four years, 1884 to 1888, the evangelicals had been outthought, but not yet outplaced in the structure of London Yearly Meeting. The Richmond controversy brought John William Graham and Edward Grubb into the campaigning company of Pollard, Frith, Turner and Worsdell. Graham was later to become well-known as the Principal of Dalton Hall, Manchester. Grubb,⁴⁷ then teaching religious studies at a school in Southport, subsequently became one of the most influential writers on Quaker life and thought in the early decades of this century. These six were an impressive group, and as five of them lived within 30 miles of Manchester they were able to support one another with power in speaking, writing and travelling throughout the Yearly Meeting but still without the flair or diplomatic gifts to initiate a movement.

The charisma came in 1893 when the young John Wilhelm Rowntree⁴⁸ electrified Yearly Meeting by saying plainly and shortly that his generation did not understand the ministry they heard from elderly Friends in the ministers' galleries and that the times needed 'plain uncontroversial sermons on the practicalities of life'. His youth and personality at once contributed exhilaration into the campaign to bring thought and imagination into the service of extension through 'a free ministry', sustained by every gift of mind, circumstance and experience.

The Quaker diplomacy needed to turn a vision into a movement came from William Charles Braithwaite, Fyfe Stewart, Ellwood Brockbank, Joshua Rowntree and others whose commitment to 'extension' had the confidence of the evangelical stream though they were not committed to its theology. It was they who guided the Society into the Manchester Conference of 1895.⁴⁹ The occasion never had another name. Its only terms of reference were 'to dispel the ignorance that, more or less, exists in the public mind with regard to the principles and practices of the Society, and to strengthen the attachment of its younger members to its work'.

Considering the Society's own very evident uncertainty about its principles this seemed a perilous exercise. Moreover it was a new kind of Quaker conference. For never before had the Society sat down to listen to and consider carefully prepared papers to find out what it did indeed think. When the time came 300 local Friends were joined by 1000 in residence. They met for three November days. Meeting for

worship was at nine o'clock, papers from ten to one, from three to five, and from six to eight-thirty. There were 30 papers, seven of them by women, grouped under the following heads: Early Quakerism; Has Quakerism a Message to the World Today?; The Relations Between Adult Schools, Mission Meetings and the Yearly Meeting; The Attitude of the Society to Social Questions; The Attitude to Modern Thought; The More Effective Presentation of Spiritual Truth; and the Vitalizing of Our Meetings for Worship.

About a third of the papers were from the evangelical wing, the others from those who saw the way forward differently. The papers and the discussions are printed *verbatim* in hardback. At least a dozen of the papers are very good reading today.

John Wilhelm Rowntree's paper was one of these answers to - Has Quakerism a Message to the World Today? At the age of 26 he was much the youngest of the speakers. He concluded his paper with his answers to three questions.

'Is there development in social ideas? We shall give more force to the preaching of Christ if we illustrate our theology by our practice, and work with a deep sense of our social responsibility ...we must study the dark problems of poverty which cry aloud for solution and give our teaching the force of APPLIED CHRISTIANITY'.

'Is there change and perplexity in Religious Thought? The Church exists to create for each succeeding generation the ideal of the Christ in the thought-form of the age, and in the adaptability of Christ's teaching lies one secret of its power'

'Is there indifference to the Higher Life? 'Then, O Christ, convince us by Thy Spirit, thrill us with Thy Divine Passion, drown our selfishness in Thy invading love, lay on us the burden of the world's suffering, drive us forth with the apostolic fervour of the early Church. So only can our message be delivered "speak to the Children of Israel, that they go forward"'

The most controversially illuminating of all the sessions was the one on 'Modern Thought', a code word used to link Darwinian Evolution, Scientific Research and Higher Biblical Criticism. The three speakers were Rendel Harris, then a Cambridge theology don, subsequently first Director of Studies at Woodbrooke; Silvanus Thompson, F.R.S., a distinguished physicist and electrical engineer; and finally John William Graham, a Cambridge mathematician. It would have been difficult for any branch of the Christian Church to field a better team to present the liberating quality of 'Modern Thought' to a lay audience.

Rendel Harris spoke of 'The doctrine of evolution... [which is] not going to be restricted to protoplasm and zoology; it is just as applicable to Scriptures, to Churches, and to Sacraments, and will tell us just as

romantic tales in interpreting the growth of these as... in the study of the lowest forms of animal life.' The question really is not whether we are afraid of thought, but whether we are afraid of thinking'.

Sylvanus Thompson spoke of his enjoyment as, at once, scientist, Christian and Friend: 'We have no right to neglect our intellects any more than we have to neglect our bodies'.

J.W. Graham spoke of the limitations of words in the spiritual life: 'The whole vocabulary of religion is, primarily, earth-born metaphor. All words used for the Unseen are borrowed from things seen; so that words hinder thought in this supreme department'.

The discussion following this session threatened to become so divisive that peace of a sort was maintained only by premature closure. The evangelicals were hurt that there was no room for the free flow of their feelings.

The British Friend reflected on the Conference: 'To many... it was as though their private and perhaps most hidden convictions were being fearlessly proclaimed... and they felt it to be a new liberation of the soul'.

Reflecting on this sketch of the course of one stream of Quaker experience through the nineteenth century, it seems appropriate to comment on the service of three particular Friends.

Isaac Crewdson overstated the evangelical conviction that there is place for doctrinal preaching in Meeting. It was the vehemence with which he put this conviction into practice that precipitated the Manchester inheritors of eighteenth-century Quietism, inert as it had become, into a noisy reaffirmation of the spiritual power of silence as the true style of Friends' worship. It was, indeed, some decades before the vitality of silence was widely rediscovered in practice. Meanwhile without Crewdson's evangelically inspired vision of the need for a huge meeting house there would probably have been no Quaker premises in the country capable of housing so effective an occasion of spiritual liberation as the Manchester Conference of 1895.

William Pollard was not a colourful character like Isaac Crewdson before him or John Wilhelm Rowntree after him. But from the early 1860s until his death in 1893, shortly before the Conference, it was, I think, he more than any other single Friend who sustained a sense of direction among the diffuse activists who were looking for a way out of the theological dead-end in which the Society was floundering. In moving to Manchester in 1872 he was able to nurse the seed sown by the

young men of the Institute through a chilly spring until others were able to join him in the planting out. Of the six Friends who carried the development forward in the 1880s five were Hardshaw members. William Pollard was as healing a Friend from his Manchester base as Isaac Crewdson had been divisively challenging in the 1830s.

The exhilaration of the Manchester Conference might have been blown away on the wind had it not been for the gifted personality of John Wilhelm Rowntree. There was a "strong individuality" about his personal faith.⁵⁰ Yet he was able to share his imagination, his outstanding administrative ability, his skill in writing and his most agreeable sense of humour. So when it quickly became clear that Yearly Meeting had no means for following up the Conference, John Wilhelm took the initiative with others in organising, in 1897, a hugely successful, largely attended, two-week Summer School at Scarborough. The themes were Christianity, Quakerism and Social Responsibility. The first school was so successful that others followed. From them flowed the idea of Woodbrooke, brought into existence in 1905, largely through the collaboration of John Wilhelm Rowntree and George Cadbury.

J.W.R. was no hoarder of ideas. Throughout his short adult life he was an enthusiastic enterprising participant in the local Adult School fellowship. His vision of thoughtful extension was at the base of the establishment of the Swarthmore Lecture as an annual assurance that Friends would be provoked into thinking about their faith. But he himself died at the age of 37, before the first lecture was given in 1908, by his great, collaborative friend, Rufus M. Jones. With failing sight and hearing and facing the likelihood of early death, had already begun to work on the material of the great Quaker histories, shortly to be developed and written by William Charles Braithwaite and Rufus Jones.

Isaac Crewdson, William Pollard and John Wilhelm Rowntree, each in ways of his own, were powerful agents in setting the Society free from its image of itself at the end of the eighteenth century as 'a peculiar people', complacently contemplating its own demise.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ *A Supposed Dialogue on Worship between a member of the Religious Society of Friends and another religious professor...* [1819?].

² *The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, (hereafter *JFHS*) 55, 190-98, (1988).

³ *James Henry Barber: a family memorial*, ed. H.M. Doncaster (1905).

- ⁴ Library of the Society of Friends: (hereafter LSF) MS Box Y1, printed in *Pen Pictures of London Yearly Meeting 1789-1833*, ed. Norman Penney (1929, 1930), 183.
- ⁵ *Op. cit.*, 106.
- ⁶ *Op. cit.*, n.8, p.144.
- ⁷ LSF: MS Box H3/1.
- ⁸ LSF: MS U2/1.
- ⁹ Larry Ingle, *Quakers in Conflict*, Univ. of Tennessee, 1986.
- ¹⁰ See below p. 15.
- ¹¹ *Op. cit.*, 207-8.
- ¹² J. and A. Frank, *Life of S. Capper*, vol.I, quoting LSF: MS U2/1, p.180.
- ¹³ *Loc. cit.*, 191.
- ¹⁴ *Beacon*, 98-9.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 77.
- ¹⁶ See below pp. 16ff.
- ¹⁷ LSF: Box H3/1 George Richardson's account of Yearly Meeting, also *The Christian Advocate*, 1 June 1835.
- ¹⁸ See *The Friend* 21st. 9th. mo. 1870 for accounts of this committee by Edward Ash (a surviving member) and extracts from J.J. Gurney's journal.
- ¹⁹ This refers to young men coming from rural families into urban employment, living in lodgings. See p.
- ²⁰ *JFHS*, 17, 82-9; London Y.M. *Epistle* 1836, p.2.
- ²¹ Published Manchester, London and Bristol 1836/7.
- ²² *The Crisis*, 36.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, Appendix, p.59.
- ²⁴ London Y.M. *Epistle* 1836.
- ²⁵ 'The evangelical movement and its impact on the Society of Friends', *Friends Quarterly Examiner*, vol.58 (1924), 1-34.
- ²⁶ 'Leeds Friends and the Beaconite controversy', *JFHS*, 54, 52-56, (1977).
- ²⁷ See *ante* p. 13.
- ²⁸ For other accounts of these events, see Richenda Scott, *JFHS*, vol.40 no.2; *The British Friend*, 8th. mo. 1858, 117-19; Thomas Kennedy, 'The Lancashire Trouble, Resistance to Modern Thought among Victorian Friends' (copy in LSF).
- ²⁹ 'Essays and Reviews': a lecture... Manchester, 1871.
- ³⁰ Hardshaw East papers, Manchester Ref. Library, M85/6/5/6.
- ³¹ *Joseph Bevan Braithwaite: A Friend of the Nineteenth Century*, by His Children, 1909.
- ³² *Op. cit.*, 89ff.
- ³³ LSF: MS Box 9.
- ³⁴ LSF: MS vol.S293, p.200.
- ³⁵ *The British Friend*, November 1871.
- ³⁶ A pencilled marginal note in the copy of *The Friend* in the library of Lancaster University reads "Because they were not welcome"
- ³⁷ *Quaker strongholds*, (1890), 169.
- ³⁸ *Manchester Conference*, 1895, p.66.
- ³⁹ *The Manchester Friend*, October 1873, 162-63.
- ⁴⁰ *The Friend*, 21st. 11th. mo. 1873, 305.
- ⁴¹ In *The Friend* and *The British Friend*.
- ⁴² *JFHS*, 55, 112-23; Roger Wilson in *A Quaker Miscellany for Edward H. Milligan* (1985), 153-60 and also in 'The Road to Manchester 1895' in *Seeking the Light*, Wallingford Pa., 1986.

- ⁴³ See *Friends Quarterly*, October 1984.
- ⁴⁴ LSF: Temp. MSS 508/6.
- ⁴⁵ *Autobiography of Allen Jay*, London and Philadelphia, [1910], 361-62.
- ⁴⁶ J. Dudley, *Life of Edward Grubb*, London, 1946.
- ⁴⁷ See letter of J.W. Graham to his sister, LSF and J.B.B. Diary, LSF.
- ⁴⁸ John Wilhelm Rowntree, *Essays and Addresses*, London, 1905.
- ⁴⁹ *Report of the Proceedings of the Conference... in Manchester*, London, 1896; Wilson 'The Road to Manchester, 1895' in *Seeking the Light*, Pendle Hill Publications, Wallingford Pa., 1986.
- ⁵⁰ Anne Vernon, *A Quaker Business Man*, Allen & Unwin, 1958, p.151.