

thanksgiving appointed by Parliament, he was suspended from his ministry, his place being taken by Christopher Feake, Fifth-monarchy Man. Jenkyn was sent to the Tower for participation in the plot of Christopher Love (1618-1651), but was restored to his living in 1655. After some retirement in consequence of the Act of Uniformity and the Oxford Act, he returned to London and preached once more in the City till his arrest in 1684.

Jenkyn collaborated with others in anti-quaker writings in 1656 and 1675.

The above recital of sufferings will serve to remind us of the many persecutions for religion outside the pale of early Quakerism.

There is a portrait of Jenkyn in an extra-illustrated copy of *The Nonconformist's Memorial*, by Calamy and Palmer, in **D**.

See Blome's *Fanatick History*, 1660; Macaulay's *History*; *D.N.B.*

---

## Daniel Defoe and William Penn

---

**W**ILLIAM PENN, the famous Quaker, . . . .  
 was then at the height of his renown. . . .  
 He occupied himself earnestly in attempting  
 to obtain a mitigation of Defoe's sentence  
 [to stand three times in the pillory, and was imprisoned for  
 more than one year]. John Hill Burton [1809-1881], in  
 his *Reign of Queen Anne*, publishes some documents,  
 which have a curious interest and have given rise to some  
 conflicting explanations in connection with Penn's humane  
 efforts for the release of Defoe. . . . Nothing came  
 of Penn's interference at that time. . . . The effort  
 made by William Penn to obtain Defoe's exemption from  
 the disgraceful punishment decreed for him is an appro-  
 priate illustration of Penn's whole career, and indeed of the  
 work which Penn's co-religionists appear always to have  
 marked out for themselves. The Quakers are hardly to  
 be classed among the dissenting bodies of Queen Anne's  
 reign. Theirs was the very dissidence of Dissent. It

cannot be said that their hand was against that of every other community in the religious world, but it may almost be said that the hand of every other religious community was against them. They only saved themselves from the worst of persecution by that course of non-resistance, or at all events passive resistance, which their religious principles prescribed for them. It was hardly possible, even in the roughest days of the controversy, to keep inflicting bodily punishment on men who were pledged never to defend themselves by force of arms. The Quakers carried out the principles of Christianity according to their own definition of those principles with a rigid fidelity which might often have put the disciples of other Christian sects to shame. They strove with undismayed perseverance to maintain peace amongst men, to treat all men as their equals and their brothers where justice had to be administered, and where charity could find work to do. The story of Penn's life belongs to earlier days than those of Queen Anne. His best work had been done and his fame as a philanthropist had been secured before the opportunity came for him to intervene on behalf of Daniel Defoe, in the futile hope of saving him from the ignominy which, after all, only inflicted disgrace upon the age, and could not inflict any dishonour on Defoe. There is, however, a peculiar fitness in the historical chance which associates, in such a manner, the names of Daniel Defoe and William Penn.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY, *The Reign of Queen Anne*, pp. 191-195.

---

1698 21 July. Peter Peacocke of Northwich, cobbler, a quaker, was buried at Whitley.

1705 (Among the burials). M<sup>d</sup>. a [blank] child of Benjamin Claridge, quaker. was born the 5th of August, but I do not know whether still-born or no. He is worth £50 per annum.

1713. 28 Sept. John, son of Joseph Kennerley, of Lostock Gram, quaker, baptized.

From the Registers of Witton (Northwich). Sent by John Brownbill, M.A.

---

Our meetings will mean nothing if they cost nothing.

GEORGE A. WALTON, *The Quaker of the Future Time*, 1916.