

CAROLINE L. LEACHMAN

FROM AN 'UNRULY SECT' TO A SOCIETY OF 'STRICT UNITY': THE  
DEVELOPMENT OF QUAKERISM IN ENGLAND c. 1650-1689

Thesis submitted for the degree of Ph.D. in History  
September, 1997

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON



## **ABSTRACT**

By 1689 Quakers had changed sufficiently from their 'radical' beginnings to be included in the Toleration Act of that year. This thesis examines key areas of Quaker thought and practice from c. 1650-1689 in an attempt to explain why Quakers became more acceptable.

Although 1660 was an obvious turning point in Quakerism, many changes did not occur until some years later. Of utmost importance was the development of the highly efficient network of both central and local business meetings during the later 1660s and into the 1670s which provided a framework for further change in the sense that organization helped to bring about some degree of control in the movement. Coupled with this were changes in patterns of leadership and authority. Quakerism developed from a movement relying on charismatic leadership to one based much more on the authority of the central bodies in London. Crucial too were the many shifts in religious thought which can be seen clearly in Quaker catechisms over the period. There was a gradual move towards more orthodox doctrinal standpoints during the 1660s and 1670s in areas where Quakers had been deemed heretical, for example in their notion of the 'inner light' and its relation to the incarnate Christ and Quaker views of the Trinity. The most noticeable change came in Quaker behaviour. By 1689, Quakers had dropped the enthusiastic activities of earlier years such as 'testifying by signs' which had attracted such attention and were no longer seen as social radicals. Anti-Quaker sources confirm this view: Quakers were still viewed with suspicion in relation to their religious beliefs but they were no longer perceived as the wild individuals of the 1650s who had appeared to their adversaries to be intent on destroying the social order.

### *Acknowledgments*

I am grateful to Dr. Nicholas Tyacke for his help and guidance throughout the four years spent on this thesis.

Thanks also to the archivists and librarians at Friend's House Library for their advice and assistance.

On a more personal note I would like to thank my family- James, Dorothy and Anthony Leachman for their support, and Ian Kirwan and Jill Isted for their assistance with the more practical matters involved in producing the thesis.

*CONTENTS*

<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1-5</b>
<b>Chapter 1</b> Quaker Doctrine c. 1650-1689	<b>6-64</b>
<b>Chapter 2</b> Quaker 'Central' Organization c. 1650-1689	<b>65-117</b>
<b>Chapter 3</b> Quaker Local Organization c. 1650-1689	<b>118-186</b>
<b>Chapter 4</b> Quaker Leadership c. 1650-1670	<b>187-224</b>
<b>Chapter 5</b> Quaker Leadership c. 1670-1689	<b>225-244</b>
<b>Chapter 6</b> Quaker Behaviour c. 1650-1689	<b>245-285</b>
<b>Chapter 7</b> Anti-Quaker Writings c. 1650-1689	<b>286-327</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>328-371</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>372-386</b>

*Abbreviations*

B.L.L.	<i>Brotherton Library, Leeds</i>
D.W.L.	<i>Dr. William's Library, London</i>
E.S.R.O	<i>East Sussex Record Office, Lewes</i>
E.Y.R.O.	<i>East Yorkshire Record Office, Beverley</i>
F.H.L.	<i>Friend's House Library, London</i>
L.P.S.	<i>Letters and Papers Respecting the Separatists, B.L.L.</i>
S.Q.M.M.	<i>Sussex Quarterly Meeting Minutes, E.S.R.O.</i>
Y.Q.M.M.	<i>Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting Minutes, B.L.L.</i>

## INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to examine changes within Quakerism, from its position as a 'radical' movement in the 1650s to its subsequent acquisition of respectability, as typified by the Quakers' inclusion in the Toleration Act of 1689. Although a number of older histories of early Quakerism exist, they are rather general in nature. W.C. Braithwaite's valuable two volume study on the subject is the standard work on Quakerism and deals closely with Quakerism in the 1650s, but the second volume covers a broad period from 1660 well into the early 18th century.<sup>1</sup> Conversely, the modern historiography of Quakerism tends to be rather specialized; historians such as Hugh Barbour and Geoffrey Nuttall, for example, stress the religious aspects of Quakerism, whilst Christopher Hill, Barry Reay and others have concentrated on the social and political elements and have analysed the movement mainly within the context of the English Civil War.<sup>2</sup> As a result no overall picture exists of the transitions in Quakerism and why Friends were able to achieve toleration in 1689. Barry Reay includes a chapter on post-Restoration Quakerism and sketches some ideas, yet he admits that 'it is

---

<sup>1</sup>W.C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (London, 1912, reprinted, York, 1981); *The Second Period of Quakerism* (London, 1919, reprinted, York, 1979).

<sup>2</sup>Hugh Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England* (New Haven, 1964, repr. 1985); Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (Oxford 1946, new edition with introduction by Peter Lake, Chicago and London, 1992); Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* (London, 1972); Barry Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (London, 1985).

easier to chart the transformation of Quakerism after 1660 than it is to account for it'.<sup>3</sup>

A number of themes have been selected as a framework with which to analyse the changes within early Quakerism; these cover doctrine, organization, leadership, behaviour and anti-Quaker writing. The opening chapter analyses doctrinal developments over the period and examines major tenets of Quaker theology such as their idea of the 'inner light' and its relation to the incarnate Christ, the Quaker belief in perfection and their questioning of the orthodox view of the Trinity, as well as covering aspects of Quaker worship. Although 1650s Quaker doctrine has been well-documented, there are gaps for the post-Restoration period. As Barry Reay has pointed out, 'We still do not know enough about the long-term development of Quaker theology to reach any firm conclusions about the period after 1660'.<sup>4</sup>

The second chapter on Quaker 'central' organization examines the move towards, and establishment in the 1670s, of the three central meetings in London: the Yearly Meeting and the two executive meetings- the Meeting for Sufferings and the Second Day Morning Meeting. Although some work has been done on these, particularly the latter two meetings, by Craig Horle and Thomas O'Malley respectively, certain areas have not been adequately explored, for example membership of these meetings

---

<sup>3</sup>Reay, *Quakers and the English Revolution*, p. 121.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 112.

and financial matters.<sup>5</sup>

The establishment of a 'central' organization was very important in the development of Quakerism, as was that of the local meeting system which began to take shape in the late 1660s under the instigation of George Fox; the effect of organization was to have a restraining influence on the more enthusiastic tendencies in early Quakerism which was crucial if the movement was to become generally accepted. Whilst a number of studies of Quakerism in different regions exists, on the whole these tend not to relate the functions of the local meetings to those of the central meetings in London, with the exception of Nicholas Morgan's work on Lancashire.<sup>6</sup> The growth of the network of meetings; preparative, monthly and quarterly meetings as well as their functions, membership and interaction with the London meetings, is the subject of chapter three.

The fourth chapter comprises an investigation of Quaker leadership and analyses how far this influenced the overall development of the movement. The contributions and significance of major Quaker figures such as George Fox, Margaret Fell, James Nayler, George Whitehead, William Penn

---

<sup>5</sup>Craig Horle, *The Quakers and the English Legal System 1660-1688* (Philadelphia, 1988); Thomas 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).

<sup>6</sup>For example, Helen Forde, 'Derbyshire Quakers 1650-1761' University of Leicester Ph.D thesis, 1977; E.K.L. Quine, 'The Quakers in Leicestershire 1648-1780' University of Nottingham Ph.D thesis, 1968; D.A. Scott, 'Politics, Dissent and Quakerism in York 1640-1700', University of York, D.Phil thesis, 1990; Nicholas Morgan, *Lancashire Quakers and the Establishment 1660-1720* (Halifax, 1993).

and Robert Barclay are examined, as well as changes in the nature of Quaker leadership, from that based on charismatic authority in the 1650s, to that grounded in the central bodies of the Quaker organization in the 1670s and 80s.

An important additional consideration relating to why Quakers became acceptable by 1689 is the changes which took place in their behaviour over the period, and provides the subject of the fifth chapter. This includes analyses of Quakers as an 'ecstatic' movement, attitudes to authority and society, their stance on violence and fighting and Quaker mores and discipline. These issues are well documented for the 1650s by historians such as Christopher Hill and Barry Reay, though less emphasis has been placed on their longer-term development after the Restoration.

The sixth chapter examines anti-Quaker writings which are a much under-used source in studies of early Quakerism, with the exception of Barry Reay's work on anti-Quaker responses in the 1650s.<sup>7</sup> It pinpoints the major objections to Friends over the decades, such as their perceived unorthodoxy, aspects of their behaviour and to what extent these views changed or shifted in emphasis. As this tests some of the findings and assumptions of the previous chapters and obviously links in especially with those on doctrine, behaviour, and organization, it is a useful way of concluding the thesis.

A number of appendices have been included where it was thought helpful; these are mostly financial accounts from the

---

<sup>7</sup>Reay, *Quakers and the English Revolution*, Part 2, pp. 49-62.

chapters on central and local organization, and a listing, by decade, of anti-Quaker publications.

## CHAPTER 1

### QUAKER DOCTRINE c.1650-1689

#### *Introduction*

It is often stated that 17th century Quakers were not much interested in matters of doctrine. Instead, they were allegedly more concerned with the promotion of moral righteousness and a kind of practical religion, a logical outcome of their belief in the 'inner light'. Nevertheless, although matters of doctrine may not have been of primary concern, Quakers were bound to touch on theological issues in order to defend themselves from the plethora of anti-Quaker publications, as well as to solicit relief from Westminster, and, very importantly, they had to outline doctrinal issues in their pamphlets as part of their missionary work and in order to spread the Quaker message. Kate Peters has recently shown how Quakers in the 1650s took pamphleteering very seriously and viewed it as an essential part of their missionary work.<sup>1</sup> In the post-Restoration years when persecution of Quakers was even greater than it had been during the Interregnum, Quakers needed to define their doctrinal position more clearly and did so with the publication of Robert Barclay's *Apology* in 1678 and his *Catechism and Confession of Faith* of 1673. Similarly, in the months leading up to the Toleration Act in 1689

---

<sup>1</sup>Kate Peters (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge) Institute of Historical Research, London. Religious History Seminar, 30.11.93. 'The Distribution and Readership of Quaker Pamphlets, 1652-1656'.

clarification on issues such as the Trinity and the Scriptures was of utmost importance and the Meeting for Sufferings and Second Day Morning Meeting were very concerned to promote an orthodox view of these and other issues where Quakers had been deemed heretical.

This chapter will survey Quaker theology from the movement's inception through to the Toleration Act of 1689. It will focus on the question of continuity and change in Quaker thought and the vexed question of orthodoxy, and how Quakers came to be included in the 1689 act when in the early years they had been branded as blasphemous and heretical for their apparent rejection of the Trinity, their belief in the supremacy of immediate revelation over scriptural authority and the lack of emphasis on the incarnate Christ. Under the Toleration Act Quakers were able to make a declaration expressing their belief in the Trinity and the Bible as the Word of God which was sufficient to bring them the benefits of toleration. Shifts in these doctrinal positions do not provide the full explanation of why Quakers were tolerated in 1689 but they go part of the way. Gradually after the Restoration in 1660, Quakers can be seen not so much changing their doctrines but altering emphases and avoiding the more enthusiastic statements so common in the 1650s. The prime example of this may be seen in their discussions of the 'inner light', and its relation to the historic Christ and the atonement, where the latter are stressed much more.

For the sake of clarity and avoidance of either repetition or the temptation perhaps to exaggerate change

post-1660, the major doctrinal issues have been looked at thematically, albeit within a chronological framework, throughout the given time-span. These themes will cover the nature of the 'inner light', its relation to Christ and the Quaker view of salvation, the Quaker idea of the Trinity, their attitude to Scripture, and a section on Quaker worship. Where appropriate various Quaker catechisms have been used which were published between 1650 and 1689 as these are a much under-used source and help to pin down Quaker thought in regard to doctrine which was not always homogeneous.

#### *Concept of the 'inner light' and related beliefs*

To begin with, it would seem appropriate to turn to the central tenet of Quaker thought that of the 'inner light' which has been viewed as an extension of the Puritan emphasis on the Holy Spirit. As Peter Lake has noted in his introduction to the reprint of Geoffrey Nuttall's *Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience*, Nuttall saw Puritanism as 'a movement along that spectrum toward a greater emphasis on the testimony of the spirit, almost to the exclusion of the other ordinances of the church, and with the Quakers almost to the exclusion of the word itself'.<sup>2</sup> Nuttall himself has stated that Quakerism was 'but the carrying forward of a development already well advanced within radical Puritanism; was an emphasis, a fusing and systematization of beliefs which had appeared earlier but which had then been more hesitant,

---

<sup>2</sup>Peter Lake, introduction, in, Nuttall, *Holy Spirit*, p. xx.

sporadic and unrelated'.<sup>3</sup> The main bone of contention between Quakers and Puritans was the extremes to which the Quakers took the doctrine of the spirit which they equated with the 'light'.

This discussion of the 'light' will lead on to Quaker views of Christ and how salvation was achieved. Quakers used the terms 'light' and Christ interchangeably and emphasised the existence of the spirit or 'light' in all men from the beginning of creation, thus reducing the role of the Incarnate Christ. It will also focus on other crucial issues such as the Quaker belief in perfectibility and the infallibility of the 'light'.

What did Quakers mean by the 'inner light' or the spirit during the movement's early years? James Nayler the prominent Yorkshire Quaker described it as 'nigh thee, in thy heart...the Word which all the prophets spoke from...that became flesh...the Word of life which the Apostles preached'.<sup>4</sup> So Quakers associated the 'light' with the Word and Christ. Margaret Fell, who later became the wife of George Fox, described the 'light' in typical Quaker terms as that 'which comes from Jesus Christ which he doth enlighten everyone that cometh into the world'.<sup>5</sup> Francis Howgill of Westmorland, university educated and a prominent early Quaker, equated the

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 151.

<sup>4</sup>James Nayler, *A Discovery of Faith* (London, 1653), pp. 10-11.

<sup>5</sup>Friend's House Library, London, Spence MSS, 3, fo. 131, Margaret Fox to Judge Windham, 1653. Friend's House Library hereafter cited as F.H.L.

'light' with grace when he said, 'it is the appearance of Christ, it is a beam of righteousness shining forth'. Howgill went on to describe how the 'light' was communicated; he said that no man could do anything 'to purchase it, none need say, where may I get it...it is in thee, it hath appeared to all men'.<sup>6</sup> Fox too equated the 'light' with grace when he warned that anyone that said 'the grace of God hath not appeared to all men to teach them' are those 'that turn the grace of God into wantonness...for that is grace that shows thee ungodliness and worldly lusts.' With regard to this belief in the universality of the 'light', Quakers went against the prevailing belief that only a few, the elect, would be saved and the rest damned, and were Arminian in the sense that they believed that everyone could be saved if they turned to Christ. This idea had first been associated with the Laudians and was then taken up by other groups such as the General Baptists and eventually, the Quakers.

Quakers were at pains to point out that the 'light' was supernatural and not human and were often engaged in bitter disputes with their religious opponents over this issue. As Geoffrey Nuttall has pointed out, Puritans associated 'the Holy Spirit in man with man's reason' and were 'also acutely aware of the primacy of conscience' and its relation to the spirit.<sup>8</sup> In his *Catechism for Children*, George Fox stressed

---

<sup>6</sup>Francis Howgill, *Some of the Mysteries of God's Kingdom* (London, 1658), p. 22.

<sup>7</sup>George Fox, *A Word from the Lord to all the World* (London, 1654), p. 7.

<sup>8</sup>Nuttall, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 36-37.

that the 'light' was 'not a natural light, but...a spiritual light and eternal light'.<sup>9</sup> In another work, Fox observed that 'the light was before anything was made, or conscience named'.<sup>10</sup> This idea was criticized by adverse writers and Quakers were accused of confusing the 'inner light' with conscience primarily because they believed that the 'light' was in all men as conscience is, whereas their critics denied that the 'light' or grace was universal; Giles Firmin, Minister of Shalford wondered 'why these Quakers confounded this light with conscience'.<sup>11</sup> At times the Quakers did speak of the 'light' appealing to the conscience, for example, George Fox wrote:

and this grace hath appeared to thee who livest wickedly, and ungodly, and are of this present evil world, to that in thy conscience I speak, which thou shalt eternally witness me, for to it the grace cometh and appears; and when the book of conscience is opened, all men shall be judged out of it: and here thou that sayest everyone hath not the light in their consciences, to exercise it, thou goest about to make God unjust.<sup>12</sup>

For Quakers, the 'light' when listened to meant that the conscience was increasingly exercised towards God, which led to a greater moral awareness.

Having established the nature of the light there remains the question of how it was communicated. Isaac Penington of

---

<sup>9</sup>George Fox, *A Catechism for Children* (London, 1657), p. 19.

<sup>10</sup>George Fox, *The Great Mystery of the Great Whore Unfolded* (London, 1659), p. 331.

<sup>11</sup>Giles Firmin, *Establishing against Shaking* (London, 1656), p. 29.

<sup>12</sup>Fox, *Word from The Lord to all the World*, p. 7.

London, the son of Alderman Sir Isaac Penington believed that the 'light' was received into the heart 'by harkening to and receiving the convictions of sin there'. He goes on to say how

the first operation of the spirit towards man lying in the sin is to convince him of the sin and he that receives not the convincing light of the spirit, the work is stopped in him at the very first...And then he may talk of Christ and practice duties, pray, read and meditate and run into ordinances...yet perish in the end.<sup>13</sup>

Penington described the work of regeneration that had to be wrought in each Quaker. At first the 'light' caused 'fear and trembling' to seize upon the sinner by which 'the work of true repentance and conversion is begun and carried on' and 'there is a turning of the soul from the darkness to the light'. Penington then went on to describe 'a time of mourning, of deep mourning, while the separation is working, while the enemies strength is not broken and subdued'. Quakers often spoke of this process in terms of 'the doctrine of the seed' and its growth, by which they meant the 'light' and Christ. In the final stage Penington described how following a belief in the light

there springs up a hope, a living hope in the living principle, which hath manifested itself and begun to work. For the soul truly turning to the light, the everlasting arm, the living power is felt...it stays the soul in all the tossings, troubles, storms and tempests it meets with afterwards.<sup>14</sup>

Once this process had been undergone, Quakers wrote of 'the

---

<sup>13</sup> Isaac Penington, *The Scattered Sheep Sought After* (London, 1659), p. 9.

<sup>14</sup> Penington, 'A Short Catechism for the Sake of the Simple-Hearted', in *The Scattered Sheep Sought After*, pp. 23-24.

old man [being] crucified' of the death of 'old works, words and thoughts' and of the 'ressurection of the seed, and the translation of man into its nature where he receives a new body and a new life'.<sup>15</sup>

Adherence to the 'light' showed the way that men and women should live and act in relation to God and man. This emphasis on the ethical implications of the 'inner light' can be seen in a number of early Quaker catechisms which deal extensively with its nature and how it reveals godliness and ungodliness. George Fox for example, described how the 'light' would

let thee see when sin doth appear in thy thoughts, and motions, before it come into actions, and to abstain from it when it appears and to shun all appearances of evil for the light doth discover it and make it manifest and is that which doth reprove.<sup>16</sup>

For Fox, receiving the 'light' made all outward means of learning about God redundant. He believed that with the new covenant of Christ, men had received a more direct knowledge of God and no longer needed to rely on outward means such as a priesthood or Scripture because 'those that be in the light, in the new heart, know God, and need not teach every man his neighbour' for 'growing up in the light, he is taught of Christ'.<sup>17</sup>

The Quaker belief in the 'inner light' was closely bound up with their millenarian ideas, which on the whole tended to

---

<sup>15</sup>William Smith, *New Catechism*, (n.p., 1665) pp. 29-30.

<sup>16</sup>Fox, *Catechism for Children*, p. 7.

<sup>17</sup>George Fox, *The Second Covenant* (London, 1657), p. 2.

be spiritual in content. Quakers, like their contemporaries, believed that the long period of apostacy was approaching its end and that the anti-Christ would be cast aside in what Quakers termed 'The Lamb's War'. They believed that Christ had come again in the hearts of his people via the 'inner light' to do battle against 'whatever is not of God'. This battle was conceived in spiritual terms as may be observed from James Nayler's description when he stated of Quakers that

they war not against men's persons, so their weapons are not carnal, nor hurtful to any of the creation; for the Lamb comes not to destroy mens lives, nor the work of God, and therefore at his appearance in his subjects he puts spiritual weapons into their hearts and hands: their armour is the light; their sword the Spirit of the Father and the Son; their shield is faith and patience; their paths are paved with the gospel of peace.<sup>18</sup>

So the Quakers did not look to the actual physical setting up of a new kingdom, but believed as Nayler stated that, 'his [Christ's] kingdom in this world...is in the hearts of such as have believed in him'.<sup>19</sup> This idea was also spoken of by George Whitehead who stated that 'the coming of Christ in the flesh...was one coming' and 'his appearance in spirit to save his people from sin, is another coming'.<sup>20</sup> As Barry Reay has written, 'Christ had come in Quakers and would come in others; social and political change would accompany this inward

---

<sup>18</sup>James Nayler, *The Lamb's War against the Man of Sin* (London, 1658), p. 4.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>20</sup>Quoted from T.L. Underwood, 'Early Quaker Eschatology', in Peter Toon, (ed.), *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology 1600 to 1660* (Cambridge and London, 1970), p. 98.

millenium.<sup>21</sup> Quakers believed that the 'light' in each person would eventually lead to a fair and just society if it were obeyed and this view of course reached its peak in the years at the end of the Interregnum when some of the leading Quakers in London called for practical reforms to be carried out.

The Quaker notion of the 'inner light' encountered criticism in terms of the extent of the indwelling of Christ in each Quaker. There do seem to have been different strands of thought here; George Fox in answer to the statement of a hostile writer that it was 'blasphemy to say that Christ is in them as God and man', wrote 'and doth not the scriptures say Christ in you, and God will dwell in you, and walk in you?'<sup>22</sup> It is difficult to know exactly what Fox meant by this but critics took such statements to mean union with God. This is no doubt why such uproar occurred in parliament in 1656 when James Nayler entered Bristol on a donkey in the manner of Christ. It would seem that Nayler himself had meant the act to be symbolic yet evidence would suggest that his followers such as Hannah Stranger and Martha Simmonds did see Nayler as Christ from their description of him as the 'fairest of ten thousand', whose 'name is no more to be called James but Jesus'.<sup>23</sup> Evidence from other Quakers however stressed that the 'light' was only a 'measure' of Christ and not the entire Christ. Francis Howgill, quoted earlier, called it a 'beam'

---

<sup>21</sup>Reay, *Quakers and the English Revolution*, p. 24.

<sup>22</sup>Fox, *Great Mystery*, p. 17.

<sup>23</sup>John Deacon, *The Grand Imposter Examined* (London, 1656), pp. 10-11.

and a 'measure' and Isaac Penington referred to the 'light' as a 'ray from Christ'.<sup>24</sup> Richard Bailey has recently questioned the prevailing Quaker historiography and has suggested that Quakers did believe in 'celestial inhabitation'. He has written that this notion 'divinized the inner body and raised Fox and his fellow Quakers to a glorified status that prompted them to speak to each other as 'gods' and treat Fox as the greatest revelation of the divine among them'.<sup>25</sup>

Quakers in the 1650s also came under attack for their idea of sin and the notion amongst them that it was possible to achieve a sinless state whilst on earth, one of perfection. Before examining this notion it is worthwhile considering the Quaker idea of sin. In a 1659 catechism, the Quaker Isaac Penington outlined his view of sin when explaining the 'estate and condition' of man who came 'out of the loins of the first Adam'. Penington wrote that man was in 'a state of sin and darkness' which he defined as 'a state of death and misery, a state of enmity against God, a state accursed from God'. Another Quaker, William Bayly, described the sinful state of Adam as having 'lost the dominion, the peace, and the blessing of God'.<sup>26</sup> The historian Wilmer A. Cooper has pointed out that early Quakers such as Fox and Isaac Penington saw sin as

---

<sup>24</sup>Howgill, *Some Mysteries*, p. 22; Penington, *Scattered Sheep*, p. 12.

<sup>25</sup>Richard G. Bailey, *New Light on George Fox and Early Quakerism: The Making and Unmaking of a God* (San Francisco, 1992), p. 131. Bailey's ideas are discussed in more detail in chapter 4.

<sup>26</sup>Penington, 'Short Catechism' in *Scattered Sheep*, p. 17; William Bayly, *A Short Discovery of the State of Man* (London, 1659), p. 1.

'man's wilful disobedience' against the will of God. Early Quakers believed in the fall of man and as Cooper has stated, 'for Fox and Penington it was not only a condition of man but also an act of disobedience'.<sup>27</sup>

It was the claim made by Quakers that perfection was possible whilst on earth which enraged their religious contemporaries. At Lancaster Sessions in 1652 when asked if he was as perfect as Christ, Fox proclaimed that 'as hee is soe are wee in this present world'.<sup>28</sup> Again, in his *Journal* for the year 1655, Fox recorded a discussion he had had with ten Independent justices in London and noted how they

pleaded for imperfection and sin as longe as they lived & did not like to heare of Christ's teachinge his people himselfe and makinge people as cleane as Adam and Eve was before they fell heere whilst upon ye earth.<sup>29</sup>

Early Quaker statements on the notion of perfection vary however. In James Nayler's *A Discovery of the Man of Sin* the author stated, 'it is a lying slander that we say every saint is perfect: for we witness the saint's growth, and the time of pressing after perfection'. Clearly then, Nayler was asserting that perfection was not easily attainable. Following the above statement however, he added, 'that it is possible to be perfectly holy and without sin'.<sup>30</sup> This notion of perfection

---

<sup>27</sup>Wilmer A. Cooper, 'Quaker Perspectives on the Nature of Man' *Quaker Religious Thought*, 2 (1960), p. 9.

<sup>28</sup>*The Journal of George Fox*, Norman Penney (ed.), 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1911), vol. 1, p. 66. The Cambridge Journal has been used throughout the thesis except where stated otherwise.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 188.

<sup>30</sup>James Nayler, *Discovery of the Man of Sin* (London, 1655), p. 6.

horrified contemporaries; Richard Baxter the celebrated religious leader of Worcester was clearly alarmed and noted that Quakers 'affirm themselves to be perfect without sin (yea, some of them say they are Christ and God)'.<sup>31</sup> The Quaker statements of the 1650s tended to present perfection along Foxian lines, as a sudden result of conversion and it was this approach which changed gradually in the years following the Restoration.

*Developments in thought on the 'inner light' and related ideas.*

The concept of the 'inner light' slowly began to alter after the Restoration. Quakers still saw the 'light' as Christ and the Word and viewed it as a purely supernatural phenomenon but recent research has shown a greater readiness on the part of some Quakers to relate the 'inner light' to reason. Stephen Trowell, in a study of post-Restoration theology has noted this tendency in William Penn and George Whitehead.<sup>32</sup> Penn seemed to suggest that the 'light' through its regeneration of man could strengthen his rational faculty and renew it. For Penn man had to 'rectify and assist his fallible judgement' and could do this through the 'light' which was

an unerring, certain, infallible spirit, power, or principle; which as man listens unto and follows, his understanding becomes illuminated, his reason

---

<sup>31</sup>Richard Baxter, *The Quaker's Catechism* (London, 1655), sig. c.

<sup>32</sup>Stephen Trowell, 'George Keith: Post-Restoration Theology and The Experience of Defeat' *Bulletin of The John Rylands University of Manchester*, 76 (1994).

purified, and a sound judgement restored.<sup>33</sup>

Trowell points out that Penn 'does not claim that the spirit given by God is in itself illuminated reason, but that it illuminates reason'.<sup>34</sup> George Whitehead also related the 'inner light' to reason describing it as 'a light of reason, proceeding from the Word'.<sup>35</sup> Other Quakers however, for example, Robert Barclay, the famous apologist, and George Keith, the Scottish Quaker, denied any spiritual role to enlighten reason. In his *Apology*, Barclay distinguished sharply between a spiritual light which he believed originated from God, and the light of reason.<sup>36</sup> He wrote that God had 'given man the light of his son a spiritual divine light, to rule him in things spiritual; and the light of reason, to rule him in things natural'. Barclay at this time was very keen to distance Quakerism from Socinianism and those who based their arguments upon reason. Certainly other Quakers stressed the supernatural nature of the light around this time: Stephen Crisp wrote in his instructive book for children that 'this light which everyone is enlightened withal, the priests of the world call it a natural light'; but he urged his young readers 'to believe them not, for they speak contrary to the scrip-

---

<sup>33</sup>Quoted in Melvin B. Endy, *William Penn and Early Quakerism* (Princeton, 1973), p. 249, from, William Penn, 'Spirit of Truth', 1672, in, *Works* vol. 2, p. 106,

<sup>34</sup>Trowell, p. 133.

<sup>35</sup>William Penn and George Whitehead, *A Serious Apology* (London, 1671), p. 58.

<sup>36</sup>Robert Barclay, *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity* (n.p., 1678), V and VI Propositions, p. 99.

ture.<sup>37</sup> It is clear from a pamphlet of George Keith's, which is catechistical in style, that he wished to stress the difference between the light which he called a 'divine and spiritual principle...the Word of God, that is nigh unto us' and reason.<sup>38</sup> In this work Keith addressed the question

that the knowledge of divine and spiritual things must flow from a divine and spiritual principle in the heart and that they cannot be known and learned sufficiently from or by the natural principle of natural reason.

In the reply to this he asserted the supernatural nature of the 'light', when Keith stated that

for though the natural reason in a subservient way may be made use of, yet it can no more reach unto the things that are spiritual and divine, nor indeed so much as a blind-man by all his reason can reach into colours.<sup>39</sup>

In addition Keith felt that natural reason was corruptible but that the 'light' was 'altogether incorruptible', and so superior. In summing up the differences, Keith asserted that reason was 'human' and 'an essential property of the human nature' whilst the 'light' was 'divine' and 'the free grace and favour of God'.<sup>40</sup> Stephen Trowell has considered the differences between the Penn-Whitehead and Barclay-Keith groups and states, 'we might say that though both accept that the divine light is something beyond natural reason, Whitehead

---

<sup>37</sup>Stephen Crisp, *A New Book for Children* (London, 1681), p. 22.

<sup>38</sup>George Keith, *The Fundamental Truths of Christianity, briefly hinted at by way of question and answer* (London, 1688), p. 16

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., pp. 3-4.

and Penn believe it to be of a similar nature to reason, while Keith and Barclay do their best to assert its difference'.<sup>41</sup> After Barclay's death in 1690 George Keith left the Society and joined the Anglican fold in 1700. He rejected belief in the 'inner light' as the prime source of authority in religion, as he feared that the links with reason were approaching Deism; he turned instead to Scripture which he felt contained all the knowledge needed for salvation.<sup>42</sup>

Other notions connected with the 'inner light' also began to change in the years following the Restoration. The extent of divine indwelling in each Quaker was clearly delineated in the 1670s and there was a definite attempt to try and distance Quakerism from its enthusiastic beginnings, as can be seen from Penn and Whitehead's *Christian Quaker* where it is stated that Friends

do not say that the light in every man is Christ, but of Christ; he is that fullness from whence all receive a measure of divine light and knowledge; but not that every individual has the whole or complete Christ in him.<sup>43</sup>

Similarly Robert Barclay asserted in the *Apology* that 'neither is Christ in all men by way of union, or...by way of inhabitation' but only as a presence. George Keith too insisted that 'the fulness of the Godhead cannot be said to dwell in us'.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup>Trowell, p. 134.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., pp. 135-37.

<sup>43</sup>William Penn and George Whitehead, *The Christian Quaker* (n.p., 1674), p. 91.

<sup>44</sup>Barclay, *Apology*, Propositions V and VI, p. 97; George Keith, *The True Christ Owned* (n.p., 1679), p. 53.

The concomitant of this was that the idea of perfection was increasingly played down; whilst Quakers still expressed a belief in perfection it was presented as a gradual process. The Quaker William Smith stated that Quakers 'believe that whosoever are born of God doth not commit sin' but are 'perfect as the heavenly father is perfect, whose children they are; and we believe that such a state is attainable in this life, whilst in the body'. He went on to admit that a person might sin whilst not properly converted or 'convinced' as the Quakers termed it, 'whilst the birth is in travail' for at that point he said, 'the birth is not come into full strength through the growth of faith, and so may sin through weakness'. Smith went on however to describe the problem of temptation which he admitted Quakers faced 'daily', but through God's love and power were able to overcome.<sup>45</sup> Robert Barclay also developed thought on the subject when he stated that by perfection Quakers meant that which might 'daily admit of a growth and consequently mean not, as if we were to be as pure, Holy, and as perfect as God...but only a perfection proportionable and answerable to man's measure'. Barclay did however allow the following statement: 'righteousness may become so natural to the regenerate soul, that in the stability of this condition they cannot sin'.<sup>46</sup>

It is also worth noting, as Wilmer A. Cooper has observed, that Barclay shifted the idea of sin as an inherited condition. He was anxious not to damn infants and therefore

---

<sup>45</sup>Smith, *New Catechism*, pp. 67-68.

<sup>46</sup>Barclay, *Apology*, VIII Proposition, pp. 169-70.

did not believe that Adam's guilt passed to the child 'until they make it theirs by the like acts of disobedience'. Conversely, Barclay believed that man had nothing good in his nature save that which God communicated to him.<sup>47</sup> This may also be seen in a tract by Stephen Crisp when he wrote that, 'although sin may be in a creature, it is not by creation, but by degeneration, not by the power that made man, but by the power that captivated man in his senses'.<sup>48</sup> Crisp criticised those that imagine 'original sin being in Adam, and so sin unto condemnation' and warned that 'the original of sin...is nearer unto you than Adam'.<sup>49</sup>

*Relationship between the 'inner light' and the incarnate Christ*

The emphasis which Quakers placed on the 'inner light' laid them open to the charge that they denied the incarnate Christ and his work. As Quakers also stressed the salvific aspects of the 'light', critics similarly attacked Friends in regard to traditional theories of the atonement. The following section will examine Quaker views of the historic Christ in relation to soteriology throughout the time-span being dealt with. There were significant shifts in emphasis in this particular area; during the years following the Restoration, Quakers began to refer to the historic Christ much more and

---

<sup>47</sup>Cooper, 'Quaker Perspectives', pp. 9-10; Barclay, *Apology Proposition IV*, p. 63.

<sup>48</sup>Crisp, *New Book for Children*, p. 59.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., pp. 66-67.

this is clearly evidenced in their catechisms.

The charge that Quakers were heretical in the 1650s emanated in considerable measure from their emphasis on the inward Christ or 'light' to the virtual exclusion of references to the historic, outward Christ. Rosemary Moore, in a recent study of early Quaker beliefs has noted that 'for the majority of Quaker authors the earthly life and death of Christ had little apparent significance at all. Most pamphlets passed from Christ to light and back again without considering any difference in meaning.' Moore has stated that 'claims that Quakers in their first decades were, more or less, orthodox Christians, need to be carefully examined'. She claims that this view has sprung from a tendency to concentrate on George Fox's writings and his Christ-centred language which Moore suggests was unusual amongst early Quakers. To back up this claim she looked at pamphlets during the years 1657 and 58, excluding those of Fox and Burrough, and found that only six of these made reference in orthodox terms to Christ's death and the atonement. In the remaining 35 pamphlets she noted that there was a 'continual transition between the words Christ and light' and around a quarter of them used the word 'light' to the 'virtual exclusion of the word Christ'.<sup>50</sup>

The interchangeable usage of 'light' and Christ also had the effect, as Maurice A. Creasey has noted, of 'evacuating the term 'Christ' of its primarily historic reference, thus

---

<sup>50</sup>Rosemary Anne Moore, 'The Faith of the First Quakers: The Development of their Beliefs and Practices up to the Restoration', University of Birmingham, Ph.D thesis, 1993, p. 226.

reducing to confusion those precisely defined theological categories and undermining the orthodox scheme of salvation'.<sup>51</sup> Creasey believed that when Quakers used the word 'light' they were really referring to Christ but for them, he said, this was a Christ

whose activity in relation to the world and man comprehended all that in the new New Testament and in the main stream of Christian orthodoxy was normally distributed among the Logos, the historic Christ, the risen and glorified Christ and the Holy Spirit.<sup>52</sup>

Geoffrey Nuttall has pinpointed this issue as the main difference between Quakers and Puritans. The Quaker emphasis on the spirit or 'light' in man since the dawn of creation was at odds with the more orthodox. As Nuttall has stated 'the Puritans allowed full value to His life, death and resurrection, and to the coming of His Holy Spirit at Pentecost, as dividing history into two parts through the provision of a possibility of redemption which previously had not existed. This sense of a Christian watershed in history was lacking in Quaker conviction'.<sup>53</sup>

Quakers in the 1650s did not actually deny the historic Christ; they instead wished to stress the importance of an inward, living experience of Christ for salvation, rather than relying on Christ's work at Calvary. As Isaac Penington stated,

---

<sup>51</sup>M.A. Creasey, 'Early Quaker Christology with Special Reference to the Teaching and Significance of Isaac Penington 1616-1679. An Essay in Interpretation', University of Leeds, D.Phil thesis, 1956, p. 30.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 29.

<sup>53</sup>Nuttall, *Holy Spirit*, p. 159.

It is not a notion of a Christ without (with multitudes of practices of self-denial and mortification thereupon) which can save, but Christ heard knocking, and let into the heart.<sup>54</sup>

In *The Great Mystery*, George Fox spoke little of the outward Christ and his work of atonement; for Fox, 'they that believe not in the light are condemned...but believing in the light, shall come out of condemnation'.<sup>55</sup> Thus salvation was made possible by harkening to the 'inner light'; Quakers denied the Calvinist belief in election and reprobation since they stressed that the saving 'light' was available to all. A look at the catechisms of early Quakerism backs up this point and finds concurrence with the views of Rosemary Moore discussed above. Isaac Penington's 'Short Catechism' made reference to the historic Christ but only to dismiss emphasis upon the Incarnation. To the question whether man's saviour had a name, the reply given was that 'it were better for thee to learn his name by feeling his virtue and power in thy heart, than by rote yet (if thou canst receive it) this is his name, the light, the light of the world'.<sup>56</sup> Later the question was posed whether a man may be saved though he 'should not know the literal name Jesus, or the literal name Christ' and the response given was that,

the names are but the signification of the thing spoken of, for it is the life, the power (the being transformed by that) that saves, not the knowledge of a name, and Christians might deceive themselves herein for they think to be saved by believing a relation concerning Christ, as he appeared in a

---

<sup>54</sup>Penington, *Scattered Sheep*, p. 12.

<sup>55</sup>Fox, *Great Mystery*, p. 345.

<sup>56</sup>Penington, 'Short Catechism', in *Scattered Sheep*, p. 20.

fleshy body, and suffered death at Jerusalem. Whereas Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever: and the saving knowledge reveals him, not only as he was then, but as he was the day before, and as he will be forever.<sup>57</sup>

So Quakers in the 1650s emphasised an eternal Christ, rather than seeing Christ's incarnation as a watershed for mankind. This can be seen from a work of Edward Burrough's, which is unusual in also making a lengthy reference to the historic Christ. Burrough stated,

concerning Christ, we believe that he is one with the Father, and was with him before the world was, and what the Father worketh is by his Son, for he is the arm of God's salvation... he was made manifest in Judea and Jerusalem, and did the work of the Father...was crucified...buried, and rose again...we believe he is to be waited for in spirit, to be known after the spirit as he was before the world was.<sup>58</sup>

George Fox also tended to refer more to the historic Christ in his discussion of the 'light'. In his *Catechism for Children* of 1657 Fox asked, 'What is Christ the Resurrection and the Life?'. The response was that Christ was he

who lighteth every man that cometh into the world, by whom the world was made, he is the restorer and the seeker of the lost, and the resurrection, and the life...and is the mediator between God and man...who covereth iniquity, and blotteth out sin and transgression.<sup>59</sup>

Despite these few examples however it is easy to see why Quakers were criticized for apparently denying an outward Christ; their stress on the sufficiency of the 'light' made the historic Christ rather redundant, and when they did speak

---

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., p. 27.

<sup>58</sup>Edward Burrough, *A Declaration to all the World of Our Faith* (London, 1659), p. 4.

<sup>59</sup>Fox, *Catechism for Children*, p. 9.

of the outward Christ they did not relate Christ's atonement to their new insights. Thomas Collier, a Baptist was scandalized by the Quaker stress on the inward Christ; according to him, 'the blood of Christ' was 'laid aside as useless and trampled under feet'.<sup>60</sup> In addition, the Quaker emphasis on an eternal Christ in all his states which enabled the Quakers' to see him as a saviour for all men, led, as Melvyn Endy has pointed out, to the position of viewing Christ's body as not 'truly human or corruptible', an idea which was popular during the continental radical reformation amongst spiritualists and Anabaptists. As Endy has stated, 'the Friends detracted from the importance of Christ's body and arrived at the Eutychian position [the idea that Christ had no soul] by making the historical Christ essentially the same divine saviour he had been throughout history'.<sup>61</sup> Fox denied that Christ had a truly human body in *The Great Mystery* when he said 'and carnal human is from the ground, human earthly, the first Adam's body, and Christ was not from the ground...but he was from heaven, his flesh came down from above, his flesh which was the meat, his flesh came down from heaven'.<sup>62</sup> This view is repeated again later on when Fox asked in a tract of 1677, 'where in scripture can we find such names as human body and humanity

---

<sup>60</sup>Thomas Collier, *A Looking Glass for the Quakers* (London, 1657), p. 3.

<sup>61</sup>Endy, *William Penn and Early Quakerism*, pp. 276-77.

<sup>62</sup>Quoted in Endy, from George Fox, 'The Great Mystery' in *Works*, III, p. 322.

given to Christ'.<sup>63</sup> This notion was blasphemous to the more orthodox to whom 'Christ was a person, sharply distinguished from God the Father'.<sup>64</sup>

In the post-Restoration period Quakers continued to be criticized for apparently denying the outward Christ. Thomas Hicks, a Baptist preacher writing in the 1670s stated,

I would ask thee whether thy light doth reprove thee for thy undervaluing thoughts of Jesus Christ, God Man, as a person without thee. And for accounting that blood which was spilt at Jerusalem, no more than of an unholy or common thing.<sup>65</sup>

Yet during this time references to the historic Christ are more frequent in Quaker pamphlets, perhaps in response to the persistent criticism which Quakers faced on this issue. Quakers still emphasised the eternal Christ who was 'the same today, yesterday and forever, not divided'.<sup>66</sup> However there was also much more reference to the incarnation and Christ's atoning work. In the mid 1660s, William Smith, showed himself aware of the concerns of the views of his religious contemporaries when he asked in his *New Catechism*,

what do you believe concerning that great work which by the death of Christ was accomplished on the cross in time past...doth not this your faith concerning such things done for you by Christ in you make void his death upon the cross, and the benefits which is to be received thereby?

The reply was written in very orthodox terms. Smith wrote how

---

<sup>63</sup>George Fox, *A Testimony of What We Believe of Christ* (n.p., 1677), p. 80.

<sup>64</sup>Barbour, p. 147.

<sup>65</sup>Thomas Hicks, *A Dialogue Between a Christian and a Quaker* (London, 1673), p. 9.

<sup>66</sup>George Whitehead and Edward Burrough, *The Son of Perdition Revealed* (London, 1661), p. 9.

Quakers believed that

the work which the father then gave unto the son to do, we believe that he fulfilled and finished according to the father's will, and that all things pertaining to life and salvation was fully and perfectly in him, and that he humbled himself to the death of the cross; and from death did rise again: and we believe that he is the resurrection and the life and gives eternal life to all that believe in Him as he is Christ, but that any do believe in him as he is Christ who are the despisers of his light and life in them, that is not our faith."<sup>67</sup>

A catechism written by George Fox and Ellis Hookes, the latter the society's recording clerk, also asked the question 'Did Christ shed his blood for all and taste death for every man? And was he an offering for the sins of the whole world?'. Again Quakers affirmed this belief, the response being 'Yes, he shed his blood for all men and tasted death for every man...though some trample the blood of the new covenant under their feet and deny the Lord Jesus that bought them.'<sup>68</sup> A slightly later pamphlet for the edification of children, by Stephen Crisp, also tried to strike a balance between the 'light' and Christ. The author, using John's Gospel, described how the 'Word became flesh, and in due time...was made manifest in the likeness of sinful flesh, in that body which was supposed to be Joseph the carpenter's son, and he was called Jesus'. He went on to write about the atonement and stated,

---

<sup>67</sup>William Smith, *New Catechism*, p. 70-71. See also pp. 64-66 for other relevant passages concerning Christ's atoning work. By contrast another catechism from the same period makes no real reference to the historic Christ. See Thomas Richardson, *A True Catechism Concerning the Word of God* (n.p., 1664).

<sup>68</sup>George Fox and Ellis Hookes, *A Primer and Catechism for Children* (n.p., 1670), p. 66.

And as concerning the flesh, he was crucified without the gates of Jerusalem, and he was buried, and he is risen again, according to the scriptures, and he wrought eternal salvation for all that obey him.<sup>69</sup>

An important work of the 1670s saw a clear attempt to link the 'inner light' and its saving effects with the historic Christ's sacrifice. In *The Christian Quaker* William Penn wrote that 'mankind was (and consequently is) antecedently to Christ's coming in the flesh, enlightened with such a measure of light, as was saving in itself.' Penn then went on to answer critics who had wondered why Christ came if he was already a saving 'light', by saying that his adversaries took 'for granted, that there was no difference in the degree of illumination before, and at the coming of Christ after that visible manner into the world'.<sup>70</sup> In the second part of the *Christian Quaker* written by George Whitehead, it was claimed that the purpose of Christ's coming in the flesh, even though he had been a saviour before this was 'to exalt his manifestation in spirit'.<sup>71</sup>

Robert Barclay also developed Quaker thought when he wrote of a two-fold process of redemption, the first was that performed by Christ at the crucifixion, 'whereby man as he stands is put into a capacity for redemption' and the other is 'redemption wrought by Christ in us' whereby 'we witness, and

---

<sup>69</sup>Crisp, *New Book*, p. 13.

<sup>70</sup>Penn and Whitehead, *The Christian Quaker*, 1st part, p. 94.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., 2nd part, p. 36.

know this pure and perfect redemption in ourselves'.<sup>72</sup> He was keen however to attack the doctrine of imputed righteousness and urged men not to think themselves justified simply by Christ's death and sufferings, 'while they remain unsanctified and unjustified in their own hearts'.<sup>73</sup> Barclay also discussed the idea of the nature of Christ's body and denied that Friends believed the heresies of Eutyches and Apollinarius who 'made the manhood to be wholly swallowed up in the Godhead'. He stated the Quaker belief that Christ was 'a true and real man', and that he continued 'to be glorified in the heavens in soul and body'.<sup>74</sup> In his *Catechism and Confession of Faith* of 1673, Barclay also raised the question of whether Christ 'who was born of the Virgin Mary, and supposed to be the son of Joseph, [was] a true and real man?' His reply was that

verily, he took not on him the nature of Angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham; wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren.<sup>75</sup>

There was a clear attempt by Quakers in their tracts and catechisms as has been shown above to present a more orthodox image. This was noted by Maurice Creasey when he wrote, concerning confessions of faith that

Quaker insights came to be expressed in the language of formal christological orthodoxy, with a corresponding decrease of emphasis upon...that deeper and more mystical apprehension of the person and work of Christ which the first friends had sought to express

---

<sup>72</sup>Barclay, *Apology*, Proposition VII, p. 142.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., pp. 167-68.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., Propositions V and VI, p. 95.

<sup>75</sup>Robert Barclay, *A Catechism and Confession of Faith* (n.p. 1673), pp. 23-24.

in the language of inner light.<sup>76</sup>

The Quaker position concerning the outward Christ was of great concern in the months before the Toleration Act of 1689. Leading Quakers were keen for their co-religionists to benefit and made great efforts to ensure that Quakers would be included. The Meeting for Sufferings met on 29th March 1689 'to peruse and consider upon a paper to clear friends from those false and malicious calumnies viz. their denying the seals of the Covenant the Man Christ and the Trinity' and specified that a paper should be drawn up.<sup>77</sup> A month later it was ordered that 'five hundred copies of the papers entitled *Christianity Asserted* be brought to this chamber and Steven Crisp to agree for the price with the booksellers for the same and Friends that attend the parliament to have...the disposal of'.<sup>78</sup> The broadside which appeared is important for our understanding of how far Quakers were prepared to go in regard to the several issues where their orthodoxy was in doubt. A large section of it is devoted to Christ and whether Quakers believed in the remission of sin, and redemption through the sufferings, death and blood of Christ. The reply is given in very orthodox terms and rather labours the point of Christ's sacrifice. Quakers affirm that,

through faith in him, as he suffered and died for all men, gave himself as ransom for all, and his blood being shed for the remission of sins, so all they who sincerely believe and obey him, receive the

---

<sup>76</sup>Creasey, p. 14.

<sup>77</sup>F.H.L., Meeting for Sufferings Minutes 1688-91, vol. 7, p. 6 29.1. [March] 1689.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., p. 15, 28.2. [April] 1689.

benefits and blessed effects of his suffering and dying for them, they by faith in his name, receive and partake of that eternal redemption which he hath obtained for us, who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, he died for our sins, and rose again for our justification.

The 'inner light' is mentioned briefly but given no prominence as emphasis again returns to Christ's sacrifice, as may be seen from the final words in the section; 'if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another; and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin'.<sup>79</sup>

### *The Trinity*

Closely connected with the ideas discussed above was the question of how far Quakers owned the traditional doctrine of the Trinity, that is the notion of one essence in three distinct persons. The *Westminster Catechism* of the Interregnum described the Trinity based on the words of the First Epistle of John, chapter 5, verse 7 in the following terms; 'there be three persons in the Godhead the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one, true eternal God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory; although distinguished by their personal properties'.<sup>80</sup> Critics certainly viewed Quaker beliefs as erroneous in this sphere; Richard Baxter, writing in 1657 noted the Quakers' 'unsound doctrine about the Trinity

---

<sup>79</sup>*The Christianity of the People Commonly Called Quakers Asserted Against the Unjust Charge of their Being no Christians, writ in behalf of the people Called Quakers, by some of them* (London, 1689), Broadside.

<sup>80</sup>*The Westminster Catechism* (London, 1658), p. 155.

and Christ in special, and the Scriptures'.<sup>81</sup> It is easy to see why Friends might have had difficulty affirming the traditional view; as has been discussed earlier, they tended to stress the eternal activity of Christ which 'left them without any reason for distributing the divine functions among Father, Son and Spirit.'<sup>82</sup>

Quakers were not overly preoccupied with discussions of the Trinity in the 1650s and the issue tended to be debated much more in the years following 1660. Nevertheless there are some references. A lesser known Quaker author, Martin Mason, writing in 1655, objected to the idea of separate identities of the persons of the Trinity for he could find no scriptural warrant and asked, 'show me those places of Scripture...that positively proves God, Christ and Holy Ghost to be three distinct persons'. Mason did admit however, by referring to 1 John, 5, 7 that 'there are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost' but adds 'does not he say these three are one?'.<sup>83</sup> Similarly, George Fox objected to received notions of the Trinity for the same reasons. He stated, 'as for the word Trinity and three persons, we have not read it in the Bible but in the Common Prayer Book or Mass-Book...but as for unity we own'.<sup>84</sup> It would seem that Quakers were not so much denying a three but more the distinc-

---

<sup>81</sup>Dr. Williams' Library, London, Richard Baxter MSS, vol. 1, 57, To Morgan Llwyd, 31 March 1657.

<sup>82</sup>Endy, p. 275.

<sup>83</sup>Martin Mason, *A Check to the Lofty Linguist* (London, 1655), pp. 8-9.

<sup>84</sup>Fox, *Great Mystery*, p. 99.

tion of persons which they felt might jeopardize the unity in the Godhead.

But it was William Penn's *Sandy Foundation Shaken* written in 1668 which really aroused contemporaries' suspicions regarding Quaker attitudes to the Trinity, and resulted in Penn's imprisonment in the Tower of London. Penn denied the doctrine on two counts, 'Scripture' and 'right reason'.<sup>85</sup> For Penn, the doctrine of the Trinity was a man-made formulation, which had been 'brought forth and maintained by cruelty' by the bishop of Alexandria, a product of the bishop's dispute with Arius and was continued through the 'Romish generations' and 'hath obtained the name of Athanasian'.<sup>86</sup> The doctrine thus established was that of one 'substance' with three 'persons' or 'subsistencies'. According to Penn, every subsistence had to have its own substance, with the result that the orthodox view really amounted to tritheism.<sup>87</sup> The second objection of Penn was that the Trinity was unscriptural; as he stated,

if God as the Scriptures testify hath never been declared or believed but as the holy one, then will it follow that God is not a holy three, nor doth subsist in three distinct and separate holy ones.<sup>88</sup>

Such ideas had prompted the charge that Penn was a Socinian. Certainly Thomas Firmin, the 'best-known and most influential Socinian in England in the latter part of the seventeenth

---

<sup>85</sup>William Penn, *The Sandy Foundation Shaken*, (London, 1668). See title page.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid, pp. 14-15.

<sup>87</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>88</sup>Ibid., p. 12.

century' was friendly with Penn.<sup>89</sup> Penn himself acknowledged a closeness when he spoke of an occasion when 'being engaged in the negative concerning the common doctrine of distinct and separate personality, (Thomas Firmin) and some others fell into great intimacy with us.'<sup>90</sup> Vincent Buranelli has highlighted the similarities between Penn's thinking and Socinianism, notably the use of the Bible and reason in defence of their arguments but has stated that William Penn's views were closer to Sabellianism rather than Socinianism. Firmin he has suggested supported his brand of unitarianism by doubting Christ's divinity, whereas 'Penn maintains a very different kind by making Christ identical with the Godhead'. Sabellius was a third century theologian who held that the biblical terms Father, Son and Holy Ghost did not refer to three persons of a triune Godhead, but to different 'modes' of a single divine being; so from this, Christ was the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.<sup>91</sup> Penn's ideas on the Trinity prompted a hostile response from the more orthodox; Thomas Vincent, a London Presbyterian minister, accused Penn of holding 'hideous blasphemies, Socinian and damnable heretical opinions'.<sup>92</sup> According to Vincent, Penn 'striketh at the root, and labour-

---

<sup>89</sup>H. John McLachlan, *Socinianism in Seventeenth Century England*, (Oxford, 1951), p. 294.

<sup>90</sup> Vincent Buranelli, 'William Penn and the Socinians', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, lxxxiii (1959), p. 372.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid., pp. 375-76.

<sup>92</sup>Thomas Vincent, *The Foundation of God Standeth Sure* (London, 1668). See title page.

eth to overthrow the foundation of Christianity'.<sup>93</sup> Penn was imprisoned on the order of the Bishop of London for his objections to the idea of three persons in one God, which was understood by the government to be a denial of Christ's divinity. At the prompting of the Anglican, Edward Stillingfleet, Penn wrote an apology for *The Sandy Foundation* entitled *Innocency with Her Open Face, Presented By Way of Apology for the Book entitled The Sandy Foundation Shaken*. In this work Penn asserted his orthodoxy, and stated that he had not 'dethroned a divinity, subverted faith, made void obedience' and professed that he was 'still confirmed in the belief of Christ the saviour's divinity'.<sup>94</sup>

Another leading Quaker, George Whitehead, refused to accept the orthodox view of the Trinity; like earlier Quaker thought on the subject, he was willing to own the statement in John of 'three that bear record in heaven'.<sup>95</sup> Whitehead disliked the term 'persons' because it was unscriptural and because he felt that the use of the word 'person' detracted from God's glory. He asked 'whether it doth not render God, or represent the Deity, to be like visible men, or finite creatures'. Furthermore, the use of the term 'persons', according to Whitehead was responsible for images and pictures

---

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>94</sup> William Penn, *Innocency With Her Open Face* (n.p., 1669), pp. 27, 10.

<sup>95</sup> George Whitehead, *The Divinity of Christ, And Unity of the Three that Bear Record in Heaven* (London, 1669), Epistle, sig. A.

of God, Christ and the Holy Ghost, so prominent in Catholicism.<sup>96</sup>

Quakers then did not share the orthodox view of the Trinity; the main thrust of Quaker teaching in this sphere was to emphasise the unity of the Godhead against orthodox interpretations which to Quakers seemed to be in danger of suggesting tritheism. It is interesting that Robert Barclay's *Apology* does not make any reference to the Trinity, perhaps because there was no firm line on the subject and possibly to avoid any ensuing contention after the scandal caused by Penn's *Sandy Foundation*. However at a slightly earlier date in his *Catechism and Confession of Faith* he briefly dealt with the matter by repeating the standard Quaker words from John concerning the three that bear record in heaven.<sup>97</sup> Another catechism-like tract of 1681 went a little further in denying the three 'persons' of the Trinity when the author stated,

And these, the Father, Son and Spirit, the world and their teachers call three persons; but they speak they know not what, even as they have imagined, contrary to the scriptures.

The author went on to explain his view of the God-head in the following way:

the father, which is called the higher power, and the son, which is called the Word, and the spirit, which is called the life, which proceeds from the Father and Son; these are one, and are not separated.<sup>98</sup>

The issue of the Quaker view of the Trinity was of utmost

---

<sup>96</sup>Ibid., sig. C2.

<sup>97</sup>Barclay, *Catechism and Confession*, p. 14.

<sup>98</sup>Crisp, *New Book*, pp. 20-21.

importance at the time of the 1688-9 debates in parliament over toleration when there was doubt over whether Quakers could properly be described as Christians. As David Wykes has stated, 'It seems likely that the charge that they [Quakers] denied the doctrine of the Trinity, if proved, would have been more serious than doubts about their political loyalty, since it is difficult to believe that any group denying the Trinity would have been granted toleration in 1689'.<sup>99</sup> In a response to the desire of some MPs to include a confession of faith in the toleration bill which as George Whitehead said could have been 'rather a snare to us', leading Quakers met to 'peruse and consider upon a paper to clear Friends from those false and malicious calumnies viz. their denying the seals of the Covenant, the man Christ and the Trinity' and a direction was given for a paper to be drawn up 'to clear friends'. Those who dealt with parliamentary business issued a 'Confession of our Christian Belief, that we might not lie under the unjust imputation of being no Christians'.<sup>100</sup> This was delivered by John Vaughton and George Whitehead and read to the Grand Committee of the whole house by Sir Thomas Clarges. It professed a belief in the Deity of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost and in the Scriptures as divinely inspired, the other point at issue, which will be discussed below. Quaker representatives, William Mead and John Osgood were called upon

---

<sup>99</sup>David L. Wykes, 'Friends, Parliament and the Toleration Act', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 45 (1994), pp. 49-50.

<sup>100</sup>George Whitehead, *The Christian Progress of that Ancient Servant and Minister of Jesus Christ*, George Whitehead (London, 1725), p. 634; F.H.L., Meeting for Sufferings Minutes 1688-1691, vol. 7, 29.1. [March] 1689, p. 6.

to make the confession before parliament in order to provide assurance. Quakers were able to assert a belief in the Trinity on the basis of the passage from John which they had always referred to in discussions on this issue.<sup>101</sup>

The beliefs in the confession were expressed in the broadside of 1689, *The Christianity of the People Commonly Called Quakers Asserted*, 500 copies of which the Meeting for Sufferings had ordered to be passed around parliament by Friends.<sup>102</sup> This stated the Quaker belief that

in the unity of the Godhead there is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, being those three divine witnesses that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and that these three are one, according to holy Scripture testimony.

Furthermore Friends made clear their belief in the divinity and humanity of Christ, saying,

Yes, we verily believe that Jesus Christ is truly God and man, according as holy scripture testifies of him, God over all blessed forever, the true God and eternal life, the one mediator between God and man.<sup>103</sup>

#### *The Quaker attitude to Scripture.*

The Quaker attitude to the Bible was another area for which the movement was attacked from the 1650s onwards. As Geoffrey Nuttall has pointed out, 'the normal central emphasis throughout Puritanism is upon the closest conjunction of Spirit and Word'. He went on to add that 'those who first in any systematic way, disturbed this conjunction, upset this

---

<sup>101</sup>Whitehead, *Christian Progress*, p. 635.

<sup>102</sup>F.H.L., Meeting for Sufferings Minutes, vol. 7, 28.2.1689., p. 15.

<sup>103</sup>*Christianity of the People Commonly called Quakers*

equilibrium...were the Quakers'.<sup>104</sup> Quakers altered this balance by placing the spirit or 'light' above the Scriptures as the touchstone of belief or truth. For Quakers, the knowledge of God wrought by the 'light' was more direct, whereas sole reliance on the Bible led to a dead rather than living faith; the Bible for Quakers was rather like the shadows in Plato's allegory of the cave, at one remove from reality. Through the 'light', Quakers claimed that they had the word of God within them; they believed that the same spirit that inspired the apostles and prophets was in themselves and available to all if people would harken to it. Fox spoke in the 1650s of 'the infallible spirit that the apostles were in, in which we are come'.<sup>105</sup> James Nayler, writing in 1653, pointed out the difference for Quakers between the Word of God and the letter, the latter meaning the Bible. For Nayler, the word was 'before any letter was written', and all who had not this word, used the letter for the word'.<sup>106</sup>

In his *Catechism for Children*, Fox posed the question whether those who professed the Scriptures but did not believe in the 'light' could have 'victory' or salvation. His reply was that they were 'of the devil'. Fox went on to add later that those who 'do not believe in the light...say they believe in God and in Christ, and they do not'.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup>Nuttall, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 23, 26.

<sup>105</sup>Fox, *Great Mystery*, p. 105.

<sup>106</sup>Nayler, *Discovery of Faith*, p. 11.

<sup>107</sup>Fox, *Catechism for Children*, pp. 3-4.

Early Quakers could sound very aggressive when speaking about Scripture, no doubt because of their eagerness to promote the idea of the primacy of the 'light'; Thomas Lawson, a Lancaster schoolmaster, and prominent early Quaker, described Scripture as 'the letter which is death'.<sup>108</sup> Yet Quakers did not see the Bible as worthless; indeed they referred to it in most of their pamphlets to back up their ideas because they believed that as Scripture was inspired by the spirit then there could be no contradiction between the two. To some degree Quakers' vehemence over the issue contributed to their being misunderstood. More orthodox contemporaries feared that Quakers were encouraging people to stop reading the Bible altogether; Giles Firmin, an Essex minister, was clearly alarmed by Quaker ideas relating to the Bible and believed that 'the Quakers light' taught men 'to forsake the Scriptures...to set up a light in men which shall not be examined by the Scriptures'.<sup>109</sup>

It is worth spending some time looking at the Quaker Samuel Fisher, an Oxford-trained minister who became a Baptist, then turned Quaker. His approach to Scripture was rather avant-garde and not typical of Quakerism in the 1650s. Fisher believed that the 'light' was the only touchstone of religious truth because the Bible had often been mistranslated and furthermore certain books, epistles and letters had not been included, such as the apocryphal books, the book of

---

<sup>108</sup>Thomas Lawson, 'Of the False Ministry', in Thomas Aldam et al., *A Brief Discovery of a Three Fold Estate of Antichrist* (London, 1653), p. 7.

<sup>109</sup>Firmin, *Establishing Against Shaking*, p. 26.

Jasher and Paul's epistle to Laodicea.<sup>110</sup> His ideas were summed up in his work *Rusticus ad Academicos* published in 1660 in which he stated that

Quakers did not with the misty ministers of the mere letter own the bare external text of scripture entire in every title, but say it hath suffered much loss of more than vowels, single letters, and single lines also, yea, even of whole epistles and prophecies of inspired men, the copies of which are not by the clergy canonized nor by the Bible-sellers bound up, and specially because we own not the said alterable and much altered outward text, but the holy truth and inward light and spirit to be the word of God, which is living [and] the true touchstone...<sup>111</sup>

The Quaker position changed fairly substantially during the time-span under question. In the 1660s Quakers started looking at the Scriptures much more critically than earlier Quakers, with the exception of Samuel Fisher, and suggested that they could not be the word of God 'for they are words and writings, and admit of alteration and change'; they therefore asserted that they could only be called 'a declaration of the Word'.<sup>112</sup> With the publication of Barclay's *Apology* though, a more positive approach to scripture appeared; although Quakers continued to view them as a 'declaration of the fountain' and not 'the fountain itself', Barclay stressed that since they were inspired by the spirit, and despite faults that had slipped in through the centuries, the Scriptures could still provide 'a sufficient clear testimony...to all the essentials of the Christian faith', and Barclay further stated

---

<sup>110</sup>See Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, pp. 290-91.

<sup>111</sup>Ibid., pp. 289-90, quoted from Samuel Fisher, *Works*, p. 194.

<sup>112</sup>Whitehead and Burrough, *Son of Perdition*, p. 58.

that the Scriptures were the 'only fit judge of controversies among Christians'.<sup>113</sup>

The Quaker standpoint on scripture was crucial at the time of the Toleration Act. As has been noted earlier, Quakers made declarations concerning the Trinity and Scripture, the latter of which stated that Quakers 'do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by Divine Inspiration'.<sup>114</sup> Quaker publications of 1689 provide evidence of Quaker eagerness to make clear their position. The broadside *The Christianity of the People Commonly Called Quakers* printed at the behest of the Second Day Morning Meeting spoke in positive terms about the Bible, acknowledging that it was given by divine inspiration and deeming it profitable for 'doctrine, correction, and instruction, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work, able to make the man of God wise unto salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ'.<sup>115</sup> In contrast to references to the Bible in the 1650s, George Fox, in another 1689 tract described it as 'the best book upon earth to be read, believed, fulfilled and practised'.<sup>116</sup>

#### *Quaker concepts of the church, ministry and worship*

Quakers saw themselves as 'the true church' and as

---

<sup>113</sup>Barclay, *Apology*, Proposition III, pp. 41, 52-55.

<sup>114</sup>Whitehead, *The Christian Progress*, pp. 634-6.

<sup>115</sup>*The Christianity of the People Commonly Called Quakers*

<sup>116</sup>George Fox, *The True Christian Distinguished* (London, 1689), p. 13.

'primitive Christianity revived'. As Hugh Barbour has pointed out, they did not think of the church in terms of buildings, or link it to the historic succession from the apostles, or to the covenant of the Elect but the church was recognised by the power of God's spirit working in it.<sup>117</sup> Early Quakers denounced church buildings and steeplehouses. One of the questions in an early catechism by Fox asked if a steeplehouse or meeting-place was a church and the reply given was, 'No, the church is in God, which is the pillar and ground of truth, where there is not a spot nor a wrinkle, or a blemish, or any such thing'.<sup>118</sup> There was a desire on the part of Quakers to portray the church as a something living and vital, thus William Smith observed in a 1660s catechism that 'the true church of which Christ is the head, is a living thing, and doth not decay, nor wax old'.<sup>119</sup> In the 1670s Robert Barclay used Fox's words when he referred to the church as the 'church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth'.<sup>120</sup> Furthermore, Barclay explained that the Quaker church was a visible one and stated, 'that is the church of Christ, when it consists of a visible people'.<sup>121</sup>

In terms of the Quaker conception of the ministry, there can be seen more of a shift in ideas. In the 1650s Quakers

---

<sup>117</sup>Barbour, p. 189.

<sup>118</sup>Fox, *Catechism for Children*, p. 58.

<sup>119</sup>Smith, *A New Primer* (London, 1662), p. 41.

<sup>120</sup>Barclay, *Catechism and Confession of Faith*, p. 75.

<sup>121</sup>Robert Barclay, *The Anarchy of the Ranters* (London, 1676), p. 84.

decried the clergy as apostates who led people away from God, rather than to him. Thomas Lawson denounced them as 'conjurors, raising dead doctrines, dead reasons, dead uses, dead motives, dead trials out of the letter, which is death...speaking a divination of their own brain.'<sup>122</sup> He accused them of being 'the only maintainers of the seven heads and ten-horned beast' of the Book of Revelations for leading people away from God.<sup>123</sup> The orthodox clergy were principally criticised for relying on Scripture as the ultimate religious truth, rather than a direct receiving of the spirit as was the experience of the apostles. Quakers denounced the clergy as being made by man rather than God. In 1659 the Quaker Edward Burrough noted how men were 'made ministers now by natural learning, receiving ordination from man, through the attainments of such arts and sciences, and degrees...' rather than 'having their ministry by the gift of the Holy Ghost'.<sup>124</sup> For this reason, Quakers believed that people of any origin could serve, for as James Nayler stated, the true ministry was the 'gift of Jesus Christ' and needed 'no addition of human help and learning'. He went on to say that God had chosen 'herds-men, fishermen and plowmen'.<sup>125</sup> They extended this idea to women which outraged contemporaries. Richard Farnworth writing

---

<sup>122</sup>Lawson, 'Of the False Ministry' in Aldam et al., *A Brief Discovery of a Three fold Estate of Anti-Christ*, p. 7.

<sup>123</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>124</sup>Edward Burrough, *A Faithful Testimony Concerning the True Worship of God* (London, 1659), p. 5.

<sup>125</sup>George Fox, James Nayler et al., *Saul's Errand to Damascus* (London, 1653), p. 18

in 1654 said 'let all flesh be silent, both in sons and daughters; and let the spirit speak for that is permitted either in son or daughter'.<sup>126</sup> He gave examples from the Old Testament of women who had the gift of prophecy such as Deborah, Priscilla and Aquila.<sup>127</sup>

Quakers vilified the clergy for the taking of tithes and Barry Reay has suggested that Quakers formed the 'vanguard of popular agitation against tithes'.<sup>128</sup> The Quaker, Susanna Bateman, urged the clergy to change their ways for she stressed that 'no thief must enter his kingdom, nor buyers nor sellers dwell in his temple, but the free gift must be freely given without money or without price'.<sup>129</sup> Edward Burrough noted how the Pope had been responsible for first introducing tithes and asked 'is it not the same as was in the days of popery and prelacy?' He urged instead that people should look at the practice of the apostles who entered the houses of the worthy and ate 'such things as were set before them' for 'the apostles might freely reap carnal things, where they had sown spiritual things'.<sup>130</sup>

These views continued to be expressed into the 1660s when ministers were still castigated by Quakers though not as

---

<sup>126</sup>Richard Farnworth, *A Woman Forbidden to Speak in the Church* (London, 1654) pp. 3-4.

<sup>127</sup>Ibid., pp. 3, 8.

<sup>128</sup>Reay, *Quakers and the English Revolution*, p. 39.

<sup>129</sup>Susanna Bateman, [No title] beginning, 'I matter not', (n.p., 1656), p. 4.

<sup>130</sup>Burrough, *Faithful Testimony*, pp. 5-6.

vehemently. William Smith wrote that 'true ministers' had their

power and authority in God...they take no tithes nor sue any people at law for maintenance, nor cast any into prison, they do not love filthy lucre, neither make their belly their God; they preach the word faithfully, and do not limit the Holy One, either to time, place or person.<sup>131</sup>

The first Quaker ministers were those known as 'the Valiant Sixty', including George Fox and others who went up and down the country disseminating the Quaker message in public places such as markets, fairs and churches. Their authority was based, not on their education or ordination but on a direct call from God. Early ministry involved a calling to preach the word and 'convince' the world. Once meetings had been settled though, as Richard Bauman has pointed out, ministers would usually 'emerge' from within their own meeting and 'were distinguished by the fact that they felt openings to speak more often than their brethren at large and were effective in articulating the word of Truth and reaching the witness of Truth in others.'<sup>132</sup> John Crook, a Quaker minister wrote in 1661 of the mechanism of speaking in a meeting, declaring that the minister 'knows how to behave himself in the church of god, both when to begin and when to make an end; ministering in the life' and feeling when 'the power stirs in another, which sense makes him cease, that the life may speak in whom and when it pleases'. Clearly even at this early time

---

<sup>131</sup>Smith, *Primer*, p. 7.

<sup>132</sup>Richard Bauman, *Let Your Words Be Few: Symbolism of Speaking and Silence Among Seventeenth-Century Quakers* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 132.



there was some kind of oversight in the meetings for Crook refers to the 'Elders' whose task is to judge 'not so much what words are spoken, as what life and power is stirring'.<sup>133</sup> The emergent minister often went through a painful process in his efforts to recognise and respond to the promptings of the spirit. Christopher Story describes the difficulties he faced at the beginning of his own ministry, around 1677, writing in his journal that 'to give up to speak a word in the meetings of the Lord's people was a thing very weighty.' He describes how 'time after time, though the Lord did appear' he 'fell short through fear and quenched the spirit' and he notes how 'ancient solid Friends perceived it, and spoke to me to give up' [i.e. to speak]. Finally Story recounts how he went to a meeting and was filled 'with life and power that I could not contain, but spoke forth these words as they sprang in me, that "they that sat in darkness, had seen a great light"'.<sup>134</sup> In order to try and prevent disputes among ministers, George Fox wrote as early as 1656 that Quakers should 'take heed of Judgeing...anyone openly in your meeting Except yea bee openly prophane...Such as bee out of ye truth'. He further added that Quakers should tolerate those who were 'tender' and if anyone should go 'beyond their measure', this should be borne in the meeting but they could

---

<sup>133</sup>John Crook, 'An Epistle for Unity to Prevent the Wiles of the Enemy', 1661, in *The Design of Christianity* (London, 1701), pp. 117-118.

<sup>134</sup>Christopher Story, *A Brief Account of the Life &c of Christopher Story* (London, 1726) pp. 30, 32.

be spoken with after the meeting ended.<sup>135</sup>

Robert Barclay's *Catechism and Confession of Faith* of 1673 reveals a change in the perception of the ministry; whilst the emphasis was still very much on the leadings of the spirit and Barclay noted that ministers 'speak not in the words which men's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, 2 Cor. 2. 13', the catechism deals much more with the notion of order in the church.<sup>136</sup> One question asked whether God had appointed any 'officers' in the church for the work of the ministry. Barclay replied by referring to Ephesians 4. 8,11,12, that God had given

gifts unto men; and he gave some apostles and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edification of the body of Christ.<sup>137</sup>

Barclay went on to stress that the ministers were worthy of respect and said with reference to 1 Timothy 5.17, 'let the Elders that rule well, be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine'. He urged Quakers to obey 'them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they must give account'.<sup>138</sup> Interestingly, Barclay limits the role of women in the church and there is a great contrast here with 1650s statements. Whilst he admits that men and women should prophesy according to Joel 2.28 and Acts 16.17 and 21.9, he

---

<sup>135</sup> Fox, *Journal*, vol. 1, pp. 222-223.

<sup>136</sup> Barclay, *Catechism and Confession*, p. 80.

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 75-76.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 77-78.

went on to refer to 1 Corinthians 14.34,35 and wrote in answer to the query whether all women may speak,

Let your women keep silence in the church; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church...

Barclay went further when he quoted 1 Timothy 2.11,12 and wrote 'let the women learn in silence with all subjection' and 'suffer not a woman to teach or usurp authority over the man; but to be in silence...' <sup>139</sup>

Richard Bauman has noted how the Quaker ministry gradually became more routinised during the 1660s and 1670s and was brought under 'corporate control'. He has pointed to the use of Elders, those ministers who helped emergent ministers and provided some kind of oversight. In this sense there was a move away from a purely prophetic ministry, dependent upon individual callings. An important epistle in 1672 addressed to the ministers and Elders in the church advised that the latter should look out for 'any weakness, want of wisdom, or miscarriage, either in doctrine or practice'. Furthermore there was an attempt to control how the message was given to people as may be seen from the following passage which advises that none are

to rush into, or strive out of God's counsel to speak of the high mysteries of the gospel, nor cast pearls before swine. Neither hastily, or at first entrance, out of their own measures and attainments, to assert the highest doctrines, as that of perfection, or height of attainments, before people's minds are prepared by the secret power of God for the first principles or beginnings; that

---

<sup>139</sup> Ibid., pp. 88-89.

they may not be stumbled, nor their minds biased against Truth, by any hasty or untimely asserting matters beyond their measures and capacities, that is, without a deliberate progress in the work and travail of the Gospel: and that Christ, his death, blood, and resurrection, be reverently spoken of, according to Scripture expressions.<sup>140</sup>

Quakers were also concerned that worship generally should be in the spirit and not follow rites and conventions. Of the worship of other churches, Edward Burrough stated, 'it is not the worship of the living God, but superstition and idolatry, for people hath not learned it by the teachings of the spirit, neither doth the spirit lead them therein'.<sup>141</sup> This view accounted very much for their attitude to the sacraments; from their earliest days the Quakers had been anti-sacramental because for them the means of grace were inward. As Richard Hubberthorne, a leading yeoman Quaker from Yealand, wrote

if you love this light it will lead you out of all your carnal ordinances and worships, and divers washings, which stands in the first covenant, which was before Christ, and is done away in Christ the second covenant, and it will lead you to worship God in the spirit.<sup>142</sup>

James Nayler was typical of early Quakers in seeing the Lord's Supper and Baptism in spiritual terms. For Nayler, 'the true Baptism is that of the spirit, with the Holy Ghost, and with fire...not the washing away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God'. Similarly, Nayler believed that 'the true supper of the Lord is the spiritual

---

<sup>140</sup> 'Epistle from Friends of the General Meeting held in London, the 31st of 3rd month, 1672', in A.R. Barclay, *Letters of Early Friends* (London, 1841), pp. 334, 330-331.

<sup>141</sup> Burrough, *Faithful Testimony*, p. 2.

<sup>142</sup> Richard Hubberthorne, *The Antipathy Betwixt Flesh and Spirit* (London, 1654), p. 3.

eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ'.<sup>143</sup>

There is evidence of a slight change in thought on the sacraments after the Restoration. The Quaker John Crook suggested that ordinances should be interpreted symbolically but that should people be commanded 'by the same spirit that commanded believers in the days past...we judge them not'. Similarly, Quakers should not criticise those who break 'outward' bread and drink 'external' wine if by doing so they are 'put in remembrance' of Christ; only those who did these by tradition or in imitation were to be condemned.<sup>144</sup>

Apart from this the Quaker attitude towards the sacraments did not change substantially; Robert Barclay's *Apology* of the 1670s re-stated earlier Quaker belief by insisting that the Last Supper and Baptism were only 'figures' until 'the spiritual worship should be set up'.<sup>145</sup> The area of the sacraments was the only issue on which Quakers cannot be seen trying to placate the government in 1689. They admitted only spiritual Baptism and Communion as essential for salvation. Quakers defended their stance by referring to number six of the 39 Articles which stated that 'whatsoever is not read in the Holy scriptures, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man'.<sup>146</sup>

Quakers believed that all praying should be in the spirit

---

<sup>143</sup>Fox and Nayler et al., *Saul's Errand to Damascus*, pp. 16-17.

<sup>144</sup>John Crook, *Truth's Principles or Those Things about Doctrine and Worship* (London, 1662), p. 16.

<sup>145</sup>Barclay, *Apology*, Proposition XII, p. 291.

<sup>146</sup>*The Christianity of the People Commonly called Quakers*

and denounced formal set prayers. George Fox wrote that 'ye spirit yt gave furth scripturs teacheth us how to pray, singe, praise, reioyce, honour & worship god'. He criticised set patterns of worship when he observed how 'church faith changeth, directory changeth, comon prayer changes & masse changes...but ye pure religeon doth not change, which we are of & owne'.<sup>147</sup> This notion was not of course new as Geoffrey Nuttall has pointed out of earlier radical Puritans who objected to 'stinted' prayers because as he says, they were 'acutely concious of the working of the Holy Spirit, immediately, in their hearts' and 'increasingly felt there to be no place in worship for liturgies or read prayers'. Such attitudes stretched as far back as early separatists such as Barrow and the Brownists, and were evident amongst the Independents of the 1640s, some of the latter even refused to say the Lords Prayer. It was also common amongst the Seekers who preferred to worship in silence.<sup>148</sup> This practice often occurred within Quakerism itself. Concerning silent meetings and speaking, George Fox wrote that, 'the intent of all speaking is was to bring into the life, and to walk in, and to possess the same, and to live and enjoy it, and to feel God's presence'. He believed that this was achieved 'in the silence, not in the wandering whirling tempest part of man or woman'.<sup>149</sup> This same idea was echoed in a catechism of the

---

<sup>147</sup>Fox, *Journal*, vol. 1, pp. 329, 331.

<sup>148</sup>Nuttall, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 66-68.

<sup>149</sup>George Fox, *Something Concerning Silent Meetings* (n.d., n.p. 1657?) single sheet.

1660s by William Smith who observed that 'the babe begotten by the spirit, prays in the spirit, and receives from the spirit, and is strengthened with the virtue of the spirit; and this is true prayer, though never a word be spoken through utterance'.<sup>150</sup> Smith objected to those who spent their time at prayer at 'set-times, and in set prayers' who 'spend away their days, but feel not the Lord nor his goodness'.<sup>151</sup>

The Quaker attitude to prayer did not change very much over the period from the 1650s to 80s. Robert Barclay urged Quakers in his *Catechism and Confession* to 'pray always, with all prayer and supplication in the spirit...'.<sup>152</sup> Barclay noted that 'when many are met together...it doth most naturally and frequently excite them to pray to, and praise God, and stir up one another by mutual exhortation and instructions', yet he emphasised the need for silent prayer when he stated that 'we judge it needful there be, in the first place, some times of silence, during which, everyone may be gathered inward to the word and gift of grace'.<sup>153</sup>

Quakers also believed that like prayer, singing should be in the spirit. Kenneth Carroll has pointed out that this was not new as from 1644 to 1660 all church music was banned by parliament save for the unaccompanied singing of "metrical versions of the Psalms". He has noted how some radical Puritans such as the Particular and General Baptists objected

---

<sup>150</sup>William Smith, *New Catechism*, p. 110.

<sup>151</sup>Ibid., p. 101.

<sup>152</sup>Robert Barclay, *Catechism and Confession*, p. 92.

<sup>153</sup>Barclay, *Apology*, XI Proposition, p. 254.

to hymn and psalm singing from books.<sup>154</sup> Quakers particularly objected to the practice of singing "David's Psalms" in rhyme and metre and attacked this as another 'form'. Edward Burrough wrote, 'And as for your singing of David's Experiences in the form and manner as you do,...neither [were] ever commanded of the Lord, nor...was it ever practised by the saints of old'.<sup>155</sup> Quakers allowed singing if it was done in accordance with the spirit. The Quaker Thomas Holme, writing to Margaret Fell, recounted how he had been prompted to sing one evening when about midnight 'he was compelled to sing and the power was so great...'<sup>156</sup> Kenneth Carroll has noted how singing could sometimes be 'disruptive or even an expression of opposition'. James Nayler's entry into Bristol for example was accompanied by singing and the Naylerite Martha Simmonds, attacked George Fox at Launceston gaol by singing in front of him.<sup>157</sup>

Later on the attitude to singing was somewhat softened for Barclay noted in his *Catechism and Confession of Faith* that the singing of psalms was 'a part of God's worship and very sweet and refreshing, when it proceeds from a true sense of God's love in the heart, and arises from the divine influence of the spirit...' Barclay objected however to 'artificial music, either by organs, or other instruments or

---

<sup>154</sup> Kenneth L. Carroll, 'Singing in the Spirit in Early Quakerism', *Quaker History*, 73 (1984), p. 2.

<sup>155</sup> Burrough, *Faithful Testimony*, p. 4.

<sup>156</sup> Quoted in Carroll, 'Singing in the Spirit', p. 5, from F.H.L. Swarthmore MSS, 1, 190.

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

voice' because Quakers saw no 'example nor precept for it in the New Testament'.<sup>158</sup>

Quakers stressed that worship should not be limited to certain days, nevertheless, from their earliest times they did meet regularly on Sundays as well as during the week. Fox advised his brethren in a work of the late 1660s to 'keep your meetings as you did in the beginning, betwixt the 10th and 11th hours, when the priest is in the heat of his worship' and advised them to 'break your meetings, as you feel the power to order you, about the third or fourth hours'. Fox noted that this was 'the practice of Friends in the beginning' and went on to urge his fellow Quakers to 'keep your meetings on the First Day, and your weekly meetings in the name of Jesus'.<sup>159</sup> Quakers refused the name Sabbath and Sunday as being heathenish, preferring to call it the first day.<sup>160</sup> Despite worshipping on certain days, Quakers believed that worship should be in the spirit and so did not attach any special importance to these. The Quaker Peter Hardcastle, referring to Colossians wrote 'Let no man judge the true Christian in meat or drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come'. Similarly, William Smith wrote 'for the sabbath is the seventh day and the observing of that is ended in Christ; and that called the Lord's day is the first day of the week'. Smith went on to

---

<sup>158</sup>Barclay, *Apology*, pp. 288-89.

<sup>159</sup>George Fox, *Friends Fellowship Must be in the Spirit*, (London, 1669), pp. 13-14.

<sup>160</sup>Fox, *Journal*, vol. 1, p. 311.

dismiss Holy days also which he viewed as being 'set up in the Apostacy'.<sup>161</sup> Like other Puritans, Quakers refused to observe holy days, feast days, saints' days and the important festivals of Christmas, Easter and Whitsuntide for they saw no precedent for them in scripture.<sup>162</sup>

The position on times of worship was clarified by Robert Barclay in his *Apology* when he reiterated the view that Quaker worship was not 'limited to times, places, nor persons'. Yet he was anxious to emphasise that Friends were 'none of those, that forsake the assembly of ourselves together, but have even certain times and places, in which we carefully meet together...to wait upon God, and worship him'. Barclay stressed that these times were for outward convenience only and people should not think that they were holy days and become superstitious in their observance of them for Quakers were to believe that 'all days are alike holy in the sight of God.' Concerning worshipping on Sundays, Barclay wrote that Quakers did not see 'any ground in scripture for it' and can not be so superstitious, as to believe that either the Jewish Sabbath now continues, or that the first day of the week is the anti-type thereof, or the true Christian Sabbath, which with Calvin we believe to have a more spiritual sense.

He went on to say that Quakers knew 'no moral obligation...to keep the first day of the week more as any other'. Following this he described a number of reasons why Quakers did set

---

<sup>161</sup>Peter Hardcastle, *A Short Relation of What is Believed Among the People of God* (n.p., 1666), p. 9; Smith, *Primer*, pp. 54-55.

<sup>162</sup>George Fox, *The Hypocrite's Fast and Feast not God's Holy Day* (n.p., 1677), sig A2.

aside the first day for worship. Firstly he said they deemed it 'most necessary, that there be some time set apart for the saints to meet together to wait upon God. Secondly, Barclay believed it was 'fit at some times they be freed from their other outward affairs' and that 'reason and equity doth allow that servants and beasts have some time allowed them, to be eased from their continual labour'. Finally, his third justification was that 'the apostles and primitive Christians, did use the first day of the week for these purposes'. Barclay ended this section by adding that though Quakers met together and abstained from working on the first day that did not 'hinder us [Quakers] from having meetings also for worship at other times.'<sup>163</sup>

#### *Oversight and Communication of Quaker Doctrine*

It has been shown then that in certain crucial areas of Quaker doctrine, particularly those pertaining to the relationship of the 'inner light' to the historic Christ, there were significant changes of emphasis. These developments may be related chiefly to the growth in central organization, and particularly the establishment of the Second Day Morning Meeting which met weekly from 1673 in order to vet Quaker manuscripts before publication. Two copies of every work were required so that nothing could be printed 'but what is first read and approved by this meeting'.<sup>164</sup> This meant that the

---

<sup>163</sup>Barclay, *Apology*, Proposition XI, pp. 245-247.

<sup>164</sup>Quoted in O'Malley, 'Defying the Powers and Tempering the Spirit', p. 77; F.H.L., Morning Meeting Book, vol. 1. 21.9.1674.

type of doctrines being presented in Quaker tracts were increasingly being controlled by a group of leading Quakers in London.

It would seem appropriate here to briefly examine how doctrine was communicated within Quakerism. Quakers had to impart their doctrinal beliefs, such as they were, to newcomers as well as children of existing members, and presumably doctrinal issues arose at the local level occasionally. One principal means of transmission was of course the Quaker ministry; in the embryonic years of Quakerism the travelling preachers were the main vehicle, who spread the Quaker message throughout the country concentrating on churches, markets, fairs and public streets as can be seen frequently in George Fox's *Journal*. In spreading the message, Quakers proclaimed the way of truth and stressed the need to adhere to the 'inner light' for salvation. Other doctrines such as perfection and the Quaker view of the sacraments were communicated inadvertently through discussion with Quaker critics, in public and in print. A further means of disseminating doctrine was via the distribution of tracts, a fair proportion of which, especially in the 1650s, dealt with doctrinal issues. Kate Peters has noted the seriousness with which early Quakers viewed pamphleteering as part of their missionary work.<sup>165</sup> Post-Restoration Quakers also had 'methods of distribution and dispersal'; Quaker printers would send books to recipients in the localities who then organized

---

<sup>165</sup>Kate Peters, I.H.R. Religious History Seminar, 'Distribution and Readership of Quaker pamphlets, 1652-1656'.

dissemination to their meetings. The 1672 Yearly Meeting ordered fixed quotas of books to be sent to the counties from the printers to named correspondents in each area who would then pass them on to local Quakers.<sup>166</sup>

Catechisms were an essential part of the transmission of doctrine and a number of these were printed throughout the period in question. John L. Stroud's study of Quaker education has shown that two of George Fox's catechisms were used quite widely in Quaker schools during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; these were *A Catechism for Children* of 1657 and *A Primer and Catechism for Children* of 1670, written by Fox and Ellis Hooke, the recording clerk of the society.<sup>167</sup> A number of other catechisms appeared which presumably were also used. In 1659 Isaac Penington produced *A Short Catechism*, and earlier his *Life of a Christian* had contained 'some few catechistical questions concerning the way of salvation by Christ'.<sup>168</sup> The 1660s saw the publication of important catechisms by William Smith: *A New Catechism* of 1666 and *A New Primer* of 1662. In addition, Thomas Richardson's *A True Catechism* appeared in 1664. As well as Fox and Hooke's *Primer and Catechism* of 1670, the Quaker Ambrose Rigge wrote his *Scripture Catechism for Children* which was published in 1672. This work was obviously intended to instruct children and make them familiar with the Bible. It went through the old and new

---

<sup>166</sup>O'Malley, p. 80.

<sup>167</sup>L. John Stroud, 'The History of Quaker Education in England 1647-1903' University of Leeds thesis, 1944, p. 30.

<sup>168</sup>Isaac Penington, *The Life of a Christian* (London, 1653).

testaments asking basic questions about biblical figures and stories.<sup>169</sup> Rigge's catechism indicates the extent to which the Quaker attitude to the Bible had changed. It is difficult to imagine such a publication appearing in the 1650s. The most important catechistical work of this decade of course was Robert Barclay's *Catechism and Confession of Faith* which along with his *Apology* helped to systematize the Quaker faith for the first time. Finally, the 1680s saw the publication of two works which were catechistical in style: Stephen Crisp's *A New Book for Children* and George Keith's *The Fundamental Truths of Christianity*.

### ***Conclusion***

The period 1650 to 1689 witnessed considerable shifts of emphasis in several areas of Quaker doctrine. These were not so much complete changes as an attempt to adapt Quaker ideas to more orthodox standpoints. This can be seen most clearly in the crucial area of the 'inner light' and its relation to the historic Christ which developed in a way which left the 'light' as the Quakers' central tenet but at the same time gave more prominence to the incarnate Christ. There was an attempt to reconcile Christ's atonement with the saving nature of the 'light' which 1650s Quakers had failed to do. Subtle changes were also seen in other contentious areas; the idea of perfection was still retained but was described as a more gradual process, rather than the sudden result of conversion

---

<sup>169</sup>Ambrose Rigge, *A Scripture Catechism for Children* (n.p., 1672).

which made the doctrine much more palatable and distanced it from its more enthusiastic beginnings. A change was also evident in the Quaker view of the Trinity; Quakers stuck to their passage from John of 'the three divine witnesses' and did not cavil so much about the orthodox concern with the notion of 'persons'. Moreover the Quaker attitude to the Bible changed quite significantly; instead of it being 'a dead letter', its positive attributes were emphasised: it was a useful guide, could be used for correction and also provided sound doctrine. Given that Quakers were castigated so vehemently in the 1650s for holding what were deemed to be blasphemous and heretical doctrines, their inclusion in the Toleration Act of 1689 seems at first remarkable. However, as has been shown, Quakers were concerned to promote a more orthodox image in the years following the Restoration, especially when there seemed to be a prospect of acceptance in 1689. The Quakers' inclusion in the act stemmed from a variety of causes but the gradual changes in their doctrine after the Interregnum were essential in allowing Quakers to benefit from the fruits of toleration.

## CHAPTER 2

### *QUAKER CENTRAL ORGANIZATION c.1650-1689*

#### *Introduction*

George Fox and the earliest Quakers highlighted the importance of man's reliance on the 'inner light' or 'Christ within' as the ultimate religious authority. Quakers associated the 'light' with the Word of John's Gospel, with Christ and with God; it was given to all and obedience to it would show the way that men should act in relation to God and man. All that was outward in religion, a man-made ministry, the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for example were frowned upon, as Fox and others believed that possession of the 'light' was sufficient for salvation. It is therefore somewhat ironic that by the mid 1670s a very sophisticated Quaker organization had been established, one in which a high degree of control emanated from the centre in London. The London Yearly Meeting, the Second Day Morning Meeting which met weekly and the Meeting for Sufferings, also a weekly body, came to be dominated by a fairly small group of Friends from London and the suburbs, particularly the latter two meetings. Even though Quakers from the counties were invited to meetings, the very fact that they were held regularly in London meant that the overall control of the Quaker movement was in the hands of Quakers from London and its environs. This central authority inevitably invited criticism from some Quakers who had witnessed the birth of the movement and had welcomed the freedom from an institutionalized religion which

Quakerism had seemed to promise. In the early days of course organization was fairly loose with the emphasis being placed much more upon spiritual leadership from the Quaker leaders, especially George Fox. After 1660 however, organization was imperative if the Quaker movement was to survive the bitter persecution which ensued with the return of the monarch and the Anglican establishment. The problem for George Fox and other leading Quakers following the Restoration was how to reconcile Christian liberty with some kind of church authority; inevitably some degree of opposition was likely.

This chapter will analyse the moves towards central organization from the foundation years of Quakerism in the 1650s up to the time of the Toleration Act in 1689. It can be argued that along with the shifts in doctrine outlined in the previous chapter, the establishment of Quaker central authority played a large role in the toleration given to Quakers in 1689. The Meeting for Sufferings sought to show that Quakers were a peaceable and loyal people by attending the King, Parliament and the assize judges, and perhaps more crucially, the Second Day Morning Meeting through its control of Quaker publications and teaching successfully ensured that any surviving 'radical' elements in the movement were suppressed. The Yearly Meeting also performed an important function in that it kept the counties in touch with the centre and was an important vehicle for the relaying of the centre's ideas to Quakers outside London.

### *Early Organization*

In the early days of Quakerism, organization was fairly minimal as one would expect. The movement depended upon the leadership of George Fox and other early converts known as 'the valiant sixty', men such as James Nayler, Francis Howgill, Richard Farnworth and William Dewsbury. These were itinerant preachers who travelled around the country from the north to spread the Quaker message. Margaret Fell of Swarthmore Hall in Lancashire, wife of Judge Thomas Fell, was also important in the first years of the movement and was to marry George Fox in the late 1660s. She was responsible for setting up the Kendal Fund in the North to help Quaker ministers and those in need. She became something of a focus and centre for the early Quaker movement. Itinerant Quakers would pass on information via Margaret Fell at Swarthmore Hall which was destined for George Fox.<sup>1</sup>

George Fox, especially, was responsible for shaping the movement, noting for example in his Journal for 1656 how he had been 'moved of ye Lord to sende for one or two out of a county to Swarthmoor & to sett uppe yee mens meetinges where they was not: & to setle yt meetinge at Skipton concerneinge ye affaires of ye church'.<sup>2</sup> Fox also exercised control over books that were published as can be seen from a letter written by the Quaker Thomas Aldam, a yeoman of Warmsworth in Yorkshire. He wrote to Fox in 1653 saying 'I do rejoice to

---

<sup>1</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 3, fo. 192, 1653, James Nayler to Margaret Fell.

<sup>2</sup>Fox, *Journal*, vol. 1, p. 266.

hear that the wisdom of God doth so order that all books may come to thy hand to be read before they be printed'.<sup>3</sup> Fox was also consulted and gave advice about the travels of the Quaker missionaries. John Blacklinge, a yeoman of Draw-well near Sedburgh in North Yorkshire, wrote to Fox in the 1650s concerning his desire to go into Cumberland to spread the Quaker message and stated 'this I have writ to let thee know of it'.<sup>4</sup> Fox's influence may also be gauged from the many epistles or papers he sent out regarding issues of concern such as marriage practice and Quaker sufferings.<sup>5</sup> Other Quakers were also influential, notably James Nayler of West Yorkshire. In 1656 Edward Burrough wrote to Nayler from Oxford reporting on his travels in Reading and Banbury.<sup>6</sup>

As well as the leaders who exercised some overall control over the growing movement, once Quakerism began to expand there also developed what may be termed 'proto-national meetings', particularly in the north. Whilst these did not cover the whole country they were nevertheless important for giving advice and making decisions which affected vast areas. Large meetings such as the one held at Balby, Yorkshire in 1656 with a view to agreeing some form of consensus on discipline had an important place in the early organization of

---

<sup>3</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 3, fo. 39, 1653, Tho. Aldam to G. Fox.

<sup>4</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 4, fo. 159, undated, John Blakeling to George Fox.

<sup>5</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 2, fo. 28, 15.3. [May] 1655, G. Fox to Friends; fo. 99, 1657, G. Fox to Friends.

<sup>6</sup>F.H.L., Portfolio MSS, 1A, fo. 43, 12.5. [July] 1656, E.B. to J.N..

Quakerism. The Balby meeting also involved Quakers from Lincoln, Derby and Nottingham. The meeting produced advice on how to deal with 'persons who walk disorderly', care for the poor and matters relating to marriage.<sup>7</sup> A similar meeting was held at Skipton in 1659 involving many northern counties, including Westmorland, Yorkshire and Cheshire. Influential northern Quakers such as Anthony Pearson and Thomas Aldam were present. This urged friends from 'particular' or weekly meetings to meet together once a month on a district basis, and those from monthly meetings to gather 'twice or thrice a year' for a county meeting. It also made a suggestion about a meeting for the whole country so that 'we may not tie ourselves to the world's limits of counties and places but join together as may conduce to the union and fellowship of the church and the mutual help of one another in the Lord and we wish the like may be settled in all parts and a general meeting of England'. This suggestion of a Yearly meeting was sent up to London to be agreed by George Fox, Edward Burrough and other friends.<sup>8</sup>

### *Early Finance*

The growth of Quakerism necessitated some kind of financial system. Margaret Fell perhaps most importantly was responsible for the setting up of the Kendal Fund, accounts of which are in volume one of the Swarthmore Manuscripts.

---

<sup>7</sup>Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, pp. 310-314. From records of Marsden Monthly Meeting.

<sup>8</sup>F.H.L., Portfolio MSS, 16, fo. 2, 'At the general meeting of friends of the North at Skipton', 5.8.[Oct] 1659

Established in June 1654 it helped those Quakers who preached and travelled at their own expense throughout the north and midlands at this point, and also relieved imprisoned Quakers. Fell appointed two agents, Thomas Willan and George Taylor, an iron-monger, as joint treasurers to oversee the collection and disbursement of money. As Quakerism in 1654 was still a northern phenomenon, the collection was at first restricted to the Kendal area and then widened to all meetings in Lancashire, Westmorland and Cumberland at the end of 1654 when Margaret Fell urged Quakers to give 'freely according to their abilities'.<sup>9</sup> Similar collections were made in Durham under Anthony Pearson of County Durham.<sup>10</sup> Pearson was a man with legal training who had been clerk and registrar to the Committee of Compounding. He was a Justice for three counties and was converted or 'convinced' at the trial of James Nayler and Francis Howgill in 1652/3. Yorkshire collections were organized by Thomas Killam, a former Seeker of Balby near Doncaster, West Yorkshire.<sup>11</sup>

It has been estimated that during the period 1654-57 around £270 was collected and disbursed.<sup>12</sup> The accounts are interesting as they reveal not only the extent of Quaker finance but also their priorities. In the opening account coming from Kendal contributions, expenditure was concentrated

---

<sup>9</sup>Quoted in, Helen G. Crosfield, *Margaret Fox* (London, 1913), p. 42, from Thirnbeck MSS, 1.

<sup>10</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 1, fo. 240, 18.6. [Aug] 1655, George Taylor to Margaret Fell.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., fo. 235, 10.3. [May] 1655, Thomas Willan to M.F. .

<sup>12</sup>Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 317.

on relief for prisoners, expenses of travelling Friends and clothing needs. By 1655 when the collection had been expanded, money was starting to be spent on service overseas, for example visits to Germany, New England and Ireland, as well as on Quaker books.<sup>13</sup>

W.C. Braithwaite has suggested that funds collected at London from 1655 for which there are no surviving accounts may also have been put to wider use. He has noted how a trip to Ireland by Edward Burrough and Francis Howgill was funded by London Friends.<sup>14</sup> The brunt of the financial burden, however, was borne by the northern counties until general collections began to be instituted in 1656 and contributed to from each county, collections which were later to be known as the general stock or national stock. It would appear that a suggestion had been made in 1656 by George Fox to set up a nationwide collection. In a letter from a meeting at Skipton, Fox had written praising the use of meetings for collections in the northern counties and suggested that the south follow suit.<sup>15</sup> A later letter from Thomas Willan to Margaret Fell, dated May 1657, relates how a meeting was held at the home of John Blaikling at Draw-well near Sedburgh with Anthony Pearson, Francis Howgill, and some lesser known Quakers, John Langstaff and Anthony Hodgson. Francis Howgill helped Pearson to choose Friends from several counties who were to send a paper 'about the collections for the great business

---

<sup>13</sup>See Appendices 1 and 2.

<sup>14</sup>Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 320.

<sup>15</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 2, fo. 18, 1656.

[international evangelism] to the several meetings' and to arrange for the money to be sent up to London to four Friends. Thomas Willan was asked by Pearson to tell Margaret Fell that he had dealt with the southern counties and left Lancashire, Cumberland and Westmorland to her.<sup>16</sup> The paper sent to the counties was signed by Pearson, Gervase Benson, a yeoman of Sedbergh, Robert Widders of Over Kellett in Lancashire and Thomas Aldam on behalf of the 'churches of Christ in the counties of York, Lancaster, Westmorland, Cumberland, Durham and the Northern parts'. The paper states how the north had 'borne the burden' and asks that 'collections be made throughout all meetings' for sending 'servants into other nations' so that 'all might come to be fellow-helpers and co partners in the service of the Lord'. Advice was given regarding the procedure to be adopted for sending up money: two or three from every meeting were to receive funds and with a note forward this to Friends in London, who are named. These were Gerrard Roberts, a wine cooper who was to become a very influential Friend, John Boulton, a Goldsmith of St. Martin le Grand and a Richard Davis.<sup>17</sup>

There are no surviving details of these first general collections except for an important paper in the Swarthmore collection, dated only by its year of 1656 which shows receipts and disbursements for the 'Service of Truth'. The majority of the counties represented are southern. The collection amounted to £443.3.5 in receipts and £479.13.13 in

---

<sup>16</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 1, fo. 297, 3. [May] 1657.

<sup>17</sup>F.H.L., Portfolio MSS, 9/11, fos. 68, 69, undated.

'disbursements'. The accounts do not show figures for London, Bristol or Kendal, probably because they had been contributing to missionary activity abroad for some time before and were overstretched. The largest contribution came from Essex at £48.10.5, with Berkshire and Norfolk sending the next largest contributions of £46.11.4 and £38 respectively. The smallest amounts came from Shrewsbury at £1.14.4 and Bedfordshire and Gloucestershire giving around the same. Expenditure largely went on financing Quaker missionaries to such places as France, Holland, New England, Turkey and Barbadoes.<sup>18</sup> It would appear that general collections carried on after this. In 1658 a northern meeting of Quakers from York, Lincoln, Lancaster, Chester, Nottingham, Derby, Westmorland, Cumberland, Durham and Northumberland met at Scalehouse near Skipton, Yorkshire in 1658 and asked for counties 'freely and liberally to offer up unto God of their earthly substance according as God hath blessed everyone'. They asked that this money be sent up to London to Gerrard Roberts and Amor Stoddard, and others. The latter who had been Fox's travelling companion during 1655-56.<sup>19</sup>

#### *The beginnings of a 'central organization'*

There are strong indications that the Quaker movement was already beginning to develop a central organization at London in the late 1650s. As has been shown a national stock was

---

<sup>18</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 1, fo. 397, 1656. See appendix 3.

<sup>19</sup>F.H.L., Portfolio MSS, 16, fo. 1, 24.4. [June] 1658.

starting to be administered from London during this time. There are few records relating to collections in the 1660s but what evidence there is would suggest that collections were only made when necessary. A letter from the 1669 Yearly Meeting mentioned a paper that was drawn up '5 or 6 years ago' about a general collection but was not sent around the country. It asks for a collection to be made as the London Friends were three score out of purse (presumably they had been bearing the costs), and urges Friends to read the letter at their quarterly, monthly and particular or weekly meetings which by this time had been established throughout the country. The amounts collected were to be returned to quarterly meetings and then to Gerrard Roberts and Amor Stoddard at London.<sup>20</sup>

In the late 1650s, a permanent recording clerk for the society was established. Ellis Hooke of Southwark Monthly Meeting was to play an important role as clerk to the society and served on all of the central meetings at London. An epistle of George Fox of May 1658 asked Friends to send records of sufferings to London and to 'send up every half year to London what is done to Friends and by whom.' Details were to be sent 'by a carrier or some faithful Friend' and to be delivered to Amor Stodard of Long Alley in Moorfields, or Thomas Hart in Swan Alley in Coleman Street.<sup>21</sup> The early attempts in the late 1650s to record Quaker sufferings can be seen as anticipating the Meeting for Sufferings which began in

---

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., fo. 6, 16.11. [Jan] 1668/9.

<sup>21</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 7, fo. 39, -5. [July] 1658.

1676.

The origins of the other executive meetings may also be traced back to the late 1650s. H. Larry Ingle, the most recent biographer of George Fox, has suggested that the Second Day Morning Meeting, a central body set up to examine Quaker manuscripts before publication, evolved from Monday meetings held at Robert Dring's home, a linen draper of Moorfields, which were attended by Fox and others.<sup>22</sup> A letter to Margaret Fell in May 1655 from Alexander Parker mentions a meeting at Dring's attended by Fox, Gervase Benson, Howgill, Burrough and Alexander Parker, a husbandman of Ardsley West Yorkshire.<sup>23</sup>

Evidence indicates that by the mid-1660s authority in the Quaker movement resided in the hands of Friends in London and power was beginning to move away from the localities to some degree. Around this time the London Friends were threatened by the Quaker John Perrot, who had been a missionary in Ireland. Perrot claimed that he had experienced a revelation from God which required him to bear testimony against the Quaker practice of taking the hat off whilst in prayer. This on the surface seemed to be quite a trivial issue but it had deeper undercurrents for it raised the vexed question of the 'inner light' in the individual as the mainspring of man's actions as against that of some kind of church authority. A group of Quakers emerged in London who took up Perrot's challenge against the growing authority that was beginning to develop.

---

<sup>22</sup>H. Larry Ingle, *First Among Friends: George Fox and the Creation of Quakerism* (Oxford, 1994), p. 126.

<sup>23</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 1, fo. 161, 3.2. [April] 1655, Alexander Parker to Margaret Fell.

This was led by John Pennyman, a woollen draper, originally of Yorkshire who gathered an influential band of supporters around him, such as John Osgood, a linen draper who interestingly became an influential member of some of the central meetings later on; also William Penington, a merchant and brother of the Quaker author Isaac Penington, together with a Nicholas Bond, who had begun some of the early Quaker meetings during the 1650s in the Strand and in Greenwich.<sup>24</sup> A letter of May 1666 from Quaker 'ministers' who had convened in London entitled 'A Testimony from the Brethren' clamped down on such views. It would seem that this letter stemmed mainly from London ministers or, as they were sometimes referred to, 'public Friends'. In effect it stated that they had exclusive authority to interpret faith and practice for other Quakers. They complained of those who 'speak evil of dignities and despise government without which we are sensible our society and fellowship can not be kept holy'. The letter urged other Quakers to have no dealings with Quaker separatists such as Perrot, or those 'who would limit the Lord to speak without instruments', and told them to be careful of any books produced by them. Furthermore the Quaker separatists were to hold no office within the society and the letter advocated that 'from time to time faithful and sound friends and brethren may have the view of such things as are printed upon truth's account as formerly it hath used to be'. The writers of the document which was to be communicated 'to faithful Friends and Elders in the counties' to be read by

---

<sup>24</sup>Ingle, *First Among Friends*, pp. 199-200.

them in their meetings, referred to themselves as those whom 'God hath called to labour and watch for the eternal good of your souls'. They saw themselves as having the same authority as 'the wisemen and...of the prophets which God sanctified' and thus can be seen as setting themselves up on this basis as repositories of authority within the Quaker organization.<sup>25</sup>

The paper was the work of Richard Farnworth, a yeoman of Tickhill in Yorkshire, and was signed by influential London Quaker ministers such as George Whitehead, Alexander Parker, Thomas Green and Stephen Crisp, all of whom were to play a large part in the system of central meetings established in the 1670s as will be shown below. George Fox at this time was imprisoned at Scarborough Castle and so probably had little to do with it. After his release in 1666 he toured the country in order to firmly establish a system of quarterly and monthly meetings, and to ensure that via discipline, separation would not grow into a bigger problem. Fox gave advice on this matter, stating that two or three must go from the general or quarterly meetings and give notice 'if there be any that walk not in the truth...that some may be ordered from the meeting to go to exhort such...' Activities like 'drunkeness' and 'gaming' were forbidden and advice was also given on a variety of other issues such as marriage procedures, care of the poor and keeping meetings on the first day and during the week.<sup>26</sup> Later on in the late 1660s and early 1670s when yearly

---

<sup>25</sup>F.H.L., Portfolio MSS, 41, fo. 94, -3. [May] 1666.

<sup>26</sup>George Fox, *Friends' Fellowship must be in the Spirit* (n.p., 1668), pp. 1-16.

meetings were established on a regular basis, information and advice was disseminated through the network of county or quarterly meetings down to those at the monthly or district level and through to the weekly meetings.

### *The centralization of the 1670s*

Quaker organization at the centre developed into a very sophisticated system during the 1670s with the establishment on a permanent basis of the London Yearly Meeting, the Meeting for Sufferings and the Second Day Morning Meeting. Yearly Meeting established on a permanent basis in 1672 dealt with practical issues, initially calling in representatives from the counties to deal with sufferings; it controlled the number and distribution of books to be sent to the counties and also dealt with a wide range of other issues such as the Quaker testimony against tithes and Quaker behaviour. Membership was made up of one or two Friends chosen from the quarterly meetings in each county before Whitsun.<sup>27</sup> The Second Day Morning Meeting, established in 1673, was the next of the meetings to develop. This met every Monday or 'second day', though in practice the minutes reveal that meetings could be more frequent. It dealt with the examination of books and occasionally intervened in internal Quaker disputes. The meeting also co-ordinated ministerial work in London. It was open to 'public Friends' from all parts, though in practice London Friends made up the nucleus of the meetings, owing to

---

<sup>27</sup>F.H.L., Yearly Meeting Minutes 1668-1693, vol. 1., pp. 1-2, 29.3. [May] 1672.

the frequency of meetings at least once a week. The last meeting to be set up was that for sufferings in 1676. It was responsible for providing advice and where necessary legal assistance to Quakers; it also appealed to parliament and arranged meetings with the king in order to gain relief for Quakers from persecution. Recording of sufferings was a central concern and in 1679 it became responsible for the printing of Quaker books though the censoring function was left to the Second Day Morning Meeting. Meeting for Sufferings met at the beginning of each Law term in a general meeting, open to all, so potentially it was the most representative. As Hugh Doncaster has stated, 'Thus there came into existence a committee, and the only one, which was constituted to be nationally representative'.<sup>28</sup> A quarter of its members met each Friday at the home of Ellis Hookes, the recording clerk. Once again London friends were prominent as two Friends from all of the London monthly meetings of Ratcliffe, London, Wheeler Street, Westminster, Peel and Soutwark were appointed to meet together with any who were 'free' to attend from the Second Day Morning Meeting. It was also stated that a Friend from each county should be ready to attend the meeting 'as their urgent occasions or sufferings require'.<sup>29</sup>

#### *Membership of the central meetings*

In practice then the three central meetings were

---

<sup>28</sup>L. Hugh Doncaster, *Quaker Organization and Business Meetings* (London, 1958), p. 19.

<sup>29</sup>F.H.L., *Meeting for Sufferings Minutes 1675-80*, vol. 1, p. 2, 18.8. [Oct] 1675.

controlled by London Friends particularly the two smaller meetings. However even the Yearly Meeting had a kind of 'inner ring' for an important committee grew up which was responsible for the general stock, its receipts of money from the county meetings and its distribution. There were usually five or six 'keepers' and records of the Yearly Meeting starting in 1672 show that these were more or less the same people, particularly for the first ten years of the meeting. There had been occasional yearly meetings in the later 1660s though full records do not survive of these. A couple of pages in the first volume of Yearly Meeting Minutes refer to the 1668 Yearly Meeting in which the keepers chosen were Gerrard Roberts, Amor Stoddard and John Boulton who had been responsible for the earlier general collections in the 1650s along with Thomas Covony and Gilbert Latye, the latter of Westminster Meeting who had been convinced in 1654 by the Quaker Edward Burrough. Latye was a prosperous tradesman and master tailor from the Strand who had connections with the court and used this on behalf of the Quakers.<sup>30</sup> In 1672 Latye and Roberts were joined by Edward Man of Waltham Abbey Meeting, a citizen and haberdasher of London, along with John Elson a carpenter of Peel Meeting and an Arthur Cooke.<sup>31</sup> This group continued until 1672-79 after which Latye and Elson remained and were joined by Thomas Rudyard, the prominent Quaker legal adviser on Meeting for Sufferings along with

---

<sup>30</sup>F.H.L. Yearly Meeting Minutes vol. 1, p. C, 16.11 [Jan] 1668/9.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 7, 29.3. [May] 1672.

James Claypoole, a merchant of London and member of the Free Society of Traders.<sup>32</sup> Also keepers in 1679 were William Mackett and William Mead, the latter a linen-draper of Devonshire House Meeting and George Fox's son-in law. Mead was a prominent member of the society and frequently made representations to the King along with another influential Quaker, George Whitehead, a schoolmaster from Cumbria.<sup>33</sup> From 1682 there was a change in membership rules for the keepers of the stock. It was agreed that each year three Friends should be chosen and those three of the six that had served two preceding years were to be dismissed.<sup>34</sup> In the closing decades of the 1680s then new Friends appeared and there tended to be less continuity in keepers.<sup>35</sup>

Many of the figures responsible for the national stock played a prominent part in other business of the Yearly Meeting. In 1672 Edward Man, William Welch and others including William Crouch, a London upholsterer, were responsible with Ellis Hookes for liaising with the counties regarding book distribution.<sup>36</sup> Other influential Friends met at Edward Man's home in 1682 to talk with Quakers from Derbyshire, Gloucestershire and Cheshire to discuss 'some

---

<sup>32</sup>For Rudyard, see Alfred. W. Braithwaite, *Thomas Rudyard Early Friends' Oracle of Law*, Friends' Historical Society Supplement No. 27, (London, 1956), pp. 1-19.

<sup>33</sup>F.H.L., Yearly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 71, 10/11.4. [June] 1679.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 103, 7.4. [June] 1682.

<sup>35</sup>See appendix 4 for list of keepers.

<sup>36</sup>F.H.L., Yearly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 3, 30.3. [May] 1672.

particular matters...wherein they desired the advice of this meeting'. These other Quakers included George Fox, George Whitehead and William Gibson, the latter an ex-soldier from Lancashire who moved to London and was believed to have engaged in trade.<sup>37</sup>

The Meeting for Sufferings' weekly meetings beginning in 1676 tended to be made up of similar Friends to those above, for example Ellis Hookes, Gilbert Latye, William Welch, Thomas Rudyard, Rowland Vaughan, John Elson, Arthur Cooke, William Mead, William Ingram, William Mackett, Walter Miors, Clement Plumstead, Benjamin Antrobus, a linen-draper initially of Bishopsgate Without and member of Devonshire House meeting, Francis Camfield, a man of some prosperity who owned a house in the city and one in Waltham Abbey and John Staploe of Aldersgate, a member of Peel Meeting. Other members included George Whitehead and William Penn, the famous founder of Pennsylvania and friend of James II, and a number of Friends who were more connected to the Second Day Morning Meeting, figures such as John Osgood, a linen-draper of Cheapside, who had homes at White Hart Court and Mortlake, William Shewen a pin-maker of Southwark, William Gibson, John Vaughton, who resided in Blaefkriars and some of whom little is known such as John Edge, William Lowthwaite, John Dove and Richard Whitspaine. George Fox does not appear to have been a regular attender with the exception of the late 1670s and 1680s when

---

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 105, 8.4. [June] 1682.

he appeared quite frequently.<sup>38</sup>

The Second Day Morning Meeting also showed considerable overlap in the nucleus of London Friends which ran it. The initial committee of ten set up by the 1672 Yearly Meeting to supervise printing and distribution was made up of leading London Friends, many of whom were connected with the other central meetings, for example William Welch, William Crouch, Edward Man, William Shewen, James Claypoole, Whitehead, Penn and Ellis Hooke. However there also appears to have been some kind of 'inner ring' as frequently in the minutes the same people can be seen to have formed smaller sub-meetings to make corrections to manuscripts or consider the more difficult ones. This group usually involved the leading Quakers Penn and Whitehead, as well as William Gibson and to a lesser degree Thomas Green, a thread seller who had been convinced in 1655 and Alexander Parker, originally of Lancashire and an early travelling companion of George Fox. This group often met separately, for example at a meeting in 1679 Whitehead, Penn, Parker and Gibson were to meet at Thomas Green's house to discuss manuscripts.<sup>39</sup> Again in 1674 when a difficulty arose over a manuscript by Solomon Eccles entitled 'The Soul Saving Principle', the matter was referred to Whitehead, Parker, Green, Gibson and others for editing and correcting.<sup>40</sup> It is

---

<sup>38</sup>F.H.L., Meeting for Sufferings Minutes, vols. 1 and 2. Fox attended frequently in November 1677, May 1678, and also in 1680. His appearances were less frequent in the early 1680s.

<sup>39</sup>F.H.L., Morning Meeting Book 1673-1692, vol. 1, p. 27, 3.9. [Nov] 1679.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 3, 2.9. [Nov] 1674.

noticeable again that Fox himself is not a frequent attender at this meeting perhaps because he was trying to distance himself from the central leadership, being seen by some as trying to impose 'Foxonian-unity' or group authority against the freedom of individual leadings which Fox's message of the 'inner light' had emphasised. As Larry Ingle has stated, 'he carefully shied away from taking a public role however much he might defend the London centre's decisions.'<sup>41</sup> Whenever Fox did attend it would appear that matters of sensitivity were referred in part to him. In 1681 for example, Fox was asked with Whitehead and Parker to consider replies to the schismatic Quaker William Roger's *The Christian Quaker* along with Parker and Whitehead.<sup>42</sup>

#### ***Functions of the central meetings***

Turning to the functions of the three main meetings beginning with the Yearly Meeting, one of the most important matters dealt with by this body was finance. As we have seen this was administered by 5 or 6 Friends who most probably met at other times from the meeting in order to disburse the money as and when it was required. Considering that many of the keepers for the stock were also members of Meeting for Sufferings it may well be the case that financial issues in between Yearly Meeting were dealt with at the latter meeting though the minutes do not throw light upon this. The general

---

<sup>41</sup>Ingle, 'First Among Friends', p. 271.

<sup>42</sup>F.H.L., Morning Meeting Book, vol. 1, p. 51, 25.5. [July] 1681.

stock accounts were inspected at intervals by other London Friends apart from those keepers mentioned, the most important being Thomas Crisp who was asked to make reports on the accounts.<sup>43</sup>

There were two types of accounts, that for 'General Service' which included costs for 'service beyond the seas', also for 'books that are disposed of and given away for the public service of truth', to the King and MPs for example, and finally for the cost of letters in relation to sufferings together with the cost of recording and transcription.<sup>44</sup> The second account paid for the redemption of Quaker captives abroad. The accounts shed light on the priorities of the Quakers as a society and may give some idea of the strength of Quakerism from the details of money received from the various counties, though of course size of counties is a key factor here. Looking at the account for general service, for which there are details from 1679-1689 it would appear that collections were not made every year but only when needed. The first dated account from August 1679 to June 1680 shows that the society received £1202.17.10½ with a few late entries of about £100 more and spent £135.10.01.<sup>45</sup> This receipt apart from a few small contributions seems to have kept the Friends going for some years. In 1685 they appear to have run into debt with a balance from June 1685 standing at £152.05.6½ and

---

<sup>43</sup>F.H.L., Yearly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, pp. 75-6, 1.4. [June] 1680.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 7, 29.3. [May] 1672.

<sup>45</sup>F.H.L., National Stock Accounts 1678-1716, vol. 1, pp. 4-5.

expenditure of £497.14.03.<sup>46</sup> Spending each year was fairly even, in the region of one or two hundred pounds with the exception of the 1682-3 account when the total was £246.18 $\frac{1}{2}$ .<sup>47</sup> The next major collection occurred for the year 1686-7 with a total of £1522.06.3 $\frac{1}{2}$  and after expenditure, a balance of £760.14.3 $\frac{1}{2}$  remained.<sup>48</sup>

Looking at the two large collections over this period it is worth noting the proportions of money coming from the different areas. In 1679 the largest offering came from the county of Yorkshire with £81.10.6 $\frac{1}{2}$ , which perhaps is understandable considering its size, followed by Oxfordshire with £52.09.9 $\frac{1}{2}$  and £50 from Bristol, the latter of course an important Quaker stronghold. Substantial sums also came from the various London meetings, for example Devonshire House contributed £42.18.06, whilst the Bull and Mouth, Southwark and Ratcliffe contributed in the range of £20 each. Those areas surrounding London also contributed generously such as Essex with just over £53.00 and Hampshire with £39.04.10 $\frac{1}{2}$ . By contrast the areas contributing the lowest amounts were predominantly from around the Midlands: Staffordshire sent £6.05.00, Leicestershire £5, Nottinghamshire £8.07.06 and Derbyshire £10. Those traditional Quaker strongholds in the Northwest yielded fairly low amounts given their prominence in the early days of Quakerism: Westmorland gave £16.08.04 and

---

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

Cumberland contributed £19.19.00.<sup>49</sup>

By the end of the period in 1686-87 London was contributing extremely large amounts in comparison with other areas which highlights the importance of the capital as the Quaker centre. The Bull and Mouth Meeting gave £196.09.09, Devonshire House around £153, Peele £68 and Ratcliffe £43.09.06. Following this the largest amounts came from Yorkshire with £59, Essex with around just over £58, Lancashire with £56, Sussex with almost £51 and finally Somerset with £46. Again the lowest contributors were the Midland areas with Staffordshire contributing £8.09.09, Leicestershire £8, Warwickshire £9 and Derbyshire £10.<sup>50</sup>

As regards what the collections were being used for, the largest sums were spent on legal costs relating to Quaker sufferings, for example for the year 1685-6 approximately £370 out of an expenditure of £497.14.03 was spent in connection with sufferings. Smaller sums were devoted to payment of society officials and other administrative costs, for example a bill for the assistant clerk Mark Swanner came to £4.11.08 and around £37 was paid for the cost of books and papers (tracts).<sup>51</sup>

The other account, that for the redemption of captives, operated in a similar way to that for general service. It would appear however, that collections were made more frequently for this. In 1679 the keepers received £821.05.1½

---

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., p. 18. See Appendix 5.

and a further sum the following year of around £650. Considering the fairly large size of the collections the amounts spent were not high, usually in the range of £200-250 per year with the exception of the years 1681-2 when around £800 was spent.<sup>52</sup>

How was the money for the two funds collected?. Local minutes shed light on this. A minute from Somersetshire Quarterly Meeting held at Ivelchester in 1676 reveals that letters were sent down from Yearly Meeting asking for money.

The minute states,

Upon reading of a letter from friends of the yearly meeting at London dated the 17th of 3rd month [May] 1676 for a collection to be made amongst friends of this county for the management of truth's affairs particularly for friends supply that are called into the service of the Lord beyond the seas and for books that are disposed of and given away for the public service of truth to the chief rulers...also the charge of returning and often transcribing Friends sufferings, forasmuch as the friends who keep the accounts of money collected for that service have made it appear to the said meeting that they have disbursed more than they have received...It is agreed by this meeting that a collection be forthwith made for the uses aforesaid.

The minute adds that 'the money so collected' be 'returned to the receivers for the respective monthly meetings at or before the next Quarterly Meeting and by them returned over to Tho. Whitehead who is appointed to receive the same'. Whitehead was instructed to return the money to Gerrard Roberts, Gilbert Latye, Edward Man, John Elson, Arthur Cooke, 'or any of them'.<sup>53</sup> The account for the redemption of captives operated

---

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., pp. 7-8.

<sup>53</sup>Stephen C. Morland (ed.), *Somersetshire Quarterly Meeting of the Society of Friends 1668-99*, (Somerset Record Society, 1978), pp. 113-4.

in a similar way. A minute of Somersetshire Quarterly Meeting on 25th September 1679 noted that,

upon due consideration of several Friends hard suffering in captivity under the Turks whose conditions are recommended by Friends from London to friends of this county for their assistance in ransoming of them out of captivity, their ransom being set at very high rates. Friends therefore at this meeting have thought fit that a paper be drawn up and sent to the several meetings...to make a speedy collection...And the monies collected to be delivered in to Samuel Sayer and Henry Gundry, that so there may be course taken for the speedy return thereof to friends at London.<sup>54</sup>

The Quakers would appear to have set up their central fund at a much earlier date than other Dissenters. As has been shown, although not that systematized, national collections had in fact begun in the late 1650s. The Presbyterians did not establish the Presbyterian Fund until 1690. This collection was made up of subscriptions from the counties and used for the relief and assistance of ministers and for the provision of ministers in those areas with no fixed preaching ministry.<sup>55</sup> This fund also assisted Congregationalists until 1695 when they set up their own fund. The former was the wealthier of the two. To take the year 1690 as an example, around £2,100 was received by the Presbyterian Fund and about £1,000 paid out. The separate Congregational Fund set up in 1695 appears to have collected and paid out sums at more frequent intervals and balances do not seem to have gone over

---

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., p. 132.

<sup>55</sup>Dr. William's Library, Presbyterian Fund Board Minutes, 1690-1693, vol. 1, no folio number, but first page of manuscript.

the £1,000 mark.<sup>56</sup> The Baptists were even later in organizing collections; the Particular Baptists started one in 1717 whilst the General Baptists did not begin theirs until 1724.

Another matter which the Yearly Meeting dealt with initially was supervision of books and their distribution. A committee of ten was set up which was mainly responsible for examining manuscripts and liaising with printers regarding the number of books to be sent to the counties, members of which became prominent on the Second Day Morning Meeting when it was set up.<sup>57</sup> Designated Friends in the quarterly meetings were responsible for receiving books, as may be seen from appendix six where the correspondents are named as well as the number of books received per county. This list from 1672 also provides a further possible insight into where Quakerism had its strengths. They suggest that London and those areas surrounding it may have become more important. As might be expected, the large county of Yorkshire received the highest number of 25, but so did Essex, and it is noticeable that Lancashire, still apparently a Quaker stronghold only received six of every book printed, whilst London received sixteen. The strength of Quakerism in Bristol may also be seen from its allocation of 15 books.<sup>58</sup> Quarterly meetings were responsible for payment to the printers from local funds. Quakers in 1673

---

<sup>56</sup>Presbyterian Fund Board Minutes, fo. 1; Dr. William's Library, Congregational Fund Board Minutes, 1695-1699/1700, vol. 1, no folio number.

<sup>57</sup>F.H.L., Yearly Meeting Minutes vol. 1, p. 3, 30.3. [May] 1672.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., p. 4. See Appendix 6.

were advised that quarterly meetings should 'return the printer his money once a quarter for his further encouragement and assistance to carry on his business'.<sup>59</sup>

Amongst other business transacted at the Yearly Meeting was that relating to sufferings. It was responsible for setting up the Meeting for Sufferings in 1676 and the system of correspondence between London and county Quakers so that they 'may better inform and advise with those concerned in their respective monthly and quarterly meetings. General issues connected with sufferings also were discussed at Yearly Meeting'.<sup>60</sup>

A key role of Yearly Meeting was the dissemination of Quaker policy to the local meetings via the quarterly, monthly and particular or weekly meetings. This was achieved through epistles carried to the localities which were then read out. Comments from the local level would then be passed up through the county structure. An example of the latter may be seen from a reply by Fox and others to Somerset Quarterly Meeting which had questioned advice by Yearly Meeting to Quakers not to marry near kin.<sup>61</sup> Details of the advice given by Yearly Meeting may be gleaned from the minutes. In 1675 for example Quakers were advised that notice of intention to marry should be given to men's and women's meetings, the latter having only

---

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., p. 11, 21.3. [May] 1673.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., p. 23, 4.4. [June] 1675.

<sup>61</sup>F.H.L., Epistles Sent 1683-1703, vol. 1, pp. 1-2, 30.3. [May] 1683.

just been set up in the 1670s.<sup>62</sup> Advice also touched trading concerns, that 'none trade beyond their ability nor stretch beyond their compass'. Furthermore Quakers were urged to 'use fair words in dealings and keep their word in all things'. It was perhaps these sort of attitudes which helped win respect for the society.<sup>63</sup> Quakers were frequently asked to maintain the society's earliest testimonies; in 1689 Friends were exhorted to maintain their testimony against tithes.<sup>64</sup> Other concerns spanned education and morality. In 1688 it was advised that parents be 'good examples to the young' and use their 'power...in the educating of...children and servants in modesty, sobriety and in the fear of God curbing extravagant humour'. Worldliness was castigated and parents were warned against the 'libertine wanton spirit' and lusting 'after the vain customs and fashions of the world...in dressings, habits, and outward adornments' and were warned to curb such tendencies.<sup>65</sup>

To a large degree an important role of Yearly Meeting was also the oversight of local meetings. This was regularised in standardised queries agreed at the 1682 Yearly Meeting. Questions posed covered the number of ministers who had died in the counties since the last Yearly Meeting, deaths of suffering Friends in the interval and finally local Quakers

---

<sup>62</sup>F.H.L., Yearly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 18, 27.3. [May] 1675.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., p. 19, 27.3. [May] 1675.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., p. 217, 21/22.3. [May] 1689.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., p. 182, 4-6.4. [June] 1688.

were asked 'how the truth [that is Quaker beliefs] had prospered' since the last Yearly Meeting and whether Friends were in 'peace and unity' in the different localities.<sup>66</sup>

Turning to the role of the Second Day Morning Meeting, this was an important executive body which played an essential role in controlling the beliefs of the society and thus helped to regularise attitudes towards Quakerism. Although there had been attempts to control and censor Quaker books in the 1650s, this was not done as systematically as in the 1670s. The Second Day Morning Meeting ordered in 1673 that nothing should be printed which was not approved by the meeting and it also called for two of every book to be kept by the society along with one copy of each anti-Quaker publication. George Whitehead and William Penn were put in charge of critics' publications.<sup>67</sup>

Thomas O'Malley has pointed out that between 1674 and 1688 the Quaker central organization rejected about twenty per cent of manuscripts submitted to them.<sup>68</sup> Books were turned down for a variety of reasons. Care was taken to ensure that nothing too controversial in the theological sphere should be printed, for example in 1683 a book by the Quaker Robert Brockhill, entitled, 'The Christian in Name' &c, was discussed and judged not 'safe to print in those parts of it that concern the controversies that concern the body and blood of

---

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., p. 115, 9.4. [June] 1682.

<sup>67</sup>F.H.L., Morning Meeting Book, vol. 1, p. 1, 21.7. [Sept] 1674; 15.7. [Sept] 1673.

<sup>68</sup>O'Malley, 'Defying the Powers', p. 83.

Christ' though it was decided that the first part of the book was 'pretty clear and safe'.<sup>69</sup> It was probably the notion prevalent among some Quakers who denied the humanity of Christ and insisted that his body was spiritual that aroused the fears of the meeting and which would have troubled more orthodox contemporaries. The books of James Nayler, who had died shortly after the Restoration and who had caused much controversy in the 1650s with his entry into Bristol on a donkey in the manner of Christ, were also considered potentially dangerous. A minute in 1677 noted that 'the printing of James Nayler's books be suspended 'till it be taken into further and more general consideration' by the Second Day Morning Meeting and 'some ancient Friends of the City'. Unfortunately no indication is given of specific titles.<sup>70</sup> Those manuscripts which might have caused trouble with the secular powers were also rejected. Thomas O'Malley has remarked on the many papers addressed to Charles II which were refused publication.<sup>71</sup> He notes that after 1672 material intended for public consumption was not seditious but more 'supplicatory'. For O'Malley, George Fox and leading Quakers ensured that 'by keeping a lid on the "light within", and control over the products of the Quaker presses, they could use the printed word to mould the movement and to deal with

---

<sup>69</sup>F.H.L., Morning Meeting Book vol. 1, p. 69, 8.11. [Jan] 1682/3.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., p. 17, 25.4. [June] 1677.

<sup>71</sup>O'Malley, 'Defying the Powers', p. 85.

the authorities in the way they thought best.<sup>72</sup>

The Second Day Morning Meeting, concerned as it was with controlling thought, also intervened in disputes with break-away Quakers. At a meeting on 18th October 1675 the issue of Quaker separatism in the North under John Wilkinson and Thomas Story, and William Rogers in Bristol was discussed. It was agreed that the influential Quakers, William Gibson, George Whitehead, Alexander Parker and Gerrard Roberts should go up North whilst other City Friends including William Penn were chosen to go to Bristol to try to sort out the dispute.<sup>73</sup> Great care was also taken over replies to separatist works and Quakers such as Fox and Whitehead were left to deal with these. In 1685 for example, the above together with Richard Richardson, clerk to the Society after 1681 were asked to review replies to the separatists William Rogers, Francis Bugg and Thomas Crisp, whose ideas will be discussed below.<sup>74</sup>

It can be seen then that the Second Day Morning Meeting was an effective agent of control over Quaker thought through its vetting of Quaker literature. It may also have helped to disseminate decisions and thinking via the county ministers who attended in London when possible, as through their share in the task of reading manuscripts they would have become familiar with the prevailing thought of the society.

The Meeting for Sufferings along with the Second Day

---

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 87.

<sup>73</sup>F.H.L., Morning Meeting Book vol. 1, p. 9, 18.8. [Oct] 1675. The issue of Quaker separatism will be discussed in more detail below.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 83, 6.2. [April] 1685.

Morning Meeting was a highly important part of Quaker organization and was very systematized. The historian N.C. Hunt has seen it as one of the earliest political associations for as he says, 'In setting up the Meeting for Sufferings in October 1675 the Quakers were consciously creating a body one of whose main uses was to make full use of their pyramidal structure to conduct a political campaign to secure political concessions.'<sup>75</sup> The minutes reveal a highly ordered body which liaised with the quarterly and monthly meetings throughout England in order to gain relief. Advice was sent to meetings regarding procedures to be followed by local Quakers relating to sufferings. At a general meeting of the Meeting for Sufferings on 22nd May 1678, it was ordered that Friends were to first lay their sufferings before a JP. and if there was no redress they were then to go before the judges of assize, failing which they were to present sufferings to the king and council or parliament.<sup>76</sup> Directions were also issued to quarterly meetings regarding the recording and collection of sufferings. Monthly meetings were to keep particular books of sufferings, accounts of which were to be sent on to the quarterly meeting which in turn would forward details on to Ellis Hooke.<sup>77</sup>

Meeting for Sufferings kept in touch with the counties via the appointment of London Friends who were to liaise with

---

<sup>75</sup>N.C. Hunt, *Two Early Political Associations* (Oxford, 1961), p. 2.

<sup>76</sup>F.H.L., *Meeting for Sufferings Minutes*, vol. 1, p. 58, 22.3. [May] 1678.

<sup>77</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 59, 23.3. [May] 1678.

Quakers in the counties. A list in volume two of the minutes shows those chosen for the period around 1680-83.<sup>78</sup> These would not appear to be permanent appointees as inspection of successive minutes shows that different Friends were chosen from time to time. Friends at the centre helped county Quakers by gaining as much information as possible in relation to the penal laws which was regularly disseminated to meetings. In May 1678, for example, Thomas Rudyard and William Penn were asked to 'seek the opinion of learned counsel in relation to the laws' and when this was obtained, a copy was to be transmitted to every quarterly meeting 'for them to enter in their books'.<sup>79</sup> Advice regarding particular cases was often sought from lawyers who were non-Quakers, for example Thomas Corbett of London helped Quakers in Nottingham in March 1677 and was paid out of the general stock.<sup>80</sup> It was later agreed that all cases, questions and queries propounded and resolved should be entered in the 'Great Book'.<sup>81</sup> This was the Book of Cases which was used when precedents were needed.<sup>82</sup> In March 1682, for example, a William Austell of Berkshire wrote to the meeting regarding the consequences of refusing to take the oath of a constable. The meeting ordered that the 'precedent of a constable' was to be copied for Friends in order to

---

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., vol. 2, 1680-83, at back of volume, See Appendix 7.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid., vol. 1, p. 58, 22.3. [May] 1678.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., p. 21, 12.2. [April] 1677.

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., p. 26, 28.4. [June] 1677.

<sup>82</sup>F.H.L., Book of Cases 1661-1695, vol. 1.

assist them.<sup>83</sup>

As well as advising on particular cases, the specific laws affecting Quakers were examined so as to try and gain relief. In March 1676 for example Thomas Rudyard was asked to obtain a copy of 'the Popish bill', a parliamentary attempt to enforce the Elizabethan statutes against recusants in order to persecute Dissenters from the Anglican church and a means of gaining added revenue. Quakers persistently objected to this on the grounds that Protestant Dissenters should be distinguished from popish recusants. Rudyard was instructed to liaise with George Whitehead and William Mead to see how the intended bill related to Friends and 'how to provide against any such clause or intention'.<sup>84</sup> Later in April 1679 Rudyard who had been asked to draw up a declaration to distinguish Protestant Dissenters from popish recusants was asked to make copies of this to present to parliament.<sup>85</sup>

London Friends also helped their county brethren by arranging to speak with the assize judges before they went on their twice yearly circuits around the country and would discuss particular cases of suffering with them. Lists frequently appear in the minutes of those Friends appointed to meet with the judges. For example in July 1678 William Mead was chosen to meet with the Norfolk circuit judges, Chief Justice Scroggs and Baron Bramston, Thomas Rudyard was

---

F.H.L., Meeting for Sufferings Minutes, vol. 2, p. 99, 10.1. [March] 1681/2.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 18-19, 1.1. [March] 1676/7.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., p. 95, 24.2. [April] 1679.

responsible for the Western circuit and met with Justices Jones and North. John Osgood and James Claypoole were to speak with Chief Baron Montague and Justice Atkins for the Oxford circuit, whilst the Home circuit was dealt with by Francis Moore, John Dew and John Vaughton who liaised with Justice Twisden and Baron Littleton. William Gibson and Philip Ford met with Justice Wild and Justice Borlin for the Northern circuit, and finally the Midland circuit was in the hands of William Shewen and John Dew who dealt with Justice Wyndham and Baron Thurland.<sup>86</sup>

In addition to the assize judges it would also appear that Quakers on the Meeting for Sufferings urged local Quakers to court J.P.s. In 1685 for example, after the Duke of Monmouth's rebellion, certificates were sought from justices stating that Quakers were a peaceable people. One such certificate, however, was supplied by the inhabitants of High Littleton in Somerset which said that they 'humbly certifieth to your sacred majesty that the several persons commonly called Quakers living within the said parish...was not in the least manner assisting, aiding or abetting the late James Duke of Monmouth'.<sup>87</sup>

The Meeting for Sufferings also arranged for London Friends to speak with Members of Parliament in regard to sufferings. In May 1678, for example, leading Friends including George Whitehead, William Gibson and Thomas Rudyard were appointed to speak to 'some particular members of

---

<sup>86</sup>Ibid., pp. 63-64, 4.5. [July] 1678.

<sup>87</sup>Ibid., vol. 4 1684-85, p. 101, 7.6. [Aug] 1685.

parliament' regarding Quaker sufferings on account of their being prosecuted for recusancy.<sup>88</sup> It became regular practice for London Friends to attend parliament and lobby members. In 1689, when William and Mary came to the throne, prominent Friends such as George Whitehead, William Mead, Gilbert Latye, John Osgood, Theodore Ecclestone, Stephen Crisp and John Vaughton, attended parliament regarding the taking of the Oath of Allegiance to the monarchs which Friends could not permit, preferring instead to declare allegiance.<sup>89</sup> The refusal to swear oaths was based on Scripture particularly the Gospel of John; Friends saw oath-taking as setting up a double standard of truth. Meeting for Sufferings ordered the drawing up of a petition to be presented to parliament requesting 'that our affirmation or denial in all cases might be taken instead of an oath'. This was to be presented by Mead and Whitehead, though the Quakers' request was only to be granted in 1696 with the Affirmation Act.<sup>90</sup>

As well as lobbying parliament the Meeting for Sufferings also arranged for influential Quakers to attend the king and present sufferings. Usually the same people would attend- George Whitehead, William Penn, William Mead and Gilbert Latye. In 1677 for example, the first three of the above were ordered to meet Charles II and others in authority about the suffering of Friends on the grounds of recusancy.<sup>91</sup> They were

---

<sup>88</sup>Ibid., vol. 1, p. 56, 16.3. [May] 1678.

<sup>89</sup>Ibid., vol. 6, 1687-88, p. 251, 15.12. [Feb] 1688/9.

<sup>90</sup>Ibid., vol. 7, 1688-91, p. 96, 27.10. [Dec] 1689.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid., vol 1, p. 26, 28.4. [June] 1677.

partially successful in their representations as in 1681 Charles instructed assize judges to make a distinction between Quakers and Catholics.

### *Separation*

The central organization described above which was firmly established by the late 1670s attracted a great deal of hostility that has often been rather played down in Quaker history. The earlier problems associated with John Perot were relatively insignificant compared with the criticism which broke out in the 1670s from those separatist Quakers who complained of the growing institutionalization of the society. The critics of central organization looked to the past and the early days of Quakerism. For those initial Quakers who had been attracted to Fox's message because he had promised that they need no longer bow to the superior wisdom of a man-made ministry but could look to the 'light' within themselves for religious truth, the burgeoning organization of the 1670s seemed like a radical departure from early Quakerism. One of the earliest critics was William Mucklow from Mortlake, South West London. In 1673 he wrote a pamphlet particularly attacking the Second Day Morning Meeting and raised the issue of liberty of conscience versus centralized decision making. Mucklow looked back nostalgically to the 1650s, when the Lord, he said, had visited 'this nation with his loving kindness, in sending forth a spiritual ministry'.<sup>92</sup> He noted how Quakers

---

<sup>92</sup>William Mucklow, *The Spirit of the Hat* (London, 1673), p. 9.

had believed that the Father would 'write his laws in our hearts, and put his spirit into our inward parts, to lead us into all truth'.<sup>93</sup> With the growth of organization, however, Mucklow suggested that the Quakers were little better than papists who asked others to 'believe as the church believes'. He added 'so likewise saith George Fox; but I say nay, I am not to believe a thing barely because the church believes it but because it's manifested in me'.<sup>94</sup> Mucklow felt that by setting up the network of local meetings and central bodies which brought with them a degree of control over other Quakers, Fox was compromising the original message of the 'inner light' as the essential guide in religion. The crux of the matter was really touched on when Mucklow stated, 'if any person had (as he thought) a command from God to do a thing, or to put forth a thing in print, he must first come and lay it before the body, and as they judge, he must submit'. Mucklow complained that the Quaker leaders were trying to reduce people to 'a formal faith' and 'build up that which they once pulled down'.<sup>95</sup> The followers of Fox were termed by one critic as the 'now-Quakers or Foxonians' who enticed people to the movement by 'crying up the light within' and that once they had been converted, 'then they must be guided by the judgement of George Fox and the ruling elders'.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

<sup>96</sup> *Anon., Tyranny and Hypocrisy Detected* (London, 1673), pp. 3, 8.

The former Quaker Robert Rich, a supporter of the schismatic John Perrot wrote two bitter invectives against George Fox and the Quaker leaders at London and accused them of

creating a dominion over your brethren, and the movings of God in them, and claiming a power to judge of all differences, prescribing rules and orders, and putting yokes upon the necks of your disciples, to the stifling of their consciences.<sup>97</sup>

Rich castigated Fox, who he said had 'attained a great reputation among the Quakers' for setting up a hierarchy amongst Friends and making the Quaker leaders the sole repository of truth using the excuse that 'they are the body, and therefore the light in them must over-rule that of particular persons'. Rich compared Quakers to papists and felt that they had 'betaken themselves to the fortress of the injurious papists' using 'the argument of number, the church, the body, which they had before deserted.'<sup>98</sup> Another former Quaker, Richard Smith attacked the impositions placed on Quakers by the centre, particularly the setting up of separate women's meetings asking on what authority leading Quakers could claim 'gospel-order' for such practices.<sup>99</sup>

A letter of May 1673, signed by leading Quakers, Whitehead, Gibson, Penn, Stephen Crisp, Alexander Parker and Thomas Green, was ordered to be read in all quarterly meetings

---

<sup>97</sup>Robert Rich, *An Epistle to the People Called Quakers* (London, 1680), pp. 8-9.

<sup>98</sup>Robert Rich, *Hidden Things Brought to Light, or the Discord of the Grand Quakers Among Themselves* (n.p., 1678), preface.

<sup>99</sup>Richard Smith, *The Light Unchangeable* (London, 1677), no pagination.

and clearly defended the central authority of the London meetings and went so far as to suggest that God had vested power within them. Similar in tone to the 'Testimony' of 1666, which had warned against separatism, it stated, 'though a general care be not laid upon every member touching the good order and government in the church affairs...yet the Lord hath laid it now upon some in whom he hath opened council for it (and particularly in our Dear Brother and God's faithful labourer G.F. [George Fox]) for the help of many'. The letter stresses the need for 'every man in his own proper order, for every member of the body is not an eye, and yet each member hath the proper place and service'. In a way the letter is something of an ultimatum to other Quakers, for it states that any spirit 'which despiseth government and dominion and speaks evil of the dignity is...a self-separating spirit that would itself bear rule'. The writers were more conciliatory at the end and added that though they had been given 'dominion over the spirit...yet 'tis no dominion of the faith we seek' and stated that they merely wished to be 'helpers' and 'co-workers'.<sup>100</sup>

Part of the reason for the criticism levelled at the central administration, and at Fox, was the latter's setting up of women's meetings in 1671, which hitherto had only existed in London and in Bristol. Fox set these up by a letter of 1671 'so the women may come into the practice of pure religion, which is to visit the widows and fatherless and to

---

<sup>100</sup>F.H.L., Portfolio MSS, 23, fo. 134, 26.3. [May] 1673. See pp. 76-77 for 1666 Testimony.

see that all be kept from the spots of the world'.<sup>101</sup> Again however the real issue at stake was the question of whether central organization should impose such things on other Quakers. The most serious separation of the period was that involving John Wilkinson and Thomas Story both of Westmorland, along with William Rogers of Reading who defended them in his pamphlets, and to a lesser extent Thomas and Anne Curtis, early acquaintances of Fox from Reading. Wilkinson and Story objected to the establishment of women's meetings as being of no use in country areas but they admitted that areas like London might benefit. The two especially disliked the advice that Quakers should submit an intention to marry before the women's as well as the men's meetings. Another issue at stake was the issuing of papers of condemnation against errant Friends.<sup>102</sup> The dislike of the central authority can clearly be seen in William Roger's *The Christian Quaker*. Rogers objected to the idea of a yearly meeting, despite acknowledging that representatives for the quarterly meetings were present. He stated that, 'we deny that it can be agreeable to the truth for such to assert that from thence they are invested with power to ordain and appoint certain things, unto which others...ought therefore to yield obedience whilst not persuaded by Christ's light in their consciences of their duty therein'.<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup>Braithwaite, *Second Period of Quakerism*, p. 273.

<sup>102</sup>Ibid., pp. 296-7.

<sup>103</sup>William Rogers, *The Christian Quaker, Distinguished from the Apostate and Innovator (First Part)*, (London, 1680), p. 8.

Wilkinson and Story received a strong condemnation at the 1677 Yearly Meeting which, by way of reaction, stirred up some support for them in Wiltshire, Hertford, Bristol, Reading and Lincolnshire. With the death of Story in 1681 and the inactivity of Wilkinson afterwards, the trouble died down somewhat, yet Quaker separatists continued to issue tracts aimed at the authorities in London. The separatist Thomas Crisp called the central Quaker figures a 'Foxonian Sect' who loved 'preheminence', and accused them of presuming 'to give laws and orders to others to conform to, or else be accounted infidels...when it is evident the cause of their rage against them...is because they will not rebel against the light in their own hearts'.<sup>104</sup> Another schismatic, Francis Bugg who later turned Anglican, wrote prolifically against mainstream Quakers from the 1680s onwards. Bugg accused the central bodies and Fox of imposing 'laws' and claiming a monopoly of truth and asked whether George Fox and Ellis Hookes 'that little cabinet of council' meaning the Second Day Meeting had 'got a patent for all gospel privileges' and whether all power was 'locked up in...the church ...a Yearly Meeting, a Second Days Meeting, a Quarterly Meeting'.<sup>105</sup> Bugg insisted that he was not prepared to 'pin my faith on their sleeve, to see with their eyes instead of my own'.<sup>106</sup> In *The Quakers Detected*, Bugg lamented the rise of George Fox to pre-eminence who he

---

<sup>104</sup>Thomas Crisp, *Babel's Builders Unmasking Themselves* (London, 1681), sig. A2.

<sup>105</sup>Francis Bugg, *De Christiana Libertate or the Mischief of Impositions* (London, 1682), 2nd part, p. 18.

<sup>106</sup>Ibid., pp. 215-16.

claimed, 'began to set task-masters over us' and then erected a church government wherein, 'monthly and quarterly meetings...[were] in every county established' and 'several outward orders, laws and canons ecclesiastical were made'. This structure Bugg noted was justified by Robert Barclay, who asserted 'that the ancient apostolic order of the church of Christ, was re-established amongst them upon its right basis and foundation'.<sup>107</sup> Bugg objected to the centralization of Quakerism, to the increasing control of the few over the many, to men such as George Whitehead whom he described as Fox's 'chief man of war'.<sup>108</sup> Thomas Crisp accused the Quaker leaders-'the body and Elders, and the church' of dishonouring the 'truth' in the move towards centralisation.<sup>109</sup>

The Quakers did not fail to respond to these criticisms. An intellectual defence of organization and authority came from the pen of the famous Quaker Apologist, Robert Barclay originally from Ury, Scotland. In 1675 Barclay published *The Anarchy of the Ranters* in which he condemned over-dependence on the spirit and stated that some Quakers were 'so much...for everyone's following their own mind, as can admit of no Christian fellowship and community'. Barclay thus asserted that the only solution to the threat of 'libertinism' was to look back to the early church when 'the ancient apostles and primitive Christians practised order and government in the

---

<sup>107</sup>Francis Bugg, *The Quakers Detected* (London, 1686), p. 4.

<sup>108</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>109</sup>Crisp, *Babel's Builders Unmasking Themselves*, p. 9.

church' and when 'some did appoint and ordain certain things, condemn and approve certain practices, as well as doctrines, by the spirit of God'.<sup>110</sup> George Fox also contributed to the intellectual debate in a number of tracts. Like Barclay, he stressed the need for order and referring to 2 Corinthians 10 noted that the 'apostles had authority which the Lord had given them for the edification of the church to keep them out of destruction'.<sup>111</sup> William Penn also vigorously defended the system that Fox had erected; as his biographer Melvyn Endy has stated, 'Penn himself believed firmly in social order and was frightened by libertarians who had no control mechanisms for their spiritual leadings'.<sup>112</sup> Penn's *Spirit of Alexander Coppersmith* was a reply to William Mucklow's *Spirit of the Hat* and in it he defended George Fox and the Quaker organization by stating that a lack of church structure would lead to 'ranterism and so to atheism'. The role of Fox and other leaders was defended against the claim of the anti-Quaker writer William Mucklow of Mortlake that each member of a church is equal when Penn stated,

That we exalt our selves is a calumny of his own making; but we know our places in the body. And for his saying, every member is equal; it is false. For though it belongs to the same body, yet not to the same service; some are in that sense more honourable

---

<sup>110</sup>Robert Barclay, *The Anarchy of the Ranters and Other Libertines* (London, 1676), pp. 6, 27.

<sup>111</sup>George Fox, *Several Plain Truths Manifested and Declared from the Spirit of God* (London, 1684), p. 21.

<sup>112</sup>Endy, *William Penn and Early Quakerism*, p. 213.

than others.<sup>113</sup>

Penn rebutted personal attacks on Fox, stating that 'George Fox I would have all to know, seeks not himself, but Christ, and as becomes a true apostle'. Penn denounced the terms used by critics to hit at the Quaker hierarchy- 'Foxonian, King George Fox, Foxonian Leven, George Fox and his party or adherents' and defended Fox by saying that he had 'no such intended lordship', nor were Quakers 'of his party, but God's free-men'.<sup>114</sup>

#### *Similarities with other Dissenting organizations*

It has been shown that the Quakers developed a very sophisticated organization, one which was clearly the most elaborate of all the dissenting groups at this time. Quaker church structure shared certain similarities with some of these groups, most notably the Presbyterians and Baptists. The Presbyterian system of church government established in 1646 by the Westminster Assembly had a four-tier hierarchical structure. In each parish there was to be a 'congregational assembly' made up of elders chosen by the minister and the congregation which met on a weekly basis. The counties were to be divided into 'classes' or 'classical presbyteries' which met monthly consisting of ministers, and lay elders chosen by parliamentary nominees. Each 'classis' had to appoint

---

<sup>113</sup> 'The Spirit of Alexander Copper-Smith Justly Rebuked' 1673, in *A Collection of the Works of William Penn*, 2 vols. (London, 1726) vol. 2, p. 193.

<sup>114</sup> 'Judas and the Jews' 1673, in *Works of William Penn*, vol. 2, p. 211.

representatives (2 ministers and 4 laymen), to go to the provincial assembly which was to meet on a twice yearly basis. The provincial assembly in turn, was to send representatives to any national assembly that might be called by parliament. The system was essentially hierarchical with the higher meetings possessing disciplinary powers. In practice however English Presbyterianism fell short of the Scottish model since local congregations tended to remain independent and gave classical and provincial assemblies only an advisory role.<sup>115</sup> Furthermore the system was not established all over the country as only Lancashire and London had provincial assemblies. Following the Restoration, and the resulting persecution of nonconformists, there was no attempt to set up the system of 'classes'; Presbyterians dared not meet in synods with the result that congregations became more independent. The Presbyterian system with its four tiers may be likened to the Quaker structure, especially in its ideal form which would have been far more hierarchical.

Quaker organization was closer in practice to the Baptist scheme. The General Baptists' church structure involved a three-fold order of local churches or particular congregations, which linked together to form 'associations' or 'general meetings'. At the top of this structure was the General Assembly which began in 1654. Officials of the church included Messengers, whose main job was to preach the gospel, together with Elders, responsible for discipline, and Deacons

---

<sup>115</sup>C.G. Bolam, J. Goring, H.L. Short, R. Thomas, *The English Presbyterians: From Elizabethan Puritanism to Modern Unitarianism* (London, 1968), p. 43.

who dealt with finance. All Messengers, Pastors and Elders had a place in the General Assembly and churches could also send their own representatives. The assembly dealt with matters sent up by the district associations and also acted as a court of appeal for individual churches if a decision made by a church or association was brought in to question. Added to this the General Assembly also decided such issues as confessions of faith and marriage.<sup>116</sup> There are obvious similarities then between the Quakers and Baptists; the churches and associations may be seen to correspond with Quaker local meetings and the General Assembly to the Yearly Meeting, though there was no meeting at a county level. That Quakers should have adopted similar features is not surprising in view of the fact that many Baptists converted to Quakerism in the 1650s. The Baptists, as B.R. White has pointed out looked to the apostolic age for their pattern of church organization and believed that this could be reconstructed using the New Testament. They tried to create a church which consisted of committed and converted people and one in which the group had certain powers over others: to determine who was taken in to the church, to discipline and to disown.<sup>117</sup> The Quakers also appear to have relied heavily on the apostolic pattern for their system of government. As has been shown, Robert Barclay justified Quaker church structure by referring

---

<sup>116</sup>A.C. Underwood, *A History of the English Baptists* (London, 1947), pp. 119-122; B.R. White, *The English Baptists of the 17th Century* (London, 1983), pp. 64ff.

<sup>117</sup>White, pp. 10-11.

to the apostolic order.

The congregational system of government, on the other hand, was the least like the Quaker organization. It was less structured as might be expected; Congregationalists viewed the local church as the supreme unit which had power to decide on all matters of conduct and membership. However church records from the 1650s show that individual churches did have ties with others; they would exchange advice, practise intercommunion, send representatives to each other's churches during ordinations, and would also transfer members from one church to another. A national gathering of over a hundred Congregational churches met together at the Savoy palace in 1658.<sup>118</sup>

#### *Sociological models of religious change*

The ideal types used by sociologists are useful in trying to understand the transition in Quakerism from the 1650s to the 1680s. It is usually 18th century Quakerism which has been viewed as so different from the movement's origins but it would appear that Quakerism had already altered considerably by the time of the Toleration Act of 1689. Sociologists have used the ideal types of church and sect to analyse religious movements and there have been numerous works on the subject, perhaps the most famous being Ernst Troeltsch's *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*.<sup>119</sup> Sociologists have

---

<sup>118</sup>Michael R. Watts, *The Dissenters* (Oxford, 1978), p. 167.

<sup>119</sup>E. Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, trans. Olive Wyon, 2 vols. (New York, 1931).

agreed on various criteria to distinguish church and sect. One of the most important is the belief that the church reflects the social order and is not at variance with it, its members being drawn from all social strata; the sect by comparison cuts itself off from the wider society and tends to be more connected with the poorer classes. Form of membership is another criterion that sociologists use. In the church type children are brought into membership straight away, through a rite such as baptism, whilst in the sect type, membership demands an active process of conversion. A further distinction is that the sect practices strict moral discipline and uses expulsion, which is not typical of churches. Finally, the church type tends to have a hierarchical structure and professional ministry, whereas the sect is made up of lay-men and does not have a trained ministry.<sup>120</sup>

The above are just some of many criteria used by sociologists in defining a church or sect. As may be expected, Quakerism in the 17th Century does not neatly fit into either category, though, on balance, it might be said that there is a tendency towards the church model from the mid 1660s onwards, along with the retention of sectarian elements. Richard Niebuhr has highlighted the difficulties for sects after the first generation. He has stated that,

By its very nature the sectarian type of organization is valid only for one generation. The children born to the voluntary members of the first generation begin to make the sect a church long before they have arrived at the years of discretion.

---

<sup>120</sup>David Martin, *A Sociology of English Religion* (London, 1967), pp. 79-80. Michael Hill, *A Sociology of Religion* (London, 1973), pp. 47ff.

For with their coming the sect must take on the character of an educational and disciplinary institution, with the purpose of bringing the new generation into conformity with ideals and customs which have become traditional.<sup>121</sup>

Looking at the category of relationship with society to begin with, it would seem that there was no great shift in Quakerism towards the inclusion of more social groups. Richard Vann has shown how many of the 'valiant sixty' were of fairly prosperous origins: eight were gentry, six were schoolmasters and a high number were freeholders or yeomen. Out of the fifty five, Vann found only four to be involved in the exercising of 'mechanic trades' or of humble origins. Obviously, though, this pattern may not have been typical for the more 'rank and file' members. Vann's work questioned the earlier work of Alan Cole who claimed that Quakerism was made up of the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie. More recently Barry Reay has suggested that the early movement was drawn from the 'more middling sort of people': yeomen, husbandmen and wholesale and retail traders and most members were not from the 'upper bourgeoisie' as Vann suggested.<sup>122</sup> By the 1660s and 1670s though, it can be said that the above position became consolidated with the inclusion of leaders of solid gentry origin such as William Penn and Robert Barclay. In addition my analysis of the members of the various central Quaker bodies

---

<sup>121</sup>Quoted in Hill, *Sociology of Religion*, p. 58. From H.R. Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*, (New York, 1929), pp. 19-20.

<sup>122</sup>Richard T. Vann, *The Social Development of English Quakerism 1655-1755* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1969), pp. 56-59; A. Cole, 'The Social Origins of the Early Friends', *Journal of the Friend's Historical Society*, xlviii (1957), p. 117; Reay, *Quakers and the English Revolution*, pp. 20-21.

has revealed that these men were often people of means who frequently had their own businesses and could be flexible with their time, which enabled them to attend the various meetings during the week. Gilbert Latye, for example, was a prosperous tradesman and master tailor, Edward Man a haberdasher, James Claypoole a wealthy merchant and finally Thomas Rudyard, a Quaker lawyer.

How far did Quakerism in the 1670s and 80s still reject the culture of the wider society? Earlier testimonies against oaths and tithes were maintained, though it can be said that there was a greater willingness to compromise with the state on the issue of oaths as by 1689 Quakers were starting to ask that a declaration be allowed instead of an oath. There was more of an emphasis on cooperation with the state as Quakers solicited the king, parliament, assize judges and J.P.s and refrained from publishing anything that might upset the secular powers. In other ways though Quakers kept themselves very much apart from the rest of society and were admonished by the society for such pursuits as dancing and card playing. At a quarterly meeting in Somerset, in 1668, it was advised that Abigail Higdon of Cadbury Meeting be visited by three Friends in relation to her intention 'to join herself in marriage with a disorderly person of the world'. They were advised to 'admonish her to beware of the ways and fashions of the world and keep clear of such evil company and give account thereof at the next monthly meeting'.<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup>*Morland, Somersetshire Quarterly Meeting Minutes*, p. 75.

Quakers retained a sectarian element in their strict emphasis upon morality, which had been important since the 1650s. Rigorous standards were demanded from Friends and those who did not match up were faced with the possibility of disownment, as may be seen from the following minute of Somerset Quarterly Meeting on 18th December 1673:

Whereas Thomas Pocock and David Webber who formerly made a profession of truth, but have since forsaken the way of truth and become very loose and scandalous in their conversation...having been visited several times by Friends, and by them exhorted to turn from the evil of their ways, have despised such exhortation...It is therefore by this meeting declared that the said Thomas Pocock and David Webber are departed from the truth and Friends...and are not owned to be of their fellowship and communion but to be accounted as publicans and heathen.<sup>124</sup>

Although with the second generation there were far fewer incidences of conversion as children were born in to Quakerism, it can still be said that the movement retained sectarian elements in that there was an ongoing test of membership in the discipline that was imposed. Quakers had never had a formal process of initiation into the faith but had instead demanded a strict moral code from all who professed Quakerism, which really amounted to a test of membership.

Finally, Quakerism became more church-like in terms of the institutionalisation which occurred in the 1670s. The central bodies in London claimed that they possessed the same authority as the apostles and were thus able to order things. Although all of the various meetings within the Quaker

---

<sup>124</sup>Ibid., p. 103.

structure were viewed as having a role to play, it would be true to say that the Yearly Meeting and the other central bodies were the pinnacle of the organization and that Quaker policy was moulded and shaped by these.

### ***Conclusion***

By the end of the 1670s then Friends had developed a very sophisticated central organization which helped to guide local meetings, dealt with practical matters such as money and book distribution and also sought to control the views and teachings of the society as well as to appease the establishment to a large degree. Although in disciplinary matters control still lay with the monthly and quarterly meetings, the locus of power had shifted to those members of the central London meetings who met frequently to decide Quaker business. Friends began to stress unity with the group rather than the leading of the spirit in each individual. Separations occurred in the 1670s as some of those Friends who had relished the spiritual freedom offered to them by George Fox's message were unable to reconcile central control with the ideas that had initially attracted them to Quakerism. Ultimately though the organization at the centre served to restrain the wilder tendencies of Quakerism as well as to promote a more respectable image of the movement. The control exercised by the leading bodies in London may have limited the freedom of each individual but it helped to ensure that Quakers as a whole were able to enjoy the benefits of the Toleration Act of 1689.

## CHAPTER 3

### *QUAKER LOCAL ORGANIZATION c.1650-1689*

#### *Introduction*

This chapter will examine the functioning of the Society of Friends at the local level, paying particular attention to the organization established by George Fox in the late 1660s; the system of particular, monthly and quarterly meetings for business which were so crucial in the transformation of Quakerism. The former were the lowest level of meeting: a number of particular meetings came under each monthly meeting which were district conferences for business and discipline. Quarterly meetings were assemblies of Quakers who met four times a year, usually on a county basis and were made up of representatives of the various monthly meetings in an area. This local structure was largely hierarchical in the sense that the higher meetings carried more authority than the lower ones. The Yearly Meeting at London was at the top of the organisation and its members were made up of representatives chosen from the quarterly meetings beneath. The local system of organization had little relation to the Second Day Morning Meeting, one of the executive meetings of central Quaker organization in London, though ministers from the counties would have been able to attend if visiting the capital. Local meetings had more of a relationship with the Meeting for Sufferings at London in terms of the county correspondent system, whereby one or two Quakers in a county would liaise with an appointed member of the executive meeting for their

own area. In addition one Friend from each county was appointed to go to London at the invitation of the Meeting for Sufferings, usually at the start of a parliamentary session or for the lobbying of the king and Privy Council. Quaker women also had their own parallel structure of particular, monthly and quarterly meetings which were set up from the 1670s onwards though these were not as influential as their male counterparts and did not liaise with the London Yearly meeting or the Meeting for Sufferings.

The bulk of this chapter will concentrate on material gleaned from Quaker archives in Yorkshire and Sussex with the aim of examining not only what these networks of local meetings were actually doing, but also their relationship with the central organization discussed in the preceeding chapter. Yorkshire and Sussex were chosen for their differing degrees of proximity to London with a view to assessing the amount of central control over Quakers in the counties. Evidence suggests that Yorkshire was less conformist, particularly over the issue of government and hierarchy within the local organization. A schism took place within York Monthly Meeting which has been well-documented by David Scott.<sup>1</sup> This arose from a marriage issue although came to embrace the whole question of authority. It was not, however, aimed directly against central control but at that within local meetings, yet because information and guidance was filtered down from London, in a sense it was an attack on overall authority

---

<sup>1</sup>David Scott, *Quakerism in York, 1650-1720* (York, 1991), Borthwick Paper No. 80.

within the movement. Dissatisfaction also occurred in other Yorkshire monthly meetings over quarterly meeting financial issues but not to the degree of separation.

A striking fact that emerges from the study of local Quakerism is the extreme care which Quakers took over their image. One of the main functions of the local meetings in addition to care of the poor and collecting money, was to enforce discipline and oversee Quaker behaviour in general. Although Quakers rejected Calvinist theology they were very much heirs to the Puritan ethical code. Matters such as debt, drunkenness, sexual offences and irregular marriages were all taken very seriously. Obviously Quakers wished to lead as godly lives as possible and used the example of scripture as their guide but over and above this their was a constant need to project a respectable image to the world which is borne out in numerous testimonies, be they from the society when disowning particular Quakers, or from errant Quakers members repenting of their deeds. It was no doubt this great regard for discipline that helped the Society of Friends reach a level of respectability in the eyes of society, something which had been harder to achieve when local organization was only partly established in the 1650s and early 60s. David Scott has suggested that 1668 when the local meeting structure was set up, was the 'crucial' year for York Quakerism and has questioned whether a major change of attitude occurred at the Restoration in 1660.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 10-11.

### *Early local organization*

Local organization in the 1650s was fairly sporadic. Some Quaker historians have suggested that the early Quakers may initially have been influenced by the organization of the Seekers. W.C. Braithwaite, for example has stated that the Westmorland Seekers provided Quakerism 'with an existing organization, immature no doubt, but sufficiently established to provide corporate fellowship to a number of groups of persons who met in their own meetings, but also kept in touch with one another throughout a wide district'. The Seekers of Preston Patrick in Westmorland had developed a system of meetings which were held once a month, known as a general meeting.<sup>3</sup> Historians however have questioned the existence of the Seekers as a coherent group. J.F. McGregor believes them to be 'artificial products of the Puritan heresiographers' methodology; convenient categories in which to dispose of some of the bewildering variety of enthusiastic speculation. As he has pointed out, there were no Seeker confessions of faith but those described as such were those who were generally seen as awaiting a 'new divine dispensation', having tired of the Puritan churches. As there were no Seeker confessions of faith McGregor has suggested that it is 'more prudent to approach the Seekers as the personification of a point of religious debate, than as a movement, let alone a sect, professing a particular doctrine'. McGregor rejects the idea that Quakerism somehow sprang from Seeker groups and has noted that Quaker pamphlets for the 1650s cite few instances of Friends meeting

---

<sup>3</sup>Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 95.

with Seekers. He points out that the first Quakers are often described as those who were seeking after some new kind of religious experience and truth but states that 'the Seeker connection is a convenient explanation of the antecedents and birth of Quakerism. But the existence of a Seeker movement cannot be established on the fragile base of the early Quakers' accounts of their spiritual insecurity before the arrival of George Fox. These are judgements of hindsight.'<sup>4</sup> In the light of this, Braithwaite's linking of Quakers with Seekers, either in organizational or doctrinal terms should be treated with some caution.

Much of the early evidence for the start of local organization comes from William Dewsberry who was responsible in 1652 for settling a general meeting every three weeks in Yorkshire's East Riding. Richard Farnworth also appears to have been behind the setting up of monthly general meetings in the West Riding of Yorkshire. Dewsberry left the first recorded instructions to these meetings between 1653-4 and these were countersigned by George Fox. He urged them to see that meetings for worship were set up twice weekly and a General meeting, once every two to three weeks. Friends in particular meetings (the basic unit for worship, corresponding to a congregation) were to choose one or two Friends to act as overseers who were 'most grown in the power and life, in the pure discerning in the truth', to take the care and charge over the flock of God in that place'. The main function of

---

<sup>4</sup>J.F. McGregor, 'Seekers and Ranters', in J.F. McGregor and B. Reay (eds.), *Radical Religion in the English Revolution* (Oxford, 1984), pp. 122-3, 128-9.

these was oversight of the congregation, 'to see that order be kept in the church' and to ensure that Friends met together once every first day or more and to have a 'general meeting with other Friends near to you, once in two or three weeks'. Instructions were given that if any 'walk disorderly', those who were responsible for oversight or any others who were discerning should reprove them, and if they persisted in wrong-doing they should be spoken to again. Should the errant member persist, he was to be spoken to before the whole congregation and failing this he was to be cast out of the group. Other Quakers were not to 'have any union with them, not so much as to eat with them, until they repent and turn to the Lord'. Dewsbury also urged Quakers to look after those in 'outward want'.<sup>5</sup>

Yet it seems to have been during the middle of the 1650s when meetings for business gathered more impetus. Fox began to build on and extend the system of meetings already established. By late 1656, monthly and quarterly meetings were gradually being set up. In his *Journal* entry for 1656, George Fox described how he had been moved, 'to sende for one or two out of a county to Swarthmoor & to sett uppe ye mens meetinges where they was not'. He also told of his work 'to sett uppe ye mens Quarterly meetinges throughout ye nation, though in ye

---

<sup>5</sup>William Dewsbury, 'This is the Word of the Living God to his Church he hath Called and Chosen out of the World' (1653) in, *The Faithful Testimony of that Ancient Servant of the Lord, and Minister of the Everlasting Gospel William Dewsbury in his Books, Epistles and Writings Collected and Printed for Future Service* (London, 1689), pp. 1-3.

north they was settled before'.<sup>6</sup> Larry Ingle has noted how these meetings 'represented a broader jurisdiction, usually that of all local bodies within a county' and has suggested that they 'institutionalised' the advice of Dewsbury in the letter referred to above, that if Friends could not solve their own problems they should enlist the help of other Quakers near to them.<sup>7</sup>

Around this time several developments can be seen in the area of local organization. In the north, groups of counties met occasionally to discuss business; one was held at Balby in Yorkshire in 1656 and discussed disciplinary matters. The document from this meeting signed by Dewsbury, Farnworth and others, listed the business matters which local meetings were to attend to. It advised that 'disorderly walkers should be dealt with, first in private then by a few witnesses, and if the trouble was not resolved it should be sent up to 'to some whom the Lord hath raised up in the power of the spirit of the Lord to be fathers'. The document also outlined various standards which Quakers were to keep to; they were to be careful and honest in business, they should not speak badly of their brethren or meddle in their affairs. It further advised for collections to be made for the benefit of the poor and that 'the needs of widows and fatherless...be supplied'. In addition it gave guidelines for the way marriages were to be carried out and ordered that births, deaths and marriages should be recorded. It is important to note however that the

---

<sup>6</sup>Fox, *Journal*, vol. 1, pp. 266-7.

<sup>7</sup>Ingle, *First Among Friends*, p. 152.

document does not refer to specific meetings here so it is difficult to know how these advices were carried out.<sup>8</sup> A meeting at Skipton in 1659, involving Friends from the the northern counties, urged the setting up on a nationwide basis of particular, monthly and quarterly or general meetings, as well as suggesting a meeting for the whole country. Friends from neigbouring particular meetings 'or some friends from any of them as are near and can conveniently meet' were to gather in a monthly meeting and those from the monthly meetings in the north were to form a general meeting two or three times each year. Larry Ingle has noted how these northern Friends objected to the idea of quarterly meetings on a county basis, instead preferring to join together in a way which would be more advantageous to the union and fellowship of the church and the mutual help of one another'. The document gave guidelines for the responsibilities of each meeting, the particular meetings were to care for the poor and help the disadvantaged and to be assisted by the monthly meetings where necessary. They in turn were to help friends in prison or suffering and to supply the 'ministry's' needs. Should the monthly meetings be short of money, the general meeting was to help out. The meeting stipulated that each level of meeting was to have its own collection to which people should freely contribute.<sup>9</sup>

Historians have attributed the growth in local

---

<sup>8</sup>Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, pp. 310-13.

<sup>9</sup>F.H.L., Portfolio MSS, 16, fo. 2., At the general meeting of Friends of the North at Skipton, 5.8.[Oct] 1659. Ingle, *First Among Friends*, pp. 156-57.

organization as stemming from the affair involving James Nayler and the subsequent desire to keep some kind of order among Friends to prevent anything similar from happening. Larry Ingle has noted the effectiveness of this system of meetings, one 'at a local level, a larger and more distant one a rung higher as forming a systematic check on a potential dissident's outward expression of inward leadings as determined by those gripping the instruments of power'.<sup>10</sup>

#### *Local Organization after 1666*

It was only after George Fox's tour of the country following his release from Scarborough prison in 1666 that the three tier system of local organization was firmly established.<sup>11</sup> These were similar to the early meetings but the quarterly meeting was reduced to more of a county basis, whereas its predecessor, the general meeting appears to have covered a larger area. Fox travelled the country advising Friends on the setting up of monthly and quarterly meetings. Many of the monthly meeting books still in existence contain initial entries with counsel and advice from Fox such as guidelines for marriage procedure, how to deal with 'disorderly walkers', advice on collecting tithes and sufferings and a whole host of other administrative matters. These may well have been taken from Fox's work on organization, *Friends' Fellowship must be in the Spirit of 1668*, arranged under 19 heads which covered advices, practices

---

<sup>10</sup>Ingle, *First Among Friends*, p. 152.

<sup>11</sup>See appendix 8

and organization.

The 1660s saw the beginning of pamphlet wars between mainstream Quakers and former Quakers who were disillusioned by the beginnings of institutionalisation within Quakerism. An anonymous pamphlet which most likely was from the pen of a schismatic Quaker contained a reprint of George Fox's *Friends Fellowship Must Be In the Spirit* of 1668. In his introduction to the work he lamented that Quakers had 'fallen from their first principles, mode and way by resolving all things thus formally when at first their religion seemed a chaos,...and the very *ratio formalis* was to cry down forms'. He suggested that the growing formality of Quakerism and their 'Quakers synod' would in the end 'break them and their forms also' and noted that 'many of their own party' had left 'by reason of it'.<sup>12</sup> In a jibe at the Quaker leadership the author noted how 'some credibly report' that before those that had erred could make their peace,

they were forced to bow down themselves, and by a willing subjection put their heads between (their president's for the time being) George Fox his legs, who was present at that days solemnity as Primate and metropolitan of the rest.<sup>13</sup>

Similar sentiments were conveyed in a pamphlet by Nathaniel Smith, another Quaker schismatic and a 'student in physick' who noted how religious groups had a tendency to become hierarchical once they started to flourish and suggested that

---

<sup>12</sup>Anonymous, *Canons and Institutions Drawn up and Agreed upon By the General Assembly or Meeting of the Heads of the Quakers...George Fox being their President* (London, 1669), sig. A.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid. sig. A.

then they 'go about to set up themselves, and make to themselves laws, whereby they may govern, and bear rule one over another'. He noted how Quakers had formerly spoken against this but now they had 'a rule or a light to walk by, (or rather a law)' and 'if any do not observe this, then he is cast out from amongst them, as not being one of the flock of God'. He referred to their meetings as 'courts' and gave an account of typical proceedings at a meeting.<sup>14</sup>

The functions, membership and relationship of the various meetings which made up Quaker local organization will be discussed below followed by an account and analysis of the parallel women's meetings which have been rather neglected in histories of Quakerism.

### *Quarterly Meetings*

The quarterly meeting met four times a year in each county, or in some cases a couple of counties, and coincided with quarter sessions. The meeting acted as a kind of switchboard between the centre and the monthly meeting. A couple of members of each quarterly meeting were chosen to attend yearly meetings in London and the meeting also liaised with Quaker central organization through the correspondent system, whereby one or two members of the quarterly meeting would correspond with nominated members of the Meeting for Sufferings at London. Epistles from the Yearly Meeting consisting of advice and directions to Quakers were an

---

<sup>14</sup>Nathaniel Smith, *The Quakers Spiritual Court* (London, n.d., but epistle dedicatory dated 1668), epistle. See appendix 9.

important way of disseminating the will of London Yearly Meeting and were sent down to the counties via the quarterly meeting and placed in monthly meeting books which in turn generated the advice for the particular meetings. As will be shown the quarterly meeting had a certain amount of jurisdiction over the monthly meetings beneath it since it conveyed the will and advice of the yearly meeting and also made decisions about difficult matters arising from the monthly meetings.

#### **Membership of quarterly meetings**

Each level of Quaker local administration was represented by one or two members from the meetings beneath. Evidence from Settle Monthly Meeting in Yorkshire shows that representatives for the quarterly meetings were chosen on a rotational basis from each of the particular meetings. A minute of 1675 ordered that Friends of particular meetings 'do observe that one Friend go to the quarterly meeting at York' and went on to state that 'this order first begin at Bentham meeting next from Scarhouse and Hampswaite meeting, then from Scalehouse, then from Broughton meeting, then from Settle meeting and so in order from time to time.'<sup>15</sup> York Monthly Meeting Minutes do not reveal how members were chosen though it regularly nominated four to six members. These tended to be more or less the same people for fairly long periods at a time in Yorkshire. Sussex minutes do not shed any light on how members

---

<sup>15</sup>Brotherton Library, Leeds, Settle Monthly Meeting Minutes 1666-1700, p. 34, 1.7. [Sept] 1675. Brotherton Library hereafter cited as B.L.L.

were chosen.<sup>16</sup>

My investigations would suggest that the status of such members tended to coincide with George Fox's pronouncement in 1669 which advised that quarterly meetings should be made up of 'weighty seasoned, and substantial Friends that understands the business of the church', for Fox stated that 'no unruly and unseasoned persons should come there, nor indeed into the Monthly Meetings'.<sup>17</sup> The prominent members of Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting, for example, were: John Hall, a school teacher and a later separatist; Thomas Waite, a bookseller; Thomas Hammond, a chamberlain who was involved in the civic government of York; John Taylor, a sugar-refiner and merchant, who later joined leading Friends in trying to get the Affirmation Bill through parliament; John Todd of York Monthly Meeting, a mercer, and John Leake of Selby who had been convinced by Fox in the 1650s. Again the pattern of occupations tended to be towards the middling scale. It has been possible to trace the occupations of many of those members of Sussex Quarterly Meeting through the meeting's Register of Indentures of the Burial Grounds and Meeting Houses. The meeting members were chosen from the four monthly

---

<sup>16</sup>For example at a meeting in March 1683, it was ordered that John Leake, Christopher Edwards, John Winder, Thomas Waite and John Taylor should attend. The following quarterly meeting representatives again included Thomas Waite, John Taylor, John Winder together with John Todd, George Canby and John Burleigh senior. Nominations in the following year in December 1684 were John Winder, John Taylor, Christopher Edwards and Edward Moore. B.L.L., York Monthly Meeting Minutes 1682-1707 vol. 2, p. 9, 1.1. [March] 1682/3; p. 11, 7.4. [June] 1683; p. 32, 5.10. [Dec.] 1684.

<sup>17</sup>Braithwaite, *Second Period of Quakerism*, p. 260, quoted from Fox, *Epistles*, p. 290.

meetings of Lewes, Arundel, Horsham and Alfriston though the minutes do not reveal the basis on which they were chosen. Ambrose Galloway and Thomas Banks were both tailors; Thomas Moseley, a linen-draper; Edward Hamper, a malster; Nicholas Rickman, a shoemaker; Mascall Picknall, a mariner; Thomas Beard, a merchant, and Orphington Elphick, John Newman, Thomas James, Moses French, Henry Scrase and William Gereing, who were all yeomen.<sup>18</sup>

Sussex Quarterly Meeting also contained a number of influential friends. Ambrose Rigge and William Welch were key figures who were involved in central organization. The former was a frequent attender at the central Second Day Morning Meeting; indeed Rigge was present at one of the first of those meetings and was one of a group along with William Penn, Steven Smith, Steven Crisp and Thomas Green who were asked to draw up a letter concerning the Wilkinson-Story controversy, involving Quakers in the north who had separated from mainstream Quakerism over a number of issues.<sup>19</sup> William Welch who was later to become an important member of the Meeting for Sufferings and Second Day Morning Meeting emerged as a prominent member of the quarterly meeting in 1669. In 1669, he was responsible along with Ambrose Rigge for taking the money

---

<sup>18</sup>East Sussex County Record Office, Lewes, Sussex Quarterly Meeting Register of Indentures of the Burial Grounds of Friends in Sussex 1667-1846, pp. 3-13. East Sussex Record Office and Sussex Quarterly Meeting Minutes hereafter cited as E.S.R.O. and S.Q.M.M. respectively.

<sup>19</sup>F.H.L., Morning Meeting Book 1673-92, pp. 8-9. 31.3. [March] 1675/6, 18.8. [Oct] 1675. For Wilkinson-Story controversy see previous chapter.

for overseas service up to London.<sup>20</sup> Another important, though infrequent attender was William Penn, whose residence was at Worminghurst, Sussex. Penn appeared a number of times from 1684 to 1685.<sup>21</sup> These links with the London organization may go some way in explaining the lack of separatism amongst Sussex Quakers compared to that in Yorkshire. Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting was obviously at a greater distance from London and covered a vast area containing the 14 monthly meetings of York, Thirsk, Balby, Richmond, Pontefract, Guisborough, Brighouse, Scarborough, Knaresborough, Kelk, Settle, Owstwick, Malton and Elloughton, which no doubt made it more difficult to control.

It is clear from the minutes that a variety of 'offices' existed at the quarterly meeting level. John Leake, for example, was an early 'clerk of the county', a post which would later be taken over by Thomas Hammond. His duties were outlined as responsibility for the papers of the meeting, corresponding with monthly meetings and with Meeting for Sufferings in London.<sup>22</sup> Certain Friends were also appointed to look after the meeting's finances; initially this was John Hall, then Thomas Waite and John Taylor and in 1681 the meeting 'desired John Todd to accept the same'.<sup>23</sup> In addition

---

<sup>20</sup>E.S.R.O., S.Q.M.M. 1668-1689, p. 10, 25.3. [May] 1669.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., for example, p. 79, 2.1. [March] 1680/81; p. 137, 21.1. [March] 1686/87.

<sup>22</sup>B.L.L., Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting Minutes 1681-1698, vol. 2, p. 2a, 1/2.5. [July] 1685. Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting Minutes cited hereafter as Y.Q.M.M.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., vol. 1, 1669-1681 p. 8, 22.4. [June] 1671; vol. 2, p. 2a 21.7. [Sept.] 1681.

Friends of the quarterly meeting were also chosen to correspond with the Meeting for Sufferings in London which will be discussed below.

### Oversight of monthly meetings

The quarterly meeting played an important supervisory role over the monthly meetings. A note from early Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting minutes reveals 'those things which the Quarterly Meeting ought to enquire of the monthly meeting and see that none of them be undone'. The note asked a variety of questions: whether the poor, widows and orphans were looked after in the lower meetings; if any had gone from 'the truth'; whether 'any difference had arisen betwixt Friend and Friend or between Friends and the world'. It asked what sufferings had occurred in the monthly meetings and whether marriages were being conducted properly. Quarterly meetings were to enquire whether prospective marriages had been published, if the couple concerned had been investigated, whether they were both believers with the assent of relatives to their intentions and if certificates had been signed. The note also enquired whether register books for marriages, births and deaths were being used in the monthly meetings.<sup>24</sup> Such instructions are frequently seen being implemented by the quarterly meeting; in 1683 for example, with regards to the recording of births, deaths and marriages, the quarterly meeting of Yorkshire advised that 'one careful Friend' was to be appointed in every particular meeting to 'take an exact

---

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., vol. 1, p. v, no date but probably 1669.

observation' of all marriages, births and burials together with dates and to bring the same to the monthly meeting to be placed in their book.<sup>25</sup>

### Discipline

An essential means of fulfilling a Christian life and also of controlling the society was via the discipline of members. The term 'disorderly walking' could cover a whole array of behaviour: drunkenness, debt, sexual offences and failure to follow Quaker standards of simplicity. The strict discipline exercised in the monthly meetings was strikingly similar to that of the Baptists which will be discussed below in the section at the close of the chapter. The role which quarterly meetings played in this area was in assisting and judging the difficult cases that were sent up to the higher meeting. At Settle Monthly Meeting in Yorkshire for example a dispute arose between Richard Scott and Richard Hobson and the former was asked to cease the suit he had brought against the latter. At the following meeting Scott had clearly not concurred with the request and it was agreed 'that a paper be sent from this meeting to the quarterly meeting at York to show them the state of Richard Scott and Richard Hobson's case'.<sup>26</sup> In Sussex, a widow, Mary Braine, of Arundel Meeting was admonished for 'aiding and abetting' her daughter in a 'contrary way of marriage'. It was the advice of Edward Hamper

---

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., vol. 2, p. 18, 3/4 6. [August] 1683.

<sup>26</sup>B.L.L., Settle Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 47, 5.12. [Feb.] 1678/79; p. 48, 5.1. [March] 1678/9.

and Tristram Martin that a paper of denial should be drawn up and taken to the quarterly meeting. This was shown to both the men's and women's meetings but it was ordered that 'the further proceedings of this meeting do at present be ceased'.<sup>27</sup> The quarterly meeting acted as a court of appeal as may be seen from a minute of Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting which stated that 'each monthly meeting may give their final judgement of controversies and also of disorderly walkers except appeals to the quarterly meeting be made'.<sup>28</sup> The higher meeting also considered queries concerning discipline that the lower meeting might send up from time to time. In 1683, for example, York Monthly Meeting asked that the quarterly meeting 'consider of the consequences of persons presenting their marriages by papers if not appearing themselves in person with which this meeting hath been much grieved'.<sup>29</sup>

### Marriage

The issue of marriage looms large in local meeting minutes and so deserves separate consideration; the supervision of marriage was an important function, and this is hardly surprising since marriage had implications for the well-being of the Society of Friends in terms of who Friends married and the subsequent rearing of children who would be birth-right members. The issue of marriage also had legal

---

<sup>27</sup>E.S.R.O., Arundel Monthly Meeting Minutes 1668-1709, vol. 1, p. 35, 4.5. [July] 1676; p. 42, 5.12. [Feb] 1677/78.

<sup>28</sup>B.L.L., Y.Q.M.M., vol. 1, p. 44, 12/12.4. [June] 1678.

<sup>29</sup>B.L.L., York Monthly Meeting Minutes 1682-1707, vol. 2, p. 9, 1.1. [March] 1682/3.

implications. Craig Horle has pointed out that 'potentially the Quaker crime with the most serious ramifications was their marriage within their own meeting', rather than in the local parish church.<sup>30</sup> The questionable legality of Quaker unions also had repercussions in terms of legitimacy of offspring and the issue of inheritance. During the Interregnum there were two lawful ways of marriage established by the Directory of 1645, one by a JP in a civil ceremony which was required and the other by a recognised minister which was optional. The Quakers refused either of these options and instead chose to marry in their own meetings after the manner of Boaz and Ruth in the 4th chapter of Ruth.<sup>31</sup> The main problem for Quakers was how the secular courts viewed their marriages for in the ecclesiastical courts the worst that could befall them would be excommunication and possibly imprisonment. Luckily for them the authorities were fairly lenient as the civil law and common law favoured mutual consent as the basis for a legal marriage. An important judgement was made in 1661 at Nottingham assizes concerning the legitimacy of a child from a Quaker marriage. The jury found for the Quakers after Judge Archer professed that 'he did believe that they did not go together like brute beasts (as has been said), but as christians'. He also told the jury that 'There was a marriage in paradise, Adam took Eve, and Eve took Adam and none other

---

<sup>30</sup>Craig W. Horle, *The Quakers and the English Legal System 1660-1688* (Philadelphia, 1988), p. 234.

<sup>31</sup>William Wistor Comfort 'Quaker Marriage Certificates' *The Bulletin of the Friends Historical Association* 40 (1951), pp. 67, 74.

present' and reasoned from this that consent made a marriage legal.<sup>32</sup> The Meeting for Sufferings in 1679, eager to get a firm opinion on the validity of Quaker marriages, asked the opinion of the lawyer, Thomas Corbett, who found that Quaker marriages were legal on the basis of consent, though not in the eyes of the Anglican Church.<sup>33</sup> Craig Horle has noted that 'although Friends were liable to prosecution in the church courts for their marriages, such suits do not appear to have been frequent, nor did they cause serious concern'.<sup>34</sup>

Epistles from London to the quarterly meetings are full of advice and exhortations relating to marriage. Those by George Fox to the Sussex Quarterly Meeting, urge Quakers to guard against being, 'unequally yoked together with unbelievers'.<sup>35</sup> An epistle from London in 1675 laid out the various stages in marriage procedure; 'no engagement was to be made without the counsel, consent of parents, relations and friends', and marriages were to be at least twice propounded to the men's and women's monthly meetings. The marriage then had to be completed 'in a grave and public assembly of Friends'. Furthermore those who had entered into a contract of marriage were not to be allowed 'in any unfaithfulness or injustice one to another to break or violate any such contract'. Other advice concerned marrying with close kindred,

---

<sup>32</sup>Quoted in, Horle, pp. 235-236. Account based on Book of Cases, 1:28-29, 93 and various sources.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., pp. 236-237, from Book of Cases, 1: 64-65.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 238.

<sup>35</sup>E.S.R.O., S.Q.M.M., p. 6, no date.

which was forbidden, though if Friends had already entered into such a union, they were advised not to break the marriage.<sup>36</sup> Quakers were exhorted by George Fox not to be married by 'priests' and 'bishops' for marriage was 'God's work and an ordinance of God'. Fox gave the standard example of Ruth and Boaz who 'took each other after both sides were satisfied in the assembly'.<sup>37</sup> Other advice concerned that of refraining from marriage for one year after the death of a spouse. An epistle by Fox to Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting, probably for 1683, urged Quakers not to marry within the year and it advised that Friends should read the epistle in their quarterly meetings and 'take heed that they act not below the laws of men'.<sup>38</sup> The desire to act above the world's standards can clearly be seen here for Fox stated that the 'world' had laws to limit re-marriage within a year and he felt that Quakers 'ought in the power of Christ Jesus to outstrip the world in virtue, chastity, modesty and temperance, and in that which is of good report'.<sup>39</sup> Sussex Quarterly Meeting also received advice on this matter, Quakers were to be careful of 'all hasty letting forth of the affections towards marriage'.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., no page, 27.3. [May] 1675.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 7, no date.

<sup>38</sup>B.L.L., Y.Q.M.M., Epistles and Advices from George Fox, the Yearly Meeting and the Meeting for Sufferings 1670-1743, vol. 1, part 1, p. 81, no date but appears after a 1683 epistle.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 83, 13.7. [Sept.] 1683.

<sup>40</sup>E.S.R.O., S.Q.M.M., p. 80, 29.1. [March] 1680.

## Sufferings

The recording of sufferings was an essential part of the work of local meetings, especially that of the quarterly meetings which also sought to alleviate them. Collection of details of sufferings provided not only a record of sufferings but lists were used to solicit relief from Westminster and the king once they had been sent up to London. As was shown in the preceding chapter, the central organization gathered information in relation to sufferings in terms of advice from lawyers and disseminated these to the quarterly meetings to be passed on to the other meetings. One principal medium for this was the system of county correspondents set up in 1676 who liaised with specific members of the Meeting for Sufferings in London. The main function was to correspond with each other regarding 'sufferings both in England and beyond the seas as for tithes, not taking oaths, not repairing of steeple houses and other sufferings for conscience's sake'. Some indication of the correspondents for 1680-1683 is given in the Meeting for Sufferings Minutes for those years. For Yorkshire, John Taylor, Thomas Waite and John Leake of York corresponded with Philip Ford, Thomas Hart, John Beller and Thomas Scott. In Sussex, Thomas Moseley of Lewes and Edward Hamper of Arundel liaised with Richard Whitspaine, Benjamin Antrobus and Walter Miors.<sup>41</sup> The type of business that was dealt with may be seen from the following Meeting for Sufferings minute.

A letter from Elias Ellis dated the 29th 8 mo: 1687

---

<sup>41</sup>F.H.L., Meeting for Sufferings Minutes, 1680-83, vol. 2, unpaginated, at back of volume. For correspondent system see chapter two.

to James Parks about his imprisonment for tithes at the suit of Dr. Morton, with a copy of his attachment dated the 15th 8 mo: 1687. Read and James Parks to return an answer and to send for an account where the Dr aforesaid may be found by some Friends if he desires may speak to the Dr on his behalf. James Park has written.<sup>42</sup>

Details of counsel's opinions and various cases were sent down to quarterly meetings and were used as precedents for local cases. To give one or two examples, in the case of marriage, Quakers, as we have seen, were faced with difficulties for not marrying according to the national form which some people tried to use to invalidate Quaker marriages. A number of counsel's opinions were included on this matter. One was the case mentioned above tried at Nottingham Assizes involving a Quaker couple who had been married for two years when the husband died leaving his widow with child. The jury found for the child 'and presented it heir to the land.'<sup>43</sup> Other types of information took the form of questions and answers relating to specific laws which the Quakers could be prosecuted under. A paper by Thomas Corbett, one of the London legal advisers, included, for example, a query 'whether a justice of peace can legally convict a person as a hearer or a person being present at a religious assembly without the person being present or summoned to appear before such a justice to answer for himself'. His answer stated that the justice 'can not legally convict any person of the offence without such summons because our common law, the civil law and the law of nature require it

---

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., vol. 6, 1687-1688 4.9. [Nov] 1687, p. 127.

<sup>43</sup>F.H.L., Y.Q.M.M., Counsel's Opinions 1661-1841, p.xxv.

of necessity in order to the judging rightly'.<sup>44</sup>

Friends in the quarterly meetings were allocated specific duties in relation to sufferings on the advice of the Yearly Meeting or the Meeting for Sufferings. For example in 1677 a paper from the Yearly Meeting to Sussex Quarterly Meeting asked them 'to take care to appoint some friends most capable to attend at Assizes and Sessions to take account what friends are charged upon the statute of recusancy...or any other presentment. Details were to be sent up to Ellis Hookes, the recorder of sufferings and those chosen for the work were Thomas Moseley, and Ambrose Galloway for Lewes and John Shaw and Thomas Sillington for the western sessions.<sup>45</sup> In Yorkshire a meeting for sufferings was set up to coincide with the quarterly meeting and the Assizes. This first began in 1683, its purpose being that 'Friends may have a ready knowledge of any proceedings to sufferings as that may be against friends at the assizes or sessions'. It was for 'the assistance of Friends with advice...when they may be summoned at any time to give their appearance there'. Those chosen to appear at the Assizes were John Taylor and John Todd; for Skipton Sessions, Joshua Dawson and George Myers; for Leeds and Wakefield, Thomas Taylor, Robert Atherton and Abraham Hodgson, and for Barnsley and Rotherham, Henry Roebuck and Thomas Aldam.<sup>46</sup>

Quarterly meeting members kept reports of petitions to

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. xxvii.

<sup>45</sup>E.S.R.O., S.Q.M.M., p. 62, 24.7. [Sept] 1677.

<sup>46</sup>B.L.L., Y.Q.M.M., vol. 1, p. 18, 3/4.6. [Aug] 1683.

judges, sheriffs, parliament and the king. There was a standard form for these; a letter addressed to the Assize judges and gaol deliverers for the Northern Circuit, stated that Quakers were a peaceable people and included a list of those imprisoned, with a numerical breakdown of their offences, for example 128 for refusing to swear, 35 for absenting from the established church 61 for meeting together for worship.<sup>47</sup>

#### Other administrative concerns

The quarterly meeting was responsible for keeping a register of indentures of burial grounds and meeting houses. Properties were usually leased from fellow-Quakers, some at nominal rents; for example the Quaker John Ellis leased some land to Friends of Sussex for 'a penny of silver' to be paid on 3rd March each year.<sup>48</sup> Buildings were also rented for meeting house purposes. In 1674 the Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting agreed to pay Edward Nightingale rent for a room adjoining the meeting house.<sup>49</sup>

Quakers also kept some copies of wills. The society experienced difficulties with wills since the deceased, witnesses and executors were most probably excommunicates and so after the Restoration the church could interfere with

---

<sup>47</sup>F.H.L., Y.Q.M.M., Petitions to the Judges &c. and Various Papers relating to Sufferings 1682-1810, p. 33, no date.

<sup>48</sup>E.S.R.O., Lewes, Register of the Wills of Friends in the County of Sussex 1663-1685, p. 14, 1679.

<sup>49</sup>B.L.L., Y.Q.M.M., vol. 1, p. 20, 25.2. [April] 1674.

executorship and administration of the will. The will could also be challenged by non-Quaker relatives on the grounds that the deceased was excommunicate. Another problem was that Quakers were unwilling to take an oath which was necessary to prove a will. Craig Horle has found that the Quakers' wills were safe where they were challenged on the grounds of excommunication or illegal marriage. The 'most definitive legal statement' he states came in 1683 when a Robert Cole's will was challenged by his brother. Cole had made bequests, the largest to his wife, also his executor and he had also settled the rights to numerous houses on trustees instead of leaving them in his will. The Quakers asked Joseph Fisher of Gray's Inn to look at the case who found that the settlement and the will were good and that the deceased man's marriage was legal. The Quaker lawyer Thomas Corbett further advised that should the brother still persist in the matter, the wife could apply to King's Bench for a *mandamus* to the church court, requiring them to grant the administration to her.<sup>50</sup> It also appears that there were not many prosecutions for refusing to take the oath. Horle cites several reasons for this, for example probate of a will was not necessary since land could be transferred following death on the basis of the signed will itself. In addition Quakers often asked non-Friends to be executors and witnesses so that they could take the oaths instead. Horle also suggests that the church courts might have been lenient with Friends and allowed them to prove wills without taking the oath. He gives the example of the

---

<sup>50</sup>Horle, p. 240.

Westmorland Quaker, Gervase Benson, a man of considerable standing in his community who was able to arrange this for his fellow Quakers.<sup>51</sup>

Another administrative concern of the quarterly meetings was the circulation of Quaker literature. As was noted in the previous chapter the central organization took immense care in the choice of manuscripts to be published and considerable attention went into the distribution of books. Designated Friends in the counties were appointed to receive books; in Yorkshire, Thomas Waite received 25 in 1672, whilst William Galten was sent 6 for Sussex at the same time.<sup>52</sup>

Quarterly meetings paid the printers once a quarter for books from local funds and ordered their lower meetings to take certain books; a minute from Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting noted that the meeting had agreed that each monthly meeting should take one of Francis Howgill's works and one of William Bayly's.<sup>53</sup>

### Finance

The quarterly meetings had the task of sending to London the collections for the national stock and captives abroad which had been collected from the particular and monthly meetings. In 1669 for example, William Welch and Ambrose Rigge sent £14.19.00 to the central organization on behalf of Sussex

---

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., pp. 240-41.

<sup>52</sup>F.H.L., Yearly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 4, 30.3. [May] 1672.

<sup>53</sup>B.L.L., Y.Q.M.M., vol. 1, p. 30, 14.7[Sept.] 1676.

Quarterly Meeting.<sup>54</sup> The meeting had a stock sent up from the monthly meetings, much of which was often spent on the relief of poverty.<sup>55</sup> Another of the meeting's financial responsibilities was to help the lower meetings in times of emergency for example in 1674 when Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting paid £4 to Malton Monthly Meeting to help relieve two prisoners at Pickering Castle. The monthly meeting was to 'take care to administer their necessities from time to time and to be reimbursed by the quarterly meeting'.<sup>56</sup>

The Quarterly meetings would also distribute money from legacies and gifts to individual monthly meetings. In 1683, Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting on receiving a £40 legacy from William Williams decided to give £10 to York Monthly Meeting and £6 to Knaresborough.<sup>57</sup>

### ***Monthly Meetings***

Whilst the quarterly meeting was particularly crucial in terms of diffusing information from London, it was really the monthly meetings which were the lynch-pin of local administration. The meeting was primarily involved in disciplinary matters but also dealt with other business: the recording of sufferings, collection of money, charity and the registration of births, deaths and marriages.

---

<sup>54</sup>E.S.R.O., S.Q.M.M., vol. 1, p. 10, 25.3. [May] 1669.

<sup>55</sup>See appendix 10

<sup>56</sup>B.L.L., Y.Q.M.M., vol. 1, p. 20, 24.5. [July] 1674.

<sup>57</sup>B.L.L., Y.Q.M., Stock Accounts vol. 1 1680-1694, p. 19, 20/21.4. [June] 1683.

## Membership

David Scott in his study of the York meetings has noted that whilst membership of preparative meetings was fairly open that of the monthly ones was more closed. He has said that by the 1690s, and probably before this, Friends were nominated to go to the monthly meetings. The effect of the separatist controversy of the 1680s may well have had a restraining effect, for the quarterly meeting asked that only Friends in unity and fellowship be sent up to the meeting.<sup>58</sup> This was probably also heeded in relation to attendance at monthly meetings. Statistics suggest that the more wealthy members were regular attenders at monthly meetings. Scott has noted how the York minutes tend to corroborate Richard Vann's findings that the more prosperous Friends who had 'the leisure and means' to take up the responsibility, tended to dominate meetings.<sup>59</sup> During the period 1670-83 for example, Thomas Waite, a stationer attended 78 times; John Hall, a schoolteacher, 66 times; John Taylor, a merchant/sugar refiner on 61 occasions; Thomas Bulmer, a gentleman 57 times; Edward Nightingale, a grocer attended on 45 occasions, and Thomas Dennison, a tailor, on 39.<sup>60</sup>

## Discipline

Responsibility for discipline chiefly lay with the

---

<sup>58</sup>Scott, 'Politics, Dissent and Quakerism in York', pp. 81-2.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., p. 80. Vann, *The Social Development of English Quakerism*, pp. 118-119.

<sup>60</sup>Scott, 'Politics, Dissent and Quakerism', table 13.

monthly meetings. The normal procedure for dealing with errant members was for a couple of Quakers to initially admonish them. Should the errant member repent, they were expected to present a paper condemning themselves to Friends. Testimonies from members appear frequently in minutes and often in separate volumes.<sup>61</sup> A James Fenner of Sussex gave a paper and explained how he had been guilty of 'drinking of brandy more than was needful or convenient' at a shop in Ruper and warned others to 'keep upon their watchtower' so that they would be able to 'resist the fiery parts of the devil'.<sup>62</sup> Quakers were keen to show how highly they disapproved of immorality and often went to the lengths of making errant Quakers denounce their behaviour to non-Quaker ministers. A John Hudson was treated severely by Kelk Monthly Meeting in the East Riding of Yorkshire for 'lying with a maid and defiling her before marriage', which had been conducted by a non-Quaker minister. To 'clear the truth' the couple gave their testimony 'to the priest where the thing was done' and it also had to be read in friends' meetings and made public.<sup>63</sup>

The ultimate sanction after failed attempts to persuade the erring member to repent was disownment, effectively excommunication. A minute from Pontefract Monthly Meeting in Yorkshire shows how a Francis Cudworth had been 'dealt with by

---

<sup>61</sup>For example, E.S.R.O., S.Q.M., Testimonies of Denial vol. 1, 1674-1767.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., no date but appears amongst 1670s papers.

<sup>63</sup>East Yorkshire Record Office, Beverley, Kelk Monthly Meeting Minutes 1669-1716, p. 79, 1.7. [Sept] 1679. East Yorks. Record Office hereafter cited as E.Y.R.O.

exhortation and reproof' for 'giving way to loose and licentious principles' and leading a 'disorderly and unchristian life'. He had been shown to have persisted in his ways by taking a wife who was not a Quaker and being married by a priest as well as committing 'other extravagances' which the writers of the minutes did not explain. The meeting testified against him and hoped that none would impute his 'unchristian practices' to Quakers.<sup>64</sup> At Lewes Monthly Meeting a Henry Beach was disowned for abstaining from meetings and having 'grown into disorder, reviling and railing against some Friends'. It was ordered that his disownment be advertised at the market cross.<sup>65</sup> The discipline of Friends then could be rigorous, as E.K.L. Quine has pointed out for Leicestershire,

the picture that the disciplinary cases in the books gives us is one of a firm, dogged, determined people, with high standards which they felt could be reached...a people zealous of their good name, even if it meant parting with a member of whom, as a person they might be fond.<sup>66</sup>

### Marriage

Marriage was taken very seriously in the monthly meetings and great care was taken over procedure. Like non-Quaker marriage customs, prospective partners had to publish intentions of marriage. They were then vetted by the men's and women's meetings; at Settle Monthly Meeting following the

---

<sup>64</sup>West Yorkshire Archives, Wakefield, Pontefract Monthly Meeting Book 1672-1700 (transcript), p.39, 12.11. [Jan] 1677/8.

<sup>65</sup>E.S.R.O. Lewes Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, unpaginated, 15.10. [Dec] 1681.

<sup>66</sup>Quine, 'Quakers in Leicestershire 1648-1780', p. 158.

publication of the intention to marriage of Richard Wilkinson and Margaret Hall it was ordered that John Hall, William Ellis, Margery Car and Isabel Dickinson 'do enquire of the clearness of the persons aforesaid concerning their intended marriage' and bring an account in to the next monthly meeeting.<sup>67</sup> Couples could be refused for various reasons; for example at Kelk Monthly Meeting in East Yorkshire, a Henry Jarrett's intended had not made 'any profession of truth' and the meeting refused to give their permission until they were further satisfied on the matter.<sup>68</sup> Former relationships with other men and women were investigated. Before Henry Scrase of Lewes Monthly Meeting could marry, his previous relationship with Theodotia Pawlett from Hampshire was looked into. She acknowledged to the meeting that there 'has been formerly some show of love betwixt us...which for divers weighty reasons we have seen cause to withdraw' and went on to say they 'do clear each other from all former shows of love.'<sup>69</sup> Another case concerned the London friend, John Field, a relative of Henry Snooke of Horsleydown Meeting who sometimes attended meetings of the central organization. His intended, Mary Ackhurst of Sussex worried friends of Lewes Monthly Meeting who had heard reports of 'light, wanton behaviour between another person and her'. The meeting being unable to find the man were willing to

---

<sup>67</sup>B.L.L., Settle Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 44, 7.12. [Feb.] 1676.

<sup>68</sup>E.Y.R.O., Kelk Monthly Meeting Minutes 1669-1716, vol. 1, p. 155, 2.12. [Jan] 1681.

<sup>69</sup>E.S.R.O., Lewes Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, no page, 17.1. [March] 1679/80.

let the matter pass 'in tenderness to him the said John Field...and also in condescension to our Friends at London and his parents.'<sup>70</sup> The monthly meetings also carefully investigated the marriage of widows to make sure that women were not taken advantage of and that children were provided for before a second marriage. A case came before Kelk Monthly Meeting of the widow, Anne Watson who wished to marry a Thomas Levitt. As the widow had several offspring 'enquiry was made if all things were settled concerning the children'.<sup>71</sup> Great care then was taken to ensure that everything was in order; proposals were published before the women's meetings in addition to the men's which reveals the scrupulousness with which marriages were investigated'.<sup>72</sup> This oversight of marriage even continued after the wedding as part of the Quaker discipline. Arundel Monthly Meeting Minutes noted how a Mary Richeson was visited on numerous occasions concerning difficulties in her marriage, though the nature of these was not specified. The minute goes on to say how 'she did acknowledge there was some difference between her husband and she but she hoped God would give her the strength to walk more orderly and bear the difference more patiently'.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., no page, 20.2. [April] 1687; 18.3. [May] 1687.

<sup>71</sup>E.Y.R.O., Kelk Monthly Meeting Minutes 1669-1716, p. 156, 1.6.1681.

<sup>72</sup>B.L.L., Thirsk Womens' Monthly Meeting Minutes 1670-1699, vol. 1, pp. 2-3, 10.3. [May] 1687.

<sup>73</sup>E.S.R.O., Arundel Monthly Meeting Minutes 1668-1709, p. 5, 2.11. [Jan] 1668/9.

## Tithes

The society was very careful to record not just prosecutions for non-payment of tithes, but also individual testimonies against tithes with explanations of why Quakers refused to pay them. Nicholas Morgan has noted the importance of tithe testimonies in the discipline of Quakers in Lancashire; he states that scrutiny of tithes had a two-fold meaning 'not only did it allow Friends' faithfulness to be maintained, but also it enabled them to maintain a register of membership on the basis of the record of acceptable testimonies'.<sup>74</sup> Morgan has asserted that the emphasis Quakers placed on tithe testimonies set them in conflict with the civil authorities and with the Quaker establishment. He has suggested that far from discipline being a 'means of retreat from the world, and a sign of resignation from the early Quaker wish to convert the world', it could be seen 'as a vehicle of outward aggression and missionary intent'.<sup>75</sup>

The main business of anti-tithe testimonies came under the monthly meetings. In 1678 Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting thought an enquiry was needed into Friends' faithfulness in the matter and so circulated a paper to each monthly meeting.<sup>76</sup> Morgan noted similar problems in Lancashire, particularly with the women's monthly meetings of Fylde, Rosendale, Marsden and Oldham who failed to bring in

---

<sup>74</sup>Morgan, *Lancashire Quakers and the Establishment*, p. 220.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., p. 244.

<sup>76</sup>B.L.L., York Monthly Meeting Minutes 1668-1682 vol. 1, p. 76, 4.4.1678.

testimonies against tithes, as did a couple of their male counterparts, Swarthmore and Cartmel.<sup>77</sup>

**Other administration:** recording of births, deaths and marriages; registering of wills and indentures; book distribution.

The monthly meetings played an important role in the recording of births, marriages and deaths. These details would normally be kept by the established church so the Quakers by necessity had to act as a separate community as far as registration was concerned. Although Friends had kept records from the 1650s this was not done systematically until the firm establishment of monthly meetings in the late 1660s. An epistle from George Fox in 1668 urged Friends to record births, marriages and deaths and to bind them in a book to be sent to the quarterly meeting where they were to be copied into a book for the whole county.<sup>78</sup> Such monthly meeting books survive from many areas. Marriage certificates were fairly lengthy and stated that the couple were 'clear' from others, that they had 'betrothed' themselves to each other according to the custom of the 'ancient people of God' and with the consent and presence of Quaker relations whose names are added at the bottom of the certificate.<sup>79</sup> Owing to a refusal on the part of some parish incumbents in the early years of Quakerism

---

<sup>77</sup>Morgan, pp. 220, 222.

<sup>78</sup>E.S.R.O., Lewes Monthly Meeting Minutes vol. 1, unpaginated, 14.7. [Sept] 1668.

<sup>79</sup>E.Y.R.O., Scarborough Monthly Meeting Marriages 1661-1724, p. 8, 11.8. [Oct] 1673.

to bury Quakers on hallowed ground the society had to provide their own burial grounds. Entries concerning burials were simple usually giving names and dates and details of the place in which the deceased was buried.<sup>80</sup> Births, as one would expect were straight forward listings of names and dates.<sup>81</sup>

The monthly meetings also had the task of arranging for the dispersal of books among their particular meetings. Settle Monthly Meeting in the North Riding of Yorkshire recorded details of books received. Precise instructions were given concerning their circulation, for example in 1673 the meeting ordered that an unnamed book of Edward Burrough's

shall this day be left at Settle and stay in that meeting 2 months and from there to Bolland meeting 2 mo. and from there to Bentham meeting 2 mo. and from there to Scarhouse meeting 2 mo. and from there to Scalehouse meeting 2 mo. and from there to Broughton meeting 2 months &c.<sup>82</sup>

As regards the other books in circulation at the time; in 1675 William Penn and George Whitehead's *The Christian Quaker* was passed around the meetings.<sup>83</sup> This was a defence of Quakerism and involved shifts in thought toward a more orthodox doctrinal position. The same year a book of William Smith's was being read which may well have been one of his catechisms, perhaps the *New Catechism* of 1665, and in 1676 the works of William Bayly, and a book with no author details entitled

---

<sup>80</sup>E.Y.R.O., Kelk Burials 1656-1773.

<sup>81</sup>E.Y.R.O., Elloughton Monthly Meeting Births 1648-1775.

<sup>82</sup>B.L.L., Settle Men's Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 27, 5.12.[Feb.]1672/3.

<sup>83</sup>Ibid., p. 34, 1.7.[Sept.]1675.

*Immediate Revelations*.<sup>84</sup> A loose paper with no date but inserted in the early part of the minutes contains an account of 'how many of Robert Barclay's *Apology* Friends in the particular meeting at Settle are willing to take', which amounted to eight in total. It is likely that the date for this minute would have been in the mid 1670s when Barclay's famous work was first published.<sup>85</sup>

### Finance

Several collections were made at the monthly meeting level as can be seen from the minutes. Collections were also made in particular meetings and sent up to the monthly meeting and were used to pay for books, salaries, and administrative concerns and for charitable purposes such as maintenance of the poor.<sup>86</sup> A collection was also made for the use of the quarterly meeting.<sup>87</sup> The monthly meeting in addition received the collections for the national stock from the particular meetings and sent this on to the quarterly meetings.<sup>88</sup> Occasionally the monthly meeting would respond to emergency financial needs from meetings elsewhere in the country, for example in December 1676 when a collection was made for

---

<sup>84</sup>Ibid., p. 36, 5.2. [Apr.] 1675; p. 42, 2.6. [Aug.] 1676. *Immediate Revelations* is most likely the tract by George Keith which was reprinted in 1676.

<sup>85</sup>Ibid., p. 19a, loose leaf.

<sup>86</sup>See appendix 11.

<sup>87</sup>see appendix 12.

<sup>88</sup>see appendix 12.

friends at Northampton who had suffered in a fire.<sup>89</sup> The monthly meetings, if over-stretched were able to borrow money from the quarterly meetings, for example in July 1687 Settle Monthly Meeting borrowed £20 from the higher meeting for the use of Thomas Hall. The quarterly meeting remitted £6 so that Settle had only to pay £14 together with 12 pence interest.<sup>90</sup>

### Charity

Much of the money collected by the local network of meetings went towards charitable concerns. One of the major reasons for the establishment of monthly meetings in the late 1660s was to ensure that none were 'lacking according to the apostle's words'.<sup>91</sup> This charity could take many forms: relief of the sick and old, widows, orphans, those without work, those who had gone bankrupt, paying for apprenticeships and paying prisoners' chamber rents. Quaker concern with charity was based upon scripture; in a tract of 1683, George Fox repeated the words of the apostle James, '"if a brother or sister be naked or destitute of daily food, and if you say to them, depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled, and you give them not these things which are needful to the body, even so is faith, if it have not works is dead"'. Fox went on to add that faith is revealed by works, feeding the hungry, clothing

---

<sup>89</sup> see appendix 12.

<sup>90</sup> B.L.L., Settle Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 111 6.5. [July] 1687.

<sup>91</sup> E.S.R.O., Lewes Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, unpaginated, undated, in early pages of volume, probably 1669, From Fox's *Friends Fellowship Must be in the Spirit* (1668)

the naked, and relieving the widows and fatherless.<sup>92</sup> The monthly meeting books are full of the efforts of Quakers to relieve and assist their brethren. At Settle Monthly Meeting in Yorkshire for example, it was agreed to pay 20 shillings a year to William Smith to take on a Richard Heartley as an apprentice who had 'not where with all to bind himself to be a beadsman' but who was 'an honest youth and owning the truth'.<sup>93</sup>

Quaker charity did not conflict with the state system of poor relief for as Arnold Lloyd has pointed out, Quakers 'paid their parish poor rate but as a body they were chiefly concerned to relieve distress amongst their own members'.<sup>94</sup> Friends then were generally independent of parish relief. Lloyd has pointed out how the Six Weeks Meeting of London refused help from parish contributions but he suggests that some other meetings may have entered into negotiations with parish officials. Lloyd also points out that in certain places officials left responsibility for the non-Quaker poor to the Quakers who might provide some temporary help in terms of finding work and then hand responsibility over to the parish

---

<sup>92</sup>George Fox, *Trying of Spirits in Our Age Now as in the Apostles Days*, (London, 1683), p. 13.

<sup>93</sup>B.L.L., Settle Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 10, 10.11. [January] 1666/7. These early minutes are actually from Skipton Monthly Meeting before the reorganization of the meeting system in the late 1660s.

<sup>94</sup>Arnold Lloyd, *Quaker Social History 1669-1738* (London, 1950), p. 32.

for further assistance.<sup>95</sup>

Certainly, evidence from Yorkshire suggests that Quakers did occasionally assist non-Quakers who were in need. A note from the Yorkshire minutes reveals that a payment of 13 shillings and 6 pence was made to George Pocket' being a separatist and...a Presbyterian also very poor'. A sum of 3 shillings and 3 pence was also given to Timothy Marshall, presumably a prisoner and an 'Independent being released by the kings letters patents and pleading poverty'.<sup>96</sup> Lloyd has also estimated that Quaker poor relief was 'at least as high as the highest figure granted by the parish overseers and usually exceeded it by a good margin'.<sup>97</sup>

#### *Preparative Meetings*

Particular meetings were comparable to a congregation. They involved Quakers from a few villages or towns who met weekly for worship and once a month for business in what came to be known as a preparative meeting. This latter meeting was the primary place for the collection of information regarding sufferings and births, deaths and marriages. It was the place where marriage plans and disciplinary matters were first considered.

---

<sup>95</sup>Ibid., p. 34. The Six Weeks Meeting was an assembly of Friends chosen from Quakers in the metropolis who dealt with matters and problems arising from the six London monthly meetings. Its responsibilities were mostly financial. See William Beck and T. Frederick Ball, *The London Friends' Meetings* (London, 1869), p. 91.

<sup>96</sup>B.L.L., Y.Q.M.M., vol. 1, p. 14, 13.1. [March] 1672/3.

<sup>97</sup>Lloyd, p. 34.

## Membership

York Preparative Meeting Minutes provide insight into the nature of membership at this level of organization for the 1670s. David Scott has noted that no formal qualifications existed in relation to membership but points out that the minutes state that church affairs should be the concern of all Friends 'who are in the sense of God's love'.<sup>98</sup> Scott goes on to add that the preparative meeting was always trying to encourage membership of the meeting, rather than restrict it. He notes that between the 1670s and the turn of the century the minutes frequently ask for more attendance owing to 'a great remissness in coming together'.<sup>99</sup> Again the more prosperous members tended to turn up most frequently. From 1670 to 1679 John Taylor, a sugar refiner and merchant attended 31 times; Thomas Waite, a stationer on 30 occasions; John Cox whose occupation is unknown appeared 29 times; George Wainwright, a tailor and meeting house caretaker 26 times; Thomas Bulmer, a gentleman 25 times; Thomas Dennison, a merchant tailor attended on 24 occasions; Walter Merry, perhaps an ex-cornet of horse attended 23 times; John Todd, a mercer 22 times; Edward Nightingale, a grocer 19 times, and Robert Jeeb, a baker on 16 occasions. Other less regular attenders were also of some status. The same pattern was also true of the period 1680 to 1689. More or less the same people

---

<sup>98</sup>Scott, 'Politics, Dissent and Quakerism', p. 80, quoted from York Preparative Meeting Minutes vol. 1 1669-1694, fo. 15.

<sup>99</sup>Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 15, 18, 20, 22, 48, 50, 53, 54, 58, 60, 66, 67, 82, 103, 106, 107, 119.

attended frequently with the addition of some new faces who were also fairly affluent, for example William Joseph Denton, an innholder and William White, a sergemaker.<sup>100</sup>

### Discipline

The preparative meetings were the first place where disciplinary cases were heard and these played an important part in meeting business. A primary task was that of admonishing and reprobating, for example on 3rd January 1677, John Hall and Thomas Dennison were appointed to go and admonish John Bradley for his drinking. By the end of the month the meeting could report that they 'had been with John Bradley' and he owned 'his condemnation...for his outgoings in drink' and that he was 'willing to do what Friends will have him'.<sup>101</sup> Another group were asked to enquire into why a group of male Quakers had failed to attend meetings and why some 'walked disorderly'.<sup>102</sup> One Quaker, a Christopher Lilburne was spoken to regarding singing in meeting and 'did alledge his being drawn out...to express himself by that singing noise in the meetings and...endeavoured to suppress it several times but could not'. The errant member however resolved that he would 'labour to refrain from it'.<sup>103</sup> The meeting also guided members as regards the customs of the society and sought to

---

<sup>100</sup>Ibid., from tables 14 and 15.

<sup>101</sup>B.L.L., York Preparative Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 26, 3.11.[Jan.] 1676/77; p. 27, 31.11.[Jan.] 1676/77.

<sup>102</sup>Ibid., 31.11. [Jan.] 1669/70, p. 6.

<sup>103</sup>Ibid., p. 30, 4.2. [Apr.] 1677.

ensure that these were followed. A minute from 1677 noted that it had been decided that it was 'a popish relic and superstitious custom to give gloves and rosemary or the like at burials'. Some Quakers followed this custom and the meeting declared that it was 'contrary to truth'.<sup>104</sup> The preparative meeting also took care to check on the 'young convinced' each month and appointed different people to do this on a monthly basis.<sup>105</sup>

### Finance

At the preparative level, details from York show that finance was one of the main preoccupations. Friends made collections for their own meeting; in 1678 York Friends agreed on 'a collection the next first day...for the use and service of this meeting'.<sup>106</sup> Collections were also made for the monthly and quarterly meetings.<sup>107</sup> In addition money was sent up through the network of meetings for the 'service of truth' (national stock) and for Quaker captives abroad. A note for December 1679 ordered that a collection in Thomas Dennison's hands should be given to George Wainwright 'to be put in to the rest of the monthly meeting's collections...so it may be all delivered in to the quarterly meeting to answer the

---

<sup>104</sup>Ibid., p. 28, 14.12. [Feb.] 1676/77

<sup>105</sup>Ibid., p. 29, 14.12 [Feb] 1676/77; p. 34 6.4. [June] 1677.

<sup>106</sup>Ibid., p. 45, 6.12. [Feb] 1677/8.

<sup>107</sup>Ibid., p. 78, 8. 7.1686. See appendix 11.

service of the Yearly Meeting'.<sup>108</sup> As may be seen from appendix 11 the money collected for the local meeting went on the relief of poor friends, rents and salaries. Occasionally special collections were made to deal with specific matters such as the building of a meeting house.<sup>109</sup> Members were appointed at intervals to receive the collections, for example in 1677 Cornelius Horsley was chosen to speak about the collection in the meeting the next first day and to receive the same the following week.<sup>110</sup>

### **Charity**

A principal task of the preparative meeting was also to visit the poor and sick each month and to this end Friends were appointed at each meeting to look into these matters. In 1677 for example Thomas Bulmer and Matthew May were chosen to visit the 'newly convinced' and 'poor Friends for the month'.<sup>111</sup>

### **Women's Meetings**

It is worth dwelling on the role of women in Quakerism particularly in relation to organization since the issue has often been overlooked.<sup>112</sup> Admittedly there is a problem of

---

<sup>108</sup>Ibid., p. 51, 17.10. [Dec] 1679; 3.1. [March] 1679/80.

<sup>109</sup>Ibid., p. 23, 1.10. [Dec.] 1675.

<sup>110</sup>Ibid., p. 29, 14.12. [Feb.] 1676/77

<sup>111</sup>Ibid., p. 40, 19.10. [Dec] 1677.

<sup>112</sup>Braithwaite for example spends only a few pages on the subject and refers mostly to London women's meetings which may well have been more sophisticated given that meetings of women

evidence in that women's minutes are often brief and few exist for the 1670s and 80s no doubt due to the difficulty of settling the meetings. Braithwaite has noted how 'the system of meetings became widely established, but with much holding back in some districts.' Thus, the Yearly Meeting had to encourage the setting up of women's meetings in 1675, 1691, 1707 and 1744 and 1745.<sup>113</sup> Helen Forde's work on Derbyshire Quakers has also highlighted the rather disappointing content of women's records; Derbyshire Women's Quarterly Meeting records 'being almost exclusively concerned with payments of poor relief'.<sup>114</sup>

From 1671 at George Fox's instigation, local meetings began to set up separate meetings for women. George Fox saw a clear division between men and women's work and stated,

God saw a service for the assemblies of the women in the time of the law about those things which appertained to his worship and service and the holy things of his tabernacle. And so doth the same spirit see now those services in his gospel and many things in those meetings which is more proper for the women to see into, than the men, and they in the power of God, such things that is not proper for them, they may inform the men and the men may inform the women of such things as are not proper for them as meet-helps.

This appears to have been part of the rationale behind the

---

existed in the late 1650s. *Second Period of Quakerism*, pp. 269-75. Christine Trevett, *Women and Quakerism in the 17th Century* (York, 1995) and Phyllis Mack, *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford, 1992) are useful studies of women but tend not to discuss organization in any detail.

<sup>113</sup>Braithwaite, *Second Period of Quakerism*, p. 274.

<sup>114</sup>Helen Forde, 'Derbyshire Quakers 1650-1761', p. xi.

introduction of women's meetings.<sup>115</sup> Although women were seen as spiritual equals since the concept of the inner light knew no gender boundaries, the actual jobs that women did in their separate meetings were limited to charity, disciplining of women and vetting of marriages, whilst the men's meetings concerned themselves with these and many more other tasks, administrative in the main, recording of sufferings, births, marriages, book distribution, dealings with separatists and most importantly, they were linked very closely with the central meetings and organized representation at these. As Christine Trevett, in her study of Quaker women has noted, 'to the modern student of Quakerism what is most remarkable about the women's meetings for business affairs (after the fact of their existence) is the lack of power associated with them'.<sup>116</sup> Similarly Phyllis Mack has suggested that Fox's system 'aimed at excluding women from a magisterial role within the movement'.<sup>117</sup> Nevertheless, although women might have been limited in the work they did in their meetings, in one important aspect they did have some authority in their jurisdiction over marriage, for they had to give their consent before a marriage could take place. Evidence from Yorkshire which will be shown below also shows that Quakers had responsibility for recording the anti-tithe testimonies of their fellow women, though this does not appear to have been

---

<sup>115</sup>B.L.L., York Women's Yearly and Quarterly Meetings Minutes, 1678-1745, vol. 1, 25/26.4. [June] 1679, p. 42. Copy of an epistle from George Fox dated 4.8. [Oct] 1676.

<sup>116</sup>Trevett, p. 81.

<sup>117</sup>Mack, p. 286.

the case in Sussex.

Women's meetings had actually existed in London from the late 1650s. Sarah Blackbury had been responsible for the setting up of the Box Meeting and the Women's Two Weeks Meeting in London after speaking to George Fox of the need for poor relief and help for the sick in the area.<sup>118</sup> Christine Trevett has suggested that these two meetings 'became a pattern for other women in the 1670s and later'.<sup>119</sup> At the time of the setting up of meetings in the rest of the country an epistle of advice was written by London women and listed many of their functions. Womens' meetings were to be responsible in the following ways:

...to visit the sick and the prisoners that suffer for the testimony of Jesus; to see they are supplied with things needful; and relieving the poor, making provision for the needy, aged, and weak, that are incapable of work; a due consideration for the widows, and care taken of the fatherless children and poor orphans (according to their capacities) for their education and bringing up in good nature and in the fear of the Lord; and putting them out to trades in the wholesome order of the creation. Also the elder women exhorting the younger, in all sobriety, modesty in apparel, and subjection to Truth; and if any should be led aside by the temptations of Satan any way, endeavouring to reclaim such; and to stop tatlers and false reports, and all such things as tend to division amongst us; following those things that make for peace, reconciliation and union. Also admonishing such maids and widows as may be in danger through the

---

<sup>118</sup>The Box Meeting began in the 1650s and was a weekly gathering of 60 women who met to deal with cases of great financial difficulty. Contributions were collected at the meeting and put in a common box, hence the name of the meeting. The Two Weeks Meeting was established in the 1650s and met each fortnight to relieve the sick and the poor. Money was collected at the meeting and some was given by the men's meeting. See Beck and Ball, *The London Friends' Meetings*, pp. 349-353.

<sup>119</sup>Trevett, p. 85.

snare of the enemy, either to marry with unbelievers, or to go to the priest to be married otherwise, and so, to bring reproach or scandal upon Truth or Friends. And that maid servants that profess Truth and want places, be orderly disposed of and settled in their services; and likewise, that the savoury life and good order of Truth, be minded between mistresses and their maids.<sup>120</sup>

The issue of women's meetings was one of the causes of complaint voiced by those separatists in the North involved in the Wilkinson-Story dispute and as a theme it appeared in many anti-Quaker works. Richard Smith, a former Quaker wrote, 'what example or command have you in the scriptures of truth, thus to set up women's meetings, separate and apart, and for what...and call it gospel-order?'. Similarly the Quakers' arch critic, Francis Bugg demanded that Quakers 'show him plain scripture for your women's meetings to be set up monthly, about the 10th hour of the day apart and distinct from the men'.<sup>121</sup>

#### *Women's Quarterly Meetings*

Like their male counterparts, Quaker women met for quarterly meetings, though evidence suggests that in Yorkshire and perhaps other parts of the country, meetings may not have been as frequent as four times a year. A minute recorded in one of the Yorkshire monthly meetings from Lancashire

---

<sup>120</sup>'An epistle from the Women Friends in London to the Women Friends in the Country, also elsewhere about the Service of a Woman's Meeting' (1674), in A.R. Barclay, *Letters &c of Early Friends*, pp. 344-45.

<sup>121</sup>Richard Smith, *The Light Unchangeable* (London, 1679), no pagination; Bugg, *De Christiana Libertate*, 1st part, p. 100.

Quarterly Meeting and signed by Margaret Fox, Sarah Fell the elder and younger stated that 'a general book' should be kept in every 'quarterly or half yearly meeting'.<sup>122</sup> Yorkshire also held yearly meetings. A letter from women in London was addressed 'to the womens yearly meeting at York, and a list exists of the women who attended York Women's Yearly Meeting in 1677.<sup>123</sup>

### **Membership**

Like the mens' quarterly meetings, membership of the parallel womens' gathering was made up of Friends from the lower meetings. Lancashire Womens' Quarterly Meeting advised that 'some of every monthly and particular meeting' ought 'to attend', though the minutes do not reveal how these were to be chosen.<sup>124</sup> The quarterly women's meetings were made up often of relatives of the equivalent men's meeting, for example Clement Picknall, the wife of Mascall Picknall appeared regularly for Sussex women's meeting and Gulielma Penn, wife of William Penn, appeared occasionally at meetings from 1682

---

<sup>122</sup>B.L.L., Knaresborough Womens' Monthly Meeting Minutes 1673-1693, vol. 1, p. 75, Copy of letter entitled, 'From our county womens' meeting in Lancashire to be dispersed abroad among the womens' meetings everywhere'. 20.4. [June] 1677.

<sup>123</sup>Ibid., In reverse at back of volume pp. 160-158, copy of a letter entitled, 'From our womens' meeting in London to the womens' yearly meeting at York', 23.4. [June] 1690. See appendix 12.

<sup>124</sup>Ibid., p. 75, 'From our county womens' meeting in Lancashire...', 20.4. [June] 1677.

to 1684.<sup>125</sup>

Christine Trevett has noted that men's and women's meetings 'sent representatives, as necessary to the business sessions of the other...to discover the progress of business'.<sup>126</sup> Evidence from Sussex seems to confirm this; Sussex Quarterly Meeting Minutes reveal that occasionally women may well have appeared at the men's meetings. One woman, Margery Wilkinson was very important in the early days of the setting up of the men's monthly meetings; she is mentioned in the men's meeting minutes, along with Margery Reynolds and two male Quakers in a list by George Fox which pertained to the establishment of men's monthly meetings in the late 1660s.<sup>127</sup> Whether Wilkinson was actually present at any of the men's quarterly meetings is difficult to ascertain, certainly she is mentioned frequently in relation to a John Hammond of Chichester who was being assisted financially by the men's quarterly meeting 'for carrying on his trade'. The men's minutes note on several occasions that money was given to Wilkinson 'for the use of John Hammond' and she is asked each time to give 'further account to the next meeting' of how the money was spent.<sup>128</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup>E.S.R.O. Sussex Quarterly Meeting Women's Minutes 1677-1696, no pagination, 2.10. [Dec] 1682, 2.8. [Oct] 1682, 24.1. [March] 1684/5.

<sup>126</sup>Trevett, p. 81.

<sup>127</sup>E.S.R.O., S.Q.M.M., p.1, 9.7. [Sept] 1668.

<sup>128</sup>E.S.R.O., S.Q.M.M., p. 60, 24.7. [Aug] 1677; p. 63, 31.10. [Dec.] 1677; p. 65, 1.2. [April] 1678; p. 67, 1.5. [May] 1678.

### Oversight of lower meetings.

A main duty of the womens' quarterly meetings was to provide guidance and advice to the meetings beneath. Quarterly meetings advised that monthly and particular meetings watched for any 'that walks disorderly'. They were also to look into the issue of marriage as 'before the womens' meetings were set up' many had entered marriages 'which brought dishonour'. It was advised that if any 'marry with priest or joineth in marriage with the world' then the women's meeting was 'to send to them, to reprove them and to bear testimony against their acting contrary to the truth'. The higher meeting also urged that collections should be made and that books should be obtained to record and collect the money.<sup>129</sup>

### Finance and Charity

Like their male counterparts, women kept detailed accounts of their financial collections and distribution. Christine Trevett has suggested that 'it was the men who controlled the purse strings' and that women had to submit their accounts to the men each year, though she gives no evidence for this. Research into Sussex and Yorkshire women's minutes does not bear this out, though this may be partly due to the brevity of the women's records. However, there is nothing in the men's records which would substantiate this either.<sup>130</sup>

---

<sup>129</sup>B.L.L., Knaresborough Womens' Monthly Meeting, p. 65, 67, 75, in copy of letter, 'From our county women's meeting in Lancashire', 20.4. [June] 1677.

<sup>130</sup>Trevett, p. 81.

Women's monthly meeting accounts were brought in to the quarterly meeting and any overplus from collections was used as a kind of central stock to provide help to the poor of the lower meetings.<sup>131</sup> The stock helped out in emergencies, for example in 1680 the quarterly meeting noted the plight of Jane Apps of Shoreham and sent ten shillings with the advice that if she required more the monthly meeting was to 'let her have what she stands in need of, and it may be reimbursed to them the next meeting'.<sup>132</sup> This kind of thing was obviously a frequent problem for a few years later it was decided that any monthly meeting whose needs exceeded its income could pay out twenty shillings more and be repaid it by the quarterly meeting.<sup>133</sup>

Women also made their own contributions to the national collections which went up to London; in 1685 the women of Sussex Quarterly Meeting ordered a collection for Quaker captives to be made within 6 weeks 'in all meetings in this county' and it was to be brought up to Clement Picknall, the wife of Mascall Picknall, to go the quarterly meeting.<sup>134</sup>

### ***Women's Monthly Meetings***

#### **Discipline**

One of the principal roles of the women's monthly

---

<sup>131</sup>See appendix 14.

<sup>132</sup>E.S.R.O., Sussex Women's Quarterly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1., 30.10. [Dec.] 1680, no pagination.

<sup>133</sup>Ibid., 27.1. [March] 1682/3.

<sup>134</sup>Ibid., no pagination, 31.1. [March] 1685/6.

meetings, like that of their male equivalent, was that of discipline. At Lewes Women's Monthly Meeting in 1677 a complaint was received of the 'disorderly walking' of Mary Movis and Ann Tuft, who it would appear were involved in some kind of quarrel. It was ordered that two Friends were to 'go and treat with the said two women and seek to make peace between them'. A couple of months later it was reported that the two women 'were agreed'.<sup>135</sup> The same meeting looked into another case of 'disorderly walking' concerning Mary Killingbeck who had taken 'one of the world for her husband' and had been 'married by a priest'. Again two Friends, were called upon to visit her and reported the next month that she 'saith her trouble was so great which made her do that which she cannot stand for to maintain'. The minute does not elaborate on the nature of the 'trouble' but it may possibly have been a pregnancy. However no further action seems to have been taken on the matter.<sup>136</sup>

As well as imposing discipline it was also the responsibility of the quarterly meeting to issue guidance to the full membership. Richmond Monthly Meeting of Yorkshire agreed with the women's quarterly meeting in guarding against 'unrighteous practices' such as 'christenings' and 'churchings' and in ensuring that women keep to all that is 'suitable to modesty, comeliness, gravity, solidity' and out

---

<sup>135</sup>E.S.R.O., Lewes Women's Monthly Meeting Minutes, 1677-1709, vol. 1, 17.8. [Oct.] 1677; 19.10. [Dec.] 1677, no pagination.

<sup>136</sup>Ibid., 18.5. [July] 1677; 15.6. [Aug.] 1677, no pagination.

of 'the vanities and superfluities of those newfangled foolish fashions of the world'.<sup>137</sup>

### Marriage

The supervision of marriage procedures was a key function of the women's monthly meetings. As in the men's meetings, the primary purpose of the women was to make sure that the prospective partners were 'clear' from other people. At Lewes Monthly Meeting in August 1677 Grace Pearse and Susannah Gates were ordered to look into the case of Thomas Snashfold who wished to marry Sarah Eger, especially in relation to past friendships. At a meeting the following month a paper was produced by Elizabeth Hammond which stated that Snashfold had previously 'a desire of marriage to me' and went on to state that 'seeing it could not be received by me he desired that it might be as if there had never been any such intention in him which was my desire also'. Following this statement the women's meeting decided that the marriage should take place 'at a meeting appointed on purpose at Paine's Place'.<sup>138</sup>

### Tithes

The women's meetings spent a great deal of time in ensuring that anti-tithe testimonies were upheld. Yorkshire Women's Quarterly Meeting requested the monthly meetings to

---

<sup>137</sup>B.L.L., York Womens' Yearly and Quarterly Meetings Minutes 1678-1745, vol. 1, pp. 52-3, 1.1. [March] 1681.

<sup>138</sup>E.S.R.O., Lewes Women's Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, no pagination, 15.6. [Aug] 1677; 17.7. [Sept] 1677; 4.8. [Oct] 1677.

take 'care and diligence in bringing in your several testimonies against tithes and steeplehouse dues.<sup>139</sup> The women's meeting made lists of testimonies as they came in from monthly and preparative meetings. For example, the women of Brighouse Monthly Meeting in the West Riding of Yorkshire sent in their testimony which stated that Christ had

changed and ended that priesthood that lived upon tithes and that law that gave them and through the ability of his grace our desire is to be a faithful testimony against them together with those unchristian burdens relating to priests, churches and steeplehouses.<sup>140</sup>

### Charity

Women's meetings played an important role in the supervision of poor relief which was one of their chief responsibilities. Fox encouraged women in 1671 when setting up women's meetings to 'keep a little stock amongst themselves to help the poor and what they cannot do in such cases they may inform the men'.<sup>141</sup> Women of the monthly meeting were often appointed to visit those in need and to assess their situations, for example at Lewes Monthly Meeting in 1678, Mary Harman and 'the widow Wigram' were chosen to visit widow Apse at Shoreham 'to enquire how it is with her' as the meeting had been advised that the latter needed help and they were asked

---

<sup>139</sup>B.L.L., York Women's Yearly and Quarterly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 3, 25/26.4. [June] 1679.

<sup>140</sup>Ibid., p. 9, 2.4. [June] 1678.

<sup>141</sup>Lloyd, p. 112.

to 'bring in the answer to the next meeting'.<sup>142</sup>

## Finance

Finance was an important issue on the agenda of women's monthly meetings for it allowed them to carry out their charity work. Money was spent mostly on relief of the poor and for schooling of children.<sup>143</sup> It was collected from each of the meetings that made up the monthly meeting and distributed to those in need.<sup>144</sup> Keepers of the public stock were appointed from time to time; for example in 1677 Lewes Women's Monthly Meeting appointed Ann Parsons to look after it 'until further order'.<sup>145</sup> Occasionally the monthly meetings might omit quarterly meeting collections if they wanted to contribute to other collections; Horsham Women's Meeting, for example decided to forgo such a collection in favour of contributing to the 'service of truth' and 'redemption of captives' [Quakers held prisoner abroad], thus indicating a degree of flexibility in local financial arrangements.<sup>146</sup>

The quarterly meeting stock could be used in emergencies by the monthly meetings if they ran out of stock, for example

---

<sup>142</sup>E.S.R.O., Lewes Women's Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, unpaginated, 15.3. [May] 1678.

<sup>143</sup>B.L.L., York Women's Monthly Meeting Minutes 1674-1767, vol. 1, p. 4, 1.4. [June] 1675.

<sup>144</sup>See appendix 15.

<sup>145</sup>E.S.R.O., Lewes Women's Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, unpaginated, 24.7. [Sept] 1677.

<sup>146</sup>Surrey Record Office, Kingston, Horsham Women's Monthly Meeting Minutes 1675-1692 vol. 1, unpaginated, 10.8. [Oct] 1679.

in 1681, Lewes Women's Monthly Meeting was under 'a necessity of a further supply' for three widows and it was agreed that the superior meeting should be approached for £1, 10 shillings.<sup>147</sup>

### *Separation*

Separation was not a problem in Sussex, perhaps owing to its reasonably close proximity to London and the presence on the quarterly meeting of influential Quakers such as Ambrose Rigge, often present at the Second Day Morning Meeting though not one of that small circle that tended to dominate, and William Penn who made appearances in the mid 1680s. By contrast, Yorkshire was more dependent on the correspondent system and the links with the Yearly Meeting.

The separation that occurred in Yorkshire, stemmed from Friends in York Monthly Meeting and according to David Scott affected between a third and a quarter of Quakers in the city of York, the majority of whom had been convinced prior to 1670 and clung more tenaciously than other Quakers to the idea of spiritual freedom.<sup>148</sup> Dissatisfaction also appeared in other meetings, notably Kelk and Owstwick Monthly meetings, though they did not go as far as separation. The main issue which sparked off the schism at York was the decision in the monthly meeting not to allow remarriage within twelve months of the death of a spouse. The idea of a 12 month limit for Quakers

---

<sup>147</sup>E.S.R.O., Lewes Women's Monthly Meeting, vol. 1, no pagination, 15.4. [June] 1681.

<sup>148</sup>Scott, *Quakerism in York*, p. 18.

was first put forward by George Fox in 1667, with the qualification though that it was 'better to marry than to burn'.<sup>149</sup> In 1682 York Monthly Meeting had refused permission to marry to one of its leading members, John Hall. Earlier in 1680 the quarterly meeting had stated that those that married within 12 months went 'out of the divine order of God's holy, precious and unspotted truth'. Such marriages they said were 'not only disowned and denied by Friends but also disowned and condemned by other sober, moderate people both in our age and in ages and generations past'.<sup>150</sup> David Scott has commented that York Friends' desire to keep to the marriage testimony and the 12 month ban was not so much out of missionary zeal as to maintain a good example among 'the sober people'.<sup>151</sup>

By 1684 York Monthly Meeting noted how Edward Nightingale, John Cox and Thomas Dennison had 'set up a separate meeting apart by themselves with some others' and had altered 'the first days meetings into another method than had formerly been used amongst Friends'.<sup>152</sup> A paper presented to York Monthly Meeting from John Cox, Thomas Dennison, Edward Nightingale, John Hall and Robert Stone attacked the ruling on hasty marriage as being,

untruthlike, anti-scriptural, and contrary to the doctrine that binds not men nor requires obedience from no believer farther than what they come into

---

<sup>149</sup>Ibid., p. 20. From F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 5, fo. 41, George Fox, 'Right Marriages' (1667).

<sup>150</sup>B.L.L., Y.Q.M.M., vol. 1, p. 14, 22/23.10. [Dec] 1680.

<sup>151</sup>Scott, *Quakerism in York*, p. 20.

<sup>152</sup>B.L.L., York Men's Monthly Meeting Minutes, 1682-1707, vol. 2, p. 24, 2.3. [May] 1684.

the understanding of and the acknowledgement of and sense of, by the Lord's teaching and leadings of his spirit in their own hearts.

The issue of personal freedom as opposed to church authority was of concern here for the separatists went on to say that, 'the Lord is the alone lawgiver...and can only bind and loose the conscience'.<sup>153</sup> In another letter, entitled 'A General Epistle to the Christian Churches', York Monthly Meeting members were accused of apostacy, which was likened to those who the separatists said, pretended to 'worship God' and 'own Christ'. They went on to say that their Quaker opponents by, denying the sufficiency of his [Christ's] spiritual and inward government, have set up their own inventions and commandments, and then have imposed conformity and uniformity thereunto'.<sup>154</sup>

A further letter to York Monthly Meeting in 1684 stated that the Quaker separatists would 'bear all your censures and all mens' judgements whatsoever, for 'tis little to us for Christ's sake who is the only Lord and lawgiver to our consciences and we cannot submit to the rudiments of men.' The letter went on to say that the Lord was 'to have the alone preheminence that worketh and leadeth into all righteousness'.<sup>155</sup>

Further more specific concerns of the separatists can be seen from a pamphlet published against them. The orthodox

---

<sup>153</sup>B.L.L., Letters and Papers Respecting the Separatists 1683-1708, hereafter cited as L.P.S., p. 9, 'At a monthly meeting in York' 7.10.[Dec.].no year .

<sup>154</sup>Ibid., , No. 1, p. 5, 'A General Epistle to the Christian Churches', 6.7.[Sept] 1683,

<sup>155</sup>B.L.L., York Mens Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 2, p. 26, 6.4.[June] 1684.

Friends of York noted how the separatists disliked Friends' practice 'of recording the judgement of Truth upon the open and scandalous offences of any under the profession thereof' and they replied to this by stating that keeping a record of offences was 'consistent with the testimony and service of truth, for the clearing thereof' and 'consistent also with the practice of the holy men of old who gave forth the scriptures'. As with the separatists in other areas, Thomas Curtis and William Rogers in Reading and the Wilkinson-Story party in Westmorland, the York separatists also objected to women's meetings.<sup>156</sup> York separatists objected to women's meetings having jurisdiction over marriage, because along with the men's meeting they also had to approve any marriage. The opponents of the separatists stated how they seemed

to scruple at our women's meetings, on the occasion of any distinct concern for them in the service of truth, as if no allowance could be proved (as you say) from the spirit of Christ, and the practices of the primitive churches.

The reply of York Friends was to say that the practice was consistent 'with the apostles' testimony' and they went on to validate women's meetings by describing how women were 'made partakers of the gift of God's spirit', male and female being 'all one in the Lord'. An important insight into Quaker patriarchy is contained in another statement by them which stated that women's meetings were 'necessary and commendable to inspect infirmities and weaknesses more particularly attending their sex' in addition to the care of widows 'and the female children left fatherless, or in need, settled and

---

<sup>156</sup>See chapter 2.

provided for'.<sup>157</sup> It is striking that the Quaker separatists, the proponents of decentralization and democracy were also against extending similar rights to women. Phyllis Mack has noted that the separatists tended to be more 'bourgeois and more status conscious' than George Fox's party; they were usually urban-dwellers and men of commerce, whilst Fox's followers tended more towards middling, yeoman status along with a few gentry Friends. It has also been proposed that the poorer northern counties favoured the women's meetings because they provided useful and inexpensive ways of dealing with concerns such as apprenticeships for children and the upbringing of children in Quaker ways.<sup>158</sup>

The separatist issue in York was evidently referred to the leaders of the Quaker organization. A letter from George Fox to John Blacklinge, a prisoner in York Castle who had become involved in the case stated that Fox and Whitehead and some others had read correspondence from Blacklinge dated 9th May. Fox went on to reprove Blacklinge, saying that,

And I and we would have wished that you had not mentioned to them the Yearly Meeting's consideration concerning them for that will make their foolish conceited spirits to huff and swell big, that by it they might be taken more notice of, and to make them more popular and known than they are.

Fox advocated that the monthly and quarterly meeting deal with them as they were 'in the authority and power of God...sufficient to stand over them...' and went on to say,

---

<sup>157</sup>B.L.L., L.P.S., 'Truth Exalted, and the peaceable fellowship and Exercise thereof vindicated against the abusive clamours of a dividing false spirit' (1685), No. 7, p. 17; pp. 19-20.

<sup>158</sup>Mack, pp. 298-300.

'we had rather that they might judge and condemn than we'. Again with reference to the Yearly Meeting Fox felt that it was not 'fit to have such filthy spirits their names mentioned publically in a yearly meeting so far off.' No doubt Fox did not wish to discuss the problem in a yearly meeting forum which might have added to separatist claims against orthodox Quakerism.<sup>159</sup>

The separatists were in fact condemned at Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting in June 1684 but entreated to return to 'their first love and do their first works and be restored again into the ancient life and fellowship'.<sup>160</sup> In reply the separatists stated that they were against the decision of the quarterly meeting to limit re-marriage since they felt 'that meeting hath no power invested or inherent in it by virtue of its constitution...nor ever since were the members thereof imbued with such a legislative power'. However they added that they were content that the monthly and quarterly meeting saw fit to limit the remarriage period to 12 months if they saw it as their duty provided they kept 'in the true charity with such as could not take...your advice'.<sup>161</sup> Again the issue at stake was one of church authority and spiritual freedom; the separatists proclaimed that they did not know of 'any true power that you have over us, that we may, or ought not to have

---

<sup>159</sup>B.L.L., L.P.S, No. 4, p. 15, George Fox to John Blacklinge, 18.3. [May] 1684.

<sup>160</sup>Ibid., No. 5, 'A Paper of Condemnation passed at York together with a Paper written by way of answer thereunto, p. 4. 19.4. [June] 1684.

<sup>161</sup>Ibid., No. 5, p. 11.

over you'. The separatists were coming close to the congregationalist view which 'agreed in asserting the independence of the local congregation from any higher ecclesiastical authority'.<sup>162</sup> They went on to spell out their position in more detail when they stated

Yet we hope we may deny that any assembly of men, though they may call themselves a church, have power to make, ordain, or constitute any order of rule 'de nova', that can, shall or ought in the church to be concluding beyond the conviction or concurrence of others; if so, then where the concurrence of others cannot be had, there ought, according to the Gospel Order, to be a waiting on such 'till conviction; for the same way that gathered us to be a people must preserve us in the unity of that spirit to which at first we were gathered.<sup>163</sup>

Although there was little separatism in the other Yorkshire meetings, there were however disagreements with the quarterly meeting over the limitation on remarriage. The problems came from the East Yorkshire monthly meetings of Owstwick and Elloughton. Owstwick objected to a paper of the quarterly meeting concerning remarriage as it did 'not take off the limitation, but rather cautioned Friends to do nothing contrary thereunto'. The monthly meeting felt that they could not 'concur' and returned the paper to the quarterly meeting not 'by way of refraction' but because they wished 'to be left to their own freedom'.<sup>164</sup> In reply the quarterly meeting stated that it did not wish to limit 'the Lord and the motion of his spirit' but only a 'forward hasty mind'. It reiterated

---

<sup>162</sup>Watts, *The Dissenters*, pp. 98-99.

<sup>163</sup>B.L.L., L.P.S., No. 5, p. 9,

<sup>164</sup>B.L.L., Y.Q.M.M., vol. 2, 1681-1698, p. 21,  
3/4.8. [Oct.] 1683

the 12 month sanction as being 'little enough for forbearance from marriage' but it appears that some leeway was allowed as the meeting stated that with regard to marriages that did occur within the time limit on account of 'urgent occasions', Friends were to be cautious.<sup>165</sup> Problems also occurred in Elloughton Monthly Meeting and the quarterly meeting sent a similar letter stating that whatever was decided at a quarterly meeting should be implemented with caution...'as might best answer the truth'.<sup>166</sup>

It would appear that the quarterly meeting experienced considerable trouble from some of the representatives from Owstwick and Elloughton monthly meetings. A letter from Owstwick to the quarterly meeting complained that its representatives had 'been denied audience' and their equal and reasonable requests...sleighted'. The quarterly meeting replied that John Lyth had represented Owstwick and had 'been very tedious in raising up objections and unnecessary scruples' and was known to have abetted 'some persons...who have separated themselves from the public meeting and assembly of Friends in the county of York'. The quarterly meeting warned Owstwick to be careful in their choice of representatives and to choose those whose 'concern would be more comfortable [conformable] to them'.<sup>167</sup> A similar letter was sent to Elloughton which stated that all people sent by monthly meetings might have liberty to speak in the quarterly

---

<sup>165</sup>Ibid., p. 22

<sup>166</sup>Ibid., p. 44a, 30/31.10. [Dec] 1685

<sup>167</sup>Ibid., pp. 43a-44, 30/31 10. [Dec] 1685.

meeting 'without interruption, provided they be such as are in unity with Friends'. As with Owstwick, reference was made to a representative, John Hogg, who had caused disturbance in the meeting and who was also known to have had links with the York separatists.<sup>168</sup>

It may well be that a small separation took place in Thirsk Monthly Meeting in the North Riding around 1672. Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting sent a letter to the 'apostates' belonging Thirsk Monthly Meeting, in which it describes members there as having 'gone out...into looseness and carelessness and other disorderly practices as bad marriages', and warns them to come to repentance. Unfortunately Thirsk minutes do not shed any further light on the issue.<sup>169</sup>

The issue of authority within the movement also reared its head in Pontefract Monthly Meeting at the beginning of 1656. A paper was sent to the quarterly meeting containing a number of queries. It asked what members did the quarterly meeting consist of, with whom did the power of judging lie and a final question asked if there was any freedom to appeal from any order or judgement given at quarterly meetings. The respective replies from the quarterly meeting were that elders, [those who were 'grown' in the truth] brethren and 'others' should attend the higher meeting; that the power of judging lay with the 'divine spirit' and 'those persons gathered together as aforesaid', and that in the case of an unsatisfactory judgement the case could be put before another

---

<sup>168</sup>Ibid., p. 45, 30/31. 10. [Dec] 1685.

<sup>169</sup>Y.Q.M.M., vol. 1, p. 12a, - 9. [Nov] 1672.

meeting, though no indication was given of the level of meeting.<sup>170</sup>

It has been suggested that there may have been a financial element in the separation in Yorkshire. R.M. Faithorn notes the concern among Leeds Friends in 1679 that 'more money was brought up to this quarterly meeting than was made use of' and he has suggested that the York crisis had the effect of producing similar criticism of the collection and distribution of money. Holderness and Elloughton meetings accused the quarterly meeting of 'getting and detaining money' and not fulfilling obligations to relieve distressed Quakers. Disatisfaction also arose in Pontefract Meeting on the same issue and it advised its quarterly meeting representatives to withhold its contributions until the matter had been investigated.<sup>171</sup> The quarterly meeting stated in reply that it had declined to give money ear-marked for sufferings for other purposes and allowed its account books to be inspected by meeting representatives.<sup>172</sup>

The problems of separation in Yorkshire were resolved by the 1690s. That in Yorkshire gradually petered out with only four separatists left to the knowledge of the quarterly meeting in 1690: Cox, Nightingale, Dennison and Winnard.

---

<sup>170</sup>West Yorkshire Archives, Wakefield, Pontefract Monthly Meeting Minutes 1672-1700 (transcript), p. 47a, 10/11.11. [Jan] 1686.

<sup>171</sup>R.M. Faithorn, 'Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth Century Yorkshire', M.Phil., University of Leeds, 1982, pp. 525, Y.Q.M.M., vol. 1, pp. 56, 11, 43-45; Pontefract Monthly Meeting Minutes 11.6.1685.

<sup>172</sup>Ibid., p. 527, Y.Q.M.M., vol. 2, pp. 43-4.

Similarly, the problems in Elloughton died down by 1696 when the meeting was reconciled to the quarterly meeting.<sup>173</sup>

#### *Comparison with other types of Dissenting Organization*

The church structure of the General Baptists was similar to Quakerism with its three tier system of local churches, district associations and General Assembly. Certainly their district associations sound strikingly similar to the Quaker monthly meetings. These gatherings considered disciplinary matters that had been referred up to them and 'undertook welfare commitments beyond the resources of particular churches'.<sup>174</sup> As in Quakerism, great emphasis was placed on relieving poor members. The General Baptist Declaration of Faith of 1660, stated that, 'the poor saints belonging to the Church of Christ, are to be sufficiently provided for by the churches, that they neither want food or rayment, and this by a free and voluntary contribution, (and not of necessity, or by the constraint or power of the magistrate)'. Money was spent on helping the destitute and even extended, as in the case of the Quakers, to giving aid to those in debt.<sup>175</sup>

The rigorous disciplinary system of the Baptists was also very similar to the Quaker one. Members would be admonished for failure to attend services and were encouraged to settle

---

<sup>173</sup> Faithorn, p. 529.

<sup>174</sup> J.F. McGregor, 'The Baptists: Fount of all Heresy', in McGregor and Reay, (eds.), *Radical Religion in the English Revolution*, p. 34.

<sup>175</sup> Ibid., pp. 43-44.

disputes amongst themselves.<sup>176</sup> Baptists dealt with disorderly behaviour such as drunkenness, fornication, swearing, gambling and indulgence in certain pastimes such as dancing, though they placed more emphasis than Quakers on doctrinal errors. The administration of discipline, like that of the Quakers, followed apostolic example involving admonition privately and publicly, followed by excommunication if repentance was not forthcoming.<sup>177</sup>

### **Conclusion**

An analysis of the local organization established by George Fox after 1666 yields a number of insights into the vexed question of how Quakers survived and developed as a movement and came to be accepted and included in the toleration of 1689. The system of local meetings, in conjunction with the central organization, allowed a degree of control over Quakers which was not possible in the 1650s and early 1660s and for this reason it must be seen as a key transition in Quakerism, more so than the effect which the Restoration had upon Friends. The decisions made at the yearly meeting could be easily disseminated to the monthly meetings via the representatives from quarterly meetings and problems could be referred back up the chain, thus ensuring a certain degree of conformity.

The establishment of the network of local meetings by Fox

---

<sup>176</sup>C.E. Whiting, *Studies in English Puritanism from the Restoration to the Revolution 1660-1668* (London, 1931), p. 96

<sup>177</sup>Ibid., p. 45.

was essential for two reasons. Most importantly it confirmed the move away from the individual leadings of the spirit to that of adhering to the group witness at meetings. There was bound to be some opposition to the change such as that which has been described in the case of Yorkshire and in that of the Wilkinson-Story Separation. The establishment of Quaker discipline was also important in another way in terms of the image that Quakers presented to the world; although this was not their primary concern, Quakers nevertheless were eager to ensure that Friends did not act below the 'standards of the world'. The fact that fairly prosperous men predominated on these meetings must also have helped in terms of image. It is clear that without the establishment of the very systematic and effective network of local meetings, the Society of Friends would have had an almost impossible task in their attempts to be included in the act of 1689.

## CHAPTER 4

### *QUAKER LEADERSHIP c.1650 - c.1670*

#### *Introduction*

An analysis of the leadership of the Quaker movement during the later seventeenth century also has much potential light to shed on the eventual toleration achieved in 1689. The early movement relied strongly on the charismatic personalities of various leaders, most importantly George Fox and other influential figures such as James Nayler, yet this type of leadership is always fairly fragile, owing to its dependence usually on a single figure. The need for security and survival after the Restoration, led Fox to establish the local meeting system and to centralize authority at London. This had the effect of gradually changing the nature of the Quaker leadership during the 1670s and 80s as authority began to emanate from the central meetings in London and percolated down to the local level. In this chapter we will be concerned with development over the first two decades.

The historiography of early Quakerism has increasingly been revised in relation to this issue of leadership. The traditional view of Fox as founder and leader owed much of its origin to the survival of George Fox's *Journal* in which Fox cast himself very much in the role of first Friend relating, for example how, 'the truth sprang up in Leicestershire [Fox's birthplace] in 1644, and in Warwickshire in 1645, and in

Nottinghamshire in 1646...'<sup>1</sup> W.C. Braithwaite's study of Quakerism marks out Fox as 'the founder of Quakerism' but was one of the first to give prominence to other early Quakers. Fox is cast in the role of leader, albeit ably assisted by people such as William Dewsbury and James Nayler and others. Braithwaite states that important figures like Farnworth, Dewsbury and Nayler had undergone similar experiences to Fox before they had even met with him. Indeed he goes on to say that the North, where these men came from proved to be the hub of the movement in terms of conversions and finance, despite Fox's earlier work in the Midlands.<sup>2</sup>

Barry Reay has criticized the Fox-centred tradition more radically, suggesting that the *Journal* has dominated perceptions of early Quakerism and the image of Fox has eclipsed other Quakers of equal importance. As Reay says, 'if we think ourselves into the 1650s we find Nayler, Farnworth, Dewsbury, Richard Hubberthorne, Edward Burrough, any of whom were then as important or influential as Fox'. Reay has very much demoted Fox, viewing the Quaker movement as 'less a gathering of eager proselytes at the feet of a charismatic prophet, than a linking of advanced Protestant separatists into a loose kind of church fellowship with a coherent ideology and a developing code of ethics.'<sup>3</sup> Reay has seen Fox's main contribution in the development of the meeting

---

<sup>1</sup>*Journal of George Fox*, John. L. Nickalls, (ed.), (Cambridge, 1952, repr. London, 1986), p. 709.

<sup>2</sup>Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 86.

<sup>3</sup>Reay, *Quakers and the English Revolution*, p. 9.

system in the later 1660s and suggests that he only became leader because of the deaths of other influential Quakers such as Nayler, Burrough and Hubberthorne. Hugh Barbour in a similar vein has pointed out that as Fox's *Journal* is one of few sources for the beginnings of the movement this 'gives greater prominence to his work and personality than even his leadership warranted'.<sup>4</sup>

R.H. Evans, on the other hand, has defended the Fox-centred approach. He notes that Braithwaite's point about the importance of other Quakers in the early movement has been developed by other historians 'into an explicit rejection of the Fox-centred account of Quaker origins'. He has suggested that this criticism has two 'prongs': the part which other leaders played has 'been magnified at Fox's expense' and more emphasis has been put on 'the element of spontaneous growth in Quakerism'.<sup>5</sup> Evans defends the view of Fox as the founder of Quakerism, arguing that the establishment of Quakerism in Leicestershire did not only date from the mission from the North in 1654-5 involving Fox and others, but also stemmed from Fox's travels on his own before 1650. He suggests that in 1655 Fox was visiting places that he had already become familiar with and that 'the object of his tour was mainly to revive old contacts and recharge the faith of adherents he had

---

<sup>4</sup>Barbour, *Quakers in Puritan England*, p. 33.

<sup>5</sup>R.H. Evans, '"The Truth First Sprang up in Leicestershire": George Fox, 1624-1691 and the origins of Quakerism'. *The Leicester Archaeological Society Transactions*, lxvi (1992), p. 124.

gained in earlier days'.<sup>6</sup> While he admits that Fox's message may not have been entirely novel, he points to the powerful forces of Fox's personality and suggests that he did have something fresh to offer those people who perhaps had already reached the Quaker position. As Evans says, 'It may be...that his prophetic confidence helped to transform their negative rejection of formalized religion into a positive faith in the validity of the position they had reached'. He goes on to add that 'at the least his [Fox's] presence seems to have served as the catalyst which transformed the lives of so many local leaders'.<sup>7</sup>

Recently, Rosemary Moore has also pointed to the prominence of Fox in the movement whilst at the same time not undermining the importance of figures such as Farnworth, Thomas Aldam, Fell and Nayler. She has noted that 'throughout the 1650s Fox was always the leading Quaker as far as Quakers themselves were concerned, and that his view of a situation, and his judgement regarding a course of action, would be accepted'.<sup>8</sup>

The most recent assessment of Fox's position comes in the biography of Larry Ingle. As the title of his book suggests, he sees Fox as 'first Friend', the founder and leader of the movement, especially early on, but he too admits that the *Journal* has 'served to distort the actual record, for Fox

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 132.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 125.

<sup>8</sup>Rosemary Moore, 'The Faith of the First Quakers', p. 255.

naturally placed himself at the centre of the movement, even in the 1660s and 1670s when his travels to the colonies, lengthy imprisonments, and debilitating illnesses forced him to step aside and permit others to bear more responsibility'.<sup>9</sup>

The truth probably lies somewhere in the middle; Reay gives little attention to Fox, perhaps because he wishes to emphasise the more radical wing of the movement, which involved people like Edward Burrough, George Bishop, James Parnell and George Fox the Younger (no relation of Fox). An investigation of some of the other early Quaker leaders such as James Nayler and Richard Farnworth who will be discussed below reveals just how influential they were. Nayler, for example, was an invaluable preacher and writer; his output during the 1650s was greater than Fox's and he wrote more eloquently. Margaret Fell too was very important and has been given too small a role in early Quakerism; without her status, patronage and great organizing abilities it is difficult to imagine that the movement would have thrived so well in the 1650s.

Just how important was George Fox then in the first decades of the movement? Early Quakerism fought against any ideas of authority and hierarchy, part of the reason for its success, and so obviously there were no formal positions or offices, for people were to be led by the will of God or the 'power of the Lord'. In these circumstances governance usually stems from personality or force of will. It would be true to say that early Quakerism was indeed to a considerable degree

---

<sup>9</sup>Ingle, *First Among Friends*, p. 251.

the product of the cult of personality, principally that of George Fox. An analysis of the Swarthmore manuscripts at Friends' House shows that Fox much more than others was seen as someone with special attributes; with the exception of James Nayler, he was by far the most charismatic. Fox fits Max Weber's model of charismatic authority quite well. Weber applies the term 'charisma' to,

a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual is treated as a leader.

In this type of authority the charismatic leader is obeyed as a result of personal trust, devotion, loyalty etc.<sup>10</sup> Of course the Quakers' central belief in the 'inner light' meant that they all experienced what they felt were direct leadings from God but it is clear that Fox was perceived as having been accorded special powers or authority. The effusive language used towards Fox appears to be reserved only for him, with the exception of that used towards James Nayler by his followers, especially in the Bristol incident which will be discussed below, and occasionally to Margaret Fell.<sup>11</sup>

There are a plethora of examples as regards attitudes to George Fox. A letter to Fox in 1656 suggested that he had unequalled gifts. The writer said 'I am weary and burdened

---

<sup>10</sup>Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans. A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (London, 1947, repr., 1964), pp. 358-359.

<sup>11</sup>See for example F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 3, fo. 17, Edward Burrough to Margaret Fell, 1655.

until I come...where thou feedest thy flock, in the day time where none is equal with thee'. He went on to add of Fox, 'above all men art thou called blessed of him who sanctifies and cleanses the heart'.<sup>12</sup> The Quaker Peter Evans, writing from Barbadoes in 1658 clearly recognized Fox as a leader and endowed with special qualities when he wrote,

In the truth (into which thou hast begot many and in which as a father thou hast rule and dominion) do I dearly salute thee, knowing thy steadfastness therein by which thou art honoured, and thereof art worthy yea even of double honour...thou hast been made an able minister through the double portion which is given thee (it is not thy person for that I never saw that I know) but the gift of God in thee which is honoured and which is accounted worthy...<sup>13</sup>

In the early 1660s, Edward Cooke told Fox 'that the Lord hath a delight in thee and anointed thee with the horn of his salvation who hath exalted his son that generations to come may call thee blessed'.<sup>14</sup> Another Quaker called Fox a 'father of the faithful' and described him as someone 'divine, in whom the spirit of the living God dwells bodily' and 'a most excellent orator, and wise understanding counsellor'.<sup>15</sup> A further example comes from a Quaker who wrote to Fox saying 'the Lord doth order all things in great wisdom in thee and I see he commands powerfully through thee'.<sup>16</sup> Again, a letter

---

<sup>12</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 1, fo. 6, A.G. to G.F. 1656

<sup>13</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 3, fo. 110, Peter Evans to George Fox, 28.2. [April] 1658.

<sup>14</sup>Swarthmore MSS, 4 fo. 125, Edward Cooke 24.11. [Jan] 1663/4.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., fo. 59, Nathaniel Weston to G.F. 20.4. [June] 1661.

<sup>16</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 1, fo. 39, undated.

signed from 'the babe E.T. to the strong man in Christ G.F.', refers to Fox as 'thou blessed man of God' and goes on to say that

my life and soul saluteth thee and the overflowings of the everlasting love of my heavenly father rusheth forth unto thee...I have thee in remembrance, as one whom the Lord hath honoured and crowned with dignity which never will fade away for thou art, and shalt be forever blessed of God.<sup>17</sup>

James Nayler can also be found writing to Fox in fulsome terms. In an early letter of 1654 Nayler wrote to Fox, 'Dearly beloved in whom my soul is refreshed and nourished. In thy bosom is my life, my heart is much with thee thou faithful one over the flock of God. They that love thee are beloved of the Father'.<sup>18</sup> One of the most adulatory of letters came from Thomas Curtis though parts of this have been obscured; he wrote, 'Dear G.F. who art the father of all the faithful who are redeemed out of the earth and who hath with the Lord the understanding of thousands by which thou...called God the Father'.<sup>19</sup>

Rosemary Moore has noted that 'owing to the small number of surviving letters that passed between other Friends, one cannot be sure if other Friends were habitually addressed in these terms'. However Moore cites a letter from Richard Farnworth to Fox and Nayler which perhaps helps to show the difference of esteem in which the two were held. The salutation to Fox begins 'My heart, my life, my oneness, thou

---

<sup>17</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 3, fo. 120, E. Trot to George Fox, 2. 4. [June] 1662.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., fo. 76 James Nayler to George Fox, 1654.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., fo. 87, 1658, T.C. to G.F.

art ever with me', whilst that to Nayler uses less high-flown language and says 'dear brother my dear love to thee'.<sup>20</sup> It must be noted that it was not unusual for Quakers to write to each other in effusive language. The difference in the letters to Fox lies in the fact that he was given the highest praise and frequently referred to as being without equal.

Referring to this extravagant language used primarily towards Fox and Nayler, Geoffrey Nuttall has asked whether Quaker followers' belief in the indwelling spirit of God led them to see Fox and Nayler as the Messiah. Nuttall stresses that 'the widespread extravagance with which language was used at this period' must be remembered, 'especially in religious circles of Ranter complexion'. Secondly he adds that the Quaker emphasis on the spirit of God within led to 'a real danger that some Quakers, in recognizing the presence of God's spirit in their leaders, would exalt those leaders unduly'.<sup>21</sup>

Recently Richard Bailey has gone further than Nuttall and reassessed the nature and meaning of the messianic, high flown language used in Quakerism, particularly with regard to George Fox. Moreover, he has pointed to changing patterns of authority in terms of the 'divinisation' and 'de-divinisation' of George Fox. Bailey describes how Fox believed in 'celestial inhabitation'- that Quakers were inhabited by the body of Christ. Bailey has suggested that 'for Fox, the presence of this celestial Christ was concrete, graphic and visceral. It

---

<sup>20</sup>Moore, 'Faith of the First Quakers', pp. 57, 35-6, quoted from Swarthmore MSS, 3, fo. 58.

<sup>21</sup>Nuttall, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 182-183.

was not a figurative presence. Nor was it a disembodied spirit presence'. He adds however that Fox was not referring to the outer flesh of Jesus but to the heavenly body that was part of the pre-existent or pre-incarnate Christ.<sup>22</sup> Bailey has claimed that the belief that the ordinary person became Christ, in some sense, was fundamental to early Quakerism. This doctrine explains the high flown language which Quakers used to address each other. Bailey insists that this was not 'excessive emotionalism or immaturity and it was more than salutary language. It was the natural, indeed the only, reasonable language of divinized creatures'.<sup>23</sup> He cites numerous cases where Quakers call Fox a God, for example Richard Sale wrote of Fox as 'thou God of life and power...glory, glory to thy name forevermore...Praises, praises, eternal praises to thee forevermore, who was and is to come, who is god over all, blessed forever, amen'.<sup>24</sup> Bailey further asserts that 'Quakers used exalted language towards Fox both to a greater degree and in a qualitatively different sense...Fox was treated differently and he was exalted in a way reserved for no other Quaker'. Titles such as Son of God, the first and the last were given to Fox, which Bailey points out were usually

---

<sup>22</sup>Richard G. Bailey, *New Light on George Fox and Early Quakerism: the Making and Unmaking of a God* (San Francisco: 1992), pp. 79, 89. For a summary of the book see Bailey, 'The Making and Unmaking of a God: New Light on George Fox and Early Quakerism' in Michael Mullett (ed.), *New Light on George Fox 1624-1691* (York, 1993), pp. 110-128.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 131.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid, pp. 128-9, quoted from Swarthmore MSS, 4, fo. 211.

reserved for Christ only.<sup>25</sup> This is a very challenging assertion though its validity depends upon just what Fox and others meant when they spoke of 'Christ within', something which is extremely difficult to ascertain.

Evidence for Fox's primacy comes in addition from contemporary critics who viewed Fox as the fount of authority within Quakerism; Francis Higginson, a vicar from Westmorland referred to Fox in 1653 as the 'grandmaster of the faction' and 'ringleader of this sect'.<sup>26</sup> On his arrest in Lancashire in 1660, Fox was cited as the 'chief upholder of the Quaker sect'.<sup>27</sup> Fox himself provides similar evidence in his *Journal* relating to an occasion in Shrewsbury when the mayor and officers 'met together to consult what to do against me for they said the great Quaker of England was come to town.'<sup>28</sup>

In other ways Fox was important too; he played a vital role as a major theoretician of the movement, distributor of ideas and a vital preacher. It is true that Fox was perhaps not the first to come up with the concept of the 'inner light' and other ideas associated with Quaker thought, yet he published them with great vigour. His *Journal* relates, time and time again, how he decided to write letters to groups he had met, to justices and clergy, explaining Quaker thought.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., pp. 126, 129.

<sup>26</sup>Francis Higginson, *A Brief Relation of the Irreligion of the Northern Quakers* (London, 1653), p. 74.

<sup>27</sup>Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers*, 2 vols. (London, 1753), vol. 1, p. 306.

<sup>28</sup>Fox, *Journal*, vol. 1, p. 115.

<sup>29</sup>See for example, Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 52ff.

Epistles flowed from Fox, for example an early one from 1652 exhorted people 'to consider your conditions and mind the light of God within you which will discover all the deceits of your hearts unto you'. He goes on to warn against 'professing a Christ in words without thee but not knowing him to be within thee'.<sup>30</sup>

Fox's significance as a writer may to some degree be gauged by his output of tracts; in the years between 1652 to 1656 he wrote on his own, or collaboratively, 41 pamphlets, though it must be mentioned that James Nayler actually exceeded this number with 47.<sup>31</sup> Like all the leading Quaker writers, Fox's ideas spanned the whole range of Quaker thought, his main contribution though must lie in his discussion of the 'inner light'. In his *Journal*, he writes in such a way as to suggest that he himself made the initial break through in the discovery of the concept, which was not the case for other groups used it such as the Baptists. During a spell of spiritual helplessness in 1647, Fox noted that,

When all my hopes in them [ministers] and in all men were gone, so that I had nothing outwardly to help me...then, Oh then I heard a voice which said "there is one, even Christ Jesus that can speak to thy condition", and when I heard it my heart did leap for joy. Then the Lord did let me see why there was none upon earth who could speak to my condition, namely, that I might give him all the glory; for all are concluded under sin, and shut up in unbelief, as I had been, that Jesus Christ might have pre-eminence, who enlightens, and gives grace, and faith, and power.

---

<sup>30</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 2, fo. 1, 'A paper from George Fox to the World', 1652.

<sup>31</sup>William G. Bittle, *James Nayler 1618-1660: The Quaker Indicted By Parliament* (York, 1986), p. 28.

Fox's importance probably lies more in the way he disseminated his message and fused other strands of Quaker thought into it.<sup>32</sup> His importance as a leading theoretician of the Quaker movement may also be seen in the texts he wrote which served to explain Quaker thought; he was the only Quaker to produce a full catechism in the 1650s which explains the main Quaker tenets, the 'inner light' and the role of Scripture.<sup>33</sup> A more important work of Fox was the lengthy *Great Mystery* which was rather like a catechism in the sense that it sought to provide short replies to criticisms that had been made of Quakerism up until 1659, and it did so in question and answer form. To give one or two examples, when asked about the 'light's sufficiency for salvation, Fox answered, 'and they that believe not in the light are condemned, but believing in the light, shall come out of condemnation' Regarding the question of the Trinity, Fox writes, 'As for the word Trinity, and three persons we have not read it in the Bible, but in the Common-Prayer Book or mass book which the Pope was the author of; but as for unity we own'.<sup>34</sup>

In the 1650s and 1660s, Fox's main role was that of spiritual leader, reinforced by his many writings and preaching tours. In terms of early organization he was also crucial, though the main administrative business was left to Margaret Fell. As has been noted in earlier chapters, Fox was often consulted regarding areas to be targeted by the Quaker

---

<sup>32</sup>Fox, *Journal*, Nickalls (ed.), p. 11.

<sup>33</sup>Fox, *Catechism for Children*.

<sup>34</sup>Fox, *Great Mystery*, pp. 345, 99.

missionaries; for example John Blackeling wrote to Fox telling him of his 'drawings into Cumberland' but wished to let him know 'lest [Fox] not expecting...[his] going so soon should have laid the thing upon some other'. Similarly, a letter from the Quaker Richard Hubberthorne to Margaret Fell related how Fox had directed his travels; thus Hubberthorne writes to her, 'it was much upon George Fox' that he should pass to Bristol 'to be there at the time of the fair'.<sup>35</sup> In addition Fox was chiefly responsible for drawing up various practices and procedures for Quakers to follow. After a general meeting in 1656, no doubt one of the many meetings of the northern counties which were frequently held, Fox's authority is invoked by the paper subsequently sent out to Quakers following the meeting. Various recommendations are made to Friends, in terms of relieving the poor and prisoners, of not printing any more than 'you are moved by the Lord', of not 'wandering about needless occasions'.<sup>36</sup>

Fox's real organizational contribution in the early phase of Quakerism came however with the establishment of the local meeting structure of quarterly and monthly meetings. Fox describes in the *Journal* how he was moved of the Lord at first to set up monthly meetings in London and recounted that the Lord thereafter opened to him how he must 'establish ye men & womens monthly and quarterly meetinges' in the rest of the

---

<sup>35</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 4, fo. 159, John Blackling to George Fox, undated. F.H.L., Caton MSS, 3, p. 399, 20.11. [Jan] 1656/7, Richard Hubberthorne to Margaret Fell.

<sup>36</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 2, fo. 95, A paper of some things G.F. gave forth at a general meeting 1656.

nation and encourage 'other nations to doe ye same: or write to ym'.<sup>37</sup> The *Journal* relates how Fox and his followers went from county to county; in early 1667 he began in Essex, Norfolk, Suffolk, Huntingdonshire, Bedfordshire, gradually working his way up through the Midlands to Lancashire at which point he

sent papers into Westmoreland: by Leo: ffell & Rob: Withers & into Bishopricke, Cleveland & Northumberland & into Cumberland & Scotland: for ym to setle ye monthly meetinges in ye Lord's power: which they did.

The tour ended in 1669 with the extension of the monthly meeting system in Yorkshire, which was already fairly well developed, from 7 to 14.<sup>38</sup> Obviously, to a certain degree, caution is needed when using the *Journal* as evidence, yet Fox's establishment of the meeting system in the late 1660s is corroborated by evidence from quarterly and monthly meeting books of this time, the opening pages of which refer to the setting up of meetings and often mention Fox's name.<sup>39</sup> Fox's authority may also be seen in the tract which he published giving directions to meetings. This covered many issues of importance to local Quaker communities; how to deal with 'disorderly walkers', advice on matters such as marriage, prisoners, sufferings and births and deaths as well as a whole range of moral issues.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup>Fox, *Journal*, vol. 2, p. 111.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., pp. 113-114, 134.

<sup>39</sup>See chapter three.

<sup>40</sup>Fox, *Friends Fellowship Must be in the Spirit*, p. 1 ff. This tract was copied and published by Quaker adversaries and appears in identical form as *Canons and Institutions* (London,

The existence of the *Journal* has contributed to the idea that Fox was founder and leader of the early movement and this view, as Reay and others have rightly pointed out, should be treated with caution. However the evidence from the Swarthmore manuscripts suggests that Fox was seen as someone very special and without equal. The only others to be treated with such reverence were James Nayler and Margaret Fell. In addition Barry Reay and others have ignored the non-Quaker evidence for the primacy of Fox in the movement as has been pointed out. Fox and sometimes Nayler are the only Quakers to be pointed to as overall leaders of the movement in the 1650s, and even some critics' claims that Nayler was a leader must be treated with suspicion since they were eager to portray him as such for propaganda purposes in order to discredit the movement.

In terms of charismatic authority as has been pointed out, the only person to rival Fox was James Nayler, born in 1616 in West Ardsley, Yorkshire. He was of yeoman stock, senior to Fox by 8 years, and had served in the parliamentary army under Major-General Lambert. Before turning to Quakerism he was of Independent persuasion.<sup>41</sup> Although it is fruitless to speculate on what might have been, it is nevertheless interesting to ponder the outcome if Nayler had written a *Journal*, had not entered Bristol on a donkey in 1656, or had lived beyond 1660. Would Fox still have emerged as the leader of the movement? As Larry Ingle and others have noted, 'Fox realized what most people who write their memoirs know: that

---

1669).

<sup>41</sup>Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, pp. 61-63.

they can determine what others know of the past by controlling the evidence' and he has commented that Fox, 'knowing himself the victor...interpreted past struggles in a way that made his triumph seem inevitable and cast those he knew would be losers as destined from the beginning to be swept into the dust bin of failure'.<sup>42</sup> This is certainly what happened to James Nayler in the *Journal* for he receives very little attention when it is obvious from other sources that he was an important rival to Fox. Christopher Hill has commented too that 'in Fox's *Journal* James Nayler plays a part only slightly greater than that of Trotsky in official Soviet histories of the Russian Revolution'.<sup>43</sup>

Quaker historians have traditionally given little attention to Nayler: W.C. Braithwaite has briefly described him until the Bristol incident, as 'the ablest speaker and one of the most trusted leaders of the movement'.<sup>44</sup> William G. Bittle, one of Nayler's most recent biographers also points to his influence but places him in a secondary position to Fox. He has noted how he travelled with Fox, wrote important tracts along with him, and asserts that 'their correspondence left no doubt either of their friendship and regard for one another, or of Nayler's acceptance of the role played by Fox as the leader of the movement'.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup>H. Larry Ingle, 'George Fox, Historian' *Quaker History*, 82 (1993), p. 29.

<sup>43</sup>Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down*, p. 186.

<sup>44</sup>Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 61.

<sup>45</sup>Bittle, *James Nayler*, p. 75.

That Nayler was seen as a leader in Quakerism is obvious from the letters of early Quakerism. Like Fox, he was referred to as a father; a letter from Francis Howgill in Cork to both Fox and Nayler stated how he was 'one subject unto you in the Lord, as unto fathers who take care of the family of God'.<sup>46</sup> In another letter, Edward Burrough wrote to Nayler in language similar to that used to address Fox when he said 'my dearest beloved in who my life dwells and by whom I am refreshed when I think upon God...I know thou art beloved of the Father and hath answer from him in thy request and thy dominion will be enlarged and thou art crowned in the sight of thy enemies'.<sup>47</sup> A journal of William Edmundson, a Quaker from Westmorland who later travelled to Ireland to spread the Quaker message clearly gave primacy to Fox and Nayler as leaders of the movement. He describes how in 1653, an acquaintance 'spoke well of George Fox and James Nayler, and of their doctrine'. He clearly saw Nayler as an erstwhile leader when he wrote of his disgrace saying 'How shall I be able to stand through so many temptations and trials which attend me daily, since such a one as he is fallen under temptations'. Edmundson ascribes more importance to Fox in terms of the latter's establishment of men's and women's meetings later on.<sup>48</sup> An early biographer of Nayler has pointed to the number of letters which were

---

<sup>46</sup>F.H.L., Portfolio MSS, 3, fo. 83 Howgill to Fox and Nayler, 18. 3. [May] 1656.

<sup>47</sup>F.H.L., Portfolio MSS, fo. 43 Burrough to Nayler 12.5. [July] 1656.

<sup>48</sup>William Edmundson, *A Journal of the Life, Travels, Sufferings and Labour of Love...of...William Edmundson* (London, 1715), pp. 10, 33, 39.

addressed to Fox and Nayler jointly in the 1650s.<sup>49</sup> Testimony to Nayler's popularity even after 1656 comes from the hand of another important early Quaker, Richard Hubberthorne, who wrote to Fox from London regarding Nayler. He noted the need for him when he wrote there was 'a great service for him [Nayler] and several great ones have a desire to hear him'.<sup>50</sup>

Nayler was frequently pointed to as a head of the Quaker movement by anti-Quaker writers, either on his own or with George Fox. William Prynne, believed Fox and Nayler to be the leaders of the movement, even before the scandal caused by Nayler's entry into Bristol in 1656, after which time Nayler was often cited by critics as the principal figure.<sup>51</sup> Also prior to 1656, Francis Higginson, although accepting Fox's prominence, noted that at Quaker meetings followers might only read 'the Epistles of Fox and Nayler'.<sup>52</sup> The Presbyterian, Ralph Farmer, noted the primacy of Nayler and Fox when he wondered at 'James Nayler and George Fox, their two chief leaders and their fellows at daggers [drawn] one against another'.<sup>53</sup> Geoffrey Nuttall has noted how Richard Baxter referred to Nayler as 'chief leader' without ever mentioning Fox, and how Baxter also referred to the disagreements between

---

<sup>49</sup>Emilia Fogelklou, *James Nayler, The Rebel Saint 1618-1660*, (trans.) L. Yapp, (London, 1931), p. 127.

<sup>50</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 4, fo. 19, Richard Hubberthorne to George Fox, 24.5. [July] 1660.

<sup>51</sup>William Prynne, *The Quakers Unmasked* (London, 1655, 2nd edition), pp. 6, 12.

<sup>52</sup>Higginson, p. 12.

<sup>53</sup>Ralph Farmer, *Satan Inthroned in His Chair of Pestilence* (London, 1657), sig. A3, Epistle.

'Nayler and his followers and Fox and his followers'.<sup>54</sup> Christopher Hill has pointed to the view amongst some anti-Quaker writers that Nayler was the head Quaker and he adds, 'such opinions were perhaps incorrect...but that they were expressed shows that Fox was by no means clearly the sole leader of the Quakers in the 1650s'.<sup>55</sup>

The charisma of Nayler is clearly seen from the group which arose around him in London from 1655, where he rapidly became popular during the absence of Francis Howgill and Edward Burrough in Ireland. Nayler attracted the attention of a group of Quakers, notably Martha Simmonds, wife of the Quaker publisher Thomas Simmonds, Hannah Stranger and Dorcas Erbury whom Bittle has called 'some of the most radical of London Quakers'.<sup>56</sup> This group interrupted the meetings of Burrough and Howgill on their return from Ireland and it has been argued that Martha and her company wished to show their preference for Nayler over the other two.<sup>57</sup> Division occurred when Nayler failed to take a definite stance on the issue. It would seem that Simmonds and certain Friends wished to see Nayler as leader of the movement. William Bittle suggests that a pamphlet written by her referred to Nayler when she wrote 'I counsel thee to prize thy time and be still and staid and seek

---

<sup>54</sup>Quoted in Nuttall, *Holy Spirit*, p. 184, from, R. Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, i. 23; R. Baxter, *One Sheet Against the Quakers*, p. 11

<sup>55</sup>Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down*, p. 186.

<sup>56</sup>Bittle, p. 95.

<sup>57</sup>Bittle, p. 84; For Martha Simmonds see Kenneth L. Carroll, 'Martha Simmonds, a Quaker Enigma' *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, 53 (1972).

diligently for that messenger, who is one of a thousand, who brings the glad tidings...<sup>58</sup>

Simmonds and the others disliked Fox which is evidenced from a letter from Fox to Nayler in which he related a visit made by Simmonds and Stranger to him in Launceston jail in which Stranger denied Fox's authority. Fox related how 'Martha Simmonds [who] is called your mother...bid me bow down and said I was lord and king and that my heart was rotten, and she said she denied that which was head in me'.<sup>59</sup>

That Fox saw a challenge to his leadership is unquestionable. Meetings with Nayler followed, the most important taking place in Exeter. In this famous episode Fox berated Nayler for 'resistinge ye power of God in mee'. Fox describes how Nayler tried to kiss him but Fox gave him his foot instead. In the *Journal* he says 'but I saide seeinge hee had turned against ye power of God itt was my foote: and soe ye Lord God moved mee to sleight him & to sett ye power of God over him'.<sup>60</sup> After meeting Nayler at Exeter, Fox wrote a number of letters which clearly show that he perceived the central issue to be one of authority. Fox wrote of Nayler

and thou being stubborn would not own me, while I was moved to pray, but stood, in the high nature rebellious, and I saw there at Exeter a cloud of darkness would arise up against me, such was entered into thee.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup>Quoted in Bittle, p. 95, from Simmonds, *A Lamentation for the Lost Sheep*, p. 2.

<sup>59</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 3, fo. 193, 1656 G.F. to J.N.

<sup>60</sup>Fox, *Journal*, vol. 1, p. 244.

<sup>61</sup>F.H.L., Portfolio MSS, 24, No. 36, undated.

Margaret Fell was clearly aware of the leadership struggle for Nayler had written to her earlier saying that Fox was trying to bury Nayler's 'name that he may raise his own'. Fell clearly supported Fox and wrote to Nayler saying, 'thou would not be subject to him to whom all nations should bow, it hath grieved my spirit, thou hath confessed him to be thy Father' and she went on to ask Nayler how he would answer to God 'who had given him [Fox] a name better than every name, to which every knee must bow.'<sup>62</sup>

Nayler made his famous entry into Bristol in 1656 and was accompanied by Martha Simmonds, Dorcas Erbury, Hannah Stranger, James Stranger, Timothy Wedlock, Samuel Cater and Robert Crab.<sup>63</sup> A number of statements made by the group became increasingly messianic in tone. At Dorcas Erbury's trial at Bristol in 1656 she claimed that Nayler was the Son of God and that she knew no other saviour but him.<sup>64</sup> Letters from Hannah Stranger to Nayler revealed her view of him as Christ when she proclaimed him to be 'the fairest of ten thousand' and 'only begotten son of God'. Stranger's husband, John, went further in a postscript to his wife's letter when he added that Nayler was 'no more to be called James but Jesus'.<sup>65</sup> Kenneth Carroll has argued that Martha Simmonds was a driving force behind Nayler's decision to enter Bristol as Christ and that he was

---

<sup>62</sup>F.H.L., Spence MSS, 3, fo. 38, 15.8. [October] 1656, M.F. to J.N.

<sup>63</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 1, fo. 188, 1656.

<sup>64</sup>William Grigge, *The Quakers' Jesus; or the Unswaddling of that Child James Nayler* (London, 1658), p. 10.

<sup>65</sup>Deacon, *The Grand Imposter Examined*, pp. 10-11.

a 'dupe'. As he says, 'Nayler always insisted he was a sign but Martha, Hannah Stranger and Dorcas Erbury were convinced he was Jesus come again. They had begun with their belief that God was present in every man, believing 'a double portion' in Nayler'.<sup>66</sup> Recently Leo Damrosch, in his study of James Nayler and the meaning of his entry into Bristol, has suggested that Nayler wished to emphasise Christ's sacrifice rather than to minimise it, by enacting 'the daily taking up of the cross' and 'a living renewal of the meaning of Christ's sacrifice'.<sup>67</sup>

Richard Bailey in turn has dismissed the notion that the Bristol episode was a kind of aberration in Quakerism. He writes that the whole incident has been 'subject to certain patent anachronisms in the historical literature- Nayler was "deluded" and his mind "distorted";...his followers were disparaged as simple or credulous...or the whole event was a fanatic jester's caper that belonged on the fringes of early Quakerism'. For Bailey, 'Fox's claims for himself dictated the choreography of the debate over leadership. Nayler had to claim literal identity with Jesus in order to advance on Fox's own exalted claims'.<sup>68</sup> Nayler's behaviour then was not aberrant but stemmed from Fox's own teachings. Bailey has seen the dispute between Fox and Nayler as being 'waged through the language and symbolism of messiahship' which was 'used to maintain, or, in Nayler's case, usurp leadership in

---

<sup>66</sup>Carroll, 'Martha Simmonds', pp. 44-5.

<sup>67</sup>Leo Damrosch, *The Sorrows of the Quaker Jesus: James Nayler and the Puritan Crackdown on the Free Spirit* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, 1996), pp. 172-173.

<sup>68</sup>Bailey, p. 137.

order to become the ideological head of the saints'.<sup>69</sup> He points out how the whole battle between the two was carried on using messianic language; Fox identified himself with the truth and called Nayler a 'false Christ'. Similarly, Margaret Fell used messianic language when she defended Fox against Nayler and Nayler's followers also employed it.<sup>70</sup> But Bailey has noted how Fox toned down his language after the Nayler incident and sees this as a pivotal moment in Quakerism. Accordingly, Fox still talked about celestial inhabitation and 'continued to make exalted claims for the saints but he was more cautious and circumspect about himself'. Bailey has claimed that evidence for this 'retreat' can be seen in the lack of blasphemy trials post 1656 and the 'ceasing of Son of God talk'.<sup>71</sup> He notes that Fox came out of the Nayler affair in 'firm control' of Quakerism but the 'retreat was Fox's unmaking as a 'god' and 'cost him time, momentum, power, prestige and divinity'.<sup>72</sup>

It is worth discussing the role of Martha Simmonds in the Nayler incident for her position, albeit briefly as a leader of Quakerism, has been overlooked. Patricia Crawford has noted how both contemporaries and later historians have tended to see Simmonds and her company of women as responsible for leading Nayler astray. Crawford has suggested that Simmonds was one of the leaders of the Quaker movement and that the

---

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., p. 139.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., pp. 156-58.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., p. 179.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 217.

'challenge to Fox was not just from Nayler: it came from a group of women too'.<sup>73</sup> Fox and other leaders were very keen to silence Simmonds and saw her as a threat to the movement, telling her that she and her followers were 'out of the truth, out of the way, out of the power, out of the wisdom, and out of the life of God'. As Crawford has pointed out, Martha Simmonds was well aware that she had a following when she noted 'I was moved by the power, I would not stay though they sometimes denied me, yet I was forced to go and my word did prosper'.<sup>74</sup> In the end, unlike Nayler, Martha Simmonds was never reconciled to Fox. Before her death in 1665 she continued to cause disruption in 1657 by speaking at the Bull and Mouth tavern in London and reading a psalm. She was prevented from continuing by Richard Hubberthorne when listeners started to sing.<sup>75</sup> The role of Martha Simmonds in the early Quaker movement deserves reconsideration then. She is one of the few women to command a following in early Quakerism and as Crawford has argued 'Martha Simmonds was, for a brief period, one of the leaders of the Quaker movement'.<sup>76</sup>

Nayler's other claim to leadership lay in his role as theologian. As has been noted before, his output of tracts in the early 1650s exceeded that of Fox, but more importantly he was also an eloquent writer, who ably expressed the whole

---

<sup>73</sup>Patricia Crawford, *Women and Religion in England 1500-1720* (London, 1993), pp. 171-2.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 174, quoted from F.H.L., Markey MSS, 120-2 and Ralph Farmer, *Satan Inthroned*, pp. 10-11.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., p. 178, from F.H.L., Caton MSS, 3, 373-4.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 176.

range of Quaker beliefs. Although Fox relates that he convinced James Nayler himself, it would appear that Nayler had reached the Quaker position of a belief in the 'inner light' on his own for in *Saul's Errand to Damascus* he describes how when he was at work at the plough he heard a voice telling him to leave his house and kindred, 'whereupon I did exceedingly rejoice that I had heard the voice of that God which I had professed as a child but had never known him.'<sup>77</sup> It is possible though that the meeting with Fox served as a catalyst from which he entered into his missionary activities. Nayler like other Quaker leaders covered most aspects of Quaker thought though his unique contribution probably lies in his treatment of the Quaker notion of perfectionism, which he dealt with more thoroughly than any other of the main Quaker writers. The basic belief was that obedience to the 'inner light' which Quakers saw as an infallible guide, would lead to perfection. Of this idea, Nayler wrote, 'the end for which Christ came into the world' was 'to set free from sin and bring to perfection, which Christ commands and which the scriptures witness in the saints'.<sup>78</sup> Nayler, in another pamphlet answered a critic by using the analogy of a physician to explain perfection, stating that

the physician discovers the disease that there may be healing, but your [i.e the critic's] discovery is that none can be free from it while they live; nor do we say you plead for sin but...that you say, no

---

<sup>77</sup>Fox and Nayler, *Saul's Errand to Damascus*, pp. 31-32.

<sup>78</sup>James Nayler, *A Few Words Occassioned* (London, 1654), p. 13.

man may shall ever be without it and here you plead that man shall serve the devil as long as they live."<sup>79</sup>

Man could attain perfection or grow towards it according to Nayler,

only by keeping an eye within to the invisible, and by giving diligent ear to that voice [i.e the inner light] that speaks to the soul...by improving that he hath freely received of God, whereby he grows in the knowledge of the father and the son from grace to grace...till he come to the unity of the faith and knowledge of the son-ship, into a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.<sup>80</sup>

Before considering the the contributions of the other leading male Quakers, who spread the early message, we need to discuss the role of Margaret Fell, later Fox's wife. Fell's most recent biographer, Bonnelyn Young Kunze has sought to cast Fell in a much more vital role than previous accounts of her. As Kunze says, 'the standard portrayal of Fell depicts her as the intrepid mother-overseer of the struggling first two generations of Quakers, wife of George Fox, and faithful supporter of his work in a secondary role.'<sup>81</sup> As has been shown in earlier chapters, Fell was crucial in terms of the early Quaker organization, particularly in relation to finance. In addition, as Kunze points out her role as 'an ideologue has been seriously underestimated' for she wrote important tracts on the position of women in Quakerism and was

---

<sup>79</sup>Nayler, *Discovery of the Man of Sin*, p. 25.

<sup>80</sup>James Nayler, *A Discovery of the First Wisdom from Beneath and the Second Wisdom from Above* (London, 1653), p. 14.

<sup>81</sup>Bonnelyn Young Kunze, *Margaret Fell and the Rise of Quakerism* (London, 1994), p. 4.

integral in the setting up of women's meetings in the 1670s, an issue which will be discussed in the second part of this chapter.<sup>82</sup>

Particularly in the embryonic years of Quakerism, Margaret Fell's organizational contribution was vital, so too was her social position. Fell was of gentry stock, and married into a similar rank, the Fell family having become landowners at the Henrician dissolution of the monasteries and chantries. Her husband, Judge Thomas Fell, was justice of the assize for North Wales and Cheshire and vice-chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster. In 1652 she was heir to her father's estate of Marsh Grange in Furness, Lancashire and mistress of Swarthmore Hall in the same district. The experiences of Fell in early married life honed the skills which were so prominently displayed in her work for the early Quaker movements since she frequently had the task of running a large household and estate single-handed during Judge Fell's frequent absences on business or on court duties.<sup>83</sup>

That Margaret Fell was seen as a figure of importance and authority within the movement can be shown from numerous letters where her advice is asked, or she is requested to sort out an issue. Margaret Fell is also occasionally addressed in effusive language, when for example one woman Quaker salutes her as an 'honourable and glorious daughter of Sion whom the

---

<sup>82</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>83</sup>Ibid., p. 29ff.

Lord hath anointed above all his handmaids'.<sup>84</sup> Similarly, another Quaker addresses her as 'the first born among thousands of honourable women'.<sup>85</sup> A letter from the Quaker Thomas Lawson to Fell relates how he had met with Ranters who had claimed they were no different from Quakers. Lawson felt that Ranters were 'stumbling blocks' who 'lay in the way to keep people from owning Friends'. Having kept a copy of their pronouncements, which he sent on to Fell he added, 'and if thou be moved to write anything to them, or to send to George, it could not but be serviceable, to scatter an answer to these things up and down the nation'.<sup>86</sup> Clearly then this issue was deemed sufficiently urgent to be referred to Fell, or if she preferred to Fox.

Margaret Fell lent her business acumen to the setting up of the Kendal Fund in June 1654 which helped to relieve imprisoned Quakers and those Quaker preachers who travelled to spread the Quaker message at their own expense. Having widened the collection from the Kendal area to Lancashire, Cumberland and Westmorland, at the end of 1654 she requested similar collections be made all over the North and these followed in Durham and Yorkshire.

Fell was also a significant pamphleteer and writer, her major contributions being in the political rather than the doctrinal sphere. This was especially the case in the years

---

<sup>84</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 1, fo. 394. Katherine Evans to Margaret Fell, 22.2. [April] 1656.

<sup>85</sup>F.H.L., Caton MSS, 3, p. 114, T.S. to M.F., undated.

<sup>86</sup>F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 1, fo. 242, no date, Thomas Lawson to Margaret Fell.

following Richard Cromwell's death; as Bonnelyn Young Kunze has noted, 'Fell is one leader of the Quakers who has been overlooked in Barry Reay's study of this eventful period'.<sup>87</sup> She wrote to the army and council of officers when the Rump was being recalled and she organized a petition to parliament against tithes which was signed by thousands of Quaker women.<sup>88</sup> The multitude of papers sent to Charles II by Fell following the Restoration asking for leniency towards Quakers shows the extent of her contribution. These activities are described in her small autobiographical work in which she states,

I stayed at London at this time one year and three months doing service for the Lord, in visiting Friends meetings, and giving papers and letters to the king and council whenever there was occasion. And I writ and gave papers and letters to every one of the family several times, viz. to the King, to the Duke of York, to the Duke of Gloucester, and to the Queen Mother, to the Princess of Orange, and to the Queen of Bohemia.<sup>89</sup>

Margaret Fell was also the first Quaker to publish a pamphlet on non-resistance to the monarchy in 1660. In *A Declaration* Fell assured Charles II that Quakers, 'love, own, and honour the king', they were 'a people that follow after those things that make for peace, love and unity' and testified 'against all strife, and wars, and contentions that come'. This paper was also signed and subscribed to by George Fox, Richard

---

<sup>87</sup>Kunze, *Margaret Fell*, p. 134.

<sup>88</sup>*These Several Papers [were] sent to the Parliament the 20th day of the fifth month 1659*, (London, 1659).

<sup>89</sup>'A Relation of Margaret Fell...', 1690, in *Margaret Fell, A Brief Collection of Remarkable Passages and Occurrences relating to... Margaret Fell*. (London, 1710), p. 4. Hereafter cited as, *Fell, Works*.

Hubberthorne and other important Quakers.<sup>90</sup>

Some mention must be made of other influential Quakers in the 1650s who have tended to be overlooked because of Fox's later prominence in the movement in the 1660s. As Barry Reay has pointed out, there were 'others upon the whom the mantle of "founder" could have fallen, others who had already established their own divine commissions'.<sup>91</sup> Richard Farnworth of Tickhill in Yorkshire died in 1666, and this along with other leaders' deaths in the 1660s left Fox as the most powerful man in the movement. W.C. Braithwaite has gone so far as to describe him as 'next to Fox, the chief leader in the north of the new movement'.<sup>92</sup> Farnworth was undoubtedly a leading preacher, responsible for the conversion of many. In an early letter of around 1652, he noted how whilst at Chester he met with a minister and from Cambridge, a tutor and two scholars, and how the Lord gave him 'both power and also wisdom to speak to them, that tears stood in the priest's eyes and the tutor was ready at first to tremble'.<sup>93</sup> Farnworth's importance as a theologian may also be gauged by his output of tracts; 25 from 1652-1656 and the fact that he wrote a confession of faith for Quakers during the first decade. In *A Confession and Profession of Faith*, published in 1658,

---

<sup>90</sup> 'A Declaration and an Information from us the People of God called Quakers and the Present Governors, the King, and Both Houses of Parliament', 1660, in Fell, *Works*, pp. 205, 208-209.

<sup>91</sup> Reay, *Quakers and the English Revolution*, p. 8.

<sup>92</sup> Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 59.

<sup>93</sup> F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 3, fo. 51, 1652.

Farnworth deals at length with the issue of Christ as the 'inner light' and also in his incarnation, which not many Quakers dwell on from this period. The tract also discusses other important issues such as tithes, the Quaker position on 'thee' and 'thou' and the question of obedience to magistrates.<sup>94</sup>

Farnworth obviously played a leading role in the early organization of the society for he signed along with William Dewsbury (who will be discussed below) a letter from a meeting of Quakers held at Balby in Yorkshire in 1656 which involved Friends from Yorkshire, Derby, Nottingham and Lincoln. This meeting drew up various advices regarding finance, marriage and other important matters.<sup>95</sup> In the 1660s, before his death, Farnworth was a major figure in the organization which had grown up in London (he had moved there around 1658).<sup>96</sup> With Fox imprisoned during the early 1660s Friends such as Farnworth played a very important role in the growing organization. He was a key character in the Perrot controversy, which on the surface involved the issue of leaving the hat on during prayer, but had deeper significance in raising the issue of the leadings of the individual against that of group authority. Farnworth wrote a reply to the Perrot challenge in 1663 in which he argued that the inward man was

---

<sup>94</sup>Richard Farnworth, *A Confession and Profession of Faith in God by his People who are in Scorn Called Quakers* (London, 1658), p. 3ff.

<sup>95</sup>See Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, pp. 311-314.

<sup>96</sup>Tam Llewellyn-Edwards, 'Richard Farnworth of Tickhill', *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, 56 (1992), p. 207.

more important than the outward man but that they were both necessary to each other."<sup>77</sup> Farnworth later took a prominent part in a special meeting of key Quakers in London and wrote an important epistle, entitled 'Testimony from the Brethren' in 1666, which was really the first attempt to strengthen the government of the Quaker church. This was aimed at Perrot and other separatists or those who 'speak evil of dignities and depose government without which we are sensible our society and fellowship cannot be kept holy'. In effect the letter implied that only leading Quakers at the centre had the authority to interpret faith and practice for others.<sup>78</sup>

Another Quaker who played a major role in the first two decades of the movement was Edward Burrough, who like many of the early prominent Friends, died during the movement's second decade, in 1662. Burrough was a yeoman from Underbarrow, near Kendal, and was convinced by Fox in the early 1650s. His main contributions lie in the fields of theology and organization. Responsible with Francis Howgill for the missionary work in London where he was 'very effectual in the conversion of many', Burrough, along with Francis Howgill and Margaret Fell was also one of the chief proponents of the national collection established around 1656.<sup>79</sup> His role as a leader in the emerging organization in London may also be gauged by the

---

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., pp. 207-208. F.H.L., John Penington MSS, 4, 40.

<sup>78</sup>F.H.L., Portfolio MSS, 41, fo. 94, 3. [May] 1666. See also chapter 2

<sup>79</sup>Francis Howgill, 'Testimony Concerning Edward Burrough', in Edward Burrough, *The Memorable Works of a Son of Thunder and Consolation...* (London, 1672), sig. F., See Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 321.

fact that country Friends, desirous of having yearly meetings suggested that they first 'write up to George Fox, Edward Burrough, and other Friends at London, and lay it before them, and if they see it fit, appoint time and place for it'.<sup>100</sup>

Burrough was also an important authority in terms of the early theology of the Quaker movement. This may be seen in the publication of his confession-like work on faith. More thorough than Farnworth's slightly later one, the tract covered the essential Quaker beliefs; it expressed the Quaker notion of perfection that 'the saints upon earth may receive forgiveness of sins, and may be perfectly freed from the body of sin and death, and in Christ may be perfect and without sin'. Burrough summed up the Quaker view of election and reprobation saying that all men were in a state of reprobation being 'in the first Adam', yet all men could leave this state as all have 'a day of visitation that they may return out of the state of reprobation, but hating knowledge and despising the love of God they continue in the state reprobate'.<sup>101</sup> Moreover, Burrough's work was one of only a few Quaker tracts to combine a belief in the 'inner light' and its saving effects with a statement of belief in the incarnate Christ whose 'blood' according to Burrough, 'cleanseth from all unrighteousness and sin'.<sup>102</sup>

Burrough along with the Quaker Richard Hubberthorne, is

---

<sup>100</sup>F.H.L., Portfolio MSS, 16, fo. 2, 'At the General Meeting of the North at Skipton', 5.8. [Oct] 1659.

<sup>101</sup>Burrough, *A Declaration to all the World*, pp. 4, 7.

<sup>102</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

also noteworthy in terms of his political impact on the Quaker movement, for in 1659 they led the group of Friends who tried to forstall the return of the Stuarts in 1659. George Fox had been influential also for he addressed a letter to parliament containing 59 suggestions for 'the regulating of things'.<sup>103</sup> However towards the end of the year Fox fell ill for ten weeks leaving Burrough and Hubberthorne to take up the work. Burrough wrote two broadsides which implied that he was willing to use force to stop a counter-revolution aimed at bringing back the Stuarts.<sup>104</sup> Richard Hubberthorne of Yealand in Lancashire who was to die a year after Burrough, in 1663, wrote in a similar vein. His several pamphlets published in 1659 resurrected the broad aims of the New Model Army such as liberty of conscience, a changed franchise, and abolition of tithes.<sup>105</sup>

Francis Howgill, of Grayrigg in Westmorland and Burrough's companion in the missionary work in London was another early Quaker leader who died in 1662. Like Burrough he was involved in the early decision to have national collections.<sup>106</sup> He was often present at the meetings at

---

<sup>103</sup>George Fox, *To the Parliament and Commonwealth of England* (London, 1659).

<sup>104</sup>Edward Burrough, *To the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England* (1659); *To the Parliament and Army (in general) of the Commonwealth of England &c.* (1659). See Barry Reay, 'The Quakers and 1659: Two Newly Discovered Broadsides by Edward Burrough', *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, 54 (1977)

<sup>105</sup>Richard Hubberthorne, *The Real Cause of the Nation's Bondage and Slavery, here Demonstrated* (London, 1659), p. 3.

<sup>106</sup>Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 321.

Gerrard Roberts' house with Fox, Hubberthorne and others which Quaker leaders in London had made a kind of headquarters from 1656 onwards.<sup>107</sup> It is possible that the meetings here later turned in to the Second Day Morning Meeting established in 1673 for we know that a Dorothy White sent a paper to Gerrard Roberts' for either Fox or Howgill to peruse before it was printed.<sup>108</sup>

William Dewsbury, a clothmaker from the East Riding of Yorkshire, who had served in the parliamentary army, was to be one of the longest living of the early Quakers, dying in 1688. He wrote a number of tracts, particularly in the 1660s, but his main contribution as a leader came in the early organization of the movement. Dewsbury had tried a number of different faiths, such as the Baptists and Independents in his religious searchings, before finally turning to Quakerism. He set up meetings as early as 1652 in the East Riding and he was responsible for drafting a letter in 1653 which was countersigned by Fox; this was concerned with providing spiritual leadership, for it advocated that one or two should be chosen to watch over the flock and were to meet with other Friends every two or three weeks [presumably the equivalent to the later monthly meeting] to keep an eye on each other and to make sure that none 'walked disorderly'. The letter also advised Friends to meet once a week or more excluding the

---

<sup>107</sup> Ibid., p. 341.

<sup>108</sup> F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 1, fo. 22, Dorothy White to Hester Bauldin, undated.

first-day (Sunday) meeting.<sup>109</sup> Dewsbury was also a signatory to the letter entitled 'Testimony to the Brethren' in 1666 which asserted the need for church authority, along with Howgill, Farnworth, Fox and others.

### **Conclusion**

Quaker leadership in the 1650s and 60s was very much dependant on personality for with little church organization authority had to emanate from those people with special attributes. Of course the Quaker message taught that all people had the 'light' within them and could experience direct leadings from God but evidence suggests that some Quakers, most notably, George Fox and James Nayler, were seen as having special authority. Although it was common for Quakers to address each other in rather high-flown language, the letters to Fox particularly reveal that he was seen as different from other Quakers, possessed of a 'double measure' of the inward light. In this respect Fox does indeed stand out from the other chief Quakers, though if Nayler had not been disgraced in 1656 and had lived on after 1660, he might well have emerged as leader. The importance of Fox and Nayler lies in their all round leadership, in terms of doctrine, organization and their charismatic personalities. The other Quaker leaders discussed, Burrough, Howgill, Hubberthorne, Farnworth and Dewsbury were obviously important in one or two spheres but none had the same power to inspire as Fox and Nayler and were

---

<sup>109</sup>Dewsbury, *The Faithful Testimony of that Ancient Servant of the Lord*, pp. 1-2.

not noted by other Quakers as possessing the special qualities of the two leading Quakers. Margaret Fell's most important contribution in this early period came with her organization of the Kendal Fund, the basis of which became the future national collection. In the 1670s she again became involved in the establishment of women's meetings (which will be discussed in the next chapter) so it would appear that her main impact lies in the organizational sphere. Without her role in this area though, Quakerism would not have prospered so rapidly in its formative years. Quaker leadership in the 1670s and years leading up to the Revolution was of a rather different nature, relying less on leading personalities as authority became subsumed into the sophisticated network of central and local business meetings.

## CHAPTER 5

### *QUAKER LEADERSHIP c.1670-1689*

#### *Introduction*

The nature of Quaker leadership, even from the mid-1660s had begun to change. The beginning of centralization had occurred and was cemented in the 1670s with the establishment of a highly sophisticated central organization- the system of Yearly Meetings, Meeting for Sufferings and the Second Day Morning Meeting. Although George Fox remained an important figure, in terms of ideology and instigating the organizational advances, Quakerism depended less on the role of such individuals and more and more on the authority instituted by the central meetings. Max Weber's theory of the 'routinization' of charisma is useful in trying to understand the transformation in Quaker leadership.<sup>1</sup> That of the 1650s and 60s may be seen as 'charismatic' in nature, principally relying on the characters of Fox and Nayler and a few others. This type of leadership by its very nature is incapable of providing a permanent basis for a stabilized order, for it is too fragile- the charismatic leader may die or his followers become disillusioned, for example. The need for stability drove the move to organize centrally and meant that authority within the movement came to lie increasingly within the Quaker bureaucracy and with those influential men of the central meetings.

---

<sup>1</sup>Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*.

George Fox played an important role as the initiator and architect of central and local meetings though he had little to do with the day to day running of them, once established. Fox relied on eminent figures in the organization, the chief ones being George Whitehead and William Penn; the influence of these two spanned the three central meetings and was even more extensive owing to their roles as leading theoreticians of the movement. Outside of the central organization however other figures were counted too. Margaret Fell remained important via her part in the establishment and encouragement of women's meetings. Robert Barclay, although he had little involvement in business matters at the centre, was a leading figure in terms of Quaker theology. The 1670s and 1680s saw a consolidation of power in the hands of these more influential members of the central meetings, yet within these circles it is clear that George Fox was held in high esteem and deferred to on crucial issues.

Nevertheless Fox's role has at times been over-emphasised during this period at the expense of other key figures and it is often overlooked that he spent much time abroad or suffering from poor health which must have stunted his activities in England at any rate. From September 1670 to the spring of 1671 he was very ill; from August 1671 to June 1673 he was in America spreading the Quaker message; from December 1673 to February 1675 he was imprisoned in Worcester jail; a large part of 1677 was spent in Holland with William Penn, Robert Barclay and George Keith. It is only after this time that he was more free to involve himself in the movement, yet

even then he did not base himself in London but travelled around the country visiting Friends.

Fox's main contribution during this second phase of leadership was as architect of the growing central organization. His responsibility for setting up the Second Day Morning Meeting on his return from America in 1673 may be seen from Fox's angry comment over the question of circulating one of his papers against the Quaker schismatics, Wilkinson and Story, when he stated that

I was not moved to set up that meeting to make orders against the reading of my papers; but to gather up bad books that are scandalous against Friends...and not for them to have an authority over the Monthly and Quarterly and other meetings or for them to stop things to the nation which I was moved of the Lord to give forth to them.<sup>2</sup>

Fox seldom attended such meetings, though when he did it appears to have been on important issues; for example in 1681 he was asked along with George Whitehead and Alexander Parker to consider replies to the *The Christian Quaker*, a pro-Wilkinson-Story work.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, he attended the Meeting for Sufferings only a little more frequently.<sup>4</sup> That he was accorded prominence though is borne out by the placing of his name first on lists of attenders, followed by influential

---

<sup>2</sup>Quoted in, *The Second Period of Quakerism*, p. 280. F.H.L., Box Meeting MSS, 29, Fox to Women's Meeting, 28.4.1676.

<sup>3</sup>F.H.L., Morning Meeting Book, vol. 1, p. 51, 25.5. [July] 1681.

<sup>4</sup>See chapter two.

Quakers such as George Whitehead and William Penn.<sup>5</sup>

Thomas O'Malley has suggested that Fox 'exercised sway' over these two meetings in his absence through a number of trusted individuals who sat on both bodies and dominated them from 1672 to 1689. O'Malley argues that out of the 14 most prominent Quakers in the Second Day Morning Meeting, 13 also played important roles in the Meeting for Sufferings, men such as George Whitehead, William Penn, William Gibson, Alexander Parker and Ellis Hookes, and has pointed out that the 'lack of friction between these men and Fox shows that some degree of loyalty existed between them and the founder of the Second Day Morning Meeting'.<sup>6</sup> Fox did however attend yearly meetings. He notes in his *Journal* in 1675, for example, how he stayed with Friends in Kingston and Middlesex and attended London Yearly Meeting.<sup>7</sup> Fox was obviously seen as some sort of fountainhead by the central organization for some lengthy epistles from him were printed at many of the yearly meetings. These were used not just to disseminate spiritual ideas but also to reinforce the framework which Fox had played such a part in setting up. An epistle addressed to the Yearly and Second Day Morning Meeting and 'to all the children of God', spoke of the opposition against the meeting structure and Fox encouraged Quakers to 'stand stedfast, in Christ Jesus your head, in whom

---

<sup>5</sup>See for example, F.H.L., Meeting for Sufferings Minutes vol. 1, p. 39, 15.9. [Nov] 1677; p. 56, 16.3. [May] 1678; p. 172, 8.5. [July] 1680.

<sup>6</sup>O'Malley, '"Defying the Powers and Tempering the Spirit."', p. 85.

<sup>7</sup>Fox, *Journal*, vol. 2, p. 310.

you are all one, male and female', urging them to 'knoweth his government, and the increase of his government, & peace, there shall bee noe end'.<sup>8</sup> Fox continued to feed the disciplinary organization which he had set up by the use of frequent epistles which he would send from whichever part of the country he was visiting and these would be sent to all the quarterly and monthly meetings.

George Fox furthermore contributed to Quaker organization with his share in the establishment of women's meetings from 1671. His first mention of his intention to establish them came in 1666 when he noted that he had been called 'to sett uppe & establish ye mens & womens monthly & quarterly meetinges...in all the nation'.<sup>9</sup> Recently, however, Bonnelyn Yunge Kunze has questioned whether in fact Fox was the sole creator of women's meetings and suggests that Margaret Fell's role was equally important. Kunze firstly notes how separate female meetings had been established in London as early as the 1650s and were the creation of women to meet the great problem of poverty.<sup>10</sup> In addition she has explained Fell's importance in the setting up of the meetings in terms of the animosity shown towards Fox and herself during the Wilkinson-Story dispute particularly in *The Christian Quaker* by William Rogers. Kunze also points to evidence for Fell's involvement in the establishment of women's meetings in Yorkshire during

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 368.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid, vol. 2, p. 111.

<sup>10</sup>Bonnelyn Young Kunze, *Margaret Fell and the Rise of Quakerism* (California, 1994), p. 145 ff.

a three week visit there in 1672. A Northern friend, Jean Simcock, wrote to Fell to tell her that she was preparing for a letter of Fell's to be distributed to Yorkshire Women's Quarterly Meeting.<sup>11</sup>

Fell was subsequently responsible for establishing women's meetings in the north generally; as Larry Ingle has stated, 'with George in America, [from 1671-3] she became the country's foremost proponent of the innovation, writing and travelling in its behalf'.<sup>12</sup> In 1672 for example, Fell visited Westmoreland Quarterly Meeting and read a paper criticizing John Story.<sup>13</sup> The importance of Margaret Fell in the establishment of these meetings can be seen from a number of sources. William Penn for example, wrote to Fox in March 1676 beseeching him to attend a meeting concerning the Wilkinson-Story separation, much of which concerned the establishment of women's meetings 'because poor Margaret is so much smit at, and run upon (as I believe never woman was), as if she was the cause', [presumably of the separation].<sup>14</sup> However, her leading role here is not surprising; she was the first woman Quaker to defend the right of women to speak in the church when she wrote the famous tract, *Women's Speaking Justified*, in 1666, in which she expounded various arguments in favour of women's

---

<sup>11</sup>Kunze, pp. 149ff., 156, F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 1, fo. 365, 1672.

<sup>12</sup>Ingle, *First Among Friends*, p. 254.

<sup>13</sup>Rogers, *The Christian Quaker*, part iv.

<sup>14</sup>Quoted in Kunze, p. 151, from *The Papers of William Penn 1644-1679*, Mary Maples Dunn and Richard S. Dunn, (eds.), 5 vols., (Pennsylvania, 1981), vol. 1, Penn to Fox, 4.1. [March] 1676, p. 360.

role: that Jesus was born of a woman and that Christ revealed himself first to women following the Resurrection. In addition, it would have been natural for Fell to have defended the settling of female meetings around the north of England since this area was her own territory.

Fox was still regarded as the head of the Quaker movement during the 1670s and 1680s by both Quakers and anti-Quakers. William Penn writing to Margaret Fell said of Fox that he was,

a servant to all; holding and exercising his eldership in the invincible power that had gathered them, with reverence to the head and care over the body and was received, only in that spirit and power of Christ, as the first and chief elder in this age who as he was therefore worthy of double honour, so for the same reason it was given by the faithful of this day; because his authority was inward and not outward.

He believed that 'God had visibly clothed him with a divine preference and authority, and indeed his very presence expressed a religious majesty'.<sup>15</sup> Another letter from Penn to Margaret Fox describes Fox in similar eulogistic terms as, 'God's angel and special messenger'.<sup>16</sup>

An indication of Fox's relationship with other leading Quakers is given by George Whitehead, William Penn, William Gibson, Alexander Parker, Stephen Crisp and Thomas Green in a letter of May 1673 which was ordered to be read in each quarterly meeting. This stated that,

though a general care be not laid upon every member touching the good order and government in church affairs...yet the Lord hath laid it now upon some in

---

<sup>15</sup>*Papers of William Penn*, vol. 1, 'A Brief Account of the Rise and Progress of the People Called Quakers', p. 883.

<sup>16</sup>*Papers of William Penn*, vol. 1, 8.11.[Jan.].1677/78, to Margaret Fox, p. 518.

whom he hath agreed council for it (and particularly in our dear brother and God's faithful labourer G.F. [George Fox]) for the help of many.<sup>17</sup>

Quaker critics also perceived Fox and a small group in the central meetings as 'holding the reins' of the movement, which can be seen from an anonymous anti-Quaker work, which stated that,

we deny not the body of the people called Quakers... but we complain against your Foxonian unity which consists of certain ministers and elders, which lift up George Fox for a bishop, a pope, and a king, making his papers edicts, and then entitling them, the judgement of the body; whereas indeed 'tis but the mind of a cabal of Foxonians.<sup>18</sup>

William Mucklow, writing in 1672 saw Fox as the leading Quaker and criticized the central leadership as an 'arbitrary government, bounded by no law, but what George Fox and a few more please'.<sup>19</sup> Thomas Crisp referred to the Quaker movement as 'the Foxonian sect' and Francis Bugg spoke of 'George Fox and his party'.<sup>20</sup> An anonymous writer noted that Fox was 'not only a great patriarch', but was also held 'in highest esteem among you'.<sup>21</sup> Yet another example of Fox's perceived leadership comes from the Baptist, Roger Williams, who wrote that 'G. Fox hath apppeared the greatest writer, and the

---

<sup>17</sup>F.H.L., Portfolio MSS, fo. 134, 26.3. [May] 1673.

<sup>18</sup>'Judas and the Jews', 1673, p. 204 in, *A Collection of the Works of William Penn*, 2 vols. (London, 1726), vol. 2. p. 204.

<sup>19</sup>Mucklow, *The Spirit of the Hat*, p. 18.

<sup>20</sup>Crisp, *Babel's Builders Unmasking Themselves*, p. A2; Bugg, *De Christiana Libertate*, p. 15.

<sup>21</sup>Anon., *The Spirit of the Quakers Tried According to that Discovery it hath made of itself in their Great Prophet and Patriarch George Fox*, (London, 1672), p. 4.

greatest preacher amongst you, and the most deified that I can hear of'.<sup>22</sup>

However, it is clear that whilst Fox was an important architect of local and central meetings, once these had been established there was a shift away from individual or 'charismatic' authority and a move to a more shared leadership. Richard Bailey has suggested that Quakerism was able to survive because Fox was able 'to adjust to shared leadership and assume the role of a respected, but unintrusive, father-figure to the movement'.<sup>23</sup> Whilst this perhaps undermines Fox's role to some degree, it is nevertheless true that his influence was lessened in the sense that authority became instilled in the central meetings.

Although, there were no official positions within the central structure of Quakerism, with the exception of those salaried clerks-Ellis Hooke, Richard Richardson and various assistants such as Mark Swannner and the Quaker solicitor, Thomas Rudyard, it is clear that a smallish body of Friends were dominant at these central meetings. As was shown in the chapter on central organization, a few Friends tended to be present at all of the central meetings: George Whitehead, William Penn, Gilbert Latye, Ellis Hooke, William Crouch and William Welch, Alexander Parker and William Gibson.<sup>24</sup> As Larry Ingle has stated, 'the leaders who had come to the fore in

---

<sup>22</sup>Roger Williams, *George Fox Digged out of His Burrows* (n.p., 1676), sig. A3.

<sup>23</sup>Bailey, p. 284.

<sup>24</sup>See chapter 2.

London...were more interested in details than Fox. They knew how to implement their leader's vision and he lent his approval.<sup>25</sup> Of all of these, George Whitehead and William Penn were the most prominent. Their importance lies in the contributions which they made to those central meetings of the Quaker organization and also to the fact that they were leading theoreticians of the Quaker movement which the others were not. It would be fair to say that no other Quakers had such a broad influence with the exception of Fox.

George Whitehead, one of the 'valiant sixty', and the longest lived of the first generation of Quakers, dying in 1723, was a prominent member on all of the central meetings. Larry Ingle has suggested that 'his influence approached that of Fox'.<sup>26</sup> Along with William Penn, Whitehead was made responsible by the Second Day Morning Meeting for the collection of anti-Quaker works and although it does not feature in the minutes the two were clearly responsible for writing replies to Quaker critics as can be seen from the many defences of Quakerism written by them this time, the most famous being the joint work, *The Christian Quaker* of 1673.<sup>27</sup>

Whitehead's prominence can be seen especially in his work on behalf of the Meeting for Sufferings for which he often headed meetings with Charles II and James II. Much of this activity can be traced in Whitehead's autobiography, *The*

---

<sup>25</sup> Ingle, *First Among Friends*, p. 252.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 255.

<sup>27</sup> F.H.L., Morning Meeting Book, vol. 1, p. 1, 15.7. [Sept] 1673.

*Christian Progress*. In the spring of 1672, as part of Charles' attempt to introduce toleration, Whitehead along with fellow Quakers, Thomas Moor and Thomas Green had an audience with the king at Whitehall in which Whitehead explained the Quakers' objection to swearing oaths and their difficulty in therefore taking the oath of allegiance. Whitehead describes how he,

had a fair opportunity to open the case of our suffering Friends as a conscientious people, chiefly to show the reason of our not swearing allegiance to the king; that it was not in any contempt...but singly as it is a matter of conscience to us, not to swear at all

Following the interview, the king gave a warrant for the release of 480 prisoners.<sup>28</sup> A year later, in 1673, Whitehead pleaded with Charles II at Hampton Court for the release of George Fox from Worcester jail.<sup>29</sup> During 1679-1680 Whitehead, along with William Mead presented details of the persecution of Quakers under the Elizabethan statute against recusants and showed how parliament had earlier placed a clause distinguishing papists and Protestants in the bill of ease, but had been prorogued before the bill got to the Lords.<sup>30</sup> Various interviews and presentations on behalf of the Quakers followed in the 1680s, one of the most important being an address from Whitehead to Charles II in August 1683 following the Rye House plot to assure the government of Quaker loyalty.<sup>31</sup> In 1686 Whitehead's overtures to the James II

---

<sup>28</sup>Whitehead, *The Christian Progress*, pp. 351.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 372.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., pp. 374-375.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., pp. 537-539.

resulted in the appointment of two commissioners to stop the informing trade against Quakers, the purpose of which was to hear the informers and Quakers 'face to face'. Whitehead noted how,

the said commissioners authorized me to give out summonses to those informers who we had complained against and charged...I had liberty to summon whom, and as many as I thought fit, both of those injurious informers, and of our Friends, in and about London, and the county of Middlesex, to appear before the said commissioners at Clifford's-Inn.<sup>32</sup>

In 1687 James' desire to repeal the penal laws against Catholics meant that he was attentive to the pleas for toleration from Whitehead and Gilbert Latey and to that end he issued his Declaration of Indulgence.<sup>33</sup> In 1689, after the revolution, Whitehead was responsible with others for drawing up a short confession to clarify the religious position of Quakers on the Trinity and scriptures, which was delivered by Whitehead and John Vaughton, another Meeting for Sufferings member, to Sir Thomas Clarges and later to a Grand Committee of the House of Commons. Whitehead described how he,

had then occasion to answer the Committee very clearly, and to their satisfaction, both as to (the Quakers) really owning the Deity, [of Christ] and the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as given forth by divine inspiration.<sup>34</sup>

Whitehead similarly recorded how Friends urged him to present the case to the William III and to take with him 'three or four ...Friends, whom he pleased' and went on to say how he

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., pp. 593-594.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., pp. 625-628.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., pp. 635-6.

'accepted of that service, being always willing and ready to serve and help suffering Friends, (as I had in the two king's reigns before) according to my ability, and as the Lord was pleased to enable me.'<sup>35</sup>

William Penn was also a leader within the Quaker central organization who no doubt helped the move towards repeatability owing to his social standing, education and acquaintance with the nation's rulers. As has been noted, he was made responsible for the collection and recording of all anti-Quaker writings along with George Whitehead. His prominence on the Second Day Morning Meeting may also be gauged from his part in the Wilkinson-Story dispute about which he kept in close touch with George Fox, advising him for example to attend a meeting in 1676.<sup>36</sup> Penn is the probable author of an epistle from the Yearly Meeting in 1675 which firmly supported the Foxonian position with regard to women's meetings and the role of women in the procedure of marriage. The paper was highly authoritarian insisting that the setting up of men's and women's meetings was 'according to the mind and counsel of God'. Penn ended by adding that if any interfered to 'weaken the hands of either men or women in that work', then the Quaker leadership would view them 'as therein not in unity with the church of Christ'. The paper was signed by Whitehead and some other influential Quakers such as Alexander Parker and thus left no doubt that Fox had their

---

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., pp. 636-7.

<sup>36</sup>*Papers of William Penn*, vol. 1, Penn to Fox, 4.1. [March] 1676, p. 360.

support.<sup>37</sup>

The aristocratic circles which Penn mixed in meant that he was a dominant force in the Meeting for Sufferings for he was in a position to represent Quaker interests to the courts of Charles II and James II, in particular the latter, and subsequently, he was present at most of the sessions of the meeting. His studies at Lincoln's Inn during 1664 and 1665 had equipped Penn with a legal knowledge which gave him an enhanced role in the Meeting for Sufferings. In May 1678 for example, Penn and Thomas Rudyard, the Quaker solicitor, were asked to 'seek the opinion of learned counsel in relation to the laws', and when obtained this was to be sent out to every quarterly meeting.<sup>38</sup> It was Penn's social standing and association with the court which were paramount though. His father, Admiral Sir William Penn had supported the restoration of Charles II in 1660 and was made Commissioner of the Navy in the same year but he became closer to Charles' brother, the Duke of York, when the latter was made Lord High Admiral of the Navy. As Vincent Buranelli has pointed out, 'the intimacy of the Duke of York and Sir William Penn led directly to the subsequent intimacy of James II and William Penn'.<sup>39</sup> During Charles' reign Penn had been helped by James in his effort to assist various Quakers; in 1673 for example, Penn was able to

---

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., Epistle from the London Yearly Meeting, 27.3. [May] 1675, pp. 329-330.

<sup>38</sup>F.H.L., Minutes of the Meeting for Sufferings, vol. 1, p. 58, 22.3. [May] 1678.

<sup>39</sup>Vincent Buranelli, *The King and the Quaker: A Study of William Penn and James II* (Philadelphia, 1962), pp. 21, 23-24.

speak with James on behalf of George Fox who had been imprisoned for refusing the oath of allegiance. During 1677 to 1678 Penn met with Charles II, along with Whitehead and William Mead, in relation to the suffering of Friends under the Elizabethan statute against recusancy.<sup>40</sup> By the opening of James' reign, the king and Penn had known each other for a quarter of a century and thus the latter was in a better position to act as an advocate of Quakerism. Their friendship was cemented by common aims. As Buranelli has pointed out; 'Penn wanted to achieve freedom of conscience for everybody in order to achieve freedom of conscience for Quakers. James wanted freedom of conscience for everybody in order to achieve freedom of conscience for Catholics'.<sup>41</sup> In 1686 Penn persuaded James to release over a thousand Quakers from prison. The year following the desire of James to help the Catholics led him to issue his first Declaration of Indulgence which gave benefit to other Dissenters also. Previously, Penn's *Persuasive to Moderation* of 1686, addressed to the king, had argued for toleration of Dissenters and Catholics and the immediate repeal of the Test Act.

With regard to doctrinal formulations, a number of leading Quakers stand out such as Isaac Penington and Robert Barclay. The aristocratic Penington, Cambridge educated, and son of Alderman Sir Isaac Penington, was a leading Quaker thinker whose subtle and profound writings further explained

---

<sup>40</sup>F.H.L., Minutes of the Meeting for Sufferings, vol. 1., p. 26, 28.4. [June] 1677.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 135.

key doctrinal positions. He sought like other leading writers to harmonize the Quaker position on the inward Christ and the historic Christ. In his work, the *Flesh and Blood of Christ* which was an answer to the Baptist Thomas Hick's charge that 'the Quakers account the blood of Christ no more than a common thing', Penington stated that 'testifying to the inward (from which the outward came) doth not make the outward void' and further added that the coming of the outward Christ was 'a spotless sacrifice of great value, and effectual for remission of sins'.<sup>42</sup> He called for people to turn to the 'inner light' for he stated, 'there is not that need of publishing the other as their formerly was' for 'the historical relation concerning Christ is generally believed' and went on to say 'but the mystery they miss of, the hidden life they are not aquainted with; but alienated from the life of God, in the midst of their literal owning and acknowledging of these things'.<sup>43</sup>

During the 1670s and 80s Quakers were much taken up with the defence of the Quaker emphasis on the 'inner light' and George Fox himself wrote numerous tracts on this subject. Fox inferred the importance of both the inward and outward Christ in his insistence that Quakers were 'witnesses of Christ's birth, suffering, death, and resurrection, and of his flesh and his Divinity' while at the same time stressing the unchanging nature of Christ who to the Quakers was 'the same

---

<sup>42</sup> Isaac Penington, *The Flesh and Blood of Christ, both in the Mystery and the Outward* (n.p., 1675), sig. A2.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 29.

today, yesterday and forever'.<sup>44</sup> In Fox's *Catechism* of 1670, he emphasised the importance of the two Christs in that he acknowledged that 'Christ shed blood for all men, and tasted death for every man' but at the same time adds that salvation comes from 'believing in the light'.<sup>45</sup>

William Penn and George Whitehead were also leading defenders of Quakerism in the 1670s and 1680s and worked on a number of important collaborative tracts such as *A Serious Apology* of 1671 and the famous *Christian Quaker* of 1673. The latter represents an important doctrinal work of early Quakerism and deals extensively with the nature of the 'inner light', relating it to Christ's outward sacrifice which had not really been attempted before. Penn and Whitehead answered the most searching question of Quaker critics in this work, that is to say the point about Christ's incarnation-if 'as the Word-God' he had 'illuminated all men antecedent to his coming in the flesh'. Penn and Whitehead replied that critics mistakenly assumed 'that there was no difference in the degree of illumination before, and at the coming of Christ after that visible manner in to the world.'<sup>46</sup>

The most important theoretician in terms of doctrine was Robert Barclay, Laird of Ury in Scotland and a distant relation of the reigning Stuart monarchs, whose *Apology* was the first systematic treatment of most aspects of Quaker

---

<sup>44</sup>Geore Fox, *A Testimony of What We Believe of Christ* (n.p., 1677), pp. 11, 81.

<sup>45</sup>Fox, *Primer and Catechism for Children*, pp. 66, 74.

<sup>46</sup>Penn and Whitehead, *The Christian Quaker*, 1st part, p. 94.

doctrine. In this he covered 15 propositions in considerable detail and clarity. Among other points, Barclay explained the Quaker position regarding perfection which so vexed critics and stated that Quakers did not mean 'such a perfection as may not daily admit of a growth, and consequently mean not as if they were to be as pure, holy and perfect, as God'. He further added that even when 'man has arrived to such a condition in which a man may not sin, he yet may sin'.<sup>47</sup> His crucial contribution to Quaker theology came in his idea of justification in which he expounds a two-fold theory of redemption, the first 'performed and accomplished by Christ for us, in his crucified body', by which man is put into a 'capacity of salvation' and the second, 'the redemption wrought by Christ in us 'whereby we witness, and know this pure and perfect redemption in ourselves'.<sup>48</sup> Barclay's *Catechism and Confession of Faith* of 1673 was also a highly important and influential work which was reprinted many times. This included a brief statement on the Trinity, which did not appear in the *Apology*, citing the epistle of John and the three divine witnesses.<sup>49</sup>

Barclay's biographer, D. Elton Trueblood has attributed the survival of Quakerism after the Restoration as being in no small part the work of Barclay. He has claimed that Barclay provided 'the intellectual basis of survival', for as Trueblood says, 'without Fox, Barclay would have had very

---

<sup>47</sup>Barclay, *Apology*, VIII Proposition, pp. 169-170.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., VII Proposition, p. 142.

<sup>49</sup>Barclay, *Catechism and Confession of Faith*, pp. 133-4.

little to say, but without Barclay, what Fox said would have been forgotten. By the genius of Barclay the basic Quaker ideas were translated into the language of thoughtful men, who in the end are the ones who establish the climate of opinion'.<sup>50</sup> It is important to remember however that even these intellectual leaders of Quakerism came under the censorship of the central organization via the Second Day Morning Meeting.

### *Conclusion*

Weber's category of 'charismatic authority' is a useful tool for the study of religious movements. As was shown in the previous section on early leadership of the Quaker movement, authority stemmed predominantly from the charismatic personality of George Fox, and to some degree that of James Nayler until his downfall in 1656. The modern historiography of the early movement has sought to downplay Fox's role as founder and leader of the movement in its emphasis on those other influential personalities such as Richard Farnworth and William Dewsberry, who underwent similar religious experiences to Fox, albeit independently of him. Nonetheless, an analysis of the surviving manuscripts undoubtedly shows that Quakers saw Fox as having special attributes and being worthy of 'double honour', though this term is occasionally used when referring to Nayler.

Following the Restoration, the need to give the movement

---

<sup>50</sup>D. Elton Trueblood, *Robert Barclay* (New York, 1968), pp. 20, 3.

some kind of stability was paramount. As Max Weber has stated, charisma as a source of authority is a 'revolutionary force' and 'cannot itself become the basis of a stabilized order without undergoing profound structural changes', by which it becomes transformed into 'rational-legal' or 'traditional authority'.<sup>51</sup> Weber saw charismatic authority as 'irrational' and the 'antithesis' of the latter two. He described 'traditional authority' as 'bound to the precedents handed down from the past' and bureaucratic or rational-legal authority he claimed was 'bound to...rules' and the belief in the legality of patterns of rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands.<sup>52</sup> With the growth of organization, authority in the Quaker movement moved away from the individual personality, though as has been shown, Fox was still very influential, and it became rooted in those bodies which made up the central organization. Those involved ran the system established by Fox and worked out his vision. The 'charismatic' authority so prominent in the first few decades of Quakerism gradually gave way to something quite different. The nature of Quaker authority was based increasingly upon adherence to a system of 'rules' and advices which had gradually been built up during the establishment of local and central meetings and were transmitted down the elaborate Quaker organizational structure.

---

<sup>51</sup>Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, p. 66.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 361.

## CHAPTER 6

### *QUAKER BEHAVIOUR c. 1650-1689*

#### *Introduction*

Along with what seemed at times blasphemous religious beliefs, the early Quakers of the 1650s aroused suspicion amongst contemporaries with their unique social customs and conventions, their aggressive attitude to magistracy and ministry and the ecstatic behaviour occasioned by their discovery of the 'inner light' and the freedom that it promised, which often linked them in adversaries' minds with the Ranters. The historians Christopher Hill and Barry Reay have seen Quakers as carrying on the radical ideas of the Levellers and Diggers of the 1640s, whilst others such as Hugh Barbour have not viewed their activities as attempts at radical social reform, but have rather seen their testimonies principally as an attempt at conversion. Barbour claims that 'testimonies for social equality were...no sign of any effort to create a new social order by custom or by law (as with the Levellers), let alone by revolution.'<sup>1</sup> Both views however, can be criticized: Barbour gives no explanation of some of the radical pamphlets that did emerge in the 1650s, whilst Reay and others tend to over-emphasise this strand in Quaker literature.

Gradually after the Restoration, certain Quaker practices

---

<sup>1</sup>Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution*; Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down*; Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England*, p. 166.

began to change. The episodes of 'going naked' and testifying by other signs, and the Quaker claim to miraculous powers were slowly dropped after the 1660s, though there were a few isolated episodes afterwards. Non-resistance also became an enshrined principle in the early 1660s which played an important part in Quakerism's gradual acceptance by the authorities. Although most of Quakerism's other social beliefs such as plain dress, refusal of hat honour and their usage of 'thee' and 'thou' survived, they did not appear as subversive as in the 1650s when Quakers had cried out against customs which embodied social distinctions. Quakers still condemned injustice and inequalities but not so vehemently and the writings of such prominent authors as Robert Barclay assured Quaker contemporaries that they accepted the hierarchical society in which they lived.

#### *Quakerism as an ecstatic movement*

As Barry Reay has pointed out, it is often forgotten that Quakerism was basically an ecstatic movement in its infancy; the effects of the workings of the 'inner light' could lead to feelings of rapture and extremes of behaviour.<sup>2</sup> Flamboyant and extravagant actions abounded as Quakers responded to the power of the 'inner light' and could take the form of quaking and trembling, prophesying, performing 'miracles' and using 'signs' such as 'going naked' as a means of revealing the Quaker message. Such activity gradually disappeared after the restored order of 1660 as the forces of Quaker organization

---

<sup>2</sup>Reay, *Quakers and the English Revolution*, p. 35.

served to curb such tendencies.

In the 1650s quaking and trembling were common during the period of 'convinement' as Quakers threw off all that was earthly or 'carnal' to reveal the 'seed', that tiny part of God within them. As Melvyn Endy has stated, Friends spoke of the beginnings of rebirth in terms of the doctrine of the 'seed' from which the new man grows. The seed was not part of the old self and was activated by the light within those who are 'tender'. This process involved 'threshing' and 'ploughing' until the hard heart of man in the fall was renewed.<sup>3</sup> George Fox defended quaking from its attackers by comparing the Quaker experience with that of the prophets and apostles and stated, 'you are ignorant of the scriptures, and the Holy men of God's words and his power which wrought upon them which made them to tremble'.<sup>4</sup> The Quaker, James Parnell, described how 'Isaac the seed of the promise trembled, Moses the servant of God quaked and trembled, Jeremiah the prophet of the Lord, his bones shook, Habakkuk, his belly trembled and lips quivered'.<sup>5</sup> Such behaviour was castigated by Quaker adversaries and exaggerated for propaganda purposes. Giles Firmin, a minister from Shalford in Essex who attended a Quaker meeting described how,

the devil roared in the deceived souls in most strange and dreadful manner, some howling, some

---

<sup>3</sup>Endy, *William Penn and Early Quakerism*, p. 73, quoted in Penington, 'The Flesh and Blood of Christ...' Works II, pp. 188-189.

<sup>4</sup>Fox, *Journal*, vol. 1, p. 8.

<sup>5</sup>James Parnell, *A Shield of the Truth or the Truth of God Cleared of from Scandals and Reproaches* (London, 1655), p. 1.

screeching, yelling, roaring, and some had a strange kind of humming, singing noise.

Firmin went on to recount how those at the meeting were 'so terribly shaken, with such strange violent various motions, that I wondered how it was possible some of them could live'.<sup>6</sup>

The promptings of the 'light' also led early Quakers to vehemently denounce the clergy and to interrupt church services. They refused like other groups to pay tithes, but as Barry Reay has pointed out they also 'waged a guerilla war against the clergy', either interrupting the minister, or arriving early at the church to address the congregation before the minister got there. Reay has noted that there were around 400 such cases, many of which went to court.<sup>7</sup> Many of these are contained in Joseph Besse's collection of Quaker sufferings. In 1655, for example, Ambrose Rigge was sent to prison 'for uttering a Christian exhortation to the people in the place of public worship at Southampton' and Ellen Embree and Anne Hersent were each fined £5 each for the same. In the same year Mary Spier was jailed for 10 months 'for reproving the priest of Basingstoke'.<sup>8</sup> Another practice which attracted criticism was the belief that Quakers were given miraculous healing powers. Richard Farnworth wrote that God had given Quakers power so that they could 'lay hands on the sick, and

---

<sup>6</sup>Giles Firmin, *Establishing against Shaking*, p. 55.

<sup>7</sup>Reay, *Quakers and the English Revolution*, pp. 43-44.

<sup>8</sup>Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers*, vol. 1, p. 229.

recover them, as the Apostles did'.<sup>9</sup> James Nayler and his associates had claimed that Nayler had raised Dorcas Erbury from the dead in 1656. The most revealing example of Quaker claims to miraculous powers is of course George Fox's 'Book of Miracles', only part of which has survived. Cadbury has noted that the Annual Catalogue of George Fox's Papers which was put together between 1694 and 1698, and partly published in 1939, contained a manuscript alphabetical index including what were clearly entries from the 'Book of Miracles' which Cadbury managed to piece together.<sup>10</sup> The cases covered people with physical illnesses and those who were 'distracted', 'possessed' and 'troubled', suggesting spiritual or mental problems.<sup>11</sup> The 'Book of Miracles' was never published and Cadbury has suggested that it may have been suppressed in case it attracted ridicule.<sup>12</sup> Occasional references to 'miracles' also occur in George Fox's *Journal*; for example, Fox noted how he was called to Whitechapel,

to a woman yt was dyeinge and her childe... & after  
a while I was moved to speak to ye woman: and shee  
& her childe was raised uppe: & shee gott uppe to ye  
astonishment of ye people & her childe alsoe was  
healed.<sup>13</sup>

Further evidence also comes from the journal of the Quaker John Banks published in 1712. In an entry for 1677 Banks

---

<sup>9</sup>Richard Farnworth, *Antichrists Man of War* (1655), p. 62.

<sup>10</sup>Henry J. Cadbury (ed.), *George Fox's Book of Miracles*, pp. 63-64.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 69. See appendix 16.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 40.

<sup>13</sup>Fox, *Journal*, vol. 2, p. 342.

recounted how his arm and hand had 'begun to wither and physicians could give no cure'. He went on to relate how he had dreamt of George Fox and the healing of his hand which had so impressed itself upon him that he visited Fox at Swarthmore. He recounts how when walking, Fox 'looked upon me, lifting up his hand, and laid it upon my shoulder, and said the Lord strengthen thee both within and without'. Later Banks describes how he went over to Thomas Lower's that evening, after leaving Fox, and whilst at supper, he recounts how his hand was lifted up to do its office, which it would not for so long...which struck me into a great admiration, and my heart was broken into true tenderness before the Lord and the next day I went home, with my hand and arm restored to its former use and strength, without any pain.<sup>14</sup>

Evidence would suggest that 'miracles' continued well into the 1670s and 1680s, the last one recorded in 'The Book of Miracles' is for 1683, an account of the Quaker James Claypoole who was 'mighty sick of the stone'.<sup>15</sup> However there is an even later example in Fox's *Itinerary Journals* where he is recorded as having visited John Rouse's house at Kingston in 1686 'being sent thither to see Nat: Rouse [who] was sick of ye small pox...'.<sup>16</sup>

One of the most extreme practices of the early Quakers was acting out 'signs' such as the wearing of sackcloth and ashes and 'going naked' as a way of spreading their message.

---

<sup>14</sup>John Banks, *A Journal of the Life, Labours, Travel, and Sufferings...* (London, 1712), pp. 66-67.

<sup>15</sup>Cadbury, p. 147.

<sup>16</sup>*The Short Journal and Itinerary Journals of George Fox*, N. Penney (ed.), (London, 1925), *Itinerary Journal*, p. 134.

Kenneth L. Carroll argues that this sprang from their investigation of the Bible and desire to know how holy men of old communicated their message. Early Quakers followed the example of Jeremiah, Isaiah, Ezekiel and Jonah, who linked the adoption of sack cloth with repentance. Carroll further indicates that a strong influence came from Revelations 11:31: 'And I have two witnesses, whom I shall appoint to prophesy, dressed in sackcloth'.<sup>17</sup> Cases of Quakers donning sackcloth are numerous from the 1650s: In Bristol in 1654, Thomas Murford was accused of being a Franciscan friar for wearing 'a coat of hair'. When asked why he had done so by the authorities, Murford replied that he had been 'commanded of the Lord to come and mourn in sackcloth for you, and to warn you to let the Lord's people alone'. He was later sent to Newgate prison. Another case was that of Sarah Goldsmith, who in 1655 went to the several gates of Bristol, accompanied by two friends, 'clad in a garment of sackcloth, reaching to the ground, with her head uncovered, and earth or ashes laid thereon, and her hair hanging down about her. Goldsmith later went 'and stood in the same habit at the high-cross...as a sign against pride'.<sup>18</sup>

The practice of 'going naked' began probably around late 1652.<sup>19</sup> It was adopted by Quakers as yet another means of

---

<sup>17</sup>Kenneth L. Carroll, 'Sackcloth and Ashes, and other Signs and Wonders' *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, 53 (1975), pp. 314-315.

<sup>18</sup>Besse, *Sufferings*, vol. 1, p. 41.

<sup>19</sup>Kenneth L. Carroll, 'Early Quakers and "Going Naked as a Sign"' *Quaker History*, 67 (1978), p. 76.

driving home the Quaker message of the spiritual nakedness of the world. As Richard Bauman has stated, 'In an age saturated with verbal religious discourse striking nonverbal enactments represented a ready means of attracting attention to the Quaker message, highlighting at the same time the Quaker challenge to conventional communicative norms'.<sup>20</sup> A number of detailed testimonies concerning the phenomenon of 'going naked' survive. William Simpson of Lancashire, travelled in Cumberland, Oxfordshire and other districts and went naked from time to time in the 1650s. Addressing the clergy he wrote, 'ye priests this is to you, ye shall become like trees in the winter, not so much as leaves to cover you withal, but your nakedness shall appear as my nakedness hath done, as a figure unto you and many people'. He goes on to add that signs are required so that people 'may be left without excuse in the day when the Lord will come to reckon with you'. Clearly then such signs were seen as essential for warning people to repent or believe.<sup>21</sup>

These signs were not the only ones in the Quakers' repertoire. Some Friends appeared with lit candles probably as a sign of the 'light' and an Elizabeth Adams went to parliament and broke a pitcher at the doors as a sign that they would be shattered similarly.<sup>22</sup> The most notorious case of testifying by signs was that of James Nayler which led to

---

<sup>20</sup>Bauman, *Let Your Words Be Few*, p. 85.

<sup>21</sup>William Simpson, *From One who was Moved of the Lord God to go a Sign...* (London, 1659), pp. 4-6.

<sup>22</sup>Carroll, 'Sackcloth and Ashes', p. 322.

an attack on Quakerism by the 1656 parliament. Nayler entered Bristol on a donkey, an act which was meant to be symbolic of Christ's coming. It appears that some of his followers went beyond this and actually saw Nayler as the messiah. Reprints of their letters refer to Nayler as 'thou fairest of ten thousand, thou only begotten Son of God' and suggest that his 'name is no more to be called James but Jesus'.<sup>23</sup>

It was these sort of practices which fuelled the contemporary idea that Quakers were like Ranters. Thomas Collier, the Baptist, linked Quakerism with Ranterism when he stated that Quaker principles were 'the same as the old Ranters', adding that in his opinion, 'though in word they deny it, yet in act he [Nayler] must come and proclaim it'.<sup>24</sup> Collier compared Nayler's entry into Bristol with the activities of the Ranter, John Robins who 'was proclaimed the great God' and who 'came to a shameful end'.<sup>25</sup> The existence of Ranters has been questioned by the historian J.C. Davis who has claimed that 'there was no Ranter movement, no Ranter sect, no Ranter theology'. Davis believes that they were the invention of hostile contemporaries who wished to create a moral panic so as to engender support for the traditional social, religious and moral order.<sup>26</sup> Davis has argued that sects such as Baptists and Quakers made use of Ranterism in

---

<sup>23</sup>Deacon, *The Grand Imposter Examined*, p. 10.

<sup>24</sup>Thomas Collier, *A Looking-Glass for the Quakers*, p. 16.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 16.

<sup>26</sup>J.C. Davis, *Fear Myth and History: The Ranters and the Historians* (Cambridge, 1986), p. 124.

order to discipline their own members, which is certainly true in the Quaker case yet while the importance of the Ranters may have been exaggerated there is a dimension to early Quakerism, typified by the activities of Nayler and his followers, and in other Quaker beliefs such as perfectionism which smack of Ranterism and which suggests that they did indeed exist. Christopher Hill has answered Davis with a number of arguments. One proof for the existence of Ranters according to Davies was that they should have clear leaders, authoritative tests on entry and controls over members. Hill has responded that if these criteria were used then it may as well be said that Quakers and Baptists did not exist either; Ranters gathered around charismatic preachers for discussion. Hill preferred to use the phrase 'Ranter milieu' pointing out that contemporaries recognized the existence of Ranters with their characteristic beliefs and attitudes such as hostility to organized churches, rejection of heaven and hell, denial of original sin and the preaching of sexual permissiveness. Hill noted that Ranters were absorbed by groups such as the Quakers and that they did indeed use them 'as a stick with which to beat the other', yet as Hill has remarked, 'there would have been no point in name-calling of this sort if there had never been any Ranters'.<sup>27</sup> Nicholas Tyacke has also criticized Davis' ideas stating that, 'It is one thing to debate the significance of the Ranters, but quite another to abolish them. The Ranters appear to have been a quite small and rather

---

<sup>27</sup>Christopher Hill, 'The Lost Ranters? a critique of J.C. Davis' *History Workshop* 24 (1987), pp. 134-5.

ephemeral grouping, whose practical antinomianism shocked contemporaries'.<sup>28</sup>

Carroll has identified those periods in the early history of Quakerism when acting out signs was most prominent. After the Nayler episode there was a temporary halt in the practice of 'going naked', a 'second wave' in 1658 and 1659, then a plethora of cases around the early 1660s, after which there was a distinct fall in the number of instances. Carroll has attributed the decrease to the schism created by the separatist Quaker John Perrot in the 1660s.<sup>29</sup> Perrot had objected to the Quaker practice of taking the hat off during prayer and had gathered a group of followers around him. The disagreement had really centred on the question of authority versus individualism, a theme which became more and more familiar. The use of other signs also decreased after 1662; there were a few cases 'but they were the exception rather than the rule'. For example, the Quaker Thomas Ibbitts went through London before the Great Fire in 1666, saying that there would be a judgement by fire on the city.<sup>30</sup> Robert Barclay, the apologist felt a command to call the people of Aberdeen to repentance in 1672.<sup>31</sup> The practice of 'going naked' also declined though there were a few cases: Solomon

---

<sup>28</sup>Review by Nicholas Tyacke of Davis' *Fear, Myth and History in History of European Ideas* vol. 9 (1988), p. 606.

<sup>29</sup>Carroll, 'Going Naked', p. 84. For Perrot, see chapter 2.

<sup>30</sup>Carroll, 'Sackcloth and Ashes', pp. 325, 324.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 319.

Eccles went naked in London in 1667, and in Galway in 1669.<sup>32</sup> The Quaker Daniel Smith went naked in Hull at a meeting of Independents in Blackfriarsgate Street. Smith later noted how he was 'moved of the Lord to leave my wife and family shop and trade, and estate, and all other affairs, and friends and relations, and to come to Hull' and there to reveal to the congregation that 'as my body was naked, so was that congregation naked, not being clothed with the spirit of the Lord'.<sup>33</sup>

Such phenomena as quaking, trembling and using signs gradually disappeared as Quakerism matured. Even during the Interregnum, as Rosemary Moore has noted during 1655-56, 'Quakerism was quietening down. There were many more references to silent meetings, and less to quaking and to signs such as going naked'.<sup>34</sup> Moore has pointed out how Fox in his *Journal* rarely mentions quaking and signs but instead refers to the 'power of the Lord' to embrace such practices. As she has suggested, 'charismatic phenomena were out of fashion in the 1670s'.<sup>35</sup>

In the 1680s the desire of leading Quakers to distance themselves from the extravagant behaviour of the past can be seen from a broadside put out by the Quaker central organization against a Solomon Hornoul who went about in

---

<sup>32</sup>Carroll, 'Going Naked', p. 83.

<sup>33</sup>Daniel Smith, *The 24th Day of the 6th month, 1673 being the 4th part of the week, in the after part of that day* (n.p., n.d.), pp. 6, 3.

<sup>34</sup>Moore, 'The Faith of the First Quakers', p. 181.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 254.

sackcloth through London. He had sometimes 'been reputed a Jesuit, and sometimes a Quaker' though the broadside adds that he was 'never in society with the Quakers, or owned by them, but testified against'. A description noted how Hornoul 'went through Leaden-Hall Street in his sackcloth coat, gathering people about him and pronouncing judgements'. He prophesied 'sword, pestilence, famine and fire on London'. The description went on to say how he later went down the Strand 'in like manner pretending a message to the King'. The writers of the document were obviously anxious to point out the failings of Hornoul and catalogue his lies such as pretending to be a Cambridge scholar and to be of 'great parentage'. They stated that 'words can scarce set forth and demonstrate all his lies, forgeries, and deceitful frenzy, works and practices'. The broadside ends with two testimonies from his brother and a kinsman which are signed by the Quaker leaders William Gibson, Richard Whitspaine and Nathaniel Brassey.<sup>6</sup> The document is important as it highlights the profound concern of the Quaker central organization to distance themselves from phenomena such as testifying by signs. The intention of the piece was to deny any association of Hornoul with Friends, but even more it was a testimony against enthusiasm.

By the mid 1670s when the central meetings were in place there was a clear attempt to discourage the more extreme forms

---

<sup>6</sup>A True Account of one Solomon Hornoul that lately went in sack-cloth, through part of London, Westminster and Southwark, &c from the people called Quakers, and from his kindred (1685) Broadside.

of Quaker behaviour. A minute from the 1675 Yearly Meeting admitted that 'there hath been and is serious sighing, sensible groaning and reverent singing' in meetings, but goes on to say that 'where any do or shall abuse the power of God, or are immoderate, or do either in imitation, which rather burdens than edifies such ought to be privately admonished'. At a later meeting in 1689 Quakers were advised to watch out for those 'who go rambling up and down the counties, under pretence of preaching truth...whose conversations are not savoury as becomes the truth'.<sup>37</sup> No doubt this was also intended as a discouragement to the former Quaker habit of interrupting priests and church services. This evidently had not ceased altogether; C. E. Whiting has noted a number of cases in the 1660s and 70s of Quakers interrupting services, for example in 1665 at Helmsley near York, Quakers interrupted a minister in the middle of a funeral service and tore his prayer book and surplice. In 1666, a Quaker woman interrupted a Christmas Day service at Windermere church, abusing the minister and parishioners.<sup>38</sup>

Such spontaneous reactions of Quakers were to be replaced by something much more measured. Robert Barclay in his *Apology* of 1676 attempted to explain the reason for the Quaker practice of trembling and portrayed it rather as a beautiful spiritual experience than the enthusiastic outpourings of earlier times when he wrote,

---

<sup>37</sup>F.H.L., Yearly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 16, 27.3. [May] 1675; p. 219, 20/21/223. [May] 1689.

<sup>38</sup>Whiting, *Studies in English Puritanism*, p. 193.

sometimes the power of God will break forth into a whole meeting, and there will be such an inward travail, while each is seeking to overcome the evil in themselves, that by the strong contrary workings of these opposite powers, like the going of the two contrary tides, every individual will be strongly exercised as in a day of battle; and thereby trembling and a motion of body will be upon most, if not upon all, which, as the power of truth prevails, will from pangs and groans end with a sweet sound of thanksgiving and praise.<sup>39</sup>

Furthermore, Barclay in his *Anarchy of the Ranters*, spoke out against enthusiasm when he wrote, 'some are so great pretenders to inward motions and revelations of the spirit, that there are no extravagances so wild which they will not cloak with it'. The antidote for Barclay and other Quaker leaders was 'good order and discipline' which Barclay stated 'the church of Christ never was nor can be without'. Lack of control would leave an 'open door to Libertinism and bring great reproach'. Barclay then went on to talk of the excesses of the Anabaptists and John of Leiden and also of the Ranters which Quakers were linked with, but stated that the Quakers worked 'to avoid them and to be found in that even and good path of the primitive church'.<sup>40</sup>

### ***The Quaker attitude towards violence and the development of the peace principle***

The question of Quaker pacifism has recently been reassessed by historians such as Barry Reay and Christopher Hill. Reay has rightly said that Quakers in the Interregnum 'were not pacifist in any modern sense of the term', that is

---

<sup>39</sup>Barclay, *Apology*, XI Proposition, pp. 253-254.

<sup>40</sup>Barclay, *The Anarchy of the Ranters*, pp. 6-7.

opposed to partaking in war.<sup>41</sup> W. A. Cole has claimed that the Quaker attitude towards politics and the use of force 'had been decidedly ambiguous. On the one hand, they stood aloof from the strife and contention among the children of the world, and on the other they recognized the responsibility of the saints to take their part in the establishment of a righteous government should circumstances permit'.<sup>42</sup> Christopher Hill has stated in a similar vein that 'The first official declaration of absolute pacifism in all circumstances was made by the Quakers in January 1661'. This was the date, Hill says from which Quakers refused military or civil offices.<sup>43</sup>

The ambiguity of the Quaker position can be seen with reference to George Fox. Fox wrote to Cromwell using belligerent language to tell him of the success he might have had if he had been faithful to the cause and lamented,

O Oliver, hadst thou been faithful and thundered down the deceit, the Hollander had been thy subject and tributary, Germany had given up to have done thy will, and the Spaniard had quivered like a dry leaf wanting the virtue of God, the King of France should have bowed his neck under thee, the Pope should have withered as in winter, the Turk in all his fatness should have smoked.<sup>44</sup>

On the other hand, Fox may also be seen vigorously denying the

---

<sup>41</sup>Reay, *Quakers and the English Revolution*, p. 42.

<sup>42</sup>W.A. Cole, 'The Quakers and Politics 1652-1660', D.Phil. University of Cambridge, 1955, p. 276. And for a shorter discussion see his 'The Quakers and the English Revolution', in T. Aston (ed.). *Crisis in Europe: 1560-1660* (London, 1965).

<sup>43</sup>Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down*, p. 194.

<sup>44</sup>Braithwaite, *Beginning of Quakerism*, p. 440, from F.H.L., Portfolio MSS, 9. p. 79.

use of force in the 1650s. In his *Journal* for 1654, for example, Fox wrote to Cromwell saying that he denied 'the carrying or drawing of any carnall sword against any'.<sup>45</sup> Similarly in 1659 before Booth's rising he warned Friends keep out of plots. After Booth's defeat, when the Committee of Safety asked Quakers to take up arms, Fox again spoke out against fighting.<sup>46</sup>

Quakers in the 1650s however did not preclude the use of violence if it might lead to the possibility of bringing about a more just world. It is well known that they served in the parliamentary forces. Cole has noted that at least 90 of the early Quakers had been soldiers in the parliamentary cause, men such as Richard Hubberthorne, James Nayler and George Bishop.<sup>47</sup> Quakers were present in the armed forces during 1659-60 and much has been made of the activities of the Quakers at the close of the Interregnum. Cole has noted how many Quakers accepted appointments as commissioners for the militia: for example, Anthony Pearson, Nicholas Bond, William Woodcock, Amor Stoddart, Richard Davis and Stephen Hart for London, Humphrey Lower for Cornwall, Thomas Curtis in Berkshire and Robert Duncan in Suffolk, though it is not known if the latter three agreed to serve. Several Friends were also offered commissions in Bristol.<sup>48</sup> Barry Reay has noted the number of Quakers who were in the army in 1659; for example

---

<sup>45</sup>Fox, *Journal*, vol. 1, p. 161.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., pp. 357-358.

<sup>47</sup>Cole, 'Quakers and Politics', p. 6.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., pp. 142-3.

the regiments at Manchester in October contained Quakers, and that of James Berry acquired Thomas Wells as a captain and Richard Ward as a cornet.<sup>49</sup>

A number of Quaker pamphlets and broadsides indicate that certain Quakers were definitely willing to take up arms in order to crush the Presbyterian-Royalist risings in 1659. John Crook who had served in the parliamentary army remarked that although Quakers had received 'the light of Jesus Christ...we are not thereby made incapable nor unwilling to serve our country and countrymen'.<sup>50</sup> Edward Burrough pleaded with the army to embrace the principles which they had fought for during the civil wars and to fight against oppression and injustice and if this could be done, Burrough concluded 'then we would rejoice and our lives would not be too dear to lay down'.<sup>51</sup> Richard Hubberthorne criticised Baptists in 1659 for saying they would be loyal to whatever government might be established when he wrote,

If Charles Stuart come, or any other and establish popery and govern by tryranny, you have begged pardon by promising willingly to submit and live peaceably under it as the ordinance of God...[but] some did judge that ye had been of another spirit.<sup>52</sup>

George Fox had little to do with the events at this juncture, owing to some kind of acute depression or spiritual crisis,

---

<sup>49</sup>Reay, *Quakers and the English Revolution*, p. 90.

<sup>50</sup>J. Crook et al., *A Declaration of the People of God* (London 1659, p. 5.

<sup>51</sup>Quoted in Reay, 'The Quakers and 1659: two newly discovered broadsheets by Edward Burrough', p. 110.

<sup>52</sup>Quoted in Christopher Hill, *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries* (London, 1984), p. 161.

(though he had managed to write his radical pamphlet addressed to the parliament and commonwealth) and it would appear that Burrough led the political wing of the Quakers, along with Hubberthorne and others. The militancy of the Quakers in the last years of the Interregnum has however been somewhat exaggerated by Barry Reay and others for it was only a small group at the centre in London who professed a willingness to take up arms in support of the Republic and there are many more pamphlets from the same year which do not mention militancy but instead look to the establishment of Christ's kingdom via more spiritual means, that is by the inward convincement wrought by the 'inner light' in each individual.

Quakers were less willing to take up arms after the Restoration. Upon the return of the king in 1660, Margaret Fell published a pamphlet which stressed the peaceful nature of the Quaker movement. She wrote that Quakers did 'love, own and honour the king' and were 'a people that follow after those things that make for peace, love and unity'.<sup>53</sup> Not all Quakers however were willing to accept the new testimony as Christopher Hill has pointed out; Edward Burrough was dubious about it and Edward Billing, another of the more radical Quakers was also unhappy at the prospect. In 1660 and 1662 Billing refused to give an undertaking not to take up arms

---

<sup>53</sup> 'A Declaration and an Information from us the People of God called Quakers and the Present Governors, the King, and Both Houses of Parliament...' in, Margaret Fell, *Works*, pp. 205, 208.

against Charles II.<sup>54</sup> In a letter of 1662 Ellis Hooke wrote to Margaret Fell regarding a handful of Friends who were unwilling to accept the peace testimony. He wrote that,

E. Billing and R. Hill and 3 or 4 more were by the desiring of some of the council sent for before Monke, and some others who upon the account that Friends were found innocent were willing to release them, if they would engage for the whole that they should set their hands to some paper wherein they should promise not to take up arms nor plot against the king, but they said they were not free to engage nor promise anything being a free people they should not engage...

Hooke was clearly worried about this group when he warned Fell that they refused to submit to the contents of her paper.<sup>55</sup>

The Quakers by necessity had to assure the new regime that they were not subversives if they were to stand any chance of survival after the return of the king; they were viewed along with other religious groups as highly suspicious by the authorities. The question remains however of the extent to which Quakers as a whole were committed to the idea of non-resistance in the Restoration years and how many were implicated in plots against the government and the king. In the Fifth Monarchy rising of 1661, known as Venner's Rising, in which around 50 rebels attempted to take control of London led by the wine-cooper, Thomas Venner, with the intention of establishing the millennium, there was hardly any Quaker

---

<sup>54</sup>Hill, *The Experience of Defeat*, p. 162.

<sup>55</sup>Extracts from State Papers relating to Friends 1654 to 1672 Norman Penney (ed.) (London, 1913), p. 153. Ellis Hooke to Margaret Fell 25. Nov. 1662.

involvement except for the Quaker William Devenham who was jailed as a suspect in the Gatehouse, Newgate.<sup>56</sup> Following this the Quaker leadership was anxious to show its commitment to pacifism and did so in a famous declaration addressed to Charles II in which it was stated that, 'the spirit of Christ which leads us in to all truth will never move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons, neither for the kingdom of Christ, nor for the kingdoms of this world'. The declaration was signed by leading Quakers: Fox, Hubberthorne, Howgill, Gerrard Roberts, Samuel Fisher and others.<sup>57</sup>

There is evidence for greater involvement in the Northern Conspiracy or Kaber Rigg plot of 1663 based on Westmorland.<sup>58</sup> A march on London and Whitehall was planned, the main aim of the plot being to make the king enforce the promises of Breda. Reports of Quaker involvement in the plot were rife. The first was from Daniel Fleming, an anti-Quaker JP from Westmorland, who wrote that 'if mischief arises now, it will be from non-licensed ministers, or from Quakers, of whom there are too many in the part of the country joining to Lancashire, where George Fox and most of his cubs have been kennelled'.<sup>59</sup> There were a small number of Quakers who do seem to have been

---

<sup>56</sup>Richard L. Greaves, *Deliver us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain 1660-1663* (Oxford, 1986), p. 53.

<sup>57</sup>*A Declaration from the Harmless and Innocent People of God called Quakers against all Plotters and Fighters in the World* (London, 1660), p. 2.

<sup>58</sup>Greaves, *Deliver us from Evil*, pp. 176-177.

<sup>59</sup>Quoted in Michael J.A. Thompson, 'The Post-Restoration Peace Testimony: Quakers and the Kaber Rigg Plot' from CSPD, Charles II, vol. III, 1663-4, p. 340., in Mullet, (ed.), *New Light on George Fox 1624-1691*, p. 157.

active; a Reynold or Richard Faucett of Orton in Westmorland, who confirmed that aid would be available to Robert Atkinson and Robert Waller from John Joplin of Durham's men. Another Quaker, Thomas Randall also appears to have given information regarding the timing of the insurrection and a Thomas Wright of Castlethwaite near Kirby Stephen told Captain John Waller of the plot. The Quaker Thomas/Robert Wharton also of Orton was meant to organize troops and there is evidence that the Quaker, Joseph Helling, a Durham prisoner wrote to a Dr. Richardson of Harrogate advising him of a favourable astrological forecast for 24th June, if all was prepared. A Quaker widow, Judith Oates was reported to have provided a horse to the rebels on the day of the insurrection.<sup>60</sup> A number of Quaker leaders including George Whitehead were suspected of complicity because they were born in Westmorland, though Whitehead later cleared himself.

As Richard Greaves has pointed out 'by 1663 Quaker leaders had not yet persuaded some of their followers that conspiracy and fighting were wrong; the militancy of the 1650s lived on, especially in the north'.<sup>61</sup> Ultimately however, the more important thing to note is the lack of Quaker support for the rising; in the end only around eight Quakers were involved, a small number given the size of the movement around 1660. Quaker involvement in the Monmouth Rebellion of 1685 was also fairly minimal; notable cases included Francis Scott who sold horses to Monmouth at Taunton and was sentenced to death

---

<sup>60</sup>Greaves, *Deliver us from Evil*, pp. 200-201.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., p. 201.

but later managed to escape. Another was John Hellier from near Highbridge who took up arms and a Thomas Plaice of Edington who appears to have been deeply involved though not in arms.<sup>62</sup> Plaice approached Monmouth at his camp in Glastonbury in June and requested a commission to call for volunteers which was given to him whereupon he subsequently raised 160 men.<sup>63</sup> The Quaker response to the rebellion was to issue a declaration reaffirming their non-resistance on 27th June 1685 when they stated 'we are redeemed out of the spirit of strife, violence, wars, and contentions, plots, and conspiracies, and so are dead to these things'. Furthermore the declaration professed loyalty to the monarchy and asserted that Quakers,

pray for the king, and the prosperity of our country, heartily desiring that peace, love, good will, and good neighbourhood may abound therein; and that all divisions, heats and animosities, and evil designs one against another may be extinguished and come to an end amongst all our neighbours, and countrymen, the which we eminently desire and remain friends of God and all men.<sup>64</sup>

This position was continually reiterated at yearly meetings, for example in 1689 Friends were urged to,

...walk wisely and circumspectly towards all men in the peaceable spirit of Christ Jesus, giving no offence nor occasions to those in outward government, nor way to any controversies, heats or distractions of this world about the kingdoms thereof.

---

<sup>62</sup>Braithwaite, *Second Period of Quakerism*, pp. 122-123.

<sup>63</sup>Robin Clifton, *The Last Popular Rebellion* (London, 1984), pp. 178-79.

<sup>64</sup>*The Christian Principle and Peaceable Conversation of the People (of God) Called Quakers with Respect to the King and Government Once More Asserted* (London, 1685), p. 8.

and they were advised to keep 'out of all discourses and words that may any ways become snares or hurtful to truth'.<sup>65</sup>

After the Restoration Friends were not only committed to a position of non-resistance they also adopted pacifism as a principle and refused to bear arms or to do anything associated with war such as paying militia contributions for which they were penalised. Quakers were also unwilling to serve as constables because the work involved militia duties, as well as administration of the Test Oath. Joseph Besse noted that Quakers were 'against wars and fighting, the practice whereof, they judged inconsistent with the precepts of Christ to 'love your enemies' and 'do good to those that hate you'.<sup>66</sup> Robert Barclay wrote in his 1678 *Apology* that 'Christ commands that we should love our enemies: but war, on the contrary, teacheth us to hate and destroy them'. He noted how Friends had

suffered much in our country because we neither could ourselves bear arms, nor send others in our place, nor give our money for buying of drums, standards, and other military attire: and lastly, because we could not hold our doors, windows, and shops closed, for conscience sake, upon such days as fasts and prayers were appointed, for to desire a blessing upon, and success for, the arms of that kingdom or common-wealth under which we live neither give thanks for the victories acquired by the effusion of much blood.<sup>67</sup>

Quakers were punished under the Militia Act of Charles II's reign by a fine and subsequent distraint upon refusal of the

---

<sup>65</sup> F.H.L., *Yearly Meeting Minutes*, vol. 1, 20/21/22.3. [May] 1689, pp. 219-220.

<sup>66</sup> Besse, *Sufferings*, vol. 1, p. 2.

<sup>67</sup> Barclay, *Apology*, Proposition XV, pp. 401, 405.

fine, which was usually the case.<sup>68</sup> An examination of Besse's collection of Quaker sufferings provides numerous examples of Quakers being prosecuted for their pacifist stance. In 1665 for example, John Furly the Younger and George Weetly, both of Colchester were fined for refusing to 'furnish soldiers' for the trained bands.<sup>69</sup> Earlier in 1662 in Yorkshire, Simon Ryther, James Graves and William Aldam were imprisoned for 'their conscientious objection to pay toward the charges of the militia'.<sup>70</sup> In Cornwall in 1688 a number of Quakers suffered distress of their goods to the sum of £12-5-0 for refusing to bear arms or contribute to the county militia charge.<sup>71</sup>

Quakers were also troubled by impressment into the Navy. Peter Brock has noted how Quakers in Kent and Sussex were particularly affected because these were the areas most likely to be invaded from the continent. Again, examples of sufferings can be seen in Besse. There is a very full account of Richard Seller, a fisherman from Yorkshire, who was made to serve in the Royal Navy in 1665 during the second Anglo-Dutch War. When on ship Sellers refused to work and was subject to various punishments and harsh treatment but eventually won the praise of the crew for performing noncombatant duties; his 'employ was to carry down the wounded men, and look out for

---

<sup>68</sup>Peter Brock, *Pacifism in Europe to 1914* (Princeton, 1972), p. 287.

<sup>69</sup>Besse, *Sufferings*, vol. 1, p. 202.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., vol. 2, p. 109.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., vol. 1, p. 126.

fire-ships'.<sup>72</sup> The problem of impressment was obviously of concern for the Meeting for Sufferings because in 1678 Daniel Lobdy of Deal was appointed to help Friends by communicating with captains of ships and asking for the discharge of any Quakers who had been made to serve.<sup>73</sup>

#### *Quaker attitudes to authority and social testimonies*

Other Quaker customs and conventions were also seen as suspect by contemporaries for they rejected many of the social niceties of their day. Flattering titles were rejected and Quakers went against social norms by advocating the use of 'thee and 'thou' irrespective of the status of the person being addressed. As James Parnel stated:

rich ones of the earth, they will either thou or you one another if they be equal in degree...but if a man of low degree in the earth come to speak to any of them, then he must you the rich man but the rich man will thou him.<sup>74</sup>

Quakers also gave offence in their refusal of hat-honour; to give one example, the Quaker William Dewsbury when commanded to take off his hat at Northamptonshire Assizes stated that, 'honour is not pulling off the hat, but in obeying the just commands of God'.<sup>75</sup>

Quaker refusal of oaths also struck at established customs since early modern England was an oath-bound society.

---

<sup>72</sup>Besse, *Sufferings*, vol. 2, p. 118. See pp. 112-20 for full account of Seller's experiences.

<sup>73</sup>Brock, *Pacifism*, p. 286.

<sup>74</sup>James Parnel, *Shield of the Truth* (London, 1655), p. 26-27.

<sup>75</sup>Besse, *Sufferings*, vol. 1, p. 520.

Quakers saw oath-taking as setting up a double standard of truth; as James Nayler stated, 'Christ saith, swear not at all, for what is more than yea and nay cometh of evil'.<sup>76</sup>

Quakers in addition refused customary greetings and salutations, such as 'good morning' and 'evening' and 'God's speed' principally because they felt that if one offered such a greeting to a person of bad character, it was tantamount to condoning their actions. Fox declared, 'cozeners, and cheaters, and brawlers and liars and swearers and persecutors would be told that their day was good, and their night is good, and their evening, and God speed their work'. It would appear though that these forms of address could be used to fellow-Quakers and so were not rejected altogether, for as Fox wrote, 'Now we that be in the light, and know the day, who witness the father and the Son...we can say God speed'.<sup>77</sup> James Nayler also made this point when he said 'the saints were forbidden to salute any but saints'.<sup>78</sup>

Early Quakerism also testified against the vanities and fashions of the world and called for simplicity. Like other customs, dress could reveal distinctions in the status of the wearer and Quakers spoke out against luxury in dress as unnecessary. George Fox vilified the 'well to do' when he asked,

where did any of the apostles...powder their hair,

---

<sup>76</sup>James Nayler, *A Lamentation for the Scattered Tribes* (London, 1653), p. 6.

<sup>77</sup>George Fox, *Concerning Good-Morrow and Good-Even*, (London, 1657), p. 1.

<sup>78</sup>Nayler, *Discovery of the Man of Sin*, p. 40.

till they had made their backs white, like a company of millers carrying their meal bags?...where did any of...the women wear gold, and great white things on their arms like butchers, and men and women daubed over with gold and silver? are these marks of a Christian life, a Christian behaviour?"<sup>79</sup>

Quakers were renowned for the abandonment of all superfluities in dress and many burned ribbons and fineries as a protest against them. The Quaker Gilbert Latye, a tailor to the court, who was to play a prominent role in the system of central meetings in the 1670s found that his business clashed with his Quaker dislike of ornate dress and so became a journeyman tailor instead. Hugh Barbour has stated that Quaker refusal of social customs was not meant as an attempt at levelling, for 'every protest in regard to equality was meant fundamentally as an assault on pride and a means of conversion'.<sup>80</sup> Those whom Quakers attack, however, could be forgiven for interpreting Quaker actions differently; one MP in the 1656 parliament said of Quakers, 'they are generally despisers of your government, condemn your magistracy and ministry and trample it under foot'.<sup>81</sup>

As remarked above, Christopher Hill and Barry Reay have portrayed Quakers as radicals carrying on the hopes of groups like the Levellers and Diggers who had suffered defeat after the Civil War, whilst historians such as Barbour have played down the radicalism of Quakers during the Interregnum. Reay

---

<sup>79</sup>George Fox, *The Priests Fruits made manifest and the Vanity of the World Discovered* (London, 1657), broadside

<sup>80</sup>Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England*, p. 163.

<sup>81</sup>*Diary of Thomas Burton Esq.*, J.T. Rutt (ed.), (London, 1974), vol. 1, p. 26.

has viewed Quakers as 'the only group capable of representing the aspirations of earlier years'.<sup>82</sup> Hill has made much of the demand by Quakers for social and political reforms. He noted that 'Quakers, as Levellers had done, cried out against the oppression of the poor'.<sup>83</sup> Certainly there are a number of examples where Quakers can be seen criticizing society and calling for changes. The Quaker Benjamin Nicholson of Tickell in Yorkshire, spoke out against the gentry and oppression when he wrote that,

you wallow yourselves in the earth's treasure like swine in the mire and never consider that the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, and that he hath given it to the sons of men in general and not to a few lofty ones.<sup>84</sup>

Although this is often quoted as an extremely radical position, the rest of the pamphlet suggests that Nicholson was simply berating the rich for their excesses which might have been put to better use to help the poor. On the whole it seems like fairly standard moral criticism of the Christian kind, Richard Baxter, for example attacked the rich and Archbishop Laud spoke out against enclosures. Nicholson went on to denounce the wealthy writing that they had 'not honoured the Lord God with...the fruits of your corn, and the overplus of your monies. Instead they had spent these 'upon your lusts, and consumed them by pride, banquetting, rioting and

---

<sup>82</sup>Reay, *Quakers*, p. 32.

<sup>83</sup>Christopher Hill, 'The Quakers and the English Revolution', *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, 56, (1992), p. 171.

<sup>84</sup>Benjamin Nicholson, *A Blast from the Lord* (London, 1653), p. 10.

drunkenness'.<sup>85</sup> Rosemary Moore has suggested that Nicholson's tract is unrepresentative and has said that 'there is nothing else precisely like this in the Quaker corpus, and little that approached it in social concern'.<sup>86</sup> It is true that such tracts were not widespread but there were some others; George Fox warned the rich to 'give over oppressing the poor' and not to 'exhalt' themselves over their fellow-men. Fox insisted that 'you are all of one mould and blood: you that set your nests on high, join house to house, field to field, til there be no place for the poor'.<sup>87</sup> The Quaker William Thomlinson of Wanstead in Essex vilified the rich whom he said 'grind the faces of the poor' and 'rack and stretch out their rents till the poor with the sweat of their brows and hard labour can scarce get bread...there is no end to their covetousness, nor no natural affection to their oppressed brother'.<sup>88</sup> At this time, Moore is right in asserting that 'Quakers rarely attacked riches as such, only the misuse of riches'. As she says, 'comfortably-off yeomen like Aldam, and wealthy gentlefolk like Margaret Fell did not feel threatened by Quakerism as regards their personal possessions'.<sup>89</sup>

Quakers advocated the kind of reforms that were popular

---

<sup>85</sup>Ibid., p. 16.

<sup>86</sup>Moore, 'Faith of the First Quakers', p. 71.

<sup>87</sup>George Fox, *The Vials of the Wrath of God* (London, 1655), p. 3.

<sup>88</sup>William Thomlinson, *Seven Particulars*, (London, 1657), p. 1.

<sup>89</sup>Moore, 'Faith of the First Quakers', p. 71.

at the time. George Fox, along with Quakers and other sectarians called for the abolition of tithes, for they had been 'set up by the Apostates (the Papists) since the days of the apostles'.<sup>90</sup> Law reform was also on his agenda and he called for men to be allowed to 'restore, and mind the law of God which is equity and measurable, agreeable to the offence'.<sup>91</sup> Fox also outlined a programme of expropriation of church, and monastic lands (the latter of course were in lay hands by this time). He suggested that the money from these be given to the poor. He asked that 'all those abbey lands, glebe lands that is given to the priests, be given to the poor of the nation and let all the great houses, abbies, steeple houses [churches], and Whitehall be used for almshouses. (or some other use than what they are) for all the blind and lame to be there, and not to go begging up and down the streets'. He called for all those fines that belong to Lords of manors' to be given to the poor, 'for lords have enough'.<sup>92</sup> Clearly these were extremely radical proposals involving dispossessing the church and gentry of their property and went far beyond the moral criticisms aimed at the wealthy outlined above. However as Rosemary Moore has pointed out there was 'little interest in practical details' on Fox's part.<sup>93</sup>

The Quaker Edward Billing put forward a plan for law

---

<sup>90</sup>George Fox, *To the Parliament and Commonwealth of England*, p. 3.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>92</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>93</sup>Moore, 'Faith of the First Quakers', p. 246.

reform. He particularly emphasised the need for decentralization of power which had been a Leveller idea and advocated that 'the whole law, and all proceeding in the law, be removed unto each county, wapentake, hundred or town'. In addition he put forward plans for governmental reform suggesting that parishes be united into hundreds and that those within each area freely elect each year one or two people. Billing suggested that the first parliament should sit for twelve months then be dissolved and advocated that office-holding should last no longer than a year unless re-election occurred.<sup>94</sup> As Rosemary Moore has stated, this tract 'was quite different from any other Quaker pamphlet, and indeed there is nothing specifically Quaker about it. It was a constitutional outline for an ideal government, resembling the Leveller position'.<sup>95</sup> Edward Burrough also advocated a more representative government and stated that,

this nation consisteth of men of diverse kinds of spirits...some crying for such a way of government and others for another manner...and yet all these are free born of the nation, and ought to be preserved and defended in their just rights and liberties.

Burrough suggested that a committee of six or eight of the 'ablest and soberest' of Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, Quakers and others be set up to establish 'an equal and just government'.<sup>96</sup>

Rosemary Moore has noted that the Quakers 'much greater

---

<sup>94</sup>Edward Billing, *A Mite of Affection* (London, 1659), pp. 3-6.

<sup>95</sup>Moore, 'Faith of the First Quakers', p. 245.

<sup>96</sup>Quoted in Reay, 'The Quakers and 1659', pp. 107-8.

involvement in the happenings of 1659 came from changes within the Quaker movement'. Previously Quakerism had been a more or less Northern phenomenon, but by 1659, the Quaker headquarters had already shifted from Swarthmore to London and thus the movement was closer to political events.<sup>77</sup> This was no doubt why Quakers proceeded with their requests for social and political change, despite the fact that Fox was not involved at this time.

Quaker customs and testimonies changed only a little after 1660. But as Hugh Barbour has stated, 'as hopes of conquering the world faded, the meaning of Quaker customs and testimonies quietly changed. Testimonies were kept up more in loyalty to Friends as much as in direct obedience to the Spirit.' A Friend kept clear of the world's standards but did not expect to change them, and their customs therefore became a badge of peculiarity for a sect.<sup>78</sup> Those testimonies against established customs continued as can be seen from Barclay's *Apology* of 1678. He noted that Quakers were distinguished by 'some singular things', that for example it was not lawful for them to 'give to men such flattering titles, as, your Holiness, Your Majesty, Your Eminency, Your Excellency, Your Grace, Your Lordship...nor use those flattering words, commonly called compliments'.<sup>79</sup> The reasoning here was that people with such titles 'may frequently be found to have nothing really in them, deserving

---

<sup>77</sup>Moore, 'Faith of the First Quakers', p. 242.

<sup>78</sup>Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England*, p. 241.

<sup>79</sup>Barclay, *Apology*, Proposition XV, p. 369.

them'.<sup>100</sup> Quakers were urged not to distinguish between 'thee' and 'thou' when addressing people of different status.<sup>101</sup> The testimony against oaths was also kept up and Quakers were told to 'let your communication be yea, yea; nay, nay; for whatsoever is more, cometh of evil'.<sup>102</sup> A willingness to conform more to the world can be seen though with the Quakers acceptance in 1689 of a declaration rather than an oath professing their belief in the Trinity and the Bible as the Word of God, this was to reach its culmination in the 1696 Affirmation Act. Kneeling, bowing and uncovering the head to people were regarded still as 'the alone outward significance of our adoration towards God, and therefore...not lawful to give...unto men'.<sup>103</sup> Quakers were counselled to beware of adornments which were 'to gratify a vain, proud and ostentatious mind'.<sup>104</sup> All of these testimonies were frequently emphasised at successive yearly meetings and Friends were called upon to maintain them. One change did occur in Quaker social testimonies; they became much less aggressive in their criticism of others, especially those from the upper echelons. Barclay was eager to point out that Quakers were not social revolutionaries when he wrote,

Let not any judge, that from our opinion in these things, any necessity of levelling will follow, or that all men must have things in common. Our

---

<sup>100</sup>Ibid., p. 372.

<sup>101</sup>Ibid., pp. 377-378.

<sup>102</sup>Ibid., p. 389.

<sup>103</sup>Ibid., pp. 379-380.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid., p. 383.

principle leaves any man to enjoy that peaceably, whether his own industry, or his parents, have purchased to him; only he is thereby instructed to use it aright, both for his own good and that of his brethren; and all to the glory of God.

The statement of the Quaker Benjamin Nicholson in the 1650s that 'the earth was the Lord's and the fulnes therof' contrasts markedly with Barclay's position in the 1670s when he wrote that '...we say not hereby that no man may use the creation more or less than another: for we know, that as it hath pleased God to dispense it diversely, giving to some more, and to some less, so they may use it accordingly.'<sup>105</sup>

William Penn also commented on the social structure of society when he wrote 'men of blood, out of their...feathers and finery, have no more marks of honour, by nature stamped upon them than their inferior neighbours and insisted that God had 'made of one blood all nations of men to dwell upon the face of the earth'. However Penn went on to add that,

when I have said all this, I intend not by debasing one false quality, to make insolent another...I would not be thought to set the churl upon the present gentlemen's shoulder, by no means, but for all this, I must allow a great advantage to the gentleman and prefer his station.<sup>106</sup>

Despite their more conservative pronouncements on society, the Quakers still showed concern for social reforms but were not so vociferous in proclaiming them. William Penn wrote that 'the best recreation is to do good' to 'see the sick, visit

---

<sup>105</sup>Ibid., p. 370.

<sup>106</sup>William Penn, *No Cross, No Crown: A Discourse Showing the Nature and Discipline of the Holy Cross of Christ* (London, 1682), pp. 153-154.

the imprisoned'.<sup>107</sup> In 'An address to the Serious Consideration of the Civil Magistrate', Penn suggested that the money spent in each

parish in such vain fashions as wearing of laces, jewels...together with what is commonly consumed in taverns, feasts...&c could be collected in a public stock...there might be reparations to the broken-tenants, work-houses for the able and alms-houses for the aged and impotent: Then we should have no beggars in the land.<sup>108</sup>

It would seem though that this was not meant as a practical reform but was merely a lamentation on luxury and waste, a preoccupation of Penn in his work, *No Cross, No Crown*.

### **Quaker morality**

Quakers placed great emphasis upon leading a good life, one of strict morality. This obviously fastened itself in the minds of contemporaries for Quakers were often criticized and mocked on this score. Thomas Collier, the Baptist, thought that Quaker morality was a cover, for he believed that inside they were 'full of filthiness, but smooth it over with an outward austere carriage'.<sup>109</sup> The emphasis on morality in the early days stemmed from preoccupation with the workings of the 'inner light', for as Fox stated,

this light shows thee, there thou hast learnt thy condemnation, thou knowest thou shouldst not lie, be dark, and that thou shouldst not steal, nor commit adultery, this light will tell thee all this, and it will condemn thee and reprove thee

---

<sup>107</sup>Ibid., p. 210.

<sup>108</sup>Ibid., p. 256.

<sup>109</sup>Baxter, *The Quakers Catechism*, p. 27; Collier, *A Looking-Glass for the Quakers*, p. 7.

Fox went on to show how the light would manifest all of the major sins, and he encouraged Quakers to lay aside 'envy, wrath, malice, hatred, drunkenness, rayling, theft, murder, fighting, quarreling, and idle-jesting, vain-songs and all venomousness, all hypocrisy, cozening, cheating, worldliness and earthly wickedness'.<sup>110</sup> Quakers were urged to be honest in all their daily employments, they were committing wrong according to William Smith, 'if they have deceitful weights and measures, and an unequal balance, and do not yield the full weight and measure to every man they deal with'. Smith noted 'how markets are filled with multitudes of words, which stands wholly in deceit and guile'.<sup>111</sup> Quakers believed in the notion of a fixed or single price according to the value of the merchants' wares rather than bargaining, as can be seen from Fox when he wrote in 1658, 'set no more upon the thing you sell or exchange than what you will have: is it not better and more ease to have done at a word than to ask double or more?'<sup>112</sup>

Pastimes were to be selected very carefully. In his advice to masters of servants, Smith warned them that servants would be better put to 'honest labour' than 'be at foot-ball, and cudghills, and dancing and revelling and drinking in ale houses and exercising themselves in all manner of vanity...' Quakers placed even more emphasis on morality in an effort to

---

<sup>110</sup>George Fox, *A Word from the Lord*, p. A2, p. 11.

<sup>111</sup>William Smith, *Universal Love* (n.p., 1664), pp. 93, 101.

<sup>112</sup>Quoted in Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 523, from Fox, *Doctrinals*, p. 74.

disassociate themselves from the Ranters, many of whom had converted to Quakerism. The Ranters were vilified by Friends for turning 'the grace of God in to wantonness', in 'drunkenness and cursed speakings, sporting...in the day time, following oaths and swearing'.<sup>113</sup>

As was seen in the previous chapter on local organization, great attention was paid by the local meetings to the supervision of Quaker behaviour. Fox stated in 1668 that two or three were to go from monthly meetings to the general meetings and give notice 'if there be any that walk not in the truth...that some may be ordered from the meeting to go to exhort such; and bring into the next general meeting what they say'. Fox counselled that 'notice be taken of all evil speakers, backbiters and slanderers, and foolish talkers and idle-jesters' and those 'men that lust after women' and vice versa, as well as cases of 'disorderly marriage' and he exhorted meetings to watch out for 'pleasure, drunkenness, gaming, indebtedness'.<sup>114</sup>

Friends meetings not only helped to ensure that discipline was imposed upon errant Quakers but they were also places where their own rites were carried out. Their funeral service was a simple memorial meeting, rather like an ordinary meeting for worship. By 1660 Friends had burial grounds of their own and emphasised plainness of coffins and interments. Quakers also had their own set customs for weddings by 1660.

---

<sup>113</sup>John Audland, *The Innocent Delivered Out of the Snare* (London, 1655), p. 14.

<sup>114</sup>George Fox, *Friends Fellowship Must be in the Spirit*, pp. 1-8.

Friends made vows to each other at a meeting attended by Friends and relatives and from 1656 at Margaret Fell's recommendation, a certificate was used and signed by all present. Quaker marriages were often criticized by more orthodox contemporaries who viewed them as invalid, yet the development of local organization in the 1660s and the emphasis on vetting couples served to temper criticism. By the end of the 1660s Quaker marriage had become a highly public and social affair and the fact that greater group control was exercised gave it a degree of respectability. It has been shown in an earlier chapter how systematic and controlled the marriage procedure was. Couples had to be examined for 'clearness' of others by both men's and women's meetings by the late 1670s. Investigatory control also extended into the matter of finance, for instance in the case of re-marriage of a widow, adequate provision had to be made for the offspring of the first marriage. As Michael Mullett has stated 'In securing control over their own marriages, Friends took on the duty to see that the minimum demands of the law-as to publication, witness, consanguinity and so on were met'.<sup>115</sup>

The attention which Quakers paid to the general behaviour of those in the society may be seen from Barclay's *Apology*. He noted that the way of life of his Quaker brethren could produce amazing results on those of previously bad character when he wrote,

---

<sup>115</sup>Michael Mullett, 'The Assembly of the People of God: The Social Organization of Lancashire Friends, in *Early Lancaster Friends*, ed. Michael Mullett (University of Lancaster Occasional Paper No. 5 1978), p. 14.

generally the very coming among this people did naturally work such a change, so that many vicious and profane persons had been known, by coming to this truth, to become sober and virtuous; and many light vain and wanton ones, to become grave and serious.<sup>116</sup>

After the Interregnum Friends continued their attitude towards pastimes. Quakers were told by Barclay that it was 'not lawful to use games, sports, plays, nor among other things comedies among Christians under the notice of recreations, which do not agree with Christian silence, gravity and sobriety'.<sup>117</sup> Barclay wrote that such activities tended to make people forget fear of the Lord and to 'forget heaven, death and judgement, to foster lust, vanity and wantonness'. In their place Barclay suggested 'other innocent diversions, which may serve for relaxation of the mind, for example visiting Friends, 'to hear or read history', 'to follow after gardening, to use geometrical and mathematical experiments' for he believed that such pursuits unlike those of the world, were unlikely to result in Friends neglecting God.<sup>118</sup>

### *Conclusion*

Quaker behaviour changed quite dramatically from the movement's inception in the 1650s. The ecstatic behaviour so common in the early years, such as testifying by signs, the claim to miraculous powers and the habit of quaking and

---

<sup>116</sup>Barclay, *Apology*, Proposition XV, pp. 367-368.

<sup>117</sup>Ibid., p. 369.

<sup>118</sup>Ibid., pp. 387-388.

trembling violently gradually disappeared as leading Quakers sought to tone down unseemly 'enthusiasm' in the movement and conversion gave way to birthright membership in the 1680s. The Quaker commitment to non-violence which had not been a definite principle of the 1650s was essential after 1660 if Quakers were not to be viewed as subversives and greatly helped them in their quest for acceptance by the authorities. The least change occurred in Quaker customs, testimonies and their moral stance. Those social testimonies of the 1650s were maintained though Quakers emphasised that they accepted the 'chain of degree' in society and so spelt their intentions out more clearly. Friends' emphasis on morality was a product of their belief in the 'inner light' which if heeded, they believed, made clear right and wrong. If anything, Quakers became even stricter in their moral stance in the years after the Restoration for the group control that went with the development of central and local organization permitted close scrutiny of the acts of each individual. Far from being the somewhat wild, enthusiastic individuals, who obeyed the promptings of the 'light' so spontaneously in the 1650s, Quakers by the 1670s and 80s had become bastions of peace and order.

## CHAPTER 7

### ANTI-QUAKER WRITINGS c. 1650-1689<sup>1</sup>

#### *Introduction*

The purpose of this final chapter is to assess how far attitudes to Quakers changed over the period and to pinpoint the extent to which the actual arguments used against them altered. There is a vast literature on the subject, particularly the plethora of anti-Quaker pamphlets written by Friends' religious contemporaries which are the central source for this chapter and a much under-used one in previous studies of Quakerism with the exception of Barry Reay's work on the 1650s.<sup>2</sup> As Geoffrey Nuttall has stated, 'throughout the second half of the seventeenth century, more particularly during the decade 1650-60, the Quakers and the puritans counted each other their bitterest opponents' which accounts for the abundance of this type of literature.<sup>3</sup> Quaker critics included men of most sections of religious opinion, the leaders of the Presbyterians such as Prynne, Thomas Danson, Giles Firmin, and Baptist leaders such as John Tombes, as well as little known pastors who felt that their parishes were under threat. Some of the smaller sects also engaged in debate; Douglas Greene

---

<sup>1</sup>Joseph Smith's *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana* (London, 1873) is a useful point of reference for any study of this kind. Rosemary Moore's *An Annotated Listing of Quaker and Anti-Quaker Publications 1652-1659* (unpublished work, F.H.L., 1994) was very useful for the 1650s material.

<sup>2</sup>Reay, *Quakers and the English Revolution*.

<sup>3</sup>Nuttall, *Holy Spirit*, p. 151.

has noted how 'one of the most bitter pamphlet wars of the late seventeenth century was fought between the Society of Friends, or Quakers...and the Muggletonians'.<sup>4</sup> Anglican criticisms of the 1650s were not prolific; as R.I. Clark has pointed out, Anglicans had a distaste for 'any involvement in public debate with Friends'.<sup>5</sup> However they do begin to increase especially from the 1670s onwards.

#### *Anti-Quaker writings c.1650-c.1670*

Quakers were viewed as blasphemous and seditious during the Interregnum years though persecution during the 1650s was sporadic owing to the largely tolerant nature of the successive regimes. Friends could be prosecuted under the Blasphemy Act of 1650 and a proclamation of 1655 required Quakers, Ranters and other sects to refrain from disturbing

---

<sup>4</sup>Douglas G. Greene, 'Muggletonians and Quakers: A Study in the Interaction of Seventeenth Century Dissent', *Albion*, vol. 15 (1983), p. 102.

<sup>5</sup>R.I. Clark, 'The Quakers and the Church of England 1670-1720', University of Lancaster, Ph.D., 1988, p. 163, R. Clark also makes this point in relation to the post 1689 situation and has noted how Anglicans 'left the management of their cause to a trio of professional anti-Quaker disputants', to men such as Francis Bugg and George Keith, both former Quakers. 'The Anglicans were in general much less at home in the world of polemic than were the Quakers: after all, inter-denominational debate presumed an England of many Christianities'. in, R. Clark, '"The Gangrene of Quakerism": An Anti-Quaker Anglican Offensive in England after the Glorious Revolution', *Journal of Religious History* vol. 11 (1981), pp. 408, 429. It must be noted that there are also a substantial number of tracts written by Quaker schismatics, those former Quakers who could not come to terms with the discipline and organization imposed by the Quakers' central and local system of organization, during and after the 1660s, but these have not been included here as most of them are dealt with in chapter two.

ministers and allowed JPs to take proceedings against offenders. The growing conservatism of the Protectorate however saw increased persecution, especially in the aftermath of the James Nayler case, which incensed many in the 1656 parliament. Floods of petitions to Westminster called for measures against Quakers. There followed the extension of the Elizabethan Vagrancy Act under which JPs could now move against idle, dissolute and wandering folk, a measure which seemed to be aimed at the Quakers and their habit of itinerant preaching around the country. Furthermore, under the provisions of the Act for the Better Observation of the Lord's Day, Quakers could be prosecuted by fine or hard labour for interrupting a minister.

With the return of the Anglican establishment at the Restoration, Quakers faced more persecution than in the 1650s with the passing of the Quaker Act concerning oath-taking and the Coventicle Act of 1664 yet the anti-Quaker literature at this time decreased probably due to the persecution of many of the Quakers' Puritan critics and their own attempts to survive. Between 1650-59 there were approximately 200 anti-Quaker pamphlets and in the following decade around 90.<sup>6</sup> What perceptions of Quakers prompted these responses and who were the Quakers fiercest critics? It would seem that the main criticism stemmed from Presbyterians and Baptists with a smaller share from the Congregationalists and the esoteric sects. T.L. Underwood has noted that Baptist attacks represented 20% of the adverse works in Joseph Smith's

---

<sup>6</sup>See appendices 17 and 18.

*Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana.*<sup>7</sup> Anglican responses are not so frequent in the 1650s which is not surprising but start to increase in the 1660s, becoming more pronounced in the 1670s and 80s when the prospect of toleration started to loom.

A number of issues feature in the adverse writings of this period; broadly these cover doctrinal matters and criticisms arising from Quaker behaviour and their social status.

### *Doctrine*

In the doctrinal sphere, Quaker Christology provoked deep concern amongst religious contemporaries, notably the Quakers' central tenet of the 'inner light' or 'Christ within', by which they sought to emphasise the necessity of a direct, living experience of Christ rather than mere adherence to the historic Christ. Ralph Farmer, Presbyterian and vicar of St. Nicholas's in Bristol noted of Quakers that,

many times (most times) when they speak of God, and Christ and scriptures...they do not mean that God and Christ, and scriptures that thou dost, and other men, (wise men, godly men) do. They do not mean a God, and Christ, and Scriptures without thee, but within thee only.<sup>8</sup>

Farmer elaborated by saying that they gave little attention to the incarnate Christ, for 'though they often mention him, yet in deed and truth they make no more use of him than...of Moses and the prophets'. Farmer concluded that Quakers diminished

---

<sup>7</sup>T.L. Underwood, 'The Controversy between the Baptists and the Quakers in England 1650-1689: A Theological Elucidation', Ph.D., University of London 1965, p. 52.

<sup>8</sup>Ralph Farmer, *The Great Mysteries of Godliness and Ungodliness* (London, 1655), p. 21.

Christ and denied his atonement for the sins of man and stated that,

as for Christ, and the death of Christ, and his righteousness wrought and done in his own individual person to be relied upon, and by faith rested in for justification of the saints to life, without any thing wrought or done in them, or by them for that end; this they utterly deny.<sup>9</sup>

Similarly, the Baptist Joseph Wright stated of Quakers, they 'never make mention of Christ's dying for the sins of the world; nor that he tasted death for every man'.<sup>10</sup> Even the smaller sects criticised Quakers on this score. In 1663, Lodowick Muggleton, referring to Quakers wrote, 'how can you know the doctrine of Christ? When as your Christ hath never a body, for you have got your Christ all within you'.<sup>11</sup>

As has been noted, Geoffrey Nuttall has seen the Quakers belief in the 'light' and its implications as the central cause of antagonism between puritans and Quakers. Friends claimed that Christ as the 'light' had been in man from the beginning of time which obviously appeared to make the historic Christ rather redundant. As Nuttall has stated,

the puritans allowed full value to his (Christ's) life, death and resurrection, and to the coming of his Holy Spirit at Pentecost, as dividing history into two parts through the provision of a possibility of redemption which previously had not existed. The Quakers' doctrine of the 'light' and 'Christ' appeared to destroy these beliefs.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 63.

<sup>10</sup>Joseph Wright, *A Testimony for the Son of Man*, (London, 1661), p. 2.

<sup>11</sup>Lodowick Muggleton, *The Neck of the Quakers Broken* (Amsterdam, 1663), p. 16.

<sup>12</sup>Nuttall, *Holy Spirit*, p. 159.

Adversaries feared that Quakers were drawing people away from the path of salvation, for they felt that they placed too much emphasis on man's merit and his own powers to save himself - which was in part a misunderstanding of the Quaker position. The latter held that salvation could not be found purely in faith in Christ and his atonement but that each man by turning to the 'light', had within him, through the power of God, the ability to distinguish between right and wrong. This was no mere Pelagianism on the Quakers' part for they always stressed that the light was supernatural and God-given though presumably human effort was needed to actually turn to the light and follow it. The curate of Deerhurst in Gloucestershire, Francis Harris, who was later to be ejected in 1662 declared that Quakers,

delude and deceive people in affirming and pressing upon them to believe that there is a pure light of God and Christ in every man and woman by nature, according to which if they walk, they never shall sin, and do good and be saved: if they refuse to hearken to it, and walk contrarily, they shall perish.

Harris went on to state the position of the more orthodox, 'that every man and woman by nature are dead in sins and trespasses, and have no more power to help themselves out of the estate, than the dead bones had to recover flesh and life unto themselves'.<sup>13</sup> Another critic, William Thomas defended the clergy and criticised the Quaker reliance on the 'light' and their belief in immediate revelation. He described Quakers as 'seducing teachers', who he feared, would lead people away

---

<sup>13</sup>Francis Harris, *Some Queries Proposed to the Quakers* (London, 1655), p. 14

from salvation with their teaching that the light was sufficient.<sup>14</sup>

Quakers were also criticised for denying the actual humanity of Christ. The Baptists spent considerable time on this issue. Thomas Collier was outraged that the Quakers, did 'account the very person of Christ to be the infinite God and own no other Christ of the seed of David according to the flesh, which is but a fancy, an imagination of Christ'.<sup>15</sup> This matter came to a head in the 1660s. The Baptist, William Burnet noted that Quakers preached Christ to be in the flesh in terms of the hearts of every man but 'not that he was flesh, or that the flesh...in the womb of the virgin was Christ'.<sup>16</sup> Another Baptist, Matthew Caffyn devoted a whole section of his work, *Faith in God's Promises* to 'the great error and mistake of the Quakers, concerning the true Christ'. Caffyn claimed that Quakers held that the 'eternal spirit of light and power which dwelt in the man whom the Jews crucified' was 'the Christ, the saviour of the world and not the man that was crucified, that was seen with visible and carnal eyes'.<sup>17</sup>

Thomas Vincent the Presbyterian minister of St. Mary Magdalene, London, before his ejection in 1662, and Thomas Danson, the Presbyterian leader were vehement in their

---

<sup>14</sup>William Thomas, *Rayling Rebuked: or a Defence of the Ministers of this Nation* (London, 1656), sig. B2.

<sup>15</sup>Thomas Collier, *A Looking-Glass for the Quakers*, p. 8.

<sup>16</sup>William Burnet, *The Capital Principles of the People Called Quakers* (London, 1668), p. 6.

<sup>17</sup>Matthew Caffyn, *Faith in God's Promises*, (London, 1661), p. 38.

denunciation of William Penn's anti-Trinitarian views in *The Sandy Foundation Shaken*. They argued that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost were three distinct persons, a term which Quakers objected to as unscriptural. Vincent urged that they were 'distinct persons, but one undivided essence' on the grounds that firstly, they had different names which he believed denoted a distinction not of nature and essence but of personality and secondly from their different personal acts and their distinct personal and incommunicable properties (the Father's property was to beget the Son, the son to be begotten and the property of the spirit to proceed from the father and the Son).<sup>18</sup> Vincent accused Penn of promoting 'hideous, blasphemies, Socinian and damnable heretical opinions'.<sup>19</sup>

The Quakers' religious contemporaries were horrified at the Quaker view of the place of scripture in religious life and this prompted much criticism, particularly from the Presbyterians and Baptists. Although Quakers rather paradoxically did make frequent use of Bible quotations to back up their arguments, they only saw the scriptures as confirming the 'light's' guidance within each individual. The anti-Quaker Francis Higginson, a Cambridge-educated schoolmaster wrote that Quakers,

hold that the holy scripture, the writings of the prophets, Evangelists and Apostles are not the Word of God, and that there is no written word of God: but they say, using a foolish distinction of their

---

<sup>18</sup>Thomas Vincent, *The Foundation of God Standeth Sure* (London, 1668), pp. 35-36. Thomas Danson, in *A Synopsis of Quakerism* (London, 1668) uses similar arguments to Vincent, pp. 8-9.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., title page.

own coining, that they are a declaration of the Word only in those that gave the faith...They hold their own speakings are a declaration of the Word [Christ] in them, thereby making them, though they be for the most part full of impiety and nonsense, to be of equal authority with the holy scriptures.<sup>20</sup>

This for the most part is a fairly accurate description of the Quaker position on the Bible. As Ralph Farmer also stated; by Scriptures Quakers meant 'not the written word without, but that word (that light) that is within; and which every man hath that comes into the world'.<sup>21</sup> The Quaker view of scripture particularly annoyed the Baptists, as T.L. Underwood has explained,

the Baptists tended to closely associate the scripture and the spirit while the Quakers tended to disassociate the two. In their discussion of the authority of scripture, the Baptists advocated the scripture as the rule and touchstone while admitting the need of the assistance of the spirit, whereas the Quakers associated the spirit as the rule and touchstone but found it necessary to appeal to the scripture.<sup>22</sup>

Matthew Caffyn, the Baptist preacher, born in Sussex and educated at Oxford, complained that Quakers 'utterly deny...the Holy Scriptures to be a rule'. Instead they looked to the 'light' as their guide which Caffyn deemed highly erroneous.<sup>23</sup> Joseph Wright a Baptist who 'practised physick' remarked how Quakers 'delight to abuse the scriptures'.<sup>24</sup>

As the Quakers paid little heed to the outward Christ so

---

<sup>20</sup>Higginson, *A Brief Relation of the Irreligion of the Northern Quakers*, p. 4.

<sup>21</sup>Farmer, *Mysteries*, p. 74.

<sup>22</sup>Underwood, 'Baptists and Quakers', p. 94.

<sup>23</sup>Caffyn, *Faith in God's Promises*, p. 46.

<sup>24</sup>Wright, *A Testimony for the Son of Man*, p. 205.

they also dismissed all ordinances. Ralph Farmer noted that they 'offered violence...to all the ordinances and holy institutions of Jesus Christ, and the Gospel' for to Quakers, Farmer claimed, 'all the ordinances and ways of worship outwardly are but types and shadows of the true spiritual worship within'.<sup>25</sup>

Adversaries tried to tar Quakers with the brush of popery and attempted to equate their teachings with Catholicism. As Stephen A. Kent has noted, 'of the emerging sectarian groups, none was more visible nor more hostile to other Puritans than Quakerism, and the "Papist" charge against it appeared soon after the group began vigorously to recruit new members'.<sup>26</sup> A prevalent idea in this type of pamphlet was that Rome was using Quakers and other sectaries to destroy Protestant England. William Prynne, the famous Presbyterian and political writer showed 'great antipathy...to the sects, in particular the Independents and the Quakers, whom he believed to provide the cloak for Jesuit intrigues'.<sup>27</sup> Prynne wrote that 'Romish emissaries and vermin' were the Quakers' 'chief speakers and rulers' whose plan was to 'reduce and divide the people'.<sup>28</sup> To Prynne, Quakers were even more under suspicion because many of them hailed from the north from 'Lancashire and other

---

<sup>25</sup>Ibid, p. 31.

<sup>26</sup>Stephen A. Kent, 'The Papist charges against the Interregnum Quakers', *Journal of Religious History* (Dec. 1982), p. 180.

<sup>27</sup>William L. Lamont, *Marginal Prynne 1600-1669* (London, 1963), p. 141.

<sup>28</sup>Quoted in Ibid., William Prynne, *Quakers Unmasked* (London 1655, 2nd edition), p. 7.

parts, where popish priests, friars and recusants formerly most abounded'.<sup>29</sup> Prynne also noted similarities in methods of disseminating their messages; Quakers 'were sent from those Northern centres, into other quarters of the kingdom, two by two, at first; no doubt by the direction of their...provincial, just as the Franciscan Friars are sent out by their provincial'.<sup>30</sup> Another writer linked Quakers with Catholics on the basis of their refusal to swear oaths for, he stated, 'he who refuseth to take the oath of abjuration is a Papist'.<sup>31</sup>

Quakers were also branded as Papists with regard to their attitude to the Bible which adverse writers tried to compare with Catholic belief. Richard Baxter, the celebrated religious leader of Worcestershire noted that 'the Papists' main error lieth in contempt of the Scriptures' and went on to add how the 'Quakers say it is not the Word of God'.<sup>32</sup> Ralph Farmer imagined that a conspiracy was at hand involving the Quakers 'to fetch people off from the Scripture altogether: that so the authority thereof being rejected, they may be the better prepared upon a new assault (in another disguise) to entertain the authority of the Romish chair'.<sup>33</sup> This idea was echoed in another work by an anonymous author who warned in his pamphlet

---

<sup>29</sup>William Prynne, *Some Popish Errors, unadvisedly Embraced* (London, 1658), p. 4

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>31</sup>Quoted in Kent, 'Papist Charges', from Thomas Smith, *The Quaker Disarmed* (London, 1659), no pagination.

<sup>32</sup>Baxter, *The Quakers Catechism*, p. 26.

<sup>33</sup>Farmer, *Great Mysteries*, p. 78.

to 'take heed some Roman spirits do not lead on these poor souls, and deceive them; take heed there be not a Roman Foxe to lead and guide your lambs'.<sup>34</sup>

### **Behaviour and Social Status**

By far the most virulent attack on Quakers, however, in the 1650s and 1660s stemmed from their behaviour. The extravagant actions of Quakers as a result of the leadings of the 'light' were derided by Friends' religious contemporaries time and time again. The habit of quaking was particularly vilified and critics made much out of this for propaganda purposes. Francis Higginson described Quakers,

that are taken with these fits...as though they were surprised with an epilepsy, or apoplexy, and lie grovelling in the earth...while the agony of the fit is upon them their lips quiver, their flesh and joints tremble, their bellies swell as though blown up with wind, they foam at the mouth, and sometimes purge as if they had taken physic.<sup>35</sup>

Critics believed that Quakers had misinterpreted scenes in the Old and New Testaments that mentioned prophets and apostles quaking. An anonymous author wrote that in these passages quaking 'was more in the inward passionate desires, and sighing of the soul complaining secretly to God, than any outward noise from the body'.<sup>36</sup>

The Quaker habit of 'going naked' was criticised in a similar fashion as stemming from 'a spirit of delusion, Satan

---

<sup>34</sup>Anon., *Querer's and Quaker's Cause* (London, 1653), no page.

<sup>35</sup>Higginson, *A Brief Relation*, p. 15.

<sup>36</sup>*Querer's and Quaker's Cause*, pp. 7-8.

setting them on'.<sup>37</sup> Such activities led one writer to describe Quakers as 'the most immodest, obscene people in the world next to the late Ranters...women stripping themselves to the skin in the presence of men, and men doing so in the presence of women'.<sup>38</sup> Like the apostles and prophets, the Quakers laid claim to miracles which more orthodox contemporaries viewed as yet another example of spiritual pride. One critic asked if their fasting for six or seven days could be viewed as miraculous when they looked as if 'they had lain some months under a languishing sickness; or as if they had passed through the jaws of death, or the territories of hell'.<sup>39</sup>

Quaker proselytising in churches and market places when imbued with the 'spirit' was interpreted as unruly behaviour by critics. Ephraim Pagitt noted how Quakers,

rush into market-places, crying woe, woe, to the wicked. They are moved again (say they) by the Lord to crowd into churches...where they interrupt the ministers, and trouble all things, roaring aloud.<sup>40</sup>

Quakers were presented as unnatural for their travelling missionary work and one critic asked, 'is this a peaceable and harmless way for a man to leave his wife and children, to run about, and let them shift for themselves? Or is this a peaceable and harmless way for wives to leave their husbands against their wills?' The author compared Quakers with the Circumcellians, a branch of the Donatists, an African sect who

---

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>38</sup>Thomas Underhill, *Hell Broke Loose* (London 1660), p. 32.

<sup>39</sup>Francis Harris, *Some Queries Proposed*, p. 24.

<sup>40</sup>Ephraim Pagitt, *Heresiography* (London, 1654, 5th edition), p. 140.

were famous 'for running far from home, roving about, and interrupting ministers...threatening, cursing, and giving bitter language.'<sup>41</sup>

Many anti-Quaker tracts included scurrilous sections in which Quakers were portrayed as immoral and little better than Ranters. Ralph Farmer noted that the Quaker tendency to believe 'there is no sin, but what contradicts a man's own light' resulted in 'the unclean lives and conversations of the followers' of Quakerism whom he perceived to be following in the footsteps of the Ranters.<sup>42</sup> Magnus Byne declared that Quakers were worse than Ranters for despite' their show of holiness, wisdom, humility, temperance' he could find 'nothing but impurity, folly, pride, madness...'<sup>43</sup> Similarly, Pagitt compared the two and described the Ranter as 'an unclean beast, much of the make with our Quaker, of the same puddle...their infidelities, villainies and debauchements are the same, only the Ranter is more open'.<sup>44</sup>

Stories of Quaker immorality resulting from following the 'light' abounded in the 1650s. One writer described how 'two goats of that herd [i.e. Quakers] met together, a man and woman, he having a wife elsewhere, yet she at nights comes from another bed to his, being of her trancing sect, and bids him open to her, for the Father had sent her'. Stories of

---

<sup>41</sup>*Querer's and Quaker's Cause*, pp. 11, 14.

<sup>42</sup>*Farmer, Mysteries*, p. 29.

<sup>43</sup>Magnus Byne, *The Scornful Quakers Answered* (London, 1656), p. A2.

<sup>44</sup>Pagitt, *Heresiography*, p. 145. (in pamphlet wrongly paged as p. 143).

sexual immorality were linked to the Quakers' method of marriage. The anonymous author above compared Quakers with the 'Liberi' or 'the free ones', a type of Anabaptist who held 'that being regenerate and re-baptised, they could not sin' for everything they did 'was the will of the Father'. The writer went on to describe their 'spiritual marriages' which he took to be 'an invention to call their lying with whom they would'. He noted too how Quakers 'have been heard to talk of being married in the spirit to those that were not their husbands and wives'.<sup>45</sup> The adverse writer, Thomas Underhill, noted how one Quaker who went naked in Newbury said that marriage was made by man and that 'any woman was as free to him as his wife'. The same author recounted the improbable story of how some Quakers killed their mother at the promptings of the light which urged them to destroy original sin, and how another Quaker 'acted that most abominable, unnameable sin with a mare'.<sup>46</sup>

Barry Reay has noted 'the recurring accusation that Quakers were witches' and certainly there are a number of pamphlets which make references to witchcraft and diabolism in their attempts to discredit the movement. This type of accusation seems to have been particularly prevalent in the crisis years of 1659 to 60.<sup>47</sup> An anonymous author noted how Quakers used 'enchanted potions, bracelets, sorcery and witchcraft, to intoxicate their novices, and draw them to

---

<sup>45</sup> *Querer's and Quaker's Cause*, p. 25.

<sup>46</sup> Underhill, *Hell Broke Loose*, pp. 36-37.

<sup>47</sup> Reay, *Quakers and the English Revolution*, p. 68.

their party.<sup>48</sup> Thomas Underhill commented that 'many of the Quakers are no doubt enchanted and bewitched by the Devil'.<sup>49</sup> George Fox himself was often charged with witchcraft by contemporaries. Francis Higginson stated that 'George Fox the ring-leader of this sect, hath been and is vehemently suspected to be a sorcerer'. He went on to describe Fox's attribute of being able to 'outlook any man' which his followers claimed he did 'to know what is in them' but the author preferred to see Fox's stare as the 'evil eye' and declared that it was that rather than any ability to discern 'the complexions of men's souls in their faces'.<sup>50</sup>

Barry Reay has suggested that the supposed links with witchcraft stemmed from a number of causes, such as the habit of those in the movement to meet on commons and woods and 'out of the way places' which may have 'encouraged speculation and fear of the unknown'. Reay also notes that quaking and trembling no doubt seemed evidence enough of demonic possession and 'witchcraft could also explain the sect's otherwise unaccountable success'.<sup>51</sup>

A further theme of anti-Quaker writings worth mentioning is that of the attempts by critics to present Quakers as deranged and deluded though this is closely bound up with accusations of witchcraft. As Charles L. Cherry has noted, 'there was particular emphasis on the relation between

---

<sup>48</sup>Anonymous, *The Quaker's Fiery Beacon*, p. 8.

<sup>49</sup>Underhill, *Hell Broke Loose*, p. 36.

<sup>50</sup>Higginson, *A Brief Relation*, pp. 18-19.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., pp. 70-71

enthusiasm and madness'.<sup>52</sup> Stories of Quakers going mad were rife such as that of John Toldervy who attended a Quaker meeting during which a fly flew on his face which he believed was a messenger from God and 'from that time' the author stated 'he was guided by flies in all things'.<sup>53</sup>

Quaker social customs and habits were another theme used by hostile writers to attack the movement. Friends customs were seen as uncivil, for example their way of addressing others. One critic wrote, 'they do not give any title or colour of respect to those that are their superiors, in office, honour, estate, such as master or sir'.<sup>54</sup> The Quaker habit of using 'thee' and 'thou' instead of 'you' was also seized upon for being used 'in a way of contempt, and singularity of uncourteousness, and banishing of a lawful urbanity and civil behaviour to be used to all men'.<sup>55</sup> Critics complained of Quakers 'damning men for wearing ribbons, cuffs, lace, rings, pins, bands, hoods, veils...and preferring to go about in plain dress themselves'.<sup>56</sup> Richard Blome felt the Quakers were 'big with swollen pride' as they would 'uncover to none' and urged people to note their 'sullen and clownish behaviour, not only towards persons of low rank, but before

---

<sup>52</sup>Charles L. Cherry, 'Enthusiasm and Madness: Anti-Quakerism in the Seventeenth Century', *Quaker History*, 73 (1984), p. 11.

<sup>53</sup>Blome, *The Fanatic History*, (London, 1660), p. 94.

<sup>54</sup>Higginson, *A Brief Relation*, p. 28.

<sup>55</sup>Querer's and Quaker's Cause, p. 20.

<sup>56</sup>Byne, *Scornful Quakers Answered*, p. A2.

magistracy itself'.<sup>57</sup>

Such lack of respect towards superiors engendered fears that Quakers were social subversives, a fear which is reflected in a number of pamphlets. The Anglican, Magnus Byne feared Quakers' 'clamouring against magistrates, ministers, tythes, customs'.<sup>58</sup> Francis Higginson wrote that Quakers 'hold that all things ought to be common, and teach the doctrine of levelling privately to their disciples'. He went on to note that 'those that know the leaders of this sect best, judge them to be downright Levellers' and related how 'several of them have affirmed that there ought to be no distinction of estates, but a universal parity'.<sup>59</sup> Francis Harris condemned Quakers' refusal to show reverence to the magistrate and feared that 'if all persons should imitate them in this, it would bring a general contempt upon authority'.<sup>60</sup> These fears were played upon to some degree in the anti-Quaker pamphlet literature of 1659-60. In 1659 Lord Saye and Sele wrote, 'O how did this take with the vulgar sort...when they thought they should enjoy that liberty, as to be under no rule, no reverence to be given either to magistrate or minister, parent or master...'.<sup>61</sup> Thomas Underhill echoed these feelings when he spoke of 'the great danger' he felt the nation was in of

---

<sup>57</sup>Blome, *Fanatic History*, p. 68.

<sup>58</sup>Byne, *Scornful Quakers Answered*, p. 78.

<sup>59</sup>Higginson, *A Brief Relation*, p. 10.

<sup>60</sup>Harris, *Some Queries*, p. 11.

<sup>61</sup>Quoted in Reay, *Quakers and the English Revolution*, p. 59, from W. Fiennes, *Folly and Ignorance Made Manifest* (London, 1659), p. 4.

being 'overrun with these poisonous weeds to the everlasting undoing of ourselves, wives, children, relations'. Underhill feared that if Quakerism increased and 'come to be predominant', England would be 'undone'. He portrayed the Quakers as violent subversives when he asked, 'would not they that scorn to petition a parliament, or be uncovered before the greatest throne of a nation, pull them out by the ears if they were able?'.<sup>62</sup> The J.P.s of Leeds, Bradford and Wakefield voiced similar fears in a petition which described how 'these populous places and parts adjacent, now are, and for a long time, have been miserably perplexed, and much dissettled by the unruly sect of people called Quakers, whose principles are to overturn, overturn, overturn, magistracy, ministry.'<sup>63</sup>

Nevertheless, even in the 1660s a slight shift occurred in the aspects of Quakerism which critics were attacking. Less emphasis was placed upon behaviour in terms of Quakerism as an ecstatic movement no doubt because Fox and others were trying to limit such enthusiasm amongst members. Indeed the writer Underhill noted in 1660 that at that time 'it was rarely seen that they quake'.<sup>64</sup> Lodowick Muggleton also noted a change in Quaker behaviour when he wrote that in the 1650s it was their 'principle...to foam at the mouth...and howl and groan as if hell were like to burst' in them, but in the 1660s he said 'I

---

<sup>62</sup>Underhill, *Hell Broke Loose*, pp. 38, 40.

<sup>63</sup>'The Humble Petition and Advice of the Justices of the Peace, Ministers, and Other Well-Principled Inhabitants of Leeds, Wakefield and Bradford', 1659, Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers*, vol. 2, p. 98.

<sup>64</sup>Underhill, *Hell Broke Loose*, p. 1.

do not hear of any Quaker that hath any fits, no not so much as to buzz or hum before the fit comes'.<sup>65</sup>

A number of the Anglican pamphlets dealt with the Quaker refusal of all oaths, an issue particularly important with the return of the Stuarts in 1660. Dr. Gauden argued for the use of oaths, saying that

probably as Christians (truly such) we shall need no swearings in public or private: but as men, weak and unworthy, we can not well be without such oaths to end controversies, and to secure, as much as man can do, the exact proceedings of justice'.<sup>66</sup>

The Anglican and doctor of divinity Allan Smallwood argued that oaths were necessary since 'wickedness, and variance too much abound in the world'.<sup>67</sup>

In the 1650s Quakers were attacked for their perceived low social status. As Charles L. Cherry has written, attacks tended to be 'virulent and personal' and Quakers were charged with being 'rude' and 'uncultivated'.<sup>68</sup> Their northern origins were emphasised; Ralph Farmer described Quakers derisively as 'certain morris-dancers from the north'.<sup>69</sup> Similarly the more humble origins of the 'rank and file' Quakers were seized upon by Ephraim Pagitt, the heresiographer, when he commented that 'the body of this heresy is composed and made up of the dregs

---

<sup>65</sup>Quoted in Greene, 'Muggletonians and Quakers', p. 116, from *A Looking Glass for George Fox* (London, 1663).

<sup>66</sup>John Gauden, *A Discourse Concerning Public Oaths* (London, 1662), p. 23.

<sup>67</sup>Allan Smallwood, *A Reply to a Pamphlet called Oaths no Gospel Ordinance* (York, 1667), p. 9.

<sup>68</sup>Cherry, 'Enthusiasm and Madness', p. 11.

<sup>69</sup>Farmer, *Great Mysteries*, p. A2.

of the common people'.<sup>70</sup>

In the 1660s pamphlets also concentrated on the social status of Quakers. Dr. John Gauden, Bishop of Exeter referred to them as 'mean people for birth or breeding, for reason and understanding, as well as estates'.<sup>71</sup> Yet a conflicting pamphlet at the start of the decade in 1660 suggested that many Quakers were men of means. William Brownsford, Presbyterian minister of Kendal who conformed at the Restoration noted the wealth of leading Quakers who,

thrive fast...make purchases, get good estates, wear of late rich clothes, ride on high prized horses, who before were mean enough to hold anothers stirrup; and have their stocks of money out of which they receive...sometimes great and large sums.<sup>72</sup>

#### *Anti-Quaker writings c.1670-1689*

The 1670s brought another period of persecution for Friends, albeit with some periods of respite. The Declaration of Indulgence of 1672 gave some relief in the short-term but the Quakers particularly suffered from the mid 1670s onwards under the Elizabethan recusancy laws which could often ruin Quakers financially. W.C. Braithwaite has noted how 'the law was perverted into a scourge for the Quakers'.<sup>73</sup> The 1670s saw a great outpouring of anti-Quaker writing with around 120

---

<sup>70</sup>Pagitt, *Heresiography*, p. 136.

<sup>71</sup>John Gauden *A Discourse Concerning Public Oaths* (London, 1662), p. 7.

<sup>72</sup>William Brownsford, *The Quaker-Jesuit* (London, 1660), p. 10.

<sup>73</sup>Braithwaite, *Second Period of Quakerism*, p. 100.

pamphlets.<sup>74</sup> The main attacks involved doctrine, Quakers being accused of heresy and popery, but there was less of an emphasis upon their behaviour. Instead, the wealth of Quakers was highlighted and they were accused of hypocrisy for changes which had occurred in their attitudes and customs and in relation to the ever mounting institutionalization of the movement.

Compared with the previous decade, the number of anti-Quaker pamphlets in the 1680s fell drastically with around 43 having been printed, an indication that criticism was beginning to abate by this time, particularly amongst Dissenters.<sup>75</sup> The first chapter of this thesis which covered Quaker doctrine highlighted the great attempts that Quakers made in the 1670s and 80s to prove their orthodoxy against the claim that they were not Christians, especially in relation to the three main issues of Christology, the Quaker doctrine of the Trinity and their view of the Scriptures. In addition, the erection of central and local organization in the late 1660s and early 70s meant that the more enthusiastic behaviour of Quakers could be restrained much more easily and effectively. More important of course was the perceived threat of Catholicism which hung over the 1680s, in comparison with which Quakerism and other Dissenters must have seemed less threatening.

---

<sup>74</sup>See appendix 19.

<sup>75</sup>See appendix 20.

## **Doctrine**

Pamphlets of the 1670s were rife with disapproval of Quaker doctrine and this constituted the major antagonism between Quakers and the more orthodox at this time. Herbert Thorndyke, prebendary of Westminster, for example, believed Quakers to be little better than Gnostics, Mohammedans and Manicheans and felt that they should be banished.<sup>76</sup> The old controversies continued concerning just what Quakers meant by the 'inner light' and its relation to Christ. This notion clearly confused Thomas Hicks, a leading Baptist preacher who wrote of the Quaker notion of the light,

what one of them saith, another of their own will contradict...one while 'tis the divine essence, 'tis Christ, 'tis increased, another while 'tis not Christ himself, but only his gift, or appearance, a seed, a measure of light, a witness for God. Now 'tis the only saviour, and rule."<sup>77</sup>

William Haworth, formerly of St. John's College, Cambridge, and ejected from St. Peter's Church, St. Alban's in 1662 wrote that 'the light in every one is the Quaker's Christ and...they believe there is no manhood of Christ now, but it vanished when Christ ascended, and diffused itself into everyone'.<sup>78</sup> A pamphlet written in poetic form by the Particular Baptist, Benjamin Keach discussed this same issue of the nature of the

---

<sup>76</sup>Herbert Thorndyke, *A Discourse of the Forbearance or the Penalties which due Reformation Requires* (1670), quoted in C.E. Whiting, *Studies in English Puritanism from the Restoration to the Revolution, 1660-1688* (London, 1931), p. 188.

<sup>77</sup>Thomas Hicks, 'A Continuation of the Dialogue Between a Christian and a Quaker' (London, 1673), epistle; in, *Three Dialogues Between a Christian and a Quaker*, (London, 1679).

<sup>78</sup>William Haworth, *The Quaker Converted to Christianity*, (London, 1674), p. 19.

indwelling of Christ and what Quakers meant by it. Using the example of the sun and its light, the author asked whether the sun's rays could be the actual essence of the sun when he stated,

Nay, if the sun should shine with splendour clear,  
And with his beams your house enlightened were.  
From his body, then immediately you can't conclude  
Its body there to be.

The author urged Quakers to 'distinguish...in the like sense between his [Christ's] essence and his influence'.<sup>79</sup> It was asserted that Quakers 'put no distinction betwixt their Christ, and their light within' and according to William Jameson, Professor of History at Glasgow University 'they decry, vilify, and do what they can to overthrow whatever ought to be precious and dear to a Christian' and 'with open mouth blaspheme and deny Jesus Christ as a person without them, or as anything distinct from their imaginary Christ'.<sup>80</sup>

Quakers were again criticised at this time for not owning the actual body of Christ or his humanity and for making themselves equal with Christ as may be seen from the following perception of their beliefs from the pen of the Baptist Henry Grigge who wrote of Quakers and their beliefs,

that body of flesh and bone that was born of the virgin, and nailed to the cross, is nowhere said to be the Christ! But that the Christ was in him in that body of flesh that was crucified: it is evident that you deny the man Christ Jesus for if the light or power in that person be the only Christ of God, distinct and apart from the body that was crucified on the cross then it followeth plainly and may

---

<sup>79</sup>Benjamin Keach., *The Grand Imposter Discovered* (London, 1675), p. 213.

<sup>80</sup>William Jameson, *Verus Patroclus: or the Weapons of Quakerism* (Edinburgh, 1689), pp. 182-183.

appear to any that your chief doctrine leads you to deny that ever the Christ of God and true saviour died; for the light, power, or Godhead, whereof you speak, could not be so crucified and nailed to the cross. And if that Man...was upon no other account called the Christ, but merely and alone, because the true Christ was in him, why may not any other man, in whose flesh or body Christ is manifested and doth dwell be called the Christ as well as he who was born of the blessed virgin?<sup>81</sup>

The same criticism came from the Independent John Faldo who castigated Quakers for believing in a 'heavenly body of Christ', consisting of 'spiritual flesh, blood, and bones, which came down from heaven' and noted how Quakers believed it 'dwells now (at least) in every Quaker'.<sup>82</sup>

It is not difficult to see why Quakers at this time should also be disparaged for denying the Trinity. John Faldo noted that 'they deny a Trinity of distinct persons to subsist in the one Godhead' and the Anglican, Henry Hedworth accused them of Sabellianism, and believed 'they mean nothing by Christ, neither substance, nor essence, person nor subsistent.'<sup>83</sup> William Jameson accused the Quakers of denying the Trinity, of rendering the humanity of Christ 'altogether monstrous' and destroying the divinity of Christ.<sup>84</sup>

In terms of justification and salvation, Quakers continued to be attacked for denying the atonement of Christ through his crucifixion. John Faldo stated that Quakers were

---

<sup>81</sup>Henry Grigg, *Light from the Son of Righteousness* (London, 1672), pp. 29-30.

<sup>82</sup>John Faldo, *Quakerism no Christianity*, (London, 1675), p. 20

<sup>83</sup>Faldo, p. 18; Henry Hedworth, *Controversy Ended* (London, 1673), p. 45.

<sup>84</sup>Jameson, *Verus Patroclus*, p. 150; p. 179.

not on their own account redeemed by the incarnate Christ but by another means, whereby 'Christ in them doth offer up himself a living sacrifice, by which the wrath of God is appeased towards them'. Here he is presumably referring to the workings of Christ within.<sup>85</sup> William Haworth, criticized Quakers for denying the imputed righteousness of Christ and instead relying on the righteousness 'attained by attending on the "light"'. He added derisively that this idea was promulgated by George Fox 22 years since, for '1600 years is too long a time for Christ's righteousness to hold its virtue' for the Quakers.<sup>86</sup> Benjamin Keach wrote in a similar vein; 'if there's salvation by the light within, in vain hath Christ laid down his life for sin'.<sup>87</sup> According to the Anglican William Allen, the Quakers confounded 'the great effects which the scripture attributes to the flesh or humane nature of Christ' by their belief that Christ was only a heavenly man.<sup>88</sup>

Quakers were criticized for not having an external rule to live by, that is for not holding the scriptures to be the touchstone in matters of uncertainty. John Faldo complained that for Quakers the scriptures were not a 'rule of faith and life' and that they did not perceive them to be the Word of God but they said 'Christ only' could be that.<sup>89</sup> The Baptist,

---

<sup>85</sup>Faldo, *Quakerism No Christianity*, p. 20.

<sup>86</sup>Haworth, *Quaker Converted to Christianity*, p. 34.

<sup>87</sup>Keach, *Grand Imposter*, p. 247.

<sup>88</sup>William Allen, *The Grand Error of the Quakers Detected and Confuted* (London, 1680), p. 99.

<sup>89</sup>Faldo, *Quakerism no Christianity*, pp. 18-19.

Thomas Grantham pinpointed the controversy between Baptists and Quakers when he stated that 'the true state of the case is this, whether the spirit of God, as he speaks to men in the scriptures or the light which every man hath in him, be this supreme judge'. He went on to say that Baptists believed the first proposition but did give some place to the light, though denying that it was 'the Holy Ghost' or that it could 'reveal all the will of God to man'.<sup>90</sup> This question was discussed in depth by Stephen Scandrett of Trinity College, Cambridge, whose father had been yeoman of the wardrobe to Charles I. Scandrett saw the essential difference between the orthodox and the Quakers to lie in views of the scriptures. He noted of Quakers that they 'hold that the light in every man is the rule that directs to heaven; that the scripture therefore is to be embraced so far only as it agrees with this light'.<sup>91</sup> Unlike the Quakers, who saw the light as supernatural, Scandrett equated the light with reason, with man's natural faculties, 'that principle of knowledge that is in every man' and he believed that only the 'spirit of God' could help men 'to understand the true sense of scripture'.<sup>92</sup> For Scandrett, Christ was revealed by the Gospel and not by the 'light'; the latter could teach 'moral duties' but it could not 'reveal Christ of itself when he is revealed by the scriptures and

---

<sup>90</sup>Thomas Grantham, 'The Baptist against the Quaker' in *Christianismus Primitivus or, The Ancient Christian Religion...* (London, 1678), p. 47.

<sup>91</sup>Stephen Scandrett, *An Antidote Against Quakerism* (London, 1671), p. 3.

<sup>92</sup>Ibid., pp. 7, 24.

preaching of the gospel' for they are spiritually discovered. He goes on to say, 'the natural man with all is light cannot reach to this'.<sup>93</sup> Similar sentiments were uttered by the Baptist, Benjamin Keach when he wrote that,

Quakers with their subtlety would quite bereave us,  
Of all the precious counsel Christ did leave us,  
With the volumes of his holy word,  
For faith and practice Quakers will afford,  
The world no other rule to worship by,  
But the light within and its authority...<sup>94</sup>

Quakers were still criticized for denying the use of ordinances. Regarding Baptism, Stephen Scandrett asked, 'are we not enemies to ourselves and children, if we reject a means of sanctification, a means of salvation?' He further asserted that what God had 'instituted for his church, and not repealed is still binding'.<sup>95</sup>

Other beliefs were attacked for their unorthodoxy. John Faldo criticized Quakers for holding that judgement, Heaven and Hell and the resurrection were all 'held to be within, in the time of this life'. For Quakers, he said, the day of judgement related to 'all disobedience to the light', meaning that a Quaker was judged during each of his actions not just at some final reckoning after death. According to Faldo, the resurrection of men did not mean a physical resurrection for the Quakers believed that 'the body shall not live again after its death' but the soul, 'a part of his (God's) being, shall

---

<sup>93</sup>Ibid., p. 30.

<sup>94</sup>Benjamin Keach, *Grand Imposter*, epistle.

<sup>95</sup>Scandrett, *An Antidote*, p. 75.

return unto him again'."<sup>6</sup> The Quaker belief in the possibility of perfection whilst on earth continued to be attacked, Faldo noted how Quakers believed 'that men attain to be without any sin in this life' and he also criticised them for denying original sin and for saying that sin only existed if it was complied with."<sup>7</sup>

A major charge in the 1670s was that Quakers were Papists which stemmed from the pens of Anglican and Dissenter alike. The Independent minister, John Faldo noted how 'Quakers built their babes on the same foundation on which popery...is founded...contempt of the scriptures, pretences of infallibility, and immediate inspirations. More emphasis however was placed on similarities between the organizations and hierarchy of Quakerism and Catholicism. Faldo noted how in their 'discipline, order and rule...they [Quakers] symbolise with Rome'. George Fox's position was likened to that of the Pope, when Faldo wrote

to find a pope, or somewhat like him among the Quakers, we need seek no further than George Fox; who is among them a pope, and more than a pope. His supremacy among the Quakers is sufficiently known among them, and by some lamented.

Faldo suggested that Fox was 'able to produce bulls as magisterial, as ever issued from St. Peter's chair'. The Quakers like Catholics had 'their little juntas' to make 'laws, canons and constitutions, beside and contrary to the Scriptures, and impose them on their members as of divine authority. Like the papists who would only allow into their

---

<sup>6</sup>"Faldo, *Quakerism no Christianity*, pp. 23-24.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

councils those in unity who acknowledged the pope, the Quakers barred anyone who dissented 'from the ruling party, are not in unity with the body, or that comply not with George Fox the Quaker Pope'. According to Faldo, Quakers exceeded Catholic idolatry, for 'in the room of St. Peter and Paul, the Virgin Mary, are William, [Penn] George [Fox] &c.'<sup>98</sup> William Haworth noted the doctrinal and organizational similarities of Quakerism and Catholicism and wrote of how the central body 'must determine all things, and every particular Quaker is to stoop to the light of that body although his and her particular light dictates otherwise'.<sup>99</sup> The Anglican John Cheyney, observed how Quakerism had turned into a 'faction' with 'some presiding and ruling over the rest with imperious authority, and giving laws and politic rules to be observed by the people and subordinate ministers, under pain of deprivation and excommunication...'.<sup>100</sup> Another critic appears to have been impressed by their talent for organization, however, when he noted that Quakers kept together

in one entire body glued together with a strict unity, as to affection and correspondence, as is evident by their weekly collections...sent up to London, where their common stock cannot but in so many years as they have maintained it be very vast. To which add the exact account and registry they everywhere keep of all their births and burials (which are likewise duly transmitted up) so that in an instant they are able to give a near estimate of

---

<sup>98</sup>John Faldo, *Quakerism no Christianity*, pp. 11-15.

<sup>99</sup>Haworth, *The Quaker Converted to Christianity*, p. 69.

<sup>100</sup>John Cheyney, *Two Sermons of Hypocrisy* (London, 1677), no page.

their number and strength in all the three nations.<sup>101</sup>

The Anglican John Williams, Rector of St. Mildred Poultry, London, in a 1679 tract also remarked on the Quakers' organization, saying however much 'they pretend to be against all forms' they nevertheless 'are fallen into such a kind of order, and have several laws amongst themselves, which become binding to the rest'.<sup>102</sup>

Around the time of the Exclusion Crisis a number of pamphlets appeared which equated Quakerism with popery. The Anglican, Laurence Wastall wrote that Quakerism was 'anti-Christian popery put forth in a new dress' and that Quakers had 'gone into the tents of Rome', stressing here doctrinal similarities relating to inherent righteousness.<sup>103</sup> Referring to George Fox's *A Primer and Catechism for Children* of 1670, the author felt that 'quaking primer-men' were 'subtly at work to corrupt the injudicious minds of children with gross popery' and asserted that 'Quakerism serves as a stepping stone for popery in this church and kingdom'.<sup>104</sup> John Alexander, a minister of Leith in Scotland, linked Quakers with Jesuits and Arminians in their assertion that Christ died for all men and thought Quakerism 'one of the chiefest and

---

<sup>101</sup>R.H., *The Character of a Quaker* (London, 1671), pp. 15-16.

<sup>102</sup>John Williams, *A Sermon Preached before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London* (London, 1679), epistle, pp. 5, 7.

<sup>103</sup>L. Wastall, *The Papists Younger Brother: or the Vileness of Quakerism Detected* (London, 1679), sig. A3, p. 11.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid., p. 29.

most damnable delusions'.<sup>105</sup> Slightly earlier, the Anglican John Nalson, J.P. for the Isle of Ely linked dissent in general with Catholicism when he attacked Presbyterianism as the producer of 'many headed progeny, Anabaptists, Quakers, Levellers, &c' and went on to remark that all of these were 'as inconsistent with monarchy as they pretend to be with Papacy...or any of them with loyalty, royalty or true religion'.<sup>106</sup>

The accusation of popery was still rife well into the 1680s and came from the pens of Anglicans yet significantly it was not directed just at Quakers. John Nalson, told the much-quoted tale of an iron-monger from Bristol who had heard from a Mr. Coppinger, an Irishman who became a Franciscan in Rome, that 'none of the sects had come so near his fraternity as the Quakers'. Coppinger also added, so the story went, that two of his acquaintances at Rome had become 'chief speakers amongst the Quakers'. Friends however were not the only group to be called papists, the author went on to note that other Catholics had licence from Rome to assume any sect 'to confound the Reformation; if not by popish doctrines, yet by heretical errors and heresies, and he included such groups as Independents, Brownists, Chialists, Antinomians, Anabaptists, Familists, Socininans and Quakers'.<sup>107</sup> In general Anglican

---

<sup>105</sup>John Alexander, *Jesuitico-Quakerism Examined* (London, 1680), p. 138, preface.

<sup>106</sup>John Nalson, *The Common Interest of King and People*, (London, 1677), p. 201.

<sup>107</sup>John Nalson, *Foxes and Firebrands* (London, 1689), pp. 195-198.

pamphlets in the 1680s were aimed at all Dissenters as can be seen from their titles, whether they were calling for a union of Protestants, or urging the continuation of the status quo, that is Anglican supremacy. The more diehard Anglicans of course attacked any kind of leniency towards Dissent. Robert Grove, Rector of St. Andrews, Undershaft and later Bishop of Chichester and prime mover against liberty of conscience in 1688, believed a Papist conspiracy was afoot when he referred to the Declarations of Charles II and James II, saying

it is well known that the papists have always endeavoured to widen our differences, and when they had been pretty successful in that, they were of late become earnest solicitors for the indulging of protestant Dissenters...But only they hoped that by this means our divisions might be easily multiplied, and the Church of England by consequence exceedingly weakened; and then they knew they should have the most promising opportunity of working their ends upon us all. For when this is done they may freely send abroad their emissaries in the likeness of Anabaptists, Quakers, Fifth-Monarchy men...And when they have broken us into several scattered independent troops, that are not agreed amongst themselves...they may overcome us.<sup>108</sup>

The Archdeacon of Chichester, Josiah Pleydell believed that 'separations and divisions in the church' would be the 'design, as well as the effects of a toleration' and were 'as sure to be succeeded as day by night with distractions, commotions, and wars in the state'.<sup>109</sup>

Other Anglicans however, were in favour of a more tolerant approach; Edward Pearse called for 'a safe and speedy union of all Dissenters' for 'union is that which all wise,

---

<sup>108</sup>Robert Grove, *A Short Defence of the Church and Clergy of England* (London, 1681), p. 89.

<sup>109</sup>Josiah Pleydell, *Loyalty and Conformity Asserted* (London, 1682), p. 13.

good and gracious souls must needs desire, and endeavour to attain'. He praised the virtues of a number of sects such as Baptists and Congregationalists and wrote also that

The Quaker must have the right of humanity, the honour of all good men...My soul grieves for them. Some of them, that I know, are a sort of Christian; they do not give enough to the scriptures, which as far as I know, is their great error, from whence the rest proceed. Their spiritual loss to me seems vast. They are gone from us indeed

He went on to add that he wished that magistrates would be more lenient to Quakers with regard to oath-taking for they 'did urge them [Quakers] with oaths when there was no cause for it'. Finally Pearse wrote that Quakers were 'men and natives' who had 'a natural right to society among us; and our rule is, to walk honestly towards them...There are many things commendable in them'.<sup>110</sup> This approach was typical of the more latitudinarian type of churchman and was prompted in part by fear of Catholicism. As R.I. Clark has noted, 'knowledge of the papist threat moved some Anglicans to urge the healing of the rift with the Protestant dissenting sects on the assumption that only by uniting would Protestant forces be strong enough to thwart Catholic plans to overthrow the state'.<sup>111</sup> The upshot of this was that in 1680 bills for comprehension and toleration were prepared which were to prove the 'precursors' of those introduced in 1689. Both of the toleration bills were to include provisions to excuse Quakers

---

<sup>110</sup>Edward Pearse, *The Conformists Fourth Plea for the Nonconformists* (London, 1683), pp. 22, 27-28.

<sup>111</sup>R.I. Clark, 'Quakers and the Church of England', p. 20.

from taking the Oaths.<sup>112</sup>

### *Behaviour and Social Status*

Some of the more interesting pamphlets concern Quaker behaviour and here there can be seen a definite shift in the perception of Quakers; the accusations of wildness and madness had now more or less disappeared and the emphasis switched to the changing social status of Friends and their growing worldliness. As John Cheyney noted in 1677, 'there is less of the frantic wild spirit, and the worldly self-seeking spirit is more grown apparent'.<sup>113</sup> Another critic wrote that the Quakers '*hocus pocus* tricks [presumably a reference to quaking and perhaps miracles] are now much laid side, and they observe that *leger de main* will not go off as formerly it had done'. Although evidence suggests that miracles particularly were still being performed into the 1680s, this had probably become a more private phenomenon than earlier on and so may have gone unnoticed. The author went on to elaborate on the striking change in Quakerism explaining that the Quakers'

zeal is most extremely fallen and abated these twelve or fourteen years and that they have exceedingly refined and improved their manners another way; being sensible by experience that preaching and their other trades go off best together, as the readier way to what they mainly aim at, worldly profit and advantage: thinking it now too unfashionable to run madding about the streets, and sometimes into churches, as formerly they

---

<sup>112</sup>See Nicholas Tyacke, 'The Rise of puritanism and the Legalizing of Dissent 1571-1719', in O.P. Grell, J.I. Israel, and N. Tyacke, (eds.), *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 37-38.

<sup>113</sup>Cheyney, *Two Sermons*, no page.

did...and differ so abundantly from their first founders, that they are now come much to the same pitch with what the Presbyterians were in 47 and 48.<sup>114</sup>

Quakers were now criticised for showing the fruits of their prosperity in material possessions unlike the early Friends who condemned luxury, for it was observed that 'they use the good things of this world with as much fondness and delight as ever other sinners did', and it was added that 'they wear...as good cloth, silks, and camlets as the proudest of mankind do, offering freely to stand proof, that the sin lies only in the colour, or the broadness of the ribbon.'<sup>115</sup> The same author also felt that Quakers had become more civil for 'their way of good-fellowship is also become very fashionable' and added that 'for their lasting commendation' they had become more sociable and 'so conformable a people in that point'.<sup>116</sup> Another anti-Quaker, Thomas Thompson wrote at length of the great changes in Quaker behaviour. He noted how Quakers used to disturb meetings but added that 'these oracles are generally ceased, or at least for the most part' which he believed 'showed their great hypocrisy'.<sup>117</sup> Thompson referred to the habit of quaking and trembling when he added 'the mighty motions of the bodies are now ceased, and Friends are

---

<sup>114</sup>William Jones, *Work for a Cooper* (London, 1679), pp. 13-14.

<sup>115</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>116</sup>Ibid., pp. 14-15.

<sup>117</sup>Thomas Thompson, *The Third Part of the Quibbling Quaker* (London, 1675), pp. 31-2.

still, cool and quiet'.<sup>118</sup> It is worth quoting the epistle from this tract at length since the writer describes the transformation he has perceived in the Quaker movement in terms of their habits and customs. The epistle to the reader, signed by Thompson asks rhetorically

who is it that knew them formerly, and doth not see their palpable and grand alteration now in their gestures, their words, their salutations, (for now they'll greet one in the market place, which formerly they used to tell us the Pharisees did, asking in the markets, how dost thou do?), in their freedom in eating and drinking, the furniture of their houses, their clothes, both for fashion and fineness of the stuff, minding the world and the things of the world, their heaping up riches, and particularly in their now going to law, and having one or more lawyers, or attorneys of them, besides their swearing in our courts, or if not, doing something that is worse; and almost in their whole practice and conversation, aswell as in many of their doctrines and principles.<sup>119</sup>

The changing status and behaviour of Quakers was also highlighted in the 1680s pamphlet literature. One writer noted that 'Friends may be observed to distinguish themselves into diverse sorts'. The first category, presumably the less well-off, he described as a rough-hewn, stubborn, stiff-necked...yea-and-nay people..of a more morose, sullen, and reserved temper'. He noted that these had 'less linen appearing in their neckcloths than the rest' and that their greetings were 'more blunt'. The second type were 'a sort of cynical, spruce, dapper, periwig-Friend, that are of a more refined cut'. These the author said had 'an air of grace very obliging, having their hats more fashionable, their cravats

---

<sup>118</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>119</sup>Ibid., epistle.

larger, their apparel of a more genteel cut, of very fine cloth and richer lining, with an inviting bow...' Finally his third 'sort' were the 'wet-Quakers' who 'lie dabbling in a tavern, or a Friend's house'; these were of a 'more sociable, complacent and debonnaire make than the rest'. He noted that this type of Quaker 'commonly greets his acquaintance not altogether unsuitable to their quality, for he is heard to say to a Lord, Lord P...' <sup>120</sup> The growing accomodation of some Quakers with the world around them may be seen in the writers' question concerning the Quakers dress code and their attitude to luxury when he asked, 'why may not Friends have as much right to the trailings of the creature, as those that are without? Shall the poor little worm spin out her bowels, only to make satin and velvet, flowered silks, and sarsnets for carnal men and their women?' <sup>121</sup> This pamphlet is interesting not only because of the writer's perception of different types of Quakers with varying standards regarding Quaker testimonies, but also because of its relative mildness in comparison with the more biting invectives of Quaker behaviour of earlier decades. The growing prosperity and worldliness of the Quakers is also commented on in another tract which told the tale of a Quaker merchant who had got a 'parcel of musty wheat' but 'found the spirit of mammon moving him to put it off to the best advantage' whereupon he hired a poor woman to

---

<sup>120</sup>Anonymous, *The Quakers Art of Courtship* (London, 1689), pp. 27-31.

<sup>121</sup>Ibid., no page, beginning of pamphlet.

sell it to a Friend who had lost his sense of smell!<sup>122</sup>

Quaker individuality and certain of the society's practices were still a bone of contention to a degree; some pamphlets spurned the Quaker marriage ceremony and accused Quakers of licentiousness. One critic wrote that the Quaker would 'consummate his marriage before it is solemnized for so soon as the spirit begins to yield to the rebellion of the flesh and his bowels yearn to be multiplying, he and his willing doxy never wait the parsons pleasure, but take each other words and so to bed'.<sup>123</sup> In a broadside of 1671 called *The Quakers Wedding* the Quaker marriage practice was also presented as an excuse for loose living and immorality.<sup>124</sup>

Some Anglican pamphlets clung to the old perceptions of Quaker behaviour. The Anglican, John Cheyney, wrote that Quakers 'make it a branch of their religion to be singular from all Christian people in giving external honour and reverence to men declaring that they believe, and are sure that God doth not require us to give respect or honour unto any person'.<sup>125</sup> Laurence Wastall, another Anglican, noted that in Quakerism 'civil honour is ridiculously decried' and went on to speak of the 'Levelling-Quakers vile doctrine' and accused them of subversion and treason when he wrote that 'this Quakers' doctrine tends diligently to nothing more than

---

<sup>122</sup>Anonymous, *The Second Part of the Yea and Nay Almanack* (London, 1680), no pagination.

<sup>123</sup>R.H., *Character of a Quaker*, p. 11.

<sup>124</sup>*The Quakers Wedding* (London, 1671), broadside.

<sup>125</sup>John Cheyney, *One Sheet Against the Quakers* (London, 1677), p. 2.

to lay the king's honour in the dust, to strike the crown from his majesty's head, and to share with the king in his high honour'.<sup>126</sup> He also warned people to 'beware of Quakers', for he noted, 'like the Jesuitical Papists, they are not in truth the king's loyal subjects.<sup>127</sup> He also railed against the Quaker refusal to take oaths, adding that they were useful to 'end strife, or engage to a ruler.'<sup>128</sup>

The matter of oaths was indeed a frequent theme in Anglican criticisms during these years, Charles Gataker condemned Quakers in this respect and wrote that 'an oath seasonably administered, and duly taken, is a fit means to preserve peace, by a firm obligation of subjects to their sovereign'.<sup>129</sup> John Cheyney softened his views somewhat in this respect towards Quakers, calling them 'poor blind souls' and desired that 'so far as it may consist with the interest of Christianity, the peace of the church, and the public weal of the nation, all clemency and toleration be showed to them in the matter of oaths'.<sup>130</sup>

### ***Conclusion***

An analysis of the attacks made upon the Quaker movement from the 1650s to 1680s is one important way of assessing

---

<sup>126</sup>Wastall, *Papist's Younger Brother*, pp. 45, 50.

<sup>127</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

<sup>128</sup>Ibid., p. 54.

<sup>129</sup>Charles Gataker, *An Examination of the Case of Quakers taking Oaths* (London, 1675), p. 33.

<sup>130</sup>John Cheyney, *A Vindication of Oaths and Swearing in Weighty Cases* (London, 1679), p. 37.

how Quakers were able to achieve toleration in 1689 and provides a gauge for the findings and assessments in previous chapters. The most marked change appears in perceptions of Quaker behaviour; the Interregnum years saw Quakers presented as wild, rebellious, 'levelling' people intent on destroying church and society. By the late 1660s and early 70s these perceptions had changed considerably; there were few references to Quakers as subversives but instead criticism centred more upon their growing wealth and some apparent shifts in their own standards and customs, for example the attitude to luxury and to the liberty of the spirit as opposed to an imposed authority. This change in attitude no doubt resulted in part from the Quakers' erection of central and local organization which provided a restraining influence on the more enthusiastic side of Quakerism and was of paramount importance in the transition of Quakerism, more so than the events of 1660, crucial as these were in terms of galvanizing Quakers into considering changes within the movement. The comments of hostile writers about the Friends' hypocrisy in setting up a hierarchical system reveal that they were well aware of the institutional changes in the Quaker movement. In addition, the strenuous efforts of the Quaker leadership in the 1670s and 80s shown in chapter one to refute the bitter charges of blasphemy in relation to the Quaker view of Christ, the Trinity and the Bible, were a result of the shift in anti-Quaker thought from Quakerism as a social threat to a heterodox one. Of course the political situation in the 1680s and the fear of Catholicism which drove many Anglicans into an

alliance with the Dissenters must also be taken into consideration when looking at changing attitudes, as well as the marginalization of the other more radical sects who did not survive the Restoration. Doubt still existed concerning Quaker orthodoxy in 1689 when toleration was being discussed, but it is clear that they were no longer seen as subversives, intent on destroying state and society, a matter which was obviously of far greater importance to the authorities than any doctrinal peculiarities.

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix 1**

**An account from the Kendal Fund**

'A note of what we have disbursed since the 1st of the 4th month (June) 1654 and some of it before'.

	f sh.
To C. Atkinson at his coming out of Bishoprick . . . . .	0-6-0
Paid for him that he borrowed . . . . .	0-5-0
Paid for him to Giles Calvert . . . . .	3-0-0
Sent our Friends in Wales . . . . .	0-12-0
While they were in prison here . . . . .	0-8-0
Sent them by John Brown	1-0-0
At their going into Wales . . . . .	1-0-0
To Jo. Story for clothes making and furniture . . . . .	1-4-9
For E. Burrough for a case of knives . . . . .	0-3-6
For Tho. Holme for a pair of breeches and shoes . . . . .	0-10-6
For E. Leavens clothing . . . . .	1-3-0
To a Friend that came from Chester . . . . .	0-3-0
Eliz. Fletcher's Hat . . . . .	0-3-4
To Mary Howgill at Lancaster twice . . . . .	0-10-0
To the Prisoners at Appelby . . . . .	0-14-0
Carriage of F. Howgill cloak . . . . .	0-1-0
For a pair of shoes to a poor Friend . . . . .	0-1-10
To Jo. Browne to help to clothe . . . . .	0-7-8
To G. Calvert for M. Halhead of Lancaster . . . . .	1-0-0
To Alexander Parker in Lincolnshire . . . . .	0-7-0
To Margaret Bradley upon demand . . . . .	0-8-0
To Jo. Browne for a pair of breeches . . . . .	0-2-8
To Bess Etherington . . . . .	0-3-6
To Two Friends going to Norwich . . . . .	0-6-0
To John Brown for buying and carrying B. Fletcher's horse . . . . .	0-6-0
For Mary Doeing, J. Harrison and Alice Birkett in the gaol . . . . .	0-12-0

14-18-07

F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 1, fo. 208.

## Appendix 2

### An account from the Kendal Fund

1655 A particular note of what money we have paid out for Friends in their service in other nations now of late which we have taken out of the General collection money gathered in these three Northern Counties of Lancashire, Westmoreland and Cumberland.

	fsh.
To Richard Roper and Rd. Walker for Ireland . . . . .	1-0-0
To Joseph Nicholson for New England . . . . .	2-0-0
To Will. Caton in Holland . . . . .	1-0-0
To James Lancaster and Richard Cleaton for Ireland .	1-11-6
To William Cartmell for books for Friends in Ireland	0-15-0
To Reginald Holme and William Wilson for Germany .	4-0-0
And for books to them . . . . .	0-3-0
To Elizabeth Cowartt for Venice . . . . .	0-10-0
To Richard Ishmaid at his going twice to Scotland .	2-0-0
To Jo. Crowe at several times for Scotland . . . . .	4-9-0
To Tho. Holme and Elizabeth Holme . . . . .	1-15-0
To Thomas Hutton for Scotland . . . . .	0-10-0
To William Simpson for Scotland . . . . .	0-15-0
To George Wilson for Scotland . . . . .	1-0-0
To Tho. Stubbs for Scotland . . . . .	1-8-6
To James Lancaster and Richard Cleaton for Scotland .	3-10-0
To Thomas Rawlinson that he laid for Friends in Scotland . . . . .	0-13-0
<hr/>	
In all	27-00-00
And in money	13-00-00
<hr/>	
	40-00-00

F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, 1, fo. 233, 1655.

*Appendix 3*

Account dated 1656

Accounts of money received for the service of truth.

	£ sh.
Yorkshire	30-00-00
Berks	46-2-4
Essex	48-10-5
Bucks.	9-00-4
Kingston	2-15-00
Wellingborough	5-13-00
Kent	14-1-00
Sussex	24-16-4
Cambridge and Huntingdon	19-12-09
Cheshire	19-05-00
Shrewsbury	1-14-4
Durham	21-00-00
Guildford	19-17-9
Lincolnshire	12-00-00
Norfolk	38-00-00
Worcestershire	10-13-1
Newport	6-8-8
Tiballs	4-6-6
Leicestershire	4-18-6
Southampton	8-18-8
Cornwall	14-00-00
Radnorshire	2-9-00
Suffolk	30-4-11
Dorset	3-12-00
Beds.	2-7-00
Jacobstreet	4-4-00
Rutland	4-16-4
Oxford	3-00-00
Glos.	2-2-6
Somerset	17-11-8
Banbury	10-13-4
<b>Total</b>	<b>443-3-5</b>

(continued)

Money Disbursed for the Service of Truth.

	f sh.
For Friends diet returning from New England	12-00-00
John Stubs to Holland	4-13-00
For clothes and other things	5-7-9
To take with him	3-10-2
Paid in Holland for him and other Friends	19-18-10
Will. Caton to Holland	2-10-00
Geo. Baly to France	4-5-00
Will. Show, a suit	2-4-00
Books to France, Jersey and New England	4-10-00
For provision for their voyage	29-10-00
Paid to them for part of his freight	30-00-00
For bedding and other things	12-8-00
And in money	35-4-4
More to Will Brand	1-10-8
M. Weatherhead	2-00-00
Sara Gibans to Turkey	4-10-00
For passage to Capt. Marshall	25-00-00
for their diet	10-00-00
For bedding and other necessaries	7-16-00
Paid in money to them	46-19-11
Paid by bill for them in Turkey	60-00-00
Again by bill for John Parrat in Turkey	20-00-00
Money and other things	7-9-8
For George Ross to Holland	2-10-00
For An. Austains passage back from Barbadoes	8-6-00
For part of M. Fisher's passage back from Barbadoes paid	2-4-6
For letters out of France	00-17-0
To Hester Biddle	1-10-00
To George Baly in France	5-00-00
For books to Virginia	2-5-00
John Hall to Holland	10-12-8
For 2 Friends that returned from Hambrough	1-10-00
For necessaries for John Hall	4-15-2
To Sam. Fisher	12-4-6
More to Sam. Fisher	1-7-6
For Friends that went to Venice	47-1-00
For one Friend to Jamaica for her passage	6-00-00
For necessaries	8-5-5
To the other Friend that went to Jamaica for her passage	6-00-00
For necessaries	8-5-5
To the other Friend that went to Jamaica	12-4-8
More for Friends beyond the sea	1-00-00
To Henry Fell clothes and necessaries	4-00-8
For clothes to Ann Austine when she went to keep Sam. Fisher's house	3-1-0
To John Harwood when he came out of France	4-10-0
 Total	 479-13-3

F.H.L., Swarthmore MSS, vol. 1, fo. 395, 1656.

## Appendix 4

### Keepers of National Stock

(Years not listed are not mentioned in the records)

1668: Gerrard Roberts, Gilbert Latye, Amor Stoddard, John Boulton, Thomas Covony.

1672: Gerrard Roberts, Gilbert Latye, Edward Man, John Elson, Arthur Cooke.

1673: Gerrard Roberts, John Elson, Arthur Cooke, Gilbert Latye, Edward Man.

1676: Gerrard Roberts, John Elson, Arthur Cooke, Gilbert Latye, Edward Man.

1679: Gilbert Latye, John Elson, James Claypoole, William Mackett, William Meade, Thomas Rudyard.

1682: Gilbert Latye, William Mead, William Mackett, George Watt, William Ingram, William Crouch.

1683: William Shewen, William Chandler, John Dew.

1684: William Shewen, John Dew, William Chandler, Charles Bathurst, Theodore Ecclestone, John Edge.

1686: Francis Camfield, Philip Ford, John Staploe, George Barr, John Hall, William Parker.

'And for the more ease to the said six Friends...some counties may return the monies so collected to William Mead, William Crouch, William Ingram, Benjamin Antrobus, George Watt or John Edridge'.

1685: Charles Bathurst, Theodore Ecclestone, John Edge, Francis Camfield, Philip Ford, John Staploe.

1686: Francis Camfield, Philip Ford, John Staploe, George Bar, John Hall, William Parker.

1687: William Parker, George Bar, John Hall, John Eldridge, Thomas Barker, Benjamin Antrobus.

1688: John Edridge, Benjamin Antrobus, Thomas Barker, Thomas Cox, Thomas Hudson, John West.

1689: Thomas Cox, Thomas Hudson, John West, Lawrence Fullove, Walter Miors, Walter Benthall.

F.H.L., Yearly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, pp. C, 7, 10, 34, 71, 103, 141, 153, 168, 173, 178, 184, 218.

Appendix 5

Account of General Service 1685

	£ sh.
Paid Andrew Sowle for books . . . . .	5-7-0
Paid Stephen Crisp to remit to poor Friends at Danzig . . . . .	30-0-0
Paid Mark Swanner his bill . . . . .	4-11-8
Paid Thomas Northcott for 1,000 papers for detection of Horloles . . . . .	0-18-0
Paid Gilbert Latye towards charges in relation to suffering Friends . . . . .	25-0-0
Paid Andrew Sowle for books . . . . .	30-0-0
Paid Mark Swanner for books sent beyond sea . . . . .	0-13-3
Paid Roger Langworth's bill for Virginia . . . . .	5-0-0
Paid Andrew Sowle for Yearly Meeting papers . . . . .	1-10-0
Paid Rowland Vaughan towards the charge of searching in the Exchequer for what is in charge there against Friends for information of the Attorney General . . . . .	30-0-0
Paid Richard Richardson's expenses for three and a half year's salary . . . . .	40-6-10
Paid William Mead and George Whitehead and other Friends attending the King &c. and for disbursements towards the charge of Nol. prosoqui. to stay the writs of £20 per month . . . . .	54-16-6
Paid towards paying same through sundry offices . .	45-3-6
Paid towards the said service . . . . .	57-1-6
Paid towards further defraying the charge of said service . . . . .	21-10-0
Paid John Edge for same . . . . .	10-0-0
Paid John Field and Rowland Vaughan for same . . . . .	7-0-0
Paid Roger Langworth charges of his journey . . . . .	18-16-0
Paid Rowland Vaughan and John Dew for further benefit to suffering Friends by nature of the King's General Order . . . . .	100-0-0

497-14-3

F.H.L., National Stock Accounts, vol. 1, p. 18.

## Appendix 6

### 1672 Yearly Meeting - Allocation of Book Quotas to county correspondents

Bedford: Edward Chester	6
Bucks.: Edward Barton	10
Berks.: Benjamin Cooke	10
Bristol: John Ware	15
Cornwall: Edmund Hinds	10
Cambridge: Wm. Brasier	5
Chester: Wm. Gandy	6
Cumberland: James Collison	10
Devon: Peter Loman	6
Derby: Wm. Storrs	5
Durham and Northumberland: John Ayrey	15
Dorset: Thomas Bagg	6
Essex: Solomon Formantell	25
Ely: George Thorowgood	5
Glos.: John Crips	10
Huntingdon: John Peacock	10
Herts: Henry Stout	10
Hereford: James Merrick	5
Kent: Luke Howard	10
Leicester: Samuel Willson	5
Lincoln: Wm. Garland	10
Lancs.: Brewen Sixsmith	6
London: Edward Man	16
Middlesex:-----	10
Notts.: John Reckles	10
Northants:-----	6
Norfolk: Samuel Duncon	10
Oxford: James Wagstaff	10
Somerset: Joseph Pierce	10
Southampton: Moses Neve	5
Sussex: Wm. (Galten)	6
Surrey: John Remnant	10
Shropshire: Constant Overton	5
Staffs.: John Beech	5
Suffolk: Edward Melsup	10
Wiltshire: John Jones	10
Worcs.: Edward Bourne	6
Warwick: Thomas Wincott	5
Wales: Richard Davies, John Biddles	25
Yorks.: Thomas Waite	25
Westmorland: James Moore	7
Colchester: Stephen Crisp	?

F.H.L., Yearly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 4, 29 May 1672.

## Appendix 7

### List of London Friends and county correspondents

'The names of the city and county Friends appointed to correspond with each other about sufferings both in England and beyond the seas as for tithes, not taking oaths, not repairing of steeple houses and other sufferings for conscience' sake'.

(City Friends are in bold)

Beds. and Northants.: **J. Staploe**, Fra. Campbell, Wm. Parker to: Ed. Chester, Baker in Dunstable, Bedford and Ed. Cooper, shopkeeper.

Berks. and Bucks.: **J. Osgood**, J. Field, Wm. Baker to: John Buy, moatman in Reading and Tho. Ellwood to carry it to John Loynwood or Tho. Zachary to convey it to T. Ellwood.

Cornwall and Devon: Henry Snook, G. Latye, Ed. Brooks, John Dowding to: Joseph Growden of St. Austell in Cornwall and Arthur Cotton in Plymouth, Devon.

Hants and Surrey: John Wilmor, Wm. Mackett, Walter Miors to: Moses More clothier in---?, Henry Gill of Godalming in Surrey, John Cooper, baker in Guildford.

Sussex and Kent: Rich. Whitspaine, Benjamin Antrobus, Walter Miors to: Thomas Mosely of Lewes, Sussex; to Ed. Hamper of Arundel; Luke Howard of Dover; Samuel Fox of Rochester.

Essex and Suffolk: Peter Longley, George Barr to: Solomon Formantell, Colchester; Edward Melsup, ironmonger in Ipswich.

Norfolk and Cambridge: Tho. Cox, Clement Plumstead, Wm. Crouch to: John Hubbet of Stoke in Norfolk; Wm. Brazier, shoemaker in Cambridge.

Ely and Lincoln: George Watts, Wm. Parker to: Samuel Caton of Littleport in Ely; Abraham Morris of Lincoln.

Yorkshire: Philip Ford, Thomas Hart, John Belles, Tho. Scott to: John Tailer, Tho. Waite, John (Loah?) in York

Durham and Northumberland: Wm. Mead, Fra. Dove to: Ed. Tunstall of Bishop Auckland; John Ayrey, merchant in Newcastle.

Cumberland and Westmorland: Wm. Lowthwaite, Fra. Stamper, Fra. Dove to: John Fallowfield, shopkeeper in Cockermouth, Cumberland; Bryan Lancaster, Tanner in Kendal.

Lancs. and Cheshire: Wm. Gibson, John West, John Hall to:

(continued)

Henry Hoeard, shopkeeper in Lancaster; John (Corby?), Distiller in Warrington, Lancs.; Wm. Gandy of Franley in Cheshire; Rich. Starky of Great Budworth in Cheshire.

Stafford and Derby: Ed. Bookes, Tim. Emerson, Robert Smith, Wm. Parker, James Claypoole to: Wm. Fallowfield of Leek in Staffs.; Gervase Gent at Leek; Wm. Storrs, shopkeeper in Chesterfield, Anthony Allen, Chesterfield, Derby.

Leicester and Notts.: John Edge, Richard Miew, John Elson to: Sam. Wilson, Baker in Leicester or to John Penford; Benjamin Reckles, shopkeeper in Nottingham or John Hart there; Joseph Holt in Oakham in Rutland.

Worcester and Gloucester: John Dew, John Vaughton, Wm. Shewen to: Ed. Bourne, Physician in Worcester; John Ellis, Upholsterer in Gloucester; Rich. Smith, Clothier in Nailesworth to be left a Rich. Townsend's at Cirencester.

Somerset and Dorset: Wm. Shewen. Henry Snook, John Dowden to: Henry Lavor of Yeovil, Somerset; John Anderson of Ivelchester in Somerset; Thomas Bagg of (Dridpond?), Dorset.

Hereford and Salop: John Dow, John Vaughton, Philip Ford to: John Cator, Glover in Rosse; Wm. (Tralle?), shopkeeper in Shrewsbury.

Warwick and Oxford: John Bellers, Wm. Crouch to: Tho. Russell, Moatman in Warwick; Silas Norton, Maltster in Oxford.

Hants. and Herts.: Wm. Ingram, Job. Boulton to: Rich. Jobson, Huntingdon; Henry Stout, maltster in Hartford.

Wilts.: Henry Gouldney, John Webster, John Ball to: Adam Gouldney of Chippenham; Wm. Hitchcock of Marlborough.

Bristol: John Osgood, George Whitehead, M. Jones to: Rich. Vickris; Charles Jones; Charles Hartford, Rich. Sneed.

N. Wales: Job Boulton, Ed. Man, Wm. Gibson to: Rich. Davis in Welshpool.

S. Wales: Benjamin Antrobus, Nathaniel Brassey to: John Bury of Haverfordwest; John Mayo of Cardiff; Ed. Lewis of Monmouthshire to be left with John Cator of Rosse.

Ireland: James Claypoole, George Watt, Wm. Gibson to: Fra. Rogers in Corke, Robert Turner, linen-draper in Dublin.

Scotland: Gavon (Larry), George Keith, George Watt to: Robert Barclay to be left at David Falcond's in Edinburgh; Thomas Martin at Aberdeen; H. Allen in Edinburgh.

F.H.L., Meeting for Sufferings Minutes 1680-83, vol.2, unpaginated, at back of volume.

*Appendix 8*

**Quaker Organization**

**YEARLY MEETING**

SECOND DAY MORNING MEETING

MEETING FOR SUFFERINGS

**QUARTERLY MEETING**

**MONTHLY MEETINGS**

**PREPARATIVE MEETINGS**  
(Business meetings of Particular Meetings)

## Appendix 9

### Anti-Quaker account of monthly meeting

First of all, when the court begins, there cometh the clerk with his green bag, like one of the clerks of the peace, and he draweth forth his papers, and layeth them before him, and then sometimes some give him more papers, which he receiveth; and after a little time, when there are many come, then he that is chief amongst them that day, (or, judge) commandeth him to call over by name the transgressors...they choose some amongst the court, or company, to go to them; then they take them into a little room, and there they confess them; and if they be tractable, and do submit, and say they repent, (or before they will stand out, if they do but say they be sorry for it, that shall serve) then they shall be forgiven, and their names shall be blotted out from amongst the wicked, and be restored to the saints...

If they refuse to confess, and repent, then they summon them in before the court, there to answer; which if they do not, they go to them the second time; if they stand out then, they pass sentence on them, that they are not to come amongst them...

After they have been once cast out, and then be found in any fault, then they are to be called as at the first, to their confession and repentance; but if they stand it out, then they are to be cast out from the society of all men...no man must have any commerce with such a one, as is thus excommunicated...but there is mercy for him, for if he will send his submission to them, signed with his own hand then they will pardon him but after the third transgression, there is no more remission for sin for he is never to be received into the church again although his repentance be ever so great.

Nathaniel Smith, Quakers Spiritual Court, pp. 19-21.

*Appendix 10*

**Sussex Men's Quarterly Meeting Collection**

Friends Public Stock	Creditor	£	sh.
For so much remaining in stock brought from the other side		47.13.2	
For so much collected the preceeding after commencing 14.10. [Dec.] 1685 and 22.1. [March] 1686/7			
Chichester		0.06.0	
Arundel		0.10.6	
Petworth		-----	
Stering		0.11.6	
Shipley		0.14.6	
Ifield		1.09.3	
Cowfold		1.01.6	
Hurstpierpoint		0.10.6	
Bletchington		0.15.0	
Lewes		0.08.7½	
Worplesdon		0.05.0	
Alfriston		0.10.6	
Brought in stock of said Irish money.		7-----	
		61.16.6	

Friends Public Stock Debtor

For so much dispersed to the poor of the respective meetings  
and other occasions commencing 14.10. [Dec.] 1685 and ending  
22.1. [March] 1686/7

Chichester	0.06.0
Arundel	-----
Petworth	-----
Stering	-----
Shipley	-----
Ifield	-----
Cowfold	1.01.06
Hurstpierpoint	0.10.06
Bletchington	0.15.00
Lewes	0.08.7½
Worplesdon	0.03.00
Alfriston	0.06.00
Boacham	-----
	3.10.7½

(continued)

Paid by order of the meeting for placing out Jo. Smith to Sweet-Aple	4-----
Ordered 40 sh. Lent to Tho. Moor by order of the Quarterly Meeting	7-----
Lent by order of meeting towards relief of Tho. Banks	4-----
Paid chamber rent at Horsham	1-----
Remains in bank to transport to the next page	19.10.07½
	42.05.04½
	61.16.00

E.S.R.O., S.Q.M, Public Stock Accounts 1682-1706, unpaginated.

## Appendix 11

### York Preparative Meeting - Collection and Disbursement

The first business we entered upon for the service of truth and friends was an account of the collections which have been received by the several friends at the several meetings as followeth

	£ sh.
1-7 Collected by John Todd	00.19.07
2-4 By Robert Hillary	01.10.06
3-2 By Timothy Lund	01.01.04
4-6 By Joseph Denton	01.03.06
5mo- 4 day By Walter Merry	01.00.00

Received this day from the mo. meeting which was the gift of the Qua. meeting towards this meeting's assistance  
09.00.06%

The whole sum is

14.15.05%

Collected

14.15.05%

These collections and money above are disposed of by this meeting as followeth

To the Quarterly Meeting collection 00.19.07

To the Monthly Meeting collection 01.01.04

To John Todd for so much he paid Edward Nightingale for half year's rent in full to May day last (so called) 03.10.00

Paid to Joseph Denton in full fo Friends' horses as per receipt in this book 06.14.00

To Walter Merry in full and the like 00.10.00

This day reckoned with Thomas Waller for his years salary and we find he hath this year of Friends his full salary of £3 and 22 shillings more and 15 shillings more Friends gives him now out of these monies above which is in full 'till 29th of this month 00.15.00  
13.09.11

(continued)  
given to Eliza Acroyd towards her relief 00.05.6%

Eliza Horsley towards her relief 0.7.00

Christopher Cashin towards his relief 0.10.0

Eliz. Newsam as Friends love 0.3.00

In all 14. 15.5%

B.L.L., York Preparative Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 78-9,  
8.5. [July] 1686.

## Appendix 12

### Settle Mens' Monthly Meeting Collections

#### *Quarterly Meeting Collection from Settle Monthly Meeting*

Settle Mens Monthly Meeting the 3rd day of the 4th month  
[June] 1674

Collections brought in this day for the service of truth to be  
disposed of at the Quarterly Meeting at York

	£ sh.
First from Settle Meeting brought in	00-15-09
From Scalehouse Meeting	00-12-05
From Bolland Meeting	00-12-00
From Broughton Meeting	00-06-00
From Bentham meeting	<hr/>
From Scarhouse Meeting	00-04-06
From Hampsthwaite Meeting	00-03-00

B.L.L., Settle Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 30,  
3.4. [June] 1674

#### *Collection for National Stock from Settle Monthly Meeting*

Collections brought this day for the national stock as  
followeth

	£ sh.
Settle Meeting	1 6 3
Bentham	0 18 6
Bolland	1 0 4
Pulston	0 15 0
Scarhouse	0 06 4
Salterforth	0 07 6

Sent by Settle Meeting to York

4 14 11

B.L.L., Settle Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 63,  
5.10. [Dec.] 1679

(continued)

*Collection for Friends outside County*

Collection brought in to this monthly meeting at Settle the 6th of the 10th month 1676 for Friends of Northampton that suffered by the late fire.

	£ sh.
Settle Meeting	0-9-10
Bentham	0-12-10
Bowland	0-10-0
Pulston	0-5-7½
Scarhouse	0-4-6
Broughton	0-6-6
Total	2-9-3½
Sent to York	2-9-3

B.L.L., Settle Monthly Meeting Minutes, vol. 1, p. 43,  
6.10. [Dec.] 1676

## Appendix 13

### *Membership of Yorkshire Women's Yearly Meeting*

Thirsk Monthly Meeting  
Lucy Hebden, Mary Ludley, Judith Boulby.

Balby Monthly Meeting  
Ann Beaman, Katherine Jackson, Margt. Hutfield.

Pontefract Monthly Meeting  
Sarah English, Mary Calf (possibly Knaresborough).

Knaresborough Monthly Meeting  
Abigail Stot, Mary Moore, Eliz. Mitchell, Elinor Crooke.

Settle Monthly Meeting  
Eliz. Atkinson, Eliz. Hall.

Sheffield Monthly Meeting  
Francis Shaw, Martha Shaw.

Brighouse Monthly Meeting  
Judith Taylor, Deborah [Wimm].

Richmond Monthly Meeting  
Isabell Atkinson, Isabell Yeamans, Hest. Lodge, Katherine White, Mary [Calet].

Scarborough Monthly Meeting  
Mary Nash, Ester Hudson, Eliz. Ledman, Ann Leake.

Kelk Monthly Meeting  
Susanna Pursglove, B. Lampley, Grace Hemsley, Frances Cannaby.

Owstwick Monthly Meeting  
Ellener Travis, Ann Storr.

Elloughton Monthly Meeting  
Katherine Langley, Dorothy Hutchinson.

B.L.L., Knaresborough Women's Monthly Meeting Minutes, p. 29,  
no date, near front of volume, probably late 1670s.

Appendix 14

Sussex Womens Quarterly Meeting Collection

At a Quarterly Meeting held at Worminghurst the 24th day first month [March] 1684/5 where the collection and disbursements were brought in.

Collection		Disbursements
	£ sh.	£ sh.
Chichester----	0.0	0.0
Arundel-----	03.0	3.0
Sterling-----	2.0	0.0
Petworth-----	0.0	0.0
Ifield-----	13.6	13.0
Shipley-----	9.0	9.0
Cowfold-----	5.0	5.0
Hurstperpoint-	7.6	7.6
Lewes-----	5.0	5.0
Bletchington--	9.0	9.0
Alfriston-----	5.0	5.0
Warbleton-----	0.0	0.0
Boacham-----	0.0	0.0
	-----	-----
	2.19.0	2.16.6
Brought into the public stock at the meeting [money left over]		0.2.6
Received of Cassandra Killingbeck the money she had in her hands belonging to the public stock with six pence advance		1.0.6
Remaining in bank and in monies	29.2.10	
lent as appears to the other side	-----	30.5.10
Disbursed to Mary Fleet at this meeting		0.5.0
Disbursed towards the widow Apse's rent		0.5.0
Disbursed toward the widow Apse's lameness		0.10.0
Disbursed to Ann Boone to help her	0.2.6	
	01.2.6	
Remaining in bank and with monies lent as appears by the account on the other side.		29.3.4

E.S.R.O., S.Q.M. Women's Fair Accounts 1677-1721, unpaginated,  
24.1. [March] 1684.

## Appendix 15

### Lewes Women's Monthly Meeting Collection

At a women's monthly meeting held at Paine's Place the 18 day of the 4th mo: [June] 84 where was present Ellen Ward, Susannah Gates, Mary Ward, Mary Grover, Susannah Randall, Cassandra Killingbeck.

The collections being made and brought in to this meeting and they are as followeth.

	fsh.
Hurst collection	0-8-0
	0-8-0
	0-7-0
	1-3-8

Disbursed as followeth to Mary Ward to repay her for what she has already disbursed to Ann Bond 5[sh.] and more 8[sh.] - 8[p.] is left in Mary Ward's hands to supply Ann Bond, if there be occasion, and there is now left in Susan. Gate's hands 10sh. for her to convey into the quarterly meeting.

E.S.R.O. Lewes Women's Monthly Meeting 1677-1709, vol. 1,  
unpaginated

## Appendix 16

Examples of 'miracles' performed by George Fox from Henry Cadbury's, *George Fox's Book of Miracles*

p. 115, 21c, And in Berkshire there was a w[oman]...ulcer...and in the year 1673

p. 117, 26b, And G.F. came to a meeting...woman...ague...fever...and G.F. stayed her.

p. 117, 26d, And G.F. came into an hose...King's evil...it left the child.

p. 121, 33a, When G.F. was cast...Nottingham...been possessed...in the year 1650.

p. 127, 43e, And so he went to another ...London ...distracted...immediately she mended.

p. 135, 61b, And also after this G.F....distracted...settled her mind, etc.

## Appendix 17

### Anti-Quaker Writings 1650s

(Rosemary Moore's, *Annotated Listing of Quaker and Anti-Quaker Publications* (unpublished work, F.H.L., 1994) has been used for the basic list of 1650s anti-Quaker works. Entries where material is not extant have been omitted. Biographical details have been added. Items in bold have been examined on a sampling basis).

*Address of some Ministers of Christ in the Isle of Wight* 1658

*Agreement and Resolution of Several Associated Ministers* 1657

*Agreement of divers Ministers of Christ* 1656

*Answer to the 36 queries of James Parnel* 1655

*Antidote against the Infection of the Times* 1656

*Antiquakerism, A Character of the Quaker's Spirit* 1659

*Richard Baxter, (Presbyterian) Judgement and Advice* 1658

*Baxter, Sheet Against the Quakers* 1657

*Baxter, One Sheet for the Ministry* 1657

*Baxter, Second Sheet for the Ministry* 1657

*Baxter, A Winding Sheet for Popery* 1657

*Baxter, The Worcester Petition to Parliament Defended* 1653

*Baxter, The Worcestershire Petition* 1652

*Baxter, Answer to Quakers Queries* 1655

*Baxter, The Quakers Catechism* 1655 (30 pp. doctrinal, Quakers and Papists)

*Phil. Bennett, (Vicar of Cartmel, ejected) A Looking Glass* 1654

*Bennett, Answer to Several Queries* 1654

*John Billingsley, Strong Comfort for Weak Christians* 1656

*Francis Blake, A Choice Collection of Scripture Against Quakers* 1655

*Richard Blome, Quaker Disarmed* 1659, (single sheet, doctrinal) *Questions Propounded to George Whitehead and George Fox the Younger* 1659 (8 pp. Doctrinal-scripture, light; behaviour-Levelling accusation)

*Immanuel Bourne, A Defence of Scripture* 1656 (54 pp. Doctrinal- scripture, light; behaviour-honour, reverence etc.)

*Immanuel Bourne, A Defence and Justification of Ministers*

Maintenance by Tithes 1659

Ed. Bowles (Presbyterian) *The Duty and Danger of Swearing* 1656

Ellis Bradshaw, *The Conviction of James Nayler* 1656

Ellis Bradshaw, *The Quakers Quaking Principles Examined* 1656

Ellis Bradshaw, *The Quakers Whitest Devil Unveiled* 1654

Ed. Breck, *The Quakers Queries* 1656

Wm. Bridge, *Scripture Light the Most Sure Light* 1656

*Brief Reply to some part of a very scurrilous...pamphlet* 1653

James. Brown, (Fifth Monarchist) *AntiChrist in Spirit Unmasked* 1657

Ed. Buckler, *Dingley, Address of Some Ministers* 1658

Cornelius Burgess, (ejected from St. Andrew's, Wells) *A Case Concerning the Buying of Bishop's Lands* 1659

Magnus Byne, *The Scornful Quakers Answered* 1656 (Doctrinal-Quaker view of Christ. Behaviour-incivility, comparison with Ranters)

Matt. Caffyn, Wm. Jeffery (Baptists), *The Deceived and Deceiving Quakers Antichrist Made Known* 1656

*Christian Concord: or the Agreement of the Associated Pastors* 1653

Clapham, *A Short and Full Vindication of...Singing of Psalms* 1656

Clapham and Jenkin, *Full Discovery of the Wicked and Damnable Quakers Doctrine* 1656

Samuel Clarke, (Presbyterian?) *A Mirror or Looking Glass for Saints and Sinners* 1657

L. Clarkson, *The Quakers Downfall* 1659

L. Clarkson, *The Right Devil Discovered* 1659

Thomas Collier (ed.) (Baptist) et al., *Confession of the Faith of Several Churches of Christ in Somerset* 1656;

Thomas Collier, *A Dialogue between a Minister of the Gospel and an enquiring Christian* 1656

Thomas Collier, *The Hypocrisy and Falsehood of Thomas Salthouse* 1659

Thomas Collier, *A Looking-Glass for the Quakers* 1656 (Doctrinal-nature of Christ, comparison with Ranters).

Thomas Collier, *To all the Churches of Christ* 1658

R. Crabbe, J.E., *A Gentle Correction* 1659

R. Crabbe, *A Tender Salutation* 1659

Thos. Danson, (Baptist) *The Quakers Folly made Manifest at Sandwich* 1659

Danson, *The Quakers Wisdom descendeth not from above* 1659

John Deacon, *An Exact History of the Life of James Nayler* 1656  
(48 pp. Nayler; doctrine-Trinity, perfection, ordinances; behaviour-going naked etc.)

John Deacon, *The Grand Imposter Examined* 1656 (Nayler's entry into Bristol, letters of followers)

John Deacon, *A Public Discovery of Deceit* 1656

Wm. Dell, (Antinomian) *The Stumbling Stone*, 1653 (Moore says not do with Quakers)

Sir J. Denham, *A Relation of a Quaker that attempted to bugger a mare near Colchester* 1659

Henry Denne, (General Baptist) *The Quaker no Papist* 1659

*The Devil Turned Quaker* 1656

Ed. Dodd, *Innocents no Saints, a pair of Spectacles* 1658

Th. Drayton, Parker, *An Answer according to the Truth* 1655

Duke of Westminster, Francis, *The Fullness and Freeness of Gods Grace* 1656

Samuel Eaton, (Independent?) *The Quakers Confuted* 1654

Elders and Messengers, *Antidote against the Infection of the Times* 1656

Thos. Ellyson, *To His Highness Oliver* 1655

Geo. Emmot, *A Northern Blast, or the Spiritual Quaker Converted* 1655

Thos. Ewens, (Baptist? Ewins?) et al., *The Church of Christ in Bristol* 1657 (70 pp. dispute, doctrinal)

Ralph Farmer, (Presbyterian) *The Great Mystery of Godliness and Ungodliness* 1655 (95 pp. doctrinal-light, scriptures. Behaviour-quaking, comparison with Ranters and Papists, Nayler)

Ralph Farmer, *The Imposter Dethroned* 1658

Ralph Farmer, *Satan Inthroned in his Chair* 1657 (68 pp. James Nayler, doctrine, behaviour)

L. Fawne, et al., *A Second Beacon Fired* 1654

Christopher Feake, (Fifth Monarchist) *A Beam of Light* 1659

Chr. Feake and Kellett, *A Faithful Discovery of a Treacherous Design* 1654

William Fiennes, (Anglican) *Folly and Madness Made Manifest* 1659

Giles Firmin (Presbyterian, ejected from Shalford, Essex), *Establishing against Shaking* 1656

Chr. Fowler, (Presbyterian) Ford, *A Sober Answer to...Christ's Innocency Pleaded* 1656

Chr. Fowler, *True Charge in Ten Particulars* 1659

Francis Fullwood, *The True Relation of a Dispute* 1656

John Gilpin, (left Quakers) *The Quakers Shaken* 1653 (author's brief fling with Quakerism. Behaviour, quaking, light etc.)

Henry Glisson, *The True and Lamentable Relation of the Death of James Parnell* 1656

Th. Goodwin (Congregationalist) et al., *The Principles of Faith* 1654

Jn. Griffith, (General Baptist), *A Voice from the Word of the Lord* 1654

Wm. Grigge, *The Quakers' Jesus* 1656 (69 pp. Nayler's trial, doctrine and behaviour)

*Hosannah to the Son of David* 1657 (incorrect pagination c. pp. 150, doctrinal)

Ralph Hall, Crofton, *The Quakers Principles Quaking* 1656

Saml. Hammond, *The Quakers House Built Upon Sand* 1658

Francis Harris, (ejected 1662) *Some Queries Proposed to the Quakers* 1655 (doctrinal-Quaker view of scripture, salvationn perfection, Trinity. Behaviour-lack of reverence, quaking, 'miracles')

Thomas Higgenson, *A Testimony to the True Jesus* 1656

Francis Higginson, *A Brief Relation of the Irreligion of the Northern Quakers* 1653 (Behaviour mostly-accusation of levelling, quaking, incivility, 'going naked')

His Highness, *A Proclamation Prohibiting the Disturbing of Ministers* 1655

Th. Hodges, *A Scripture Catechism*, 1658

John Horne, Thomas Moore, *Brief Discovery* 1659 (Doctrinal-

Quaker christology)

Jn. Horne, *The Quakers Proved Deceivers* 1660

Geo. Horton, *A Faithful Scout* 1655

Henoch Howet, (Baptist) *The Beast that was and is not and yet is* 1659 (64 pp. general criticism of sects. Small part on Quakers and light)

Henoch Howet, *The Doctrine of the Light Within and the Natural Man*

Henoch Howet, *Quaking Principles Dashed in Pieces* 1654 (behaviour-quaking)

*Humble Petition of many Thousand of the County of Worcs* 1652

R. Ibbotson-Henry Walker, no details, 1655

Jeremiah Ives, (Baptist) *Confidence Encountered* 1658

Jeremiah Ives, *Innocency Above Impudency* 1656

Jeremiah Ives, *The Quakers' Quaking* 1656

T.J., *Letters sent from a Merchant in Dublin* 1660

Jn. Jackson, *Hosanna to the Son of David* 1657

Jn. Jackson, *Strength in Weakness* 1655

*James Nayler's Recantation* 1659

Jeffery, Caffyn, *Antichrist Made Known* 1656

Wm. Jenkin, Adderley, *Foot out of the Snare* 1656

Johnson, Jonathan, *The Quaker Quashed* 1659

Wm. Kays, *A Plain Answer to the 18 Queries of John Whitehead* 1654

Thos. Lamb, (Congregationalist) *Absolute Freedom from Sin* 1656

Thos. Larkham, (Independent, Vicar of Tavistock) *The Attributes of God Unfolded* 1656

*A Leaf from the Tree of Life* 1659

Thos. Ledgear, *A Discourse Concerning the Quakers* 1653

Lupton, *Quaking Mountebank* 1655

J. M., *The Ranters Last Sermon* 1654

Joshua Miller, (Fifth Monarchist) *Anti-Christ in Man, the Quakers Idol* 1655

Thos. Moore, (Manifestarian) *Antidote Against the spreading infection of Anti-Christ* 1655

Thos. Moore, Horne, *A Brief Discovery of the People Called Quakers* 1659

Thos. Moore, *A Defence against Poyson of Satan's Design* 1656  
Thos. Moore, *A Lamentation over the Dead in Christ* 1656  
Sam. Morris, *A Looking-Glass for the Quakers or Shakers and their Followers* 1655  
Lodowick Muggleton, *Joyful News from Heaven* 1658  
Jn. Norton, *The Heart of New England Rent* 1660  
Hy. Oasland, *Antiqueries* 1657  
Jn. Owen, (Independent) *Of the Divine Original...Scripture* 1658  
Jn. Owen, *The Principles of the Doctrine of Christ* 1645  
Ephraim Pagitt, *Heresiography* 1654, 5th edition (Description of various heresies, including Quakers. Mostly behaviour-incivility, 'miracles', comparison with Anabaptists and Ranters)  
Wm. Parker, Drayton, *An Answer according to the Truth* 1655  
Pendarves, Ewens, *Arrows against Babylon* 1656  
Daniel Pointel, *Moses and Aaron, Ministers Right and Duty* 1659  
T. Pollard, Haggar (Baptist), *Holy Scripture Clearing itself from Scandals* 1655  
James Pope, *A Plea for Truth in Love for Truth* 1659  
*Principles of Faith* 1654  
Wm. Prynne, (Presbyterian) *A New Discovery of Some Romish Emissaries* 1656  
Prynne, *The Quakers Unmasked* 1655  
Prynne, *Some Popish Errors* 1658 (Quakers likened to Papists)  
Not on Moore's list.  
*Quaking Mountebank, the Jesuit Turned Quaker* 1655  
*Quakers are Inchanters and Dangerous Seducers* 1655  
*Quakers Dream or the Devil's Pilgrimage* 1655  
*The Quaker's Fear* 1656  
*The Quaker's Fiery Beacon* 1655 (short, behaviour-accusation of withccraft, comparison with Ranters)  
*The Quaker's Terrible Vision* 1655  
*Querer's and Quaker's Cause at Second Hearing* 1653 (57 pp. doctrine-'light within', salvation, perfection., Behaviour-quaking, incivility, comparison with Ranters and Papists)  
Jn. Reeve (Muggletonian) *Epistle to Friends, discovering the*

*Light* 1654

Jn. Reeve, *Epistle to Isaac Penington* 1658

Ed. Reyner, *Precepts for Christian Practice* 1655

Jn. Reyner, *Several Queries* 1655

Thos. Robins, *The Sinners Warning Piece* 1650?

Thos. Rosewell, *Answer unto Thirty Queries* 1656

Alexander Ross, *ΙΑΝΣΕΒΕΙΑ* 1653

*Sad Caveat to all Quakers* 1657

Josh Scottow, *Johannes Becoldus Redivivus* 1659

*Serious Review of some Principles of the Quakers* 1655

Wm. Sheppard, *The Parson's Guide; or the Law of Tithes* 1654

Richard Sherlock, (Chaplain to Sir Robert Bindloss of Borwick, near Carnforth) *The Quakers Wild Questions Objected* 1657  
(criticism of 'inner light')

Richard Sherlock, *A Discourse of the Holy Spirit*, 1654 Not on Moore's list

Simpson, Ewens, *Church of Christ in Bristol* 1657

Edm. Skipp, *The World's Wonder, or, Quakers' Blazing Star* 1655

Samuel Smith, *Malice Stipped and Whipped* 1656

Thos. Smith, *A Gagg for the Quakers* 1659 (Behaviour-scurrilous account of Quaker witches in Dorset)

Thos. Smith, Rd. Blome, *The Quaker Disarmed* 1659 (short, doctrinal)

Spenceley, Bunyan (Baptist) See Bunyan, *Vindication*

Jn. Stalham, (Congregational) *Contradictions of the Quakers* 1655

Jn. Stalham, *Marginal Antidotes* 1657

Jn. Stalham, *The Reviler Rebuked* 1657

Nathaniel Stephens, (Presbyterian) *Vindiciae Fundamenti* 1658  
*Strange and Terrible News from Cambridge* 1659

Ph. Taverner, *The Quakers' Rounds* 1658 (39 pp., Doctrinal-perfection, scripture etc.)

Ph. Taverner, *Some Principles of Edward Burrough* 1658

Wm. Thomas, *A Defence of the Ministry of the Nation* 1656

Wm. Thomas, *Rayling Rebuked, or, a Defence of the Ministry of this Nation* 1656 (Doctrinal-Quaker form of ministry, inner light, revelation)

Wm. Thomas, *Vindication of Scripture and Ministry* 1657  
Th. Tillam, *The Seventh Day Sabbath* 1658  
Jn. Timson, *The Quakers' Apostacy* 1656  
Jn. Toldervy, *The Foot out of the Snare* 1655  
Jn. Toldervy, *The Snare Broken* 1656  
Jn. Tombes, (Particular Baptist) *Antipaedobaptism* 1657  
Sampson Townsend, *The Scripture Proved the Word of God* 1655  
*True and Lamentable Relation of the Death of James Parnell*  
1656  
Jane Turner, (of Newcastle-upon-Tyne) *Choice Experiences* 1653  
*Twenty Quaking Queries* 1659  
Thomas Underhill, *Hell Broke Loose* 1660 (Doctrinal-comparison  
with Popery, Quaker view of Christ, scripture, ordinances,  
Trinity)  
Saml. Vernon, *The Trepan* 1656  
Chr. Wade, *Quakery Slain Irrevocably* 1657 (56 pp. Doctrinal,  
lot about James Nayler)  
Wade, *To All Those Called Quakers* 1659 (Comparison with  
Familists, criticism of Quaker doctrine) Not on Moore's list  
Elkanah Wales, *A Catechism of Christian Religion* 1652  
*Water upon the Flame, 20 queries* 1659  
Thos. Weld, (Independent?) et al. *Further Discovery of that*  
*Generation of Men called Quakers* 1654  
Thos. Weld, Cole, *The Perfect Pharisee* 1653 (51 pp. doctrinal-  
trinity, light, perfection. Behaviour, salutations, Quaking)  
Geo. Wellington, *The Gadding Tribe Reproved* 1655  
Thos. Winterton, *The Chasing Young Quaker Harlot* 1656  
Thos. Winterton *The Quaking Prophets* 1655 (16 pp. doctrinal-  
light)  
Fred. Woodall, (Congregationalist) *Natural and Spiritual Light*  
*Distinguished* 1655  
*The Worcestershire Petition* 1652

## Appendix 18

### 1660s Anti-Quaker Writings

(These works have been abstracted from Joseph Smith's *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana* (London, 1873). Smith based his research for this on works in the hands of the Society of Friends and those in the British Library. Entries which are not extant have been omitted. Items in bold have been examined on a sampling basis).

*An Account of Several things that Passed between his Sacred Majesty and Richard Hubberhorne* 1660

John Batchiler (Vice Provost, Eton, restored 1660) *Christian Queries to Quaking Christians* 1663

Richard Baxter, (Presbyterian ejected 1660) John Tombes, *True Old Light Exalted...* 1660

Richard Baxter, *The True Catholic and Catholic Church* 1660

John Bewick (Rector of parish church of Stanhope in Weredale, Durham. Conformed at Restoration) *An Answer to a Quakers Seventeen Heads of Queries* 1660 (165 pp. Anglican defence of ministry, tithes. Some Quaker doctrine)

Richard Blome, *The Fanatic History* 1660 (Doctrine-ordinances, perfection. Behaviour-quaking, 'going naked', incivility, comparison with Papists)

William Brownsford, (Presbyterian, conformed 1660) *The Quaker Jesuit* 1660 (Comparison with Papists)

William Burnet (Baptist) *The Capital Principles of the People Called Quakers* 1668 (Quaker view of Christ, light, scriptures as rule, 54 pp.)

### *Canons and Institutions* 1669

Jonathan Clapham, *A Guide to the True Religion* 1669

R.C., *Queries propounded to George Fox* 1669

W.C., *The New Light, or Tub-Lecture of Thomas Grace* 1664

Matthew Caffyn, (Baptist) *Faith in God's Promises the Saints Best Weapon* 1661 (Doctrine-nature of Christ, perfection...)

John V. Cane (Franciscan Friar) *Fiat Lux* 1661

Lawrence Claxton (former Ranter, then Muggletonian)

*A Paradisical Dialogue between Faith and Reason* 1660

Laurence Claxton, *A Wonder of Wonders* 1660

Laurence Claxton, *The Lost Sheep Found* 1660

Thomas Danson (Presbyterian, ejected minister) *A Synopsis of Quakerism* 1668 (doctrinal-light, perfection, scripture, ordinances, 83 pp.)

Henry Denne (Baptist) *An Epistle Recommended to all the Prisons* 1660

John Endicott (Governor of New England) *The Humble Petition and Address to the General Court sitting at Boston* 1660

Robert Everard (captain), *An Epistle to the Several Congregations* 1664

Ralph Farmer (Presbyterian vicar of St. Nicholas, Bristol, ejected 1662) *The Lord Craven's Case Stated...George Bishop, a Grand Quaker; A Plain Dealing and Plain Meaning Sermon* 1660

Luke Fawne and Samuel Gellibrand (Bookseller and stationers of London) *A Catalogue of New Books* 1660

Simon Ford Θαυμάσια Κύριχ ὀγκυθῶ or *the Lord's Wonders in the Deep* 1665

Francis Duke of Westminster, *An Answer to some of the Principal* 1660 (88 pp. doctrinal- Quakers' 'light').

John of Gaskin, *A Just Defence and Vindication of Gospel Ministers and Gospel Ordinances* 1660 (144pp. also criticism of Quakers' perfection and 'light')

John Gauden (Anglican, Bishop of Exeter 1662) *A Discourse concerning Public Oaths* 1662 (55 pp.)

John Hacket (Anglican, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield after Restoration) *A Sermon preached, 1660.*

Thomas Hall, (Presbyterian, curate of King's Norton in Worcs.,) *Apology for the Ministry and its Maintenance* 1660

*The Harmony of Confessions: or The Fanatic Directory* 1660-62

Sarah Hayward of Colchester, *A Lying Scandalous Paper* 1666.

Richard Hobbs, *A True and Impartial Relation* 1667

Francis Holcroft (congregationalist) *Six Sheets against Friends* 1664

John Horne, (vicar of Lynn, Norfolk, ejected from All Hallows 1662) *The Quakers Proved Deceivers* 1660 (14 pp. account of dispute-doctrinal)

John Horne, *Fuller Discovery of the Dangerous Principles* 1660 (not in Smith)

John Horne, *Truths Triumph* 1660.

An Humble Apology for Nonconformists 1669

R.I., *Ignis Fatuus* 1660

*The Image of Jealousy Sought Out* 1660 (behaviour-fasting, going naked, 10 pp.)

Edward Lane (vicar of Sparsholt, Herts) *Look unto Jesus, or an ascent to the Holy Mount* 1663

Edward Maning, *The Masked Devil* 1664

Nathaniel Morton, (sec. to the court for ther jurisdiction of New Plymouth) *New England's Memorial* 1669

Lodowick Muggleton, *A True Interpretation of the Eleventh Chapter...* 1662

Lodowick Muggleton *A Letter sent to Thomas Taylor* 1665

Lodowick Muggleton *A True Interpretation of all the Chief Texts* 1665

Lodowick Muggleton *A Looking Glass for George Fox...doctrine of light within them* 1668 (Behaviour-Ranters, quaking)

Lodowick Muggleton *A True Interpretation of the Witch of Endor* 1669

Lodowick Muggleton, 'A Copy of a letter written by the Prophet Muggleton', 1660, reprinted in *A Stream from the Tree of Life* 1758

Lodowick Muggleton, *The Neck of the Quakers Broken* 1663 (Doctrinal-criticise idea of 'Christ within'. Behaviour-quaking 'witchcraft fits', says changed)

John Owen (Congregational) *A Brief Declaration and Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity* 1669

Acts of Parliament- An Act for preventing Mischiefs and Dangers that may arise by certain persons called Quakers and others refusing to take lawful oaths; An Act to prevent and suppress seditious conventicles 1664

Thomas Partridge (Baptist) and Rich. Hobbs, *A True and Impartial Relation* 1667

*Perrot against the Pope* 1662

Vavasor Powell (Baptist), *Common Prayer and Divine Service* 1660

Vavasor Powell, *The Bird in the Cage...* 1661

George Pressick of Dublin, *A Brief Relation of Some of the Most Remarkable Passages of the Anabaptists* 1660

A Letter from Shrewsbury setting forth the design which the Anabaptists and Quakers had to secure the Castle 1660 (broadside)

*The Quakers Proved Deceivers* 1660

*To the Quakers Some Queries is Sent to be Answered* 1660

Edward Rawson, *A True Relation of the Proceedings against Certain Quakers* 1660 (Broadside)

*A Relation of a Quaker, that to the shame of his profession, attempted to...near Colchester* 1660

Randall Roper (Baptist) *Truth Vindicated...answer to the high flown fancies of John Perot* 1661

T.S., *A Review of that which Richard Hubberthorne did affirm to the King* 1661

*Semper Iidem; or a Parallel Betwixt the Ancient and Modern Fanatics* 1661 (compares Quakers with older heretics, Lollards, Anabaptists, Copinger. Also deals with Fifth Monarchists and Levellers, 19 pp.)

*Seasonable Exhortations by 61 Teachers* 1660

Allan Smallwood (Anglican) *A Sermon Preached at Carlisle 1664, 1665 (oaths)*

Allan Smallwood, *A Reply to a Pamphlet called Oaths no Gospel Ordinance* 1667

John Stillingfleet (rector of Beckingham in Lincs.,) *Shechinah; or a demonstration of the divine presence* 1663

Thomas William, *Christian and Conjugal Counsel* 1661

John Tombes (Baptist, ejected 1662) *True Old Light exalted* 1660

John Tombes, *A Serious Consideration of the Oath of the King's Supremacy* 1660

John Tombes, *A Supplement to the Serious Consideration* 1660

John Tombes, *Sepher Sheba, or the Oath Book* 1662

Thomas Underhill, (London bookseller) *Hell Broke Loose* 1660 (50 pp. Quaker doctrine, behaviour)

Thomas Vincent (Presbyterian, ejected 1662) *The Foundation of God Standeth Sure* 1668 (79 pp. Doctrinal-Trinity,

satisfaction)

Christopher Wade, *The Quakers Answers in their Conference 1661*  
(doctrinal-incarnate Christ)

Thomas Wadsworth (curate of St. Lawrence. Putney, London, ejected 1662) *A Serious Exhortation to the Holy Life 1660* (Smith says not written against Friends but alludes to them in pleading for judicial swearing)

John Wigan (Baptist) *Antichrist's Strongest Hold Overturned 1665*

George Willington, *The Thrice Happy Welcome 1660*

Joseph Wright (Baptist preacher) *A Testimony for the Son of Man 1661* (doctrinal-light, ordinances)

M. John Joachim Zentgrott (university of Strassbourg)  
*Colluvies Quackerorum 1665*

## Appendix 19

### 1670s Anti-Quaker Writings

(These works have been abstracted from Joseph Smith's *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana* (London, 1873). Entries which are not extant have been omitted. Items in bold have been examined on a sampling basis).

Will. Allen, *The Danger of Enthusiasm Discovered* 1674

Almanacks, *Poor Robin* 1677

*An Answer to a Seditious Libel* 1670

*The Anti-Quaker; or a compendious answer to a tedious pamphlet entitled a treatise of Oaths* 1676

Ralph Austen, (Baptist?) *The Strong Man Armed not Cast Out* 1676 (Doctrine- light, scripture etc. 118 pp.)

*Baptism, Infant Baptism and Quakerism* 1674

Richard Baxter, *The Cure of Church Divisions* 1670

Baxter, *A Defence of the principle of Love* 1671

Baxter, *A Treatise of Death* 1672

Baxter, *A Sermon of Judgement* 1672

Baxter, *Richard Baxter's Catholic Theology* 1675

John Brown, Scotland, banished 1662, *Quakerism the Path-way to Paganism...an Examination of the Theses and Apology of Robert Barclay* 1678 (Doctrinal- Quaker view of scripture, Christ and Light, Trinity, sacraments. Behaviour-civil honours, 565 pp.)

William Burrell, *A Paper Sent to the Quakers from W.B.* 1676

Samuel Butler (poet, secretary to Earl of Carberry after Restoration, Steward of Ludlow Castle), *Two Letters, One from John Audland, a Quaker to William Prynne....* 1672

John Vincent Cane, (Franciscan Friar) *Stillingfleeton; or an Account of Dr. Stillingfleet's late Book against the Roman Church...* 1672

John Cheyney, episcopalian of Warrington,  
*A Skirmish Made upon Quakerism* 1676 (doctrine-scriptures and conscience, 14 pp.)

John Cheyney, *The Shibboleth of Quakerism ...'You-ing and 'thou-ing', and the naming of days and months* 1676

John Cheyney *One Sheet against the Quakers* 1677 (behaviour- irreverence of Quakers, 8 pp.)

John Cheyney, *Quakerism Proved to be Gross Blasphemy* 1677,  
repr, 1678 (light within, 31pp.)

John Cheyney, *Two Sermons of Hypocrisy...* 1677 (behaviour,  
social status, 248 pp.)

John Cheyney, *A Call to Prayer* 1677 (Quaker view of prayer,  
152 pp.)

John Cheyney, *Quakerism Subverted* 1677 (doctrinal-light,  
scripture, ministry, Quaker worship, 37 pp.)

John Cheyney, *A Warning to Souls to Beware of Quakers* 1677

John Cheyney, *A Vindication of Oaths and Swearing* 1677 (Oaths,  
38 pp.)

John Child (Baptist, later conformed to Cof E.), *A Moderate  
Message to Quakers, Seekers and Socinians* 1676 (Quakers and  
denial of water baptism, 74 pp.)

Thomas Comber, (Anglican bishop) *The Right of Tythes Asserted*  
1677 (246pp.)

Thomas Comber, *Christianity No Enthusiasm* 1678 (doctrinal,  
humanity of Christ, Immediate revelation, 191 pp.)

Thomas Danson, *An Answer to Sherlock's Discourse on the  
Knowledge of Christ* 1676

Thomas Danson, *The Saint's Perseverance Asserted against  
Jeremy Ives* 1672

Charles Stanley, Earl of Derby, *The Protestant Religion* 1671

Charles Stanley, Earl, *Truth Triumphant; in a Dialogue Between  
a Papist and a Quaker* 1671

John Faldo, (Independent) *Quakerism No Christianity* 1673

John Faldo, *Quakerism No Christianity; or a Thorough Quaker No  
Christian* 1672 (doctrinal- light and Christ, scripture,  
ordinancs, 330 pp.)

John Faldo, *Quakerism No Christianity Clearly and Abundantly  
proved* 1673

John Faldo, *A Vindication of Quakerism no Christianity* 1673  
(Doctrinal 96 pp.)

John Faldo, *A Cause for Will. Penn's Confidence* 1674

John Faldo, *Quakerism no Christianity...added an appendix  
containing the Canons and Constitutions for their  
ecclesiastical order* 1675

John Faldo, *XX1 Divines...Cleared of the Unjust Criminations of William Penn* 1675 (Defence of Quakerism no Christianity, 104 pp.)

*A Few Words Concerning the Trial of Spirits* 1673 (account of schismatic work 'Spirit of the hat', pp. 7)

Robert Fleming, Scottish Divine, *A Survey of Quakerism* 1677

Edward Fowler, (Anglican, 1681 vicar of St. Giles', Cripplegate, *The Design of Christianity* 1671

*A Friendly Conference between a Minister and a Parishioner of His, inclining to Quakerism* 1676 (behaviour-civil titles, 'thee and thou', oath-taking. Doctrinal-perfection, immediate revelation, lawfulness of tithes pp. 167)

*The Fundamental Errors of the Quakers Detected*, c. 1677

Charles Gataker, (Anglican, Rector of Hoggeston in Bucks.,) *An Examination of the Case of the Quakers concerning oaths...* 1675 (42 pp.)

Thomas Good (Anglican) *Firmanius and Dubitantius...dialogues concerning atheism, infidelity, popery and other heresies* 1674

Robert Gordon, *Christianity Vindicated* 1671 (doctrine- person of Christ, 48 pp.). Not in Smith

Thomas Grantham (General Baptist), 'The Baptist against the Quaker being a defence of the spirit speaking in the scripture as aforesaid to be the supreme judge of controversies' 1678 in *Christianimus Primitivus* (Doctrinal, but no specific mention of Quakers, dialogue on 'anti-scripturalism'. Brief mention p. 98 of Quakers and links with Popery, pp. 43-74; 166 pp.

Henry Grigg (Anabaptist), *Light from the Son of Righteousness* 1672 (doctrinal-light, 94 pp.)

Henry Grigg, *The Baptist not Babylonish* 1672

R.H., *The Character of a Quaker* 1671 (behaviour-marriage; organization)

R.H. *Plus Ultra or the second part of the Character of a Quaker* 1672 (13 pp. behaviour)

Henry Hallywell (vicar of Cowfold in Sussex), *An Account of Familism* 1673 (comparison of Quakers with older heretics; accusation of sedition, refusal of oaths, 133 pp.)

John Hamilton of Leith, His attestation to John Alexander's

'Jesuitico-Quakerism'. 'My Lord Bishop of Edinburgh' 1679

William Haworth, *The Quaker Converted to Christianity*

*Re-established 1674* (doctrine-light, Christ, comparison with Popery 164 pp.)

Will. Haworth, *An Antidote against that Poisonous and Fundamental Error of the Quakers 1676* (doctrinal- humanity of Christ, 20 pp.)

Will. Haworth, *Animadversions upon a Late Quibbling Libel from the Hartford Quakers 1676* (32 pp.)

Will. Haworth, *Jesus of Nazareth not the Quakers Messiah 1677*

Henry Hedworth, *The Spirit of the Quakers Tried 1672*

Henry Hedworth, *Controversy Ended 1673* (doctrinal, humanity and divinity of Christ, 72 pp.)

Thomas Hicks (Particular Baptist preacher) *A Dialogue between a Christian and a Quaker 1672* (doctrinal-light and Christ, scripture, resurrection of body, ordinances, Behaviour-reference to quaking, 94 pp.)

Thomas Hicks, *A Continuation of the Dialogue between a Christian and a Quaker 1673* (similar to above, 88 pp.)

Thomas Hicks, *The Quaker Condemned out of his own Mouth 1673* (see above two, 88 pp.),

Thomas Hicks, *Three Dialogues between a Christian and a Quaker 1679* (contains above three tracts)

Thomas Hicks, *The Quakers' Appeal Answered 1674* (doctrinal, 36 pp.)

Richard Hobbs, *The Quakers' Looking Glass Looked Upon 1673* (extravagancies of Charles Bailey, Quaker-pretended miracles, prophesies, visions etc.)

John Humfrey, (Presbyterian, vicar of Frome, Somerset, resigned living 1662), *The Middle Way of Perfection 1674*

Jeremiah Ives (General Baptist, pastor of church in Old Jewry, London), *Sober Request 1674*

Ralph James (Baptist, pastor of church, North Willington, Lincoln, *A True and Impartial Narrative of the Eminent hand of God that befell a Quaker 1672* (26 pp.)

Ralph James, *The Quakers' Subterfuge or Evasion Overturned*

1672 (24 pp.)

William Jeffery (Baptist), *The Lawfulness of Tithes* 1676  
(24 pp.)

Thomas Jenner (of Carlow in Ireland, Anglican), *Quakerism Anatomised and Confuted* 1676

William Jones, *Work for a Cooper*, 1679 (behaviour, 'going naked', Nayler, changes in Quakerism, 33 pp.)

Benjamin Keach (Particular Baptist minister), *The Grand Imposter Discovered* 1675 (doctrinal-light, scripture, perfection, pagination incorrect, approx. 100 pp.)

William Kiffin (Baptist minister, Devonshire Sq. London), *The Quakers' Appeal Answered* 1674

John Leanerd, *The Country Innocence* 1677

John Leverat (Governor of Boston in New England) *A Letter to William Coddington* 1677

John Menzeis, *Roma Mendax* 1675

William Mitchell, *A Sober Answer to an Angry Pamphlet* 1671

John Morse (Anabaptist, Watford), *A Letter to Will. Penn* 1672

Lodowick Muggleton, *An Answer to Will. Penn* 1673

John Nalson, (Anglican) *The True Liberty and Dominion of Conscience Vindicated* 1675 (a few references to Quakers, against liberty of conscience in general, 133 pp.). Not in Smith

Clement Needham (Presbyterian, Saxelby, Leics.), *A Sober Disquisition of the People's Right to Tithes* 1672

John Newman, *The Light Within &c.* 1671

Thomas Plant (Baptist, Elder of congregation in Barbican), *A Contest for Christianity* 1674 (doctrinal- Quaker christology, 120pp.)

Vavasor Powell, (Fifth Monarchist) *A Concordance to the Bible* 1671

Vavasor Powell, *The Life and death of Mr. Vavasor Powell* 1671  
*The Quaker turned Jew* 1675

*The Quakers' Caveat and testimonies against Popery* 1679/80  
(about resurgence of Popery 4 pp.)

*The Quakers' Creed Concerning the Man Christ Jesus*, 1679

*The Quakers' Farewell to England* 1675

*The Quakers' Last Shift Found Out* 1674

*Quakers Meer Obbists* 1678 (Behaviour-description of Quaker meeting, accusation of madness)

*The Quakers' Opinions* c. 1677-78

*The Quakers' Pedigree; or a Dialogue between a Quaker and a Jesuit* 1674 (A comparison of Quakers and Papists 8 pp.)

*A Quakers' Sermon* 1674 (not particularly adverse, 8 pp.)

Alexander Ross (episcopal divine, Scotland) *ΠΑΝΣΕΒΕΙΑ or, a view of all religions* 1671, reprint from 1653

William Russell, *Quakerism is Paganism* 1674 (doctrinal-light, Christ's humanity, Trinity, scriptures, resurrection, 96 pp.)

Samuel Rutherford (Prof. Divinity, St. Andrews), *Mr. Rutherford's Letters* 1675

*The Sad and Dreadful End of one of the Quakers* 1675

John Saddington, (Muggletonian) *A Prospective Glass for Saints and Sinners* 1673

*The Second Part of the Yea and Nay Almanack* 1679

*A Serious Expostulation with B.E. an Eminent Quaker* 1673

Stephen Scandrett, *An Antidote against Quakerism* 1671 (doctrinal-scriptures against light, perfection, ordinances 119 pp.)

Alexander Shirreff, John Leslie and Paul Gellie, (students, Aberdeen), *Quakerism: Robin [Robert?] Barclay Baffled* 1675 (136 pp.)

*The Spirit of the Quakers Tried* 1672 (Quakers' allegorical use of scripture, 45 pp.)

Samuel Starling (Mayor of London), *An Answer to the Seditious and Scandalous Pamphlet* 1670

Matthew Stevenson, *The Quakers Wedding* 1671 (behaviour, Broadside);

Matthew Stevenson, *Poems; or a Miscellany of Sonnets* 1673

Thomas Thompson, *The Quakers Quibbles..the Pretended Prophet Lod. Muggleton and the Quakers Compared* 1674 (doctrinal; comparison between Muggletonians and Quakers, 38pp.)

Thomas Thompson, *The Quakers Quibbles in three parts* 1675; Thomas Thompson, *The Second Part of the Quakers' Quibbles* 1675 (Doctrinal-person of Christ, Trinity, compares with

*Muggletonians*, 101 pp.) Not in Smith

Thomas Thompson *The Third Part of the Quakers Quibbles* 1675  
(Mostly behaviour and how Quakers have changed, doctrine-  
Trinity, scripture, light, 99 pp.) Not in Smith

Herbert Thorndike (Anglican, prebendary of Westminster at  
Restoration), *A Discourse of the Forbearance or the Penalties  
which due Reformation Requires* 1670

W.J., *The Greatest Light of the World, far exceeding the light  
of the Quakers* 1674

Mr. Wastall (Anglican), *The Papists' Younger Brother; or the  
Vileness of Quakerism* 1679 (comparison with Popery, behaviour,  
manners, 179pp.)

*Wickham Wakened* 1672 (mostly behaviour - marriage, inheritance  
etc. 8 pp.)

Robert Wild (Presbyterian ejected from Aynhoe, Northants.,  
1660) *A Letter from Dr. Robert Wild to his friend N.J.J.* 1672

Roger Williams (Baptist), *George Fox Digged out of His Burrows*  
1676 (various references to light, going naked, comparison  
with papists 7 pp.)

Thomas Wilson, *Quakers' False Interpretations of Holy  
Scripture* 1678

*A Yea and Nay Almanack* 1678

## Appendix 20

### 1680s Anti-Quaker Writings

(These works have been abstracted from Joseph Smith's *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana* (London, 1873). Entries which are not extant have been omitted. Items in bold have been examined on a sampling basis).

John Alexander, *Jesuitico-Quakerism* 1680 (comparison with Papists; doctrinal-scripture,, perfection, justification, Quaker worship, 219 pp.)

Will. Allen, *The Grand Error of the Quakers Detected and Confuted* 1680 (doctrinal-light, scripture, Christ's humanity, 136 pp.)

Vincent Alsop (Presbyterian), *The Mischief of Impositions* 1680

Vinc. Alsop, *The Rector of Sutton* 1680

Vinc. Alsop, *The Rector of Sutton Committed with the Dean of St. Paul's* 1680

Sampson Bond *A Public Trial of the Quakers* 1682

E.B. Esq. *An Apology for the Church of England* 1685

John William Bajer, *Dissertatio I Contra Quakeros* 1683

Richard Baxter, (Presbyterian) *The Judgement of the Late Chief Justice Sir Matthew Hale of the Nature of true Religion* 1684

Thomas Comber, (Anglican) *The Right of Tithes Re-asserted* 1680

Thomas Comber *An Historic Vindication of the Divine Right of Tithes* 1682

Sir John Denham, *A Relation of a Quaker that to the shame of his profession attempted to...near Colchester, in, Sir John Denham, Poems and translations with the Sophy* 1684

*Devon Ss. And General Quarterial Sessionem* 1682

*A Dialogue between Father P-rs and Will. P-n* 1687

John Faldo, (Independent) *A Discourse of the Gospel of Peace* 1686

Will. Falkner (DD of Lynn, Norfolk), *Two Treatises* 1684

*Five Important Queries Humbly Propounded* 1681

Henry Hallywell, *A Discourse of the Use of Reason in the Matter of Religion* 1683

Eleanor James (wife of printer Tho. James), *Mrs. James'*

*Vindication of the Church of England* 1687  
George Hickes, (Anglican, prebend of Worcester and vicar of All-Hallows, Barking), *The Spirit of Enthusiasm Exorcised in a Sermon Preached before the Univ. of Oxford* 1680  
Will. Jameson, *Verus Patroclus* 1689 (doctrinal-scripture, perfection, Trinity, nature of Christ)  
*A Law of Maryland Concerning Religion* 1689  
*A Letter to a Dissenter* 1688/9  
*A Looking-Glass for the Quakers* 1689  
Increase Mather (of New England, Congregational), *An Essay for the Recording of Illustrious Providences*, reprint in *Remarkable Providences* 1856 Chapter XI (various tales of Quakers as mad, bewitched etc., 262 pp.)  
*Middlesex Ss. and General Quarterial Sessionem* 1682  
Henry Nalson (Anglican, J.P. for Isle of Ely) *Foxes and Firebrands* 1680, repr. 1681, 1682 with 2nd part, 1689 with 3rd part  
*The New Orders of his Majesties Justices of the Peace* 1681  
John Norris (conformed after Restoration), *Reason and Religion* 1680 1689  
W.P., *The Quakers Elegy on the death of Charles...* 1685  
W.P., *Tears Wiped off, or the second Essay* 1685  
*The Quakers' Art of Courtship* 1689 (behaviour)  
*The Quakers Remonstrance to the Parliament &c. touching the Popish Plot* (8 pp.) 1689  
George Rust (Anglican) *A Discourse of the Use of Reason in Religion* 1683  
*The Second Part of the Yea and Nay Almanack* 1680 (behaviour)  
Robert Southey (poet laureate) *Evangelicum Syderum* 1680  
*Some Queries Concerning Liberty of Conscience* 1688  
Edward Stillingfleet (Archdeacon of London and Dean of St. Paul's), *The Mischief of Separation* 1680  
Edward Stillingfleet, *The Rector of Sutton* 1680  
Philip Taverner (vicar, West Drayton and minister of Hillingdon, Middx., ejected 1660), *The Grandfather's Advice* 1680-1  
*Three Considerations to Mr. William Penn* 1688

*Three Letters of Thanks to the Protestant Reconciler* 1683  
*The Vanity of all Pretences for Toleration* 1685  
*A Vindication of the Friendly Conference Between a Minister and a Parishioner of His* 1678 (335 pp.)  
*The Voice of Light...in relation to tithes* 1678 (10 pp.)  
R.W. *Two Letters to a Friend* 1686  
Robert Ware, (son of Sir James Ware) *The Hunting of the Romish Fox* 1683 (comparison with Papists)  
*A Yea and Nay Almanack* 1680

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Manuscripts

#### *Brotherton Library, Leeds.*

Epistles and Advices from George Fox, the Yearly Meeting and the Meeting for Sufferings 1670-1743.

Knaresborough Women's Monthly Meeting Minutes 1673-1693.

Letters and Papers Respecting the Separatists 1683-1708

Settle Monthly Meeting Minutes 1666-1700.

Thirsk Women's Monthly Meeting Minutes 1668-1699

York Monthly Meeting Minutes 1668-1682, vol. 1; 1682-1707, vol. 2, 1687-1707.

York Preparative Meeting Minutes 1669-1694.

York Women's Monthly Meeting Minutes 1674-1767.

York Women's Yearly and Quarterly Meetings Minutes 1678-1745.

Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting Minutes 1669-1681, vol. 1, 1681-1698, vol. 2, 1681-1698.

Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting, Counsel's Opinions 1661-1841.

Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting, Petitions to the Judges &c. and Various Papers Relating to Sufferings 1682-1810.

Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting Stock Accounts 1680-1694.

#### *East Sussex County Record Office, Lewes*

Arundel Monthly Meeting 1668-1709.

Lewes Men's Monthly Meeting Minutes 1669-1695.

Lewes Women's Monthly Meeting Minutes 1677-1709.

Register of Indentures of the Burial Ground and Meeting Houses of Friends in Sussex 1667-1846.

Register of the Wills of Friends in the County of Sussex 1663-1685

Sussex Quarterly Meeting Epistles and Advice from Yearly  
Sussex Quarterly Meeting Men's Minutes 1668-1689

Sussex Quarterly Meeting Public Stock Accounts 1682-1706.

Sussex Quarterly Meeting Testimonies of Denial 1674-1767.

Sussex Quarterly Meeting Women's Fair Accounts 1677-1721

Sussex Quarterly Meeting Women's Minutes 1677-1696

*East Yorkshire Record Office, Beverley*

Elloughton Monthly Meeting Births 1648-1775.

Kelk Monthly Meeting Minutes 1669-1716.

Owstwick Monthly Meeting Minutes 1669-1707.

Scarborough Monthly Meeting Marriages 1661-1724.

Kelk Burials 1656-1773.

*Friends House Library, London*

Swarthmore MSS.

Portfolio MSS.

Caton MSS.

Spence MSS.

Yearly Meeting Minutes 1668-1693.

Meeting for Sufferings Minutes, 5 vols. to 1690.

Morning Meeting Book 1673-1692.

National Stock Accounts 1678-1716.

Epistles Sent 1683-1703.

Book of Cases 1661-1695.

*Surrey Record Office, Kingston*

Horsham Women's Monthly Meeting Minutes 1675-1692.

*West Yorkshire Archives, Wakefield*

Pontefract Monthly Meeting Minutes 1672-1700 (transcript).

*Dr. Williams' Library, London*

Presbyterian Fund Board Minutes

1690-1693.

Congregational Fund Board Minutes

1695-1699/1700.

Richard Baxter MSS

### Printed Primary Works

Aldam, Thomas, *A Brief Discovery of a Threefold Estate of Antichrist* (London, 1653)

Alexander, John, *Jesuitico-Quakerism Examined* (London, 1680)

Allen, William, *The Grand Error of the Quakers Detected and Confuted* (London, 1680)

Audland, John, *The Innocent Delivered out of the Snare* (London, 1655)

Banks, John, *A Journal of the Life, Labours, Travel, and Sufferings* (London, 1712)

Barclay, Robert, *The Anarchy of the Ranters and other Libertines* (London, 1676)

Barclay, Robert, *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity* (London, 1678)

Barclay, Robert, *A Catechism and Confession of Faith* (London, 1673)

Bateman, Susanna, No title, beginning, 'I matter not' (n.p., 1656)

Baxter, Richard, *The Quaker's Catechism* (London, 1655)

Besse, J., *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers*, 2 vols., (London, 1753)

Billing, Edward, *A Mite of Affection* (London, 1659)

Blome, Richard, *The Fanatic History* (London, 1660)

Brownsford, *The Quaker Jesuit* (London, 1660)

Bugg, Francis, *De Christiana Libertate* (London, 1682)

Bugg, Francis, *The Quakers Detected* (London, 1686)

Burnet, William, *The Capital Principles of the People Called Quakers* (London, 1688)

Burrough, Edward, *A Declaration to all the World of our Faith* (London, 1659)

Burrough, Edward, *A Faithful Testimony Concerning the True Worship of God* (London, 1659)

Burrough, Edward, *The Memorable Works of a Son of Thunder and Consolation* (London, 1672)

Byne, Magnus, *The Scornful Quakers Answered* (London, 1656)

Caffyn, Matthew, *Faith in God's Promises* (London, 1661)

*Canons and Institutions Drawn up and Agreed upon by the*

*General Assembly or Heads of the Quakers* (London, 1669)  
The Character of a Quaker (London, 1671)  
Cheyney, John, *One Sheet against the Quakers* (London, 1677)  
Cheyney, John, *Two Sermons of Hypocrisy* (London, 1677)  
Cheyney, John, *A Vindication of Oaths and Swearing in Weighty Cases* (London, 1679)  
*The Christianity of the People Commonly Called Quakers Asserted against the Charge of their being no Christians writ in behalf of the People of God called Quakers, by some of them* (London, 1689)  
Collier, Thomas, *A Looking Glass for the Quakers* (London, 1656)  
Crisp, Stephen, *A New Book for Children* (London, 1681)  
Crisp, Thomas, *Babel's Builders Unmasking Themselves* (London, 1681)  
Crook, John, *The Design of Christianity* (London, 1701)  
Crook, John, *Truth's Principles* (London, 1662)  
Danson, Thomas, *A Synopsis of Quakerism* (London, 1668)  
Deacon, John, *The Grand Imposter Examined* (London, 1656)  
*A Declaration from the Harmless and Innocent People of God called Quakers against all Plotters and Fighters in the World* (London, 1660)  
Dewsbury, William, *The Faithful Testimony of that Ancient Servant of the Lord, and Minister of the Everlasting Gospel William Dewsbury in His Books, Epistles and Writings, Collected and Printed for Future Service* (London, 1689)  
Faldo, John, *Quakerism no Christianity*, (London, 1675)  
Farmer, Ralph, *Satan Enthroned in his Chair of Pestilence* (London, 1657)  
Farmer, Ralph, *The Great Mysteries of Godliness and Ungodliness* (London, 1655)  
Farnworth, Richard, *A Confession and Profession of Faith in God by His People who are in Scorn Called Quakers* (London, 1658)  
Farnworth, Richard, *A Woman Forbidden to Speak in the Church* (London, 1654)  
Fell, Margaret, *A Brief Collection of Remarkable Passages and*

Occurrences Relating to the Birth, Education, Life, Conversion, Travels, Services and Deep Sufferings of that Ancient, Eminent, and faithful Servant of the Lord, Margaret Fell, But by Her Second Marriage M. Fox (London, 1710)

Gataker, Charles, *An Examination of the Case of Quakers Taking Oaths* (London, 1675)

Gauden, John, *A Discourse Concerning Public Oaths* (London, 1662)

Hedworth, Henry, *Controversy Ended* (London, 1673)

Firmin, Giles, *Establishing against Shaking* (London, 1656)

Fox, George, *A Catechism for Children that they May Come to Learn of the Light* (London, 1657)

Fox, George, *Concerning Good-Morrow and Good-Even; the World's Customs* (London, 1657)

Fox, George, *Friends' Fellowship Must be in the Spirit* (n.p., 1668)

Fox, George, *The Great Mystery of the Great Whore Unfolded* (London, 1659)

Fox, George, *The Hypocrite's Feast and Feast not God's Holy Day* (n.p., 1677)

Fox, George, *To the Parliament and Commonwealth of England: Fifty Nine Particulars for the Regulating of Things* (London, 1659)

Fox, George, *The Priest's Fruits made Manifest and the Vanity of the World Discovered* (London, 1657)

Fox, George and Hookes, Ellis, *A Primer and Catechism for Children* (n.p., 1670)

Fox, George, *The Second Covenant* (London, 1657).

Fox, George, *Several Plain truths Manifested and Declared from the Spirit of God* (London, 1684).

Fox, George, *Something Concerning Silent Meetings* (n.d., n.p., 1657?)

Fox, George, *A Testimony of What We Believe of Christ* (London, 1677)

Fox, George, *The True Christian Distinguished* (London, 1689).

Fox, George, *The Trying of Spirits in Our Age Now as in the Apostles Days* (London, 1683)

Fox, George, *The Vials of the Wrath of God* (London, 1655)

Fox, George, *A Word from the Lord to All the World* (London 1654)

Grantham, Thomas, *Christianimus Primitivus or, The Ancient Christian Religion* (London, 1678)

Grigg, Henry, *Light from the Son of Righteousness* (London, 1672)

Grigge, William, *The Quakers' Jesus; or the Unswaddling of that Child James Nayler* (London, 1658)

Grove, Robert, *A Short Defence of the Church and Clergy of England* (London, 1681)

Hardcastle, Peter, *A Short Relation of What is Believed among the People of God* (n.p., 1666)

Harris, Francis, *Some Queries Proposed to the Quakers* (London, 1655)

Haworth, William, *The Quaker Converted to Christianity*

Hicks, Thomas, *A Dialogue Between a Christian and a Quaker* (London, 1673)

Hicks, Thomas, *Three Dialogues between a Christian and a Quaker* (London, 1679)

Higginson, Francis, *A Brief Relation of the Irreligion of the Northen Quakers* (London, 1653)

Horne, John and Moore, Thomas, *A Brief Discovery of the People Called Quakers* (London, 1659)

Howgill, Francis, *Some Mysteries of God's Kingdom* (London, 1658)

Hubberthorne, Richard, *The Antipathy Betwixt Flesh and Spirit* (London, 1654)

Hubberthorne, Richard, *The Real Cause of tha Nation's Bondage and Slavery* (London, 1659)

Jameson, William, *Verus Patroclus: or the Weapons of Quakerism* (Edinburgh, 1689)

Jones, William, *Work for a Cooper* (London, 1679)

Keach, Benjamin, *The Grand Imposter Discovered* (London, 1675)

Keith, George, *The Fundamental Truths of Christianity* (London, 1688)

Lawson, Thomas, *A Brief Discovery of a Threefold Estate of*

Antichrist (London, 1653)

Mason, Martin, *A Check to the Lofty Linguist* (London, 1655)

Mucklow, William, *The Spirit of the Hat, or the Government of the Quakers amongst themselves* (London, 1673)

Muggleton, Lodowick, *The Neck of the Quakers Broken* (Amsterdam, 1663)

Nalson, John, *The Common Interest of King and People* (London, 1683)

Nalson, John, *Foxes and Firebrands* (London, 1689).

Nayler, James, *A Discovery of the First Wisdom from Beneath and the Second Wisdom from Above* (London, 1653)

Nayler, James, *A Discovery of Faith* (London, 1653).

Nayler, James, *A Discovery of the Man of Sin* (London, 1654)

Nayler, James, *A Few Words Occasioned* (London, 1654)

Nayler, James, *The Lamb's War against the Man of Sin* (London, 1658)

Nayler, James, *A Lamentation for the Scattered Tribes* (London, 1653)

Nayler, James and Fox, George, *Saul's Errand to Damascus* (London, 1653)

Nicholson, Benjamin, *A Blast from the Lord* (London, 1653)

Pagitt, Ephraim, *Heresiography* (London, 1654, 5th edition)

Parnell, James, *A Shield of the Truth* (London, 1655)

Pearse, Edward, *The Conformist's Fourth Plea* (London, 1683)

Penington, Isaac, *The Flesh and Blood of Christ* (London, 1674)

Penington, Isaac, *The Life of a Christian* (London, 1653)

Penington, Isaac, *The Scattered Sheep Sought After* (London, 1658)

Penn, William, *A Collection of the Works of William Penn* (London, 1726), 2 vols.

Penn, William, and Whitehead, George, *The Christian Quaker* (London, 1674)

Penn, William, *Innocency with her Open Face* (London, 1669)

Penn, William, *No Cross, No Crown: A Discourse showing the Nature and Discipline of the Holy Cross of Christ* (London, 1682)

Penn, William, *The Sandy Foundation Shaken* (London, 1668)

Penn, William, and Whitehead George, *A Serious Apology* (London, 1671)

Pleydell, Josiah, *Loyalty and Conformity Asserted* (London, 1682)

Prynne, William, *Some Popish Errors Unadvisedly Embraced* (London, 1658)

Prynne, William, *The Quakers Unmasked* (London, 1655, 2nd edition).

*The Quaker's Art of Courtship* (London, 1689)

*The Quaker's Fiery Beacon* (London, 1655)

*The Querer's and Quaker's Cause* (London, 1653)

*The Quaker's Wedding* (London, 1671)

Rich, Richard, *An Epistle to the People Called Quakers* (London, 1680)

Rich, Richard, *Hidden Things Brought to Light, or the Discord of the Grand Quakers Among Themselves* (n.p., 1678).

Rigge, Ambrose, *A Scripture Catechism for Children* (n.p., 1672)

Rogers, William, *The Christian Quaker Distinguished from the Apostate and Innovator* (London, 1680)

*The Second Part of the Yea and Nay Almanac* (London, 1680)

*These Several Papers was sent to the Parliament the 20th day of the fifth month, 1659, being above seven thousand of the names of the Handmaids and Daughters of the Lord and such as feels the Oppression of Tithes* (London, 1659)

Scandrett, Stephen, *An Antidote against Quakerism* (London, 1671)

Simpson, William, *From One that was Moved of the Lord to Go as a Sign* (London, 1659)

Smallwood, Allan, *A Reply to a Pamphlet called Oaths no Gospel Ordinance* (York, 1667)

Smith, Daniel, 'The 24th Day of the 6th month, 1673... (n.p., n.d.)

Smith, Joseph, *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana* (London, 1873)

Smith, Nathaniel, *The Quakers' Spritual Court* (London, 1668)

Smith, Richard, *The Light Unchangeable* (London, 1679)

Smith, Stephen, *The True Light* (London, 1679)

Smith, William, *A New Catechism* (London, 1665)

Smith, William, *A New Primer* (London, 1662)

Smith, William, *Universal Love* (n.p., 1664)

The Spirit of the Quakers Tried (London, 1672)

Story, Christopher, *A Brief Account of the Life...Christopher Story* (London, 1726)

Thomas, William, *Rayling Rebuked: or a Defence of the Ministers of this Nation* (London, 1656)

Thompson, Thomas, *The Third Part of the Quibbling Quaker* (London, 1675)

*A True Account of Samuel Hornoul that Lately Went in Sack-Cloth, Through Part of London, Westminster and Southwark, &c from the People Called Quakers and from his Kindred* (n.p., 1685)

*Tyranny and Hypocrisy Detected* (London, 1673)

Underhill, Thomas, *Hell Broke Loose* (London, 1660)

Vincent, Thomas, *The Foundation of God Standeth Sure* (London, 1668)

Wastall, L., *The Papist's Younger Brother: or the Vileness of Quakerism Detected* (London, 1679)

The Westminster Catechism (London, 1658)

Whitehead, George, *The Christian Progress of that Ancient Servant and Minister of Jesus Christ, George Whitehead...* (London, 1725)

Whitehead, George, *The Divinity of Christ and Unity of the Three that bear record in Heaven* (London, 1669)

Whitehead, George, and Burrough, Edward, *The Son of Perdition Revealed* (London, 1661).

Whiting, John, *A Catalogue of Friend's Books* (London, 1708)

William, John, *A Sermon Preached before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London* (London, 1679)

Wright, Joseph, *A Testimony for the Son of Man* (London, 1661)

### Printed Secondary Works

Bailey, Richard, G., *New Light on George Fox and Early Quakerism: The Making and Unmaking of a God* (San Francisco, 1992)

Barbour, Hugh, *The Quakers in Puritan England* (New Haven, 1964)

Bauman, Richard, *Let Your Words Be Few: Symbolism of Speaking and Silence among Seventeenth Century Quakers* (Cambridge, 1983)

Bittle, William, G., *James Nayler 1618-1660: The Quaker Indicted by Parliament* (York, 1986)

Bolam, C.G., Goring, J., Short, H.L., Thomas, R., (eds.) *The English Presbyterians* (London, 1968)

Braithwaite, A.W., *Thomas Rudyard Early Friends' Oracle of Law*, (Friends' Historical Society Supplement no. 27, London, 1956)

Braithwaite, W.C. *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (London, 1912, reprinted, York, 1981).

Braithwaite, W.C., *The Second Period of Quakerism* (London, 1919, reprinted, York, 1979).

Brock, Peter, *Pacifism in Europe to 1914* (Princeton, 1972).

Buranelli, Vincent, *The King and The Quaker: A Study of William Penn and James II* (Philadelphia, 1962)

Buranelli, Vincent, 'William Penn and the Socinians', *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* lxxxiii (1959), pp. 369-381

Cadbury, Henry, J., *George Fox's Book of Miracles* (Cambridge, 1948)

Carroll, Kenneth, L., 'Early Quakers and "Going Naked as a Sign"', *Quaker History*, 67 (1978), pp. 69-87.

Carroll, Kenneth, L., 'Martha Simmonds, a Quaker Enigma', *Journal of the Friend's Historical Society*, 53 (1972), pp. 31-52.

Carroll, Kenneth, L., 'Sackcloth and Ashes, and Other Signs and Wonders', *Journal of the Friends Historical Society*, 53 (1975) pp. 314-325.

Carroll, Kenneth, L., 'Singing in the Spirit in Early

Quakerism', *Quaker History*, 73 (1984), pp. 1-13.

Cherry, Charles, L. 'Enthusiasm and Madness: Anti-Quakerism in the Seventeenth Century', *Quaker History*, 73 (1984), pp. 1-24

Clark, R.I., '"The Gangreen of Quakerism": An Anti- Quaker Anglican Offensive in England after the Glorious Revolution' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 31 (1981), pp. 404-429

Clark, R.I., 'The Quakers and the Church of England 1670-1720' University of Lancaster, Ph.D, 1988

Clifton, Robin, *The Last Popular Rebellion* (London, 1984)

Cole, W.A., 'The Quakers and Politics 1652-1660', D.Phil., University of Cambridge, 1955).

Cole, W.A., 'The Quakers and the English Revolution', *Past and Present*, 10 (1956), pp. 39-53.

Cole, A., 'The Social Origins of Early Friends', *Journal of the Friend's Historical Society*, 48 (1957), pp. 99-118.

Comfort, William Wistor, 'Quaker Marriage Certificates' *The Bulletin of the Friend's Historical Association*, 40 (1951), pp. 67-80

Cooper, Wilmer, A., 'Quaker Perspectives on the Nature of Man' *Quaker Religious Thought*, 2 (1960), pp. 1-36

Crawford, Patricia, *Women and Religion in England 1500-1720* (London, 1993).

Creasey, M.A. 'Early Quaker Christology with special reference to the teaching and significance of Isaac Penington 1616-1679. An essay in Interpretation' , D.Phil., University of Leeds, 1956.

Crosfield, Helen G., *Margaret Fox*, (London, 1913).

Damrosch, Leo, *The Sorrows of the Quaker Jesus: James Nayler and the Puritan Crackdown on the Free Spirit* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1996)

Davis, J.C., *Fear, Myth and History: The Ranters and the Historians* (Cambridge, 1986)

Dunn, Richard S. and Dunn Mary Maples (eds.) *The Papers of William Penn 1644-1679*, 5 vols, (Pennsylvania, 1981).

Endy, Melvyn B., *William Penn and Early Quakerism* (Princeton, 1973).

Evans, R.H., '"The Truth First Sprang up in Leicestershire".

George Fox, 1624-1691 and the Origins of Quakerism', *The Leicester Archaeological Society Transactions*, lxvi (1992), pp. 121-135.

Faithorn, R.M., 'Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth Century Yorkshire', University of Leeds, M.Phil., 1982

Fogelklou, Emilia, *James Nayler, The Rebel Saint 1618-1660*, L. Yapp., (trans.), (London, 1931)

Forde, Helen, 'Derbyshire Quakers 1650-1761', University of Leicester, Ph.D., 1977

Greaves, Richard, L., *Deliver us from Evil, The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663* (Oxford, 1986)

Greaves, Richard, L., *Enemies Under His Feet, Radicals and Nonconformists in Britain, 1664-1677* (Stanford, California, 1990).

Greene, Douglas, G., 'Muggletonians and Quakers: A Study in the Interaction of Seventeenth Century Dissent' *Albion*, 15 (1983), pp. 102-122.

Grell, O.P., Israel, J.I., and Tyacke, N. (eds.), *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991)

Gwyn, Douglas, *Apocalypse of the Word: The Life and Message of George Fox (1624-1691)* (1948, repr., Richmond, Indiana, 1986)

Hill, C., 'The Lost Ranters? a critique of J.C. Davis' *History Workshop*, 24 (1987), pp. 134-140.

Hill, C., *Milton and Some Contemporaries: The Experience of Defeat* (London, 1984)

Hill, C., 'The Quakers and the English Revolution', *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, 56 (1992), pp. 165-179.

Hill, C., *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (London, 1972).

Hill, Michael, *A Sociology of Religion* (London, 1973).

Horle, Craig, *The Quakers and the English Legal System 1660-1688* (Philadelphia, 1988).

Hunt, N.C., *Two Early Political Associations: The Quakers and the Dissenting Deputies in the Age of Sir Robert Walpole* (Oxford, 1961).

Ingle, H. Larry, *First Among Friends George Fox and the*

*Creation of Quakerism* (Oxford, 1994).

Ingle, H. Larry, 'George Fox, Historian' *Quaker History*, 82 (1993), pp. 28-35

Ingle, H. Larry, 'Richard Hubberthorne and History: the Crisis of 1659', *Journal of the Friend's Historical Society*, 56, (1992), pp. 189-200.

Kent, Stephen, A. 'The Papist Charges against the Interregnum Quakers', *Journal of Religious History* (Dec. 1982), pp. 180-190.

Kunze, Bonnelyn Young, *Margaret Fell and the Rise of Quakerism* (Stanford, 1994)

Lamont, William, L., *Marginal Prynne 1600-1669* (London, 1963)

Llewellyn-Edwards, Tam, 'Richard Farnworth of Tickhill' *Journal of the Friend's Historical Society*, 56 (1992), pp. 201-209.

LLoyd, Arnold, *Quaker Social History* (London, 1950).

Mack, Phyllis, *Visionary Women, Ecstatic Prohecy in Seventeenth Century England* (California, 1992).

Martin, David, *A Sociology of English Religion* (London, 1967).

McGregor,, J.F. and Reay, B. (eds.) *Radical Religion in the English Revolution* (Oxford, 1984)

McLachlan, H.J., *Socinianism in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford, 1951).

Moore, Rosemary Anne, 'The Faith of the First Quakers: The Development of their Beliefs and Practices up to the Restoration', University of Birmingham, Ph.D., 1993.

Moore, Rosemary, *Annotated Listing of Quaker and Anti-Quaker Publications*, (unpublished work, 1994).

Morgan, Nicholas, *Lancashire Quakers and the Establishment 1660-1720* (Halifax, 1993)

Morland, Steven, C. (ed.) *Somersetshire Quarterly Meeting 1668-99* (Somerset Record Society, 1978).

Mullett, Michael, (ed.), *Early Lancaster Friends* (University of Lancaster, occasional paper, 1978)

Michael Mullett, (ed.), *New Light on George Fox 1624-1691* (York, 1993)

Nickalls, John L., *Journal of George Fox*, (Cambridge, 1952,

reprinted, London, 1986)

Nuttall, Geoffrey, F., *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (Chicago, 1947, new edition Chicago, 1992).

Nuttall, Geoffrey, F., *Studies in Christian Enthusiasm Illustrated from Early Quakerism*, (Pennsylvania, 1948).

O'Malley, Thomas, '"Defying the Powers and Tempering the Spirit". A Review of Quaker Control over their Publications 1672-1689' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 33 (1982), pp. 72-88

Penney, Norman, (ed.), *Extracts from State Papers Relating to Friends 1654-1672* (London, 1913)

Penney, Norman, (ed.), *The Journal of George Fox* (Cambridge, 1911), 2 vols..

Penney, Norman (ed.) *The Short Journal and Itinerary Journals of George Fox* (London, 1925)

Quine, E.K.L., 'The Quakers in Leicestershire 1648-1780', University of Nottingham Ph.D., 1968

Reay, Barry, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (London, 1988).

Reay, Barry, 'Quaker Opposition to Tithes 1652-1660', *Past and Present*, 86 (1980), pp. 99-117.

Reay, Barry, 'The Quakers and 1659: two newly discovered broadsheets by Edward Burrough' *Journal of the Friend's Historical Society*, 54 (1977), pp. 101-111.

Ross, Isabel, Margaret Fell, *Mother of Quakerism* (London, 1949).

Russell, E, *The History of Quakerism* (Richmond, Indiana, 1979)

Rutt, J.T., (ed.), *Diary of Thomas Burton*, 2 vols. (New York, 1974)

Scott, D.A., 'Politics, Dissent and Quakerism in York 1640-1700', University of York, D.Phil, 1990

Scott, David, *Quakerism in York 1650-1720* (University of York Borthwick Paper No. 80: 1991).

Stroud, John L., 'The History of Quaker Education in England 1647-1903', University of Leeds thesis, 1944.

Toon, Peter, (ed.), *Puritans the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology 1600-1660* (Cambridge and London,

1970)

Trevett, Christine, *Women and Quakerism in the 17th Century* (York, 1995)

Trowell, Stephen, 'George Keith: Post Restoration Theology and the Experience of Defeat', *Bulletin of John Rylands University of Manchester*, 76 (1994), pp. 119-137

Trueblood, D. Elton, *Robert Barclay* (New York, 1968)

Tyacke, Nicholas, review of J.C. Davis, *Fear Myth and History, History of European Ideas*, 9 (1988), p. 606.

Underwood, A.C., *A History of the English Baptists* (London, 1947).

Underwood, T.L., 'The Controversy between the Baptists and the Quakers in England 1650-1689: A Theological Elucidation', University of London, Ph.D., 1965

Vann, R.T., *The Social Development of Quakerism 1655-1755* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1969).

Watts, M.R., *The Dissenters* (Oxford, 1978).

Weber, Max, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans. A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (London, 1947, repr., London, 1964).

White, B.R., *The English Baptists of the 17th Century* (London, 1978)

Whiting, C.E., *Studies in English Puritanism from the Restoration to the Revolution 1660-1668* (London, 1931)

Wing, Donald, *Short Title Catalogue of Books*, 3 vols., (New York, 1982-1994, 2nd edition).

Wykes, David, L., 'Friends, Parliament and the Toleration Act', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 45 (1994), pp. 42-63.

