

The Journal
of the
Friends' Historical
Society

VOLUME 49

NUMBER 1

1959

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.

Yearly 10s.

Contents

	PAGE
Editorial	I
Early Use of the Word "Quaker". <i>Henry J. Cadbury</i>	3
Reports on Archives	6
Elizabeth Bevan Tonjoroff (1847-1907). <i>Ormerod Greenwood</i>	7
"Errors in the Indictment" and Pardons: the Case of Theophilus Green. <i>Alfred W. Braithwaite</i> ..	24
Ellwood's <i>Davideis</i> : a newly discovered version? <i>Andrew and Helen Brink</i>	31
Wordsworth's Quaker Servant: Mary Dawson, afterwards Fisher, d.1854. <i>H. Rossiter Smith</i>	34
Accounts	40
From Radicalism to Quakerism: Gerrard Winstanley and Friends. <i>Richard T. Vann</i>	41
J. J. Gurney and Norwich Politics. <i>David Swift</i> ..	47
Recent Publications	59
Notes and Queries	64

Friends' Historical Society

President: 1959—Richenda C. Scott
1960—Olive C. Goodbody

Chairman: Geoffrey F. Nuttall

Secretary: Muriel A. Hicks

Joint Alfred W. Braithwaite and
Editors: Russell S. Mortimer

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

THIS issue of the *Journal*, the sole number for 1959 and somewhat delayed in appearance, is the first to see the light since John Nickalls ceased to be editor at the end of 1958. The Society's Minute recording its appreciation of all the work which John Nickalls has put into the *Journal* over the past three decades is reproduced at the end of this Editorial Note. We are fortunate too, to have a review of—John Nickalls: *Some Quaker Portraits* (the illustrated Supplement to the *Journal* which reproduces the Presidential Address which he delivered in 1957) by Mr. Charles Kingsley Adams, the Director of the National Portrait Gallery.

The first long article on Elizabeth Bevan Tonjoroff, missionary and relief worker in Bulgaria at the end of the 19th century, is a quite thrilling story written by Ormerod Greenwood, from Friends' mission records and Tonjoroff family documents and reminiscences. Alfred Braithwaite contributes a study of 17th century legal methods "*Errors in the Indictment*" and *Pardons*, based on the case of Theophilus Green, a Thames waterman, praemunired in 1671. Andrew and Helen Brink discuss what is thought to be an 18th-century manuscript version of Ellwood's *Davideis*. A paper by H. Rossiter Smith is concerned with Mary Dawson Fisher, one of William Wordsworth's servants, who was born and bred a Quaker. Richard T. Vann of Harvard University, produces material connecting Gerrard Winstanley the Digger with Friends, and David Swift of Wesleyan University, Connecticut, deals with the part Joseph John Gurney played in Norwich politics.

We shall resume half-yearly publication, and in the next issue we hope to print the Presidential Address for 1959, delivered by Richenda Scott.

* * *

THE following is the minute of the Friends' Historical Society adopted on 5th March, 1959 with regard to the retirement of John Nickalls from the Editorship of this Journal.

Since Norman Penney's name ceased to appear on the title-page of the *Journal* with the issue for 1932, and the first long editorship of the publications of the Friends' Historical Society ended, John Nickalls has edited for the Society twenty-nine volumes of the *Journal* and a complement of Supplements. This is not the place to note his editorial work in other fields which has brought no little honour to the Historical Society, but we should mention the gain the Society has experienced through his wide acquaintance, kept up to date and extended constantly by his position as Librarian at Friends House. This has enabled him to make the *Journal* in the past three decades more broadly based and happily circumstanced with a steady flow of material, widely varying in topic and treatment. Of course, not all material submitted is in form or content suitable for publication, or quite within the field in which the *Journal* has to specialize, and it has to be the lot of the editor to advise an author how to place his material for publication, or to suggest alterations which might bring the material into a form acceptable for printing in the *Journal*. For the way in which this difficult, unobtrusive and sometimes thankless task has been carried out we have to thank John Nickalls. We believe that as editor he can retire with much goodwill on that score.

During his tenure of the office of editor, John Nickalls has maintained a high level of critical work. This is remarkable, and is a tribute to his workmanship and his ability to obtain the co-operation of persons working in the field of Quaker history. The workers and writers on historical subjects among Friends are few. The number of Quaker historians has never been more than limited, and the majority are members of this Historical Society and known to one another. This is a strong reason for maintaining the standards in historical work at a high level. Objective, intelligent and thoughtful scholarship, making use of all modern techniques for research into the varied fields of Quaker history needs to be brought to bear upon the questions which arise, when we indulge our natural enthusiasm for inquiring into the past of the Society of Friends of which we form a part. The editorial chair which John Nickalls vacates has become more than the seat of the proof-reader for an antiquarian magazine.

We look forward with confidence to a continuance of the same high standard of scholarship and readability which John Nickalls has maintained during his tenure of office.

Early Use of the Word "Quaker"

WHILE looking up the references to Quakers in the lately published volume 5 of *Aberdeen Council Letters*, edited by Louise Taylor, I came across in an earlier volume one dated 22 February, 1640. This by its ending, "God Save the King", is evidently a proclamation. It is Letter 135, Vol. 2, 1950, p. 174. In order to give its Scots flavor to the eye, as I cannot to the ear, I shall transcribe its beginning literatim.

Where as the provest baillies and councell of this burghe by their late act groundit upon the acts of Parliament and Lords of his maiesties secret councell did appoynt and ordane that no inhabitant within this Burghe should resett supplie intertane or furnish meat or drink to or keep correspondence or intelligence with or lett hous or chambers to Jesuits preists or traffiqueing strangers papists or Quackers under payne of ffyve hundreth markes scots money by and attour their censure and punishment to be inflictit on them according to their severall qualities and degrees upon the first legall convictione thairanent. And that no papist or quaker residing within this burghe or other inhabitant within the same sould resett in their hosses ludge or intertaine any papist or quaker or any persone suspect of aither of the same . . .

In a note to the word "act" in the second line of this text the editor refers to an act against papists of 8 January, 1640, published in *Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen*, i. 1625-1642, 1871, p. 196.

Here apparently is a document well prior to 1650, the year when George Fox says the word Quaker was first used, a document which employs the term no less than five times, bracketed with Papists, Jesuits or the like. Naturally this raises suspicions. Again and again I have traced such early occurrences and have found them due to error.¹ Accordingly I wrote to the editor of the *Aberdeen Letters*, who promptly admitted that the date was probably wrong, having been misread for the original contemporary 1670 by the person who about 150 years ago sorted the letter from a confused mass. The latter date suits an Aberdeen Act against Papists

¹ An instance in the Quarter Sessions Record of Chester in 1607 was noted and corrected in the *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* in 1949, Vol. xli, pp. 4f., 91. I had already dealt with this, a misprint of the word "cocker," in the *Friends Intelligencer*, 98, 1941, p. 330.

and *Quakers*, dated 16 February, 1670, published in the above named *Extracts*, ii. 1643-1747, p. 261.

Having thus disposed of this instance of a premature use of "Quaker", I naturally turned again to the classic instances in the Clarendon MSS at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, whither I was travelling anyhow a few days later, and could once more examine them directly. There are three of them. The first (No. 1034) is filed and calendared under 1637! But it bears no date and evidently belongs about forty years later. Cf. Besse, *Sufferings*, i, 260, Anno 1677. It is a petition to the King and Privy Council and is entitled "The case of several Protestant Dissenters called Quakers, within the County of Hereford, stated in relation to their late and present sufferings upon old Statutes made against popish Recusants."

The second and third (Nos. 2624, 2639) are definitely dated in 1647. Though calendared in the *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers*, i, 1872, and printed in whole or in part nearly a century earlier in *Clarendon State Papers*, Vol. ii, Appendix and p. 383, they were apparently little noticed until they were quoted in the Oxford English Dictionary, viii, 1910, s.v. Quaker. Since then they have been accepted by Quaker historians as by Rufus M. Jones, *George Fox, an Autobiography*, 1903, p. 125 f., note (The fascicle Q of the dictionary was issued in October 1902); Norman Penney, *Cambridge Journal of George Fox*, 1911, i. 395 note; W. C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, 1912, p. 57 note. Cf. my caveat, *ibid.*, 2nd edition, 1955, p. 550.

That in Clarendon MS. 2639 reads:

There are a sect of women lately come from foreign parts and lodged in Southwark, called Quakers, who swell, shiver and shake when come to themselves (for in all the time of their fit Mohamet's holy ghost converses with them) they begin to preach what hath been delivered to them by the Spirit.

This is a letter dated 4th November, 1647 (new Style) signed by John Wilcocks, a pseudonym for Secretary Nicholas, in the latter's handwriting and addressed to Monsieur Edgeman. But this and other parts of the letter are evidently based on No. 2624 in the same collection, the copy of a news letter dated, London, 14th October, 1647 (old Style) and written without address or signature in the hand of Mr. Trethewy.

Thus the occurrences are reduced to an original and a copy. Can the original be nullified or in any way traced? It may be well to quote enough of the text of No. 2624 to show its animus and character. Its mood is Royalist and High Church.

Presbytery was yesterday voted in the Lower House being carried by 25 voices . . .

I hear of a sect of women (they are at Southwark) from beyond sea called Quakers, and these swell, shiver and shake, and when they come to themselves (for in all this fit Mohamet's holy ghost hath been conversing with them) they begin to preach what hath been delivered to them by the Spirit.

There are other new sects coming forth and good reason, for the House of Commons hath, upon a debate of the Fifth Article, given a toleration to all to exercise the liberty of conscience but to Papists and the Common Prayer . . .

Judge Jenkins was sent yesterday to Newgate . . .

The army takes care in all counties to purge the militia of malignants as they call them, and put Anabaptists and other violent sectaries in their places.

The King between Parliament and army is in a sad condition, for they'll agree (like Herod and Pilate) to crucify him.

There can be no doubt of the accuracy of date of this letter. For example, contemporary printed newsbooks report for October 13th: "The Commons likewise insisting upon the business of religion passed several particulars as that Presbytery be established." (*A Perfect Diurnal of Some Passages in Parliament*, Numb. 220); "Judge Jenkins late prisoner in the Tower is removed thence to Newgate" (*The Perfect Weekly Account*), Numb. 4; cf. the French *Le Mercure Anglois*, Num. 5, p. 58.

I have cited the printed newsbooks to confirm the data of the manuscript news letter, not to suggest that they were the source of it. They may have been used and I suppose it is possible that some newsbook that I have not seen, less sober than these quoted, is the real source of the reference to Quakers in the letter of October 14th. But the use of the word Quaker in the Clarendon MSS for 1647 though reduced in effect to a single instance, remains so far unchallenged, untraced to a source, and unparalleled so early.

HENRY J. CADBURY

Reports on Archives

THE National Register of Archives (Historical Manuscripts Commission) *List of accessions to repositories in 1957* (*Her Majesty's Stationery Office*, 1958, 3s. od.), reports the following additions to the manuscript collections in various institutions which may interest workers on Quaker history:

Birmingham University Library.

Capper family: album of family memoranda and religious verse, 1837.

Leeds University, Brotherton Library.

Letters: Robert Arthington to Sir Abstrupus Danby, 1700; John Bright to Samuel Gurney, 1877.

Berkshire Record Office, Shire Hall, Reading.

Society of Friends: minute books, accounts, and other miscellaneous records, Berkshire and Oxfordshire monthly meetings, 17th-19th cent.

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

Society of Friends: account and other books of East Cornwall monthly meeting, 1702-1903. Papers relating to sufferings, discipline, etc., 1656-19th cent.

Glamorgan County Record Office, County Hall, Cardiff.

Society of Friends: South Wales, minutes, accounts, 1660-1897 (762 documents).

Gloucestershire Records Office, Shire Hall, Gloucester.

Society of Friends (additional): deeds, minutes and accounts of quarterly and monthly meetings, Gloucester, Nailsworth, Stoke Orchard, Tewkesbury, 1655-1872.

Kent Archives Office, County Hall, Maidstone.

Nonconformist: Folkestone Adult Schools: minutes, 1897-1939.

London County Record Office, County Hall, Westminster Bridge, London, S.E.1.

Societies and Institutions: records of Foundling Hospital's old school at Ackworth, Yorks, c.1760-75.

Nottinghamshire Record Office, Shire Hall, Nottingham.

Vere-Laurie of Carlton-on-Trent: deeds (some for Quaker meeting house, 1725-1802).

Worcestershire County Record Office, Shirehall, Worcester.

Society of Friends: Western quarterly meeting, sufferings book, 1704-30.

Bristol Archives Department, Council House, Bristol, 1.

Deeds, etc. 61 for premises on the Weare, 1626-1874.

Leicester Museums & Art Gallery, New Walk, Leicester.

Societies, etc: records of Friends Book Society, 1854-1937.

Norwich Central Library, Norwich.

Notebooks and 12 letters of Elizabeth Fry, 1828-46.

Elizabeth Bevan Tonjoroff (1847-1907)

IN 1893 (6 mo.) Westminster and Longford Meeting considered a joint application for membership from 48 citizens of Philippopolis.

Among the mementoes found in the house of Catharine Braithwaite at Banbury after her death was a plain but elegant wooden spoon inscribed: "First spoon made by the prisoners in the prison of Philippopolis, 1884."

But why this Quakerly stir during the last century, in a city of southern Bulgaria whose name probably rouses in the English reader nothing but faint memories of George Bernard Shaw's *Arms and the Man*? The reference is not inappropriate, for Shaw's play with its atmosphere of barbaric splendours crossed with tawdry Western innovations and Byronic cynicism was written in 1894 and set in 1885, and authentically belongs to our period: and no Shavian heroine, not even Lady Cicely Waynflete,¹ was so complete a "New Woman" as Elizabeth Bevan, riding through the snows of the Rhodope Mountains, decorated by Gladstone's "Great Assassin" Abdul Hamid II, and able to cow a whole courtyard full of Bashi-bazouks, burning for the virgins under her protection. Yet when she died on 14th May, 1907 in Saffron Walden, no obituary article in *The Friend*, no Testimony from her Monthly Meeting to the grace of God in her life, marked her passage. This article is a belated attempt to commemorate her remarkable career.

Of her early years hardly anything is known. Her father was a partner in the banking house of Barclay and Bevan; but in spite of the Quakerly names, she had no birthright in our Society. Some wealthy Bulgarian merchants on a visit to England, clients one supposes of her father's, invited her to go as governess to their children, and so in 1872, when she was about 25, she went out to Philippopolis (renamed now—alas!—Plovdiv).

¹ *Captain Brassbound's Conversion*, Act II: "This castle is very romantic, Captain; but it hasn't had a spring cleaning since the Prophet lived in it. There's only one room I can put the wounded man into. Its the only one that has a bed in it . . ."

Only those who were born before 1914, or are gifted with historical imagination, will realize what that meant. The "turbulent Balkans"—the most unreliable place on earth. Outside Europe, the British Navy could cope—any hint of trouble, and a gun-boat or two would be on the scene; the sight of a solar topee would quell a riotous crowd like magic. But what could one do with the Balkans? There they lay between the suspicious and aggressive Russian, the unspeakable Turk—"the sick man of Europe", and the dubious chaotic Austro-Hungarian; a welter of little, backward countries, pushed and pulled by their powerful neighbours; mountainous, half Mohammedan, more than half feudal; in Europe, yet not of it; unresponsive to the frown of Lord Palmerston, and indifferent even to the rolling periods of Mr. Gladstone himself. Elizabeth Bevan found that they lived up to their reputation; "severe difficulties and trials" were her lot, "hindered at every turn by the extreme worldliness and superstition around her, and the persecution entailed on the children whenever the truths she inculcated appeared to influence their conduct." When one of the girls of whom she had charge got typhus, "the parents in their dread of contagion, withdrew from all communication with the sick chamber, leaving their child to the care of the English governess, and even urging her, when delirium set in with terrible violence, to consult her own safety by withdrawing from her charge. But she could not forsake the beautiful girl who had been the object of so many hopes and prayers. She watched her to the last."¹

When the child was dead, the English governess went out feeble, lonely, and despondent into the streets of Philippopolis, and came by chance on "a few men gathered together in a small upper room to study the word of God, having no preacher or leader among them." They were part of that unorganized religious movement, so like the "seekers" of the seventeenth century, which spread through the Balkans at that time, subject to fierce persecution from the Orthodox Church and the Turkish authorities; a movement best known to Friends in England through the Serbian "Nazarenes". Elizabeth Bevan, who had so far acquired only a smattering

¹ Jane E. Newman, article in *The Friends' Quarterly Examiner*, vol. 29 (1895) pp. 249-63, using, apparently, an autobiographical account which cannot now be traced.

of Bulgarian, now set herself to acquire the language thoroughly, and began to identify herself with the dissenters, visiting their houses, where she found much ignorance, superstition and misery, tending them in sickness, supplying them with books and teaching them to read. "The people were astonished to see one so young fearlessly entering houses infected with . . . smallpox, typhus, fever, etc., to help the sufferers both temporally and spiritually." Her help was available to all, and in 1874 she was decorated for her services by the Sultan of Turkey.

About the same time, she met her future husband. Ivan Alex. (John Alexander) Tonjoroff had been dedicated as a child to the service of the Greek Orthodox Church and brought up to the priesthood. Doubt and dissatisfaction with church doctrine and practice led him to study the New Testament, and then to renounce his orders and make common cause with a group of dissidents at Bansko in the district of Raslog¹ in the Macedonian highlands: a primitive remote place about one hundred miles south-west of Philippopolis. On a visit to the city he met Elizabeth Bevan, married her in 1875, and took her to live with him in Bansko. Her family were appalled, and except for a sister who supported her, cut her off completely. Nor were the highlanders, her new people, any more sympathetic and understanding at first. She helped her husband in a district which included thirteen towns and villages; the people shrank from the foreigner with fear and suspicion, and she often returned from meetings plastered with mud. But they were destitute of medical assistance, and she had discovered her power to heal.

The sad condition of these people deeply touched my heart. Looking for strength and guidance from on high, I decided to consecrate myself to their welfare. Having an early inclination to serve the sick, and having a supply of drugs, I endeavoured to help them, not only by giving them medicines, but also by attending in different ways to their temporal wants. My simple efforts found grace in the sight of the Great Physician, and He blessed my work for their good.²

Cleanliness, fresh air, simple hygiene, hopeful words, soothing ministrations and the confidence she soon inspired

¹ Spelt in modern maps Raslag.

² Quoted in Jane E. Newman's article, *Friends' Quarterly Examiner*, April 1895, p. 251.

made people consider her a messenger sent by God: "I saw her in my sweet dreams dressed in white like the Virgin Mary" said the wife of their leading Orthodox opponent in Bansko after she had been cured. In the villages the people crowded round her with tales of suffering, clinging to her horse's bridle and entreating her to stay.

But Elizabeth Bevan Tonjoroff was not merely a minister of healing, she was also the wife of a leading Protestant, and bound to become involved in politics. In the Spring of 1876 while on a visit to Samokov (thirty miles south of Sofia) she heard of a poor Protestant whose wife had left him at the instigation of the Orthodox Bishop, and who, sick and ailing, had been carried off to prison in Sofia; she went to the Pasha to plead for him, and succeeded in procuring his release. Her triumph was brief, for the Bishop knew (and sneeringly told them) that a warrant was out for her husband's arrest. Injudicious speeches had been magnified by the Church authorities into an accusation of treason laid before the Grand Vizier; and in Bansko (to which they felt it their duty to return) he was arrested by two Turkish zaptiehs,¹ and dragged off from one prison to another, and finally to Salonika, where he was held under the threat of being hanged.

For Elizabeth, public and private calamity coincided. 9th-16th May, 1876 marked the peak of the Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria which so shocked the conscience of Europe, and led to the Berlin memorandum of May 13th in which Germany, Russia and Austria insisted on Turkish reforms. The dreaded Turkish mercenaries, the Bashi-bazouks ("those whose heads are turned" is the meaning of the name) ravaged the country; and one night Elizabeth, with her husband under threat of death stood in her courtyard between the maddened soldiers and the girls of Bansko who had been confided to her care, and sent them away silent and ashamed. Shortly afterwards her health broke down, and as soon as her husband had been released (through the good offices of Lord Salisbury, Sir Henry Drummond Woolf, the British Ambassador, and the American Ambassador in Constantinople) she returned with him to England, where the first of her five children, Catherine Mildmay Bevan Tonjoroff, was born on

¹ Policemen.

26th January, 1878.¹ The child was born lame, probably as a result of her mother's sufferings; but although the best surgeons of London and Vienna failed to remedy the condition, she grew up to a life of brave and undefeated activity and died at 72 on 17th January, 1951.

While the Tonjoroffs were in England, full scale war broke out in Bulgaria between Serbia and Turkey, and then between Russia and Turkey; wars short but terrible, which culminated in the capitulation of the Turks at Shipka Pass (January 1878,) and the Congress of Berlin (June-July, 1878) in which Russia, Austria and Rumania all gained Turkish provinces, and Rumania and Serbia became independent. Bulgaria, although in April 1879, it acquired its own prince (Alexander of Battenberg) remained under Turkish suzerainty, and when the Tonjoroffs returned in 1878 they found the streets full of starving, half-naked refugees; they joined immediately in the work of relief and rehabilitation, in which various voluntary committees were active.

As early as September, 1876 the Quakers had been active, setting up a Bulgarian War Victims' Relief Committee, which continued the tradition established in the Franco-Prussian war, under William Jones (a leading spirit in Bulgaria as in France) and James Long, that inspired and indefatigable non-Friend commissioner, who now led a team of his veteran Alsatian foreman-carpenters and French engineers to construct new villages at Tatar Bazardjik, between Philippopolis and the Balkan Mountains (about 30 miles west of the city).² There the full tide of the Russo-Turkish war rolled over them, but they stood their ground and survived. Perhaps it was admiration for this, one of the most notable episodes in Quaker relief service, which first led Elizabeth Tonjoroff to thoughts of membership; but there may have been earlier contacts, for already in 1872, Friends were circulating in

¹ Date as given in Westminster and Longford Monthly Meeting minutes, 1877, is incorrect. Her daughter, E. Mary Hooper, states that it should be 1878, which tallies with her age as given at the time of her application for membership and at her death. Catherine was the first surviving, but probably not the first-born child, as E. B. Tonjoroff in a letter of 13.viii. 1901 (Bulgaria papers, Friends House Library) refers to "our four dear children" whom we were obliged to bury "in our own garden where their little bodies remained for years". Her other recorded children were Braithwaite Charles (born 30.xii.1883), Alexander Braithwaite Bevan (born v.1887) and Albert E. Bevan (born viii.1889).

² E. B. Tonjoroff's brother-in-law Nicola later lived and preached there.

Bulgarian their *Plca for the Freedom of Conscience*. Other relief agencies besides Quakers were, however, active. On the Bosnian frontier were two noble women, A. P. Kirby and P. H. Johnstone. On a larger scale was the European Commission, represented in Philippopolis by Sir Henry Drummond Woolf, who had been instrumental in getting Tonjoroff released from prison in Salonika. Working under him, and with funds supplied by him, the Tonjoroffs fed 3,000-5,000 refugees every day during the winter of 1878-9, and set up an orphanage and a home of refuge for the helpless.

Many of the refugees came from the Raslog district, the Tonjoroffs' former home, where the excesses of the Bashibazouks had been most severe; and like all refugees, their chief longing was to return home. But the prospects were bleak; John Alexander Tonjoroff and Mr. Walpole of the European Commission returned from reconnaissance to report conditions still disturbed and food and provender non-existent. Nevertheless, pressure grew, and at last Elizabeth took the risk of advising the people to return, promising to go and stay with them. In June 1879, she rode on ahead, three hard days on horseback, leading a baggage train of food, clothing, medicine and money; the British Embassy at Constantinople asked the Pasha of Salonika for help and protection for her. Hard on her heels, the refugees followed.

Feeling between Turks and Bulgarians was still running high. Back home at Bansko, the Tonjoroffs heard rumours of a Turkish plot to kill thirty-seven leading Bulgarians; and while they were at Meeting, a man came with news that the thirty seven had been rounded up and were under guard in a stable. Dashing to the spot, Elizabeth asked the reason for their arrest and remonstrated with the Turkish officer, who said: "They do not pay their taxes." "But how can they?" asked Elizabeth, "They have lost everything." Unable to make any impression on the officer who refused to release them, she rode off to plead their case with the Governor. The Governor, she was told, was asleep. She telegraphed to the Pasha at Salonika. British prestige did count for something, even in the Balkans, it appeared; and besides, only the previous year Elizabeth had (for the second time) been decorated by the Turkish government for her help to Turkish soldiers. The Pasha ordered the release of the prisoners. The Governor at Raslog, now wide awake, was furious; he sum-

moned Elizabeth to court at Mahoomia and demanded the names of her informants. She refused to tell.

Nevertheless, she was determined not to appear anti-Turkish. There had been a lot of looting among the Turkish garrison at Bansko, who were poorly clad and badly fed. Elizabeth went to see the military Pasha, and offered to get supplies of cloth and comforts and make clothing for the soldiers. Incensed by his "loss of face" at the hands of the charitable young Englishwoman, the Commandant threatened to put a bullet through her head; but the Pasha was shamed into making better provision for the soldiers, and eventually withdrew the garrison altogether.

Gradually things quietened down. In 1883, Elizabeth returned to England for the birth of another child, Braithwaite Charles, born on 30th December, 1883. He was named in honour of J. Bevan Braithwaite; and it was from Bevan Braithwaite's home at 312 Camden Road (he was no relation, in spite of the name they shared) that Elizabeth Bevan Tonjoroff addressed her application for membership of Westminster and Longford Monthly Meeting, on behalf of herself and her children. It sounds like a last-minute decision, for the application was written the day before Monthly Meeting held on 16.x.1884. She was visited by Richard Dell, Sophia H. Brown and Sarah M. Lecky, and in November she was admitted to membership. The children were not, no doubt because they were domiciled abroad and with a father not in membership. Nine years later (15.viii.1893) Catherine Tonjoroff "not yet 16" was to renew her application from Penketh School on her own behalf, and to be admitted on the recommendation of Albert Pollard, the Superintendent, as "Sufficiently mature and a Christian girl". She had written to Martha Braithwaite:

Dear Mrs. Braithwaite:

I greatly wish to become a member of the Westminster Monthly Meeting, I know it is my dear Parents earnest desire that I should become one, and I myself should very much like to join it . . . if possible before my parents go back . . .¹

Eventually all the children were accepted into membership.² John Alexander, however, did not join; although he

¹ Minutes of Westminster and Longford Monthly Meeting, 17.viii.1893 (p. 235).

² Two younger boys, Alex B. B. and Albert E. Bevan, were admitted "by convincement" while at Saffron Walden School, 1901.

held and preached Quaker doctrines his heart was in his own land, and he was never more than a visitor in England. The exceptional position he held, however, is shown by his attendance several times at London Yearly Meeting.

The grimmest of the personal sufferings of the Tonjoroffs were now over. John Alexander was becoming an important person, and sat in the Senate of the Bulgarian Sobranje (Parliament) as representative of the Protestant Church. He and his wife transferred their residence to Philippopolis on her return from England with the new baby, and they were received by the young Prince Ferdinand on a visit to the city in 1885. The prince, who was to succeed to the throne in 1887 following the abdication of Alexander, held Tonjoroff in high esteem, and at one time offered him ministerial office, which he refused in order to continue with his evangelical and philanthropic work. Ferdinand and his first wife, Princess Marie, frequently entertained the Tonjoroffs, and a ruby pendant presented by the Prince is still a family heirloom. But if this patronage gave them a more assured position, their troubles were by no means at an end, and the terrible sufferings of the Bulgarian people continued. Very soon after Elizabeth's return from England, Serbia and Bulgaria were again at war; once more she helped the sick and wounded; once more she was decorated by the government. The war, which ended with the stalemate Treaty of Bucharest (3rd May, 1886) was followed by a revolution in which Alexander lost his throne, and Tonjoroff his seat in the senate.

While they continued their mission activities on tours of the villages, sometimes meeting in the fields with priests and people, (as Elizabeth reported to her new friends in England through the columns of the *British Friend* and *The Friend*), the Tonjoroffs had acquired two new major interests: in prisons and hospitals.

John Alexander's concern for prisoners went back to his own incarceration, in insanitary conditions, without facilities for reading or any employment. While his wife was in England in 1883-4, he began a long fluctuating struggle to improve prison conditions, to get the prisoners' chains struck off, to provide occupations and literature "in pure Bulgarian". He had raised the matter in the Sobranje, and "obtained some amelioration in the regulation of the prisons". In 1886 he was able to take Martha Braithwaite's brother,

Charles Gillett, on a tour of inspection, and show him the men working at their crafts, the bookshelves and the books which he had provided, and to give Charles as a souvenir to take home "the first spoon made by the prisoners in the prison of Philippopolis, 1884". The success, however, was temporary; the suspicions of the Orthodox Church were roused by the presence of Bibles in the cells, reactionary authority raised the usual objections to "pampering" prisoners, and the new government, following the revolution of 1886, threw out the books and bookcases. It was not until July, 1890 that Elizabeth was able to report to Charles Gillett, who had become her standing correspondent, and chief supporter and fundraiser among English Friends, that her husband was preaching to 150 prisoners in the prison, that the government had withdrawn their opposition, and ordered the return of the books and bookcases,

so the Bible is again in every prison cell in Philippopolis. The Government say we are free to go when we like and give them all the useful work we please, and my husband can preach Christ with the Bible in the prisoners' hands.¹

Elizabeth herself, however, was mainly concerned with the sick. With an energy like that of Florence Nightingale, and equally disconcerting to the authorities, she threw herself into the improvement of the shocking conditions of the few government hospitals. In spite of partial success in Philippopolis, "influencing doctors and nurses to a kinder treatment of the sufferers, till the whole aspect of the hospital was softened and brightened by her means"² she was not satisfied. What was to happen, for example, to the incurables? Soon she took a small house, where she received a young man with a leg amputated as a result of a railway accident, a woman with internal cancer, another dying of consumption. Still she was not satisfied. With £400 raised in England among Friends by Charles Gillett, and drawing on her own patrimony and what other money she could muster, she opened a cottage hospital on 27th July, 1888. It had sixteen beds in four wards, a library, a dispensary, a kitchen and a soup-kitchen. The library was open to the public three times a week, and there was a room where meetings could be held, including a public meeting for worship on first-day. It opened with friendly

¹ E. B. T. to Charles Gillett, *The Friend*, 1.vii.1890.

² Jane E. Newman, *Friends' Quarterly Examiner*, April 1895, p. 258.

support from the press, and the Armenian Bishop of the city; and M. Dimitroff, Governor of Southern Bulgaria, although absent from the city at the time of the opening, later declared himself "quite charmed with everything".

But this apparently modest, innocent and admirable scheme proved the beginning of Elizabeth Bevan Tonjoroff's undoing. The use of a room for religious meetings roused her Orthodox enemies, who were further incensed by the proposal to buy land and erect a Mission Hall. Having been prevented from acquiring the site she wanted, Elizabeth had to choose another, owned by Turks. But meanwhile another attack was developing on the opposite flank. Hitherto there had been no other missionary activity on the part of foreign Protestants in Bulgaria. By the Constantinople agreement between the British and American Bible societies, the European field had been divided between them, and Bulgaria fell into the American sector. In the wake of American Bibles came two missionaries from the American Board. John Alexander was soon on bad terms with them and the church which they organized, the Bulgarian Evangelical Alliance; complaints and recriminations flowed in which, as usual, neither side appears blameless.

But the worst problem of all was money. Elizabeth's ambitions grew. From the south was heard the age-old cry: "Come over into Macedonia and help us". It was five days' journey on horseback, through mountains infested with brigands, but Elizabeth dreamed of spending her summers there, "The poor Friends there are begging me to come over." The winter of 1888-89 was a bitter one of fearful distress, and in Philippopolis the hospital coped with cases from all over the country. At the end of its first year there was a deficit of £75; a cloud no bigger than a man's hand which was to grow and grow.

At this point, when the Tonjoroffs stood in great need of sympathetic and wise advice, they did not get it. In October 1891 there arrived on a visit one of the most distinguished Quaker visitors, greatest of all the "travelling Friends" of the late nineteenth century, Isaac Sharp. Already 85 years old, and travelling with a physician, Dr. Henry Appleton, but far from finished, and in fact en route for the Far East, Isaac Sharp was a person of immense zest and enthusiasm. These qualities, among the most precious though they are, were not

at all what the present situation required. "The good they have effected is simply marvellous" wrote Appleton to the *British Friend* "everything has been so evidently prospered by the Lord of the harvest that we must give him the praise." They admired the "large medical mission" and contrasted the "jeers, scoffs, mud, stones, filth" with which the Tonjoroffs had been met at first with the present success of the cottage hospital, which had forced the government to make improvements in its own to compete. With John Alexander they visited the prisons, where he had won the confidence of the authorities and the love of the poor prisoners; and approved the newspaper which he edited, through which he enlightened and educated the Bulgarians. "Go on" said Isaac Sharp "the gold and silver is the Lord's"; and with this encouragement on 2nd October, 1891, "today" as Appleton dramatically wrote, the Tonjoroffs paid down £310 for the land to build a meeting house. The next distinguished Quaker visitor, the scholar J. Rendel Harris, laid the foundation stone of white marble found on the site, and the building was completed in time for the first Bulgarian Exhibition, held in Philippopolis in the autumn of 1892. An article in *The Friend* of 23rd December in that year¹ shows the hall, looking like a Friends' Institute in a midland town dumped inappropriately in its Balkan setting. Its main room held 500 people (about 70-80 attended the morning services); it had a Sunday school, a temperance society, a women's afternoon meeting—the full programme of a contemporary English nonconformist chapel; and an itinerating Bible woman (Bena Mumford) completed the organization. The article was accompanied by an appeal from Martha Braithwaite for £471 needed to complete the building. The gold and silver was the Lord's, as Isaac Sharp had said, but Friends did not know it well enough, apparently . . . this cynical comment is not that of the present author, but of Jane Newman in 1895.

For the moment, however, hope lay in a closer association with Friends. In 1893 came the dramatic letter, dated 3.vi. mo., from 48 members of the mission asking for visits, recalling those of Charles Gillett, Isaac Sharp and Dr. Appleton, and J. Rendel Harris, describing the work of the mission and its need of funds, and asking for membership of Westminster and Longford Monthly Meeting. The letter

¹ *The Friend*, N.S. vol. xxxii, (1892) p. 849.

was followed by the arrival of the Tonjoroffs, who came "unexpectedly" to England and gave further interesting particulars. The Monthly Meeting set up a committee (George Gillett, John Dixon, Alfred Wright, Joseph Bevan and Rachel B. Braithwaite and Sarah J. Smith) to go into the matter. The circumstances were unusual, the financial liabilities dangerous . . . it was clear that a deputation should go and interview the applicants, but for the moment no one was available; a temporizing message was prepared for the Tonjoroffs to take home:

To the little company [*little deleted*] assembling at the Medical Mission [*altered to:*] professing with Friends at Philippopolis, S. Bulgaria.

. . . We look upon your admission into actual membership with our religious Society as an important step, only to be taken after careful consideration of each individual case, upon satisfactory evidence of genuine conversion and conviction of the truth of our religious principles. But we think that you have been well advised as a preliminary step to organize yourselves as a little missionary band . . .¹

The committee was kept standing for two years, until a deputation arranged by Meeting for Sufferings had visited Bulgaria and presented its report; Westminster and Longford Monthly Meeting then (13.vi.1895) handed the future of the concern to the Continental Committee. But while this was going on, it was clear that some more urgent help for the mission was required. On 5th April, 1894, the faithful Charles Gillett convened a meeting "of a few Friends interested in Philippopolis" at Devonshire House, and they decided to "form themselves into a Committee to help forward the Mission work and communicate with E.B. Tonjoroff. Also to communicate with the Constantinople Committee as to whether they could act as a Sub-Committee for Bulgaria."² The new Committee had some difficulty in finding officers, the first minutes being signed by Charles Gillett, and the second by John T. Dorland, each acting "pro temp."; but finally William Baker agreed to serve, and Edmund Wright Brooks became treasurer. They decided that they must take a strong line at the outset. Matters had in fact become desperate. It was necessary to close the cottage hospital after

¹ From draft in Westminster and Longford M.M. minutes.

² Opening minute of Minutes of the Bulgarian Medical Mission Committee, 5.iv.1894.

only six years. On 6th September, 1894, the second minute recorded:

Careful consideration has been given to the responsibility of the Committee with regard to the financial expenditure upon the Mission Work at Philippopolis. It is decided that no liability can be undertaken by the Committee in respect of debts at present remaining unpaid in connection with the Mission there. It is also decided that the sanction of this Committee must in every case be obtained before any step is decided upon by Friends at Philippopolis which involves the expenditure of money upon special objects.

In October, the Committee was glad to hear that Elizabeth Bevan Tonjoroff had closed the cottage hospital, and hoped that the staff of the mission would be reduced; they asked her also to fix the salary of workers "as low as circumstances would permit". The hospital building was let, and in 1896 steps were taken to sell it. The Tonjoroffs' home was also let, and part of the mission hall adapted for their residence, "including a necessary water supply, not at first contemplated"; the money for this conversion was raised by a special fund in England, and the building vested in trustees.

By this time the projected deputation from Meeting for Sufferings had paid its long-expected visit. It consisted of Dr. John Dixon (one of the members of the original Westminster and Longford Committee), Walter and Louisa Morice, who had had long experience of Friends' works in Scandinavia and in consequence of what they had encountered there were inclined to be rather rigid and strait-laced, and Hannah F. White from Ireland, whose ministry and loving spirit often acted "like oil on troubled waters." They arrived to find the annual meeting of the Bulgarian Evangelical Church (the rival organization to which allusion has been made above, founded by some American congregational ministers) in session in Philippopolis. Their first efforts, therefore, were to effect a reconciliation between the rival bodies:

. . . the cause of much of the friction that has existed between them and our friends the Tonjoroffs was explained, and best endeavours were used to put an end to this unhappy condition of affairs.

After much and continued prayer for guidance, we again saw the persons chiefly concerned, and after many painful hours of conference during several consecutive days, by our Heavenly Father's blessing we were enabled to bring about a reconciliation

between the most active opponents—who gave the hand of fellowship to J.A.T. and one also the kiss of peace . . . We had to press upon *all* the absolute necessity of setting a strict watch not merely upon their hearts but equally upon their lips.

It was touching to hear the testimonies to the good that our dear friend J.A.T. had been the means of doing in former years; and no word is now spoken against his present consistent life and character, but it was with regret we found that a feeling of soreness existed, that a second Protestant Church had of late years arisen in the city and very near to the older community.¹

The next stage was to discuss the question of membership with the Friends' group, and this was done in family visits and social gatherings, as well as in formal session in which an adaptation of the Discipline was prepared for them. The visitors were impressed with "the intelligence and neat order of their houses"; they were mostly humble people "all but three teetotalers", and outstanding among them was an ex-major of the army who acted as secretary of the group.

They appeared to be largely led in the direction of Friends, to have fully come out from dependance upon man, to realize the headship of Christ in his Church, and the necessity in all work for the guidance of the Holy Spirit.²

We think it will be impracticable to admit the applicants as members of an English Monthly Meeting, but we approve of their present Monthly Meeting being further developed after the manner of that in Constantinople.³

On financial questions the reports are discreetly silent, but whatever good resolutions were made, they were soon under pressure. During the winter of 1895-96 there was serious flooding, and Elizabeth was again stretching her slender resources in relief. Her children were growing up, and needed education in England. Her own patrimony was spent, and she had drawn on her sister's charity. But an even more serious threat to her peace of mind was developing: in 1894 the first organised massacres of Armenians in the Turkish Empire had begun, and in 1896 refugees came flooding into Bulgaria.

In the summer of that year, the Tonjoroffs were called to England for discussion, "for a period of rest and change, as well as the opportunity of attending Yearly Meeting and of seeing mission work in this country." A seed of resentment had been left by the Deputation's visit; "allusion has been

¹ Report of the Deputation to Meeting for Sufferings, 7.vi.1895.

² Report of Walter Morice to Yearly Meeting, in *British Friend*, N.S. vol. 4 (1895), p. 183.

³ Report of the Deputation, to Meeting for Sufferings, 7.vi.1895.

made to our friends' recent visit to Philippopolis in a way which the Committee much regret, and which has evidently been the result of a misunderstanding." In May, 1896 there was a full financial discussion not only with Elizabeth and John Alexander, but with their daughter Catherine, who shortly afterwards was asked to undertake the clerical and book-keeping side of the work and to report quarterly. The committee agreed to try and increase its contributions, and to provide £200 a year for the maintenance of the Tonjoroffs and their two youngest children. While in England Elizabeth and John were sent on deputation work to Quaker centres to solicit support. The indefatigable Charles Gillett had just died, and new names were proposed to widen the committee. The cottage hospital was to be sold as soon as possible.

But back home in Philippopolis, what use were resolutions of economy in face of the Armenian refugees? On 9th December, 1896, Elizabeth wrote:

Ours is quite a public house; all the poor and needy come to me; and now, with the poor Armenian refugees who are coming from morning till night, I am very busy. In visiting the different districts what awful scenes we have to see! There are in Philippopolis 800 poor in great need, and 1000 who are better off . . . Our own refuge has forty-five persons in it, and I have not the means to provide for them all; and there are several needing better care than they are getting. I do hope someone will send me help soon . . . One woman, whose husband was in a good position, came to me just now; she had sold her dress, which was a good one, off her back, and came to me in her petticoat; she has three children, and is begging for help to keep them alive until her husband, whom she expected to follow her, could join her. What is the cause of his delay she does not know.¹

Alexander Bevan Tonjoroff, then a child of nine, still vividly recalls those nightmare days of more than sixty years ago, when their home and garden were literally packed with poor mutilated men and women, with arms and legs cut off, breasts cut off, heads gashed open; they all received treatment and care.²

Help did indeed come from England, but only a portion of it reached the Tonjoroffs. The greater part went in sporadic relief given at the Black Sea ports in Varna and Bourgas, through Mary Anne Marriage Allen (the first to arrive with a Monthly Meeting minute) John and Elizabeth Bellows and James Adams, who set up workshops in the Varna district,

¹ Letter of Dec. 9th, 1896 to *Our Missions*, 1897, pp. 3-4.

² As reported by E. Mary Hooper in a letter to the present writer.

and a Miss Fraser at Varna who administered non-Quaker funds but also large sums provided by Friends.

In 1897 the London committee despaired of persuading the Tonjoroffs to balance their books, and disclaimed responsibility, having issued just one printed Annual Report. A minority, however, continued to believe in the value of the work and to support it. Curbed by lack of money, John Alexander resumed the itinerant evangelism of his earlier days. In March, 1898, Elizabeth wrote to Ellen Barclay, secretary of the Missionary Helpers' Union which had given her much support, finding "the great pecuniary difficulties a trial of faith", but describing "my dear husband, baptized with power from on high", holding open-air meetings; "he has visited and talked to all the Bishops and to all the priests".¹

There must have been much joy and satisfaction, one feels, in this way-side evangelism, which was to be interrupted once again by the horrors and atrocities of the Macedonian massacres of 1903. Certainly the Tonjoroffs' home appeared a haven of rest and peace to the last of their Quaker visitors from England, attempting once more to help and heal 15,000 victims of human inhumanity. This was Georgina King Lewis, who in 1904, with Catherine Tonjoroff as her interpreter, rode through the devastated mountain villages.

We left Bourgas yesterday at 6 a.m. in deep snow, and though it was quite dark and very cold and still snowing, a great number of the poor refugees were standing all along the line to bid us good-bye . . .

I reached Philippopolis at 9 p.m. and Mr. Tonjoroff kindly met us and here I am in a comfortable home with every possible kindness shown me. Oh, how I did sleep that night! No rats or mice. No fleas or bugs, no drunken men screaming out under my room, no dirt, no smells. It was a little heaven below.²

I am glad that this should be the note on which the story ends; for shortly afterwards Elizabeth Bevan Tonjoroff's health again broke down, and she returned to England for good, settling at Saffron Walden so that she could watch over the boys at the Friends' School there. John Alexander, however, could not relinquish his country or his calling, and so

¹ Autograph letter of March 25th, 1898 to Ellen Barclay in C. W. Pumphrey collection (Friends House library).

² Foreword to her autobiography, *Georgina King Lewis, an autobiographical sketch* (1925), pp. 11-12.

they were compelled to part. He made his last visit to Elizabeth three weeks before she died on 14th May, 1907. I have not been able to ascertain the date of his own death, but it seems that he may not have long survived her, for there is no mention of him in 1912, when Friends again set up a War Victims' Relief Committee for Bulgaria in what is ironically called the First Balkan War.

In Philippopolis the Tonjoroffs were long remembered, and in the nineteen thirties there were still "Friends of the Friends" there, with whom Headley and Elizabeth Horsnail and Emma Cadbury renewed contacts. But in England they were soon forgotten; and only the members of their family retained stories, mostly stark and grim, of the young English governess and her labours for the country of her adoption. How can one end this story of such deep shadows without despair, but by recalling the words of God the Father in an old morality play from that other dark age of the Wars of the Roses:

The seven deeds of mercy shall make secure
 Those good hearts who to the hungry have given meat,
 Or drink to the thirsty, to the naked, vesture,
 The poor or the pilgrim, in whom thou hast met
 Thy neighbour that hath need.
 Whoso doth mercy in my sight
 To the sick, or him in prison pight,
 He doth it to me, I shall him requite.
 Heaven's bliss shall be his meed.¹

Sources: For this account I have used the minutes of Meeting for Sufferings; the Continental Committee; Westminster and Longford Monthly Meeting, 1883-95; the Bulgarian Medical Mission Committee (recently deposited in Friends House Library by Mary Allen Baker, daughter of its secretary William Baker); Letters to the *Friend*, the *British Friend*, and *Our Missions* by Elizabeth Bevan Tonjoroff, 1885 ff.; an article on her by Jane E. Newman (using autobiographical material) in *Friends' Quarterly Examiner*, April 1895; the autobiography of Georgina King Lewis (1925); and family recollections kindly collected for me by E. Mary Hooper, daughter of Catherine Tonjoroff, from her sister Georgina Shrewsbury and her uncle Alexander Bevan Tonjoroff, to all of whom I am greatly indebted.

ORMEROD GREENWOOD

¹ Closing speech of God the Father in *The Castle of Perseverance* (c. 1425).

“Errors in the Indictment” and Pardons The Case of Theophilus Green

A POINT that sometimes puzzles readers of Quaker history is that early Friends, so full of troublesome scruples in other directions, seemed somewhat “unscrupulous” in their use of one method to evade conviction;—this method being the search for “errors”, that is, technical flaws, in the legal documents under which they were indicted. It has surprised some readers, for example, to find George Fox’s account of the long legal struggle that followed his arrest in Worcestershire, concluding with words of sober, but undisguised, satisfaction:

So that I was set at liberty . . . upon a trial of the errors in my indictment, without receiving any pardon or coming under any obligation or engagement at all. And the Lord’s everlasting power went over all to his glory and praise, and to the magnifying of his name for ever, Amen.¹

In our eyes the acceptance of a pardon might seem less unsatisfactory than to escape by reason of technical flaws. This method of evasion may appear to us not only unworthy, but inconsistent with the Quaker testimony against attaching importance to “the letter”.

I think that the severity of such a judgment will be relaxed when we consider the circumstances affecting criminal trials in the 17th century. Before doing so, however, it may be worth while to look at an example of this sort of defence, selecting for this purpose a case not readily accessible, the appeal of Theophilus Green and other Friends against sentences of praemunire.

Theophilus Green was an interesting man who would make a good subject for a biographical essay: a short narrative of his religious experiences was written by him, or at any rate published, when he was about 80.² He was a Thames waterman by trade, and was for some time in the employment of Cromwell: his is one of the names available to the editors of Fox’s *Journal* to substantiate Fox’s statement that (in 1655): “A great convincement there was in London,

¹ *Journal* (ed. Nickalls), p. 705.

² *A Narrative of some Passages of the Life of Theophilus Green from his Youth*, 1702.

and many in Oliver Protector’s house and family.”¹ It is noteworthy that Green’s own *Narrative* makes no reference to this employment by Cromwell; and indeed the nature of his trade itself only appears incidentally, from the fact that goods taken from him by legal process included oars, poles and a barge that had cost £51—an interesting example of the way in which all mundane matters were excluded from these spiritual autobiographies.

The events leading up to Theophilus Green and nine other Friends being “run into a praemunire” in 1671, for refusal to take the oath of allegiance, are related in Green’s *Narrative* (and by Sewel and Besse), but their appeal to the King’s Bench is only found in the Law Reports.² The appeal was heard during the Michaelmas term of the same year, and was based on the following errors in the indictment:

1. That the indictment was for refusing the oath contained in a Statute of James I. But the form of oath contained in the Statute refers specifically to James I; therefore it is no offence against the Statute to refuse an Oath of allegiance to Charles II.³

2. That the judgment, instead of reading “that the prisoners *are* committed etc.” (*committuntur*), ought to have read “that the prisoners should be committed etc.” (*committantur*), the judgment itself being distinct from the execution of the judgment.

3. That the Statute was misquoted in the indictment: instead of referring to the *See* of Rome, the indictment says *Sea* of Rome, “which makes it to be no sense”.⁴

4. Similarly, that “the words of the Statute are, ‘I do declare in my Conscience before God’, whereas the indictment is, ‘I do declare in Conscience’, and leaves out ‘my’ ”.

¹ *Journal* (ed. Nickalls), p. 202. As authority for Green’s employment by Cromwell, Norman Penney relied on the statement of Sewel: it does not seem to have been noted that corroboration can be found in an entry in the State Papers (Cal. S.P. (Dom.) 1655/56, p. 144), referring to Theophilus Green as “one of his Highness’s” (i.e. Cromwell’s) “watermen”. A later passage in the State Papers mentions Green’s boats as having been used “in seizing dangerous persons that passed to and fro on the river during the late rebellion” (Cal. S.P. (Dom.) 1659/60, p. 252). This was the premature rising of Sir Geo. Booth and the Royalist party in July and August, 1659.

² I Ventriss 171.

³ Cf., for this argument, Besse, I, p. 373n.

⁴ Even this is not so far-fetched as it appears. Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, III, p. 618, quotes a case in which the misspelling of *murdravit* as *murderavit* was fatal to an indictment.

5. That the Sheriff was ordered by the indictment to return twelve "good men and true" to act as jury, "who had no kinship either with the King or with any other party". But there is no rule of law against the King's kindred being returned, nor could they be successfully challenged; the suggestion that they could, therefore, invalidates the indictment.

Of these "errors" the Court had no difficulty in disallowing all but the last,¹ judgment on which was reserved until the following term; but that in this case also the decision was against the prisoners can be deduced from the fact that they remained in custody until released under the "Great Pardon" during the following summer.

We can now return to our question: under what circumstances was it possible for such trifling errors and quibbles to be seriously put forward as a reason for reversing a judgment, and seriously debated upon by a full bench of judges. In answering this it must be remembered that in the seventeenth century the scales were in general heavily weighted against the prisoner. We do not always realize this, because the legal forms were much the same as they are to-day, but the rules of procedure behind the forms were very different. No prisoner was entitled as of right to know what he was accused of until he appeared for trial; we read of several Friends being refused information as to the contents of their indictment.² Nor was a prisoner entitled as of right to obtain legal advice before his trial, or legal representation during it; he was sometimes allowed it as a favour, but it was often refused.

Again, the seventeenth century attitude to evidence was quite different from our own; in our eyes it appears absurdly credulous. There was little thought of any need for corroboration, or for weighing the credibility of a witness. The sanctity of the oath was regarded as sufficient to authenticate the most improbable statement; it is scarcely an exaggeration to define the principle as being, "If a man came and swore to anything whatever, he ought to be believed".³ We can see, from our own Quaker examples, how this system played into the hands of the professional informer; it also shows how salutary was the steadfast Quaker opposition to the idea that

¹ One other obscure error was allowed, but held not to affect the judgment.

² E.g. Francis Howgill at Appleby in 1664 (Besse II, p. 15).

³ Holdsworth, *op. cit.* IX, p. 232.

an oath gave any additional validity to a statement. When the justices swore, at Lancaster in 1664, that they had tendered the oath to George Fox according to the indictment, and he showed this to be impossible, because the dates in the indictment were wrong, he had every justification for adding:

Is not the court here, that have sworn so against me, perjured persons, and have not you false swearing enough here, who put the oath to me that cannot swear at all because Christ forbids it?¹

Moreover, the evidence for the prosecution could not be effectively challenged by cross-examination, because of the rule of procedure which forbade “breaking in upon the King’s evidence”.² Nor could a prisoner rebut the witnesses by giving contrary evidence himself; neither then, nor for long afterwards, was the accused an admissible witness in his own case.

Against these grievous handicaps to any successful defence, the prisoner’s one effective weapon was this, that the Common Law had always demanded the utmost precision in the framing of indictments; consequently, if it could be shown that the indictment had not been correctly worded, the prisoner was entitled to be discharged. The effectiveness of this weapon was limited: as the prisoner did not normally see his indictment before the trial, he had to raise his objections extempore, and without legal assistance (unless he was granted an adjournment), or else pursue them by the cumbersome and expensive method of a habeas corpus appeal. But with all its shortcomings, the defence of “errors” was universally regarded as the fundamental means of protection against the tyranny of the law; and the art of skilled advocacy lay, not, as now, in disproving the evidence (which was usually impossible), but in invalidating the indictment by the discovery of “errors”. Any attempts to whittle down this means of defence by statutory exceptions were strenuously resisted. One of the few statutes which modified the Common Law in this respect was an Act of 1605-06 providing that indictments for recusancy (i.e. non-attendance at Church services—originally directed against the “Papists”) should not be invalidated for lack of form. The favoured position thus accorded to recusancy indictments may have been one

¹ *Journal* (ed. Nickalls), p. 479.

² See, for an example of this, the account of Thos. Rudyard’s trial in *The Second Part of the People’s Ancient and Just Liberties asserted*, 1670.

reason why the authorities were so loth to admit that the procedure was inapplicable in the case of Protestant dissenters.

I think that enough has been said to indicate that it would be "reading history backwards" with a vengeance to suppose that Fox and his contemporaries would regard the defence of "errors" as in any sense pettifogging or unworthy: to them it was one of the bulwarks of the "fundamental laws of England", to whose authority they were so constantly appealing. Looked at in its historical setting, there is no longer any cause for surprise in Fox's expressed attitude in 1674, when, speaking of his refusal to accept a pardon, he says:

For I had rather have lain in prison all my days than have come out in any way dishonourable to truth; wherefore I chose to have the validity of my indictment tried before the judges.¹

Whether, however, this attitude to pardons was a wholly reasonable one is another matter, and some brief notes may perhaps be added on this.

At the end of the Report on Theophilus Green's Case, the following passage occurs:

"They" (the Court) "told the Prisoners, (who were Quakers and had brought a paper which they said contained their acknowledgment of the King's authority, and profession to submit to his government; and that they had no exception to the matter contained in the oath, but to the circumstances only, and that they durst not take an oath in any cause, which they prayed might be read, but could not be permitted) that their best course was to supplicate his Majesty in the meantime for his gracious pardon".

The Court here was evidently sympathetic, and endeavouring to assist the prisoners as far as it was able; similarly Charles II, when told that George Fox had scruples against a pardon "as not agreeable with the innocency of his cause", is said to have replied that "many a man that was as innocent as a child had had a pardon granted him."²

What then was the nature of Friends' scruples? This appears most clearly in a passage in George Whitehead's Autobiography³ dealing with the Pardon of 1672, of which he was the prime mover. The King was persuaded, following his "Declaration of Indulgence to Dissenters", to exercise the royal prerogative of mercy in favour of 491 prisoners,

¹ *Journal* (ed. Nickalls), p. 702.

² *Journal* (ed. Nickalls), p. 701.

³ *Christian Progress*, 1725, pp. 350 et seq.

mainly Friends; it was one of the most spectacular undertakings in Whitehead's long life, and is narrated by him with quiet satisfaction. Yet it almost foundered at its inception through the doubts expressed by Thomas Moore (when he and Whitehead interviewed the King and afterwards the Attorney-General) as to whether Friends could accept a pardon. The King waved the objection aside, with the same assurance that was later given in the case of George Fox: “Oh, Mr. Moore, there are persons as innocent as a child new born, that are pardoned”; but the Attorney-General was less magnanimous: “He took up Thomas somewhat short, telling him, ‘Mr. Moore, if you'll not accept of his Majesty's Pardon, I'll tell him, you'll not accept thereof.’ ”

Whitehead, with his customary skill, was able to smooth things over until he could get Moore to himself, and his record of the ensuing discussion is illuminating.

T.M. His scruples, or objections, against the word Pardon, or its being necessary to our suffering friends, were upon these tender points:

1. That they being innocent, and no criminal persons, needed no pardon, as criminals do.

2. That their testimony for Christ Jesus allowed of no pardon; neither indeed can we allow, or accept of any man's pardon in that case, singly considered; we cannot give away the cause of Christ, or our sincere obedience to him, as any offence, or crime, needing any pardon, or forgiveness from men; nor does Christ require us to ask it of him, but accepts and approves of us, in that wherein we truly obey him.

To this Whitehead replied:

But then, on the other hand, we must reasonably allow of this distinction—that wherein we, or our friends, were judged or condemned by human laws, and the ministers thereof, unto imprisonments, fines, forfeitures, praemunires, confiscation of estates to the King (and power given him to banish us) and thereby we made debtors to him (though unduly), the King has power to remit, pardon or forgive what the Law has made a debt to him, as well as any creditor has power to forgive a debt owing him, and so to pardon and release his debtor out of prison.

The case is plain, and the distinction evident.

Neither Pope, Priest, nor Prince, can acquit or pardon men in the sight of God, for offences against him, but the King may forgive debts owing by law to him, and release and reconvey his subjects' estates by law forfeit to him, or else he has less power than any of them.

This cogent line of reasoning convinced Thomas Moore; and the Pardon seems to have been approved and welcomed

by the main body of Friends, though it may not have been usually spoken of by that name.¹ Whether George Fox would have approved, we do not know, as he was absent in America. But it is noteworthy that in spite of his scruples in his own case 2 years later, we find him, a decade later still, taking part in the deliberations that led to the Pardon on James II's accession.² It may therefore be that his attitude in 1674 arose rather from special considerations, as to what would be best for the reputation of himself and Friends at the time, than from any fixed principle. This seems to be what is implied by the phrase "any way dishonourable to truth" quoted above. The extant correspondence between Fox's advisers shows clearly the "political" aspect of their deliberations, and also the modest feeling of triumph that resulted from his successful discharge under the writ of error.³ The triumph might, however, have been a hollow one, if the oath of allegiance had been again tendered to Fox after his discharge, as some of the judges desired.

It may be mentioned, in conclusion, that neither Fox nor other Friends appear to have felt any scruple about accepting release by the King's order, as long as such release was not called a pardon—this was in fact how Fox was released from his Scarborough imprisonment in 1666. But Charles II seems later to have been advised that the royal prerogative of mercy could only constitutionally be exercised by means of a pardon. It was also pointed out to George Whitehead, by the Duke of Lauderdale, that, as regards praemunired Friends, the King's private warrant of release might be quite ineffective without a pardon, as neither their persons nor their estates would be free from further action against them. That this was so had already been demonstrated in the case of Margaret Fell, who had been re-imprisoned after such a release.

ALFRED W. BRAITHWAITE

¹ See letter from Ed. Man in *Cambridge Journal* II, p. 215, where the word used is "Release". Theophilus Green, in his *Narrative*, speaks of the "Act of Grace from the King".

² *Itinerary Journal*, p. 107 (quoted by W. C. Braithwaite, *S.P.Q.*, p. 119n.). Fox also records with satisfaction the Pardon granted to his wife in 1671 (*Journal*, ed. Nickalls, p. 579). He speaks of it as a "discharge", but it is clear that it took the form of a pardon (Cal. S.P. (Dom.) 1671, p. 171).

³ See esp. letters from Thos. Lower in *J.F.H.S.* x. p. 144, *Camb. Jnl.* II, p. 307.

Ellwood's *Davideis*: a newly discovered version?

THOMAS ELLWOOD (1639-1713) owes his place in English literary history to his autobiography and to his friendships with John Milton and Edmund Waller, not to his own achievements as a poet, though for some of his contemporaries, Quakers in particular, these must have seemed considerable. But the judgment of one of them, Mary Tyndall, that "he hath mistaken his vocation as a poet", has proved true;¹ he lacked poetic genius, and the passing of time has brought the almost total disappearance of his verse from publication. A final, and it was believed, definitive edition of Ellwood's *Davideis* (1712), a life of David King of Israel, was made by Walther Fischer in 1936.² Fischer saw in the poem "... a contribution towards the development of the psychological and sentimental narrative in English literature." If that is so, the contribution was slight, and it is not surprising that the poem has again fallen from scholarly notice. Nevertheless, Ellwood's importance in the early history of Quakerism makes any new information bearing on his writing welcome.

Following his death in 1713 there was some criticism in Quaker circles of the theology and morality of the *Davideis*, despite the fact that Ellwood had intended it as an alternative to licentious post-Restoration reading and as an edification for the young. Richard Claridge (1649-1723) who had been at Oxford before becoming a Friend, requested permission from the Morning Meeting to prepare a revision. This was granted, but the matter appears to have been dropped since there is no further mention of it in the Morning Meeting minutes and no MSS which are conclusively Claridge's have been identified. At the same time, Claridge's proposal is the only historical clue to the origin of some MSS which have recently been discovered.

Several months ago two volumes containing three MSS of a poem entitled *Davideis* were lent to the Friends' Reference

¹ *Diary of Mary Tyndall*, ed. Ellen Marriage 1876, p. 92.

² *Thomas Ellwood's Davideis, A Reprint of the First Edition of 1712* with various readings of later editions, edited with an introduction and notes by Walther Fischer, Ph.D. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1936.

Library by Mr. Ewart Steevens of High Wycombe. These came to him from his grandfather, Joseph Steevens and an aunt. The Steevens family had been members of the Society of Friends from the seventeenth century until the latter part of the last century and Jeremiah Steevens was a friend of both Ellwood and Isaac Penington. From these facts, it is natural to expect some correspondence between the MSS and Ellwood's poem.

All three MSS are in the same hand which, on comparison, does not seem to be that of either Ellwood or Claridge. Rather it seems to be a later, more flowery style differing in the formation of the letters from that of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. On the other hand, it is probably about contemporary with some poems at the end of the first volume, immediately after the second *Davideis* , which are copied from Martin's Magazine¹ for March 1758, April 1758 and August 1758, dated as such, using the name for the month rather than the figure.

The *Davideis* written on pages cut from the front of one volume appears to have been the first written and must be a fair copy taken from a rough draft. It is the shortest of the three and has few corrections. In the same volume, on the pages still attached to the binding, appears a version much enlarged and corrected from the first, but definitely the same poem. In the second volume is the fair copy of the latter, with only minor textual corrections.

On comparison with Ellwood's *Davideis* , the MSS, unlike the interleaved revision made by John Fry (1701-1775),² appears at first sight to be a quite independent poem written, however, using the same source which was the King James Version of the *Bible* . On closer examination correspondences appear which differ from the Biblical text and are unlikely to have occurred without the author of the MSS having a thorough knowledge of Ellwood's poem. In several places

¹ "The General Magazine of Arts and Sciences, Philosophical, Philological, Mathematical and Mechanical", published in London from 1755 to 1765, in 14 volumes.

² John Fry, who was a prominent Wiltshire Friend and three times Clerk of London Yearly Meeting, added to the complicated history of the *Davideis* by making important textual changes which he hoped would improve the poem's religious appeal. This revision, (thoroughly documented by Walther Fischer) was written into an interleaved 1712-printed copy of the poem, now preserved in the Library at Friends House; a facsimile of p. 119 is reproduced in Walther Fischer's book.

words and phrases are identical. For example, with reference to the parting of David and Jonathan, Ellwood says, "With Eyes cast back while either was in View" and the first MS, "And oft look'd back while either was in View". It may therefore be right to regard the MSS as a revision of Ellwood's poem, and not an original work.

Ellwood's style has a bold directness which is frequently pleasing in its economy of words but many times he had to try hard to complete the rhyme or metre as in, "Did good old Jesse the good Tydings hear". The author of the MSS did not improve on him very much in this latter respect but he added a good many frilly "literary" words and expressions. He did, however, feel free to break the slightly monotonous couplets with an occasional triplet, a thing which Ellwood seldom if ever did in his poem.

In his edition of Ellwood's *Davideis*, Walther Fischer mentions the possibility of the poet having used Cowley's poem of the same title (1656), but was convinced that, as Ellwood himself asserts, he had only a very slight knowledge of the earlier work at the time of writing. Cowley's treatment of the David story has quite a different character from that of the MSS with the possible exception of the first lines of each. Cowley begins, "I Sing the Man who Judah's Scepter bore" and the MSS, "I Sing the Man sprung from ye humble Plains", but the use of this epic device does not signify borrowing.

Since there was some discussion in the Society of Friends as to the orthodoxy and morality of certain passages in Ellwood's *Davideis*, more than one person may have undertaken a revision. However, unless the points are very subtle the theology of the MSS seems not much changed and the shifts in emphasis are not in keeping with the testimonies and strict morality of eighteenth century Quakerism, being elaborations of such episodes as the bloody battles and David's illicit love affair. Certainly the poem is longer and more detailed than Ellwood's and it does not show the "amendments or obliterations" called for by the Morning Meeting of 2nd December, 1713. The identity of the MSS remain unknown; possibly they are not Quaker documents at all, but the probability is that they are, and, on this assumption, what the author of the MSS did to Ellwood's poem has some bearing on the eighteenth-century Quaker view of the arts.

ANDREW AND HELEN BRINK

Wordsworth's Quaker Servant:

Mary Dawson, afterwards Fisher, d.1854.

WORDSWORTH, in a letter to Sir George Beaumont, September 1806, refers to his domestic servants, and mentions, that one is "by birth and breeding a Quaker". He writes:

The picture of the Thorn¹ has been ten days under our roof. It has pleased us greatly; and the more it is looked at, the more it pleases. Yet we have two objections to it; one, that the upright bough in the thorn is, we think, too tall for a tree in so exposed a situation; and the other,—which I remember you mentioned as having been made by somebody in town,—that the woman appears too old. I did not feel this much myself, but both my wife and sister have felt it. The picture is, I think, beautifully coloured; and assuredly if it be the best praise of a picture that it should be often looked at, that praise yours has in abundant measure, and is likely to have. Our servant (observe, she is a Quaker by birth and breeding) thought that the colours were too grave. Our old Molly, of whom you have heard, did not venture to give her opinion in our presence; but as we learned afterwards, she laid her head close to a neighbour's of ours, whispering, "What do ye think of it?" "To be sure, the frame's varra bonny, but, for my part, I can mak nowt on't" (meaning "nothing of it"); to which her neighbour replied that she thought it was very natural.²

The servant's name is not mentioned in this letter, neither is the surname of Old Molly. It is known that Old Molly was Mary Fisher, who lived with her brother and sister-in-law, John and Agnes Fisher, at Sykeside, the house across the road from Dove Cottage. Her surname is never given in Dorothy Wordsworth's Journals or Letters. The other servant's name it will be shown was Mary (Molly) Dawson, the Quaker. It is difficult to distinguish the two since both are often referred to as Molly.

Much more is known of Mary (Molly) Fisher than of Mary (Molly) Dawson. Old Molly as Mary Fisher is called, was a quaint character; she amused the Wordsworths, and Coleridge by her drollery and amusing sayings. The first we

¹ This picture by Sir George Beaumont, *The Thorn*, was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1806.

² *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: the middle years.* Ed. E. de Selincourt, vol. 1: 1806 to June 1811 (1937), Letter 275, p. 64.

learn of her is in a letter from Wordsworth to Coleridge, Christmas Eve, Grasmere (1799). He writes:

We do not think it will be necessary for us to keep a servant. We have agreed to give a woman, who lives in one of the adjoining cottages two shillings a week for attending two or three hours a day to light the fires, wash dishes, etc., etc.¹

In 1804, Old Molly has left the service of the Wordsworths. Dorothy Wordsworth in a letter to Catherine Clarkson, 3rd May, 1804 writes:

Aggy Fisher is dead and Molly is promoted to the high office of her Brother's Housekeeper and attendant upon his single cow for he has sold the rest of the stock and lett the land. It is a great comfort to us that Molly has been taken from us in so quiet and natural a way, for we were afraid of breaking her heart by telling her that she was not fit for her place which indeed has been the truth for the last six months at least. At present Sally Ashburner is with us— We are too late I fear to get a good Servant, for they are all hired in this neighbourhood.²

A letter from Charles Lamb to Mr. Wordsworth (undated), but presumably about the same time as the previous letter to Catherine Clarkson, since in the letter Lamb mentions the cow, says:

Poor Old Molly! to have lost her pride, that "last infirmity of noble minds", and her cow. Fate need not have set her wits to such an Old Molly. I am heartily sorry for her. Remember us lovingly to her; and in particular remember us to Mrs. Clarkson in the most kind manner.³

Wordsworth in *The Excursion*, tells of Aggie Fisher's bitterness upon her death-bed, as she thinks of Old Molly, her sister-in-law, taking her place in her home after she has gone.

'And must she rule',

This was the death-doomed Woman heard to say
In bitterness, 'and must she rule and reign,
Sole Mistress of this house, when I am gone?
Tend what I tended, calling it her own!'⁴

It is probable that Old Molly helped the Wordsworths occasionally in their home after she had left their service. At any rate she visited them from time to time. Dorothy

¹ *The Early Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth (1787-1805)*. Ed. E. de Selincourt (1935), Letter 105, p. 236.

² *Ibid.*, Letter 170, p. 387.

³ Thomas Noon Talfourd: *Final Memorials of Charles Lamb*, (1848), Vol. 1, p. 149.

⁴ Wordsworth: *Poetical Works*, Ed. by T. Hutchinson, (1936). *The Excursion*, Book VI, lines 752-756.

Wordsworth writes to Catherine Clarkson, Grasmere, Christmas Day, 1805:

Old Molly and John Fisher are in the kitchen, but when dinner is ready they are to come upstairs and partake with us, and "*Johnny and all.*" The evening before the shortest day Molly came in in her brisk way and shook hands with me at six o'clock, the time when we arrived here 6 years ago. "Aye", says the poor creature, "I mun never forget t'laal striped gown and t'laal straw Bonnet as ye stood here" (by the parlour fire). It was a miserable dark chimney with an handful of reddish cinders in it, for you must know that Molly had kept fires in the houses for a fortnight with *two buckets of coals* that it might be dry and comfortable to receive us.¹

In 1807, we hear of Molly Dawson for the first time. Again Dorothy Wordsworth writes to Catherine Clarkson, Coleorton, 20th January, (1807).

Peggy Ashburner and Old Molly and all neighbours are as well as usual, thinking much of us. Our old servant, Molly Dawson, lives with Mrs. Lloyd. We wish we could have her again at our return as we intend to keep two women servants, our family with Coleridge and the Boys will be so large. Molly would gladly have come with us hither, but we thought ourselves bound in honour to another.²

It will be observed that in this letter Molly Dawson is described as "Our old servant". In a letter from D.W. to W.W., *Grasmere, Wednesday, 23rd March (1808)*, we are told of Old Molly's approaching death.

Old Molly's legs are much swoln and she grows daily weaker. I hope her sufferings will soon be at an end. She talks with cheerfulness of dying except when she turns to poor John's desolate condition. I really think I have nothing more to say for I have not heart to talk of our own little concerns, all being well with us.³

A few months later Dorothy Wordsworth writes to Catherine Clarkson, telling her of Old Molly's death.

*Grasmere, Sunday, July 3rd or 4th
(I believe) 1808.*

Poor old Molly Fisher is at rest in the quiet grave. She had long and earnestly prayed for Death, therefore we were pleased

¹ *The Early Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth*, Letter 239, p. 558.

² *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth, 1806-1811*, Letter 291, pp. 109-110. Mrs. Lloyd was the daughter of Samuel Pemberton of Birmingham. She married Charles Lloyd (1775-1839), eldest son of Charles Lloyd the Quaker banker and philanthropist. Charles Lloyd Jun. was the friend of Wordsworth, Coleridge and Lamb; see my articles in *Notes and Queries*, December 1956, and October 1957.

³ *Ibid.*, Letter 322, p. 179.

and thankful when she died—but many a pensive thought have I in my walks to and from Town-End, of her and her chearful happy ways. The house where she lived is almost as desolate as our own, for her Brother "John Fisher", lives there alone. It goes through my heart to see her empty chair, and a hundred little things that she prized, remaining just as she left them, only dull and dusty.¹

The Parish Register records her death:

Mary F. of Town End, spinster buried Jun 3. 1808.

The preceding account of Old Molly has been necessary in order to discover which of the two servants was the Quaker.

The letter in which Wordsworth mentions this, it will be remembered, was written to Sir George Beaumont, September, 1806. Old Molly left the employment of the Wordsworths in 1804, and died in 1808. In a letter already given, Dorothy Wordsworth writes to Catherine Clarkson, 20th January, (1807) "Our old servant, Molly Dawson, lives with Mrs. Lloyd". Again she writes to Catherine Clarkson, 22nd April, (1808).

Thomas is very well; and Dorothy has been at Brathay since the third day after her Father's arrival. We are afraid that she disgraces herself by her waywardness, though Mrs. Lloyd will hear nothing of it. She is in high spirits, enchanted with all the novelties that are about her and declares that she will never come home again, yet she takes no delight in any company but that of the Gardener and our old Servant Mary Dawson who is Mrs. Lloyd's Cook—She calls her *my* Mary Dawson and to her and the Gardener she clings from morning to night.²

A letter from Dorothy Wordsworth to Thomas De Quincey, gives information that Mary Dawson is about to leave the Lloyds, and is going to work for De Quincey.

D.W. to Thomas De Quincey,
Wednesday, 5th April [1809]

We have engaged an excellent servant for you, to come at Martinmas, Mr. Lloyd's cook, formerly our servant; but we must hire another to serve you till that time. Might not your brother have arrived before this time.³

In November, Mary Dawson is with De Quincey.

D.W. to Catherine Clarkson,
Grasmere, November 18th [1809]

Mr. De Quincey has been at Grasmere five weeks, and has taken possession of his cottage as a lodging-place, and our little orphan maiden Sally Green has prepared his breakfast, but

¹ *Ibid.*, Letter 341, pp. 232-233.

² *Ibid.*, Letter 331, pp. 202-203.

³ *Ibid.*, Letter 364, p. 283.

wanting a housekeeper he grew tired of that plan and lately has been wholly with us. To-night, however, his housekeeper is arrived, and a proud and happy woman she is as any within twenty miles. You remember our old servant, Mary Dawson, she will suit the place exactly, and the place exalts her to the very tip-top of exaltation.¹

Further letters referring to Mary Dawson, are as follows:

D.W. to Jane Marshall,
Grasmere, November 19th, 1809

Our Friend, Mr. de Quincey, is come to the cottage, rather I should say to Grasmere, though we have already spent several comfortable evenings at the cottage—but he is with us at present, his servant arrived only the day before yesterday, and she is now busied in preparing the cottage for his permanent Residence.²

M.W. to Thomas De Quincey,
Grasmere, Aug. 20th, [1810]

I find upon enquiring into the state of Mary Dawson's purse that she is very near the bottom of it, and that she has had Miss Crosthwaite's bill with the receipt, presented to her for payment.³

D.W. to W.W.,
Thursday 23rd April, 1812

Mary Dawson has been very kind to us in taking the Children, but she is very poorly, and being so could not amuse them so well as the society they found at the carriers, therefore she could hardly keep them within the garden gate.⁴

D.W. to Thomas De Quincey
June 5, 1812

You will be pleased to hear that Mary Dawson has been very kind in her attentions to us.⁵

D.W. to Mary Hutchinson (*née* Monkhouse)
Feby, 1st, 1813

Mary Dawson talks in private to us of leaving Mr. de Quincey—What a prize she would be to your Brother John as housekeeper! She is tired of Mr. De Q's meanness and greediness.⁶

The last published letter which mentions Mary Dawson so far as can be discovered, was in the year 1814, when she had left De Quincey to return to the Wordsworths. How long she remained with them must be a matter of conjecture.

¹ *Ibid.*, Letter 393, p. 344.

² *Ibid.*, Letter 394, p. 346.

³ *Ibid.*, Letter 419, p. 393.

⁴ *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: the middle years.* Ed. E. de Selincourt, vol. 2: August 1811-1820 (1937), Letter 445, pp. 490-491 (written across a letter of De Quincey's to W.W. which D.W. is forwarding to London).

⁵ *Ibid.*, Letter 450, p. 503.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Letter 475, p. 551.

D.W. to Catherine Clarkson,
Keswick, Sunday, April 24th [1814]

Unfortunately we happen for the last half-year to have had the worst cook in England—but Mary Dawson is coming to live with us at Whitsuntide (whom you remember our servant at the Town End) and Sara and I intend to give *her* an unlimited commission to cook all sorts of nice things for Mary, to which Mary will not object; for (strange it is) Mary in these things would be far more easily ruled by a servant than by us.¹

It is a pity that not more is known of Mary Dawson, but we do know that on 8th November, 1817, she was married to John Fisher Junior, who had lived a wild life in his youth and afterwards settled down as a cobbler in his father's house at Sykeside. Probably Mary Dawson remained in service with the Wordsworths until her marriage. In *The Excursion* Wordsworth refers to John Fisher, and his mother in the following lines:

Two passions, both degenerate, for they both
 Began in honour, gradually obtained
 Rule over her, and vexed her daily life;
 An unremitting, avaricious thrift;
 And a strange thralldom of maternal love,
 That held her spirit, in its own despite,
 Bound—by vexation, and regret, and scorn,
 Constrained forgiveness, and relenting vows,
 And tears, in pride suppressed, in shame concealed—
 To a poor dissolute Son, her only child.²

Perhaps John Fisher was not entirely responsible for his actions, for it will be remembered that Aggie Fisher, his mother, was an embittered woman, and strongly resented the thought that Old Molly, her sister-in-law, would take her place in the home at her death.

“And must she rule and reign,
 Sole mistress of this house, when I am gone?”

Whether the marriage was a happy one we do not know. John Fisher died at Sykeside on 23rd April, 1827. “Mary Fisher resided there till her death in 1854, at the age of 76, and as a last remaining link with the Old Town End days her house and conversation formed a strong attraction to W. in his old age.”³ There is no mention of either of their deaths in

¹ *Ibid.*, Letter 498, p. 590.

² *Wordsworth: Poetical Works*, Ed. by T. Hutchinson (1936), *The Excursion*, Book VI, lines 706-715.

³ See Dorothy Wordsworth: *Journals*. Ed. by E. de Selincourt, (1941), Vol. 1, appendix p. 434-5. Notes on some of the persons mentioned in the *Grasmere Journal*. By the late Gordon Graham Wordsworth.

From Radicalism to Quakerism: Gerrard Winstanley and Friends

EARLY Friends were suspected of being many things—Franciscan friars, Jesuits, Fifth-Monarchy men, Levellers, and sometimes an unlikely combination of these. Several of their earliest pamphleteering adversaries exposed Friends' supposed connection with the radical political views of the Levellers. In 1678, Thomas Comber, Dean of Durham, published an even more startling discovery. The Quakers, he thought, had derived their ideas from the communist writer Gerrard Winstanley. Consequently, repression of Quakerism was not only a service to God, but a preservative of every man in his property.¹

Modern writers, too, have discussed the influence of the Levellers and Diggers on the Quaker movement.² The striking similarities between Gerrard Winstanley's ideas and those of Friends have long been remarked. In his early writings Winstanley charged the ecclesiastical power with: setting up the teaching of men against the teaching of the spirit; teaching according to books and authorities rather than the teaching of the indwelling God; upholding forms and customs against the communion of saints; commending observance of days against the indwelling of Christ in the soul; and practising corrupt forms of baptism, communion, and the maintenance of ministers against Christ's clear teaching about these matters.³ You are not to be saved, he argued, by believing that a man lived and died long ago at Jerusalem, but by the power of the spirit within you treading down all unrighteousness of the flesh. Neither are you to look for God in a place of glory beyond the sun, but within yourself and in every man.⁴

His doctrine of scriptural authority, often the surest touchstone for judging religious affiliation, is the same as

¹ *Christianity No Enthusiasm* (1678).

² For example, Emilia Fogelklou, *James Nayler: The Rebel Saint* (1931), pp. 22-23.

³ *The Breaking of the Day of God* (1648), as paraphrased in *The Works of Gerrard Winstanley, with an Appendix of Documents Relating to the Digger Movement*, edited by George H. Sabine (1941), p. 89.

⁴ *The Saints Paradise* (1648?), as paraphrased in Sabine, p. 96.

that professed by Friends. In answer to the question, Are not the Scriptures the truths of God? he replied:

I shall demand of you how you know that these Scriptures are the word of God, in the sense you call them, but [by] the testimony of the spirit within your selves; I say, there is no way to know but by the spirit himself; seeing there are so many expositions upon them, which without doubt hath varied the copies.¹

W. C. Braithwaite, however, concluded that the two men [Winstanley and Fox] seem to be independent products of the peculiar social and spiritual climate of the age; and it is doubtful if Winstanley ever influenced Fox or associated with Friends.²

The question of influence will always be arguable; but that of personal association can more easily be settled. It has always been known that John Lilburne, the Leveller, became a Quaker, for of course he wrote a book about it: *The Resurrection of John Lilburne, Now a Prisoner in Dover Castle, Declared* (1656). Now there has been discovered in Friends' death registers an entry reporting the death and burial of a Gerrard Winstanley.

The register kept by the Westminster Monthly Meeting records on 10th September, 1676 the death of Gerrard Winstanley, corn-chandler, living in the parish of (St.) Giles in the Field, Bloomsbury. Winstanley was buried in Long Acre burying ground; his age is given as about 62. The burials of two sons of his are also recorded—Gerrard Winstanley, who died 20th August, 1683, aged about 18, and Clement Winstanley, who died 2nd October, 1684, aged about 14. The two boys are mentioned as sons-in-law (presumably stepsons) to one Giles Hilbury (or possibly Tichbury).³

Was this *the* Gerrard Winstanley? So little is known of his later life that positive identification is beyond our reach. Furthermore, there is no corroborative evidence from Quaker sources. Winstanley is not mentioned in the earliest minute book of Westminster Monthly Meeting, which begins in 1674 (and goes to 1689). I have not been able to find any reference to him in the records of sufferings. A search of the London probate registries failed to discover a will or letters of

¹ *Truth Lifting up its head Above Scandals* (1649) in Sabine, pp. 127-28.

² *The Second Period of Quakerism*, p. 557.

³ Friends' registers record the marriage of Elizabeth Winstanley, widow of Jarret Winstanley and daughter of Gabriel Stanley, of the parish of Giles in the Fields, to Giles Tutchbury (Tutchberry), cooper, of the parish of Newington Butts (son of Giles Tutchbery, of Oxfordshire), at Bull & Mouth, London, 15.i.1680 (15 March 1681).

administration.¹ But what little else we know about Winstanley's life is not inconsistent with his being the Quaker corn-chandler who died in 1676.

He was certainly born in Lancashire, as we know from his first published book, *The Myserie of God* (1648). An entry in the Wigan parish register for 10th July, 1609, showing the baptism of "Gerrard, son of Edward Winstanlie" may relate to him. He came to London and became a tradesman and freeman of the city, but suffered bankruptcy during the early years of the civil war and had to retire to the country. There is a record in the London marriage licenses in the Bishop of London's Register of the marriage 28th September, 1640, of a Jerrard Winstanley to one Susan King.²

Winstanley published his first pamphlet, a theological treatise, in 1648. His thought soon turned to economics, and at once he showed an unsettling willingness to live as he preached. He and his followers commenced the cultivation of St. George's Hill, in the parishes of Walton-upon-Thames and Cobham, Surrey, on 1st April, 1649. The local magnates resorted to both legal and illegal violence to disperse the Diggers and trample down their crops. Winstanley, refusing to fee a lawyer in his defence, resorted instead to the public press, without effect. In 1652, just after the settlement of the legal matters pending against him, he published his last pamphlet.

The next time the name of Winstanley has been discovered is October, 1660, this time appended to a petition in Chancery. There seems little doubt that this action was brought by the former Digger, for the details of his London career are consonant with the incidental remarks in his writings, and he describes himself as a gentleman living in Cobham, Surrey (the site of the Diggings). The petition arose out of Winstanley's financial difficulties; for "about the beginning of Aprill, 1641, your Orator then being a Cittizen of London" he had had "some trading wth Richard Alsworth, late citizen . . . of London, for fustians, dimities

¹ I am indebted to the assistance of Mr. A. H. Hall, librarian of the Guildhall, and Miss E. D. Mercer, Middlesex County archivist, in searching for the will. I should also like to thank Professor W. K. Jordan of Harvard, for his advice on the preparation of this paper.

² These details are taken from Sabine's introduction to his edition of Winstanley's works. The introduction contains the most complete account of Winstanley's life that has appeared.

and lynnin cloth, and such like comodities, w^{ch} trading continued for the space of twoe or three yeres.”¹ In 1643, because of the badness of the times, he left off trading altogether, and settled with all his creditors. Although (he claimed) he had paid £434 to Richard Alsworth, and had specifically paid him £42 and a piece of blue cloth worth £9 to redeem a bond of £50, he was being harassed by the executors of Richard Alsworth. Winstanley asked that the executors be subpoenaed to bring into court the account books of Richard Alsworth, to demonstrate that he had in fact paid all his obligations.

From the sums mentioned it is obvious that Winstanley was more than a petty tradesman; his total obligations must have run into thousands of pounds. Since the plain speech is not used in the petition, and since Friends did not ordinarily approve of actions in Chancery, it seems likely that Winstanley was not a Quaker in 1660.²

No corroborating evidence ties together the entries of birth, marriage, and death in the way that this petition agrees with the autobiographical bits in Winstanley's writings. But the age at death given in the death register fits the outline of Winstanley's life.³ And the fact that Mr. C. W. Winstanley, in the course of his (presumably genealogical) researches, could unearth only two references to Gerrard Winstanley in London makes it appear unlikely that there was more than one person of that name. This is perhaps a place for Occam's razor; Winstanleys ought not to be unduly multiplied.

Although the similarities between Winstanley's thought and Quaker teachings would make it appear possible that he joined Friends, Quakerism gave a conservative twist to

¹ The petition is C. 9/412/269 in Reynardson's Division, Chancery Proceedings, Public Record Office. I am grateful to Mr. C. W. Berry for having a photostatic copy made for me. This reference was discovered by a Mr. C. W. Winstanley, who also found the marriage license (Sabine, p. 6).

² Winstanley in his Digger writings was no great friend to the law, for that matter: “. . . for truly Attourneys are such neat workmen, that they can turn a Cause which way those that have the biggest purse will have them . . . *England* is a Prison; the variety of subtilties in the Laws preserved by the Sword, are bolts, bars, and doors of the prison; the Lawyers are the Jaylors, and poor men are the prisoners . . . Woe to you Lawyers, for your trade is the bane and miserie of the world; your power is the only power that hinders Christ from rising . . .” *A New-Yeers Gift for the Parliament and Armie* (1650) in Sabine, pp. 360-62. See also *A Watch-Word to the City of London and the Armie* (1649) in Sabine, p. 320.

³ Although, if he died aged 62 in 1676, it would mean he was born about 1614, not 1609 as in the Wigan parish register.

his career. This is indicated in his final choice of a trade, that of corn-chandler. Winstanley the prophet had cried out:

every one shall put to their hands to till the earth, and bring up cattle, and the blessing of the earth shall be common to all; when a man hath need of any corn for cattle, take from the next store-house he meets with. *Act.* 4. 32. There shall be no buying nor selling, no fairs nor markets.¹

“All buying and selling of Land, and the fruits of the earth”, he wrote, “is the art of cheating one another, is but the actings of Mankind in darknesse, under the power of the fall . . .”²

Friends' critique of economic life was far less radical. The only trades they objected to were lace-making and preaching. Anyone else, even a distiller, could serve the Lord acceptably in his calling so long as he was honest and “at a word” in his dealings, and avoided extending his trade beyond his means. If Winstanley as corn-chandler is more astonishing than Winstanley as Quaker, it is only because his new occupation dramatizes the social conservatism entailed in his conversion.

It would seem that both Lilburne and Winstanley gave up their agitating before or when they became Friends. Perhaps it would be more appropriate for historians to study the influence of Quakerism on the Diggers and Levellers, rather than the reverse. Friends' records are so complete that Levellers and Diggers could probably be identified if they later became Friends. If many followed the path of Lilburne and Winstanley, the role of Quakerism as a conservative political influence may have been considerable. It would be ironical if the Quaker movement, so much persecuted as subversive, in fact contributed to the political stability, such as it was, of Oliver's Protectorate. But if Lilburne and Winstanley stopped their agitation for social reform when they joined Friends, may not many who would have heard their message have done the same? Was it pure coincidence that the rise of Quakerism so closely succeeded the collapse of the Leveller impulse?

Elie Halevy's famous thesis contended that the Methodist revival deflected the English working classes from the support of a social revolution like that in France. The impact of Quakerism on English society, at least during the decade of

¹ *The New Law of Righteousnes* (1649), in Sabine, p. 184.

² *An Humble Request to the Ministers of both Universities and to all Lawyers in every Inns-a-Court* (1650), in Sabine, p. 425.

the Commonwealth, was perhaps as great as that of Wesley and Whitefield. The spiritual pilgrimage of Lilburne and Winstanley may explain why the English propertied classes won so easy a victory over the spectre of radicalism.

RICHARD T. VANN

Somerset in manuscript, a selection from the records preserved in the Somerset Record Office, published by the Records Committee, Somerset County Council, June 1959, includes notes on the main archive groups preserved in the Somerset Record Office, with a description of documents selected for exhibition.

Among the Quarter sessions records showing the justices at work is Exhibit 2—The preliminary hearing.

Quarter Sessions Roll, 1657. The seventeenth century rolls consist largely of examinations before local Justices. Displayed is an examination of Thomas Salthouse, an early leader of the Quaker movement, who travelled and preached widely in the West Country.

Among business records (from the Dickinson collection) are two Exhibits:

112. The trade of a Bristol merchant, 1734.

Instructions issued by Graffin Prankard, a Quaker merchant, to his ship's master, 1734. His activities, as the name of his vessel, "Baltic Merchant", implies, were principally directed to the Baltic ports. However, his trade was sometimes with North America where he had agents in Charleston, South Carolina, from which his principal imports were rice and logwood.

113. Hazards of the sea.

Letter from a prisoner in Spain, 1740. On a later trip from South Carolina the "Baltic Merchant" had to face additional risks in that England had declared war on Spain. Within sight of the Scilly Islands she was attacked by a Spanish privateer, and the surviving crew, with passengers, were taken to San Sebastian; from here the Captain was able to get letters through to his kinsman, Prankard, in Bristol.

Other Prankard manuscripts are in Bristol Public Library.

Exhibit 115 is a letter from Edmund Rack and John Collinson (c.1785) soliciting support for the history of Somerset on which they collaborated, and which was issued under Collinson's name after the death of Rack.

J. J. Gurney and Norwich Politics

J. GURNEY is best known as a member of the Gurney banking family and as an influential Evangelical minister in the Society of Friends between 1818 and 1847. He also played an important role as an active citizen in Norwich. He led the way in the founding of a Lancasterian school for needy boys, supplying them with a virtually free elementary education. He played a prominent role in organizing relief for unemployed weavers and their families during the severe depression which struck Norwich textile businesses in the winters of 1825-26 and 1829-30. In the latter winter, feelings were running high among the weavers who were refusing to work because of the low wages being offered by manufacturers, and Gurney tried to effect some kind of resolution of the impasse. From time to time he entered the political arena. The record of these forays, though brief, illumines the political scene of that time and the changing attitude of Friends toward participation in political activity.

Gurney's primary political aim was to eliminate or lessen corrupt election practices. His general aloofness from politics was prompted by disgust with the extent of this corruption and by sympathy with traditional Quaker opposition to its members, and especially its ministers, becoming active in political party struggles. The corruption in Norwich city elections during Gurney's early manhood was notorious. Bribery and illegal influence of other forms were practised on a large scale by both Whigs and Tories. In the autumn of 1833, in part as a result of a Norwich citizens' petition to Parliament which Gurney had actively supported,¹ a Public Inquiry was begun by Parliament into election practices and city constitutions in Norwich and other English cities. In 1835 the Municipal Corporations Act wiped out the city constitution of Norwich which had been in force since 1404. A recurring problem in Norwich elections had been the small number of those eligible to vote. Even in 1841, five years after the reorganization of the municipal corporation, there were fewer than 3,000 electors in a population of 60,000.

¹ cf. below, p. 55 f.

R. H. Mottram, Norwich novelist and local historian, has concluded that rampant corruption came into Norwich politics about 1808-10, as part of the disruption of a generation of war.

. . . the ancient body of freemen, whose status had once been a guarantee of settled interests and responsible conduct, had been reduced by long chronic unemployment to precisely that state at which men will do anything for money, drink, or excitement.

At a time when there were only 2,316 municipal voters, 1,123 owned so little property that they paid no rates (taxes), and 315 more were classed as paupers.¹

Parliament's Public Inquiry met massive resistance in Norwich. At first the Sheriffs refused to attend hearings or to allow evidence to be taken from their officers. Eventually, however, a fairly clear picture was uncovered. It showed widespread bribery, primarily in local rather than parliamentary elections. Both parties used substantial funds at each election, to purchase votes outright and to treat voters to enough drinks to influence them to vote the right way. Tickets of admission to almshouses under municipal control were given, by the party which won, to its needy supporters. Sheriff's posse men, paid by those running for office, ran away in 1830, when the wooden polling booth was burnt by a mob. And "cooping" was frequently practised, i.e. forcible seizure and abduction of voters known to support the other party. On one occasion several electors were seized, drugged and maltreated, and then taken to Ranworth, 12 miles north-east of Norwich, put on board a wherry and guarded by men with clubs and scythes. They were released only by a counter-attack by the opposing party using another wherry.²

The Gurneys were Whigs, and Gurneys Bank was accused by the Tories of supplying large sums of money to secure Whig victories in city elections. It is a fact that the first Tory ever allowed on the Bank staff in Norwich was employed in 1838. He was taken on only after he had solemnly promised to regard Whig party secrets as equal in sanctity to bank secrets and never to pass on Whig gossip to his Tory friends.³

At Bartlett Gurney's death in 1803, Richard Gurney, Joseph John's elder uncle, had become head of the Norwich

¹ R. H. Mottram, *Success to the Mayor* (London, 1937), pp. 220 ff.

² *Ibid.*

³ W. H. Bidwell, *Annals of an East Anglian Bank*, (Norwich, 1900), p. 195.

Gurney family. He was a conscientious business man and a strict Friend, but the latter description could not be applied to his sons, Hudson and Richard Hanbury Gurney. Hudson, cousin of Joseph John, and a partner in the Norwich Bank, was disowned by the Norwich Monthly Meeting in 1804 for "contributing to a fund for military purposes".¹ His interests were chiefly literary and he had wanted to resign from the Bank long before he actually did, in 1832. His step-brother, Richard Hanbury Gurney, had been a partner in the Yarmouth branch of Gurneys Bank. He successfully stood for Parliament in 1818,² and it was in support of his candidacy that Joseph John Gurney first made a political speech. Something of R. H. Gurney's political platform can be gathered from toasts he proposed at a birthday party for a local squire, in the month before the election. He toasted "The cause of Liberty all over the world"; "the Bishop of Norwich, the Friend of Toleration"; and "Sir Francis Burdett and a Reform in Parliament."³

After the votes were counted, Joseph John Gurney made two speeches on his cousin's behalf to a large gathering in the Swan Inn Yard and to a crowd in the Market Place. These events occurred very soon after the Norwich Monthly Meeting had recognized him as a minister. He was afterwards taken sharply to task within the Society for having appeared on these occasions, though his comments were evidently restrained. To the first gathering he spoke on church and state, contrasting the true Christian understanding of the Church with the narrower view taken by the Tories. The state he defined as being the equivalent of the "people", i.e. King, lords and commons. In the Market Place Gurney paid Norwich's M.P., Wm. Smith, high compliments, thanked the free-men of Norwich for having elected his cousin, and declared that the latter would prove himself a liberal and dependable representative of the free-men of Norwich.⁴

R. H. Gurney again stood successfully for Parliament in 1820. By 1826 he had decided to retire. The Whig paper, the *Norwich Mercury*, spoke well of his record:

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

² That R.H.G. went to Parliament at this time indicates that he was not a practising Friend.

³ *Norwich Mercury*, 9.v.1818.

⁴ MS. Autobiography (The Library, Friends House, London); *Norfolk Chronicle*, 20.vi.1818.

he returns to the condition of a private gentleman in the full retention of the same independence with which he entered the House of Commons, with the same plain integrity that has marked his public actions.¹

Yet R. H. Gurney was evidently disapproved of by some in the Society of Friends as a lapsed Quaker, and in the spring of 1819, J. J. Gurney received a sharp rebuke for having appeared in public on his behalf. Ann Alexander was an eloquent Friend and strong supporter of Gurney's Bible-study programme just getting under way at Ackworth School. She had played a major part in dispelling, at summer school Committee Meetings, the suspicions of Gurney's educational methods roused by John Barclay and others. Having heard of Gurney's activities in the recent Norwich election, she wrote him with loving forthrightness, expressing a position widely held by Friends at that time.

As I cannot but believe that serious reflection must lead to the full conviction that the spirit of electioneering is as opposite to the example and precept of him who was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners" as light is from darkness, it is always to me a matter of surprise that religious characters under our name can take any great part in this business, as it is now so generally conducted.²

In the same year that Joseph John Gurney helped celebrate his "black-sheep" cousin's first election to Parliament, a relative of greater stature was elected to Parliament from Weymouth. Thomas Fowell Buxton had married Gurney's sister Hannah and was to be Wilberforce's successor in Parliament as indefatigable labourer in and leader of the drive for abolition of slavery. Buxton, though never a member of the Society, was close to many Quakers and was obviously an independent, uncompromising and vastly effective Christian politician. His presence in Parliament forced many Friends who had eschewed political activity as spiritually contaminating, to rethink their position. Gurney, two years younger than Buxton, and distantly related to him, had known him well from boyhood. Years before Buxton stood for Parliament, Gurney had recommended this to him as his "most useful and desirable field of action". (Before entering the political world, Buxton had been in the brewery business in London.) Gurney's letter of counsel after Buxton's election

¹ 26.v.1826.

² Letter of 7.v.1819, Gurney MSS. (The Library at Friends House, London.)

in 1818, shows the former's positive view of the possibilities in a political vocation. After urging Buxton to take up "one great object" such as revision of the criminal code, and to pursue it with single-minded vigour, Gurney added:

Do not let thy independence of all party be the means of leading thee away from *sound Whiggism* . . . *there is a great work going on in the world* . . . the human mind, under the safeguard of *religious education*, is advancing to the shaking off of so many of its trammels, and so many of its prejudices . . . But let us not admit any check to the progress of true light, whether moral, political, or religious; and let us take especial care to avoid the *spirit of Toryism*. I mean that spirit which bears the worst things with endless apathy, *because they are old*; and with which reason and even humanity are nothing, and the authority of creatures as fallible as ourselves, everything.¹

One of the ironies of the 1818 Norwich election for Parliament was that the Tory candidate, Harbord,² whom R. H. Gurney defeated, was actually a person of greater integrity and more substantial religious interests than the victor. J. J. Gurney and Edward Harbord came to appreciate each other in the spring of 1819, in a common protest against the practices engaged in during Norwich elections. In March Gurney had written a letter to the city magistrates, defending critical remarks he had made in print previously regarding the Norwich Jail. To this letter, published in the *Norfolk Chronicle* and the *Norwich Mercury*, Gurney had added a footnote on ward elections. He declared that, as they were then conducted by both parties, there could hardly be

a more open scheme of scandalous bribery and corruption; a more profligate waste of money; a more convenient occasion for loose and blasphemous ribaldry; a more fruitful source of misery, drunkenness, and crime; a more certain method of sapping the independence and destroying the morals of the community, of plentifully replenishing both our workhouses and our jails!³

Harbord, who, though well-to-do had not put up any money to secure his own election the previous year, was delighted to read Gurney's statement. The day the newspaper came out he wrote to Gurney,

I willingly surrender to you the glory of having struck the first blow, but as the field is yet open, I must beg leave to put in my claim

¹ Letter of 8.vii.1818, in Charles Buxton (ed.), *Memoirs of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, Baronet* (Phila., 1840), pp. 75 ff.

² Edward Harbord, 3rd baron Suffield, 1821 (1781-1835) *D.N.B.*

³ *Norfolk Chronicle*, 20.iii.1819.

as an ally and coadjutor, not of the past, but of your future efforts.¹

Gurney at once answered Harbord's warm letter. He cited more details than he had done in his open letter in the newspapers. Husbands, he declared, were taken from their families and kept sequestered for two or three weeks, in a state of intoxication. Young men, just come of voting age, were "plunged into scenes of dissipation, from the effects of which they never recover". Young and old voters were aroused to a state of enmity against each other once a year, so as to throw the whole city of Norwich into a ferment. It all added up to the destruction of "all right political motives" in the poor who were qualified to vote.

Gurney had a specific solution in mind, a public declaration against all these abuses, signed by all men of influence in both parties in Norwich. Such a declaration should include a public commitment not to open any public houses or spend any money on either drinks or bribes. "Why should not the poor men go quietly up to the Hall and vote, and then go back to their homes?"² Harbord supported Gurney's proposed plan, but felt it needed "teeth" in it. There should be provisions for punishment in case of violation and a system of inspection of the election by both parties. Otherwise each party would fear that the other would covertly resort to the old tactics, and win. Gurney agreed to Harbord's machinery for prosecution as a later step, but persisted in his judgment that a public declaration should be tried first.³

This hopeful planning was interrupted by a scathing reply to Gurney's charges. An open letter to Gurney by an attorney named Atkinson appeared in the 27th March *Norfolk Chronicle* and the 3rd April *Norwich Mercury*. The writer acknowledged that both parties did engage in the disgraceful practices alluded to by Gurney, but he expressed surprise that a member of the Gurney family should publicly be deploring these abuses. The remedy he declared,

rests with you and your nearest connections. Let the Gurney family declare that they will never subscribe another shilling to the support of our Ward and other Local Elections, and do you, Sir, prevent in

¹ Letter of 20.iii.1819 in J. B. Braithwaite, *Memoirs of Joseph John Gurney: with selections from his Journal and Correspondence*, (Phila., 1854), I, pp. 165 f.

² Letter of 22.iii.1819, in Braithwaite, *op. cit.*, I, p. 166.

³ Letter from Harbord to Gurney, 23.iii.1819, and from Gurney to Harbord 18.viii.1819, *ibid.*, pp. 166 f.

future your confidential clerks from becoming the active agents and profuse Paymasters of this profligate waste of money, and we shall soon see our city in peace and quietness again.

Does not the sin, Sir, lie at the door of those who last year subscribed many thousand pounds to bribe and corrupt the freemen of the Long Ward? Were not there poor men, after they had promised to vote in the same interest they had always supported, induced to break their promises by bribes of 40 *l.* and 50 *l.*? a temptation too great to be resisted by most needy voters! Were not a large number of these men *cooped up* at one of R.G.'s [Richard Gurney's] tenants at Northrepps, and there maintained in idleness and drunkenness . . . ? Were not the carriages of some of the Gurney family employed in conveying these miserable promise-breakers, in a beastly state of intemperance, to the poll? And did we not, for the first time, see Quakers, who refuse to bow to Royalty itself, pulling off their hats and saluting these intoxicated wretches?¹

Since Gurney wrote no open letter in reply to Atkinson, we can only suppose that the latter's accusations were founded in fact. Indeed, Richard H. Gurney later admitted to spending £80,000 on electioneering for himself and his friends.² How, then, are we to explain Gurney's actions in speaking in support of his cousin in the spring of 1818, and, in the spring of 1819, openly deploring abuses which were actually being practised by his own Bank? We can only make informed guesses. It seems likely that Gurney learned more, shortly after his cousin's election, as to what had actually been done to win the election. The entry in his Journal shortly after he had spoken in his cousin's behalf, betrayed uneasiness. He noted that "some public measures in support of Smith and Gurney seemed unavoidable" and excused himself by affirming that in his talk on church and state he had tried to raise people's minds a little above mere politics. Yet, all in all, he was unhappy at finding himself enrolled with a party and was convinced that his foray into politics had been "rather lowering to the best things."³

Did Gurney's Bank actually supply money, in addition to individual contributions from members of the Gurney family to defray Richard Gurney's election expenses? We do not know. But the evidence seems clear that money earned by the Bank and distributed as profits to R. H. Gurney and

¹ Letter of 24.iii.1819 in *Norfolk Chronicle*, 27.iii.1819, and in *Norwich Mercury* 3.iv.1819.

² Bidwell, *Annals of an East Anglian Bank*, pp. 139 ff.

³ Entry for 20.vi.1818, in the privately printed folio volume, "Extracts from the Letters, Journals, etc. of Joseph John Gurney" (The Quaker Collection, Haverford College Library; Friends House Library, London), p. 100.

others, played an important part in the corrupt practices alluded to by Atkinson. Probably the Tory machine, though not Edward Harbord personally, gained support from another Norwich institution, the Crown Bank.¹

It seems likely that J. J. Gurney wrote his open letter condemning corrupt election practices, quite aware that his relatives, and even the Bank, had been involved. Indeed, his letter may well have been prompted by a sense of guilt over being a junior partner in such affairs, and as a public protest against Bank policies dominated by his uncle Richard and his cousins, Hudson and R. H. Gurney. Of this we cannot be sure, but it is borne out by the comment made by Bidwell, historian of Gurneys Bank, whose natural sympathies inclined toward those Gurneys who threw themselves without reservation into business and political careers. Bidwell remarked of the 1818 election,

Mr. J. J. Gurney, however, disliked the strife of politics, and abhorred the party spirit, the dissipation and corruption so much in evidence at a contested election. Mr. R. H. Gurney had far more effective help from Mr. Simon Martin [Bank manager] who, though he took no part in public meetings, was a strong Whig.²

Gurney's concern over election corruption was not permanently driven underground by the irrefutable charges against the Gurney family which had appeared in the newspapers early in 1819. During the following summer Gurney talked to a number of citizens about his and Harbord's proposal of a public declaration eschewing the use of illegal influence on voters. Yet nothing substantial was accomplished. Gurney was discouraged by the amount of suspicion and deep prejudice which he encountered in most of the devotees of either party. For more than ten years thereafter, he had nothing to do with party proceedings on either side, and refused to give a shilling towards either local or general election expenses.

After the December 1832 election for Parliament, however, Gurney exploded again in an indignant protest in public print. R. H. Gurney, having retired from Parliament in 1826, had returned to the fray and won elections in 1830 and 1831. In 1832, the year of the passage of the Reform Bill, the election at Norwich reached new depths. Tory candidates

¹ Bidwell, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

² *Ibid.*

won in a contest in which the fraudulent methods hitherto largely limited to city elections were extensively used in the general election.

J. J. Gurney was faced with an awkward decision. Two years earlier his cousin, the defeated candidate, had been involved in some "sorrowful affair", serious enough to have caused J. J. Gurney to be uneasy at that time about his continuing to share in the management of the Bank. When R. H. Gurney had stood for Parliament in 1830, Joseph John had decided that he could not, as a Christian and a Friend, vote for his cousin. He had urged his brother Samuel to take the same position, telling him, "I have reason to know that many eyes are upon us, to watch whether we will act up to our profession or not."¹ Now, in 1832 any public protest against his cousin's defeat would be interpreted both as family bias and as condoning R. H. Gurney's previous lapse.

After anxious deliberation, J. J. Gurney took the more risky path. He wrote another open letter to the *Chronicle* and *Mercury*, declaring that he was preparing to give some money to support a petition to Parliament contesting the results of the recent election, in which thousands of pounds had been spent "in the horrid work of depriving the poor voters of their best treasures—integrity and temperance". Since rottenness had invaded the *Parliamentary* election there seemed a basis for appeal for a Parliamentary investigation of Norwich city politics. "Whatever may be the result of the inquiry as relates to these gentlemen [the successful Tory candidates], the curse and sorrow of our city will unquestionably be brought to light."²

Actually, Gurney hoped that the threat of Parliamentary investigation would force local party leaders to clean their own house. The *Norwich Mercury* (Whig) applauded his letter and eulogized Gurney as the man in all Norwich in whose integrity and good judgment the local citizens had the most confidence.³ The Tory *Chronicle* published a vituperative attack on the "House of Gurney" as the fountainhead of Whig political corruption, at least since R. H. Gurney had

¹ Letters by J. J. Gurney to Joseph Gurney, 26.i.1830, and to Samuel Gurney, 13.vii.1830, Gurney MSS., III, 520, 526.

² Letter of 1.i.1833 published in *Norfolk Chronicle* and *Norwich Mercury*, 5.i.1833.

³ *Norwich Mercury*, 5.i.1833.

entered politics in 1818.¹ Yet in spite of the high feeling, it looked for a time as though J. J. Gurney would be successful in bringing about reform. In February the City Recorder came to him, on behalf of the Tories, asking him whether he would seek to avert the petition to Parliament, if the two local parties would jointly eliminate corrupt practices. Gurney held extended conversations with the Whigs who had drawn up the petition to Parliament and with the Tories, and presented the latter with a scheme for completely remodelling or even abolishing the City Corporation. Nevertheless, though the Tory leaders conferred with Gurney again, his proposed reforms were evidently too drastic to be acceptable. Eventually, as we have seen, Parliamentary action forced a revision of the city government.

Gurney's role in the 1833 petition to Parliament against Tory corruption in Norwich was complicated by the fact that he was himself considering standing for Parliament at the time. Given the general feeling in the Society of Friends against active involvement in politics, it is notable that Gurney, a leading Quaker minister, should have seriously considered going into Parliament. Undoubtedly close association with Fowell Buxton's career as an anti-slavery politician played a part. And the slavery issue was at a crisis stage. (Abolition was finally to be carried in August 1833.) Moreover, the Reform Bill of 1832 made it easier for a Quaker to go to Parliament, since the likelihood increased that a member could enter on affirmation rather than on oath. Gurney was well aware of the case of his cousin, Joseph Pease, who had stood for Parliament in 1832, in spite of strong opposition to this step from both his family and his Quaker meeting. Pease had been asked by the electors of southern Durham to stand as their candidate. He had agreed, but had made no canvas for votes, had spent no money on the election and had declared he would vote in Parliament according to Friends' principles. Pease had been elected and became the first Quaker M.P.²

¹ Letter by M. J. U. Browne to Gurney, 7.i.1833 in *Norfolk Chronicle*, 12.i.1833. Browne reprinted Atkinson's letter of 1819 and added charges of his own.

² Joseph Pease was the son of Edward Pease, "The Father of Railways", who had helped open up the Stockton and Darlington Railway in 1825. The Pease family, like the Gurneys, had been in business as wool merchants. This may have been the railway into which Gurneys Bank put money in the 1820's. (Cf. Gurney MSS. III, 450, cited by L. S. Pressnell, *Country Banking in the Industrial Revolution* [Oxford, 1956], p. 400).

But something more immediate than Buxton's and Pease's examples prompted Gurney to consider entering Parliament. In the fall of 1832, he broke his rule, followed since 1818, of no election speeches. He spoke at the county election in support of the Whig anti-slavery platform, which played a significant part in the victory of the Whigs. In his Journal on 12th December, 1832 he wrote:

Public affairs—the strife of party—the victories of the hot Tory partizans on the one side, and the brawlings of Radicals on the other—the absence of religious and even decently moral restraint—are subjects of true lamentation to me; and I tremble lest the righteous cause of the abolition of slavery should be frustrated.¹

By early January 1833 Gurney was fairly clear in his mind that he should accede to what seemed likely to be a call from his fellow citizens to send him and John Weyland² to Parliament, “present members being likely to be displaced for gross corruption.”³ Though Gurney's references to the probable vacancy in Parliament were always veiled, he must have been approached by the Whigs who were contesting the recent Norwich Tory victory.⁴ This would explain his Journal comment in late February regarding conference with “High Tories” over reform of the City Corporation. “If I hear nothing further, the negotiation ceases, and I have done my *very best* both for quieting the contentions, and for shutting the door on the possibility of my own election.”⁵

Since there was no precedent for a Quaker minister entering Parliament, Gurney took counsel, in mid-January, with a number of Friends prominent in the committee affairs of London Yearly Meeting or in the Quaker ministry. Three urged caution, but wanted the matter left to divine guidance. Four, including Buxton's brother-in-law, were ready to have

¹ In “Extracts” p. 325.

² John Weyland (1774-1854) *D.N.B.*

³ 1837 Autobiography, in “Extracts”, p. 331; and a letter of 28.ii.1833 to Jonathan Hutchinson, Gurney MSS. III, 571.

⁴ The violent letter in the *Norfolk Chronicle* to Gurney after he had proposed to support the appeal to Parliament contesting the Tory victory, included the following, “Whether the spirit of representation awakened in your breast by the triumph of your friend Pease, shall quit its hiding-place and be made manifest with the electors, or whether, with a decent and appropriate humility, shrinking from your desires, you strangle the ambitious hope in its birth,—whether you prefer the care of souls to the instruction of a nation, the holy murmurs of the Conventicle to the earthly delusions of the Senate, are points which cannot be decided at the present moment.” (*Norfolk Chronicle*, 12.i.1833).

⁵ MS. Journal (The Library at Friends House, London).

Gurney go ahead.¹ But his brother Samuel opposed it and his wife Mary saw "nothing but danger and the cross" in it.² For six weeks Gurney wrestled with the matter. At the end of February he still felt "it may be a service required of me, by the Great Head of the Church." But Gurney would have stood for Parliament as part of his calling as a minister.

The awful question which has haunted me day and night, is *this*: Whether I have a testimony to bear, I mean a quiet, patient, persevering testimony to the cause of Christianity in the British Parliament. If this be indeed the Master's will, I fully believe it would not *bar* or *mar* the anointing in ministry.³

Early in March the problem was solved when Gurney came to have a strong "leading" to pay a ministerial visit to Friends in the London area. A religious visit at that time clearly precluded him from taking the political course, and he was easy in his mind at turning his back on standing for Parliament.

Joseph John Gurney's urge toward political responsibility had been something deeper than toying with distinction. In 1837, as he set sail for three years in America, he was still inclined to think it likely that he would feel called to serve in Parliament sometime in the future "for a specific purpose and a short time."⁴ During the remaining ten years of his life, however, Gurney became increasingly absorbed in the travelling ministry and in the anti-slavery cause in America and on the Continent. There is no evidence of his having again seriously considered standing for Parliament.

DAVID SWIFT

¹ One of these, Joseph Foster, cited the legislative functions of Friends and even Friend ministers in Pennsylvania as precedent.

² MS. Journal, entry on 21.i.1833.

³ Letter of 28.ii.1833 to Jonathan Hutchinson, Gurney MSS. III, 571.

⁴ MS. Autobiography.

Recent Publications

Some Quaker Portraits, certain and uncertain. By John Nickalls. Pp.iv,20; 4 plates. Supplement no. 29 to the *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*. London, Friends' Historical Society, jointly with Friends Historical Association. Haverford, Pa., 1958. 3s. 6d./50c.

For centuries persons have enjoyed having about them portraits not only of those dear to them but also of those no longer living of particular interest or venerated by them. To satisfy the latter demand, unscrupulous persons, as well as honest but too-wishful thinkers, have been responsible for the naming of many portraits which have subsequently done duty as representing famous men of the past, but on the authenticity of which we cannot rely. John Nickalls has done good service by searching for and setting down what evidence he has been able to collect for and against the reliability of certain portraits, which have often been reproduced as representing famous early Quakers.

He reproduces three portrait engravings which were published in the seventeenth century, all called James Nayler but hardly reconcilable. He shows that the head of one, published in 1661, may have been copied from a painting of Christ, another which was engraved in Holland in 1657 was found to have been copied from a painting of an unknown man by Rembrandt; the third is from a plate believed to have been engraved as Nayler by Francis Place. Did Place who was only thirteen years old when Nayler died, draw the portrait from memory or did he copy a painting or drawing of Nayler? Will the true answer ever be known?

Curiously no portrait was engraved or recorded before 1799 as representing George Fox, or so it seems. The first engraving published as representing him is very unconvincing, and there is little hope that any portrait of him has survived, if one ever existed. John Nickalls has had the ingenuity to study the physiognomy of certain members of the Fox family who are likely to be collateral descendants and considers that certain characteristics persist in the family. The bronze bust of a fairly recent date in Friends House reminds him of a John Fox of Lubenham who he knew many years ago.

Of William Penn there is a well-established carved ivory relief done late in life by his friend, Silvanus Bevan. Versions of this are the only certain portraits of him, and fortunately there is evidence that Bevan's portrait was considered a good resemblance.

A portrait of a young man in armour inscribed as aged 22, has been copied and reproduced time and again as William Penn. Rarely has it been suggested that the portrait might be misnamed. John Nickalls has looked into the history of all the versions known to him. All have the appearance of being copies from an original which might well

have been painted about the year when Penn was 22. Unfortunately he has not found any mention of a portrait of this type before 1800. The possibility or even likelihood is that a version which had lost its true identity was sold as William Penn to one of the Penn family in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century, and that the other versions are copies, several being made soon after its acquisition.

Sixteen portraits which are discussed in the text are well produced in half-tone. The reproductions include authentic portraits of William Dillwyn and Willem Sewel.

C. K. ADAMS

Hannah Penn and the Proprietorship of Pennsylvania. By Sophie Hutchinson Drinker. Privately printed under the auspices of The National Society of the Colonial Dames of America. Philadelphia, 1958. Pp. (iii), iv, 207; 4 plates.

For reasons that have been obscured in the passage of 250 years, Friends, or rather, some Friends, did not altogether approve of the second marriage of William Penn, and it is perhaps for this reason that the life and abilities of Hannah Callowhill (1671-1726), whom he married in Bristol in 1696, have not received the attention which they deserve.

It is true that Penn's second marriage did not have the romance woven around it that his first to Gulielma Maria Springett received, but from the manner in which Hannah faced the difficulties which pressed in upon Penn in the last dozen years of his life we cannot doubt the strength of the bond between the two. In marrying Hannah Callowhill, daughter of Thomas and Hannah (Hollister) Callowhill, Penn became connected with the whole circle of Quaker merchants in Bristol. Money was available when his financial position was most grave, sound commercial advice was there for the asking and Hannah had the stamina and business ability to sustain the proprietorship during Penn's incapacity after 1712 and as executrix after his death.

In *Hannah Penn and the Proprietorship of Pennsylvania* Sophie Hutchinson Drinker has produced a readable edition of 58 letters of Hannah Penn dealing with Pennsylvania affairs from 1700 to 1726 now in the possession of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. The correspondence is almost wholly with James Logan, who left his post as usher in Friends' School in Bristol to go with Penn in 1699 to his colony. There Logan proved himself an able administrator, a true friend to the proprietors and an ornament to the commonwealth.

The introductory chapter and the connecting narrative provide the necessary biographical outline and historical perspective for understanding the letters. One can have nothing but praise for Mrs. Drinker's presentation of this important material in modern form, and the tasteful book production, with endpaper map, portraits, and facsimiles, makes the volume a satisfying piece of work, and a fitting memorial to a woman whose sterling character, abilities and service to Pennsylvania have not hitherto been sufficiently appreciated.

R. S. MORTIMER

The Bulletin of Friends Historical Association, Spring 1958 (vol. 47, no. 1) opens with an article on the Nicholites, a Quaker-like sect of the later eighteenth century, in Maryland and Virginia, which united with Friends about 1800. There is an account of a pro-Southern influence on British opinion in the American Civil War through the correspondence recently come to light in Dublin, of Joshua Toolhunter, an Irish Friend living in New York as a merchant. Henry J. Cadbury shows the probability from documentary evidence that Fox's reference to Holland under date 1651, in his *Journal* (Cambridge ed., 1911, omitted in other editions) means the Netherlands and not the district of Lincolnshire.

The Autumn number, 1958 (vol. 47, no. 2) contains four main articles: "Some Quaker furniture makers", in colonial Philadelphia when the best furniture in America was made in the city (Marguerite Hallowell); "The reputation of a Quaker businessman" (Isaac Hicks, 1767-1820, cousin of Elias Hicks), by Robert Davidson of Hofstra College; "James M. Haworth, Quaker India agent" (d. 1885), by Burritt M. Hiatt; and "William Allen, Negro evangelist" (d. 1898) by Fred L. Ryon, reminiscences based on personal acquaintance of seventy-five years ago of one who was born a slave and joined the Society of Friends.

The Spring number, 1959 (vol. 48, no. 1) opens with a paper on "Quakerism and foreign policy" in which Robert O. Byrd, clerk of Illinois Y.M. and member of the Department of Political Science at North Park College, Chicago, traces the development of Friends' attitude to and involvement in foreign policy.

"John Candler's visit to America, 1850", edited by Joseph A. Boromé from the MS of John Candler's journal at Friends House Library, is the second major paper in this issue, which concludes with the usual valuable bibliographical notices of research in progress, book reviews and periodical articles.

The William and Mary quarterly, 3rd series, vol. 15, no. 3 (July 1958) opens with the first part of a paper on "The Crown and the colonial charters, 1675-1688" by Philip S. Haffenden, lecturer in history at King's College, Aberdeen. The author views royal policy as part of the movement for imperial centralization under the later Stuarts. The apparent contradiction in the grant of the Pennsylvania charter during the period when proprietary government was at a discount was because Charles refused to subordinate personal wishes to the demands of approved policy, although he did yield to the demands of the Lords of Trade in imposing greater limitations upon the proprietor than in earlier charters. The compromise thus arrived at was at best of limited stability and if Mr. Haffenden's thesis is correct it will account for many of Penn's later difficulties with Whitehall.

Vol. 16, no. 2 (April 1959), pp. 228-243, includes "An account of the Indians in Virginia" from a manuscript of 1689 in the Newberry Library, printed by Stanley Pargellis. In dealing with the "State of the English churches in Virginia" the manuscript records:

"There are about 50 parishes in Virginia. There are many little

poor parishes not able to give a minister a competent maintenance; so that two of them must joyn to have one minister to preach to them every other Sunday . . . There are abundance of churches empty in all places of that colony . . . There is no manner of church government among them, but every man does what seems good in his own eyes. Prophaness reigns in most places to an excessive degree; and where there is a man more serious than the rest, the Quakers do presently catch him."

The Mennonite quarterly review, vol. 33, no. 1 (January 1959) pp. 42-59, includes an article by J. Herbert Fretz, pastor of the Salem Mennonite Church, Freeman, South Dakota, entitled "The Germantown anti-slavery petition of 1688" commemorating the 270th anniversary of that historic document. The article reproduces the text printed in William I. Hull's *William Penn and the Dutch Quaker migration to Pennsylvania* (1935).

The number for April 1959 (vol. 33, no. 2) includes (pp. 143-151) "A newly discovered Pennsylvania Mennonite petition of 1755", by Professor Guy F. Hershberger, in which he prints a petition to the Pennsylvania Assembly by thirteen "signers of typical Mennonite names". It seems that the petition was pigeonholed and remained with the papers of Isaac Norris, the Speaker (1701-1766), and was given to the American Philosophical Society in 1815 with other Norris papers. The petitioners recalled that when they came to Pennsylvania as immigrants from Germany and took the Declarations of Allegiance (to the British crown) and Fidelity and Abjuration (against the Pretender), they did not know English and were not fully instructed in the meaning of the declarations. They re-affirm their allegiance, goodwill to the crown, and obedience to government, but, being non-resisters, they could not take up arms even to defend the King.

The October 1958 number of *The Pennsylvania Magazine*, vol. 82, no. 4, includes "Town House and Country House—inventories from the estate of William Logan, 1776", listing the contents of his houses on Second Street in Philadelphia and Stenton. This is edited by Frederick B. Tolles. Selections from the diary of Sarah Logan Fisher, edited by Nicholas B. Wainwright, give an interesting account of events from the Quaker viewpoint occurring in Philadelphia in 1776-78 during the War of Independence.

Saul Sack, lecturer in the history of education at the University of Pennsylvania, has contributed a paper on "Higher education of women in Pennsylvania" to the January 1959 issue, vol. 83, no. 1, pp. 29-73. The author describes the early history and development of Bryn Mawr College. This institution was, from the time it opened its doors in 1885, more than a Quaker undergraduate college. The trustees recognized that it would be impracticable to fill the faculty chairs with members of the Society of Friends, and so they were prepared to look outside. From the beginning post-graduate work for higher degrees was a feature of the college. The first Bryn Mawr degrees were awarded in 1888, but it is interesting to note that the trustees ratified these *ex post facto* under an amended charter granted in 1896.

Other articles include "The Civil War correspondence of Dr. Thomas S. Kirkbride" (Dr. Clifford B. Farr), and "The (Delaware) Swedes" Letter to William Penn (1697)."

Vol. 83, no. 2 (April 1959) includes (p. 810) an article by Edwin Wolf 2nd of the Library Company of Philadelphia on the library of Judge John Guest who died in 1707. The author identifies the fifty-odd books recorded and valued in the inventory of Guest's estate, and remarks that it was quite a considerable library for the time. The great majority of Guest's books were law books used for his work, but we note that he had a copy of William Penn's *Christian Quaker*. It is against this sort of background that one must gauge the achievement of James Logan in building up his great library and securing for western literary culture a foothold in the frontier of America.

The *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society*, vol. 11, no. 4 (May 1959) includes part III of a series of studies by the president of that Society, Dr. S. W. Carruthers, on "Conventicles and Conventiclors", dealing with Wiltshire and Berkshire. The author quotes from the State Papers, 10th July, 1670, reporting "a meeting of 2000 persons on Roade Common, erroneously said to be Presbyterians, but actually Quakers" (p. 194).

The *Guide to the Kent County Archives Office* prepared for the County Archives Committee by Felix Hull (Maidstone, Kent County Council, 1958) devotes a section to the records of Kent Quarterly Meeting, which were transferred to the County Archives Office in 1954. The Guide enumerates the various meetings, the records of which are deposited there:

Kent Quarterly Meeting (minutes etc. 1733-1943); Ashford Monthly Meeting (1673-1764); Canterbury (originally East Kent) M.M. (1699-1892); Folkestone (originally West Kent) M.M. (1699-1892); Rochester Monthly Meeting (1804-1909). Individual notice is made of some "Kent Quarterly Meeting MSS"—Sufferings books, 1655-1759 and 1655-90; Information and instructions, 1657-1706 (a general book of meeting papers and letters); and early certificates, 1674-1761.

Notes and Queries

WILLIAM PENN PORTRAIT

As a footnote to John Nickalls' paper on "Quaker Portraits", it may be of interest to mention the portrait of William Penn on the seal of the Friends' Provident and Century Life Office; a short account of this "Quaker Firm" formed part of William Marwick's article in our last issue. Until quite recently a reproduction of this seal appeared on much of the literature issued by the Friends' Provident Office, and it will be familiar to many.

When the office was incorporated in 1915, a seal was needed, and a well-known engraver, H. Macbeth-Raeburn (afterwards a Royal Academician) was commissioned to design and engrave this. He gave the principal place in his design to a representation of Penn, and his own account describes how this was prepared. It has to be admitted that Silvanus Bevan's medallion, regarded as a portrait of Penn, suffers from having been made, not only when its subject was an old man, but when his mental powers had largely failed. Although therefore it is vivid and forceful, it is hardly Penn at his best.

Macbeth-Raeburn's solution was to portray Penn "in a compromise between Admiral Penn's portrait (by Lely) and Bevan's bust". He justified this by two considerations, first, that William Penn's son John was said to resemble his father closely, and secondly, that there is much resemblance between the Admiral Penn of the Lely portrait and the existing portraits of John.

The other details of the seal were carefully conceived, as emblematic of Penn or of the Friends' Provident. Special mention may perhaps be made of the Penn family motto, *Dum clavum teneam*, which appears on the seal, as it raises again the interesting question whether this is really the original version of the motto. This question was referred to in the first volume (1894) of *Quakeriana*, that entertaining precursor of our own *Journal*. It seems clear that *Dum clavum teneam* was the version used by Penn himself and his descendants, on their book-plates. But some old pedigrees (e.g. "Pedigrees of Buckinghamshire families collected by William Berry of the College of Arms", 1837, p. 72) give the version *Dum clavum rectum teneam*. This would be a much more satisfying motto, recommending as it does the steadfastness and rectitude symbolized by "holding the helm steady", and it is moreover a well-known proverbial expression in Latin: examples of its use are cited in the dictionaries from Ennius and Quintilian. *Dum clavum teneam*, on the other hand, seems to convey nothing but a rather meaningless boast ("While I hold the helm"). A.W.B.

PORTRAIT OF WILLIAM PENN

The Rev. Mark Noble's *Biographical History of England*, a continuation of Granger, includes (vol. 2, pp. 298-302) a short account of William Penn. The engraved portrait which the anecdotes were to illustrate is

one of 1773 by John Hall, from the bust by Silvanus Bevan. A footnote states (referring to Benjamin West's picture of the Treaty with the Indians) "The figure of him in the celebrated picture by West, and engraved by Hall, though expressive of his make and general appearance, is not esteemed a true portrait."

NELL GWYNN

An account in French of the success with which Nell Gwynn (or rather, "la fameuse Nayle Guine") played the part of a Quakeress preaching ("les contorsions d'une Prophetesse à la manière de Trembleurs") appears in François Catrou's anonymously published *Histoire des Trembleurs* (1733), the third volume of his *Histoire du Fanatisme*. The author bases his account on the work of Gerard Croese and claims also to have read works of George Fox, William Penn and George Keith. His work shows no acquaintance with Friends of the eighteenth century.

JESUITS AT FRIENDS' MEETING?
In the Popish plot tract. *The cabal of several notorious priests and Jesuits, discovered, as, William of Ireland . . . (and others) shewing their endeavours to subvert the government, and Protestant religion. Viz. their treasonable practices in England and France: articles of their Creed: their stirring people to rebellion: frequenting Quaker's meeting in all sorts of apparel . . . By a lover of his King and country, who formerly was an eye-witness of these things.* (Anon.), 1679, (Wing C 181), Chapter V (p. 7) is titled "Their frequenting Quakers meetings, and their Apparel." An account is given of

a certain gentleman passing by Dorchester saw a concourse of Quakers, and Whitebread among them.

There is no evidence that Thomas Whitbread, (Thomas Harcourt, 1618-79 *D.N.B.*) the Jesuit who refused Oates admission to the Order and who was convicted (on the evidence of Titus Oates) of complicity in the "Popish Plot" and executed, ever attended a Quaker meeting.

QUAKER BREWERS

The Brewing industry in England, 1700-1830, by Peter Mathias (Cambridge University Press, 1959), is a book which must prove to be the standard general account of an industry which developed in the eighteenth century in the favourable conditions of the expanding London market along the lines of its own industrial revolution. A few firms early developed characteristics of the large-scale business finance usually only associated with later phases of the industrial revolution.

Before the rise of the temperance movement, Friends were active in the industry and Quaker businesses figure significantly in the book. Gurney manuscripts (at Friends House) and the records of firms like Courage and Barclay and Truman Hanbury Buxton have been used to good effect. There is a section on Quaker finance, particularly in connection with the Anchor Brewery, and the author has quoted from the diary of Peter Briggins (1666-1717).

FRIENDS AND THE THEATRE

To the *University of Birmingham historical journal*, vol. 6, no. 2 (1958), P. T. Underdown contri-

butes an article on "Religious opposition to licensing the Bristol and Birmingham theatres" (pp. 149-160). In Bristol, Friends were strenuously opposed to the Theatre in King Street, opened in 1766 (and still in use as a theatre nearly two centuries later), and in Birmingham the Lloyds were among the leaders of the opposition. The author has consulted Friends' records in Bristol and remarks on the activity of Richard Champion as one of the leaders in the campaign of protest.

BRISTOL FRIENDS IN POLITICS
 "Burke's Bristol friends", by P. T. Underdown, an article appearing in *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society for 1958* (vol. 77), pp. 127-150, gives an account of the statesman's dealings with four of his chief supporters in the city. The first two of these are Richard Champion (1743-91), whose friendship with Burke is well documented in correspondence now available to scholars, and Joseph Harford (1741-1802), whose radical politics are noticed and who was disowned by Bristol Friends in 1779 for taking the oath to qualify as sheriff. The author concludes that Harford was "a man of independent outlook, who, while loyal to his party and his friends, was not prepared to allow personalities to override principles, nor politics to degenerate into faction".

COALBROOKDALE IRONWORKS
 The *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society*, vol. 56, part A (1957-58) carries two articles (pp. 69-92) on "The Shropshire iron industry" and "Coalbrookdale: the early years"

by Dr. R. A. Mott, giving an account of the industrial activities of the Darby family and its partnerships—a combination which gave to the Dale Company a stability which enabled the inventive genius of the Darby family to proceed with industrial development without the firm succumbing in the recurring financial crises of the eighteenth century.

SCIENTIFIC CORRESPONDENCE

Published by the British Museum (Natural History), and edited by Warren R. Dawson, *The Banks Letters: a calendar of the manuscript correspondence of Sir Joseph Banks* (1958) includes letters from, to and about a wide range of scientific and public men of the time of Sir Joseph Banks (1743-1820). Sir Joseph Banks went round the world with Captain Cook and was instrumental in furthering discoveries in many fields. He became president of the Royal Society, and this recent volume of over 1,000 pages bears witness to his voluminous correspondence.

Among Friends who figure in the calendar are William Allen, David and Robert Barclay, John Churchman, William Curtis, Dr. Fothergill, Dr. Lettsom, Sydney Parkinson, James Phillips (the bookseller in George Yard), and Benjamin West.

FRIENDS IN FURNESS

Furness and the industrial Revolution: an economic history of Furness (1711-1900) and the town of Barrow (1717-1897), by J. D. Marshall (Barrow-in-Furness, 1958), includes a considerable amount of material of interest to the Quaker historian. The author concludes that Furness

Friends in the eighteenth century never numbered more than 300. The appeal of Quakerism was chiefly to the independent yeoman class, but the economic influence of Friends was also strong in the iron industry, led by the Rawlinsons in the Backbarrow Company. This company had contacts with Friends in Bristol, Lancaster, Warrington, Whitehaven and elsewhere. The author has used many original manuscripts and the standard secondary authorities (including Arthur Raistrick and Isabel Ross) and produced a very useful work packed with information. (Copy in the Library at Friends House.)

QUAKERS AT RYDAL MOUNT

The letters of Mary Wordsworth, 1800-1855. Selected and edited by Mary E. Burton (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1958) includes (p. 182) a letter to Dora Wordsworth written 4th September 1837 (Dove Cottage MS. 84) which gives a graphic account of a visit by a family of Friends who called at Rydal Mount and were allowed to see over the place in the absence of William Wordsworth.

"An inundation of Quakers! 4 Poneys at the gate, to Henry's delight. First a Poem is sent in 'A Traveller's thoughts on the Continent', with a request to see the grounds—granted,—and a long visitation was made: then a halt on the front, and loud chat—while Mary came in with a request to see the study; and *the little boy!* (So the darling already comes in for a share of Grandfather's fame)—could not be stingy—tho' kept close to the Hall fire but bid Ann say they were welcome to walk into the front rooms, but she thought

Master's *study* was out of doors. They are in no hurry to depart—making the most of the liberty granted, and H. is chatting away at a fine rate to the gentleman, who asks him if he would not wish to be like Grandpapa.—They are gone! and Ann is charmed with them—they asked no questions—but were much interested to see, etc., etc. H. acted the showman to admiration, knowing where to find the picture which I treat him with—Cottle's present to me of the *Youthful Poets* was a grand treat. The poem is from the son of the gent. If I had not expected Quaker audacity I should have appeared. But Ann gave them to understand nobody was at home—and so she got 2s. for her civility, and all is well—"Leatham" is the name of the Author of the Poem—from near Wakefield—Father, Mother and two daughters . . . R.M. will be as bad as Abbotsford if we go on as we have lately done. But I tell Mary that when Master's at home she must not ask for beyond the Mount."

The visiting family was that of William (1784-1842) and Margaret (Walker) (1793-1871) Leatham, of Heath, banker at Wakefield and Pontefract. The son, William Henry Leatham (1815-89), M.P. (see *D.N.B.*) was author of several poems and lectures, *A traveller's thoughts* (1837) is the first work of his listed in E. N. Armitage *Quaker Poets*, 8196, p. 168. The two daughters can be identified as Margaret Elizabeth (who married John Bright in 1847) and Mary Walker (who married Joseph Gurney Barclay the banker in 1842). See family tree in Sir Arthur Leathams' *Origin and lineage of the Leatham family*, 1919.

In the volume other Friends are mentioned, including the Crewdsons of Kendal.

LEATHAM, TEW & CO., BANKERS
Under the title "The oldest Bank premises in the County?" an article in *The Dalesman* for February 1959 (vol. 20, no. 11, pp. 745-750) describes the Leatham's Bank at Pontefract. The Leathams were Barnsley Quakers and William Leatham (1784-1842), linendraper in Pontefract, developed the banking side to his business. In 1801 he went into partnership in banking with Thomas William Tew and others, under the name of Leatham, Tew & Co., and the bank (since 1906 amalgamated with Barclays) has had continuous existence in the same premises since that date. Outline family trees of the Leatham and Tew families are provided.

BERNARD BARTON AUTOGRAPH
The Librarian's report on the University Library, Birmingham, 1957-58, records among manuscript purchases the following item:

Badham (Sarah): Album, c. 1835-60, containing autograph verses by Charles Badham, C. C. F. Greville, Bernard Barton, etc.

CHILDREN'S BOOKS

The handsomely-produced catalogue of *The Osborne Collection of Early Children's Books, 1566-1910* (Toronto Public Library, 1958) includes about three thousand books recently presented to the Toronto Public Library. Writers and publishers among Friends in the early nineteenth century played a significant part in this developing and

educative field. Schoolbooks and formal works are not included in the collection, so one finds nothing by Lindley Murray, but works by Amelia Opie, Maria Hack and William and Mary Howitt, and publications by the Arch firm of Cornhill and Darton and Harvey are well represented.

WARWICKSHIRE MEETINGS

The Printed Maps of Warwickshire, 1576-1900, by P. D. A. Harvey and Harry Thorpe (Warwickshire Records and Museum Committee, 1959), lists two maps of Friends' meetings in Warwickshire in the eighteenth century (Nos. 118 and 127) published in the first and second editions of William White's *Friends in Warwickshire*, 1873 and 1886. The third edition of White's book was published without a map in 1894. The 1886 map is slightly larger than the first (6.1" x 3.4"), but the scale (One statute mile: 0.09") is the same in both. The publishers were White and Pike of Birmingham.

WELSH FRIENDS

The Dictionary of Welsh Biography down to 1940 (Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion, London; Blackwell, Oxford, 1959) includes the following Quakers: Allgood family, Elisha Beadles (1670-1734), Silvanus Bevan (1691-1765), Richard Davies (1635-1708), William Dillwyn, Rowland Ellis (1650-1731), Dorcas Erbery, Cadwaladr Evans (1664-1745), Frederick William Gibbins (1861-1937), John Goodwin (1681-1763), John Griffith (1713-76), Hanbury family, Walter Jenkins (d.1661), John ap John (1625?-1697), William Jones (1826-1899), John Kelsall (fl. 1683-1743), Lewis and Owen

families, Ellis Lewis (1677-1764), John Lewis (*fl.* 1759-1773), Lloyd family of Dolobran, Griffith Owen (1647-1717), Robert Owen (d.1685), Robert Owen (1771-1858), James Park (or Parkes) (1636-1696), Ellis Pugh (1656-1718), Joseph Tregelles Price (1784-1854), Thomas Prichard (1764-1843), Hugh Roberts (1644?-1702), Mary, wife of Thomas, Roberts (d.1829), John Edward Southall (1855-1928), Samuel Prideaux Tregelles (1813-1875) and Elijah Waring (c.1788-1857). Passing references to Friends, persecutions and controversies are scattered elsewhere throughout the volume.

THE WELSH IN PENNSYLVANIA

"Welsh churchmen in colonial Pennsylvania", by Rev. J. Alun. Thomas, an article in the *Journal of the Historical Society of the Church of Wales*, vol. 4, pp. 23-35; vol. 5, pp. 52-66, gives an account of the pull which Rev. Evan Evans, from 1700, rector of Christ Church in Philadelphia, and John Thomas exerted to draw the Welsh Quakers in Pennsylvania into the Anglican church, and the difficulties which lack of trained ministers, lack of books in the Welsh language, and "the numerous Dissenters" put in the path of the expansion of the Church of England in the colony.

GLASGOW FRIENDS

The Third Statistical Account of Scotland: Glasgow (1958) includes a detailed chapter by Dr. John Hight on "The Churches" (pp. 713-750). Friends are included among the churches which are "predominantly middle-class and lower-middle-class". There is one meeting in the city, with 123 members and 48 "regular atten-

ders"; 30 children "temporary members" with a children's class on Sundays at 11 a.m. The founding date of the meeting is given as 1716. Average attendance at meeting for worship, 53.

"For its size the group is notably active in social and welfare work . . . An Adult School is held on Sundays at 6 p.m."

FRIENDS' SCHOOL, MOUNTMELICK

In *The Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, 1959, vol. 89, part 1 (pp. 59-89), there is an article on "The Friends' Provincial School, Mountmellick", by Michael Quane. It is solidly based on Irish Friends' records. The author begins with a general introductory account of Friends in Ireland and the developments which led to the establishment of the school in 1786. Early directions for the management of the household, clothing lists, and school time-tables are given *in extenso*. Mention is made of some of the school books adopted, and it is noted that the school library was begun in 1793 with the purchase of several "suitable Books to lie at the School for the use of the Children". The "suitable books" were all by Quaker authors, but the policy then adopted was progressively expanded to include standard general works, a development well in advance of normal practice in Irish schools of the period.

The author carries the story down to 1855, when Munster Quarterly Meeting opened Newtown school for boys. From that time, until it was laid down in 1920, Mountmellick School was opened for girls, and "was rightly regarded as one of the best of

the boarding-schools providing secondary education for girls in Ireland.”

PHILADELPHIA BEFORE THE REVOLUTION

Cities in Revolt: urban life in America, 1743-1776, by Carl Bridenbaugh (New York, Knopf, 1955) gives a well-documented survey of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Newport and Charleston in the period just before the American Revolution. It is no occasion for surprise that by 1760 less than a quarter of the inhabitants of Philadelphia were Friends, but Quaker influence was strong in social and humanitarian affairs in a city which had strong ties with the other seaboard colonies, and which the author terms “the Mecca of colonial Protestantism”.

AMERICAN FRIENDS, 1777

On the threshold of liberty is the journal of a Frenchman’s tour of the American colonies in 1777. (Translated from the original manuscript (Bibliothèque Nationale. Département des Manuscrits, fonds français, 14696) by Edward D. Seeber. Indiana University publications, Humanities series, 43. Bloomington, *Indiana University Press*, 1959.)

Philadelphia he found to be “a very large, beautiful, and superb city for one that is but ninety years old”.

Of Friends he said (pp. 31-33), “Most of them (though not all) are at the present time the most hard-hearted, ungrateful people once they are dissociated from sectarian interests . . . This is the sect that shows the greatest desire to dominate, that displays the readiest resources of vengeance and obduracy, that em-

ployes oaths, perjury, usury, and hypocrisy as the commonest means for the execution of any project calculated to strengthen it or to guarantee the pleasure of seeing itself in complete control of the civil and military administration . . .

. . . They . . . were, great and small, rich or poor, . . . trafficking in and betraying all the decisions of Congress, and plotting to deliver it into the hands of General Howe. What is more, they were stripping themselves of their own wealth by offering seven or eight paper guineas for one of gold in order to destroy the credit of the continental paper currency; they were even supplying the enemy with their scarcely ripened crops and paying for guides who would furnish them ready knowledge of defiles and fording-places in creeks and rivers.”

A QUAKER REPUBLICAN

The following anecdote of the early life of Sir Brenton Halliburton, Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, is printed in George W. Hill’s *Memoir* (Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1864), pp. 6-7. As a boy Halliburton lived at Newport, Rhode Island, where his father, Dr. Halliburton, was an ardent Royalist during the American War of Independence.

“At the time of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown in 1781, Brenton Halliburton was about six years of age. He had heard the critical situation of the British army frequently discussed in his father’s house, and well knew the anxiety which was felt. Coming out of school one day he heard people calling through the streets, “Good news!” “Glorious news!” Asking the cause of the

cry, he was informed of the surrender of the Royalist troops, whereupon he raised the counter cry, as he ran along, "Bad news!" "Bad news!" An old Quaker, who lived opposite to Dr. Halliburton, and bitterly disliked him for his loyalty, hearing these boyish shouts, bustled out and enquired who cried "Bad news?" Seeing and hearing the little loyalist in the act, so exasperated were his feelings that he actually gave him in charge to some militia men who were passing at the time, and directed them to carry him to the jail . . . (The jailer's wife was an old family servant, she gave him tea and cake and sent him home.)

Although the old Quaker had permitted his irritable temper to get the better of his judgment, and had acted with such petty and childish haste on this occasion, he liked the little boy for his lively disposition, and not unfrequently called him in from the street, and endeavoured to persuade him by a bribe of cake, to drink the President's health. Brenton, however, having obtained the cake, invariably changed the toast, "to the health of the king", and made the best of his way out, knowing that the old Quaker, though lame, and

unable to catch him, would, at least, throw his crutch at him".

NORTH ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

Friends who have been interested in the subjects covered by Thomas Drake and Frederick Tolles in their recent presidential addresses to F.H.S. (published as Supplements to this *Journal*) will be further interested in *The Anglo-American connection in the Early Nineteenth Century*, by Frank Thistlethwaite (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959). This volume is based on lectures given at the University of Pennsylvania in 1956. It includes chapters devoted particularly to humanitarian endeavour, anti-slavery, women's rights, and educational reform. The activities of Friends like the Gurneys, Lucretia Mott, and Joseph Sturge and the records of their activities which have survived to illustrate Quaker activity on both sides of the ocean in the fields of peace, philanthropy, prison reform, treatment of the insane, and the like, provide valuable material in a thoroughly scholarly and readable book. (Copy in the Library at Friends House).

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.

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.
28. PATTERNS OF INFLUENCE IN ANGLO-AMERICAN QUAKERISM. By Thomas E. Drake. 1958. 1s. 6d., post 2d.
29. SOME QUAKER PORTRAITS, CERTAIN AND UNCERTAIN. By John Nickalls, 1958. Illustrated. 3s. 6d., post 4d.
-

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.

CAREERS IN INSURANCE

In this modern age no prudent individual or business organization 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 organization 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 Department
THE FRIENDS' PROVIDENT & CENTURY INSURANCE
OFFICES

7 Leadenhall Street, London, E.C.3