

“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,¹ 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.²

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 Friends³ 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 1901.⁴ 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.⁵ It changed in terms of the language it used and how it used it⁶ and by becoming increasingly institutionalised and patriarchal.⁷ It became London-centred⁸ 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).⁹

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.¹⁰

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.¹¹ 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”.¹²

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.¹³ *Meeting for Sufferings* was minuted from 1676 and the Meeting which concerns us, the *Morning Meeting* was minuted was from 1673. All but the *Six Weeks Meeting* was comprised only of men.¹⁴

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,¹⁵ 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.¹⁶

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.¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ Larry Ingle wrote¹⁹ 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.²⁰

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.²¹

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,²² so that the Meeting did indeed have a censoring role.²³

"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 writings²⁴ 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.²⁵

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*.²⁶ 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-meeting²⁷

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 Meeting²⁸ and with reading manuscripts submitted to it. The men met in the houses of Friends as early as 6 a.m.²⁹ and were indeed “longsuffering and superconscientious”, as one writer has observed.³⁰

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"³¹ ... "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"³² ... "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.³³ 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.³⁴ 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 published³⁵ - it had always been a small minority of women Friends, though their numbers were very significant in seventeenth century publishing terms.³⁶ Nevertheless the work of the *Morning Meeting* was ensuring that it was less easy to be published.³⁷ 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.³⁸

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.³⁹ 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.⁴⁰ There are hints of an undercurrent of discontent about the way things were going in relation to women's "public" ministry⁴¹ 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.⁴² Thereafter they would be able to join the men in the Yearly Meeting of ministers.⁴³ The *Morning Meeting* was also conscious that Meetings for female ministers were an issue⁴⁴ 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.⁴⁵ 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.⁴⁶ 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.⁴⁷ Prophesying had provided a loophole

through which a woman might slip into the public sphere, a sphere otherwise denied to her.⁴⁸ Now, however, the language most characteristic of the prophet was being outlawed by Friends⁴⁹ and William Edmundson was telling them that the “hardy temper, capacity and ability of men” was “fitter” for journeying to “publish the doctrine”.⁵⁰

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.⁵¹

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.⁵² I shall take three examples. These will be Judith Boulby,⁵³ Mary Scott and Joan Whitrow(e).⁵⁴

(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.⁵⁵ Six years later (26.3.1679) *A Warning and Lament over England* came before the *Morning Meeting*⁵⁶ 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. 11th 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 3rd 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".⁵⁷

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".⁵⁸ 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,⁵⁹ Once scrutinised, the Meeting decided (in the 5th 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 onwards⁶⁰ 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".⁶¹

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".⁶² 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.⁶³ 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".⁶⁴ It would not have appealed to the *Morning Meeting*.⁶⁵

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 1653.⁶⁶ 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*,⁶⁷ 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,⁶⁸ 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.⁶⁹

The progress of Quakerism was hindered abruptly by the migration of hundreds of Welsh Friends to Pennsylvania from the early 1680s,⁷⁰ so as to participate in William Penn's *Holy Experiment*.⁷¹ It never recovered or regained a distinctively *Welsh* character thereafter. Indeed in 1684 Richard Davies⁷² wrote to William Penn prophetically saying "this country will be shortly with but few friends in".⁷³ Some Meetings died: some struggled into life again a few years later.⁷⁴

In England and in Wales the young were drawn to land and opportunity in Pennsylvania⁷⁵ but some of those left behind felt abandoned and complained⁷⁶ and eighteenth century Welsh Quakerism was depleted and struggling,⁷⁷ though still it produced colourful characters.⁷⁸

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,⁷⁹ 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.⁸⁰ 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”⁸¹ 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.⁸² Even their horses were peculiar.⁸³ 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.⁸⁴ 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,⁸⁵ 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.⁸⁶ However, there was a book-buying clientele⁸⁷ 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.⁸⁸ 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.⁸⁹ 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.⁹⁰

This brings me back to the work of the *Morning Meeting* and to late 17th and early 18th 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.⁹¹ 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 Jenkins⁹² 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 dead⁹³ 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?⁹⁴ 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.⁹⁵

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 1707⁹⁶ 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.⁹⁷ 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 (21.3rd month) “Prudence Davies of Wales” was requesting that her manuscript should be returned.⁹⁸ 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.⁹⁹ 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 two¹⁰⁰ and the works tend to belong to women.¹⁰¹ 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.¹⁰² 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.¹⁰³

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 capacity¹⁰⁴ and women Friends might fail for reasons not to do with English grammar,¹⁰⁵ 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.¹⁰⁶

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.¹⁰⁷ 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.¹⁰⁸ 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.¹⁰⁹ 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.¹¹⁰ 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.¹¹¹

Lydia Erbery, now Fell, had lived and ministered in the West Indies with her husband Henry.¹¹² 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.¹¹³ 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".¹¹⁴ 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.¹¹⁵ 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.¹¹⁶ 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*.¹¹⁷ He is first recorded in the Minutes in 1693 (19.12th 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.¹¹⁸ 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 1704.¹¹⁹

Geraint H. Jenkins has noted Wales fared badly with the *Morning Meeting*.¹²⁰ 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.¹²¹

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 researched¹²² 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 2nd 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 19th 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 18th 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. Foxton, “*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, Traffferthion, 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 13th of 6th 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 2nd 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. 11th. 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 13th 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 11th 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.