

ELIZABETH BATHURST'S SOTERIOLOGY  
AND A LIST OF CORRECTIONS IN  
SEVERAL EDITIONS OF HER WORKS

Yasuharu Nakano  
University of Birmingham, England

ABSTRACT

Elizabeth Bathurst (1655–1685) was one of few Quaker systematic theologians in the Restoration. Her soteriology showed a pattern of traditional Quakerism common to earlier and contemporary Quakers like Fox and Barclay. However, her theology created a different theological atmosphere from them, in that she stoutly insisted on the sole authority of the Light and on the infallibility of human beings guided by the Holy Spirit against mainstream Quakerism after the 1660s. The first part of this paper briefly introduces the soteriology of Bathurst together with her understanding of human nature. In the second part, many citation errors from the Bible in Bathurst's works are examined and compiled as a list of corrections to call editors' and publishers' attention to rough handling of research materials in the field of Quaker studies and publishing.

KEYWORDS

Elizabeth Bathurst; Restoration Quakerism; soteriology; the Light; authority; citation errors

INTRODUCTION

This paper is constituted of two parts. The first part briefly introduces the soteriology of Elizabeth Bathurst together with her understanding of human nature. This has not been closely explored by previous scholarship, and it is hoped that this article will stimulate further discussion on her theology. Insofar as Christian soteriology deals with the relationships between God and human beings in the scheme of so-called *die Heilsgeschichte* (Salvation History), which begins with the Creation and the Fall of Adam, and ends with the perfection of the Kingdom through the redemptive work of Christ, it can be said that the matter of salvation closely reflects on, and covers, humanity's self-understanding of its own nature. Looking at her theology from this angle provides new perspectives on the theological characteristics of second-generation Quakerism after the Restoration,

ideological shifts as well as the particular mood in a Quaker Meetings at that time. In particular, her position can be seen more clearly by comparison with that of earlier and contemporary theologians, especially Robert Barclay (1648-1690). The view shown in this paper is that Bathurst's theology centres on the insistence on the sole authority of the Inward Light and on the infallibility of human beings guided by the infallible working of the Spirit, and that this position sits in opposition to mainstream Quakerism after the Restoration.

The second part shows that each edition of her published works contains a lot of errors, misprinting and miscopying, especially in terms of Scriptural sources, (some of which were modified in the later editions). Of course, Bathurst's own mistakes in citing the Bible are included in these mistakes, but regrettably, many of them are probably introduced by later publishers and editors. It holds true of the newest edition of her works in *Hidden in Plain Sight* (from here, referred to as HPS).<sup>1</sup> This is a case study of Bathurst's works only in terms of the citations from the Bible, but such a roughness in handling materials cannot only be seen in other places in Bathurst's writings, but might be a common tendency of Quaker publications.

#### PART I: BATHURST'S SOTERIOLOGY AND ITS EMPHASIS ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE LIGHT

Bathurst was a contemporary of Barclay, a leading theologian in the period of the Restoration, and she was also one of few systematic writers of Quakerism throughout its history. She was born in 1655 and became a Quaker in 1678.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately, she was not endowed with physical health for the whole of her life but, by using her mastery of the Bible, she wrote a systematic theological work, *Truth's Vindication* (published in 1679). Posthumously, this was republished as her collected works *Truth Vindicated*, which was compiled together with testimonies about Bathurst and her other papers, *An Expostulatory Appeal to the Professors* and *The Saying of Women* in 1691. These writings of hers were intended to urge members of Quaker Meetings to turn to the Lord and to clear away theological suspicions against Quakerism from outside. In these works, she strongly presents Quaker soteriology together with similar and different understandings of human nature in comparison with earlier and contemporary Quakerism, especially Barclay's theology—namely, the same emphasis of self-denial as the way to salvation—but her simple understanding of perfection as a linear process, and her insistence on the infallibility of human beings makes crucially different theological points.

According to Bathurst, human beings were originally created after the image of God and they had the beautiful nature of God, but unfortunately 'by yielding to the Tempter, went out from the first Nature'.<sup>3</sup> As a result, they came to be a stranger to the divine life, and 'had not Power to do any thing to appease [God]'.<sup>4</sup> That is, human beings are not able to save themselves even if they want to, nor are they able to think good things by themselves.<sup>5</sup> This is because human free will is corrupted and 'naturally froward and averse to anything spiritually good'.<sup>6</sup>

Thus, Bathurst starts her arguments on *die Heilsgeschichte* from the same theme of totally depraved the human condition in the world, as earlier and contemporary Friends like George Fox (1624-1691) and Barclay did.<sup>7</sup> How, then, can human beings be redeemed out of such a miserable state? She gives an answer to this question, asserting that the Principle of Light was given to all people through Christ's death for reconciliation with God.<sup>8</sup> That is, if they believe in the Light, receive and keep its workings in their hearts during the day of visitation, they will be 'called, justified and saved'.<sup>9</sup> This is almost the same motif used by Fox and Barclay, namely obedience to the Light as the way to salvation.

From here, however, Bathurst's arguments take a different line. Specifically, she put more emphasis on, and devotes many pages in her writings to, the denial of human will and subjection of the self to Christ,<sup>10</sup> expounding that it should be a time of agony and sadness, which we have to experience before our victory over sin.<sup>11</sup> She says, 'all that have sinned, must know a time of Sorrow'.<sup>12</sup> And '...first they must come to know a passing through Judgment, and their works must be burnt'.<sup>13</sup> She also argues concerning the relations between human mind and the Spirit of God:

Operation of the Spirit (or Principle of God within) is not, nor cannot be known without a being centred down into the same... [T]he Spirit's first work is, to convince of Sin,... [B]efore Remission of Sins comes to be known, there must be a centring down into the Manifestation of the Spirit of God within, which will bring down every exalted Imagination, and every high Thing, and lay it Low, even to the Ground; that so every Thought may be brought into Subjection to Jesus Christ.<sup>14</sup>

It is not clear what Bathurst actually means by the words 'centred down' or 'centring down', but she apparently recognises that it is necessary for humanity to be humbled before the remission of sin and salvation by Christ. She says, 'it appears by Scripture, that Christians were exercised in Fear and Trembling, (together with Humility, Patience and Self denial)'.<sup>15</sup> Of course, many earlier Quakers such as Fox, Isaac Pennington (1616-1679) and Francis Howgill (1618-1669) also had a difficult experience, as if crucified on the cross before their conviction,<sup>16</sup> but it is certain that Bathurst recognises and expresses more of a positive significance to sorrow for salvation. According to Tousley, this was one of the theological characteristics of second-generation Quakers, including Bathurst and Barclay: 'The conviction narratives of second-generation Friends follow the form of early Friends, but emphasise struggle with sin rather than the victory of regeneration'.<sup>17</sup>

As to Quaker perfectionism, Bathurst also goes in almost the same direction as Barclay but with several exceptions. That is to say, she maintains that Quakers believe in the perfection of saints, and that perfection is not only a command by Christ but also a promise to people to be fulfilled.<sup>18</sup> And she argues that perfection was even the end of Apostles' ministry, the end of God's appointment of teachers in church and the end of Christ's death on the cross.<sup>19</sup> So, she continues, 'those that deny Perfection to be attained by Lord's People do in effect deny Christ the one Offering'.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, she admits that even though believers

take part in God's Grace, they may fall out of the heavenly state.<sup>21</sup> Besides, this perfection of saints is not immediately but gradually attained by continually attending to the workings of the Light in their hearts; she says, 'it is a gradual Work, carried on by degrees in the Soul, which is not presently Compleat and Perfect'.<sup>22</sup> This position of hers seems to be exactly like Barclay's arguments on perfectionism. In Barclay's case, it is asserted, people can be perfect in this world by God's grace, but at the same time, perfection still has a room for further growth. Namely, perfection for Barclay is in the present tense (so to speak, *kairos*) and also in the future tense (*chronos*). For Bathurst, perfection is a gradual process as in orthodox Calvinism,<sup>23</sup> though Calvinists thought it only possible after the death of believers.<sup>24</sup> This is also reflected in her understanding of the Kingdom of God. In Bathurst's view, the way to the Kingdom within is a long and winding road; 'yet must we travel through the Spiritual Wilderness, before we arrive at the Heavenly Canaan'.<sup>25</sup> And the Kingdom without is expected to be realised after all the people in the world become faithful and perfect by following the Quaker model 'as a City set upon a Hill'.<sup>26</sup> The eschatological belief of Christ's imminent second coming in the 1640s, which spread abroad as the consciousness of the time and reached its peak in England during the Puritan Revolution,<sup>27</sup> driving early Quakers to the radical assertion of the end-time,<sup>28</sup> had rapidly receded after the Restoration.<sup>29</sup> Apparently, Bathurst felt the end-time had already receded like other contemporaries at that time,<sup>30</sup> and for her, the Kingdom is what humanity is waiting for, not experiencing immediately, in particular contrast to early Quakers.

The most significant difference concerning Bathurst's understanding of human nature is the matter of infallibility of the Spirit and of people guided by its workings. To be specific, Bathurst asserts that the Spirit of the Lord is infallible, a theological position which is common to Fox and Barclay.<sup>31</sup> However, she goes so far as to argue, 'They [Quakers] hold not themselves Infallible, as they are Men; but only as they are guided by the Infallible Spirit, namely, the Spirit of the Lord, a Measure of which he hath placed in all Men'.<sup>32</sup> In other words, she asserts that people led by the infallible Spirit are infallible. Fox himself did not clearly give any comments on the theme, and this point of her discussion makes a sharp contrast with Barclay's theology. Barclay says:

For it is one thing to affirm, that the true and undoubted revelation of God's Spirit is certain and infallible; and another thing to affirm, that this or that particular person or people is led infallibly by this revelation in what they speak or write, because they affirm themselves to be so led by the inward and immediate revelation of the Spirit. The first is only asserted by us, the latter may be called in question.<sup>33</sup>

In short, Bathurst optimistically claims the infallibility of humanity with the infallible Spirit, not taking into account the fact that there have been a lot of fanatics who pretend to be guided by God or the Spirit.<sup>34</sup> In contrast, Barclay clearly separates the Spirit and the Spirit's interaction with human subjectivity. Namely, he admits that human subjectivity is prone to misunderstanding, even though under the influence of infallible spiritual workings.<sup>35</sup> Therefore he urges people to examine their own personal subjective views through the Bible and

joint experience.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, this position of Bathurst's resonates with her view of the Bible. For her, the Bible is useful for believers' instruction and it directs 'unto him (to wit, Christ) who is the Object of our Faith, and Lord of Light and Life'.<sup>37</sup> However, 'inward Oracle...is of greater Authority...a more Perfect Rule to guide our lives, than the outward Writings of the Scriptures'.<sup>38</sup> Hence, the Bible is not called 'the Word and the Rule of Faith and Life'.<sup>39</sup> Such an attitude towards the Spirit and the Bible is not so distinct from that of the early Quakers, and Bathurst never mentions what to do if revelation and the Bible or other testimonies contradict each other. According to her logic, revelation is the primary authority. If so, she might allow people to justify anything they do under the name of God's revelation. This must have been considered to be inappropriate even by Quakers themselves just after the Nayler affair in 1656.<sup>40</sup>

To sum up, Bathurst followed almost the same pattern of earlier and contemporary Quakers as Fox and Barclay: the idea of depraved human nature, the Light given to all human beings by God through Christ's death and obedience to the Light as the way to salvation. However, she took a slightly different view on 'obedience' from early Quakers, placing more emphasis on the denial of human will and subjection of the self to Christ. That is, she asserted the necessity for human will and mind to be thrown down before the redemption of sin and salvation by Christ. On this point, it can be said that she went along with Barclay. But she also had a different understanding of human nature from Barclay; that is to say, her simple view of perfection with a sense of gradual and linear progress towards the Kingdom, and her insistence on the infallibility of humanity led by the infallible Spirit. Therefore, Bathurst presented the motif of self-denial as the key factor for salvation more than early Quakers, especially Fox, but she still had a simple understanding of humanity, given that she lived in the difficult time of the Restoration. In her book, there are descriptions of trouble between Bathurst and a Quaker Meeting, where her preaching was rejected by a certain leader of the Meeting.<sup>41</sup> The case is to be further investigated for details, but it is easy to imagine that this situation of the developing authority of a Meeting as organisation reinforced her theological counter-position of the Inward Light as the principal and highest authority, and humanity led by the Light as infallible. Unfortunately for her, it may be questioned how much power of persuasion or influence such a simple and optimistic view of human nature had within a Quaker circle at that time, when that eschatological sense of time underlying enthusiasm in the 1650s had already passed away, and a rethinking of Christian discipline within the movement was underway.

## PART II: A LIST OF COLLECTIONS OF HER WRITINGS IN EACH EDITION

In Bathurst's *Truth Vindicated* and its accompanying paper *The Sayings of Women* (the latter paper was published in 1683, so is not contained in the 1679 edition), there are many errors, especially in her indications of sources from the



The same kind of error is made on page 375 of HPS. *'Forasmuch as the Children are Partakers of the Flesh and Blood, he also took part of the same, that through Death, he might destroy him that had the power of Death, that is, the Devil'*. This sentence is from Heb. 2:14. This might be also attributed to Bathurst.

3. Gal. 3.14 (p. 358) → Gal. 3.24

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
Gal. 3.24	Gal. 3.24	Gal. 3.24	Gal. 3.24 (looks like Gal. 3.14 due to the battered print)	<b>Gal. 3.14</b>	Gal. 3.24	Gal. 3.24

Only HPS on page 358 makes an error in referring to Gal. 3.14. *'wherefore the Law was our School-Master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified (page 24) by Faith'*. This should be Gal. 3.24. This error probably occurred when the editors of HPS scanned the 1695 edition.

4. Acts 1.45 (p. 364) → Acts 1.4-5

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
<b>Acts 1.45</b>	<b>Acts 1.45</b>	<b>Acts 1.45</b>	<b>Acts 1.45</b>	<b>Acts 1.45</b>	<b>Acts 1.45</b>	<b>Acts 1.45</b>

Bathurst also made a mistake here. Acts 1.45 on page 364 of HPS should be Acts 1.4-5: *'And being assembled together with them, he commanded them, that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the Promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me; for John truly baptized with Water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence'*.

5. Rom. 4.17 (p. 368) → Rom. 14.17

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
Rom. 14.17	Rom. 14.17	Rom. 14.17	Rom. 14.17	<b>Rom. 4.17</b>	Rom. 14.17	Rom. 14.17

This error was made by the editors of HPS probably when scanning the original texts of the 1695 edition. Rom. 4.17 should be Rom. 14.17. *'The kingdom of God is not Meat, and Drink, but Righteousness, and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghost'*.

6. his Epistle to them in the 11th Verse of the same Chapter (2 Cor. 12.11) (p. 377.) → 2 Cor. 13.11

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
<b>2 Cor. 12.11</b>	<b>2 Cor. 12.11</b>	<b>2 Cor. 12.11</b>	<b>2 Cor. 12.11</b>	<b>2 Cor. 12.11</b>	<b>2 Cor. 12.11</b>	<b>2 Cor. 12.11</b>

As for this error, all the editions wrongly refer to 2 Cor. 12.11: *'Finally, Brethren, farewell, be perfect, & c'*. This sentence is actually from 2 Cor. 13.11. Therefore, this error could be attributed to Bathurst herself.

## 7. Isa. 4.9.6 (p. 382) → Isa. 49.6

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
Isa. 49.6	<b>Isa. 4.9.6</b>	<b>Isa. 4.9.6</b>	<b>Isa. 4.9.6</b>	<b>Isa. 4.9.6</b>	Isa. 49.6	Isa .49.6

This is a new pattern of error. The 1679 edition points to the correct scripture, but the next edition published in 1683 had Isa. 49.6 as Isa. 4.9.6, which continued until the 1695 edition and inevitably HPS. *‘It is a light thing that then shouldst be my Servant to raise up the Tribes of Jacob and to restore the Preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a Covenant to the Gentiles, that thou may’st be my Salvation (page 75 [sic]) to the Ends of the Earth’.*

## 8. 2 Pet. 11.9 (p. 384) → 2 Pet. 1.19

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
2 Pet. 1.19	<b>2 Pet. 11.9</b>	<b>2 Pet. 11.9</b>	<b>2 Pet. 11.9</b>	<b>2 Pet. 11.9</b>	<b>2 Pet. 11.9</b>	2 Pet. 1.19

This is the same pattern of error. The 1679 edition points to the correct scripture, 2 Pet. 1.19, but the next edition, 1683, made a mistake in making it 2 Pet. 11.9. This error continued until the 1731 edition. *‘yet it is that sure Word of Prophecy whereunto we do well take heed, as unto a Light that shineth in a dark place, until the Day dawn, and the Day-star arise in our Hearts’.*

## 9. Job 27.3 (p. 384) → Job 29.3

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
<b>Job 29.8</b>	<b>Job 27.3</b>	<b>Job 27.3</b>	<b>Job 27.3</b>	<b>Job 27.3</b>	<b>Job 27.3</b>	Job 29.3

This is another new pattern of error. Only the 1773 edition makes the correct reference to the scripture, Job 29.3. The first edition in 1679 wrongly has Job 29.8, and all other editions Job 27.3:<sup>49</sup> *‘It was by the Light that Job walked through Darkness’.*

## 10. Mt. 24.25 (p. 388) → Mt. 24.23–25

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
<b>Mt. 24.25</b>	<b>Mt. 24.25</b>	<b>Mt. 24.25</b>	<b>Mt. 24.25</b>	<b>Mt. 24.25</b>	<b>Mt. 24.25</b>	<b>Mt. 24.25</b>

This cannot be regarded as an error, but this sentence is actually related to the whole of Mt. 24.23–25. *‘they shall say, Lo here is Christ, and Lo he is there, but go yet not out after them, nor follow them; behold, I have told you before’.*

## 11. Jn 12.16 (p. 391) → Jn 12.36

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
Jn 12.36	<b>Jn 12.16</b>	<b>Jn 12.16</b>	<b>Jn 12.16</b>	<b>Jn 12.16</b>	<b>Jn 12.16</b>	Jn 12.36

The edition in 1679 correctly refers to the scripture, Jn 12.36, but the later editions, from 1683 to 1731, wrongly make it Jn 12.16. *‘Therefore while ye have Light, believe in the Light (saith Christ) that ye may become Children of the Light’.*



12. 1 Pet. 2.3 (p. 391) → 1 Pet. 1.23

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
1 Pet. 1.23	<b>1 Pet. 23</b>	<b>1 Pet. 23</b>	<b>1 Pet. 2.3</b>	<b>1 Pet. 2.3</b>	1 Pet. 1.23	1 Pet. 1.23

This is also a new pattern of error. The edition in 1679 makes the correct reference, 1 Pet. 1.23. The 1683 and 1691 editions change it to 1 Pet. 23. Moreover, the 1695 and HPS mistake the citation for 1 Pet. 2.3. This error is finally amended in 1731 and 1773. ‘And this Light is elsewhere called the Seed, even that Incorruptible Seed (*page 98 [sic]*) by which we are Begotten to God, and Born again by his Eternal Word, which liveth and abideth for ever.’

13. Acts 7.5 (p. 394) → Acts 7.51

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
Acts 7.51	<b>Acts 7.5</b>	<b>Acts 7.5</b>	<b>Acts 7.5</b>	<b>Acts 7.5</b>	<b>Acts 7.5</b>	Acts 7.51

This is a common error. The 1679 edition and the 1773 3rd edition point to the correct scripture, Acts 7.51, but all other editions wrongly refer to verse 5. ‘*Being Stiff-necked and Uncircumcised in Heart and Ears, always resisting the Holy Ghost*’.

14. 1 Jn 1.40 (p. 397) → 1 Jn 1.5

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
1 Jn 1.5	1 Jn 1.5 (looks like 1 Jn 1.9 due to ink bleed)	1 Jn 1.5 (looks like 1 Jn 1.9 due to ink bleed)	<b>1 Jn 1.9</b>	<b>1 Jn 1.40</b>	<b>1 Jn 1.9</b>	1 Jn 1.5

The error might originally have been the result of an ink bleed, making 1 Jn 1.5 look like 1 Jn 1.9 in the 1695 and 1731 editions. It is furthermore mistaken for 1 Jn 1.40 in HPS for unknown reasons. ‘God is the Author of it, *who is Light, and in him is no Darkness at all*’.

15. Ps. 104.1 (p. 397) → Ps. 104.2

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
<b>Ps. 104.1</b>	<b>Ps. 104.1</b>	<b>Ps. 104.1</b>	<b>Ps. 104.1</b>	<b>Ps. 104.1</b>	<b>Ps. 104.1</b>	Ps. 104.2

This error might have been made by Bathurst herself, which went on until the 1731 edition. Only the 3rd edition in 1773 makes the correct reference to the scripture, Ps. 104.2. ‘*for he covereth himself with Light, as with a Garment*’.

16. 1 Tim. 6.26 (p. 397) → 1 Tim. 6.16

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
<b>1 Tim. 6.26</b>	<b>1 Tim. 6.26</b>	<b>1 Tim. 6.26</b>	<b>1 Tim. 6.26</b>	<b>1 Tim. 6.26</b>	<b>1 Tim. 6.26</b>	1 Tim. 6.16

This is the same pattern of error, as above. Bathurst made a mistake in citing scripture, which went on until the 1731 edition. Only the 3rd edition in 1773 is rightly referring to 1 Tim. 6.16. ‘and *dwelleth in that Light which is inaccessible, which no mortal Eye can approach unto*’.

## 17. Isa. 66.1 (p. 409) → Isa. 61.3

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
Isa. 61.3	<b>Isa. 66.1</b>	<b>Isa. 66.1</b>	<b>Isa. 66.1</b>	<b>Isa. 66.1</b>	<b>Isa. 66.1</b>	Isa. 61.3

This is a common error. The edition in 1679 and the 3rd edition in 1773 refer to the correct scripture, Isa. 61.3, while all other editions make the citation Isa. 66.1. *'and appointeth to Zion's Mourners Beauty for Ashes, the Oyl of Joy for Mourning, and a Garment of Praises for the Spirit of Heaviness'*.

## 18. Rev. 22.12 (p. 409) → Rev. 22.13

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
Rev. 22.13	Rev. 22.13	Rev. 22.13	Rev. 22.13	<b>Rev. 22.12</b>	Rev. 22.13	Rev. 22.13

This mistake in HPS can probably be attributed to mis-scanning from the 1695 edition. *'the Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End. The First and the Last'*.

## 19. Rom. 7.13, 14 (p. 409) → Dan. 7.13-14

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
Dan. 7.13, 14	Dan. 7.13, 14	Dan. 7.13, 14	Dan. 7.13, 14	<b>Rom. 7.13, 14</b>	Dan. 7.13, 14	Dan. 7.13, 14

This is the same pattern of error as above, namely mis-scanning from the 1695 edition. But it is a more serious mistake, for this implies that editors of HPS did not double-check this passage after the transcription. *'the Ancient of Dayes; whose Dominion (page 114 [sic]) is an Everlasting Dominion, which shall not pass away, and his Kingdom, that which shall not be destroyed'*.

## 20. Jer. 5.21 (p. 416) → Jer. 5.21-22

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
<b>Jer. 5.21</b>	<b>Jer. 5.21</b>	<b>Jer. 5.21</b>	<b>Jer. 5.21</b>	<b>Jer. 5.21</b>	<b>Jer. 5.21</b>	Jer. 5.21, 22

This cannot be regarded totally as an error, but the citation actually includes Jer. 5.21 and 22. *'Hear now this, O foolish people, and without Understanding; which have eyes, and see not; which have Ears, and hear not: Fear ye not me, saith the Lord? Will ye not Tremble at my Presence?'*

## 21. Ps. 30.2, 13 (p. 425.) → Ps. 37.13

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
Ps. 37.12, 13	<b>Ps. 30.2, 13</b>	<b>Ps. 30.2, 13</b>	<b>Ps. 30.2, 13</b>	<b>Ps. 30.2, 13</b>	<b>Ps. 30.2, 13</b>	Ps. 37.13

This is a common error. The edition in 1679 and the 3rd edition in 1773 rightly refer to Ps. 37.13, while all other editions mistake it for Ps. 30.2.13. *'the Wicked will be plotting against; yet God will laugh at him, for he seeth that his Day is coming'*.

## 22. 2 Pet. 2.11, 12 (pp. 425–26) → 1 Pet. 2.11–12

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
1 Pet. 2.11, 12	<b>2 Pet.</b> <b>2.11, 12</b>	<b>2 Pet.</b> <b>2.11, 12</b>	<b>2 Pet.</b> <b>2.11, 12</b>	<b>2 Pet.</b> <b>2.11, 12</b>	<b>2 Pet.</b> <b>2.11, 12</b>	1 Pet. 2.11, 12

This is the same type of error as above. The correct scripture is 1 Pet. 2.11–12: ‘while we are strangers and Pilgrims on the Earth, to have our Conversation honest (and as much as in us lies inoffensive) amongst them that are (*page 187* [sic]) without; that whereas they speak against us as Evil-Doers, they may by the Good Works which they shall behold in us, *Glorifie God in the Day of their Visitation*’.

## 23. 1 Pet. 1.1 (p. 429) → 2 Pet. 1.1

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
2 Pet. 1.1	<b>1 Pet. 1.1</b>	<b>1 Pet. 1.1</b>	<b>1 Pet. 1.1</b>	<b>1 Pet. 1.1</b>	<b>1 Pet. 1.1</b>	2 Pet. 1.1

This is also the same pattern. ‘only by way of Remembrance, as knowing, none need teach us to love those who have received like precious Faith with us’.

## 24. 2 Thess. 4.9 (p.429.) → 1 Thess. 4.9

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
1 Thess. 4.9	<b>2 Thess.</b> <b>4.9</b>	<b>2 Thess.</b> <b>4.9</b>	<b>2 Thess.</b> <b>4.9</b>	<b>2 Thess.</b> <b>4.9</b>	<b>2 Thess.</b> <b>4.9</b>	1 Thess. 4.9

This type of error is repeated in all other editions except the first edition in 1679 and the 3rd edition. ‘For we are taught of God to *Love one another*’.

## 25. Jn 13.5 (p. 429) → Jn 13.35

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
<b>Jn 13.5</b>	<b>Jn 13.5</b>	<b>Jn 13.5</b>	<b>Jn 13.5</b>	<b>Jn 13.5</b>	<b>Jn 13.5</b>	Jn 13.35

This error can be attributed to Bathurst herself. Only the 3rd edition in 1773 refers to the correct place in the scripture, Jn 13.35. ‘by this shall all men know, that we are the *Disciples of Jesus Christ*’.

## 26. Gen. 31.10 (p. 431.) → Gen. 31.16

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
n/a	<b>Gen. 31.10</b>	<b>Gen. 31.10</b>	<b>Gen. 31.10</b>	<b>Gen. 31.10</b>	<b>Gen. 31.10</b>	Gen. 31.16

From here, the text goes into another work, *The Saying of Women*. The edition in 1679 does not have this text. The mistake starts from the edition in 1683 to the 1731 edition. Only the 3rd edition in 1773 refers to the correct scripture, Gen. 31.16. ‘*Now therefore whatsoever God hath said unto thee, do*’.

## 27. Judg. 11.26 (p. 432) → Judg. 11.36

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
n/a	<b>Judg.</b> <b>11.26</b>	<b>Judg.</b> <b>11.26</b>	<b>Judg.</b> <b>11.26</b>	<b>Judg.</b> <b>11.26</b>	<b>Judg.</b> <b>11.26</b>	Judg. 11.36

This is the same pattern of error. Only the 3rd edition makes the correct reference to the scripture, Judg. 11.36, while all other editions mistake it for Judg. 11.26. *'As thou hast opened thy Mouth unto the Lord, so do unto me according to what hath proceeded out of thy Mouth, for as much as the Lord hath taken Vengeancefor thee on thine Enemies, even of the Children of Ammon'*.

28. Judg. 13.7 (p. 432) → Judg. 13.6-7

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
n/a	<b>Judg. 13.7</b>	<b>Judg. 13.7</b>	<b>Judg. 13.7</b>	<b>Judg. 13.7</b>	<b>Judg. 13.7</b>	Judg. 13.6, 7

This is also the same pattern. The correct scripture is Judg. 13.6-7. *'A Man of God came unto me, and his Countenance was like the Countenance of an Angel of God, very terrible; but I asked him not whence he was, neither told he me his Name; but he said unto me, Behold thou shalt conceive and bear (page 205 [sic]) a Son; and now drink no Wine, nor strong Drink, neither eat any unclean thing, for the Child shall be a Nazarite to God from the Womb, to the day of his Death'*.

29. 2 Kgs 5.23 (p. 434) → 2 Kgs 5.3

1679	1683	1691	1695	HPS	1731	3rd (1773)
n/a	<b>2 Kgs 5.23</b>	<b>2 Kgs 5.23</b>	<b>2 Kgs 5.23</b>	<b>2 Kgs 5.23</b>	<b>2 Kgs 5.23</b>	2 Kgs 5.3

The last mistake is also of the same pattern. The correct scripture is 2 Kgs 5.3. *'Would God, my Lord were with the Prophet that is in Samaria, for he would recover him of his Leprosie'*.

Thus, there are many errors in Bathurst's works, even as far as just the citations from the Bible in HPS are concerned. We have to note that there might be more errors in her writings, not only in terms of the citation from the Bible. As seen above, some errors might be attributed to Bathurst herself, but many of them were probably made by later publishers and editors themselves. Regrettably, these mistakes are carried over to the newest version in HPS, and, furthermore, new errors are added there, which may be caused by mis-scanning the original texts in the 1695 edition. It appears that the editors of HPS have never double-checked the texts. With a computer and Bible software, it is now quite easy to do this. It is to be hoped that future editors and publishers will be more careful in handling their research materials in order to further develop and improve Quaker Studies in the future.

## NOTES

1. Garman, M., Applegate, J., Benefiel, M., and Meredith, D. (eds.), *Hidden in Plain Sight: Quaker Women's Writings 1650-1700*, Wallingford, PA: Pendle Hill Publications, 1996. This book is a collection of Quaker women's writings in the seventeenth century, and here Elizabeth Bathurst's *Truth Vindicated* (1695) and *The Saying of Women* (1695) are included.

2. Abbott, M.P., Chijioko, M.E., Dandelion, P., Oliver, J.W., Jr. (eds.), *Historical Dictionary of the Friends (Quakers)*, Lanham, MD: Oxford: The Scarecrow Press, 2003, p. 22. Mack, P.,

*Visionary Women, Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1992, p. 312.

3. Bathurst, E., *Truth Vindicated*, in HPS, p. 397. This is a reprint of the edition published by T. Sowle in London in 1695, omitting testimonies about Bathurst and another paper, *An Expostulatory Appeal to the Professors*.

4. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 398.

5. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 369.

6. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 370.

7. Nickalls, J.L. (ed.), *The Journal of George Fox*, rev. ed., Philadelphia: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 1997, pp. 121-22, 367, 727. See also the Chapter 4 in Barclay, R., *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity*, Stereotype ed., Philadelphia: Friends' Book Store, 1908.

8. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, pp. 403, 412-13.

9. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, pp. 363, 394, 382, 402.

10. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, pp. 370, 413.

11. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 407.

12. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 404.

13. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 407.

14. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, pp. 403-404.

15. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 417.

16. Dandelion, P., *The Liturgies of Quakerism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 15-17. For another example, Richard Hubberthone (1628-62) explicitly asserted, '...[man] is separated from God and knoweth not any of his ways; but when the Lord revealeth any of his ways within man, man must die and know his ways no more, but must "be led in a way which he knoweth not," contrary to his will, contrary to his wisdom, contrary to his reason, and to his carnal mind' (Damrosch, L., *The Sorrows of the Quaker Jesus: James Nayler and the Puritan Crackdown on the Free Spirit*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996, pp. 108-10).

17. Tousley, N.C., 'The Experience of Regeneration and Erosion of Certainty in the Theology of Second-Generation Quakers: No Place for Doubt?' *Quaker Studies* 13/1 (2008), p. 36. This work is useful in that it contains data about different thoughts and positions of first- and second-generation Quakers.

18. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, pp. 376, 422.

19. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 377.

20. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 377. Remarkably, Bathurst also placed emphasis on the imputation of Christ's righteousness along with imparted righteousness of believers. This was quite unusual for Quaker theology (Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 359).

21. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 375.

22. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, pp. 421-22.

23. This view of gradual perfection was another theological characteristic of second-generation Quakers (Tousley, 'The Experience', p. 37).

24. Macpherson, J. (ed.), *The Westminster Confession of Faith*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1977, p. 64.

25. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 421.

26. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 426.

27. See 'Millenarianism', in Livingstone, E.A. (eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed., New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

28. As to Fox, N. (ed.), *Journal*, pp. 121-23, 135, 261.

29. Garret, C., *Respectable Folly: Millenarians and the French Revolution in France and England*, Baltimore, MD/London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975, p. 125.

30. For instance, Barclay apparently thought the end-time to have already receded, given that he made distinct a visible church [a certain number of persons gathered by God's Spirit] from the invisible church [the one catholic church,] which would finally comprehend the whole world (Barclay, *Apology*, pp. 262-65). Such division is not there in Fox's discussion. This implies, Barclay thinks, that there is a temporal separation between now and the end-time.

31. Nickalls (ed.), *Journal*, p. 495.
32. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 379.
33. Barclay, *Apology*, p. 58.
34. For example, Barclay expresses the coming of the Kingdom in the progressive or present form, not the perfect form (Barclay, *Apology*, pp. 172–73, 279, 542).
35. Barclay, *Apology*, p. 68.
36. Barclay, *Apology*, pp. 26, 89.
37. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 351.
38. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 353.
39. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated*, p. 352.
40. This affair of Naylor sparked the outrage of the political and religious elites against Quakers at that time. The behaviour of Naylor and his followers was regarded as blasphemy against God, and at the same time a great threat to national authority (Reay, B., *The Quakers and the English Revolution*, London: Temple Smith, 1985, p. 54). The Parliament severely punished Naylor and used this chance to suppress the growing movement of Quakerism, setting up several anti-Quaker laws which came to a climax with new legislations such as the Clarendon Code (1661–65). After the Restoration, Quaker leaders, especially Fox, had to constrain fanatic behaviours within the movement, and to establish institutional disciplines, lessening the relative primacy of the Spirit's authority, so as to defend the integrity of the Quaker movement. This incident showed the risk of overly stressing personal revelation within the Quaker movement (Moore, R., *The Light in their Consciences: Early Quakers in Britain 1646–1666*, University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000, pp. 167, 215, 222–23. For the details of the Naylor affair and its aftermath, see Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution*, pp. 54–57. And see also Chapters 3, 4, and 5 in Damrosch, *The Sorrows of the Quaker Jesus*). On this point, it might be said that Bathurst had a naïve understanding of human nature and could not find a role appropriate to the needs of the times.
41. Bathurst, E., *Truth Vindicated*, 3rd ed., London: Mary Hinde, 1773, pp. 36–39.
42. All the scriptures indicated below in the table and comments are from the King James Version (from here, referred to as KJV).
43. Bathurst, E., *Truth's Vindication*, London: n.p., 1679.
44. Bathurst, E., *Truth Vindicated*, London: Andrew Sowle, 1683.
45. Bathurst, E., *Truth Vindicated*, London: T. Sowle, 1691.
46. Bathurst, E., *Truth Vindicated*, London: T. Sowle, 1695.
47. Bathurst, E., *Truth Vindicated*, London: F. Sowle, 1731.
48. Bathurst, *Truth Vindicated* (1773).
49. The underlining here means that the editions from 1683 to 1731 make a different mistake from that of the 1679 edition.

#### AUTHOR DETAILS

Yasuharu Nakano is a PhD student in the Centre for Postgraduate Quaker Studies at the University of Birmingham. His masters and doctoral work focus on the theology of Robert Barclay. He has previously published 'The Role of Free Will in the Universal Redemption of Quakerism; based mainly on R. Barclay's *Apology*, in *Studies in Christianity* 67.1 (Kyoto: Society of Christian Studies, 2005).

Mailing address: 582-105 Shimogawara-cho, Nakagyo-ku, Kyoto-city, Kyoto, Japan 604-8354. Email: hiob@mbp.ocn.ne.jp.