

The Journal
of the
Friends' Historical
Society

VOLUME 46 NUMBER 2 AUTUMN 1954

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

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

Price 5s. Yearly 10s.

Contents

	PAGE
Editorial	45
The Peace Testimony in 1659. <i>Alan Cole</i>	48
The Quaker Marriage Declaration. <i>Ruth G. Burtt</i> ..	53
George Keith to Henry More. <i>Henry J. Cadbury</i> ..	59
Penn and His Printer	64
Friends and the Slave Trade : a Yorkshire Election Declaration, 1806	65
The Baptism of Maria Hack, 1837	67
A. R. Barclay MSS. XCIII to CV	78
Recent Publications	91
Index	96

LONDON TO PHILADELPHIA

by Caroline C. Graveson

The story of a London family set against the background of the momentous years of 1670-89. The author has included episodes in the lives of well-known historical figures, among them William Penn, the founder of Pennsylvania, and George Fox—the Quaker evangelist.

All those, young and old who have enjoyed the Author's previous book "The Farthing Family" will be glad to meet some old friends now grown up.

7/6 (*post 6d.*)

Send 1½d. stamp for Catalogue

BANNISDALE PRESS

46-47 CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.2

THE JOURNAL
OF THE
FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

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

Communications should be addressed to the Editor at
Friends House.

Editorial

IRENE L. EDWARDS delivered her Presidential Address, entitled "The Women Friends of London," on 30th September, 1954. We hope to print it in the Spring issue. At the meeting it was announced that John M. Douglas had accepted the invitation to become president in 1955 in place of the late Doris N. Dalglish.

James Nayler, a Fresh Approach, being Geoffrey F. Nuttall's Presidential Address given on 1st October, 1953, and repeated at Woodbrooke on 1st November, was published with our last issue as Supplement No. 26, and is separately available at 1s. 6d. (postage 1½d.). The Society is indebted to the Woodbrooke Readership Committee for generous assistance to secure the wider circulation of this valuable paper.

With the prospect of an Irish president for the Society in 1955, we hope to give more prominence to the work which is going on dealing with the records of Friends in the Yearly Meeting of Ireland. Isabel Grubb has recently retired from the post of Secretary to the Historical Committee of the Yearly Meeting, and her place has been taken by Mary Bewley. Irish Friends have commemorated in 1954 the setting-up of the first regular Friends' Meeting for worship in Ireland at the house of William Edmundson at Lurgan in 1654.

A well attended and very successful conference was held at Lisburn School from 2nd to 5th July, to hear and discuss addresses by John M. Douglas, Isabel Grubb and Winifred G. Squire. There was also time for discussion, and excursions

were made to a number of historic Quaker sites in Northern Ireland.

* * * * *

Two years ago, in the hills of north-western England and on the coastal plain round Morecambe Bay, Friends were commemorating the foundation 300 years ago of a movement which in this century has become the Society of Friends as we know it. Friends' Historical Society, founded half a century ago, one outcome of a renaissance in Quaker thought which is linked with the names of John Wilhelm Rowntree and his contemporaries, has itself reached a stage when its origins antedate the memory of many of us and when a picture of its progress and achievement is possible. The viewpoint is too close for any definitive conclusions to be drawn, but certain points will stand out. Correction can safely be left to the fuller understanding of posterity, for even today emphasis is being laid by scholars on fresh aspects of the origin and development of Quakerism which the Historical Society was founded to study and interpret.

From the beginning Friends realised the danger of the Historical Society engaging itself in work which was "archaeologically curious, rather than practically useful,"¹ but it may be that we have not guarded sufficiently against the danger. It may be that the Historical Society has not made, and is not yet making, the impact that it might on the life of the Society of Friends in this country because it has not provided sufficient historical background material against which Friends may judge present Quaker practice. This may be because the lure of the "curious" has been too strong, and articles of the right kind have not been forthcoming in a form useful to those who should be informed on the historical bases for present conditions and action.

It is one of the duties of the historian to interpret the past to the present. For this he must both know the past and what portions of his knowledge can usefully be applied today. It cannot be too much emphasised how much any publishing society owes to the quality and calibre of the research which goes into the articles submitted for publication. The antiquary can give a faithful picture of conditions at a time now past; the genealogist and biographer can resolve family tangles and

¹ The words are those of John S. Rowntree, from a review of *The First Publishers of Truth* in *Journal F.H.S.*, vol. 1, no. 3.

point to unsuspected connections; the local historian can reveal activities particular to a district and regional evidence of more general application. This *Journal* should also aim to present documents and historical papers in reliable shape so that the general historian will have readily available a corpus of knowledge faithfully presented on which he can base his conclusions.

We would encourage all our members to aid the Historical Society to play its part more fully by bringing to our notice current events, exhibitions, historical papers and any information which will aid in a more adequate presentation of Quaker history.

Periodicals Exchanged

Receipt of the following periodicals is gratefully acknowledged:

Bulletin of the Friends Historical Association (Philadelphia).
 Institute of Historical Research, *Bulletin*.
Mennonite Quarterly Review (U.S.A.).
Presbyterian Historical Journal (U.S.A.).
 Presbyterian Historical Society, *Proceedings*.
 Unitarian Historical Society, *Transactions*.
 Wesley Historical Society, *Proceedings*.

Accounts for the year 1953 and *Journal*, vol. xlv

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
<i>Journal of Friends' Historical Society</i> , vol. xlv, parts 1 and 2	160	0	9	Balance brought forward	242	13	2
Stationery	12	15	9	Subscriptions	177	4	5
Expenses, including postage	22	12	10	Anonymous donation	50	0	0
Balance carried forward to 1954:				Sales	24	6	9
Post Office account	168	11	0	Advertisements	4	14	0
Barclays Bank	138	1	9	Interest on Post Office Savings Account	3	3	9
	<hr/>						
	306	12	9				
	<hr/>						
	£502	2	1		£502	2	1
	<hr/>				<hr/>		

Examined with the books of the Society and found correct.

(Signed) BASIL G. BURTON.

25.ii.1954.

The Peace Testimony in 1659

More Light on John Hodgson¹

SOME years ago Henry J. Cadbury presented to Friends House Library a copy of a rare Commonwealth tract entitled *A Letter from a Member of the Army, to the Committee of Safety, and Councell of Officers of the Army*, which was written on November 8, 1659. In the course of the description of the gift in this *Journal*² the question was asked whether the author, a certain John Hodgson, could be identified with the Quaker of that name who published *Love, Kindness, and due Respect* in the same year. The discussion then left open three possibilities:

- (1) that the tracts were by two different authors, despite similarities of argument and style ;
- (2) that the Quaker John Hodgson was a civilian in the summer of 1659 when he addressed his paper, *Love, Kindness, and due Respect*, to the restored Rump of the Long Parliament which was sitting at the time, and that he subsequently enlisted or re-enlisted in the Army;
- (3) that Hodgson was a member of the Army until the publication of the *Letter*, but was later cashiered, before the publication of *Love, Kindness, and due Respect*, which would then have been addressed to the Long Parliament after its second restoration, i.e., between December 26, 1659, and March 16, 1659/60.

It seems likely that the second possibility is the correct one, that John Hodgson the Quaker was the author of both tracts. The third of the possibilities may at once be eliminated: there is a copy of *Love, Kindness, and due Respect* among the Thomason tracts at the British Museum, and the printed catalogue of the collection gives the date of publication as June 23, 1659. Moreover, there is evidence to support the view that Hodgson the Quaker was a civilian at this time, and also to suggest that he had been connected with Friends for some years. Thomas Aldam sent his greetings to a John

¹ This article has a bearing on "Relations with the State," the subject of Chap. xiv in W. C. Braithwaite : *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, especially pp. 453-467.

² *Jnl. F.H.S.*, Vol. xlii, pp. 8off.

Hodgson in a letter written from York Castle to Captain Amor Stoddart in London as far back as June 21, 1653.¹ We know, too, that Hodgson was in London again in June, 1659, since he was mentioned by Alexander Parker as one of a number of Friends "out of the Countries" who were there to present the petition against tithes.² His association with Friends during the reaction under the Protectorate (1653-8), and his apparent freedom to move about as he pleased, make it very doubtful whether the Friend in question could have been under military discipline during this period.

If the two tracts had one author, the conclusion seems inescapable that John Hodgson joined the Army between June and November, 1659. But had they?

It would certainly be a rather striking coincidence if two writers of the same name had published tracts with such marked similarities of argument and style as we find in these two pamphlets; but it may also seem unlikely that a Quaker would have felt free to join the Army. On the other hand, we know that Friends generally were much concerned at this time about the question of bearing arms, and it is this fact which lends added interest to the case of John Hodgson. At periods of political crisis there have usually been a few Friends who have felt unable to adhere fully to the Peace Testimony. On this occasion, however, Friends were confronted with just such a crisis before the Peace Testimony had taken definite shape. Furthermore, they were in a stronger position to influence the course of events than at any other time in the seventeenth century; and they were more actively interested in the outcome of the crisis than has hitherto been generally recognised.³ The reasons for this are too complicated to admit of a full discussion here, but a few comments may not be out of place.

On the title page of *Love, Kindness, and due Respect*, Hodgson signs himself as "a Servant of the Lord, who hath born his Testimonie for the Lord in the day of Apostacy, and hath been a Sufferer for the Testimonie of a good Conscience,

¹ A. R. Barclay MSS No. 17. See the *précis* in *Journal F.H.S.*, xxviii, p. 53, where the name is rendered as "Hodgson."

² Swarth. MSS., i, 84. The names of Hodgson and Captain Watkinson are omitted from the copy of the letter printed in Barclay's *Letters, etc., of Early Friends*, pp. 69ff.

³ See James Maclear, "Quakerism and the end of the Interregnum," in *Church History*, December, 1950.

by Oppressors, under the name of a Quaker." In this particular context the reference to the "day of Apostacy" probably signifies the period of the Protectorate. Friends had consistently testified against Cromwell's departure from his early principles, and some, like Fox and Burrough, had warned him that compromise on the question of liberty of conscience was alienating the affections of his most faithful friends.¹ In the spring of 1659, however, an alliance between the republicans, the Army and many of the sectaries led to the fall of the Protectorate and the recall of the Rump of the Long Parliament, which had been expelled by Cromwell six years before. A number of Friends welcomed this development and the revival of interest in the "Good Old Cause" of civil and religious liberty which it seemed to imply. Edward Burrough and George Bishop both spoke of the preceding years as the late "Interruption," and others, such as Richard Hubberthorne, Isaac Penington and George Fox the younger, echoed Burrough's hope that

the Lord our *deliverer* hath begun to appear for the freedom of the Nations. . . . and we are in good expectations, that the Lord will suddenly so appear, as to free us from future oppressions in this respect, for we look for a *New Earth*, as well as for a *New Heaven*, according to the Lord's promise to us, which is to be fulfilled in these latter dayes.²

At the same time, however, the optimism of Quaker writers was tempered by sober recognition of the fact that Army and Parliament were by no means consistent in their efforts to call a halt to persecution. The ruling minority was bound both by principle and self-interest to oppose pressure for a royalist restoration, but its desire to propitiate Presbyterian and Royalist sentiment made it only too liable to compromise on matters of civil and religious liberty at the expense of its radical supporters. Torn between these conflicting pressures, the leaders in Army and Parliament vacillated between opposing policies, fell out among themselves, and opened the way to a bloodless restoration of Charles II. It was this situation which ultimately made political action impossible for Friends. Profoundly concerned about the cause of religious liberty, they seem to have been

¹ See, in particular, the collection of letters by Fox and Burrough entitled *Good Counsel and Advice Rejected by Disobedient men*, 1659.

² E. Burrough, *To the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England*, 6 viii mo. 1659, p. 3.

more disturbed by the Army and Parliament's weakness on this score than by the fact that, whatever faction was in power, it represented a minority dictatorship. But so long as supporters of religious liberty like Sir Henry Vane maintained their influence, some Friends felt moved to co-operate with the civil authorities.

It is well known, of course, that a number of Quakers did in fact agree to act as commissioners for the militia during this year of anarchy. And it is possible that a Friend who was ready to do so might have been able to return to the ranks of the Army. It seems that Friends in Yorkshire, like their fellows elsewhere, were troubled about participation in military activities. There is a letter extant in which Samuel Watson of Great Stainforth replied to a paper by a certain J.H. "concerning takeing up Arms or ye like."¹ There is no evidence that this J.H. can be identified with John Hodgson, but we do know that Hodgson himself was concerned to vindicate the right of Quakers to bear office under the Commonwealth. The names of several of the Friends who were in London in June, 1659, over the petition against tithes appear again as signatories of *A Declaration of the people of God in scorn called Quakers, to all Magistrates and People,*² and among them is the name of "John Hodson." This declaration protests against the expulsion of Friends from civil and military offices and, to the charge that the Quakers had "unchristian'd" and "unman'd" themselves, replies with an assertion that they are neither incapable nor unwilling to serve their country and countrymen "in the lowest employments and places that are any ways tending to the thing that is just, and to the suppression of that which is evil."³

Although the argument of both the *Letter* and *Love, Kindness, and due Respect* is remarkably similar to that of numerous contemporary Quaker tracts, it may be significant that in one respect the writer of the *Letter* was evidently prepared to go further than other Friends in siding with the

¹ Samuel Watson MSS., p. 302.

² In Joseph Smith's *Catalogue* under John Crook, and under Quakers.

³ *A Declaration, etc.*, p. 5. Cf. *Love, Kindness, and due Respect*, p. 4, where Hodgson himself protests against the view that "men were altogether incapable for the service of their Country, that cannot bow, swear, and give respect to persons, although in all things else duly qualified."

military junto which was in power during the autumn. Despite his misgivings, he could write:

Your adversaries in *Scotland*, and elsewhere, have learnt faire words, and glorious pretences: your words without fruits are vain; yet is our hearts more enclined to hearken to you, because we know theirs many among you have a great love to Gods people, and true desires begot in some to do well, if you would not hearken to your home-councillors that stifles before brought forth.¹

Considerations such as these may well have led this Friend to take a step which was certainly uncommon, and perhaps unique. If the case of John Hodgson could be cleared up, it would cast a little further light on the evolution of the Peace Testimony at a critical moment in its history.

ALAN COLE

The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, vol. 78, No. 2 (April, 1954), pp. 143-176), opens with an article, "James Logan, proprietary agent," by Albright G. Zimmerman of Temple University. It deals with Logan's operations in the West India trade, which served to provide the basis of his own family fortune and to provide the Penns with the money which they had long awaited from the developing colony of Pennsylvania.

A paper on "Religious Beliefs of the Levellers," by D. Mervyn Himbury, of Cardiff Baptist College, appears in the April, 1954, issue *The Baptist Quarterly* (vol. 15, No. 6, pp. 269-276).

The Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England, vol. 10, No. 3 (May, 1954), includes at pp. 102-117, the Society's annual lecture delivered in October, 1953, by Dr. S. W. Carruthers, the Society's president. It is entitled "Conventicles and Conventiclors" and gives a picture of Presbyterian life in the South-west of England during the persecution which came in the wake of the Restoration of 1660. There are various references to the activities of Friends.

Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society, vol. 29, part 5, March, 1954, pp. 103-111, contains an article by the Editor, the Rev. Wesley F. Swift, entitled "How to write a local history of Methodism." The sources and types of documents enumerated in this useful guide would serve as a reminder of classes of records easily overlooked by the local historian in his search for material dealing with any religious denomination.

¹ *A Letter, etc.*, p. 4. Again on p. 5: "and loath are we to see you, whom the Lord hath so often tryed, and visited by his love, to be made as a thing of nought, even as others before you, through their own fearfulness."

The Quaker Marriage Declaration

THE simple marriage promise made by Friends has been thought often to be so typically Quaker, that it is interesting to recall how it followed a declaration framed before the days of the Society, which was used for a time by all in the land.

In 1645 the Long Parliament forbade the use of the Prayer Book, providing instead the "Directory for Publick Worship,"¹ which was prepared by an Assembly of Divines summoned to meet in Westminster Abbey to give advice on affairs concerning religion. Four-fifths of the members were Doctors or Bachelors of Divinity, and the rest were lay, chosen by the Lords and Commons from their own number.² Four influential Kirk leaders came from Scotland, in response to an invitation from Parliament "for the Speedying away of so many Godly divines as you shall make choice of to Assist our Assembly."

The new marriage service in the Directory was short and devout. The minister "must earnestly entreat the Lord whose presence sweetens every Relation . . . to be the portion of those now to be joyned." A homily followed, bidding them "to be content in the midst of all Marriage cares and troubles, sanctifying God's name in a thankful, sober and holy use of all Conjugal comforts, and provoking each other to love and good works." Then the pair clasped right hands, and the man made this declaration:

I . . . do take thee . . . to be my Married Wife, and do, in the presence of God and before this Congregation, promise and covenant to be a loving and faithfull Husband unto thee untill God shall separate us by death.

The woman declared similarly, adding the word "obedient," and the minister pronounced them husband and wife according to God's Ordinance.

The drafting of this marriage service, containing the declaration later followed by Friends, had been handed over with other forms of church worship to a sub-committee of five

¹ The earliest printed edition is dated 1644. The text is also printed in *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660*, ed. Firth and Rait, for the Statute Law Committee, 1911. Quotations are from the 1911 ed.

² Members' names were given in the Ordinance which summoned them, June, 1643 (Firth and Rait, I, 180-184).

English divines, together with the four delegates from Scotland.¹ Their chairman was Stephen Marshall, reputed the finest preacher in the land—a talent not appreciated by the captive Charles I, to whom he was sent as chaplain not long after; for it was noted that the king said his own grace and began his dinner, while Mr. Marshall was still making a long prayer.²

The clash of theological opinion often held up the drafting, and Robert Baillie, professor of Divinity in Glasgow, wrote home “we have stuck longer than we expected over marriage.” But at length he could report of his Independent colleagues, “God in his mercie so guided it that we gott them satisfied.” Once completed the new services passed both Houses of Parliament with hardly an altered word, and the Directory became law on January 5th, 1645. Constables had to carry a copy to the minister of every parish, and its use on the first Sunday after arrival was enjoined throughout England and Wales, a Welsh translation being prepared.³

The new worship book was laid before the Kirk Assembly in Edinburgh, where it was received with great joy and contentment; and in the Scottish Parliament it was accepted without a contrary vote. A letter to the English Parliament stated that the Directory was to be used in all the kirks of Scotland, and added the desire that it should become the service book also of the Church and Kingdom of Ireland.⁴

Thus came into being the simple marriage declaration still used by the Church of Scotland, and by the Presbyterian Churches in Ireland and in Wales, which our Quaker marriage promise so closely resembles.⁵ In Scotland they have kept the exact wording of the Directory, except that both parties now promise to be loving, faithful, and dutiful. In Ireland the declaration is put as a question . . . “do you solemnly promise to be unto her a loving and faithful husband until God shall separate you by death?” In Wales the two covenant

¹ From the *Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie* (one of the Scottish delegates), ed. from his mss. by Laing, 1841.

² *The Godly Man's Legacy to the Saints upon Earth, exhibited in the life of . . . S. Marshal*, 1680.

³ Minutes of the Westminster Assembly for 1644.

⁴ A Paper presented to the two Houses of Parliament as well as to the Assembly. (Journals of the House of Lords, VII, pp. 317-8).

⁵ See the modern Service Books of the three Churches.

to be faithful and true. Alone of their brethren in the British Isles, the English Presbyterians do not continue to follow the 17th-century form.

Further search has been made as to whether the Directory declaration owed anything to the marriage service of John Knox,¹ based on Calvin's, which was in use in Scotland till 1645. This contained a far longer marriage vow, read by the minister to the parties, who responded: "Even so doe I take her/hym before God and in the presence of this Congregation." The last phrase appears again in the Directory: but it would seem that the brevity of the promise on which our own is based was a notable change from previous custom, when it originated among the divines of the Westminster Assembly in the Jerusalem Chamber.

The few Quaker marriage certificates existing from the first days of Friends are very brief in content compared with later times. A copy of one of these papers records thus simply the marriage of a Cotswold hand-loom weaver in Painswick, Gloucestershire.²

10.4 Mo.1658. We whose names are underwritten doe beare witness in the presents of the Lord; these two parties Walter Humphris and Mary Osborne, who are joyned in Marriag together by consent of their Parents: and our names as followeth are Witnesses . . .

Six men Friends sign, following Margaret Fell's advice in 1656: "And after the meeting freinds may draw a little note concerning that action of that day . . . and as many freinds who are men as are free may set their hands to it."³

It will be noted that at this early period the promise made by the pair is not recorded, and there is indication that Fox and Margaret Fell may have been reluctant to bind Friends to any set form of words. Among the oldest of our dated documents are two papers on marriage, one by Fox in 1653,⁴ the other by Margaret Fell three years later.⁵ Fox counsels

¹ John Knox's Genevan Service Book, 1556 (Ed. Maxwell).

² From "A Register Booke of the People of God called Quakers, in and about Painswick, of Births, Marriages, Deaths and Buryalls." (Being an exact Duplicate . . . carefully compared and examined with the Original in 1790.) Glos. and Nailsworth M.M. Safe, Gloucester.

³ Epistle on Marriage, 1656, endorsed personally by Fox. MS. belonging to Isabel Ross.

⁴ MS. Portfolio 36.19 (Friends House Library).

⁵ Note 2 above.

that the parties "may speak as they are moved how that they are in marriage joynd together"; and Margaret Fell, more exuberantly, "as they are moved of the Lord by his power and in his fear they may take each other in the meeting and speak what the unlimited power and spirit give utterance."

Both leaders acted thus in their own marriage in Bristol in 1669, when their declarations were reported in these terms:

. . . G.F. . . . did solemnly, in the presence of God and us his people, declare, that he tooke the saide Margaret Fell, in the everlasting power and covenant of God, which is from everlasting to everlasting, and in the honourable marriage to be his bride and his wife. And likewise the said Margaret did solemnly declare, that, in the everlasting power of the Mighty God, and in the unalterable word, and in the presence of God, his angels, and us, his holy assembly, she tooke the saide George Fox to be her husband.¹ . . .

It must have become obvious very early that some clear mutual promise was essential if Quaker marriages were to be recognised universally as valid. From the purely practical point of view also it was necessary, for our local Quaker records show that comparatively early marriage was as common among Friends as it was elsewhere in the 17th century, and youths and maidens in their late 'teens were sometimes married in our meetings. On such occasions not all would find it easy to follow the exalted advice to speak what the spirit gave utterance. It was natural that these young Quaker folk should tend to make use of the marriage promise so familiar to them already in the weddings of their Puritan friends.

There is evidence that soon after the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings had been set up, some of them adopted forms of marriage certificates for their own locality, in order to make their procedure uniform and their declaration clear. An early example is found in the Minutes of the Bristol Men's Meeting, 13th 10 Mo. 1669.² The wording of another, from the Edinburgh Monthly Meeting Book of 1671, is given in full by Robert Barclay, a descendant of the author of the *Apology*, in his work on the religious societies of the Commonwealth.

In 1672 a Minute of Gloucestershire Quarterly Meeting

¹ Thirnbeck MSS. Printed in *Irish Friend*, 1841, 148; and Webb's *Fells of Swarthmore Hall*, Appendix C.

² At the Friars Meeting House, Bristol.

(held at Stinchcombe at the house of Thomas Daniell, 27th of Sixth Month), was headed "Arrangements for Quaker Marriages," and states that "All marriages must be recorded by a Forme of Certificate as followeth . . ." The form then suggested for Gloucestershire Friends followed closely the one given in the Bristol Minutes of 1669. The marriage declaration was still in reported speech in the certificate, but the words spoken by the parties must have been in effect those of the Directory.

. . . We therefore are witnesses that on the day of the date of these presents, ye said A. did in the presence of the Lord and us his people take ye said B. to be his wife, and ye said B. did take ye said A. to be her husband, and did mutually promise each to the other to live together in love and faithfulness according to God's Ordainence untill by death they should be separated. . . .¹

In 1677 a form of certificate was discussed in London, and Minutes were recorded as follows:

Meeting for Sufferings, 18th, Eighth Month (October), 1677.

The business about the forme of a Certificate for Marriage is referred to be perused by friends in the Ministry next 2d day and Tho. Rudyard to bring an Account of their answer Next Meeting.

Morning Meeting, 22nd Eighth Month (October), 1677.

A Certificate of Marriages by T. Rudyard² read and referred to the friends of the next six weekes meeting to consider of.

Six Weeks Meeting, 20th Ninth Month (November), 1677.

That the forme of a Certificate about Marriages this day read is agreed to be made use of For the time to come and that the words to be Spoken by the friends that take each other to be given to the persons by E.H.³ and they desired to speake them as neare as they can.

From about this time onwards the declaration seems to have been as we have known it up to our own day. In 1690⁴ Meeting for Sufferings agreed to "the printing of Friends' Marriage Certificate to deliver to some of the members of Parliament, that they may see the Method Friends takes in their Consumating their Marriages." The occasion was a Bill relating to Clandestine Marriages, and the Society's action

¹ From "Ye Booke belonging to the frends of the quarterly meeting within the County of Glocester," 1670. M.M. Safe, Gloucester.

² A London Friend skilled in law, "and zealous for the liberties of the people." (Besse: Sufferings.)

³ Ellis Hookes, first Recording Clerk of the Society, from c. 1657-1681.

⁴ Minute of Meeting for Sufferings, 7.ix.1690.

was "to manifest our Christian care and righteous proceedings in not admitting clandestine or unwarrantable marriages amongst us." In the certificate printed,¹ the marriage promise was thus given:

Friends, in the fear of the Lord and in the presence of you his people I take this my friend . . . to be my wife, promising by the assistance of God, to be to her a faithfull and loving husband till it please the Lord to separate us by death.

It will be seen that now the significant phrase "by the assistance of God" has been added. This was a Quaker addition to the Directory form, and is not used by the other churches which follow it. The wording "in the presence of this Assembly" is found also about this period.

It is noteworthy that in this certificate, printed as typical of those in current use, the Quaker bride promised obedience, but others of the time indicate that option on this point was possible. The mere word "obedient," inserted in the Directory declaration of 1645, was mild compared with the emphasis on the subservience of women shown in the marriage service books of the early Reformers. In those of Calvinist origin, the wife promised to her husband subjection and obedience, and before taking her marriage vow she was thus addressed: "It is the wife's dewtie to studie to please and obey her husbände, serving hym in all thynges that be godly and honeste, for she is in subjection, and under the Governace of her husbände so long as they continue both alive."²

In the first days of the Society of Friends, the view in Puritan England could still be expressed in Milton's line on Adam and Eve, "He for God only, she for God in him."³ It was the Quaker belief in the universality of the Inner Light which in itself challenged this conception, and made Fox so outstanding a champion of the spiritual rights of women.

The fact that our marriage promise "is that prescribed by the Directory with very slight variation," was pointed out by Robert Barclay in the *Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth* (1876). It has been mentioned again recently by Arnold Lloyd in *Quaker Social History* (1950).

¹ Copy in the Men's Minute Book, The Vale M.M., 1673-1706, at Friends House Library.

² From John Knox's Genevan Service Book, *op. cit.* First used by the congregation of Marian exiles in Geneva, of which he was minister, 1556. Brought by him to Scotland, 1560.

³ Paradise Lost, Book IV.

The knowledge may seem enriching to us, for the Westminster Assembly comprised some of the most stalwart Puritan personalities of the day. In few ways could Quakers have followed them in their State-religion, based upon the Catechism and the Westminster Confession of Faith which they produced soon after the Directory. But their marriage declaration proved so akin to the manner of Friends in its direct simplicity that we have never needed to seek further, and besides ourselves it has long satisfied many others. We are reminded of Henry Cadbury's suggestion in his "Revised Views of Quaker Origins,"¹ that when Quakerism can be viewed in the light of its first setting, the early Friends may be found to overlap their contemporaries more than we have guessed.

RUTH G. BURTT

George Keith to Henry More

THE original letter published herewith by permission is at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.² Not many letters of George Keith appear to be extant.³ Their absence from Quaker collections is easily explained by his later apostasy. This letter fits, however, into a large correspondence which is preserved, centering around the lifelong friendship of Henry More and Anne, Viscountess Conway.⁴

¹ Article in *The Friend* (Lond.), 1954, p. 5.

² Colonial Clergy, Case 8, Box 23. That this is an original is confirmed by comparing another letter of Keith owned by the same Society and printed in the *Pennsylvania Magazine*, 41, 1917, p. 381.

³ Ethyn W. Kirby, *George Keith, 1638-1716*, p. 165, refers to a few copies, but original letters are scarce.

⁴ Marjorie Hope Nicolson, *Conway Letters*, 1930, has edited much of this material in admirable fashion. Though largely repeated in this book, her earlier essays are worth reading: "George Keith and the Cambridge Platonists," *Philosophical Review*, 39, 1930, 36-55, and (on Van Helmont) "The Real Scholar Gipsy," *Yale Review*, N.S., 18, 1929, 347-363. This correspondence must have been known to Dr. Richard Ward who in his *Life of More* (1710) cited from it, including passages showing the more favourable opinion which More came to entertain concerning the Quakers. These were thus available to the anonymous writer of *A Vindication of the Quakers, or an Answer to the B[isho]p of L[ichfield]'s Charge against them*, 1732, where they are repeated, pp. 23-28. More's fullest discussion of Quakerism published by himself is in the *Scholia*, added in the Latin collection of his works, in 1679 and later, to his *Divine Dialogues* published in 1669. See on Dialogue V, Section XV.

Henry More was from an early date intrigued by some features of Quakerism. By the time the Countess became an acknowledged Friend (about 1670) as well as her learned continental physician in residence, Francis Mercurius van Helmont, More was on terms of friendly debate with other Friends, especially Keith and Barclay and also William Penn and George Fox. The situation reflected in this letter belongs to this general background, and in particular it results from the formal debate in August, 1675, between four non-Quaker students at Aberdeen and George Keith and others. At least four books were published about this occasion. Each side claimed the victory. The Quakers claimed that as a result some of the students were converted to Quakerism. In the other account it was stated that the Quakers claimed that Henry More accepted the Quaker position.

The Quakers led off with *A True and Faithful Accompt of the most material Passages of a Dispute betwixt some Students of Divinity (so called) of the University of Aberdeen, and the People called Quakers, &c.* (1675). The students answered at length with *Quakerism Canvassed . . . Or a Most True and Faithful Account*, etc., where on page 66 they say, "it shall suffice us to give a specimen [of Quaker pranks] out of D. Henry Moir, as being both eminent and credible, and likewise esteemed so by our Antagonists [the Quakers], who have as we conceive, without any just ground, often reported through the City of Aberdene, that H. Moir is a Quaker and owns their chiefest principles in a Letter lately written to G.K." The students proceed to quote a passage from More's *Mystery of Godliness*, p. 111f., ending with the phrase, "Such wild tricks are those deluded souls made to play, to make sport of these Aerial Goblins that drive and actuate them." The Quakers answered in two pamphlets both entitled *Quakerism Confirmed* (1676). The second, written by Keith and Barclay, replied to the second part of *Quakerism Canvassed*, and on page 18 referred to the above quoted passage thus: "They place at large a citation out of H. Moir, whom they say the Q. have reported to be a Quaker." To a certain extent that was true. Keith and More had extensively compared notes in writing about their beliefs and had determined their areas of agreement and disagreement. On the Inner Light More's views very closely approached those that Keith expressed in his *Immediate Revelation* (1668).

More had indicated his criticisms of this early volume in writing. Keith printed answers to five of these in a later edition without mentioning More's name, and apparently prepared a fuller answer in manuscript, but this the Second Day's Morning Meeting did not approve for publication.¹ Meanwhile the limited agreement of More and Keith which their correspondence had indicated, and which had become known to some other Friends, led the students to say at the debate that Friends claimed More had become a Friend. Keith naturally felt that he would be blamed for this report, and his sensitiveness about the matter led him to send the following letter to More.

His anxiety in this regard was perhaps unnecessary, for More, referring evidently to this very letter, writes to Lady Conway:—²

He [Keith] sends me word that the Students of Aberdeen have writt a great book against the Quakers, wherein they tell the world that the Quakers give out that I am a Quaker. In which George concernes himself to be troubled at it. But no body that knowes me can take me to be a Quaker, and they that know me not, it is some body els they mean is a Quaker, or the image of their own brains not me.

Such misreports were numerous. On an earlier occasion More says he heard from a "sober person, a Bishop's son in Scotland, that G. Keith says that the reading of my *Mystery of Godliness* first turned him Quaker."³ This is very probably Henry Scougal, the son of Patrick Scougal, bishop of Aberdeen, mentioned in the letter below. The son was the author of the religious classic, first published in 1677, *The Life of God in the Soul of Man*. It was a favourite among Friends, which is only another evidence that the author would be a congenial confidant of Keith. The two stories may be allowed to cancel each other out.

Though Keith's letter⁴ is brief and adds nothing to what

¹ Cf. Morning Meeting Minutes, 28 Feb. 1675/6.

² Corpus Christi College, 26 Febr., 1676, published in *Conway Letters*, 425. He had received the present letter from Keith "yesterday" and his account of it agrees with this text.

³ To Lady Conway, 14 July, 1671, *ibid.* 341. More's *Mystery of Godliness* had been published in 1660.

⁴ The history of this letter is not known. Other letters to More passed from Dr. Ward to James Crossley and were then sold at auction. Some obtained by J. Armitage Robinson were given to Christ's College, Cambridge; three came to J. J. Green. See *Jnl. F.H.S.*, vii, 1910, p 7ff., where two from Lady Conway are published, now in the possession of Friends House Library, London.

we have known from other sources, its text reminds us that within the circle of discussion and correspondence here under review a tone of controversy much more urbane than usual at that period marked the attitudes of the Cambridge Platonists on the one hand and the Quakers and especially George Keith on the other. His vitriolic spirit showed later when he came into opposition to the Quakers themselves.

Aberden 12 of 12th mo: 1675

Dearly Beloved friend

6

Whom I often remember in true love, and thy love and kindness unto me, for which thou art like in some manner to suffer, although I can and doe assure thee in the sincerity of my heart, I have given no cause therefor. The matter is this. Some Schollars here in the University of Aberden have printed a great book against the Quakers, full of lyes and pittifull stuffe, wher among other lyes, they tell the world, that the Quakers have reported, that Doctor Henry More is turned Quaker. when I did read this lying expression in their book, it troubled me more then anything else in it, for thy cause or least thou should have any occasion to repent of thy love and friendship towards me. I can assure thee neither I nor any Quaker that I know of ever said such a thing of thee but after that I received thy papers the last summer, before I saw thee at London, I did lett one man, called Doctor Keith, who was a sober man and had a kindness for thee see thy papers, and by him it seems the report passed, not that thou was a Quaker, but that thou agreed with the Quakers in owning immediate objective revelation, and that regeneration is substantiall (the said Doctor Keith so called is now out of this life) and to some freinds in this place I did show thy papers, who were discreet persons, and it is like they did say to some, that in some principles thou did agree with the Quakers, the which to be a truth I know thou art not ashamed of. Since I read and heard this lying report of thy being a Quaker (glad should I be that thou were indeed a Quaker) I have spoke with diverse of the preachers and University telling them the report was a lye, raised only by the students (no doubt to offend thee, and irritate thee if they could) without any ground given by the Quakers themselves, and particularly I have spoken with the bishop of Aberdeen his

son, Henry Skugall, who hath seen thee and have offered to let him see thy paper, wherin thou art so fare from being a Quaker, that thou finds great fault with them, for making a skisme from the church, and for diverse other things. I hope thou will take in good part this suffering for the poor Quakers, and for thy love towards some of them. and indeed it seemeth unto me to be a fitt occasion wherein a call is given unto thee, to publish to the world something concerning the Quakers and the Lord direct thee in it, and give thee a perfect understanding of his voice, and counsell. The occasion seemeth unto me to be fitt (I say) because the students book will passe through England and be at London er long, and in their book they cite a very sadde passage out of some of thy books in print, as if the Quakers were generally bodily possessed by divells and very (?) hobgoblins, a thing I hope thou art not persuaded of but rather, that many at least of the Quakers are possessed with the fear of the Lord. I shall not trouble thee further at present but recommend thee unto the Lord, earnestly desiring thee (if it stand with thy freedome) to write a few lynes to me how thou art (also I desire to hear how the lady Coneway is, & how Van Helmont is to whom is my dear love) and how thou doest resent this injury not proceeding from us, but indeed we suffer in it, and intend God willing to clear ourselves of that and many other lyes in the students book in our answer therunto. If thou writt to me direct it to me in Aberden in Scotland, and send it by post, and it will come safe. farewell.

I am thy reall freind in the truth
George Keith

[Written in margin]

The papers I promised to thee to cause cobby over, which were an answer unto thy papers, are near ready & will be shortly sent unto thee, and I have heard lately from London, my book of Immediate revelation is near reprinted to which I have added a postscript or appendix containing an answer to five of the greatest of thy objections, but concealing thy name. I have desired to send the paper unto thee, before it be printed, if conveniently it may be done, I hope it shall pretty well satisfie thee.

HENRY J. CADBURY

Penn and His Printer

A DOCUMENT in the Public Record Office which was not included in *Extracts from State Papers, 1664-1669*, published as Supplement No. 10 to this *Journal* (1912), but which concerns *The Sandy Foundation Shaken* (1668), on account of which William Penn spent some months in the Tower of London, has been brought to our notice by Dr. S. W. Carruthers of the Presbyterian Historical Society of England.

A photographic copy of the document is in the Library at Friends House. It is a petition from Joan Darby to the Secretary of State, Lord Arlington, asking that she might be allowed to see her husband and minister to his needs. John Darby, printer, had been sent to prison in the Gatehouse at Westminster under a warrant of 7th December, 1668, for printing *The Sandy Foundation Shaken* (*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1668-69*, p. 92). In her petition Joan Darby stated that her husband's fault had been committed in ignorance:

"he not being acquainted with the dangerous and pernicious things contained in the book he printed, the copy being brought to him but by piecemeale, and the author himself, William Penn, did sometimes dictate to the compositor as he was setting the letters, so that he knew not of the poyson therein contained."

The document (State Papers, Domestic, Car. II, 233, No. 140) is calendared in the *Calendar S.P. Dom., 1667-68*, p. 201, under date Jan. ? 1668. From the photostat the document appears to have had a date added in pencil, 21 Jan. 1668 [*i.e.* 1669]. This would seem to relate the petition to a warrant of 21 Jan. 1668 (just a year before) to bring Darby and Elizabeth Calvert before Secretary Morice (*Calendar S.P. Dom., 1667-68*, p. 178); but they were at liberty at this time. If January, 1669, is correct, then Darby would have been a prisoner for about six weeks, and his wife might well have had hopes of making a successful application to visit her husband.

Joan Darby's petition does not mention any particular book as the occasion of the imprisonment, but the naming of William Penn fixes it fairly conclusively as *The Sandy Foundation*, because Darby does not seem to have got into trouble over any other books by Penn.

It has been suggested (*Notes and Queries*, vol. 198, p. 282, July, 1953) that the petition refers to the printing of *A Trumpet blown in Sion* (1666), which Darby printed but for which no author has previously been assigned. This is hardly likely; there is no mention of William Penn in the State Papers when that work was being investigated in the summer of 1667 (*Calendar S.P. Dom.*, 1667, p. 395), and he was in Ireland from the summer of 1666 until nearly Christmas 1667 (except for a very short break in early Spring, 1667), so it is most unlikely that he was then dictating at a compositor's elbow in London—as he might well have been a year later.

R.S.M.

Friends and the Slave Trade

A Yorkshire Election Declaration, 1806

IN the General Election, 1806, three candidates originally offered themselves for the two Yorkshire county seats: William Wilberforce, Henry Lascelles of Harewood House, and Walter Fawkes of Farnley Hall. Lascelles withdrew before the contest was due to take place, allowing Wilberforce and Fawkes to be elected unopposed.

During the election the slave trade issue came into some prominence. William Wilberforce was secure in the support of abolitionists. Henry Lascelles was suspect because of his family interests in the West Indies, so it is not surprising to find Walter Fawkes issuing a declaration on the slave trade to secure for himself the second votes of abolitionists. It may well have been his success in this which turned the scales against Lascelles and caused him to retire from the contest.

In the printed *Report of the Proceedings relative to the Election for Yorkshire, Nov. 13, 1806*,¹ Fawkes's announcement is preceded by the following "Circular Letter from three of the People called Quakers," which was published during the contest. It shows clearly where the sympathies of Friends lay.

¹ York: Printed and Published by A. Bartholoman, Herald Office. The Circular is printed on pp. 29-30.

(CIRCULAR)

As a new Election of Members of Parliament for the County of York, will soon commence, we take the liberty of recommending to the members of our society, who are entitled to vote on this occasion, to consider whether their late Representative, William Wilberforce, is not peculiarly entitled to their vote and interest. Independently of other considerations, the zeal, steadiness, and ability, with which he has long maintained the cause of the African race, and, on every proper occasion, urged the abolition of the slave trade, give him a strong claim to the attachment and support of Friends.

We are sensible that, in general, it does not comport with the principles and practice of our society, to take a very active part in elections—But there are, doubtless, occasions which call for such exertions: and we conceive that the present is one of this nature; as it involves a subject, which has, for half a century, deeply engaged the sympathy and attention of the Society.

If the friends whom we now address, should view the subject in the same light as we do, they will probably deem it of importance to be present at the time of Nomination; as a seasonable and numerous attendance of the friends of William Wilberforce, may have a great influence in securing his election; and in preventing a contest, which would be attended with serious and distressful consequences. It is scarcely necessary to observe, that, in supporting their late representative, friends will see the propriety of bearing their own expenses, and putting the candidate in no charge whatever.

We trust that this application to the members of our society will not be thought, by any of them, an improper interference. We desire only to turn their attention seriously to the subject; and to induce them to reflect on the great importance of re-electing a person, whose labours have done so much towards abolishing the iniquitous trade in human beings; whose views, on this interesting subject, have so fully corresponded with our own; and whose continued exertions, in the present critical state of the question, would greatly contribute to a happy termination of the wrongs and sorrows of Africa.

William Tuke
Thomas Priestman
Lindley Murray

York, 27th of 10th Month, 1806.

The Rise of Nonconformity in the Forest of Dean. By Thomas Bright. Forest of Dean Local History Society, [1954]. pp. 52. 5s.

This deals in seven chapters with the various denominations, including Friends. There is more evidence available about Friends than some of the other denominations because their open defiance of oppression brought so much persecution upon them. The early meeting of Friends, at Coleford, died out some time late in the eighteenth century. Mary Botham, afterwards well known under her married name of Mary Howitt, was born there in 1799.

The Baptism of Maria Hack, 1837

An Episode of the Beacon Controversy

The letter printed below, in which Maria Hack describes her baptism by Isaac Crewdson needs some introduction on the situation in the Society of Friends which led to it. For permission to print the letter we are indebted to Mrs. Charlotte S. Hack, of Westbrook, Edna Road, Maida Vale, W. Australia. For notes and for much of this introduction we thank Lawrence Darton.

Isaac Crewdson (1780-1844), of Manchester, an acknowledged minister in Hardshaw East Monthly Meeting, published in January, 1835, *A Beacon to the Society of Friends*, in which he set forth his belief in the final authority of Scripture, to the belittlement of guidance by the Inner Light. The *Beacon* consisted largely of a refutation, by appropriate quotations from the Bible, of some of the writings of Elias Hicks (1748-1830), who had held an almost exactly opposite position.

The Society had long known both the experience of the Light and the value of the Scriptures, but these attempts to make either exclude the other troubled many who had never thought of them as antithetical.

In the evangelical atmosphere prevailing at this period, the *Beacon* precipitated serious disagreement among Friends, first of all in Lancashire Quarterly Meeting. Yearly Meeting of 1835 appointed a committee to restore unity, a difficult task which it failed to accomplish. It contained some Friends of markedly evangelical outlook, including Joseph John Gurney, and, without condemning Crewdson's teaching, nevertheless counselled him for "practical" reasons first to withdraw his pamphlet, and then to suspend his ministry. Both counsels were in turn rejected by him.

He and his wife and, within a short period, about 300 other Friends in different parts of the country seceded from the Society. For a time they called themselves "Evangelical Friends"; eventually most of them joined the Plymouth Brethren or the Church of England.

A large crop of tracts sprang up, mushroom fashion, almost overnight, and the controversy continued, conducted principally by quoting judiciously selected passages of Scripture and of early Friends' writings. It was a controversy between moderate and extreme evangelicals, and the anti-Beaconites were anxious to prove the orthodox Christianity of the early Quaker leaders. The argument came to relate not only to the authority of Scripture but also to the use of outward baptism and the Lord's Supper. A number of literal-minded Beaconites felt called upon to receive water-baptism. Among them was Elisha Bates (c. 1780-1861), of Ohio, a prominent ministering Friend on a visit to England. Another was Maria Hack (1777-1844), the writer of the letter printed below.

MARIA HACK was the eldest child of John Barton (1755-1789) of Carlisle, and Mary (Done) (1752-1784), his wife. Maria's mother came of a Cheshire family and was a birthright Friend, and her father joined the Society at about the time of his marriage, which was in about 1775. Her mother died in 1784, soon after giving birth to a son, Bernard, who later became known as the Quaker poet. Shortly before his wife's death, John Barton had given up the calico-printing business in Carlisle which he had inherited from his father and had moved to London. In 1787 he became a member, with Thomas Clarkson, of the first committee for the abolition of the slave trade and in the same year re-married, his second wife being Elizabeth Horne (1760-1833), daughter of Thomas and Mary Horne, Friends of Bankside and Tottenham. When Maria was 12 years old her father died and her step-mother took her to live at or near the Hornes' house at Tottenham. It was from Tottenham that in 1800 at the age of 23 she was married to Stephen Hack (1775-1823), a Quaker currier of Chichester, and son of James and Priscilla (Hayller) Hack of Chichester. Maria Hack had a family of four sons and six daughters, several of whom eventually left the Society of Friends. Her husband died in 1823, when her youngest child was three years old, and after continuing to live at Chichester for another ten years, she moved to Gloucester. At the age of about 35 or 40, she had begun writing books for children, and after some years she acquired quite a reputation as an author of educational works suitable for home use. Amongst the better known of these were *English Stories* (1820-5) and *Lectures at Home* (1834), and at least one of them, *Familiar Illustrations of the Principal Evidences and Design of Christianity* (1824), which was written in the form of a series of conversations, shows that her outlook was decidedly evangelical some years before the Beacon controversy. Her personal letters at the time of the controversy itself, however, reveal her religious attitude in greater detail. Writing to her son-in-law, Thomas Gates Darton (1810-1887) on 9th of Fourth Month, 1836, she says:

“Samuel Tuke's *Letter*¹ seems to be as tardy in showing

¹ *A Letter to John Wilkinson* (1836). John Wilkinson (c. 1783-1846), of High Wycombe, married to Esther Wilson (1781-1856) of Kendal, had been Clerk of Yearly Meeting from 1808-1814. On resigning from the Society in Second Month, 1836, he had published *A Letter on resigning his membership in the Society of Friends*, to which Samuel Tuke's *Letter* was a

itself as this most dilatory Spring, which has so long been tantalizing us. I shall be very glad to see them both—the *Letter* and the fine weather—and hope both may have a beneficial influence. For Samuel Tuke's judgment I feel much respect,¹ and as so much consultation has been held on the subject, suppose his *Letter*, when it appears, may be regarded as an *ex cathedra* statement. I have no connection with any Beaconites or any description of partisans in this controversy, and shall be glad if Samuel Tuke can show better reasons on his side of the question than I have yet seen. The phraseology unfortunately adopted by Friends so nearly resembles that used by Elias Hicks that, unless they will so far renounce it as to state in plain, modern English what their doctrine with regard to Immediate Revelation really *is*, it seems impossible to draw a clear line of distinction between the *tendency* of the two *systems*. . . . How can we account for the providential preservation of the Scriptures, so free from any material error as they are acknowledged to be by all Christians, but on this ground—that He who only knows the deceitfulness of the human heart has so preserved them that they might be The Rule, the definite standard to which amidst all our wanderings we might ever return? . . . A firm belief in the influence of the Spirit is surely a very different thing from the acknowledgment of a special, internal, individual *revelation* of the truth. I hope that Samuel Tuke will clearly state what Friends *do* believe on this point and also whether Friends of the present day do really go the same length as Robert Barclay. I have not now either time or space to state *why* I think Robert Barclay is mistaken in his opinion of the authority of Scripture and of *the distinction between the law and the gospel*,² but the latter is so palpable that I shall be much disappointed if Samuel Tuke does not acknowledge it and explain the Apologist's views, if they do admit of explanation. He is a clever man and, I believe, a sincerely good one, perhaps as likely as any to state opinions intelligibly, and I

reply. John Wilkinson had written of the necessity of "accepting Holy Scripture, not as a *secondary* rule, but as THE RULE of faith and practice"—a reference to Robert Barclay's statement in the Third Proposition of his *Apology* that the Scriptures are a "secondary rule, subordinate to the Spirit, from which they have all their excellency and certainty."

¹ Samuel Tuke (1784-1857) of York was at this time Clerk of Yearly Meeting. He had married (1810) Maria Hack's niece, Priscilla Hack.

² Robert Barclay, *Apology*, Third proposition, § II.

should hope he would not be inclined to attach undue importance to the opinions of the Fathers of our Church. Surely John Wilkinson has ground for his apprehension that there is too much of this deference amongst us. . . ."

Two or three weeks later, on 27th of Fourth Month, 1836, Maria Hack adds, writing to the same correspondent: "I am grieved and disappointed by some passages in Samuel Tuke's *Letter*, for from *him* I had hoped better things. Still, I would not despair, but look forward with anxiety to the approaching Y.M., trusting that a more humble, candid and at the same time *courageous* spirit may be manifested."

The Yearly Meeting of 1836 issued an Epistle which contained a statement on the Society's beliefs concerning the authority of the Bible—a statement which follows very closely the definitions given by Samuel Tuke in his *Letter to John Wilkinson* and by Joseph John Gurney in his *Strictures*¹, but omits all reference to Barclay's controversial "secondary rule."² In his autobiography, Joseph John Gurney says: "I ventured to state to the Yearly Meeting what I apprehended ought to be the substance of it. These suggestions were afterwards adopted; the declaration was brought in and passed, with the warm concurrence of the body at large. It formed a part of the general epistle, which was carefully drawn up by a judicious committee, and which I believe to be as clear and important a document, considered as a confession of faith, as was ever put forth by a body of professing Christians; and it certainly ought to be received as a sufficient reply to all doubters and cavillers on the subject of the Christian belief of the Society of Friends."³ The Yearly Meeting of 1836, in fact, confirmed the tendency of the Society to veer towards the general evangelical position, and did not of itself widen the split in the Society's ranks.

During the following twelve months Maria Hack appears to have come round to the view that outward baptism and the Lord's Supper were ordinances which were obligatory for all Christians, and in 1836 or 1837 before the Yearly Meeting of 1837, she became a "communicant." In Sixth Month, 1837, while the Yearly Meeting was in progress, she was baptized, and in the following Eleventh Month her resignation from

¹ *Strictures on . . . The Truth Vindicated* (1836).

² *Apology*, Prop. III.

³ Quoted from *Memoirs of Joseph John Gurney* (1854), ii, p. 58.

the Society was accepted by Gloucester Monthly Meeting, whose testimony of disownment refers to their not desiring "to cast uncharitable reflection on those who may conscientiously differ from us."

At the end of 1837, after leaving the Society, Maria Hack published a short tract entitled *The Christian Ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper*, and "addressed to the Society of Friends," in which she opposed the arguments advanced by Joseph John Gurney in his *Observations on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends* (1824) against the Christian use of these ceremonies. "I wish," comments her brother, Barnard Barton, "my dear good sister would betake herself to her old vocation of writing far pleasanter tomes than her recent polemical tracts. Giving her credit as I do most sincerely for the best of intentions, I cannot help being doubtful of her benefitting others or herself by her new line of authorship."¹ Bernard Barton himself, in spite of the secession of nearly all his near relatives, remained faithful to what he called "old-fashioned Quakerism." "I might say," he writes, "that I felt quite unable to define what the belief or doctrine of our seceders were; or to what extent they differ from us, except as to what they term *ordinances*. But a difference on this point alone, is not in my view a little one. I have no sort of controversy with the good and the pious of other sects who have always thought it their duty to participate in such rites; I have no desire to dispute with those who, amongst us, thinking such things to be essential, quietly leave us and join in religious profession with those who practise them. But I have an abiding, and for aught I can see, an interminable controversy with those who would still hold their membership with us by forcing on us the observance of these rites, and mixing them up with our simpler and spiritual creed as part and parcel of a new-fangled system which they are pleased to call Evangelical Quakerism. I get puzzled and bewildered among these nondescript novelties; a sprinkling, or water-sprinkled, sacrament-taking Quaker is a sort of incongruous medley I can neither classify nor understand."²

Soon after leaving the Society of Friends, Maria Hack

¹ Letter to Thomas Gates Darton, 30th of Fifth Month, 1838.

² Letter to Mrs. Sutton, quoted undated in *Selections from the Poems and Letters of Bernard Barton* (1849), pp. 48-9.

joined the Church of England. At the end of 1841 or the beginning of 1842 she moved from Gloucester to Southampton, where she died on 4th of First Month, 1844.

The letter which follows was written just after Yearly Meeting, 1837, while she was staying at Catherine Court, near the Tower of London, to help during the confinement of her daughter, Margaret Emily Darton (1814-1886), the wife of Thomas Gates Darton.

Stephen Hack (1816-1894), to whom the letter was addressed, was Maria Hack's youngest son, who with his brother, John Barton Hack (1805-1884), had left England for South Australia in 1836. The two brothers were amongst the first Friends to arrive in this new colony, which they reached in Second Month, 1837, six weeks after it had been proclaimed. They were partly responsible for the erection in 1840 of the Adelaide Meeting House, a prefabricated wooden building which was subscribed for and sent out by Friends in England and is still used by Adelaide Friends as their Meeting House. Both brothers afterwards left the Society of Friends, John Barton Hack to become a Methodist and Stephen Hack to join the Church of England.

Catherine Court, [London].
17 June, 1837.

My dearest Stephen,

. . . If dear Margaret's disappointment with regard to Mary Capper had not occurred,¹ I hardly think I should have come to town. . . . Still, being here, I felt very anxious to avail myself of any opportunity that might be put in my way, especially as I was in some measure *under dealing*, having been visited by the Overseer of Gloucester Meeting on account of having received the Lord's Supper. . . . The obligation of baptism had also much engaged my thoughts, but there seemed to be difficulties in the way of receiving it, as I have so little of sectarian feeling that I rather shrink from any overt act which might pledge me to membership with any other Society lest thereby I might become entangled with some other yoke of bondage. At least, I determined *first* to use the opportunity this journey to London presented for learning whether our seceding Friends are likely to remain a

¹ Mary Capper was to have assisted during Margaret Emily Darton's confinement.

distinct body of Christians and whether, if so, I could so fully unite in their views as to consider myself a member of their association. It has happened, and I trust ever gratefully to acknowledge the goodness of Providence in so ordering events that, without any particular difficulty from which my natural shyness would probably have made me recoil, way has opened far beyond what I could have anticipated. For instance, the very first meeting I attended after coming to town—that for Worship on 4th day at Devonshire House—Anna Braithwaite,¹ to whom I should hardly have ventured to introduce myself from the persuasion that she would not know me, came to me after Meeting, addressed me very kindly, said she particularly wished for an opportunity of having some private conversation with me, and invited me to go home and dine with her the next day, to which I gladly consented.

During the interim I heard that Isaac Crewdson, though no longer a member of [the] Society, was in town *and baptizing*. I thought, if this were really true, my difficulties might be overcome, and on enquiry of Anna Braithwaite the next day found the report was correct [and] that Rachel Howard,² who is at Tottenham, to all appearance in the last stage of consumption, having told [her father] that she believed it her duty to obey in this particular the ordinance of Christ, Luke had written to Isaac Crewdson requesting him to come and administer the ordinance to his daughter. When I heard this, I asked Anna Braithwaite if she would be so kind, seeing I was quite a stranger, [as] to state my wishes on the subject and ask Isaac Crewdson to appoint some time and place where I could have the opportunity of speaking to him. With some difficulty arising from his being out of town, this was accomplished.

I had a private interview with Isaac Crewdson at Clapton³ that very evening, and I can hardly tell you how much

¹ Anna Braithwaite (1788-1859) was the daughter of Charles and Mary Lloyd of Birmingham, and wife of Isaac Braithwaite of Kendal. She was a prominent Minister of extreme evangelical outlook and had visited the United States during the Hicksite Controversy in which she had strongly supported the "orthodox" side.

² Rachel Howard (c. 1803-1837) was the author of *Lessons in Scripture History* (1834) and daughter of Luke Howard (1772-1864), the well-known meteorologist, and editor of *The Yorkshireman* (1833-7).

³ Presumably at the house of Isaac Crewdson's cousins, Hannah Messer and her husband, where Maria Hack was later baptized

comforted I was to find him a very superior kind of man to the idea I had conceived of him. I expected meekness, humility and simplicity: one could not read *The Crisis*¹ without receiving that impression of his character. I expected also from his benevolence that I should meet with kindness and Christian sympathy. But I was not prepared for so much dignity, nor for the *cautious* enquiry into the progress of conviction as to this ordinance. At length he professed himself satisfied and appointed the next day but one, requesting me to bring with me any persons I might desire to have as witnesses. This I declined, preferring to leave the whole arrangement to him. As you well know, I could not have asked such a thing of the Dartons,² indeed of any one I know about London.

Well, I went again to Clapton on the 7th day (yesterday fortnight) and, by Isaac Crewdson's request, was immediately shown upstairs into a room where he seemed to be waiting for me, with a Bible open on the table before him in which I saw many slips of paper. He received me with more than kindness, with affection, and again entered on the subject of religious belief, especially with regard to what is called the Trinity and the Atonement. I told him that, with regard to the latter, I thought the reasons I had given for desiring to receive the Lord's Supper must fully explain my feelings; but that I was not so sure my view of the Trinity would to *him* appear satisfactory; however, that I would unequivocally explain what it *had* been and what it now *is*. Having done so, I had the comfort of finding that my sentiments fully accorded with his own.

After perhaps half an hour's conversation, he proposed joining the company in the drawing-room. As we were going downstairs he stopped, and turning round to me, said that though no doubt remained on *his own* mind, yet as most unjust and . . . [illegible] reports of the proceedings of himself and his friends had been industriously circulated, he hoped I would not think he asked *too much* if he requested

¹ *The Crisis of the Quaker Contest in Manchester* (1837).

² This refers either to Thomas Gates Darton or to his father, Samuel Darton (1785-1840), who was at the time Clerk of Devonshire House Monthly Meeting. Although Darton and Harvey, of which Samuel Darton was senior partner and in which Thomas Gates Darton was an assistant, had been one of the joint publishers of the first edition of the *Beacon*, thereafter the firm published no pro-Beacon literature.

that before the ceremony I would explicitly state my belief in the Divine nature and the Offices of the Saviour, *lest it should be said he had baptized a Unitarian*. This was no small trial to me, but knowing that even of late years some Unitarians have spoken of me as belonging to them, I could not refuse a request so reasonable; and Isaac Crewdson most kindly made it easier by adverting to the obligation every one ought to feel, in receiving Christian baptism, to look upon it as an open profession of faith in the Divine Saviour, etc., etc. (He had previously read the passages from the New Testament into which he had put marks of reference, and spoken of the *intent* of the ordinances, etc.) I shall not have room to go into all the detail, but you will perceive how greatly this manner of introducing it lessened the trial to me. After I had said what was needful, Isaac Crewdson prayed that the Divine blessing might accompany the ordinance about to be administered; and subsequently made some observations upon the circumstances—upon his own apprehension that it was a duty required of him as a Christian minister, and one in which he requested the prayers of those present that he might be enabled to perform rightly. He then put something for me to kneel upon, and taking some water from a bowl on the table, poured it on my head, holding his hand upon it while he repeated very solemnly, “I baptize thee in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost.” After this he prayed again—particularly, dear, good man, for the Divine blessing to rest upon me—and then there was a shaking of hands as is usual after one of Friends’ religious opportunities. Altogether, the ceremony appeared to me more solemn and impressive than the way in which the ordinance is administered in the Church of England, where the questions and answers are all prepared. Here everything arose out of the circumstances, and though it was not only trying, but really very awful to be called upon as I was, yet the very singularity of the thing seemed to bring it more home to the conscience, and surely it was *right* it should be so.

I know not, my dearest Stephen, whether my account of this will seem tedious to thee, but as thou wilt probably read a little paragraph which some officious person foolishly put into the newspaper (and I hear it has been copied into another), I should like you to know what really did pass on that occasion. It is true, as the paper states, that Luke

Howard himself was baptized, *not* when I was, but at seven o'clock in the morning of the same day. There were a good many, perhaps twenty, witnesses present with me, among them Esther Wilkinson. I am not sure about John Wilkinson; I do not recollect seeing him till sometime afterwards; the folding doors were open and he was probably in the adjoining room. He came and sat by me on the sofa and we had much interesting conversation. Tea was brought in and there was much coming and going in Y.M. fashion, though the Messers at whose house this took place have resigned their membership.

I returned to town in the evening by the stage with Robert Jowitt¹ of Leeds, who very kindly accompanied me to Catherine Court. He adverted to his schoolboy days and to the kindness he had received from me and Aunt Lizzy² when he used to come as a schoolboy to dine at Grandfather Horne's.³ He joined our company at tea-time and, I believe, was not aware of the ceremony that had taken place. During our ride to town he adverted to the changes taking place among Friends. I assented to or differed from him as it happened, but quite in a general way; having read his pamphlet on the subject of water baptism and, notwithstanding the sentiments therein expressed, feeling great esteem for him and his ministry, I should have been very sorry to wound his feelings by any unguarded remark.

I do sincerely love and esteem really pious Friends and I do believe that such, if they could only think themselves at liberty to examine the obligation of baptism and the Supper on purely *Scriptural* grounds, without referring at all to the judgment of *early Friends* on these points, (that they) would see the thing in a very different light from that in which they now view it. My reason for thinking so is this. It is not a matter of *opinion* in which men may from various circumstances arrive at opposite conclusions, and are perhaps allowed to entertain different views while they cultivate an

¹ Robert Jowitt (1784-1862) was the son of John and Susanna Jowitt of Leeds and brother of Elizabeth (Jowitt) Crewdson, Isaac Crewdson's wife. He had married (1810) Isaac Crewdson's sister, Rachel (1782-1856). He was, however, no Beaconite and in 1837 published *Thoughts on Water Baptism*, a tract which supported the Society's traditional views on baptism.

² Elizabeth Barton (1779-c. 1838), Maria Hack's sister, who joined the Church of England in 1837.

³ Thomas Horne of Tottenham, Maria Hack's step-mother's father.

humble spirit and regard the opinions of others with charity. But in this case, we have plain injunctions as to matters of fact—things to be done. . . . All Christians agree that our Lord promised the Holy Spirit to his Apostles, adding that he should *guide them into all truth and bring all that he had said to their remembrance*. No one disputes this, or that the promise was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. How then can we suppose that the Apostles, when filled with the Holy Spirit, that infallible guide and remembrancer, could possibly *misunderstand* the parting injunction of their Lord to go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, etc.? Their conduct plainly shows that they believed *water* baptism to be what they were enjoined to practise, and the Lord was pleased to confirm their word by signs following, i.e., by the evidence of miracles. What awful presumption does it then seem for a set of men 1,600 years afterwards to imagine that they could have a more full and clear understanding of the commands of Christ than was possessed by his own Apostles! The power of God *is understood by the things that he has made*. Deists are willing to acknowledge him as the universal Father, but this is only a *part* of the Divine character, of which our unassisted reason can assure us. He has revealed himself to be also our Redeemer and our Sanctifier, and ordains this simple rite as the acknowledgment that his fallen, sinful creatures gladly and thankfully accept his offered mercy, and believe in and receive him as the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. By doing this they glorify him before men, they give an evident *token* of their faith. I am sure it is far, very far from my wish to condemn the *intentions* of our early Friends, but I do believe they fell into a great but specious delusion, the participation and effects of which will long be lamented.

I was much interrupted while writing the above and fear it will not appear so intelligible as I could wish. I hope to send thee Isaac Crewdson's little tract on baptism.¹

¹ *Water Baptism an Ordinance of Christ* (1837).

A. R. Barclay MSS

Extracts. Continued from vol. xlv, p. 45.

Notes are not supplied to Friends respecting whom notes appear in "The Journal of George Fox," Cambridge edition, 1911, or "The Short and Itinerary Journal," 1925. The use of capital letters has been reduced and the punctuation and paragraphing adapted where necessary in the interest of clarity. The A.R.B. MSS. are in the Library a Friends House, and also available on microfilm.

XCIH

FRANCIS HOWGILL to GEORGE FOX. *Appleby,*
3.vii.1664¹

Dear Geo

In the most deare & tender love of God made manifest in my harte, doe I most dearly remember, & present my intire love unto the, because it is thy owne. I had a greatte and a sore confflicte heare, att the Assise² butt the Lord was on my side indeed ; so the face of noe man I feared, though indeed I had very many enimies, As I did right well know befforhand, butt oh dear Geo: I was so cleare in the sight off God & in my owne harte that made me³ very bould. Though Indeed I have borne a greatt weight many monethes upon my backe about this plotting, & the like & some that weare to much inclined I know to it whome I could nott wholly rejecte, as beleveing in the treuth, nether yett justisse so that I have been as upon a racke betwixt my freinds & enimies yett I did beleive the Lord, worke throug it all & cleare his treuth & ease me. Their was none caled hear butt myselffe, & my enimies shott hard att me : & all the justises in the cuntrie insenced the judge agaynst me, then I did perseve they had noe purposse to have done so sevearly as they wear putt upon : I had a most galent time, 2 times In the courte : beffor the face of the wholle cuntrie, & sumtime they wear putt to a stand, butt being resolved whatever I could say to doe even as they did, as I did forsee pramunired me, though both the clarke & the judges affter would have washed their hands, butt I am well, & indeed none of these things as to my

¹ See the preceding paper (XCII), printed in *Journal F.H.S.*, vol. xlv, 40-45, for Francis Howgill's account of the proceedings at the previous assize.

² 22, 23, vi. 1664.

³ MS. has *be*.

selffe troubl[1]es me. I had only a copie that I could spare I sent by this young man, to lett the[e] heare of my triall, only to aquent the[e] : I was infformed that Philip Musgrove had Rich:Flettcher^r in hand & siffed him very much: & flatterd & tould him he had done well in confforming butt iff he would discover any thing ether in acction or counsayle frome the[e] or me : he promised him : to aquent the King with it & bring him into favour att courte : Butt I heard the man sayd noe evill : nether could treuly ; butt only sayd we wear much esteemed among the Quackers but he had nothing agaynst us for we wear altogither for peace ; the Lord preserve us out off the hands of unreasonable men.

I long to heare off the[e] : & how they proceeded agaynst the[e] & dear M: F: unto whome dearly salutte me in the Lord : the justises heare are all like an oven & drives on hastelley, the Lord shorten these dayes for his ellecte sake. I am exeding well blessed be the Lord, only through much straytnesse my ould inffirmity troubles me : most dearly farwell, & remember me to all the prisoners & Freinds.

Thy owne sonn begotten by the word off liffe
Apelby 3 of this 7 month

F. H.

1664

[endorsed by G.F.] F.H. to G.F.

[address] For the hands of
G.F. these

XCIV

ESTHER BIDDLE to JOHN SMITH. *London*, 28.ix.1665.
John Smith,

In yt which changes not doe I tenderly salute thee desireing thy prosperity in yt which is imutable & shall remaine when fading man shall have an end, and although it hath been a day of death & an houre of darknes wherein many hath laid downe theire heads in endles misery yet hath ye glorious light shined forth as clear as ye sun at noneday & as a morning without clouds have we seen our beloved, which hath caried us above ye fear of death on ye stroake of ye destroyer; glory be to his Name for ever, & he hath yet left himselfe a remnant in this dying & fading Citty, which are as lights in ye midst of gross darknes, & I beleeve they will see ye darknes expelld before ye Lord calles them home, and indeed

^r Of Carlisle.

we could willingly [have] inoyed each other here below if ye Lord had seen it good, we thought we were not so many but still desired ye Lord to add unto our number, & keep us together in his life & power as he did untill their worke was finished, which he gave them to doe, and now are they at rest with Abraham Isaac & Jacob.

And as for Freinds in ye ministry their hath none dyed but John Sheild & John Fothergill & as for Margrett Too[m]s [?] she is pretty well & John Gibson is in health. Francis Howgill is yet a prisoner in Apelby & pretty well. G: F: is kept very close & is not sufferd to write. Wm Crouch is in health, George Gosnell his wife & childeren are deceased. Wm Bayly is well in this Citty, John Crooke & Isaac Benington they be well, & we have heard from Jamaico, and Edward Brough & ye other friend is arrived there & they have much liberty by ye governour¹ & we have heard from Merri[land] from Tho: Gibson & ye other seaven yt ye Lord struck ye master of ye ship dumb & about a fortnight after he dyed & was Throwne over board about 4 dayes before they came to land. The governour² we heard would not receive them unles they were willing to come ashoare. Ye Lord hath promised to pleid ye cause of his afflicted, & he is doing of it now & we have seen his goodnes to break forth upon us far beyond oure afflictions & all yt ever we might suffer here below is not to be weighed with yt weight of glory, which is hid from ye wisdome of ye wise & ye folly of ye foole.

Deare freind my husband desireth thee to acquaint Margarett Reynolds yt he would have her son to come home, Anthony being dead, we have need of one; & if he cometh not he intendeth to have another in his steed & not to receive him againe. It is about 3 months agoe since our Maid and Antony dyed, I think here is not now much danger, soe farewell my husbands love is to thee & Margrett my deare love salluteth all Freinds yt way in hast I rest Thy sure Freind

Esther Biddle

The 55 lost aboard and about halfe dead & ye rest are about beyond graves end.³

[endorsed] Esther Biddle's Letter to me 1667 [in error]

¹ Sir Thomas Modyford, 1620?-1679. *Dictionary of National Biography*.

² Charles Calvert, 1637-1715, governor of Maryland, 3rd Baron Baltimore.

³ A reference to the 55 shipped in the *Black Eagle* for transportation.

XCV

WILLIAM STORRS to SAMUEL HOOTON. *Chesterfield*,
30.xi.1666.

Deare Samuell

O how weare I with the Rest of freinds truely Refreshed
in ye lord to heare from thee. . . .

Deare Samuell Friends heare are Jenerally well and at
Libertie, & meeteings peaceabley, onely at Chesterfeild they
will not suffer us to meete in ye towne but forses us to the
Towns end. Things goes well in most places in this Land, the
truth is over the heades of all soarts of people, meeteings
weare never soe large as now at London and very peaceable
but ye wourd is in a troubled condition full of feares &
distructions, that many knows not what to doe.

I have a kinsman or two which went into New England
about 3 yeares since, the one is Samuell Stors the other is
Will Throupe, if thou could heare of them they would be
Joyfull of thee, they came from Lound in Nottinghamshire,
my Cosin Samuell is a Chandler by trade, ye other is a
husbandman which is married lately. I doe not know what
place they live at, but they say they are about four-score
miles within New England. I should be very glad to heare
from them.

Dear Samuell, Remember my Dear Love to George
Heathcoat and tell him his Relations is in health. John Frith
and Susan with several other friends hath there Dear love to
thee, & soe Dear Samuell my love in the Lord is truely with
thee and Remaines

thy friend in ye truth

Will Storrs

Chesterfeild, ye 30th of ye 11th moneth

66

[address] For the hand of his
Deare Friend Samuel
Hooton in New England
with Care
send this to Elizabeth Hooton
to be convaied for her
Lo: Friend will: Stors

[endorsed] Will Stors to Samuel
Hooton 66

O. E.

XCVI

WILLIAM GIBSON to ELLIS HOOKES. *Maidston, ye*
5 of ye 5 Mo: 69

E.H.

In the Love of god which endures for ever I doe salute thee, & Friends. This may Certifie you that I am well every way, praised bee the Lord god for the same. Dear Elis I Receved a Letter Lately from John Midlton, In which hee Did signifie unto mee that hee had been with Judge Ceeling on my account & that hee did Intend to goe againe & that hee was not without hope to doe some service in the thing. I did write to him to speake unto thee to draw over, both my Comittment, & a short account of the proceedings that hath been against mee & that if John or any other Friends doe goe to Judge Ceeling yt they may present the paper to him. I sent a Large draught of the whole proceedings that hath been against mee to John Rouse for M. Fell according to her desire (when shee was with mee) soe I desire thee to Enquire for those papers of John Rouse & to doe accordingly as thou & Friends sees meet. I desire J.M. to shewe thee Letter which I write unto him, in which thou may see what I doe desire to have anexed to my Comittments In Its order & place, that soe the Judge may have a sight thereby, how they have proceeded against mee alltogether Contrary unto their owne Law, & then if it bee in him to doe any good in it hee may doe it, if not I am given up in the will of the Lord god & doe Rest in peace with him, not fearing what man Can doe unto mee. I did write to Jo: Midlton to speake to thee about a poore Friend that is prisnor here for tythes I sent a Coppy of his Comittment unto W. Myres, & his Man write to me that hee had given it to thee, I doe desire thee to give us an account whither any thing may bee don in it or one [*i.e.*, noe?]. I send thee by this beator 4s for Som Bookes which thou sent mee. I desire the to Remember my dear Love to friends generally as it is in thy minde, & Lett mee heare from thee of the Freinds busines, & my owne. I doe heare that Judge Ceeling is Like to bee the man that I am Like to Com before at the Assizes. Thy Friend & Brother in the Covenant Love life & peace which is Everlasting

W. Gibson

[address] To the hands of Elis
 Hookes at Ann Trauarce
 her house in horsadown
 In South warke These
 deliver with Care
 or Elsewhear

[endorsed] a letter fro W.G. to E.H.
 when priso at Maidston
 abt 1669.

XCVII

JOHN STUBBS to ELIZABETH HOOTON. *Enfield,*
 15.x.1670.

Dear Elisabeth Hutton

I received thy letter this week, and did read it to George, it had been well if that Book¹ had been printed to have given them before they had risen; if they be not risen, there is foure hundred Bookes of G.F. at Amors [Amor Stoddart's] called Gosple Liberty,² if they be not risen he would have them dispersed among them, and the other alsoe if it be printed. He is satisfied about thy dilligence and Service. When thou goes with the Bookes thou maist take with thee whom thou sees meet yt is willing to goe with thee.

Remember my Dear love to Henry and Hannah and yt family.

farewell

From thy true friend
 & Brother J. Stubbs

Enfield

ye 15th 10 m. 1670.

[address] O. E.
 For
 Elsabeth
 Hutton
 Theise
 with care.

¹ Possibly Elizabeth Hooton and Thomas Taylor's *To the King and both Houses of Parliament*, 1670.

² *Gospel Liberty and the Royal-Law of Love, from Christ Jesus . . . set above Artaxerxes, and, Nebuchadnezer's Law and Commands . . .*, &c., 1668.

XCVIII

GEORGE FOX to ISAAC RUSH. *Swarthmoor*, 8.i.1676/7.¹

Dear Friend Isaac Rush

I Received thy Letter from New providence, dated ye 10th of ye 6: Month 1676: And I am glad to heare of thy preservation, & yt ye Lord has a standart in yt place for his name. There was severall Friends yt went from about London to Ashly Cooper River, above a yeare agoe. Now concerning thy publick place, doe not lay it downe, but keep to truth & righteousness, in all thy undertakings, yt thee mayst bee a blessing to ye Lord in thy generation, & yt thou may Answer ye wittness of God in all peoples.

And as for thy Copping or Ingrossing other swearing, which thou neither putts ye Oath to ym, nor putts it upon ym to sweare; but keeps thy Testimony and there being Liberty granted without swearing, in time thou may Convince some of ym, keeping over ym in thy place: and keeping of ye Testimony of Jesus & his doctrine against swearing. . . . And hee is able to support thee in all Conditions, and though thou art alone, yett feele him & his presence with thee, who hath all power in heaven & earth given to him, Glory over all bee to his Name for Ever: In whose name is salvation, & not by any other Name under ye whole heaven.

And so ye Lord God Almighty preserve thee & keep thee, yt thou may grow in ye grace & truth which comes from Jesus, & in ye faith, which hee is ye Author & finisher of.

And if thee would have any Bookes, thee may write to Ralfe Frettwell in Barbadoes: or write to Benjamin Clarke a stationer in George Yard in Lumbardstreet, London & have one of a sort of all Friends bookes yt comes out yearly, and keep a Correspondence with him.

So in haste because of ye post, with my Love in ye truth
G.F.

Swarthmoore

8: day of ye 1st

month 1676/7

[endorsed]

G. F. to Isaac
Rush Secretary
in New Providence
ye 1st moth
1676/7

No. 43.F
Read not thought
meet to be
printed.

¹ 43F in *Annual catalogue*, ed. Cadbury, 1939, p. 137. Not autograph.

XCIX

RALPH FRETTEWELL to GEORGE FOX. [Barbados],
31.xi.1681.

Dearest Friend:

Thine I Recei[ve]d at our Quarterly Meeteing ye 10th mo: Last, Intymateing after other things: as after: vizt:

And Remember my Love to Soll: E[ccles]: & John Rous his wife & tell Sollomon & John R: that I desire all who are Ministers in yt Island, and yt have Testimonyes for ye Lord May have a Meeteing together, and yt they may bee familliar with one annother, and in Love & unity; and whatever is amisse, & past, let it bee come over, for ye Spirit of ye prophets are Subject to ye prophets. For they that Speake must bee in unity however, Else itt will distract ye hearers, and Scatter, & make partyes, which bee sure to avoyd. And keepe in unity. And if you had a Meeteing every other Second day (as it is here in London every Second day) it might doe well, and that all might take their Motions & places that they go unto, that all Meeteings might bee Supplied and all go on in Love & unity not hurt one annother in Gods holy Mountaine and that you may bee Sure to keepe out that ill Custome of hurteing & Strife, & Contention in your meeteings or in ye Church of God &c. But if there bee any differance beeweene any Minister or others, lett itt bee Ended privately out of Meeteings; that ye peace of God may bee kept among Breitheren & in ye Love of God you may all bee built upp: and have fellowship in ye holy Ghost. But I desire that ye Meeteing of Ministers May bee Settled before Sollomon comes over. . . .

Which advise, S.E. beeing Gon before it came, I Shewed itt unto M. Rous & John & R. Forde and Gave ym a Copie of it to Consider, that ye thing might bee Managed accordeing to thy advise in peace & Love . . . [gives a long account of difficulties stemming from the Wilkinson-Story controversy, in establishing ministers' meetings in Barbados].¹

As for my Son: Blessed be God for itt hee is now arrived,

¹ See William Charles Braithwaite's *Second Period*, 348-349, and the references given there. Henry J. Cadbury's *Annual catalogue of George Fox's papers*, 1939, assigns the serial number 10,56G to the letter from George Fox which is quoted at the beginning of Ralph Fretwell's account. The original letter is not known to exist and was not in the hands of the original cataloguer in 1694-98.

when I had almost don Expecting of him, for friends in ye Cuntry was Loath to Lett him come, and Hen[ry] Jackson Stood with him in yt perticular. But uppon my Spetiall order hee Gott an honnist friend & his wife to Looke after things, whome Hen Jackson & other Friends aproved of. Itt is better with my Son yn freinds here or I expected for hee Gained Love where hee was in ye Countrye by his deportement and bore his Testimony against ye Priest of ye Parish: and understood there was a Citation out against him: and to our Relations Stood by ye Principles of truth: and in perticular that of Tyth alledgeing that of ye hebrews: Some of ym Said they did not know there had beene Soe much to bee said against itt: and Soe abated their Anger, that are conserved in receiveing of Tyth: But Smileingly Said, hee was a Great Heretick, also when hee came Last to London hee mett with Some of his Schoolfellowes that had Given Testimonies that were in print, in ye Litle booke who putt of their hatt, & Invited him unto ye Taverne; But hee dealt with them for ye Same: and hee is very Sensible that those that Goes from Truth are ye Worst of Men: and hath a prety Good understanding of things, better then I Expected: but I indeavour to Shew him his Shortnesse.

I perceive by him that young Folkes finde wayes to understand how Many things passe among ye Ellders in London: But these things hee speakes of to my wife &c. Hee saith hee went to Christopher Taylors, and Some other places to See thee accordeing to my order, but thou was Gon abroad into ye Countrie, and heard that thou wast at uxbridge, But itt was when ye Ship was Goeing to Saile or hee had Gon downe to Richard Richardsons to thee. Hee said Most of ye Neighbors about my howse (att Hellaby¹ in Yorkeshire) which ye Said Richard Richardson knowes, tould Ralph if hee would Gett a Meeteing there they would come unto itt, and hee Twice Spoke to Hen Jackson: who did not Speake anything against itt, or Incouridg itt, vizt. to have there a Meeting or Two for the neighbours. I know it is a Convenient place for a Meeteing: None beeing within 3 or 4 Miles on it on any hand:

Now hee is Come, my minde Inclines More towards England: to See thee, and Settle ye affaires there, and I hope way will bee made for ye Same . . . Eliz Carter is arrived

¹ Hellaby, hamlet 5 miles East of Rotherham.

well, haveing beene abroad, in New England, Virginea, and parts adjoyneing. Shee Saith there is Greate Service for Good friends in Virginea: But they had neede to bee Good friends: Truth hath had Good dominion where they went, her Love is unto thee.

Soe with my Love unto thee, Margrett and yor whole Family; with other friends thou Sees Meete I take Leave who am:

Thy Friend in Truth accordeing to my Measure

Ra Fretwell

Month ye 11th day 31th 1681.

[address] For

G F owne hands

dd

or Convey as desired in

ye Cover.

[endorsed by G.F.]

raff Fretwell

C

[There is no separate manuscript with this number.]

CI

MARY HAMPTON to GEORGE FOX. [*Bristol*, 1681]

Dear George Fox

By whom my Soul hath been refreshed many a time, My Soul saluteth thee in the fear and dread of the lord at this time, the lord hath been pleased to exercise me at this time, as I lay in my bed betime in the morning very early as I waked out of my Sleep the power of the lord came upon me and made me bow under it to feel what it was for and after some hours did work mightily in me and brought me very low. This word Sprung in me mightily. *Hear O King and live for Ever &c.* And after that the power of the lord worked mightily in me, and A great dread was upon me, and I rose, and the dread and power worked in me all the day after, and followed me all the day . . . [recounts her unwillingness to write to the King and her dread of "the lord's anger" if she does not].

After this I waited to feel what I might do, and it was with me to acquaint Laurence Steel with it and Richard Sneade, That they might Convey them to thee, and A Coppy of it helped forward by thee as in the truth thou shalt feel the

service thereof. I could not be at ease till I sent them to thee for I felt the lords anger against me, because of the delaying of it, and that if I did not send it my life must go for it, but I am better satisfied since my Friends undertook to send it to thee. So in the truth I am thy Loving Friend

Mary Hampton¹

The words that lay upon me to send are as follows—

Hear O King and live for ever, for the lord requires it of thee that thou wilt take this great oppression that is put upon the tender Consciences of his tender people, that thou mayest live for ever, Therefore be faithful O King to the requiring of the great God of heaven and Earth that thou mayest live for ever for they cannott bow to every Order or requiring of men, that is contrary to the mind of God for Conscience sake, for the lord God that formed the Mountains and Created the Windes and gave to Man his breath requires this of thee, O King, that thy Soul may rest in peace with God when time shall be no more.

CII

LAURENCE STEEL to GEORGE FOX. [*Bristol*, 1681]

Dear G.F.

With dear love to thee, as also the Love of faithfull friends. . . .

So with dear love, bei[torn] to write by reason of pain & weaknes in my head.

I am thy Loving Friend,

L. St[torn].

This letter is in print, *Journal F.H.S.*, xxv (1928), 16-17. It gives Bristol Friends' news and encloses Mary Hampton's letter, the preceding item, only for the sake of her peace of mind.

¹ Mary Hampton, an active woman Friend of Bristol, imprisoned during 1664-65 and 1682-83; widow, aged 68, in 1682. Besse: *Sufferings*, 1753, I. 68; *Relation of the Inhumane and Barbarous Sufferings . . . in . . . Bristoll*, 1665; *Farther Account . . . of the Cruel Persecution . . . in Bristol*, 1682, 3. Her signature in Dix MS. E.10 (at Friends House).

CIII

WILLIAM EDMONDSON to GEORGE FOX.

Dublin ye 12 of 9 mo. 87.

dear G F

I received thy letter of tender admonition which is allways welcom to me, but I am sorry for those trubls in Barbados which thou mentions in thine, & I had a ful account of it from thence. & as touching yt mony they charge on R.f[retwell?], he cleared him selfe of it at a 6 weeks meting when I was ther, but ther is a party yt hath a life in contencions & devisions, but was all quiet when I came from thence.

And dear G: as touching things heer, som tims wee mete with exersises with some perticlors yt feers not ranks our gospel order under our heavenly spiretual capten, but it is over & blesed be ye Lord, Truth is over al, & frinds is in pease & quiatnesse one with another, & truth is in good credit both with rulers & people & great opennesse in many plases & many frequants our metings. & I thenk things amongst frinds in this nation in ye general is as wel as in any plase yt I know & hath bene presarved out of jumb[l]es & deferensis more then in some other plases to our cumfort for which we have cause to bles ye lord.

This day ended our half yeers meeting & ye lord apered gloryusly amongst us to our great cumfort & refreshment & a godly cayer fel resting upon ye elders for ye probigation of truth & presarvation of frinds out of all such things as gives occation against it, & ye lords goodnesse plentiusly with us: & truths businesse caryed on in great unity concord & love; to our great setisfaction.

Wee have several of us several tims upon several occations bene with ye lord debity¹ & chansler² & others chefe in government & they are redy to heer us: who is very [kind]³ but espishely lord chefe justes newgnte⁴ who is redy to doe anything he can for us. Several frinds in dublin, Cork, cashell & limbrick is maid Aldermen & in corperations some maid

¹ Lord Deputy of Ireland, Richard Talbot, Earl (later titular Duke) of Tyrconnel, 1630-1691. *Dictionary of National Biography*.

² Chancellor of Ireland, Sir Alexander Fitton (a Catholic convert), d. 1698. *D.N.B.*

³ Torn.

⁴ Lord Chief Justice Nugent, d. 1715, was created (titular) Lord Riverston, in the Irish peerage by James II in 1689. *D.N.B.*

burgesis. Soe such is like to meet with tryels in ther plases & I wish ye truth sufer not in yt case. My deer & true love is to ye in ye everlasting unchangable truth wher I have bene presarved through many exercises & in which I remaine

William Edmondson¹

[address] To George Fox Att
William Meads
Linnen Draper Att
the ship in Fenchurch
street

London

[endorsed] Wm Edmunsons Letter
of passidges to G.F.
from Ireland
ye 12th 9th mo 87

To be Read in ye
2d Dayes Meeting

read 12. 10m. 87

CIV

FRANCIS HOWGILL to GEORGE FOX. *Appleby*, [1664]

Most Dear

G.F. whome I dearly love & ever have done since I knew the & I beleive shall doe for ever: I am very well blessed be god & in perfecte peace & Joy in the lord & Indeed: changable things are under my Feete: blesed be the lord for ever. Thy letter I received with gladnesse & thine I sent to oule Martin, he was hear & stayd one night, they be very mad & Creuall att this Strickland head. power harts they suffer much. divers is brought to the house of Corection agayne.

My wiffe was heare as she Came From New-Castell & stayed with me, she is much Down & Loving & tender towards me now, for which I give the lord thankes. Litle more butt my Intire love to all Freinds to M:F: more especially
dearly Farwell. F.H.

Appelby
the: 16 of
this month

¹ George Fox's reply, dealing *inter alia* with the Friends who had taken offices in corporations, is listed, 6,57H (28.ix.1687) in Henry J. Cadbury's *Annual catalogue of George Fox's papers*, 1939, p. 193. It is printed on pp. 142-143 of the 1800, 2nd edition, of Ruddy's *History*.

[address] Thes For
 G.F.
[endorsed by G.F.] F h to gF
 1664
[in another hand] Private
 Letters &c.

CV

MARGARET FOX to LORD ANCRAM 31.xi.1684/5.

[rough draft]

Lord Ancram

I am very much engaged to thee for thy Christian kindness to me who am a Sufferer for ye Lord of heavens Sake . . .

I believe yt ye Lord will rewarde thee many fold into thy own bosome such a Christian act of Charity, &c.

From her yt desires thy happiness in this world & that which is to come	}	Margret Fox
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	-------------

Printed in Isabel Ross: *Margaret Fell*, 1949, p. 401.

Charles Kerr, 2nd Earl of Ancram (Scottish peerage), d. 1690, came of a staunch royalist family. He was five times M.P. for Wigan.

Recent Publications

The Conception of the Inner Light in Robert Barclay's Theology. (No. 5 of *Studia Theologica Lundensia*). By Leif Eeg-Olofsson. Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup, 1954. pp. 258. 20 Kr.

Although Dr. Alexander Gordon's estimate of Robert Barclay, almost eighty years ago, as "Scotland's one great original theologian" may well be thought to-day to be too enthusiastic, it is still true that less than justice has so far been done to Robert Barclay's significance in the history of Protestant religious thought; for it was upon Barclay that, to quote Alexander Gordon again, there fell the main burden of responsibility for "deciphering the meaning and recommending the life of the Quaker movement, that it might benefit those to whom Fox was a mystery and Quakerism a madness."

In this important study, Dr. Eeg-Olofsson, who spent a term at Woodbrooke in 1931 and again in 1946, examines the influence of Barclay's central doctrine of inward and immediate revelation upon his treatment of man's knowledge of God, Justification, Perfection

and Perseverance, Scripture, the worship and ministry of the Church, the Sacraments and some characteristics of Quaker ethical practice.

When full allowance has been made, as in this important study, for the extent to which Barclay overestimated the scope of "inward and immediate revelation," and its independence of "outward" historical facts and knowledge, it remains true that Barclay, more clearly than most of his contemporaries, understood the deep significance of the work of the Holy Spirit as experienced in the moral life of man. In the face of Churches which, although rejecting all the outward features of the Church of Rome, seemed still to be infected with its intolerance and externality, Barclay proclaimed the reality of a universal confrontation of man by God, not limited by tradition and rite, and the centrality of a worship that was manifestly in spirit and in truth.

MAURICE CREASEY

George Logan of Philadelphia. By Frederick B. Tolles. Oxford University Press, 1953. 30s.

George Logan was neither a great man, politician, nor a good Quaker, yet this is all the more a book for Friends to read. He came from a solid Quaker background in Pennsylvania, but after an education in England and Edinburgh, and the benefit of the friendship of many wise Quakers, his religious views were little different from those of any enlightened eighteenth-century gentleman. His political philosophy was largely influenced by the Physiocrats and throughout a long life as agriculturalist, pamphleteer and politician he sought to put his ideas into practice. His tenacious championship of the causes of peace, agricultural prosperity and the "yeoman democracy," led him to apparent inconsistencies in political life and some estrangement from parties and friends. Whilst he, for example, remained attached to the ideas expressed by the young Jefferson in his "Notes on Virginia," their author, after gaining office, expanded and altered his views; which seemed to Logan a capitulation to those manufacturing and financial interests which he had always opposed, and, we might add, often misunderstood.

Frederick Tolles has achieved a remarkable balance between the setting of the necessary background of events and the placing of Logan in them. The faithful use of sources helps to give a clear sense of the atmosphere of his surroundings, and especially of his delightful home-life, gradual mellowing and reconciliation with old enemies and return to something approximating to traditional Quakerism in his belief that God had given to all men "a monitor in their own breasts." The author's success in fulfilling his aim of giving "as far as may be, some sense of how it felt to be George Logan," widens our appreciation of the difficulties of man of principle faces in politics, and of the need for a religious faith which is aware of the realities of the situation and able to meet the challenge there.

CHRISTOPHER HOLDSWORTH

Religious Liberalism in Eighteenth Century England. By Roland N. Stromberg. Oxford University Press, 1954. 21s.

Friends are accustomed to think of the eighteenth century in England so far as it concerns the Society as a period in which Quakerism as a religious faith passed into a rather indrawn Quietism, and a way of life chiefly successful in winning a well-deserved reputation for honesty and competence in business and for political loyalty to the government in power. No doubt this picture is not seriously at fault so far as it goes, at any rate so far as concerns the first half of the century; what it lacks is the background—the recognition of the new movements and stresses and frustrations in Protestant and secular thought in England in the half century that followed the Settlement of 1689, without which background we may easily misprize the continued fidelity of the Society to its testimonies.

Dr. R. N. Stromberg, of the University of Maryland, is one of those American scholars whose critical and scholarly works on the interpretation of English letters, movements of thought, and religion—at a time when the American nation did not yet exist—are laying us under an ever-increasing debt. His theme is a most interesting one and the development of it displays an exceptional freedom from bias and an exceptional breadth of sympathy for the most diverse points of view. He gives an impressive bibliography and the book abounds in fine and memorable quotations from writers of the period. If there seems something over-tentative and inconclusive about some of his judgments we may rather perhaps commend the author who, where the evidence is so prolific and so varied, prefers to avoid glib dogmatism.

In a picture so crowded with the interplay of contending doctrines and influences, Christian versus deist, Anglican against nonconformist, High Church against Latitudinarian, the fortunes and the record of Quakerism occupy quite properly a very small place. Quakers were disliked, they repudiated actively the charge of deism, they shared with other Christian bodies “signs of a diminishing vitality,” they became respectable and respected, and later in the century were together with some Anglicans pioneers in certain social and philanthropic movements. In all this there is nothing unfamiliar. “Clearly the decline of persecution and the growth of their wealth softened the Dissenters’ zeal” (p. 94) ; the second was no doubt a temptation to play for safety and to avoid the extremer religious commitment; but is it quite fair to make the toleration which was after all the eighteenth century’s great achievement in the religious field, a *cause* of lessened religious zeal? Persecution may temper and *purify* a faith (religious or political) and free its membership from dross, but it cannot *foster* it; and, as recent history alone has surely demonstrated, it may if inflicted with sufficient ruthlessness, efficiency and persistence, virtually obliterate it as an effective corporate movement. And who can measure the effect of the loss by imprisonment and premature death of some of nonconformity’s most heroic witnesses before toleration had been won?

What a book such as this brings out vividly is not, I think, so

much the slackening effect of physical security, as the changing character of the challenge which any genuine religious movement must be prepared to meet—and had to meet in the first half of the eighteenth century. In the generations in which nonconformity really took root in England the historicity of the Bible and its authority were hardly called in question by any disputant, nor was there any disposition to regard miracle and mystery as inessentials in the Christian faith. But these were just the assumptions that began to be increasingly debated from about 1690, particularly under the stimulus of the "Deistic" movement. Though the author has much to say about various more or less heretical Christian doctrines, he is mainly concerned with Deism and the repercussions of deistic ideas upon Christian thought in England. The deists, Toland and Tindal, Collins and others, rejected any religious doctrines that were not based on the interpretation of nature as a harmonious rational order. They extruded all special revelation, any intervention of supernature upon nature, and in particular rejected with contumely the claim that the history of the Jewish people and its experience of God had any contemporary significance. The movement was a sort of "scientific humanism," but the science was uncritically sanguine and the human interests arid and narrow. Dr. Stromberg brings out, for instance, how little in this half century the deists, and the free-thinkers generally, were concerned with humanitarian effort and the righting of social injustices. One need not belittle the pertinence of much of their criticism, nor the sincerity that animated some (not all) of it, and the author does justice to these. But one is left with the feeling that had these writers been men of greater depth and broader outlook the impact their ideas made upon the mind of early Georgian England might have been much more formidable even than in fact it turned out to be. In this battle of ideas orthodoxy had on its side many inconsiderable pamphleteers (attacking the deists was a good way to qualify for preferment in the Church), but also fortunately some men of outstanding intellectual quality and unshakable Christian conviction, such as Joseph Butler, William Law, and Isaac Watts; and the rise and rapid success of Wesley and Whitefield constituted a counter-challenge which the deists might repudiate but could not effectively meet. But the survival of a Protestant Christianity was also, perhaps mainly, due to the quiet loyalty and piety of ordinary humble men in all denominations maintaining their faith in steadfastness through these two or three specially inclement generations.

It is impossible to do justice shortly to the comprehension and thoroughness of Dr. Stromberg's survey. Only here and there does one presume to cavil. Does he not, for instance, take Bernard de Mandeville too seriously as a sincere controversialist? And ought he not to have mentioned perhaps the most brilliant sceptical discussion of the mid-century, David Hume's "Dialogues concerning Natural Religion," which though only published posthumously were written about 1752, and have a modern note very rare in this period.

As one turns back to our own day one feels that this sojourn in the thought of the earlier eighteenth century is on the whole a saddening experience. So enlightened were the men of that day—yet so shallow;

so keen of mind, yet so abortive in their thought, so mutually frustrating; discerning to chart life's contours, yet unwitting of the subterranean forces that may be so shattering to its complacencies, but bring to its insufficiencies revelation and promise.

Perhaps we are after all not very different to-day.

JOHN W. HARVEY

Thomas Young, natural philosopher, 1773-1829. By the late Alexander Wood, completed by Frank Oldham. With a memoir of Alexander Wood by Charles E. Raven. Pp. xx, 355; 4 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1954. 30s.

Thomas Young, F.R.S., born of Quaker parents at Milverton, Somerset, was one of the group of Fellows of the Royal Society with Quaker connections, who at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth did much to further the development of scientific thought and prepare the way for modern discoveries in the physical sciences, notably concerning light, the human eye, and Egyptian hieroglyphics.

Thomas Young spent some years at Jonah Thompson's school at Compton, Dorset, and there can be little doubt where he developed the attitude of mind which enabled him to develop his natural capacities for scientific investigation and discovery. The author says:

"There can be no question of the lasting influence of the atmosphere in which Young's early days were spent. There is a certain affinity between the Quaker pursuit of truth, with its emphasis on verification in personal experience, and the scientific method." (p. 3).

Two Studies in Integrity: Gerald Griffin and Rev. Francis Mahony (Father Prout). By Ethel Mannin. London: Jarrolds, 1954. 16s.

The former of these Irish writers was linked with a family of Limerick Friends.

Gerald Griffin (1803-1840), as a young novelist and poet, found encouragement, friendship and occasional hospitality in the home of James and Lydia Fisher of Limerick, to one of whose children he was tutor for a short time. Lydia Fisher, daughter of Mary Leadbeater, edited her mother's best-known work, *The Annals of Ballitore* (1862). The ten years of affectionate friendship for her on the part of the shy and sensitive writer was probably the most important experience in his life, as evidenced by extracts from their correspondence. A portrait of Lydia Fisher is reproduced.

At the age of 36 Gerald Griffin entered the order of the Society of Christian Brothers, in whose house at Cork he died little more than a year later.

The course of the other life narrated took an opposite direction. Francis Mahony (1804-1866), after entering the priesthood against all advice, abandoned it for a literary and journalistic career in London and Paris under the pen name of Father Prout.

Index

Aberdeen, 3-4, 6, 8-9, 14, 60-3
 Aberdeenshire, 7-8
 Abraham, Daniel, 28
 Abraham, John, 28
 Accounts, 47
 Adelaide Meeting House, 72
 Addison, Joseph, 42
 Aldam, Thomas, 48
 Aldermen, Friends as, 89
 Allan, Robert T. M., 18
 Allen, William, 10, 26, 42
 Allgood, Edward, 41
 Allgood, Thomas, 41
 Ancram, Charles Kerr, 2nd earl of, 91
 Annan, 18
 Appleby, 78, 80, 90
 Ardrossan, 18
 Armour, Harry, 15
 Ashley Cooper River, 84
 Askrigg, 34
 Australia, South, 72

Baillie, Robert, 54
 Baker, James, 12
 Bank, Ross and Archenfield, 19
Baptism of Maria Hack, 67-77
 Barbados, 85, 89
Barclay, A. R., MSS. XCIII-CV, 78-91
 Barclay, Lydia Ann, 7
 Barclay, Robert, 10, 60, 69, 91-2
 Barlow, John, 12
 Barton, Bernard, 68, 71
 Barton, Elizabeth, 76
 Barton, Elizabeth (Horne), 68
 Barton, John, 68
 Barton, Mary (Done), 68
 Bates, Elisha, 67
 Bayly, William, 80
Beacon controversy, 67-77
 Beaufort, N. C., 35
 Begg, William James, 12, 16
 Benbow, John, 36
 Benezet, "James", 35
 Bewley, Mary, 45
 Biddle, Esther, letter, 79-80
 Bird, Robert, 12-13
 Bishop, George, 50
 Bolam, David, 38
 Books, 82
 Bowley, Samuel, 26
 Braithwaite, Anna (Lloyd), 73
 Braithwaite, Isaac, 73n
 Braithwaite, James A., 18
 Brantingham, George, 17
 Brighthouse Friends, 43
 Bright, Thomas, 66
 Bristol, 56, 87-8

British Friend, The, 4-5, 7, 12, 16
 Brockbank, Richard, 6
 Brough, Edward, 80
 Brougham, Lord, 27
 Broughty Ferry, 18
 Bryson, Agnes, 16
 Burrough, Edward, 50
 Burritt, Elihu, 14
 Burt, Ruth G., *Quaker Marriage Declaration*, 53-9

Cadbury, Henry J., 40, 48; *Ex libris M. Fox*, 28-29; *Keith to More*, 59-63
 Calvert, Charles, 3rd baron Baltimore, 80
 Calvert, Elizabeth, 64
 Capper, Mary, 72
 Carlisle, 6, 9, 68
 Carruthers, S. W., 52, 64
 Carter, Elizabeth, 86
 Cash, John Theodore, 12
 Cash, Sophia (Bright), 17
 Cashel, 89
 Ceeling, Judge, 82
 Chambers, William, 14
 Charles II, 87
 Chaucer, Geoffrey, 40-1
 Chester, 41
 Chesterfield, 81
 Clapton, 73-4
 Clark, Benjamin, 84
 Clarkson, Thomas, 68
 Coanwood, 15
 Cobden, Richard, 26
 Cole, Alan, *John Hodgson*, 48-52
 Coleford, 66
 Conway, Anne, Viscountess, 59, 61
 Cork, 18, 89
 Cotterell, John G., 23
 Creasey, Maurice, 91-2
 Crewdson, Elizabeth (Jowitt), 76n
 Crewdson, Isaac, 67, 73-5, 77
 Crook, John, 80
 Crosshill, 18
 Crouch, William, 80
 Cruickshank, Alexander, 9
 Cruickshank, Amos, 8, 17
 Cruickshank, Anthony, 8, 17
 Cruickshank, John, 17
 Cruickshank, John William, 9
 Cruickshank family, 8, 17
 Cuthbert, George, 18
 Cuthbertson, Catherine, 16, 18

Dalglish, Doris N., 1, 45
 Daniell, Thomas, 57
 Darby, Deborah, 5, 21

Darby, Joan, 64
 Darby, John, 64-5
 Darton, Lawrence, 67
 Darton, Margaret Emily, 72
 Darton, Samuel, 74n
 Darton, Thomas Gates, 68, 74
 Darton and Harvey, 74n
 Davidson, Thomas, 6
 Dean, Forest of, 66
 Deism, 93-5
 Derbyshire, 6
 Dillwyn, George, 3
 Douglas, John M., 45
 Doull, David, 15
 Drummond, May, 10
 Dublin, 89
 Duguid, John, 17
 Duncan, Henry, 5
 Dundee, 6, 17
 Dunkirk, 44
 Dunlop, Alexander, 6, 18

Easton, Dr., 36
 Eccles, Solomon, 85
Economist, The, 8
 Edinburgh, 3-4, 9-10, 12-15, 17; M.M., 56
 Edmundson, William, letter, 89-90
 Education, 29, 37-8
 Edwards, Irene L., 45
 Eeg-Olofsson, Leif, *Robert Barclay*, review, 91-2
 Egerton, Jesse, 6
 Enfield, 83
 Evie, 6

Fawkes, Walter, 65
 Fenwick, James, 17
 Fenwick, James Edwin, 17
 Fenwick, Sarah, 17
 Ferdinand Albrecht, Duke of Brunswick, 30-1
 Fisher, James, 95
 Fisher, Lydia (Leadbeater), 95
 Fitch, Stanley H. G., *Sudbury Quakers*, review, 38-9
 Fletcher, Richard, 79
 Forde, R., 85
 Fothergill, John, 80
 Fothergill, Dr. John, 41
 Fox, George, 1, 7, 50, 55-6, 83; letter, 84; letters to, 78-9, 85-91
 Fox, George, the younger, 50
 Fox, Margaret, 55-6, 79, 82; letter, 91; *ex libris*, 28-9
 Fretwell, Ralph, 84, 89; letter, 85-7
 Fritchley, 6
 Frith, John, 81

Fry, Elizabeth, 5, 10, 33-4
Fuller, James Canning, 26

German views on Quakers, 30-2

Gibbs, Helenus, 15
Gibson, John, 80
Gibson, Thomas, 80
Gibson, William, letter, 82-3
Gig(g)er, John, 40
Gigger, Martha, 40
Gillett, Henry, 12
Glasgow, 3-5, 10-12, 15-16
Glenny, James, 8
Gloucester M.M., 71-2; Q.M., 56-7
Gosnell, George, 80
Gracechurch Street Meeting, 1753, 31-2
Gray, James, 17
Gray, Robert, 17
Gray, William, 16-17
Gray family, 3, 9-11, 16
Gray Dunn & Co., 9
Grellet, Stephen, 5
Griffin, Gerald, 95
Grubb, Isabel, 45
Grubb, John, 5
Grubb, Sarah, 5
Gurney, Joseph John, 5, 67

Hack, James, 68
Hack, John Barton, 72
Hack, Maria (Barton), 67-77
Hack, Priscilla (Hayler), 68
Hack, Stephen, 68, 72, 75
Hampton, Mary, letter, 87-8
Harvey, John W., 93-5
Hawick, 5-6, 8, 17
Heathcoat, George, 81
Hellaby, 86
Henderson, James, 11
Henderson, John, 11
Hersent, Anne, 40
Hicks, Elias, 67
Hodge family, 16
Hodgson, John, 48-52
Holdsworth, Christopher, 92
Hookes, Ellis, 57; letter to, 82-3
Hooton, Elizabeth, 81; letter to, 83
Hooton, Samuel, letter to, 81
Horne, Mary, 68
Horne, Thomas, 68, 76
Howard, Luke, 23, 73, 75
Howard, Rachel, 73
Howgill, Francis, 28, 80; letters, 78-9, 90-1
Howitt, Mary (Botham), 66
Hubberthorne, Richard, 50
Hume, Joseph, 20
Humphris, Walter, 55

Industry, Friends in, 7-10
Irish Friends, 45-6, 89-90
Irvine, 18

Jackson, Henry, 86
Jackson, Martha, 40
Jamaica, 80
Jones, T. Canby, 1
Jowitt, John, 76n
Jowitt, Robert, 76
Jowitt, Susanna, 76n

Keith, Dr., 62

Keith, George, 59-63
Kelso, 17
Kilmarnock, 18
Kinmuck, 3-4, 8, 17, 43
Kirkintilloch, 18
Kirkwall, 6

Lamont, Alexander, 18
Lancashire, 9; Q.M., 67
Lancaster, Joseph, 26
Lascelles, Henry, 65
Leith, 5, 16
Lerwick, 5
Limerick, 89
Lister, Joseph, 12
Logan, George, 92
Logan, James, 52
London, 79, 86; meetings at, 81; Y.M., *see* Yearly Meeting
Lound, 81

McLaren, Duncan, 14
McLaren, Priscilla (Bright), 14
Macnair, Robert, 7
Maidstone, 82-3
Marriage Declaration, Quaker, 53-9
Marshall, Isabella, 35
Marshall, Stephen, 54
Martin, —, 90
Marwick, William H., *Friends in Scotland*, 3-18
Maryland, 80
Mason, Robert, 9-10
Maybole, 18
Mead, William, 90
Meeting for Sufferings, 57
Meldrum, Old, 17
Membership statistics, Scottish, 4
Merrick, James, 20
Messer, Hannah, 73, 76
Meyrick, Sir Samuel, 26
Midlton, John, 82
Miller, Jane, 13
Miller, Joseph, 13
Miller, William, 3, 6, 12, 13
Miller, William F., 13
Miller, William Henry, 13
Milligan, Edward H., 39
Ministers, Meeting of (Barbados), 85
Miranda, Francisco de, 35-7
Modyford, Sir Thomas, 80
More, Henry, 59-63
Morgan, Ann (Taylor), 21
Morgan, Caleb, 21
Morgan, Elizabeth, 25
Morgan, James, 20
Morgan, Joseph, 25, 26
Morgan, Nathaniel, 19-27
Morgan, Sarah (Baker), 20
Morgan, Sarah (Taylor), 21
Morgan, Thomas, 20
Morris, Rebecca, 35
Morris, Susan, 35
Morning Meeting, Second Day's, 57, 61
Mott, Lucretia, 26
Murdoch, Patrick, 17
Murray, Sir J. A. H., 17
Murray, Lindley, 66
Musgrave, Sir Philip, 79
Mylius, Christlob, 31-2
Myres, W., 82

Nayler, James, 1, 45
Neave, Helen M., 13, 18
Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 90
New England, 81, 87
Newgate Prison (London), 33-4
New Lanark, 10
Newman, Sir George, 12
Newport, R. I., 36-7
New Providence, 84
Nugent, Lord Chief Justice (Lord Riverston), 89
Nuttall, Geoffrey F., 1, 45

Oaths, 84
Opie, Amelia Alderson, 34
Orkney Islands, 5-6
Osborne, Mary, 55
Owen, Robert, 10

Painswick, 55
Parker, Alexander, 49
Partick, 5
Peace testimony, 22-5, 48-52
Pease, Edward, 10
Peel Meeting, 25
Penington, Isaac, 40, 50, 80
Penington, Mary, 40
Penn, John, 35
Penn, William, 40, 41, 43, 60; and the printer, 64-5
Penn-Mead trial, 32
Pennsylvania, 43-44
Pensen, Jane, 40
Perth, 17
Peterhead, 6
Philadelphia, 35-6
Pickard, Daniel, 6
Pilkington, Captain, 24
Politics, Friends in, 11-2, 15-16, 89
Porter, Jane, 34
Price, Joseph Tregelles, 22
Priestman, Thomas, 66
Prisons, 44

Reynolds, Margaret, 80
Richardson, Richard, 86
Robertson, John, 4, 16
Robson-Scott, W. D., 30-2
Ross-on-Wye, 19-27
Rous, John, 82, 85
Rous, Margaret, 85
Rowntree, John Wilhelm, 46
Rudyard, Thomas, 57
Rush, Isaac, letter to, 84

Scottish Friends, 3-18
Scougal, Henry, 61
Senter, Dr., 36
Shawtonhill, 5
Shetland Islands, 5
Shield, John, 80
Shipley, Elizabeth (Lewis), 28-9
Shipley, William, 29
Sienkiewicz, Charles, 33-4, 41-2
Six Week's Meeting, 57
Slavery, Anti-, 11, 65-6
Smeal, Robert, 16
Smeal, William, 10-11, 16
Smeal family, 15
Smiley, Sarah, 6
Smith, George, 6

- Smith, John, letter to, 79-80
 Sneade, Richard, 87
 Southall, John, 26
 Southall, Samuel, 26
 Southampton, 72
 Springett, Gulielma Maria, 40
 Squire, Sarah, 5-6
 Squire, Winifred G., 45
 Stainforth, Great, 51
 Steel, James C., 18
 Steel, Laurence, 87; letter, 88
 Stephens, John Sturge, *Nathaniel Morgan*, 19-27
 Stewart, W. A. C., *Quakers and Education*, review, 37-8
 Stinchcombe, 57
 Stoddart, Amor, 49, 83
 Stonehaven, 6
 Storrs, Samuel, 81
 Storrs, William, letter, 81
 Stowe, Harriet Beecher, 14
 Stromberg, Roland N., *Religious liberalism*, review, 93-5
 Stromness, 6
 Stubbs, John, letter, 83
 Sudbury, 38
 Sufferings in Scotland, 4
 Swarthmoor, 84
 Sweane, Anne, 40
 Taylor, C. Marshall, 2
 Taylor, Christopher, 86
 Taylor, Thomas, 83n
 Thompson, Edwin, 12
 Thompson, John, 9, 11
 Thompson family, 16
 Throupe, William, 81
 Tolles, Frederick B., *George Logan*, review, 92
 Tooms, Margaret, 80
 Tottenham, 73
 Travers, Ann, 83
 Tuke, Henry, 3
 Tuke, Samuel, 68-9
 Tuke, William, 66
 Uxbridge, 86
 Vaux, Roberts, 29
 Virginia, 87
 Waldie, Jane, 17
 Warwickshire Friends, 39
 Watson, Samuel, 51
 Watson, William, 8
 Waysblum, Marek, *Elizabeth Fry*, 33-4
 Webster, Alexander, 17
 Wellstood, Stephen, 9, 11
 Westminster Assembly, 53-5
 White, John Charles, 9, 16
 White, Mary, 16
 White, William, 9
 White, Winifred M., 27
 White family, 16
 Whittier, John Greenleaf, 2
 Wigham, Amos, 17
 Wigham, Anthony, 16
 Wigham, Eliza, 11-12, 15
 Wigham, Henry, 12
 Wigham, Jane, 15
 Wigham, John, sen., 3, 6, 14
 Wigham, John, jun., 10, 14, 16
 Wigham, John, tertius, 15
 Wigham, Sarah, 11
 Wigham family, 7, 9, 14-5, 17-18
 Wigton School, 17
 Wilberforce, William, 65-6
 Wilkinson, Esther, 76
 Wilkinson, John, 70, 76
 Wilkinson-Story controversy, 85
 Wilson, George, 8
 Wilson, James, 8
 Wilson, Walter, 8, 11
 Wilson, William, 8
 Wiltshire Quakers, 43
 Wood, Alexander, *Thomas Young*, review, 95
 Yearly Meeting (London), 4;
 (1798), 21; (1813), 22;
 (1814), 22; (1817), 23;
 (1835), 67; (1836), 70;
 (1837), 72-3
 York Castle, 49
 Yorkshire election, 1806, 65-6
 Young, Thomas, 95

THE JOURNAL
OF THE
FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY

VOLUME XLVI

1954

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



HEADLEY BROTHERS LTD
109 Kingsway London WC2
and Ashford Kent

Contents

	PAGE
Editorial	I, 45
Friends in Nineteenth Century Scotland. <i>William H. Marwick</i>	3
Nathaniel Morgan of Ross. <i>John Sturge Stephens</i> ..	19
<i>Ex Libris</i> Margaret Fox. <i>Henry J. Cadbury</i>	28
Two German Views on Quakers. <i>W. D. Robson-Scott</i>	30
Elizabeth Fry at Newgate, 1820. <i>Marek Waysblum</i>	33
A Spanish Officer among the Quakers : Francisco de Miranda	35
Recent Publications	37, 91
Notes and Queries	40
The Peace Testimony in 1659. <i>Alan Cole</i>	48
The Quaker Marriage Declaration. <i>Ruth G. Burt</i> ..	53
George Keith to Henry More. <i>Henry J. Cadbury</i> ..	59
Penn and His Printer	64
Friends and the Slave Trade : a Yorkshire Election Declaration, 1806	65
The Baptism of Maria Hack, 1837	67
A. R. Barclay MSS. XCIII to CV	78
Index	96

FRIENDS' PROVIDENT
AND CENTURY LIFE OFFICE

**A UNIQUE AND
USEFUL PRESENT**

for the
Equivalent of 1s. 9d. a day

You can provide your child (if aged under one
year) with

A Gift of £969 at age 25

to help buy a professional or business partner-
ship or for any other purpose

ALTERNATIVELY

if, after age 25, your child, who then takes over
the contract, continues the payments, there would
be available

A Lump Sum of £2,478

at age 60 or previous death, PLUS substantial
bonuses

*N.B.—If you die before your child reaches age 25, no further
payments are called for until that age is reached, so that
the child's future benefit is guaranteed.*

7 Leadenhall Street, LONDON, E.C.3

18 Charlotte Square, Edinburgh 2

Supplements to the Journal of Friends' Historical Society

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 pp., 2s., post 1½d.
 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.
 23. SLAVERY AND "THE WOMAN QUESTION." Lucretia Mott's Diary, 1840. By F. B. Tolles. 5s., cloth 7s. 6d.
 24. THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY OF THE EARLY FRIENDS. Presidential address by Frederick B. Tolles, 1952. 2s. 6d.
 25. JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER. By C. Marshall Taylor. 1954. 2s. 6d.
 26. JAMES NAYLER, A FRESH APPROACH. By Geoffrey F. Nuttall, D.D. 1954. 1s. 6d.
-

Journals and Supplements Wanted

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

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

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

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

More Members Needed

During the last two or three years the Committee of the Friends' Historical Society has made special efforts to bring to the notice of Friends and others information regarding the Society with a view to increasing its membership.

The Society needs the support of its members to get new subscribers. Members are invited:

- (1) To encourage people who do not wish to subscribe to give a donation.
- (2) To increase their own subscription above the normal 10s. per annum.
- (3) To send an annual subscription as a gift to someone else.
- (4) To remind Monthly Meetings and Preparative Meetings that they may become Institutional Members for 10s. a year.