



From Sixpenny Entry to Five Shilling Subscription: Charting Cathedral Outreach and Friends' Associations in the 1920s and 1930s

Judith A. Muskett¹

j.muskett@yorks.j.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

All Anglican cathedrals in England have formal associations of Friends (like other institutions in the heritage sector). The majority arose in the 1920s/30s, a period that coincided with the gradual development of a focused outreach strategy by cathedrals, and the abandonment of sixpenny entrance fees. By analysing Letters to the Editor and news reports in *The Times*, this article explores the origins of cathedral Friends' associations. The sources illustrate the benefits of Friendship for both sides of the dyad: for the cathedrals, primarily the five shilling subscriptions and the creation of an informed supporter base; and for the members, mainly esoteric benefits. It is also demonstrated that, in the north, Friends' gifts directly replaced cathedral/diocesan resources being deployed for social welfare. A particular value in focusing on the history of the cathedral Friends' movement is that it highlights the history of the cathedrals themselves in this difficult inter-war period.

KEYWORDS: admission charges, Anglican cathedrals, deans, Friends, heritage, newspapers, philanthropy

Introduction

In 1925, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York were two signatories to the public circular about the formation of the Friends of Oxford's Bodleian Library.² Following the Bodleian's example (and also that of Cambridge's Fitzwilliam Museum, whose Friends had

1. Judith A. Muskett, *Theology & Religious Studies*, York St John University, Lord Mayor's Walk, York, YO31 7EX, UK.

2. 'Friends of the Bodleian', *The Times* (16 June 1925), p. 17, col. E.

been formed nearly two decades earlier), the English Anglican cathedrals started making their own Friends in 1927–28, when associations at Canterbury, Peterborough, York and Birmingham were established. By the start of World War II, at least 23 more cathedrals had followed suit. Friends in the locality and those farther away became part of a network of supporters. Out of love for the buildings and for altruistic reasons, they pledged their subscriptions and prayer for the mother church of the diocese. In return, Friends were kept in touch with their cathedral through regular newsletters, a process which created a well-informed supporter base.

It has been recognized that the Bodleian and the Fitzwilliam are unusual, for until 1950 it was more common for Friends to be located at heritage sites such as cathedrals and churches.³ It is therefore somewhat surprising that researchers in the fields of leisure and marketing who focus on friends and membership organizations in the broad heritage sector (which is deemed to include cathedrals) pay little attention to the historical perspective and, in particular, neglect the early development of the cathedral associations.⁴ Furthermore, whereas there has been an acknowledgement of the substantial contribution of today's Friends in terms of service to cathedrals⁵ and of the substantial source of income now provided to cathedrals by the organizations,⁶ the overall significance of cathedral Friends' associations both today and in the past has been neglected by empiricists. The results of the historical survey documented here, together with

3. A. Slater, 'An Audit of Friends Schemes at UK Heritage Sites', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 9.4 (2003), pp. 357–73 (357).

4. See, for example: D. Heaton, *Museums among Friends: The Wider Museum Community* (London: HMSO, 1992); C. Raymond, *Members Matter: Making the Most of your Membership Scheme* (London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1992); D. Hayes and A. Slater, 'From "Social Club" to "Integrated Membership Scheme": Developing Membership Schemes Strategically', *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 8.1 (2003), pp. 59–75; Slater, 'An Audit of Friends Schemes'; A. Slater, 'Revisiting Membership Scheme Typologies in Museums and Galleries', *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 9.3 (2004), pp. 238–60.

5. J.H. Churchill and A. Webster, 'From Close to Open: A Future for the Past' in D. Marcombe and C.S. Knighton (eds.), *Close Encounters: English Cathedrals and Society since 1540. Studies in Local and Regional History*, No. 3 (Nottingham: University of Nottingham Department of Adult Education, 1991), pp. 161–84; Archbishops' Commission on Cathedrals, *Heritage and Renewal* (London: Church House, 1994).

6. T. Beeson, *The Deans* (London: SCM Press, 2004).

- (i) a recent analysis of the characteristics and significance of today's cathedral Friends' associations as revealed by their publications,⁷ and
 (ii) an assessment of the role and merits of royal patronage for the associations,⁸ seek to redress the balance.

Method

The websites of the 42 Anglican cathedrals in England were surveyed in autumn 2009, and each was found to have a Friends' association. Publications by and on behalf of the associations were downloaded from cathedral/Friends' websites and also from the website of the Charity Commission.⁹ Where data were available, the year of each association's establishment was tabulated. If foundation dates were not evident, correspondence with individual cathedrals and Friends' officers sought to supplement the information in the public domain. Non-responses were followed up on three occasions. As shown in Table 1 later, lack of response eventually resulted in missing data for two associations (5% of the total).

Subsequently, a systematic search was made of *The Times* newspaper digital archive,¹⁰ focusing primarily on the 1920s and 1930s (when the majority of the Friends' associations were formed). The power of newspapers to arouse interest and galvanize the public into cooperative action had been recognized a century earlier by the French theorist de Tocqueville, in his tract on democracy in America.¹¹

According to Merrill and Fisher's account of the world's great daily newspapers, '[*The Times*] is much more than a newspaper; it is a national institution'.¹² It 'has always been considered the Establishment

7. J.A. Muskett, 'Cathedrals Making Friends: The Significance of Today's Friends' Associations for the Anglican Cathedrals in England' (forthcoming).

8. J.A. Muskett, 'Deferential or Dazzled? Rural Cathedral Friends' Associations and their Royal Patronage, Past and Present', *Rural Theology* (in press).

9. www.charity-commission.gov.uk/showcharity/registerofcharities/

10. The Times Archive is a searchable database of the newspaper from the year of its launch (1785) to 1985. Every page of *The Times* has been scanned and digitized, thus permitting searches to be made by keyword and date. See <http://archive.timesonline.co.uk/tol/archive/>. Gratitude is expressed to *The Times* for permission to reproduce material over which it holds the copyright.

11. See 'Of the Relation between Public Associations and the Newspapers', in A. de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America: Specially Edited and Abridged for the Modern Reader* by Richard D. Heffner (New York: New American Library, 1956), pp. 202–205.

12. J.C. Merrill and H.A. Fisher, *The World's Great Dailies: Profiles of Fifty Newspapers* (New York: Hastings House, 1980), p. 320.

newspaper, a daily to read to keep up with the affairs of empire'.¹³ As such, *The Times* has been regarded as *the* medium for communicating official notices and ecclesiastical news.¹⁴ For this study, the focus was on both primary and secondary sources: Letters to the Editor, news reports and leading articles about cathedral outreach and the formation of the earliest Friends' groups (in cathedrals and in prominent institutions in the heritage sector).¹⁵ For the purposes of this study, it has been assumed that *The Times* (accessed through its digital archive) is a wholly reliable source of primary documentation (such as Letters). But is it a reliable source of secondary material? Naturally, as Olechnowicz observes, 'By their nature ... newspaper comments, may be deliberately biased, or may be suggestive but "unrepresentative"'.¹⁶ Yet, because *The Times* has been recognized throughout its history 'for its thoughtful and interpretive articles, for its calm and rational discourses, and for its selective, but thorough news coverage',¹⁷ and has been regarded as *the* paper to read especially for 'the influential opinion-maker of government, nobility, ruling class',¹⁸ there was no reluctance to rely on its accuracy in reportage of the events and opinions.

Analysis and Discussion

The First Friends' Schemes

The first recorded British museum Friends' group dates from 1909 at the Fitzwilliam in Cambridge.¹⁹ The group was inspired by the example of Les Amis du Louvre in Paris,²⁰ formed in 1897.²¹ The Fitzwilliam Museum now boasts that, all over the world, institutions

13. Merrill and Fisher, *The World's Great Dailies*, p. 322.

14. C. Algar, British Library Newspapers, personal communication, 6 July 2010.

15. Searches were made by keywords (cathedral, Friends; and also place names) and known foundation dates of the Friends' associations.

16. A. Olechnowicz, "'A Jealous Hatred': Royal Popularity and Social Inequality', in A. Olechnowicz (ed.), *The Monarchy and the British Nation 1780 to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 280–314 (283).

17. Merrill and Fisher, *The World's Great Dailies*, p. 329.

18. Merrill and Fisher, *The World's Great Dailies*, p. 320.

19. As reported by Slater, 'An Audit of Friends Schemes', and Heaton, *Museums among Friends*.

20. Fitzwilliam Museum, 'Brief History of the Friends' (Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 2010). Available from: <http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/support/friends/briefhistory.html> (accessed 31 May 2010).

21. Société des Amis du Louvre, 'Accueil' (Paris: The Louvre, 2010). Available from: <http://www.amisdulouvre.fr> (accessed 31 May 2010).

(such as cathedrals) are sustained with the financial and practical support of Friends' organizations like their own.²² Rich and influential Cambridge residents were approached to be Friends of the museum, and the Director used the national press to encourage alumni, undergraduates and other visitors to become loyal subscribers.²³ Around two decades later, Friends' groups were being formed elsewhere in the heritage sector to acquire materials that would otherwise have been beyond reach. One example is the Bodleian Library in Oxford, which claims that its Friends, founded in 1925, is one of the oldest of its kind.²⁴ At the time, the Bodleian was reputed to be by far the poorest of all the great libraries of Europe, with 'hopelessly inadequate' resources.²⁵ The ten shilling minimum annual subscription, regarded as low, was justified as follows:

Though money is of course wanted, the main purpose is to create a personal tie of interest between the Bodleian and all those, whatever their pecuniary position and whether they be members of the University or not, who have at heart the welfare of humane letters and culture as an essential part of the highest civilisation.²⁶

The Friends of the Old Ashmolean in Oxford, formed in 1928, sought from members a minimum annual subscription of only five shillings, in order to create a fund to purchase desirable objects of historic scientific interest.²⁷ A year later, the Friends of the National Libraries was established to assist with the acquisition of such treasures as historical documents, early printed books, and correspondence of eminent people.²⁸

*The State of the Country, the Church of England,
and the Cathedrals in the 1920s/30s*

The 1920s/30s was a troubled period for the country, for the Church of England and for the cathedrals alike. The country's social problems, the despondency in its people in the inter-war years, and the resulting

22. Fitzwilliam Museum, 'Brief History of the Friends'.

23. Fitzwilliam Museum, 'Brief History of the Friends'.

24. Bodleian Library, 'About the Friends' (Oxford: University of Oxford, 2010). Available from: <http://www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/bodley/friends/about> (accessed 31 May 2010).

25. 'Friends of the Bodleian', *The Times* (16 June 1925), p. 17, col. E.

26. 'Friends of the Bodleian', *The Times*.

27. 'Friends of the Old Ashmolean', *The Times* (4 May 1928), p. 23, col. D.

28. 'Friends of the National Libraries', *The Times* (23 October 1929), p. 26, col. D.

north/south divide, are captured by two different histories of the Church of England, thus:

No historian will ever be able to write happily about English history between 1919 and 1939, and it would be hard to find any other period of twenty years in which more people were unhappy, or more people also believed that their unhappiness was neither necessary nor of their own making, but due to some betrayal of the powers-that-be, the custodians and vested interests of the old order, or to the indifference of God himself.²⁹

The inter-war period was characterised by unremitting high levels of unemployment, child poverty and the collapse of entire communities due to structural decay in staple industries. Coal-mining, shipbuilding, the iron and steel industries and the textile industries suffered especially badly, creating intense regional economic crises accentuated by the Wall Street Crash of 1929. In general ... the north and the Midlands fared worse than London and the south.³⁰

Describing domestic politics in the 1930s in his history of English Christianity 1920–85, Hastings also highlights the marked differences between north and south. For example, unemployment among insured workers in 1934 was 44.2 per cent in Gateshead, 67.8 per cent in Jarrow, but only 3.9 per cent in St Albans and 3.3 per cent in High Wycombe.³¹ He explains that heavy unemployment in such northern communities was not an invention of the 1930s; however, this time, it 'certainly lasted longer, was more heavily concentrated in certain areas' and was accompanied by 'a new hopelessness as the industries themselves upon which the people depended for the little they had were so clearly decaying'.³² He also contends that the hopeful south and hopeless north rarely converged:

The marked improvement in living conditions of the south-east was pointing up more emphatically than ever a difference which had always existed. The one was getting richer, the other still poorer; and the two nations seldom met, except when hunger marches from the north were viewed uneasily as they tramped ... through the streets of some southern town. There seemed plenty of hope for the people of High Wycombe in the 1930s, but none at all for those of Jarrow or Gateshead or the mining villages round Bishop Auckland.³³

29. R. Lloyd, *The Church of England, 1900–65* (London: SCM Press, 1966), p. 243.

30. C.G. Brown, *Religion and Society in Twentieth-Century Britain* (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2006), p. 153.

31. A. Hastings, *A History of English Christianity 1920–1985* (London: Fount Paperbacks, 1987), p. 244.

32. Hastings, *A History of English Christianity*, p. 245.

33. Hastings, *A History of English Christianity*, p. 245.

Hylson-Smith portrays a Church of England which, in town and countryside, and at national and local levels, was confused and divided: 'she struggled with a severe identity problem, and she had no vision or great sense of purpose and direction'.³⁴ At the turn of that century, the Church of England entered upon 'forty of the most difficult, exacting, and discouraging years of all her history'.³⁵

At this time, cathedrals were remote from the general populace, not least because sixpenny entrance fees served to deter visitors and pilgrims.³⁶ In 1925, Dean Bennett of Chester wrote about the iniquity of cathedral entrance fees:

What began as a Family House of prayer for all, has come to be regarded as something very like the special property of a small corporation ... it does not strike people as outrageous if the said small corporation charges those to whom the cathedral really belongs, sixpence or a shilling for going round what is their own.³⁷

The aloofness of cathedrals and the low standards of their life and worship hitherto were described by the Archbishop of York in a sermon delivered while on an official visit to Chester in 1925:

Little more than fifty years ago [our English cathedrals] might have been described as the lost heritage of the Church of England. ... Their bodies, so to say, remained beautiful and imperishable, but the soul seemed to have gone. A strange blight seemed to fill their great spaces, and a smell as of death seemed often to pervade them. ... In many dioceses and in many parishes the cathedral is still a place remote and strange. Individuals may enter it sometimes, but it has little place of its own in the corporate life of the Church.³⁸

Then, in 1926, the anonymous Editor of Crockford's clerical directory wrote: 'The Church as a whole is not yet fully alive to the value, actual and potential, of cathedrals'.³⁹ Only three years later, the Editor was able to write about the cathedrals in astonishing terms: 'There is hardly anything more noticeable in the life of the Church than the resurrection - that is not too strong a word to use - of Cathedral Churches'.⁴⁰

34. K. Hylson-Smith, *The Churches in England from Elizabeth I to Elizabeth II: Volume III, 1833-1998* (London: SCM Press, 1998), p. 169.

35. Hylson-Smith, *The Churches in England: Volume III*, p. 169.

36. D.L. Edwards, *The Cathedrals of Britain* (Andover: Pitkin, 1989), p. 39.

37. Cited in Beeson, *The Deans*, p. 126.

38. Cited in Lloyd, *The Church of England*, p. 387.

39. Crockford's Editor, *Crockford's Prefaces: The Editor Looks Back* (London: Oxford University Press, 1947), p. 50.

40. Crockford's Editor, *Crockford's Prefaces*, p. 83.

This was judged all the more remarkable because so many cathedrals had been hampered by lack of revenue for many years.⁴¹ So what had happened to dispel the 'blight' and promote this change?

*A Vision for Cathedrals in the Inter-war Period:
Becoming Useful and Lovable*

Bennett's Pioneering Work at Chester Cathedral. The cathedrals' renaissance had two distinct phases, each with a visionary proponent: first, the cathedrals had to be made useful, and second, they had to be made lovable.⁴² Benson⁴³ is cited as the pioneer of the modern effort (in the previous century) to think through the role of the cathedral; and Bennett⁴⁴ is credited with having the genius to bring a fresh and original mind to the question of a cathedral's purpose in the 1920s.⁴⁵

Chester is recognized as the first to abolish entrance fees.⁴⁶ Four years after Bennett's appointment there as Dean, a journalist provided what has been deemed the best of all the testimonies to his work:⁴⁷

No traveller can enter Chester Cathedral today without feeling at once that it is different from other cathedrals. ... If he is used to the ways of English cathedrals, he may even feel a little ill at ease when he can find no notices forbidding him to do this or that, no locked gates, and not a single official demanding 6 d. He begins by wondering whether he has had the bad luck to be an intruder upon a specially invited party, and whether he ought not apologetically to slip out. A very little perseverance will show him that he, too, has been specially invited, and that all day and every day throughout the year the whole cathedral is open and free and his.⁴⁸

A year later, in a landmark book on the nature of cathedrals,⁴⁹ Bennett declared: 'a cathedral can[not] even begin to do its proper work until it has replaced visitors' fees with pilgrims' offerings'. Commending 'aggressive hospitableness', he aimed to return cathedrals to the people.

41. Crockford's Editor, *Crockford's Prefaces*, p. 83.

42. Lloyd, *The Church of England*, p. 388.

43. Archbishop of Canterbury, 1882–96.

44. Dean of Chester, 1920–37.

45. Lloyd, *The Church of England*, pp. 388–92.

46. Edwards, *The Cathedrals of Britain*, p. 40; Beeson, *The Deans*, p. 127.

47. Lloyd, *The Church of England*, p. 397.

48. 'A Cathedral in Use: New Methods at Chester', *The Times* (31 July 1924), p. 15, col. E.

49. F.S.M. Bennett, *The Nature of a Cathedral* (Chester: Phillipson and Golder Limited; London and Oxford: A.R. Mowbray & Co Limited, 1925).

Bennett's pioneering work is described as 'domesticating a cathedral'.⁵⁰ He transformed Chester from a 'cold and remote institution' into a 'powerhouse of pastoral activity, known and loved by increasingly large numbers of people'.⁵¹ Chester was rendered interesting by displaying notices that explained the purpose of various parts of the cathedral; and Bennett subsequently had the ruined monastic refectory rebuilt, which encouraged parishes and other organizations to visit the cathedral for some religious purpose.⁵² In a moving and solidly evidenced account of Bennett's vision and influence, Lloyd attributes Bennett's genius to his gifts as a pastor (with a profound interest in people, and no sense of class-consciousness), his flair for the right kind of publicity, and his power to persuade people to give money to the cathedral to support his dreams.⁵³

Following the Chester Model: Outreach at other Anglican Cathedrals in England. Lloyd describes Bennett as 'the greatest Dean of his generation'.⁵⁴ For his part, Beeson asserts that Bennett not only transformed his cathedral but also exerted an enormous influence on cathedral life throughout the country;⁵⁵ while Moorman remarks that Bennett 'inspired many cathedral chapters to unlock their doors and welcome the stranger'.⁵⁶

The remarkable effect of parallel changes at Salisbury was captured by the author of a cathedrals guide in 1923. Comparing this cathedral with Chichester and Winchester (where the visitor was said to feel like a trespasser), Gostling wrote: 'at Salisbury all that feeling has been swept away and we are left to stroll about as freely and unconcernedly as though we were in some splendid but rather empty museum'.⁵⁷ The Salisbury Dean subsequently made this observation, published in the second edition of Gostling's cathedrals guide: 'It is far better to

50. H. Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*. V. *The Ecumenical Century, 1900–1965*. VI. *Crisis and Creativity, 1965–Present* (Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 1996), p. 51.

51. R.C.D. Jasper, *George Bell, Bishop of Chichester* (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 36.

52. Beeson, *The Deans*, p. 127; Lloyd, *The Church of England*, p. 397.

53. Lloyd, *The Church of England*, pp. 392–97.

54. Lloyd, *The Church of England*, p. 238.

55. Beeson, *The Deans*, p. 126.

56. J.R.H. Moorman, *A History of the Church of England* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 3rd edn, 1973), p. 426.

57. F.M. Gostling, *The Lure of English Cathedrals (Southern)* (London: Mills & Boon, 2nd edn, 1925), p. 145.

open a house of prayer to all comers ... the atmosphere is quite different since we ceased to make a charge for seeing the cathedral: the voluntary offerings are double what we got by sixpences. But the vergers are always ready to show people round without charge'.⁵⁸

Canterbury is another cathedral to follow the Chester model. After his installation at Canterbury in March 1924, one of Dean Bell's first acts was to visit Chester; he wanted to witness for himself what the Dean had achieved there, determined that 'Canterbury must not lag behind'.⁵⁹ The next year, Bell 'achieved a cherished desire' and abolished entrance fees in his own cathedral for an experimental period of two years.⁶⁰ Though small when considered individually, Bell's improvements at Canterbury (for example, positive notices replacing prohibitory ones, a series of penny leaflets on various features, vergers instructed to allow lady sightseers to enter without hats) are said to have been 'important cumulatively, especially by their psychological effect in welcoming instead of repelling visitors'.⁶¹ At the end of the two-year experiment, the Chapter decided to make the system permanent.⁶² By that stage, experience at Bristol, Chester, Salisbury and Worcester had shown that visitors made voluntary gifts greater than receipts in fees hitherto.⁶³ When Bell was translated to the See of Chichester by the end of that decade, commentators on his appointment remarked upon 'the charming kindness' that he showed to Canterbury pilgrims⁶⁴ and on the 'marked change in the atmosphere at Canterbury Cathedral'.⁶⁵

In 1926, a *Times* correspondent told of the Bristol experiment, which illustrates how Bennett's vision was spreading in the south:

On three Sunday afternoons in August, when the regular choir was on holiday and the 3.30 evensong suspended, the Dean and Chapter opened the whole of Bristol Cathedral to visitors. The Dean and the Sub-Dean announced that they would be there to explain the building and to conduct parties round. The response to this invitation was quite remarkable, the numbers beginning with 250 on the first Sunday and

58. Gostling, *The Lure of English Cathedrals*, p. 187.

59. Jasper, *George Bell*, p. 36.

60. Bell was not prepared to take a risk, and sought guarantors to cover any losses resulting from the experiment; however, no call was made on their generosity. See Jasper, *George Bell*, p. 38.

61. Jasper, *George Bell*, p. 36.

62. Jasper, *George Bell*, pp. 38–39.

63. Jasper, *George Bell*, p. 38.

64. *The Church Times*, 28 March 1929, cited in Jasper, *George Bell*, p. 164.

65. *The English Churchman*, 4 April 1929, cited in Jasper, *George Bell*, p. 164.

rising to double that on the last. Widespread interest in the Cathedral has been aroused ... The experiment has been abundantly justified ... It has been an object lesson in the growing desire on the part of the public to know more about their cathedrals and their readiness to respond to information and guidance when put within their reach.⁶⁶

Also in the south, St Albans provides an example of a cathedral wishing to follow suit. But it did not find the Chester model easy, as two letters to the Editor of *The Times* reveal.⁶⁷ A lay person at St Albans wrote:

The exceedingly interesting article ... that appeared in the Times of 28 July is a challenge to all cathedrals, but the good example set by Chester cannot be followed easily in all places, as circumstances differ. Here, at St Albans, there is a huge church, for the repair of which provision has fortunately been made, but otherwise scantily endowed and dependent on the parochial church council of a comparatively small parish for the upkeep of its constant services and of a choir ... Hitherto a fee of 6d. has been charged for admission ... For some years there has been a widespread desire to abolish this fee and to substitute voluntary offerings, but something over £900 a year is needed to take the place of the "visitors' fund", on which the Cathedral is largely dependent. It has now been resolved to suspend the 6d. fee for a year as an experiment and to appeal to the diocese for a guarantee fund to cover possible loss, though it is hoped that, as at Chester, voluntary offerings will be sufficient and that the guarantors will not be called on to supply any deficiency. ... Perhaps this letter may be of interest as showing that in spite of special difficulties, in spite of poverty, this Cathedral is doing something to follow Chester ... and to rise to the full measure of its responsibility.⁶⁸

It is recounted that, when taking up the Deanship at Durham in 1933, Alington recognized that 'changing social conditions required from the cathedral a changing response': he decided it 'must be open and available to everyone, and not just to the chosen and well-heeled few'.⁶⁹ One of his first innovations was to throw open the cathedral and abolish customary vergers' fees (at the same time, increasing their salaries).

The Canterbury, Bristol and St Albans experiments and the transformation at Salisbury and Durham are but five examples. While

66. 'An Experiment at Bristol Cathedral', *The Times* (24 August 1926), p. 13, col. B.

67. 'St Alban's Abbey', *The Times* (3 September 1924), p. 15, col. C; 'A Cathedral in Use: Letter to the Editor', *The Times* (31 July 1924), p. 8, col. E.

68. 'A Cathedral in Use: Letter to the Editor', *The Times* (31 July 1924).

69. C.J. Stranks, *This Sumptuous Church: The Story of Durham Cathedral* (London: SPCK, 1993), p. 99.

one historian has suggested that Bennett's pioneering work was widely though not quickly followed,⁷⁰ it is the case that the Dean's 1925 manifesto appears to have found relatively widespread favour: in a book published three years later,⁷¹ he recorded that only a few cathedrals then charged fees.⁷² Bennett was thus at the forefront of a spirit of openness which paved the way for an increasing involvement of lay people in the cathedrals, which had been rendered lovable.

The Formation of Cathedral Friends' Associations

It is not surprising that cathedrals should start to make Friends at this time of transformation. Gradually, sixpenny entrance fees were abandoned; and supporters were encouraged to pledge five shilling subscriptions to their cathedrals. After the examples set in the late 1920s by the ancient foundations at Canterbury, Peterborough, York and Exeter, and also at Birmingham (a former parish church), 22 more cathedral Friends' associations were established in the 1930s. Of the remainder, eight associations were founded in the 1940s, one in the 1950s, three in the 1960s (all at newer cathedrals), and one just 20 years ago (as shown in Table 1).

The Benefits of Friendship

Benefits for Cathedrals. The establishment of the new associations was driven primarily by a financial imperative to repair, preserve for future generations and contribute to the upkeep and improvement of the fabric of cathedrals. The new Friends were to complement the efforts of The Pilgrim Trust, which had a special interest in preserving the national architectural heritage.⁷³ It is documented that 'between 1930 and 1949, over £112,000 was provided for the repair and preservation of nineteen cathedrals' by that trust.⁷⁴ But the scale of the task of repairing and preserving the cathedrals was immense. Even with increases in receipts from visitors' gifts and purchases, Canterbury could not maintain its fabric: a report on the structure of the cathedral in 1924 stated that it was in urgent need of repairs

70. Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*, p. 51.

71. F.S.M. Bennett, *On Cathedrals in the Meantime* (London: The Faith Press, 1928).

72. See Beeson, *The Deans*, p. 128.

73. D. Owen, *English Philanthropy 1660–1960* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964), p. 563.

74. Owen, *English Philanthropy*, p. 563.

Table 1. Formation dates of the Friends' Associations at Anglican Cathedrals in England

	Dean and Chapter cathedrals	Parish church cathedrals
1920s	Canterbury, Peterborough, York, Exeter	Birmingham
1930s	Chester, Norwich, Salisbury, Winchester, Worcester, Truro, Hereford, Durham, Wells, Carlisle, Rochester, Ely, Bristol, Gloucester, Lincoln, Lichfield, Manchester, Chichester	Coventry, Newcastle, Bradford, Chelmsford
1940s	Ripon, St Alban's and Oxford, Christ Church (collegiate foundation)	Leicester, Derby, Southwark, Southwell, St Edmundsbury
1950s	London St Paul's	
1960s	Liverpool, Guildford	Blackburn
Later		Portsmouth
Missing data		Sheffield, Wakefield

'Dean and Chapter Cathedral' and 'Parish Church Cathedral' categories follow: Archbishops' Commission on Cathedrals, *Heritage and Renewal* (London: Church House Publishing, 1994).

totalling £100,000.⁷⁵ A more stable income stream was thus required.⁷⁶ In 1927, Dean Bell of Canterbury wrote to the Editor of *The Times*: 'The society [of Friends] is being formed with a simple object. It is to gather round the Cathedral in association with the Dean and Chapter a body of supporters who are prepared to take some share in caring for it and preserving it for posterity'.⁷⁷ The next year, the Dean and Chapter at York Minster followed suit in launching their Friends' organization, highlighting also the need to maintain the costly public worship:

The Dean and Chapter of York Minster, who are responsible for maintaining its fabric and traditions, have formulated a scheme which

75. Jasper, *George Bell*, p. 40.

76. Jasper, *George Bell*, p. 39.

77. "'Friends' of the Cathedral: A New Society', *The Times* (20 July 1927), p. 17, col. G.

will enable others who value the Minster to assist them in their stewardship.

They have organised like Canterbury and other old foundations, a society which is to be called 'The Friends of York Minster'. Its immediate objects are to maintain worthily alike the services, which are inevitably costly, and the fabric, which is making abnormally heavy demands at the present time in respect of its stonework, its roofs and especially its unique heritage of stained glass.

An annual subscription of 5 s. will admit to membership, and already subscriptions varying from that amount to £20 have been received or promised.⁷⁸

In launching his new association in 1935, the Dean of Rochester emphasized that those beyond the immediate locality of the cathedral were encouraged to take a share in its preservation:

We are ... asking all who care for this venerable church, whether they live in Kent or outside it, to join the Association of Friends of Rochester Cathedral, and thus to help the Dean and Chapter to bear the responsibility of preserving for future generations a building which stands for so much in the history of our National Church.⁷⁹

In their letter to the Editor of *The Times* four years later, the proponents at Chichester also explained that their new association was aimed not only at those in close proximity: 'in response to many requests a Society of Friends of Chichester Cathedral has been formed in order to draw together all those in Sussex and elsewhere who have an interest in the Cathedral'.⁸⁰

The association at Lincoln was formed in 1936, three years after a special service of thanksgiving to mark the completion of repairs that had necessitated the raising of approximately £130,000 (mostly from individual Americans and The Pilgrim Trust);⁸¹ ten years earlier the state of the building had been 'so bad that its complete collapse was not beyond the range of possibility'.⁸² In July 1936, the Dean of

78. 'The Friends of York Minster', *The Times* (19 May 1928), p. 16, col. C.

79. F. Underhill, 'Cathedral at Rochester: An Association of Friends. Letter to the Editor', *The Times* (8 February 1935), p. 10, col. C.

80. Leconfield *et al.*, 'Friends of Chichester Cathedral. To the Editor of The Times', *The Times* (25 March 1939), p. 8, col. D.

81. To underscore the magnitude of this sum, it is worth noting that the estimated cost of building the entire cathedral in the new Diocese of Guildford was only £120,000 more (see Crockford's Editor, *Crockford's Prefaces*, p. 150).

82. Crockford's Editor, *Crockford's Prefaces*, p. 140.

Lincoln wrote to the Editor of *The Times* to explain the continuing need for extra funds.⁸³

Gloucester is also a prime example of a cathedral whose chief motivation in establishing an association was the funding of repairs. The Cathedral Architect had drawn up three lists of works that were deemed 'essential' (including the tower and nave roofs: total estimated costs £9,500), 'desirable' (£12,000), and 'expedient' (£600). Presiding at the launch meeting in the Guildhall there on 24 September 1936, the Dean observed that when Gloucester became a cathedral church after 1541 no provision was made for a fabric fund. An article in *The Times* reported:

It had been concluded that about £400 yearly, apart from the wages of workmen employed, was the normal expense of the fabric, but that did not include any special demands which might suddenly arise and prove far beyond the means of the Dean and Chapter. Those who had the trusteeship of Gloucester Cathedral proposed to form a band of friends similar to that at Canterbury, for the Dean and Chapter wanted to take up some tasks that were crying aloud to be taken up.⁸⁴

While other cathedrals were attempting to fund repairs and to preserve their buildings for future generations, the new Dean of Durham may have been unusual in seeking funds from his Friends' association to improve his cathedral. A successor Dean captures Alington's original intention thus: 'any monies subscribed by the Friends should be used for the embellishment of the cathedral rather than for its general repair and upkeep'.⁸⁵ To this end, the Friends' first Annual General Meeting resolved that their primary objective was 'to restore some of the damage done in past generations by mistaken zeal or sheer wanton destruction'.^{86,87} However, by the end of the subsequent decade, Alington found it necessary to ask the AGM to

83. R.A. Mitchell, 'Friends of Lincoln. To the Editor of The Times', *The Times* (31 July 1936), p. 15, col. F.

84. 'Friends of Gloucester Cathedral: Urgent Fabric Repairs', *The Times* (25 September 1936), p. 16, col. D.

85. Stranks, *This Sumptuous Church*, p. 100.

86. Stranks, *This Sumptuous Church*, pp. 99–100.

87. For example, in 1935, the Friends approved a plan to substitute a wooden lectern for a brass one designed by Gilbert Scott (at a cost of £700) and erected sixty years earlier, but which was regarded as 'pretentious' and unsuitable for its position in the cathedral (Stranks, *This Sumptuous Church*, p. 104). Only in 1977 was the use of 'blunt and tendentious words' on the front cover of the Friends' annual report discontinued (see Stranks, *This Sumptuous Church*, p. 100).

vary the objectives to enable income to be used not only for 'luxuries' but also for regular expenditure.⁸⁸

Thus, the most direct way that the cathedrals benefitted from their new-found Friends was through income from the annual subscriptions. The newspaper extracts have revealed that there was uniformity in the setting of the initial subscriptions at five shillings. However, in a memorandum to the Canterbury Chapter dated 22 November 1926, Dean Bell had initially suggested a subscription of ten shillings or one pound; eventually, 'in order to make the basis of the society as wide as possible' the minimum subscription was fixed at five shillings.⁸⁹ An annual subscription at that level would have been equivalent to ten sixpenny cathedral visits. In 1930, five shillings had the same spending power of today's £8.36.⁹⁰ However, Baldwin (the historian of the Exeter Friends' association) notes that when a good weekly wage in 1930 was £3 and an annual income of £1,000 meant affluence, even five shillings was not a trivial amount.⁹¹

While the importance of the new Friends' financial support cannot be underestimated, Friends' support through prayer may have been valued as highly as their financial contributions in at least one setting. Explaining the aims of the new association at Norwich, a journalist wrote: 'The object of the society will be to bind together in a strong fellowship all who have loved the Cathedral Church and are anxious to help it. This help can be given in various ways, spiritual even more than material'.⁹²

Benefits for Friends. The greater proportion of the benefits of the new-found Friendship accrued to the cathedrals, but the relationship was not asymmetrical. Although the subscribers may not have given with the expectation of return, it was possible to point to some membership benefits for Friends (either tangible or more esoteric). For example, despite the earnest nature of the task in hand, a remark from a participant at the Gloucester launch illustrates that the benefits of joining were not wholly reckoned in tangible terms: 'membership of

88. Stranks, *This Sumptuous Church*, p. 101.

89. Jasper, *George Bell*, p. 39.

90. According to The National Archives currency converter, available at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency> (accessed on 22 December 2009).

91. J. Baldwin, *The History of The Friends* (2004), available from: <http://www.exeter-cathedral.org.uk/communities/thefriends/the-history-of-the-friends> (accessed on 28 September 2009).

92. 'Friends of Norwich Cathedral: Gifts from the King and Queen', *The Times* (3 February 1930), p. 9, col. D.

the Society of Cathedral Friends created a tie between them and a famous cathedral that must give pleasure'.⁹³

In particular, the new Friends benefitted from information about the cathedrals. For example, the Durham Dean declared: 'It is ... hoped that through the association ... it will be possible to keep the Friends of the Cathedral in touch with what is done and contemplated - an object which has been so admirably attained by the other similar associations which I have mentioned'.⁹⁴ Subsequently, a journalist echoed the Dean's remarks:

Even the Friends who live far away oversea (and there are many) can keep in touch with their friend the cathedral through such publications as those put forth by the Friends of Canterbury. The effect is a great increase in well-informed and intelligent appreciation of the many elements that make up the life of that very lively entity, a cathedral church.⁹⁵

While informing cathedrals' supporters through annual reports, the Friends' associations were also assembling invaluable historical records about their cathedrals. The cumulative effect of the reports is evidenced by this extract from a volume commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the installation in 1941 of a Dean of York:

The Annual Reports of the Friends of York Minster ... constitute a record of considerable historical importance. They tell not only of the acquisition of ornaments and furnishings, of restoration and adornment, but also recount year by year much of Minster life and the doings of its clergy and officers.⁹⁶

Cathedrals and Social Action Projects: Friends Making Up a Funding Shortfall

The motivations of certain cathedrals forming Friends were somewhat different. In a humble tone, the Dean of Durham wrote to the Editor of *The Times*:

While the Dean and Chapter have no desire to evade their responsibilities for the major needs of the Cathedral and hope to be able adequately to deal with them, there are many minor works of

93. 'Friends of Gloucester Cathedral: Urgent fabric repairs', *The Times* (25 September 1936), p. 16, col. D.

94. C. Alington, 'Friends of Durham Cathedral: A New Association Formed', *The Times* (10 October 1933), p. 10, col. D.

95. 'Friends of Cathedrals', *The Times* (21 January 1937), p. 13, col. E.

96. R.T. Holtby (ed.), *Eric Milner-White: A Memorial* (Chichester: Phillimore & Co, 1991), pp. 3-4.

reparation and improvement which they cannot easily afford, especially since their recent decision to assign half the money contributed by visitors to the relief of distress in the City and County of Durham.⁹⁷

Accordingly, they looked to new Friends to fund repairs and improvements, by making up for a shortfall arising from an effort to alleviate poverty in the immediate vicinity. However, there appears to be a paradox: here was a cathedral seeking funds from new Friends to embellish itself, while at the same time assisting efforts to relieve poverty in the locality. Notwithstanding the incongruity, it is significant that, by heralding the altruistic effort within his appeal to Friends, the Dean is demonstrating that he and the Chapter are sympathetic to the distress of the people in the north-east, that the cathedral is no longer remote from everyday concerns, and that (to quote Stranks) it is there not just for 'the well-heeled few'.

The Durham decision chimed with a call from Archbishops Temple and Cosmo Lang for the Church to support the people in economic distress,⁹⁸ and preceded, by only a few months, the national cathedral pilgrimage during the first fortnight of July 1934. Following the example of the King and Queen (who became pilgrims to Westminster Abbey), thousands of people bought tickets to visit at least one cathedral and wore a badge to show they had made a donation for the comfort and health of the unemployed in the distressed and derelict areas of the country.⁹⁹ Encouraged by the special pilgrimage prayer (which referred to the suffering of 'needless want in a world where plenty abounds'), pilgrims were invited to give half a crown, or a shilling, or just a penny or two (according to their ability to pay) to demonstrate solidarity with those lacking employment. Lloyd's account records that pilgrims thronged to Durham Cathedral and contributed the most they could spare, even though some were too poor even to afford a sixpenny badge.¹⁰⁰

In 1934, the Dean of Carlisle followed his counterparts' examples, writing to the Editor of *The Times*:

At a meeting held in this city on June 25 by invitation of the Dean and Chapter it was resolved to form a Company of Friends of Carlisle

97. Alington, 'Friends of Durham Cathedral'.

98. Brown, *Religion and Society in Twentieth-Century Britain*, p. 148.

99. Lloyd, *The Church of England*, pp. 399–401; 'The Cathedral Pilgrimage: Disposal of the Fund', *The Times* (7 July 1934), p. 9, col. E. In total, over £10,000 was raised. See 'Cathedral Pilgrimage', *The Times* (25 October 1934), p. 12. Col. F.

100. Lloyd, *The Church of England*, p. 400.

Cathedral. Last year we celebrated the eight hundredth anniversary of the founding of the See, and the moment seems to us to be specially opportune for inviting all our well-wishers to help us in preserving the legacy for so many centuries.¹⁰¹

Like Durham, Carlisle was committing some existing funds to social welfare concerns. Mindful of these other calls on diocesan resources at this testing time, the Carlisle Dean continued:

We are well aware that the present may seem hardly the best time for such an undertaking, and it is equally certain that we can expect little help from this diocese, which is already struggling its hardest to finance the building of three new churches and to supply the pressing needs of our local hospital. We believe, nevertheless, that there may be many of our more distant friends who will be inspired even now to join us in this venture.¹⁰²

Challenged by the need to fund charitable work in their wider dioceses, these cathedrals looked to a new constituency to support their own fabric. In one sense, this broad aim would appear to chime with calls from secretaries of some other philanthropic agencies in the inter-war period for a 'broadening [of] the base of support': acutely aware that ordinary income failed to keep pace with rising costs, and foreseeing an inevitable reduction in the larger reservoirs of benevolence, they too recognized that new sources of revenue had to be found.¹⁰³

Parish Church Cathedral Friends

As Table 1 reveals, over four-fifths of the Dean and Chapter Cathedrals had established Friends' groups by the end of the 1930s, whereas little over one-third of the Parish Church Cathedrals had followed suit.

The Parish Church Cathedrals have been regarded as a problematic group,¹⁰⁴ and their evolution since the nineteenth century has been described as 'hesitant, muddled and beset by unclear aims and considerable self-doubt'.¹⁰⁵ Indeed, Dean Bennett of Chester argued

101. 'Friends of Carlisle Cathedral. Letter to the Editor', *The Times* (6 July 1934), p. 10, col. D.

102. 'Friends of Carlisle Cathedral. Letter to the Editor', *The Times* (6 July 1934), p. 10, col. D.

103. Owen, *English Philanthropy*, p. 528.

104. P.S. Morrish, 'Parish-Church Cathedrals, 1836–1931: Some Problems and their Solution', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 49.3 (1998), pp. 434–64.

105. M. Sadgrove, 'Cathedrals and Urban Life', in S. Platten and C. Lewis (eds.), *Dreaming Spires? Cathedrals in a New Age* (London: SPCK, 2006), p. 95.

passionately against the principle of choosing old parish churches to be cathedrals in newly created dioceses.¹⁰⁶

Those Parish Church Cathedrals that have minimal historic endowments and are not buildings of national importance on main tourist routes have been doubly disadvantaged.¹⁰⁷ But the scale of Parish Church Cathedrals and their retention of parish structures may have rendered financial assistance from a fresh body of supporters less vital in the early twentieth century. The failure of the search of *The Times* to yield news reports or correspondence regarding the early Friends at Parish Church Cathedrals implies that their formation may not have had the widespread appeal of the associations at the ancient foundations.

*The National Movement to Establish Cathedral Friends
Gathers Momentum*

As the national movement to form cathedral Friends' associations gathered momentum, leading articles in *The Times* followed its progress. Commenting upon Friends' Festivals held at Canterbury and Norwich cathedrals, a columnist referred to Friends as a 'pleasing notion'; and, recollecting the Fitzwilliam and the Bodleian, analysed the motivations and responsibilities of those who joined such societies:

Some of the libraries and museums have their Friends. In all such cases the first and simplest duty of a Friend is to give all the money he can spare, because there is not in all England a Cathedral, an institution, even a parish church, which is not in sore need of money for mere self-preservation. Next to money come gifts in kind ... And outside all giving of material things lies the illimitable services of other kinds, without which all the giving would lack the true fire of benevolence and fail of its complete effect. To put it bluntly, what these recipients really want is not charity but love. That is where Cathedrals have a pull over museums. It is not hard to love the Bodleian; and the Fitzwilliam has been known to arouse an even passionate devotion. But it is impossible not to love one of the great English Cathedrals. Its daily life and its continuous being engage all the arts and please nearly all the senses. It appeals to the intellect, but also to the deepest and shyest of the emotions.¹⁰⁸

106. See Sadgrove, 'Cathedrals and Urban Life', p. 85.

107. Sadgrove, 'Cathedrals and Urban Life', pp. 93–94.

108. 'Cathedrals and their Friends', *The Times* (25 July 1931), p. 13, col. E.

The columnist elaborated the paradigm of a cathedral as a focus of different sorts of activity, and referred to the love that Friends at home and overseas perpetuated and propagated for their cathedrals:

Less and less is a Cathedral thought of as an ancient building that may be seen in bits for sixpence. The ideal of a Cathedral today is a centre of many kinds of active life and art and work; and while English people in the far ends of the earth, as well as at home, may well dream over the ancient beauty of their own Cathedral – be it Canterbury or Norwich or another – the love which these bodies of Friends maintain and spread demands more than a dream for sustenance.¹⁰⁹

Six years later, a leading article developed the notion of such Friendship as a reciprocal endeavour involving both parties. The opening paragraph observed that ‘Friends of Cathedrals’ was a phrase that had ‘become so familiar that few find anything odd in it’. The writer continued:

Yet, a cathedral is a queer thing to be a friend of. ... The words become a little more intelligible when it is remembered that it takes two to make a friendship. From which side came the first advance? It came from the cathedrals – or rather from one particular cathedral. Nearly fifty years ago Truro, then the youngest of the cathedrals, started a Truro Cathedral Union; but it was Chester Cathedral which first realised, something less than twenty years ago, that, if a cathedral wants friends, it had better begin by being friendly.¹¹⁰

As has been described above, the friendly act which Chester was said to have committed was to open its doors freely to the public, and *The Times* leader writer observed that this paid dividends: ‘the gain in interest, in knowledge, in good will, in friendship was incalculable’. The spirit of Friendship spread, and this 1937 journalist noted that ‘it is today almost universal’. Elsewhere in that edition of the newspaper, an article about the formation of Lichfield Cathedral’s Friends opened with the observation: ‘The 1937 programmes of the Friends of the Cathedrals, though not everywhere complete, are well advanced. In the last six years the movement has made rapid progress and is now represented in some 30 cathedrals of England and Wales.’¹¹¹

109. ‘Cathedrals and their Friends’, *The Times* (25 July 1931), p. 13, col. E.

110. ‘Friends of Cathedrals’, *The Times* (21 January 1937), p. 13, col. E.

111. ‘Friends of Cathedrals: Fellowship of St Chad at Lichfield’, *The Times* (21 January 1937), p. 15, col. G.

Conclusions

Analysis of the primary and secondary sources has revealed that, during a period of transformation in the Anglican cathedrals in England, new Friends' associations were formed to encourage local and more distant well-wishers to make annual donations to maintain and to preserve for posterity the fabric of these important buildings. At Canterbury Cathedral, which set the trend, it was a calculated decision to pitch the annual subscription at a relatively low level. This may have broadened the appeal of the associations, and served to encourage the general public to add their names to the membership rolls.

The cathedrals had acknowledged that it takes two to make a friendship: prior to making Friends, cathedrals became friendly through a focused outreach strategy (which, among other acts, involved abandoning sixpenny entrance fees). Thus, a particular value in focusing on the history of the cathedral Friends' movement is that it highlights the history of the cathedrals themselves in this inter-war period.

The survey has also demonstrated the importance to both sides of the dyad of creating an informed supporter base. The geographical spread of the Friends' membership necessarily led to differences in the strengths of ties between the cathedrals and those who held a deep affection for them. Accordingly, keeping in touch through publications was an important aspect of the early Friends' scheme concept; and journalists' commentaries have demonstrated that publications were expected to engender a well-informed appreciation of the cathedral. Such reciprocity in the relationship (however limited) doubtless reinforced the bonds of love and affection, and helped to sustain the supporter base.

Additionally, it has been shown that, in certain instances, new funds raised through Friendship directly replaced cathedral/diocesan resources being deployed in more needy settings. There are limited grounds to suppose there may have been a north/south divide in the motivations of the deans and chapters who formed the new associations. In the north of England, where regional economic crises hit the populace particularly hard, Friends supported repairs and maintenance, while their cathedral/diocese took a share in social welfare. In sources concerning cathedrals in the more affluent south of England, where employment was comparatively high, no evidence has been uncovered of the early Friends' movement indirectly helping to sustain such altruism.

There has also been shown to be a divide between the more ancient foundations and the cathedrals that were originally parish churches,

in so far as the early Friends' associations were predominantly founded at Dean and Chapter cathedrals. Winning new Friends may have been less important to parish church cathedrals; but, in reality, their capacity to arouse passionate devotion and attract this new type of supporter may not have seemed as great as that of the historic cathedrals.

A limitation of the analysis may be perceived to be its relatively heavy reliance on a national newspaper for primary and some secondary sources. Four points can be made in response to such a charge. First, it has long been recognized that there is a pivotal link between newspapers and voluntary associations.¹¹² Second, it is noteworthy that, like other elements in the nation,¹¹³ cathedrals appear to have been actively using the press (in this case, *The Times*) to attract comment. In the spirit of outreach, cathedrals were enhancing their visibility and popularity through this mechanism. Third, the study's use of material sourced elsewhere (from biographies, cathedral stories, a cathedrals guide and Church histories) has provided a measure of triangulation. Fourth, a study of cathedral Chapter minutes and archival material from the Friends' associations themselves might illuminate further the rationale for founding these groups, the earliest of which date from a time when the Church of England was riven by ecclesiastical politics.

The companion study of the present-day cathedral Friends' associations, as revealed in their published literature,¹¹⁴ demonstrates that there are at least five noteworthy differences between Friends now and then. First, there was a directness and simplicity in the initial approaches in the 1920s and 1930s: appeals tended to come straight from Deans to potential Friends, whereas the relationship between Friends and cathedrals nowadays is most likely to be mediated through formal associations. Second, Friends' groups today are evidently generators not only of financial resources for the cathedrals, but also of opportunities for social networking for the members (through rich programmes of social events). Third, the associations appear to act as pathways into volunteering, providing working Friends who assist the cathedrals in practical ways (such as stewards and guides, information desk staff, flower arrangers and cleaners). A fourth point of difference,

112. De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*.

113. See, for example, P. Williamson, 'The Monarchy and Public Values 1910–1953' in A. Olechnowicz (ed.), *The Monarchy and the British Nation 1780 to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 223–57.

114. Muskett, 'Cathedrals Making Friends'.

in relation to some associations, is a stated aim to beautify and enhance their cathedral; additionally, some publications make reference to special projects that would not come to fruition without the Friends' assistance. A fifth point of disparity is the scale of benefits that accrue to members. Whereas it was sufficient to reward the first Friends with esoteric benefits such as pleasure and information, present-day Friends may receive a bundle of fiscal benefits, in addition to regular mailings.

Fiscal benefits of Friendship with a cathedral now might include discounts in the shop/refectory and free entry if it levies a charge. This highlights a sobering difference between some of today's cathedrals and those that adopted Bennett's model. The year 1973 saw the reintroduction of an entry charge,¹¹⁵ at a cathedral struggling with a deficit.¹¹⁶ In some smaller cathedrals and those beyond the main tourist routes, charges also became essential in order to remain open, whereas in other places, charges had the welcome effect of limiting the number of visitors and recovering 'the calm'.¹¹⁷ Charging for admission has been controversial.¹¹⁸ Further, when the cost of entry is around half a Friends' annual subscription,¹¹⁹ there is a temptation to view Friends' membership in a new way: less an act of devotion and more the acquisition of an annual pass.

The differences in the Friends' schemes past and present may give the impression that Friends today are not necessarily supporters of mainstream cathedral activity in the exact manner of their forebears. Moreover, as groups that receive privileged treatment and some of whose members may have a regular on-site presence through

115. See 'Cathedral Charges for Admission', *The Times* (2 August 1973), p. 2, col. A.

116. 'Cathedral Charges for Admission', *The Times*. Salisbury, the first, charged 10 pence for adult admission, in an experimental scheme.

117. J. Kennedy, 'Conservation and Renewal', in Platten and Lewis (eds.), *Dreaming Spires?*, pp. 115–28.

118. For the rationale, see, for example: English Tourist Board, *English Cathedrals and Tourism: Problems and Opportunities* (London: English Tourist Board, 1979), pp. 7 and 15; Archbishops' Commission on Cathedrals, *Heritage and Renewal* (London: Church House Publishing, 1994), pp. 147–50. For discussion, see, for example, R. Lewis, 'Cathedrals and Tourism', in I.M. MacKenzie (ed.), *Cathedrals Now: Their Use and Place in Society* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1996), pp. 25–41; F. Field, 'Why Cathedrals Matter: The Friends of Chester Cathedral Autumn Lecture, 22 October 2009', in *Friends of Chester Cathedral Newsletter*, January 2010, pp. 4–5.

119. For example, 2011 adult entry to Canterbury Cathedral, £9 (compared with annual membership of The Friends, £22); entry to York Minster, £9 (Friends, £20); entry to St Paul's, London, £14.50 (Friends, £20).

volunteering, there might also be an anxiety that, as elsewhere in the heritage sector, Friends have become a potential 'thorn in the side' of their organization¹²⁰ and represent stakeholders who expect to enjoy a disproportionate amount of influence there.¹²¹ Thus, there is particular merit in reflecting on the characteristics of the earliest Friends' groups, and the directness and simplicity of the bond between cathedral and loyal supporter.

120. A. Slater, 'Strategies for Success', *Journal of Arts Marketing* 19 (2005), pp. 16–17.

121. L. Blackadder, 'Influential Friends', *Journal of Arts Marketing* 9 (2005), pp. 6–7.