The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society

VOLUME 50 NUMBER 4 1964

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

Friends' Historical Society

Vol. 50 No. 4 1964

THE JOURNAL
OF THE
FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

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

Communications should be addressed to the Editors at
Friends House

Editorial

THE Presidential Address to the Friends' Historical Society for 1964 was delivered by Elfrida Vipont Foulds on October 1st before a large and appreciative audience in the Small Meeting House at Friends House. The address, entitled: "Travel under concern—300 years of Quaker experience" forms the main item in this 1964 issue of the *Journal*.

The substance of the paper by George Edwards on the Six Weeks Meeting in London, read before the Society at its Spring Meeting, also appears in these pages. Other articles include one by Roger Howell of St. John's College, Oxford, which throws more light on Thomas Ledgard's *Discourse* concerning the Quakers and early Quakerism at Newcastle upon Tyne. Henry J. Cadbury contributes a brief survey of the Tangye Manuscripts, a collection now in the Haverford College Quaker Collection. Alfred Braithwaite on "Early Friends' Experience with Juries" is concerned with cases (not so well known as *Bushell's Case* arising from the Penn–Mead trial) in which Friends' clashes with the law in the seventeenth century raise points of interest in the treatment of juries and the development of the law in that respect.

Olive Goodbody publishes a note concerning a move in Cork diocese to have Friends' marriages registered in the ecclesiastical records. The number also contains reports on Archives, and Notes and Queries, and it concludes the 50th volume of the *Journal*.

We hope to send to our Subscribers shortly, as a Supplement to the *Journal*, a detailed account by Henry J. Cadbury of Woolman's last days in England, and a discussion of some problems arising, which we think will be of great interest.

Isabel Ross

We regret to announce the death of Isabel Ross, president of the Society in 1951, and author of the standard life of her ancestress Margaret Fox. *Margaret Fell, Mother of Quakerism* (Longmans, 1949) made available in readable form for students of this generation the extensive materials which survive for an appreciation of all that Swarthmoor meant to the early leaders of Quakerism and the growing Society of Friends right from 1652 down to the end of the century. Isabel Ross's Presidential Address, "Some byways in Quaker research," dealing with I. The people of the North-West, II. Daniel Fleming, III. Household Economy—is printed in volume 43 (1951) of the *Journal* and reflects the scope of her local and historical studies.

Friends who attended the Tercentenary Commemoration in the North-West in 1952 will remember that Isabel Ross was present at Swarthmoor Hall to welcome the visiting Friends as they came, and she also on that occasion took the chair at what was probably the largest meeting ever held by the Historical Society when Frederick Tolles gave his presidential address in Lancaster Meeting House on "The Atlantic Community of the Early Friends." The Historical Society owes much to Isabel Ross and Friends of her calibre, who are willing to study and make known the results of their researches into the local history of Quakerism.

Travel Under Concern

300 Years of Quaker Experience

Presidential Address to the Friends' Historical Society, 1964

"THE North of Europe, Norway, Sweden, Russia, parts of Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, Rome, many parts of Germany and Spain, etc., were brought into view, as portions of the earth where I should have to proclaim the Lord's redeeming love and power. Strong and awful was the impression made on my mind, that I could not enter into my Master's rest till this work was accomplished."[1]

This passage from the writings of Stephen Grellet has gripped my imagination for many years. It has now provided the theme for this lecture; it might equally well have provided the theme for a book. Obviously, for the purpose of a lecture, some restriction is necessary. I do not propose to deal with travel under concern for the purpose of service overseas. With some reluctance, I have also excluded travel under concern to declare some specific testimony, or to undertake some specific task—for instance, the journey of William Robinson, Marmaduke Stephenson, Mary Dyer, and little Patience Scott to testify against "the law to put the servants of the living God to death,"[2] a road which ended for all save the child in martyrdom; or the journey of Emma Noble in 1926 when, having attended Yearly Meeting for the first time, she was so impressed by reports of the desperate state of things in the Welsh coalfield that she went home, packed her bag, and set off for South Wales, a road which ended both for herself and her husband in a lifework of social service. Colonizing journeys, too, must be regarded as outside the scope of this lecture. Our concern is to study this urge which makes so "strong and awful" an impression upon the mind, to see whither it has led those who can know no rest until their Master's work has been accomplished, to investigate the results, whether transient or lasting, and to explain, if

[1] S. Grellet, *Memoirs* (1860) i. 329; 3rd ed. (1862) i. 292.

[2] *New England judged* (1661) Letter from Marmaduke Stephenson pp. 131-133; quoted in Rufus M. Jones, *Quakers in the American colonies* (1923) p. 83.

possible, the nature of travel under concern as experienced over three centuries.

The broad sweep of Stephen Grellet's vision—"strong and awful was the impression made on my mind"—occurs and recurs throughout three hundred years of Quaker history. It is to be found in the twentieth century as in the seventeenth. However, there is, and always has been, a price to be paid. Even George Fox's vision from Pendle Hill had to be won.

"I spied a great high hill called Pendle Hill, and I went on the top of it with much ado, it was so steep; but I was moved of the Lord to go atop of it; and when I came atop of it I saw Lancashire sea; and there atop of the hill I was moved to sound the day of the Lord; and the Lord let me see a-top of the hill in what places he had a great people to be gathered."[1]

The moving of the Lord, the obedience to God's guidance, the "much ado," all had to come before the vision was revealed. The "vernal equinox of the spirit," as Rufus Jones never tired of reminding us, "does not come as lightning out of the sky." Nevertheless, it can appear to do so; the final revelation can come with so intense a clarity and illumination that the exact time and place can be remembered.

"In the beginning of the year 1655," wrote Marmaduke Stephenson, "I was at the plough in the east parts of Yorkshire in Old England, near the place where my outward being was, and as I walked after the plough, I was filled with the love and the presence of the living God which did ravish my heart when I felt it; . . . and as I stood a little still, with my heart and mind stayed on the Lord, the word of the Lord came to me in a still small voice, which I did hear perfectly, saying to me, in the secret of my heart and conscience, 'I have ordained thee a prophet unto the nations.' "[2]

James Nayler, on trial before the magistrates at Appleby in 1653, was able to convey the experience with such clarity that Anthony Pearson was convinced even as he sat on the Bench. "I was at the Plough, meditating on the Things of God, and suddenly I heard a Voice, saying unto me, 'Get thee out from thy Kindred and from thy Father's House.' And I

1 *The Journal of George Fox*. Edited by John Nickalls (1952) pp. 103-104.

2 *New England judged* (1661) Letter from Marmaduke Stephenson pp. 131-133; quoted in Rufus M. Jones, *Quakers in the American colonies* (1923) pp. 82-83.

had a Promise given in with it."[1] A little later in the interrogation, one of the magistrates asked him curiously: "What was the Promise that thou hadst given?" He answered: "That *God would be with me:* Which Promise I find made good every Day."[2]

The seventeenth-century testimony rings true, partly because it is so clearly and simply described, and partly because the experience is still typical, and valid, and unchanged. When a young American Friend began to describe his spiritual experience to me with these words: "When I was driving the tractor one morning . . ." he was at first surprised when I continued with ". . . meditating on the things of God . . ." but it did not take us long to discover that James in the seventeenth century and Jim in the twentieth were in the same tradition.

The experience recurs throughout Quaker history. Thomas Story records it in his *Journal.* "In the year 1693, towards the latter End of Autumn, as I was riding alone in an Evening in Cumberland, the Power of divine Truth moved upon my Mind, and my Heart was greatly tendered before the Lord; and the Word of the Lord opened in me, saying, 'Behold, my Visitation cometh over the Western Parts of the World, towards the Sun-setting in time of Winter . . .' From henceforth I was often tendered in Spirit in remembrance of the Western World, in a Sense of the Love and Visitation of God to a People there, whom I had never seen."[3]

In the next century, John Churchman, a Pennsylvanian Friend, is stirred in the silence of a meeting for worship by a message "uttered in a language intelligent to the inward man, 'Gather thyself from all the cumbers of the world and be thou weaned from the popularity, love, and friendship thereof.' " Not knowing whether this is a "merciful warning" of death, or a call "To stand ready for some service which would separate me from temporal business, and the nearest connections in life," he settles his affairs and later feels "an inward silence for about two or three weeks." Then "one day, walking alone, I felt myself so inwardly weak and feeble, that I stood still, and, by the reverence that covered my mind, I knew that the hand of the Lord was on me, and

1 Besse, *Sufferings,* (1753) ii, 4.
2 *Ibid.*
3 *Journal of the Life of Thomas Story* (1747) p. 147.

his presence round about: the earth was silent, and all flesh brought into stillness, and light went forth with brightness, and shone on Great Britain, Ireland, and Holland, and my mind felt the gentle, yet strongly drawing cords of that love which is stronger than death, which made me say, 'Lord! go before, and strengthen me, and I will follow whithersoever thou leadest.' "[1]

The Australian travels of James Backhouse in the nineteenth century are often felt to have been in a more practical, down-to-earth category. A Friend with such definite aims in view regarding penal reform, investigation into the state of the aborigines, and encouragement of scattered members of the Society of Friends, might be held to need no mystical summons. Yet seventeen years before he set out, when he was about twenty years of age, the preliminary intimation came. "About this time," he wrote later, "I was first impressed with the belief that it was the will of the Lord that, at a future time, I should go on a gospel errand into Australia. The impression was sudden but very clear. It occurred as I was standing in the nursery ground at Norwich, not thinking on such subjects. I felt as though I could have sunk under it, but I dared not to oppose it, and I prayed in spirit that if it were indeed the will of God, He would be pleased to prepare me for it, and to open the way for it, both in my own mind and in the minds of my friends."[2]

Later in the same century, the veteran traveller, Isaac Sharp expressed his mystical summons in words which powerfully recall those of Stephen Grellet. In 1874, when he was sixty-eight years of age, he was so ill that some of his friends thought he could not recover. One of these visited him and must have betrayed his feelings. Isaac Sharp remained silent for a while and then said: "O my dear friend, my Lord has shewn me while I have been laid on this bed of sickness, that He has yet much work for me to do, and that I shall be raised up to do it. He has shewn me clearly a prospect of service at Cape Colony, including visits to the mission stations in the far interior. Thence to our Friends' missions in Madagascar. After this, extensive service awaits me in each of our Australian colonies and in New Zealand. I have further seen

1 *An Account of the Gospel Labours and Christian Experience of a Faithful Minister of Christ, John Churchman* (1780) pp. 104-106.
2 *Memoir of James Backhouse by his Sister* (1870) p. 13.

that the mighty Pacific Ocean must be crossed, and that I am to enter the United States of America by the Golden Gate of San Francisco."[1]

Yet another concern for travel was laid upon Isaac Sharp when he was over eighty, for in 1888 he made an entry in his diary: "I have been permitted to glance at 1890 as a probable period—when on the verge of four score and four—for entering on this work of faith."[2]

Those who in recent years have heard Friend after Friend lay before Meeting for Sufferings their concern for travel in South Africa, often in face of what might seem to be almost insuperable obstacles, will recognize that the "work of faith" continues. And those who today feel the concern for far-flung travel will testify that the call still comes in exactly the same way.

From the earliest days of Quakerism, the validity of the *joint* concern for travel has been recognized. In 1655, Edward Burrough and Francis Howgill received independently and almost simultaneously a call to travel in Ireland. Edward Burrough wrote: "On the tenth day of the fourth month late in the evening, the movings of the Lord came upon me to go to Dublin city in Ireland. Upon the thirtieth day of the fourth month I submitted, and gave myself up to go."[3] And Francis Howgill records: "The word of the Lord came upon me the seventh day of the fourth month about the tenth hour of the day near Islington a mile off London, as I was waiting upon the Lord, saying, 'Go to Dublin in Ireland with my servant Edward Burrough.' "[4] It meant leaving work in London for which they were well fitted, but there was no doubt in their minds, or in the minds of Friends, that they must go.

Thomas Story, in 1698, confided to Roger Gill his concern to visit America, and asked him "if he knew of any ministering Friend concerned for those Parts, for I wanted a Companion; To which, being silent for some Time, he replied, 'It is now long since I was first concerned that Way, and the last Night,

1 *Isaac Sharp: An Apostle of the Nineteenth Century*, Frances Anne Budge (1898) p. 77.

2 *Ibid*. p. 157.

3 Friends House: Boswell Middleton Collection. Quoted by Elizabeth Brockbank in *Edward Burrough* (1949), pp. 67-68.

4 *Ibid*.

in my Sleep, was as if making all things ready for my Voyage.' To which I replied, 'Is it no more but a Dream yet?' and so we left it for that Time. Afterward, going to a Meeting at Enfield, he overtook me in the Way; and we, having some more Discourse on that subject, he told me it would be the Seventh Month at soonest before he could be ready; for he had his Wife and Family to put in a Way of Living, not knowing whether ever he might see them any more."[1] They sailed in the following November, and many Friends gathered to see them off, including William Penn, who prayed fervently "for the good and preservation of all."

In the following century, Sarah (Tuke) Grubb and Mary Dudley shared a concern to travel on the continent of Europe. Sarah saw clearly where she was to go; Mary knew only that she would be called to a foreign country, where people spoke a tongue she did not know. It was in the course of the resultant journey, accomplished with other Friends in 1788, that the little group at Congénies was first visited. Similarly, in the same century, the American Friends, Samuel Emlen and George Dillwyn, simultaneously laboured under a concern for travel, Samuel being quite clear as to his destination, and George only certain that he was preparing for service in some region yet unrevealed. Both attended a meeting in London, where they sat together, Samuel fully clear, and George in great uncertainty and distress of mind. At the close of the meeting, Samuel Emlen turned to his friend and said quietly: "Thou must go with me to Holland."[2]

Sometimes a joint concern does not necessarily involve shared travel; one may see the destination and the other be called to go. When the young John Richardson visited the veteran William Dewsbury, he was immediately directed to Coventry. The young man was unwilling to go; he had seen quite enough of Coventry, where "rude people" had flung stones at him. "But William was positive, and said, *I must go, for there was a service for me to do there.* Upon a deliberate Consideration of the Matter, and a seeking to the Lord to know his Will in it, I found my Way clear to go, and I had some Service and good Satisfaction, and left Friends nearer to one

1 *Journal of the Life of Thomas Story* (1747), p. 150.
2 Rufus M. Jones, *Later Periods of Quakerism* (1921), p. 227.

another than when I first met them; for there had been a misunderstanding amongst Friends in that City."[1]

Akin to this type of joint service is *prophetic* sharing. Aunt Peace lifts the new-born infant, Rufus Jones, in her arms and prophesies: "This child will one day bear the message of the gospel to distant lands and to peoples across the sea."[2] The prophecy may not be fulfilled in the way she imagines as she utters it, but the influence of the words will be lifelong, and in all the far flung travels of Rufus Jones, the prophecy of Aunt Peace will be remembered.

The joint concern and prophetic sharing both involve an acute sensitivity which has been characteristic of travel under concern throughout Quaker history. Thomas Scattergood visits Rebecca Jones in 1793, when the yellow fever is raging in Philadelphia. His mind has long been exercised with a concern to visit Friends and others in Great Britain and Ireland, but he is not clear that the time is ripe and he has shared his thoughts with none. Rebecca Jones, almost too ill to speak, looks up at him: "Go and the Lord go with thee!" she says. Later in the day, when he visits her again, she explains: "I alluded to thy going over great waters. The Lord has in some instances entrusted me with His secrets, and I have not betrayed them."[3]

Sometimes the concern for travel overseas appears to have been influenced by prophetic dreams, and it is a relief to find that even the worthiest and weightiest Friends were sometimes sufficiently human to forget them on waking. John Yeardley, destined to go to Germany in 1822, was greatly distressed four years previously, when he had a vivid dream about places in Germany which he would be called to visit, yet could not remember any of the names on waking. John Yeardley had three prophetic dreams in two years, but what really confirmed his faith was a message from John Kirkham of Essex who, when worshipping with the family, said: "We cannot be faithful to the vision of another man, we do not know it except it be revealed to us; but we must be *faithful to our own vision.*"[4]

1 *An Account of the life of the ancient servant of Christ, John Richardson* (1774), pp. 35-36.
2 Elizabeth Gray Vining, *Friend of Life* (1958), p. 17.
3 *Memoirs of Thomas Scattergood* (1859), p. 122.
4 *Memoir and Diary of John Yeardley* (1859), p. 57.

Possibly the most striking instance of the prophetic dream as affecting travel under concern is Lindley Murray Hoag's dream of the Roldal Valley. This was described by John William Graham in his *Psychical Experiences*, but there is also a contemporary record dictated by Knud Knudsen Botnen, and preserved in America by the descendants of the original Roldal group, who kindly made it available to me. I quote the manuscript in full.

These are a few remembrances concerning how the Lord's servant, Lindley Murray Hoag, came to our help when we were in our land of birth, Norway, 1853.

About 1849, I, Knud Knudsen Botnen, and a few with me did not see it right for us to be united any longer with the Lutheran Church. Although we were not acquainted with any other meeting for religious expression, we felt it right for us to come together on First Days to read the Bible and spend some time in silence to wait upon the Lord.

It continued for more than two years. Through it we realized a soul's peace and tranquility in our inner mind. Although tale-bearing and persecution by our brothers of the Lutheran faith often was our part, we thought that an unusual new trial was over us when two of our little group declared that they thought it right for them to unite in marriage with each other. We did not know of any other than the priest, who had the right to perform the marriage ceremony, and that would mean reinstatement with the Lutheran Church which was contrary to our views. One day it clearly came to me that I should say to them that they should wait and the Lord would in His time send some people who could help us. It was an assurance that our leading was from the Lord, when Lindley Murray Hoag came to us.

Lindley Murray Hoag came from America by way of London to Stavanger accompanied by James Backhouse of England. At this time "Quakers" were totally unknown to us. He was called to preach Christ's truth in different places in the country and surely we could say that had not the Lord been their leader they would have passed us by.

Friends in Stavanger directed them around in our land where they knew of others. Lindley felt that his work was not yet fulfilled, for there was a place he had not found. He added, "There is a valley in between the mountains where there are some people that I must visit and if I do not, my journey from America will be in vain. That valley was shewn me in a dream when I was in my home in America. There was a lake and it seemed I ate fish that a man had caught there and gave me."

Where was this place that none of the Friends could give him direction? A map of Norway was given him and he pointed with his finger to a place that was eighty-five miles from Stavanger.

They set out on the journey. As they approached the place they met Tormod Botnen coming from the lake carrying a few

fish (trout) that he had caught. They were their first meal in Roldal, the name of the valley. These men though strangers soon became most beloved and dear to us.

They soon appointed a meeting and the truths that were interpreted to us were so in harmony with our feelings and spiritual knowledge that we felt we could say yea to all they declared, and also to what we read in the Friends writings which came into our hands for the first time.

Before they departed they performed the marriage in a meeting appointed in my house which was attended by a large number of people.

There was persecution and imprisonment for not taking up arms and the taking of property for the priests tithes. Our members increased and regular meeting held. A Meeting-House and School-House were established. In 1869 we felt it right for us to emigrate to America and unite with some Friends that had come before. These families composed Stavanger meeting near Le Grand, Marshall County, Iowa.

Dictated by Knud Knudsen Botnen to his sister's son, Helger Thompson, in 1885.[1]

It is good to remember that for Knud Botnen, Lindley Murray Hoag was none other than "the Lord's servant," for on his first visit to England, in 1845, an eloquent and handsome widower, he created such a sensation amongst susceptible women Friends that it was considered advisable for him to return home, at least for the time being.

Truly the treasure is in earthen vessels, and we are constantly reminded of the fact. Many Friends went to view the ships on which they were to travel, but it took a John Woolman to reject the proffered accommodation as too luxurious and elect to travel steerage. Some Friends would have forebodings of ship-wreck and disembark, to record later that the vessel had been lost with all hands; it took a Mary Pryor deliberately to choose an old tub, in spite of the protests of her friends and relations, and through her faith and courage, maintained by constant prayer, to be the means of saving all who sailed in her.

The very fact that the treasure is in earthen vessels renders the records more credible. We might feel inclined to doubt John Richardson's "little white horse," which he dreamt about during his voyage to America in 1700, afterwards seeing the identical little horse "near a great house in

[1] MS. copied by Wilmer L. Tjossem from records in the possession of the Thompson family of Iowa and made available through the kind offices of Joe and Teresina Havens of Northfield, Minnesota.

Maryland," were it not that, being a matter-of-fact Yorkshireman, he offered £5 for it, when its owner had asked him for £8. "The Man's Wife coming up the Passage, heard what I had offered, and she said to her Husband, *It is enough:* So I had him, and a good Horse he proved, and carried me, by a moderate Computation, four thousand Miles."[1]

John Richardson may have been a visionary at times, but he was very shrewd, and the story in his *Journal* lives. He disputes with a minister in Virginia, "a topping brisk Man, his Temper in this case not unsuitable to his Name, which was Sharp."[2] When in Flushing, Long Island, he stayed with Samuel Bowne at the Bowne house, which is still standing. As he was about to leave, he saw clearly the treatment which would heal Mary Bowne's sore breast, and returning hurriedly to the house, he told her what to do. Afterwards he heard that the treatment had been successful, "so it is good to mind Truth and the Workings of it in all Things. I met with the great Doctor (as he was esteemed) who had it under hand, and he said, *I was a bold fellow*: I said, *It proved well.* He answered, *It was well for me it did.*"[3]

Sometimes travel under concern involves a clear message which must be given. After the vision on Pendle Hill, George Fox knew that he must tell "the great people to be gathered" that "Christ was come to teach people himself by his power and spirit and to bring them off all the world's ways and teachers to his own free teaching, who had bought them and was the Saviour."[4] On the other hand, Mary Fisher made her incredible journey over sea and land to the Grand Turk not knowing what she had to say to him, save that she brought a message from God. She waited in silence and the message came. Similarly James Nayler declared: "I was commanded to go into the West, not knowing whither I should go, nor what I had to do there, but, when I had been there a little while, I had given me what I was to declare, and ever since I have remained, not knowing today what I was to do tomorrow."[5]

Sometimes the traveller knew clearly what he was to do

1 *An Account of . . . John Richardson* (1774), p. 63.
2 *Ibid.*, p. 65.
3 *Ibid.*, p. 156.
4 *The Journal of George Fox*. Ed. John Nickalls (1952), p. 104.
5 Besse, *Sufferings*, (1753) ii, 4.

tomorrow. James Backhouse, during his travels in Australia from 1831-41, visited convict settlements and prisons, studied laws and regulations, advised governors and officials. Daniel Wheeler in Russia carried out formidable practical undertakings, the draining and reclaiming of the Crown Lands near Petersburg. On the other hand, it was possible even for the same traveller to set out on another occasion with apparently no definite aim in view. Daniel Wheeler, when laying his concern for travel in the Pacific before the Morning Meeting in 1832, could only say, when asked what he expected to do in those distant parts, that no specific line of duty was pointed out to him, in this early stage of the business.

Many who travel under concern experience the frustration of delay. John Richardson recorded that when the time drew near for his voyage to America, "having had a Sight of it about Ten years before . . . it sounded in my Ears several Days and Nights, *Now is the Time, Now is the Time.*"[1] John Churchman "saw" his journey to England "near fifteen years in a very plain manner, and at times, for ten years, thought the concern so strong upon me, that I must lay it before my friends for their advice, but was secretly restrained; being made to believe that an exercise of that sort would ripen best to be kept quiet in my own heart, to know the right time, by no means desiring to run without being sent. To see a thing is not a commission to do that thing: the time when, and judgment to know the acceptable time, are the gifts of God."[2] Similarly, Isaac Sharp wrote to his daughter in 1890: "Four years ago *I* was ready, but the dear Lord said *not yet*, and moreover gave the charge, the imperative charge, *tell the vision to no man*. I have faith to begin this long journey, and faith to leave the issue, and here is my stronghold of rest and peace."[3]

The right time for the sharing of the concern is followed by liberation to carry it out. Friend after Friend records this stage in the carrying out of the concern. William Edmundson writes: "In the year 1671, I had movings upon my spirit to travel to the West-Indies, which thing had remained with me for some time before; so I went to the Half-years-Meeting at

[1] *An Account of . . . John Richardson* (1774), pp. 59-60.
[2] *An Account of . . . John Churchman* (1780), p. 106.
[3] Frances Anne Budge, *Isaac Sharp: an Apostle of the Nineteenth Century* (1898), p. 165.

Dublin in the third month, where I acquainted Friends with my intended journey, who had unity therewith, and the Lord's presence and power appear'd mightily among us, to our great comfort, confirmation and satisfaction."[1]

John Richardson described the exact procedure of liberation to an enquirer in Bermuda in 1702:

> I opened to her the Case of such Journeys and Services, how we proceeded, and how the Meetings were constituted in which we did so proceed, and from whence we had certificates, from Monthly, Quarterly, or Meetings of Ministers to which we belonged, and from Friends in several Provinces and Islands where we travelled, if we desired them . . . She craved to see some of those certificates: I shewed her them, beginning at the first, wherein Friends of Kelk, now Bridlington Monthly Meeting in Yorkshire, to Friends in America, shewed not only their full Unity with this my present Journey, but also with my Service for the Truth, and Conversation to the same, where I had lived and travelled; and that I had settled my outward Affairs to Friends' Satisfaction, under many Hands variously writ.[2]

Liberation is no mere matter of form, even in the case of well-known Friends and seasoned travellers. During the Yearly Meeting of 1803, the Meeting of Ministers and Elders could not at first unite to liberate Thomas Shillitoe, who was concerned to visit parts of Holland, Germany and France. Thomas Shillitoe was a much-loved Friend whose service when travelling under concern had been deeply valued and richly blest. Nevertheless, on this occasion the liberating body had to meet a second time, and even then many Friends expressed doubts. Richard Cockin records that Thomas Shillitoe then

> informed the meeting, how he continued to feel respecting the subject. He said that since the preceding meeting, he had endeavoured to feel whether the trial of his faith in communicating the concern to the meeting would not have been accepted as the ram for the sacrifice, but in his indeavouring to feel after the will of his heavenly Father, he could not witness his mind to be released, without still casting his burthen upon the meeting, for it to dispose of him, and if the meeting should come to the conclusion not to set him at liberty, he should regard it as a great favour, he having done what he believed to be required of him, as he would not take one step therein without the unity of his friends. It felt to me like deep calling unto deep, and for a considerable time sufficient light did not appear to shine upon it, so as the meeting could move

[1] William Edmundson, *Journal* (1715), p. 52.
[2] *An Account of . . . John Richardson* (1774), pp. 171-172.

> forward, but in time the cloud gradually appeared to disperce, till at length Friends became so unanimous as that the Clerk could form a minute recording that the meeting sweetly united in liberating our beloved Friend.[1]

In 1891, London Yearly Meeting was faced with the decision whether to encourage Isaac Sharp, then eighty-five years of age, in further travel under concern. "What saith the Master?" wrote Isaac Sharp, before the meeting. "From Him I catch no bugle notes from the heavenly armoury to surrender, to lay the armour down."[2] The Yearly Meeting could not resist his gallant spirit, and Frederick Andrews is said to have returned to Ackworth resolved to inspire the young people there with this example of undaunted faith.

There have been times when liberation has involved plain speaking. The concern of Herbert Sefton-Jones "for religious service amongst Friends in Australia, New Zealand, British Columbia and elsewhere" received loving support from his Monthly and Quarterly Meetings, and from Meeting for Sufferings, but the Monthly Meeting minute states clearly that "our Friend's point of view on some important matters differs from our own and from that expressed by our Yearly Meeting,"[3] and the Meeting for Sufferings minute is even more explicit: "Although our Friend has not been able to agree unreservedly with our Yearly Meeting in its testimony concerning war, yet, having known his unwearied service amongst Friends, his sincerity of speech, and his warm sympathy, we gladly unite in wishing him every blessing on his journey, and in the desire that he may constantly experience the guiding hand of God."[4] Herbert Sefton-Jones faithfully presented this minute to all the groups of Friends he visited; the liberating bodies had spoken the truth in love, and their action had inspired neither chagrin nor resentment, but a grace of acceptance which enhanced the value of the original concern.

After liberation comes the opening of the door. This may come through the sudden offering of an opportunity. For instance, in 1657 eleven Friends were waiting in London for a passage to America, rendered almost unobtainable

1 *Pen Pictures of London Yearly Meeting*, ed. N. Penney (1930), pp. 86-87.
2 F. A. Budge, *Isaac Sharp* (1898), p. 178.
3 Minute 4 of Westminster and Longford Monthly Meeting held at Golders Green 14.vi.1923.
4 Minute of Meeting for Sufferings, 5.x.1923.

owing to the penalties imposed on ships' captains conveying Quakers to Boston. Their opportunity came when Robert Fowler of Bridlington sailed up the Thames in the *Woodhouse*, a vessel which he had felt it laid upon him to build "in the cause of truth." To take a later example, Thomas Hodgkin had for years felt concerned to visit Friends in Australia, so that when, during the Yearly Meeting held at Leeds in 1905, an appeal was made for such a visit to be paid, he nearly responded, though he was approaching seventy-four years of age. It was not until three years later that the way suddenly opened. A sea voyage was recommended for his daughter Violet's health. "The question came to me in the night watches, 'What if this means for us that visit to Australia which we talked of and abandoned three years ago?' "[1] He laid his concern before Newcastle Monthly Meeting in October 1908, and set off with his wife and daughter and one of his sons in January, 1909.

Sometimes the opening of the door comes through the unexpected solving of the financial problem. The post brings a letter promising financial help and the concern, dormant for many years, flares up as the way is opened. Sometimes a wise older Friend discerns a growing concern in one too young or too modest to give way to it. Ormerod Greenwood, in an article in the *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, describes how, early in the eighteenth century, John Hunt prophesied in an Irish country meeting that there was one present who would "go forth to publish the glad tidings of the gospel." Among those who heard him was young Susanna Hudson, who had been called to the ministry, "as from the milking pail," at the age of seventeen. "Recalling the occasion forty years later as she lay dying, Susanna remembered that 'Friends remarked that there was nobody for it but Susie—which exceedingly humbled me.' "[2] Isabel Richardson, who later travelled widely in the ministry, was first encouraged in 1795, when she was a young and timid girl, by an older Friend who pointed to her in Durham Women's Quarterly Meeting and said: "I do not know the name of that young Friend, but I should wish her to be one of our representatives at Yearly Meeting." Riding home behind

1 Louise Creighton, *Life and Letters of Thomas Hodgkin* (1918), p. 288.
2 "John Woolman and Susanna Lightfoot," Ormerod Greenwood, *Jnl. F.H.S.*, xlviii, 148.

her father on a pillion, she told him the names of the older women Friends who had been appointed, and then added: "And me, Father!" "What, *thee*, bairn!" exclaimed her father in astonishment.[1] Travelling in the ministry was no light duty in Isabel's day. It is recorded that once, when on a ministerial journey with Ann Jones, she expressed a wish to return home to her sister Sarah's wedding. Ann Jones was made of sterner stuff. "Let the dead bury their dead!" she replied.[2]

Even when the concern is unmistakable and the way apparently clear, the opening of the door by another hand is sometimes needed. In 1850 Sybil Jones, an American Friend, felt a concern to visit Liberia and Sierra Leone, with her husband, Eli, but

> so deep was my sense of frailty and entire inability to do the work that I could not believe that the Master would select me to go on such an important embassy . . . I thought unless some person would come to me and tell me that the Lord required it, and would fit me for the work, I would not take a step. I thought I could not receive it but from someone clothed with gospel authority; and in looking over this class I selected dear Benjamin Seebohm, who I knew was somewhere in America . . . Our Monthly Meeting day arrived and, though my health was so frail that I had gotten out to meeting but little for some time, I felt an almost irresistible impression to go. I accordingly went. As I entered the door, almost the first person I met was Benjamin Seebohm. I could not have been more surprised at the appearance of any person. In a moment my request rushed into my mind, and thought I, "I am caught now; I have done wrong in asking this sign, and may the Lord forgive me and in mercy overlook this presumption, and not grant the request unless it is His will, in condescension to my low estate." The meeting gathered under a solemnity. It seemed to me that this weighty service fell upon it, and after a time of very solemn silence dear Benjamin arose and took up an individual case, and so exactly described my feelings at the service that no doubt remained that the Most High had sent him with this message to me.[3]

The part played by the family circle in the opening of the door cannot be overlooked. It is always a shared service. John Banks expressed this most clearly in a letter written from Warwick in 1668 to his wife, Ann, at home in Cumberland. "In my heart I reach forth a hand unto thee; give me

1 Anne Ogden Boyce, *Records of a Quaker family: the Richardsons of Cleveland* (1889), pp. 53-54.
2 *Ibid.*, p. 61.
3 Rufus M. Jones, *Eli and Sybil Jones* (1889), pp. 72-74.

thine and let us go along together, in heart and mind, in the work and service of the Lord."[1] William Edmundson wrote of his wife after her death in 1691:

> When I was called to travell in the service and labour of the gospell of our lord and saviour Jesus Christ, she never opposed me, but gave me up, and with all readiness would provide things nessesary & suitable to my jorney . . . to make things as easy to me as she could, and my labours without charge to others. I was three times in the West Indies in Truth's service, and the least was a year and a half from her, and my expence much, which she knew was supplyd mostly by her endeavors, and I never heard her mention the charge in way of reflection . . . She tooke the charge of our outward concerns & famely upon her in my absence, and stood in her testemony against tithes, and the Lord increased things under her hand beyond ordinary.[2]

In remembering thankfully the missionary labours of those who bore the message of Quakerism out into the world, we too easily overlook those who remained behind and made their service possible. It was a shared service in the material sense; it was a shared service in the spiritual sense; it was a shared service that sprang from the very heart of the love between husband and wife. After Gulielma Penn died in 1694, William Penn, remembering her who was the love of his youth and much the joy of his life wrote: "She would not suffer me to neglect any Publick Meeting, after I had my Liberty, upon her account, saying often, 'O go, my dearest! Don't hinder any Good for me. I desire thee go; I have cast my care upon the Lord: I shall see thee again."[3]

Throughout three centuries of travel under concern, this "shared concern" has been apparent. In 1769 Rachel Wilson of Kendal wrote from America to her husband, Isaac, who with the help of their eldest daughter was caring for their large family during her absence: "My mind was never nearer united to my dear husband than now."[4] Isaac confesses in one of his letters that "I cannot help being anxiously concerned on thy account, and many pensive, musing moments occur; though I keep these to myself, and we go on as well as one could expect, our children that are grown up

1 John Banks, *Journal* (1798), 2nd ed., p. 59.
2 From William Edmundson's *Testimony* to his wife after her death in 1691 (*Jnl.F.H.S.* xxxiii (1936), 32-33).
3 William Penn, *Works* (1726), i, 231.
4 John Somervell, *Isaac and Rachel Wilson* (1924), p. 72.

being very dutiful and ready to do all in their power, to make things as easy for me as possible."[1] In modern times, with little or no domestic help, not only "children that are grown up," but younger ones than these have their part to play. "We haven't much money to give," said one of Amy Lewis's younger children when the family agreed to release her for Friends' service. "So I think we ought to lend Mum for a while!"

Sometimes the opening of the door comes when a load of care is divinely lifted. Marmaduke Stephenson testified before his martyrdom that when in 1658 he was "required of the Lord" to go to Barbados, "the Lord said unto me immediately by his spirit, that he would be as a husband to my wife, and as a father to my children, and they should not want in my absence, for he would provide for them when I was gone."[2]

Thomas Shillitoe, in 1790, felt concerned to travel "in the Lord's work," but could not see how he could possibly leave his wife and family and his tailoring business, especially as his assistant was very unreliable. He had almost given way to despair when suddenly the door opened.

> One day, when I was standing cutting out work for my men, my mind being again brought under the weight of the service that had thus been before me, these discouragements again presented themselves . . . but my tried mind, in adorable mercy, was so brought under the calming influence of divine help, as I had not often if ever before known. And as I became willing to yield in its holy operation, the power of the mighty God of Jacob was mercifully manifest to the subduing the influence and power of the adversary; holding out for my acceptance and help this encouraging promise, which was addressed to my inward hearing, or the ear of my soul, in a language as intelligible as ever I heard word spoken to my outward ear,—"I will be more than bolts and bars to thy outward habitation . . . more than a master to thy servants . . . more than a husband to thy wife, and a parent to thy infant children." At which, the knife I was using fell out of my hand; I no longer daring to hesitate, after such a confirmation.[3]

Such an experience more than justifies the aged Isaac Sharp's declaration to London Yearly Meeting in 1894: "Bear in your hearts that when the Lord has service for his

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 84-85.

[2] *New England judged* (1661) Letter from Marmaduke Stephenson, pp. 131-133; quoted in Rufus M. Jones, *Quakers in the American colonies* (1923), p. 83.

[3] *Journal of . . . Thomas Shillitoe* (1839), i, 10.

people, He can enable them to do it. There *is* a Providence over us. Bear this in mind, when your eyes are holden, *the Lord reigneth.*"[1]

The closing of the door comes in due course with an equal certainty. Sometimes it closes because the work has been accomplished, and as much sensitivity is required for the discernment of this as was needed for the acceptance of the original concern. Robert Fowler of Melksham wrote to Samuel Capper, in 1818: "I have often found that it requires deep watchfulness to step forward at the right time after the seal is opened, and to stand still when it is divinely shut."[2] The intimation can come with a clearness of fulfilment, or it can be impressed upon the mind with a sudden loss of inspiration, or even of the extra physical strength granted to the traveller for the required period.

On the other hand, the door can close temporarily owing to human fallibility. Samuel Bownas, whose life and service are always of personal interest to me because his first concern was "to visit a neighbouring meeting called Yelland"[3] (my own meeting), experienced many difficulties and discouragements during his early travels in the ministry. His companion was Isaac Alexander, and both were young and inexperienced. Samuel felt himself to be completely outshone by Isaac. "I thought [he] had very fine service, so much superior to mine, that after him I was afraid to lessen or hurt what good he had done; and before him, I was afraid to stand in his way."[4]

Samuel had yet to learn that there are diversities of gifts, and that those who travel under concern must learn to use their own, instead of envying or trying to imitate those of others. However, no sooner did he begin to gain confidence, than he experienced another setback. During one of his visits to Yorkshire, an older Friend encouraged him and assured him that God would enlarge his gift. "*And when thou findest it so*, said he, *don't value thyself upon it, but give the honour of it where it's due, and keep humble, and God will bless thee, and make thee a useful Member in his Hand.*"[5] Carried away by the praise of less discerning Friends, Samuel

1 Frances Anne Budge, *Isaac Sharp* (1898), p. 259.
2 *Memoir of Samuel Capper* (1855), p. 13.
3 *An account of the life, travels and Christian experience in the work of the Ministry of Samuel Bownas* (1756), p. 9.
4 *Ibid.*, p. 11.
5 *Ibid.*, p.12.

all too soon forgot this good advice, only to undergo a shattering experience at Swannington. "I had not stood above fifteen, if so many Minutes, until all was shut up, and it seemed as though both the Sun and Air were darkened. I sat down under a great Cloud, to think what I should do, appealing to God, as having no ill Design, but much otherwise, and earnestly in secret desiring Help; and immediately as though a Voice had spoken intelligibly, 'Thou runs, and God has not sent thee; thou speaks, but God don't speak by thee; therefore thou shalt not profit the People.' "[1] The lesson was learnt in all humility, until it might well have been said of Samuel Bownas, as it was of an earlier Friend: "God made him and his service a blessing to many."

Even those whom we love and honour as the saints of Quakerism felt the need at times to examine their hearts and make sure that the door was indeed divinely opened. Amidst the perils of his Indian Journey, John Woolman wrestled with himself one night for fear lest, in persisting with his plans, he might be giving way to pride.

> I thought that, to all outward appearances, it was dangerous travelling at this time; and was, after a hard day's journey, brought into a painful exercise at night, in which I had to trace back, and view over the steps I had taken from my first moving in the visit; and though I had to bewail some weakness which, at times, had attended me, yet I could not find that I had ever given way to a wilful disobedience: and then as I believed I had, under a sense of duty, come thus far, I was now earnest in spirit beseeching the Lord to show me what I ought to do. In this great distress I grew jealous of myself, lest the desire of reputation, as a man firmly settled to persevere through dangers, or the fear of disgrace arising on my returning without performing the visit, might have some place in me: Thus I lay, full of thoughts, a great part of the night, while my beloved companion lay and slept by me, till the Lord, my gracious Father, who saw the conflicts of my soul, was pleased to give quietness; then I was again strengthened to commit my life, and all things relating thereto, into his heavenly hands.[2]

Sometimes a door which seems divinely opened closes, because the concern has been laid upon another; the willingness was all that was required. Thomas Shillitoe long felt a concern to visit Australia, but other leadings proved stronger.

[1] *An account of . . . Samuel Bownas* (1756), p. 14.
[2] John Woolman, *Journal*, (1794), pp. 156-157; cf *Journal and essays*, ed. A. M. Gummere (1922), p. 257.

James Backhouse records that when he approached him in his old age, on his return from a visit to America, and offered to be his companion, Thomas Shillitoe, alluding "to his own advanced age, and that of his wife, signified that he did not now know how it might be with him in regard to this service. It proved, however, that the further steps I took in the matter the more the burden was removed from his mind. Thus our good Lord and Master saw meet to take the burden off the shoulders of his aged servant and to lay it upon one who was younger."[1]

Sometimes the closing of the door was sensed more clearly by Friends other than those immediately concerned. In 1849, in spite of failing health, Hannah Chapman Backhouse laid before her Monthly Meeting a concern "to pay a visit, in the love of the gospel, to Friends in Van Diemen's Land and parts of Australia." After a time of silence, a Friend prayed that "as it was with Abraham, the sacrifice might be accepted, and a ram provided in its stead." Her sister Katherine reminded the meeting of "a passage in the life of the Patriarch David, when he told the prophet that it was his intention to build a house for the Lord his God. The prophet immediately answered: 'Do all that is in thy heart, for the Lord thy God is with thee!' but after he was gone, the king received a message from the Lord forbidding him to do it; *but that it was well that it was in his heart.*" Friends trusted that in this instance the will might be accepted for the deed, and that it might prove to be an encouragement to some other Friend to undertake the service. "This was evidently the mind of the meeting," recorded Hannah Chapman Backhouse. "I then thought I might conclude by saying that I now felt satisfied and could rejoicingly accept the judgment of my Friends."[2] Hannah Chapman Backhouse had been a much travelled Friend and must have had a dry sense of humour, for an early entry in her diary records: "dined at George Stacey's: after the ice was broken, which among Friends is very thick, I enjoyed the dinner."

A feature of travel under concern to which Friends have borne witness down the centuries is the peace of mind which accompanies acceptance. Elizabeth Hooton wrote in 1662:

1 *Memoir of James Backhouse by his Sister* (1870), pp. 41-42.
2 *Extracts from the Journal and Letters of Hannah Chapman Backhouse* (1858), pp. 287-288.

"My going to London hath not been for my own ends, but in obedience to the will of God . . . and the Lord hath given me peace in my journey."[1] Two centuries later, James Backhouse wrote: "Often afterwards, even when sunk very low through unfaithfulness in other respects, if I turned to this subject in the same confiding state, the feeling of heavenly peace attended it."[2] From this peace of mind, all subsequent action springs.

When the inspiration has been experienced and the concern nurtured and shared; when the door has been opened; when the heavenly peace is known; the carrying out is in God's hands. The Friends in the *Woodhouse* "were carried far above storms and tempests, and we saw the Lord leading our vessel as it were a man leading a horse by the head."[3] William Edmundson, lost in an American wilderness, records: "I had eaten little or nothing that day, neither had I anything to refresh me but the Lord."[4] It was enough.

There are, of course, practical difficulties, but these are never allowed to weigh in the balance. Mary Fisher serenely sets off in her fantastic journey to visit the Grand Turk and eventually—she gets there. The clue to the explanation probably lies in peasant hospitality. Friends struggle desperately with the pangs of home-sickness. "As thou canst, an opportunity to write to us, it will make me glad." writes Edward Burrough to Margaret Fell. "The face of one Friend would rejoice my soul."[5] Thomas Scattergood, in 1799, reaches a point where he can hardly bear the long separation from his home and family any longer. Yet even after five years of service he does not feel free to return to America. He can only find consolation at Ackworth School. "I awoke this morning with greater quietness and sweetness of mind than frequently has been the case, and in this humble, quiet frame, my will was resigned up to the divine will. I have spent some weeks in this place, and do not know that there has been so much health of body experienced, for the same length of time, in this land." He visits the classrooms and tries his hand at teaching; he walks with the boys and girls and chats with

1 Emily Manners, *Elizabeth Hooton* (*Jnl.F.H.S.* Suppl. 12), p. 36.
2 *Memoir of James Backhouse by his Sister* (1870), pp. 13-14.
3 Rufus M. Jones, *The Quakers in the American colonies* (1923), p. 50.
4 William Edmundson, *Journal* (ed. 1829), p. 60.
5 *Letters of Early Friends*, ed. A. R. Barclay, p. 264.

them; also, one is glad to know, he "plays with them a little at times."[1] When the burden becomes too great for him, it is always to Ackworth that Thomas Scattergood's steps turn.

The travellers are constantly upheld by Friends at home. "You are all dear to me," wrote Margaret Fell to some of the Valiant Sixty, "and you are all present with me, and are all met together in my heart."[2] Friends constantly bear witness to this fact. They draw strength from the home meeting for worship; they feel the sustaining love of their fellow-members. In recent years two Friends travelling overseas from the same meeting have testified to the unfailing help given to them in times of difficulty by one woman Friend—"I knew that she was praying for me."

The results of all this richness of endeavour are difficult to assess. In some cases they are obvious; in some they are never known; in others they are discovered by chance. In 1846, Isaac Sharp and Barnard Dickinson felt called to visit Fair Isle. With difficulty they secured a passage on a whaling or sealing vessel, travelling in great discomfort, their cabins "foul with the oil." Next morning they walked through the cornfields to hold a meeting in the little church. It was not until fifty years later, when on his deathbed, that Isaac Sharp discovered that one of his hearers had received a life-long blessing from attending that meeting. George Edmundson worked for some time in Russia with Daniel Wheeler, but only a chance encounter with some Russians many years later revealed to him what had resulted from those toilsome years. "These hands helped to make the first drains!"[3] he said.

In 1920, an American Friend visited Quaker meetings and families in England and met with a somewhat discouraging response. "Plough up the fallow ground!" he pleaded during a visit to one family, and the apparently frivolous young people did not seem to be impressed. He never knew that the words would linger in the mind of a rebellious fifteen-year-old boy, never knew that they would haunt him for the rest of his life. Had he lived to meet Reginald Reynolds again he might not have recognized or perhaps even appreciated the

[1] *Memoirs of Thomas Scattergood* (1859), p. 378.
[2] William Charles Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (1912; 2nd ed. 1955), p. 162.
[3] Jane Benson, *Quaker Pioneers in Russia* (1902), p. 108.

result of his handiwork, yet surely those hands helped to make the first drains and many have received a lifelong blessing as a result.

Once, on a visit to a Friends School in 1957, I suddenly realized that for my evening address I must speak on another subject than the one I had prepared. This is always a somewhat trying experience, especially when the new subject is not immediately revealed to one. Suddenly I discovered what it must be. Three hundred years previously, in 1657, Mary Fisher had set out for the East, the *Woodhouse* had sailed for America, and Thomas Loe had visited Ireland—a memorable year in the history of Quakerism, and of travel under concern. How can we assess or compare the value of these three journeys? Thomas Loe fired the heart of the boy William Penn. The voyage of the *Woodhouse* scattered precious seed which has flowered gloriously in American Quakerism. Mary Fisher's journey left no known trace save in the hearts of men and women all down the centuries. It is not for us to judge, but to be thankful. We may do well to remember another journey undertaken during that same eventful year, for in 1657 John Camm returned home to Camsgill to die. The convincement of Thomas Loe was the one solitary fruit of his failure at Oxford. He must have brought about hundreds of convincements during his successful campaign in Bristol, but God used his failure to pave the road to Pennsylvania.

Like all work done in God's name, travel under concern is deeply sacramental. John Woolman gives us the key to it. "Love was the first motion, and thence the concern arose."[1] It is the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace, or it is nothing. It is because of this that the cost is so great. We love to take a quotation out of its context and talk about George Fox telling us to "walk cheerfully over the world." The full passage is too hard for us.

"And this is the word of the Lord God to you all, and a charge to you all in the presence of the living God, be patterns, be examples in all countries, places, islands, nations, wherever you come; that your carriage and life may preach among all sorts of people, and to them. Then you will come to walk cheerfully over the world, answering that of God in every one;

[1] John Woolman, *Journal* (1794), p. 152; cf *Journal and essays*, ed. A. M. Gummere (1922), p. 254.

whereby in them ye may be a blessing, and make the witness of God in them to bless you."[1]

There is only one source from which we can draw strength for such an undertaking as travel under concern, only one source which will enable us to walk cheerfully over the world. It is a source which has never failed. "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest."[2]

ELFRIDA VIPONT FOULDS

1 *The Journal of George Fox*. Ed. John Nickalls (1952), p. 263.
2 *Joshua*, chap. 1, v. 9.

Early Quakerism in Newcastle upon Tyne

Thomas Ledgard's *Discourse Concerning the Quakers*

IN his article on William Coatesworth and the early Quakers of Newcastle upon Tyne, Henry Cadbury has drawn attention to the vigorous outpouring of anti-Quaker literature from the ministers of the town and from "one Thomas Ledgerd."[1] Although the study of anti-Quaker literature is an important part of the history of Friends, Ledgard and his work have received scant attention. It has long been assumed that none of his writings have survived, and consequently there has been little investigation of either him or his views. In fact, a copy of one of his tracts does exist in the Library of the Society of Friends in London; this is the pamphlet *A Discourse Concerning the Quakers set out by T. L.* There are, moreover, several references to it and to its author in contemporary tracts of both Quaker and non-Quaker origin, and information about the author and his own views can be extracted from the records relating to the town of Newcastle during the Interregnum.

The tract itself is a brief one, containing only eight pages. No date and no place of publication are indicated, nor is the author identified except by the initials T. L. The clue to the date of publication and the author's name is, however, provided by one of the tracts written in response to the *Discourse*, George Bateman's *An Answer to a Discourse Concerning the Quakers*.[2] On the title page of this work, Bateman identified the initials T. L. by the phrase "or as I understand the significance of the Letters Tho: Ledger." This is, without doubt, the Thomas Ledgard whose name figures prominently in the records of the Newcastle corporation after 1645 and in the account by George Fox of his second visit to the town in 1658. At the end of the tract,

[1] H. J. Cadbury, "Early Quakerism at Newcastle upon Tyne: William Coatesworth," *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, vol. 50, no. 3 (1963), pp. 91-96; see particularly p. 92.

[2] G. Bateman, *An Answer to (vindicate the cause of the Nick-named Quakers of such scandalls and untruths as is falsly cast upon them in a lying pamphlet otherwise called) A Discourse concerning the Quakers* [n.p., n.d.]. There is a copy in Friends House Library, London. Wing B 1094.

Bateman gives the date of 16 July, 1653, which provides certain evidence that Ledgard's *Discourse* was written in or before 1653. The first known Quaker answer to the tract, James Nayler's *A Few Words Occasioned by a Paper Lately Printed stiled a Discourse Concerning the Quakers* was dated by the London bookseller George Thomason as appearing on 17 March, 1654, but it is apparent from the preface to the reader that a long enough interval had elapsed since the publication of the *Discourse* for the author to have written another tract.[1] It is also suggestive that the period 1653-1654 marked the beginning of the steady stream of anti-Quaker publications written by men with Newcastle connections. The vast majority of these were published by the Newcastle press of Stephen Buckley, and it is possible that Ledgard's *Discourse* may be a hitherto unidentified product of that press.[2] The fact that Thomason did not include Ledgard's work in his collection provides an additional suggestion that the tract was not readily available in London and that it probably was not published there.

Who, then, was Thomas Ledgard? The answer, surprisingly enough in view of the lack of attention he has received, is that he was one of the most prominent merchants and politicians in Newcastle after the reduction of the town to parliamentary control in 1644. He had taken up his freedom of the town of Newcastle in 1633 as a draper.[3] At about the same time, apparently, he became a member of the Hostmen's Company, the guild of coal traders who were the chief powers in the economic life of the town.[4] Although he does not appear to have made a great mark as a merchant before the Civil War, he had achieved some status by the late 1630's when he became a member of the monopolistic South and North

1 E 731(23). J. Nayler, *A Few words occasioned by a Paper lately printed stiled a Discourse concerning the Quakers* (London, 1654). The interval is mentioned in the preface by A. P. (Anthony Pearson). Wing N 279.

2 On Buckley's press and its products, see R. Welford, "Early Newcastle Typography," *Archæologia Aeliana*, 3rd Series, iii (1907), pp. 56-58; H. R. Plomer and R. A. Peddie, "Stephen Buckley, Printer," *Library*, New Series, viii (1907), pp. 42-56; R. Davies, *A Memoir of the York Press* (Westminster, 1868), pp. 57-69.

3 M. H. Dodds, ed. *The Register of Freemen of Newcastle upon Tyne chiefly of the seventeenth century* (Newcastle, 1923), p. 17.

4 F. W. Dendy, ed., *Extracts from the Records of the Company of Hostmen of Newcastle upon Tyne* (Durham, 1901), p. 268. His entry is recorded in an undated list of hostmen admitted between 1617 and 1642.

Shields Salt Makers.[1] At the same time, however, Ledgard became a convert to the Puritan movement which had been growing steadily despite determined opposition within the town, and he appears as a correspondent of the Puritan lecturer, William Morton.[2] His Puritan inclinations were well known to the town authorities, for he was summoned on bond to appear before the Common Council to answer for them, and, in 1643, he was disfranchised as a supporter of the Puritans and parliament by the royalist oligarchy of the town.[3] With the capture of the town by the parliamentarians, Ledgard came into a position of political prominence. He became an alderman in the Puritan corporation, served as mayor on one occasion, and as deputy mayor on a later one.[4] His financial position was secure enough so that he could lend the town £450 out of his own pocket, and he had in his possession the no doubt profitable offices of bailiff of Gateshead and steward of Whickham.[5]

By 1653, when he wrote *A Discourse*, Ledgard was a well-established member of the town oligarchy, related by marriage to one of its most influential families (the Bonners), and thoroughly representative of the upper layers of a society which feared the disruptive effects of spreading sectarianism among the lower classes. His position of power in the town no doubt gave the tract added authority with the audience to whom it was directed, but the arguments which he produced against the Quakers were hardly original ones. Even at an early date, anti-Quaker literature had developed its stereotypes. He alleged that their "quaking" was either counterfeit or else that it was a product of the devil;[6] the latter point had

1 C. T. Carr, ed., *Select Charters of Trading Companies* (London, 1913), pp. 143-144.

2 PRO SP 16/540/446 no. 33; R. Howell, "Puritanism in Newcastle before the Summoning of the Long Parliament," *Archæologia Aeliana*, 4th Series, xli (1963), pp. 135-155.

3 W. H. D. Longstaffe, ed., *Memoirs of the life of Mr. Ambrose Barnes* (Durham, 1867), pp. 161, 352; H. M. Dodds, ed., *Extracts from the Newcastle upon Tyne Council Minute Book* 1639-1656 (Newcastle, 1920), p. 28.

4 C. H. Hunter Blair, *The Mayors and Lord Mayors of Newcastle upon Tyne* (Newcastle, 1940), p. 68. The first mention of him as an alderman is 4 October, 1645. Newcastle Chamberlains' Accounts 1642-5, f. 167. He officiated as deputy Mayor in March, 1651. Newcastle Council Book 1650-9, f. 69. He had been mayor in 1647-8.

5 Dodds, *Council Book*, pp. 65-66, 138-139; Newcastle Council Book 1650-9, f. 134.

6 T. Ledgard, *A Discourse concerning Quakers* (n.p., 1653), p. 1.

been the main burden of another attack on the Quakers published in the same year by the Newcastle press, Gilpin's *The Quakers Shaken*.[1] He asserted that the rule which they followed was not one which could be justified in the Gospels, another frequent complaint against the Quakers.[2] In view of his own position as a town magistrate, it is not surprising that he particularly stressed the characteristics of the early Quakers which were most upsetting to established authority in the seventeenth century, their refusal to pay "proper" respect to those in office by taking off their hats to them and by addressing them as sir and master.[3] In amplifying this point, Ledgard introduced incidentally a point which may have been of more significance in the anti-Quaker literature than is generally supposed. He drew a connection between their public disavowal of respect to earthly authority and the relations between members of the family. It is certain that patriarchalism had a stronger hold on the general consciousness than the apparent shortcomings of the theory would seem to warrant. Historians are becoming increasingly aware of the fact that family rather than class was the pre-eminent social institution of the seventeenth century. Yet, as Ledgard appears to argue, the failure of the Quakers to show respect to authority was as damaging to this institution as it was to society at large. No one would dispute that conversion to Quakerism could entail a considerable strain on family ties, and this was obviously strongly marked in a society which could view the head of the household in terms of a magistrate.[4]

Ledgard's tract drew three known responses, two from Quaker sources and one from a sympathizer who was not a Friend. Although the replies varied somewhat in length and character, their main arguments were very similar, those of Fox and Nayler being rather more outspoken, on the whole, than that of Bateman. In answering Ledgard's arguments, George Fox did not spare harsh words:

1 J. Gilpin, *The Quakers shaken or a Fire-brand snatch'd out of the Fire* (Gateshead, 1653). Wing G 769.

2 Ledgard, *Discourse*, p. 5.

3 *Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

4 On patriarchalism and the importance of the family, see the suggestive remarks in P. Laslett, ed., *Patriarcha and other political works of Sir Robert Filmer* (Oxford, 1949), pp. 20-33; P. Laslett, "The Sovereignty of the Family," *Listener*, 7 April, 1960.

> Many may have the Scripture and deny the power of God which is the Gospel, many had the Scripture and the form, and stood against the Son of truth, Christ Jesus, the power of God, the Gospel; And as for thy other lies and slanders which are not worth mentioning, which comes from thy drunken spirit, when the spirit is awakened that suffers by it, thou shalt feel every word of thy own, thy burthen, and thou that dost set the Scriptures above Christ and God, and the spirit, art a heathen.[1]

Bateman's answer to *A Discourse* was more moderate; he was not, of course, so personally involved as Fox, for he was not a Quaker. He challenged Ledgard to find scriptural support for the view that men should put off their hats to magistrates, and accused the alderman of confusing somewhat the ordinances of God and those of men. His summation of Ledgard's character was not, however, much kinder than that made by Fox. Ledgard was, he wrote,

> one of those good thinking Proselytes, who thinketh they have God hard tyed to them in the chaines of a faire-seeking Forme, and through that great light he may imagine himselfe to have, may become captivated under a judgement, whose gates may prove as narrow as the eye of a Needle.[2]

The career of Ledgard subsequent to the publication of *A Discourse* is not entirely clear. He certainly remained a determined foe of the Quakers and was one of those who were, to a large extent, successful in keeping the Quakers outside the liberties of the town of Newcastle during the Interregnum. It has been asserted that he wrote two other anti-Quaker tracts, one entitled *Another Discourse,* the second called *Anti-Quaker Assertions.*[3] It does not appear that copies of either of these tracts have survived. The latter one was answered by Fox; it appears to have been concerned mainly with the questions of the nature of sin and the role of the scriptures.[4] Of the former, nothing is known, unless perhaps it is that work which Anthony Pearson referred to as "another paper come forth by the author of the discourse occasioned by something written in answer to it."[5]

1 G. Fox, *The Great mistery of the Great Whore unfolded* (London, 1659), p. 257.

2 Bateman, *Answer to a Discourse,* p. 8; Bateman denied being a Quaker, ibid., p. 3.

3 J. Smith, *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana* (London, 1873), pp. 265-266.

4 Fox, *Great Mistery,* p. 257.

5 Nayler, *A Few words occasioned by a paper lately printed,* p. 2.

Although it cannot be precisely documented, it is extremely probable that Ledgard clashed as well with the Quakers over the issue of education in Northumberland and Durham. Ledgard certainly displayed a keen interest in education when he was an alderman. He became a visitor of the newly-founded college at Durham in 1657. This was a creation towards which the hostility of the Quakers was strong since they viewed it as an institution for the making of priests. Although Ledgard was not mentioned by name (no laymen were) in the Quaker attacks on Durham College's Newcastle backers, the clergy who were mentioned were men with whom he had close connections.[1]

Ledgard also took an active part in disputing with George Fox when the latter paid his second visit to Newcastle in 1658, although the discussion does not seem to have involved Durham College directly. According to Fox's account, in fact, the Quaker leader came to the town in direct response to the challenge of Ledgard that "ye Quakers would not come Into noe great toundes, but lived in ye ffells, like butter flyes."[2] The meeting of Fox and Ledgard was, not surprisingly, unfruitful. After exchanging mutual accusations, they parted, Ledgard and the rest of the Newcastle magistrates thinking that they had secured the religious peace of the town by keeping the Quakers out. Fox, rather more accurately, wrote that "As I was passing away by ye markett place, ye power of ye Lord risse in mee to warn ym of ye Lord yt was comeinge upon ym. And soe not longe after all those preists of Newcastle and there profession was turned out when ye Kinge came in."[3]

ROGER HOWELL

1 For Ledgard's interest in education, see Newcastle Council Book 1645-50, f. 176. The letters patent to Durham College (15 May, 1657) list him as a visitor, *Allen Tracts* (Darlington, 1777), no. 44. His father-in-law Thomas Bonner was one of those ordered to prepare orders and rules for governing the college. *Cal. S. P. Dom., 1655-6*, p. 218. For a Quaker attack on the college, see *Some Quaeries to be answered in writing or print by the Masters, Heads, Fellows & Tutors of the Colledge they are setting up at Durham* [n.p., n.d.]. Ledgard had close connections with Samuel Hammond and William Durant, two of the Newcastle clergy mentioned by name in the tract.

2 G. Fox, *Journal*, ed. Penney (Cambridge, 1911), i, 310.

3 *Ibid.*, i, 311.

Early Friends' Experience with Juries

IT is often supposed that early Friends were on the whole badly treated by the seventeenth century juries before whom they appeared, the jury who acquitted Penn and Meade in 1670 being thought of as a glorious exception. But a scrutiny of the cases does not altogether bear out this judgement. It is true that there are many instances recorded of prejudiced or subservient juries. But there are many cases also, in addition to the 1670 one, of juries acquitting Friends, or only convicting them under extreme pressure from the Bench. Besse[1] records at least thirty of such cases, and this is the more remarkable, when we remember that he and his sources were interested primarily in "sufferings," and only incidentally in avoidance of sufferings; so that there must have been a number of acquittals by juries not noted in Friends' records at all. For example, the famous case known as Wagstaffe's Case (1667), in which the fining of a jury for acquitting Quakers was the occasion of an adverse vote in Parliament, is not mentioned by Besse.

Before going on to recall some of these acquittals, it may be worth while, in further exoneration of the seventeenth-century juryman, to refer to a few of the difficulties under which he laboured.

Thomas Rudyard's "Dialogue"

There is an excellent discussion of these in the Appendix to *The Second Part of the People's Ancient and Just Liberties asserted*, which is the account by Thomas Rudyard, the Quaker lawyer, of the trial of himself and ten others at the Old Bailey in 1670: this followed immediately after the trial of Penn and Meade, so graphically described in the first part. The Appendix takes the form of a "Dialogue, in a Plain and Friendly Discourse between a Student in the Laws and Liberties of England, and a true Citizen of London;" it is written with considerable literary skill, and the writing of it must have helped to solace Rudyard during his long imprisonment in Newgate.

[1] *A collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers, for the testimony of a good conscience, from . . . 1650, to . . . the Act of Toleration 1689*, 2 vols., 1753.

The Dialogue opens with the true Citizen "hasting out" to find a Sheriff friend of his, who may be able to get him excused from the jury-service to which he has been summoned; the treatment of the Penn–Meade jury, which is now the talk of the town, has thoroughly alarmed him. The Student in the Laws then labours, successfully, to bring him back to a sense of his duties as a citizen, by showing him how such treatment of a jury is without justification in law or practice. It may be mentioned, in passing, that Rudyard a little over-states his case here: we, looking back, with our greater knowledge of legal history[1], can see that it was neither so unprecedented nor so wholly irrational as Penn and Rudyard thought. The truth is that ever since its inception, in the early days of the Norman kings, the jury-system had been seen to suffer from one grave disadvantage: what were you to do about an obviously wrong verdict given by a venal, or partial, or over-sympathetic jury? The remedy that evolved, in civil cases, of proceeding against a jury whose verdict was disapproved of, by way of "attaint," though still discussed in the seventeenth century, had long fallen into disuse, so much so that it was debated whether or not it had ever applied in cases of acquittal on a criminal charge. Another device, used in the case of juries who failed to bring in a unanimous verdict, of carrying them round the town in a cart, in an ignominious fashion, till they agreed, was recognized to be barbarous and uncivilized long before the date we are considering.[2] The practice therefore grew up of fining and imprisoning juries for "contumacious" verdicts, and the statement has been made that "in the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII, Queen Mary and the beginning of Elizabeth's reign there was scarce one term praetermitted but some grand inquest or jury was fined for acquitting felons or murderers".[3] This fining was done to some extent by the Star Chamber, but by the common law courts as well, and Holdsworth continues:

> It is not surprising that after the Restoration the common law courts should suppose that they still possessed these powers . . . But

1 See the account in Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, vol. I.

2 Though it will be remembered that the Recorder used the same threat to Penn and Meade's jury: "I will have you carted about the City, as in Edward the Third's time."

3 See Holdsworth, *loc. cit.*, p. 344.

it is clear that public opinion was beginning to come round to the view that it was only a corrupt verdict which ought to be thus punished, and that merely to find a verdict contrary to the direction of the court or contrary to the evidence ought not to expose the jury to penalties . . . It was the argument of Chief Justice Vaughan in *Bushell's Case*[1] which finally fixed the law on these lines . . . The only way in which the Crown could now exert pressure to get a favourable verdict was by exercising care in the choice of the jury—a mode of pressure which Charles II and James II freely employed. But such practices were irregular, and they came to an end at the Revolution.

After this a wrong verdict by a jury had to be accepted, until the modern system of appeal courts came into being.

The "Matter of Form" Artifice

The foregoing is only a parenthesis. As far as the parties to Rudyard's "Dialogue" are concerned, neither of them doubts that the practice of fining and imprisoning juries was a palpable infringement of the liberty of the subject, and must be strenuously resisted. But there were other, subtler, means of influencing or imposing on a jury that were equally to be deplored. The first of these is thus given by Rudyard:

> First, Observe the form wherein they draw up their indictments; that is, subtilly to place a small matter of fact, as they call it, in the midst of a whole sea of their decriminating and obnoxious terms, which they call law, that deserve severe punishments wherever they are found, viz. To do an act with force and arms, riotously, routously, tumultuously, seditiously, illegally, deceitfully, subtilly, fallaciously, in contempt of the King and his laws, to the disturbance and affrighting the King's liege people, to the evil example of others, against the King's peace, his crown, and dignity, and such like.
>
> Secondly, the fact in issue, pretended to be committed, although it be never so innocent or lawful (as standing in the street, or highway, in peaceable manner . . .) they environ with many of those foul criminations, thereby to misrepresent the fact or matter in issue, to the jury . . . Against any of which criminal terms, if the jurors object, by reason the evidence did not reach them, the Court presently stops their mouths with saying, "You have nothing to do with that, it's only matter of form or matter of law, you are only to examine the fact." Which the ignorant jurors taking for answer, bring in the prisoners guilty (as they suppose) of the fact or trespass only; but the Clerk of the Peace recording it, demands a further confirmation, saying thus: "Well then, you say A. B. is guilty of the fact or trespass, in manner and form as he

[1] *i.e.* the case brought by the imprisoned jurymen who had acquitted Penn & Mead (1670).

stands indicted, and so you say all?" To which the Foreman answers for himself and fellows, "Yes."

Whereupon the verdict is drawn up, that the jurors do say upon their oaths, That A. B. did, or committed such a fact, with force of arms—did such a seditious action—did meet such persons in a riotous, routous, manner—did such an act deceitfully, subtilly, illegally, fallaciously, in contempt of the King and his laws, to disturb or affright the King's liege people, against the King's peace, his crown and dignity . . . So by reason of the Court's subtilty on the one hand, and the juries' ignorance on the other . . . the Court with safety passes most severe judgments and censures upon such prisoners; and all because the jury have upon their oaths (as was said before) made that innocent action, or pretended fact, criminal, which the law or Court never could have done, had not they in such manner given a verdict, so many degrees worse than the fact in issue was evidenced unto them.

We can recall with pleasure that this artifice was the undoing of the prosecution in the Penn–Meade trial: the jury at first brought in Penn (though not Meade) guilty of "speaking or preaching to an assembly met together in Gracious Street"; and if the Court had accepted this "special" verdict, as some of them were inclined to do, they would no doubt have felt justified in sentencing him, on the basis that this speaking or preaching was illegality enough. But they insisted on the jury delivering their verdict in accordance with the indictment, which contained many of the "foul criminations" (with force and arms, etc.); and this the jury refused to do. When told that they must acquit or convict on the whole indictment, they eventually acquitted.

There are a number of similar cases recorded by Besse[1], which show that there were some juries who were strong-minded enough to resist this artifice. Those in Bristol appear to have been particularly resistant.

The "Unwritten Law" Artifice

On this we may quote Rudyard's lively exposition again.

Student. Sir John Howel your Recorder, and your City magistrates, have a further artifice; that is, to indict all men by the common law, and waive intermeddling with any of the statutes in force against such misdemeanours, as they pretend the persons indicted are guilty of.

Citizen. Pray, what do you suppose their drift is in that?

Student. No other than that they may as well make the law, as

[1] *e.g.* I, p. 48, p. 634, p. 730.

proportion the punishment; for when an indictment is grounded on the common law, and the prisoner desires to have the law read to the jury . . . on which such indictment is grounded, the Court answers, "It's *lex non scripta*, a law not written, therefore not to be produced." By this means the prisoner is incapacitated to make his defence, and the jury kept ignorant whether the offence charged to be done by the prisoner be innocency or guilt: and so the Bench at the Old Bailey acted last sessions, in the case of riots, routs, and unlawful assemblies. And although there be several statutes in force, which point out the persons that ought to be apprehended and punished as rioters and routers . . . yet your Recorder and magistrates pretending to proceed by the common law (non scripta) apprehended quiet and peaceable religious assemblies as riots and routs, and punished them as such . . .

And after the rate of their proceedings, by their abuse of the law, they might have framed an indictment against a man, for ("with force and arms") eating meat at his own table with his wife and children, and at last ushering in the fact committed with these obnoxious terms, as "Against the King and his laws, illegally, and in contempt of his crown and dignity etc." And a jury of their packing would have found them guilty " in manner and form."

In support of this final statement another case recorded by Besse[1] may be cited, where the Recorder told 24 London prisoners, indicted for a riotous assembly with force and arms, etc., that "the words 'force and arms' were but matter of form, and that if a neighbour's bullock broke into another man's ground, the indictment for the trespass must be laid, with force and arms."

Some Friends, for example George Whitehead,[2] attempted to parry this artifice by themselves producing legal definitions of what constituted a rout or a riot. They used mostly for this purpose the Institutes of Sir Edward Coke, or Cooke as they usually called him, James I's Chief Justice, which was the great legal text-book of the age. But Coke's Institutes, however great an authority, had not the force of law; and the Recorder of London, and others whose business it was to state the law for the instruction of the jury, did not hesitate to inform them that Coke was wrong, and that the correct legal definition was wide enough to allow what the accused had done to be brought within it. And this the jury had to accept.

Penn indeed endeavoured to maintain that the English jury was the proper judge of law as well as of fact, arguing

[1] I, p. 469.
[2] Besse, I, p. 464.

that although judges may have to *inform* juries of law, yet the juries' verdict must be as "understood, digested and judiciously made the juries', by their own free will and acceptance, upon their conviction of the truth of things reported by the Bench," and they are still therefore judges of the law.[1] This proposition is not, strictly speaking, tenable; but Penn's conclusion, that in no case can a judge positively *direct* a jury to convict, appears to be correct. Chief Justice Vaughan, in *Bushell's Case*, put it in his usual forceful manner: he is referring to the "Return," or certificate, which in Habeas Corpus cases was required to be delivered to the Court by those having custody of the prisoner, to justify his detention.

> We come now to the next part of the Return, viz. "That the jury acquitted those indicted against the direction of the Court, in matter of law openly given and declared to them in Court."
>
> The words "That the jury did acquit against the direction of the Court in matter of law," literally taken, are insignificant and not intelligible; for no issue can be joined of matter in law, no jury can be charged with the trial of matter in law barely, no evidence[2] ever was or can be given to a jury, of what is law or not . . .
>
> Therefore we must take off this veil and colour of words, which make a show of being something, and in truth are nothing.
>
> If the meaning of the words, "finding against the Court in matter of law," be, "That if the Judge having heard the evidence given in Court (for he knows no other) shall tell the jury, upon this evidence, the law is for the plaintiff or for the defendant, and you are under the pain of fine and imprisonment to find accordingly, then the jury ought of duty so to do"—what use can there be for juries . . .
>
> And how the jury should in any other manner, according to the course of trials used, find against the Court in matter of law, is really not conceivable . . .
>
> Therefore always in discreet and lawful assistance of the jury the judge's direction is hypothetical and upon supposition, and not positive and upon coercion; viz, "If you find the fact thus" (leaving it to them what to find) "then you are to find for the plaintiff; but if you find the fact thus, then it is for the defendant."

This is now the procedure universally adopted.

Some Cases of Acquittal

1. Samuel Clift of Avening, in 1657. Prior to the Restoration,

[1] In *Truth rescued from Imposture*, in Penn's *Works* (the reply by Penn and Rudyard to a pamphlet criticizing the account of Penn and Mead's Trial), p. 502 of vol. I of the 1726 ed.

[2] *i.e.* "Evidence" as opposed to "direction".

under the Cromwellian system of "toleration within the bounds of reasonable behaviour," there were very few indictments of Friends. Samuel Clift was charged at Gloucester Quarter Sessions with interrupting divine Service. He was acquitted by the jury when it was shown that he had not said anything, but merely stood up.[1]

2. 34 Friends at Abingdon Quarter Sessions in 1662, indicted "for not going to the national worship." Acquitted.[2]

3. Some 50 Friends at Reading Quarter Sessions in 1664, acquitted for refusing the oath of allegiance, the jury not being satisfied that it had been properly tendered.[3]

4. 9 Friends at Hertford Assizes in 1664, indicted "for the third offence upon the Conventicle Act, the penalty of which was banishment." The Grand Jury were dissatisfied with the evidence, and at first refused to find a true bill, but the judge, Orlando Bridgman, threatened them, accusing them of making "a nose of wax of the law," and they reversed their finding.[4]

LEACH'S CASE, 1664

5. This case was quoted both in support of and against the punishing of juries. The jury at the Old Bailey had found 16 Friends "not guilty of meeting contrary to the liturgy of the Church of England."[5] The Judges Hyde and Keeling disputed angrily with the jurymen, and induced half of them to change their minds, but the other six stood firm. Hyde thereupon bound these six over to appear at the King's Bench Bar. It was later alleged[6] that "they appeared accordingly, and the Court directed an information to be brought against them, and upon that they were fined." Rudyard however denies that they were fined[7], and his statement appears to be confirmed by this case not being cited by Vaughan, in his consideration of the precedents, in *Bushell's Case.*

1 Besse, I, p. 209.
2 *Idem*, I, p. 13.
3 *Idem*, I, p. 22.
4 *Idem*, I, p. 245. W. C. Braithwaite, *Second Period of Quakerism*, p. 42.
5 *Idem*, I, p. 401. W. C. Braithwaite, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
6 In the pamphlet criticizing the account of Penn & Mead's trial.
7 In *Truth rescued from Imposture, loc. cit.* (Penn, *Works*, 1726, i, 514). A letter preserved in the State Papers says merely that they were "charged and like to receive a trial at Guildhall." (*Extracts from State Papers*, p. 221.)

WAGSTAFFE'S CASE, 1667

6. This case was a precursor of the Penn–Meade trial and its sequel. It does not appear in Quaker records of sufferings, and we do not even know the names of the Friends involved, but it is reported in some detail in three contemporary volumes of Law Reports[1], and is referred to extensively in the 1670 "pamphlet-war."

Wagstaffe was a member of a jury at the Old Bailey which acquitted a number of Quakers charged with a "second offence" under the 1664 Conventicle Act. Although there was evidence that many more persons than five had assembled, and that they had "Bibles with them, and were suspicious persons and sectaries," the jury declared themselves as unsatisfied that they were met together "to exercise any religious worship," as the Act required.

Keeling, now Chief Justice, directed them to convict, saying that it was for the Quakers to prove that there was some other occasion for their meeting, "otherwise the new law would be elusory;" but this the jury refused to accept. They were required to give their verdicts separately, and all except three or four were for acquittal. After another direction to convict, again refused, they were fined 100 marks apiece (the Penn–Meade jury were to be fined 40 marks), and committed to Newgate until payment.

They appealed first to the Exchequer Court, under the certiorari procedure for removing cases to a higher court; but although the Chief Baron, Hale,[2] was inclined to doubt the legality of what had been done, no precedent for certiorari in such a case could be found, and after adjournment the application was refused. The jury then, like Bushell in the Penn–Meade case, appealed under the Habeas Corpus procedure. The "Return," or defence by those detaining the appellants, was, in this case also, that the jury gave their verdict "against the direction of the Court in matter of law," the defence which Chief Justice Vaughan was to treat so contemptuously three years later. But in Wagstaffe's case, after lengthy legal argument, the jury were refused relief,

[1] W. C. Braithwaite, *op. cit.* p. 45 cites 1 Keble 934 & 938 and 1 Siderfin 272, but not Hardress 409, which gives some additional material.

[2] For Sir Matthew Hale, & his sympathetic attitude to Friends, see note in *Cambridge Journal* II, p. 449.

and they were compelled to pay their fines before they were released.

This case therefore established a clear precedent for the fining and imprisonment of a jury, which might have become firmly established had not Vaughan and his colleagues been able, in spite of it, to come to a contrary decision in *Bushell's Case*. Vaughan's judgment made some attempt to distinguish between the two: "By the record it is reasonable to think the jurors [in *Wagstaffe's Case*] committed some fault besides going against their evidence, for they were unequally fined." But there is no such suggestion anywhere else, and it is likely that this attempted distinction was something of a subterfuge, to justify the contrary decision.

Rudyard indeed was able to claim[1] that the House of Commons strongly disapproved of Keeling's action, and had passed a resolution condemning it, "a resolution not inferior to the Consideratum est of the King's Bench." But such resolution had not of course the force of law.

The Penn–Meade Trial and Others

7. The events of the Penn–Meade trial (1670) itself are well known and need not be repeated here. It is clear that the Court, having obtained a verdict against Penn on the actual fact of "speaking or preaching to an assembly met together in Gracious Street," was convinced that if the jury were sufficiently bullied, they would find him guilty "in manner and form" also; but this the jury refused to do; and when pressed to the limits of their endurance, found him "not guilty" instead. This is the reason for the rather lame attempt that was made, in the subsequent controversy, to maintain that the jury were fined and imprisoned "for giving two contrary verdicts." Penn and Rudyard both deal effectively with this,[2] the latter using the conclusive argument that the "Return" of the cause of the jurors' imprisonment (in *Bushell's Case*) makes no mention of these alleged "contrary verdicts." A few months later he could have added that Chief Justice Vaughan's judgment makes no mention of them either.

[1] In *Truth rescued from Imposture, loc. cit.* See Postscript to *The People's Ancient & Just Liberties asserted* (first part) for details of the resolution.

[2] In *Truth rescued from Imposture, loc. cit.* (Penn, *Works*, 1726, i, 515).

8. The next three cases are all similar to the Penn–Meade case in the browbeating of the jury. In January 1666 Joseph Phipps was tried at Reading Quarter Sessions "for the third offence on the Act of Banishment."[1] Another Friend had just previously been acquitted; his jury was discharged, and the bailiffs were instructed to pick an "honest" jury. Nevertheless this jury, though threatened, could not agree on a conviction; until, having been "kept all night without fire or candle," some of them showed themselves willing to comply, and the foreman said "Guilty," which verdict was accepted, although four jurors had not concurred in it.

9. This was a case of two Nottinghamshire Appeals in 1676 against fines under the Second Conventicle Act.[2] The first appellant, John Sayton, was cleared by the jury, upon proof that he was 60 miles distant from the place at which the Meeting informed against had been held. The jury was abused and dismissed. The second appellant, William Hudson, could not be proved to have been at the Meeting charged against him: "though eight of the jury were picked men, known to be against the appellant, yet the other four stood out, and no verdict was agreed on till about eight at night, when one of those four being taken ill, and needing refreshment, Justice Whaley told them, 'If they did not agree, they should be kept there till they died, and as one of them died, the Court would choose another, till they were all dead.' They were overawed into a compliance, and after the Court was adjourned, privately gave in a verdict against the appellant." (It is interesting that in the Penn–Meade trial there was the same minority of four as in these last two cases. In the Penn–Meade case, however, they were sufficiently persistent to prevail.)

10. 12 Friends were indicted for a riot, at Andover Quarter Sessions in 1681. The Grand Jury, "though menaced and frowned at by the Court," would not find a true bill, even after an adjournment.[3]

11. 10 Cheshire Friends were acquitted in 1683 on an indictment: "a verdict the Court rejected twice, and sent the jury out again, but they persisted in their judgment."[4]

1 Besse, I, p. 26.
2 *Idem*, I, p. 560.
3 *Idem*, I, p. 239.
4 *Idem*, I, p. 110.

12. Sarah Casimire, a London Friend, indicted for a riot in 1685, was acquitted.[1]

Conclusion

A number of other examples might be quoted, but the above are probably enough to show that there were many cases in which a jury, or some of its members, were sufficiently sympathetic to Friends to be unwilling to convict, even where there was substantial evidence that an offence had been committed. On two matters in particular they seem to have shown Friends considerable favour. Firstly, the "Act of Banishment" was most unpopular, and loopholes were sought for and found by juries, to relieve the necessity for a conviction. Secondly, many juries seem to have disliked, as much as Rudyard's Student did, the artifice whereby a number of meaningless accusations were added "as a matter of form" to an indictment, and were expected to be included in the jury's verdict for the Crown.

We can dwell with some satisfaction on the thought that, as in more recent history, the sufferings of Friends have helped in the development of a humaner and juster legal system. Certainly, after *Bushell's Case*, though the browbeating of juries did not entirely disappear, most jurymen were aware that, in the last resort, they could maintain their desired verdict with impunity. This knowledge penetrated to all territories where English case-law held good, and we may close by recalling the retort of a juryman in New York in 1703 to a threat of fine and imprisonment:[2]

"You may hang us by the heels if you please, but if you do the matter will be carried to Westminster Hall; for juries, whether grand or petty, are not to be menaced with threats, but are to act freely."

ALFRED W. BRAITHWAITE

[1] Besse, I, p. 479.

[2] R. M. Jones, *Quakers in the American colonies*, p. 235.
The occasion was the trial of Samuel Bownas for "speaking lies and reflections against the Church of England."

The London Six Weeks Meeting

Some of its Work and Records over 200 Years[1]

IN January of the year 1661 the City of London was in the grip of a series of riots which had broken out from the headquarters of The Fifth Monarchy Men in Coleman Street. These so alarmed the authorities that, during the following decade, they enacted a series of repressive laws against Dissenters, with special legislation against Quakers. The most vindictive was the Second Conventicle Act 1670 which has been described as the quintessence of arbitrary malice. King Charles II showed no enthusiasm for the Act but was powerless to prevent its passing, he knew that it was the "price of money," of which he was in dire need at all times. "An Act to Prevent and suppress Seditious Conventicles" aimed at providing "further and more speedy remedies against the growing dangerous practices of seditious sectaries who used the plea of tender consciences as a screen behind which to plot revolution." Informers were encouraged, and, probably no other single Act caused so much suffering among the Nonconformists. While Parliament was sitting the Act was enforced, but when it stood prorogued pressure was relaxed, and in March 1672 the King issued a Declaration of Indulgence which went far to mitigate the worst effects of the Act.

To counter the activities of the informers and the Authorities and to collect evidence to rebut false charges, Friends began to keep careful records.

The year 1667 had seen the establishment of district meetings, known as Monthly Meetings; these regular gatherings of Friends from a definite area were intended to give each Friend a channel through which to exercise his or her particular gift for the benefit of the whole group, to regulate conduct, and to watch over one another in love. The City of London and its environs had been divided into six Monthly Meetings. Any matters that the local group were not able to solve were referred to George Fox, as leader of the Quaker

[1] The substance of a paper read before the Friends' Historical Society, 5 March, 1964.

movement. He journeyed up and down the country strengthening these groups.

ORIGINS

In August 1671 George Fox left for a prolonged visit to America. Before sailing he had chosen 84 "grave and ancient" Friends[1]—that is they were all well established in the Quaker faith—to advise Friends.

By this time London had become the most important centre of Quakerism. It was the seat of government and the residence of the King, to whose attention cases of persecution could be brought. London Friends often acted for and represented all English Quakers in these matters. Up to 1671 it had been possible to consult George Fox and obtain his advice when necessary, now he was going to undertake a long and hazardous journey overseas, so he had felt it incumbent to appoint a group of tested Friends who would act as a court of appeal and advice.[2]

The first meeting of this body took place on 28th October 1671 at 8 o'clock in the morning. The second meeting was held at the Bull and Mouth Meeting House, Aldersgate on the 13th May 1672, when they agreed to meet every six weeks, and this arrangement has continued ever since. When visiting London, leading Friends often attend Six Weeks Meeting. George Fox and William Penn were present at various times. A difficult marriage question was adjourned until "dear G.F." could be present.

For the first twelve years when some of the original members moved to the country or "laid down the body" Six Weeks Meeting filled the vacancies by its own choice, but in 1683 it invited each of the Six Monthly Meetings of London to send representatives and that practice has continued. Financial matters were entrusted to twelve Friends known as the Committee of Twelve, and for a short time they were called "the Committee that has charge of the Poor's money." The period of service was limited, but difficulties arose when some useful member had to retire by rotation and this rule was altered. Ellis Hooks was its first clerk at £20 per annum plus the marriage fees, and successive Recording Clerks continued

[1] 49 men, 35 women, average age 45 years.
[2] There is an extended account of the Six Weeks Meeting in W. Beck & T. F. Ball, *The London Friends' meetings* (1869), pp. 91-112.

to serve Six Weeks Meeting until 1862 when a secretary was engaged to take his place.

George Fox was evidently well satisfied with the way that the Meeting had fulfilled its function during his two years' absence. Some eighteen years later he wrote an account of its setting up and of the kind of Friend who should be appointed to serve; they were, he said, to be men and women that knew the affairs of the Church and had stood sufferings,

> such as are impartall that will not respect persons nor relations in Judgment. Approved men and women that will not by any means be drawn away by affections into sects or parties but have a general care of the peace of the Church and the prosperity of Truth: none but sensible men and women in the fear of God & that are of good lives & conversation, *for it is the chief meeting of the city which all Monthly Meetings appeal to.*

Six Weeks Meeting has always been concerned with the maintenance of Friends' witness for Truth. At its first meeting it was decided to return John Pennyman's contribution, which he had made towards Gracechurch Street Meeting, he having become a backslider. If it became known after his death that a Friend had not been faithful in his life, his donations were returned to his relatives.

Having established themselves, and having received a measure of toleration in 1689, Friends had more freedom to show that their faith was a way of life, and to this end more and more advice was issued as to conduct in daily living and conversation. Some of the more obvious misdemeanours were early dealt with, in 1690 the Six Weeks Meeting advised:

> Dear Friends,
>
> We hear that there are some that come among us and make profession of the Truth that do not answer it in their conversation but are loose in their words and take a liberty, neglect their Watch, keep not to the daily Cross but run into the Spirit and Friendships of the Evil world in keeping ill houses, ill company, sitting idely and excessivly drinking and Tipling, haunting Alehouses and Taverns, Gameing and neglecting of their own affairs ruining their Families, which is contrary to our holy profession and brings a reproach upon us and it greatly obstructs the prosperity of Truth by their loose and disorderly conversation.

Property

The Six Weeks Meeting early took over the care of all matters which affected the whole of London Friends. Its area consisted of the City of London, Southwark, Ratcliff

and Westminster; to which very soon were added the country Meetings of Hammersmith and Staines.

The maintenance of meeting house property and the renewing of leases were soon in its care. All the early meeting houses were leasehold, the term often being for the duration of the lives of certain Friends, and when only one life remained the term was vested in a new group of lives; at the same time a fine was paid for the renewal. The head landlord of the Bull and Mouth meeting house was Christ's Hospital (Blue Coat School), of Devonshire House, Bishopsgate (eventually made a freehold) the Earl of Devonshire, and of Westminster meeting house the Dean and Chapter of Westminster Abbey. The Park, Southwark was owned by the Bishop of Winchester, and Savoy by the King—whether he held it as King of England or as Duke of Lancaster was a point which the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury were not able to say and the caretaker of the Meeting House was served a notice at one time from both the Duchy and the Crown in order that a case could come before the courts and decide the point, but Friends had given up their tenancy before it was settled.

Gracechurch Street was leased from the Fishmongers Guild; Horslydown was on land belonging to the Vestry of St. Olaves, Southwark; Peel was bequeathed to Friends. Deptford was the first freehold meeting house site to be purchased, though the burying ground at Bunhill had been its first freehold property. From time to time tenements adjoining Bunhill Burial Ground were purchased, and when required the houses were pulled down and the ground used for interments. This also happened at Whitechapel and Long Lane, Bermondsey, two burial grounds situated away from meeting houses. There was another burial ground about 100 yards from the first Park meeting house in Southwark, and the second Park meeting house was built adjoining this ground.

Sometimes Six Weeks Meeting would have to remove the tenants of their properties which adjoined burial grounds because they were aiding in the business of body stealing. At Whitechapel the son of the gravemaker was found to have assisted in the removal of a body after burial. All the family were promptly expelled from the caretaker's cottage, new locks were put on the gate and orders were given to fill up graves the same day as the funeral. Six Weeks Meeting advised

the monthly meetings to comply with the law as to burial in woollen. Graves were to be at least six feet deep and interments were not to be promiscuous but to follow each other in rows. No individual markers were permitted; when one was placed in Long Lane it was ordered to be removed. Gravemakers were not to sell the herbage, cattle were not to be allowed, but sheep could be grazed. Washerwomen were not to hang out washing to dry in the burial grounds. Neighbours were not allowed to dump stones or rubbish on the ground. Trees were planted and all was to be kept neat and tidy. Meetings were instructed to provide sufficient of their men Friends to carry the corpse to burial.

In 1691 these instructions were issued:

> Dear Friends,
>
> Our love in the Truth salute you and these are tenderly to recommend unto you the need these many times is of more men Friends being at Burials than sometimes there are, to help to perform the last office of love unto our deceased Friends, and in order that that service made be made more easie, we intereat you to stir up such young men in your respective Monthly Meetings that they be serviceable herein to attend the same. Also procure (as much as may be possible) light coffins made of Wainscott or Deal so that Friends may not be oppressed with the weight of them and when corps' are large and coffins heavy that they get padds for the coffins & to take particular care to get those who are able to bare the same. That so we may in no wise oppress one another but with ease and readyness of mind discharge that office of Love one for another, therefore we doe request & hope that None for the future may be backward herein.
>
> 12 $\frac{11}{\text{Mo}}$ 1691 S.W.M. held at the Bull.

The Burial Act of 1853 closed all metropolitan churchyards and burial grounds and the Six Weeks Meeting purchased land adjoining Isleworth meeting house for the use of the whole Quarterly Meeting. In 1864 the Six Weeks Meeting allowed the erection of a marquee on its Whitechapel Burial Ground for the purpose of conducting a mission among "the class of persons who are not in the habit of attending any place of worship." The missioner was a young Methodist minister named William Booth and that Mission was the beginning of the Salvation Army.

For many years the keeping of disused burial grounds in a state of tidiness was a problem, eventually solved by allowing the local municipal authorities to use them as Children's playing places.

When Long Lane, Bermondsey, was opened as a Children's playground (1894) the following appeared in a journal called *Fun:*

> The decorous Quakers, demure and staid,
> Are said to have taken their pleasures sadly.
> But ever the Quakers with joy surveyed
> The Faces of little ones, smiling gladly.
> And none the less pleasant, or sweet, or sound,
> The repose will be of the bygone Quaker
> Who rests in the Bermondsey burial ground
> When over his head in the hushed Gods Acre
> He knew of, he hears the delightful noise
> Of the mirth of the Bermondsey girls and boys.

If I may be forgiven a personal note. We lived near Long Lane, Bermondsey; one day when I was very young I remember playing with a hoop in the Anglican churchyard. The Keeper stopped me saying: "You must not bowl hoops here, go and play in the Quaker Burial Ground!"

Charities

Jailers and officials who had been considerate to Friends were suitably rewarded. In 1680 John Dew and John West received five pounds to give to the warden of the Fleet Prison and to the keeper of the King's Bench for their kindness to Friend prisoners. A gift was made to the City Marshal on account of his protecting from disturbance the public meetings for worship in the City.

Six Weeks Meeting had the care of the casual poor, they were Friends not members of any of the London meetings. Under this heading French, Danes, Germans and Spaniards who claimed to be Friends received help.

Later the charges for care of all poor Friends came to the Six Weeks Meeting. The heavy charge of this service often proved a great source of anxiety as to where the necessary money was to be found. Various schemes were tried. As early as 1676 William Meade was asked to purchase flax and provide work of spinning and weaving for the poor; as spinning was essentially a female occupation, it became the care of the Women members, and they appointed Margery Brown to distribute the flax and collect the cloth. John Bellers was early engaged with William Meade in this service and it may be that the experience he gained in 25 years service on Six Weeks Meeting inspired him to advocate the setting up of a

permanent establishment where work could be provided to employ the poor both young and old. This was done in 1702 at Clerkenwell. After the setting up of the Clerkenwell Workhouse the Six Weeks Meeting did not directly concern itself with providing work for poor Friends but it kept a watchful eye on the Clerkenwell experiment and later helped financially.

The Young

Education has always been a concern of Friends. As early as 1674 the Six Weeks Meeting engaged Richard Richardson as school master (later he became the second Recording Clerk) and they laid down Rules for teaching Latin, Writing, Arithmetic and languages, also the nature of flowers, roots and trees. This school was held at Devonshire House, another was at Shacklewell. Each monthly meeting was regularly asked as to the schools in its area. These were private ventures encouraged by Friends and sometimes the schoolmaster was employed to copy out the minutes of monthly meetings in a fair hand.

The treatment of apprentices and servants received attention. One Friend was reprimanded "for correcting his apprentice immeasurably," and the judgment of his monthly meeting, against which he had appealed, was "to stand over his head until he submits and repents."

Monthly meetings were advised to see that maidservants did not leave their service and go and live "at their own hand" without previously obtaining the consent of the monthly meeting. Having advised the monthly meetings about the young women, they added as an end piece "the like as to Young Men."

Marriages

Six Weeks Meeting settled the form of words to be used at marriages and the procedure to be followed for the ceremony. They laid it down that the women's meeting was to be the liberating Meeting, and that all proposals of marriage were to come before the Two Weeks Meeting and receive its approval. The wedding services were to be arranged so as not to clash with the time of Meeting for Sufferings. Monthly meetings were to appoint Friends, not only to see that the

marriage ceremony was performed correctly but that the subsequent festivities were also decorous and seemly. Elaborate wedding breakfasts were to be discouraged and excessive wine drinking at these times was to be prevented.

In the case of a second marriage, Six Weeks Meeting saw to it that any children of the first marriage were provided for properly. Difficult cases were reported to Six Weeks Meeting for its advice, such as when a woman asked to be allowed to assume that her husband had been drowned at sea, when his ship was lost three years previously, but they advised further waiting before proceeding with a second marriage.

A couple who, without prior notice or liberation, repeated the marriage promises at the close of a Meeting for Worship, were reprimanded and told it was "no marriage."

In 1683 Dutch Quakers consulted Six Weeks Meeting with regard to their marriage procedure. In Holland they were required to give notice to the local Magistrate before the ceremony and also to notify the same authority after the wedding. As these regulations were civil and not concerned in any way with the Priest the Dutch Friends were advised to comply, it not being inconsistent with Truth. All wills which brought legacies to the Society were read at the Six Weeks Meeting and copied into a special book. Executors who were dilatory in proving wills were dealt with; one such was the Deputy Governor of the Tower of London, who tried to evade payment of a gift which his mother had bequeathed to Quakers.

London being a port, Friends who lived near the river were often engaged in shipping, some were mariners. One of the hazards of seafaring in the seventeenth century was the risk of being captured by pirates and forced to work on the Algerian galleys. Sometimes the Quaker captives appealed to the Six Weeks Meeting to redeem them; as much as £70 to £100 was needed and special collections, known as "the Captives' money," were authorized to meet these heavy demands.

Friends were advised to give employment to Friends rather than to non-Friends. In 1680 Six Weeks Meeting wrote:

There is a complaint that Friends do employ some of the world's people in printing and binding of Friends' books. Upon consideration it is this Meeting's desire and advice that henceforth such as print Friends' books do for the future employ only Friends

in printing & binding, provided that Friends do it as well and as reasonable as the world's people will do it.[1]

Minute books, ink and stationery were supplied by Samuel West, a Southwark Friend living on London Bridge.

From time to time Six Weeks Meeting received legacies for distribution to poor Friends. In 1695 "as the Chief Meeting of the City" they were made trustees for Thomas Pollard's bequest of £400, with instructions that it was to be invested and only the interest distributed annually. Among the Friends appointed to find an investment for this capital was Daniel Quare, the clockmaker, and John Freame, the goldsmith banker.[2] A few years later Elizabeth Dickson bequeathed £500 for a similar purpose and these two legacies were invested in property in Crutched Friars. The Committee in charge being known as "The Committee of 4/9 & 5/9," being the proportions of the original bequests. These trusts are still administered by the Six Weeks Meeting.

In 1677 the women Friends of Gracechurch Street Meeting sent this letter to the Six Weeks Meeting:

Friends and Brethren,

Several of us having suffered oft in our Spirits through something that appears to us unseemly, and a disorder in our meeting place in Gracechurch Street, we thought it meet to lay the matter before you that if you see it convenient in the wisdom of Truth to Indeavour the rectifying of it. The Womans' Gallery which was intended for our Convenience we could not enjoy, it being taken up with most unseasoned persons and forward lasses. Under that same gallery were many of us sitt, many forward young lads and apprentices thrust themselves although it be much to our opression, without respect to women with child and the like, they set themselves as if it were their only proper place among some young maids, which commonly sitts on that side, which is unseemly in our view, and if it might be so ordered that from Gerard Roberts' yard doore, that side might be ordered for women only, we think it would appear more comely and orderly in our assembly. This we offer for our conveniency and savoury order with subjection to your understanding in this affaire that are your Sisters in the fellowship and service of all wholesome manners & order that becomes Truth in the Service of it.

[1] Tace Raylton continued to print for Friends after the death of her father Andrew Sowle; her premises adjoined Gracechurch Street meeting house. As she sometimes printed more copies than were ordered, the Six Weeks Meeting had to direct her to print no more than ordered till Friends gave a further instruction.

[2] His bank subsequently became Barclays Bank.

To this the Six Weeks Meeting replied:

> At this Meeting it was represented that some inconveniency attends in the women and men sitting together as usualy hath been in public Meetings in this city, whereby the women are sometimes much prest & straitened for room: it was therefore agreed upon by this Meeting that a paper should bee drawn up & sent to each Monthly Meeting to advise and exhort Friends in general that the men Friends may have publick notice to give way to the women & lett them have the libertie of one side of the meeting place to themselves to sitt apart from the men. The side that is thought most convenient for the woman to sitt in Gracious Street Meetinghouse is the side next the women's gallery & for the other meetings where the men see the women sitt they may take the other side, & this is advised only for decency and conveniency's sake & it is desired that Friends will take care to see it performed.

John Elson, a carpenter Friend, was instructed to provide a crossform with a back toward the meeting to prevent the young men from crowding out the women.

Friends were also advised to look after disorderly children, those who got into trouble with officers of the parish; young men were advised not to marry before 21; and Friends were not to allow servants and children to walk in the fields during time of Meeting.

There were several districts in London to which persons who wished to escape their creditors could remove themselves. Whitefriars near the river Fleet, and The Mint in Southwark were among these. In 1693 it was proposed "that all persons going to live in The Mint and other Privelidged places to shift themselves from payment of their just debts be declared to act contrary to Truth and not to be of our Society." The Six Weeks Meeting advertised publicly for a runaway debtor:

> Matthew Scoryer a young man that sold Cider near the ditch at Fleet Bridge of a middle stature, Fair hair cut short, having lately wore a Perewig, about 25 years of age, being a prisoner for debt for about 60 pounds in the Fleet & having libertie with a keeper to go abroad he ran away from his keeper. It is desired that Friends may have notice in Citty and Countrie to the end he may be discovered & apprehended if possible, he going under the name of Friend, he escaped 24-4Mo-1678.

Friends were advised not to wear elaborate clothes or to permit their children to do so. In 1691

> Those that have immitated the world wheather it be men in their extravagant Periwiggs, Modes and fashions in their apparell, or whether it be women in their High Towering dresses, Gold

chains or gaudy attire whether it be Parents like old Ely not sufficiently restraining their children therefrom or whether it be in volumptuous feasting without fear or in costly furniture and too rich adorning of houses.

All that profess the Truth as it is in Christ Jesus are advised to be careful not to use those reflecting disgustfull Termes of distinction of Wigg and Tory or any other Nicknames or words tending to provoke one neighbour against another.

Appeals from monthly meetings against Friends living in one area and being members of another were heard by the Six Weeks Meeting. A gift from Jamaica was claimed by both the Bull and Mouth Meeting and the Meeting of the Women Friends of London. The bequest being loosely worded and the Women having helped the donor in the past, they sent a deputation to Six Weeks Meeting with their minute book showing how they had helped the testator. A conference was arranged but the Bull and Mouth representatives, though appointed by that meeting, failed to appear, such discourtesy to a superior meeting received a sharp rebuke. Eventually, the gift was equally, and very equally, divided, each receiving £37 4s. 1½d.

Disownments

All disownments by monthly meetings were forwarded to Six Weeks Meeting and read there. Copies were then sent to the other five monthly meetings. Sometimes notice of reinstatements were received, and details of any appeals against disownment addressed to Quarterly Meeting were also read at Six Weeks Meeting. A typical example of disownment is that received from Westminster on 23.iii.1756 and which was read at a later meeting. It reads:

> Whereas Hannah Lightfoot a person educated under our profession and who for several years past resided within the compass of this Meeting, did then enter into a state of marriage by the Priest with one not of our Society, which is directly repugnant to the good rule and orders well known to be established amongst us. On which this meeting appointed Friends to visit her, who several times endeavoured to find where she was, in order to speak with her, but to no purpose, nor could they obtain any intelligence where she is. We therefore being desirous (as much as in us lies) to clear the Truth which we profess, and ourselves, from any aspersions which through the misconduct of the said Hannah may be cast upon Friends, do hereby testify against her proceeding as aforesaid, and Disown her for the same, as one with whom we can have no fellowship until from a penitent mind,

and true contrition of heart she shall be induced to signifie her unfeigned sorrow for her offence, and that this may be her case is what we truly desire.

From our Monthly Meeting for Westminster held at the Savoy.[1]

Legend has it that "the one not of our Society" with whom Hannah had entered into a state of marriage by the priest was the Prince of Wales who later became George III.

Travelling Friends

The provision of facilities for Friends travelling in the Ministry was always one of the heaviest items of expenditure. For nearly 200 years it consisted in providing horses to convey these Friends on their journey; Truth's Horse it was sometimes called. Occasionally provision was made for a companion to accompany the visitor part way on his departure.

For 25 years the stable used for Friends' horses was at the Castle and Falcon, Aldersgate, the ostler being a Friend. After his decease, varying opinions were expressed from time to time as to whether it would be cheaper to hire a horse when needed, or to purchase one and stable it at an hostelry. Two years after the establishing of the Clerkenwell school and workhouse, the committee of that house asked that public Friends' horses might be stabled there on the same terms as other places charged. Four years later, the Six Weeks Meeting investigated the cost of horse "meat" and received the following report (1708):

One of the greatest charges is that on account of Friends' horses—and it is our thought that 8d. per night at grass and 14d. for Hay and Corn a night is 2d. too much for each, by reason of which the said Bill is about 1/5d. more charge than otherwise it would be. Considering there is no trouble for their lodging that brings horses at ye workhouse as it is at Publick Inns they stand cheaper. Besides there are nameless persons in the Horse Bills and several under this head—A.B. and his nameless companion.

Our opinion is that for ye future bills for Friends' Horses may be examined and signed either by the Six Weeks Meeting or the Meeting of 12, rather than by some of the (Workhouse) Committee.

We also find by examining over the accounts for Friends horses for four years before this account, amounted to one year with another to £86 or £87 a year, and that by this last account for 16 or 17 months is charged £166 17s. 6d. besides several horse bills for grass at Richd. Kirtons and others have not yet come in.

[1] For documents in this case see Beck & Ball, *The London Friends' meetings*, 1869, p. 255-256, and *Jnl. F.H.S.*, v (1908), pp. 93-4.

Paid for keeping Horses at Workhouse 2½ years £176 17s. 11d.

The following are to enquire of Friends of Workhouse about their charging 2 pence per night too much, and also to enquire after ye names of those Friends that are paid for and not named, whether they are publick and approved Friends . . .

Friends of the Workhouse Committee lost no time in answering the charges and replied

as for the two pence a night extraordinary for hay, it was in respect to the dearness thereof and if we had not charged the said two pence the House would have been losers. We always take care to buy the best Hay and Corn of which they had plenty, and we have reason to believe that many country Friends are sensible of it by the improvement of their horses while here, and we are informed that almost all Inns advanced from said 8d. to 10d. when we advanced. As for the grass, considering the charge of Hay when they come in and out of the stable, and our trouble in sending them out, although we pay but sixpence per night for grass, all being computed there is but little gained, and we hope that Friends will not be dissatisfied with the account and we shall take care for time to come to charge none without the names of the owners.

The stir up about the charges at the Workhouse also called forth a request from Southwark to be allowed to keep a horse at the Ship Inn, Southwark. The journey across London Bridge and through the City to Clerkenwell and back was long and unnecessary, so Southwark Friends sent a minute "desiring that they may have the Brown Horse which now stands at the Workhouse removed to Southwark it being more convenient for them on that side of the water." The Six Weeks Meeting agreed to a "tryall for 3 months," but added "not that the use of the said horse is limited only for the use of Friends in Southwark."

Two months later Southwark Friends report "The Brown Horse not proving fitt for business, by the advice of Friends was sold for 50/-," and Six Weeks Meeting gave consent for Southwark to buy another horse for the service intended and that they are willing to add £3 to £3 10s. 0d. to the said 50s. plus 20s. for a saddle and bridle. Not only did the brown horse prove inadequate but a mare kept at the Workhouse proving insufficient was sold and was replaced by the gift of another mare from a Friend of New England, who after a visit of several months was returning home to America. But the cost of keeping a horse continued to rise. Nine years later the Workhouse charge had increased to 16d. per day and night, and the Six Weeks Meeting decided that they would

only pay 8d. per night for hay and three quarters of a peck of corn for each horse, if it only stayed a few nights, but if it stayed a week or more then Six Weeks Meeting would allow but half a peck of oats a day after the first week. The whole question was raised, whether it was not more economical to give up keeping a horse and only hiring one when required. Southwark reported that they had found this method the more satisfactory and the Six Weeks Meeting also adopted it. If the journey was only a short way visiting ministers were advised to walk.

In view of the complaint against the Workhouse committee for allowing nameless accounts to appear in their bills for horses it is interesting to note that public Friends protested at having their names appear in the Horse hire account when the audit was made up, so the two Friends in charge of this were told not to disclose the names of public Friends who shall have horses hired for them.

The coming of the railway age proved a mixed blessing. It solved the problem of travelling for Public Friends but the many railway companies which sprang up began casting covetous eyes on Friends' properties. In 1842 the Blackwall Railway acquired for the sum of £2,600 the Pollard and Dickson property in Crutched Friars to erect Fenchurch Street station. In 1846 the Southwark meeting house was threatened by a proposed railway but this did not materialize and it was the construction of Southwark Street which eventually compelled Friends to sell that meeting house. In 1864 Friends learnt that there was a proposal by the East London Railway to construct a line which would pass right through Devonshire House, and at the same time the Metropolitan Railway sought powers to bring an Underground line immediately below Devonshire House. The Chairman of the House of Commons Committee before whom the bills came was Lord Stanley[1] and he paid a visit to Devonshire House. The East London Railway's scheme was dropped and the Metropolitan line was sited so that it did not pass immediately under the meeting house.

In 1869 the Islington Railway tried to obtain powers to build a railway which would have passed through Bunhill Fields burial ground but this too failed. Isleworth was also threatened at one time.

[1] Edward Henry Stanley, later 15th Earl of Derby.

Workhouse and School

The provision of employment for poor Friends was early a concern of Six Weeks Meeting. In 1676 they were buying flax for spinning and weaving, and Friends were urged to encourage this effort by purchasing the cloth and other articles produced. Schools were established, and the possibility of a home for "discomposed and distempered persons" was seriously considered.

In 1702 the Quarterly Meeting supported a scheme for establishing an institution for the accommodation of aged, as well as young necessitous Friends. It became known as the Workhouse, work being provided for all, to employ them in earning their livelihood. Schooling was soon added for the children, but the elderly folk seem to have regarded the children as their personal attendants and this had to be corrected. John Bellers who was the prime mover in the venture had been an active member of the Six Weeks Meeting especially in their scheme for providing flax for spinning. The Committee of the Workhouse sought the help and advice of the Six Weeks Meeting on difficult questions, and in time the Workhouse came to submit its annual accounts to Six Weeks Meeting who often gave it financial assistance. For the erection of the second premises when the Institution was moved to Islington in 1786 the Six Weeks Meeting promoted an annuity scheme, whereby Friends advanced sums from £50 to £200 receiving in return an annuity. Children who ran away were not readmitted more than once, while a woman who sold her bedding and "disguised herself in liquor" was referred to her monthly meeting overseers for disciplinary action. A casual, for whom they felt sorry, though it was very doubtful whether he had any claim on Friends, gave much trouble.

Difficulties with Stewards were a cause of trouble. In 1742 George Reynolds and his wife were dismissed from the position of Steward and Stewardess, but before departing asked for a copy in writing of the reasons of their dismissal and received the following:

> Not only for their repeated disregard to the Committee's orders, but also for the haughty and imperious temper of the Stewardess, which neither private entreaty nor long forebearance were able to soften, much less subdue.

Very different were the Steward and his wife who, "in order

to save the Committee expense, dressed and prepared the food for the children in their own private room and used their own fire."

During the Napoleonic Wars, when expenditure had been particularly heavy, detailed lists of costs were submitted and the number of inmates with the amount and cost of each article was analysed—soap, candles, flour, bread and beer. The increase in the consumption of milk from 34 to 60 quarts was accounted for "owing to Rice puddings being substituted for flour puddings and the children having milk porridge more frequently than formerly." The amount of soap used increased from 18 to 20 lb. weight "owing to girls clothes being washed more frequently." Grocery costs increased from 9s. to 22s. because

> this article has been more used in consequence of sugar being used with the puddings and in beer instead of malt by which there has been a saving of flour to much greater amount.

Malt and hops went up from 7/2d. per bushel to 11/8d. To sum up, the Committee pointed out that the Six Weeks Meeting had not noticed articles on which there had been considerable saving and added:

> It cannot be conceived but that children if they do not have Bread, Meat and Beer in the usual quantity, must have other articles in their place, which appears to account for all the increased Expense and consumption when a due allowance is also made for this—that a smaller family cannot be maintained at the same rate per head as a larger.

In 1698, Six Weeks Meeting, in conjunction with Two Weeks Meeting, prepared a detailed list of harmful practices which tended to bring discredit on our profession and recommend avoidance of the following practices: "Great diners at Marriages. Costly Treats and giving of gloves after the Birth of Children. Too pompous displays and wearing of black at funerals . . ." A minute of 22nd September 1698 reads:

> Sleeping in Meeting is a great fault, a dishonour to our holy profession, a grief and an exercise to all the faithful amongst us which such that are concerned are desired to watch against and to be very sparing both in eating and drinking before they goe to Meeting for the contrary ('tis believed) is one great occasion thereof.

In 1861 an opportunity occurred to obtain an extension

in Bishopsgate to Devonshire House premises. It was suggested that this should be acquired

> that by a judicious adaptation of the property it may be rendered eminently useful not only to Friends of this Quarterly Meeting but to the Society of Friends at large by the formation of rooms adapted for an Institute to supersede the Reading Rooms at Gracechurch Street and afford ample accommodation for Lectures, Class Rooms, Reading Rooms & Refreshment Rooms as well as Dormitories adapted for Young Men engaged in commercial and other persuits in London, also rooms for a Book Depository for the Society, an extensive covered yard for the use in wet weather of Friends attending Yearly Meeting and other meetings. A part may be used for a commodious Boarding House intended principly for the use of Friends, which could be let to a tenant for a considerable rent, and the portion facing Bishopsgate Street could be let as a shop for which a good rent might be obtained.

Not all this was practical, too many objects were mixed together, however, the sale of the lease of Gracechurch Street meeting house back to the Fishmongers Guild for £6,000 enabled part to be carried out. Bookshop, Institute, covered and open courtyard have been reproduced at Friends House. The Boarding House was let to an outside firm but the accommodation for Young Men proved impractical.

By the middle of the eighteenth century the Quaker discipline had become established, and modifications in the activities of the Six Weeks Meeting were taking place. Monthly meetings were more independent. The Quarterly Meeting had taken over many of the disciplinary duties. Meeting for Sufferings was changing from being a body of London Friends who dealt only with Sufferings, to being the Executive of the Society of Friends and consisted of Elders and representatives from a much wider area. The main work of the Six Weeks Meeting today is as managing trustees for the meeting houses and other properties of the six monthly meetings which make up London and Middlesex Quarterly Meeting, and to act as the finance committee of the Quarterly Meeting.

For long periods the Six Weeks Meeting was handicapped by not having a regular source of income. Monthly meetings expected Six Weeks to pay, but they were slack in contributing the necessary funds. It was not until 1745 that a system of Quota contributions from each monthly meeting was instituted. Some forty years later a great effort was made to form a Capital Fund in order to obtain an income which

would make it possible to dispense with annual contributions, but expenditure has always been ahead of income.

The expenditure and income of the six monthly meetings and of the Quarterly Meeting are pooled; thus the more affluent meetings help the less affluent. The Six Weeks Meeting's income from investments is wholly set off against the expenditure of the pooled funds. The amount by which expenditure exceeds income has to be found by contributions from the members of the Quarterly Meeting through their respective monthly meetings to the "Six Weeks Meeting Quota."

GEORGE W. EDWARDS

Tangye MSS.

A SMALL collection of Quaker MSS. of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was purchased for the Quaker Collection at Haverford College in 1963. There are about fifty items, professionally mounted in an album, and numbered in pencil not quite continuously from 2 to 63. The album was once owned by Sir Richard Tangye (1833-1906) then of Coombe Ridge, Kingston Hall, Surrey, for whom see *The Friend* (London) 26 October, 1906, *D.N.B.* Second Supplement, and the autobiography entitled *One and All* and, in a later edition, *The Rise of a Great Industry*. He came from a Quaker family in Cornwall but was himself not a member of the Society. Beside his notable achievements as an engineer he was something of an antiquary, especially as a collector of Cromwelliana. The existence of this collection of MSS. was known to Friends but it was lost sight of.

Nearly all the papers have Yorkshire connections. The largest single group pertains to the early stages of the controversy which later resulted in a separation, because York Quarterly Meeting absolutely forbade remarriage within a year after the death of a spouse. See W. C. Braithwaite, *The Second Period of Quakerism*, 1919, 1961, pp. 475-478. These MSS. include epistles of York Quarterly Meeting (14, 16, 20, 31) of Carleton Monthly Meeting in Coverdale (12, 15) and letters from or to John Blaykling of Draw-well (5, 17, 25, 29, 43), Richard Robinson of Countersett (Counterside) (5, 27, 44, of which the last two are originals with the seals intact) and Philip Swale of Hartforth near Richmond (17, 27, 28, 29, 43, 44) who has copied both his own letters and some of the other pieces in his own hand and is presumably responsible for this part of the collection. He was a lawyer and is known to have copied and collected other Quaker documents, the Swale MSS. (see *J.F.H.S.* v. 1908, pp. 4, 8). There are several letters of George Fox on this and more general subjects. But only that to John Blaykling, London 20th of 8mo. 1683 (40) is not otherwise known. See *Annual Catalogue of George Fox's Papers* 19, 94G. It is in the handwriting of Mark Swanner.

These papers belong in 1683 or a little earlier. Still earlier in authorship are two copies of thirteen questions "to you that

affirm the Scriptures is the way to bring man to know God" (2, 3) by George Fox, Junior, who died in 1661, and a letter from Thomas Salthouse at Plymouth in 1660 to Friends in the North (8). There is a general epistle, 15 day of 1st month 1682 from Robert Sandilands (38). There are two undated statements against tithes from groups of parishioners of Downham and Boulton-upon-Swale (34, 35) in Yorkshire. The numerous signatures I have not identified as all actually Friends of the period but I suspect these were the local results of an appeal like that which Friends made in the spring of 1659 for signers to a petition to Parliament against tithes. I do not remember seeing other papers of the sort, though many must have existed. There were more than 15,000 men including non-Friends, who responded. In a parallel petition from over 7,000 women the names were printed. See Smith *Catalogue of Friends' Books*, ii, 160 and Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism, 1912, 1955*, p. 458.

From early in the eighteenth century there is a letter from Theodore Eccleston to John Cox, the leader of the Quaker secession in Yorkshire, in reply to a confused letter of Cox in which the latter had offered to lend some papers of Rice Jones (30). It was many years since this ex-Friend was mentioned in Quaker records. Copies of the addresses to the sovereign by Friends and the reply on two occasions are given (45, 61) in 1710 and 1714. Cf. J. J. Green, *Souvenir of the Address to King Edward* VII, 1901, pp. 42 and 43. There are some family records of Henry Jackson (1680-1727) written on the back of a frontispiece to a Bible (50). There are also sundry papers connected with York Quarterly Meeting, London Yearly Meeting and various local Yorkshire meetings of Friends but none later than 1770 (48).

HENRY J. CADBURY

Seventeenth-Century Quaker Marriages in Ireland

CORK Men's Minutes provide an interesting illustration of church co-operation in the year 1683. The following extract is taken from the Minutes of 3rd, 11th month that year.

"It being mentioned to this meeting by some Friends that the Register of the Bishop's Court of Cork did inform them that the present Bishop of Cork observing some favour Extended by the Council Table at Dublin towards the Papists in reference to their Marriages, that though they were not done according to the rules of the English Clergie, yet they should be owned Lawful upon causing a record to be made in the Registers office of the Bishops Court; upon which the said Bishop according as the register have informed John Haman, did say, why might the Quakers Marriages be made Lawfull that way, as well as the Papists? and with all signified to the Register his willingness thereunto. The said register having informed some Friends thereof and that if friends will cause an entry of their marriages after Consumation, to be made in his office, It shall be done and Approved of by them. The most of this Meeting thinking Well of it, have Left it to Francis Rogers and John Haman to go to the said Register and further inform themselves hereof, and unless they saw something in the relation of it that may be inconsistant will treat to close with him in it."

No further entry occurs on the subject until 24th, 1st month 1687, when the following is recorded:

"The Bishop of Corke having lately spoake to Francis Rogers that his register should record our marriages in his office, paying him his fee and it appearing there was an order in this book the 3. 11.mo. 83. Leaving the further understanding thereof to Francis Rogers and John Hamans enquiry. Its now desired the sd. Francis and Jon Haman may go again and enquire of the sd. Register whether they will record the certificates fully as we see fit to draw it (in our own book) and will indorse on the back of the Certificate that the same was examined and recorded and allowed of by him or them, and also whether they will leave friends to

their liberty that in case anyone might not have freedom to have their marriage so entered they shall not be troubled for it nor summoned by apparator But such as are willing to have the marriage so entered will pay as accustomed for it. That when they have thus informed themselves are to give an account to next mens Meeting."

It will be recalled that the Bishop of Cork at this period was Edward Wetenhall (1636-1713) who was bishop of the diocese of Cork and Ross from 1679 until his translation to Kilmore and Ardagh in 1699. *The Dictionary of National Biography* notices that he was one of the seven bishops who remained in Ireland during the troubles which began in 1688, being exposed to much ill-usage at the hands of the partisans of James II. As early as 1682 he is said to have advocated concessions to the dissenters, and perhaps his approach to Cork Friends falls in with his policy in that respect.

In 1698 Wetenhall entered into controversy with Friends in answer to "Gospel-truths held and briefly declared by the people called Quakers," dated from Dublin, 14.iii.1698, and signed by William Penn, Thomas Story, Anthony Sharp and George Rooke. William Penn wrote a *Defence* (1698, 2 editions, Wing P. 1273, 1274) and Wetenhall answered with *A brief and modest reply to Mr. Penn's tedious, scurrilous* and *unchristian Defence* (1699, Wing W. 1489), to which Thomas Wight and Nicholas Harris replied (as Penn was in Pennsylvania at the time) with *Truth further defended, and William Penn vindicated* (1700, W. 2108). In 1710 he drew up a memorial to the Lord Lieutenant, urging the need of providing "books of religion" in the Irish language.

OLIVE C. GOODBODY

Reports on Archives

The National Register of Archives (Historical Manuscripts Commission) *List of accessions to repositories in 1962* (Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1963), reports the following additions to the manuscript collections in various institutions which may interest workers on Quaker history.

Birmingham University Library, Edgbaston, Birmingham, 15.

Single letters and small groups: John Bright; 45 letters to George and Elizabeth Cadbury.

Brotherton Collection, The Brotherton Library, The University, Leeds, 2.

3 letters, with poems, of Bernard Barton, Quaker poet (1784-1849), 1833, 1843, 1845.

Cumberland, Westmorland and Carlisle Record Office, The Castle, Carlisle.

Katherine Marshall (Suffragette and Fabian): letters, papers; corresp. about conscientious objectors, conditions in army camps, 1914-18.

Derbyshire Record Office, County Offices, Matlock.

Margaret Howitt: corresp. concerning literary works of parents, William and Mary Howitt, and current topics, 1925-29.

Gloucestershire Records Office, Shire Hall, Gloucester.

Society of Friends: copy registers of births, marriages, burials, 17c.-1837; deeds, Broad Campden meeting house, 1664-1896. Danvers (Thornbury): deeds, Alveston, 1561-1728; corresp., accts. of Danvers, Ward, Yeates families of Bristol, Swainswick from 1708.

Herefordshire County Record Office, Shirehall, Hereford.

Society of Friends: Leominster Orphan Homes, minute book, 1938-1951.

Hertfordshire Record Office, County Hall, Hertford.

Society of Friends: Knebworth P.M., minute, 1926-36; Woolmer Green P.M., minutes and accts., 1936-38.

Imperial College Archives, Imperial College of Science and Technology, 13 Princes Gardens, London, S.W.7.

Silvanus P. Thompson (addnl.); further corresp. and papers, incl. letters from Faraday, Lord Kelvin, Sir Joseph Swan, Count Volta and others (*c.* 400 letters).

National Library of Scotland (Department of Manuscripts), Edinburgh, 1.

Letters: John Bright.

National Library of Wales (Department of Manuscripts), Aberystwyth, Cardiganshire.

Letter: John Bright, 1887.

Nottingham Public Libraries, Central Library, South Sherwood Street, Nottingham.

Society of Friends: Notts. and Derbyshire meeting records, 1591-1940.

Lincolnshire Archives Committee. Archivists' report, 14. 21st March 1962 to 18th March 1963.

Deposited records (account on pp. 11-12) of the following: 2 Brace, summarized under the following headings:

Copies of bishops' transcripts, many collated with parish registers, typewritten, and sometimes indexed.

Notes and extracts for the history of Quakerism.

Notes and extracts on the history of Gainsborough. 12 vols.

The summary of documents collected by Howard Brace (who died 2 October 1962) connected with his edition of Gainsborough M.M. minutes, 1669-1719 (published by the Lincoln Record Society, 1948-51) and projected historical work on Lincolnshire Friends is preceded by an account of his work and some of the main interest in the collection.

The 6th general report of the City Archivist (Newcastle upon Tyne City Archives), for October 1962 to December 1963, reports that the records of "Newcastle Quarterly Meeting" had been taken into the office for fumigation and treatment, and some progress had been made in microfilming them. The address of the City Archives Office is 7, Saville Place, Newcastle upon Tyne, 1.

The following items in the schedule of accessions are noted:

DD33 The Society of Friends (Newcastle Monthly Meeting): Bundle of deeds relating to the Quakers Meeting House in Pilgrim Street, 1600-1697.

DD20/6 The Town Clerk: Bundle of deeds relating to the site of the Society of Friends Meeting House in Pilgrim Street, 1697-1937.

Microfilm accessions. MA 12-35. Archives of the Society of Friends (Quakers), Newcastle Monthly Meeting. Originals in custody of the Monthly Meeting, Quaker Meeting House, Jesmond Road, Newcastle upon Tyne, 2. Includes—Minutes of Monthly Meetings, including those held at Durham, North and South Shields and Benfieldside, 1675-1931; Birth and Burial and Marriage Notes, 1660-1955; Registers of Members 1741-1907.

Recent Publications

Isaac Hicks: New York Merchant and Quaker, 1767-1820. By Robert A. Davidson (No. 22 of Harvard Studies in Business History). Harvard University Press (Oxford University Press), 1964. pp. xiii, 217; 5 plates.

Unlike his cousin and contemporary Elias Hicks, Isaac Hicks is not a Friend prominent in Quaker annals. But the fortunate survival of a large collection of letters and business records relating to this New York merchant has enabled a very interesting biography of him to be written, which, besides describing his business activities, discusses in some detail the way in which his Quakerism influenced his business career. The close links existing between Friends in commerce at the beginning of the 19th Century are well brought out.

The Quakers in Puritan England. By Hugh Barbour. Yale University Press, 1964. pp. xviii, 272. 45s.

Some Quaker historians in the past have appeared to have little knowledge of the Puritan background in which Quakerism came to life. This was excusable, as there was no compendious treatment of Puritanism, in its relation to Quakerism, readily available. It will be less excusable now; for this book is a mine of information on the subject, dealing not only with the theological aspects, but also with such matters as the Quaker testimonies, behaviour, and way of life.

It is part of the author's thesis that the elements of "newness" in the Quaker 17th century movement should "neither be exaggerated nor undervalued," to use the phrase in Roland Bainton's foreword. The steering of the correct middle course between these is one of the most difficult tasks of the historian of early Quakerism. This cannot be accomplished simply by an analysis of similarities and differences, as they appear to us 300 years later; it is necessary also to assess, with as much historical insight as we can attain to, how important they appeared in the eyes of contemporaries, both Friends themselves and their opponents. In endeavouring to make such assessments the material in this book will be of great value.

* * *

Among the collections noticed in an article in *Archives*, vol. 6, no. 30, Michaelmas 1963, p. 95-107, entitled "Collections of English historical manuscripts in the Huntington Library," by Jean Preston, may be noticed the papers and letters of Thomas Clarkson (dealing with anti-slavery movements), and the correspondence and papers of Richard Shackleton (1728-92), the master of the school of Ballitore [purchased at Sotheby's on 22 June 1953].

Notes and Queries

State Papers

The 2nd volume of the *Calendar of State Papers . . . Domestic series, James II* (H.M. Stationery Office, 1964) covers the period from January 1686 to May 1687. The volume records various warrants, petitions and accounts concerning the imprisonment of Friends and orders for their release, the King "being pleased to extend his favour to those of that persuasion." Among the cases recorded is a petition from Mary, Lady Rodes, of Barlborough Hall for the release of her Quaker steward, and the petition from John Osgood, William Ingram, George Whitehead and Gilbert Latye on behalf of over 100 Bristol Quaker prisoners (April 1686).

Registers

"Nonconformist registers," by Edwin Welch, an article in the *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, vol. 2, no. 9 (April 1964), pp. 411-417, includes an historical account of the various registers compiled by bodies not in unity with the established church from the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries. References to Friends' registers are backed by the authority of William Charles Braithwaite's *Beginnings of Quakerism*.

Sunday Travel

"The opposition to Sunday rail services in north-eastern England 1834-1914," an article by David Brooke in *The journal of transport history*, vol. 6, no. 2 (Nov. 1963), pp. 95-109, notes that there was no single religious denomination behind Sabbatarianism in the area, but that Quakers were in the lead in south Durham.

The Apothecaries' Company

A history of the Worshipful Society of Apothecaries of London, vol. 1, 1617-1815. Abstracted and arranged from the manuscript notes of Cecil Wall by H. Charles Cameron. Revised, annotated, and edited by E. Ashworth Underwood (Oxford University Press, 1963, 55s.) contains some brief mention of Dr. Fothergill, of William Cookworthy of Plymouth who broke the company's monopoly and supplied drugs to the naval hospital ship *Rupert*, 1755, and William Curtis (1746-1799) founder of the *Botanical magazine* who for five years from 1772 served at the Physic Garden at Chelsea as Demonstrator of Plants.

Birmingham Friends

The Victoria History continues its measured way. A recent volume, *Warwick*, vol. 7 deals with the City of Birmingham (1964), and contains (pp. 455-58) three pages of lists of Friends' meeting houses and adult schools, and historical notes concerning them. In the general sphere this volume has considerable wider interest for Friends as the sections on economic and social and political and administrative history take note of the contributions of the Cadbury and Sturge families to the development of the city.

Cornish Quakers

Mary Coate's *Cornwall in the great civil war and interregnum*, 1642-1660, reprinted in 1963 (Truro, D. Bradford Barton Ltd.) after thirty years, includes a solid well-documented six-page account of the rise and persecution of Friends before the Stuart Restoration.

Bristol Quaker Merchants

A register of the members of the Bristol Society of Merchant Venturers appears in W. E. Minchinton's "Politics and the port of Bristol in the 18th century" (Bristol Record Society, vol. 23, 1963). It includes the names of members of the families of Harford (although Charles Harford was rejected as a member in 1711 "he being a professed Quaker"), Jones, Hort, Coysgarne, Lloyd, Rogers, Champion, Day, Graffin Prankard, William Reeve.

Fenny Drayton

"Early nonconformity in Leicestershire," an article by C. E. Welch in the *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archæological and Historical Society*, vol. 37, 1961-2, pp. 29-43, has notice of traces of nonconformity in the parish of Fenny Drayton which had a long tradition of puritanism. The rector during George Fox's early years was Robert Mason, one suspected of Presbyterian sympathies, and he was succeeded in 1638 by Nathaniel Stephens—the Priest Stephens of Fox's *Journal*.

Frenchay Friends

Dorothy Vinter has produced a pamphlet history of *The Friends' Meeting House, Frenchay* (1963, paper covers, 16 pages) which might well serve as a pattern for similar publications. Four illustrations from the National Buildings Record photographs show the exterior and interior of the present meeting house (built 1809, with additions in 1814). This building replaced an original one built in 1673, just short of twenty years after the first Friends came to the hamlet.

Hangleton, Sx.

Sussex archæological collections, vol. 101 (1963) includes the first part of a paper on "Excavations at the deserted medieval village of Hangleton." In the course of the historical introduction, which traces the development of the settlement and its growth until the beginning of the 14th century and decline thereafter, reference is made to Horsfield's *History and antiquities of Sussex*, 1835, to support the statement that "In 1724, five families are recorded as living in the parish of Hangleton, most of them Quakers."

Helmsley and Bilsdale, Yorks.

Ten pages in a locally produced local history are devoted to the rise and fall of the Quaker movement. The meetings concerned were those of Helmsley (in the valley of the Rye in the North Riding of Yorkshire) and Bilsdale (Laskill). The members of the Helmsley and Area Group of the Yorkshire Archæological Society have used the local documents (both Quaker and non-Quaker) and are to be congratulated on producing a fully documented local history of which the inhabitants can be proud. (York, Stonegate Press, 1963).

Kent Friends

In the course of an article entitled "Dissenting churches in Kent before 1700," (*Journal of ecclesiastical history*, vol. 14, no. 2, Oct. 1963, 175-189) Dr. Geoffrey Nuttall uses evidence from Quaker sources to fill in his picture of the 17th century nonconformist bodies in the county. Records of the ministerial work of William Caton, John Stubbs, Ambrose Rigge and Luke Howard are mentioned, and at one point Dr. Nuttall notes that *First Publishers of Truth* provides a record of two Congregational churches not otherwise known.

Quakers in Norwich Diocese, 1669

C. B. Jewson's "Return of conventicles in Norwich Diocese, 1669—Lambeth MS. no. 639" (*Norfolk archæology*, vol. 33, pp. 6-34, 1962) is accounted to include notices of 21 Quaker meetings, a quarter of the total number returned. Norfolk and Suffolk did not necessarily include that number of weekly Friends' meetings however, since some are specifically noted as being held at longer intervals. The editor has used A. J. Eddington's *First 50 years of Quakerism in Norwich* to good effect in his notes.

Radnorshire Quakers, 1829

The National Library of Wales Journal, vol. 13, no. 2 (Winter 1963), pp. 204-208, includes a note by G. Milwyn Griffiths, in which he recites the returns made in answer to a resolution of the House of Commons of 19 June 1829 to compile the number of places of worship which did not belong to the Church of England in every parish, as recorded in letters from incumbents preserved in the Radnorshire Quarter Sessions records at the National Library of Wales.

The following items mention Quakers.

Cascob.
No meeting house. Two parishioners who were Quakers attended a place of worship in the parish of Llandegley.

Llandegley.
"One place of worship . . . which belongs to the Quakers; the number of that sect in our parish is eight persons . . ."

Shropshire Registers

"Aspects of the demographic situation in seventeen parishes in Shropshire 1711-60. An exercise based on parish registers," by Sølvi Sogner, an article in *Population studies*, November 1963 (vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 126-146), is based on registers of Coalbrookdale (the parishes of Barrow, Benthall, Broseley, Buildwas, Dawley, Kemberton, Leighton, Lilleshall, Madeley, Shifnal, Stirchley, Sutton Maddock, Willey, Little Wenlock, Wellington, Wombridge, and Wrockwardine). It is unfortunate that the author found Quaker registers (PRO. Shropshire Monthly Meeting. No. 703, 705, 707) "so scanty, and the geographical location of the entries so dubious, that they have been excluded." The author assumes that 84 baptisms(!), 2 marriages and 39 burials are from the chosen district in 1711-60; the majority from Coalbrookdale —75 baptisms and 35 burials in Madeley.

York Retreat

Three hundred years of psychiatry, 1535-1860—a history presented in selected English texts, by Richard Hunter and Ida MacAlpine (Oxford University Press, 1963), includes (as well as the predictable Samuel Tuke) passages by Francis Mercurius van Helmont on shock treatment by ducking, Benjamin Rush of Pennsylvania Hospital, accounts of various local asylums like Dr. Fox's at Bridlington, and the work of doctors like James Cowles Prichard. A seven-page account and extract from the *Description of the Retreat* (1813) sets the work there in its background, and gives reference for any who wish to go further.

The Linen Industry

The industrial archæology of County Down, by E. R. R. Green (Belfast, H. M. Stationery Office, 1963), deals with old linen sites, mills of other sorts, windmills, the Newry and the Lagan navigations, harbours and lighthouses and railway stations. In this handsome new departure into publication on a new subject, the author acknowledges the help he has received from pedigrees of Quaker linen families from Col. J. R. H. Greeves, and a brief glance at the contents of the book reveals a good many Quaker names in this field. Calling for particular mention are Joseph Nicholson's early spinning mill at Bessbrook; the Banville mills of the McClelland family, and the Clibborns (originally from Co. Westmeath); the Moyallon works (Richardsons, Christy, and Wakefield); the Kiltonga bleachworks in Milecross Townland (Bradshaw family).

Cork Friends and Social Welfare

"Some chapters of Cork medical history," by N. Marshall Cummins (Cork University Press, 1957), includes some references to Friends. As early as 1836 the temperance movement in the city of Cork was headed by Quaker William Martin "an elderly and eccentric shopkeeper" but the work made little headway until Father Mathew took up the cause and founded the Cork Total Abstinence Society.

There is some horrifying evidence of conditions in and around Cork during the Famine, and in one quotation the death is mentioned of Abraham Beale on 12 August, 1847. He died of a fever. "He was Secretary to the Friends' Relief Committee in Cork and had travelled throughout the county distributing relief in money and food."

The name of Cooper Penrose (married Elizabeth Dennis at Cork, 1763) appears as a vice-president of the first committee of the Cork Fever Hospital, opened in 1802.

The Scotch-Irish

"A settlement of five families from the North of Ireland gives me more trouble than fifty of any other people" so wrote James Logan, Secretary of Pennsylvania, and the turbulence of the settlers who came out to the American colonies in the 18th century from an impoverished Ulster, has been recorded before. Professor James G. Leyburn of Washington and Lee University has produced a readable and satisfying social history covering the three aspects of the development of this body of immigrants

which made a large contribution in the development of the American frontier and rugged frontier philosophy—"The Scot in 1600," "The Scots in Ireland," and "The Scotch-Irish in America."

Professor Leyburn notes that James Logan actually invited the first group of his "brave" fellow-countrymen to settle in Pennsylvania because he apprehended trouble from the Northern Indians. Logan later changed his views but the contribution of the Scotch-Irish to American life is considerable, and as many as ten Presidents of the United States have been claimed as of Scotch-Irish ancestry. (James G. Leyburn, *The Scotch-Irish*, University of North Carolina Press, 1962.)

Quakers in Massachusetts

A sidelight on the persecution of Friends is given in an article in "The William and Mary quarterly," 3rd series, vol. 20, October 1963, pp. 513-526, by George D. Langdon, jr., entitled "The franchise and political democracy in Plymouth Colony." The author notices that Plymouth never admitted Quakers to citizenship, and disfranchised persons who displayed any sympathy for Friends, but in the 1660s they seem to have gained tacit permission to live in the colony.

New England Friends

Carl Bridenbaugh's *Mitre and Sceptre: transatlantic faiths, ideas, personalities, and politics 1689-1775* (Oxford University Press, 1962) is largely concerned with the gradual extension of the influence of the Church of England in the American colonies. In passing, the author mentions Quakers; as well as attending to developments in Pennsylvania he brings to notice New England Friends' appeal to London Meeting for Sufferings, and the latter's advances to the nonconformist leaders in the capital to bring influence on their brethren in Massachusetts to ease the legal restrictions on dissenters in the province in 1703.

Quaker Poets

Harold S. Jantz: *The first century of New England verse* (New York, Russell & Russell, 1962, copyright 1943) has the following notes:

George Joy, mariner. A Quaker, probably English. Innocency's Complaint against Tyrannical Court Faction in Newengland. 10 lines, broadside, MHS, signed George Joy, Mariner, 1677, protesting the persecution of the Quakers in New England. The MHS broadside was, to judge from paper and type, obviously printed in the late 18th or early 19th century, though Ford and other bibliographers fail to mention this fact. Apparently no contemporaneous copy is known, though one certainly existed, for John Whiting, in his *Truth and Innocency Defended* (London, 1702), quoted extensively from the poem "in a paper lately come to my hands," a common way at the time of referring to a broadside. (p. 225)

Edward Wharton (-1677), a Quaker Merchant of Salem, Mass.

1. "Although our Bodyes here in silent Earth do lie" couplet, in his *New England's Present Suffering under their*

Cruel Neighbouring Indians (London, 1675). Verses placed by him over the graves of the Quakers executed and buried in Boston.

2. "Beware, beware, and enter not!" verses affixed to the meeting house in Salem, 2 lines quoted in the *Magnalia*, vol. 2, p. 566; by "a noted Quaker there," not certainly but very possibly Wharton. (p. 274)

Tennyson on John Bright

T. G. Pinney's edition of the *Essays of George Eliot* (Routledge, 1963, 45s.) reproduces George Eliot's unfavourable review of Tennyson's *Maud, and other poems* which appeared in the *Westminster Review* for October 1855. In the course of the essay George Eliot accuses Tennyson of snobbishness, and continues:

> "The gall presently overflows, as gall is apt to do, without any visible sequence of association, on Mr. Bright, who is denounced as:
>
> This broad-brimm'd hawker of holy things,
> Whose ear is stuft with his cotton, and rings
> Even in dreams to the chink of his pence.
>
> In a second edition of 'Maud,' we hope these lines will no longer appear on Tennyson's page . . ."

A footnote recalls that Tennyson said later that he did not know at the time that Bright was a Quaker and that the words were written not "against Quakers but against peace-at-all-price men." However, the end of the Crimean War did not cause Tennyson to expunge the lines, as George Eliot had hoped, but merely to substitute "cramm'd" for "stuft" in the accepted text which appeared at the end of the century in the Globe Edition of his complete works.

The Elam Family

A Leeds doctoral dissertation (Ph.D., 1964) on "Leeds woollen merchants, 1700-1830," by Richard George Wilson includes some notices on Friends in the borough. The author notes that "The Quakers in Leeds were a small, but influential group after 1770. The Elams, Bensons, and after 1800, the Peases were all prominent merchant families. Pym Nevins was an early large-scale merchant-manufacturer." In a biographical appendix Dr. Wilson deals with the family of Gervase Elam (1679-1771) as follows:

Elam, Gervaise (1679-1771). A prominent Quaker clothier. Four sons, all of them eventually merchants in Leeds:

1. John Elam (d. 1789). Described as a tobacconist 1744. Through importing tobacco from America began to export cloth across the Atlantic. An early pioneer of the American cloth trade, where the Elam family made their fortune after 1760. Retired from business some years before his death.
2. Emmanuel Elam (d. 1796). Like his brother, concerned in the American trade. Retired from trade with upwards of £100,000. In 1795 purchased a 5,500 acre estate near Malton with his brother Samuel, and Isaac Leatham, a fellow-Quaker and model farmer. His will was fiercely contested for over 20 years after his death.

3. Samuel Elam (d. 1797). Described as "grocer" in 1750, but became a merchant by 1770. In 1772 married daughter of William Greenwood of Hatfield She had a reputed fortune of £5,000.

Succeeded by his son Samuel (d. 1811) who joined his fellow-Quaker merchant, William Thompson, to form a bank in Leeds around 1800. Purchased half the Roundhay estate in 1800, but continued to live in Leeds. In dire financial difficulties in 1810; died the following year.

4. Joseph Elam. Merchant, declared bankrupt 1769.

This family concerned in exporting cloth, shipowning, land speculation and banking between 1780-1810; quickly fell from prominence after Samuel Elam's virtual bankruptcy in 1810.

William Erbury

"Two roads to the Puritan millennium: William Erbury and Vavasor Powell," by Alfred Cohen of Trenton State College, an article in *Church History*, vol. 32, no. 3 (Sept. 1963), concerns the development of William Erbury in the last years of his life advancing towards a position later identified with that taken up by Quakers. The author notes that Dorcas Erbury was with Nayler in 1656.

A comment by John F. Wilson draws the conclusion that before 1659 Friends did not dissociate themselves from the state and from politics.

William Grimshaw of Haworth

Frank Baker's biography of William Grimshaw, 1708-1763, clergyman of Haworth in Yorkshire and precursor of the evangelical revival, has a short account of Grimshaw's relations with the Stanbury Quakers—a hamlet where Friends had all but died out but where in the middle of the 18th century an annual general meeting was held. William Grimshaw suggested that these meetings were occasions for riotous and unseemly behaviour by many who came out of curiosity, which might be avoided if they were held more frequently. The author quotes two letters from Grimshaw printed in the *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, vol. 10, pp. 206-207. (Epworth Press, 1963, 45s.)

J. J. Gurney

James A. Rawley, professor of history in Sweet Briar College, contributes an article on "Joseph John Gurney's mission to America, 1837-1840" to *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, vol. 49, no. 4 (March 1963), p. 653-674. The article is based largely on the manuscript letters and journal (deposited at Friends House Library); it was written and accepted for publication before the appearance of David Swift's biography (reviewed in a 1962 number of the *Journal F.H.S.*, p. 82).

John Barton Hack

John Barton Hack's Diary, now in the South Australian Archives, provides some information concerning Sir John Jeffcott, the colonial judge, duellist and graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, who slept on the sofa during the voyage on the *Isabella*, the ship

which took the Hack family and its belongings on the way to settle in Van Diemen's Land in 1836. See page 60 of *Sir John Jeffcott*, by R. M. Hague (Melbourne University Press, 1963).

Reuben Harvey of Cork

A footnote to p. 297 of *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. 21, no. 2 (April 1964), in an article by Ernest J. Moyne, entitled: "The Reverend William Hazlitt: a friend of liberty in Ireland during the American Revolution," mentions Reuben Harvey, a Quaker merchant in Cork, an acquaintance of Hazlitt. Reuben Harvey worked on behalf of the American prisoners in distress in Ireland. The author mentions that Washington wrote to Harvey, and the Congress passed a resolution thanking him for his services. Reference is given to the *Journal of the Cork Historical & Archæological Society*, 2nd series, vol. 2, pp. 89-90 (1896).

John Stuart Mill

The earlier letters of John Stuart Mill, 1812-1848, edited by Francis E. Mineka (volumes 12 & 13 of the *Collected Works* of John Stuart Mill, Routledge, 1964, 126s. the set) includes letters written to Robert Barclay Fox and Robert Were Fox, together with notes from Caroline Fox's Diary.

In a letter from Kensington, 23rd December 1840, to Robert Were Fox, Mill comments on the *Testimony to the authority of Christ in his Church, and to the spirituality of the Gospel Dispensation; also, against some of the corruptions of professing Christendom*, signed by George Stacey, clerk to London Yearly Meeting, 1840. Mill wrote: (vol. 14, p. 453)

> "The Testimony of the Yearly Meeting I have read with great interest & though I had read several similar documents before I do not remember any in which the peculiarities of the Society in reference to the questions of Church Government &c. which agitate the present day, are so pointedly stated & so vigorously enforced."

In a later letter to the same recipient, dated from the India House, 6th May 1841 (vol. 14, p. 474), Mill answered a question about capital punishment, and said:

> "I do hold that society has or rather that Man has a right to take away life when without doing so he cannot protect rights of his own as sacred as the 'divine right to live.' But I would confine the right of inflicting death to cases in which it was certain that no other punishment or means of prevention would have the effect of protecting the innocent against atrocious crimes, & I very much doubt whether any such cases exist."

At this time it seems Robert Barclay Fox was writing an essay on the subject, but there is no record of its publication.

Joseph Priestley

> "With respect to miscellaneous reading, I was pretty well supplied by means of a library belonging to Mr. S Alexander, a Quaker, to which I had the freest access. Here it was that I was first acquainted with any person of that persuasion; and I must acknowledge my obligation to many of

them in every future stage of my life. I have met with the noblest instances of liberality of sentiment, and the truest generosity, among them."

The above extract from Joseph Priestley's *Memoirs*, appears in Ira V. Brown's edition of *Selections* from the writings of Joseph Priestley (Penna. State University Press, 1962). It refers to the period of Priestley's first pastorate at Needham Market in Suffolk in the years 1755 to 1758.

Captain Stephen Rich

Documents relating to the Civil War, 1642-1648, edited by J. R. Powell and E. K. Timings (Navy Records Society, vol. 105, 1963), include papers which record the service of Stephen Rich in command of the merchant ship *Rebecca*, on the summer and winter guards during the years 1644 to 1645 on the Irish squadron (1646 summer, stationed at Chester).

"Simon Stukeley, quaker"

"In Quest of a Quaker: a Note on Henry Savery's *Nom de Plume*," by Cecil Hadgraft, appears in *Australian Literary Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, June 1963, pp. 57-58. It attempts to trace the original source of the pen-name adopted by Henry Savery, the convict-author, 1791-1842, who wrote a series of thirty essays under the name of "Simon Stukeley" during the time of his imprisonment, 1829.

The author has found the following entry in West's *History of Tasmania*, 1852:

"The original Simon Stukeley was a quaker, who went to Turkey with an intention of converting the Grand Turk: he narrowly escaped decapitation, by the interposition of the English ambassador. He was afterwards confined in an asylum, in answer to inquiries how he came there, he replied —'I said the world was mad, and the world said I was mad; and they out-voted me.'"

The tentative suggestion is made that Stukeley is a corruption of Buckley, one of the party who set out to visit the Grand Turk in 1658 (see Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*).

Voltaire

Voltaire and the Gentleman's Magazine, 1731-1868. An index compiled by J. A. R. Séguin (New York, Ross Paxton, 1962), lists the following references to Quakers in the *Gentleman's Magazine:* August 1733, pp. 424-425, 443-444; Feb. 1741, p. 112; December 1768, pp. 556-558. In the 1733 issue is an announcement of the publication of Voltaire's *Letters concerning the English nation* (on Quakers and others). The February 1741 issue carried an announcement of publication of Josiah Martin's *Letter* concerning the foregoing work by Voltaire.

Interest in this subject continued, for the December 1768 issue had a new English translation of one of the letters, entitled "Voltaire's account of the religion of the Quakers."

Index

THE JOURNAL

OF THE

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOLUME L

1962-64

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

HEADLEY BROTHERS LTD
109 Kingsway London WC2
and Ashford Kent

Contents

Supplements to the Journal of Friends' Historical Society

7. THOMAS POLE, M.D. (1753-1829). By E. T. Wedmore. 1908. 53 pp., 10s. 6d., post 9d.

8-11. EXTRACTS FROM STATE PAPERS relating to Friends, 1654-1672. Ed. N. Penney. 1910-13. 4 parts. 365 pp., 21s., post 1s. 6d.

12. ELIZABETH HOOTON, First Quaker woman preacher (1600-1672). By Emily Manners. 1914. 95 pp., 10s. 6d., post 9d.

13. TORTOLA. By C. F. Jenkins. 1923. 106 pp., 10s. 6d., post 9d.

14. Record of the SUFFERINGS OF FRIENDS IN CORNWALL, 1655-1686. 1928. 152 pp., 15s., post 9d.

15. QUAKER LANGUAGE. F.H.S. Presidential address by T. Edmund Harvey. 1928. 30 pp., 5s., post 3d.

16-17. PEN PICTURES OF LONDON YEARLY MEETING, 1789-1833. Ed. Norman Penney. 1930. 227 pp., 25s., post 1s.

21. AN ORATOR'S LIBRARY. John Bright's books. Presidential address 1936 by J. Travis Mills. 1946. 24 pp., 2s., post 3d.

22. LETTERS TO WILLIAM DEWSBURY AND OTHERS. Edited by Henry J. Cadbury. 1948. 68 pp., 8s., post 3d.

23. SLAVERY AND "THE WOMAN QUESTION." Lucretia Mott's Diary. 1840. By F. B. Tolles. 1952. 7s. 6d., cloth 12s. 6d., post 6d.

24. THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY OF THE EARLY FRIENDS. Presidential address by Frederick B. Tolles, 1952. 3s. 6d., post 3d.

25. JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER, The Quaker. By C. Marshall Taylor. 1954. 3s. 6d., post 3d.

26. JAMES NAYLER, A FRESH APPROACH. By Geoffrey F. Nuttall, D.D. 1954. 2s. 6d., post 3d.

27. THOMAS RUDYARD, EARLY FRIENDS' "ORACLE OF LAW." By Alfred W. Braithwaite. 1956. 2s. 6d., post 3d.

28. PATTERNS OF INFLUENCE IN ANGLO-AMERICAN QUAKERISM. By Thomas E. Drake. 1958. 1s. 6d., post 3d.

29. SOME QUAKER PORTRAITS, CERTAIN AND UNCERTAIN. By John Nickalls. 1958. Illustrated. 3s. 6d., post 4d.

30. "INWARD AND OUTWARD." A study of Early Quaker Language. By Maurice A. Creasey. 1962. 3s. 6d., post 4d.

Journals and Supplements Wanted

F.H.S. would be glad to receive unwanted copies of back issues of the *Journal* and of the Supplements. Address to F.H.S., c/o The Library, Friends House, London, N.W.1.

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 Officer
THE FRIENDS' PROVIDENT & CENTURY INSURANCE OFFICES

Pixham End, Dorking, Surrey

PRINTED BY HEADLEY BROTHERS LTD 109 KINGSWAY LONDON WC2 AND ASHFORD KENT