

THE JOURNAL
OF THE
FRIENDS' HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

VOLUME FORTY-TWO

NUMBER ONE

1950

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

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

Price 5s. Yearly 10s.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

The present membership of the Friends' Historical Society does not provide sufficient income to enable the Society to do its work as effectively as it desires.

Documents and articles of historical interest remain unpublished, and at least 50 more annual subscriptions are needed.

The Committee therefore appeals to members and others interested to:

- (1) Secure new subscribers.
- (2) Pay 10s. for the Journal to be sent as a gift to someone.
- (3) Pay a larger annual subscription than the present minimum of 10s.
- (4) Send a donation independent of the subscription.

The Society does important and valuable work, but it can only continue to do so if it is supplied with more funds.

Contributions should be sent to the Secretary, Friends House.

ALFRED B. SEARLE,
President.

Contents

	PAGE
Editorial	I
Thomas Shillitoe. <i>T. Edmund Harvey</i>	3
Researches in Progress	16
Quakerism and Democracy. <i>Emilia Fogelklou</i> <i>Norlind</i>	17
Some Whittier First Editions. <i>C. Marshall Taylor</i>	41
<i>Quaker Social History.</i> (Review)	46
Notes and Queries	47

THE JOURNAL

OF THE

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

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

Communications should be addressed to the Editor at
Friends House.

Announcement

The next annual meeting will be held on Thursday, 6th July, at 6.15 p.m. at Friends House, when Alfred B. Searle will deliver his presidential address entitled "Friends and Arbitration."

Officers for 1951—two will be appointed at this meeting.

* * * *

Local History

QUAKER historians are always likely to be amateurs rather than professionals. This has certain advantages which everyone must appreciate. The Friend who lives and moves among members of his local meeting has unparalleled opportunities to observe and record the customs and traditions current among Friends; he has more opportunities to study the local records, and possesses the local knowledge which can readily appreciate the significance of the material he finds there. On the other hand his outlook may be restricted in historical matters through lack of knowledge of comparable periods of political, social and Friends' national history. This may cause him to give undue emphasis to the commonplace events of Quaker studies—the regularity of the records, the care for the local poor, the method and amounts of collections, the discipline exercised in cases of delinquency—and to overlook or fail to appreciate any significant local variation from normal practice. He may also pass over the fields of activity in which preparative and monthly meeting are met by quarterly and yearly meeting, and may not sense the interest to be found in relating and comparing local phenomena with national trends of development among Friends.

To overcome this the amateur, as the professional before him, must read widely. Before embarking on a local study he should have read a history of Quakerism, be acquainted with the standard general

histories of Quakerism in so far as they illustrate his subject and bear on local events, and have read the local histories of the district which he desires to cover. In the course of his studies the historian may find special topics on which he would appreciate information from an outside or national standpoint. Such subjects immediately spring to mind in the case of periods of persecution under various acts of Parliament, in the comparable activities of the local authorities in care of poor, or in the attitude or action of other religious bodies in similar situations.

The historian aiming at a true picture of Quakerism in his chosen area and period owes it to himself to survey the whole field of the surviving records dealing with his subject. Only thus, and with the benefit of previous research in the form of printed histories to fit his own discoveries surely into a wider pattern, can he give a judgement based on full evidence, well considered and with due weight given to all the facts at his disposal. This does not mean that the would-be historian must read diligently every page of minutes, epistles and accounts, but he should be familiar with and appreciate the significance of the types of material found among the records of the meetings he studies.

The writer with some new fact of significance to bring before the world has, on the whole, an easy task in presenting his thesis. In such a case, stating the plan of the work, enumerating his discoveries and placing them in their local and national perspective, is a work which can lead naturally to a satisfying conclusion and a rounded complete work. But the Friend who sets out to give a history of his meeting can, without thinking, find himself lost, and lose his readers or his hearers in a maze of detail and local instances.

There are certain questions which every local meeting history should answer, or, if they cannot be answered, state why not. Friends can pose these questions for themselves; beginning with the questions on early history, development, and sufferings, which provided a framework for the *First Publishers of Truth* (F.P.T. 3). To these a modern student would add: What changes have taken place in the constitution of the meeting? Who were the leaders of local meetings? What social classes were represented? What was the strength of the meetings? What part did Friends play in commercial and industrial, social and political affairs? How well were Friends' testimonies observed? What local manifestations appear of movements which affected the Society as a whole, and what points of difference from the main stream of Quaker development are visible?

That so many local histories fail to answer these questions in any certain manner is probably due more to the fact that the authors do not ask themselves these questions than that they do not know the answers. Although one may not produce a "standard" history of a local meeting to which all, all over the country, would be bound to conform, attention to the answers to questions such as those propounded above would translate the welcome and necessary interest of local Friends in their history into studies and articles which would present to the general student more uniformly useful and reliable material.

R.S.M.

Thomas Shillitoe (1754-1836)

Some hitherto unpublished particulars

By T. EDMUND HARVEY

THE memory of a loved and honoured forebear is often cherished for generations by members of his family who preserve with care some piece of furniture or other little thing which once was his, and not only old letters or documents associated with him, but sometimes also recollections of sayings or incidents otherwise unrecorded.

This was the case in the family of Thomas Shillitoe, my mother's great-grandfather, whose *Journal*, with characteristic reticence, gives hints only occasionally of the depth of his family affection, but leaves far more unrevealed.

THE MAN AND HIS FAMILY

How warmly he was loved by his children and grandchildren is indicated by the way in which his memory has been held in regard by many descendants both within and without the Society of Friends.

His beloved wife Mary Pace, whom he married in the year 1778, was in feeble health during the later part of their lives, and his senior in age, though she survived him. This made all the harder the long absences from home which his arduous journeys in the service of the ministry involved.

On one occasion he returned from the Monthly Meeting at Hitchin to tell his wife that Friends had united with the concern which he had laid before them for religious service on the Continent. It must, I believe, have been on the 27th of 2nd mo. 1821, when, as we read in his *Journal*, he "opened a religious prospect my mind had long been exercised with, to pay a visit to some parts of Holland, Norway, Germany and the South of France, and to take up my residence for some time in those parts, and to seek out such suitable employ as was to be had to fill up my spare time." He had just been visiting Yorkshire and had

journeyed south with some exertion, in order to lay his concern before his own Monthly Meeting at Hitchin. This had involved, after attending Meeting at Wellingborough (and he had already walked over 30 miles on the previous day) being driven for some distance by a Friend and then walking about 18 miles to an inn at Shefford, which he reached about ten o'clock at night. His *Journal* continues, "After taking refreshment and ordering an early breakfast, having eight miles to travel to-morrow to meeting, I retired to bed. Second-day morning reached Hitchin in time for meeting." Clearly he had gone straight to the meeting and not first to his home on Highbury Hill. Thus it was that his wife now heard for the first time of this arduous duty lying before him. When he told her, she looked up calmly (and was there a smile on her gentle face?) with the words, "And how many shirts wilt thou require?"

Mary Shillitoe knew that the husband she loved was a man with ways of his own. He was to go on one occasion to London and wished to walk part of the way before taking the coach. She spoke to the driver of the coach at Hitchin and asked him to look out for her husband on the road. "But how am I to tell, Ma'am, which is your husband?" asked the puzzled driver. "When thou sees a man who is not like any other man, that is my husband," was her reply.

Reginald Hine, in his delightful *Hitchin Worthies*,¹ relates this incident in a slightly different form, as told him by my aunt, Mary Sturge Whiting, who was Thomas Shillitoe's great-granddaughter, and illustrates it by a description of Thomas Shillitoe recorded by the Rev. James Everett: "He was below the middle height, spare, active, buoyant in spirit, and appeared as if made of wire and muscle. He was generally attired in a 'pepper and salt' suit, with a dowlas shirt often open at the neck, and a chip hat, which he usually carried in his hand, or on his umbrella stick in hot weather. He walked vigorously, often with his coat over his arm." The driver of that coach cannot, after all, have had great difficulty in recognizing his prospective passenger.

We may supplement Everett's description by glimpses of Thomas Shillitoe's figure which we have in contemporary silhouettes, and in the lively portrait sketches by Samuel

¹ p. 187.

Lucas of Hitchin. His *Journal* gives to us glimpses of his inner life : at many points revealing touches show how in sensitive faithfulness to inward guidance, and to his apprehension of the duty laid upon him, this naturally timid man, who could be startled at the sight of a mouse or the mooing of a cow and dreaded the sight of a precipitous road, went through hardship and danger by land and sea in years of laborious travel in pursuance of his service. The message of his life, his humble, loving faithfulness and utter loyalty to his Master, lives on even though we may in many ways not share his application to the complex life of men of the implications of Christian discipleship.

Years ago there came to me as a gift from another descendant of Thomas Shillitoe a packet of old family letters and papers, most of which relate to the days of his last illness in the summer of 1836, when his family lovingly recorded and transcribed his words and messages to those about him. In the printed *Journal*, his editor, A. Rawlinson Barclay, faithfully reproduces a large part of these, but his narrative fails to include one or two little touches of humour, which show a lovable feature of which the serious pages of the *Journal* itself hardly give a hint.

Thus one loose page in the packet before me records : " On his requesting that something might be tied to the bedpost to hold by and it being said ' It must be made secure ', he replied, ' not as the flimsy door-post that Samson leaned upon ! ' " (He was a frail old man in his 83rd year.) Later on in the course of his illness he asked for a little cold water, adding " but not to cool my tongue, not to cool my tongue ! "

He had long been in deep inward sympathy with the social teaching of John Woolman, and it is characteristic of his concern for a simpler and juster way of life that one of these manuscripts records : " He said of his children that they were all comfortably settled : he hoped they would not be anxious after worldly matters. They (his children) had been in his daily prayers for their happiness. He prayed for his children and grandchildren that they might not be middlemen. ' O the middle men, they are filthy men. These unstable, unmeaning Quakers are offensive to God and man. Middlemen, these double-minded Quakers ! O to be one of them, these double-minded folks. Flee from

them as from a serpent ! ' ' ' His thought and love, however, went out to all wrongdoers. At another time he exclaimed, " O the depth of human misery, separated from divine harmony ! " More than once he spoke of his love going out to the whole human race " even the most wicked ", and added, " if it were not so, how miserable indeed should I feel."

Sometimes he was drawn to humble prayer for the Heavenly Father's mercy to himself in his weakness. " Pray have pity upon a sinner, upon a poor old man ! " His thoughts, too, turned to the gateway of life to which he was now so near. " I would not change situations with King William. I humbly hope I am going to meet the Emperor Alexander. O ; the dear, dedicated Creature ! "

HIS RELATIONS WITH CZAR ALEXANDER I AND KING GEORGE IV

Readers of his *Journal* will not forget Thomas Shillitoe's account of his two long private interviews with the Emperor Alexander in an apartment of the Palace at Petersburg in 1824, and how intimately they had conversed and joined in worship together. In that short time they had been drawn very close to one another. Two months later when he left Russia, Thomas Shillitoe brought home with him some keepsakes sent him by the Czar : he would never have wished for any such gift, but how could he send back these tokens of friendship ? One of them was a tiny inlaid miniature cabinet of tortoise-shell and ivory, with drawers for letters, which now stands near me as I write.¹

Less than a year after they parted the Emperor died. He was never forgotten.

It may seem strange that it fell to the lot of one naturally timid, a man of very simple life who for years had earned his living as a working shoemaker and had no contact with the ways of ministers and courts, to seek and obtain opportunities to give the message with which, as he believed, he was entrusted by his Divine Master, to so many kings and princes. It was always with him a matter of painful

¹ Other similar mementos preserved by different descendants, a Russian New Testament with the autograph of Alexander, a tea-caddy, and a piece of Sèvres china, are mentioned by Reginald Hine in his *Hitchin Worthies*, p. 188 n.

exercise of spirit, sometimes involving long periods of distress and even physical prostration before the interview took place. But each time the way opened for him and when needful the right interpreter was forthcoming. Thus he had interviews with George III, with George IV as Prince Regent and later as King, with the Duke of Cumberland as Viceroy of Hanover (of which he later became King), with the King and Crown Prince of Denmark, with Frederick William III of Prussia and the Crown Prince (afterwards Frederick William IV), with Alexander I of Russia, and finally, in 1832 (accompanied by Peter Bedford), with William IV and then Queen Adelaide.

Yet of all these it was for George IV that he went through the greatest exercise of spirit. He was in deep trouble of heart for the man himself, surrounded by temptations, the prey of flatterers and of those who appealed to his sensual nature; yet not without his better moments, and still capable of turning to the way of life. In the letter which he presented to the Prince Regent at Brighton in 1813, Thomas Shillitoe had written: "Words fail me to set forth the conflict of mind which at times I have passed through for many years on account of thy precious, immortal soul," and a little later, "I believe, never has the report gone abroad and reached my ear of thy grand entertainments being about to take place, but my poor mind has felt sorrow on thy account; and in spirit I have been with thee as a mournful spectator at the banquet." When nearly eleven years later Thomas Shillitoe again saw George IV in the Park at Windsor and mentioned his presentation of his address at Brighton, the King replied: "I remember you did."¹ Did the King continue to remember?

In the early summer of 1830 George IV lay on his death-bed at Windsor. While the Yearly Meeting was sitting, the Duchess of Gloucester, the King's favourite sister, drove down in her carriage to old Devonshire House and William Allen and Elizabeth Fry were called out of the meeting to

¹ We owe our knowledge of these words to the editorial footnote in Thomas Shillitoe's *Journal*, vol. 1, p. 201. The *Journal* itself (vol. 2, pp. 2-3), with characteristic reticence, does not relate this. Abram Rawlinson Barclay, who carried through the editing of the *Journal* on the death of his brother John Barclay, to whom T.S. had given the MS. in his lifetime, had access to first-hand confirmation, through their friendship with Thomas Shillitoe.

her, when she informed them "that the King being in great extremity, both in mind and body, desired the prayers of Friends." "This request was communicated to both the Men's and Women's Meetings, and the business being suspended, each meeting became a Meeting for Worship during the rest of the sitting. Friends were requested not to speak of it out of meeting." This account is given by Thomas Davidson of Fritchley,¹ as related to him by Ann Hunt of Bristol (1810-1897) a year or two before her death. (It was the first yearly meeting she had attended and her memory of it would naturally be an outstanding one.) This is confirmed by a letter of Octavius Hunt quoted by Norman Penney in *Pen Pictures of London Yearly Meeting*.² "I had been reading with intense interest the account in Thomas Shillitoe's Journal of the letter he wrote to George IV, and delivered in person to him, and I asked Ann Hunt if there was any sequel to that letter, and she told me that she was sitting in the Yearly Meeting in 1830, when the Duchess came to the Meeting, and called some Friends out and asked the Friends to pray for the King. She further told me that the King had been asked by the Duchess if he would see a clergyman, and he said: 'No. Send for that Quaker,' meaning Thomas Shillitoe. Thomas Shillitoe was in the Y.M. when the message came, but he did not speak on the matter; and my aunt did not think he communicated with the King. I think she (A.H.) said that the information of the exact message of George IV was told to some Friend visiting the Court later on."³

There are other reports of words spoken by the dying King which tell of how his thoughts turned toward that old Quaker minister who had brought him years ago his message of outspoken reproof and tender pleading. "O that Quaker, that Quaker!" the King is said to have murmured sadly.⁴ Francis C. Clayton, in his article in the *Journal of the Friends'*

¹ In *Journal F.H.S.*, ix, 173.

² Part II (Supplement 17 to *Journal F.H.S.*), 195.

³ In Richard Cockin's account of the Y.M. of 1830, we read: "*Fifth-day afternoon* J. J. Gurney adverted to the illness of the King, which appeared to bring some weight over the Meeting." There is, of course, no reference to the subject in the Minutes.

⁴ Reported by William Tallack in his life of *Thomas Shillitoe* (1867), p. 111.

*Historical Society*¹ on "George IV and Thomas Shillitoe," states that meeting in 1909 a great-grandson of Thomas Shillitoe, "I repeated to him the version I had heard, viz. that the Archbishop of Canterbury, approaching the King, informed him that his end was near and that he wished to offer the consolations of the Church. The King's reply was 'Send for that little Quaker, he is the only one who ever told me the Truth.'" "Mr. Shillitoe said," continues F. C. Clayton, "he heard a similar account, and that this interview was a most treasured memory in the family." Years ago I heard a different version, according to which the King had expressed a desire to see Thomas Shillitoe, but his indistinct speech had been misunderstood and instead, the Bishop of Chichester had been sent for, the mistake being only discovered too late for it to be set right.

It is interesting to note that while the *Dictionary of National Biography* states that it was the Bishop of Winchester (in whose diocese Windsor lay) who was called on by the Duke of Wellington to prepare the King for his end, Roger Fulford in his biography of George IV states that the Bishop of Chichester had two satisfactory conversations with the King, knelt by his bed and read the prayer appointed to be read in churches for the King's recovery, to which the King responded "Amen. Amen," and afterwards said that the prayer was in very good taste.

The King died on June 25th. When the news came to Thomas Shillitoe he was staying at Hitchin with his son-in-law and daughter, John and Margaret Whiting. My grandfather John Whiting and his brother Joshua were living as small boys in the house at the time and recalled in later years the solemn feeling which their grandfather's grief aroused in them. I remember my uncle Joshua Whiting telling me how he listened with awe to the sound of Thomas Shillitoe's footsteps as he paced up and down, alone, in his room overhead, up and down for hours, in an agony of sorrow.

The far-reaching love which sought the wellbeing of a man like George IV did not with Thomas Shillitoe involve any compromise with truth. In loyalty to truth, as he saw it, he made on his deathbed a solemn statement in disavowal

¹ Vol. xi, 195-208.

of the views and activities of one of the most prominent and esteemed of his fellow members of the Society of Friends, which cost him some exercise of spirit to make.

HIS TESTIMONY AS TO JOSEPH JOHN GURNEY

After Thomas Shillitoe's death reports reached a number of Quaker circles of his having dictated during his last illness a solemn testimony against the teaching of Joseph John Gurney. No reference of any kind to this appears in the account of his last days which is printed at the close of his *Journal*. What were believed to be quotations from this testimony must, however, have been circulated at an early date, as a letter from Jonathan Evans of Philadelphia, dated 9th mo. 11th, 1837, addressed to John Wilbur contained an extract.¹ Later, during his second visit to England (in 1853-54), John Wilbur, in replying to a letter to him from John Pease added a postscript in which he said: "Instead of proving J.J.G. to be sound by quoting his doctrines, thou hast brought to view the vague sentiments of his votaries; but I would advert briefly to the sentiments of that devoted and faithful servant of Christ, Thomas Shillitoe, who had known his course of life from his youth and had read his writings. He said in his last sickness, 'I declare that J.J.G. is an Episcopalian, not a Quaker.'"²

John Wilbur's quotation of Thomas Shillitoe evidently caused concern amongst some English Friends at that time, for amongst the papers now before me is an unsigned draft or copy of a letter by a son or daughter of Thomas Shillitoe which reads as follows: "Esteemed Friend, I believe I may state that my dear Father did not retract from what he said respecting J. J. Gurney and which was taken down by J. Hodgkin³ a few days before his death. I do not know in what way J. Wilbur came in possession of a copy of the testimony, but certainly it was not sent him by any of our family. I heard such a paragraph was in the Book but

¹ The letter is printed in the *Journal of the Life of John Wilbur*, 1859, 228-30, but does not include the extract. Instead appears the editorial insertion: "[He here inserts an extract from Thomas Shillitoe's dying testimony, declaring J.J.G. to be no Quaker, &c., which is omitted.]"

² *op. cit.*, p. 546.

³ The initial appears to be J, not T. John Hodgkin, the eminent Quaker minister, resided at Tottenham; his brother Dr. Thomas Hodgkin was the physician who attended T.S. in his last illness.

not having seen it myself I did not know how far it was correct.

“Thou art at liberty to make use of my name to W. Smeal if thou thinks best.” (The name of the Friend to whom the letter is addressed does not appear.)

It seems clear that weighty influence was exerted to prevent the widespread dissemination of the document, of which John Wilbur later made such use. There was considerable opposition, less than a year after Thomas Shillitoe's death, to the liberation of Joseph John Gurney for his visit to America by the Select Yearly Meeting of 1837,¹ and both then and later added weight might have been given to this opposition had the testimony of Thomas Shillitoe been generally known at the time. Among the papers before me are two copies of this testimony, in different hands, and apparently contemporary. The watermark in the paper of one is dated 1834, in the other 1827. There are small verbal variations in several places, but otherwise the text is substantially identical in each case.

More than a hundred years have passed away since the impact of the growing evangelical movement stirred the thought and life of the Society of Friends. Now that the bitterness of controversy has died we may be able to see that the evangelical Friends had indeed an important contribution to bring to the Society, and yet that there were vital truths for which those who were thought of as conservative Friends were contending which were essential to the message of Christianity as the early Friends apprehended it. We have reason to be grateful to Joseph John Gurney for the stimulus he gave to thought and social action, for his wide-hearted co-operation and fellowship with others outside the Quaker fold, his sense of the community of the Christian Church, his influence in promoting a teaching ministry, and for that pregnant saying of his, “We can never thrive upon ignorance.” But a teaching ministry cannot itself replace the prophetic ministry without immeasurable loss to the church. It was for this free prophetic ministry and the inward spiritual experience of communion that Thomas Shillitoe, Sarah Grubb and men like John and A. R. Barclay pleaded. With all their limitations they held fast to the

¹ This is described in a letter of Margaret Crosfield of Liverpool to John Wilbur (2nd mo. 23rd, 1838) in the *Journal* of John Wilbur, 231-2.

very heart of the religious experience through which the Society of Friends originated, and without which it would not be able to continue its distinctive service.

With this in mind we may be able to realize how deep was the concern which weighed on Thomas Shillitoe and led him upon his deathbed to give his witness. Here is the testimony which he dictated, in the wording of one of the two copies which for more than three generations have been silently laid aside.

“ I want a great deal of time and patience to hear what I have got to say and it must be faithfully delivered, for I am afraid at a future date it will devolve heavy on thy shoulders. It is extraordinary thou shouldst have come in at this juncture, for I have been wanting my son-in-law¹ to come in to put down what I am now better satisfied should be received by thee from my mouth, and I therefore declare unequivocally against the generality of the writings of Joseph John Gurney as being unquaker principles, not sound Quaker principles but Episcopalian ones, and have done great mischief in our Society, and the Society will go gradually down if it yields to the further circulation of that part of his work which they have it in their power to suppress. This is my firm belief, I have laboured under the weight of it for the last 12 months beyond what human nature is able to support, and the committee of the Morning Meeting which passed that last work must be willing to come forward to be sufficiently humble to acknowledge their error. And the Meeting for Sufferings must also be willing to remove its authority in allowing it to be given away to those not of our Society. I declare the Author is an Episcopalian, not a Quaker—the views received by him at Oxford still remain with him.

“ I love the man for the work's sake, as far as it goes, but he has never been emptied from vessel to vessel and from sieve to sieve, nor known the Baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire to cleanse the floor of his heart from his Episcopalian notions.

“ He has spread a linsey woolsey garment over our members, but in a future day it will be stripped off, it will be too short for them as they will be without Christ Jesus the Lord.

¹ John Whiting of Hitchin.

“ This is my testimony and I must sign it. If I had been faithful, I should have expressed it in the last Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders : But I hope I shall be forgiven. Oh Lord accept me with the best that I have ! I have had letters from America which confirm me in the truth of every part of what I now state. I believe, there is not one individual member of our Society in England, Scotland or Ireland more willing to do good than Joseph John Gurney, but willingness is not qualification.

“ This is my dying testimony to Quaker views, especially to the Ministry. What was Antichrist in George Fox’s days is Antichrist now. The clergy of this country to a man everyone of them are antichrist so long as they wear the gowns and receive the pay and continue building the people up in the relics of Popery which the Church of England left behind it. It will not do to speak of a man doing a great deal for a little pay and call him a Minister of Christ. It is grievous that any, especially a Minister in our Society, should so speak. They are Antichrist still since they lead the people away from Christ. And yet I love some of them for the work’s sake, as far as they go.”

It is not difficult for us to understand the hesitation which A. R. Barclay must have felt at including an account of this testimony or extracts from it in the record of the last days of Thomas Shillitoe with which his *Journal* concludes. His brother John Barclay, who had begun the task of editing the *Journal* and only completed a part of it before his death, evidently felt that there might be weighty opposition to encounter, as appears from a letter of his of 1838 cited in Reginald Hine’s bibliography appended to *A Mirror for the Society of Friends*. The citation runs :

(103) 1838. Letter by John Barclay of Stoke Newington to Joseph Grubb of Clonmel, Ireland, concerning the preparation of Thomas Shillitoe’s *Journal* for the press and the risk of its being censored by the Morning Meeting (MS. in the possession of the late J. Ernest Grubb of Carrick-on-Suir).¹

¹ The letter is now in the Grubb Collection, Friends’ Historical Library, 6 Eustace Street, Dublin.

Note

It is natural that we should wish to ascertain what "that last work" was which the Morning Meeting had passed concerning which Thomas Shillitoe made his protest.

In the minutes of the Morning Meeting for 1836 occurs the entry :

"Fifth Day Afternoon 17th of 3rd Month 1836. Met according to adjournment.

"At the two former sittings of this Meeting held on Second Day, an Essay was read, written by our friend Joseph John Gurney entitled *Strictures on certain parts of an anonymous pamphlet 'The Truth Vindicated,' with evidences of the sound and Christian views of the Society of Friends on the subject of the Holy Scriptures*. The Essay has been again read yesterday afternoon and at this sitting; and this Meeting finding nothing in the Author's reasoning at variance with our Christian principles, leaves the author at liberty to publish the same. This Meeting however thinks it right to add, that as the Essay is controversial in its character, and the work commented upon has not been in any way examined by this Meeting, it does not feel itself committed to the mode of the Author's reviewing the work on which he has animadverted. The judgment now given has been simply founded on the consideration that the Author's arguments are in accordance with the acknowledged principles of our Religious Society."

Though at first sight this would seem to refer to the work we are seeking, it is possible that we should consider an earlier and more important book to be the one which Thomas Shillitoe had in mind. Although several other books and pamphlets by Joseph John Gurney were printed at this period the only other one which is minuted as considered by the Morning Meeting during the years in question is a new and enlarged edition of a well-known work of his. In the minutes of Morning Meeting we read that on 1st month 13th, 1834: "Our friend Joseph John Gurney informed this Meeting at its last sitting that he was proposing to make

some additions to a new Edition of his *Observations on the religious peculiarities of Friends* submitted to this Meeting in the 8th month 1823 and subsequently approved ; the said additions are referred to the Committee now appointed who are to report to a future meeting." The committee consisted of William Allen, George Stacey, Josiah Forster, Elizabeth Dudley, Peter Bedford, John Barclay, Joseph Foster, Richard Barrett, John Kitching, Joseph Neatby, Elizabeth (Joseph) Fry, Elizabeth Fry, Susanna Corder and Rachel Foster.

A later minute of the 10th of 3rd month 1834 reads : " Joseph Forster on behalf of the Committee appointed on the revision of manuscripts reports that they have carefully considered what has been submitted to them by Joseph John Gurney as additions to his work on the distinguishing views and practices of Friends ; and that with some alterations proposed by the Committee, which the Author has with much readiness adopted, they are of the judgment that he should be left at liberty to print the same. The Meeting therefore confirms the judgment of the Committee."

I incline to the view that it was this work to which Thomas Shillitoe referred.

More than three generations have gone by since all these dear Friends have passed beyond the noise of controversy. So at length it is possible to bring to light the testimony of one who strove faithfully to serve the truth, as it was given him to see it. Then he knew in part and prophesied in part, but he was faithful to the end. His faithfulness still speaks to us, and, above all, that love which on his deathbed went out toward the whole human race, even the most wicked.

T. EDMUND HARVEY

Researches in Progress or Recently Completed

M. FAY WILLIAMS, of 1 Montpelier Terrace, Swansea, studying for the degree of Master of Arts in the Welsh History Department of the University of Wales, has been writing a thesis on *The Society of Friends in Glamorganhire, 1654-1908*, covering the development of the Society from all aspects. The thesis is to be submitted in 1950.

Lulie A. Shaw, holder of a Woodbrooke Fellowship, has been pursuing her study on *Quakerism and the Family*, at Woodbrooke, Selly Oak, Birmingham, 29. She is tracing the influence of family life in the growth of Quakerism, particularly in connection with religious education and preparation for the ministry, the relationships within the family (including the servants and apprentices), and the position of women.

Mr. C. E. A. Turner, of 11 Beresford Avenue, Surbiton, Surrey, is planning to present a study on the *History of Education* for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of London (1951). He is particularly concerned to trace the contribution of Puritans to scientific education in seventeenth century England.

Bettina S. Laycock of Wakefield, an old Ackworth scholar and now a student at Woodbrooke, is presenting a study on *The Quaker Missions to Europe and the Near East, 1655-1665*, as her research project for the B.A. degree in the History Department of the University of Birmingham (1950).

Accounts for the year 1949 and *Journal*, vol. xli

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Balance brought forward	176	15	5	<i>Journal of Friends' Historical Society,</i>			
Subscriptions	68	3	7	Vol. xli Parts I & II	123	2	0
Sales	27	18	6	Stationery	17	8	6
				Petty Cash and Postage	21	10	0
				Cheque Book	4	2	
				Balance carried forward to 1950	110	12	10
	<u>£272</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>6</u>		<u>£272</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>6</u>

Examined with the Books of the Society, and found correct.

BASIL G. BURTON.

25.2.1950.

Quakerism and Democracy

Some points concerning Revelation and Organisation

By EMILIA FOGELKLOU NORLIND

Presidential Address to the Friends' Historical Society, read to the Society by Margaret M. Harvey at the meeting held in London, 30th June, 1949

INTRODUCTION

For churches as well as for states, the problem of to-day is not so much a question of creed or theory as a question of actual (not only traditional) religious *experience*, and of *organization*. "Every human community from the lowest to the highest should be a church or an organ for religion and its ends, otherwise it cannot match its destiny."¹

Rufus Jones in his introduction to *The Second Period of Quakerism*, says: "Their Society was in idea a complete democracy,"² but he adds that the "formulation of Quaker doctrine was . . . not performed in a manner as accordant with the genius of the movement as was the form of the organization. . . ."³

Other churches were by tradition patriarchally organized. Political democracies were the result of revolutions and a definite change of national laws. Quakerism was born a democracy. Its organization was not a political revolution, but, in a constitutional way, became an affirmation of its creative origin, of what had already entered into real life.

We all know the intimate connection between the Levellers and some of those who first became Seekers and Quakers. Here it is unnecessary to stress this ideological affinity, with parallel customs to mark the equality of human value. What I want to stress now is the unique birth of

¹ C. J. Bostrom, a Swedish philosopher of the beginning of last century.

² Braithwaite, W. C., *The Second Period of Quakerism* (1919), xxix.

³ *ibid.*, xxx.

religious first-hand experience, not only in one, but in so many of the first publishers of truth.

I can find nowhere in the earlier history of religion a corresponding group of finders, not adherents. The first publishers of truth did not go out to make adherents. They went out "to discover in all lands those who were true fellow-members with them."¹ "You are become companions with all that are born from above."²

William Sewel in his *History of the . . . Christian People called Quakers* (1722), expressly says: "There were also some others who, by the like immediate way, as George Fox himself, were convinced in their minds. . . . These unexpectedly and unawares came to meet with fellow-believers, which they were not acquainted with before. . . ."³ This statement very well corresponds to the spirit of early Quakerism as documented in *The First Publishers of Truth*,⁴ and in the letters of the earliest years, especially in letters written by, or to, those who shared the leadership.

But in a later period, the great survivor, George Fox, sums up the beginnings otherwise. In his Foreword to William Dewsbury's gathered writings⁵—1688, the year of William Dewsbury's death—he begins the story of Quakerism with the Balby group, who "came to me and were convinced . . . James Nayler was convinced after I had some discourse with him." Goodyear "came to me, and after I had declared the truth to him, he was convinced, and received the truth—and confessed to the truth, and received it, and after some time he did testifie it." Certain as he was that "ye truth sprange uppe first in Leistersheere"⁶, he did not take any notice of the previous spiritual history of others. Dewsbury himself declares, "This I witness to all the sons of men, that the knowledge of Eternal life I came not to by the letter of the scripture, nor hearing men speak of the name

¹ Braithwaite, W. C., *The Second Period of Quakerism* (1919), xxvii.

² John Crook, quoted in Budge, F. A., *Annals of the Early Friends* (1896), 114.

³ p. 28.

⁴ *The First Publishers of Truth. Being Early Records . . . of . . . Quakerism . . .* Edited by Norman Penney, 1907. (Supplements 1-5 to *Journal F.H.S.*)

⁵ *The Faithful Testimony of that Antient Servant of the Lord . . . William Dewsbury* (1689).

⁶ *Journal of George Fox* (Camb.), II, 338.

of the Lord.”¹ I shall return later to George Fox, whose own experiences are so richly documented. But now I will linger on other first-hand experience.

“It is evident that Farnsworth and Aldam, and probably the other members of the group, had reached the Quaker experience before Fox came among them.”² As for Farnsworth “in influence he ranked by the side of Fox.”³

Of Dewsbury, we get a similar impression in *The First Publishers of Truth*, where he is mirrored with great affection in several accounts. Dewsbury in every difficulty stands as an elder brother, courageous, suffering, understanding, always ready to find ways, never harsh, possessing a true Christian and democratic spirit of reconciliation.

Regarding James Nayler, “who made Quakers before he was one,” I need not add much. He says himself: “I was at the Plough, meditating on the things of God, and suddenly I heard a voice. . . .” His inspired resolution after contact with Fox, the young prophet, should not be omitted. In the early years these two are often addressed together. Fox’s *Journal*⁴ includes Humphrey Norton’s letter: “it lay upon me to lay it before the[e] and J.N. who are sufficient for these things.” Richard Baxter as well as others look on Nayler as the chief Quaker. In Fox’s *Journal* there is a strange little sentence. Fox has been beaten, and so has Nayler afterwards. Fox writes: “they never minded him till I was gone.”⁵ Did not Fox become much more “minded” when Nayler was gone?

William Crouch in his *Memoirs* says: “A particular account of each messenger and servant, whom it pleased God by his own immediate arm and power, to raise up, and send forth to publish . . . I cannot undertake to give.”⁶ Here, however, are personal confessions from some of them:

Richard Hubberthorne: “The Lord raised up in me a love to his Word. . . . This I was moved to declare from the spirit of my Father dwelling in me.”

¹ Cadbury, H. J., *Letters to William Dewsbury* (1948), 54.

² Braithwaite, W. C., *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, (1912), 60.

³ *ibid.*, 302.

⁴ *Journal of George Fox* (Camb.), I, 246.

⁵ *ibid.*, 60.

⁶ Ch. II.

Thomas Green : " As I was walking in an orchard, the word of the Lord came unto me. . . ."¹

William Britton : " The eternal God . . . by a further discovery of himself brought me back to silence that I should remain with the despised remnants of the Quakers."

William Ames : " I had no more need to be taught by men."

Humphrey Smith : " The Lord did not only call me but also thrust me forth of the world."

William Caton : " I began to find the truth of what he had spoken in myself."

It was said of William Crouch : " He was enriched with a large stock of experimental knowledge . . . though he lived not on his former experiences but upon Christ the living bread." And Fox himself : " seventy ministers did ye Lord raise uppe & sent abroad out of ye north Countreyes."²

But I need not continue. I could go on quoting autobiographical confessions on conviction.

I only want to say some words about Elizabeth Hooton, " whose mouth was opnd to preach ye gospell,"³ who probably " had been a Baptist preacher " before she met the young George Fox.⁴ Fox writes : " She had Meetings at her house where ye Lord by his power wrought many Myracles to ye Astonishing of ye world & Confirming People of ye Truth."⁵ Henry Cadbury remarks that the earliest miracle recorded is described as though neither Fox nor any other individual had performed it alone ; it took place in Elizabeth Hooton's house.⁶ (To Muggleton, Elizabeth Hooton was one of the most dangerous " old dragons.") We have no autobiographical statement left from her. But a woman could not have been a Baptist preacher without a spiritual history. How much Fox owes her for his faithful

¹ In the notes to Penney's edition of Fox's *Journal*, Dewsbury, Farnsworth, Green and Nayler are mentioned as convinced through Fox ; in Ellwood's edition, Hubberthorne also.

² *Journal of George Fox* (Camb.), I, 14.

³ *Journal of George Fox* (Camb.), II, 325.

⁴ Braithwaite, W. C., *Beginnings*, 44.

⁵ Manners, E., *Elizabeth Hooton*, 5.

⁶ Cadbury, H. J., *George Fox's " Book of Miracles "*, 60.

standing up for women as fellow-workers in the Quaker movement we can only guess but never know. "Women were the first to preach the principles of Quakerism in London, in the English universities, and in the American colonies."¹

The very heart of the early Quaker message was just this : finding your own teacher. And all the Journals, this very special contribution from Quakerism to the history of religious experience, are in themselves a testimony that the Quaker movement demonstratively began not with followers of one prophet, as most other religious revivals have done, but with human beings, "taught by God." "The Lord hath brought forth many" (R. Farnsworth to W. Dewsbury).

In confessions printed before 1669, no mediators are mentioned and what names are mentioned have no formal attributes affixed. During the years 1669 till 1688—years of persecution—very few, if any, such books seem to have been printed.²

But after 1688 Fox is put into the foreground in many journals as mediator, honoured with very special attributes never used in the early years. He is "God's dear servant G.F."³ "Above all G.F."; "The true and faithful messenger G.F."⁴ etc. In those days he is also to outsiders "George Fox of Swarthmore, gentleman."⁵

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

I. The first period of Quaker history was one of religious democracy, sprung up spontaneously after the experience of the Civil War. As far as I can see it represents something unique in Western history, and to study and renew it is of the utmost significance in our situation to-day.

II. In the second period—after the split of 1656, when enthusiasm (or rather one very exhausted enthusiast) became a source of scandal and was condemned—unemotionalism, reason and prudence marked out a gulf not to be bridged, and there arose in Quakerism, as in Cromwell's case, a tendency to "monarchy," i.e. towards one leader.

¹ Notes to the Cambridge *Journal*, II, 463.

² I owe this statement to Elin Sigmers who has had the kindness to go through some material for me in Friends House Library.

³ Thomas Briggs.

⁴ Ambrose Rigge.

⁵ *Journal of George Fox* (Camb.), II, 361.

III. Interspersed we find attempts towards a collectivistic unity, in which Barclay and Penn with all their interest in constitutional government, shared with their contemporaries, had a certain influence, none of them having experienced the very first great conviction.

IV. It was Fox's genius which was able to provide a constitutional aspect, the "Gospel Order", corresponding to the early democracy at least in giving great care to individual possibilities within the educative frame of smaller or wider assemblies. This "Gospel order" came to Fox as a revelation with a new wave of creative life. It is like a vessel in which wine from the grape of the early days could be gathered anew. In his own wonderful words: "The least member in the church is serviceable," and "all the members of Christ have need one of another."

An important part of democracy is its capacity or incapacity to settle conflicts. As for war, Quakers denied its means and spirit. As for the solution of internal conflicts, Dewsbury represents a deeper level than George Fox, who frequently condemned not only attitudes but persons, a weapon of more ancient model than his Gospel order. Of the three chief conflicts in English Quakerism during Fox's lifetime I find it most practical to deal with the first two before I consider the birth of Fox's constitution and to end by dealing with the Wilkinson-Story matter, which partly represents something of a constitutional conflict.

THE DEMOCRACY OF THE PIONEERS

"The great secret of the coming age of this world is that civilization rests not on reason but on emotion."¹ "Politics—in our present world situation, reckoning only with secular elements and leaving out man's spiritual existence—merits no other name than quackery" writes a more recent author from Finland. Secular politics does not yet count man as a spiritual being—a great wrong to mankind. In a Swedish paper of to-day (27. vii. 1949), I read: "Democracy will die for lack of communion between human beings." The early Friends were "bound up in union, in the free covenant of life in the Lord Jesus and one with another in the same spirit" (Dewsbury). Archbishop Tillotson in his description of

¹ Benjamin Kidd.

them, quoted in the Foreword to William Crouch's book,¹ accuses Quakers of exactly the same things for which democracies have been frequently blamed: they "bring men to a level, hoping it will be some justification of them, if they can but render others as bad as themselves!"

Quakers in their early days had not only expressed human equality on spiritual and political grounds, as had the Levellers and Diggers. The strength of fresh revelation was theirs. "O happy men," says Dewsbury, for the sake of the "living testimony that streams through the whole body as a river of oil and virtuous refreshings." The very glands had entered a new life with a joyous note, however hard was this life!

"In L[uke] H[oward] Life sprung. . ."² "Theyr flesh trembeled upon theyr bones."³

They knew the experience of being pushed out of their old surroundings into an isolation without which new births and new spiritual groupings seldom came into being. Most of them "had died" at least once in this life. "All my former life was ripped up," says young Ellwood. They entered a life of co-operation, of wonderful friendships in a dangerous and necessary common task. Quakerism, like early Christianity, stood for an experiment in community life not narrowed down to certain rites in common, but applied to the whole of life from a religious point of view. Their religious concerns were social concerns, and vice versa. They lived as children of a new age, asking, seeking, discovering, before every new situation or activity, not in blind obedience hanging on to conventional patterns of feeling and doing, which tend to turn life rigid and stiff. Also, as finders they must continue to be daily seekers.

The cultural background of their childhood and youth had been of a feudal type, which had imbued them—from church, home, army—with a thoroughbred force of loyalty, a great asset to any group life, even though it may imply some occasional sinking back into outworn attitudes of feudal pattern—after the passing of the first great conviction. Loyalty is a good backbone to enthusiasm. And so is friendship. The first movement is woven through with friendships and yokefellowships between those "who had first come to the spirit of God in themselves" and in each

¹ *Posthuma Christiana* (1712).

² *F.P.T.*, 133.

³ *ibid.*, 116.

other, a friendship stabilized by the hardships of their work as "soldiers of the Lamb". Between some of them there was the spiritual bond of "father" and "son," but there were many fathers just as there were many sons. Hero-worship of a feudal type is not lacking, but there is also good comradeship with frank and friendly outspokenness. We all know those pairs of messengers—Burrough and Howgill, Camm and Audland, Caton and Stubbs, Mary Fisher and Ann Austin, Ann Audland and Mabel Camm, and so on. Fox and Naylor were such a pair in the beginning, settling meetings together at Isell,¹ writing books together, travelling together, being addressed together.

If Benjamin Kidd is right in what he says about civilization and emotion, this movement represents the "coming of age" of society. The community pattern is a tissue woven by threads of immediate warm and human affection between those who shared the great adventure, all the while "knowing the power of God in each other." There was no "tabu on tenderness"² in those days. . . . "I have cause to bless the Eternall God that ever I did see thy face, for what thou hast spoken to me is Eternall," Thomas Forester writes to William Dewsbury.³

Compare this with the mighty organization of the Jesuits, where special friendships are forbidden, and where the exclusion of the female sex is thought to favour the task.

This co-operation between men and women practised in the Quaker movement is a pioneer feature even to-day. It had utmost significance for this young "democracy"—not without its difficulties at a time when elsewhere it was out of custom, but furthering a synthesis between personal concern and flexibility of emotion, which are sometimes opposed to group loyalty.

We know the "extravagancies," acted by men as well as women in the period of abundant creative life. Acted out after the prophets in the Bible, or as fresh inspirations or imaginations, these "signs," as the atmosphere grew cooler and unfriendlier, fell down like angels with frozen wings, becoming ugly, blasphemous or meaningless in an alien climate.

¹ *First Publishers of Truth*, 43.

² Ian D. Suttee, *Origins of Love and Hate*.

³ Cadbury, H. J., *Letters to William Dewsbury*, p. 22.

As for discipline in the early days, instead of laws or constitutions I find, together with the overwhelming influence of the silent meetings, three concepts of significance marked in early pamphlets and letters. They are Measure, Freedom and Power of the Lord.

(i) Regarding the word Measure, I quote Bonaventura's medieval expression: "None partaketh God supremely in the absolute sense, but supremely with respect to himself. For each one partaketh him so largely, not that he may not be partaken more, but that he may not advance beyond, and is utterly content with, that state which he hath." Man is born a slave under his inherited tendencies. In God he becomes freeborn, after his "measure." I quote George Fox: "Every one *in the measure of life* wait, that . . . all your minds may be guided up to the Father of life,"¹ "And if they should *go beyond their measure*, bear it in the meeting for peace and order's sake. . . ."² Margaret Fell: "Look not forth *from your own measures* at other's conditions, and so neglect your own."³ Nayler: "If thou standeth. . . . in the meek Spirit, not lifted up *above thy measure*, thou wilt come to feel how that of God in thee answers to the things of God."⁴ James Nayler to Richard Myers: "Thou gets *above thy condition*." James Parnell on Martha Simmonds: "She is A faythful hearte *in her measure*."⁵ Ann Sherwood to William Dewsbury writes of "the Lord, in whose treuth I now waite *in my meaesher*."⁶

"Measure" is a check on imitation and exaltation. It is the personal limit, which cannot be exceeded without trespassing on genuineness and authenticity. "Over-magnifying spiritual leaders"⁷ offends against "measure"—it is a fall backwards into primitive idolatry in the form of hero-worship.

As for appreciative adjectives, the one who first came to a village usually got the strongest appreciation in its reports.⁸

¹ *Journal* (Bicentenary ed., 1901), I, 193.

² G. F. quoted in Braithwaite's *Beginnings*, p. 310.

³ *A Brief Collection* (1710), 69.

⁴ Works, p. 256.

⁵ Cadbury, H. J., *Letters to William Dewsbury*, p. 41.

⁶ *ibid.*, p. 65.

⁷ Nuttall, G. F., *Studies in Christian Enthusiasm*.

⁸ Small biographies of Dewsbury (197-199, cf. 294) and of George Fox (241, 311), Elizabeth Fletcher (260), Christopher Hutton (291), Richard Robinson (311).—*First Publishers of Truth*.

"That faithfull servant of the Lord" is said of Humphrey Smith as well as of George Fox and many others.¹ "That Eminent Minister and Faithfull Labourer James Parnell."² Many men unknown to posterity such as the "Brother [in] Laws"³ were made great instruments in the hand of the Lord." "Eliz Hutton (Hooton), a good ould woman";⁴ Gilpin, called "an apostele of thos parts";⁵ Ann Downer, "Convinced of ye blessed truth through obedience thereunto . . . a faithfull Minister . . . very instrumentall for ye good of many";⁶ "Our dear and honorable Friend, George Fox," and, in the same report, "our dear and Honorabel friend, Thomas Gilpin"; John Watson "one of the Lord's worthyes";⁷ "Ye Servant of ye Lord and Minister of his Everlasting Gospel, Alexander Parker."⁸

On the other hand, George Fox is mentioned sometimes without adjective,⁹ or they are all mentioned only by their names. They all get their share of affection and appreciation. Many are "Ready & ffree to Entertain the lords seruants."¹⁰

It may be that James Naylor somewhere is excluded, but nowhere is there a trace of extra blame on him. George Fox "the younger," whose letter on religious freedom Hubberthorne gave over to Charles II, is mentioned as "a true and faithful minister of Christ Jesus," who "laid down ye body" in 1661. "Friends grew as ye Garden of ye Lord."¹¹

(ii) Freedom (in the moral sense) is parallel to "measure." When both an inner concern and an outward situation claim an action, the Friend is "free" to carry it out. In *Letters to William Dewsbury* you find this expression very often: "Dear brother let me hear from the as often as thou *finds fredom* in the Lord & canst conveniently."¹² "It were of great service if the Lord God should bring thee hither, *in my measure* I see it soe *I am free* to lay it before thee."¹³ "I desired E.B. as he *found freedome*, for to goe & speak to Ja[m]es Nayler."¹⁴ So in *First Publishers of Truth*, ". . . until *they were free* in the LORD to depart."¹⁵ "They

¹ *First Publishers of Truth*, 105-6.

² *ibid.*, 91.

³ *ibid.*, 107.

⁴ *ibid.*, 219.

⁵ *ibid.*, 206.

⁶ *ibid.*, 204.

⁷ *ibid.*, 71.

⁸ *ibid.*, 117.

⁹ *ibid.*, 222.

¹⁰ *ibid.*, 224. cf. 237-8.

¹¹ *ibid.*, 145.

¹² Cadbury, H. J., *Letters to William Dewsbury*, p. 18 (Thomas Stubbs).

¹³ *ibid.*, p. 24.

¹⁴ *ibid.*, p. 25.

¹⁵ *F.P.T.*, 132.

had not Freedome to receiue one penny of Them " who " would have given them both Gold & Silver."¹

Admonitions concerning places, where one of the Friends feels another to be needed, are very often expressed in this form of confident freedom. Ann Sherwood has had " some movings concarning a generall meeting " ; she writes to Dewsbury about it, having feared that " something in the will *was not free* to write to thee."²

(iii) As for the " Power of the Lord " I can best refer you to Nuttall.³ As long as they live, we find Dewsbury, Farnsworth and others of the first publishers " moved by the Lord," free to work and travel in communication with each other and also free to judge over what they think valuable to have in print or not, without submissiveness or disloyalty. The sincere comradely spirit without any trace of disloyalty could think as did John Lilburne : " George Fox . . . a precious man in my eyes, his particular actions being no rules for me to walk by."

I have gone through *The First Publishers of Truth* without finding an instance of anyone being sent away at the request of another in any accounts of " ye Breaking forth of Truth in this place."⁴ The formulas are : " The Lords good hand brought amongst us Thomas Salthouse " ; Margaret Killam and Barbara Pattison, " whom the Lord maid his Instrjments " ⁵ etc. " It pleased God to putt it into the heart of his servant . . . to goe ouer to New England."⁶ George Fox " was ordered first into these parts."⁷ Miles Halhead " was moved of ye Lord," " Commanded of ye Lord."⁸ " The first Comeing of the people of God " ⁹ came in the movings of the Lord ; " Sounding the Trumpett of the Lord."¹⁰ " The Lord is to be looked unto who only and alone raises them up." The individual " publisher " steps behind his message : " it pleased the Lord, in the year 1653, to draw sevrall of his servants to Abby holme."¹¹ " In or about ye year 1653, did ye Lord move upon ye hearts of James Nayler & Robert Withers to come into Swaledale."¹² " God's

¹ *F.P.T.*, 135.

² Cadbury, H. J., *Letters to William Dewsbury*, p. 65.

³ *Studies in Christian Enthusiasm*, 58 ff.

⁴ *F.P.T.*, 91.

⁵ *ibid.*, 77-8.

⁶ *ibid.*, 159.

⁷ *ibid.*, 293.

⁸ *ibid.*, 202.

⁹ *ibid.*, 323.

¹⁰ *ibid.*, 293.

¹¹ *ibid.*, 72.

¹² *ibid.*, 309.

despised Truth shall Prosper whether I Live or Dye.”¹ In the Wellingborough account Dewsbury’s last words are quoted: “If any one has received any good or benefit thorow this Vessel, called, Willm Dewsbury, Give God the Glory, I’le have none, I’le have none, I’le have none.”²

“The power of the Lord” can be dislocated by human limitations. As the fire of the divine election burns down, the pillar of fire can be turned into a pedestal below the chosen individual. He may get disordered or not return to his measure or become “an imperialistic human type on English democratic soil”.

In the “Power of the Lord,” nevertheless, the first Quakers challenged the whole feudal system in state and church, “exercised in going to their courts to cry for justice” (George Fox); “going to help the Lord against the mighty” (William Dewsbury). For three years and a half a revelation of democracy without external regulations was realized in England, nationally surrounded by the new republican spirit, and free from disaffections and inner disintegration.³

THE NAYLOR AND THE PERROT CONFLICTS

The first conflict, so imbued with public disrepute and extended persecution, is not only a question of extravagance and hero-worship exaggerated into adoration. At bottom there is a personal conflict, a rivalry of influence, “secret smitings” and a sort of definite grouping round one only of the “dear friends George Fox and James Nayler,” formerly so often addressed together.

The tension arises in London where George Fox, to begin with, “seems strange,” and where Nayler seems “fitted for this great place,” with his educational advantages, his many acceptable acquaintances⁴ and his burning political interest, in the Fifth monarchy days, when official power evidently had made Cromwell a dictator, ready for kingship.

We all know the external picture of this conflict and its fatal consequences in splitting up and making ridiculous the Quaker movement. In it there are some traces of a

¹ *F.P.T.*, 289.

² *ibid.*, 199.

³ *ibid.*, cp., p. 11.

⁴ In Quaker literature we hear of *Captain* Stoddard and *Justice* Benson. Why is Nayler always termed “a soldier”? A quartermaster had a high rank in the army as well as great responsibility.

“ women’s movement,” not only from the then unbalanced Martha Simmonds, but also through other women taking sides with Nayler ; while young Burrough, the “ son ” of Fox, harshly dismisses their overtures.

The total conflict is known under the name of “ Nayler’s fall.” Nayler obviously made the scandal.

But was there not subtly a George Fox’s “ fall ”—without provoking any bad reputé at all ? Not only Hubberthorne’s letter to Margaret Fell reports what happened between the two in Exeter Jail. So also does Rich’s report after Nayler’s death, and above all Fox’s own words about James Nayler long afterwards : he “ was dark & much out : neverthelesse hee woulde have come and kisst me but I saide seeinge hee had turned against ye power of God Itt was my foote : & soe ye Lord God moved mee to sleight him & to sett ye power of God over him ”.¹ As Cromwell felt God’s call to chastise Ireland, so Fox was moved to “ sett ye power of God over ” Nayler. He identifies himself with God as did the anointed rulers of old. Fox had frankly and rightly said he was the son of God without being punished. Fox had got adoring letters² without being accused. Fox was cleared of connection with the public scandal because of his judging letter, found in Nayler’s pocket. Fox is entirely on the side of reason, respectability and unemotionalism—but not of charity.

And now as to the way of dealing with this conflict, with its terrible public consequences, with echoes in books and pamphlets all over the continent, and with a considerable number of men and women taking Nayler’s side. Nayler in prison after his cruel treatment, begins to realize the cost to Friends of his consent to an extravagance inspired by others. “ James said that he see it his place to lie under the feet of all,” Roger Hebden writes to Dewsbury,³ ignorant of the smarting memory attached to those words. Several of the old friends show as before much affection to Nayler. Farnsworth, Hubberthorne, Dewsbury, Alexander Parker, John Audland, Rebecca Travers, Sarah Blackbury, “ M.T.”⁴

¹ *Journal* (Camb.), I, 244.

² For example ; *Journal* (Camb.), I. 245, “ Umphery norton to g ff 1656.”

³ Cadbury, H. J., *Letters to William Dewsbury*, p. 25.

⁴ *ibid.*, p. 23 (unidentified).

all take him in as of old. "The love that rounds to him I cannot express" (1658). Some of them endeavour to moderate Fox, who rode to meeting-place after meeting-place disowning not only the painful action, but also Nayler in person, especially in Bristol, where many had been moved by the spectacle of Nayler's martyrdom. "M.T." appeals to Dewsbury, whose "care in healing up breaches" is well known to the writer. And Alexander Parker writes to Margaret Fell, "My dear sister, as thou hast been tender and of large compassion unto the sufferers, I beseech thee make intercession for him; that in the spirit of meekness, he may be restored again." We see how all these here mentioned try to heal the wound.

I have not the date of a certain sermon by Dewsbury, included in his Works—maybe it came forth in those days: "Thou must be slain to thy pride . . . thou must have God to burn it up in thee. He abhors the proud. . . . People may die into life."

To Nayler, Fox shewed no meekness. Nayler went through the kneeling scene, described and opposed by Rich. Nayler would not continue the conflict by setting up others against Fox.¹ But he continued as an apostle, even in Bristol, much in London, during two years. On Fox's order to him to leave London and go into the country, Hubberthorne answers: "Here is great service for him, and several great ones have a desire to hear him." He is in no disrepute among these comrades.

In Fox something hardened, just as Fox had found "O.P. began to harden."² From a secular point of view he had victoriously put down the resistance and for the future has prevented identification between Quakers and extravagance. But somewhere in the movement there was a deep loss on the emotional side, not only through giving up extravagances. Some of the group "runn out with" Nayler, others are "restored". But a deep wound of unemotionalism and fear of too immediate obedience to the Voice has marred the movement, and tends to reveal its existence in future relationships, not being abolished "by the mere fiat of power."

¹ His last words on "exaltation and cruelty" may mean the weak points on both sides (which will both be overcome by the spirit felt by him).

² *Journal* (Camb.), 1, 263.

A year after Nayler's death (Margaret Fell could still write about Nayler's death without unkindness), George Fox visited the house where Nayler had died, "where ye maior of Huntingeton came to see me"¹ Nayler is not mentioned. After the death of Hubberthorne, Farnsworth and Dewsbury, Nayler's name becomes buried in hard silence. He is just "another" or one amongst "several others," his works being published only after George Fox's death. Crouch's (censored?) autobiography, with so many vivid glimpses of the "first publishers," omits mention of Nayler.

Of the two reports from Swaledale,² one tells us of James Nayler and Robert Withers (already quoted) "being ye first yt we know of yt came there with yt Testimony." The other begins: "Note, That the first man that came into Swaledale to preach the Gospel was one Robert Wethers (so farr as can be maid out)."

In the report of Somersetshire³—where I do not know of any visit from James Nayler—we read: "Seuerall others there were That has a seruice And ministry for Truth About the Time before Mentioned, some whereof haue not Continued ffaithful to the Lord . . . are not worthy to haue Their Names Recorded amongst the Righteous. . . . This account is ffaithfully drawn up According to fformer advice ffrom the yearly meetting."

THE SECOND CONFLICT

Out of this first conflict Fox went externally as the victor, the survivor, and by-and-by as leader above the others. On the inner stage things were perhaps otherwise. (I venture to believe that Nayler's loving spirit still worked in the silence for good!) But persecutions were terribly hard, life was dry and poor, and the need for a rock "in a weary land" grew stronger and stronger in the post-pioneer generation. "The power" was not something George Fox took. It was something he represented (biologically, psychologically). When the First Publishers were all gone nobody would doubt his supremacy; idolizing affection had not been declined by him. But it was a step backwards from the original Quaker "democracy" where social contacts were woven through with spiritual unity.

¹ *Journal* (Camb.), II, 9.

² *F.P.T.*, 309, 316.

³ *ibid.*, 224.

The second conflict was subdued by Fox on much the same lines as the first one. A definite antipathy against Perrot and his spontaneity, when the group so recently had passed through the great risk of extravagancy, acts in cutting off Perrot from the movement. After his adventures and sufferings in foreign countries, Perrot at his return in 1657 must have been struck by the radical change of atmosphere among Friends in London, and reacted against it, much supported by a hidden uneasiness in many. To the last he longed for "amity and unity" in his own way. As a democratic Swedish writer, writes: "He felt lack of interpersonal affection dangerous, naive as he was, this poet!" He had a refreshing effect on dry meetings, and was appreciated by Penington, Ellwood, Richard Davies and Jane Stokes—women on the whole did not seem to take a vivid part in this conflict.

Perrot's "Humility of God"¹ touched upon a delicate matter, and his testimony against formalities and the importance of the hat question, bitterly recalled the dynamic and smarting recollection of those (including James Nayler) who "kept on there hatts when I prayde," "ye first yt gave yt bad example amongst freindes."² The hat had grown to be an important symbol, like a banner to a nation. How many had not in the first days been cast into prison because of their hat.

Fox makes speedy work of it. He did not "see my soul," an expression by the poet Perrot. But he saw tendencies towards dissolving the Quaker movement, and judges harshly. Loyalty to Fox now very evidently influences most of those who had at first appreciated Perrot. They kept aloof, could not stand hearing "evil of Friends that bore the burden and heat of the day," nor the crying out "against Friends as death and formal."³

Braithwaite says of Fox: "With him tenderness to the individual must be subordinated to the welfare of the group." Of a secular group, perhaps. But was he true to his beginnings in his attitude towards Perrot? "Eccentricity is not healed by harshness."

¹ On men's judging: "There is a secret seed of prejudice and enmity in the heart, which stirreth up prejudice in the hearts of the persons judged."

² *Journal* (Camb.), I, 244.

³ Braithwaite, W. C., *The Second Period of Quakerism* (1912), 230.

Spontaneity, enthusiasm and group consolidation became more and more separated. An aftermath spirit of disaffection ate like worms in spite of faithful loyalty to Fox's judgment.

GROUP AUTHORITY

After these first conflicts, during Fox's three years in prison we find a new tendency towards group consolidation. Farnsworth's constitutional proposal strengthens the group authority, the corporate sense, to which individual guidance must be subordinated. In Fox's long absence this church authority was the solution arrived at in 1666, at the special ministers' meeting in London. The group authority—over against other groups and other attitudes of a minority—has the day. There is a collectivistic trend, more or less outspoken. When the third conflict, the constitutional one, comes to life later on, we find that both Penn and Barclay, the two most interested in the great constitutional questions of their time, more or less openly think in terms of this group authority, while Fox comes out of his prison with a wonderful solution of another kind.

Neither "Foxonian unity"—his enemies' expression—nor the effort towards church control over individual consciences corresponds to the original unity of spirit, friendship, social conscience and great work. We are not able to realize fully the enormous cost and challenge of the revelation of a new human type of individual and community life, when there darted out into the world those first publishers of truth, "above 20 yeeres agoe when wee were but younge lads & lasses."¹

THE "GOSPEL ORDER"

There are leaders who avoid the organizational implications of the principle they stand for. George Fox did not. He is not the single "founder of Quakerism"; but he is the founder of the constitution through which a living Quaker movement was able to survive. There he stands foremost.

J. S. Rowntree says: "Beginning his ministry as an iconoclast—the apostle of a singularly individualistic faith . . . George Fox preserved that saving sense of the proportion of things, which qualified him to become the architect of a system of church organization suitable for the present need

¹ *Journal* (Camb.), II, 98.

of a religious body." Howard Brinton opposes the first part of this utterance and approves Troeltsch's assertion that the Quakers "overcame the natural anti-social or rather individualistic part of mysticism," I do not like to have the Society of Friends interpreted in terms of architecture. Early Quakerism was no "construction." It was the outcome of a spiritual and historical event, interpreted, after twenty years, in a unique religious constitution. And this constitutional interpretation—after several earlier tentative endeavours—was given through George Fox. His "Gospel Order" was revealed to him while he was "buried alive." In organizational form, Fox stated finally what had come into life as a fellowship 20 years before. He is not "the founder of a creed" but of an organization where it should be possible for living individuals to be their creed. I would modify Gerald Heard's saying: "History is only the shadow cast by growing and defining spirit of man," and say that the spirit of history discloses what existed before it was defined.

"Ye Lord opned to me & lett mee see what I must doe."¹ With an immense joy and inner strength Fox goes out with this revelation, although bodily much weakened. Fervently he stresses the importance of each individual for the whole group. "Every man & woman yt be ye heires of ye gospel they are heires of this authority."² Bodily pain and weakness is as if they are not. His newly-opened energy is "on top of it."³ His inspiration drives him through all the meetings in England and out of his native country. This gospel order gives him the fresh gladness of early days. To quote again one of his latest expressions in this matter: "The least member in the church has an office and is serviceable, and every member hath need one of another."

Never was the *we* accent stronger in him. "And I said then [1672] it was time for mee to goe away, for then they would not come to their owne Teacher . . . for wee brought every one to their owne teacher."⁴ I cannot with Rufus Jones see in this new task "opened to him" "a surrender

¹ *Journal* (Camb.), II, 111.

² *cf.*, *ibid.*, II, 343, 344.

³ Even if new personal hopes in connection with M.F. are part of this joy, it is but human and uplifting—as is love in every age of man.

⁴ *ibid.*, II, 224 etc.

of the primitive dream," nor that he "bent in this crisis." The more I look on his "gospel order" and the spiritual freshness surrounding its origin, the more I find it a translation of the early glorious fellowship experience into terms of organization. The genius of Fox defined in action—not in analysing—what had already existed as a Quaker democracy. The melody of the early years echoes in the "Gospel Order."

But to Fox himself there is in it something more than merely fetching up the past. "The sacrifice of the man in power" was fulfilled in himself. In that moment he, for the most part, dethroned himself from a rather stabilized leadership. Is it too bold a conjecture to put the question thus: was this his way of unconscious, unspoken, but practised atonement for things past—mute in the world of spoken words, very real in demonstrative action? He never was conscious of sin,¹ but his incessant religious appeal to his inner Teacher cleanses the depths of his soul for action, even though personality traits betraying power-urge and domination are still identified with "ye power of ye Lord."

Even such an utterance as "Friends putt there names to them by my leave & order,"² with several others which seem to contradict the spirit of his own first inspiration, do not alter this fact. When a man's excellence is taken for granted, it is not easy to conquer the superman in him, especially in a person of his mature age with an overwhelming religious experience in his youth.

He now lives surrounded by an admiring wife and family. Margaret's sons-in-law defend his memory against William Penn, not to mention Margaret herself.³ We are wrong to wish George Fox to remain a young prophet. Growing into manhood he was within his rights in enjoying a good reputation—none could take from him the merit of having suffered terribly for his deep conviction.

Yet Fox, for the most part, gave up being the man of power. It has been pointed out that Fox's death led to no

¹ *Journal* (Bicentenary), I, 2; *Journal* (Camb.), I, 2-4 etc.

² *Journal* (Camb.), II, 313. Compare his pungent words against *Gleichschaltung* when the priests "drew upp articles to bee reade in there parishes—& all ye people shoulde say Amen to them" (*ibid.*, I, 295). Or, "I did not set up that meeting to make orders against the reading of my papers" (Barclay: *Inner Life*, p. 403).

³ For instance Spence MSS. 33 (or Camelford).

disturbance. This was a great victory. What that meant to the Quaker movement, nay, to Quaker democracy, is something great and unique. He had done what Cromwell could not do. "Ye Lord God whose I am & we are" opened to Fox another way. It is true "the system could only be worked well by men of enlightened spiritual experience,"¹ as were those first publishers of truth. Fox's outlook afterwards, during the years of subdued "extravagances" and quenched enthusiasm sounds like this: "Many have gone beyond their measures, but more have quenched the Spirit and so become dead and dull or subject to a false fear."²

"Peoples who had experienced and praised political freedom, abstained from it without resistance and ended by entirely forgetting it."³ We have actual knowledge to-day of such experiences. The way to forward democracy to a new generation is through education. It is interesting to find how George Fox became open to this problem in his age. I am thinking not only of his ideas of schools, even for "lasses." I think also of the exercise of citizenship and responsibility brought forth through all the different "parliaments," monthly, quarterly, yearly, by far the most important education in democracy—the more so as in no other "church" do worship, debates and responsible citizenship go together in the same way. To-day when mechanization takes hold of human societies and "the tabu on tenderness" is the rule, I think there is much to learn from this constitutional synthesis, this vessel wherein inspiration was reckoned with in the social order, where debates alternate with silences, and where co-operation is possible without the rigid schemes of yesterday. Secular societies do not yet reckon for inspiration; Quakerism does not exist without it. The "machine way" of never touching each other, only fitting in with a part of our life in a common system, has nothing in it of early Quaker spirit.

There is no need in this place to linger on details or even occasional relapses to a wooden order, instead of actualizing always the living community, woven through with friendships and spiritual unity.

¹ Braithwaite, W. C., *Second Period*, 259.

² Fox, G., *Epistles*, No. 275, quoted in *Second Period*, 264.

³ Bryce, J., *Modern Democracies*.

THE WILKINSON-STORY CONFLICT

Now to the third Quaker conflict in Fox's lifetime, the Wilkinson-Story separation. It is, partly, a real conflict of constitution, though other stronger problems of an emotional kind blur the contours. It seems to me a paradoxical situation, that the mistakes for which Fox is rightly criticized are chiefly his previous attitudes in the two earlier conflicts, while the real intentions of his constitution are not understood by many defenders, out of loyalty to Fox, nor by the opposers. Somewhat anachronistically, old wounds are disclosed as new suspicions against the constitutional aim, as is very often the case in secular political life, where there is seldom such a rich documentation at hand as in Quaker literature of the tissue of emotions and motives behind ideological contrasts, falsely taken as the only issue in question. Because of the scars left in the Quaker body after Fox's summary judging in the two previous conflicts (which were subdued, not solved), his renouncing of his special supremacy in order to get again a fellowship spirit is interpreted as if this very action were the utmost outcome of dictatorship.

A few of the oppositional items only: specialized business meetings as the opposers wanted, would have separated practical things from the spirit of worship—a unity which has meant so much to the Quaker message. Limiting Friends' opportunities of taking part in conferences would have meant reducing the possibility of education for responsibility. The opposition to women's meetings which turned up only after earlier approval, had a personal bias against Margaret Fox, "the woman high sheriff." There is also the very reasonable claim of the opposers that singing, groaning and other disturbances should not interfere with actual spoken witness.

The opposition to condemnation papers seems very sound, but it was weakened through a suspicion of self defence in the opposers. "Deal gently . . . instead of publishing their weakness."¹ "Condemnations should not stand on our deacon's books to posterity."² An accusation against Fox as lacking courage is entirely absurd. But the cardinal accusation has to be a little more examined.

Returning from America, where Fox had had such great

¹ Rogers, W., *Christian Quaker*, p. 29.

² *ibid.*, p. 8.

care not to be in the foreground but to direct everyone to their inner Teacher, he found dissension between Margaret and John Story. "He did," says Braithwaite, "everything in his power to get the difficulty composed without assertion of his own authority," in harmony with the new order. He "was careful to leave the responsibility to the bodies concerned." At the opposers' visit to Swarthmore, he was "loving to them and tender on their behalf, letting them see the danger they were in." In his Epistle No. 308 he says: "when I turned you to Him that is able to save you, I left you to him." The strong condemnation of John Story and John Wilkinson by the Yearly Meeting of ministers in 1677 was not signed by George Whitehead and Fox kept in the background.

This reticence of Fox is consistent with the spirit of the constitution. But others are eager to have him "step in and stand in the gap." Margaret and other Friends, primarily defending Fox himself, not the "Gospel Order," had part in the stressed misunderstandings of the aim of the constitution. The words of the Y.M. Epistle of 1673 are in direct contrast to Fox's "Gospel Order": "A general care is not laid upon every member . . ." but "particularly our dear brother and God's faithful labourer George Fox." Here is that formulation of principle which becomes a fixed attribute—not belonging in a real fellowship where such things are not needed. "When love begins to sicken and decay it useth an enforced ceremony."¹ Not even Penn and Barclay, neither of whom had been among the first publishers, understood Fox's educational aim in making everyone able to give service. Both stress too much the corporate authority. When this point was exaggeratedly stressed from Barbados (as honouring Fox?) George Fox and others of the old fellowship replied that such is the very way to weaken the life of the whole body. "The universal spirit of God has unity with the least measure now as it was in the apostles' days."

But there are deep personal conflicts in the controversy, opening up old veins of disaffection.²

"What we stand for is Truth and Righteousness and that *Christ's Government* may be exalted in every heart . . . not

¹ Shakespeare, W., *Julius Caesar*, Act IV, Scene 2.

² Stirred, E., *Strength in Weakness*, p. 36; *F.P.T.*, 267.

to depend on man for teaching but on sufficiency of God's grace."¹ And further: "Persons are exceeding prone to receive things as truths from those whom they have an high opinion of, and to imitate their practices and so hurt their own growth."² In a paper against the two Johns these were said to have "sleighted the cause of God."³ Rogers quoted a letter from Fox in 1670: "This is the word of the Lord to you . . . you will become hardened and as bad as the old opposers James Nayler and his company, and John Perrot."⁴

Consciousness of the real content of the Nayler conflict is always lacking in Fox. There he tragically repeats old impressions in spite of all. Rightly he is answered: "Well may Friends be called apostates in their day and be cursed of men when they are dead . . . seeing James Nayler by thee is called an old opposer, who confest his weakness . . . and died in Truth and peace with God."⁵ And Rogers also points out that the adoration for which Nayler was judged is just the peril of George Fox. Nayler seems to have grown into a type of every disturbance in Quakerism. "My judgment shall stand for ever noe pardon for thee." He, who "was in love of God to all that persecuted me" (1653) had a hard spot, where old friendship had been externally killed.

There are " . . . two ways. One is to build up round ourselves a protective wall, to shield our self-esteem . . . But in the end what we have built is not a fortress but a jail. The other is to endure the shame of self-revelation in a spirit of true humility."⁶

In a secular state only the hardened self-defensive man can lead. The Society of Friends began as a community where threads of love were the binding element "united (as they were) to the Lord & one to another in the blessed fellowship of the spirit, the which in those days was plentyfully enjoyed."

¹ Rogers, W., *Christian Quaker*, p. 27.

² *ibid.*, p. 90, quoted from Penington.

³ *ibid.*, p. 26. The "two Johns" were, of course John Wilkinson and John Story.

⁴ *ibid.*, p. 41.

⁵ *ibid.*, p. 43.

⁶ Hugh Stafford in *The Friend* (London), 15.iv.49.

But "It may be feared many do eye more the orders from thee than they eye the Lord in them."¹ "Hast thou forgotten how thou hast testified against J.N's. spirit, whose great fall was his owning or at least not reproaching the women? . . . If such things are crimes in others, how comes it to pass that the like are not crimes when committed by thee?"²

This unhealed wound lies behind much coldness and behind much wrongly directed, but real opposition, against a constitution born out of a renewed spirit of love. And although Fox had suffered so deeply that even in his constitution he made the attempt Cromwell could never make, he never became conscious of the enduring after-effect of the Naylor conflict, which was the petrified point in his great heart. I sometimes think that this after-effect secretly lasted longer in the Society even than the effect of the "extravagance" and the scandal.

¹ Rogers, W., *Christian Quaker*, p. 77.

² *ibid.*, p. 93.

Some Whittier First Editions

Published in the British Isles

By C. MARSHALL TAYLOR

IN collecting John Greenleaf Whittier first printings, one is impressed with the fact that the Quaker poet found favour in the British Isles almost as early as he did in America, and has held it ever since.¹

Considering he was born in December, 1807, it is surprising to find one of his poems, "To the Author of the Improvisatrice," in *The Literary Gazette and Journal of Belles Lettres, Arts, Sciences, &c.* (London) for 19th June, 1830. Whittier, having seen a poem by Letitia E. Landon, wrote the poem and sent it to the *Philadelphia Gazette*. It came into the hands of Willis Gaylord Clark, who forwarded it to the *Gazette* in London, the editor of which was glad to publish the poem about Letitia E. Landon who, at that moment, was a favourite in English literary circles.

The editor of the *London Gazette* was greatly impressed by Whittier's poem, so much so that he added a note at the end of the poem saying: "We do not often admit personal tributes into our columns but the poetical beauties of this composition and its gratifying character, as confirming from another hemisphere the fame attached to the writings of L.E.L. (Letitia E. Landon), our long-valued and especial favourite in this country, have induced us to give it insertion. The author is described to us in a letter from Philadelphia, to be a "young American poet-editor of great promise" in the U.S., and these lines afford high proof of talent."

Another Whittier poem, "The Indian Girl's Lament," written two months earlier (November, 1829), was the first book printing of Whittier's poems in England, appearing in *The Literary Souvenir*, London, 1830. The poem was first published in the *New England Weekly Review*, Hartford, Conn., 2nd August, 1830. Whittier included the poem in his *Legends of New England*, 1831, yet omitted it from his

¹ The author's list of Whittier printings in the British Isles is preserved at Friends' Reference Library, Friends House, Euston Road, London, N.W.1.

subsequent authorized collected editions, which would seem to indicate that he did not have too high a regard for it. My copy of the *Souvenir*, in the original red watered silk boards, includes two poems each by William and Mary Howitt, three by Miss Landon and one by William Cullen Bryant.

Whittier, on the other hand, seems to have become well acquainted with English politics, even at this early date, for he wrote a poem "Tariffiana" in the spring of 1829, which, however, was never published in England. Earlier that year the *Liverpool Advertiser* had said, "The only true policy for America is entire freedom of trade. Every other system is false, delusive and hazardous." Whittier, though a very young man (21), was editor of *The American Manufacturer*, a paper favouring duties to protect American industries. Two verses suffice to indicate Whittier's unwillingness to accept the *Liverpool Advertiser's* advice :

" Hark ! The voice of John Bull, who with fatherly care
Still watches the nation he governed of old,
And breathes for its weal a benevolent prayer,
Whenever the tale of our greatness is told !

Let the eagle that soars with the wings of the storm,
The bird of our country, his wanderings check.
Bend lowly in homage the pride of his form
That the foot of the lion may rest on his neck."

Dublin was next to become acquainted with Whittier's poems in *Selections From the American Poets* (1834) which printed "To the Dying Year," "The Indian's Tale," "A Legend," and some parts of "The Minstrel Girl." These poems no doubt were copied from Cheever's *American Common-Place Book of Poetry*, Boston, 1831, as it contained the identical Whittier poems. There is supporting evidence for this claim because the Dublin editor compounded an error originally made by Cheever who had ascribed some lines from "The Minstrel Girl" to James G. Whittier, and also all the other poems by the Quaker poet were credited to James G. Whittier by the Dublin publisher.

This editor, who apparently desired to remain anonymous, makes the following comment in the preface : "It has been asserted that no American poet has as yet produced a continuous poem capable of arresting attention." In his search for a reason for this dearth, the editor goes on to explain, "We shall perhaps conclude from an inspection of

the specimens collected, that American intellect is not capable of producing poetry of a very high order—we need not advert to their advancement in every branch of knowledge that can be rendered profitable by application to practical purposes” for “amidst the cares of gain, the noise, the bustle, the distractions of agricultural, commercial and political pursuits, polite literature can scarcely be expected to be cultivated, except as a matter of taste or amusement.” Whittier no doubt read this and other similar comments. He had to bide his time, for it is related that when Longfellow published “Evangeline” in 1847, Whittier is quoted as saying, “Eureka! Here, then we have it at last—an American poem, with the lack of which British reviewers have so long reproached us.” Added pleasure must have come to Whittier when he published “Snow-Bound” in 1866.

Ballads, and Other Poems, by John G. Whittier, H. G. Clarke and Co., 66 Old Bailey, 1844, was the largest collection of Whittier poems published up to that date on either side of the Atlantic. It was a compilation of the poems included in the Philadelphia edition of 1838, *Lays of My Home and Other Poems*, Boston, 1843, two other poems previously published and four printed therein for the first time, “The New Wife and the Old,” “The Christian Slave,” “Texas” and “Stanzas for the Times.” It was issued as No. 30 in *Clarke’s Cabinet Series*, similar in style and published by the same firm as that to whom we owe Emerson’s *Nature; An Essay. And Lectures on the Times*, another Anglo-American first edition published in 1844.¹

It is interesting to note that, in commissioning his friend Professor Elizur Wright to try to arrange for the publication of his first volume of poems in England, Whittier wrote, “I think an edition of my poems would sell pretty well in England, irrespective of any merit or demerit,” for the Quaker poet was the acknowledged poet laureate of freedom and no doubt Joseph Sturge’s friendship was very helpful also.

Probably the most elusive Whittier English first editions are the Leeds Anti-Slavery four-page leaflets, issued separately in 1852-3 as numbers of the “Leeds Anti-Slavery Series” carrying the note “Sold by W. and G. F. Cash, 5 Bishopsgate Street, London; and by Jane Jowett, Friends

¹ Brussell, I. R., *Anglo-American First Editions. Part Two: West to East, 1786-1930, 1936*, pp. 124-5.

Meeting Yard, Leeds, at 1s. 2d. per 100." The four leaflets carried the following poems :

No. 10—" The Farewell of a Virginia Slave—Mother to be."

No. 21—" Clerical Oppressors."

No. 43—" The Slave Ship."

No. 52—" The Christian Slave."

Later eighty-two tracts were gathered together into a volume, the title page of which read "*Five Hundred Thousand Strokes for Freedom. A Series of Anti-Slavery tracts, of which half-a-million are now first issued by the Friends of the Negro, London, W. & F. Cash and may be had of all Booksellers, 1853.*" The preface states that "whilst the first impression is passing through the printer's hands, the demand for these tracts has been so great, that a second Half Million are already in the press." This ten-page preface is signed "Wilson Armistead. Leeds. 6th Month, 1853."

Whittier's English *Snow-Bound* is an interesting first edition. It was published by Alfred W. Bennett, 5 Bishopsgate without, and contains five photographs of American winter scenes. It also carries an actual photograph of Whittier taken specially for this volume and which seems never to have been reproduced or republished elsewhere. Unfortunately none of the scenes have any connection with the poet's birthplace at Haverhill, Mass. They are no doubt real American snow scenes and possibly help to spread the tale that, on occasions when Englishmen assigned to the tropics become a bit wearied with the excessive heat, they retire to their libraries, relax, reach for a copy of *Snow-Bound* and, with the reading of the lines describing the snow storm, enjoy at least mental cooling, an example of mind over matter, so to speak.

English appreciation of Whittier's poetry and his anti-slavery activities in many ways surpassed that in America. Two English Friends were his ardent admirers, Joseph Sturge and John Bright. The former aided quite substantially in a financial way and the latter, in addition to his worded praises and support, was said to be able to recite "*Snow-Bound*" from beginning to the end. Who else could or can do that? Likewise, in our own day, Winston S. Churchill, whom no one claims to be a Friend, surprised the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt on the occasion when they rode together through Frederick,

Maryland, by reciting in full the Whittier poem that will no doubt be remembered for all time—"Barbara Frietchie."

Rufus M. Jones rarely gave an address without quoting from Whittier, and a choice selection of Whittier's poems "pre-eminently calculated to nourish "the inner life" of the seekers after Truth" was published in 1909 by the Friends' "Yorkshire 1905 Committee" with an introduction by Rufus M. Jones entitled "Whittier the Mystic." This collection, somewhat enlarged and with a longer introduction by Rufus Jones, was republished in 1919 and again in 1920 under the title *Whittier's Poems (Selected)*. In 1947 under the title *Poems of the Inner Life*, a similar but shorter collection with the same introduction was published by the Friends Home Service Committee in London. Whittier, though he never spoke in meeting, is responsible for the words of over one hundred hymns, the most popular, world-wide, being his "Dear Lord and Father of Mankind," which was sung at the 1948 Amsterdam meeting of the World Council of Churches.

In addition to furnishing words for hymns, a great many of Whittier's other poems have been set to music and published by English music publishers. Among these might be mentioned *The Meeting* (J. Curwen & Sons, Ltd., 1935) and *The Light That is Felt* (C. Jefferys & Sons, no date). These are of special interest to Friends. The words from "The Meeting" are set to music by Sir Hugh S. Robertson, carrying the salutation "To the Society of Friends—Dedication Hymn with Faux Bourdon," with the explanatory note, "The words are taken from Whittier's poem describing the conversation of a Quaker and her guest after Morning Meeting. It was said of Avis Keene, of whom the poem speaks, that she was a woman lovely in spirit and person, whose words seemed a message of love and tender concern to all her hearers." One may well ask how the following words would find any appropriate setting except in deep silence, certainly not to the strains of any music :

" And from the silence multiplied
By these still forms on either side,
The world that time and sense have known
Falls off, and leaves us God alone."

Likewise, it seems most inappropriate to set "The Light that is Felt" to music.

As long as Whittier's religious poems, hymns and songs find favour, his memory and his influence will be felt. What more need we ask ?

Quaker Social History

Quaker Social History, 1669-1738. By Arnold Lloyd. With an Introduction by Herbert G. Wood. London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1950. Pp. xv, 207, 12 plates.

It may not be particularly apt that the title chosen for this book challenges for it a comparison with *English Social History*, the fruit of G. M. Trevelyan's ripe scholarship ; nevertheless Arnold Lloyd's studies here given to the public do cover the types of material needed for a social history of early Quakerism.

In his preface the author tells how a comparison of the Advices and Queries sent down by George Fox in 1681 to Warwickshire Friends with the *Digest* of 1738 (the first in the line of comprehensive Books of Discipline) suggested two questions needing answer. " By what process did those homely advices, circulated among a loose confederation of local meetings, harden into a rigid discipline administered by a vigilant national assembly ? Could George Fox, who wrote those simple queries about the oversight of disorderly walkers and the encouragement of widows in trade indeed be the author of that national system of Quaker church government which has stood the strain of two and a half centuries ? "

Arnold Lloyd answers these questions in the first thirty pages of the book—in chapters on Church government, and on Individual freedom and group authority. Having laid down his principles the author proceeds in the rest of the book, to give topical studies on Quaker poor relief, marriage, the Quakers and the State, the Quaker Yearly Meeting, and the like. These essays show how the principles were worked out in different spheres of activity.

This is a book which all interested in Quaker history should read, and we cannot attempt to touch on the many issues raised. In the course of his work Arnold Lloyd gives welcome space to William Penn and his English political activities, although he perhaps tends to lay too modern an emphasis on Penn's personal activities as a parliamentary manager. It is interesting to note that the author observes the Meeting for Sufferings was unique in power and influence among nonconformist bodies of the period.

There are many pitfalls for the historian using local material unless he has intimate knowledge of the places and persons concerned, so it is no discredit to the author that there are inaccuracies in some minor points—although it is unfortunate that these should have publicity. For instance (in spite of note 25 to p. 34), there is no Quaker record of Bristol Friends' poor being sent to the parish for relief—the woman concerned had lost touch with Friends three

years before. The difficulty over the application of the meeting collection in Bristol in 1679 (see note 36 to p. 161) was not due to financial stringency but to the opposition of the Wilkinson-Story party to proposals to send a subscription to the London National Stock from the Bristol meeting funds which they had helped to collect. Dennis Hollister was once Member of Parliament for Somerset, never for Bristol.

The volume is well produced, and illustrated with facsimiles of documents—although these lack reference to source, and it is disconcerting to have Francis Bugg's caricature *The Quakers' Synod* described as "George Whitehead opening the Yearly Meeting, 1696." The price is 21s.

Notes and Queries

THE QUAKER CALENDAR

WHEN did the Quaker year begin? Before England changed from the Julian Calendar (Old Style) to the Gregorian Calendar (New Style) in 1752, the year was accounted to begin on Lady Day (25th March) not 1st January. Did Friends likewise begin the year on 25th March? Much evidence points to the conclusion that they did, but Henry J. Cadbury has drawn attention to an inscription in a Sussex Friends' register (Ifield and Shipley, 1659-1775), which was printed by Perceval Lucas in his article "Some Notes on the Early Sussex Quaker Registers" (in *Sussex Archæological Collections*, Vol. 55, 1912, pp. 74-96, quoted at p. 81). As this may not have come to the notice of many Friends it is reproduced here:

"Memorandum: That ye Names of ye Months mention'd in this Book does Hold like correspondence with the Other Months Named after ye Manner of ye world as they are distinguished hereafter followeing vizt

The First Month is called by ye world March.

The Second Month is called by ye world April.

The Third Month is called by ye world May, etc., etc.

And Note that by the Acct in this Book the year is (to be understood) to Begin the First day of the First Month comonly called March Whereas in the worlds Accompt it begins not till ye 25th day of the said Month."

This statement bears out the contention of Samuel G. Barton in his article on *The Quaker Calendar* (publication of the University of Pennsylvania: Flower Astronomical Observatory, Reprint No. 74. Reprinted from *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 93, No. 1, April, 1949, pp. 32-39). Samuel Barton, who is Associate Professor of Astronomy at the University of Pennsylvania, argues that before the change to New Style the Quaker year began on 1st March not 25th March.

The English evidence we have studied points overwhelmingly to the fact that English Friends as a whole did not consciously adopt a system of dating (as distinct from the names applied to days

and months) different from that of their fellow countrymen. The dating practice in the Minutes of the London Meeting for Sufferings, and in a typical provincial meeting book (the fortnightly Bristol Men's Meeting—from which the examples quoted next are taken), indicate 25th March as the beginning of the year. Typical date sequences are: 6.xii.1670, 20.xii.1670, 6.i.1670, 20.i.1670, 3.ii.1671; 4.i.1671, 18.i.1671, 1.ii.1672; 3.i.1672, 17.i.1672-3 [here the double year is given, as often in March up to the 24th, never after the new year had begun on the 25th], 31.i.1673; 5.i.1682 [alternatively given as 5.i.1682-83], 19.i.1682 [with similar alternative]; 11.i.1688-89, 25.i.1689.

As this evidence seems to bring to light a possibly unsuspected difference between English and American Quaker practice, and one in which perhaps English records are not consistent, we should very much like to have further record evidence on the matter.

NELL GWYNN AND FRIENDS

It is possible to make some answer at this late date to a query under the above title by my late friend and fellow countryman Francis R. Taylor, published in 1932 in this *Journal* (xxix, 71). He wrote: "Hast thou ever run across Nell Gwyn in a Quaker connection? I find the following in Bancroft's *United States History*, ii, 347: "Profligate gallants of the Court of Charles II assembled to hear the drollery of Nell Gwyn heap ridicule on the Quakers.'"

Perhaps the source is Gerard Croese who wrote in Holland

in Latin in 1695 the first history of the Quakers. I quote from his English translation, published in 1696, Part II, p. 96 [= 2nd Latin edition, 1696, p. 356].

"Yea, in the Courts of Kings and Princes, their Fools and Pleasants, which they kept to relax them from grief and pensiveness, could not show themselves more dexterously ridiculous, than by representing the Quakers, or aping the motions of their mouth, voice, gesture, and countenance: I heard a pleasant story from them, Helen which the English for shortness calls Nell at London, a most noted Dancer at the Playhouse (afterward a miss of King Cha. II) tho she could imitate all the Actors by any gesture of her body, yet she could not by her outmost effort and endeavour, even before the King and Courtiers (whom she often pleased with such ludicrous Actions) Act the Quaker so to the life as to draw out, compress and remit the Spirit, and so to ape their praying and holding forth, without betraying force and affectation, and how unhappy she was in Imitating those Actions, which she could never have knowledge of by any Conjecture."

I do not vouch for Croese's historical accuracy here or elsewhere, still less for the recent play of Bernard Shaw, *In Good King Charles's Golden Days*, which brings together in its scenes Charles II, Nell Gwyn, George Fox, Sir Isaac Newton and others as part of a motley *dramatis personae*.

HENRY J. CADBURY, 7 Buckingham Place, Cambridge, 38, Mass.



For **QUAKERIANA**

OLD OR NEW

enquire from the

FRIENDS' BOOK CENTRE

FRIENDS HOUSE, EUSTON ROAD

LONDON, N.W.1 Telephone: Euston 3602

A LARGE STOCK IN HAND

BOOKS SOUGHT FOR

SUPPLEMENTS TO THE JOURNAL OF FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

6. JOHN AP JOHN and early Friends in Wales. 1s. 6d., post 2d.
7. THOMAS POLE, M.D. (1753-1829). 2s. 6d., post 4d.
14. Record of the SUFFERINGS OF FRIENDS IN CORNWALL, 1655-1686. 152 pp., 7s. 6d., post 4d.
15. QUAKER LANGUAGE. F.H.S. Presidential address by T. Edmund Harvey, 1928. 30 pp., 1s. 6d., post 2d.
- 16-17. PEN PICTURES OF LONDON YEARLY MEETING, 1789-1833. Ed. Norman Penney. 227 pp., price 10s., post 6d.
20. THE SWARTHMORE DOCUMENTS IN AMERICA. Edited by Henry J. Cadbury, Ph.D. 1940. 90 pp. Thirty-five 17th c. MSS., originally in the Swarthmore Hall collection. 5s., post 2½d.
21. AN ORATOR'S LIBRARY. John Bright's books. Presidential address 1936 by J. Travis Mills. 1946. 24 pages, 2s., post 1d.
22. LETTERS TO WILLIAM DEWSBURY AND OTHERS. Edited by Henry J. Cadbury, Ph.D. 1948. 68 pp. Thirty-three early Quaker letters, 1655 to 1678. 5s., post 2½d.

AN
ANNUITY
WHICH IS
DIFFERENT !

The
FRIENDS' PROVIDENT
Special Guaranteed
Annuity
has the following
unusual features :

1. It has two main advantages over the ordinary form of Immediate Annuity—
 - (a) THE CAPITAL IS NOT LOST TO THE ESTATE in the event of your early death ; the Annuity is payable for a fixed selected period (10, 15 or 20 years) whether you survive the term or not.
 - (b) INCOME TAX IS ONLY PAYABLE UPON THE INTEREST PORTION of such payment during the fixed period.
2. If you survive the fixed period, the Annuity continues as long as you live, but the payments then become subject to Income Tax upon the full amount.
3. A higher Income Yield can be obtained than is possible upon an ordinary investment, and it is guaranteed throughout.

Write for a quotation, giving date of birth, amount of Capital to be invested, and mention this journal.

THE FRIENDS' PROVIDENT AND
CENTURY INSURANCE OFFICES

Aggregate Funds exceed £30,000,000

HEAD OFFICES :

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

18 Charlotte Sq., Edinburgh, 2