

The *Editio Princeps* of Fox's Journal

THERE is a good deal of information already collected and printed about the process by which Fox's Journal was edited and published less than four years after his death. He himself had planned an even larger collection of his writings, he had made reference to the location of manuscript copies of them, had named thirteen Friends to attend to their publication, and had instructed that after other legacies had been paid his residuary estate should be used to finance the publication, and so far as possible, the free distribution of this material.¹

The Journal with many inserted papers was the first instalment of this plan. As issued in 1694 it carried on the title page the caption "The First Volume". In an Advertisement (p. xvii) it mentions other testimonies for Fox, omitted in the Journal but "reserved for further consideration, to be disposed of, as a future service may be seen in the wisdom of God for them, when way is made for his Epistles, or any of his other works to be published". Already the collecting of further materials had begun, which resulted, first, in the enormous manuscript Annual Catalogue of George Fox's papers and, then, in two large additional printed folio volumes, the *Epistles* in 1698, and the *Doctrinal Works (Gospel Truth Demonstrated)* in 1706.

Evidently the transcribing and editing of the Journal was early delegated primarily to Thomas Ellwood, one of the thirteen Friends named. To him the principal source materials were entrusted.² He worked at his home in Buckinghamshire whence he sent reports of his progress to the Morning Meeting at London. By April 1692 he had transcribed the journal up to 1666, about 200 sheets, which he later delivered to William Meade in London. By April 1693 he was working on the year 1684.³

¹ See the three papers printed in *Camb. Jnl.*, ii, 347-351, the first dated June 27, 1685, the third in October, 1688.

² See *Narrative Papers of George Fox*, ed. by H. J. Cadbury, 1972, pp. 49-51.

³ Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, 531-2.

When Ellwood had completed this task his manuscript was brought to London and was read over in instalments by members of the Morning Meeting. They met by adjournments in the last half of 1693. The minutes record the meetings of those engaged in this review, but tell nothing of their detailed action. My impression is that they made few changes in Ellwood's transcript. It is most likely that they simply omitted certain further passages. The more detailed editorial process apparently had been already done by Thomas Ellwood himself. Writing in April 1692 to the Morning Meeting he explains his delay. He had "spent more time in perusal and comparing than writing".

THE SPENCE MANUSCRIPT

Though neither Ellwood nor any later writer seems to have described in detail the additions or alterations which he introduced,¹ the material for such a description is available at least for the earlier and major section of the Journal. The Spence MSS., Vols. 1 and 2 contain what is obviously the direct narrative source used by Ellwood not only to 1666, but, except for Fox's Irish and American travels, up to 1676. This was printed verbatim and literatim in 1911 in the *Cambridge Journal*, and edited by Norman Penney, and thus provides, though not without a good deal of patient study, the basis for a minute comparison. In 1893 Charles J. Spence, who was then owner of the Spence MSS., wrote one of the fullest descriptions of the differences.²

A systematic collation of the manuscript with the edition of 1694 is in progress. It has not proceeded very far, and the work is necessarily slow. The constant transposition of paragraphs makes it impossible to decide at once whether a passage has been cut out or whether it may reappear, grouped in a later page, for clearness sake, with incidents to which it is more nearly related. Alterations in spelling, wording, and construction are of constant occurrence and there are few cases in which these amendments do not take something from the freshness of the original narrative.

¹ Ellwood's testimony to Fox printed with the Journal does not suggest that he had any part in editing it. His own autobiography ends in 1683, too early to contain reference to this labour. When that was printed in 1714, Joseph Wyeth wrote an appendix in which Ellwood's work of transcribing Fox's Journal and fitting it for the press is mentioned briefly.

² Published in *The Essayist and Friends Review*, pp. 5-8, cf. p. 12 for authorship and facsimile opposite. The quotation is from p. 6.

This is all well said, but no record of the "systematic collation" has been found that might have anticipated what is offered here. The omissions from the original have received a good deal of attention,¹ but in more than sixty years since the *Cambridge Journal* was published the additions and other changes made in the printed edition have not been the subject of much study. T. E. Harvey's introductory account in that 1911 edition runs:

In comparing, as we are now able to do, the largest section of the original MS. with the first printed edition, it is possible for us to realise how difficult and responsible the task was that fell to Ellwood's pen. Compression and abbreviation were a necessary part of that task, and on the whole well carried out: the portrait which the manuscript *Journal* gives us is essentially the same as that of the printed edition, yet, in comparing the two, one is sensible that here and there the cautious care of the editor has removed some rough vigorous touch: the whole is quieter, a shade less naïf, a shade nearer the conventional. Sometimes some picturesque detail which Fox had recorded disappears as unnecessary, sometimes some incident or saying which contemporaries might misunderstand is omitted: occasionally some obvious slip is corrected, and in other cases fear of political or theological misunderstanding has led to longer passages being omitted.²

The Spence MS. here used as evidence of Ellwood's editing is a continuous narrative nearly all in the hand of Thomas Lower, and much of it paged continuously. There were many other unnumbered sheets in the same hand, often with a devotional ending. There were a good many separate documents written in various other hands. The place for insertion of both these kinds of papers was often indicated. Most of these are bound with the MS. Others are referred to in it but lost. A few have turned up elsewhere. Also now lost are the first sixteen numbered pages and any unnumbered pages that belonged with them. Comparison can therefore

¹ They were conveniently indicated by square brackets in *Camb. Jnl.* They were classified by N. Penney, *ibid.* vol. i, pp. xl, xli, and analyzed by T. Edmund Harvey, vol. i, pp. xv-xx. See also T. E. Harvey, *The Journals of George Fox* (a paper read before the London Society for the Study of Religion, 5 Dec. 1911 and privately printed), and more briefly John L. Nickalls, "The Journal of George Fox", *Friends' Quarterly*, 6, 1952, pp. 144-151, who suggests (p. 146), that the Great Journal marks a stage between the Cambridge Journal and Ellwood's edition. I cannot confirm this. See *Narrative Papers*, pp. 65 ff.

² T. E. Harvey, introduction to *Camb. Jnl.*, vol. i, pp. xv-xvi.

begin only with page 17 of the Spence MS. and the bottom of page 30 in the printed Journal.¹

ELLWOOD'S EDITORIAL ADDITIONS

A major problem in preparing the manuscript copy for the press was the insertion into the continuous narrative of the separate documents,² largely epistles by Fox, which the editor decided to include. Where he did include them he usually wrote a sentence or two of explanation. These are among the more extensive of his editorial additions.³

In the later part of the Journal such introductions, often deduced simply from the contents and date line of the document, represent, in the absence of any biographical narrative source, Ellwood's free invention of all the narrative given.

Another common element of editorial revision is in the transition of the narrative from place to place or scene to scene. The simple monotonous connective "and" of the original is often omitted or replaced by other conjunctions or adverbs or by a resumptive clause. Several times Ellwood has a phrase beginning "when I had cleared my self" (Ellwood 65, 135, etc.), "having cleared my self" (56, cf. 96, 169,), "After I had cleared my self in the market" (81, cf. 166). For change of scene Lower, presumably following Fox's dictation, used the verb "passed". Ellwood sometimes varies this to "travelled", "went". In connection with arrival at or near Swarthmoor, the original naturally used "came". One notes that this is sometimes changed by Ellwood to "went" (76, 77, 105, 216[Ddd2b], 226[Eee3b], etc.). This may be additional evidence that the Spence MS. was written or dictated at Swarthmoor.

¹ In what follows page reference for minor differences is usually given only to the 1694 edition (referred to as "Ellwood" where confusion might occur). Ellwood page numbers between 188 and 288 (anni 1656-1664) are followed by the signatures [running between Bb2 and Nnn2]; in this part of the volume signatures are in regular sequence, pagination is irregular. The corresponding passage in later editions like the Bi-centenary of 1891, or in the Spence MSS. as printed in the *Cambridge Journal* can be usually found because the order remains the same, and proper names can be used by help of the indexes to locate corresponding passages.

² The last index or "fourth table" in the *editio princeps* lists these in the printed order, over 350 of them. Before the indexes, on pp. 617-632, the text of four letters by Fox in 1677 is added, and their titles are inserted in the "fourth table".

³ An early and lengthy instance is on p. 207 [Ccc2a] describing the custom of robbing shipwrecks on the Cornish coast.

A major set of changes in the printed text is due to an extensive and intelligent rearrangement of clauses, sentences and paragraphs. Thus the editor has put into chronological order episodes recorded as afterthoughts, and has brought together or in better sequence what pertains to the same person or occasion. This required no little skill and was done with a maximum retention of the original wording. When the original order was satisfactory one finds page after page where the transcription follows in essentially the same wording as well as order.

Of the minor differences between the printed first edition and the Spence MS. as printed in the *Cambridge Journal* there must be a few that are accidental. Copyists and printers are not infallible and obscurities in what one is copying leads to some error. There were at least two steps of transfer, from Spence MS. to the copy that Ellwood prepared for the press¹ and from the latter to the printed page.² One can only conjecture the presence of such accidental errors.

ELLWOOD'S EDITORIAL STYLE

Certain changes in word forms are pretty regular in Ellwood's editing. The frequent seventeenth century use of the singular verb with a plural subject is avoided, e.g. "many was" becomes "many were". (260[Iii4b] and *passim*.) Ellwood often used the pluperfect tense with "had" quite

¹ Ellwood, as reported above, mentions such a transcript. I do not know on what authority or evidence. Elisha Bates, *An Appeal to the Society of Friends*, London, 1836, p. 3 says: "I understand that the MS from which this edition was printed, is still in being."

² A frequent deviation between the two texts is between singular and plural. This is possibly sometimes due to the obscurity in handwriting of words ending in s and e. Other instances that look like misreading are "I was commanded by the Lord to pull off my shoes" (Ellwood 53) for "to putt off my shoes" (*Camb. Jnl.*, i. 15); "I felt the power of the Lord" (Ellwood 170) for "I sett the power of the Lord" (*Camb. Jnl.* i. 199); "Spirit and Truth" (Ellwood 173) for "Spirit and Faith" *Camb. Jnl.* i, 203), and "the power of the Word" (Ellwood 253* [Kk3a]), for "the power of the Lord" (*Camb. Jnl.* i, 277). Again when we read in the *Camb. Jnl.* (i, 256) "and the scriptures were largely opened to them [and they turned to the spirit of God in themselves that would lead them into all truth and open the Scriptures to them] and the traditions and rudiments and ways and doctrines of men were opened to the people", Ellwood, p. 221*-222* [Ff3], who is otherwise following pretty closely, omits the words bracketed above. They are not bracketed in *Camb. Jnl.* The accidental omission of words that follow and end with the same phrase is well known to palaeographers (called homoiarchton, homoioteleuton).

idiomatically, in cases where his source used the past.¹ Strangely enough from our perspective he often substitutes for the present "has" the more archaic looking "hath". A favourite form of simplification of the original abundant paratactic sentences is Ellwood's use of the participle, including the nominative absolute. Ellwood also affects the use of "his" in place of an apostrophe and "s" for the genitive of proper names both in the text and in the running title: "George Fox his Journal". But also this form of possessive of proper names, characteristic of the period, is sometimes in both the MS. and printed form, as in the oft quoted reference to the Epistle of St. James: "I knew, from whence all wars did arise, even from the lust, according to James his doctrine" (46). The exceptional (but Shakespearean) use of she (objective): to she and her family was of course changed to "to her and her family" (78).

The editor often inverted a pair of words from the order in his source. Sometimes this has been done for no obvious reason. A few examples of such inversion are: the Lord's Spirit and Power (53), rain and snow (57), civil and loving (80), envious and devillish (84), the Spirit and the letter (89), glorious and heavenly (120), the most and the best (120), thou and thee (121, 179), crost and vext (135), shake and shatter (139), principles and practices (139), wicked and devilish (186), dog nor cat (222[Eee1b]).

Many times the changes by Ellwood suggest a mere difference of literary taste. Twice Ellwood has avoided the apparently idiomatic "might have killed him with a crabb", substituting "he had little strength left him" (Ellwood 37; *Camb. Jnl.* i, 9), or "his spirit was ready to fail" (74). Some of the expressions he changed we also would avoid as archaic, but others which he retained seem to us equally so. And even with the same term his practice was not uniform. I think he usually replaced "mazed" with "amazed" (86), and "stunn'd" (87). Even "amazed" was replaced by "struck" (173), but Ellwood kept the noun "maze" (68). I think he regularly substituted the preposition "over" or "upon" for Fox's picturesque "a top of" (87, 259*[L12a], 278*[Nn3b]), although, exceptionally, one finds "God would bring that a top of them, which they had been a top of" (199[Bbb2a]). Other

¹ e.g. 54 "had had in the inn", 131 "had known from a child", cf. 186.

prepositions replace Fox's "a matter of" followed by a number (124, 136, 225*[Gg1a]).

ELLWOOD'S EDITORIAL CAUTION

A mark of caution is to be found perhaps in Ellwood's frequent addition in parentheses of phrases like "as I was told", "as he said", "as he was accused" in connection with statements by Fox that were evidently hearsay. For "a Conjuror" Ellwood wrote "reputed a Conjuror" (48), and for "had killed" "had been accused of killing" (128, 129). So are added "we were informed" and "I understood that" on page 187 and "as I was credibly informed" (327). The definite numbers given in Spence MSS. are sometimes retained but sometimes made general, as "many leagues" for "100 miles" (58), "about half a dozen" for six (89), "above sixty Ministers" (the Valiant Sixty) for "a matter of seventy" (124). In the last change Ellwood may be suspected of avoiding the obvious parallel between Fox's seventy and the seventy appointed by Jesus. This kind of motive evidently led Ellwood to omit the words early inserted in his source "for the word of the Lord came to me I must go and sit down upon the rock in the mountain as Christ had done before" (74, at Firbank Fell; *Camb. Jnl.* i, 43).

On the other hand, when Fox echoes Bible language, Ellwood often alters the wording to that of the Authorised Version. Thus he writes (180) of the "three children" in the fiery furnace in Daniel 3:21 "coats, hose(n), hats" instead of "cloaks, hose, hats" of his source. He assimilates (247[Hhh2a]) the description of the beast in Daniel 2:32-33 to the Authorised Version reading. Ellwood wrote "Christ the true and living way" (79) for "Christ their way" and "Christ, the new and living way to God" (280*[Nn4b], cf. Hebrews 10:20) where his source simply had "Christ their way to God". I think his addition of the phrase "in their inward parts" (56) to the Spirit of God, and elsewhere, is another Biblical reminiscence. At page 270*[Mm3b] Ellwood expanded the Scripture quotation and supplied references (*Camb. Jnl.* i, 294).

One cannot count on the consistency of Ellwood's changes, or generalize on his presumed motives. T. Edmund Harvey suggested for example that "possibly some thought of avoiding misunderstanding led the good editor also to

omit the reference to Margaret Fell and her daughters joining Fox on his journey for a short time in 1663 (ii. 34), and her daughters Sarah and Susanna meeting him on another journey in 1669 (ii. 135)".¹ We may add that Ellwood (129) omitted previously the words "where two of Judge Fell's daughters met me" (*Camb. Jnl.* i, 150; Derbyshire, 1654). On the other hand, he had not omitted at Reading in 1655 the words "thither came two of Judge Fell's daughters to me" (152), nor at two other points in his travels in 1663: "At Topsham we met with Margaret Fell, and two of her Daughters, Sarah and Mary" (262[Kkk1b]), and at Bristol "we met Margaret Fell and her Daughters again" (266 [Kkk3b]).

Similarly, if one suspects theological reasons for the additions and omissions of Ellwood one would find it difficult to explain why he omits the second of the two verbs applied to Christ "that has bought them and purchased them" (267[Kkk4a]; *Camb. Jnl.* ii, 33). Elsewhere Ellwood shows no aversion to the phrase.

There are many occasions when what Fox said he had done, in the revision is attributed to God by the use of the passive of the verb. For example, "his understanding was opened" (45), "so was the power of the Lord brought" (47, cf. 66), or "was" (94), or "was set" (109), "Friends, who were turned to the Lord, and established by his Power upon Christ" (120). In these cases "I" has disappeared. In others, where the Lord's power is said to have given dominion, the indirect object "me" has been omitted (92, 130). I have indicated elsewhere that in repeating accounts of cures Ellwood has made similar changes.²

Twice after "Truth" Ellwood omitted the phrase "as it is in Jesus" (70, 79 cf. Ephesians 4:21), but at page 286 he has added it. Where the source reads both "the truth" and "the word of life" Ellwood retained the latter alone (65 bis, 76).

¹ *Camb. Jnl.* i, p. xx.

² *George Fox's Book of Miracles*, pp. 41 f. Cf. *Camb. Jnl.* i, 420-1, note 1 to p. 140: "Where Fox mentions these cures, he is careful to acknowledge the accompanying Divine power", but the passage there quoted (27-28, Mansfield Woodhouse, 1649) is not extant in manuscript and may have been rewritten by Ellwood.

Fox's terminology for his service and message was evidently mostly unobjectionable to his editor, who sometimes patches with cloth of the same kind. When George Fox says that he turned people to Christ their teacher, Ellwood often, but not always, replaces the verb by "directed" (174, 223*[Ff4a], 251*[Kk2a], 258*[Ll1b], 223[Eee2a]), and at least in the early part of the Journal adds "in them" (45), "within" (39, 71), "inward" (35), "in their own hearts" (39), "in their inward parts" (56), to make sure that the reader understands that no outward teacher is meant. Fox like other Friends used Truth of Quakerism; Ellwood often adds an article, "the truth". The favourite early Quaker phrase "received the Truth in the love of it" is retained by Ellwood where it occurs (79, 173), and is sometimes added or substituted for the simpler "received the truth" (151, where both forms occur). So "spoke to his (their) condition" is added (12, 139) as well as retained. "Holy Scriptures" in Ellwood is sometimes retained from the source and sometimes used for its simple "scriptures" (70). "Eminently manifested" is sometimes Ellwood's substitute for "came over all" (152). "Divine mysteries" are his words with the verb 'opened' (74, 107) or "reveal" (257*[Ll1a]).

A recurrent feature of the original manuscript is the reference to a convert or a group of converts as remaining steadfast "to this day". Obviously for a book to be published in the 1690's what was true in the 1670's needed to be checked. It could remain unchanged if confirmed (257*[Ll1a], 281*[Oo1a]), could be omitted if not confirmed, or could be corrected if known to be no longer true. Frequently the most one could say is that those convinced remained so "long after". In place of the dated "to this day" Ellwood occasionally prefers to say "ever since" (225*[Gg1a], 244*[Ii2b]) or "continued faithful" (123, John ap John, d. 1695), or "came to be a serviceable man in Truth" (171, Thomas Moore), or "stood faithful ever after" (177), or "remained a very good Friend" (220*[Ff2b]). Several individuals of whom was used the phrase "to this day" were known to have died before 1693. Thus Ellwood writes for "stands to this day", "stood so to the end of his days" (90, Thomas Briggs, d. 1685), "continued so to his death" (185, Humphrey Lower, d. 1672), or omits "remains to this day" (212*[Ee2b] Loveday Hambly,

d. 1682).¹ A more substantial and elaborate explanation about the meeting at Swarthmoor occurs in Ellwood 80-91. Fox himself had said that in spite of opposition Judge Fell allowed it to be held at the Hall, and it "has remained above 20 yeeres to this day" (*Camb. Jnl.* i, 52). Ellwood wrote that it "hath continued there near Forty Years, until the Year 1690. that a New Meeting-house was erected near it". Obviously in other instances the perspective of changed date has been most easily cared for by simply omitting an original dated allusion, as where George Fox had said in an inserted document, "about 1676", "I . . . have continued in it [*i.e.* this ministry] this 27 yeere" (*Camb. Jnl.* i, 250; Ellwood 228*[Gg2b]).

NAMING OF PERSONS

In the naming of persons there is some difference between Ellwood and his sources, apart from the simple matter of spelling. He omits the names of some Friends who had become renegades², like Humphrey Norton, who once had offered to take Fox's place in Doomsdale (214*[Ee3b]), John Story who with John Wilkinson had first become good Friends and then leaders in a secession (*Camb. Jnl.* i, 44, ii, 312), Hannah Stringer,³ one of the two ardent admirers of James Nayler (*Camb. Jnl.* ii, 169), and Rose Atkins (*Camb. Jnl.* ii, 124). William Salt is mentioned five times in *Camb. Jnl.* but not once in Ellwood. Sometimes Ellwood substitutes "a Friend", "another woman Friend", or "two Friends houses" (118). But not all such omissions are to be so explained. Indeed several names omitted at one place occur elsewhere in

¹ Similarly see passages concerning Captain Davenport (279*[Nn4a]), and unnamed converts in Birmingham (167), Warwick (169), Podimore, etc. (221*[Ff3a]), Marlborough (223*[Ff4a]), Crowland (225*[Gg1a]), Pontamile (247*[Ii4a]), and in Scotland (281*[Oo1a]). Norman Penney referred to six omissions (see *Camb. Jnl.* i, 428, note 2 to p. 180 in the text) when he noted, "This is a striking instance among others of a too hasty assertion of the convincement of various persons mentioned, or at least of a statement which was not accurate at the time when the *Journal* was prepared for the printer". He could have added others at *Camb. Jnl.* i, 242, 243, 271, 308, and ii, 28 (first line).

² A collected list of some of these was available elsewhere in the Spence MS. (see *Camb. Jnl.*, ii, 314-5).

³ Perhaps Ellwood did not know that Hannah (from 1666, Hannah Salter, wife of Henry Salter of London) had repented of her actions and gave to Bristol Friends in 1669 a paper of contrition (see *Camb. Jnl.*, ii, 422; Bristol Record Society's publications, vol. 26, p. 25n) [Ed.].

Ellwood or are of people not known ever to have "run out" or defected. Thus Major Beard, as already changed to Nicholas Beard, is retained at 151 but is merely "a Friend" at 230.¹

Ellwood or the revision committee were able to identify certain persons left anonymous in the original manuscript, as T. Bushel (59), the leader of all the ranters, Robert Craven (140), frequently mentioned in the source as the sheriff of Lincoln, and Grace Billing, sister of Thomas Lower's Aunt [Loveday] Hambly. One would think Lower himself could have supplied the name when he took the passage from Fox's dictation. At 171 Ellwood supplied the Christian name Thomas to the Quaker martyr Patching, while both he and his source had both names at 231[Fff2a]. At 268*-269*[Mm2b-Mm3a] he has Col. William Osborn for Col. Osborn. At 239[Ggg2a] he supplies the Christian name Robert for the Quaker prophet "one Huntington". Ellwood is apparently at a loss for the first name of Esquire Marsh (Richard Marche) and even of Priest (William) Lampitt of Ulverston and when not using those titles leaves a blank. For the varied terms used in the sources for Cromwell—Oliver, O. P., O. C., O. Cromwell, etc.—Ellwood uses generally the Protector. Once also (46) he writes out "Charles Steward" for "the King". When his sources used "officers" of persons in civil office, Ellwood substitutes "magistrates", "justices", and once at least "aldermen" (210[Ccc3b]). He substitutes "persons of note" for "persons of quality" (124, 153) and prefers "the chief" for the "heads" of a town.

LANGUAGE

It is tempting to try to find a motive or conscious nuance in every change but to do so is probably ill advised. At this remove even the literary implication of seventeenth century English is not readily gauged. Often Ellwood seems as quaint and vernacular as the original, when he retains it and also when he does not. I may set down a few examples taken at random:

¹ As will be seen by a study of the passages listed in *Camb. Jnl.*, vol. i, p. xl. The footnotes of this edition indicate some cases of the next phenomenon discussed, the addition in Ellwood editions of the names of various persons.

ELLWOOD	SPENCE MSS. (<i>Camb. Jnl.</i>)
47 up in the airy Mind	uppe in ye ayre (i. 11)
48 Rebuke him	thresh him (i. 10)
54 without my Shoos	in my stockinges (i. 16)
56 hastned away	packt away (i. 19) [but retained by Ellwood at 135]
57 all shattered to pieces	all scattered to peices (i. 21)
60 this high-flown Priest	this high preist (i. 24)
77 an high Notionist	a ranter in his minde (i. 47)
178 in their Dumps, being pitifully blankt, and down	& was pitifully blankt & doune (i. 209)
222*[Ff3b] put down	denyed (i. 256)
224*[Ff4b] slunk away	fled away (i. 260)
246*[Ii3b] writ	after I had given foorth (i. 272)
257*[Ll1a] very dark	as darke as darke coulde bee (i. 283)
269*[Mm3a] frightened	frightned (i. 293)
274*[Nn1b] by that day Sevensnight	by tuesday next (i. 300)
278*[Nn3b] so much the better	best of all (i. 305)
228 [Ee4b] yes, with a good will	with all my hearte (i. 366)

From our point of view Ellwood is plainly more modern in using "sought" for "seekt", "toil" for "broil", "rose" or "arisen" for "risse", "spied" for "espied", "frightened" for "frighted", "quencht" for "squencht", "snatched up" for "snitshed up", "struck" for "thwacked".

Idiomatic expressions are lost when Ellwood (174) writes of deaf Elizabeth Trelawney that she "gave testimony" to "the Lord's power", instead of she "came & saide: 'George is over all' with a loud voice".

Attention here given to slight changes must not be allowed to overshadow the essential identity of the two versions. Ellwood has edited with some freedom but also with great fidelity not only to the thought but to the wording. There are many extended passages that run almost verbatim paragraph after paragraph. Possibly some of the more sensitive passages were more thoughtfully revised by the editor than the simpler flowing narrative of Fox's rather monotonous visits to one part of England after another. I think Ellwood was more careful in dealing with passages where Fox's lack of vindictiveness is shown, or where, as already mentioned, cures are claimed, and wherever else Fox's attitude could be criticized. Any suggestion that the printed edition radically or consistently misrepresents what Fox actually wrote (or rather, dictated) is quite unjustified.

The bulk of the *editio princeps* of Fox's Journal may be

accounted for by assuming that the editor used the Spence MSS. including the interlined additions on the numbered sheets and the unnumbered sheets bound with them and sundry loose papers, largely of George Fox's authorship but not in his handwriting.¹ Reference has been made to his many omissions long and short and his short editorial changes and additions.

OTHER SOURCES

There remain, however, a series of passages which appear to rest on other written sources than the continuous narrative extant in the Spence MSS. It may be worthwhile to indicate what these are and to speculate on the possible original basis for them. I limit myself to the period up to 1663.

1. The account of Fox's childhood and early religious experiences (Ellwood 1-30; *Bicent.* i, 1-49), until page 17 of the Spence MS. begins to be followed. There is every reason to suppose the lost 16 first pages were used in much the same way as were pages 17 and following, and included unnumbered pages.² Since this section is one of the most important and interesting parts, those who wish to distinguish Ellwood's editing from the original manuscript are here frustrated. Nothing here specially resembles any of the recurrent changes by Ellwood. On the other hand, though the subject matter here is a little different from much of the later journal dealing with his maturer life, the manner of expression is consistent. Favourite expressions occur, as when he says that the tolling of the steeple house bell "struck at my life" (25; *Bicent.* i, 41). Several episodes can be confirmed by Fox's own independent accounts in the *Short Journal*³, pp. 2, 3, 12-15; in Port. 36.172, in Port. 10.41, and by the cross references in the later pages of the Spence MSS. to material contained in this period.

2. At the examination preceding his commitment to prison as a blasphemer at Derby in 1650 (Ellwood, 31; *Bicent.* i, 50 f.) Ellwood editions contain several further questions and answers, including the oft quoted words, 'We are nothing: Christ is all.' The *Annual Catalogue*⁴ 1, 27A attests the former existence of an independent account of this examination. Perhaps it was available to the editor of the Journal.

¹ The few and slight holograph passages in the Spence MSS. are listed in *Camb. Jnl.*, vol. i, p. xxxvii.

² See *Camb. Jnl.*, vol. i, pp. xxxii ff.

³ Printed edition: *The Short Journal and Itinerary Journals of George Fox*. Edited by Norman Penney, 1925.

⁴ *Annual catalogue of George Fox's papers*. Edited by H. J. Cadbury, 1939.

3. There are two accounts in Ellwood of pressure put on Fox while imprisoned at Derby to become a soldier. One (Ellwood, 45 f; *Bicent.* i, 68 f) closely follows the Spence MS. and is very familiar. The second (Ellwood 48-49; *Bicent.* i, 72 f.) though it begins as the Spence MS. does has no real parallel there. It may be an alternative version from a different source. Though it also mentions the commissioners, it associates the events with Justice Bennett and Sergeant Holes. Its text is as follows:

Now the Time of Worcester-Fight coming on, Justice Bennet sent the Constables to press me for a Souldier, seeing I would not voluntarily accept of a Command: And I told them, That I was brought off from outward Wars. They came down again to give me Press-Money; but I would take none. Then I was brought up to Sergeant Holes, and kept there a while; and then I was taken down again. Then, after a while, the Constable fetched me up again, and then I was brought before the Commissioners; and they said I should go for a Souldier: But I told them, I was dead to it. They said, I was Alive: I told them, where Envy and Hatred is, there is Confusion. They proffered me Money twice; but I would not take it. Then they were Wroth, and I was Committed Close Prisoner, without Bail or Mainprize.

4. A vision during his imprisonment at Derby of his near release and of the conflict with opponents to follow (Ellwood 52; *Bicent.* i, 76 f.). The dating may be derived from the Lamentation on Derby, a separate paper which precedes. The vision may have been in a separate source. This was a category of Fox's writing which was susceptible to independent circulation.

5. A summary of the terror struck into people by Fox's message with a reference to the dreadful report, "The Man in Leathern Breeches is come" (Ellwood 60; *Bicent.* i, 89). An insertion marked ~~■~~ in an account of Fox's travels in 1651 in Yorkshire. The context follows closely the account in Spence MS. but that does not include this passage, though it has two other references to his leather breeches which Ellwood omits (*Camb. Jnl.* i, 52, 170).

6. An "opening" concerning the refusal of Fox to use Steeplehouses, received while he was in Derby prison and reported by Ellwood at his later visit to Malton in 1651 (Ellwood 61; *Bicent.* i, 90 f.) but not in Spence MS. which is quoted continuously in the context.

7. The summary of Fox's preaching at an unnamed town in Yorkshire (63) is partly based on the parallels in Spence (*Camb. Jnl.* i, 27 and 28) but has a good deal of expansion, and ends with the Ellwood doxology, "Blessed be the Lord" (Ellwood 62 f.; *Bicent.* i, 93 f.).

8. In describing how Fox on Walney Island was attacked by a group of men and James Lancaster's wife while James himself was lying on top of Fox to protect him. Ellwood editions (87; *Bicent.* i, 135) add "For the People had persuaded James Lancaster's Wife that I had bewitched her Husband; and had promised her, That if she would let them know, when I came thither, they would be my death," etc. Cf. *Camb. Jnl.* i, 60, and note.

9. In his account of Fox's visit to Bootle, Ellwood gives details of Fox's argument with the local priest exceeding those which he quotes from Spence MSS. (105; *Bicent.* i, 161; Cf. *Camb. Jnl.* i, 416, note 1 to p. 109.)

10. Ellwood (108; *Bicent.* i, 165 f.), following Spence MSS., relates a series of passages in which Fox identified three women, one at an unnamed village as a witch, the second at Swarthmoor also as a witch, a third as an harlot, but he adds also an earlier episode in which Fox discerned some women in a field to be witches. This last apparently is not in the Spence MSS.

11. To the account of Fox's meeting with the Protector in 1654 when he had been sent up as a prisoner, Ellwood (138; *Bicent.* i, 211) appends a statement that Cromwell had invited Fox to dine in the great hall with his "gentlemen", but Fox had declined. Fox's words were: "Let the Protector know, I would not eat a bit of his Bread, nor drink a sup of his Drink." Part of the Protector's subsequent comment is found in *Camb. Jnl.* i, 342, but not in this setting. Cf. *Camb. Jnl.* i, 427, note 1 to p. 168.

12. At Doomsdale in Launceston *Camb. Journal* concludes an account of Fox's preservation from hostile persons with the words: "I saw, it was the Lord alone, that did preserve me out of and over their bloody Hands: for the Devil had a great Enmity to me." Ellwood (189 [Bb3a]; *Bicent.* i, 287) continues "... and stirred up his Instruments to seek my hurt. But the Lord prevented them; and my Heart was filled with Thanksgivings and Praises unto him". Perhaps this was a characteristic conclusion by the editor.

13. In 1656 Ellwood (211*[Ee2a]; *Bicent.* i, 314) notes that the Fifth Monarchy Men and Baptists expected Christ to come that year and reign a thousand years.¹ The answer of Fox to this view is also given. But all this is not apparently derived from the Spence MSS.

14. In 1657 in the account of Fox's travels from Swarthmoor through Westmorland to Strickland Head Ellwood (267*[Mm2a]; *Bicent.* i, 392) inserts an account of Fox's narrow escape while passing through Kendal where the constables had a warrant for his arrest but failed to fetch it in time to use it.

15. In the account of Fox's visit to Scotland Ellwood (271*[Mm4a]; *Bicent.* i, 397 f.) inserts an episode of a pastor of the Independents at an unspecified place in Scotland who was so hostile to Friends that he cursed the Light from the pulpit, and at once fell down and became distracted and unable to preach. This was not a direct experience of Fox's visit but was told to him by Andrew Robinson, a Friend who had formerly been a parishioner of the pastor. This episode of judgment was also doubtless included in the *Book of Examples*², but it is not part of the Spence MSS.

16. Following the account taken from Spence MSS. of Fox's interview with the man intending to set up a college at Durham

¹ For the expectation of a millennium to begin in 1656, see Braithwaite, *Second Period*, 2nd ed., 1961, p. 650.

² *Narrative Papers of George Fox*, 1972, pp. 228 f.

Ellwood has nearly eight folio pages before he resumes the narrative.¹ This tells of travels until he arrives in 1658 at a Yearly Meeting at John Crook's, and follows with a full summary of what he said at the general meeting and a transcript of what he said especially to the Quaker ministers there. But just here two numbered leaves of the Spence MS. are missing and may have included (with attached unnumbered leaves?) all this material. What Fox said to the ministers "was taken down in writing by one that was present" and copies were extant in collections of Fox's papers. See manuscript *Annual Catalogue* 3, 78D; 3, 91D.

17. In connection with Fox's visit to Somerset Ellwood inserts (206-7[Ccc1b-Ccc2a]; *Bicent.* i, 457 f.) an incident reported to him of the retributive injury by a bull to a man who had ridiculed Friends. This is not autobiographical and is printed throughout within quotation marks and is designated twice in the margin "Example". It belongs plainly in that category and may have been available to Ellwood from a narrative parallel to other known versions.²

18. Ellwood (222[Eeelb]; *Bicent.* i, 479 f.) gives a much fuller account than any of those in Spence MSS. of the technical difficulties encountered by Ann Curtis and Margaret Fell in 1660 in putting in effect the king's promise to bring Fox up from Lancaster to London.

19. One of the most important and baffling additions to the Spence MSS. is the account in Ellwood (241-243[Ggg3a-Ggg4a]) of the intervention in 1660 of Friends in England with Charles II to stop the execution of Friends by the New England government. The source begins:

And about this time wee had sevrall freinds in prison in New Englande under ye sentence of death: & some was putt to death. And when they was putt to death as I was in prison att Lancaster I had a perfect sense of it: as though it had beene myselfe & as though ye halter had beene putt about my necke: butt wee did procure an order from ye Kinge . . . (*Camb. Jnl.* ii, 5).

Now Ellwood retains the second sentence above, but otherwise gives a much fuller account of the proceedings. He tells of Edward Burrough's interviews with the king, with the arrangement of Friends to secure a vessel of Ralph Goldsmith and to have Samuel Shattock carry the mandamus, of the reception in Boston of the ship and its messengers, and of the submission of the authorities to the king's command. I am not aware of any printed or manuscript source that Ellwood could have used for most of his information.³ George Bishop's *New England Judged*, Second Part, 1666 had published some of the information, including the text of the royal mandamus. The Spence MSS. refers to a book by William Coddington (*Camb. Jnl.* ii, 5), as well as to the text of the king's order, and in

¹ Ellwood, beginning on the page following 281*[Oora]; *Bicent.*, i, 415-427.

² *Narrative Papers of George Fox*, 1972, p. 220.

³ There is nothing in Sewel's *History* or Besse's *Sufferings* that is not derived from Ellwood's Journal of Fox.

another connection: "as the books of Friends sufferings in New England will largely show," to which Ellwood adds (244[Ggg4b]), "particularly a Book written by Geo. Bishop of Bristol, entituled, *New-England judged*. (In two parts)." The postscript of the second part (1667, pp. 145-9 omitted in later reprinting) has an account of the interviews with Simon Bradstreet in the third person, parallel to what Ellwood tells in the first person. This postscript may have been written by Fox. It is unsigned and could have been re-written by Ellwood for part of his additional material. But for the vivid account he gives of the "King's Missive" the nearest to an extant source is a letter from Samuel Shattuck first printed in the Aspinwall Papers II (*Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Fourth Series, Vol. IX (1871), pp. 160 ff).

20. In connection with the remarkable polyglot publication called the *Battledoor* Ellwood inserts the sentence "John Stubbs and Benjamin Furly took great Pains in the Compiling of it, which I put them upon; and some things I added to it". This seems to be an editorial defence of Fox's claim to a share in the work, on which there had been before Ellwood's Journal "considerable discussion in print" (*Camb. Jnl.* ii, 379, note 4 to p. 7; see Ellwood 245; *Bicent.* i, 513).

21. The sufferings that Friends had to meet from without and from within referred to in Spence MSS. are elucidated in Ellwood, the latter by adding to John Perrot and his company "who giving heed to a Spirit of Delusion, sought to introduce and set up among Friends that evil and uncomely Practice of keeping on the Hat in time of publick Prayers (248-9 [Hhh2b-Hhh3a]; *Bicent.* i, 519), the former by an account of the Nottingham case in 1661, by which the legality of a Quaker marriage was established (Ellwood 249; *Bicent.* i, 520).

This precedent was widely circulated in MS. and would be accessible to Ellwood if not in his main source. The explanation of the hat controversy is alluded to at an earlier point where the Spence MS. (*Camb. Jnl.* i, 244) not Ellwood (though not bracketed by Penney) makes the comment that James Nayler and some of his company "kept on there hatts when I prayde: & they was ye first yt gave yt bad example amongst freindes".

22. Fox's experience in 1663 at Tenterden in Kent is more fully told in Ellwood (260[Iii4b]; *Bicent.* ii, 2 f.) than in Spence MSS. Ellwood's account is probably based on a lost page or pages indicated by marks of reference on the extant pages (*Camb. Jnl.* ii, 24 footnote).

23. George Fox's narrow escape soon after at Ringwood in Hampshire is also told more fully in Ellwood (261-2[Kkk1]; *Bicent.* ii, 3 f.) than in his source. Evidently this episode became the subject of controversy, some Friends accusing Fox of having deliberately evaded arrest. Ellwood's fuller account is apologetic in purpose. An alternate account of the occasion occurred in the *Book of Miracles* and/or the *Book of Examples*. (See George Fox's *Book of Miracles*, 1948, p. 145 f.)

The preceding analysis of changes, and of shorter and longer additions in Ellwood is based upon the longest and closest of the known sources for Ellwood's edition of the Journal, and only on the earlier years. Even before the Spence MS. concludes in 1676 the editorial problem became complicated. The sources were some of them not dictated continuously, but the editor had older records, some in the third person, some only in the form of letters written by others. The records of Fox's visit to Ireland in 1669, and of that to America in 1671-3 were of this sort. A multiplicity of sources complicated the telling of the story of long legal delays which marked Fox's imprisonment between his return from America to his release and arrival at Swarthmoor in 1675, when the Spence MS. ends.

For the remaining years of his life the major narrative sources were diaries kept for him. Those now extant were published in the latter part of the *Short Journal and Itinerary Journals of George Fox*, 1925. These are the Haistwell Diary (March 26 1677 to June 24 1678) including three months on the continent of Europe, and itinerary journals for parts of the years 1681, 1683-1685, 1686 to his death. Evidently Ellwood had similar detailed journals for other parts of these final years.¹ His procedure, however, was quite different from that of the earlier part of the Journal. Except for the two European journeys of 1677 and 1684 he generally reduces the narrative to mere summary. Three-quarters of the printed Journal after 1677 consists of the text of letters or epistles written by Fox.

MAJOR DECISION

The publication of the *Journal* in one handsome folio volume was a major event in Quaker literary history. It at once became a source for biographers and historians, the latter including Croese (in Latin 1695, in English 1696) and Willem Sewel (in Dutch 1717, in English 1722. In fact, it had probably more general influence through Sewel's *History* than directly).

There had evidently been some lack of continuity or division of assignment in the printing, for a new series of signatures begins with p. 189 [Aaa, following Pp] in the text covering the year 1658. The earlier section has great con-

¹ Cf. what I have written in G. Fox, *Journal*, ed. Nickalls, 1952, p. 728.

fusion of page numbering caused by the need to allow for over 100 new pages. The title page carries the imprint: "London, Printed for Thomas Northcott in George-Yard, in Lombard-Street. MDCXCIV". The preface by William Penn has a colophon: "London, Printed and Sold by T. Sowle . . . 1694." We know that for a while there was objection by some of Margaret Fox's family to the inclusion of this preface and that some copies were bound up without it, but others were not.¹

Already while it was being completed two significant errors were found and were noted at the very end of the last index [Gggggg2b]. One was the omission of an episode in Barbados related in *Camb. Jnl.* in connection with an encounter with Paul Gwin in 1656 at Bristol and promised by Ellwood in its place but not included at p. 356 in Ellwood. The other error is described: "The Letter against plotting is printed p. 200, and the same over again p. 267. by a mistake." Minor errata were not printed but were corrected in later editions.

Two passages subject to criticism on historical grounds were soon brought to the attention of the Morning Meeting and substitute pages were printed to correct them. These both had to do with exaggerated "examples" of divine judgment.² These were corrected in later editions.

This is not the place to give in detail the later history of this form of Fox's Journal. The *editio princeps* was reported in 1708 as "out of print and very scarce these four or five years past".³ Its price had advanced from 13s. to 20s. per copy. The subsequent editions were, except the folio of 1765, in octavo, and mostly bound in two volumes. Some of them were checked by comparison with the first edition. Others were modernized in spelling and punctuation, and by the omission of unnecessary words. Rarely were changes introduced as substantial as those introduced by Ellwood in editing the manuscript.

¹ *Camb. Jnl.*, vol. i, pp. xiv-xv.

² They are described at length in *George Fox's Book of Miracles*, pp. 91-93. Cf. N. Penney, "Geo. Fox's Writings and the Morning Meeting", *Friends' Quarterly Examiner*, 1902, pp. 67-69.

³ See Eighth (Bi-Centenary edition, 1891, 1901), ii, 541 ff. where the several editions are described, eight in England 1694, 1709, 1765, 1827, 1836, 1852, 1891, 1901, and four in America 1800, 1808, 1831 and one of no date. Cf. Joseph Smith, *Descriptive catalogue of Friends' books*, 1867, i, 690 f., *Supplement*, 1893, 135.

In the following quotation the text of the 1694 edition (p. 2) is given with notes showing minor changes (other than punctuation and capitalization) that had come in by the last edition of 1901.

In my very Young Years, I had a Gravity and stayedness of Mind and Spirit, not usual in Children; insomuch, that when I have seen¹ Old Men carry themselves² lightly and wantonly towards each other, I have had³ a Dislike thereof risen⁴ in my Heart, and have said⁵ within myself; If ever I come to be a Man, surely, I should not do so, nor be so wanton.

Afterwards, as I grew up, my Relations thought to have made⁶ me a Priest; but others perswaded to the Contrary. Whereupon I was put to a Man, that was⁷ Shoemaker by Trade, and that⁸ dealt in Wooll and used Grazing,⁹ and sold Cattel.

Abridged editions were published in 1886, edited by Henry Stanley Newman, in 1903, 1906, edited by Percy Livingston Parker, and in 1903, 1919 edited by Rufus M. Jones (paperback reprint 1963). Since the publication of the *Cambridge Journal* in 1911 and the *Short Journal* in 1925, editors of the Journal have used the Ellwood edition only in combination with the earlier texts represented by these newer printed works.

APPENDIX

There was one bit of Ellwood's editing which deserves perhaps extended reference here. That was in the letter written by Fox to Cromwell in 1654 (*Camb. Jnl.* i, 161-2). The Protector asked for Fox to sign a letter promising not to take up a sword against him or against his government. This Fox agreed to do, and while the letter had never been printed its contents were widely known as it was distributed in MS.¹⁰

A copy was in the Spence MSS. which lay before Ellwood, but it contained phrases that could easily be objected to as blasphemous. Ellwood, who is otherwise not averse to giving documents in full, abbreviates this one and rephrases it in indirect speech in this innocuous way (137; *Bicent.* i, 209 f.):
But the next Morning I was moved of the Lord to write a Paper 'To the Protector, by the name of Oliver Cromwel, wherein I did in the presence of the Lord God declare, that I did deny the wearing or

¹ saw ² behave ³ I had ⁴ raised ⁵ and said

⁶ to make ⁷ omit that was ⁸ but who ⁹ and was a grazier.

¹⁰ See references to many copies in *Annual Catalogue of George Fox's Papers* (1939), 23, 4A.

drawing of a carnal Sword, or any other outward Weapon against him or any Man. And that I was sent of God to stand a Witness against all Violence, and against the Works of Darkness; and to turn People from the Darkness to the Light, and to bring them from the Occasion of War and Fighting, to the peaceable Gospel; and from being Evil-Doers, which the Magistrates Sword should be a Terror to.' When I had written, what the Lord had given me to write, I set my Name to it, and gave it to Captain Drury to give to O Cromwell; which he did.

Charles Leslie, however, came upon a copy of this "Letter of his to Oliver Cromwel, transcrib'd by a Quaker, and preserved as a precious Piece. He then calls himself the Son of God, and says of himself My Kingdom is not of this World". Leslie quotes these passages in their context and goes on:

These are his words. And tho' given forth (as he pretended, and the Quakers own) as from the Mouth of the Lord: Yet the editors of his Journal since his death have made bold (as in many other instances hereafter mentioned) to alter his work, to leave out, and put in, as they see cause, to blind the eyes of the world, and obviate the objections against their horrid blasphemies. Therefore in his Journal, printed 1694 p. 137 these words of Fox's letter [My kingdom is not of this world] are left out as likewise these [who is the Son of God] instead of which is added [I set my name to it].¹

A century later the anonymous author of the article on "Quakers" in the *First American Edition in Eighteen Volumes Greatly improved of the Encyclopaedia, or a Dictionary of Arts Sciences and Miscellaneous Literature* quotes from Leslie's *Theological Works* the same letter, printing in italics blasphemous-sounding phrases. The writer regards the letters as genuine and, following Leslie, notes that "the Quakers, after the death of their apostle expunged from their edition of it the words which we have printed in italics, ashamed, as we hope of the blasphemy, imputed to them". He infers from it that Fox was "one of the most extravagant and absurd enthusiasts that ever lived and fancied himself, in his apostolic character, something infinitely superior to man". In addition, the writer endorsed the view that Fox was nothing

¹ *Snake in the Grass*, 1698, pp. 113 f. The "instances hereafter mentioned" do not appear to be from Fox's Journal but from the collected Works of Howgill and Burrough. Leslie in his *Defence of the Snake*, 1700, pt. 3, p. 39 gives the full text of Fox's letter. It agrees with other early copies in Quaker hands, including the attestation of Thos. Aldam and Robert Craven.

more than a tool employed by certain deists to pave the way for their system of natural religion.¹

Evidently Philadelphia Friends learned of this particular attack on Fox before it was published in permanent form. Included in the bound volume was a four-page printed "vindication of the character of George Fox from the account given of him in the *Encyclopaedia*, Vol. XV, page 734 . . . drawn up by the Society called Quakers and . . . now printed by their particular desire". The vindication was "signed on behalf of and by direction of a meeting of the representatives of the religious Society called Quakers held in Philadelphia, 15th of 12th month, 1796, John Drinker, Clerk".

These Friends assumed that George Fox's Journal is to be trusted rather than Charles Leslie's version of the letter to Cromwell. The latter it calls "a palpable perversion—a piece of mockery thru' a mimicry of the style of George Fox and making use of some of the expressions contained in his genuine letter to Oliver Cromwell of which this forgery is pretended to be a copy". The Friends admit that Leslie's version "affords ample grounds indeed", if genuine, for calling Fox a senseless enthusiast.

The genuineness of the longer version was soon to be discovered by an American Friend, Elisha Bates, who was preparing a History of the Society of Friends. He was allowed to look at the original MSS. of Fox's Journal on two successive visits to England, and, recognizing their bearing on a current controversy, he printed this paper with some others in *An Appeal to the Society of Friends* (London 1836), pp. 13 f. with a facsimile of it as a frontispiece. The purpose of Bates' publication was not so much to discredit Fox as to encourage Friends to give more authority to the Bible than to the utterances of the respected founders of the Society.

HENRY J. CADBURY

¹ This article and indeed much of the *Encyclopedia* is largely independent of the third (1788–1797) edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. It omits the latter's repeated mention of the persecution of Quakers in New England. For the main contents it quotes pretty fully parts 2 and 3 of the anonymous *Summary of the History, Doctrine and Discipline of Friends: written at the desire of the Meeting for Sufferings*, 1790. The author of the summary was Joseph Gurney Bevan. This summary was mentioned and partially used in the British edition.