QUAKERISM IN THE PISCATAQUA.

A Historical Address delivered before

THE PISCATAQUA PIONEERS

Exeter, New Hampshire, August 7, 1945

Quakerism first came to New England in July, 1656, when Ann Austin and Mary Fisher, two Quaker women, arrived at Boston on a ship from the Barbadoes. Because the treatment given these women illustrates perfectly both the technique of the Puritan approach to the Quaker problem, and the absolute lack of justification of the barbarism and cruelty with which the Puritan authorities treated the Quakers, I shall recount briefly the experience of these Quaker pioneers. First of all, it must be stated that there was at that time no law in Massachusetts against Quakers or Quaker activities. The only charge that was made against the two women was that they were Quakers, which was a charge unknown to the law. Everything that was done to them was wholly illegal and completely without sanction of law.

Before they could land, they were arrested, their baggage was searched, their books, of which they had a considerable number, were seized and burned, and for five weeks they were kept in close confinement before they were shipped back to the Barbadoes. While they were in prison, no one was allowed to visit them, or to speak with them, and that no one might see them, a board was nailed over their window. They were so insufficiently fed that they were near starvation; if one Nicholas Upsall had not bribed the jailer with five shillings a week for the privilege of sending them food, starvation might have become a fact.

They were stripped naked and their bodies were minutely and indecently searched for witch marks, it being a

prevalent idea among the Puritans, learned and ignorant alike, that a witch bore on the body some mark or malformation which testified to her supernatural quality.

This was the first collision between the Quakers and the Puritans. In this incident, as in most of the later ones, the Puritans were the aggressors, acting without justification. And yet, in the Puritan accounts, the Quakers are always presented as the aggressors, with the Puritans portrayed as badly treated and sorely harassed, inoffensive individuals. If a Quaker remonstrated that his treatment was illegal, he was charged with attacking the government; if he resented the abusive talk of a magistrate, he was represented as not having proper respect for lawful authority; and if he worsted a Puritan divine in a theological argument, the public were told that the Quakers taught and practiced a heretical and blasphemous religion.

Two days after Ann Austin and Mary Fisher sailed out of Boston harbor in August, 1656, eight other Quakers arrived in Boston. After arrest and an imprisonment of eleven weeks, they were sent away in the ship which had brought them. Although their arrest and imprisonment was as illegal and as lacking in authority as that of Ann Austin and Mary Fisher, these Quakers were not stripped and examined, and they were not subjected to starvation as were the first two.

October 14, 1656, the General Court passed the first of a series of repressive laws aimed at the Quakers, in which they were referred to "as a cursed set of heretics," and were accused of speaking and writing "blasphemous opinions, despising government and the order of God in church and Commonwealth, speaking evil of dignities, reproaching and reviling magistrates and ministers, seeking to turn the people from the faith and gain proselytes to their pernicious ways".

It has always been claimed, and so appears in standard historical works, that the Puritans were obliged to pass such laws because of the conduct of the Quakers. This first law, however, was passed before a single Quaker had pub-

licly appeared in the Province or had spoken to anyone except the "dignities" and "magistrates" who were illegally confining them. In neither action nor speech had any Quaker at that time offended.

There were three reasons why the Puritans were so bitter and so determined to head off the Quaker invasion. First, as shown by the treatment of Ann Austin and Mary Fisher, they associated Quakerism with witchcraft. Second, they believed that the Quakers were the same sect as the Anabaptists who, in 1534, had seized Munster in Wesphalia, Germany, and had committed excesses there. There are frequent references in the contemporary Puritan writings to "Munzer". At one time later, when the Quaker settlement in Rhode Island had assumed size and substance, there were rumors in Boston that the Quakers were planning to march on Boston to seize and burn it.

These two attitudes toward the Quakers were based on fear and ignorance. It is not a creditable commentary on the mental processes of the educated men among the Puritans that they should have been so credulous and so unable to grasp facts that they could not make more accurate estimates of their opponents.

It may be that the explanation of this lack of understanding is to be found in the third reason for their hatred of the Quakers. If the latter were right and human action was to be controlled by the inner light, as taught by the Quakers, what was to become of the authority of the Puritan church and the Puritan ministers? If every individual was to have freedom to act in accordance with the inner light, then the ministers would become but figureheads, and the discipline of the church itself would lose all strength. But there was a more important, a more personal factor. If the inner light was to counsel against the payment of church rates, how were the clergy to live?

The first two grounds of objection to the Quakers were based on fear, amounting almost to terror, of unpleasant consequences to result from their presence; the third, represented a grim battle by the Puritan clergy to safeguard

their authority, their prestige, and their incomes. A theocracy then controlled the government of Massachusetts. The fight against the Quakers was one of the weakening influences which, later, caused the theocracy to lose completely its hold upon the government.

The further story of Quakerism in Massachusetts can be briefly told. More and more repressive laws were passed, until finally one was enacted imposing death as a penalty. Still the Quakers came. Fines, imprisonment, brandings, whippings, cutting off ears, did not stop them. An order was passed for the sale of two Salem children in Virginia, or at the Barbadoes, to satisfy fines imposed upon them, but no shipmaster could be found who would transport them. Two men, Marmaduke Stephenson and William Robinson, were hanged at Boston, October 27, 1659. Mary Dyer, who was sentenced with them, was reprieved, and, refusing to leave Boston, was carried away by her friends, only to return, and was hanged, May 2, 1660. The fourth martyr was William Leddra, who, after his sentence of death, claimed an appeal to England, which, as an English subject, he had a right to do. His appeal was denied him, another illegal act, and he was executed, March 14, 1661.

These executions were the high tide of the persecution; from that time on, although it did not lack in ferocity and hate, it began to dwindle.

The first note that we have of Quakerism in the Piscataqua region is in 1659. Marmaduke Stephenson and William Robinson, were banished from Boston, September 12, 1659. Before they returned to Boston for their final sentence and execution in October, they travelled as far north as New Hampshire. They recorded that in the Piscataqua they found friends to welcome them.

It may be that their journey was the first introduction to that region of Quakerism but one doubts it. Only three years later, there seem to have been active groups of Quakers in Hampton and Dover and in that part of Kittery, which is now Eliot, as well as individual Quakers in other places.

There are only two kinds of sources from which one can get definite facts about the early Piscataqua Quakers. One is the Quaker accounts, such as George Bishop's "New England Judged", first published in 1661, which, when checked by the contemporary court records, proves to be surprisingly accurate. For the latter part of the period in question, the Journal of William Edmundson, published in Dublin in 1715, gives us valuable information. The other contemporary sources are the records of the several courts, which, however, are not all in print, and, when printed, are not always complete.

It was very seldom that anyone was directly charged with being a Quaker, so that one has to look in other directions for evidence. It was, however, a criminal offence not to attend public worship on Sunday, and Quakers could not conscientiously attend the Puritan services. Thus it happens that by studying the names of those who repeatedly were brought to court for such non-attendance, one has an opportunity to locate and identify the Quakers.

In the Essex County Quarterly Court, which included Hampton, in the twenty years from 1636 to 1656, there were twenty-five prosecutions for non-attendance, an average of slightly more than one a year. This was before the Quaker agitation; although one finds among those prosecuted, some who apparently were not satisfied with Puritan theology, known Quakers are not among them. From 1656 to 1662, after the Quaker invasion of Boston, there were, in the six years, one hundred and forty-seven such prosecutions; chiefly of members of the Salem group of Quakers. From 1662 to 1667, five years, there were one hundred and ninety-eight, mostly Quakers; while from 1667 to 1671, four years, there were seventy-eight; from 1672 to 1674 inclusive, there were eight; from 1675 to 1678, there were eleven; and from 1678 to 1680, although there were several prosecutions, only three convictions can be found. Thus, these prosecutions not only identify the Quakers, but they furnish, also, a measure of the rise and fall of the fury of the persecution.

The first New Hampshire names which definitely can be identified as those of Quakers, appear in April, 1662, when John Hussey, Eliakim Wardell and John Swain, all of Hampton, were convicted of absence from public worship. Hussey and Wardell, for twenty-six absences, were fined 6 £, 10 s each. This means that they had been absent for the six months preceding the complaint. The absences of John Swain are not set forth, nor the penalty.

In this way, I have found twenty individuals, resident in Hampton, who were undoubtedly Quakers. Their names and the number of times prosecuted are:

Abraham Chase, prosecuted once;
Thomas Chase, prosecuted three times;
Thomas Cram, prosecuted once;
John Garland, prosecuted once;
Christopher Hussey, prosecuted once;
John Hussey, prosecuted six times;
Rebecca Hussey, John's wife, prosecuted three times;
Stephen Hussey, prosecuted twice;
Francis Jennings, prosecuted once;
James Johnson, prosecuted once;
John Marston, prosecuted once;
William Marston, prosecuted four times;
Caleb Perkins, prosecuted once;
Josiah Sanborn, prosecuted once;
John Smith, prosecuted once;
John Stanyan, prosecuted once;
John Swain, prosecuted once;
Richard Swain, prosecuted once, fined and disfranchised;
Eliakim Wardell, prosecuted three times;
Lydia Wardell, prosecuted three times;
Jonathan Wedgewood, prosecuted once.

It has not been so easy to identify the Dover Quakers, because there are no published court records for Dover which give us the specific information that we have for Hampton. As we shall soon see, however, there is abundant proof that there was a substantial group there.

The only Exeter names that I can positively identify in this period as possible Quakers are those of Christian Dolloff, James Godfrey, Richard Morgan, William Taylor, Robert Powell and Charles Glidden, who with Arthur Bennett of Oyster River, were prosecuted in 1673 for non-attendance at church.

The man of most importance in the Piscataqua region who was definitely committed to the cause of the Quakers was Nicholas Shapleigh of Kittery. He was the son of Alexander Shapleigh, one of the earliest settlers of Kittery, the one who was responsible for the name of the town. Nicholas Shapleigh was a business man, a prominent town and county official, and, before 1662, an active military officer. Under the first Maine Provincial government, he was a member of the Provincial Council from 1644 to 1652.

He acknowledged himself subject to the government of Massachusetts in 1652, and in 1653, was appointed one of the magistrates for the new County of York and the Isles of Shoals, and treasurer of the County. In 1656, he was appointed one of the commissioners to take York and Kittery into the Massachusetts government. The same year, he was also commissioned a Major. In 1658, he was appointed a commissioner to settle the civil government in the eastern parts of Maine, and a magistrate to receive wills for probate and to grant administrations.

The tide now begins to ebb. In 1662, he refused to recognize the claim of Massachusetts to sovereignty over Maine. The same year he was prosecuted "for not frequenting the place of public worship"; in other words, he was a Quaker. In 1663, his commission as major was declared to be null and void. In 1663, also, Maj. Waldron, at Dover, wrote the Massachusetts authorities as follows:

"Major Shapleigh shelters the Quakers that come into our parts, and followeth them where they are met; which is not only a disturber on that side of the River, but also on our side; they come to our Town (and lecture) and presently they are gone over the River; and so his house is the harbor of them; and some say he is dictated by the little

crooked Quaker (Edward Wharton). Our Town will be so disturbed by the Quakers and others that we shall hardly be at peace."

In 1669, the court at York, decreed,

"that the Town of Kittery had acted contrary to law in choosing Mr. Nichollus Shapleigh, James Heard, and Richard Naly, Townsmen" (that is, selectmen). "They being Quakers are dismissed from that trust and the Town is order to make another choice."

In 1674, we find Shapleigh in prison in Massachusetts, his offence being that he had received and concealed one William Forrest and two other men, who were charged with piracy; and were subsequently executed for that offence. In a plea for leniency, he said that the men aided being in a sudden hurry, he had helped them, "my compassion overcoming my reason". His sister, Katherine Hilton, widow of Edward Hilton, also appealed to the Massachusetts authorities for leniency, relating that in 1636, when the settlement at Boston was near famine, her father, Alexander Shapleigh, had, on his own account, relieved their distress by sending a shipload of provisions. She also pointed out that Nicholas, after his offence, had brought about the arrest of the three men and their delivery to the authorities.

Nicholas Shapleigh was released on his paying 50 £, and his giving surety for the further payment of 150 £.

A few months later, King Philip's war having broken out, and the eastern Indians being active, the Massachusetts authorities had need of Shapleigh, who was well known among the Indians, and February 21, 1675/6, he and Major Richard Waldron were commissioned to treat with the Indians. A queer combination, a Quaker and a Quaker persecutor. In May, 1676, a peace having been negotiated, Shapleigh was appointed one of a commission to examine the militia accounts. He was killed in an accident in May, 1682.

This is an outline of Shapleigh's life and activities as we get them from the public records. Bishop in "New England Judged", (he calls him Slapleigh) writes of his entertaining Alice Ambrose and Mary Tomkins, as follows:

(They were) "invited to Major Slapleigh's, who was the Magistrate for that part of the Country, who kept a Priest in his House, and allowed him and the People a Room in his house to do their worship; and he being an inquiring man after the Truth, desired the Priest that he and the Quakers might have some Dispute together, unto which the Priest seemed Willing; but soon after that he got away by which his Deceit was manifest and the same Major Slapleigh and his wife were convinced of the Truth and in a good measure of Obedience gave up to it, and turned the Priest and his worship away; and whereas his House had formerly served the Priest, now both he and his House served for the Lord to be Worshipped in; and great Dominion got the Truth in this Day in the Hearts of People thereaways, which tormented many of the Priests and Rulers".

Edmundson, who was in the Piscataqua in 1675, writes of Shapleigh's house as follows:

"then went to Salem, and so to Piscattaway River visiting Friends, and having Meetings at several Places. I came to Great Island, and staid a Meeting or Two with Friends there, and we were well Refresh'd together in the Lord.

"Then leaving my Horse there, I went in a Boat to Nicholas Shapley's, a Man of Note in that country, (who, and his wife were both honest Friends) from thence over the River several Miles, where there were many honest Friends, and had a Meeting with them on the First Day of the week, it was a very large and precious Meeting, many came from far to it, and bles'd the Lord for that comfortable Opportunity. After the Meeting I took leave of Friends in the Love of God, and went back to Nicholas Shapley's, staid there Two or Three Days, and had a Meeting there. Many Friends and Others came to it, a good Meeting it was, we had also a Mens Meeting about Church affairs.

"Now about this time, there was a Cessation of the War with the Indians on that River, and one Evening, whilst I was at Nicholas Shapley's, there came in Fourteen Lusty Indian Men, with their Heads trimmed, and Faces painted

for War, they lookt Fierce. I sat down with them in the Hall, and would have discours'd with them familiarly, for some of them spoke broken English; but they were churlish, and their Countenances bloody; So I left them, and told the Friend, I saw They intended Mischief in their Hearts, but the Lord chain'd them, they went away in the Night, without doing us any Harm. Next Day I was to go to Great Island and in the Morning Nicholas Shapley told me, that he was inform'd, the Indians intended to make a new Insurrection; so I went by Water to Great Island, as I intended, and had a Heavenly Meeting with Friends before parting; so I left them tender, in a Sense of the Love of God. After I left them, the Indians rose in Arms and murther'd about Seventy Christians, as the Post brought News, but I did not hear of one Friend murther'd that Night."

There has been some discussion as to whether the Shapleighs were actually Quakers, or were only tolerant Puritans who sympathized with the Quakers. It has been pointed out that Shapleigh was a military officer, and that military service is not consistent with the Quaker faith. On the other hand, both Bishop and Edmundson say explicitly that the Shapleighs were Friends, while Waldron and the Puritan authorities certainly considered Shapleigh a Quaker and treated him as such. If Bishop is to be believed, the Shapleighs became Quakers in 1662, and there is no record of military activity on Shapleigh's part after that date. His commission as Major was cancelled in 1663. His activities in 1675 and 1676, during the Indian troubles, were, as a commissioner to bring about peace, and as an auditor of militia accounts, neither of which employments required him to bear arms or to participate in military activities.

From Edmundson's Journal we know that there were Quakers at Great Island, now Newcastle, N. H. Edmundson seems to have made this place a headquarters and to have found it satisfactory both in accommodation and in spiritual atmosphere. It may be that he was entertained there by George Walton, who kept a tavern. Walton was prosecuted in 1663 for non-attendance at church. His wife

Alice is described elsewhere, "as one of the most godly women thereabouts".

Edmundson visited, also, a considerable group "over the river" from Shapleigh's. Shapleigh's house was in that part of Kittery which is now Eliot and was opposite the Dover of that day, which was on Dover Point. "Over the river" from Shapleigh's might ordinarily mean Dover, but "over the river several miles" certainly did not mean Dover. We shall hear later of Quakers at Newichawannock, who may have constituted the group that Edmundson visited. They may have been at Berwick, where, later, there was a regularly organized Quaker meeting. It may be, however, that Edmundson went as far "over the river" as Oyster River, now Durham, where there was Quaker activity. In 1662, John Goddard, Robert Burnham, William Williams, James Smith, and William Roberts, summoned to appear at Court "in his Majesty's name", refused to appear as ordered, because they were not "arasted in ye kings nam" but "are arasted in his majesty's nam", the king's name not appearing in the summons. Whether this technicality, set forth in a letter to Major Waldron, was too subtle for the Puritan authorities to circumvent, I do not know, but as far as existing records show, these men were never in court.

All of these Oyster River residents were men of substance. It is possible that not all of them continued Quakers, as some of them later held offices and engaged in governmental activities which could have been inconsistent with the Quaker profession. James Smith died in 1690 from a "surfeit", caused by too much running in an Indian fight. William Roberts, however, was a staunch Quaker to the end and was frequently at odds with the authorities.

According to Bishop, "In the year 1662, Mary Tomkins and Alice Ambrose . . . came to Piscataqua River and passing up, landed at the Town aforesaid (Dover); whither to go it was with them from the Lord, where they had a good Opportunity in the Inn, with the People that resorted to them; who reasoned with them concerning their Faith

and Hope, which to the People being made manifest, some to the Truth thereof confessed; and others, being not able to gainsay the Truth, ran to Rayner (Rev. Joseph Reyner of the First Church of Dover) their Priest, and told him, That such a People were come to Town; and that they had much Discourse with them about their Religion, and were not able to contradict what they said, and therefore desireth him to come forth and help them, Or else, said they, We are like to be run on ground.

"At this the Priest chafed and fretted; and asked his People why they came amongst them? To which they answered, Sir, it is so, we have been amongst them; and if you come not forth to help us, we are on ground. And said the Priest's wife, Which do you like best, my Husband or the Quakers? Said one of them, we shall tell you that after your Husband hath been with them.

"Whereupon, in came Rayner, in a fretting and forward manner, saying, What came ye here for, seeing the Laws of the Country are against such as you are? But what has thou against us? reply'd Mary Tomkins. You deny Magistrates (said the Priest) and Ministers, and the Churches of Christ. Thou sayest so (reply'd Mary). And you deny the three Persons in the Trinity (said the Priest). To which Mary answered, Take notice, People, this man falsely accuseth us; for godly Magistrates and the Ministers of Christ, we own; and the Churches of Christ we own; and that there are Three that bear Record in Heaven, which Three are, the Father, Word, and Spirit, that we own; But for the Three Persons in the Trinity, that's for Thee to prove.

"I will prove the Three Persons in the Trinity (said the Priest). Thou say'st so said George Preston; but prove it by the Scripture. Yes, reply'd Rayner, by this I will prove it, where it is said, And he is the Express Image of his Father's Person. But said One, That is falsely Translated. Yea, it is, reply'd a learned man, for in the Greek it is, not Person, but Substance. But said the Priest, it is Person, and so there is one Person. Thou sayst so, (said George)

but prove thy other two if thou canst. Said the Priest, There are Three Somethings, and so in a Rage flung away, calling to his People at the window to go from amongst them; but Mary soon got after him and spoke to him to come back and not to leave his People amongst them he called Wolves; but away packt the Priest; whereupon she said to the People, Is not this the Hireling that flees and leaves the Flock? So Truth came over them all, and there was a great service for the Lord, and many were convinced of the Truth that Day; and notwithstanding the Terror of your Wicked Laws , Many Waxed Bold, and invited them to their Houses, and they had at that time a great and good Meeting amongst them all; and the Truth by George Preston, Mary Tomkins and Alice Ambrose, was preached amongst them, and the Power of the Lord reached many of them that Day."

It was probably this favorable reception of the Quaker message that caused the Dover authorities to apply to those at Boston for advice and assistance, for we find that on October 8, 1662, the Court of Assistants at Boston ordered,

"In ansr to the petition of the inhabitants of Dover, humbly craving reliefe against the Spreading &c, the wicked Errors of the Quakers amongst them, &c, it is ordered that Capt. Richard Waldron shall &c hereby is impowered to act in the execution of the lawes of this jurisdiction against all criminal offenders wthin the sayd towns of Dover, as any one magistrate may doe, until this Court shall take further order."

It was after the incident with Rev. Mr. Reyner, just related, that Mary Tomkins and Alice Ambrose first visited Major Shapleigh at Kittery. After that,

"they staid in those parts for some time, wherein they had very good Service for the Truth, they departed westward; and towards the Winter, it came into the hearts of Alice Ambrose and Mary Tomkins, and Ann Coleman to go and visit the Seed of God amongst them that had received the Truth in Piscataqua River, where they were not long, but a flood of Persecution arose by the Instigation of

the Priest, caused them to be apprehended, by Vertue of your Cart law; an order was made to whip and pass them away as followeth:

"To the Constables of Dover, Hampton, Salisbury, Newbury, Rowley, Ipswich, Wennam, Linn, Boston, Roxbury, Dedham; and until these Vagabond Quakers are carried out of this jurisdiction.

"You and every of you, are required, in the King's Majesty's Name, to take these Vagabond-Quakers, Ann Coleman, Mary Tomkins, Alice Ambrose, and make them fast to the Cart's Tail, and driving the cart through your several Towns, to whip them upon their Backs, not exceeding Ten Stripes apiece, on each of them, in each town, and so to convey them from Constable to Constable, till they come out of this Jurisdiction, as you will answer it at Your Peril; and this shall be your Warrant. per me.

RICHARD WALDEN." (S)

December 22, 1662.

This order or warrant, of Waldron's is probably the most famous document in the whole Quaker persecution. Not only is it noteworthy in its innate cruelty and severity, but it is noteworthy, also, as showing how little the Puritan authorities regarded the law when they set about doing a thing of this kind.

The original law providing for the whipping of Quakers through various towns had been enacted in May, 1661, but the Great and General Court, in consequence of an order from King Charles II, had ordered, in November, 1661, "that the execution of the laws in force against the Quakers, as such, so far as they respect corporal punishment or death be suspended until this Court take further order." On October 8, 1662, the same day that the Court authorized Waldron to proceed against the Quakers, it re-enacted the whipping law of May, 1661, with, however, an amendment that "the whipping be but through three towns". And yet, Waldron ordered it to be done in eleven towns by name and in any other towns through which a constable should take the women!

Bishop goes on with the story, "A Cruel Warrant, through Eleven Townships by name and whatsoever else were in that Jurisdiction, to whip three tender women, and one of them little and crooked, with ten stripes apiece at each Place, in the bitter cold weather, through such a length of ground, near eighty miles, enough to have beaten their Flesh raw and their Bones bare."

Bishop says, also, that Reyner drew the warrant and Waldron signed it. He makes Reyner out as the moving party in the proceedings.

"By reason of Whom (Reyner) they were brought before Walden, who began to tell them of your Law against Quakers; Mary Tomkins reply'd, So there was a Law that Daniel should not pray to his God. Yes, said Walden, and Daniel suffered, and so shall you. . . . and so demands of Alice Ambrose her name, tho he had it in the Warrant; my name, said she, is written in the Lamb's Book of Life. He answered, No Body here knows this Book; and for this you shall suffer.

"So, in a very cold Day, your Deputy, Walden, caused these women to be stripped naked, from the middle upward, and tyed to a Cart, and after a while cruelly whipped them, whilst the Priest stood and looked and laughed at it, which some of their Friends seeing, testified against for which Walden put two of them (Eliakim Wardel of Hampton and William Fourbish of Dover) in the stocks. (During the whipping James Heard asked whether those were the Cords of their Covenant)". This was probably the same James Heard, who seven years later, in 1669, was elected a Townsman at Kittery with Nicholas Shapleigh, and was removed from office because he was a Quaker.

Bishop continues: "Having dispatched them in this Town, and made way to carry them over the waters, and thro Woods to another, the women deny'd to go, unless they had a copy of their Warrant; so your Executioner sought to set them on Horseback but they slid off; then they endeavored to tie each to a Man on Horse Back, but that would not do neither, nor any course they took, till the copy was

given them; insomuch the Constable professed, that he was almost Wearied with them. (The Constable of Dover's name was Thomas Roberts, who looking pitifully the same Night through his Extream Toyle to bring the Servants of the Lord thither to be whipped, as they had been at Dover, they were so far above his cruelty, that they made him some good thing for his refreshment, which he took)."

In Bishop's account we have a picture of the way in which the journey was made. The common idea of this terrible punishment is that the women were tied to a cart in Dover and that the cart, with the women tied behind, was driven to Hampton, and then on to Salisbury. Whittier so assumes in his poem "How the Women Went from Dover". Such a thing was physically impossible in 1662. There was no road by which a cart could be driven from Dover to Hampton, and no bridges across the Piscataqua. To make this journey, it was necessary to "carry them over the waters" by boat, and then by forest trail to Hampton. Undoubtedly the journey was made on horseback, each woman riding behind a man to whom she was tied. When Hampton was reached, the constable had to hunt up a cart for the whipping in that town, after which, travel to the next town was made by horseback, and another cart provided for the whipping there. The unwillingness of the women to go was not in resistance to the journey, but was due to the lack of a copy of the warrant, upon which they insisted, possibly, for later proof of their illegal sentence.

In other particulars, Whittier's poem is wrong when measured by the facts. The whipping did not take place in the centre of the present Dover, but at the church which then stood on Dover Point; neither did the women prophecy Waldron's "coming doom"; such was not their mental state. Throughout it all they were meek and forgiving; according to Bishop, the constable "looking pitifully" at night, because of his "extream Toyl" or, more probably, because of his sense of shame, the women "made him some good thing for his refreshment" and he did not refuse it.

Let us go on with Bishop. "But the copy being given

them, they went with the Executioner to Hampton and through Dirt and Snow at Salisbury, halfway the Leg deep the Constable forced them after the Cart's Tayl at which he whipped them; under which Cruelty and sore Usage, the tender women traversing their way through all, was a hard Spectacle to those who had in them anything of Tenderness; but the Presence of the Lord was so with them (in the extremity of their suffering) that they sung in the midst of them, to the astonishment of their Enemies.

"At Hampton, William Fifield, the Constable, having received the Women to whip them, said, I profess you must not think to make Fools of Men; meaning thereby that he would not be outdone, upon the Relation of the Constable of Dover, what work he had with them. The Women answered, They should be able to deal with him, as well as the other. So this Constable, Fifield, who professed himself so Stout, the next morning would have whipped them before Day; but they refused, saying, That they were not ashamed of their Sufferings. Then he would have whipped them on their Cloaths, contrary to the Warrant. But they said, Set us free or do according to thine Order, which was to whip them on their naked Backs. Then he spake to a Woman to take off their Cloaths.

"The Woman said She would not do it for all the World; and so did other Women deny to do it. Then he said, I profess I will do it myself. So he stripped them and then stood Trembling with the Whip in his Hand, as a man condemned, and did the Execution as a man in that Condition. But one called Anthony Stanyel, who having a great desire to do the Execution himself on the women, hasted up for the work, but he was disappointed, for it was done ere he came; a monstrous fellow, who desired such a dishonorable Service, to do such Execution on three Women; . . .

"Now amongst the rest of the Spectators, Edward Wharton, not knowing ought of what they were about, passing along the Way, and meeting with them came to be one; whose Eye beholding their torn Bodies, and weary Steps, and yet no Remorse in their Persecutors, affected his Heart,

and he could not withhold but testified against them, Seeing this bloody Engagement. Whereupon (Thomas Bradbury, Clerk of Courts at Salisbury & Hampton) one of the officers said, Edward Wharton, what do you here? I am here, answered Edward, to see your Wickedness and Cruelty, so that if you kill them, I may be able to declare how you murthered them. But the Lord unexpectedly wrought a Way at that time to deliver them out of the Tyrant's hands.

"(Walter Barefoote, at Salisbury, got the Constable to make him his Deputy; who receiving the Warrant, thereupon set them at Liberty, so they were delivered; but John Wheelwright, the Priest, advised the Constable to drive on, as his safest Way).

"So through three Towns only were they whipped, but Cruelly,-and then they were discharged."

Edward Wharton, who "testified" against the whipping at Hampton, was born at Salem. He was "the little crooked Quaker" by whom Major Shapleigh was "dictated", according to Waldron's letter to the Massachusetts authorities. He was one of the group of Salem Quakers who had been fined and imprisoned repeatedly and, at the same time that William Leddra was sentenced to death at Boston, Wharton was banished from Massachusetts on pain of death, being allowed ten days in which to leave the jurisdiction. He stayed in Boston, attended Leddra to the gallows, he had been nearly a year in prison with him, caught the lifeless body when it fell from the scaffold, and, with three other Quakers, give it burial. Then he went home to Salem and wrote the authorities of Boston that he was there and expected to stay there. They did not pursue him further. After the incident at Hampton, he was several times active in the Piscataqua and was punished in various ways.

It is to be noted that Bishop says that the women were whipped in only three places, which were Dover, Hampton and Salisbury. This disagrees with the account in Whittier's poem in which the poet has Major Robert Pike forbid the whipping and free the women. Pike, as the central figure of the poem, indulges in heroics, to the effect that

"No warrant is good, though backed by the Crown,
For whipping women in Salisbury town!"

Pike's participation in the incident, nevertheless, is purely poetic license. No one of the contemporary accounts mentions him; in all of them Walter Barefoot is given the entire credit. It was the one creditable, high minded act that Barefoot ever did and it is uncharitable to deprive him of the credit which is rightly his. His record needs all of it.

Whatever Barefoot's failings and conduct may have been in general, a study of his life reveals one thing, that he was learned in the law. There are many instances in his career in which he displayed legal knowledge sufficient to baffle and thwart his opponents as well as to advance his own ends. One wonders whether he pointed out the defect in the warrant, authorizing eleven whippings instead of the legal three, and suggested that, as they had had three whippings, they could be discharged with safety.

It is to be noted that John Wheelwright "advised the constable to drive on, as his safest way". Bishop's account thus suggests some kind of an argument as to the course to be followed; Barefoot was right at home in any such controversy, and, as usually happened, in the end he had his way. His proposition to the constable to make him his deputy was probably welcome to the constable as it placed any subsequent blame upon Barefoot and also relieved the constable from an unpleasant task.

Bishop's story goes on, after Barefoot's interference. "Being set at Liberty, the women returned to Major Slapleigh's House, near unto Dover; and from thence they went to a place called Newquechawanach, where they had a Meeting and Shubal Dummer the Priest of the Place, was at the Meeting, who sat quiet; and the Meeting being ended he stood up, and said, Good Women, you have spoken Well, and prayed Well; Pray what is your Rule? The women reply'd, The Spirit of the Lord is our Rule, and it ought to be thine and all Mens to walk by. To which the Priest answered, It is not my Rule, nor I hope it ever shall be."

Then Bishop makes this interesting summing up:

"See the sad condition of your Priests and Magistrates and those who are led by them. One saith, The Three Persons in the Trinity are Three Somethings, and so flies away. Another saith, The Lamb's Book of Life, No Body here knows that Book. A third saith, The Spirit of the Lord is not my Rule, nor I hope it never shall be."

We learn from this part of Bishop's account that, after being set free by Walter Barefoote, the women returned to Major Shapleigh's and that from that place, they went to Newichawannock where Shubael Dummer was priest. The Genealogical Dictionary of Maine and New Hampshire says that Shubael Dummer was the priest at Shapleigh's, but Bishop names the priest there as Thomas Millett, whom I have not been able to identify. These particular Quakers had several passages at Shapleigh's with Millett, in one of which, one of the women was thrown down a flight of stairs.

They did not meet Dummer, according to Bishop, until they had left Shapleigh's. Dummer was at Salisbury, Massachusetts in 1660, and at a much later period was pastor at York, Maine, where he was killed by the Indians.

Newichawannock might mean Eliot, where Shapleigh lived, or it might mean Berwick. Until some one ascertains where Shubael Dummer was preaching in 1662 or 1663, we must remain in doubt as to what part of the Newichawannock area was visited by these Quaker missionaries at this time. William Edmundson, also, you will remember, visited a Quaker group in this vicinity, "over the River several miles" from Shapleigh's.

Undaunted by their terrible experiences at Dover, Hampton and Salisbury, Alice Ambrose, Mary Tomkins and Ann Colman returned to Dover. While attending a Quaker meeting there, Alice Ambrose and Mary Tomkins were seized by Thomas Roberts, the constable who had whipped them, and his brother John. They were dragged, face down, across a snow covered field, filled with stumps and fallen trees. Thomas Roberts, senior, father of the two men, described by Bishop as "an aged man, 30 years at Dover",

followed, lamenting the conduct of his sons. Thomas Roberts was one of the first settlers at Dover Point and at one time had been the head of the settlement there, having served as President of the Court in 1640 and 1641. He was at least a sympathizer with the Quakers, as we can infer from his conduct just related, as well as from the fact that he had been fined for absenting himself from Sunday worship.

The two women were kept over night in a dwelling house. The next morning their captors attempted to put them into a canoe, or dugout, to take them to some unannounced destination. Mary Tomkins was dragged on her back down a steep hill over stumps. The bank where the canoe was, was steep and slippery; in the scuffle, Alice Ambrose was pushed overboard and nearly drowned. A storm came up, causing the trip to be abandoned, and the two women, Alice Ambrose with her clothes frozen stiff, were taken to a house and kept there till midnight when they were released.

These episodes at Dover were closely linked with happenings at Hampton, and had a part in producing one of the most tragic incidents of the entire Quaker persecution in New England. These Quaker women were no strangers at Hampton, where, undoubtedly, they had been sheltered by Eliakim Wardell and his wife Lydia.

The Wardells were ardent Quakers, and much of the Hampton activities centered about them. Wenlock Christison was staying at the Wardell house when he was arrested by a posse led by Rev. Seaborne Cotton and dragged away. Later Christison was tried at Boston and was sentenced to die but was not executed. Wardell was fined for entertaining him. Between the Wardells and Seaborne Cotton there were many clashes and controversies. Alice Ambrose and Mary Tomkins attended Cotton's church one Sunday and were ordered out by him. A considerable scene ensued during which Captain Thomas Wiggin struck Mary Tomkins.

At that time, churches were supported by rates, a form of taxation, levied on all the inhabitants. Payment of these

rates was enforced, as in the case of any other taxes; whether or not an individual was interested in the church in his town, or cared for the pastor, he was obliged to pay the rate levied upon him.

One method of collection was by distress, a procedure little known today. The constable, armed with a warrant, distrained (or seized) personal property belonging to the delinquent, sold it and collected what was due, for the payment of the tax or rate, with costs. Court fines were some times collected in this way.

When Eliakim Wardell was fined for entertaining Christison, a saddle horse of a value much greater than the amount of the fine was seized. Instead of paying Wardell the difference, a jar of green ginger, seized from William Marston, another Quaker, was left at Wardell's house. The Wardells refused to receive it. When another fine was imposed on Wardell, the jar of green ginger was taken in payment of that.

Nathaniel Boulter purchased a rate warrant against Wardell, and then went to Wardell's house, pretending to be in need and asking for corn. Wardell unhesitatingly gave him some, whereupon Boulter, having thus found out where Wardell kept his corn, returned and seized it on the rate warrant.

Wardell had a pied heifer which Seaborne Cotton coveted. On another rate warrant, the heifer was seized and Cotton acquired ownership through a pretended sale. We shall hear more about the pied heifer later.

Eliakim Wardell was born in Boston in 1634, and came to Hampton in 1659. He married, in October of that year, Lydia Perkins, daughter of Isaac. Her sister Rebecca married John Hussey, a brother of Stephen Hussey, who later moved to Nantucket. The Wardells and the Husseys were all Quakers.

Wardell's removal to Hampton may have been due to his having received there, in 1658, considerable real estate and personal property by the will of Jeffrey Mingay. What Mingay's relation to Wardell was and why the property was

left to him does not appear, but Wardell, at the beginning of the Quaker troubles in Hampton, was a person of property and substance.

It is significant that Wardell was in Dover on that day in December, 1662, when Alice Ambrose, Mary Tomkins, and Ann Coleman were whipped at the cart's tail, before they began their journey to Hampton and Salisbury. For remonstrating with Rev. Mr. Reyner, who laughed at the spectacle, Wardell was placed in the stocks. Despite this detention, it is possible that he was at Hampton when they were whipped there, and, doubtless, so was his wife, Lydia.

One can imagine what an upsetting spectacle it was for the Wardells, who must have known the three women intimately, and had entertained them at their home, to see their friends brutally exposed and whipped. They had the memory of seeing Wenlock Christison, roughly dragged from their house, and they knew only too well of the cruel treatment suffered by other Quaker friends. They, themselves, lived in the midst of constant and repeated persecution, fines imposed and property seized. Their situation, the certainty of further cruelties, and loss of property, must daily have weighed on their minds.

In April, 1663, Eliakim and Lydia, with William Marston and John and Rebecca Hussey, were prosecuted for absence from meeting and fined. This may have been the last straw. In May, 1663, Henry Jaques, constable of Newbury, informed the Ipswich Court "of a Quaker Eliacom Aldrous' wife of Hampton came part naked into our meeting house on a lord's Day a litl before meeting began."

Henry Jaques did not get the culprit's name correctly; the wrong doer was Lydia Wardell, wife of Eliakim.

There are some details that it is well to notice. First, Henry Jaques, who was making the complaint, and presumably an eye witness, described Lydia as "part naked." Second, while her act certainly disturbed the gathering, it did not disturb the service of worship, as it happened before "meeting began".

May 5, 1663, the court at Ipswich ordered Lydia to be

severely whipped "for going naked into Newbury meeting house". She was stripped to the waist, tied to a fence post of the tavern, where the magistrates could watch the spectacle from the windows, and received either twenty or thirty stripes.

There are many angles from which this incident must be considered. The most important of these is the frequently repeated canard that the Quaker women were in the habit of doing this sort of thing. Even John Fiske writes casually that such was their habit. And yet, Lydia Wardell's case is the only recorded instance of such a thing happening in a church; and there is only one other instance of such a thing happening elsewhere.

In June, 1662, Deborah Wilson, wife of Robert Wilson, "for her barbarous & inhuman goeing naked through the Towne is sentenced to be tied at a Cart's Tayle with her body naked downward to her Wast &c whipped . . . not exceeding 30 stripes &c her mother Buffum &c her sister Smith, that were abetted to her &c to be tyed on either side of her at the cart's tayle naked to their shifts to ye wast & accompany her."

To dispose of Deborah Wilson's case, it is necessary only to tell a short story. She was the daughter of Joshua Buffum of Salem, and, with the other members of the Buffum family, was one of the constantly and persistently punished Salem group, who for five years had been harried, fined, whipped and imprisoned.

In January, 1668, six years later, at the Salem Court, "The wife of Robert Wilson, presented for frequently absenting herself from the public ordinances, was dismissed, court being informed 'yt she is distempered in her head' ".

In other words, in 1668, the court had found out that the woman was insane. She was beyond doubt insane in 1662, when she was whipped for doing an insane act. The court at that time, however, was not seeking an explanation of her conduct; it was looking for an excuse for imposing a cruel punishment.

In Lydia Wardell's case, as in Deborah Wilson's, there

was the same history of cruel and inhuman persecution, of brutal whippings of friends and relatives. In the explanation of one is found the explanation of the other; each was purely a psychopathic case brought about by the barbarous and inhuman treatment of the Quakers by the Puritan authorities.

One of the pathetic pictures of the Puritan persecution is that of Robert Wilson, himself not a Quaker, walking behind his wife as she was whipped, and, as he could, interposing his hat between her bare back and the lash. So, also, was Eliakim Wardell, his wife's champion. At the trial of Lydia, Simon Bradstreet, one of the magistrates, had gone out of his way to make certain uncalled for remarks reflecting upon Lydia's chastity. Their falseness is clearly known, when one remembers that she was a loyal and fervent Quaker. Meeting Simon Bradstreet on the street later, Eliakim publicly took him to task for his remarks, and in the course of his rebuke, compared Lydia's chastity with that of Simon's daughter, who was the wife of Seaborne Cotton, and the not infrequent subject of village gossip. Bradstreet, thoroughly enraged, demanded of the other magistrates that Eliakim be punished. And so Eliakim, in October, 1663, received fifteen stripes after the noon recess of court.

Among the spectators at the whipping was Seaborne Cotton. When the ordeal was over, Eliakim seeing Cotton in the group, called out, "Seaborne, hath my pied heifer calved yet?" Whereupon, Seaborne "stole away like a thief."

At this same term of court, Eliakim was fined five pounds for twenty days absence from church of Lydia and himself. Some time later, Eliakim and Lydia removed to New Jersey.

Why did Lydia Wardell choose the Newbury church for her demonstration? Bishop says that she was a member of that church, a fact which as yet I have been unable to prove or disprove. In the list of the members of that

church in 1674 is the name Lydia Pemberton Wardwell. I have not yet identified the person who bore that name.

Rufus M. Jones points out that both the Puritans and Friends were diligent readers of the Hebrew prophets, and that both, especially the Friends, made much of "signs" which the prophets had often felt called upon to act out in person. Thus, in 1661, Catherine Chatham, another victim of harsh persecution, appeared in church in Boston clothed in sack cloth and ashes, and Thomas Newhouse entered a church and broke two empty bottles as a sign that those who persecuted the Quakers would be dashed to pieces; while Margaret Brewster, in 1677, went to church with her face colored black, ashes on her head, and sack cloth over her garments.

Lydia Wardell undoubtedly felt called upon to appear "as a naked sign" as did Deborah Wilson in Salem. Whether either was actually naked is perhaps a question, especially in view of Henry Jaques' information to the court that Lydia appeared "part naked." In any event, if nakedness was a matter deserving severe punishment, what is to be said of the magistrates who stripped two women absolutely naked and subjected them to indecent indignities, and of the others who again and again caused women to be stripped to the waist publicly and whipped on their bare backs. There is some excuse for Lydia Wardell and Deborah Wilson, because it can be understood that what they did was the result of mental breakdowns, caused by the strain of the continued persecution they and their friends and relatives had faced and were facing. No such excuse can be found for the Puritan magistrates and clergy, who inspired and guided the persecution and demanded such punishments.

It should be repeated, once more, that the two cases, of Lydia Wardell and Deborah Wilson, are the only ones that ever happened in New England of this kind of demonstration, and that Lydia Wardell was undoubtedly a psychopathic case, as Deborah Wilson admittedly was.

The Quaker persecution failed ultimately because a considerable portion of the people were not in favor of it. It

took John Endecott two weeks to induce the court to pass the death sentence upon Wenlock Christison; when Robinson and Stevenson were executed, the authorities so feared a rescue that they had a substantial military guard in attendance, with sentinels posted about the town. One of the executions was ordered by a margin of only one vote.

All of this shows that there was a substantial part of the community which was not hostile to the Quakers, and was not in sympathy with the cruelties practiced upon them. There were many, not Quakers, who were firmly opposed to the policy of cruel repression. When Robinson and Stevenson were sentenced to death, John Winthrop, Governor of Connecticut and son of the former Governor of Massachusetts, and Governor Temple of Acadia and Nova Scotia, interceded for them, in unsuccessful efforts to stop the executions. After Mary Dyer and William Leddra were executed, there was such a revulsion of feeling in Boston that the authorities did not dare to attempt another hanging. The right to vote was limited to church members, who were under the control of the clergy, but there was a constantly growing number of non-voters, not so controlled, who were becoming strong enough to be a factor in public opinion. And all through these persecutions the Quakers, also, were gaining in numbers.

One result of the persecution was to cause many of them to move out of the reach of the Massachusetts law. Rhode Island received a large number of these, Nantucket was settled largely by Quakers from Dover and Hampton; some went from the Piscataqua to New Jersey, or to Delaware. Nevertheless, Rufus M. Jones says that at the end of the persecution, one third of the inhabitants of the Piscataqua region were Quakers, a statement which I find confirmed by John Scales, who gives the same proportion for Dover.

An interesting question arises why, if the Quakers were so numerous at the end of the seventeenth century, they later lost so heavily in numbers and strength. Rufus M. Jones gives an answer to this question which is interesting and logical.

It is his opinion that the movement, full of power and vitality at its origin, failed to expand with the expanding life of America, when its members were free and unopposed, because of the early adoption by the Quakers of the ideal that they were to form a "peculiar people". In the first stages, the movement was full of vitality and power, possessing a universal truth which was to permeate humanity. In the face of opposition the movement narrowed down to the theory of a "spiritual remnant" set apart to preserve and guard "the truth". The "world vision" faded, and Quakerism became an end in itself. The ideas of the Society crystallized into stated concepts of truth, the form of worship became fixed and well nigh unalterable, and the Quaker became a well-marked definitely labelled individual "quite as rigidly set as any of the 'religious orders' of church history and quite as bent on preserving the type. Men spent their precious lives not in propagating the living principles of spiritual religion in the great life of the world but in perfecting and transmitting a 'system' within the circle of the Society".

Then again the movement was hampered by an imperfect conception of the inward Light, and the failure to recognize the important part to be played by education in the expansion of human personality. Mr. Jones says, "If there could have been established in the northern, central and southern sections of the Atlantic coast line, institutions adapted to the right education of Quaker youth, as Harvard and Yale were to the education of the Puritan youth, there would be quite another story to tell. As the problem was worked out, no adequate instruction for Quaker youth was available. They soon found themselves largely cut off from the great currents of culture, and thus they missed the personal enlargement which comes when one is forced to make his own ideals fit into larger systems of thought and is compelled to reshape them in the light of facts."

When the awakening came to the Quakers of the ground already lost by this withdrawal from education and culture,

they had lost so much ground that it could not be made up, especially in view of the ideal, already accepted, that they were to be a small and isolated sect.

We of today have much to learn from this persecution, from the Quakers, who heroically suffered for their beliefs and their opinions, but much, also, from the Puritans, who unwisely sought by force to make all men conform to the views of a dominating class. Today, with the world all aflame, with dangers real and imaginary threatening us, there are those who would repress all who disagree with them. If we learn nothing more from this period of history, we should learn that no fear and no terror justifies us in shutting our eyes to possible truth and reason and in acting roughly and harshly with those whom we do not understand. Let us learn, at least, that our first duty is to try to understand, and to realize that, after all, the fault may be with us and not with the other fellow. There are enough real dangers in the world; let us develop our perception and appreciation of facts as they exist, so that we may not build imaginary dangers and waste our substance and our mental and nervous energies in guarding against what does not exist.