

*The  
Journal of the  
Friends Historical  
Society*

*Volume 59 Number 2*



# CONTENTS

page

112-114 Editorial

115 Presidential Address: "Not Fit to be printed"  
*Christine Trevett*

145 The Complaints Book of Richard Hutton  
*John Wood*

155 Thomas Crowley's Proposal...  
*Neil L. York*

175 Recent Publications

182 Correspondence: - Hannah Lightfoot  
*Sheila Mitchell*

184 Notes and Queries:

185 Publisher's Information

186 Biographies

---

## FRIENDS HISTORICAL SOCIETY

---

*President:* 2001 Christine Trevett  
*Clerk:* Howard F. Gregg  
*Membership*  
*Secretary:* Malcolm J. Thomas  
*Treasurer:* Christopher Denman  
*Editor of the*  
*Journal:* Howard F. Gregg

Annual membership Subscription due 1st January (personal, Meetings and Quaker Institutions in Great Britain and Ireland) £8 US \$16 (Overseas Institutions) £13 US \$26. Subscriptions should be paid to the Membership Secretary, FHS, c/o the Library, Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ. Orders for single numbers and back issues should be sent to FHS at the same address.



Volume 59

Number 2

2001 (Issued 2004)

THE  
JOURNAL OF THE  
FRIENDS HISTORICAL  
SOCIETY

Part 574  
Words  
01653 65857

Communications should be addressed to the Editor of the *Journal*  
c/o 6 Kenlay Close, New Earswick, York YO32 4DW, U.K.

52904

---

---

## EDITORIAL

The Editor again apologises for the delay in the appearance of *J.F.H.S. Volume 59, Number 2*. I apologise to both contributors and readers. The second half of 2003 was taken up with a move from London to York with all the attendant difficulties and problems this can cause. Now having settled at Hartrigg Oaks the reins can again be taken up. *Please note my new address as given above*. Please do not write to me c/o the Library at Friends House as I shall now rarely be in London.

All correspondence regarding reviews should now be sent to David Sox, who has kindly undertaken the service of Assistant Editor. Please note his address: David Sox, 20 The Vineyard, Richmond-upon-Thames, Surrey TW10 6AN. I recently attended a Memorial Meeting in Leeds for Russell S. Mortimer, who died on 18 March 2004. In 1986 my predecessor, Gerald A. J. Hodgett, wrote: 'In December 1948 Russell S. Mortimer was appointed assistant editor to John Nickalls and upon the latter's relinquishing the editorship in 1959 he became joint editor with the late Alfred Braithwaite. Following Alfred BNraithwaite's death in 1975 he continued to serve as joint editor with Christopher J. Holdsworth. In these capacities he served the *JOURNAL* for nearly 37 years. The volumes that have appeared during that long period are a tribute to the meticulous way in which he carried out his duties. The wide range of his reading made his contributions to the section entitled *NOTES and QUERIES*

extremely valuable. We wish to express our thanks to him for all he has done for the *JOURNAL*. Whilst again expressing appreciation for the considerable service Russell has given to Friends Historical Society, I hope that members will hold his widow, Jean, a past President, in our prayers at this sad time.

The Presidential Address of the Society 2004, will take place in the Margaret Fell Room at the Quaker International Centre, at 6.15 p.m., on Sunday 30 May 2004, during Britain Yearly Meeting. John Punshon will be the speaker. His title is: "THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TRADITION: REFLECTIONS ON THE WRITING OF QUAKER HISTORY". The lecture will be preceded by a General Meeting of the Society at 5.45 p.m.

Quaker Tapestry members have recently learned of the financial difficulties currently facing the Exhibition and Centre at Kendal due to a fall in gifts and donations which are an essential support to the income received from visitors to the Centre. Reserves have had to be used to meet the gap. If the financial difficulties cannot be resolved the Exhibition and Centre may not open in 2005. An appeal has been made to members and groups to give what help they can. The Quaker Tapestry is a major resource for both Quaker history and spirituality and I bring the appeal to the attention of members of the Friends Historical Society. Further information can be requested from The Quaker Tapestry at Kendal Ltd, Friends Meeting House, Stramongate, Kendal, Cumbria LA9 4BH.

This issue is the first of two short volumes which should enable Volume 59 Number 3 to be with the printer by June 2004. The 2003 issue should appear towards the end of this year.

At its meeting on 11 March 2004 the Executive Committee, following the discretion given by the General Meeting last year, accepted a recommendation from the Treasurer to increase the subscription rate for 2004 to £12 for individual members anywhere and Quaker bodies in the U.K. and Ireland, and to £20 or \$40 for other institutional members.

Volume 59, Number 2 begins with Christine Trevett's Presidential Address, which is a stimulating exploration of tensions, inequality and authority to print amongst early Quakers.

John Woods illustrates well how a document can yield insights into the life, humanity and difficulties of managing a Quaker establishment.

Neil L York details a combative Quaker's sustained effort to find a solution to the developing crisis in Anglo-colonial American relations between 1763 and 1775.

The Editor welcomes articles or short items for consideration for inclusion in succeeding *Journals*. Contributors are advised to use the MHRA (Modern Humanities Research Association) STYLE BOOK in the preparation of material, which is available from Subscriptions Department, Maney Publishing, Hudson Road, Leeds LS9 7DL (e-mail [maney@maney.co.uk](mailto:maney@maney.co.uk)) or online at the MHRA's website ([www.mhra.org.uk](http://www.mhra.org.uk)). The Editor's decision is final as regards publication or revision.

*Howard F. Gregg*

# **“NOT FIT TO BE PRINTED”: THE WELSH, THE WOMEN AND THE SECOND DAY’S MORNING MEETING**

## **INTRODUCTION**

My interest as a historian of religion has tended to be in the back-benchers or the marginalised and so it has included study of women, schismatics and heretics,<sup>1</sup> in an attempt to uncover, retrospectively, what the losers had been saying. Like a former President of the Friends’ Historical Society I would like to see a well-rounded Quaker history, one which takes account of the byways *not* travelled by those whose view of Quaker organisation “won”. Such a history, Larry Ingle suggested, would be as aware of the back-benches as the facing ones.<sup>2</sup>

This paper offers snapshots from the years between 1673 and (around) 1720. They concern mainstream Quakerism’s censorship of ideas and writings, in relation to two groups, at a time when both organisation of the Friends (Quakers) and their revised self-definition were being consolidated. The categories of people to be looked at are Welsh Friends<sup>3</sup> and women Friends. Both may be described as back-benchers.

My primary source of evidence comes from the body of Quakers which had been given the task of vetting written material, before deciding whether it might be printed. It comes from the Minutes of the *Second Day’s Morning Meeting*, a Meeting that existed for 228 years and ceased to exist in 1901.<sup>4</sup> I shall deal briefly with some general points about developing seventeenth century Quakerism before turning to the nature of the *Morning Meeting* and its dealings with some women and finally how prospective publications by the Welsh fared at its hands.

## **THE CHANGING FACE OF QUAKERISM**

Between 1650 and 1700 Quakerism emerged, spread and changed.<sup>5</sup> It changed in terms of the language it used and how it used it<sup>6</sup> and by becoming increasingly institutionalised and patriarchal.<sup>7</sup> It became London-centred<sup>8</sup> and fronted by “respectable” people, so as to be no longer the Quakerism of either writhing, quaking charismatics or of paired evangelists declaring doom on magistrates

and towns in a “prophetic” manner and being dragged protesting out of churches though we should remember that neither of these things had been central to the experience of most Friends).<sup>9</sup>

When *Morning Meeting* began in the 1670s change was very much in the air. The organisation inaugurated in the 1660s was being consolidated and by the time of George Fox’s demise in 1691 major “shifts” had been achieved. Nevertheless unresolved tensions remained. As Larry Ingle put it, Fox’s successors

were destined to relive the contradictions he left them ... the Society of Friends reflected both the individual, radical Christian approach he championed ... and the determined, more realistic and authoritarian stance he found necessary when dealing with dissidents.<sup>10</sup>

In these “more realistic” 1670s the public “face” of Quakers did not belong to people who could be dismissed as ill-educated, crypto-Levellers. Men with social know-how, such as William Penn and George Whitehead had come to the fore.<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless an anonymous work of 1689 could still speak of some Friends as “rough hewn. Stubborn ... yea and nay people ... sullen... blunt”, while it also referred to cynical, dapper, “perriwig-Friends, that are of a more refined cut ... hats more fashionable, their cravats larger”.<sup>12</sup>

The 1670s was also the decade for forming the influential London Meetings. 1671 had seen the creation of the *Six Weeks Meeting*, in which women and men alike served.<sup>13</sup> *Meeting for Sufferings* was minuted from 1676 and the Meeting which concerns us, the *Morning Meeting* was minuted from 1673. All but the *Six Weeks Meeting* was comprised only of men.<sup>14</sup>

Ministers for Friends were now officially “recognised” by the group and hence marked out as acceptable and fit to be “public”. Quakers were thus discouraging the individualism which had both enlivened and dogged its early decades and this went in parallel with the channelling of Quaker women’s service into more conventional spheres,<sup>15</sup> through the work of the Women’s Meetings. The validity of those Meetings was debated and disputed until well into the eighteenth century. Yet the Women’s Meetings were far from being places for the rule of Amazons and for female usurpers of male authority, such as their detractors within and beyond Quakerism liked to portray them. They tended instead to be places of good works. There sober matrons, some of whom had once been criticised as rabble-rousing street prophets, advised younger Quaker women on decorous behaviour.<sup>16</sup>



These, then, were some of the directions for change in the first half-century of Quakerism. Along with them there came the first inklings of toleration and when a modicum of toleration had been won, the leadership did not want to see it jeopardised. As part of this process the Morning Meeting set about ensuring that Friends, male and female, did not rock a steady boat by their actions or writings.<sup>17</sup> The Yearly Meeting Epistle of 1692 referred to "a quiet life", which was to be conserved under "the higher powers that God is pleased to set over us". Greater conformism was valued, albeit in a setting which was always counter-cultural, simply by virtue of being Quaker.

#### THE (SECOND DAY'S) MORNING MEETING

The *Morning Meeting* met most Mondays, and in the morning, as its name suggests. Its origins lay with a Meeting of ministering Friends who were based in, or were visiting, London and with the need to ensure that London gatherings were supplied with such ministers.<sup>18</sup> Larry Ingle wrote<sup>19</sup> that

Its tone was set by regular attenders at its meetings, men characterised by access to nation-wide contacts and information, a broad outlook, and an understandable view that these qualities, made them obvious leaders.<sup>20</sup>

However, certain seventeenth and eighteenth century contemporaries, some of them former and disaffected Friends, had no such high view of the *Morning Meeting*. This was the Meeting "where Satan dwells", as one wrote. Its editorial, revising and censorship roles were described as to

chop and change the writings of their dead prophets, to answer the exigency of the times.<sup>21</sup>

Part of the *Mornings Meeting's* function was indeed to monitor, control and revise written material by Quakers, as well as to monitor and answer the writings of others who were hostile to the Friends. Nothing might be published in the Friends' name which would bring them into disrepute,<sup>22</sup> so that the Meeting did indeed have a censoring role.<sup>23</sup>

"Not fit to be printed"

"Judged not convenient"

"Not safe to be published"

"Not convenient or safe"



“Not of service to the Truth”  
 “Printed at own charge only”  
 “Not fit to be delivered”  
 “Not fit to be printed nor  
 spread in manuscript”  
 “Cannot print it”.

These and many similar examples of decisions derive from Minutes of the *Morning Meeting* 1673-1683.

Historians of these times owe the *Morning Meeting* a debt, for ensuring the collection of Quaker and anti-Quaker writings<sup>24</sup> for posterity. The first entry in its Minute Book (15.7.1673) reads as follows:

[agreed] that 2 of a sort of all books written by friends be procured and kept together and for the time to come that the bookseller bring in 2 of a sort likewise of all books that are printed, that if any book be perverted by our adversaries we may know where to find it. And that there be gotten one of a sort of every book that has been written against the truth from the beginning.<sup>25</sup>

Thereafter (5.2.1675) a Minute recorded that no Friends' books or papers should be published without first having been scrutinised by the Meeting. To have passed the test of the readers of the *Morning Meeting* and to be “fit” for publication was to have gained a kind of Friends' *imprimatur*, an equivalent of the Roman Church's *nihil obstat*.<sup>26</sup> In the eighteenth century their refusal to pass one Friend's manuscript was memorably described by another Friend as his “literary child” being

knocked on the head with the critical axes of the morning-meeting<sup>27</sup>

The Meeting was a busy one, dealing with complaints against Friends by Friends (especially with regard to ministry and publications), with supplying ministers as need arose around London, with arranging for the countering of charges made against itself as a Meeting<sup>28</sup> and with reading manuscripts submitted to it. The men met in the houses of Friends as early as 6 a.m.<sup>29</sup> and were indeed “longsuffering and superconscientious”, as one writer has observed.<sup>30</sup>

Its members suffered the trials known to editors, proof-readers and publishers through the ages:

"not without some alterations or amendments" ... "to be corrected" ... "check the Latin" ... "for the future he take care to make Erratas to all the books he prints for Friends"<sup>31</sup> ... "small writing ... many interlinations" ... "not *Three Papers of Verses to England and London*" ... "amended in part and prepared for printing" ... "to be laid by" ... "large and tedious, some things often repeated" ... "another paper by Elizabeth Steridge" ... "not clear" ... :Divers of the said papers and books are worn and defaced and others of them so badly writ that many things are not legible"<sup>32</sup> ... "fair writ unto page eight" ... "Read some of the papers ... and marked many places" ... "very difficult to read and to distinguish the matter" ... "some small mistakes" ... "a large treatise in folio" ... "read and correct" ... "read manuscript... to page 126" ... "adjourned".

The minutes of the *Morning Meeting* and of the other London Meetings bear witness to some Friends' depth of religious commitment and personal outlay of energy, time and money in the cause of "Truth". However, the *Morning Meeting* was also the forum in which Quaker power interacted with Quaker response to the wider world. Its Minutes are the place to see late seventeenth century Friends' pragmatism, politics and patriarchy at work.

In looking at women, the Welsh and the *Morning Meeting* we are seeing front-benchers and back-benchers in relief. Women had no place in the decision-making of the Meeting and almost all Welsh Friends were peripheral to this new kind of leadership in Quakerism, for reasons of "class", language and mores.<sup>33</sup> The "back-bench status of women Friends needs some clarification, however, because the high profile which seventeenth century women Friends enjoyed is well-known. Something must be said of women Friends.

It is true that post-1670, Quaker women continued to enjoy freedoms denied to their female contemporaries in other religious groups.<sup>34</sup> They spoke publicly in mixed gatherings - though the new emphasis on accredited ministry was ensuring that fewer of them did so. A small minority of them published<sup>35</sup> - it had always been a small minority of women Friends, though their numbers were very significant in seventeenth century publishing terms.<sup>36</sup> Nevertheless the work of the *Morning Meeting* was ensuring that it was less easy to be published.<sup>37</sup> Friends' *Women's Meetings* were seen by some as dangerously liberated settings, in which a woman might exercise

authority over men, in unscriptural fashion, for example on vetoing a man's marriage plans. Thus it seems that women Friends, in terms of their standing within their church, still enjoyed an unmatched level of recognition and respect.<sup>38</sup>

Yet at the same time, as Quakerism changed, women had also been seeing their activities as ministers and as prophets more and more hedged-about with restrictions.<sup>39</sup> The Minutes of the *Morning Meeting* let us glimpse kinds of change which circumscribed women's ministries and bridled the female prophet. They also give us occasional glimpses into some women's response to this altered Quakerism.

#### BRIDLING THE FEMALE PROPHET

By the 1680s not only did male-dominated committees hold the reins in decision-making but women Friends were being dissuaded from ministering in large gatherings, or where ministering *male* Friends were available.<sup>40</sup> There are hints of an undercurrent of discontent about the way things were going in relation to women's "public" ministry<sup>41</sup> and whereas men had the *Morning Meeting*, there was nothing to serve female "public" Friends.

Difficulties do not emerge in the records for a number of years but in 1697 the Yearly Meeting of ministers indicated that *female* ministering Friends (who had no particular forum) would be permitted to hold their own Meeting the next day.<sup>42</sup> Thereafter they would be able to join the men in the Yearly Meeting of ministers.<sup>43</sup> The *Morning Meeting* was also conscious that Meetings for female ministers were an issue<sup>44</sup> but (undocumented) difficulties with regard to this seem to have led to the *Morning Meeting's* Minute of complaint in 1700. It reported that women "public" ministering Friends were holding their own meeting, not on Second Day but on Seventh Day (Saturday). Moreover, and without due notice and permission, some female ministers were appearing and ministering in the London Meetings. They may have been deliberately circumventing the *Morning Meeting* and making their own decisions about ministry but the *Morning Meeting* would have none of it. The Minute read as follows:

There being several women Friends in and about this city that have a public testimony for the Truth and have sometimes met on the Seventh-day, this meeting, having considered the same, do declare that they do not understand that ever this meeting gave direction for the setting up the said meeting; neither do they judge there is any necessity for it or service in the



continuance thereof: and therefore do advise that when any public approved women Friends have a concern of service upon them to go to any particular public meeting in or about this city, they may leave their names at the Chamber, that Friends may have notice thereof; and such may ... have an opportunity to clear themselves, and yet be careful not to interfere with their brethren in their public mixed meetings.

Then in the following year, at the beginning (March) of 1701, women were said to be taking up too much time in ministering in the London Meetings, when male ("public") ministering Friends were present and might have given better service. Women Friends were therefore "tenderly cautioned" against such behaviour.<sup>45</sup> This was change, although since the 1680s women had been discouraged by the Yearly Meeting from offering themselves as ministers in large cities. Ministry in London, Bristol and Norwich, they were told, was too onerous for them.<sup>46</sup> Also, and importantly, the *form* of public ministry and speech was now a matter to be commented on, from the administrative heart of Quakerism: prophet-like denunciations of, and woes on, individuals, towns and specific injustices were to be suppressed. These had been commonplace in former decades of Quakerism. In 1700, however, the *Morning Meeting* decreed that Friends were no longer "forwardly" to enter churches without its approval. "Presumptuous prophesying" against nation or town was decried in 1702. There was to be no rocking of boats, lest "the present liberty" be threatened.

What was prescribed and proscribed in this way needs to be understood in the context of a group which had now benefited from the *Act of Toleration* (1689) and did not want to jeopardise its gains. Preaching women still had novelty value, but the fact was that in settings where the purpose was to win newcomers to the Quaker cause it would be a high-risk strategy to have women in the forefront of evangelism. Nevertheless such shifts in patterns of ministry had a particular bearing on women.

For women, the prophet role had been central: denouncing injustice, declaring woe and judgement, foretelling inevitable outcomes and recalling the experiences of the oppressed messengers of God. The prophet role, it must be remembered, was one which Scripture had allowed for women - Paul in the New Testament (notably in 1 Corinthians) had acknowledged women's prophesying whereas other public activity ("speaking"), which might be suggestive of their preaching or teaching-authority over men, was much more debatable.<sup>47</sup> Prophesying had provided a loophole

through which a woman might slip into the public sphere, a sphere otherwise denied to her.<sup>48</sup> Now, however, the language most characteristic of the prophet was being outlawed by Friends<sup>49</sup> and William Edmundson was telling them that the “hardy temper, capacity and ability of men” was “fitter” for journeying to “publish the doctrine”.<sup>50</sup>

For the disaffected Francis Bugg, however, who was targeting the *Morning Meeting* in his work *The Pilgrim’s Progress* (1698), what the *Morning Meeting* was in fact doing in censoring and sanctioning revisions in the writings of famous Friends past, was to

alter and change any message, stop any prophecy, stifle any revelation, silence the voice of God uttered by the Spirit of the Lord thro’ their most eminent prophets.<sup>51</sup>

#### SOME WOMEN FRIENDS AND THE MORNING MEETING

It is against this backdrop of what was seen to be necessary change that we have to look at what the Minutes of the *Morning Meeting* say about some women. They offer hints that some of them did not take kindly to the new restraints and from time to time they tell of continued and unacceptable prophet-like behaviour in women.<sup>52</sup> I shall take three examples. These will be Judith Boulby,<sup>53</sup> Mary Scott and Joan Whitrow(e).<sup>54</sup>

(1) The name of *Judith Boulby* recurs in the Minutes. She was a Yorkshirewoman and in 1670 her Quarterly Meeting had scrutinised a writing by her and then gave financial support to its publication (this was her *Testimony for Truth*), In 1673, however, by which time the centralised scrutiny of Friends’ writings had been established, the Yorkshire Friends were passing one of her writings to the London leadership.<sup>55</sup> Six years later (26.3.1679) *A Warning and Lament over England* came before the *Morning Meeting*<sup>56</sup> and after correction it was passed for publication. However, when her next work, *Judgement Impending*, was read the *Morning Meeting* decided to “enquire further” (25.5.1686). It is not mentioned again. Undaunted, near the turn of 1688-9 (7. 11<sup>th</sup> month) the prophet Judith Boulby produced *A Lament*. This was judged “not safe to print” *at any time* without amendment, for it contained “several severe ancient prophecies applied to England too general and absolute”. One other paper by Judith Boulby was “left in the drawer” (6.3.1700) and disappears from the record.

(2) In the case of Mary Scott, a Wiltshire Friend, her prophetic inclinations had taken her onto the streets of London and word had got to the men of the *Morning Meeting* of Mary Scott “pronouncing of

divers judgements to come upon the people". The year was 1703 and the *Morning Meeting* declared itself "dissatisfied". She was to be "spoken to", her ministry assessed and Wiltshire Friends apprised of events.

The Minutes over the next weeks (3 and 10 of 3<sup>rd</sup> month 1703) suggest there had been a saga of separation from her family and refusal to return. She was threatened with having to appear before Devonshire House Meeting to give account. Neither this nor letters from Wiltshire Friends could persuade her back to husband, hearth and home. The Minute reported that "she doth not incline to go as yet".<sup>57</sup>

Other Mary Scott misdemeanours apart, declaring judgement in the streets of London was no longer fit Quaker activity and certainly not for a woman. Both the important *Six Weeks Meeting* and Women's Meetings country-wide had in their midst women Friends who had done similar things some decades past, that is they had left their families and had even been imprisoned for their prophet-like activities. Now, however, such women had become "mothers in Israel".<sup>58</sup> Times had changed.

(3) Joan Whitrow(e) is my third case and her response to the face of change was to abandon Quakerism. The Friend Rebeckah Travers, a member of the *Six Weeks Meeting* was called on to remonstrate with Joan Whitrowe in 1677 (23.5. and 30.5), over the matter of a proposed publication in memory of her fifteen year old daughter Susanna Whitrowe. She had not submitted this to the *Morning Meeting*, "as others do".

Joan Whitrowe had seen more than one of her children die, had put on sackcloth and committed herself to written testimony,<sup>59</sup> Once scrutinised, the Meeting decided (in the 5<sup>th</sup> month of 1677), that Joan Whitrowe's writing was too self-serving. It required her to excise material which was "chiefly to her own praise".

Her immediate response is not recorded and this happened in 1677. However, Joan Whitrowe ("the widow Whitrow" as she subsequently sometimes styled herself) did publish a number of further items between 1689-97, though not under Friends' auspices. they included several addresses to King William and Queen Mary from 1689 onwards<sup>60</sup> and it was probably these that the *Six Weeks Meeting* had in mind on 30.10.1690, when it was passing judgement on Joan Whitrowe:

No books or papers be sold in Friends meetings that Friends have not approved, and particularly Joan Whitrow's pamphlets to be stopt from being sold amongst Friend's books



Joan Whitrowe had by that time ceased to be a Quaker. Indeed in the 1689 writing she had written that she was "one that is of no sect or gathered people".<sup>61</sup>

The strictures of the *Six Weeks Meeting* indicate, nevertheless, that some Friends were continuing to value her writings, even though that Meeting deemed it risky to allow the works to be sold, perhaps lest they be taken to be by a Friend

Evidently Joan Whitrowe had firstly taken the road to be trodden later by Margaret Everard, who in 1699 determined that there was no point in submitting a writing to the *Morning Meeting* if you had things to say which were at odds with what was now Quaker theology. As she put it: "I was not willing to give them trouble or myself the disappointment".<sup>62</sup> Secondly, however, Joan Whitrowe had also decided there was no point in being a Quaker. Nevertheless some Friends were evidently buying her printed writings.

Those writings show that she was championing social justice and had a strong sense of the rightness of her calling.<sup>63</sup> In the book *Visionary Women* Phyllis Mack probably put her finger on the truth. She discerned in Joan Whitrowe's published works (those which had not been printed under Friends' auspices) language reminiscent of the radical prophecy of the Interregnum. It was also, she observed, "dazzling prose ... Inspired... by the works of the mystic Johan Tauler".<sup>64</sup> It would not have appealed to the *Morning Meeting*.<sup>65</sup>

These examples must suffice to illustrate one way in which change in Quakerism and the oversight of the *Morning Meeting* touched women as ministers and publishers. The history of seventeenth century women Friends is increasingly well-documented, however, whereas the history of Quakerism in Wales has been less so. It is time to say something about the Welsh and Quakerism before turning to the fate of writings from the Welsh, at the hands of the *Morning Meeting*. Some of them were by women.

#### QUAKERISM AND WALES

Quakers got the usual negative response from most of their contemporaries, after their message arrived in Wales with John ap John in 1653.<sup>66</sup> There was the added problem for its evangelists that Quakerism was perceptibly *English*. In fact its detractors determinedly did not use the Welsh form *Crynwyr* (from the verb *crynu*, shake/quake) to describe the Friends, but instead they used the pseudo-"Welsh" forms *Quacceriaid/Cwaceriaid/Cwackers*,<sup>67</sup> thereby robbing the Friends of credibility in the eyes of Welsh-speaking potential converts.

Wales was not like the North of England, Quakerism's birthplace. Dissenters had not been particularly thick on the ground and in the civil war period Wales had been on the "wrong" side. Its loyalty (with a few regional exceptions) was for the king. Its religion was decried as popish. Quakerism was not to be expected to make spectacular progress in Wales, though progress it did. That was because there had been religious activists there who were of Seeker, Independent and Fifth Monarchist persuasions, some of them with a strong message for social reform. It was they - the likes of Morgan Llwyd,<sup>68</sup> Vavasor Powell, Walter Cradoc and William Erbery, who proved to be the precursors of the Friends. Welsh Quakerism won many of its first converts from their dissenting congregations.<sup>69</sup>

The progress of Quakerism was hindered abruptly by the migration of hundreds of Welsh Friends to Pennsylvania from the early 1680s,<sup>70</sup> so as to participate in William Penn's *Holy Experiment*.<sup>71</sup> It never recovered or regained a distinctively Welsh character thereafter. Indeed in 1684 Richard Davies<sup>72</sup> wrote to William Penn prophetically saying "this country will be shortly with but few friends in".<sup>73</sup> Some Meetings died: some struggled into life again a few years later.<sup>74</sup>

In England and in Wales the young were drawn to land and opportunity in Pennsylvania<sup>75</sup> but some of those left behind felt abandoned and complained<sup>76</sup> and eighteenth century Welsh Quakerism was depleted and struggling,<sup>77</sup> though still it produced colourful characters.<sup>78</sup>

Welsh Quakerism depended heavily for its influence in the London Meetings on a small number of better-educated, financially-sound Friends from Wales, men of the professional and land-owning classes and the "pillar apostle" John ap John, Wales's first Quaker. By the mid 1680s, however, some of those few key figures, had emigrated,<sup>79</sup> which diminished further the London Friends' understanding of the Welsh scene. Characteristics of that scene made it harder for Welsh Friends' writing to pass the scrutiny of the *Morning Meeting*, as we shall see.

#### "POOR ... TAFFIE"

The Welsh had been fair game for the political and social satire of the pamphlet-writers during the civil wars. They mocked their distinctive speech patterns when speaking English, derided their poverty-stricken lifestyles and their pride in their own Welsh pedigrees. "Shinkin" (Siencyn) and "Shone" (Siôn) were the butt of many jokes and were the chief characters in printed tales of Welsh

inadequacy and hubris.<sup>80</sup> Differences of language and culture were ammunition in an age before political correctness.

Wales, writers said, was “the fag end of the creation” and “the most monstrous limb in the whole body of geography”. The Welsh inhabited “the very testicles of the nation”<sup>81</sup> and were the products of “a turd left on the Malvern hills” or of “snot and goose-parts” or of French whores and Irish rogues.<sup>82</sup> Even their horses were peculiar.<sup>83</sup> Everywhere the hapless Englishman went he met with bad roads, or more often no roads, and when he asked directions he would be told *Dim Saesneg* (no English). The Friends’ writings do not reflect strong prejudice, though George Fox’s indicate both that he had recognised the dire poverty of the people of Wales and that he did not find Cardiganshire easy.<sup>84</sup> In any case, Quaker writings did not generally deal with Wales.

Then there was the matter of the language. Until 1695 licensing laws hampered printing outside of London, Oxford or Cambridge. Welsh language publication was particularly difficult,<sup>85</sup> because the problems of printing such material in London, or Cambridge were not just problems of distribution and cost, but of finding printers willing to engage with the Welsh language, and capable of mangling it only minimally. The level of literacy in Wales in the late seventeenth century, in either English or Welsh, is not easy to determine.<sup>86</sup> However, there was a book-buying clientele<sup>87</sup> and it is clear that quite large numbers of copies of works could be off-loaded, if the writer and subject matter were of interest.<sup>88</sup> Consequently there would seem to have been a good case for material by Quakers about Quakerism to be published for use in Wales, and both languages. Nevertheless it was not.

The Yearly Meeting in Wales in 1682 had addressed the question. In 1683 there appeared John ap John’s only publication in Welsh, a translation of a 1680 English writing, now in Welsh as *Tystiolaeth o Gariad ac Ewyllys Da*. Almost immediately, however, many of those most able and hence likely to be the writers for Friends were involved in the emigration.<sup>89</sup> Consequently, post-1682 the publication level was very low and as Geraint H Jenkins has observed,

in the early eighteenth century ... the contribution of Quakers to the astonishing increase in the number of Welsh books was modest and infrequent.<sup>90</sup>

This brings me back to the work of the *Morning Meeting* and to late 17<sup>th</sup> and early 18<sup>th</sup> century Minutes dealing with Welsh and the Welsh.



## WELSH, THE WELSH AND THE MORNING MEETING

Writers of all classes and both English and Welsh were sometimes refused publication by the *Morning Meeting*. Nevertheless there are special features of the treatment of Welsh authors which deserve mention. There was some remorse among emigrants to Pennsylvania that they had abandoned their compatriots to a life without access to *Truth*, as the Friends understood it.<sup>91</sup> Consequently there was an acknowledged need for ministry and writing for Wales. For that reason some tried to have work published. Yet they did not gain the approval of the *Morning Meeting*. Once handed in, writings sometimes disappeared into a void. Manuscripts went astray or were not referred to again after being "laid by" and it was the kiss of death to have your work put "in the drawer". However Welsh Friends seem to have met with particular misfortune where their work was concerned.

There was the case of Elisha Biddles (Beadles), who had gone in person from Monmouthshire to the *Morning Meeting* in 1701 (10.9mo.), taking a proposal for a publication in Welsh. He had made a translation of a collection of Epistles, in English, by the Welsh Friend Walter Jenkins<sup>92</sup> and in properly - organised fashion took to London both the English text and his translation. The matter was still being considered the following week. Thereafter it disappeared from the record.

Writings by two women writers from Wales were submitted within the space of a few months and they fared especially badly. Firstly there was Barbara Bevan. Her writings ("a book and two papers") appeared on the scene on 17.4.1706. Six weeks later some of this was read. It was "marked many places". Then after a further five months John Whiting, a Friend from South Wales who was acting as agent in the Barbara Bevan affair, turned up and had to be told in person why her papers had been "laid by" (39.10.1706). The reason for the delay (12.6.1706) was that Barbara Bevan was dead<sup>93</sup> and her writings needed "so much correction" that, given that preparing the work of a deceased writer was difficult, the *Meeting* found it "not convenient to print".

Who was Barbara Bevan?<sup>94</sup> She was the daughter of a family which had emigrated to Pennsylvania, leaving the estate of Tref-y-rhug near Llantrisant in Glamorganshire. Some of the family returned there two decades later, to support diminished Quakerism in Wales. By that time Barbara was fully-fledged as a ministering Friend and she continued to use her gifts, travelling more than 600 miles in the months between her return to Wales and her death.<sup>95</sup>

In the Minutes there is a gap of more than four years before Barbara Bevan is mentioned again (10.11.1710). John Whiting re-appears bringing a paper from the Quarterly Meeting held at Tref-y-Rhug itself. Friends in Wales were recommending that Barbara Bevan’s papers should be printed. The Minute suggests a state of confusion about the “papers which were formerly before this meeting and laid by” and it records that the relevant earlier Minutes referring to Barbara Bevan should be salvaged and delivered to the Quarterly Meeting at Tref y Rhug, “it not appearing to us that they have yet had the said minutes”.

There is no record to this effect but it is possible that Barbara Bevan’s work had been *re*-submitted at some point during the four years - perhaps after some editing on the part of Friends in Wales. Either the Quarterly Meeting had not subsequently received the news that it was not for the printer after all, or perhaps this was a case of Friends in Wales being unwilling to take “No” as an answer, and of the *Morning Meeting* being fazed by that fact. There were no printed writings of Barbara Bevan.

This is a loss, for there are very few sources for Quakerism in South Wales in this period and a publication which might have provided us with comparative material on ministry (and female ministry) in Wales and in Meetings overseas would be welcome.

A few months later, in 1707<sup>96</sup> some writing was brought to London from a woman called Prudence Davies. After six weeks the Minutes noted that “some papers” of hers were committed to Richard Claridge to look over.<sup>97</sup> No fewer than *fourteen years* after this in time (19.5.1721) Richard Claridge re-emerged in the Minutes with a manuscript of Prudence Davies. A mere fortnight later they read to the bottom of the fourth leaf and then decided to proceed only when Richard Claridge was present. It may be that the Minutes have failed to note on-going correspondence and further meetings but it is not surprising to read that eight months later, in 1722 (21.3<sup>rd</sup> month) “Prudence Davies of Wales” was requesting that her manuscript should be returned.<sup>98</sup> Nothing was ever published by Prudence Davies. Yet if she was who I think she was, she had a story to tell.

She was almost certainly that Prudence Davies who was the daughter of the vicar of Meifod. He had been bitterly opposed to the Friends and published against them.<sup>99</sup> Some of the best-documented Welsh Quakers had had dealings with vicar Randl Davies, Prudence’s father, who had disowned her. She had been promised an inheritance in her father’s will and a “pied heifer” but only if she stopped attending the Meetings of Friends. Instead she married a Quaker blacksmith. A published work from her may well have

provided us with something unique, *viz.*, . a picture of the other side of the coin from the Welsh anti-Quaker one we know about, and provided by a Welsh *woman* Friend.

These two instances are unusual in terms of the Minutes of the *Morning Meeting*. Certainly individuals and works do sometimes disappear from the record after a reference or two<sup>100</sup> and the works tend to belong to women.<sup>101</sup> But these are instances of an unusually, inordinately, long period for inaction, protracted consideration and confusion, followed by non-publication, and they concern *Welsh* women. What might have been the cause of this?

It seems to me that the *Morning Meeting* was ill-equipped to deal with writings which derived from authors whose first language was Welsh. Consequently their written English was probably not of the highest standard.<sup>102</sup> The fact that the authors were *women* would also have made it likely that they had not received an education rich in "grammar", so that some correction would have been necessary in any case. In addition, however, the peculiarities of the Welsh speaker's syntax and spelling, when speaking or writing English - peculiarities reflected in the seventeenth century publications lampooning the Welsh - may have been a hurdle too far for the editorial committee.

In the case of Elisha Biddles' translation *into* Welsh, we do not know whether feelings about the quality of the original English publication (published before the scrutiny of the *Morning Meeting* became the norm), impotence when faced with material in Welsh which it could not readily judge, or simple incompetence, led to another failure by the *Morning Meeting* to grasp the nettle of providing material by the Welsh for the Welsh, for the furtherance of Quakerism in Wales.<sup>103</sup>

An additional factor in the dearth of Welsh Quakers publishing for the Welsh was probably that of lack of patronage. Prudence Davies and Barbara Bevan were women who were not of the families of the great and the good in Quakerism, nor were they women who had enjoyed the friendship of individuals in the *Morning Meetings*. Certainly some *male* writers also fell foul of the *Morning Meeting* because they were striving to express themselves beyond their capacity<sup>104</sup> and women Friends might fail for reasons not to do with English grammar,<sup>105</sup> but patrons were helpful. They might smooth one's entry to the circle of "the wheel within the wheel", to the parts of which were invisible, known to few and not "chargeable by name", as one opponent of the *Morning Meeting* had described it.<sup>106</sup>

One telling example of a Welsh writer whose work *did* achieve publication suggests that patronage might have been at work. This



man's writing was treated with greater circumspection, perhaps because he was a man and also a person with friends of significance amongst the Friends. He was Dr Thomas Wynne of Caerwys, surgeon and apothecary, emigrant, soon-to-be physician to William Penn and the Speaker of Philadelphia's first provincial Assembly. Thomas Wynne's work *An Antichristian Conspiracy* was submitted to the Morning Meeting in 1679. His *Antiquity of the Quakers* had been passed for printing two years earlier (23.5.1677) but this 1679 writing, *An Antichristian Conspiracy*, was judged "difficult to read".

On first sitting, the readers managed only 12 pages:

by reason of that it is not right English and that the opposers words and the reply are not distinctly set down with breaches between

(24.1mo.). "Cymraeg oedd ei famiaith" ("Welsh was his mother tongue") wrote Geraint H. Jenkins in his Welsh language study of Thomas Wynne.<sup>107</sup> Yet Wynne's work was not consigned to the drawer or to the fate of being "laid by". Instead two Friends were set first to try to correct the manuscript and, in the event of difficulty, Friends in Wales were to be called on to amend it, so as to have it better composed "and made shorter". *An Anti-Christian Conspiracy* was published.<sup>108</sup> The work of the women was not and we may not be sure of the reasons.

In the case of each of the writers so far referred to, however, there is evidence that they would have spoken Welsh as well as English. Was unwillingness to publish their writings to do with unwillingness to invest time in dealing with inadequacies of language (except in the case of Dr Thomas Wynne who also wrote "not right English")? Or were there other reasons?

Determined "prophet" types were now being left behind, as we have seen.<sup>109</sup> So was an over-enthusiastic form of Quakerism the cause of the Welsh women's writings being rejected? The fact is that we have no record of what Prudence Davies or Barbara Bevan wrote, so we cannot know whether radicalism, or what was now judged intemperate prophetic language, would have been factors which weighed against their writings or whether their writing betrayed too much the influence of their mother tongue.

This brings me to my final case of a woman from Wales and one who, so far as I can discern, was not Welsh-speaking. This was Lydia Fell, related by marriage to the Fells of Swarthmore Hall and hence by marriage also to George Fox, the husband of Margaret Fell. Lydia Fell was formerly of Cardiff but later of Rhyd y Grug (now known as

Quakers' Yard), in the parish of Merthyr Tudful. The *Morning Meeting* record offers no clue that Lydia Fell was from Wales and it was only through knowing her history already that I was able to add her to the list of Welsh females who had had dealings with the *Morning Meeting*.

Lydia had married into the Fell family but she was the daughter of William Erbery, a turbulent priest and the father of the Seekers in South Wales.<sup>110</sup> Her sister was called Dorcas and Dorcas Erbery is a name familiar to anyone who knows about the happenings around James Nayler in 1656 and the parliamentary case which followed. It was Dorcas Erbery's evidence about Nayler which helped to seal his fate, though that had not been her intention.<sup>111</sup>

Lydia Erbery, now Fell, had lived and ministered in the West Indies with her husband Henry.<sup>112</sup> In the 1670s she had published *A Testimony and Warning*, addressed to the people of Barbados and around 1674 she had returned home. As a widow she settled in the region of what is now Quakers' Yard, c. 18 miles north of Cardiff. There she was buried in 1699. Four years prior to her death, in 1695, she had contact with the *Morning Meeting*.

The Minute of 17.3.1695 noted cryptically that it desired "some women Friends" to speak with Lydia Fell.<sup>113</sup> We do not know *why* the women Friends were required to talk with her but it may be significant that they were. It may signify care in dealings with the name of Fell (she seems to have been in London at the time, so a meeting would have been convenient). It may signify that she was one of those *uncompliant* women who from time to time needed to be "spoken to".<sup>114</sup> There is no reference to any proposed writing in this Minute but three months later (19.6.1695), the *Morning Meeting* was considering a paper written by Lydia Fell. Again cryptically we hear that some Friends were being appointed to "acquaint" her with the outcome.

I know of only the one published item by Lydia Fell, so I must assume that the result was that her paper was either not intended for publication or was refused permission to go to print. Possibly she had at first been invited to produce a document or alternatively she may have been spoken with because Friends knew of something in the offing from Lydia Fell which they wished to pre-empt.<sup>115</sup> The problem was probably not the standard of her written English. Was she likely to have been a radical prophet and so to have fallen foul of the Meeting's views on what might be said and done in 1695?

Lydia Fell's only published work shows that in time past she was the sort of woman Friend who interrupted priests in their own "steeple houses", attracted attention and was pulled through the

streets and imprisoned.<sup>116</sup> Yet given the silence about Lydia in the intervening years and the fact that, in 1695, she would not have been a young woman, an upsurge of prophetic zeal, committed to the page, does not seem the most likely explanation.

#### THE *JOURNAL* OF RICHARD DAVIES

Fortunately for historians of Quakerism in Wales one particular item from a *Welsh Friend* did survive the scrutiny of the London Meeting. That was the autobiographical work of Richard Davies of Cloddiau Cochion near Welshpool. This was the man who had observed sadly by letter that there were likely to be few Quakers left in Wales.

Richard Davies was known to a number of leading London Friends and to the *Morning Meeting*.<sup>117</sup> He is first recorded in the Minutes in 1693 (19.12<sup>th</sup> month), when a paper of his was declared “not meet to be printed” and then at other times. Some time after his death in 1708, however, a Friend from Wales appeared in London bearing “a large treatise in folio” belonging to Richard Davies. Then three months later there was delivered “a manuscript concerning Richard Davies” (20.4.1708). This was read in small amounts at intervals over the following seven months. Among the various documents was his *Journal* (9.11.1709).

Little material was published but fortunately the *Journal* was and it went into six English editions before being translated into Welsh long after his death.<sup>118</sup> Without it, the historian of seventeenth century Welsh Quakerism would be in the dark about many things.

#### AFTERWORD

What may be said? For whatever reason, there was an ongoing failure on the part of the *Morning Meeting* to grasp the implications of the fact that Wales was not a monoglot country and that the printed testimonies and the apologetics of *Welsh* Friends, some at least in Welsh, were needed for Quakerism to be spread. This failure was not mitigated by the very rare appearance of a writing in *Welsh*, such as W. Chandler, A. Pyott and I. Hodges. *Amddiffyniant Byrr Tros y Bobl (mewn Gwawd) a Elwir Qwakers* of 1704.<sup>119</sup>

Geraint H. Jenkins has noted Wales fared badly with the *Morning Meeting*.<sup>120</sup> I do not think this was due to the spectres of Shinkin and Shone, or to the fact that, as William Erbery had once put it, the Welsh, poor and oppressed, were also “despised”. Nevertheless it was not conducive to the survival and progress of Quakerism in Wales. The *Morning Meeting* had an agenda which was both clear and



of necessity changing as circumstances changed. David J. Hall observes rightly that

There was more vehemence in the business of religious literature than the restrained formality of the Morning Meeting's minutes usually indicates.<sup>121</sup>

It is clear, however, that there is much the Minutes do not tell us. Regional Quaker records need to be examined (as David J. Hall has written), so as to determine the relation of Meetings elsewhere to the London *Morning Meeting* and to the fate of would-be-printed works from the regions. Was Wales indeed a place which fared *particularly* badly in terms of the *Morning Meeting's* response to its needs and in its success-rate in seeing its protégées in print?

As for women Friends, Welsh and otherwise, how many were there who, whether kicking against restraint or declaring against the unrestrained and ill-disciplined, had hoped to do so *in print* or *in person* but saw that hope fade? Such things remain to be researched<sup>122</sup> and the study of regional Quaker records may help in that respect. Is there even, perhaps, among some archive collections or in the attic of a descendant many generations on, documents unprinted, which represent a Quaker byway or a view from the back-benches which never survived the scrutiny of the Friends in *Second Day's Morning Meeting*?

Christine Trevett  
*Presidential Address to The Friends Historical Society  
 given during Yearly Meeting,  
 Exeter, August 2<sup>nd</sup> 2001*

## NOTES AND REFERENCES

- 1 Quaker history is my hobby and not my primary field of study.
- 2 H. Larry Ingle, "The future of Quaker History", *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 58/1 (1997), 1-16. This was his Presidential Address to the Friends' Historical Society.
- 3 One of the gaps in Quaker history writing is the absence of a comprehensive and modern overview of Quakerism in Wales
- 4 Its functions passed to *Meeting for Sufferings*
- 5 As introduction to the pattern of change see the discussion in "Introduction and Scene-Setting", and "Holy Tremblers: Quaker Prophet-Preachers" in Trevett, *Quaker Women Prophets in England and Wales, 1650-1700* (Mellen: Lampeter, 2000), 1-22, 23-61 and the literature there, and W.C. Braithwaite *The Second Period of Quakerism*, (York: Sessions, 1979).

- 6 E.G. Rosemary Moore, in her book *The Light in Their Consciences: the Early Quakers in Britain 1646-1666*, (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000, xi) notes that the words "light" and "conscience" meant different things to the charismatic Quaker of the 1650s and the sober dissenter Friend of the later seventeenth century.
- 7 As early as the second half of the 1650s there had been clear signs that "charismatic Quakerism was rapidly changing into the Religious Society of Friends": Rosemary Moore, *The Faith of the First Quakers*, PhD thesis, University of Birmingham 1993, Synopsis and 208, published as *The Light in their Consciences*, see xi, and 167 in her chapter "The Defeat of the Radicals".
- 8 This change began early. Rosemary Moore tells of the "shifting center" and of London as the "nerve center" of Quakerism in the late 1650s: *Light in Their Consciences*, 140.
- 9 See Caroline L. Leachman, *From an unruly sect" to a society of "strict unity": the development of Quakerism in England c. 1650-1689*, PhD thesis, University College, London 1997. By 1689 (she indicates in the *Abstract* of the thesis) Quakers had ceased "testifying by signs ... and were no longer seen as social radicals".
- 10 H. Larry Ingle, *First Among Friends; George Fox and the Creation of Quakerism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 285.
- 11 In 1675 the Cambridge Platonist Henry More had described George Whitehead as follows: "A man with an aspect smug and plump, *and more expert*, but the air of his countenance was more hard and opaque". Henry More was a man for whom questioning and debate were second nature. "I meant him no ill", he reported, saying that having asked Whitehead a question concerning Christ he was told "(which I must confess I marvelled at), that he came not thither to be catech-ised". See M.H. Nicolson (ed), *The Conway Letters* (rev. edn. Sarah Hutton ed.), (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), which contains many references to Quakers. More disliked George Fox also, cf. Braithwaite, *Second Period*, 687-8. Lady Conway became a Quaker.
- 12 *The Quakers Art of Courtship*, n.p. 1689, 27-9.
- 13 It dealt with matters of policy, finance and discipline as well as being the Friends' forum for final appeal. Among those who served in the *Six Weeks Meeting* were Anne (Downer) Whitehead and her husband George, Mary Elson and Rebeckah Travers. It was such leading women Friends who were called on from time to time by the *Morning Meeting*, to "speak" with women Friends about its deliberations. See W. Beck and T.F. Ball, *The London Friends Meetings: Showing the Rise of The Society of Friends in London*, (London: F. Bowyer Kitto, 1869), 91-133, especially 93.
- 14 At the front of the first volume of Minutes (Library of Friends House, London) is a list of the initial members of the *Six Weeks' Meeting*. The names of the 35 women are headed by Rebeckah Travers and Anne Whitehead. A Minute of 3.4.1696 indicates that membership was for those who have "known the affairs of the Church... have stood sufferings and such as are impartial ... none but sensible men and women in the fear of God ... as it was in the beginning". Winifrid M. White notes that women, though active in the Meeting at first, subsequently came to devote their energies to Women's Meetings. "It was not until the twentieth century that women were again appointed to Six Weeks Meeting": *Six Weeks Meeting 1671-1971*, (London: Six Weeks Meeting Religious Society of Friends, 1971), 78.

- 15 Trevett, "Introduction and Scene Setting", 12.
- 16 On Women's Meetings see Trevett, *Women and Quakerism in the Seventeenth Century*, York: Sessions 1991, chp. 3 and Phyllis Mack, *Visionary Women Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England*, (California, 1992), 265-304.
- 17 For example, the proposed Address of Judith Boulby "To the Magistrates" was inappropriate "in this time of peace and quietness" (18.4.1690). "To avoid provocations", proposed Addresses to magistrates should be received in manuscript form *prior* to having been printed (27.7.1684). Papers relating to Friends' indiscretions ("disorderly and scandalous conversations") only gave scandalous facts to "the world" and scope for actions of defamation against Friends (2.2.1683). See also David J. Hall, "'The fiery Tryal of their Infallible Examination': self-control in the regulation of Quaker publishing in England from the 1670s to the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century" in R. Myers, M. Harris eds.), *Censorship and the control of Print in England and France 1600-1910*, (Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1992), 59-86, especially 73, 75. I am grateful to David Hall for drawing my attention to this study.
- 18 Minute of 12.6.1689 records the need to keep "public Friends" in London on Sundays, or at least the *Morning Meeting* should know where they were.
- 19 It was, he wrote, the committee of Quakerism "which gradually came to set the agenda for the movement". Its influence was "not artificial or forced but represented a natural evolution": H. Larry Ingle, *First Among Friends*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1994), 126, 203. Rosemary Moore described the *Morning Meeting* as "powerful" (*The Light in Their Consciences: the Early Quakers in Britain, 1646-1666*, (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), 227. For Braithwaite it was "a body of the first importance" (*Second Period*), 281.
- 20 *First Among Friends*, 203. On the Morning Meeting's (1695) response to theological attacks see Braithwaite, *Second Period*, 495-6. Those wishing to minister overseas and Friends visiting from foreign parts came under its jurisdiction and care.
- 21 "Where Satan dwells": Francis Bugg, *The Pilgrim's Progress from Quakerism to Christianity*, (London, 1698), 72; for "dead prophets" see, Charles Leslie, *The Snake in the Grass*, (London: for Charles Brome, 1696), cclxx. See too Hall, "'The Fiery Tryall...'", who includes 18<sup>th</sup> century material. Post-1680, Bugg published over 60 items against Quakers, containing an abundance of accusations.
- 22 I have not seen the 1983 Master's thesis by Jeffrey E. Crosby, "*Friends See It Not Safe To Print*": the Historical Development of Censorship Among the Quakers in the Seventeenth Century, Brigham Young University.
- 23 See too Luella M Wright, *The Literary Life of the Early Friends 1650-1725* (New York: Columbia University Press 1932), chp, 8.
- 24 The task of helping to procure the anti-Quaker books fell to George Whitehead and to William Penn, the former an important controversialist for Friends. See T.P. O'Malley, "The Press and Quakerism 1653-1659". *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 54/4 (1979), 169-84 and "Defying the Powers"; David J. Hall, "'The fiery Tryal'".
- 25 In 1672 the Yearly Meeting had set up a committee of ten Friends to oversee the correction of books, to make agreement for the printing of new ones and new editions of others. That committee existed for seven years but *The Morning Meeting* quickly took over its role and significant revisions were later



- made in some earlier writings by Friends. One of George Fox's works fell foul of the *Morning Meeting* in its early years, which prompted his observation that he had not been “moved to set up that meeting to make orders against the reading of papers; but to gather up bad books that was scandalous against Friends; and see that young Friends books that was sent to be printed might be stood by... and not for them ... to stop things to the nation which I was moved by the Lord to give forth to them”. See T.P. O'Malley, “Defying the Powers and Tempering the Spirit: A Review of Quaker Control over their Publications 1672-1689”, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33 (1982), 72-88, especially 75-6. The matter is covered also in Braithwaite, *Second Period*, 280; Norman Penney, “George Fox's writings and the Morning Meeting”, *Friends Quarterly Examiner* 36 (1902), 63-72.
- 26 The word *imprimatur* occurs in writings negative towards the Meeting. Hall (p.79) notes an eighteenth century writer who likened the Meeting's role to the of the Roman Catholics' *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*.
- 27 J. W. Frost (ed.), *The Records and Recollections of James Jenkins*, (Lewiston-New York: Mellen, 1984), 298.
- 28 E.g William Rogers's book *The Christian Quaker distinguished from the Apostate and Innovator*, which appeared in parts from 1680 (Minute of 18.5.1681). George Whitehead countered in *the Accuser of Our Brethren*, London: for John Bringhurst 1681.
- 29 Given the mass of manuscript material to be covered, they would then find themselves delegating people to gather at someone else's house to read at other times, as on 21.4.1680.
- 30 Luella M. Wright, *Literary Life*, 104.
- 31 This entry, for 24.5.1676, concerns errors found in the printing of a book by George Fox.
- 32 Minute of 27.12 (February) 1690/1, concerning unpublished writings of Robert Barclay.
- 33 “‘Sufferings’ and the lost prophets of Wales: 1660-1700” provides background for this period in Wales (one of nine studies in *Quaker Women Prophets*. See pp. 179-210). The Yearly Meeting in London did not ignore Wales. Correspondents who reported on sufferings and those who were allocated book quotas included Richard Davies and John Biddles.
- 34 See the discussion in “Introduction and Scene-Setting”, and “Holy Tremblers” and also *Women and Quakerism in the Seventeenth Century*, (Sessions: York 1991) Cf. too H. Larry Ingle, “A Woman on Women's Roles: Mary Penington to her Friends, 1678”, *Signs* (1991). 587-96.
- 35 There is now an extensive literature on women Friends' writings. See for example M. Garman, J. Applegate *et al.*, *Hidden in Plain Sight: Quaker Women's Writings 1650-1700*, (Wallingford PA, Pendle Hill publications, 1996); Hilary Hinds, *God's Englishwomen: seventeenth century radical sectarian writing and feminist criticism*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990.)
- 36 Elaine Hobby, *Virtue of Necessity: English Women's Writings 1649-1668*, (London: Virago, 1988); R. Foxtton, “*Hear the Word of the Lord*”: a Critical and Bibliographical Study of Quaker Women's Writing 1650-1700, (Melbourne: Bibliographical Society of Australia and New Zealand, 1994); H. Wilcox (ed.), *Women and Literature in Britain 1500-1700*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1996); H.E. Smith and S. Cardinale (eds.), *Women and Literature of the*

- Seventeenth Century: an Annotated Bibliography based on Wing's Short Title Catalogue*, (London: Greenwood, 1990); M. Bell, G. Parfitt, S. Shepherd (eds.), *A Biographical Dictionary of English Women Writers, 1580-1720*, (Boston: G.K. Hall and Co., 1990). Appendix 3 "Quaker Women Writers", 257-63; Mary Prior, *Women in English Society 1500-1800*, (London: Methuen 1985), 242-44.
- 37 Hall ("The fiery Tryal", 59, citing W.G. Mason) lists an average 117 p.a. Quaker publications in the 1660s (= 13% of national total given by Wing), 65 p.a. (= 7%) in the 1670s and an annual average of six Quaker publications by the 1700s. He comments that among other factors "the reduction in the 1670s resulted partly from the activities of the Morning Meeting"
- 38 On seventeenth century women see Antonia Fraser, *The Weaker Vessel: Woman's Lot in Seventeenth Century England*, (London Methuen, 1984); S. Mendelson and P. Crawford (eds.) *Women in Early Modern England 1550-1720*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998); N.H. Keeble (ed.) *The Cultural Identity of Seventeenth Century Woman: a Reader*, (London: Routledge, 1994); Anne Laurence, *Women in England 1500-1760: a Social History*, (London: Phoenix, 1994.)
- 39 Stevie Davies, in *Unbridled Spirits: Women of the English Revolution 1640-1660* (London: The Women's Press, 1998), gives a spirited, novelistic account of pre-Restoration women Friends, describing the publicly-active women of this period as "a story teller's dream" (pp. 8-9).
- 40 On some joint Meetings of men and women and the debate about separate Meetings for the business of Quakerism see Braithwaite, *Second Period*, 274-6.
- 41 The *Morning Meeting* Minute of 16.3.1681 had instructed "public" Friends to leave their names with Ellis Hookes, so that the *Morning Meeting* might ensure a good distribution of such Friends for Meetings in and around London. By the end of the 1690s, however, "public" women Friends, or those women who thought they should be "public", were evidently feeling marginalised in this process.
- 42 Minute of 24.3.1697.
- 43 Braithwaite, *Second Period*, 287.
- 44 See Mack, *Visionary Women*, 366 and Braithwaite, *Second Period*, 287.
- 45 Cf. Mack's quotation of George Fox's letter of 1687, to Elizabeth Hearbey (*Visionary Women*, 300-1): "thou was a little too long in thy testimony" when last in London, he wrote, "when so many ancient friends were gathered ... it is good at such times to be swift to hear and slow to speak".
- 46 Evidently these cities acted as magnets for some younger Friends, so that women had to be advised that ministry nearer home might be more fitting See Yearly Meeting proceedings, letter to be read in Meetings, from Box Meeting MSS fol, 15, cited in Mack *Visionary Women*, 367.
- 47 Injunctions in Paul's first letter to Corinth and 1 Timothy lay at the heart of the matter. In many a *Household Conduct Book* and sermon women were reminded of "the apostle" and his teaching about not usurping authority or seeking a public place.
- 48 This is discussed in Trevett, "Holy Tremblers", in "Like Apostles and Prophets" (comparing early Christianity) and in *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy*, (Cambridge University Press, 1996). See also Mack, *Visionary Women*.

- 49 On the fringes of the eighteenth century, reason rather than prophesying, was holding sway in Quaker circles. See Trevett, “Holy Tremblers” and the discussion and literature there. The epilogue to Mack’s *Visionary Women* (pp. 403-6) cites the cases of Jane Fearon and James Dickinson (cf.n. 100). Dickinson’s prophetic insight had allegedly saved them both from the clutches of would-be murderers, probably in the 1680s. Unusually he was still a prophet Quaker, declaring Woe in London as late as 1694. His account of this (*A Message and Warning I Delivered in the Streets of London ...*) was not passed by the *Morning Meeting* (which had also sidelined a potential publication by him in 1687.) He is defensive in his later *Journal* (1745, 69-70), maintaining that he had told no one of his intention to prophesy in London because God had forbidden him to tell. Jane Fearon moved from being “in the light” to being enlightened (in tune with the Age of Enlightenment). Her publication was *Universal Redemption Offered in Jesus Christ in Opposition to That Pernicious and Destructive Doctrine of Election and Reprobation of Persons from Everlasting* n.p. 1698.
- 50 Edmundson’s *Epistle Containing Wholesome Advice and Counsel* dated from 1702. See too Trevett, “Anne Camm and the Vanishing Quaker Prophets” in *Quaker Women Prophets*. Beck and Ball [eds.], *The London Friends’ Meetings*, record that a few years later (1706) Mary Elson was complaining in the London Peel Monthly Meeting that women Friends had no place allocated from which to stand and speak. They were provided with one so placed that they faced and addressed *women* Friends (192-4).
- 51 Francis Bugg, *Pilgrim’s Progress* (1698), 73-4.
- 52 At first sight there seems to be some irony in the fact that the very Meeting which was aiding the demise of prophesying and “the repression of Friends’ visionary writings” (Mack, 370), was sometimes holding its deliberations in the house of Rebeckah Travers, “convinced” by James Nayler and a woman who once opined that the testimony being written to another women Friend was deficient, due to there being “not much prophecy” in it. But Rebeckah Travers, too, had come to terms with change. It was valid to testify to life well-lived and to dying in peace, for “prophecy has and must cease, and tongues fail, but the peace that is given us in Jesus Christ is everlasting”. See “R.T’s testimony” in Alice Curwen, *A Relation of the Labour, Travail and Suffering...* published in 1680. Papers of Thomas and Alice Curwen (died 1679) were referred to the *Morning Meeting* in Minute of 26.11.1679 (i.e. January 1679/80).
- 53 Various spelt as Boulbie, Bowlbie, Bulbye, Bowlby, Boulbye.
- 54 Writers such as Elizabeth Bathurst and Anne Docwra, Elizabeth Redford and Abigail Fisher deserve consideration too, but can not receive it here.
- 55 This was probably *A Few Words to the Rulers of the Nation*, printed in London in 1673. See W. Pearson Thistlethwaite, *Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting 1665-1966*, (Harrogate: privately published, 1979), Library of Friends House, London, 279-80. 292.
- 56 This is the printed title as it appears in Wing’s Short Title Catalogue. The Minutes often preserve abbreviated or “working” titles, or none at all. In the 1660s she had published *A Testimony for Truth Against All Hireling Priests* (London 1665) and *To All Justices of Peace, or Other Magistrates* (London 1667).
- 57 26.5.1703 see also the preceding week and 2.6.1703. Cf. Mack, *Visionary Women*, 388-9.



- 58 J.Cheryl Exum, "'Mother in Israel': a familiar figure reconsidered", in Letty M. Russell (ed.), *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press 1985), 73-85; Mack, *Visionary Women*, 215-235; Elaine Hobby, "Handmaids of the Lord and Mothers in Israel: Early Vindications of Quaker Women's' Prophecy", *Prose Studies* 17 (1995), 88-98.
- 59 Prophet-type witness and apocalyptic turns-of-phrase had been Joan's legacy to her offspring. Rebeckah Travers had prayed at the bedside of Susanna who declared "Come all ye holy prophets, who were Quakers and tremblers at the word of the Lord; come Moses, come Jeremiah ... I am one with thee, now my belly trembles, my lips quiver ... because of the Lord". See *The Work of God in a Dying Maid*, (London, 1677), 26; Mack, *Visionary Women*, 386-7, 393-4.
- 60 *Faithful Warnings, Expostulations and Exhortations* (London, to be sold by E. Whitlock), 1697 and before that various *Addresses* to the monarchs between 1689-92, followed by *The Widow Whitrow's Humble Thanksgiving* (London, by D. Edwards), in 1694.
- 61 "Whitrow had apparently defected", wrote Mack; *Visionary Women*, 386.
- 62 *An Epistle of Margaret Everard to the People Called Quakers and the Ministry Among Them*, (London: for Brabazion Aylmer, 1699).
- 63 Cf. Frances Denson (Danson) of Virginia who was instructed to be "still and quiet" and her paper *To the King* was not to be delivered (8.6.1681). She was forbidden to preach and a letter to George Fox spoke of her dismay and bewilderment: "I knew not wherein I had done wrong ... fearing to sin against god by condemning that which god had not condemned: and fearing to give offence to friends" (n.d. Barclay MSS, in *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 50/3 [1953], 173 and in Mack, *Visionary Women*, 191-2). Mack does not mention the Minute of 8.6.1681.
- 64 Mack, *op.cit.*, 386-7.
- 65 In the early eighteenth century "Other women felt entitled to greater freedom of movement and expression than the movement could or would tolerate... nine defected and joined the Camisards, five of them as prophets": Mack, *Visionary Women*, 388. Thirteen male Friends joined the Camisards too.
- 66 "Women and the Coming of Quakerism to Wales, 1653-1660" and Sufferings' and the lost prophets" in Trevett, *Quaker Women Prophets* and the literature there.
- 67 *Qwakers* occurs also, as witness W. Chandler, A Pyott, I Hodges *et al.*, *Amddiffyniad Byrr Tros y Bobl (mewn Gwawd) a Elwir Qwakers*, n.p. 1704.
- 68 G.F. Nuttall, "A Parcel of Books for Morgan Llwyd", *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 56/3 (1992), 180-188. In 1654 Morgan Llwyd was sent writings which were hot from the press. They included works by the leading Friends Isaac Penington, George Fox, William Dewsbury and Richard Hubberthorne. Llwyd died in 1659, aged forty. Nuttall remarks (p. 180) that "in the history of Quakerism in Wales he stands like a Moses who did not enter the promised land".
- 69 John ap John had been part of Morgan Llwyd's Wreccsam congregation; William Erbery's family became Quaker after his death. See Trevett, *Quaker Women Prophets*, the chapters "Women and the coming of Quakerism to Wales...", "The women around James Nayler..." and "William Erbery and his Daughter Dorcas: Dissenter and Resurrected Radical" (this last also in *Journal of Welsh Religious History* 4 [1996], 23-50).

- 70 The majority of emigrants originated in Merionethshire, though all parts of Wales were touched by emigration.
- 71 William Penn advertised his Welsh ancestry. On the phrase "holy experiment" and much more, see the Presidential Address to the Friends Historical Society by J. William Frost, "Wear the Sword as Long as Thou Canst'. William Penn in Myth and History", *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 58/2 (1998), 91-113.
- 72 Richard Davies's important autobiographical account is a rich source of information on Welsh Quakerism: *An Account of the Convincement, Exercises, Services... of Richard Davies*, (London, 1710). This was translated into Welsh after its sixth English edition, as *Hanes Argyhoeddiad, Trafferthion, Gwasanaeth a Theithiau...Richard Davies*, (London: H. Hughes 1840).
- 73 In 1778 after the Yearly Meeting for Wales held in Llandeilo (almost a century after the first emigrations) Catherine Payton Phillips of Dudley, a widely-travelled Quaker minister who was married to a Welshman, felt herself "dipped into sympathy with the few Friends scattered about Wales". See E. Whiting "The Yearly Meeting for Wales, 1682-1797", *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 47 (1955), 65; Trevett, "Introduction and Scene-Setting" and "Sufferings" especially 197-8; also Rebecca Larson, *Daughters of Light: Quaker Women Preaching and Prophesying in the Colonies and Abroad 1700-1775*, (New York: E.E. Knopf, 1999), 50-54 and *Memoirs ...of Catherine Phillips*, London 1797.
- 74 See W.C. Braithwaite, *The Second Period of Quakerism*, 408 n. 3.
- 75 The Yearly Meetings in Wales of 1698 and 1699 deplored "disorderly ... runnings" into Pennsylvania. See Trevett, "Sufferings", 193-5; Braithwaite, *Second Period*, 408-9.
- 76 Thomas Ellis, Welshman and emigrant, had been "convinced" in 1662 and had originally been apart of the congregation of the remarkable Puritan preacher Vavasor Powell. He observed in a letter to George Fox in 1685 that he wished "those that have estates of their own to leave fullness to their posterity, may not be offended at the Lord's opening a door of mercy to thousands in England, especially in Wales ... who had no estates either for themselves or children". Thomas Ellis to George Fox, on 13<sup>th</sup> of 6<sup>th</sup> month, 1685, Devonshire House A.R.B. Coll. 108; Braithwaite, *Second Period*, 408.
- 77 Ministering English Friends tried to support depleted post-1685 Welsh Quakerism, as their travels and attendance at Yearly Meetings in Wales show. See on the eighteenth century Trevett, "Suffering" and for late seventeenth century examples the two *Journal of the Life, Travels etc.* of James Dickinson and Thomas Wilson (London: J. Sowle, 1730). See too "Religion Outside the Establishment" in William Gibson (ed.), *Religion and Society in England and Wales 1689-1800*, (London: Leicester University Press, 1998), 93-136.
- 78 See for example Richard Allen, "A Pilgrim's Progress. A Welsh Quaker's Spiritual Journey. Four Papers Written by Thomas Lewis of Shirenewton, Gwent. C. 1741-2", *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 58/2 (1998), 136-162.
- 79 Not Richard Davies or John ap John but among those who *did* emigrate was Dr Thomas Wynne, author of *The Antiquity of Quakers*, 1677 and *An Anti-Christian Conspiracy Detected*, 1679, who will figure later in this study. Together with John ap John he had purchased 5000 acres from William Penn. See

- Geraint H. Jenkins, *Thomas Wynne (1627-1692): Crynwr, Heddychwyr a Chyfaill William Penn*, (Llandysul: Gomer 1992) Welsh Committee of the Society of Friends in Wales).
- 80 E.g. *The Welch Doctor: or the Welch Man Turn'd Physician Being a New Way to Cure all diseases in these times ...* by Shinkin ap Morgan (pseudonym), first published (1642) and thereafter in several editions; *The Welch-mans Complements; or the true manner of how Shinkin wooed his sweet-heart Maudlin... a satire*, London 1643; Shone up (*sic*) Owen (pseudonym), *The True Copy of a Welch Sermon [on 2 Esdras vii. 15,16] preached before prince Maurice in Wales... a satire*, (London 1643) and 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. (1646); Shon ap Morgan (pseudonym), *The Welch-man's Warning Piece*, (London 1642); *The Honest Welch-Cobler* ("printed by A. Shinkin, printer to S. Taffie and are to be sold at the signe of the Goat on the Welch Mountain, London, 1647), by Shinkin ap Shone, ap Griffith, ap Gerard etc. etc. All Shentlemen in Wales"); Shinkin ap Shone *her Prognostication*, n.p. 1654 ("Printed for the Author and are to be sold at his shop at the sign of the ... Cows Bobby behind the Welch Mountain..."); *Shinkin's Misfortune*, (London: for J. Deacon, c. 1688-90). References to leeks, cheese (sometimes together and the latter often toasted), lice and dirt recur in writings like these. So too does the epithet "Taffie", as in "poor Taffie" ... was bread [*sic*] and born a thief" (both of these from Humphrey Crouch, *The Welch Traveller: or the Unfortunate Welshman*) or "The first day of March is St Taffie's day" (from *Shinkin ap Shone her Prognostication*, p. A2). The Peculiarities of English pronunciation among the Welsh (protical, cood Welch shees [this in M. Shinkin, *The Honest Welch-Cobler*, p. 3]), and of speech ("her" instead of *his*) and of Welsh language spelling occur a lot. This last is satirised in *The Welch School-Master ... in the school of Llandwfwrhwyr* (spurious date of 1708, by R.P., in W.R., *Wallography: or the Britton Describ'd...London for Obadiah Blagraves, 1682, p. 88); "for w is significant of a mountain, and the more w's there is in a town's name, the more mountains about it..." Many writers refer to (a) Welsh pretensions to the status of "shentleman" and (b) Welsh love of genealogy (-back to Noah one author observed tartly, a Welsh person's status being determined not least on the basis of recitable ancestry). In short, "Their language ... is stuffed as full with Aps, as ever you saw a leg of veal with parsly" (*A Trip to North Wales*, p. 65). These kinds of observations, found also in Shakespeare's time, continued beyond the seventeenth century. Cf., for example, *The protical Son: a second Welch preachment by the parson of Langtyddre. On the return of the protical son*, (London: J. Dorrison, 1752).*
- 81 "Fag end" from *A Trip of North Wales*, (London 1742), p. 62; "testicles" from *Wallography: or the Britton describ'd...relation of a Journey in Wales (see Dean Swift's Ghost*, London: for J. Wilkinson 1753), p. 39, describing Wales also as "a wilderness... a Stony land".
- 82 *Shinkin ap Shone her Prognostication*, p. 3.
- 83 Of the smallness of creatures in Wales: "horses are no rarities, but very easily mistaken for Mastiff Dogs, unless viewed attentively ... Their beasts are all small, except their women and their lice, both of which are ... of the largest size" (*A Trip to North Wales*, p. 6) and of the Welshman "his stature is of the lowest size" (*Wallography*. p.44).
- 84 Of Fox Larry Ingle wrote: "When they reached Wales, where poverty was so



- rife that people went barelegged and barefoot and their pathetic thatched huts seemed ready to fall down, they were shocked at conditions... Fox issued an epistle describing how poor people cried out from their inability to get food, lodging and apparel" (*First Among Friends*, 155). On Cardigan and Aberystwyth see Fox, *Journal* (ed. J.L. Nickalls, London 1975), 300-301. Cf. too Trevett, "'Sufferings'", 197-9 for examples of Quakers' comments on Wales.
- 85 Geraint H. Jenkins, *Literature, Religion and Society in Wales, 1660-1730*, (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1978), 230-254.
- 86 Geraint H. Jenkins has suggested that assessing literacy levels is "one of the most urgent and difficult tasks facing Welsh historians": See "Subscribers and Book Owners" in *Literature, Religion and Society in Wales 1660-1730*, (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1978), p. 255. On literacy, literature and English women see Anne Laurence, *Women in England*, 165-180. Reading and writing were separate skills and more would have been able to read than to write.
- 87 Writing of England, Mandelson and Crawford noted that "Gentlewomen engaged in a separate literate culture to a much lesser extent than their male counterparts" (*Women in Early Modern England*, 203).
- 88 E.g. in the 1630s a publisher in Bristol had been confident of ridding himself of 600 copies of the (English language) work of William Erbery. For discussion see "William Erbery and His Daughter Dorcas", in *Quaker Women Prophets*, 121-149 and especially 125 n. 21.
- 89 This was John Songhurst's 1680 work, printed in London, *A Testimony of Love and Goodwill*.
- 90 Geraint H. Jenkins, *Literature, Religion and Society in Wales*, pp. 178-80 and 200. See too his "Quaker and Anti-Quaker Literature in Wales from the Restoration to Methodism", *The Welsh History Review* 7 (1975), 409-10.
- 91 Ellis Pugh, stonemason, had emigrated in 1686 and his writing in Welsh was finally published posthumously in 1721, directed to the "poor unlearned craftsmen, labourers and shepherds" of Wales, entitled *Annerch ir Cymru*. An English version, *A Salutation to the Britons* (Philadelphia, 1726) followed.
- 92 The son of Thomas Jenkins, rector of Llanfihangel Ystum Llawern, where the Biddles (Beadles) family also lived. Walter Jenkins had published *The Law Given Forth Out of Sion* (for Robert Wilson), in 1663, before the establishment of the *Morning Meeting*.
- 93 John and Barbara Bevan senior had emigrated in 1683 and returned in 1704. Barbara Bevan Jnr. was born in 1682, began her public ministry at 16 and died aged 23.
- 94 See to Phyllis Mack, *Visionary Women*, 385-6; "'Sufferings'", 199-201 and the literature there.
- 95 In *Daughters of Light* Rebecca Larson discusses Barbara along with scores of other women Friends who in the eighteenth century travelled as ministers between continents. The women Friends who emigrated probably found an atmosphere more open to their ministry. Carla G. Pestana reminds us that in Massachusetts there had been opposition (not least from women) to institutionalisation and change in Quakerism, *Quakers and Baptists in Colonial Massachusetts*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1991), 92-3.
- 96 6. 11<sup>th</sup>. month in vol, 3 of the Minutes.
- 97 Richard Claridge, Quaker schoolmaster, had been a Baptist before being Quaker and a clergyman before that. He was an important controversialist for

- Friends, with five published items to his name between 1689-97 and more in the eighteenth century.
- 98 Was this a revised version of the original manuscript of fifteen years previously, which had been submitted for re-consideration? Was it a different one? We do not know. The Minutes are surely not a complete record of all the Meeting was doing.
- 99 The vicar of Meifod, Randl Davies, published *Profiad yr Ysprydion/Tryall of the Spirits*, Rhydychen (Oxford H. Hall, 1675). Prudence Davies married Joseph Davies. See Trevett, "Sufferings", 191.
- 100 James Dickinson (Dickenson) represented an account of his travels in Wales (this was read 9.10.1687) which was not mentioned thereafter. Not until 1745 do we see in print *A Journal of the Life, Travels and Labour ... of That Worthy Elder ... James Dickinson* (London: Sowle Raylton and L. Hinde). This mentions visits to Wales, 18-19, 36-8, 41, 67. The woman Friend and printer Tace Sowle had produced his work *A Salutation of Love* in 1696.
- 101 I have mentioned the case of the English Friend Judith Boulby. Her paper "left in the drawer" on 6.3.1700 disappears thereafter. On 5.8.1691 Susannah Sparkes's paper was said to be due to be reported on. There is no further reference to it.
- 102 Welsh was spoken in the families of both the women.
- 103 Some Welsh Friends found other outlets for their message. For example, Evan Bevan, Friend and teacher from Pont-y-Moel in Gwent, published *Of the Evils of Cockfighting in The Gloster Journal* of April 13<sup>th</sup> 1731. Pont-y-Moel Meeting agreed to his tract to counter *Profane Swearing and Cursing...* again being put into the *Gloster Journal* in 1734. He had wanted to see it in print since 1730 (Richard Allen, "Dress and deportment of Monmouthshire Friends c. 1655-1850", *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 57/1 [1994], 52-56, here p. 55). Richard Allen notes that Montgomeryshire and Shropshire Monthly Meeting in 1701 provided for a Welsh translation of the 1682 *Testimony Against Gaming, Musick, Dancing, Singing...* by the father of John Kelsall ("A Pilgrim's Progress", 152). See too Geraint H. Jenkins "Quaker and Anti-Quaker Literature", 413.
- 104 Humphrey Woolrich's paper *Against Perriwigs* (27.3.1700) was judged not "well- distinguished" in parts. He was happy to leave it to the Meeting to deal with ("after he hath a copy of it" - a wise move given the tendency to delays and losses!). Woolrich, a Staffordshire Friend had, however, previously challenged the *Morning Meeting* and had written against George Whitehead. Wing's *Short Title Catalogue* cites just two writings by him post-1673 (after the *Morning Meeting* began its work), whereas between 1659 and 1670 he had seen 16 items into print.
- 105 Isabel Eaton's work, *A Warning Piece...* was described as "Not only large and tedious, some things often repeated" (19.1.1682/3) but the damning conclusion was that the "substance" of its good portions "might be abstracted and collected in one sheet". There are no publications by her.
- 106 The complaint is from Francis Bugg again, in *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 1698.
- 107 Geraint H. Jenkins, *Thomas Wynne*, 7.
- 108 *An Anti-Christian Conspiracy Detected...* was published in London in 1679. It may be that Thomas Wynne was not a gifted literary man, for it was not only in English that his work was in need of correction. Geraint H Jenkins described the letter in Welsh which accompanied his 1677 work *The Antiquity*

- of the Quakers as hesitant and the Welsh as “flaw-ridden”. The Welsh text is given in *Thomas Wynne*.
- 109 “Hocus pocus tricks” and “the days of immediate inspiration” were things of the past for Quakers, as one critic of Thomas Wynne admitted in print: William Jones, *Work for a Cooper, answer to ... Thomas Wynne ... the Quack*, (London: by JC for SC, 1679), 13.
- 110 William Erbery had died not long before Quakerism reached South Wales. See “William Erbery and His Daughter Dorcas”.
- 111 See “William Erbery ...” and “The Women Around James Nayler ...” in *Quaker Women Prophets* (the latter 151-178).
- 112 Henry Fell was one of the signatories to the 11<sup>th</sup> month 1660/61 statement of Quakers’ peacability, *A Declaration from the Harmless and Innocent People of God Called Quakers*. In 1661 Henry Fell had been one of two who got as far as Alexandria on the abortive journey to the legendary kingdom of Prester John, as George Fox’s *Journal* recalls (J.L. Nickalls [rev’d. ed.], *The Journal of George Fox*, London: Religious Society of Friends, 1975, 420). He had married Lydia Erbery c. 1665.
- 113 These included Mary Elson who with Ann (Downer) Whitehead had promoted the Women’s Meetings and good order and compliance among Friends. See *Women and Quakerism*, pp. 83-5; “Holy Tremblers”, 33-5. On 25.8.1680 the *Morning Meeting* had agreed to the printing of their *Epistle for True Love and Unity* (London: Andrew Sowle, 1680) which was a defence of the Women’s Meetings and an apologia for the kind of women they would contain.
- 114 Friends were similarly delegated to “speak to” George Fox when a matter arose which bore on his writing e.g. the Minute of 24.4.1676.
- 115 I remain intrigued as to what befell Dorcas Erbery, whose history I have so far traced to 1659, and to her children (see Trevett, “William Erbery”). It would have been good to have a *Journal* or similar from Lydia Fell, who was daughter of one of Wales’s determined non-conformists, sister of the infamous Dorcas, a travelled and ministering Friend and wife to a well-known member of the Fell clan, who had had financial difficulties and wavered in his Quakerism.
- 116 As early as 1679 William Jones, in *Work for a Cooper* (p. 13) wrote that for Quakers it was now “too unfashionable to run madding about the streets and sometimes into churches as formerly they did”.
- 117 On 20.3.1695 he is mentioned among those Friends who had offered to read books, epistles and papers on “seventh day forenoon” that week, on the Meeting’s behalf.
- 118 Extracts were allowed from a paper he had written on baptising, for use in the preparation of George Whitehead’s printed *Testimony* to Richard Davies. On the *Journal* see note 72.
- 119 N.p. 1704.
- 120 Geraint H. Jenkins in “Quaker and Anti-Quaker Literature ...” T. Mardy Rees, the author in 1925 of what is still the only available history of Quakers in Wales in this period, was conscious of the dearth of literature in Welsh.
- 121 Hall, “The fiery Tryal”, 63.
- 122 A careful scrutiny of Mack’s *Visionary Women* would yield some examples of women and works dealt with by regional and/or London Meetings.



# THE COMPLAINTS BOOK OF RICHARD HUTTON

One of the treasures of the archives of Friends School Saffron Walden, now stored in ideal conditions in the Record Office at Chelmsford, is the Complaints Book of Richard Hutton, who was Steward at Clerkenwell from 1711 to 1737. It is a large, leather bound book with nearly 190 folio pages, containing, in Richard Hutton's handwriting, a collection of documents relating to his service as Steward. The London Record Society thought the work to be so important for knowledge of London life, that they obtained permission for Timothy Hitchcock to transcribe, edit and print the book, which was published in 1987 as Volume 24 of their publications of primary sources of London life.

The purpose of the Institution, the brainchild of the Quaker pioneer, John Bellers, was outlined in his "Proposals for Raising a Colledge of Industry". Friends in the Quarterly Meeting of the London Monthly Meetings established it in 1702. A community, housing poor people, a family of both old and young, admitted on the recommendation of Friends, was to be governed by a committee of Friends, supported financially by Monthly Meetings and the profits gained from the trade in yarn, - cotton worsted and linen - spun in the house.

Most of the entries are copies of papers that were prepared for other purposes. There is no way of discovering the criteria that Richard Hutton used to select his entries. Some do not relate to his time of office. The inclusion of a copy of a letter, dated 1683, about consanguinity signed by, among others, George Fox<sup>1</sup> and a series of entries, dated 1681, about taking oaths<sup>2</sup>, do not, on the face of it, have much to do with the Institution.

Together, however, the entries give a fascinating glimpse into the details of life in the house during his Stewardship. It is as though Richard Hutton uses the Complaints Book to get things off his chest or to create a record of his side of the story. But it is not a journal or a diary. There is no systematic or chronological account. He records, almost randomly, the daily situations, the recurring difficulties and the occasional problems of the family. Indirectly, he shows that he brought effective administrative skills to the complex task of managing an institution that had an amalgam of personnel problems, trading business, educational responsibilities, public and Quaker relationships, community health matters and financial

solvency to resolve. But he tells us very little about himself or his family. We know from elsewhere, not from the Complaints Book, that he was born into a Quaker family in Lancaster in 1662, was apprenticed as a tailor, married Sarah Steed, and with her had nine children, all of whom died before they were eighteen months old. He died while still Steward of Clerkenwell in 1737 and is buried in Bunhill Fields, where George Fox is buried<sup>3</sup>.

Throughout we find we are in touch with a man who was determined to rescue the reputation of the institution to which he was appointed Steward nearly ten years after it was founded. He shows that he had an eye for detail and a command of all the various elements involved in running what was, in effect, a great experiment. He recognised that the committee was responsible for the existence of the institution, deferred to its wisdom and worked very hard on its behalf. If some of the entries feel a little tetchy, it is because the situations recorded were exasperating. Perhaps writing in the Complaints Book enabled him to deal better with the matters than he might otherwise have done.

Even on their own, without reference to any other document, such as the best and rough minutes of the Committee, the entries in the Complaints Book give a very comprehensive picture of the Institution. They show most aspects of the management of a community housing both old people (ancients) and children. There are details of the finances of trading in yarn<sup>4</sup>, of tending to sick inmates<sup>5</sup>, of receiving, or not, the legacies due to the House<sup>6</sup>. There is evidence of the continual tightrope walked in dealing with interested Friends and relatives of inmates<sup>7</sup>. Accounts of indiscipline and of predicaments of individual inmates bring a very personal touch<sup>8</sup>. There is reference to the bill of fare<sup>9</sup>, central to the welfare of an institution at that time, which was the cause of argument, complaint and rumour. There are copies of the documents that Richard Hutton used to negotiate his own salary from a committee keen to make ends meet and glad to have the service of two, Richard and Sarah, for the price of one<sup>10</sup>. The qualifications and duties of teachers are included<sup>11</sup>. And for good measure there is an extract from a sermon of Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury<sup>12</sup>, and an essay by Richard Hutton on methods for being

**a dextrous and ready penman and accurate accomptant<sup>13</sup>.**

The details are different but the situations are recognizable from experience over two hundred years later, though there is no Complaints Book for 1968 - 1989<sup>14</sup> to prove it!!

Let Richard Hutton describe the House, mostly, in the words of his own entries.

By May 1718:

**After 17 years continuance (the House) hath 75 persons maintained in it (including steward & servant)<sup>15</sup>.**

But they caused problems:

**Two of them, a man and the other a woman, are lame and use crutches, and another woman friend is blind. The rest are mostly aged and weak, of whom several have kept their beds pretty much this last winter and three of the women friends who are usually sent into the house now are not of ability to be nurses as formerly they were. And our children are generally now small and several of them have been sickly and weak most part of last winter. One girl in particular was ill near six months, who had been sorely afflicted with convulsion fits to such a degree as had made her incapable of walking but by use of crutches; and she had a fire in her chamber constantly for several weeks and one to sit up or be with her in her chamber all the time, the fits being often upon her and suddenly taken<sup>16</sup>.**

And:

**...there are so many small children and 17 or 18 of them are girls, who are more trouble than boys...<sup>17</sup>**

Attending to ancients and children simultaneously with very different needs presented real problems.

**To keep in good order a family made up partially of men and women who are aged and too liable to be discontent, also boys and girls whose parents and other relations... has and yet may give much uneasiness, seems to be very difficult to keep in good order...<sup>18</sup>**

This situation was only one reason for discontent. One ancient, William Brady, had complained that he was starved while he was in the house. Richard Hutton had to write a long report to the committee refuting the allegations. William Brady was not alone.



**Our family have generally speaking consisted of dissatisfied persons very unfit for a community, also having amongst us as a people such who are very unskillful in their sentiments relating to the managing such an affair...<sup>19</sup>**

Older residents had been granted special favours before Richard Hutton became Steward. They resisted change.

**...many other difficulties I could mention which we have and do still lay under. And it seems to us very unlike it should be, otherwise, whilst persons are placed here on a different foot to the rest, who esteem themselves not equal but superior to us, and we but as their servants...<sup>20</sup>**

William Townsend caused many headaches. He objected to the bill of fare, wanted repayments if he stayed away from the house, demanded special treatment and alleged that the Steward was cruel, did not give good value and lined his own pocket from the inmates' payments. He took his complaints to the committee on three occasions. Richard Hutton faced considerable difficulties. He and Sarah were sufficiently incensed to prepare detailed memoranda giving their version of the altercations over provisions, bill of fare and reports to and from people outside the institution. Clearly personal relationships were fraught. He described his difficulties:

**...how hard it is for us, and my wife in particular, to reside in a community amongst a dissatisfied people some of which will give themselves liberty to say almost anything to serve a turn, you would conclude our post very uncomfortable... Justice ought to be done upon us... I know not one friend who has thoroughly known of our treatment but who have thought it very unreasonable that we should be thus imposed upon<sup>21</sup>. We do think that if the committee were sensible how hard it is for us... to reside constantly amongst a dissatisfied people...**

Hopefully, the writing of fifteen pages<sup>22</sup> was therapeutic, bringing a clearer mind and calmer emotions. The detailed memoranda suggest that Richard Hutton, even if he was not entirely confident that he would receive full support from the Committee, recognized that the Committee had loyalties, often conflicting, to the institution as a whole, to the family within, and the Society of Friends without as well as to the Superintendent and his wife. He expected redress

from the committee, but there is no record in the Complaints Book of the outcome.

Richard Hutton found that he and Sarah had little privacy.

**So we hope it may not be thought unreasonable if, with submission, we desire the little parlour and kitchen to ourselves... We desire it not for ostentation, but... that the business which requires privacy may be done accordingly, also to have a place to retire to as occasion requires...<sup>23</sup>**

Some inmates wanted special attention, such as fires in their chambers and constant attendance. Some had higher expectations because they made greater payment and demanded separate rooms. These demands caused difficulties within the house and damaging accounts of it outside. The choice was between a charge for such services and a poor reputation for inadequate attention. Richard Hutton proposed action to quell both difficulties. He could improve matters by increasing contentment within the house from the better bill of fare that he had introduced in 1713:

**they are allowed each: 8oz of butter and 16oz of cheese per week, about 14oz of bread (it not being weighed except Daniel Rosier's, who has 18oz) per day, 8oz of flesh per meal & if not enough they are desired to send for more, 19oz of pudding per meal, and more if they can eat it (which is 10oz per meal more than the former allowance), furmenty, milk etc a sufficient quantity<sup>24</sup>.**

The committee could also play their part by visiting once a week to see that things were in good order, by giving regular reports to meetings and by discouraging false reports. The Steward could try to manage affairs within the house, but he could not control what went on outside. A recurring difficulty was the spread of these reports, which did such damage to the reputation of the house, especially among the meetings that sent the inmates to it. He clearly thought that the committee should tackle this:

**...complaints were taken out of the house: the poor were oppressed, the aged and sick wanted due tendance. Which proved to the disadvantage to the house by discouraging several poor honest friends who might have been helpful and likewise thankful for so comfortable a provision<sup>25</sup>. There has**

lately been many false stories spread abroad to the defaming of the house and those who have the care thereof and hurt of the children already here, to whom such reports have been privately brought. Which to prevent for the future we see no way at present... unless ...a minute ...from the committee be directed to each monthly meeting requesting such reports may be discouraged so often as they are related. And also that at the taking children into the house the parents have both orders (rules) and bill of fare read to them and report thereof made to the committee before such child be admitted into the house<sup>26</sup>.

But there was appreciation. Richard Hutton records a letter of thanks from Thomas Sands.

**Kind steward**

These are to acquaint thee that I am safe arrived at my uncle's house where I was kindly received. My love to thee and thy wife, also to all the friends of the committee and to my master that taught me to write. My love to all the ancient friends and all the children of the workhouse which were my school fellows...My uncle is about placing me at Exeter to Arthur Purchas, a tucker. I am in all due respects thy friends<sup>27</sup>.

And in 1721 Richard and Sarah would have been pleased to receive this:

Ed. H. Said thou and thy wife are brave folks indeed, and much valued. This great undertaking has been a great success under your management<sup>28</sup>.

Perhaps these commendations helped the Steward to deal with the problems of discipline, which challenged his authority.

It would be tedious, also unpleasant, to hear the whole of the provocations rehearsed; also here are too many to mention the particulars of those who in their turns are addicted unto. But, the ground of it all is their being under any obligation, either with respect to the orders of the house, bill of fare and the diet therein mentioned<sup>29</sup>.

He certainly needed his wits to deal with John Gorden, a boy who got up to much mischief before he broke into the storeroom.



**...At another time he got a candle over night and got up about twelve o'clock at night and took a pane of glass out of the storeroom window and got in, from whence he took four pounds of plum pudding, although he, as well as the rest of the big boys, had a full pound for dinner besides their suppers. And he ate so much in the storeroom he could not come thence without leaving behind what is not fit here to mention...<sup>30</sup>**

The servants were not an unmixed blessing either! Elizabeth Rand refused to carry out instructions, complained about her work, was reported to the committee, apologized and then negotiated with the Steward and his wife the basis of a return to work<sup>31</sup>. Other servants employed as teachers were given detailed directions for the schoolmaster and schoolmistress to observe.

The Steward had to negotiate his own salary with the committee and produced papers to justify his requests. In 1720 he wrote to the committee:

**Friends, It's not pleasant to use this to apply, yet think ourselves under a necessity to let you understand that we are not thoroughly satisfied with our present salary, it being now going on nine years since we came to serve the committee...<sup>32</sup>**

He had been engaged for £20 per annum in 1711, which was increased to £25 next year and to £30 in 1714<sup>33</sup>. He felt that he deserved more than the £40 paid since 1719<sup>34</sup>. In 1725 he asked for £60 arguing that this was for the service of two people, that they had no other income, had no time for other employment and had improved the reputation of the house. He reminded the committee of his duties: buying wool, spinning yarn, trading in spun yarn, keeping accounts, drawing bills, clothing the family, buying provisions. The committee agreed that he deserved £60, but in February decided to advance £10 now and £10 some time after as that would be easier for them than to find £20 at one time<sup>35</sup>. Richard Hutton renewed his case and in September 1725 the committee agreed to the full £60.

**...in consideration of his care and pains with respect to the trade and his wife's conduct and service in the family, ... himself and his wife having assured us that they will not at anytime hereafter ask any farther advance to said salary and that they will continue their service so long as they live and are able<sup>36</sup>.**

There are several entries that relate to the finances of the house. The Steward negotiated the price of bread

**(8s 6d per hundredweight)<sup>37</sup>.**

recorded the costs of supplying clothes for members of the family

**(26 new hats brought of Thomas Pittflow £2 12s)<sup>38</sup>.**

and entered schedules of the earnings and gains from the work of the children

**(earnings and gains over 12 years £2590 3s 6<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> d)<sup>39</sup>.**

When John Wilson was sick, he received a special diet. Over six months his supply of 71 oysters cost 10d and 1<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> lbs of chocolate cost 6s 1<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> d<sup>40</sup>. There is an estimate for repairs of the workhouse at Clerkenwell, which was not new when Friends leased it.

<b>Ripping and tiling the whole in the same form as it is now in, being 158 square at 15s per square</b>	<b>£118.10s</b>
<b>Materials and carpenter's work shoring and repairing the rafters and eaves boards</b>	<b>£30.00s</b>
	<hr/>
	<b>£148.10s<sup>41</sup></b>

The house made its own beer to provide sufficient for the inmates. Richard Hutton tells us how.

**Take about 2 ounces of the finest & clearest isinglass beat or cut very small, put it into an earthen vessel with as much vinegar... as will cover the isinglass. Brush it very well with a whisk twice or thrice a day till it be quite dissolved & as it grows thick put a little more vinegar to it till becomes a very thick syrup, then strain through a cloth about a pint thereof,.... Then open the bung of the cask. With a whisk then pour in the strained isinglass, stirring it very well also & bung the cask very close & in 24 hours your drink will be very clear<sup>42</sup>.**

There is a recipe for a lotion to apply to sore eyes and a recipe to deal with an incipient problem, bedbugs.

**Take of the highest rectified spirit of wine... half a pint; newly**

**distilled oil or spirit of turpentine, half a pint; mix them together and break into it , in small bits, half an ounce of camphor, which will dissolve in it in a few minutes. Shake them well together, and with a sponge... wet very well the bed or furniture wherein those vermin harbour or breed, and it will infallibly kill and destroy both them and their nits...<sup>43</sup>**

A paper of this length cannot do full justice to the riches in the Complaints Book. Together, the entries give a comprehensive view of the issues involved in managing an institution in the eighteenth century. It was a community of old and young, the ancients needing shelter, support and some nursing, the children needing nurture, learning and some training. But it is also a human document about a family. Individuals come vividly to life: mischievous John Gorden, cantankerous William Townsend, grumbling William Brady and grateful Thomas Sands. So also, despite his dry, sometimes long-winded reports, does the Steward: anxious, serious, diligent, meticulous, purposeful, determined that the inmates should have comfort and no cause for complaint within the house and concerned that the committee should promote its reputation for fairness and good-order without. Surely the institution is able to celebrate its tercentenary partly because Richard Hutton established such a firm foundation in those early years between 1711 and 1737.

*John Woods*

This paper is a revised version of the article published in *"The School on the Hill", 300 years of Friends' School, Saffron Walden, 1792-2002*, edited by Hilary Halter, with a foreword by Tony Newton, the Rt Hon Lord Newton of Braintree, published in 2002 by the Friends' School, Saffron Walden, Essex. CB11 3EB, pages 12-15 The article was based on the original document "Richard Hutton's Complaints Book: The notebook of the Steward of the Quaker Workhouse at Clerkenwell, 1711-1737" held by the Essex Records Office, Chelmsford.

An edition edited by Timothy V Hitchcock was published in 1987 by the London Record Society as volume XXIV of LRS Publications.

References give date, when available, the page in the original (O) and the page in the published edition (P). e.g. 11 May 1713, O.p.4, P.p.2.



## NOTES AND REFERENCES

- 1 30 May 1683, O. p. 158, P. p. 84.
- 2 14 November 1677, O. p. 22, P. p. 13.
- 3 P. p. vii
- 4 e.g. 25 March 1729, O. p. 154, P. p. 82.
- 5 e.g. 14 June 1729, O. p. 157, P. p. 84
- 6 e.g. 1716, O. pp. 16-21, P. pp. 10-13.
- 7 e.g. 4 February 1727, O. p. 146, P. pp. 78-9.
- 8 e.g. 30 January 1716, O. pp. 41-3. P. pp. 22-4.
- 9 e.g. 11 May 1713, O. p.4, P. pp. 2-3
- 10 O. p. 150, P. p. 81.
- 11 O. p. 45, P. p. 25.
- 12 O. pp. 160-61, P. pp. 85-6.
- 13 O. pp. 10-14, P. pp. 6-9.
- 14 When the writer of the article was Head of Friends School Saffron Walden.
- 15 O. p. 66, P. p. 37.
- 16 1716, O. p. 67, P. pp. 37-8.
- 17 1712, O. p. 68, P. p. 38.
- 18 O. p. 174, P. p. 91.
- 19 O. p. 115, P. p. 63.
- 20 18 October 1711, O. p. 111, P. p. 61.
- 21 O. p. 93. P. pp. 52-3.
- 22 3 November 1718 onwards, O. pp. 74-93, P. pp. 41-53.
- 23 18 October 1711, O. pp. 112-3, P. pp. 61-2.
- 24 11 May 1711, O. p. 4, P. pp. 2-3.
- 25 April 1717, O. p. 50, P. p. 28.
- 26 O. p. 66, P. p. 37.
- 27 30 October 1717, O. p. 52, P. p. 29.
- 28 1721, O. p. 178, P. p. 92.
- 29 30 March 1720. O. p. 120, P. p. 66.
- 30 O. p. 5, P. p. 3.
- 31 30 January 1716, O. pp. 41-3, P. pp. 22-4.
- 32 8 February 1720, O. p. 148, P. p. 80.
- 33 22 November 1714, O. p. 52, P. pp. 81-2.
- 34 1 February 1725, O. p. 148, P. p. 80.
- 35 1 February 1725, O. p. 148, P. p. 80.
- 36 13 September 1725, O. p. 151, P. p. 81.
- 37 O. p. 3, P. p. 2.
- 38 15 May 1713, O. p. 35, P. p. 20.
- 39 O. p. 168, P. p. 88.
- 40 O. p. 136, P. p. 73.
- 41 O. p. 118, P. p. 65.
- 42 O. p. 162, P. pp. 86-7.
- 43 O. p. 170, P. pp. 88-9.

## THOMAS CROWLEY'S PROPOSAL TO SEAT AMERICANS IN PARLIAMENT, 1765-1775

Imperial crises spawned proposals for imperial reform. Not surprisingly, the disputes triggered by George Grenville's Stamp Act in 1765, which led, ultimately, to the American revolt ten years later, brought with them numerous plans to restructure and thereby save the empire. One of the more ambitious and consequently more notable came from Thomas Crowley, a wealthy London merchant and unorthodox Quaker.<sup>1</sup> Only by seating colonists in both the House of Commons and House of Lords, Crowley contended, could the American right to representation be coupled with the American duty to pay taxes in support of the empire. Others had suggested that Americans be represented in Parliament but Crowley was possibly the most insistent, most persistent of them all, so persistent that Benjamin Franklin ultimately dismissed him as "a little cracked upon the subject."<sup>2</sup>

If Franklin found Crowley trying, Crowley's Quaker brethren had even more cause for exasperation. Crowley showed the same tenacity, even pugnacity, when debating theological and ecclesiastical points as he did in pressing for imperial reform. Indeed, his zest for the one probably fed his vigour in the other. In both instances, whatever merits his arguments may have had were overshadowed by his difficult personality. And yet, even if he had been less emphatic and more accommodating, he had little hope of changing Quaker ways or reshaping the empire.

Crowley turned his attention to the empire in the mid-1760s, at the same moment that he became strident in his opposition to various Quaker practices, especially the disowning of Society members who paid tithes to the Church of England. According to a minute passed by the London Yearly Meeting in 1706, those who continued the practice, even after being counselled to desist, should be considered "unworthy to be admitted to the Meetings for Business among Friends, or to be received to join in the Collections, made by Friends, for the Service of the Church of Christ."<sup>3</sup> Tithes, these Quakers felt, were unjustified throwbacks to a Mosaic code that had been superseded by Christ's higher law. To pay them violated the Saviour's creed and insulted the memory of early Quakers who died as martyrs in God's name.

Crowley disagreed and tried to convert others to his cause. He launched a letter-writing campaign that began privately but soon enough became public, as Crowley took his case to the press and laid out his position in newspaper pieces and pamphlets. Hoping to demonstrate his prowess as a scripturist, he sometimes turned to the Old Testament, sometimes to the New—particularly the Pauline epistles. It was not just an issue of tithes or the question of taxes in general; it was, he emphasized, a matter of civic duty, of whether Quakers were good subjects of their king. Crowley, who completed his apprenticeship to a linen draper in the 1730s and went on to make a sizable fortune, had paid taxes gladly and proudly ever since. He did not mince words:

My Doctrine is this, "neither Government, nor Society, have any Right over my Conscience in Religion," but the supreme Legislature of every Nation hath a just Right to assess the Property of the Subject in all Cases which they judge for the Public Good, and the same is very clearly held forth in the Doctrine of Christ, and the Apostle Paul and Peter.<sup>4</sup>

In March 1771 Crowley finally elicited a formal reaction. A minute from Meeting for Sufferings was brought to London and Middlesex Quarterly Meeting, advising local Quakers that the dissident merchant's writings "contain Opinions inconsistent with Christian testimony." Still, Society members were urged to treat Crowley kindly even if his ideas were erroneous and behaviour disruptive. "Much tenderness hath been exercised towards the author on various considerations, and the same considerations may perhaps induce Friends still to use all possible Lenity & forbearance" in dealing with him.<sup>5</sup> All of that came to an end in February 1774 when the Devonshire House Monthly Meeting, which Crowley had attended for many years, agreed to disown him because of "His inflexible Continuance in Opposition, and refractory Behaviour." Despite every effort to deter him he insisted on his right to pay tithes and he admonished other Quakers to do the same. Crowley had only to repent to be welcomed back into fellowship. "We sincerely desire, both for his own Sake, and that of his Family," the members entreated, "That he may come to see his Errors in the Light of Truth, and thro' unfeigned Repentance, be restored into membership again."<sup>6</sup>

Crowley would have none of that. He refused to confess error where he believed none existed. He appealed for reinstatement and lost.<sup>7</sup> Once, in frustration, he forced his way into the Devonshire



House Monthly Meeting with two constables in tow to assert his right to attend, but that changed nothing.<sup>8</sup> His wife Mary continued her affiliation with the Monthly Meeting there, her husband never did have his membership restored. He dismissed his opponents as modern-day Pharisees and came to characterize himself defiantly as "a rational Christian."<sup>9</sup> That his sixteen-year-old daughter Ann, the second-youngest of eight children, died of a lingering illness in the midst of all this probably added to Crowley's sense of alienation. He nonetheless made it clear that his dispute was with Quaker leaders, not their God. He and his wife Mary gathered together their daughter's musings as she lay dying and had them published- as a message of hope, not despair. Parents and child believed that death brought deliverance through Christ's redemption and that they needed to lead Godly lives in preparation for that day.<sup>10</sup>

All along Crowley had contended that he should have been able to pay tithes without interference from the Quaker brethren. He was, he stressed, entitled to the rights of "liberty of conscience" that every true Christian should respect. "No Man or Society has any Right to usurp Authority over the Consciences of sincere Men, it being the Prerogative of Heaven only" to set such limits.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, as a loyal Briton it was his duty to pay those tithes, it was even his duty to pay taxes that could be used to fund the militia. Quakers enjoyed religious toleration through law, thus, he reasoned, it was only proper that they reciprocate by supporting the government that protected them. He signed one of his pieces "Amor Patriae"- a lover of his country-to drive the point home.<sup>12</sup>

He adopted that non de plume even when he wrote as an advocate of imperial reform-for him a variation on the problem of rights and responsibilities that he encountered in his religious disputes. George Grenville's controversial Stamp Act precipitated his entry into the rhetorical fray. He fought on two fronts: in the press, most frequently in the *Public Ledger*, and in letters to leaders of government. On occasion he carried over his practice of scripture-quoting to make a point, from the familiar admonition in Matthew about a house divided against itself not standing to a more obscure passage in Ecclesiastes sent to the religiously devout earl of Dartmouth that advised "Wisdom is better than Weapons of War, but one Sinner destroyeth much Good."<sup>13</sup>

Initially Crowley did not push for a major structural change in the empire. He began more modestly, suggesting that the colonists be allowed to tax themselves for imperial purposes through their local legislatures. He even calculated what he considered an equitable tax

schedule and had it published in February 1766, in the midst of Parliamentary debates over repealing the Stamp Act. He settled on a proportionate rate of one pound for every thirty inhabitants, distributed as follows:

	Inhabitants	Proportion £
Canada and its Dependencies	90,000	3,000
Nova-Scotia and its Dependencies, being young for the present	15,000	500
New Hampshire	60,000	2,000
Massachusetts Bay	240,000	8,000
Connecticut	150,000	5,000
Rhode Island	45,000	1,500
New York	150,000	5,000
Jerseys	90,000	3,000
Pennsylvania	210,000	7,000
Lower Counties	and 45,000	255,000
Maryland	120,000	4,000
Virginia	180,000	6,000
North Carolina	45,000	1,500
South Carolina	105,000	3,500
Georgia, East and West Florida		
Ba[ham]a and Bermuda	30,000	1,000
Jamaica	150,000	5,000
Barbadoes	75,000	2,500
Antigua	45,000	1,500
St. Christophers, Nevis, and Montserrat, Dominica, Tobago and St. Vincent	45,000	1,500
<hr/>		
Total	1,890,000	£63,000 <sup>14</sup>

Crowley's figures were proportionate on yet another level. He understood that Americans had a relative sense of equity - that they cared about their own tax rates, not those figures compared with tax levels in Britain. They could not be expected to be assessed at the same rate as residents of the mother country, whose levels were markedly higher. If his figures were used as the basis for a new tax system the colonists would pay, on average, eight pence apiece each

to help cover imperial expenses. By contrast residents of the British Isles would be called on to pay twelve shillings annually - eighteen times more than the colonists. Their assessment would go toward paying the interest on the national debt, a debt, Crowley emphasized, "almost wholly borrowed to carry on several Wars, and near Half of it on Account of the *last, begun in America.*"<sup>15</sup>

His stress on the colonists being the primary beneficiaries of the last war showed that he had something in common with Grenville after all. True, he disagreed with Grenville over the wisdom of the Stamp Act and it is no coincidence that he made £63,000 his target figure, which was just a few thousand pounds above what Grenville had at one point estimated the Stamp Act would generate in colonial revenue. He would even accuse Grenville's ministry of acting unconstitutionally in taxing Americans directly and depriving them of the rights of Englishmen. Nonetheless, he agreed with the failed minister that the colonists needed to carry a bigger share of the imperial tax burden and he believed, like Grenville, that the colonists were ingrates who needed to be brought into line before they became uncontrollable and sought independence.

Furthermore, like Grenville he suspected that Americans would do little if they were left to raise new taxes through their own legislatures. But unlike Grenville, who was only lukewarm to the subject of seating Americans in Parliament, Crowley came to see that change as a panacea, as in fact the *only* solution to perpetual, otherwise insoluble, imperial problems.<sup>16</sup> Virtual representation did not, could not, work for the Americans, pure and simple. "The late Taxation of America therefore appears absolutely unconstitutional," running "contrary to the constitutional Maxims of Government" which "every true-born Englishman is bound in Honour to support."<sup>17</sup> Though he read and admired James Otis's early tracts on colonial rights and came to concur with Otis that Americans needed to be represented at Westminster, he devised his plan independently of Otis and in a detail that Otis never achieved.<sup>18</sup>

Once he began pondering structural reform he did not stop with the colonies, he turned to Ireland and included that "kingdom" in his proposal. Under his plan in its final incarnation the Irish would join colonial Americans at Westminster. Ireland would keep its Parliament to handle local, internal affairs, just as the colonies would retain their existing legislatures for like purposes. As Irish and American members of the expanded imperial Parliament learned to trust their British colleagues, all would ideally act in concert to bolster the navigation system, make the empire economically solvent and politically stable, and protect colonial rights in the process. "A



wise-established Representation of all considerable Parts of the British Dominions in Europe and America, in one central Parliament, to be the common Center and Spring of all Grants for Money, for national Purposes," he declared, "would give Stability, Unity and Concord, and consequently greater Strength to the Whole."<sup>19</sup> Crowley had his basic outline roughed in by the end of 1765 and fully developed five years later.

To those whom it most immediately concerns, in regard of their several Stations, in the LEGISLATURE and ADMINISTRATION.

*Memorial and Plan of Union,  
Presented to his Majesty, Ministers, and the Privy-Council.*

SUFFER it to take Place and remain on your Minds, as an important Truth, that the jarring Interests, and want of Unity, between Great Britain and her Colonies, is the grand Foundation, wheron the Enemies of these once happy Dominions, build their Prospect, and Confidence of Success against us, and that nothing more strongly or more happily tend, to remove such threatening Prospect and Confidence; and in lieu thereof to substitute, on the Part of our Enemies, a permanent Dread, or Fear of offending in future, than a happy and durable Union, between the Mother Country and her Colonies, including Ireland therewith. To proceed then, if this be granted, as in general doth evidently appear to be the Case, it will follow of Course, that the proper and essential Business of Government, doth much consist in planning and drawing into Practice, the wisest, safest, and most permanent Mode of conciliating the many internal Difficulties, now subsisting, by essentially removing the Grounds thereof, so far as appears to the Intelligent and Candid, and many such there are, on both Sides, who very clearly perceive that the Mode and Proportion of AMERICAN TAXATION, has never yet been wisely modelled, nor made constitutional, so as to be of a Piece with the Principles of the British Constitution, in general, respecting Representation and consequent Taxation; nor by any other Means made safe, or honourable, for the Colonies, by Act of Assembly, to adopt; and every arbitrary, or unconstitutional Mode, or Manner, of drawing Supplies from them, which they cannot safely and honourably adopt, will increase the Danger of Quarrel and Ruin, on both Sides. It is therefore of much Importance to both, mutually, that a Mode of Union and Taxation, as well as

regulating their Trade, should be enacted and practised, which would prove safe and honourable to the Whole, so laying the true and rational Foundation of Peace and Concord, throughout these Dominions.

To make it constitutional and honourable, the Colonies should have proper Members of their own, to represent them in Parliament, so that they may, in future thereby co-operate in making the Laws of Taxation and Legislation, which must necessarily bind them; but then to make it also safe for the Colonies to accept the Honour of Representation, it evidently appears, some barrier must be enacted to bound the Right of Parliamentary Taxation over the Colonies, else would they be liable by being, on every Occasion, outnumbered, to be taxed too high, beyond their reasonable Abilities, after the Right once admitted; so that taking in the Consideration of future Consequences, and the Temper and Benevolence of future Kings, and future Ministers, &c. as may be found to arise in the Course of Time, it is but reasonable, on Behalf of the Colonies, that this Right of Taxation should be so happily bounded, as that it may not be in the Power of Parliament, in succeeding Times, to tax America, or Ireland, APART, or separately from Great Britain, to raise a Revenue, or for Protection; nor without, at the same Time, in the same Acts, and in the same Mode, taxing the British Subjects also; without such Barrier, or some other adequate Method, so as to effectually prevent the Americans and Irish, from being TAXED APART from the British, or to prevent the Taxes laid, or to be laid, on America and Ireland, from exceeding certain limited Proportions, to be previously agreed on, they will never think themselves safe, in accepting a Representation, nor yet will they be content to be taxed by Parliament without it; and as it is evidently just and reasonable, they should somehow LEGALLY CONTRIBUTE their proportionate Quota of Supplies, towards general Protection and Defence, a wise Union, by Representation, evidently appears the proper Means; and the Duties apart, necessarily arising, by regulating their Trade, to be applied to their own particular Provincial Concerns, for the Support of Civil Government, &c. And I do presume, no general Taxation to be made common to the British, American, and Irish Subjects, in one and the same Act, can be devised so proper, as that heretofore pointed out by the Author of these Lines, viz. A Pound Rate on their real and Personal Estates, a proper Mode of Proof, being first adopted, *i.e.* Every Parish[i]oner, who hath served the Office of Church-Warden or Overseer of the Poor, in

each Parish, separately; together with the Assessors, and Collectors of the Land-Tax, for the preceeding Year, in the District, to be commissioned to assess, and properly empowered to ballot, taking the medium Valuation; but with this Proviso, if any one should appear to be immoderately excessive, his Vote to be rejected, by the Majority of the Rest; and after such Decision, if any Parish[i]oner should find himself aggrieved, in being overvalued, beyond his real Abilities, he should be indulged with the Liberty of swearing off, and in Consequence, to a rational alleviation, to be decided by the same Assessors. And as it is always sound good Policy, to make every new Measure of Importance, as moderate and equitable, as the Nature of the Case, for the Time being, will, with Prudence, admit, I do presume, that such a general Tax, of only ONE SHILLING in the Pound, equitably and justly assessed, according to the original Intention of the present disproportionate Assessment, commonly called the Land-Tax in England, would bring in a larger Revenue, than Three Shillings in the Pound doth, in the hitherto practised, partial, unequitable Mode, in this Country.

I therefore humbly recommend the following Plan of Union and Representation to be seriously considered.

AMOR PATRIAE.

*Gracechurch-Street*  
*Dec. 10, 1770*

A PLAN OF UNION, BY ADMITTING REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE AMERICAN COLONIES, AND FROM IRELAND, INTO THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT.

<p>AMERICA</p> <p>Massachusetts Bay</p> <p>Pensylvania</p> <p>Virginia</p> <p>South Carolina</p> <p>Jamaica</p>	<p>each 4- - -20</p>	<p>Lords, for the principal Provinces and Islands, as soon as found Convenient to be created by the Royal Prerogative</p>	<p>10</p>
---	----------------------	---	-----------



New York				
Maryland	each 3- - -9		IRELAND	
Canada			Each Province four Members	16
			Dublin	2
Connecticut				
E, and W. Jersey	each 2- - -4		Cork	
			Kinsale	
New Hampshire			Waterford	
Nova Scotia			Limerick	each 1- - -7
Rhode Island			Kilkenny	
Lower Counties			Wicklow	
of Pennsylvania	each 1- - -8		Wexford	
Georgia				
East Florida			Dundalk	
West Florida			Drogheda	2
North Carolina			Yougall	
Barbadoes			Galway	
Antigua			Belfast	each.1- - -3
St. Christopher's	ditto- - -4		Londonderry	
Bahama				
				30
Bermuda				
Montserrat	to choose in	1	And a proportionate Number	
Nevis	Rotation		of Lords, to be elected by the	10
			Irish from among themselves	
Grenada's		2		
Newfoundland and St. John's		1	American Commons	50
Dominica, St. Vincent's			Lords	10
and Tobago, to choose		1	Irish Commons	30
in Rotation			Lords	10
		50		100
Commons				100

CONDITIONS PROPOSED

1. THESE Representatives may be elected, by each Assembly, from among themselves, and also by the Parliament, of Ireland, from among themselves, if to them more eligible than the particular local Elections, proposed in the Plan.

2d. It may be needful to exempt them from the same Qualifications, which are the Condition of British Members, enjoying a Seat in Parliament, respecting the value of their real Estates.

3d. It may be needful to insert a Clause, in the proposed Act of Union, that on the dissolving any Parliament, the same member, which represented America, in such dissolved Parliament, should continue to represent them in the next ensuing, until others are returned from their respective Constituents, in lieu thereof.

4th. It may be needful that special Distance of Time be allowed in the new Writs, for American Members, beyond the usual Time in Great Britain, perhaps six Months.

5th. The Residence (in or near London) of ever[y] American Merchant, may be required, to be constantly left, in Writing, with the Speaker of the House of Commons, for the Time being.

6th. In order to prevent the evil Effect of any Mistrust of the Colonies, being liable to be over burthened with Taxes, beyond their reasonable Abilities, after Representation takes Place; it would be wise and concilating to enact, in the proposed *Act*, granting the Honour of Representation, that neither America, nor Ireland, shall be afterwards liable to be taxed separately, or a Part, from the British, towards raising a Revenue, or for general Protection or Defence; this, it is humbly conceived, would be much wiser than to fix any limited Sums, on account of the probable growing Population and Abilities of America, in future; and altho' it might appear an Indignity to the supreme legislative Power, to be limited by her own Subjects; it nevertheless would be a Manifestation of Wisdom, Justice, and Prudence, for the said supreme Power to so limit its own Operations, for the Peace, Safety, and Satisfaction of the Public, and of every part of these Dominions, inasmuch as it would strongly, and happily tend to make the proposed Union eligible [sic], and durable, to *general Content mutually*, which happy Cement, would be the very best Security to the Whole.

7th. It is not unlikely, that the Americans may want some Restrictions to be taken off their maritime and inland Trade, which may become a necessary Consideration, under due

Regard to the principal end of colonizing; but it should at all Events be stipulated, that the Act of Navigation should be maintained, in Favour of the Mother Country, in regard of the enormous Expence, she has already incurred, in settling, protecting and defending the Plantations, &c. As also on Account of Emigration, having without such Limitations, too strong a Tendency to weaken and impoverish the Parent Country, so running out from themselves, and otherwise setting up a separate Interest of opposite Principles.

8th. The Duties apart, necessarily arising in the Colonies, from Acts of Parliament, to regulate their Trade, may be applied to the particular uses of each Province apart, for the Purpose of defraying the Charges of civil Government, and other local, particular, provincial, evil [Editor: as printed in the *Memorial and Plan...* should it read 'provincial, civil'?] Concerns; so removing the Distrust of Dread; either to accept the Honour of Representation, or to adopt the Right of parliamentary Taxation without it, and without Limitation.

*P.S.* It may be proper to allow each Colony to send either the whole Number allowed of, or a smaller Number, at their Option, if any should choose to save Expence.<sup>20</sup>

Crowley pushed his proposal tirelessly, until events after the outbreak of fighting in April 1775 made it moot. Long connected with Quaker merchants in Philadelphia and London merchants concerned about trade in the empire, it was easy enough for him to arrange a meeting with Benjamin Franklin. The two men had their first long conversation outside the House of Commons in February 1766, just days before Franklin would be called on to testify and offer criticisms that Rockinghamites could draw on in their campaign against Grenville's programme. Crowley revealed to Franklin his identity as *Amor Patriae*. Franklin had read some of his pieces, notably one in the *Gazetteer* on the preceding New Year's Day where Crowley called for repeal of the Stamp Act and inclusion of Americans in Parliament. At that point Franklin professed not to be averse to the idea. Even so, he was quite certain that Americans would not make the request themselves. Although they might accept it if were offered to them, they would not do so unenthusiastically and the time was fast approaching when they would spurn it altogether.<sup>21</sup> That in subsequent pieces Crowley wrote as much about American responsibilities as American rights irritated



Franklin, particularly when the dissident Quaker seemed to be snide about American protests. "I am ever for *Moderation* as being the most likely means to produce *Reconciliation*," he told Franklin, but "allegations tenacious of Rigid Right" only alienated and divided people when the goal should be to unite them.<sup>22</sup>

When Crowley, using his own name, authored a newspaper piece in October 1768 that Franklin thought unfair to Americans, the Pennsylvanian responded immediately. Crowley had followed his usual call for American representation at Westminster with an observation that the "last extremely expensive War" had advanced colonial interests while burdening Britain with a horrendous debt. And even though France had been defeated the colonies still needed British protection if they were to continue prospering. "Without the Aid and Influence of the British Navy," he argued, the colonies "would be soon over-run by the maritime Powers of Europe, and divided among them." Moreover, he issued a warning to any Americans who might be tempted to seek independence: that same navy could be used against them. Therefore if they were not willing to carry their share of the imperial burden through new taxes passed by their own legislatures they should embrace his oft-repeated proposal "for a mutual[ly] beneficent Union."<sup>23</sup>

Franklin fired back his retort under the pseudonym "Francis Lynn." After commending Crowley for wanting "Peace and Harmony" he contended that Americans were perfectly willing to carry their share of the imperial burden and insisted that they sought reconciliation, not independence. He made it clear that he and Crowley had very different notions of who was to blame for the current crisis.

On the whole, as we are not presumptuous enough to ask an *Union* with Britain, such as England contracted with Scotland, we have no "Propositions" to make, but that she would leave us the Enjoyment of our native and dear-bought Privileges, and not attempt to alter or innovate our Constitutions, in the Exercise of which every thing went prosperously for both Countries, 'till the Idea of Taxing us by the Power of Parliament unfortunately enter'd the Heads of your Ministers, which has occasion'd a publick Discussion of Questions that had better never been started, and thrown all into Confusion.<sup>24</sup>

His irritation with Crowley notwithstanding, Franklin avoided a formal rift. He no doubt accepted the copies of Crowley's final plan,

presented to him at the end of 1770, politely, though he had long before abandoned any hope or desire of seeing Americans in Parliament.<sup>25</sup> Crowley, for his part, had continued to take his case to whomever would hear it, even by mail to Franklin's son, William, who informed his father that Crowley sent him several essays with a request that he have them inserted in the *New Jersey Gazette*- -though no such paper existed. The younger Franklin thought Crowley "crack'd;"<sup>26</sup> his father came to share his sentiments, noting, with a tinge of sadness, that Crowley "was much among the Ministers" of government, trying- -and failing- -to interest them in his plan.<sup>27</sup>

Crowley had indeed dispatched copies of his proposal, unsolicited, to various political leaders. Early in 1766 he sent William Pitt, soon to become Earl of Chatham, his recommendations on repealing the Stamp Act and setting tax rates that the colonial legislatures could meet. In 1770 he sent Chatham his full scheme for seating Americans and Irish at Westminster.<sup>28</sup> He made similar approaches to the Earl of Dartmouth and the Marquess of Rockingham, and even tried to get his ideas presented to the King during the North ministry.<sup>29</sup> It is doubtful that he had much of an impact on Chatham or Rockingham, on Dartmouth or the King- -or on anyone else, for that matter, charged with running the empire. No one took up his cause in Lords or Commons; his various drafts probably elicited only a glance here and a shrug there.

Already on the margins of public life, Crowley further marginalized himself by his acerbic tendencies. Franklin kept his distance and did not involve Crowley in last ditch efforts on the eve of Lexington and Concord to head off an imperial break. Franklin joined with Quaker merchant David Barclay and Quaker physician John Fothergill- -both acquaintances of Crowley, but not with Crowley, who was monomaniacal in pushing his plan to the exclusion of all others.<sup>30</sup> Ultimately Crowley was reduced to taking his plan to the public at his own expense, paying the printing costs of a pamphlet that brought his various newspaper pieces together under one cover.

Does that mean Crowley's failed proposal should be left behind on the trash heap of forgotten failures? Not quite. His warnings were all too prescient. He advised Pitt in 1766 that if the mother country and her colonies failed to reconcile their differences, then Britain's "Glorious Empire" could be in a "tottering situation," susceptible to crumbling from within and relentless pressure from without. Unless something were done, and done soon, he predicted, "it[']s not unlikely that France in Europe and our Colonies in America may Phoenix[-]like Raise themselves as out of the Ashes of this Empire

and the latter become independent."<sup>31</sup> Although Franklin was not being disingenuous when he contended that, contrary to Crowley, the Patriots wanted reconciliation, not independence, it is equally true that the drift toward independence came because of the unresolved issues that Crowley had identified. Whether or not his plan, if implemented, would have helped solve problems or actually compound them is another matter.<sup>32</sup>

When Crowley warned that something had to be done to prevent the colonies from drifting further away from the mother country, "*toward a state of Independance, & the many dreadfull intervening scenes w[hi]ch in such Case must necessarily befall the Lives & Properties of both Britain & America,*" he said nothing new.<sup>33</sup> When he warned that Britain's enemies might intervene in the event of war, he, again, said nothing new. Crowley well understood the geopolitical context of colonial crisis; so did many British policymakers and so did many American Patriots, not just Franklin. Their general awareness is a useful reminder that miscalculation played a more important role than simple ignorance in the unravelling of imperial ties. Asking whether leaders on either side of the Atlantic could- -and should - -have seen more clearly only leads toward a causational mire.<sup>34</sup>

That Crowley could accept Patriot arguments about no taxation without representation, that he could see American liberties as grounded in the law of nature as well as the rights of Englishmen, are reminders that there were those in Britain who agreed with the Patriots on certain constitutional issues even if they did not care much for them or the way they comported themselves politically. Even so, British acceptance of fundamental American rights did not necessarily extend, as Patriots would have had it, to colonial charters. Crowley did not see them as sacred or inviolable; they could, with cause, be set aside by crown and parliament. In his eyes Patriot behaviour in Massachusetts verged on justifying that very course.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, given the Patriots' confidence that time was on their side- -that the colonies would grow ever larger, ever stronger, Crowley recommended that transatlantic emigration to them be curtailed until imperial problems were solved. When the Patriots finally turned to force, Crowley condemned them utterly. "If any Part of the Empire is aggrieved, they have a Right to petition for Relief, but in no Case whatever have a Right to rebel," he wrote in bitter disappointment.<sup>36</sup>

Crowley's inability to find disciples is also a reminder that the failure of imperial reform was only superficially constitutional and

political; on a deeper level it was primarily social. Crowley tried desperately to salvage an Atlantic community that existed more as an idealized notion than as a functional entity. He, like the politicians who ignored his proposal, believed in indivisible sovereignty, the supremacy of crown and parliament, and the magnificence of mixed government. That belief proved a stumbling block, not because it was impossible to work out in any form, but because it could not be adapted to the real world of the moment for *some* of the colonies in *part* of the empire.<sup>37</sup>

Crowley continued to offer advice on imperial affairs long after it should have been obvious that no one in government was listening, just as he continued to argue his case for liberty of conscience long after his former Quaker brethren had given him up for lost. Once the shooting started he urged government to amend the Declaratory Act and send a plenipotentiary over to discuss terms for reconciliation, preferably along the lines of his 1770 proposal.<sup>38</sup> He then fell silent on the empire. Not so on the question of his disownment. His adversaries among the Quakers, he charged, "appear more *zealous* of their own *human Traditions*" and had punished him "for acting conscientiously agreeable to our *Saviour's* and his *Apostles Doctrine*."<sup>39</sup> Unable to argue his way back into the Devonshire House Monthly Meeting, he threatened to build a new church at his own expense for himself and other "sober, rational Christians."<sup>40</sup> He died in 1787, unrepentant. Still a wealthy man, in his will he provided generously for his surviving children, now all grown.<sup>41</sup> Though never able to rejoin his wife in public worship, he did rejoin her in death: he was buried alongside her among the Quaker plots in Bunhill Fields, a concession to her, perhaps even a mark of forgiveness toward him.<sup>42</sup>

Neil L. York

A revised version of this article has appeared in *Quaker History*, 91, (2002), pp. 1-19.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> To this point Crowley has been a footnote character in British imperial history. Alfred Leroy Burt, *Imperial Architects* (Oxford: B.H. Blackwell, 1913) saw the "Amor Patriae" proposals in the Earl of Chatham's papers. "Perhaps the details are not" Chatham's, "but of the idea there is no doubt at all," he concluded - -incorrectly (p.28). Charles Mullett, "English Imperial Thinking, 1764-1783" *Political Science Quarterly* 45 (1930): 548-579, noted Burt's mistake and correctly identified Crowley as the author, though "who Crowley was I have been unable to discover." (p.55, n. 6). See too Mullett's *Fundamental Law*



and *The American Revolution, 1760-1776* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1933), p.138. Brief allusions to Crowley as Amor Patriae can also be found in Fred Junkin Hinkhouse, *The Preliminaries of the American Revolution as seen in the English Press, 1763-1775* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1926), pp. 28, 122; Richard Koebner, *Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), p.160; and Arthur J. Mekeel, *The Relation of the Quakers to the American Revolution* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1979), passim, but Crowley had dropped out of the picture by the time of Jack P. Greene's *Peripheries and Center* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986). I wrote the sketch of Crowley that will appear in *The New Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming). Crowley was not included in the original *DNB*.

2 Benjamin Franklin to William Franklin, 1 September 1773, in Leonard Labaree, et al., eds., *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, 29 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press), 20: 387.

3 As cited from Crowley's compilation of his letters and essays in *Dissertations on Liberty of Conscience, Respecting the Payment of Tythes, and other Pecuniary and Legal Assessments. In Four Parts* (London: Dilly, Richardson and Urquhart, and Elizabeth Brooke, {1774}), p.210. Crowley pieces first published in *Reasons for Liberty of Conscience Respecting the Payment of Tythes, Or complying with other Pecuniary Laws Enacted by the Legislature* (London: n.p., 1771) and *Copies of Thomas Crowley's Letters and Dissertations on Society Concerns* (n.p., n.d.) were incorporated here.

4 *Ibid.*, pp.127-128, from a letter Crowley wrote to an unnamed "Esteemed Friend" on 1 January 1774.

5 Minute of 22 March 1771 of the London and Middlesex Quarterly Meeting Minutes, vol. 7, 1764-1772, p.418. Friends House Library, London

6 The Minutes of the [London] Six Weeks Meeting, 1772-1778, vol. 14, pp.98-99, Friends House Library.

7 See the London and Middlesex Quarterly Meeting Minutes, vol. 8, 1772-1777, which noted Crowley's appeal on 28 March 1774 (p.163) and the adverse report submitted on April 11th by the group appointed to hear the appeal (pp.166-167). Crowley brought together many of the documents connected to his disownment, including his protests that he was treated unfairly, in his *Dissertations on Liberty of Conscience*, pp.161-217.

8 Crowley alludes to this event, which took place in January 1776, in *Copies of Thomas Crowley's Letters to the Quakers, Not Printed before May 1, 1776; (Except a Few of the Latter) Together with some Essays in his Youth* (n.p., n.d.), pp.36-38. His request for reinstatement denied, Crowley became harsher in his criticism, as evidenced in many of the pieces included here. He questioned George Fox's knowledge of the scriptures (p.10, in a letter of 10 June 1774; two other examples on pp.15-17) and went so far as to draft a bill for Parliament's consideration that would have prevented the Society of Friends from punishing members for paying tithes (written by January 1776, on pp.38-40).

9 See, for example, the essays in *Dissertations on Liberty of Conscience*, pp.186-200. He was even more emphatic on the title page of his *Poetical Essays on Various Subjects* (London: n.p., 1784), stating "These by a Rational Christian, But no Quaker."

10 [Thomas and Mary Crowley] *Some Expressions of Ann Crowley* (London: Mary

Hinde, 1774). This pamphlet carried Psalms 90: 12 as an epigraph: "So teach us to number our Days that we may apply our Hearts unto Wisdom." It was apparently much in demand on the American side of the Atlantic, where it went through at least four editions in two years.

- 11 Crowley, *Dissertations on Liberty of Conscience*, p.79, from a piece dated 31 March 1767.
- 12 In *Ibid.*, pp.120-121, from a letter of 16 November 1773.
- 13 Crowley, signing himself Amor Patriae, to Dartmouth, 8 January 1774, in *Dartmouth Papers*, D (W) 1778/II/87, Staffordshire Record Office.
- 14 Crowley sent these figures to Dartmouth in a letter of February 1766, found in *ibid.* D (W) 1778/II/158, because Dartmouth was then head of the Board of Trade. The printed version was in turn reprinted in [Thomas Crowley] *Letters and Dissertations on Various Subjects, By the Author of the Letter Analysis A.P. On the Disputes between Great Britain and America* (London: Dilly, Richardson and Urquhart, and Eliz. Brooke, [1776]), pp.19-20. In this instance, as in the *Dissertations on Liberty of Conscience*, the title page noted "Printed for the AUTHOR" - -meaning that Crowley subsidized the costs. Crowley included in his *Letters and Dissertations* the four pieces that had been gathered earlier as *Dissertations on the Grand Dispute between Great-Britain and America* [London,1774].
- 15 Crowley, *Letters and Dissertations*, p.20. Crowley's figures were not necessarily accurate, however. His population estimates were probably low, as was his twelve shillings estimate. Grenville gave various amounts for expected stamp tax revenue, anywhere from £40,000 to £100,000. See John Bullion, *A Great and Necessary Measure* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1982). See too Crowley's "letters" to Grenville on pp.4-7, and the characterizations of who won the war and who should carry the postwar burden in a published piece from the *Gazetteer*, dated 1 January 1766 (in *Letters and Dissertations*, pp.7-9), that prompted Benjamin Franklin to draft a retort dated five days later, printed in Labaree, et al., eds., *Papers of Franklin*, 13-24. Franklin and Crowley never did see eye-to-eye on the question of imperial rights and responsibilities.
- 16 [William Knox] *Extra Official State Papers*, 2 vols. (London: J. Debrett, 1789) included in the appendix to volume 1 (on p.14) a letter that Grenville wrote to him on 4 September 1768, which read in part "Whether it would not be just and reasonable to grant to the Colonies Members of Parliament upon their petition to Parliament, for that purpose, in like manner as was done in the cases of Chester and Durham, is another question which, whenever such an application shall be properly made, will I hope be considered with every favourable disposition which their situation requires or admits of." Knox used the letter in an attempt to prove that Grenville supported his suggestion- -dating from the same period as Crowley's first thoughts on the subject, incidentally- -that Americans be seated in the House of Commons.
- 17 From Crowley's "Observations and Propositions for an Accommodation between Great Britain and her Colonies," 10 October 1768, in *Letters and Disquisitions*, p.79. There is a printed copy at the John Carter Brown Library, Brown University. As noted in Thomas R. Adams, ed., *The American Controversy*, 2 vols. (Providence: Brown University Press,1980), it had been sent to Governor Samuel Ward, who received it in January 1769. There is no

way of knowing how many copies Crowley paid to have printed or to whom they were sent. Crowley certainly had the financial wherewithal to pay for what he wanted, both in his imperial reform efforts and in his struggles with other Quakers.

- 18 For Otis see William Tudor's adulatory *The Life of James Otis of Massachusetts* (Boston: Wells and Lilly, 1823); Ellen Elizabeth Brennan's critical "James Otis: Recreant and Patriot" *New England Quarterly* 12 (1939): 691-725; and Bernard Bailyn's more balanced *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge: the Belknap Press, 1967), pp.176-181. which allows for Otis's personal peculiarities but also warned of the "confusion and difficulties inherent" if historians emphasize "principles above institutions" (p.176) in their quest to reconstruct Patriot notions about rights in the empire. Neither Grenville nor Otis thought much of Thomas Pownall's plans for imperial reform. Pownall was never concise, especially when compared with Crowley. In the first edition of *The Administration of the Colonies* (London: J. Wilkie, 1764) Pownall observed, vaguely, that the relationship between the mother country and the colonies "ought to be settled some way or the other." (p.38) He was only slightly clearer in 1774, though by then in his fifth edition. "No other line of pacification remains, than either that the Colonies be admitted into the Parliament of Great Britain by a general *British Union*; or that they have a *Parliament of their own under an American Union*." From *The Administration of the British Colonies* (London: J. Walter, 1774), p.82. Neither option was acceptable to enough politicians on either side of the Atlantic to work. For Pownall's gyrations see G.H. Guttridge, "Thomas Pownall's *The Administration of the Colonies: the Six Editions*" *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series 26 (1969): 31-46.
- 19 Crowley, "Observations and Propositions," *Letters and Dissertations*, p.79.
- 20 As taken from the *Letters and Dissertations*, pp.137-144, See below for handwritten copies that ended up in the Chatham and Franklin papers. There is also a printed version, without the introductory "Memorial" but also dated 10 December 1770, preserved in the Library Company of Philadelphia collections.
- 21 See Franklin's draft letter of 6 January 1766 in Labaree, et al., eds., *Papers of Franklin*, 13:23-26. Franklin erred; the Stamp Act Congress had already made it clear that leading colonists felt they could not be adequately represented in Parliament.
- 22 Crowley to Franklin, 8 February 1766, in *ibid.*, 13:122.
- 23 Crowley's "letter" to a "Gentleman in America" is in *The Public Advertiser*, 21 October 1768; reprinted in Crowley, *Letters and Dissertations*, pp. 47-49; quotes from pp.48-49.
- 24 Dated 21 October 1768, from *The Public Advertiser*, 24 October 1768; reprinted in Labaree, et al., eds., *Papers of Franklin*, 15:238-241 (quote from p.241). A handwritten copy is also in Additional Manuscripts 36, 596, fos. 201-204 (quoted portion, fos. 203-204), British Library.
- 25 See, notably, Franklin to Lord Kames, 25 February 1767 and to Jacques Barbeu-Dubourg, 2 October 1770, in Labaree, et al., eds., *Papers of Franklin*, 14:62-71 and 17:233-234, resp. There are three copies of Crowley's plan in the Benjamin Franklin Papers at the American Philosophical Society library, all of them signed *Amor Patriae*, with no hint as to actual authorship. Two are



- dated 17 November 1770 and can be found in Volume 53, fol. 5 (which has the plan alone) and Volume 69, fol. 92 (which includes the memorial with the plan). The third, dated 10 December 1770, is in Volume 69, fol. 93. This last includes the plan and conditions but not the introductory memorial. Albert Henry Smyth, ed., *The Writing of Benjamin Franklin*, 10 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1905-1907), 10:291-292, mistakenly presented the plan as Franklin's. I made Smyth's error my own in *Neither Kingdom Nor Nation: The Irish Quest for Constitutional Rights, 1698-1800* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1994), pp.92-93.
- 26 William Franklin to Benjamin Franklin, 31 January 1769, in Labaree, et al., eds., *Papers of Franklin*, 16:35. Thus, four years later (see note 2 above) the father was echoing the son.
- 27 Benjamin Franklin to William Franklin, 1 September 1773, in *ibid.*, 30:387.
- 28 See *Amor Patriae* to Pitt, 2 February 1766 and 17 November 1770, in the Chatham Papers 30/8/97 and 30/8/82, resp., Public Record Office, Kew. Basil Williams, "Chatham and the Representation of the Colonies in the Imperial Parliament" *English Historical Review* 22 (1907): 756-758, edited yet another version, also from the Chatham Papers (30/8/97). "That the scheme was Chatham's own in its details is not probable, but its main outlines at any rate concides with his well-known views for making the house of commons more truly representative." (p.757) Compare Williams with Burt (see n. 1 above) on this matter. Both were a bit off in their observations.
- 29 Crowley mentioned his approaching Rockingham in a letter to Dartmouth of 1 February 1766 in the Dartmouth Papers, D (W) 1778/II/58. He apparently sent his finished plan to George III- -see the *Letters and Dissertations*, p.136.
- 30 See R. Hingston Fox, *Dr. John Fothergill and His Friends* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1919); Betsy Copping Corner and Dorothea Waley Singer, "Dr. John Fothergill, Peacemaker" *Proceedings of the American Philsophical Society* 98 (February 1954): 11-22; and Franklin's commentary in Labaree, et al., eds., *Papers of Franklin*, 21:360-599, *passim*.
- 31 Crowley (as *Amor Patriae*) to Pitt, 2 February 1766, Chatham Papers 30/8/97.
- 32 Problems of representation went to the very core of political identity in the empire and may well have been worsened with any attempt to alter the basic composition at Westminster. The Irish, for example, might have taken issue with the larger American representation in the Commons provided for in Crowley's plan- -50 M.P.s versus their 30- -because Ireland's population was larger than that of the colonies. Crowley was probably considering representation for the Anglo-Irish elite more than for the island as a whole- -thus his favoring the eastern fringe, which could have shaken an already precarious political situation for the so-called "Protestant Ascendancy" in that "kingdom." And of course an infusion of Irish and American members would have affected the movement for Parliamentary reform just getting underway in Britain itself.
- 33 Crowley (as *Amor Patriae*) to Pitt, 2 February 1766, Chatham Papers 30/8/97, PRO.
- 34 The Revolutionary Era does not really have an equivalent to the "blundering generation" historiography of the Civil War, though Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Background of the American Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, revised ed., 1931) does come close to performing that role.



- 35 See Crowley, *Letters and Dissertations*, p.35, an undated "Memorandum," ca. 1766. Crowley had no objections to using British troops to enforce imperial law in the colonies- -see *ibid.*, p.65 and his argument, ca. 1768-1769, that troops ought to be used to humble the Patriots "arbitrary and rebellious Spirits."
- 36 *Ibid.*, p.244, from "A Dissertation on Disputes between Great Britain and her Colonies," which he signed ANALYSIS A.P., and dated 10 October 1775.
- 37 After all, many British parliamentarians held to a centrist political philosophy, a view best articulated for the Revolutionary generation in William Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1765-1769), but they still adapted their ideas to their needs. Even now, in the midst of devolution within the British Isles and wider involvement in the European Community, centrists may yet find a way to keep their notions about indivisible sovereignty and the crown in parliament intact. But then Americans have been able to perform their own logical gymnastics with their concept of federalism. These are issues that I am pursuing at greater length elsewhere. I will only note here that the intergrationist approach taken by Crowley was taken by others over the same ten year period. For an early example see *An Account of a Late Conference on the Occurrences in America, In a Letter to a Friend* (London: J. Almon, 1766); for a later one see political reformer Samuel Clay Harvey's proposal, reprinted in Peter Force, ed., *American Archives*, 9 vols. (Washington, D.C.: M. St. Clair Clarke and Peter Force, 1837-1853), 4th series, vol 1, pp.1204-1208. There were also those who sought a solution by moving in the opposite direction- -allowing the colonists some form of legislative autonomy while preserving direct imperial ties through the crown in parliament or the crown alone. For an example of the former see Joseph Galloway's 1774 plan presented at the First Continental Congress- -a revision of Franklin's 1754 Albany plan- -reprinted in Julian Boyd, *Anglo-American Union* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941); and the latter in [John Cartwright] *American Independence The Interest and Glory of Great-Britain. A New Edition* (London: H.S. Woodfall, 1775), the "postscript," pp. 1-51. Cartwright's ideas went far beyond those of Pownall and, in some respects, past those of Crowley as well.
- 38 Crowley, *Letters and Dissertations*, pp.249-251, from "A Copy of a letter to His MAJESTY," dated 31 October 1775.
- 39 From Crowley's blast at "the chief Priests or Preachers, Scribes or Clerks and Elders, who as Tools do rule," a printed sheet dated 3 October 1782, Adverse Box C2, Friends House Library, London.
- 40 From Crowley's 1784 handbill in *ibid.*
- 41 Crowley's will, proved in London on 18 December 1787, is in the Wills and Administrations at Somerset House, Prerogative Court of Canterbury, no. 1160, volume 12.
- 42 Mary Crowley had died in 1778. The burial records for both Thomas and Mary Crowley can be found in the London Quarterly Meeting, Digest Register of Burials, 1749-1837, Friends House Library; also the Society of Friends, Quarterly Meeting, London and Middlesex: no. 860, Burials 1776-1779, p.156, Public Record Office (Kew), Record Group 6/975 (for Mary); and no. 862, Burials, 1783-1787, p.270, PRO (Kew), RG 6/670 (for Thomas).

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

**Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation - Europe's House Divided 1490-1700*, London, Allen Lane for Penguin, 2003, £25.00.**

Diarmaid MacCulloch has a gift for writing clear and compelling narrative history, and his *Reformation* will provide the standard introduction to the subject for many years. He weaves together the diverse strands of religious change across the later denominational boundaries with exemplary skill, and lively sketches of character give a human depth to his portrayal of ecclesiastical history. He is not afraid to take long views. This gives his analysis a breadth of sympathy which perceives "reformation" as a process that involved all the churches under papal jurisdiction in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. One might however question whether the Europe he frequently invokes is not something of an anachronism. It was Western Christendom which was decisively fragmented by the processes of reformation. The tragic process left its heirs with nothing more than a residual geographical expression - Europe - unable to confer identity or inspire loyalty. If "Europe" is still marked by the divisions of religious strife, it is itself the creation of that conflict.

MacCulloch divides his massive work into three parts. 1570 separates the two sections of his narrative, and the third part traces the social implications of the religious change. The narrative and analysis of the origins and development of the Reformation to 1570 are masterly and show an extraordinary command of complexities, which in other hands might simply bewilder. He seems less at home and perhaps less excited by the developments after 1570, although on his own showing this was the crucial period when division became irreversible. By comparison this second part seems hurried. It finds no place to examine the catholic intransigence of Pascal or the repudiation of Calvinism by the Cambridge Platonists in the very college that had been founded to propagate it.

He obviously enjoyed writing the final section on patterns of life, particularly the chapters on love and sex, but it might have been better if the social analysis had been developed in a separate volume. As it stands one has the uneasy sense that a major scholarly work has been literally "sexed-up". He allows us to enjoy the salacious gossip of the Reformation, but sheds little light on the explosion of ribald and scurrilous polemic that the invention of printing seems to have released. More seriously he provides only occasional glimpses of the economic dimension of the changes that the Reformation brought about. One would barely guess that the period saw a massive change in European land ownership unparalleled since the barbarian invasions. In this respect MacCulloch displays an almost clerical disregard for the ecclesiastical consumption of resources.

Quaker readers will appreciate the sympathetic treatment of the radical aspect of the Reformation, which helps to place the origin of the Religious Society of Friends in a wider European context. They may also reflect on the spectacular failure of good will to overcome religious rancour. Despite outstanding personal examples of sweetness and light, they seem to have lacked the energy and the ability to overcome the power of passionate intransigence. This sorry tale of western Christendom unable to discover or deploy the political resources to overcome its own conflicts raises disturbing questions about the religion and society we have inherited. As Christians and Europeans today endeavour to heal old wounds, the precedent suggests that such opportunities are not only rare - they require a benevolent providence to be realised.

*Graham Shaw*

**Josiah Langdale: *A Quaker Spiritual Autobiography*. By Gil Skidmore, Reading, The Sowle Press, 1999. pp27.**

Josiah Langdale (1673-1723), *A Quaker Spiritual Autobiography*, is an admirable example of the search for spiritual fulfilment of an early Friend. In this slim volume, Gil Skidmore first provides a useful biographical introduction and then prints a full transcript of Langdale's autobiographical account of his life. It has been preserved in the Friends House Library since 1934, when it was bought from an American bookseller. It has not been published before. It appears to be a later copy of an eighteenth century text.

Josiah Langdale did not have an easy childhood. Born in Nafferton in the Yorkshire Wolds in 1673, his father died when he was eight. His mother remarried when he was fifteen, leaving him to find his own way in the world as a farm labourer. He found the solitary life of a ploughman congenial to his contemplative nature. It was through his Quaker employer, David Milner, and particularly his wife Sarah, that he first became involved with Friends. He had been brought up an Anglican but found no spiritual solace from the Established Church. After much soul-searching and attempts by his family and his local priest to deter him, he found his spiritual home among the "people of God", honest, virtuous, serious and caring people as he described them. His conviction was complete after his first attendance at Meeting by his own choice. He then experienced a call to the Ministry and was to travel widely in both Britain and the American Colonies. He married a fellow Quaker, Margaret Burton, in 1710, when he was thirty-seven. They had two children. In 1723, they set sail together for America but sadly Josiah died at sea. He was only forth-nine.

Such are the bare bones of his life. But the manuscript of his autobiography provides a very much more fascinating account of his spiritual odyssey. He describes in graphic detail his disappointment at his confirmation by his local Bishop, when after the laying on of his



hand, he "found no strength that I had received to my soul". He bares himself unreservedly when he gives an account of his subsequent search for grace and his discovery of Friends whom he "loved...because they were love-worthy". Josiah Langdale's autobiography, naïve and simplistic though it is, remains today a moving document. Gil Skidmore is to be commended for rescuing it from oblivion.

*Christopher Booth.*

***Scott of Amwell: Dr Johnson's Quaker Critic.* By David Pearman. Rockingham Press Ware, Hertfordshire 2001. Pp. 368. Illustrated. £28 (hardbound).**

David Pearman has written a substantial book about John Scott of Amwell (1731-1783), Friend, poet, reformer and grotto builder. It is well illustrated. Unusually it comes in two editions, casebound with notes, a bibliography, a fourteen page chapter containing unpublished poems (five sonnets and two others, one certain and one probable) and an index or paperbound without any of those important elements. While most of the notes simply cite the sources of statements or quotations in the text some are more extended. Pearman suggests that Scott is best remembered now for the grotto and asks 'But what was a Quaker doing building a grotto?' (there were others, for example built by a member of the Brassey family at Roxford near Ware and by Thomas Goldney in Bristol). It features quite largely in this book and its illustrations and Pearman explains its place in the eighteenth century fashion for follies, grottoes and the picturesque which connects with Scott's literary work.

Scott emerges less clearly as a Friend than in his other roles from Pearman's account, perhaps reflecting the information available rather than Quakerism's importance in Scott's life. However it is made clear that Scott was untypical as a Friend in his tastes, interests and pursuits whether in poetry, the appreciation of paintings, his love of music, public life and politics or the grotto. Yet in public life and his poetry Scott did demonstrate the kind of concerns appropriate to Friends if in less usual ways, two of his better poems were odes written against military recruiting and privateering. Scott's circle included other Friends who were well known outside the Society, Lettsom and Dimsdale for example. He was a fifth generation Friend, his brother Samuel was both more conventional and more prominent within the Society, a source of coolness between them if not tension. There was family wealth which came from a business as maltsters and Pearman is illuminating on the Quaker maltsters of Ware and Southwark. Scott was clerk of his monthly meeting on more than one occasion, attended monthly meeting regularly at other times besides his own meeting for worship and took his share of the other tasks that fell to Friends for example several times being appointed to visit Friends whose behaviour was unsatisfactory. Perhaps more unusual were his membership of the Great Amwell Parish Vestry and his ready adoption and defence of the usage Esquire which his friend and correspondent Joseph Cockfield firmly declined. Pearman



describes how Scott took offence when his Quakerism was derided in a published criticism of his poems. There is an affecting account of his last days, especially the final conversations with his brother drawn from his brother's writings (and widely available later to Friends also in *Piety Promoted*, the ninth part). So Scott though untypical in many ways was a committed Friend whose last words were an example to others and who attended yearly meeting in his last year. He was one of a number whose lives contradict the assumptions of an almost totally quietist Quaker eighteenth century.

Scott's involvement in public affairs was more extensive than that of most of his contemporaries amongst Friends. His aims, if not his participation in controversy and politics, were largely consistent with Friends' beliefs and causes. He made a serious and solid if not innovative contribution to contemporary discussions of the poor law system, served on turnpike trusts, published the useful *Digests* which contained a summary of the law and practical advice on road building (perhaps his major concern and interest in local and national public affairs) and expressed his opinions publicly on the evils of corruption, gambling, cruelty to animals and capital punishment. Several of his publications were more political and Pearman undertakes a fairly detailed examination of the opposing pamphlets by Scott and Samuel Johnson (who was otherwise on friendly terms with Scott and visited the grotto). Scott also took issue with Johnson on his *Lives of the Poets*.

Scott does rank among the many minor English poets of the eighteenth century the best of whose works deservedly survive in many anthologies. His published output was not great, partly because of his standards and, one assumes, the sheer amount of his other activities. Small parts of it, most frequently the short poem 'Ode on hearing the drum', have appeared steadily in a variety of anthologies, general, dealing with Quaker verse or of topographical poetry. Both his *Poetical Works* (1782 and two other eighteenth century editions) and his *Critical Essays on Some of the Poems of Several English Poets* (1785) were reprinted in 1969. Pearman gives a good deal of space both to Scott's verse and to discussion of its genesis and prolonged revision. While he may seem to overvalue Scott's poetry he does ask why he 'could turn out poem after poem of banal imagery and diction'. The earlier biography of Scott by Lawrence D. Stewart (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1956) is perhaps better on the criticism of Scott's poetry and literary output but Pearman's thorough research has discovered previously unknown letters and poems.

All in all Scott's achievements were relatively minor but worth narrating. They are of interest to specialists in the various fields that absorbed his energies, their unusual conjunction in one eighteenth century Friend has been worth study. David Pearman has brought together a good deal of unfamiliar information. He quotes extensively from unpublished materials, at times he is repetitive and could perhaps have been selective. His account of Scott may be read more by local historians than others and must be a valuable contribution to

Hertfordshire history as well as a useful portrait of a Friend from a period not well served by modern biographies.

*David J. Hall*

**"Cowards" by Marcus Sedgwick**

**Hodder Children's Books 2003 £4.99 ISBN: 0340860618**

A sealed train speeds through the night around the outskirts of wartime London in 1916. As it passes through a dimly-lit station without stopping, a note is thrown out on to the platform. What is happening to the men on board? Why do they have to resort to such a desperate method of contacting their loved ones?

Marcus Sedgwick is primarily a children's writer, but please do not let this put you off reading this compelling true story about two brave First World War conscientious objectors, as he calls them "the men who refused to fight". In fact this makes it an even more powerful read. As we all know children are often very discerning critics and I think you will agree that the sooner they can come into contact with peace issues and pacifism of this nature the better. However, my only real criticism is that the inclusion of illustrations, photographs and some statistical graphs would in my view have made this an even more readable and accessible book to children and adults alike. Marcus Sedgwick's most recent novel, *The Dark Horse*, a mysterious magical legend set mythically in Icelandic saga country was short listed for the prestigious Carnegie Children's Book Award 2003.

Marcus had actually set out to write a novel about the subject, but after extensive research initially at Friend's House Library and ironically much more fruitfully at The Imperial War Museum, he changed his mind and wrote a non-fiction book instead with a real human interest dimension. I met Marcus recently when he was promoting his new book at a Hodder Publishers event for School Librarians in Euston Road, London. In my capacity as both a Secondary School Librarian and a Quaker I quizzed him about his connections and interest in Quakers. He told me that his father and his grandfather were both CO's during the Second World War and that his grandmother is in fact herself a Quaker. He is interested in Quakerism but does not attend meeting. I noticed that there is reassuringly, a definition in the Glossary and also seven page references in the index to the Quakers.

The book tells the poignant, courageous personal story of two ordinary working men who were both Londoners. Alfred Evans, was an apprentice in a piano factory and Howard Marten was a bank clerk and many of his family including his father and acquaintances were Quakers. The author was accustomed to doing historical research for his novels; but he was very surprised at how difficult it was to find plentiful and reliable sources of information about World War 1 CO's and how

little there was to be found before the trail ran cold. His key sources were two transcripts (one written, one spoken) made around the 1960's by the men while they were still alive.

Surprisingly there were as many as 16,500 men (and possibly some women) who claimed a conscientious objection to fighting in the First World War. I had been unaware just how severely they were treated. Not only were these brave and principled men scorned, reviled or insulted by almost every other member of their society and subjected to constant daily verbal abuse, for instance the word "conchie" short for conscientious objector was shouted at them in the street. They were also often stopped and handed a white feather - the sign of cowardice. This handing of a white feather may account for why many people are still resistant to the use of white poppies around Remembrance Sunday. Ideally to prevent offence I tend to try and wear both a red and white poppy together. The red one to remember those who died in both World Wars and the white one to signify hope for the future and support for peace initiatives.

Not only were they subjected to verbal abuse of this nature but CO's lives were also at risk daily on account of their pacifist stance, especially after they were sent to France on a ship as prisoners when nobody knew what else to do with them. They were treated with extreme cruelty and the conditions were inhuman and harsh. Howard says:-

"We were forever being threatened with the death sentence. Over and over again we'd be marched up and read out a notice: some man had been sentenced to death through disobedience at the front. They had the power to"

In fact thankfully and due to a set of amazing coincidences and lucky breaks both Howard and Alfred lived to tell their tale and at no time did they compromise their strongly held conviction that war was wrong and they would take no active part in it.

The book reminds us that at the outbreak of war the Quakers devised and circulated a Declaration on the War to all their Meetings, stating that "all war is utterly incompatible with the plain precepts of our divine lord". Also at this time, as we know, the Friend's Ambulance Unit which provided ambulance services on the front line, and the War Victim's Relief Committee, which brought food and medicine to civilian victims of the war across France and Belgium were set up, or took up new service.

I would recommend this book to anyone who has an historical interest in the sparsely documented treatment of First World War CO's. or in the motivations and background of these ordinary and exceptionally brave young people who stepped out of the mould and paved the way for our present day peace movements and the much more extensive CO presence in the Second World War. It is a short and simple introduction

to a complex and little researched subject area. Also, this book is a must for our individual Quaker Meeting's libraries for both children and adults to read. It could act as a powerful vehicle for outreach, as the story straddles both the Quaker and the non-Quaker approaches to the Testimony for Peace in the troubled and violent times we all live.

Some suggested websites:-

[www.ppu.org.uk/learn/infodocs/cos/st\\_co\\_wwone.htm](http://www.ppu.org.uk/learn/infodocs/cos/st_co_wwone.htm)

[www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/FWWpacifists.htm](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/FWWpacifists.htm)

[www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/2WWco.htm](http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/2WWco.htm)

*Alison Wallace*



## CORRESPONDENCE

Sheila Mitchell  
38 Moresby Close,  
Westlea,  
Swindon,  
Wilts,  
SN5 7BX

E Mail - [sheila@hannahlightfoot.freeseve.co.uk](mailto:sheila@hannahlightfoot.freeseve.co.uk)

06 November 2002

The Editor,

**Hannah Lightfoot - Volume 59 Number 1.**

I read with great interest the article about Hannah Lightfoot written by David Sox as I have been researching this lady's story for the last twenty-seven years.

If I may I would just like to bring the story of Hannah up to date. At the beginning of 2002 Tigress Productions, a television production company based in Bristol, were able to further their aim to make a programme about Hannah Lightfoot when they gained the support of the widow of the late Earl of Munster. She agreed to allow DNA testing to be carried out on DNA obtained from the late Earl. The late Earl of Munster was an acknowledged male descendant of George III through an entire male line of descent and once the geneticists had identified the unique male marker they were able to compare DNA from putative male descendants of George III through an entire male line to see whether any of the putative male descendants had this same unique marker and were thus descended from George III.

Many putative descendants have a cross gender line of descent and were therefore unsuitable for comparison. In the end three families were identified. These were descendants of George Rex of Knysna, George Rex of Hobart, Tasmania and General John Mackelcan. The results indicated that none of the putative male descendants shared the same male marker that was found in the DNA of the late Earl of Munster thus negating the possibility of descent from George III.

Further, the production company also tested the documents produced in the Ryves/Serres's court case of 1866. These documents had been authenticated by Sir Ernest Netherclift but were deemed to be forgeries by the court of law and were thus impounded for 100 years.

A handwriting expert looked at these documents again and determined that the signatures of the various personalities involved were within the limits of change expected by any one person during the course of their lives and dependent upon the nature of the document to

which the signature was appended. However, Peter Bower, a Paper Historian showed that watermarks within the paper proved that the paper had been made between 1790 and 1810. Thus, as the signatures on these documents were said to have been applied in 1759 and 1762 the documents cannot possibly be genuine.

Many might feel that this proof concludes the Hannah Lightfoot story however, the fact that the marriage certificates produced were not genuine simply proves that the documents were not documentary evidence of a marriage. In themselves they do not prove that a marriage or a relationship did not take place.

The hunt for the truth about Hannah Lightfoot and her time and place of death and her final resting place continues.

Yours faithfully,

Sheila Mitchell

The Editor,  
The Journal of the Friends Historical Society,

## NOTES AND QUERIES

Stefano Villani has published an article: 'Una quacchera a Lisbona. I viaggi e gli scritti di Ann Gargill' published in [*Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa - Classe di Lettere e Filosofia*]. serie IV, vol. IV, I (1999), pp 247-281.

The article is based on unpublished Inquisition material of the Archivs Nacionais/Torne do Tombo in Lisbon that casts light on Ann Gargill's travels in Portugal, mentioned (with a wrong date) in Fox's *Journal*. A copy has been presented to the Library at Friends House, London.

A copy has been received, March 2004, of: *A True Account of the Great Tryals and Cruel Sufferings Undergone By Those Two Faithful Servants of God Katherine Evans and Sarah Cheevers*.

*La vicenda di due quacchera prigioniere dell' inquisizione di Malta*. [A cura di Stefano Villani.] Pubblicazioni Della Classe Di Lettere e Filosofia, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa. XXIX (2003).

This contains a detailed introduction in Italian followed by texts in English and Latin. I should be interested to hear from any member of the Society fluent in Italian and Latin who can undertake a review of the above for a subsequent issue of the *Journal*.

Should a review not be possible I shall place the volume in the Library at Friends House, London, with thanks to Stefano Villani.

## PUBLISHER'S INFORMATION

Boydell & Brewer  
 PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF ♦ Tel: 01394 610660,  
 Fax: 01394 610616  
 Also 668 Mount Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620-2731

**John Lambert, Parliamentary Soldier and  
 Cromwellian Major-General, 1619-1684**

DAVID FARR

**A biography of one of the most prominent soldiers in the New Model Army, who made Cromwell Lord Protector but stopped him becoming king.**

Lambert first rose to prominence as a cavalry commander in the civil wars of 1642-51. He was a prominent upholder of power of the New Model Army through his creation of the Major Generals who ruled England in 1655. He was instrumental in Cromwell becoming Lord Protector in 1653 and was the originator of the Instrument of Government on which Cromwell's Protectorate was based, but prevented him becoming king in 1657. He emerged after the Protector's death as a possible successor, but his radical ideas seemed to threaten even 'his own side', and led to his imprisonment in the Tower. He escaped to stage a last desperate republican stand against the return of Charles II, and although subsequently convicted of treason, was not executed - sure recognition that his character, private actions and beliefs were something more than those of a military revolutionary.

**DAVID FARR** is head of history at Norwich School.

### BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS

**1 b/w illus.; 278pp, 23.4 x 15.6cm, 1 84383 004 3, Sterling £50.00(s)**

**US dollar \$85.00, hardback**

**Publication 15 August 2003**

**US: Boydell & Brewer Inc**

The book is available to members of F.H.S at a special discount of £37.50 instead of £50.00.

Please quote ref: 04507 when making the order and send to the above address. Postage and packing is £2.00 within UK irrespective of number of copies ordered and £4.00 overseas.



## BIOGRAPHIES

CHRISTINE TREVETT is a Quaker who teaches in the University of Wales, Cardiff. There she is a professor of religion, specialising in the second and third centuries, but her interest in seventeenth century Quakerism drags her away from what she is *supposed* to be researching!

JOHN WOODS was educated at Saffron Walden before returning as Head from 1968 to 1989, with Manchester University for a degree in history, Wennington School. Wetherby and Friends School Kamusinga, Kenya, among other places, for teaching history in between. Since retirement he has written a dissertation on the context and experience of early Quaker worship for a degree from York University.

NEIL L. YORK is a professor of history and history department chair at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. His most recent book was *TURNING THE WORLD UPSIDE DOWN: THE WAR OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE AND THE PROBLEM OF EMPIRE*, published in 2003 by Praeger, for a series edited by Jeremy Black of the University of Exeter.





## Supplements to the Journal of Friends Historical Society

21. AN ORATOR'S LIBRARY. John Bright's books. Presidential address 1936 by J. Travis Mills. 1946. 24pp., 50p
22. LETTERS TO WILLIAM DEWSBURY AND OTHERS. Edited by Henry J. Cadbury. 1948. 68pp. £3.00
24. THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY OF EARLY FRIENDS, Presidential address by Frederick B. Tolles, 1952. £1.00
28. PATTERNS OF INFLUENCE IN ANGLO-AMERICAN QUAKERISM. By Thomas E. Drake. 1958. £1.00
29. SOME QUAKER PORTRAITS, CERTAIN AND UNCERTAIN. By John Nickalls. 1958. Illustrated. £1.00
32. JOHN WOOLMAN IN ENGLAND, 1772. By Henry J. Cadbury. 1971. £2.00
33. JOHN PERROT. By Kenneth L. Carroll. 1971. £2.00
34. "THE OTHER BRANCH": LONDON Y.M. AND THE HICKSITES, 1827-1912. By Edwin B. Bronner. 1975. £1.25
35. ALEXANDER COWAN WILSON, 1866-1955. By Stephen Wilson. 1974. £1.00
- FHS, Occasional Series No. 1 MANCHESTER, MANCHESTER AND MANCHESTER AGAIN: from 'SOUND DOCTRINE' to 'A FREE MINISTRY'. By Roger C. Wilson. 1990. Members £2.00, Non-Members £3.00.

Back issues of the *JOURNAL* can be obtained for £3 per issue for members and £5 for non members to include postage and packing. Overseas applicants are asked to add £2 to cover the additional cost of post. Requests should be made to the Treasurer c/o The Library, Friends House, 173 Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ.

---

### *Journals and Supplements Wanted*

FHS would be glad to receive unwanted copies of back issues of the *Journal* and of the Supplements. Address to FHS, c/o The Library, Friends House, London NW1 2BJ.



ISSN No. 0071 9587

---

E. & E. Plumridge Ltd, Linton Cambridge