Hannah Callowhill and Penn's Second Marriage

In two earlier notes in these pages corrections were suggested of two long-standing errors about Gulielma, first wife of William Penn, and their children. The errors had resulted either from assuming the completeness of the meeting records or from misreading them. The present article deals with three matters connected with Penn's second marriage, two of them similar to the points raised about his earlier family.

I

Hannah Callowhill, who was married to William Penn at Bristol, March 5, 1696, was the sole surviving child and heiress of Thomas Callowhill of that city and of his wife Hannah. She outlived her husband by more than eight years, and died on December 20, 1726.

Of these dates there is unanimous testimony and no citation of authorities is needed, but contemporary references to her age at these times, as far as I know, are not forthcoming. Nor do the older biographies of Penn offer any information on this point. More recently, however, Quaker historians have supplied the lack, and with slight exception they either state or imply a birth date in 1664, specifically April 18, 1664, thus making her nearly thirty-two years old when she married Penn (he was fifty-one and a half) and sixty-two when she died. This date is taken avowedly from the Bristol Quaker birth records by Howard M. Jenkins. Probably from Jenkins the dating passed down to Joseph J. Green, John William Graham, William I. Hull, William W. Comfort, and L. V. Hodgkin.

The records of births at Bristol are not, however, quite so unambiguous. Altogether the following nine children are credited to Thomas and Hannah (Anna) Callowhill. Such deaths as are noted in the record of burials are added here also, and all dates are transposed to modern usage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Age (when married)</th>
<th>Burial Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>September 16, 1661; buried October 10, 1662</td>
<td>51 years old</td>
<td>October 10, 1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>November 9, 1662; buried December 5, 1678</td>
<td>16 years old</td>
<td>December 5, 1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>April 18, 1664</td>
<td>23 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget</td>
<td>March 2, 1666; buried April 1, 1680</td>
<td>18 years old</td>
<td>April 1, 1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>May 31, 1668; buried January 18, 1685</td>
<td>17 years old</td>
<td>January 18, 1685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>February 11, 1671</td>
<td>41 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>June 26, 1673</td>
<td>42 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>November 28, 1675; died or buried October 23, 1678</td>
<td>47 years old</td>
<td>October 23, 1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>March 8, 1680; died or buried January 12, 1685</td>
<td>41 years old</td>
<td>January 12, 1685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen that there are two Hannahs, and that their deaths and that of Thomas are not recorded, although one of the Hannahs was the only child living in 1696. Evidently Thomas and one Hannah had died or removed without being included in the Bristol records. It is more than probable that they died quite young. Since the common practice of the time was to use a name over again in cases of infant mortality, it is altogether likely that the surviving Hannah was the second one. In that case she was twenty-four when she became engaged, just twenty-five when she married, and nearly fifty-six when she died.\(^4\)

The reason for accepting 1664 as the year of Hannah Penn's birth has probably been the fact that in the transcript summary of the Bristol and Somerset births derived from the original registers now at Somerset House, those in Bristol for the 1660's are separated from those of the next decade by the births in the 1660's for the North and

\(^4\) There is also a supplementary record of these births (not the deaths). Except for discrepancies in the birth dates of Bridget and Dennis, both records agree as above. The will of the grandfather Dennis Hollister \((PMHB, XVII (1893), 66f.)\) mentions under date of Sept. 1, 1675, five children of his daughter Hannah Callowhill: Sarah (eldest daughter), Hannah, Bridget, Dennis (eldest son), and Thomas (second son); the codicil dated July 6, 1676, names Hannah, Thomas, and Elizabeth. They do not at any point contradict the data above, but unfortunately they do not indicate whether Hannah was older or younger than Bridget or Dennis.
West Divisions of Somerset. Anyone looking for the children of Thomas and Hannah Callowhill will find only five children, including Hannah born in 1664, unless he notices some pages later the four later children, including Hannah born in 1671. Evidently Albert Cook Myers was aware of the problem, for Arthur Pound, although he adds errors of his own, says “Hannah Callowhill was twenty-six years old, twenty-four years younger than her suitor. . . . Her birthdate is usually given as 1666, but the researches of Myers indicate that the child Hannah, born to the Callowhills in 1666 died in infancy. As was then common, a later child was given the same name.”

Amelia M. Gummere in her sketch of Hannah Penn came near the truth when she said about her death, “She was fifty-six.” It is perhaps slight contemporary confirmation of the younger alternative for Hannah Callowhill’s age that Letitia Penn during her courtship wrote to her much as if to an older sister and that she had been thought of as a suitable match for young Sir John Rodes. If she had been born in 1664, she would have been fourteen years older than Letitia and several years older than Sir John.

II

The number of children of each of Penn’s marriages is usually reported as seven. But the discovery of another child born to Gulielma in March, 1683, a child who died within three weeks, shows that the Quaker records cannot be trusted for completeness, since neither the birth nor the death of this child is there listed. Such a hiatus in the list of known births might have been suspected since the average interval following Gulielma’s marriage or between the births of her children is much exceeded by that between her child of 1680 and that of 1685. An additional child in 1683 divides that interval in two.

In the same way one finds an unexpectedly long interval between the marriage of Hannah Penn on March 5, 1696, and her first recorded child, John Penn “the American.” The usual list otherwise shows a normal spacing as follows:

6 The Penns of Pennsylvania and England (New York, 1932), 225, and note.
6 The Friend, 100 (1927), 379.
7 PMHB, LXXIV (1950), 110–112.
John  b. January 29, 1700
Thomas  b. March 9, 1702
Hannah Margarita  b. July 30, 1703
Margaret  b. November 7, 1704
Richard  b. January 17, 1706
Dennis  b. February 26, 1707
Hannah  b. September 5, 1708

There is no reference in the Quaker records to an earlier child, but as in Gulielma's case, correspondence reveals what the records do not tell. At least an earlier pregnancy is noted.

Sir John Rodes, a young Quaker of rank living at Barlbrough in Derbyshire, was a friend of William Penn. Two of Penn's friends in London kept Rodes informed of what "the Governor" was doing in letters that have been partly preserved and published. Thus, John Tomkins on September 26, 1696, wrote from London: "Dear W. P. and his wife is expected next week from Worminghurst, where she hath been this 3 or 4 months past. They intend from hence to Bristol. I understand she is toward a litell one."\(^8\)

The reference is unmistakable and probably authoritative. Some six months after her marriage Hannah Penn was "expecting." More than this we do not know. Whether the sequel was a miscarriage, a stillbirth, or a child who did not long survive we can only guess. Nor do we know whether this situation had some bearing on Penn's delay in going to Pennsylvania or his removal to Bristol. When at last in September, 1699, he embarked for Pennsylvania with his wife and Letitia, the grown daughter of his first marriage, there was no baby with them. But Hannah was again "toward a litell one." The voyage took three months and on January 29, 1700, John Penn was born in Philadelphia. The contemporary letters that I have seen do not speak of him as a first child, though he was then her only one.

III

From the same correspondence comes earlier reference to some objections felt toward Penn's marriage with Hannah Callowhill. The grounds are not specified and the references are vague, but they

---

imply uneasiness about the intended marriage. Penn’s intention was no secret several months before the event itself. His daughter Letitia remembers suspecting it more than a year before, and, of course, Quaker procedure required considerable advance notice. John Tomkins wrote to Sir John Rodes from London on October 22, 1695:

My last gave the reasons why I believed if dear W. P. had come into your parts I could not come with him. Now I dont know when you will see him. If not suddenly, I doubt not this winter. Suppose need not tell the reason why I think so, believing thou hath heard what work he is engaged in at Bristol. Perhaps he may give you a visit from thence, for I understand the expectation of the people in your parts (the world, as well as Friends) if it be not answered by him may give them that offense as may not easily be removed. I know not how to show dislike to what he doth: he is a man to whom I have given preference in my respect and esteem to any I know, therefore must be excused if am sparing of writing against his present proceedings. Many here are not satisfied with the object for a helpmeet, tho she may be a person unexceptionable for some other (perhaps thyself if thou had thought so). His circumstances considered every way several of his nearest friends in affection do not think so of it as I suppose he doth; but it may be objected by some, should not every man have the privilege to choose his own wife. So it must be left hoping that [as] the Lord hath been with him and signally appeared on his behalf in many respects, so in this which is none of the least affairs of his life he will so work by his divine providence that, if it will not prove to the honor of Truth and his benefit, it may not come to pass. I would be willing to leave the issue thereof to this effect.

Three weeks later Henry Gouldney wrote to Sir John:

Can thou do less than go to the marriage of thy old friend? I heard he intended first for your parts and to that end was desired to press J. Gratton to meet him, but I had no answer from him, nor know not what is intended. Love has an influence upon our friend; he now makes Bristol his center, but does keep moving to and fro, and has great and good service.

9 "And if I may be so bold, I must tell thee that at my father’s first coming from Bristoll ten months since, tho I kept it to myself, I perceived which way his inclinations was going." Letitia Penn to Hannah Callowhill, Worminghurst, Dec. 12, 1695, PMHB, XXXVI (1912), 123.

10 Lampson, 127. A month earlier Tomkins had urged Sir John Rodes, if he came up to London with Penn, to use the opportunity: “I beseech thee dont use reserves, but be open and free with him. I suppose thou knows my meaning.” Sept. 24, 1695, ibid., 126. Was it his meaning that Rodes should directly discourage Penn from his prospective marriage?

But this affair is not very well relished by many, yet I hope, after all, 'twill terminate in a comfort to him; but was it now to do, I see nothing in me to advise him to it. He has judgment, and I believe has sought for counsel. I hope his own inclinations did not hinder the openings of it unto him. I have been as plain as I dare, since I knew nothing of it till twas too late for contrary considerations to take place. I am not easy in it, yet I don't see how he could much mend it unless by letting all alone.

One would like to know how much Penn knew of his friends’ uneasiness and how he reacted to it. The letters preserved in The Historical Society of Pennsylvania from Penn to Hannah Callowhill during their courtship or engagement make no explicit reference to these criticisms. One would hardly expect them to do so, but that does not mean that in his dealing with Hannah’s hesitations she was ignorant of them or he unmindful of them. In his letter of January 23, 1696, he wrote: “O my dearest be of good cheer and be assured that as I loved thee first upon the best of bottoms, so it could never be overset. I have been sometimes troubled I found no more, but never repented I had so much, nor has distance, age, reports or anything else made me hesitate, less decline.” What does “reports” mean? A few days later Penn again alluded to his age in writing to Hannah of “thy general indifferency if not aversion, my years and character.”

Recently, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania acquired a letter written by William Penn which reflects more clearly his reaction to criticism about his marriage. Penn wrote this letter on December 12, 1695, just a month after Henry Gouldney’s letter to Sir John Rodes, quoted above. He addressed it to John Gratton, mentioned in Gouldney’s letter, as, indeed, he is in much of the correspondence. Gratton was an older and trusted Friend who lived at Monyash not far from Sir John. Evidently, Gratton had written to Penn about the criticism of his engagement on the part of London Friends. He may have known of it from precisely the two letters already quoted, for his intimacy with the young Quaker noble was such that he may well have been a sharer of those letters. Gratton’s letter to Penn is not extant, but it would seem that one basis of uneasiness reported in it, or assumed by Penn in his reply to it, was the feeling that in his private plans Penn was ignoring or was likely to ignore the welfare of the Society of Friends.

12 Penn Manuscripts, Domestic and Miscellaneous Letters, 46; Penn-Forbes Collection, I, 64.
The pertinent part of Penn’s letter, when put in modern form, reads:

As for what thou writ to me of some Friends at London about my matter, it moves me little and it is whimsey or self that is the ground. I know what moved, how it came, how I received it, and in whose sight, and how it has lived in his presence and been an increase of my life and joy, in the best frame and condition I have been in, and whither then should I go to be satisfied, or why should I be otherwise troubled than for them that can think he should ever forget Truth’s service that has only forgot himself to a great fault. I think he is ill and meanly treated by such poor jealousies, after the example of self denial and pilgrimage he has, through grace, lived in the midst of such excellent enjoyments which he has passed but as a wayfaring man. But no more of this.

... I had a blessed time in the west, many miles about that city [Bristol] and it was a working time as well as a wooing time and my soul blesseth the Lord therefor.

Penn’s defense is as vague as are the other letters in helping us define the reasons for criticism of his marriage. Without knowing the background, a reader would hardly divine what he means by “my matter.” There is small profit in guessing whether the point of criticism was Hannah’s youth, or her wealth, or something quite different. With a certain querulousness, familiar to us in Penn in other situations, he claims his past as the best guarantee of the rightness of his present actions. As far as we can tell at this distance his critics were proved wrong, and his “matter” turned out better than they feared—or rather as well as they hoped in spite of fears. He did not turn his back on the affairs of Quakerism in England. If he could not promptly go to Pennsylvania and stay there long, that was only partly Hannah’s fault. Though Springett Penn died shortly after the marriage, his stepmother did her best with the surviving Letitia and Billy, and she provided Penn with adequate male succession. Moreover, she won the affection and approval of Penn’s friends and colonists.

Wallingford  

HENRY J. CADBURY

13 The word has been corrected and is not quite certain. It is not “moving.”
14 I have already discussed the subject briefly in The Bulletin of Friends Historical Association, XXXIV (1945), 17-19.
Ebenezer Hazard in Pennsylvania, 1777

Ebenezer Hazard, born in Philadelphia in 1745, was the son of Samuel Hazard, a merchant and original trustee of the College of New Jersey. After five years at Dr. Samuel Finley's school, later West Nottingham Academy, young Hazard went to Princeton where he was graduated in the Class of 1762. For a decade he earned his living as a bookseller in New York, and then for fifteen years he served in the postal service as postmaster of New York (1775-1777), surveyor (inspector) of the New England area (1777-1782), and Postmaster General of the United States (1782-1789). When the new government was formed Hazard lost his position and returned to Philadelphia where he spent the remainder of his life. During these years he made a notable contribution to American history by printing two large volumes of historical records under the title Historical Collections: Consisting of State Papers, and Other Authentic Documents; Intended as Materials for an History of the United States of America (Philadelphia: T. Dobson, 1792-94). After completing this publication, Hazard served eight years as the first secretary of the Insurance Company of North America. He died in 1817.

In 1777 and 1778, Hazard took three long journeys in a successful effort to put a war-disrupted postal service in order. Of the first trip—to New England—no record remains, but he kept a lengthy journal of his two trips to the South. When Hazard began his first southern sojourn, John Adams wrote Thomas Jefferson, “Mr. Hazard is now gone southward in the character of surveyor of the post office, and I hope will have as good success as he lately had, eastward, where he put the office into very good order.” On the following pages is...

1 There is no life of Hazard, but see Dictionary of American Biography; “Ebenezer Hazard: A Profile of America's First Historical Editor,” William and Mary Quarterly, XII (1955), 44-73; Marquis James, Biography of a Business, 1792-1942, Insurance Company of North America (Indianapolis, Ind., 1942), 11-57.

printed the portion of the journal describing Hazard's trip to Lancaster and York and the reception at Lancaster of the triumphant news of the Battle of Saratoga. The original journal is owned by The Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

New Jersey Historical Society

Fred Shelley

[October 8] Set out for Lancaster by Way of Parkers Ford. Care is necessary in crossing the Schuylkill here as there is a deep Hole on the West Side. This Road is shorter & better than that by Potts Town. Passed Pott's Forge on Frevich Creek. Lodged at Dr. Clarkson's. . . .

[October 15] Left Lancaster & rode to York. Crossed little Conestogo by a Bridge. At Wright's Ferry the Susquehannah is a Mile & a quarter wide, the Water shallow, & the Bed of the River a Rock. The View here is exceedingly romantic. The Road from Lancaster to York is very good. Lodged at the Widow Moore's, a good House, but they charge extravagantly.

[October 16] York is a large Town, the Capital of the County & pleasantly situated on Codorus Creek which runs through it & is usually crossed by a Bridge but may be forded at Times. The Buildings, as at Reading & Lancaster, are generally small & shabby, framed, & the Interstices filled with Clay stiffened with Straw. There are some good Houses in the Town. York is 89 Miles from Phila. The Congress sits here at present: the Town is much crowded, & every Thing extravagantly dear. We learn by Express that on the 7th. Inst. Gen'l. Gates obtained a signal Victory over Gen'l. Burgoyne.

[October 18] Returned to Lancaster. . . .

[October 21] The Windows of the Court House were decorated with several American Standards; those taken from the Hessians at Trenton were nailed to the Wall on the Outside of the House. At Night Lancaster was illuminated. We had a cold Collation at the Court House, with Music. Guns were discharged at the Drinking of

3 Probably Dr. Gerardus Clarkson, of Philadelphia (d. 1790).
4 Now Columbia.
5 Congress met in York for nine months in 1777-1778.
several patriotic Toasts. A Thomas Poulteney a Quaker, who would not illuminate his House, had his Windows broken.\(^6\)

[October 22] Saw a boy of 22 Months old beat a Drum with great Exactness. A Fifer played a Variety of Tunes, & this Child followed them with the Drum without any further Notice of the Change of the Tune than what his Ear afforded, and kept Time to Admiration. He could not speak.

[October 23–29] At Lancaster. The Streets are paved after the Manner of those at Phila. A Kind of Pyrites which contain Sulphur, is found here in great Quantities. They are of a dark brown Color, approaching to a black; generally oblong or square in their Form, & some of them are highly polished. Near Lancaster & York and all through the circumjacent Country, are large Quantities of Lime Stone which remarkably affects the Water. It usually operates as a Cathartic upon Persons unaccustomed to it. Very heavy Rains all the 27th. 28th. & 29th.

[October 30] Clear Weather. Roads very muddy. Set out for York, & after riding four Miles met a Man who informed that the Rain had swelled the Susquehannah so as to render it impassable, which caused me to return. On the West Side of Lancaster is a Hill which commands a complete & beautiful View of the Town.

[October 31] Made another Attempt to cross Susquehannah, & for this Purpose went to Anderson’s Ferry (the River is \(\frac{1}{2}\) a Mile wide here) 13 Miles from Lancaster, & 4 from Boyd’s, commonly called Wright’s Ferry. Crossed Great & little Chickesalunge Creeks; the Water of the former was not deep, but very rapid & the Bottom stony; the latter is very small, but excessively stony. Being unable to cross the River on Accott of the Wind & a great Number of Waggons & Soldiers, I went to Boyd’s: in my Way rode over a very long, steep, stony Mountain, & passed by a Place called Smoaky Town, consisting of three of four Houses situate among the Mountains, the Inhabitants of which live, as I am informed, by begging & stealing. I could not cross at Boyd’s, & as the House was much crowded, & I could get nothing for my Horse I returned to Lancaster, where I staid till—Novr. 3d. when I went again to Boyd’s & was detained

there three Hours, being prevented from crossing by a large number of Continental Waggons which got to the Ferry before me, and some of which had been here several Days. The Tide was very rapid, but I crossed the River expeditiously. Lodged at Stake’s at York, a tolerable House. . . .

John Bartram in the Cedar Swamps

JOHN BARTRAM (1699-1777), America’s first native botanist, was described by Linnaeus as the greatest contemporary “natural botanist” in the world. In the early 1730’s, Bartram began his celebrated correspondence with Peter Collinson of London, a fellow Quaker and plantsman. This correspondence was accompanied by a constant interchange of plant material. Collinson was one of a group of botanists and horticulturists who met frequently at the Royal Society of London. Soon after Bartram’s consignments of seeds and plants began to arrive in London, Collinson’s group fell into a discussion of the identity of certain North American evergreens.

A Massachusetts member, Paul Dudley of Roxbury, had sent a list of the evergreens of New England, which included a savin, a juniper, and two “cedars,” a white and a red.1 This interested Dr. John James Dillenius (1687-1747), recently appointed professor of botany at Oxford.

Dillenius was familiar with John Parkinson’s description of an American juniper in his century-old Theatrum Botanicum and with his comment: “This tree which they of our English colonies in the Bermuda and Virginia, etc., call Cedar.”2 He had been checking John Ray’s Historia Plantarum, which incorporated John Banister’s herbarium of Virginia trees and plants, but followed Parkinson’s classifications.3 Dillenius was not satisfied with the identification of the white cedar.

2 John Parkinson, Theatrum Botanicum (London, 1640), 1029.
To determine the correct classification of these evergreens, new specimens of the trees, and especially of the seed vessels, were required. Consequently, Collinson wrote to Bartram, asking him to collect two or three specimens of the two trees that Bartram and Dudley knew as cedars, and to send "the berries, or seed-vessel of each."

Toward the end of May, 1736, Bartram started out on horseback from his home at Kingsessing near Philadelphia. He crossed the Schuylkill and the Delaware, and headed toward the bogs about the headwaters of Egg Harbor River. There he found the desired specimens and sent them to Collinson with a letter describing his trip. In a letter of July 31, 1736, to Dr. Dillenius at Holy Well, Oxford, Collinson quoted Bartram's letter at length. The pertinent part of Collinson's letter follows:

My indefatigable Friend John Bartram in Pensilvania has taken an Expedition of 140 or 150 miles in search of the white Cedar. I press'd Him to satisfy us in particular relating to this plant & if it had been twice as far he would have done it. I will give you part of his Letter—

I engag'd an owner of part of a Cedar swamp for my Guide without whom I could hardly have found it. Wee travel'd about Twelve Miles beyond the inhabitants over Desarts of sand & such deep mirery Swamps that sometimes both Wee and our Horses had much ado to gett out. The Sand lies in Ridges 40 or 50 or 60 poles over & the swamps lie between which are the heads of Rivers & Brooks but so thick sett with shrubs and Bushes about 10 poles Wide yt wee had great Difficulty in passing these swamps att Last wee came to the Head of (Egharbour River) where the great Cedar Swamp Began containing many hundred Acres Chiefly producing White Cedar but in some dryer places, Silver Laurell or Bay Maple, Holley, & Sassafras & about the Ridges Some pines, but I observed no Red Cedar. The White Grows only in wet places often knee deep in Water in wet seasons—they grow near together the small ones within a foot or Two of one another a white Cedar of Two inches Diameter will be

4 Collinson to Bartram, Apr. 21, 1736, Darlington, 75.
5 The original letter is in the Sherardian Collection of the library of the Department of Botany of Oxford University.
20 feet high, the larger Trees grows all att 10 or 20 feet Distance which makes them grow very tall, a Tree of Two feet diamr att the Hump, will be 80 or 100 feet in highth and 30 or 40 feet without a Limb, the soil where they grow I take to be Clay but the surface is a matt of Roots all interlac’d one with another which intangles the Leaves and Rubish & makes a Bogg the Bark of the Root is Red which gives a tincture to the Waters that runs from them but the Tast is good & sweet. Our Ceterach & Sarsaparilla grows att the Roots where the sun is rarely seen so thick is the shade above, the Leaves is not near so long & prickly as the Red Cedar, the Fruite is Coniferous & seed very small—to satisfie your Immediate Curiosity I inclose a small speciment, but this second of Last June, I cutt down a Large Tree for to send you Larger specimens which I shall send by first oppertunity.

Now Dear Docr. I think by what Mr. Dudley says & My Friend Bartram who has used Great Dispatch to Informe us, thee art now fully Quallified to sett Mr. Ray and all Curious Inquirers since in a Clear Light respecting the White and Red Cedars—the white by it’s seed Vessell Here Inclosed appears to be a True Cedar, but what is [called] the Red Cedar are only Junipers or Savins.

Schenectady, N. Y.

Winifred Notman Prince

---

**Sweden Honors John Bartram**

On April 26, 1769, John Bartram was elected a member of the Royal Academy of Sciences of Stockholm. The Reverend Charles Magnus Wrangel, who had recently returned to Sweden from America where he had come to know Bartram well, described his friend’s election in a letter to him of July 2, 1769.¹

¹ Bartram Papers, IV, 114, The Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Dr. Wrangel had come from Sweden in 1759 to take charge of Gloria Dei Church. He was provost of the Swedish Lutheran Church and an intimate friend of the Rev. Henry Melchior Muhlenberg. In 1763 he applied to the Pennsylvania Assembly for citizenship, which was granted. He returned to Sweden in 1768, becoming court chaplain and later bishop. He died in 1786.
Dear Sir & beloved Friend

When ever I think of America (which I do every day of my Life) I think at the same time of you & your House & as ingratitude is what I detest I cannot but bear you the warmest gratitude, for all the civilities you were pleased to show me while I had the pleasure to cultivat a Friendship with you at a nearer distance. I always looked upon myself as one of your Famely, being happy enough to be counted so by you & yours. It grieved me when I was in America that your great merit had not in my Native Land received the marks of Esteem in the Public, as it deserved, & therefore it gives me great satisfaction when I now assure you, that you are well known hear from the Throne to every one that regards Learning & the Society of Science in Stockholm, which has from its first institution been known for the greatest delicacy in choosing members of distinction & note, has manifested their great regard for you by choosing you a membre unanimously at the proposal of Professor Bergius. I had the pleasur to be present in the Society that same day when you were proposed & to deliver to the Society the drafts of your Son & some other things in your name, which were received with satisfaction. Dr Linæus is so used to receive presents from all quarters, that he hardly thinks of it, & therefore I took the liberty to give what was intended for him to the Society as I expected that they would show more gratitude & I hope I have your aprobation in it. Your Son’s corespondence with Professor Bergius will no doubt be of great use to him & do him much honour. I have not ben like Professor Kalm in taking the honour to myself of what belongs to others. I have given my Dear Friend Mr John Bartram Jun his due & I hope he will not repent of what he has donne for Professor Bergius, who is a man hear & abroad of great repute & at the same time very attentive to any thing that is donne for him. He expects that his Correspondent will send him some seeds.

The certificate of Bartram’s membership in the Royal Academy, which was written in Latin but here printed in translation, is in the Bartram Papers in The Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

The Royal Academy of Sciences of Stockholm has wished to show in the only way it can how much it regards the merits of the celebrated man JOHN BARTRAM, Royal Botanist in North America of the British Domain, and for that reason it has received this MR. BARTRAM into its fellowship and among the members of the Academy April 26, 1769.

2 Benedict Bergius or Berg (1723–1784), Swedish botanist.
3 Peter Kalm (1715–1779), noted Swedish botanist, had visited Bartram during his American tour, 1748–1751.
4 Bartram Papers, I, 67.
Therefore I salute him as a fellow with these presents in the name of the Royal Academy of Stockholm. In evidence of the matter I affix the Large Seal of the Academy.

PETER WARGENTIN
Permanent Secretary
Royal Academy of Sciences of Stockholm

In acknowledging his receipt of the certificate and his pleasure at this new honor, Bartram wrote in a long letter to Linnaeus: “I am obliged to your illustrious Philosophical Society of Stockholm for nominating me a member of it & to them my gratitude.”

Philadelphia

FRANCIS D. WEST

5 This letter is one of four written by Bartram to Linnaeus preserved in the Linnaean Society in the museum of the Royal Society in London. Microfilms of these letters are in the American Philosophical Society.