Punishment in Friends' Schools, 1779-1900

By W. A. CAMPBELL STEWART, Ph.D.

ACKWORTH was founded when the negative doctrines of Quietism had strong influence. If adults had to regulate their lives to the Quaker pattern, how much more severe was the control of children who were susceptible, as Friends thought, to all the wayward gusts of evil. They were placed in a "guarded" community, shown the Quaker pattern of life and taught subjection of own-will. One of the results was a record of punishment during the first half-century covered by this survey which is at times astonishing in a body which was responsible for so many humanitarian reforms.

One of the main reasons for the establishment and prolongation of severity in Quaker schools was that Ackworth, the Yearly Meeting school, was at first a pattern and example to Sidcot, Islington, and Wigton. Its rules, drawn up in 1779, were adopted almost completely by the schools for children of those disowned, founded in the 'thirties and 'forties. Ackworth was founded for the children of those not in affluence, and life was, at first, so dull that mischief and disorder were common. With no organized free-time pursuits and a limited school curriculum of reading, writing, spelling and arithmetic, with no freedom to leave the estate and no real comfort in the building, the children, hungry as they often were, became unruly. Until 1809, there was one fire in schoolrooms with stone floors fifty feet by twenty feet. The Meeting House, in which three lengthy Meetings were held each week, had also a stone floor, and had no heating at all until 1820. The boys used to go to the bath (a cold bath in an open air pool into which the smaller boys were thrown if they did not wish to go and were then helped out by the bigger boys) before 6 a.m. up to 1825. The wash house for ordinary daily washing was in the cellars and had one long trough in it until 1826, and this was filled by water from a force-pump

worked by one of the school employees who apparently neglected his work frequently. There was one iron saucer for drinking water, and if boys wanted a wash during the day, this water supply only could be used, for the early morning wash in the cellars was the only one permitted there during the day. If, during the day, a boy had to dry himself after an improvised wash, he could only use his handkerchief. In this same handkerchief he might carry the produce of his allotment to add to his tea![1]

The whole situation was made the more difficult to manage by the swift, if irregular, increase in the numbers. In 1780 there were 123 children in the school. By 1781 there were 310. So, with too few adults, and the acceptance of apprentices, it is small wonder that, from the disciplinary point of view, as well as from the scholastic point of view, Ackworth started badly. The rigour of the repression established the form of control for seventy years and became a pattern of experience for the other schools.

The authorities started off with temperate conditions, for, so that punishment should be administered with coolness and in proportion to the offence, a special method was agreed upon :

> that the treasurer and each master keep a book and minute down offences committed within the day ; that once a week or oftener they meet together and inspect these books and administer such punishments as may be agreed upon, using their endeavours to convince the children that the only purpose of correction is for their amendment, and to deter others from the commission of like offences.[2]

This machinery seems humane and admirable. Inside a year it was found to be unworkable. With over 150 boys in the school a quicker method was needed. So it was stated that a master could call in two colleagues when any offence like rudeness or disobedience or laziness was involved, and a group decision would be promulgated. Punishment was allowed :

> Inflict it with the rod with due caution, not exceeding three strokes, to be done by one of the masters not offended.[3]

[1] Valuable details of the early life at Ackworth are to be found in the first few chapters of Henry Thompson's *History* (1879).

[2] *Collection of Rules*, published 1785.

[3] *Ibid.*

The more serious offences could still be judged by the weekly " court." This record book was kept carefully from 1781-85 and contains some interesting accounts of the order maintained and the methods by which it was preserved. After 1785 the record is discontinued, and from then until 1815 we have no systematic account of what took place. After 1815 there are more careful written records again, though the special punishment record-book disappears.

This 1781-85 record shows the patience with which the authorities at first administered their responsibilities. For example, in 1783 we have records of forgiveness on promise of amendment, or one stroke as a punishment, or a memory task set by the " court " (the perennial grammatical rules or tables). There was a place of detention (we shall mention this again later) which the pupils called " the new prison " or, more colloquially, " the Holes ", and there are records of short periods of solitary confinement for offences such as rudeness, teasing, fighting, causing wilful disturbance, cruelty to other children, or even only half an hour for " stealing worsted," or for damaging school books by tearing out pages. There were some domestic duties (often work in the kitchens, or seasonal work in the garden or on the estate) which were much enjoyed by the pupils as variants in their dull lives. The " court " used occasionally to deprive children of this " privilege " as a punishment.

The " court " also developed a system of guarantors, a form of security or bail for the offender. This meant that (say) two children would guarantee the good behaviour of a friend who was to be punished, for a period, and would undertake to surrender him if he broke the promise. This form of moral compulsion might now be criticized but it was an original variation on the monotonous theme of birching, flogging, expelling, that occurred in the " public " schools of the time. There were occasions recorded in this book when the children had to confess their guilt publicly before the whole school, or a concerned group, ask for their forgiveness and seek guarantors for their good behaviour.

At any rate, the public confession, or the public recitation of a learned task (a frequent variant), or the public exposure when a child would stand, say, at meal-times with a large card round his neck saying " I am a liar," or " I must remember to write home," were not having a strong enough

effect by the end of 1782. The first reaction was to become stricter. In the autumn of 1783 members of the Committee went to the school to stay for a time and to give the staff support in its disciplinary efforts. Chastisement and solitary confinement increased in 1784, and there were many cases of boys deliberately inciting disturbance. The school seems to have taken on all the surface appearances of a penitentiary. Between 1780 and 1783 floggings were rare. Between 1784 and 1785, when the records end, there were between 40 and 50 records of whipping or birching or chastising with a rod. These were sometimes carried out in the presence of the "court," sometimes in public in the dining room, school-rooms, bedrooms and elsewhere.

Once the method of corporal punishment was firmly established, it set the pattern of harsh treatment, and for thirty years Ackworth underwent a dark period. This can best be illustrated by the words of a writer who recalls vividly his own schooldays in 1819, by which time some of the worst features were passing. In 1819 were built "the Light and Airy Rooms," to replace "the Holes" as places of solitary confinement:

> (They were) of quite plain and white-washed walls and tolerably lofty with one small window at the top from which it was impossible to look out without getting on to something. The furniture was limited to one chair and one small deal table, and no books or other articles of amusement were allowed except the Bible or such book as the boy might be required to learn a task from: but as the windows were made to open a short way, a surreptitious communication was frequently kept up with the outer world by means of a piece of string and an accomplice . . . Except in very bad cases, confinement in these rooms did not exclude from the usual school business, but the meals had to be taken in them and were conveyed by one of the apprentices; and the journeys to and from the rooms were performed under escort, and no conversation was allowed with any other boys . . . About this time . . . flogging or birching was altogether abolished, and caning was but seldom resorted to, both having hitherto been the most usual punishments inflicted. The improved remedial means . . . were tasks and solitary confinement and the restriction from certain amusements, with the prohibition from talking or keeping company with your favourite companions; and it was marvellous how candid and honest most of the boys were in submitting to their punishments—it was a sort of Spartanism . . . unless there was a chance of breaking through it with a certainty of not being found out.[1]

[1] "William's Schooldays at Ackworth in 1819." *Friends' Quarterly Examiner*, No. 307, pp. 160-1.

Corporal Punishment

We have shown how chastising grew at Ackworth. John Bright, speaking of the years about 1820 said:

> In the matter of punishments it was harsh, if not barbarous, and the comfort and health of the children were very inadequately attended to.[1]

At Sidcot, established in 1808, "open thrashing" (that is, thrashing in public) was the usual form of punishment, often given, so its historian reports, for only slight offences. In the early 'twenties one boy was repeatedly caned. Though flogging and birching were not permitted, as occurred at Ackworth, this caning can have been scarcely less painful:

> (He was) repeatedly caned, thirty or forty cuts on the palm of the hand. He was looked on as a hero for bearing it without flinching, whilst the master seemed determined to go on caning until the boy broke down. But . . . I do not remember that he ever did.[2]

Barton Dell, one well known Sidcot master of the 'twenties and 'thirties, used to use a strap, and thrashed "on the hand, as a rule." The history of one of his chastisements will indicate something of the tension of life in the school. One boy, goaded by Dell's unrelenting precision, flew at him and tried to attack him with a knife. He succeeded in gashing Dell's hand. Barton Dell immediately rang the bell and summoned all the boys together, and, holding up his bleeding hand, said, "Look, boys, at your master's bloody hand!"[3]

The cane and the strap were often used in the 'thirties and early 'forties at Sidcot. The Committee, in 1844, had asked for a list of all canings in the previous quarter, and gave severe warning that corporal punishment must become an exception. The changes in staff were frequent up to the 'sixties, and in the 'fifties some of the inexperienced newcomers cuffed their pupils. One older and respected boy in 1858 stood up in class to protest against such treatment of a younger boy, but there was little noticeable change in the staff's behaviour. Resentment was such that in the next year the boys staged a rebellion. This deep ill-will in staff-pupil attitudes poisoned relationships for some years,

[1] Quoted R. M. Jones: *Later Periods of Quakerism*, II, p. 631.
[2] F. A. Knight: *History of Sidcot School*, p. 82.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

but it is worth noting that the result of the mutiny of 22nd October, 1859 was that no teacher thereafter struck the pupils as a regular form of punishment.

Islington, from its foundation in 1811, followed the early Ackworth pattern of having a different master inflict chastisement from the master emotionally involved. This had to be administered after a careful public examination, and in the Great Hall. In their anxiety to gain the maximum effect in terms of public justice, dramatic value and deterrent conditions, Friends largely overlooked the emotional conflict such public trials would cause in the culprits.

At Islington, as at Ackworth, practical problems in handling growing numbers meant that the impressive machinery of public enquiry was not adequate. Private arbitrations meant *ad hoc* punishments, and while there is no record of severe punishment, the cane was freely used. Wigton, founded in 1815, started with a severe discipline, and the cane was recognized as a legitimate weapon, though, in a smaller school like Wigton, it was easier to have control of affairs without regular use of such measures.

Bootham and the Mount did not use methods of corporal punishment. The Heads approached matters differently, and the emotional blackmail of respected Quaker homes was often served on the boys and girls of the York schools instead. Lydia Rous at the Mount in the 'sixties introduced the significant new pressure of "a school for young ladies," albeit young Quaker ladies.

The Friends' Educational Society reported in 1839 at one of its earliest meetings that corporal punishment was no longer in use in Friends' schools in this country. This seems to have been a considerable piece of wishful thinking. The Sidcot Committee asked, in 1844 as mentioned above, for a record of canings, and when the schools for those disowned were founded in the 'thirties and 'forties the discipline was hard :

> "No namby-pamby methods sufficed, and though cuffs, blows and beatings were conspicuous only by their rarity, the normal master demanded, expected and received quick obedience."[1]

This was said of Ayton, and it is said of various other schools in one way and another. Of Sibford, in 1897 over

[1] G. A. Watson : *History of Ayton School*, p. 110.

fifty years after the Friends' Educational Society said corporal punishment was no longer used in Friends' schools, a School Enquiry Committee reported :

"Ten years ago, fines of small amounts paid into the Games Fund of the School, the writing of lines and very occasional corporal punishment, constituted the discipline in use . . . There is now no corporal punishment, and the Superintendent intends to avoid it in future, not as being an undesirable method of punishment . . . but as being specially liable to cause misapprehension to those unacquainted with the circumstances."[1]

We can conclude then, that corporal punishment as one of the main methods of maintaining order in Quaker schools died between 1840 and 1850, but that it remained a subordinate method in some schools for varying periods, until nearly the end of the century in one case, at least. The change was due partly to a more generous proportion of adult staff who were progressively better trained as the century passed. It was due in part to a wider scope of work for the children, better equipment, and more varied out-of-school society work. It was due in part to greater opportunity for the children to get away from the schools for short periods, and for more people to visit the schools because of improved communications. These considerations make for a wider horizon and a truer perspective of points of tension in the relationship between teacher and pupil. Besides such factors, there was of course, the public concern for the lot of children. Friends, whose "antennae" are always stretched and sensitive to moral and social concerns, saw corporal punishment of children as an inadequate method of solving conflicts in community. They were roughly seventy years ahead of most of the rest of the country in coming to this conclusion.

Punishment by "Detention"

It should not be thought that chastisement was the only severe means of control which Friends applied. Another important general heading is detention. By this is meant here any kind of incarceration. The two main forms which this took were detention with a set task (writing, knitting, chores), or detention with no task (such as standing in public with a pasteboard notice hung round the pupil's neck, or

[1] Report of Sibford School Enquiry Committee, 1897, p. 9.

sitting still with arms folded, or "standing to the line" with hands behind back).

"The Light and Airy Rooms" built at Ackworth in 1819 were mentioned earlier. Solitary confinement may have commended itself especially to Friends because of their emphasis on personal and direct communion with God. The punished child would have time to attend to the voice of God and to repent. Certainly the children were often given enough time in these rooms to listen. Sometimes, as has been said, half-an-hour sufficed in "the Holes" in the early days at Ackworth, when the extent of punishment was very carefully weighed. After the severe thirty years from about 1785 to 1815, we find children in solitary confinement for six days reasonably frequently, occasionally for eleven or twelve days, and at times for periods up to three weeks. Offences which called down these penalties were such as "disobedience, taking bread out of the dining room and telling several lies." The predominant evil from 1821-25, we are told, was lying and general unruliness, and there was also some pilfering. In the great majority of cases the offender was allowed to take part in school work, but was isolated at meal times and in free time. Usually he was allowed to sleep in his own bed, but with a rule of silence in the bedrooms, it did not mean that legitimate social contact was being granted.

At Sidcot there was an astonishing variant on this solitary confinement. Boxes were made, 5 feet 6 inches by 20 inches by 21 inches, and in these (there were three of them, placed near the teachers' beds) offenders had to stand.[1] They were on a diet of bread and water, and they might have to stand in these "coffins", as they were colloquially called, for hours each night, and for several nights. It should not be thought that the "coffins" were sparingly used. They were used first in 1821 and for two years they made life miserable for many children, for masters seemed agreed about 1820 that the School was unruly and that severity was the only practicable method of control. This unruliness was partly due, as in so many of the Friends' schools at their foundation and in their early years, to very frequent changes of staff as teachers

[1] The curious can still see what they were like in the relic preserved at Sidcot.

and apprentices found themselves dissatisfied with living conditions, food, payment and hours of work. It was due also, of course, to bare and uninviting premises and lack of free time activity, as at Ackworth.

However, in 1823, the Committee ordered that the "coffins" should be removed. The strain and misery they had caused were blatant. One observer comments on the "coffins": "(It was) a punishment by refined cruelty, far worse than the open thrashing which was often inflicted."[1]

There was a recurrence of a similar type of punishment at Sidcot about 1850. The Committee discovered that one of the masters had made a small pen in which he confined offenders in the dormitories. By this time the feeling of most Friends was against such forms of solitary confinement, and the Committee asked the Head to have the pen immediately removed.[2] But confinement was a common method of punishment for many years, and not only for the boys. A Sibford girl, writing of the early 'forties, when the school was in its first years, reports that girls were shut up alone with endless knitting tasks and were fed only on gruel for periods varying from an afternoon and a night to several days. Disobedience or dishonesty were the usual offences which led to this, but this pupil quotes that a girl was sent to bed without dinner and was shut off from her fellows for a time for smiling across at a girl friend during Meeting for Worship.[3] One boy offender at Sidcot in the late 'forties had to stand through all the school periods for a week, and during that time was debarred from all playtime and conversation. Compared with that, the four hours "standing to the line" with hands behind back which a senior underwent was lenient. In the 'sixties two new senior teachers went to Sidcot, Josiah Evans and William Kitching. Their relationships were altogether more harmonious, but they still gave standard punishments of two hours of confinement, either sitting or standing. These punishments were usual at all the schools except the York schools. Of course, many writing or learning tasks were

[1] Knight, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-2.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 150.

[3] Jane Shemeld: "Some Reminiscences of Sibford School." *Friends' Quarterly Examiner*. Vol. 61.

given. Children at Wigton, set to copy words out of a spelling manual as punishment in detention, were known, in the first half of the century, to have copied a thousand before they were released. The learning might vary from mathematical formulae to poetry or prose of an improving nature. At Sibford in the late 'fifties a girl was heard humming a line from a hymn. After a severe rebuke for her wickedness she was set sixty rounds of stocking knitting as a task.[1]

There is no need to multiply these instances. Those given help to indicate the proportion of time spent in single detentions as punishment during two-thirds of the nineteenth century. "Gatings," that is confining children to premises, and often to rooms on half-holidays, were another form of detention.

Exposing to Public Censure

We have already mentioned in passing the method of exposing a child to the ridicule of his or her fellows by wearing and displaying a board in a public place. An Old Scholar of Rawdon recalling his early days at the school in the 'thirties says :

> "He remembered very well that one great grievance was their aptness to speak very vulgarly and ungrammatically, and so to check that the scholars used to have a pasteboard card on which was printed 'Vulgar boy'."[2]

Jane Shemeld at Sibford recalls that the girls in the 'forties had often to stand on a form in a public place so that the whole school could see them, and this is mentioned as a form of "disgracing" which was much employed at most of the schools. At Ackworth there was "disgracing" of boys exiled from company of their fellows by making them take exercise on the "green" under a guard of their fellows specially chosen to see that the boy marched round. The cards with "Liar," and "I must write home" appeared on pupils at Sidcot and Sibford and Islington and Ackworth, for certain, and probably at the other schools, except the York schools. One girl at Sibford had to stand with the board round her neck and on the board was "I am not allowed to sing."

[1] A. Johnstone : *Odd Facts*. 1942.
[2] John Wood speaking at Rawdon Jubilee, 1882.

"Disgracing" by public exposure, a form of detention, is a punishment-mechanism which can tell us a good deal of the psychological temper of the schools. By naming the offence it states without equivocation the official attitude to the offence and to anyone who commits that offence. So, by strong suggestion a moral attitude is encouraged, an inculcation of an attitude to a principle, and a minimizing of personality factors. The basis of this inculcation is fear, fear of exposure rather than realization of the positive value of the moral principle. Enforcement of such a form of control stresses superior-inferior relationships, it emphasizes the authoritarian position and social distance of the staff and its standards, and it minimizes the power of the scholars. That such a method is used regularly indicates that the subjection is accepted by the scholars, though there are occasional instances of resistance. This method divides the unity of the scholar-group in relation to resistance, though it may unite them in sympathy.

"Disgracing" as a regular mode of punishment, that is a public display of faults to the whole school, or to a large group, occurs rarely after 1860, and so far as has been ascertained, the display of a board is not found after the late 'fifties. Standing on a form, however, as a form of isolating, occurs until early in this century reasonably often.

"Plain Meals"

There are many instances of stopping children having the food that the others had: bread and water sometimes in solitary confinement at Ackworth and Sidcot, gruel only with salt in for some of the girls of Sibford at dinner time. When we remember that in the 'twenties, 'thirties and 'forties at Ackworth, Sidcot, Islington, Wigton, Rawdon, one or more additions to the diet were ordered by the school doctors, we can see that this form of punishment could be particularly hard. However, it is fair to say that, compared with many other boarding schools of the times, the records of health were satisfactory in the Quaker schools. But the importance for our purpose of this possible reduction to plain food, even to bread and water, is to indicate again the modes of control. The Ackworth historian advances

a frail defence: "(This was) the sympathy of a rigid Puritan father: but better Puritanism than licence."[1]

The worst that happens after 1870 is "a plain tea," that is an absence of delicacies such as jam and cakes. This deprivation one has known to be used as punishment for dining room indiscipline up to the present day.

Expulsion

The most severe of punishments, because the most final, was expulsion. The positive desire to educate children in a Quakerly environment has caused Committees and Heads to resort to expulsion with the greatest reluctance. From the point of view of the researcher it is difficult, if not impossible, to get any clear picture of the situations to which expulsion seemed the only adequate answer, for the minutes are, understandably, vague and generalized. For example, in December 1848 the Sidcot Committee investigated "a serious moral trouble—most of the boys were implicated." Then, we read, that it was necessary for the moral purification of the school that four of the most flagrant offenders should be expelled.[2]

At Ackworth, after a long period of conflict and tension, we find that there was in the 'forties:

"Extensive use of profane language in the private conversation of boys, some of the Monitors and many other boys being implicated."

After persuasion and other punishment, a few boys were expelled, and they were also considered as examples of boys who showed "much want of respect for sacred things" about the same time.

Sidcot provides some further cases of expulsion. In April, 1846, there was a mutiny in the school (we have already mentioned the more protracted insurrection of 1859), and as a result of this short-lived defiance, the ringleaders were expelled.[3] It is interesting to note that there were no expulsions after the rebellions of 1859 and the early 'eighties. It was not then at once assumed that the pupils were to be broken of dangerous ways of thinking and acting by "making examples" of a few and expelling them.

[1] Henry Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 63.
[2] F. A. Knight, *op.cit.*, p. 148.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 113.

At Bootham we hear of another vague expulsion in the 'sixties :

"In face of facts definite and owned to, [the Head] held his hand, wept over, prayed with, accepted the snivellings and lying half-confessions of the hardened, restored him to the fold presently to find him at his tricks again and had to expel after all."[1]

Profanity, "moral" offences of a serious nature, organized and persistent resistance to authority, were the rather ill-defined causes for the expulsions named. Where boys and girls were in the same building or in buildings near to one another, there are a few expulsions because of nocturnal expeditions. But not every master allowed the matter to come to the full light :

"There were naughtinesses afoot of which Thorp knew nothing, at which some of his staff winked: to wit, those after-dark excursions across intervening garden walls to visit the girls at No. 25. The masters must have known."[2]

It is true that offences which often meant expulsion from other schools, like stealing or dishonesty in work, were, to Friends, weaknesses which they were always fully prepared to try to overcome. In common with many Victorians and Edwardians, they seemed to lose proportion in face of sexual difficulties, and, when religious "shaming" and persuasion did not provide a satisfactory answer, expulsion, for the sake of the other children, seemed the only answer. When once co-education became a settled method in the majority of their schools and they had learned what they could from psychologists, Friends emerged from this repressive sex-attitude, and expulsion is not now considered automatic for escapades such as those night trips named above, though expulsion is often still their reward on the very rare occasions on which they are recorded as having taken place.

The purpose of considering punishment as we have is to deduce something of certain aspects of the school life and something of the psychological climate of the community. Though it is not strictly under the heading of punishment, we shall know more of the inner life of the community if we consider some of the rules over our period.

[1] Bootham *History*, p. 61.

[2] *Ibid.* In the Mount *History* there is no mention to show that the boys did more than watch the windows from afar. As one of the boys says: "Cool and unsatisfying work."

School Rules

There are many rules which enjoin sober behaviour. Here are some examples from the Ackworth collection of 1785 which was the pattern for other schools :

" 1st. That they rise at 6 o'clock in the Summer and 7 o'clock in the Winter, and dress themselves quietly and orderly, endeavouring to begin the day in the Fear of the Lord which is a foundation of life preserving from the snares of death.

" 3rd. That they refrain from talking or whispering in the schools . . .

" 5th. That when the bell rings for breakfast, dinner or supper, they collect themselves together in silence and in due order, having their faces and hands washed, their hair combed, &c., and so proceed quietly into the dining room.

" 6th. That they observe a Solemn Silence, both before and after meals, that they eat their food decently and refrain from talking.

" 7th. That they avoid quarrelling, throwing sticks, stones, and dirt, striking and teazing one another, and they are enjoined not to complain about trifles, and, when at play, to observe moderation and decency.

" 9th. That they use a sober and becoming behaviour when going to, in, and coming from religious Meetings."

Silence, restraint, modesty, sobriety. These are the key-words of the Quaker pattern for their school community. Silence, for adults, had a symbolic significance, and young Friends in the first half of the nineteenth century grew up with a greater imposition of silence in their schools than there was in the public schools and other boarding schools of the period. Adults felt it was " good for the children," it encouraged the right Friendly behaviour, and it gave scope for nurturing the Seed :

" Order in school, at collect, in preparation, in the bedrooms, was secured by the rule of silence. ' No Talking ' stood as the official word on official occasions . . ."[1]

In bedrooms at Sibford in the 'forties and 'fifties, a monitor presided, and reported to the master in the morning : " Please Master, no boy has talked, half-talked, signed, whispered, hummed or motioned."[2]

These conditions of silence were relaxed as the last quarter of the century ran its course, for they are really an aspect of the " guarded " conception of education. At Sibford one of the compromises at meal times was to allow

[1] G. A. Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

[2] Sibford School : *The Schools' Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 2, Nov. 1923, p. 94.

speaking, but if the master thought it too much, he would ring a bell and stop all conversation for the rest of the meal.

Other rules kept a sense of strain in some of the schools at different times. At the Mount in the 'fifties there was much emphasis on punctuality, and a lost monthly holiday for girls who were late twice for lessons or collects or bed. Half an hour was allowed for brothers from Bootham to visit sisters, which meant a considerable hurry.

Bootham boys complain of pettifogging rules in the 'sixties like that which ordered boys who entered the garden by one gate to come out by the same gate. Jumping the wire barrier, which was about two feet high, was forbidden.

Until about the middle of the century all letters written by scholars at Ackworth, Sidcot and Islington were read by the Superintendent. It is possible similar practices were followed elsewhere. This was ostensibly to make sure that the children had addressed their letters correctly, and in the days when they wrote only once in a long period (three months at Ackworth) because postage was as much as elevenpence, this was probably a necessary thing. But it went on for some time after the Penny Post was in force, and it was, of course, an invaluable means of noting and thwarting complaint. Indeed, for some years at the beginning of Ackworth history, children were not allowed to go off the premises with visitors. Since a regular vacation was only established at that school in 1847 (other schools arranged this earlier), a visit to a tried School friend like Luke Howard might, up to the 'thirties, provide the first home table at which an Ackworth scholar had sat for four or five years. In the second half of the century, of course, excursions, walks, visits and vacations were encouraged and much enjoyed in all the schools.

While punishment has been reviewed, it is only fair to say that systems of rewards and a carefully controlled number of prizes were tried at some schools to encourage good behaviour. Ackworth had a system of tickets from 1817-44, when it was discarded. Sidcot tried a similar system 1825-32. A boy started as a "Blank," and good behaviour could raise him to a "Third," a "Second" and a "Veteran." These systems did not please Friends much, for rewards were considered as indulging a competitive spirit lacking in true humility. Most of the prizes were

given after the 'sixties, interestingly enough, and were not given for schoolwork, but for work done in spare time and in Societies. No school had more than half a dozen prizes, most had none.

The Present Century

What has been the prevailing form of punishment in this century? Most schools have adopted the House System, and some, for many years, worked a punishment statistics section into House competitions, the idea being that this entailed working for a larger group. This has been substantially dropped as being altogether too cumbersome. Merit holidays have acted as rewards which can be lost if punishment records are bad, and detention usually entails a nominal amount of work, the actual detaining being considered the main reminder. The Inspectors of 1904 characterize the climate of the schools as:

> "(A) quiet family life averse from the stimulus of competition and all artificial forms of rivalry . . . of a character which is retiring and peaceable rather than combative and ambitious."

Those concerned with Friends' Schools today may feel that they could not accurately be called "retiring and peaceable"!

Library Rules, 1699

The following inscription is to be found in a copy of George Fox's *Epistles* (1698) now in the possession of Roger Clark of Street.

This Book was brought from Banbury ye 18 of the 6th Mo 1699
By the Order of friends for the use of friends bellonging to Southnewington Meeting

And after some time who ever they be
Retturne it againe that others may see
But if it be kept time out of minde
Some they may want, But cannot it finde
And also be Careful that it be not Toare
For such they desarve to have it noe More
And those that observe these Rules that yee see
By Reason should have it, whoever they be.