

The Cambridge "Journal."

Continued from page 67.

11.—Vol. II., p. 394.—Matthew Richardson cannot have been *own brother* of Margaret Fell. Her maiden name was Askew. In a letter written in 1685, she states that her father, John Askew, "had Children only me & another daughter" (D., A.R.B. MSS., quoted in *Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 99). George Fell mentions *uncle* Matthew Richardson, and George Fox writes to his wife of "thy *brother* Richardson" (THE JOURNAL, viii. 4). Perhaps Richardson had married Margaret Fell's only sister, and was hence her *brother-in-law*.

12.—Vol. II., p. 435.—Hannah *Field* should be Hannah *Feake*. A story introducing the Bowne and other Long Island families has been recently published in New York City—*The Quaker Cross*, by Cornelia M. Parsons.

13.—Vol. II., p. 376.—Date of the death of John Perrot. See THE JOURNAL, ix. 95 n.

14.—Vol. II., p. 484.—The conclusion of the quotation from Orme's *Baxter* should read "they had the less leisure to look after the meetings of *sobever* men, which was much to their present ease." See A. N. Brayshaw in *Swanwick*, 1911, p. 115.

15.—Vol. II., p. 421. A discrepancy has been noted in the presumed date of the birth of Mary Fell. The date given here (*circa* 1644) has been calculated from the Register of her death. She died 1719, x. 22, aged 75, so would have been born about 1644. But the statement on the paper containing her address to Priest Lampitt (i. 439)—"When she was 8 years old 1655"—would, as read, put the year of her birth about 1647. It may be, however, that 1655 was the date of the endorsement and not the year in which she became eight years old. Reckoning from 1644, she would be eight in 1652 and this was the year in which the controversy raged between early Friends and Lampitt. The Ulverston Parish Registers for this period are, unfortunately, destroyed.

16.—Vol. I., p. 396.—Will of Rice Jones of the town of Nottingham, cordwainer, dated 28 March, 1693. To my eldest son Rice Jones 5s. To my dau^r Mary Doidge¹ £10. To my son Abell Jones² all the rest of my

¹ Wife of Richard Doidge, of Westcott, near Collington, co. Cornwall, gent., 1722.

² His will, as of Nottingham, glassfounder, was proved at York in 1723.

estate and make him exor. Wit^{ns} William Rhodes, James Pearson, William Rhodes junior.

Proved at York. Vol. 62—167.

17.—Vol. I., p. 438.—Alfred F. Robbins, of Dunheved, Villa Road, Brixton, S.W., writes,

"I have been reading with deep interest your recently published edition of *The Journal of George Fox*, for, as one of the historians of my native town of Launceston, I have an especial interest in the persecution of Fox there in 1656. In your notes (i. 438), you refer to an informing article on "Launceston Castle and Doomsdale" in *The Friend* of 1846; but I would suggest that at least one of the notes would have been rendered more assured if you had also referred to two articles in *The Friends' Quarterly Examiner* of Tenth Month, 1895, and First Month, 1896, the former by Dr. Hodgkin, and the latter by myself. It may further interest you to know that in the St. Ives (Cornwall) Borough accounts for 1656-7, is an item 'Payd ffor goeing to Lanceson with the Quakers £1 2s. od.'"

18.—Vol. II., p. 155.—"ffreindes gott a certificate under some of ye parlamente mens handes as aforesaid to cleere George ffox: from y^t abuse: & how y^t it was Jo: ffox: ye p(r)esbyterian preist & not G. ff: ye quaker."

In a bound volume of MSS. belonging to Bristol and Frenchay M.M. (now on a short loan in D.), entitled *Letters and Papers of George Fox and other Early Friends*,³ there is an ancient sheet, endorsed thus:—"y^e copie of the Certificats under the hands of two members of y^e pliamet that G. ffox was not that ffox which was accused for speakeing treasonable words, 1670." These certificates, with accompanying letter by Thomas Ellwood and Edward Man, believed to be in the handwriting of the former, are as follows:—

Thes is a true testemony against those lies and slanders and fals[ehoods]⁴ that hath been of late Cast upon George ffox who in scorn [is called] a quaker, and is spread up and downe the Citty towns & Countreys. [These] false reports was that he should speake treasonable words against [the] Kinge, which was Contrarie to his nature and principles, And soe it was Cleared and proued amongst the parliament men, that it was not George ffox who is Called a quaker, but one ffox who neuer was a quaker whose name was not George neither was those words spoken in any of the quakers meetings, You may see where he liued in the Certificatos from some of the parliament men, And About that tyme when those words were spoken George ffox who is Called a quaker was aboue one hundred Myles of that place where that meeting was when those words were spoken, And these Certificatos following were gotten from the parliament

³ Four other volumes, bound in similar style, are "deposited" in D. and known as Bristol MSS. i.-iv.—this volume may be referred to as Bristol MSS. v.

⁴ The words within brackets were probably written on the paper worn away at the edges of the sheet.

men for Clearing of his Inocency, for it was reported that a Judge should speak it in his Charge that [it] was a quaker that spake those words; And wee knowing y^t [people] are soe apt to belieue reports against us: and if there be any ba[dness] don in the world they are apt to Cast it upon us, as formerly we[re the] Monarchy mens actions and doeings cast upon us, soe now th[ey have] don the same by this priests Actions to set the world again[st us] and to render us and our principles of truth Odious, But the lo[rd] cleared his people and George his Inocency from all such Act[ions] and words blessed be his name for euer; And Soe it is good for all people to take heed how they report and how they belieue reports but to mind the royall law of god which is not to doe to others that w^{ch} they would not haue don to them sealues. And soe from them which oweth nothing but loue and good will to the Kinge and desires his euerlasting good and his prosperity in the truth and wisdom of god and all people upon the earth

London y^e 9th of
y^e 2th mō 1670.

THO. ELLWOOD.
EDWARD MAN.

This is to be sent to all y^e Magistrates and officers where that false reports hath been spoken of George ffox.

These are to Certify to whom it may Concerne, that the p[erson] named ffox: complained of to the house of Commons to [be] the Chife ring leader in the unlawfull Assembly at Wootton-under-hedge in the County of Glocester; was some tymes Parson of Marshfield in the County of Wilts.

G. TALBOT.⁵

Wesminster Aprill
y^e 8th 1670.

J doe farther Certify, that the aboue named ffox was the same person that was Complained off to the house of Commons, to be the principle saducer in that Conventicle in Wiltshire where those treasonable words were spoken which ware report[ed] to the house in ffebruary last.

White hall Aprill
y^e 9th 1670.

W. CHURCHIL[1].⁶

A true Copie from
the Originall.

19.—Vol. II., p. 326.—A further reference to Anne Gargill's visit to Portugal in 1655 is given by Mary G. Swift, of Millbrook, N.Y., in the *Bulletin of Friends' Historical Society of Philadelphia*, for Third Month, taken from Bishop's *New England Judged*, published in 1661; and in the same periodical, the same writer cites from Sewel's *History* another and later notice of A. G., when she gave trouble in Holland in 1657.

⁵ Sir Gilbert Talbot, Knt. and Bart., was M.P. for Plymouth Borough from 1666, also Master of the Jewels under Charles II. (*Cal. S.P.Dom.*)

⁶ Sir Winston Churchill (1620?-1688) was knighted in 1663, and was M.P. for Weymouth and Melcomb Regis Borough at the date of his letter. (*D.N.B.*)

20.—Vol. II., p. 446.—For *Alexandria* read *Alexandretta*, and insert latter name in the Index. *Alexandria* was taken from the *F.Q.E.* article referred to in the note to Stephen Smith.

21.—Vol. II., p. 455.—Thomas Davidson, of Fritchley, writes:—

“George Keith’s wife was *Elizabeth* Johnston, daughter of Dr. William Johnston and his wife Barbara Forbes. Dr. William Johnston was a son of Sir George Johnston, of Caskieben.⁷ Elizabeth Johnston was the widow of Dr. Alexander Whyte, also a University Professor as her father had been, but she and her mother were both widows at the time of their convincement (1663). Elizabeth Johnston must have received a gift in the Ministry very early, as she and Patrick Livingstone were largely instrumental in gathering the Meeting at Kinmuck. After the appearance of their defection, Aberdeen Friends in 1694 wrote a beautiful and pathetic letter to ‘Our Ancient Friends George and Elizabeth Keith,’ but, alas, without the desired effect. In 1676 we find a George Johnston among the Aberdeen sufferers, and the surname of Johnston lingered on among Friends in that county till about twenty years ago, when Barbara Johnston, wife of Alexander Littlejohn, died at Kinmuck, leaving no descendants. The present Lord Leith of Fyvie represents the branch of the Forbes family who were most prominent among early Friends. Lord Leith’s mother was the last Forbes of Blackford.”

The name, *Anna*, was too hastily incorporated in the note from *Quakers in the American Colonies*, p. 369, where we read, “The provincial records shew that in 1684 George Keith arrived with his wife Anna, . . .” Amelia M. Gummere, the writer of this section of the book, states that the information as to George and *Anna* Keith was taken from the *New Jersey Archives*, vol. xxi., p. 69, dated 1684/5, February. She adds, “I feel sure *Elizabeth* was the wife who went on the Dutch journey.”

It may be that George Keith married, first, Elizabeth Johnston, and secondly, before 1684, Anna —, but against this is the reference to the Aberdeen Friends’ letter to George and *Elizabeth* Keith in 1694, the year of Keith’s disownment by London Y.M.

22.—Vol. II., pp. 385, 416.—The actual number of Friends who signed the Fox-fell marriage certificate was *ninety-four*. See THE JOURNAL, ix. 100.

⁷ One of the Johnstons was the original of George Macdonald’s cobbler-baronet in *Sir Gibbie*.

Many would fain imagine, that man may be saved merely by the imputation of Christ’s righteousness; which, if it were true, would be a mighty palatable doctrine to a multitude of self-lovers.

JOHN GRIFFITHS, *Some Brief Remarks upon Sundry Important Subjects*, 1764, p. 35.