

The Journal
of the
Friends' Historical
Society

VOLUME 48 NUMBER 4 AUTUMN 1957

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY
FRIENDS HOUSE • EUSTON ROAD • LONDON N.W.1

also obtainable at Friends Book Store :
302 Arch Street, Philadelphia 6, Pa., U.S.A.

Price 5s. Yearly 10s.

Contents

	PAGE
Editorial	145
John Woolman and Susanna Lightfoot. <i>Ormerod Greenwood</i>	147
Reports on Archives	156
New Evidence of Francis Mercury Van Helmont's Relations with the Quakers. <i>Grace B. Sherrer</i> ..	157
Quakers and Politics	162
Friends and the American Civil War: the <i>Trent</i> Affair <i>David Large</i>	163
Quakerism in a Country Town. <i>Roger H. M. Warner</i>	168
Quakerism in an Industrial Town. <i>J. Clement Jones</i>	170
Marriage Discipline of Early Friends. <i>R. S. Mortimer</i>	175
James Logan	196

Journals and Supplements Wanted

F.H.S. would be glad to receive, and in some cases to buy unwanted copies of the following. Address to F.H.S., The Library, Friends House, London, N.W.1.

Journal: Vol. 37 (1940); Vol. 46, No. 1 (1954).

The London (Quaker) Lead Co. By Arthur Raistrick. 1938.

Psychical Experiences of Quaker Ministers. By John W. Graham. 1933.

Appeal to Members

During the last two or three years the Committee has made repeated efforts to gain new members for the Friends' Historical Society. The Society needs also the help of members in getting new subscribers.

You are invited to do one of these things:

- (1) Encourage someone who does not wish to subscribe to give a donation.
- (2) Increase your own subscription above the minimum 10s. per annum.
- (3) Send an annual subscription as a gift to someone else.
- (4) Remind your Monthly or Preparative Meeting that it may become an Institutional Member for 10s. a year.

THE JOURNAL
OF THE
FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Publishing Office: Friends House, Euston Road, London, N.W.1.

Communications should be addressed to the Editor at
Friends House.

Editorial

AT a well-attended meeting of the Society held at Friends House on 5th December, under the Chairmanship of Alfred W. Braithwaite, the presidential address was given by John L. Nickalls on "Some Quaker Portraits, certain and uncertain." Illustrations, some of which were in colour, were projected during the address. Many of them were made by George Edwards who also very kindly lent and operated the projector.

By way of introduction, the speaker dealt briefly with the limitations imposed by early Quaker simplicity on any interest in portraits, and he touched upon the change towards greater freedom in the matter which took place gradually in the first half of the nineteenth century. The main part of the address was devoted to an examination of various traditional portraits which have been claimed to represent James Nayler, George Fox and William Penn. Some assessment of each supposed portrait was attempted, calling in evidence of authenticity and date provided by the portrait itself, documentary record of the history of the portrait and its descent, and verbal descriptions by contemporaries of the subject's personal appearance.

Three portraits of James Nayler, three or four of George Fox, and a larger number of William Penn were considered, and some tentative judgments were suggested in the light of evidence discovered up to the present. The possibility of publication with the necessary illustrations is being considered.

The meeting was preceded by a tea and presentation in the Library at Friends House to mark the retirement of

John Nickalls as Librarian to the Society of Friends in London.

John Nickalls, editor of the current standard edition of George Fox's *Journal*, editor since 1933 and this year's president of the Friends' Historical Society, and for the past thirty years Librarian to the Society of Friends, is the first to have held that post wholly during the period when the London headquarters of the Society have been at Friends House. John Nickalls has continued the now traditional link between the Library and the Historical Society. Without the Library and the continuous service which the staff there give to Quaker studies in all sorts of fields, the Society of Friends, and the Historical Society in particular would be infinitely the poorer.

We welcome the new Librarian, Edward H. Milligan, as the fourth friend of Quaker historians in succession to Norman Penney, Ethel Crawshaw and John Nickalls.

We are glad to print below a minute received from the Friends Historical Association of Philadelphia on the retirement of John Nickalls.

R.S.M.

Copy of minute recorded by the Friends Historical Association of Philadelphia, held 4th mo. 4th, 1957.

"The retirement in the Autumn of this year, of John L. Nickalls, Librarian of the Society of Friends of London Yearly Meeting, marks the conclusion of a long term of service, of which all interested in Quaker history have been beneficiaries. He began work in Friends Library in 1921, and was appointed Librarian at the beginning of 1927. In 1933 he also succeeded Norman Penney in the naturally associated capacity of Editor of the *Journal of the Friends Historical Society*. In 1952 his painstaking and experienced editing ability was illustrated by the *Journal of George Fox* as published in that tercentenary year. The routine work of the Library and correspondence have prevented his own capacities for authorship having much chance for display. But he has delighted to help others. The acknowledgment of his help in prefaces of dozens of the important publications on Quaker subjects in recent decades are a genuine tribute to his substantial, if modest, contribution to Quaker historiography, and in this tribute, this Association gladly joins."

NOTE

This volume will run to six issues instead of four as previously stated.

John Woolman and Susanna Lightfoot

His unpublished letter to her

IT seems improbable that a major Woolman document should still be lying, unknown and unprinted, in Friends House Library; yet such appears to be the case. There are, in fact, two copies there, one in MS. Portfolio 31 (88), and the other in the Catchpool MSS., Vol. II, 305, on which the text below is based. Two other copies are known: one (which I have collated) in the Proctor Commonplace Book, in possession of Mr. Spence Sanders, of Farnham Common; the other (which I have not seen) in the Nicholson MSS., belonging to Liverpool Friends' Meeting. No American copies are known to me; but the practice of copying such epistles into commonplace books, under the injunction: "Gather up the fragments that remain" was so frequent, that perhaps others may still be found, and from them it may be possible to establish the date and the occasion of the letter, at present unknown. The three copies I have seen have neither date nor place; they show about 50 small verbal differences of little importance. It is likely, however, that the letter belongs to the last years of Woolman's life, and it can hardly be earlier than the summer of 1764, when Susanna went to settle with her second husband, Thomas Lightfoot, in Uwchlan, Chester County, Penna., a place well known to readers of Woolman's *Journal*.

That, however, was not the beginning of the acquaintance between Susanna and John Woolman. But, since she is one of the forgotten figures of eighteenth century Quakerism, unmentioned (for instance) in Rufus Jones's *Later Periods of Quakerism*, or Elfrida Vipont's *The Story of Quakerism*, perhaps a brief biography may be of value. It is based on the account in Comly's *Friends' Miscellany* (1836), Vol. IX, 2, and that of John Gough in *Friends' Library* (1838), Vol. II, 460 (see also IV, 262; X, 444; XI, 49-59). There are many other passing references to her in the journals of eighteenth century ministering Friends, always affectionate and approving.

Susanna, daughter of John and Margaret Hudson, was born 10th of 1st mo. 1720 (N.S.) at Grange, Co. Antrim, in

Northern Ireland. Her parents were Friends, but her father died young and she was put out to service; she remained devoted to the Society, and in her teens walked miles to attend meetings, and "laboured hard to make up the time to her master and mistress." It is a great mistake to suppose, as we often do, that eighteenth century ministers were all old in years; Susanna appeared in the ministry at seventeen, being taken (she said on her death-bed) "as from the milking-pail."

Her call came through John Hunt of London, who later settled in America, that "great, wise and experienced minister and elder" as John Pemberton called him—not the same as John Woolman's cousin of the same name. John Hunt prophesied in an Irish country meeting, before he had yet met her, that there was one present who would "go forth to publish the glad tidings of the gospel." Recalling the occasion forty years later as she lay dying, Susanna remembered that "Friends remarked, that there was nobody for it but Susy,—which exceedingly humbled me." Perhaps it was this humility, which she kept all her life, which endeared her to John Woolman. She called back a young woman Friend who had visited her in her last illness to say to her: "Dear child, be humble; for it is in the low valley of humility that the Lord will teach thee of his ways."

Susanna Hudson had plenty of opportunity for practising humility, for Friends at the time kept their "station in life" even while acknowledging spiritual equality. She took service with Ruth Courtney, a ministering Friend, and in 1737 travelled with her to America. Perhaps a little human jealousy of her gifted maid was mingled with the ministry they shared, for John Gough recorded that Ruth Courtney "made her not only wash their linen constantly, but supply with her own hands the horses with hay and oats, and rub them with straw several times a day, and would let no other Friend's servants intermeddle. Her public services in meetings were generally acceptable to Friends, and they pitied her." Susanna was not only eloquent, she was beautiful; proposals of marriage followed her. But her first choice was unfortunate. In 1742 she married Jesse (some accounts call him Joseph) Hatton, a linen weaver; Friends collected thirty pounds to set them up in a huckster's shop in Lisburn. "Whilst she was capable of attending to it," says John

Gough, "the shop seemed likely to do well, but having twins a second time, and having them both to nurse, as soon as she could inspect the state of affairs, she found them neglected and impaired." The shop was sold up, and the Hattons moved first to Lurgan, and later to Waterford, in a vain search for financial stability and prosperity. Persecution was added to the private trials she endured, but "through all these things, she grew brighter and more excellent in her ministry . . . not one in those large [Irish] meetings rose up with that Divine authority and dignity that she did."

In 1759 her husband died; and in 1760, having apprenticed her older children and left the younger ones in the care of Friends, she travelled for the second time to America, and spent two years in the ministry, through New England and as far south as Charleston, Carolina. It was on this second journey that the friendship of John Woolman and Susanna Hatton began. They were both of an age; Susanna was 41 and John Woolman about to have his 41st birthday when they attended, with other Friends, the Indian Treaty at Easton in the autumn of 1761. The Indian chief, Papunahung, whom John Woolman visited two years later at Wyalusing, brought his wife with him and Susanna Hatton spoke at a meeting with her and the other squaws, with "such a remarkable display of the tendering power of Divine Grace over the Indians that several Friends present declared that they never saw the like before."¹

It was during this American visit that Thomas Lightfoot, brother of William Lightfoot who accompanied John Woolman on part of his Indian journey, met and fell in love with Susanna Hatton. After she had returned to Ireland he followed her there and proposed to her; they were married in September of 1763, and in the following summer she took several of her children with her to settle in Uwchlan.

Her second marriage was one of deep affection. "I never grieved thee willingly. Our life was one continued scene of love to each other," said Thomas at the end.²

Sensitive as she was, Susanna soon felt bowed down with the coming Revolution; and proclaimed again and again "the approach of a stormy trying time, that would shake the

¹ MS. account in Boston Public Library, quoted in Gummere, *Journal of John Woolman* (1922), p. 81.

² Susanna Lightfoot died at Uwchlan, 8.v.1781, aged 61 years.

sandy foundations of formal, or mere nominal professors." Perhaps it was this dark mood of Cassandra-like prophecy in a time of the breaking of nations, or some more private grief, which John Woolman answered in the letter which follows. Here, more than anywhere even in the Journal, he reveals the dark night of the soul which he sometimes knew, in phrases that have none of the careful simplicity of the Journal, but pour out in breathless profusion, the more moving from their formless and impetuous flood.

ORMEROD GREENWOOD

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM JOHN WOOLMAN
TO SUSANNA LIGHTFOOT

Undated.

In the fellowship of true & unfeigned love, that unites the hearts of the faithful in a joint communion one with another, do I dearly salute thee; even that communion that begets a sympathy in Spirit, to partake in some degree of the state of one another as Members of one body in the mystery that the World knows not of; for by this communion the members are not insensible of the state one of another, and if one member suffers, the other suffers with it; and if one rejoices or abounds the rest are rejoiced in a degree of the same abounding love; by this there is help communicated without partiality or sinister views, according to the proportion of that Love which is boundless, proceeding from God, thro' Jesus Christ, and centering in the same eternal fulness.

Thus my Dear Friend, if I may be so qualified as to be any way useful, I shall be much satisfied that I have performed that part of friendship that may be profitable to thee, with a great deal of pleasure, and judging also that I have had some experience of the various states and conditions of a christian life, & the manner of the Lord's dealings with his people. These I have learned in the deeps; & in the silence of fleshly reasonings; in the stillness where the Enemy approaches not have had to cry out in admiration with the Prophet: "how unsearchable are thy Judgments, O Lord! & thy ways past finding out!" Yet there is often a long time of suffering in hunger & thirst, in nakedness & distress, before we can come here to this stillness, to the intent that God Almighty in his infinite wisdom, may manifest his own Arm of power, which sometimes brings deliverance without any means of our own

proposing. I have often observed that he reserves entirely to himself the greatest deliverances, yet not always so, as not to make use of any means at all; but then those means appear on a just view, to have something in them so extraordinary and providential that they appear plainly to be from the first moving cause; the instrument is in some sort overlooked, tho' it is in sincerity acknowledged as the bounty of heaven, in the distribution of his providence, yet the acknowledgment does not terminate in the means or instrument, but arises in pure breathings, as a divine flame to the source and fountain of all our mercies.

Thus his Judgments are to human attainments unsearchable, & his ways (tho' ways that lead to peace) past our finding out. When he corrects, 'tis not in his sore displeasure, lest he should bring us to nothing; but by the chastisements, as of a merciful Father, he urges and draws a greater degree of obedience from his children, for it is in his love.

Our time then, is to be still, to bear all things, to endure all things, to rejoice in all things that he shall lay upon us, as knowing that thereby we may procure to ourselves the most lasting peace by being thus restored again to favour. And oh! how happy are all those that can so quietly submit in all things! & in order to this let us only consider that they are distributed to mankind in his abundant wisdom and counsel. But I freely confess and acknowledge, that there is another sort of affliction that is as bonds and imprisonments, as laying nights and days in the deeps (yea more afflicting than bonds outwardly,) and the cause intirely hid from us, wherein there is a striving between Life and Death, between hope and despair, longing to be delivered, and but short glimpses of it, if at all beholding the deliverer, & at times crying out with the Prophet: "Thou hast compassed thyself about with a Cloud, that our prayers cannot pass thro!" There appears no mediator, no High Priest before the Throne of God, he forever seems to hide his blessed countenance, and his absence is our greatest pain; for being deprived of his presence, all things else yield no relief. O! then how does the Soul tremble, how does the heart faint! the tears are dried up, no vent that seems to ease the anguish of the Soul, no Balm in Gilead, no Physician there, so that we are ready to cry out, "Our bones are dried up! our hope is lost! we are cast off forever!" & with Job "O that my griefs were thro'ly weighed, & my calamities

put into the balance together; for then it would appear heavier than the Sands of the Sea; therefore my words are swallowed up!" O that I could feel so much softness in my heart as might affect mine eyes, then should I have hope; if it were the effect of contrition or consolation, it would yield me equal Joy, that my Redeemer had not quite forsaken me, nor given me up to the rage of my most cruel Enemy, but has mercy for me still in store. Thus lamenting Days and Nights when it is Day we wish for night, & when Night we desire Day; fear to be alone, & fear to be in company; we can neither read nor hear with attention, nor meditate on God with any composed devotion.

Yet let me tell thee, O my Friend! (having waded thro' these and more afflictions, that are not to be express'd) if such distress is now, or has been upon thee, God is near at hand to bear up thy drooping Soul; he is ever underneath and round about thee, tho' for a while thou seest him not. And I have always found, that after these times he has appeared with abundant more lustre & glory; to teach us not to attribute anything to ourselves, nor fix our thoughts on anything less than his omnipotency.

He that has made the Sea, & prescribed bounds to the Waves thereof, saying "hitherto shalt thou come & no further; & here shall thy proud waves be stayed;" is not to be limited by finite creatures, as the best of Men are; & tho' the Sea may dash and foam, yet it cannot make an inundation but by the direction, or at least high sufferance of Almighty wisdom; who is not less in regard to his Children's well-being than wise in his counsels to frustrate the proudest attempts of the wicked. Wherefore by having an eye single to him at all times of tossing or fluctuation of the Mind, proceeding from what cause they will, is the most proper method of attaining to a settled state and condition.

When the disciples of our Lord were tossed on the Sea, their help was near, tho' to them Jesus seem'd asleep & undisturbed, yet his inward apprehension as God was awake, & ready to help them at their call, "Master, carest not thou, that we perish?" Whereat he arose, & rebuked the Winds, & said to the Sea, "Peace, be still!" & the Wind ceased, & there was a great calm, whereupon their admiration seemed to be raised more by that signal deliverance, than by any other miracle, inasmuch as they at that time were the more

immediate objects of his mercy & partook of the blessing of his powerful word; neither did they spare returning their acknowledgments by saying "What manner of Man is this, that even the Winds & the Seas obey him?"

Thus is he near when he seems most absent, ready to help in every needful time of trouble, as he is called upon in the least degree of faith (tho small as a grain of Mustard Seed) settling & quieting the Mind in his own time; sometimes before we ask, to prevent our asking; herein is fulfilled that saying of Scripture, "I was found of them that sought me not, & made manifest unto them that enquired not after me;" Sometimes he waits long, according to the strength of the sufferer, as is illustrated in the cause of the importunate Widow, by his saying "tho he bear long with them, yet always in his own time he will answer (and that is the best time) sometimes entirely unexpected by the Creature, & whether the Deliverer comes early or late, in that deliverance there is a looking back with wonder and acknowledgment to God, as Israel sang on the Banks of the Sea, saying, "The Lord is glorious in holiness, fearful in praise, doing wonders;" or again, "these are thy wonderful works, O God! my soul has been brought down to the bottom of the pit, & thou hast delivered it again from the Destroyer, & hast once more set my Feet in the just man's path, in the bright shining light that shall shine more and more unto the perfect Day."

In these short intervals the Soul gathers strength to ascend to her Beloved, & rejoices in her happy deliverance from bondage. And it is agreeable to the experience of many, that there is no state that produces such convincing proof of the regard of Heaven, as that wherein we are reduced to the last degree of poverty and want; to that degree that there appears nothing but confusion; the very brute Animals seem in a more desirable condition; they rove idly unemployed, & have their food prepared in season, & if they are slain, Death is to them an end of all sorrows. The Trees & the Shrubs, & all the species of inanimated things, seem to discover a greater beauty & display in livelier texture their great original than we; these tho' they all suffer decay in the course of nature, & by the Scythe of time are soon reduced to the earth from whence they sprang; yet as they are insensible of pain, they neither can nor need cry out for succour; but Man, the noblest part of God's creation, made to adore and

reverence the supreme being with sublime intellects, is of all creatures taught of God, to trust in him, to wait upon him, to be resigned to his will in all things; & if at any time he is pleased to hide his face for awhile. 'tis in order to manifest his power, & bring forth more lasting fruits of praise to himself; and more honour and dignity to the Creator by virtue of his prolific Word; for by Death is Life perfected; by staining the glory of this World, the glory of God is rendered more conspicuous; by seeing ourselves really as we are, we have a glimpse of what God is; by beholding our own emptiness, we desire to partake of his fullness; by feeling our own poverty, we covet his riches; by being hungry & thirsty we have a true relish of the Bread and Water of Life; by a real sense of our own nothingness, we dare not murmur if we receive nothing; but in all states, with the Holy Apostle, learn to be content; thus God becomes all in all. And thus it is necessary that we have a spiritual assistance, to distinguish times and seasons as they are in the hand of God; when we abound, not to be lifted up; when in poverty & want not to repine too much; when afflicted, that we pray first for the spirit of prayer & supplication, that we may be directed how, & in what manner to pray: for it is not always consistent that we should have what we most desire as Creatures, but that which is most profitable for us as Christians, Believers, & Followers of Christ, who was a most perfect pattern of humility & self-denial whilst in the Flesh, who just before the offering up his Life for the Sins of the whole World; & by having an apprehension of the greatest of all agonies, he breathes as if constrained by the most perfect weight, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me" but as if he checked himself adds, with submission and filial duty: "Nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt!"

We therefore have great need to distinguish aright that in all things we may be preserved, by watching in stillness, to be renewed in strength; by virtue of the holy anointing to know what to ask, & temper our longings by a perfect submission: sometimes to ask no more than to be endued with patience and strength to bear the present affliction, that it may terminate to our advantage, & acceptance with Almighty God.

At other times when the Days of captivity are ended, & the Seed that has been oppressed is to be set at liberty, the Lord gives notice thereof by causing the Soul to breathe in

open air, & to ascend to the Divine Majesty with an easy supplication; and an earnest, as it were resounding back upon the Soul, with heavenly harmony that strikes a firm belief that our prayers are heard, like the fire that fell upon Elijah's offering, & consumed the Wood, the Flesh, the Stone, & the Water. But when the emanations of this divine life are absent, which is not to be counted strange or a new thing, the enemy of Man's happiness who waits all opportunities like a restless & indefatigable Foe, to besiege, & if possible to storm & sack the whole City of God; he is then ready to make his strongest attempts, if possible to shake the foundation; but the foundation of God stands sure, having this Seal: "The Lord knows them that are his"; and them he will preserve and care for; tho' the Enemy may tempt, & raise considerable disorders & fluctuations in the Mind without any visible cause; at other time suggests into the Mind desponding thoughts, as if we should never more be regarded; but he who was a lyar & a murderer from the beginning, is so still; & as he abode not in the Truth, his Envy is raised the more particularly against all who strive to persevere aright.

But let us trust in God, who will not suffer us to be tempted above what we are able to bear, but will with the temptation also make a way to escape it; but those desponding thoughts have so much influence sometimes, that the Creature seems wholly swallowed up in them, & complains like Zion in bitterness of Soul saying "The Lord hath forsaken me! My God hath forgotten me!"

But he that was nearer than she was aware of & readier to help than she hoped, expostulated with her in the most affectionate & moving manner; "Can a Woman forget her sucking Child that she should not have compassion on the Son of her Womb?" "Yea, she may!" No compassion is sufficient to illustrate the Love of God! Women may become hardened & be careless of their own offspring, & be inexorable to the cries of their Children; "but the Lord thy Maker, thy Husband that takes care of thee, will not forsake thee," "Thou art graven on the Palms of my Hands;" as much as to say, "to forget thee were to forget myself; to forget my Power, that made all things & upholds all things," "thy Walls of Protection are continually before me," "Thy Salvation is not out of sight, thy Redeemer is near at hand."

My dear Friend, I seem to have exceeded the Bounds of a

letter already, altho' I have been obliged to confine my thoughts very much, & have sent thee only a short extract of what has presented itself to my Mind, with a considerable degree of warmth & sweetness; but I'll just add, that I have been deeply engaged in humble petition to Almighty God, that he may vouchsafe to draw nigh with the visitation of his pure light, & in mercy cause his brightness to appear, by removing the Cloud that hangs over the Tabernacle; & so far favour those who have no might of their own, as to guard them by his own Arm by Day & Night, gently leading those who are with young, & bearing them in his Arms. Amen.

John Woolman.

From a copy "Wrote 17th of 4 mo. 1800 at London by J. C[atchpool]" in Catchpool MSS., II, 305-10, collated with another copy in Friends House, Portfolio 31.88, and another in the Proctor commonplace Book (in possession of Mr. Spence Sanders of Farnham Common). Where there are slight verbal differences the best reading has been chosen.

Reports on Archives

The *Bulletin of the National Register of Archives* (Historical Manuscripts Commission). List of accessions to repositories, No 8 (1956) reports the following additions to the manuscript collections in various institutions which may interest workers on Quaker History: Berkshire County Record Office, Shire Hall, Reading.

Society of Friends: minutes of 4 Berkshire monthly meetings, 1668-1755; accounts, 2 Berkshire monthly meetings and Warborough (Oxon) meeting, 18th-19th cent.; transcripts of birth, marriage and burial registers, Berks. and Oxon quarterly meeting 1612-1837.

Other deposits include the diary of Edward Belson, Quaker and distiller, 1707-22.

Cornwall County Record Office, "Gwendroc", Barrack Lane, Truro.

Society of Friends: quarterly and monthly meetings: minute books, suffering books, registers, record book of muniments, 1655-1904.

Glamorgan County Record Office, County Hall, Cardiff.

Society of Friends: monthly meeting minutes, etc., South Wales and Monmouthshire, 1660-1947 (45 vols.).

Kent Archives Office, County Hall, Maidstone.

Society of Friends: minutes, etc., of quarterly and monthly meetings for Kent, 1648-1943.

Lancashire County Record Office, County Hall, Preston.

Society of Friends: records of Marsden monthly meeting (covering most of East Lancashire), 1653-1938.

Leicester Museums and Art Gallery, New Walk, Leicester.

Society of Friends, further minute books, etc., 19th cent.

New Evidence of Francis Mercury Van Helmont's Relations with the Quakers

TWO events of more than passing importance to the Cambridge Platonists in the last quarter of the seventeenth century are commonly attributed to the influence of one man. One of these events was the apostasy of an important leader of the English Quakers; the other was the unprecedented going over of a lady of illustrious family who had been intimately associated with the Platonists from the accepted religious practices of her social group to those of the despised, persecuted "quiet people."

The intellectual stimulus which drove George Keith away from the Quakers after his intimate association with such leaders as George Fox and William Penn came largely from Keith's conversations with Francis Mercury Van Helmont.¹ The influence which led Lady Anne, Viscountess Conway, from the Church of England to the serene attitudes and practices of the Friends certainly came from her conversations with Van Helmont and from the books which she read at his suggestion.²

Van Helmont's continental reputation as a physician of almost supernatural power had preceded him when he arrived at the Court of Charles II on a diplomatic mission from the court of Bohemia to stay "not above a month."³ Lord Conway persuaded Van Helmont to go with him to his seat in Warwickshire where Lady Conway, relapsed into invalidism after the failure of Valentine Greatrakes to cure her malady, lived in the retirement imposed by her condition. It was hoped that the great Belgian physician would succeed in dispelling Lady Conway's most distressing symptom, a headache of many years' duration and shocking intensity.

Although Van Helmont was not able to effect a cure, the Countess found with him a stimulating and satisfying

¹ Keith, George. *Mr. George Keith's Reasons for Renouncing Quakerism and Entering into Communion with the Church of England*, London, 1700.

² *Conway Letters: The Correspondence of Anne, Viscountess Conway, Henry More, and Their Friends, 1642-1684*, ed. Marjorie Hope Nicolson, New Haven, 1930, p. 413.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 323.

relationship so agreeable that the few days he had allowed for his visit to Ragley Hall extended themselves to the nine remaining years of Lady Conway's life. Except for a few brief journeys to Germany he remained at her side, helping her through her last hours, and finally planning and making that curious lead and glass coffin which would permit her husband to look upon her face when he should return from Ireland.

The record of the steps by which physician and patient approached the Quaker experience are well documented in the letters which passed between the Countess, her husband, and her friend Henry More of Cambridge.¹ Lady Conway, writing to More from Ragley Hall on 29th November, 1675, suggested the initial prejudice which must have been overcome by members of England's upper classes as they regarded the despised sect.

I am glad that you had an opportunity so free and full a converse with several of the Quakers, when you were in London, by which means you will be able to give a better judgment of their principles and practices, than you do upon the reports of others, who either through prejudice or ignorance had doubtlessly misrepresented them to you. The reading of their books lately had in a great measure freed me from former prejudicate opinions, but their conversation doth much more to reconcile me to them.²

A postscript to this letter reports Van Helmont's situation.

Monsieur Van Helmont is growne a very religious churchman; he goes every Sunday to the Quaker's meetings.³

In his answer to Lady Anne's letter Henry More, expressing his concern over the drift away from orthodoxy, could not forego the role of adviser.

And though Monsieur Van Helmont go to their meetings, yett I would advize him by all means to abstain from using their garb in Hall or speech.⁴

To this reasonable counsel Lady Conway replied,

Neither is it true you heard reported that Monsieur Van Helmont has Quaker meetings here though he continues a frequenter of their meetings but has not altered either his garb or his language.⁵

¹ *Conway Letters*, ed. Marjorie Hope Nicolson.

² *Ibid.*, p. 407.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 409.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 415.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 420.

From these cautious beginnings in 1675 the Countess and her physician moved to what we may regard as full acceptance of Quaker doctrine and practice. The extent of their devotion to the new religion is indicated by Lord Conway's somewhat bitter letter of 28th December, 1677, to his brother-in-law, Sir George Rawdon, who had asked the Conways to accept into their home his motherless daughter. Lord Conway regretted that he could not welcome his niece to Ragley.

In my family all the women about my wife and most of the rest [of the servants] are Quakers and Monsieur Van Helmont is governor of that flock, an unpleasing sort of people, silent, sullen, and of a removed conversation.¹

The currently accepted belief that Lady Conway and Van Helmont became Quakers has been based upon items in the Conway letters, upon the references by George Fox in his journal to his visits at Ragley Hall,² and upon the record of Lady Conway's contribution toward the building of the Quaker Meeting House at Alcester.³

The period being earlier than the establishment of any formally recorded membership among Friends we are dependent upon other evidence of active association.

New evidence of Van Helmont's relations with the Quakers is contained in the account book of the Women's Box Meeting, 1669-1749,⁴ a Quaker charity managed by women for the relief of distressed Friends in London.⁵

The accounts of the Box Meeting record small transactions for the early years after its foundation in 1659. As the fund grew its work became known in the Quaker community, and so well endowed did the fund gradually become that it took on the function of a bank, making loans, accepting notes and bonds. In 1674 William Penn borrowed £300 under his bond, repaying the amount four years later.

¹ *Conway Letters*, p. 439. Lord Conway's opinion of the Quakers did not change. Writing a year later from Ireland, he declared, "I find them to be a senseless, wilful, ridiculous generation of people, rather to be pitied than envied." *Ibid.*, p. 274.

² *The Journal of George Fox*, ed. John L. Nickalls (Cambridge, 1952), p. 729.

³ *Warwick County Records Proceedings in Quarter Sessions*, Vol. VIII, cxvi.

⁴ The MS. is listed in the Library of the Society of Friends, London, as *Account Book of Women's Box Meeting, 1669-1749*, No. 2.

⁵ Edwards, Irene, "The Women Friends of London," *Journal of Friends' Historical Society*, 1955, Vol. 47, No. 1.

The Box Meeting Fund was by the year of Lady Conway's death, 1679, so well known among the Quakers that Van Helmont was moved to contribute to it part of his legacy from the countess. The MS. entry under date of 3rd April, 1679, lists.

Received of Thomas Rudger of Lady Conaways legacy paid by Van Helmont £10¹

This entry establishes two interesting new facts about Van Helmont. The first is the revelation of his attitude toward the legacy left him by the woman whose long friendship had given him the most settled and serene years of his life. The will of Lady Conway¹ does not list any legacy to the Quakers. All the legacies listed are left to specified persons except one bequeathed to the poor of Alcester. Van Helmont was to receive £300, and it is doubtless from this bequest that he made the contribution to the Box Meeting Fund, rather in memory of Lady Anne than as a payment requested by her. The payment and the wording of the entry which records it indicate Van Helmont's feeling that the Quaker experience had been deeply felt by Lady Anne.

A second point of interest in this entry is the fact that Van Helmont made the payment by the hand of Thomas Rudger or Rudyard, of Lombard Street, lawyer, author, influential Quaker, who in 1680 was to be one of the nine purchasers from the trustees of Sir George Carteret of the lands called "East New Jersey in North America."² Rudyard's name appears frequently in the records of the Court of King's Bench; he was especially active as legal counsellor and defender of Quakers from August, 1674, until his departure for America in 1682.³ In the year when he appears to have acted as Van Helmont's agent in making the payment to the Box Meeting Fund, he was actively engaged in a "pamphlet war" with the Baptists.⁴

¹ *Prerogative Court of Canterbury*, 53 King, Somerset House.

² "East New Jersey, 1682," *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 1916. Also, "Letter of George Fox to William Penn," 13th November, 1678, *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, Vol. 11, No. 1, January, 1914. Rudyard is listed as author of ten books in Joseph Smith, *A Catalogue of Friends' Books*, Vol. II, p. 516.

³ Alfred W. Braithwaite, "Thomas Rudyard, Early Friends' Oracle of Law," Supplement No. 27, *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, 1956, p. 12.

⁴ C. E. Whiting, *Studies in English Puritanism, 1660-1688*, 1931, pp. 167-9.

A second item in the Box Meeting account book relating to Van Helmont indicates not only his connection with the Quakers but also the extraordinary financial success and security achieved by the Box Meeting Fund. The item is entered as of 1st September, 1679.

Reced of Francis Van Helmont £110 for the consideration thereof to pay him £11 per year during his life if he demands.¹

This entry, made six months after Lady Conway's death, indicates that Van Helmont had received the full amount of the £300 which had been bequeathed to him and that he had probably taken residence in London. This payment is obviously to be regarded as an investment of the annuity type. Van Helmont's selection of the Box Meeting Fund as depository indicates the reputation for solidity and security which the fund enjoyed in the twentieth year of its existence.

Three years later Van Helmont withdrew his money; there is no indication of his purpose. We can only surmise that, feeling himself rootless in England after Lady Anne's death, he had returned to the continent in the autumn of 1679 and thought that his money might be better invested in a continental fund. Under date of 9th September, 1682, the Box Meeting treasurer listed the transaction.

Paid Van Helmett his £110 againe recd in 1659 110.00.00²

The treasurer who set down this item was in error in regard to the date of Van Helmont's earlier deposit. In the MS. the figure 1659 is very legibly written, an apparent slip-of-the-pen for 1679. Obviously "his £110 againe" can refer only to the item described above which records the amount paid to the fund by Van Helmont in 1679.

The importance of the item, in spite of the obvious error in date of reference for the original payment of Van Helmont's £110.00, lies in the precision with which it enables us to identify him upon a new evidence with the practice as well as to the philosophy of the Quakers.

These transactions may be regarded as supporting evidence for the statement, hitherto based only upon the Conway papers, Fox's Journal and Warwick County Records, that Van Helmont and Lady Anne, Viscountess Conway, regarded themselves as true Quakers. The ageing physician

¹ Box Meeting MS. p. 8.

² Box Meeting MS. p. 15.

was evidently so deeply integrated with the Quaker ways of thought that use of the Box Meeting Fund was a natural and logical step when he wished to memorialize Lady Anne and when he planned for the financial security of his remaining years.

GRACE B. SHERRER

The Quakers and Politics, 1652-1660. By W. Alan Cole. A Cambridge University Ph.D. thesis, presented in June, 1955. Pp. 349. Unpublished typescript.

Until recently there has been little detailed study of the political standpoint of the early Friends, and even less of their political activities; and many historians still regard the Quaker movement as essentially non-political.

In this essay, however (which is available in typescript in the library at Friends House) the author shows that throughout the Commonwealth period Friends took a keen interest in the course of political events. He dismisses the charge that Friends were ever seriously implicated in political intrigues and plots as without foundation. But his central thesis is that their comparative aloofness from political activities was due neither to indifference nor even to pacifism, but to political circumstances, to the growing conflict between the interests of property and radical demands for further reform in Church and State which characterized the years after the civil wars.

During the Protectorate, Friends were driven into isolation by religious persecution, by their expulsion from civil and military offices and the proposal to make Cromwell king; and they warned the Protector that by relying on conservative interests at the expense of his former friends he was undermining the basis of his power and paving the way for a Restoration. After Cromwell's death, on the other hand, the situation temporarily improved, and the author tells in detail the little known story of Quaker activities during the year of anarchy, 1659. In these critical months, leading Friends frequently indicated their willingness to co-operate with other groups in promoting the reforms by which alone they believed the Commonwealth might yet be established in peace. But when instead the rulers of the Commonwealth preferred to recall the King, their disillusion with other parties was complete. Hence, the author concludes, it was at this time that the main body of Friends came to a pacifist and politically neutral position, strengthened by their conviction that the moral structure of history must ultimately ensure their toleration by a hostile world.

Although the writer consulted the main manuscript collections at Friends House, most of the less familiar evidence on which his account is based was taken from the innumerable Quaker tracts published in the Commonwealth period. The work includes a bibliography and index, and there is also an appendix dealing with the social origins of the early Friends, based on the occupational data in the Quaker registers of birth, marriages and deaths.

Friends and the American Civil War: the Trent affair

THE seizure on 8th November, 1861, of the two Confederate envoys to Britain and France by Captain Charles Wilkes, commander of the *San Jacinto*, an American warship, while they were travelling across the Atlantic on the British mailship *Trent*, caused a great wave of hysterical excitement both in Britain and the northern states of America. Wilkes, although he acted entirely on his own responsibility, without orders, was acclaimed as a popular hero in many circles in the northern states. He had paid Britain out in her own coin, and rightly so, thought the Americans, for Britain's own interpretation of belligerent rights at sea in the era of the Napoleonic wars had long rankled in their minds. In Britain feeling ran no less high. There was tremendous excitement and much righteous anger: Britain had done nothing to provoke a war, but now it was being deliberately forced upon her, she was being challenged on two points on which she prided herself as always having taken a firm stand, the freedom of the seas and the right of asylum. One American wrote home from London, "the people are frantic with rage, and were the country polled, I fear 999 men out of every thousand would declare for immediate war."¹ The *Trent* incident, in reality, provided a focal point for the widespread sympathy in Britain for the southern secessionists and for the hostility, especially among the governing classes, to the North. In fact, there was hardly anyone in England who did not think that the northern secretary of state, Seward, wanted a war.

The British Cabinet was forced to act quickly, once the law officers had declared the seizure of the Confederate envoys to be illegal. A despatch was sent to Washington demanding the restoration of the envoys, an apology and a reply to be made within seven days; defence preparations were put in hand. While the American reply was awaited nearly everyone was discussing what the war would be like,

¹ E. D. Adams, *Great Britain and the American civil war* (1925), i, p. 217.

rather than whether it would materialise, so inevitable had its prospect become.¹

It was in this critical situation that developed from 27th November, 1861, onwards, when the first news of the seizure of the envoys reached England, that Friends in Britain seized the opportunity to witness for peace. They were not the only forces working for peace. Americans of the northern persuasion, resident in Europe, did their best to dispel the idea that their countrymen were impatient for war with Britain. Cobden and Bright came out for peace, but they stood almost alone among public men in this respect. They needed support if they were to make any impression on the public mind. This support they received from the nonconformists and especially from Friends, who seem to have been the first in the field among the churches.²

Friends' intervention took the form of a memorial³ from Meeting for Sufferings in London, to the British government, on the subject of Anglo-American relations. It contained a special appeal to the government to avoid war between "two independent nations so closely united together . . . by the combined ties of blood, of language, of religion, of constitutional freedom, and of commercial interest." The memorial asked that while the American reply was awaited, the British cabinet should prepare "so to meet that reply (whatever it may be) that the next step may not be a declaration of war, but the putting of the remaining issue, if any, between the two countries in train for a pacific decision." Friends recommended that the government should propose referring the dispute to arbitration, which principle they rejoiced to see had been strongly recommended by the powers who were parties to the treaty of Paris in 1856, although they admitted that no prospective provision for arbitration existed that covered this particular dispute. Nevertheless, the memorial urged, there were good reasons why Britain should preserve a conciliatory attitude. It would be ungenerous to proceed to extremes when the United States was struggling for "their national integrity, if not their national existence." Furthermore, it would ill behove England "after the vast sacrifices

¹ D. Jordan and E. J. Pratt, *Europe and the American civil war* (1931), pp. 28-35, for public opinion; E. D. Adams, *op. cit.*, especially i., p. 217.

² D. Jordan and E. J. Pratt, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-39.

³ Prepared by Josiah Forster, John Hodgkin and seven other Friends, appointed by Meeting for Sufferings, 5.xii.1861.

which she has made for the abolition of the slave trade and slavery in her own possessions, which has been an object so consistently promoted through life by the statesmen whom we are now addressing [i.e. Palmerston and Russell] if, by being involved in this war, England should eventually find herself in active co-operation with the South and slavery against the North and freedom." At this point Friends were careful to add a qualification to the simple version of the civil war just enunciated. They did not intend, the memorial continued, to express approval, in all respects, of the course pursued by the North in reference to slavery. Finally, Friends mentioned their "special religious as well as national interest in the question" of peace with America, in that "the principal Founders" of two of the American states, "and many of the original settlers of other states, were our brethren in religious profession, between whom and ourselves a cordial correspondence has been maintained for nearly two centuries." The signatories promised that they would urge American Friends to use their by no means inconsiderable influence on their state legislatures in the cause of peace.¹

Such was the impressive memorial drawn up on behalf of the Society for presentation to the Prime Minister, Lord Palmerston, and the Foreign Secretary, Earl Russell, after full deliberation of the London Meeting for Sufferings on 6th December, 1861, and at an adjourned meeting on 9th December. The draft had been prepared by John Hodgkin. The background to the preparation of the memorial is a little obscure, although it is clear that one of the moving spirits in bringing Friends to consider the American question was Jonathan Pim, of Dublin. He apparently advocated the settlement of the dispute by referring the whole question of the rights of neutrals in time of war, and the limitations under which the right of search should be exercised, to a congress of all the maritime powers including Britain and the United States.² This view he pressed on several Friends in different

¹ Printed copy of the memorial of 9.xii.1861 in Meeting for Sufferings minutes [Friends House, London]; and in the Pim MSS. in the possession of Mr. Jonathan Pim of Dublin, whose kindness in permitting me to see these papers is gratefully acknowledged.

² The Pim MSS. contain a printed copy, almost certainly the work of Jonathan Pim, entitled "War with America," reasons for offering to the United States the alternative of arbitration before appealing to the sword, which embodies the above views.

parts of Britain, meeting with their approval.¹ While he was doing this, Meeting for Sufferings met in London on 6th December, and decided to send a memorial on the threatened war to the government. A committee was appointed to prepare it, which met on 9th December and approved John Hodgkin's draft. At the first meeting it was evidently thought that a specific recommendation to apply the practice of arbitration to this particular case had not been deemed feasible. But Pim's advocacy of the importance of stressing the principle of arbitration impressed some Friends, especially William Tanner of Bristol, where the Friends decided to send a messenger to London in the hope that he would arrive in time to procure the insertion of Pim's suggestions in the memorial.² Plainly Pim's views were adopted in part as the memorial did contain a specific reference to arbitration, although his more extensive plan of a congress of maritime powers was not taken up.³ The upshot of the efforts of Friends was, however, not encouraging. Palmerston refused to see a deputation from the London Meeting for Sufferings. As Rickman Godlee told Pim, the memorial would, however, go to him and Earl Russell all the same and it was printed.⁴ The efforts of Jonathan Pim did not cease here. He was encouraged by John Hodgkin to continue to use every possible method to press his views as embodied in a paper that Hodgkin thought was the best he had seen on the American difficulty. Hodgkin urged Jonathan Pim to persevere, to "try the Earl of Carlisle, Sir Robert Peel, the Earl of Clarendon, or any private channell" to bring his notions before Earl Russell "effectively and reiteratedly," for Pim's views "differed from either arbitration or mediation and it may not be too late." John Hodgkin's letter of 20th December, 1861, just quoted from, shows just how deeply a Friend felt about the dangers of war at this time, for he concludes,

¹ J. Pim to J. Ford, 7th Dec., 1861; J. Ford to J. Pim, 9th Dec., 1861 (Pim MSS.).

² William Tanner to J. Pim, 9th Dec., 1861 (Pim MSS.).

³ Rickman Godlee to J. Pim, 9th Dec., 1861, reporting that at the adjourned meeting "it was expressly agreed that the method of proposing a reference to arbitration should be pressed on the government," while William Tanner in his letter of the same date (see note 4) had said that at the meeting on 6th December such a step had not been deemed feasible (Pim MSS.).

⁴ Rickman Godlee to J. Pim, 17th December, 1861 (Pim MSS.).

I have sought relief in prayer that He who can turn the hearts of rulers as easily as the skilful husbandman can direct the stream in a well prepared channel of irrigation, will be pleased to stay the feelings of wrath which are so likely to be kindled at Washington by a temperate and well reasoned request for surrender. But prayer does not preclude the diligent, skilful use of means—quite the contrary. And whether the American answer be *nearly* all that we could desire, or *quite unfavourable*, there is yet the *possibility* that the meekness, and the wisdom and the right temper of our chastened Queen and her rulers may after all prove efficacious to bring about a right result, which we can hardly look for from the passions of the multitudes on either side of the Atlantic. Possibly our memorial may, in some directions and especially with men of Christian feeling, have a sedative effect, and tend to lessen the pressure upon our government to vindicate the national honour. I think we ought to leave no stone unturned.¹

This may well remain a fitting epitaph of Friends' witness for peace in the critical six weeks that elapsed between the receipt in Britain of the news of the seizure of the Confederate envoys and the American reply that consented to restore the envoys to freedom, but contained no formal apology. The reply dispelled the myth that the Washington Cabinet wanted war and ensured peace. The worst of the war tension, however, was over before the reply was received.² Friends' endeavours had not been entirely in vain.

DAVID LARGE

¹ John Hodgkin to J. Pim, 20th December, 1861 (Pim MSS.). The reference to the chastened Queen is an allusion to the death of the Prince Consort that had taken place a week previously.

² D. Jordan and E. J. Pratt, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-46.

Quakerism in a Country Town

Burford (Oxon)¹ and its Meeting House

BY ROGER H. M. WARNER

IN 1700 the site of Burford Meeting House and burial ground formed part of an orchard belonging to the Bull Inn, just then refronted with red brick specially brought into the town to catch the eye. To this day the Bull is the only brick-built building in the High Street of this grey Cotswold stone town, which was at the height of its prosperity in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

In 1700 Burford was still prosperous and famous for its saddle making, five years previously two saddles had been given to William III which he specially ordered to be kept for his personal use. At this date a small Quaker group must have existed in Burford and there were Meetings at Barrington, three miles west up the Windrush valley and at Milton-under-Wychwood, three miles to the north.

In Witney Division Monthly Meeting Minutes for 1677 mention of Burford first appears with a payment of 2s. 6d. a week rent for Ann Cook. Some years later comes the following minute: 1701, 10th of 12th month; "Proposed of Building a Meeting Hous at Burfut desering the consent of this Meeting. And the Meeting consents that they may goe on in building when they pleas." Ten months later Burford Friends found they needed more money and Monthly Meeting "Orders them to take care and get a just Estamite of what more may be wanting and propose it to the next Q.M. in order to have their consent to have a collection amongst Friends throughout the County." Consent was not forthcoming and the Quarterly Meeting ordered every Particular Meeting in Witney division to make a collection for the same. In December, 1709, Burford Friends were £37 9s. od. out of pocket and another collection was made; but in 1713 money

¹ In Friends House Library there is a typescript volume of "Minutes relating to Burford Meeting, Oxon," transcribed and indexed in 1939 by Nina Saxon Snell from the Minute books of Witney M.M. (1731-1854), Oxford M.M. (1675-1731), with notes from Witney Women's M.M. (1752-1806).

was still short and further amounts were subscribed. Total sums raised by surrounding meetings were:

Witney, £11 4s. 6d.;	Milton, £11 4s. 6d.;
Chipping Norton, £3 7s. od.;	Charlbury, £2 17s. od.;
Oxford, £3 3s. od.;	Alvescot, £1 9s. od.

Forty years later Burford and Milton Friends were in a position to subscribe £15 15s. od. towards repairs to Witney Meeting House.

Burford Meeting House is situated in a quiet lane parallel to the High Street. In its original form, it was a high barn-like room with an elders' gallery at one end, and with galleries on two sides approached by a staircase. Fairly soon,¹ however, a floor was made across the beams, and another small stairway taken up from the gallery to a small upper room. It is this upper room which Friends now use for meeting for worship during the winter months as it is easier to heat. Tradition says that it was for the use of Visiting Friends, and might perhaps have been used by the Women's Meeting. There is no record of the opening of Burford Meeting House, but this must have been in 1708 or 1709, as by midsummer, 1709, the Meeting at Barrington had closed and had been transferred to Burford, from which a Register was received by Monthly Meeting.

In 1716 two Friends are noted "that have proposed to send borders towards furnishing a skolle for an Incuragement of a skollemaster," and two years later Milton and Burford contributed £1 16s. 6d. to the schoolmaster's salary. In 1722 they again subscribe 50s. towards the rent of Nicholas Marshall, the master, for his encouragement. About 1750 Thomas Huntley became the schoolmaster and continued running the boarding school for more than 50 years.

The Monthly Meeting was held at Burford in November, 1741, on account of smallpox in Witney, but throughout the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries there was little to report. In 1768 a small additional piece of adjoining ground was bought as burial ground, and in 1842 repairs to the walls of Burford burial ground are the first repairs noted by Monthly Meeting.

In 1813 Milton Meeting was discontinued, and a decline in Burford Meeting must also have begun, for in 1841

¹ The exact date is not known.

Quarterly Meeting agreed to discontinue preparative meetings at Burford, and in 1854 Quarterly Meeting was informed that the Particular Meeting of Burford was closed as all the members had removed from Burford. A few very elderly Friends had died in Burford in the previous five years. Minute books for the next fifty years have not been consulted, but meetings were again being held by the early 1900's but again ceased during the 1920's. Mention of Burford crops up 27 times between 1931 and 1947 in Monthly Meeting Minutes. In 1932 a committee was appointed to consider disposal of the meeting house, but the sale was not recommended. At this time the building was in use by the town band, Girl Guides, and Rover Scouts. In 1939 it was considered for use as a Government emergency food store, but not actually used. Then briefly it became a club room for evacuee mothers and babies, and was visited by Queen Mary. From 1941 Meetings for Worship were again held twice monthly by Friends and attenders then working in the district, and the building was also used as a boys' club. A youth club was set up in the building in 1947, when the ministers' gallery was removed, and this continued for a few years.

In 1955 with the arrival of more Friends in Burford, the meeting house was restored, and regular meetings were once again established.

Quakerism in an Industrial Town

Some Notes on Wolverhampton Meeting,

1704-1903

BY J. CLEMENT JONES

QUAKERISM in Wolverhampton goes back to 1704. It was in that year that Robert and Joan Hill gave to the trustees of Wolverhampton meeting, two cottages in what was once called Lower Lichfield Street. Later it became known as Canal Street and now is Broad Street. With the two cottages which Robert and Joan Hill gave to Friends was a small patch of land, the burial ground which remains today. The trust deed of 1704 states that the trustees "shall permit and suffer forever hereafter the dead bodies or carcases of all such persons who shall die in the parish of Wolverhampton aforesaid in the profession or religion of the people

called Quakers to be buried there (if desired) without fee, reward or satisfaction, otherwise than the charge of the grave."

From the rents of the cottages the trustees had to help "such poor persons of the people called Quakers as they in their discretion, wisdom and prudence shall think fit and approve." In a later recital of the deed the term "carcases" is dropped, and there is a clause limiting the Friends who shall benefit from the rents to Wolverhampton.

Charles Osborne was the real founder of the meeting in Wolverhampton, and he was in close touch with Wednesbury,¹ Dudley and other Black Country places and with Welsh Friends. Mention of Charles Osborne is found in 1688, but how he came to join Friends does not appear. He settled in Wolverhampton and became a prosperous business man. He had at first a small workshop for making tobacco boxes, and Shaw's *History of Staffordshire* records that "he acquired a considerable amount of money from nothing; some said more than £10,000." In 1739 he bought up the then derelict estates of the Leveson Gowers in Wolverhampton, and his son in turn carried on the business and also acted as a banker.

Charles Osborne was a great friend of Abraham Darby, who was the son of a Dudley Quaker, lived at Wrens Nest, Dudley, and was apprenticed to a Birmingham Friend, Jonathan Freeth, a nailmaker. Freeth had two sons, who had a gift in the ministry and they used to meet together frequently with Abraham Darby. Darby was married at Dudley Meeting House: and when his apprenticeship was ended he went to Bristol and set up in business. There he met some of the Lloyds and another Friend, John Thomas, who was born at Welshpool and whose grandfather died in Welshpool prison. Later they moved to Coalbrookdale.²

It is to John Thomas's daughter, Hannah Rose, that we owe much information about Abraham Darby. She records that he (Darby) and her father used to meet Charles Osborne of Wolverhampton, at Newport to hold meetings once a month near the Swan Inn—"and many of the inhabitants would come and behave sober and attentive."

¹ Wednesbury Meeting House built 1680. A "hemplott" (a small area of ground used for drying hemp) purchased for £19 by Henry Fidoe for a burial ground was bought by the South Staffordshire Railway in 1849.

² See Arthur Raistrick: *Dynasty of Ironfounders*, 1953.

At this time the Darby family, Abraham I and his son, Abraham II, were very active in the Society and served as clerks of local meetings and of Wales Yearly Meeting. The interchange between Wolverhampton and the strong Quaker community at Coalbrookdale was considerable in friendship and in marriage. In 1717 there was the marriage at Wolverhampton Meeting House of Mary Osborne, daughter of Charles, to John Fowler. He was a Friend, a civil engineer and connected with the Darby's works. He designed the iron railway bridge cast and erected by the Coalbrookdale Company which crosses the River Severn a little higher up than the famous Ironbridge.

John Fowler must have come to live in Wolverhampton after that. His name crops up several times, and particularly over the misdemeanours of Charles Osborne, junior. Young Charles was not so serious a man as his father. In 1725 he married "one not of our society." The year after he sent Friends a letter "wherein he gives some expectation of being more regular in his conduct for the future." Later John Fowler "informs this meeting that it is reported he is much reformed."

Charles Osborne, the "founder" of Wolverhampton Meeting, died on the 9th of 10th month, 1729. Until 1730 Monthly Meetings were held at Wolverhampton, the last one was on the 12th of 11th month of that year and was attended by John Fowler, William Webb, Edward Mason, Dorothy Osborne, Sarah Mason, and Mary Webb.

John Fowler died in 1767 and his son Henry then moved with his wife to Leek, and this more or less saw the end of the first period in the history of Wolverhampton Meeting. Charles Osborne, John Fowler and the Darbys were dead. They were the Public or Weighty Friends of the period. The younger generation had either lost interest or moved elsewhere.

Wolverhampton as a live Meeting fades out of record. It remained, however, as a problem meeting to Friends elsewhere.

In 1840 the property in Wolverhampton was sold for £400. At one time Leek Friends considered that the income from the Wolverhampton property was the prerogative of Leek, Uttoxeter and Stafford Meetings "and that Friends who occasionally resided in Wolverhampton possessed in themselves no vested right or interest in them."

It was not until 1859 that Wolverhampton became linked with Birmingham Monthly Meeting. In that year a Committee of Birmingham Monthly Meeting considered the problems of Friends living in Wolverhampton and it was decided to ask Staffordshire Meeting for Discipline to let the Friends living in Wolverhampton be under the care of Birmingham Monthly Meeting and that the money resulting from the sale of the Meeting property 20 years earlier, should be transferred to Birmingham.

In 1860 Warwickshire Monthly Meeting accepted £200—half the amount received by Stafford Friends from the sale of the Meeting House in Wolverhampton. This money was to go to the relief of poor Friends or to help with the cost of any Meeting House thereafter needed in Wolverhampton.

There is a gap until 23rd February, 1896, when a few Friends who had come to live in Wolverhampton started an Allowed Meeting in the Y.M.C.A. They paid 2s. 6d. a week rent for the room in which they met in Darlington Street.

Friends were very socially active about 1900. The adult school movement was considered. There are several minutes re-affirming the Peace Testimony during the South African War. There was also a Bill before Parliament to stop the sale of intoxicating liquors to young people under 16 which Friends asked the three borough members to support. Of the three, only Sir Henry Fowler said he was in sympathy; the other two formally acknowledged Friends letters.

In March, 1901, Wolverhampton Friends asked Monthly Meeting to help them build a Meeting House. They had, they said, a site offered to them upon condition that a Meeting House was built forthwith.

Meetings for Worship had by then been held regularly for five years, and there was a membership of 19. Monthly Meeting was informed that because Wolverhampton Friends were "meeting in a semi-public room the state of things on our gathering together has occasionally left much to be desired in the way of ventilation and comfort, whilst we are always liable to disturbance arising from the movements in or about the building of those connected with the institution itself."

Wolverhampton, they said, "has a population of 90,000 and is extending on all sides; and there are not wanting signs of the healthy expansion and growth of the other religious

denominations, and it would be only right and fitting that our own Society should take its share in this growth."

Monthly Meeting appointed Oliver Morland, Walter Barrow and William A. Albright to confer with local Friends and the Monthly Meeting Trust Property Committee.

The three Friends reported:

"We have also attended the Meeting for Worship and conferred with the Friends there as to the probable future of the Meeting which is now attended by from 12-20, and while there does not seem to be very much life or enthusiasm, the Friends who appreciate the privilege of worshipping together once in the week, and who already attract one or two to join with them and who think they might do so more largely, if they had a room of their own . . . Friends lay a good deal of stress on the need there is in Wolverhampton for a room to be used as a meeting ground for those interested in such causes as peace and temperance."

These three visiting Friends went on to advise building a small Meeting House to seat 60-70. The lowest tender for the building was £646 15s. 8d., with extras, the total came to £717 3s. 2d. The £201 15s. 0d. site cost was given privately.

The first preparative meeting was held in Horsman Street on 2nd January, 1903—just under two years after the decision to press for a new Meeting House was made.

It is soberly recorded:

"With Reference to the third Minute of our last P.M. held at the Y.M.C.A. in Darlington Street (this was a continuation of the 'proposed New Meeting House Minute' which had been occurring regularly for these years) our new meeting house was opened on the 28th of 12th Month 1902. We regard the completion of the new premises with thankfulness and we desire to place on record the very generous initiative taken in the matter by Thomas Parker in purchasing the site."

The first Meeting House Committee was:

Thomas Brockbank, Mary M. Carr, Maria Radley, Edward Hipsley. Reginald Carr was asked to act as treasurer and S. P. Lidbetter as librarian. To this committee was left the arrangements for the formal opening, which did not take place until 4th March, 1903.

Marriage Discipline in Early Friends

A Study in Church Administration illustrated from Bristol Records

There is a Christian obligation incumbent on every member of yt holy body and society whereof Christ our Lord is head to watch over one another & to be reprovng one another in the spirit of meekness & of sound judgment; not that thereby only we may respect the particular good of such member of the body but yt alsoe a true regard may be had to the glory of the name of the Lord, that soe his power & spirit may bee exalted over all.¹

THESE words, written in 1669 in a brotherly letter from Bristol Men's Meeting to Friends in Virginia and Maryland, give due emphasis to the two aims which the discipline had in view: the welfare of the individual Friend and the needs of the whole "society" of Friends.

The marriage discipline among Friends probably shows more clearly than any other by what means and with what measure of success they translated their ideals into practical policy. By its sheer volume too the marriage business gives more insight than lesser branches of discipline into the working of the system, for as meetings for business were established and began to preserve records, something like a quarter or a third of all minutes recorded concerned marriages.

In 1653 George Fox

waited upon the Lord, and saw in his Eternal Light, that all that did Marry, they should lay it before some faithful Friends in the Wisdom of God, that they might see into it.²

From this elementary principle developed the whole marriage discipline through the business meetings. In replacing the accepted forms of marriage ceremonial, early Friends retained features of church procedure and of the Commonwealth civil registration which they could accept and which served a useful purpose. This aspect has recently been illustrated by Ruth G. Burt in her article on "The Quaker Marriage Declaration" (*Journal, F.H.S.*, xlv, 53-59). As Friends'

¹ Copy of letter from Bristol Men's meeting to Virginia and Maryland, 28.x.1669; Bristol Friends' records, 105, p. xlv.

² George Fox: *Epistles* (1698), no. 317, p. 359, dated from Swarthmoor 12.xii.1675 [1676].

discipline developed, care was taken to make preliminary enquiries into the freedom of the parties who came before the meeting wishing to be married; and as soon as the period of written minutes is arrived at, this aspect is seen to be developing rapidly into a series of carefully considered sanctioning minutes and certificates of consent, which figure largely in many older minute books.

It was with some care that Friends arranged for publicity for marriage proposals so that no charge of clandestine irregularity might be laid against them. In the earliest surviving paper of advice from Bristol Men's Meeting, the witness of God was declared to be against any who "have contrary to the practice and good order of the People and lawes of God come together in marriage in any private way out of unity of the ye people of god."¹

Evidence is to seek that Friends usually went so far as did Richard Snead, a leading Bristol Friend, in asking the advice of Friends in the city before proposing to marry. The minute in which Bristol Men's Meeting intimated to London Friends Richard's clearness and their consent, states that he had

proposed his desires of taking Bridget Sharpe of London to wife, with submission to the councell and advice of friends here, that soe hee might not take her to wife, but in unity with freinds.²

More often it was the other way: some Friends found the discipline irksome; a couple being dealt with for marrying in church, replied that they had indeed proposed their marriage to Friends, but Friends had put them off.³ Mary Dedicott was reported to have said

that her husband fownd soe much dificalty in the bringing about the marriage of his former daughter that he was not willing that his daughter (lately maryed [at church] to Thomas Taylor) should come amongst them and moreover said to this purpose, She would not make them hipocrites to perswade them to it.⁴

In 1667, when Bristol Men's Meeting minute books begin, records of marriage proposals made to the Meeting were not kept, but within a couple of years written minutes recording procedure appear, and from then on there was a steady

¹ Paper of 27.vii.1669; Bristol Friends' records, 98, p. 2.

² Bristol Friends' records, 195, p. xlix; 12.iv.1671.

³ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 13.x.1669. Friends were usually willing to assist in speeding proposals where a case could be made out for it.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 29.vii.1669.

development and filling in of procedure until the close of the century. In its final form the outlines of which become quickly clear as one studies the records of the meetings for business, marriage proposals took just over a month to pass through the meetings. At the first meeting the parties proposed their intentions and produced consent of relations; if Friends approved they appointed two Friends particularly to make inquiries to be satisfied that the parties were free to marry. At the second meeting the two appointed Friends reported how they found it and the couple produced any further evidence of the consent of interested parties which the first meeting may have called for; if Friends approved they gave permission for the intention of marriage to be announced at the end of a public meeting for worship. At the third meeting, Friends had before them a certificate recording the publication of the marriage and that there had been no objection made against it, and they gave permission for the couple to fix a day for the wedding.

THE PROPOSALS MADE TO MEN'S MEETING

Turning to the actual process through the meetings: in 1670 the Men's Meeting began to insist upon the attendance of both parties to the marriage, when they brought their proposals. Thomas Pearce attended on 7th February, 1670, to propose his intention of marriage with Joan, daughter of Peter Hiley, and he was asked to be present at the next meeting "with his freind Joan & her mother". In the following April a firm rule was laid down

Upon consideration of some inconvenience in the making Certificate of friends marriages, It is ordered yt for tyme to come both the persons concerned doe present themsealves to the meeting at the first signifying of such their intentions.¹

Two years later, consideration of a proposal was deferred for the attendance of both parties, and this seems to show that by that time the practice had become well established.² Only very special circumstances were allowed to override this general rule. "Exterordinary occations" called Sampson Coysgarne into Cornwall in 1686 when his marriage was before the Men's Meeting, and he wrote asking them "to

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 4.ii.1670.

² *Ibid.*, 18.i.1671-72.

suffer my business to goe on" notwithstanding that he could not attend in person.¹

Strangers proceeding towards marriage in Bristol were sometimes allowed (after one personal appearance before the Men's Meeting) to be represented by a Bristol Friend when the matter came again before the Meeting. Richard Snead performed this service in 1689 for Richard Richards of Port Isaac, proposing to marry Mary Day, and in 1692 for Robert Ingram of London, marrying Christobel Coal.² A similar case had come up in 1683, when John Lloyd wrote from Shropshire asking that his brother might attend the Meeting on his behalf to receive Friends' approval of his intended marriage, "inasmuch as that my present residence is considerably remote by reason whereof I cannot conveniently attend".³ In all cases the Meeting reserved the right to demand attendance. For instance, when Thomas Lloyd and Sarah Young were unable to come to one meeting they were asked to come the next time:

Samson Lloyd on behalfe of Thomas Lloyd and Peter Young on behalfe of his daughter Sarah (Tho. Lloyd being not well, could not well com abroad) desired concent of the meeting for ye publication of the intended marriage . . . They have concent . . . Butt in that the parties is not present at this meeting, tis expected they both present themselves yet once again to the meeting before they doe approve of their marriage.⁴

In 1670 the Men's Meeting

order that for the future every person whatsoever that shall propose the entention of a mariage, bee desired to withdraw after the proposall thereof that so every freind may the more freely offer what hee hath to say in the matter; & that any freind that shall for future bee privy to anyones intentions of mariage doe advise them to cause some freind of the meetinge to propose the same for them & they to bee in readines to attend the call of the meeting.⁵

One feature of these attendances at Men's Meetings for their consent to marriage proposals was added only in 1692—over twenty years later, and arose out of a particular difficulty at our Friends marriages in this citty the parties that marry, Espeasially the Wooman, manytime Speakes to[o] low. Sometimes soe low that they are not heard nor understood by halfe the Meeting which they assemble for wittnesses, which is become a trouble upon friends

¹ Bristol Friends' records, 139, p. 49. Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 5.v.1686.

² Men's Meeting minutes, 1.v.1689, 11.v.1692.

³ Dix MSS. (Friends House), E.8.

⁴ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 31.xi.1697.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 10.xi.1669.

that observe it & many therefore are not free to subscribe as witnesses to the Certificate of their Marriage.¹

Thereupon the Men's Meeting decided, in

hopes to enure them in speakeing, that at their first proposeing their intention of marriage at the Mens meeting that both the parties doe first express their intentions & desires before questions be asked them, and then as friends may see occation at the same meeting may advise them both to appeare at the second meeting in like manner, and when they shall have matters cleare as the Meeting see meete may advise them that when they consumeate their marriage that they both speake out soe cleare that the parties which they shall invite together for wittness may all heare & be satisfied in what they say.

On the first attendance of couples proposing to marry, the Men's Meeting would enter a minute in form as follows:

Edward Harford Son of Charles Harford of this Citty soapmaker and Elizabeth Jones daughter of Charles Jones of same Citty soapmaker signified their intention of marriage & desire to accomplish the same in the way & manner of friends. All their parents are here present testefieing their concent and aprobacon.

William Taylour & Wm Itheld to Enquire.²

Proposers were required to attend twice before publication was permitted—usually of course for the receipt of the report of the two Friends appointed to enquire into clearness, but even if clearness was very well known to Friends and apparent at the first attendance, the proposers would “for order's sake” be desired to attend another meeting before consent was given.³

ENQUIRIES CONCERNING CLEARNESS FOR MARRIAGE

Specific appointment of two or more Friends to enquire into clearness was not made regularly in the period before 1682, but during the persecution of 1682-86, when attendance at meetings for discipline was small, it became the practice to appoint two Friends to enquire further into the case of each proposal, and this procedure (adopted to suit special conditions) remained part of standard marriage procedure when persecution had passed.⁴

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 26.x.1692.

² *Ibid.*, 26.vi.1689.

³ *Ibid.*, 1.vii.1673. For an exception see minutes for 9.vii.1678.

⁴ The usual number for these general enquiries was two Friends, although in one case three Friends were appointed, but in this case also the two-Friend standard appointment appears to have been the original design because between the first two names appears an “&”, struck through when the third name was added (7.ix.1687).

There is evidence from one meeting in 1688 that women were present at the Men's Meeting when marriages were proposed, and although no report is recorded, this may possibly have been in order to set on foot enquiries in the Women's Meeting.¹ It is not until 1698 that we find reference to the concern of the women in the enquiries, although silence in the record may not be evidence that participation did not take place. The two men Friends appointed to enquire were asked to inform the Women's Meeting in order that the women might make enquiry among themselves and appoint a woman Friend "as the Center of their Intilligence" and to certify the result.²

In earlier times, appointments were made for enquiry only if special cause arose, as when

Arther Russell & Joan Houlder proposed their Intention of Marriage . . . but inasmuch as the meeting hath little knowlidg of Arther they have desired Wm. Lane & Erasmus Dole to inquiry among som friends that know him & acquaint this meeting how they find it, yt soe wee may be more cleare in our proceedings therein.³

When Thomas Speed proposed his marriage with Ann Sherman, Friends

appointed some amongst themselves to speak with her, shee being unknowne to most of them both as to her purson, & principle in relation unto trueth.⁴

Enquiries of this sort continue throughout the period, and the reports often make good reading. Thomas Clarke, not well known to the meeting, was visited, and the Friends report they

take the man to be a simple hearted man. And though he haue not much to say to commend himselfe in respect to his knowlidg or growth in the truth, yet soe farr as wee can learne he is honest in his conversation and desires to owne & be owned by the friends of truth.⁵

If on report Friends were satisfied that the parties each acted as and could be owned by Friends the marriage proposed was allowed to go forward, but if not, it might be deferred for further observation or stopped if the persons could not be owned.

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 12.i.1687-88.

² *Ibid.*, 25.ii.1698.

³ *Ibid.*, 8.ii.1678.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 15.iv.1668.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 10.ii.1699.

MARRIAGES DEFERRED

Deferment was the lot of Thomas Morrice when he proposed to marry Joan Howell, for Friends were

not satisfied that the said Thomas was so far convinced of the principle of truth as to have a reall sense of truth upon his spirit, therefore doe they admonish him, and her, to waite patiently until the Lord in his time brings them sense of that with which friends have unity.¹

One unfortunate woman had her marriage deferred for the sins of her mother

being soe much scandalous in her conversation and soe infameous, as reflects soe much on her famely & those that frequents her house that friends cannot be free to countenance their marriage amongst friends untill they have better satisfaction.²

One man, having "not made a profession off (nor walked as a friend Convinced of) Truth as wee proffess", asked the Meeting's advice when his marriage proposal was not approved

they Answered him if he pleased he might waite some time longer to see whether friends could receive satisfaction therein or not.³

In some instances naturally the parties lost patience and went to church to be married. Friends anticipated this danger and might appoint Friends to visit one or both of them "in order to their preservation". One interesting instance of deferment and subsequent marriage comes from 1698 when

Eliz: Hodg signified to this meeting that she had been ingadged in inclyneation to marriage to Henry Monck for neare six yeares past, the first 3 yeares of the time they nither was convinced of the truth, but this last 3 yeares she has been convinced & hee for this last yeare have frequented our publick meeting. She desires yt friends would consider her case.

The Men's Meeting advised

that she waite in the patience, and not be hastie or forward in proceeding untill friends could have som farther knowledg and more freenes to them. ⁴

After six months

The Meeting, being moved on behalfe of Henry Monck who have inclineacon: to joyne in marriage with Eliz. Hodge, have answered

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 21.xii.1669-70.

² *Ibid.*, 14.iii.1694.

³ *Ibid.*, 27.vi.1688.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 25.iv.1698.

. . . that this Meeting doth give leave for them to lay their intentions before this Meeting when they see meet.¹

The proposals were made at the next Men's Meeting.

Friends would not concern themselves with forwarding marriages with people "differing from our principles". The Meeting refused to countenance "unequall yoakes"

that wee might not open a gap for our Children to Joyne their affections to those who doe not profess the truth with us.²

In addition to the deferment and refusal meted out to those whose connection with Friends was doubtful or of no significance, Friends enquired to see that the Friends proposing had been faithful in their actions so that Friends could accept them as in good standing. One aspect (which comes up more frequently than any other) may suffice to illustrate this. Young men Friends who had served their apprenticeship, had to take up the freedom of the city in order to set up shop unhindered and gain the privileges of a burgess. Before 1697 this required an oath and Friends refusing to take the oath could not legally take up their right. Some few did take the oath and evidence of the Men's Meeting's displeasure is to be found in the minutes.

When Isaac Partridge appeared to propose his marriage with Margaret Gush, the Men's Meeting noted that he had taken the burgess oath, and recorded

although he declares that he hath had troble and condemnation on him for it, Yet friends hath a sense that he hath not soe past through judgment as to cleare himselfe, nor take off the reproach thereof from friends and therefore cannot at present have unity with their marriage, but desires him to waite on the lord for som farther testimony to arise from him to cleare the truth of that reproach.³

Two years later, Friends were appointed

to vissit Tho. Taylard & by advice & assistant to him to helpe him out of the snare he hath fallen in by his underly dealing in & takeing the oathes.⁴

The Meeting expected some evidence of contrition before

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 12.vii.1698.

² *Ibid.*, 6.iv.1687.

³ *Ibid.*, 3.ii.1671. The marriage stood in abeyance for four months before the proposals were allowed to go forward (7.vi.1671).

⁴ *Ibid.*, 13.viii.1673.

they could approve his marriage. Another Friend was advised "in patience to waite untill the lord shall give him true repentance".¹ Four months after his former appearance

Thomas Taylour againe presented himselfe . . . & he Accnowlidgeth his former transgression soe farr to the satisfaction of friends as that they permitt him to publish their intentions in our meetinge.²

An interesting sidelight shows that some Friends had their doubts about their special marriage arrangements, and were inclined (like other Dissenters) to go to church for the solemnization. Edward Knee and his wife were by the Men's Meeting summoned

to be present here the next meeting, to see what satisfaction they can offer for the abuse done to this meeting by them, in their desiring to be marryed among friends after they had been privately maryed by a preist.³

Friends in good standing were allowed to put forward their proposals for marriage in the Men's Meeting. The Meeting required them to show themselves clear from all others and that they had the consent of persons who had particular charge of them or special interest in their welfare.

CONSENT OF PARENTS AND GUARDIANS

The desirability of gaining the consent of parents or guardians was increasingly recognized by Friends, and became marked as the second generation grew up in the church. Fox, in his epistle "To all the elect", directed

all are to speak first to their Parents, and have their Consent, before they engage the Affections of the Children; and this Order is settled by the Power of God, in the Men and Womens Meetings; for some formerly did speak to neither Father nor Mother, till they had drawn out, and entangled the Affections of the Daughter; and that brought great trouble and discontent upon the Parents, and among Friends. And therefore this is to be enquired into, in the Men and Womens Meetings, where their Marriages are to be spoken of.⁴

Soon after, Bristol Men's Meeting recorded that friends have a sence that Inconveniency and Griefe hath hapened to som friends, by some young people amongst us in their entangling

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 16.viii.1671.

² *Ibid.*, 19.ix.1673.

³ Bristol Friends' records, 96, 17.xii.1672. On another occasion the Men's Meeting wrongly suspected a couple of having acted similarly (Men's Meeting minutes, 6, 20.vii.1680).

⁴ *Epistles*, no. 317, p. 360; copy in Bristol MSS. V., 8-9. Dated at Swarthmoor, 12.xii.1675.

their affections each to other in relation to marriage before they have acquainted their relations therewith.¹

The Meeting drew up a paper of advice against hasty or disorderly marriage, advising the parties timely to seek the consent of their parents "this being the most likely meanes wee could see for the preventing the Enemies snares in this kind."²

The problem was perennial.

One early minute recording the marriage proposals of John Weare and Hester Guest, asked her to produce a certificate of consent from her mother and step-father. The Men's Meeting added "& in as much as the said Hester hath not yet acquainted them therewith, in that respect friends judgeth she hath not don soe well".³

Parents giving their consent might be present with the persons proposing marriage, or might send a certificate with them in such terms as the following:

These are to Certify all persons whom it may conserne that whereas our son Henry James of Bristoll have made us aquainte of his intentions of marriage with Ann Harris of Bristoll wee . . . Henry James & Elizabeth James father & mother of the said Henry doe give our free consents to the aforesaid marriage intended.⁴

If not brought at the first attendance, the proposers would be asked to produce one at the second appearance.

Where only one parent survived the consent of him or her was required, but where none were living other members of the family were sought. One Friend "haveing noe parrents liveing, Friends expects he should procure a certificate from his eldest brother or next relation yt had the care of him of his or their aprobacon."⁵

Cases are on record of requests for a stepfather's consent. Three grandparents were present when Mary Jones and William Penn jr. were before the Men's Meeting.

Wm Penn his father is present; soe is Charles Jones her father, together with Charles Jones, Anne Jones & Jane Wathin, her grandfather & grandmothers, all signifying their concent.⁶

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 25.i.1678.

² Men's Meeting paper, dated 6.iii.1678; Bristol MSS., V, 117.

³ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 16.iv.1679.

⁴ Bristol Friends' records, 102, 13: certificate dated from Painswick, 15.iv.1684.

⁵ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 3.viii.1692.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 24.viii.1698.

On occasion, consent of brother and sister or uncle and aunt were recorded in the Meeting; but nothing quite so comprehensive as the consent signified by Margaret Fell's relations in the Men's Meeting on 18th October, 1669, has been recorded elsewhere.

John Rowse & Margaret his wife, Thomas Lowre and Mary his wife, Issabell Yeamans and Rachell Fell daughters of the said Margaret Fell have all of them one by one not onely declared their free assent to said intended mariage butt also have for the most of them signified that they have had a sence that the thinge intended to bee accomplisht doth stand in the Covenant of light and life & therefore doe rejoice for that the accomplishment thereof draweth nigh.¹

Failing relations, a guardian's consent was sought. Nathaniel Allen's daughter, left in England after her father's emigration to Pennsylvania, being under the care of four Friends, procured from them a paper to certify their consent.² Overseers and executors of the wills of deceased parents were also to be asked, or informed "as a comendable thing".³ In this connection, the marriage proposal of Robert Ingram and Christobel Coale daughter of George Coale deceased, may be quoted. A certificate was produced

from the two weekes meeting in London, whereat was present Wm Ingram & Wm Philips two of the executors in trust apoynted by the last will of George Cole, from which meeting is signified their approbation on their procedure to marriage. R. Sneade on[e] other of the executors in trust is present . . . testefieing his approbation and that also Walter Grimes, the other executor in trust has been acquainted therewith & is not in opposition.⁴

When neither parents nor relations nor guardians were forthcoming the proposers might bring other Friends to give testimony for them. Thus servants would ask their masters and mistresses to come, and on one occasion Jane Wathen told the meeting that Jane Bayly "hath behaved her selfe as a fathfull servant with her & yt she doth approve of ther intentions".⁵ True as this may be, it seems scarcely of great moment.

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 18.viii.1669.

² *Ibid.*, 5.x.1687.

³ *Ibid.*, 19.x.1698.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 27.iv.1692.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 2.v.1677.

CERTIFICATES FROM OTHER MEETINGS

In their consideration of marriages the Men's Meeting might call for certificates from other meetings to witness to the freedom of the parties proposing marriage. The Horsham certificate of 8th January, 1696, is already known to Friends, but as it relates to William Penn it may bear reprinting. Horsham Friends wrote to Bristol concerning their investigations on his marriage proposal, that on

Enquirey both in city and countrey there being nothing found that may impead or hinder his intention, but to the best of our knowledge he is free and cleare from all other persons on the accounte of marriage, soe that he may proceed in Truths way to the accomplishment of the same, and we leave it to the wisdome of God in you and your Christian care to see that all things been cleare on the said Hannah Callowhill and her relations parte.¹

Horsham Friends had no need to fear for any hasty procedure in Bristol. The Men's Meeting there was holding up consideration of the marriage until a satisfactory account was received from Sussex. A study of the minute books reveals that marriage proposals might be rejected because the parties were not in good standing as Friends, because conflicting claims could not be cleared (earlier engagements or promises not dissolved, and the like), or because of a withdrawal by one of the parties when the matter was already under consideration by the Meeting. But when all matters seemed clear and enquiries revealed no impediment, the next step was to order publication of the proposed marriage in a meeting for worship, "that upon such publique notice, if any have ought theragainst they may have opportunity to acquaint friends".²

PUBLICATION

This procedure probably dates from the earliest form of marriage discipline among Friends, and it was doubtless adopted as the most convenient means of publication, like the banns in church. If one can judge from the following minute, however, the object of publication in this manner does not appear to have been widely recognized. In 1673 the Men's Meeting recorded that

¹ Bristol Friends' records, 102, 97. Certificate dated Horsham, 8.xi.1695. (Cf. Horsham M.M. minutes, printed *Journal F.H.S.*, viii. 32.)

² Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 24.xii.1667.

Friends desires for the future that when publicacon shall be made in our publick meetings of the intentions of Friends marriages, that the Friend that maketh that publicacon shall signify the reason of the publication thereof, which is that if any hath any thing reasonable to object against the intended marriage they may signify the same to the next Men's Meeting.¹

On one occasion, Friends ordered notice of publication to be given to one claimant who had failed to produce evidence for a claim he made to the hand of a woman who was proposing to marry someone else. The person who delivered the notice gave the Men's Meeting a certificate that he had been asked

to goe to Thomas Pugsly to his lodging, & to give him notis that Sarah Cornish was to be axt or published to Richard Bird in ye Meeting howse of ye people caled quakers ye next Fryday neare fowerth hower in ye after noone, which notice was accordingly given, about three dayes before ye publication thearof . . . & if that he had any thing to objectt against it that he mighte appeare, & forbide the proceedings.²

Friends were not very happy about this case and they kept all the papers about it, although there seems little doubt that their decision to allow the marriage to go forward was the right one.

At latest since 1671, and probably before then, marriages were regularly announced at the Friday weekday meeting for worship.³ It seems probable that when the Men's Meeting passed a marriage for publication in open meeting for worship, a paper or certificate authorizing it was given to the parties for them to hand to the Friend by whom they desired the announcement to be made. This procedure may be inferred from the phrases used authorizing four Friends to act for the Meeting in a marriage case where some further information was asked for, that "if they do receive satisfaction in it, to give order that it [the marriage] may be published".⁴ In 1687 at any rate, this method was established:

Its the desire of this meeting yt when Friends have concent of this meeting to publish any intention of mariage, that a line or two to certefiy the same be given from this Meeting to the end that those who shall publish the same may be satisfied it is by concent of the

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 13.viii.1673.

² Bristol Friends' records, 139, 26; 3.xi.1676.

³ This procedure was settled by minute of 6.i.1670-71, and probably reflects previous practice.

⁴ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 19.ii.1669.

Meeting, & also for conveniency may when published signe their name & day of publication, which, upon its retorne will signify to the Meeting what may be nessesary to remaine with them.¹

Then follows a specimen entry, in a form which had long been in use:

Viz. Richard Mittings & Mary Hollister have the concent of this Meeting to cause their intention of marriage to be published amongst friends as is usuall.

In consenting to the publication of a marriage the Meeting stipulated that they should receive sufficient proof that the publication had not produced any opposition, and thus gradually there came the need for the third attendance at meeting. A minute of 1669 records that the parties are permitted to publish such their intentions in the way of freinds in the publicke meeting house on next sixth day, and are desired to forebeare cominge together untill the next mens meeting.²

Some months later a similar clause was added to another minute; the parties

are desired not to consummate their mariage untill after the next mens meetinge that shalbee after such publicacon.³

This became common practice later, and the minute entering note of publication signified the successful passage of proposals through the Men's Meeting. Not until 1680 is a minute found directing attendance at meeting after publication, but this appears to have become usual by the end of the century.

Some persons did attempt to evade the discipline of the meetings. The most notable occasion in Bristol was the marriage of Nathaniel Wade and Ann Davis which Friends had refused to countenance (6th June, 1687)—doubtless because of their dissatisfaction about his former activities under the Duke of Monmouth in the rebellion. This marriage was published in meeting for worship, and the Men's Meeting recorded that the marriage when proposed to them, Friends had not freedome to incoradg or countenance such their proceedings in our meeting. And in as much as Wm. Foord [who made the announcement without the customary note for publication from the Men's Meeting] have in time past Joynt with us given forth from this our Mens meeting under his & severall of our hands a testimony against unequall yoakes & disorderly walkeing. Butt now he the said William Foord haveing on the 28th of the 4th mo. last unfriendly &

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 14.xii.1686.

² *Ibid.*, 28.iv.1669.

³ *Ibid.*, 21.xii.1669.

disorderly, without the consent of the meeting, published their intentions in our publick meeting to the trouble greife & dissatisfaction of friends. This meeting doe now enter this our dislike or memorial thereof against such his disorderly practice.¹

Another similar unauthorized publication in meeting for worship is noted in the following year,² and the Friend who published that one received an admonition, like William Ford.

PROCEDURE IN TIME OF PERSECUTION

During persecution, when meetings were disturbed and many Friends were in prison, special difficulties attended the publication of marriages. In September, 1670, when the Meeting houses were closed, Abel Chandler and Mary Sterridge, having passed the Men's Meeting were "permitted to take a convenient opportunity to publish their intentions of marriage".³ In the following month, definite procedure was set down in the minute:

Whereas it hath been the approved practice of freinds to cause all marriages to bee publisht at their publick assemblies, & whereas also freinds are at this time forcibly kept out of their publick meetinge houses, it is therefore agreed that for the future ye intentions of all mariages amongst freinds bee publisht in their mens and womens meetings usually held once every fortnight on the second dayes of the weekes untill such time as that they have admittance into their publique meetinge houses againe, when the former practice & order on this behalfe is againe to take place.⁴

During the persecution in the 1680's, the smallness of meetings for worship and the unrepresentative number of those able to attend the Men's Meeting constrained Friends to desire the parties to intimate their intentions to prisoners and to the Women's Meeting "to the end [as the minute runs] if they find noething meet to obstruct it there might be their joynt consent with this of ours" for proceeding.⁵

This special procedure is explicitly stated in a minute of April, 1683, asking a Friend

to cause his said intentions to be mentioned at ye Meeting of our Women Friends as alsoe among the Friends in Prison, viz. Newgate & Bridewell, which done and an account thereof given to this Meeting

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 4.v.1687.

² *Ibid.*, 24.vii.1688.

³ *Ibid.*, 5.vii.1670.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 17.viii.1670.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 20.xii.1681.

of theyer satisfaction . . . [the proposers] may proceed to ye accomplishment of theyer intended marryedge when they shall see meet.¹

Copy of the minute consenting to the intimation of the proposals to prisoners and the Women's Meeting was given to the party,² that the Friends to whom he made application might be satisfied of the approval of Friends still at liberty, and that the Friends to whom he applied might in their turn sign some certificate "of their concurrence", which could be returned to the Men's Meeting.³

When returned, note was made of the receipt of these certificates—as

This meeting haveing received a Certificate from our friends at both prisons and also from the Weomens Meeting that there was publickca- tion of the intent of marriage betwixt William Gravit & Martha Frye & that they could find nothing meet to obstruct them therein.

They have concent of this meeting to finish such their intended marriage when they shall see meete.⁴

Six of these certificates are preserved among the Dix Manuscripts at Friends House, all dated between 1683 and 1685, and there are doubtless some others among family archives dating from the same period.⁵ They have much the same form; a recitation of the proposals made to the Men's Meeting, and the order from that Meeting for the publication among the prisoners and at the Women's Meeting. After the preamble follows the note of publication and signature. For Robert Lux and Margaret Taylour it was stated (Dix MS. E7)

These are therefore to Certefie friends of the mens meeting that the said Robert Lux hath accordingly acquainted friends and that nothing hath apeared to or knowlidge meet to obstruct their said Intention to wch wee Subscribe or names

noe obstruction apearethe before friends
at Newgate

{ Charles Harford
Paul Moone
at Newgate.

it was published in the womans meting &
thare apeared no thing of obstrucken

Sarah Moone
Ann Jones
Jane Warren

{ at Weomens Meeting—
ye 7th of 3d mo. 1683

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 2.ii.1683 (typescript copy of rough minutes in Bristol Friends' records, p. 210).

² *Ibid.*, 20.xii.1681.

³ *Ibid.*, 30.ii.1683 (typescript copy, p. 211).

⁴ *Ibid.*, 3.i.1683-84.

⁵ Dix MSS., E6, E7, E9-12. Another is printed in *Journal F.H.S.*, ii., 15.

The certificate for Gregory Powell and Ann Sanders (Dix MS. E6), in common with most certificates now known, have signatures for Friends at both Newgate and Bridewell. It is dated 16th April, 1683, and the body of the work is in the hand of Richard Sneade, it records that the couple were advised to

acquaint friends at the Weomens Meeting Newgate and Bridewell. [The signatures follow]

“At Newgate—Richd: Sneade
At Bridewell
At Weoms. Meeting

As it have past throu you
so we do all so in bridewell let it pass
Bridewell—Rebeckeh Hhill
Womens meeting—Joan Dickson”

These certificates doubtless came from Bristol Meeting records, saved from among the bulk of “Certificates of ye Publications of Marriages with those of Parents & Guardians Consent thereto”,¹ mentioned in the 1737 catalogue of deeds and records in the Meeting, which were destroyed or dispersed by the Committee on Registers in 1842.

EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Some proposals of marriage which came before the Meeting were from people who had reason to desire a swift passage.

Jonathon Packer & Sarah Baugh signified to this meeting their intentions of marriage . . . The said Jonathon being sudenly bound away to Virgina desires the speedy effecting thereof it also being the earnest request of her now dyeing mother: and things apeareing Cleare betwixt them.²

Friends allowed publication after the first appearance. Roger Hollard in like case, being “bound shortly to sett out on a Voiage to sea” was allowed to publish after first appearance “to the End that . . . they might have Concent of the next mens meeting for the accomplishment thereof”.³ Similar action was taken for Friends from away whose business concerns would not permit them long absences, like William Gravet, of Exeter;⁴ and William Walker, a London tailor:

¹ Bristol Friends' records, 124, p. 39.

² Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 26.vi.1678.

³ *Ibid.*, 1.ix.1680.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 18.xii.1683.

William Walker & Mary Kippon proposed their intention of marriage . . . And the said William Walker being an inhabitant of London saith his occasions there will not admitt of his being longe from whome without much prejudice, maketh his request to this meeting to give them concent to have their intentions published before next meeting to the end that if nothing appeare meet to obstruct their marriage they might have concent the next meeting to consumate the same . . . They have the consent of this meeting, to cause the same to be published on next sixth day, but not to consumate their marriage here without the concent & satisfaction of the next meeting.¹

For another case Friends appointed Thomas Callowhill to receive the return on a marriage publication before the next meeting, in order that, if clear, the parties might "proceed to Marriage . . . notwithstanding it be before next M. Meeting".² Similar means were more than once adopted to speed publication when it was only delayed for an awaited certificate. Benjamin Coole being before the Men's Meeting on proceeding to marriage with Joan Yeate

he have not yet a certeficate from friends in the County of Wilts nor can have untill their next monethly meeting which falling upon the same day as doe also our next meeting cannot be procured time enough to be presented to this next Meeting. Now therefore upon request of Benjamine Coole: This Meeting doe advise if the said Benjamine doe soone after the day of the next meeting bring such certeficate to Richard Snead & Tho. Callowhill or one of them & desire that publicacon of their marriage may be made before another Mens meeting that then the said Richard Snead or Tho. Callowhill may signify for this meeting their concent & allowance of such publicacon.³

After the return of publication of the marriage had been received, no further entries occur in the minute book; except in the marriage of Thomas Denham and Dorcas Willis. There the following note is added to the final passing minute: "yet before the accomplishment of their marriage Dorcas dyed."⁴ The wedding ceremony would take place in one of the meeting houses before the required attendance of "nott . . . les then a dossen Friends and relations".⁵ During the persecutions when the meeting houses were boarded up by the authorities, marriages took place in Friends' private houses. The Men's Meeting passed marriages for "accomplishment . . . at such

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 20.v.1674.

² *Ibid.*, 14.xii.1685.

³ *Ibid.*, 18.ix.1689. Isaac Morss (Moss) of Manchester obtained a similar concession, 21.xi.1694.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 14.iii.1683.

⁵ George Fox's paper "Friends fellowship", copy in Bristol MSS. I, 5 (Friends House).

tyme and place as they [the parties] with their relations & friends of truth who shalbe acquainted therewith shall see meet".¹

SPECIAL CASES

Marriages with which Friends had not complete satisfaction were sometimes passed by the Men's Meeting, but it is clear that they did not receive the full approbation usually accorded. The minutes are sometimes obscure. In the case of James Wallis and Mary Gouldney perhaps Friends were not entirely satisfied with the faithfulness of one of the parties to Quaker principles:

James Wallis & Mary Gouldney haveing at the former meeting signified their Intention of Marriage, & there appearing nothing to the contrary but that they are both of them free from all other persons in relation to mariage, & it being also the desire & request of both their parents yt the same may be accomplished in ye way of friends, the meeting doth for conveniency sake permitt the publication therof in our publique meeting.²

At a later date the Men's Meeting passed another marriage, although

for divers reasons wee cannot aprove or incoradge their intended marriage; yet perceiveing they have ingadged themselves soe farr as not fairely to be disjoyned

it was allowed to go forward.³ In yet another case, the Meeting, not having "freedom to countenance their marriage in the meetings in the way & manner of friends", offered an alternative to the parties

either to waite longer for our better satisfaction: or to consumate the same assoone as they please amongst such friends as may be free to be present thereat: or otherwise as they shall see meet.⁴

The second alternative put forward may have been suggested with a mind to the procedure laid down some years before, when the marriage of a man and woman with child by him had been proposed. At that time the Men's Meeting recorded:

such a Marriage being not honourable may not be approved to pass in these meetings according to our accostomed manner . . . But if

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 20.xii.1681.

² *Ibid.*, 4.viii.1678.

³ *Ibid.*, 10.ix.1684.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 21.ix.1687.

they [the parties] under a true sence and sorrow and brokenness of heart, being bowed downe under the Judgments of the Lord doe condemne their miscarriages, Then it is desired that some expedient may be found out to helpe such that they may not be lost.¹

A committee was appointed to consider the matter, so that the Friends concerned should not be left to the temptation of going to church for their marriage. As a result of the committee's deliberations, the following Men's Meeting recorded:

First, That our meetings may not be farther trobled with marriages of this kind, let five wise and prudent Friends of this meeting be nominated and appoynted by the meeting to take care & inspect the cases . . . to consider and advise the parties concerned . . .

Secondly, If any miscarriage happen of that kind . . . information be given to some or one of those friends apoynted . . . to make inquiry . . . And if they find a tenderness in them . . . That they advise them to give or signe a paper of condemnation against themselves . . .

Thirdly, Seeing they cannot with cleareness or safety be advised either to publish their marriage amongst us or goe to the priests, and there being a nessesity from the law of god & equity for their marriage; a forme of certificate may be allowed them of their takeing each other to be man and wife and of their promise each to other in that case to be signed by themselves and those who shalbe present at their marriage.

Fowerthly, That they be advised to procure such of their relations, neybour or friends as are free to be present at their marriage to be witness and signe such their certeficate, which in number shall not be less than Ten or Twelve.

Fifthly, That . . . friends . . . provide and signe a paper containeing a testimony for truth . . . And this said paper soe signed to be kept in readyness to produce as a deffence for truth . . .²

The marriage under consideration in 1674 appears to be the only one dealt with by this procedure.

MARRIAGES OUTSIDE FRIENDS DISCIPLINE

Marriages which the meetings for discipline had not approved could not be held after the manner of Friends, but there are a few cases recorded where the parties defied the Men's Meeting and persisted in holding their weddings as Friends were wont to do, persuading some Friends to be present as witnesses. In November, 1667, Henry Pritchard married Mary Smith, although previously the Men's Meeting

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 31.vii.1674.

² *Ibid.*, 14.vii.1674.

had "denied to have to doe in his Mariage".¹ After dealing with him unsuccessfully, a paper was issued by the Men's Meeting stating that Friends

Doe Disowne the sayd Marriadge, as not being done in the Trueth, but in, & by a Lye; as alsoe the Manner of the doeing of it; & the Coming together of those whoe were present therat as a breach of good Order.²

Years later, Joseph Hort married his brother's widow after the Men's Meeting had refused its sanction. The wedding was held "in a Clandestine Manner" at their own house, "the Circoomstances being Fowle and Reproachfull". Joseph Hort's action was strongly condemned, and the Friends whom "Brightweed Hortt had beguiled . . . to be present at her Son Joseph Hortts pretended Mariage with his brothers wife" were dealt with also.³ The Friends present at Henry Pritchard's marriage had been prevailed upon to sign a paper of contrition for their action. In the course of the paper they expressed sorrow

because our presence as witnesses to his marriage tends (as upon serious consideration wee have found) to the breach of good Order among friends. And therefore wee disowne the sayd Marriadge, & our being therat.⁴

One Friend married in the Meeting without first consulting the Men's Meeting, and his action was condemned by a testimony signed by the Meeting:

Friends, being not satisfied with Benjamin Maynards taken to wife Ann [blank] in the Publique Meetinghouse without acquainting the Meeting of friends, & haveing their Approbation as to the Publication therof first . . . alsoe without any Publication of that his intent beforehand, as is right & meet, & the Order of Friends.⁵

The constant references to marriage discipline in the general papers of advice issued by individual Friends and meetings for discipline show the importance which Friends attached to this testimony for Truth. A study of the minute books reveals the difficulties Friends met with, and how far they translated in church administration their ideals into reality.

R. S. MORTIMER

¹ Bristol Men's Meeting minutes, 13.ix.1667.

² *Ibid.*, 13.xi.1667. Two years later Henry Pritchard expressed his sorrow for having spurned the Meeting's advice, 21.xii.1669.

³ *Ibid.*, 15, 29.iii. and 26.iv.1693.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 16.x.1667.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 24.xii.1667.

James Logan

James Logan and the Culture of Provincial America. By Frederick B. Tolles. Boston, Toronto, Little, Brown and Company. 1957. *The Library of American Biography.* Edited by Oscar Handlin. pp. xi, 228. \$3.50. (Available from Adam and Charles Black at 18s.)

This life of James Logan (1674-1751), successively schoolmaster, secretary, fur trader, and Chief Justice of Pennsylvania, is at once solid history and enjoyable biography. The publishers' policy for the series in which Frederick Tolles's book appears doubtless accounts for the absence of the detailed apparatus of footnotes and references to sources (these being dealt with generally in a 5-page note at the end) which one looks for in historical work. The severe specialist will be alone in regretting this. Every page assures the reader of the careful collection, weighing and sifting of evidence which has gone into the making of this book.

James Logan's claim to fame rests on his connection with the development of Pennsylvania from the moment in 1699 when he took up employment with William Penn. At this distance we cannot say that Penn could have chosen a better secretary and factotum, but for his family's prosperity he probably chose better than he knew. The unpopularity among Pennsylvanians, which the austerity in Logan's personality engendered, only served to wed him more closely to the proprietors.

The debate as to whether the "Holy Experiment" as a Quaker adventure in statecraft was in all circumstances doomed to failure may not, on the basis of our present knowledge, yet be decided, but the evidence marshalled in Frederick Tolles's book can leave us in no doubt, that with James Logan playing a central part, no lasting success would be achieved. It is not to be wondered at that the clever young schoolmaster, largely self-educated, and (dare we say it) self-opinionated, saddled as he was with multifarious duties, with the task of resolving conflicting interests, and fundamentally out of sympathy with Penn's ideal of government, should have failed to show brilliant statesmanship in the spirit of his employer. The other aspect of James Logan's contribution to American life is well covered in this book, viz. Logan's remarkable scientific and humanistic interests, collecting mathematical instruments from Europe, and books on a wide range of subjects from classics to the Norse sagas. The Loganian library has recently been described as "the greatest single intellectual monument of colonial America which has survived."

This book is a satisfying account of one of the three or four most considerable men in colonial America. Local patriotism prompts a single correction! Philip Ford was no Bristol Quaker; he lived in London.

R. S. MORTIMER

Supplements to the Journal of Friends' Historical Society

- 1-7. FIRST PUBLISHERS OF TRUTH. Ed. Norman Penney. 1907. 410 pp. with binding case, unbound. 15s., post 1s. 5d.
14. Record of the SUFFERINGS OF FRIENDS IN CORNWALL, 1655-1686. 1928. 152 pp., 7s. 6d., post 5d.
15. QUAKER LANGUAGE. F.H.S. Presidential address by T. Edmund Harvey, 1928. 30 pp., 1s. 6d., post 2d.
- 16-17. PEN PICTURES OF LONDON YEARLY MEETING, 1789-1833. Ed. Norman Penney. 1930. 227 pp., 10s., post 10d.
21. AN ORATOR'S LIBRARY. John Bright's books. Presidential address 1936 by J. Travis Mills. 1946. 24 pp., 2s., post 2d.
22. LETTERS TO WILLIAM DEWSBURY AND OTHERS. Edited by Henry J. Cadbury. 1948. 68 pp., 5s., post 3d.
23. SLAVERY AND "THE WOMAN QUESTION." Lucretia Mott's Diary, 1840. By F. B. Tolles. 1952. 5s., cloth 7s. 6d., post 3d.
24. THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY OF THE EARLY FRIENDS. Presidential address by Frederick B. Tolles, 1952. 2s. 6d., post 2d.
25. JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER, The Quaker. By C. Marshall Taylor. 1954. 2s. 6d. post 2d.
26. JAMES NAYLER, A FRESH APPROACH. By Geoffrey F. Nuttall, D.D. 1954. 1s. 6d., post 2d.
27. THOMAS RUDYARD, EARLY FRIENDS' "ORACLE OF LAW." By Alfred W. Braithwaite. 1956. 1s. 6d., post 2d.
-

Careers in Insurance

In this modern age no prudent individual or business organisation can afford to ignore the consequences of misfortune or disaster. The whole world has become increasingly conscious of the need for the protection which Insurance provides, and this large and prosperous industry is expanding rapidly.

Opportunity for a Career: High in the ranks of the leading Offices stands the FRIENDS' PROVIDENT & CENTURY INSURANCE OFFICES who, in recent years, have met an increasing share of this growing demand for Insurance. The organisation continues to develop throughout the world, and there is ample opportunity for ambitious young men to find profitable and worth-while careers on the Staff of the Offices at home and overseas.

Training: Adequate training facilities are provided to assist in ultimate qualification for the most senior positions. Each man on entry is placed with regard to his particular ability and inclinations, and individual training is given either in London or at Branches in the main provincial cities.

Educational Requirements: The minimum standard is at least four passes in G.C.E. (O) (English Language, Mathematics and two other subjects), and trainees are recruited from men up to the age of 25 from Grammar and Public Schools and Universities.

Prospects: There are many fine opportunities for advancement with the Offices, and those who make satisfactory progress can look forward to earning substantial salaries in responsible positions while still comparatively young.

Full details can be obtained from

The Personnel Officer

The Friends' Provident & Century Insurance Offices

7 Leadenhall Street, London, E.C.3.