

A Bibliographical Note

The effect of this note is to identify a publication¹ against Quakerism omitted from Joseph Smith's *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana* and to distinguish between two pieces there confused;² and also conjecturally to identify a publication³ by a Friend omitted from Smith's *Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books*.

In 1690 there appeared the following item of Quaker apologetic: *The Christianity of the People Commonly Called Quakers, Vindicated from Antichristian Opposition. I. In a serious Examination of Doctor Ford's Preservative against Quakerism; in a large fallacious Scheme Tendered by S.F. D.D. as he stiles himself. II. In a brief Answer to Henry Osland's Manuscript against the said People. III. In a brief Consideration of an Epistle directed to Friends and Brethren at their next General Meeting in London. Signed N.N. but no Name to it. Sincerely Tendered in behalf of the aforesaid People and their Ancient Friends, by some of them.* It is attributed by Joseph Smith, *Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books* (1867), ii. 897 to George Whitehead: and with good reason, for in the margin of p. 28 are printed the words "To this I subscribe, Geo. Whitehead."

The passage in the text against which these words appear is of some interest. In the following transcription of it the round and square brackets and italics of the original are preserved, as are the asterisk and dagger indicating the statements to his subscription to which George Whitehead wished to draw attention.

The words cited against G.W. and others, Thus, *Viz. and hereby thy Antiquity, thy Reasons, (and [about] the 3 Persons thou dreamest of, which thou wouldst divide out of one like a Conjuror,) are all denyed, and thou with them (i.e. his dark Reasons and Imaginations,) shut up in perpetuaal [sic, G.F.N.] Darkness, &c.*

¹ Simon Ford: *Preservative against Quakerism*. (Term Catalogue, ii, 331; not in J. I. Dredge: *A few sheaves of Devon bibliography*, iv (1893); no copy known.)

² Henry Osland: *Antiquaries*. MS. [ante 1658; not extant]: *An Epistle directed to Friends and Brethren*. MS. [post 1675; not extant].

³ John Humphreys: . . . *Persecution for conscience sake*. (Wing H3722, copy in Bodleian Library and in Dr. Williams' Library.)

G.W. positively disowns the Words, and affirms they are none of his, and that he writ not that part of the Answer to *Townsend* (which was about the Year 1654.) yet looks on the words as wrong writ or wrong printed, and that he rased them out, or corrected them long since, where he has met with that Answer. For instead of [*and the 3 Persons,*] it should have rather been [*about the 3 Persons.*] And *G.W.* shall neither stand by, nor own those words as charged; after he see them in Print, he was sorry his Name was to that Paper without distinction between what he writ, and what he did not write in it, wherein those words are which give the Occasion. Let this Advertisement clear *G.W.* and others, and suffice every charitable and ingenuous Reader, as we hope it will.

The *Townsend* to whom George Whitehead refers was Sampson *Townsend*, who in 1661 was ejected from the Vicarage of Whitwell with Hackford, Norfolk (see A. G. Matthews, *Calamy Revised*, s.v.). In 1654 he published *The Scripture proved to be the Word of God, and the only foundation of Faith, and rule for our obedience; or a clear conviction of the errours of those that are called Quakers*. The answer to this to which George Whitehead contributed, together with Christopher Atkinson, James Lancaster and Thomas Simonds, then his fellow-prisoners at Norwich, was entitled *Ishmael and his Mother, cast out into the Wilderness, amongst the Wild Beasts of the same nature: or a Reply to a Book entituled, The Scriptures proved to be the word of God* (1655).¹ The piece is noticed by Smith s.vv. Atkinson, Lancaster and Whitehead, but not s.v. Simonds.

George Whitehead's disclaimer *post eventum* of the false doctrine charged to him is characteristic and illuminating. In 1690, shortly after the passing of the Toleration Act, by the terms of which Unitarians were still excluded from toleration, it was highly desirable for Friends to dissociate themselves from any apparent anti-Trinitarianism. In 1655, on the other hand, when Friends were in the first flush of their enthusiasm and when Whitehead himself was not yet twenty, their impatience with "notions" led them not infrequently into rash statements which proved all too easy for theologically equipped opponents to turn against them. In none of the three copies of the reply to *Townsend* which are preserved in the Society's Library at Friends House has the offending passage been altered to the form which Whitehead preferred.

¹ Reprinted by Francis Bugg in *A Modest Defence* (1700).

The passage quoted above, to which George Whitehead drew attention by adding his name in the margin, occurs in the third part of his tract, in reply to "An Epistle directed to Friends and Brethren, at their next general Meeting in London." In *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana* (1873), Smith includes this as *An Epistle*, s.v. N.N., with a cross-reference to George Whitehead's reply (here misdated 1694). There seems no evidence from the reply or from bibliographical sources that the *Epistle* was printed. It is probably vain to attempt the identification of "N.N.," which is no more than an accepted form for "anonymous."

The piece to which the second part of George Whitehead's tract replies is expressly described by him as an "abusive and insulting Manuscript." Its author, Henry Osland, was ejected from the curacy of Bewdley, Worcs., in 1662 (see *Dict. Nat. Biog. and Cal. Rev.*, s.v., as Oasland; in letters to Richard Baxter preserved among the Baxter MSS. at Dr. Williams' Library he always signs Osland, the form George Whitehead uses). It is treated by Smith, *Bibl. Anti-Quak.*, s.v. Oasland, as the same MS. work as that replied to in 1657 by the Quaker John Humphryes (see below). This is a mistake. Passages quoted from the MS. and answered by George Whitehead include references to "Dr. Ford" as an "able ancient Preacher" "in the publick Assembly" "at Stowerbridge" and to "a young lively Non-conformist" "at the licensed Meeting House." This provides for the piece a date not only in or after 1672, when licenses for Nonconformist worship were first granted, but in or after 1676, on 22nd May of which year Dr. Simon Ford received the rectory of Old Swinford or Stourbridge, Worcs. (see *D.N.B.*). It is unlikely, in any case, that in 1690 George Whitehead would have published a reply to a manuscript written in or before 1657.

The first part of George Whitehead's tract is "a serious Examination of Doctor Ford's Preservative against Quakerism." This piece, by the Dr. Simon Ford to whom reference has just been made, was missed by Smith, who does not even note it *pro forma* (as he does the *Epistle* by "N.N."), and it should therefore be added to the other works by Ford which do find a place in *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana*. It bore the title *Dr. Ford's Preservative against Quakerism: in answer to a Paper pretending to contain*

the Christianity of the people called Quakers. It appeared "In one large sheet. Printed for R. Wilde at the Map of the World in St. Paul's Churchyard" (see *Term Catalogue*, ii, 331). It was published at Michaelmas 1690, so George Whitehead was evidently prompt in issuing his reply. It does not appear that any copy of the *Preservative* is now extant.

The earlier work by Henry Osland (mentioned above) was answered in 1657 by *The Bίος πάντων ειδέοτος, or נבט* or *the Vision of Eternity Held forth, in Answer to some Antiquaeries Which were given forth from Ægypt by one of Babels Builders, a pretended Minister of Christ, living in Worcestershire at Beaudly, that is called Mr. Henry Osland . . . by one . . . whose name is known to God by these three Jews Letters in the sequel, אא* but to men by John Humphryes (as Smith, *Descr. Cat.*, s.v. ; not Humphreys, as Smith, *Bibl. Anti-Quak.*, s.v. Oasland). There is no proof that Osland's *Antiquaeries* were not printed (Smith's identification of them with Osland's later anti-Quaker manuscript having been shown to be mistaken); but it is likely that they were only in manuscript. The Quaker queries to which they were a retort were probably not printed, either. At this time the issuing of queries simultaneously in many different parts of England was part of the nationwide Quaker campaign. Some of these were printed. To the short list given in my *Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, p. 153, n. 3, may be added two by Fox entitled *Here are several Queries Put forth in Print for all, or any of you whose names are hereunder written* (1657: "For Robert Gell, William Lilly, and other Astrologers and Doctors of Physick") and *A few Queries for Thomas Moor the Elder* (s.a. ; dated 1660 by Smith).

Others of the Quaker queries were not printed but can be recovered in whole or in part from the retorts they provoked, or even from the Quaker replies to those retorts. Thus Humphryes refers back to a query he had put forth to Osland "on the Catechism of your Assemblies Agreement" (p. 15), i.e. to the catechism published in *The Agreement of the Associated Ministers of Christ in the County of Worcestershire* (1656). The Voluntary Association of ministers of all parties in Worcestershire inspired and led by Richard Baxter was much concerned with the challenge

of Quakerism at this time. Quaker queries also reached Baxter, and in "An Answer to the Quaker's Queries" in *The Quakers Catechism* (1655) he, like Osland, replied to them. (The inclusion by Smith of the *Answer* as a separate piece is a mistake, which appears to have been caused by the mishap that one copy of this second part of *The Quakers Catechism* was severed from the first part and preserved separately in the Library at Friends House.) A collation of Baxter's *Quakers Catechism* and Osland's *Antiquaeries* (as quoted in Humphryes' reply) makes it plain that they were not retorts to the same queries. As ministers who were leaders of the Worcestershire Association, however, Baxter and Osland were as united against the Quakers as were the Quakers against them. Humphryes quotes Osland as saying that "Burraston and Baxter thy fellow Priests are more fitter to whip me then dispute with me" (p. 16): and Boraston also, the Rector of Ribbesford, was a member of the Association.

In her work at Dr. Williams' Library, where she is compiling a Bibliography of Early Nonconformity, Miss G. Woodward recently came upon a work with the following title: **הבל הבליים** *Or, Persecution for Conscience sake, most vain, cruel and destructive to the Promoters and Abettors of it . . .* by John Humphreys, London, Printed for the Author, 1682. This work is in the form of "a Discourse from *Matth. 2.16, 17, 18,*" and is therefore hardly likely to have been written by a Quaker; but the use of Hebrew and Greek in the title and margins gives it a certain similarity to the work published in 1657 by the Quaker John Humphryes. The latter was certainly an unconventional Friend. His having a new "name . . . known to God" is an aspect of the early enthusiasm which fed upon *Revelation* and is not without parallel (cf. Fox himself in his *Journal*, ed. N. Penney, i. 162; and *Rev. ii. 17*), nor is his mystagogic use of Hebrew unique. What is stranger is the Latinity of his letter to the reader, beginning "Charissime Lector," and his dating it "Juno 3^o 1657"; for by 1657 few Friends used the names of the months. That he departed in these ways from the Quaker norm makes it perhaps a little more probable that he also wrote the tract published in 1682; it further suggests that by that date he may have ceased to be a Friend.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.