

Carnall Reassoon but he argues strongly for the preists & for the popeish law to vp hould them & pleads for every mans Liberty & none to disterbe an other & soe he would keep vp him selfe by getting or keepeing fflaue with all & soe sin must be vphoulden by a Law he is ffull of subtility & Can stand on every one It wase tould vs he vsed to weare Rich aparrell but he had a grey Rugh Cotte on wass not worth three shilings a yeard when we Cam to him he had hard we weare plain men & he Condesended vnto vs he offered vs money or any thinge we needed but we denyed to tak any thinge ffrom him soe he desired vs to leave him he wase tyered with bussynes & we should Com to him within a day or tow again soe we shall discharge our Consseinces to him in the sight of God & leav it vpon his Consseince whether he will heare or fforbeare.

“ After we had waited about ffive dayes we wear moved to write a Letter vnto him & maid vse of Captain Howward to gett it to him or else we should not have gatten admittance to him, but Really he is in great danger to be lost ffor he hath gott the fform of truth but ffeights against the power of truth ffor he houlds that all the worships of this nation is the worship of God but the blind Cannot Judge of truth. I shall say noe more.”

To be continued

The Family of Thomas and Margaret Fell

Reading through the recent life of George Fox, written by Rufus M. Jones, we met the statement that Margaret Fell “ became the mother of nine children, of whom seven daughters and one son were living at the time of Judge Fell’s death in 1658.”

Search among the several pedigrees of the family—*British Friend*, iii ; Barber, *Furness and Cartmel Notes* ; Crosfield, *Margaret Fox* ; etc., revealed no intimation of a family of more than eight children.

But the mother herself is the authority for the statement that there were *nine* children :

“ We liv’d together twenty-six Years, in which time we had *nine* Children ” (auto. Relation in *Works*, 1710, p. 2).

The succession of the seven daughters seems to have been established (*Jnl. F.H.S.* vi. 162). There are various spaces between the births of several of them which might have been occupied by a child that died young. The son George may have been the third or fourth in the family—born *c.* 1639.