

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

Quaker Social History

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Notes and Queries

THE QUAKER CALENDAR

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

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

The First Month is called by ye world March.

The Second Month is called by ye world April.

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

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

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

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