

## MUGGLETONIAN–QUAKER DEBATES

Richard Bailey  
Queen's University (Kingston), Canada

### ABSTRACT

The Quaker Christ within necessitated a belief in the immortal soul that was identified with the pre-existent Christ whose body of 'flesh and bone' was an immaterial uncreated substance. The Muggletonians stood well within the tradition of orthodoxy by advocating for a Christ whose glorified body of flesh was confined to the bodily form of a man. Fox's Christ might have been truer to the earliest traditions of Christianity established by St. Paul who was deeply influenced by Greek thought but by the time we reach the seventeenth century Fox was well outside the fold of theological orthodoxy. As long as Fox was alive he and the majority of his followers were considered to hold grossly unorthodox, unbalanced and even blasphemous views about Christ. By focusing on the debates between Quakers and adversaries such as the Muggletonians it becomes apparent that the controversy created by differing ideas of what constituted 'divine eternal unchangeable substance' was both fundamental and irreconcilable.

### KEYWORDS

Lodowick Muggleton, John Reeve, George Fox, Christology, substance, witchcraft.

Using the forum of debate to reconstruct theological opinion can be a useful and productive exercise. Kate Peters said, with respect to the Quaker debates with Puritans, that these exchanges 'have often been described by scholars as a unique category or genre of tract, and have been studied separately in order to understand the nature of Quaker theology...' (Peters 2005: 153). By engaging Quaker debates with adversaries such as the Muggletonians<sup>1</sup> we learn a great deal about vastly different ways of thinking about the person of God and Christ.<sup>2</sup>

The Muggletonian conception of God as a man was the first of six Muggletonian 'Foundations' or 'Heads'.<sup>3</sup> 'God's Form is spiritual, heavenly, and glorious, yet in the Form of a Man' (Reeve and Muggleton 1758: 26). No spirit can exist without a body. In a January 1668 letter to the Quaker Elizabeth Hooten, Muggleton said Quakers denied his 'five foot high' God in heaven. He then cursed and damned Elizabeth Hooten to hell (Delamaine 1755: 339-40).<sup>4</sup> William Penn would later

charge that Muggleton's anthropomorphizing of God was 'blasphemous, ignorant, and sottish' for 'If God were a Person of mans stature; it would destroy his ubiquity or omnipresence' (Penn 1672: 8, 10).<sup>5</sup> In a 1668 letter to the Muggletonian Dorothy Carter, Muggleton raised some matters about a discourse he had with George Whitehead and Josiah Coale in which Coale accused Muggleton of believing 'God is in the Form of a Man' (Delamaine 1755: 367). Muggleton said he detested the notion of Christ within 'as his skin could hold, it was even ready to crack with that conceited Light of a bodiless Christ within him' (Delamaine 1755: 371). Terrible words were spoken on both sides during this encounter. They can be found in Muggleton's autobiography (Underwood 1999: 99–105). Later, in 1674 Muggleton said to the Quaker Isabella Malum that Quakers believed that God was 'an infinite Spirit without a Body' (Delamaine 1755: 133, 141). And the same year in a letter to the Quaker John Gratton, Muggleton denounced the Quaker doctrines that there is no God but the God within and that spirits are bodiless. To believe in a God without a body like a man was to believe in an 'imaginary God' (Delamaine 1755: 484). The debates between the Muggletonians and the Quakers did not have the same soteriological emphasis as the debates between the Puritans and the Quakers although the notion that God was a bodiless spirit living within had obvious soteriological consequences.<sup>6</sup> The Muggletonian attack on Quakers focused more on discrediting the notion of bodiless spirits. Reeve and Muggleton were apocalyptists who were seriously perturbed that Fox denied the second *bodily* coming of Christ.<sup>7</sup>

The clearest statement of Muggletonian views about God appears in John Reeve's 1654 *Epistle to the Earl of Pembroke* (Philip, 5th Earl of Pembroke; see Reeve 1856: 53–68). The Earl had befriended Henry More and Lady Anne Conway and according to Edward Burrough and Francis Howgill he frequented Quaker meetings in London (Barclay 1841: 59). According to Reeve he said that God was a 'vast bodiless spirit' (Reeve 1856: 66). Reeve countered by declaring that Christ was 'a glorified body of flesh and bone, in the likeness of a man and is essentially distinct from men and angels to all eternity; and the compass or substance of His glorious person is no bigger than a mans, and the essence of it is but in one place at once' (Reeve 1856: 66). God's '*Essence or personal Substance*' (emphasis mine) was circumscribed by a circumference no larger than a man's and could only be resident in one place at a time although God's power was omnipresent (Reeve 1856: 56).

The Quaker John Harwood, answering a claim made by the erstwhile Presbyterian, Baptist, Ranter turned Muggletonian Laurence Claxton (Clarkson) that a spirit could not move or see without a body, said that nowhere in Scripture was it said that 'the Spirit is nothing without a body'—not even the Papists held such a doctrine (Harwood 1659: 6; Claxton 1659: 29).<sup>8</sup> The God which Harwood experienced ('I see and know him') was nothing less than 'an Eternal Spirit, a *devine substance*'. Harwood said that Muggleton knew nothing about 'devine eternal unchangeable substance' which is 'the Spirit which gives everything its being, body or form... though thou would have the form, the body, to be the substance of the Spirit' (Harwood 1659: 6–7). Muggleton was confusing physical form with the spirit that enlivened that form according to Harwood. There was an important distinction

between how the Muggletonian witnesses viewed spiritual substance, or in Reeve's phrase the 'glorified Body of Flesh and Bone' of Christ (Delamaine 1755: 57) and how Quakers viewed the glorified flesh and bone of Christ. The point where the debate broke down was along the one great fissure of divine eternal unchangeable substance.

In order to effectively counter Fox's powerful claims to equality with God based upon the premise of the Christ within Reeve and Muggleton mounted a challenge to discredit the doctrinal accuracy of what they thought of as a 'heathenish' view of bodiless spirits as extendable immaterial substances. A spiritual body had to be *felt and handled*. Nor could spirit and body (the form) be separated. Nor was it reasonable to have Christ's glorified body existing within the bodies of Quakers. The Muggletonian understanding of divine substance precluded any notion of one body inhabiting another. Indeed it was a bizarre thought.

In the seventh of an unpublished collection of John Reeve's letters<sup>9</sup> which Nigel Smith treats as a true statement of Muggletonian views about the Quaker tendency to dissociate spirit from substance (Smith 1989: 240), Reeve's warning against the 'heathenish' notion that spirits could be bodiless is reminiscent of St. Paul's warning about vain speculations in Col. 2:8. Reeve questioned how something immaterial could even be called a substance (Reeve 1654: 11-14).<sup>10</sup> He equated substance with *form* and *body*. Christ had form and body even in his glorified state. Quakers agreed that Christ had a body. But their notion of substance was one that included *substantial immaterial body*, the only body that could possibly inhabit the mortal frame. For example in a letter sent by Samuel Hooton and William Smith to Lodowick Muggleton they said that 'the treasure in earthen vessels' is the '*Flesh and Bone and Blood* of Christ' which is '*manifest within us*' (Muggleton 1663: 8-9, emphasis mine). Hooton was affirming the widely held Quaker view on divine substance. George Fox and James Nayler said the glorified flesh of Christ was 'a substance' (Fox 1659: 247; Nayler 1656: 48). Francis Howgill said that the *immaterially fleshed* body of Christ inhabited the saints (Howgill 1659: 23). This was the language they used. It was Christ's bodily presence within the saints that enabled them to speak in the person of Christ. 'I have heard', said Muggleton, 'that an Ambassador hath represented the person of a King, and his speech by vertue of a Commission from the King is in the Kings stead, but the Ambassador is not in the Kings person, though he represents the Kings person, the Kings person is at a great distance from his Messenger' (Muggleton 1668: 63). The Quakers on the other hand 'will either get into Christs body, or else Christ must get into Quakers bodies, so that no man can tell how to part them one from another' (Muggleton 1668: 61). According to Muggleton this erroneous thinking was a direct result of the belief that God was bodiless Spirit. If, in Muggleton's view, the selfsame body that Christ had while on earth rose to Heaven, how was it possible that the Quakers should 'get Christ within them' since his body 'though a spiritual body now in heaven' was still a distinct body with form and shape (Muggleton 1663: 22).

Differing views on how *substance* was constituted had a predictable outcome with respect to differing views on Christ's resurrection. Fox said that 'Quakers are Witnesses of Christ's death and Suffering, and do not deny his Flesh and Bones, who

remain in the Heavens until the restitution of all things, and they are Heires of the power of an endless Life; and are *flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone*' (Fox 1667: 6, 10, emphasis mine). To affirm that the body of the glorified Christ is in heaven until the final restitution of all things and at the same time affirm that Quakers are of Christ's flesh and bone prompted this response from Muggleton in *A Looking-Glass for George Fox*:

Here Fox shews himself to be a meer Juggler, for he confesses Christ hath a body, but never confesses that this body of Christ is at a distance from the Quakers...the Quakers believe their flesh and bone is that body which the Spirit of Christ doth dwell in... Now will any man be so senseless to think this body of Christ to be within a man? for he that can get Christs body of flesh and bone into him, he will get the fulness of the God-head also into him, so that he that can do this will be a God, and not a man (Muggleton 1668: 23-24).

Muggleton correctly understood that Fox's Christ inhabited a heaven within.

Disembodied spirits are also a profound challenge to ordinary human experience. Reeve and Muggleton said 'there never was any Spirit without a body or Person... the invisible Spirit...can never be seen or known, but through a visible Body or Person' (Reeve and Muggleton 1832: 85). Spirit and body can never be de-linked. As Reeve explained, the soul 'is so essentially one with its Body, being both produced together by natural Generation, that it is utterly incapable of any Kind of Life without it. Thus the Soul is fixed to the Body' (Reeve and Muggleton 1751: 10).<sup>11</sup> To imply that the soul was immortal was to imply that it could have a separate existence from the body after death which was the Quaker belief. In the *Witch of Endor* Muggleton unequivocally stated that spiritual bodies must be 'felt and handled'. A spirit without a body that can be felt or handled is a deception, the product of witchcraft (Muggleton 1669: 24-28, 33, 49-50). The soul and body (both mortal) are so essentially one at birth that it is 'impossible to divide them in Death' (Reeve and Muggleton 1751: 25-26; Muggleton 1669: 29, 32). At death the soul enters into a deep sleep which Reeve called a 'dead sleep' (Reeve and Muggleton 1751: 25). For seventeenth century advocates of psychopannychism (soul sleep) like Reeve and Muggleton the mortal soul remained in a dead sleep until the final quickening at the resurrection when the mortal body and soul would rise together, a view to be distinguished from St. Augustine's idea that a sentient immortal soul was separated from the body at death and reunited with the body at the resurrection. The Quaker Christ which in the words of Muggleton is 'a spirit without a body' inside the Quakers' bodies and which 'slipped out of their bodies at death' and returned to 'Gods vast Spirit' was no more than allegory according to Muggleton and 'a riddle to the Prophet Muggleton' according to Fox (Muggleton 1668: 45-46; Fox 1667: 14). Fox's pre-existent Christ within was not an allegory as Muggleton inferred. The Inner Christ was the real Christ, that which was more excellent and unailing. It was the true Christ. There was no other. However, the sufferings, death, and resurrection of the historical Jesus were an 'allegory', to use Muggleton's term, of what every Quaker personally experienced within.

Muggletonian mortalism necessitated the mortal soul dying with the mortal body as a prerequisite for the equally necessary bodily resurrection (Reeve 1654: 4). And it was equally a precondition for God becoming mortal and dying in order to fully share in the human condition. The same principle of associating spirit and body applied to the God-man Christ as it did to the saints (Muggleton 1669: 28). The Muggletonians were at all times mindful to ensure that God's body and spirit, either in its 'eternall spirituall forme' or in its body of 'pure mortalitie' were never de-linked (Reeve and Muggleton 1653: 3). The logic of the Muggletonian emphasis on the bodily form of God necessitated the immortal God being transmuted into pure mortality, dying and then miraculously coming to life again.<sup>12</sup> The Elect would have a similar experience, dying physically and spiritually, and at the resurrection would 'possesse glorious bodies of the same divine nature of our God and Father' (Reeve and Muggleton 1653: 4). Quakers, with their undivided Christ within, were able to escape the meta-physical acrobatics that accompanied the Muggletonian explanation for how God became man and died and was resurrected. The human Jesus died and remained dead while the pre-existent Christ (the Godhead) remained universally present and known to everyone who was awakened to the bodily (as Quakers understood 'bodily') presence of Christ within.

It was what Fox said about Christ's bodiless Spirit indwelling the saints that rankled Muggleton. Christ must be 'manifested *in* his people' said Fox, otherwise they would be unable to see Him, the very image of the Father (Fox 1667: 25, cf. 22). How, asked many a Quaker, can you see and commune with a Christ who is locked up in a distant heaven? That would imply conjuration and hence witchcraft.<sup>13</sup> The charge of witchcraft came from both sides. Two views of what comprised spiritual substance were in irreconcilable conflict. Muggleton's God was tangible and touchable. Fox's God was an intangible, physically untouchable substance that was extended throughout the universe 'for the Scripture saith, That God is a Spirit. And Christ saith, That a Spirit hath not flesh and bone as I have. And, God fills Heaven and Earth; God saith so of himself' (Fox 1667: 14). Muggleton queried Quakers about what exactly they worshipped if not the external Christ:

Where does the Scripture say that God is an infinite Spirit without a body? The Scripture saith, God is infinite, and so he is. Also the Scripture saith, God is a Spirit, and will be worshipped in spirit and truth: but it is not said, God is a Spirit without a body for I say that if a man may worship God in spirit and truth in this his natural body, as the disciples of Christ did in their natural bodies, and as I my self do in my natural body, then of necessity it will follow that God hath a spiritual body, whereby I may worship him, else I shall worship I know not what, as you Quakers do (Muggleton 1668: 65).

Muggleton's 'no-damn-nonsense' (Hill, Reay and Lamont 1983: 102) pragmatism was offended by Fox's idea that God was an infinite bodiless Spirit. Muggleton was trying to demonstrate that the Quakers, like the early disciples, were deceived into thinking that 'Spirits can walk without bodies' (Muggleton 1668: 40). The disciples were dumbfounded when they saw the resurrected Christ who finally had to encourage them to *feel* and *handle* him 'for a Spirit hath not flesh and bone as I have'.

In his book *Joyful News from Heaven*, John Reeve inquired about Christ's words that 'a spirit hath not flesh and bones'. No spirit could have life without a distinct body to manifest it (Reeve and Muggleton 1751: 30–31). Muggleton queried Quakers about the body of the risen Christ which the disciples felt and handled:

No Spirit can appear without a body, for a Spirit without a body is a meer shadow presented to your fantasie through your ignorance, as if Christ should say, do not believe that Spirits can walk without bodies, there is no such thing, it is but a meer shadow you suppose to be a Spirit, but come to me, and feel me, and handle me, for a shadow as you take or think to be a Spirit, hath not flesh and bone, nor is of no substance as I am...now I would fain know of the Quakers what became of this flesh and bone of Christ, where it went, or where it is now? Sure you Quakers will say this flesh and bone of Christ is within you, neither will you acknowledge that the flesh and bone which is the body of Christ risen from the dead, to be now in Heaven above the stars distinct of himself (Muggleton 1668: 39–40).

The Muggletonian query about what became of the Christ whom the disciples *touched* had merit. Christ would seem to have dispelled any doubts about whether a spirit could be bodiless. His disciples even watched as his glorified body rose above the clouds.

Biblical scholar Robert M. Grant offered a solid historical context for the debate. According to Grant the question concerning what kind of a body would rise from the dead was a question left unsettled by primitive Christianity (Grant 1948: 123). In the Early Church those who believed Jesus' risen body was spiritual also believed the bodies of the risen saints would be spiritual. Those who believed Jesus' risen body was flesh also believed the risen bodies of the saints would be of the flesh (Grant 1948: 123). Matthew and especially Luke had a strong sense of the materiality of Jesus' post-resurrection flesh. On the other hand John placed an extraordinary emphasis on the spiritual flesh of the resurrected Christ (Grant 1948: 126–27). From my perspective since the resurrected Christ was capable of appearing and disappearing at will and was able to walk through closed doors his flesh must have been something weirdly unfamiliar to our everyday human experience. I wonder how a flesh that could pass through closed doors could even be touched. Claxton added another curious twist to the discussion: 'now if ye believed that Christ with his spiritual body, that could enter the house the doors and windows being shut, hath in the same manner entered you...then take notice he is in but one of you, unless you can make it appear that Christ hath as many bodies as there is Quakers' (Claxton 1659: 25).<sup>14</sup> Claxton's thought processes were based on his belief that Christ continued to exist in the form of a man with glorified flesh and bone.

Grant says that John was the last writer considered orthodox by the Church to declare the spiritual nature of Jesus' risen flesh. Thereafter a somewhat crude emphasis was placed on the flesh of Jesus at the expense of John's spiritualism. By the end of the second century the view of Jesus' resurrection body as a body of flesh had come to preempt the view of a purely spiritual body: 'The needs of simple believers, who thought in rather crudely materialistic terms, had triumphed over the subtlety of

theologians or others who were influenced by classical theology' (Grant 1948: 128). Origen was a lone leading dissenting voice in favour of the spiritualist approach. Grant sided with Origen and concluded that the phrase 'resurrection of the flesh' was not scriptural. For Origen the resurrection body would be 'like the Lord's...spiritual, perhaps of ether in spherical shape [one thinks of Cicero recounting the myth of Balbus]; and eventually we shall again be completely incorporeal spirit' (Grant 1948: 193). The inner person wearing the resurrected spiritual body would be the same but the resurrected body would not be a body of flesh. Origen's attack against his opponents rested on his interpretation of 1 Corinthians 15—flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. Jesus did rise from the dead but his risen body was not one of flesh and blood. Grant's analysis helps us to situate the feuding sides historically. Muggleton and Fox stood on opposite sides of a longstanding debate.

Muggleton was trying to conceptualize how a God whose form and essence was spatially limited and touchable could also be in the bodies of Quakers:

Fox and the Quakers look upon God to be so big in his Essence and Spirit without a body, that he fills heaven and earth, the Air, and all things else with his great big Spirit without a body, this is the Quakers God, and Christ; so they can get God in to them, as they think; and then when they part out of the body they now have, then their spirits goes into God again, so that the Quakers God and their Spirits doth so whip into one another, so that no body can tell where to find either of them (Muggleton 1656: 43).<sup>15</sup>

Fox's theology of non-distinction so vividly captured by Muggleton was inconsistent. What goes back to God at death if the immortal soul is already part of God? Fox and Muggleton were both literalists each in their own way. God was a Spirit to be sure. But for Muggleton God was confined to the shape of a man whereas for Fox God *substantively* filled and permeated the bodies of Quakers permanently (Fox 1667: 13–14). The Quaker theology of *non-distinction* is better associated with Sebastian Franck's pantheism than with mysticism which with some exceptions kept Christ and saint distinct.<sup>16</sup> Theologies of non-distinction (we can include Gnostic and neoplatonist influenced theologies here) have always been eyed with suspicion by the Church. Not only do they interfere with the soteriology of the Church but they create confusion of the sort that Muggleton's mortalism avoided. For his part Fox claimed to occupy an exegetical high ground of his own, arguing that certain New Testament passages tell us that Christ lives in the saint.<sup>17</sup>

Materialist and immaterialist views of the nature and essence of God and Christ were clashing in the debates between Quakers and Muggletonians. There was no common ground. Fox articulated a theology that was but a riddle to Muggleton—the saints were *not distinct* from a Christ without form and shape. The flesh that Christ was crucified in died and returned to dust and remained dust. What survived was the pre-existent Christ 'whose glory and presence filleth all things, and is *manifest in us*', said John Harwood, 'his beauty, his presence and power is seen, known and rightly understood; and his spiritual body, his pure Divine presence is but one, yet in thousands it is manifest' (Harwood 1659: 8, emphasis mine). Christ's was an *undivided* spiritual body (not divided between a distant heaven and earth) but not in the

Muggletonian sense of the union of body and soul. Neither Fox nor Harwood were delivering an apology for mystical experience. They were delivering an apology for a theology of non-distinction that was anathema to Catholics and Protestants alike.

The mechanics of how Christ (the fullness of the Godhead) could be in the bodies of Quakers and everywhere else at the same time is as difficult to visualize as it is to visualize any dimension beyond our familiar three except maybe the fourth if you are a brilliant mathematician. That is, it is almost impossible. Reeve and Muggleton were mesmerized by the thought.

#### NOTES

1. For a sect as small as the Muggletonians (Muggleton's funeral was attended by 248 followers and Lamont says that 'this is generally accepted as the membership peak' [Lamont 2006: 3]) they have received a disproportional amount of attention from prominent historians of seventeenth-century English sectarianism including, most recently, William Lamont and T.L. Underwood. Scholarly interest in such a small sect may be the result of longevity, with Muggletonians surviving well into the twentieth century. It is also surely the result of the cantankerousness of their debates with Quakers. Douglas Greene called the adversarial relationship between the Muggletonians and the Quakers 'one of the most bitter pamphlet wars of the later seventeenth century' (Greene 1983: 102).

2. This article fits into a larger book-length project investigating Quaker debates with adversaries in the seventeenth century and exploring possible avenues for rapprochement.

3. The six Foundations are listed in a letter that Reeve wrote to Alice Webb on 15 August 1656 (Underwood 1999: 196). Underwood identified the Muggletonian doctrine of 'the belief that God was literally a man' as one of two doctrines 'that dramatically set them apart from other movements' (Underwood 1999: 12). Barry Reay underscored the Muggletonian inability to conceive of God as 'a formless creature...not as a doctrinal quibble but for what it came to represent. Belief in it became the seal of membership for Muggleton's saints, the elect; it also became the banner of Muggleton's authority within the sect' (Reay 1976: 36).

4. The Muggletonian practice of cursing lived on into the nineteenth century (Lamont 1996: 40).

5. Muggleton in turn condemned Penn for rejecting the doctrine that God had the body, shape and form of a man (Delamaine 1755: 90-91).

6. 'God the Father went that fore Journey in flesh to redeem his elect ones by faith in his blood' (Reeve and Muggleton 1653: 4).

7. I am grateful to Professor John F.H. New for drawing my attention to this point. According to Reeve and Muggleton, 'The third and last Witnesses of the Holy Spirit unto the man Jesus to be the onely God, are those two in the Revelation, spoken of by *John* the beloved disciple, that were to appear in this last age, and are upon the Stage of this world at this time in this great city of *London*; where the Elect shall see the great wonders of the Lord' (Reeve and Muggleton 1653: 6; see also Muggleton 1668: 93). Elsewhere Muggleton said: 'So God hath raised me up to be his last Prophet' (Reeve and Muggleton 1758: 2). Lamont discusses the claims of Reeve and Muggleton to be the two latter day witnesses of Rev. 11:3 (Lamont 2006: 55-57). He points out that the basis for these claims 'are modest' and not thoroughly worked through. Muggletonian authority was drawn from a moment in early February 1651 when God spoke audibly to John Reeve (Reeve 1652: 1-2). The voice Reeve heard (the 'hearing of the eare') was audible for anyone to hear. It did not come from within. Lamont distinguishes this source of divine authority which made no claim to visions, dreams, dark nights of the soul or vivid spiritual experiences from the Quaker source of



divine authority which relied on the 'inner voice', dreams, visions and divine illumination which the Muggletonians associated with witchcraft (Lamont 2006: 16, 53). The Muggletonians were not millenarians, at least not after Muggleton's revisionary commentary on Rev. 11 (Lamont 2006: 57-59; see also 26, 45, 66, and Chapter 8). Moses was equated with the first commission and the Apostles with the second commission. Reeve's and Muggleton's commission was to be messengers to an unbelieving world. The Spirit put a sword in their mouths to bless and curse to eternity which bears some resemblance to the early Mormon patriarchs.

8. Augustine held to a view of God as incorporeal substance that was not extendable through time and space. Harwood later left the Society of Friends. Claxton's bid for Muggletonian leadership following the death of John Reeve in 1658 is discussed by Lamont (2006: 16).

9. Identified by the title of the first Epistle: *The prophet Reeve's epistle to his friend, discovering the dark light of the Quakers written in the year 1654. September the 20<sup>th</sup> (1660?)*. *Early English Books Online* has the following citation: 'Wing (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1994) states this item was not separately published. A collection of anti-Quaker and pro-Muggletonian letters to several friends including Christopher Hill, Alice Webb, Isaac Pennington and others unnamed, each headed by a caption title. Reproduction of the original in the British Library'.

10. William Penn made an eloquent case for the the soul's immateriality and immortality (Penn 1672: 16-21).

11. Lodowick Muggleton is given as a co-author of *Joyful News from Heaven* but Lamont has established that Reeve was the sole author (Lamont 2006: 33).

12. 'Moses and Elijah were caretakers in Heaven while God became the man Jesus on earth' (Lamont 2006: 26) following Reeve, *A Transcendental Spiritual Treatise*, Proposition 8 (Reeve 1652: 52).

13. The Quaker Anne Blackly asked how else one might commune with a distant Christ apart from conjuration (Bunyan 1980: 185).

14. The same argument reappeared in Muggleton (1663: 22).

15. Claxton said something similar: Quakers say 'God is a Spirit without form, and so lives in the form of a man that he made, and so they suppose when man dies...then that God flies out of them...and whither that God or Spirit goes, they cannot tell...' (1659: 23).

16. George Fox's library contained an English translation of one of Franck's pseudonymous works, 'The Forbidden Fruit' (Cadbury 1970: 168-69). Franck wrote under many pseudonyms. Franck's thought has often been described as 'mystical pantheism' (God is in all things as an essential qualitative force). Franck's monism/pantheism is the subject of much debate. See Tinsley 2001: 162-80. Hayden-Roy (1994) is silent on the subject of Franck's pantheistic tendencies.

17. At the end of George Fox's book, *The Great Mystery of the Great Whore* (1659), there are a number of examples where the King James Version of the Bible (the version used by Fox) mistranslated the Greek preposition 'ev' as 'among' instead of 'in'. For example, Fox cites Rom. 1:19 and Jn 1:14. In *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, H.E. Dana and J.R. Mantey say that 'to understand the full significance of a [Greek] preposition one needs to know the function of the case with which it is used in each instance, the meaning of the preposition absolutely, and, what is most difficult, learn what it means relatively in each context' (1955: 98). An interpreter would be correct to translate the preposition 'ev' as it appears in Fox's two examples (Rom. 1:19 and Jn 1:14) as 'in' (Fox) or 'among' (KJV). An example of where the preposition 'ev' is indisputably 'in' would be Gal. 4:19. The choice of the translation of the verb is also important for it might be better to translate Rom. 1:19 as 'was shown to them'. One might also say 'was revealed *in* them'. Ultimately, one can never go wrong using the root meaning of the verb and the preposition—in this instance 'to reveal' and 'in'. A grammatically and contextually informed consideration of Rom. 1:19 would yield the following translation: 'what has been shown to them is manifest to them' or 'what can be known about God has been shown to them'.

## REFERENCES

- Barclay, J. (1841), *Letters of Early Friends*, London.
- Bunyan, J. (1980), *Some Gospel-Truths Opened; A Vindication of Some Gospel-Truths Opened; A Few Sighs from Hell*, ed. T.L. Underwood, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cadbury, H.J. (1970), 'Tracing the Influence of Sebastian Franck', *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 52, pp. 168–69.
- Claxton, L. (1659), *The Quakers Downfall*, London.
- Coale, J. (1671), *A Vindication of the Light Within in The Books and divers Epistles of...Josiah Coale*.
- Dana, H.E., and Mantey, J.R. (1955), *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, Toronto: Macmillan.
- Delamaine, A. (ed.) (1755), *Verae Fidei Gloria est Corona Vitae. A Volume of Spiritual Epistles: Being the Copies of Several Letters Written by...John Reeve and Lodowick Muggleton*. n.p.
- Fox, G. (1659), *The Great Mystery of the Great Whore Unfolded*, London.
- (1667), *Something in Answer to Lodowick Muggleton's Book which he calls, The Quakers Neck Broken*.
- Grant, R.M. (1948), 'The Resurrection of the Body', *Journal of Religion* 28, pp. 120–30, 188–208.
- Greene, D.G. (1983), 'Muggletonians and Quakers: A Study in the Interaction of Seventeenth-Century Dissent', *Albion* 15/2, pp. 102–22.
- Harwood, J. (1659), *The Lying Prophet Discovered and Reproved*. London: printed for Thomas Simmons at the Bull and Mouth near Aldersgate
- Hayden-Roy, P. (1994), *The Inner Word and the Outer Word: A Biography of Sebastian Franck*, New York: Peter Lang.
- Hill, C., Reay, B., and Lamont, W. (1983), *The World of the Muggletonians*, London: Temple Smith.
- Howgill, F. (1659), *Darkness and Ignorance Expelled*, London.
- Lamont, W. (1983), 'The Muggletonians 1652–1679: A Vertical Approach', *Past and Present* 99, pp. 22–40.
- (1996), *Puritanism and Historical Controversy*, London: UCL Press.
- (2006), *Last Witnesses: The Muggletonian History, 1652–1979*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Muggleton, L., (1663), *The Neck of the Quakers Broken*, Amsterdam.
- (1668), *A Looking-Glass for George Fox*. n.p.
- (1669), *A True Interpretation of the Witch of Endor*, London.
- Nayler, J. (1656), *A Publike Discovery*, London.
- Penn, W. (1672), *The New Witnesses Proved Old Heretiks*. n.p.
- Peters, K. (2005), *Print Culture and the Early Quakers*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reay, B. (1976), 'The Muggletonians: A Study in Seventeenth Century English Sectarianism', *Journal of Religious History* 9/1, pp. 32–49.
- Reeve, J. (1652), *A Transcendent Spiritual Treatise*, London.
- (1654), *An Epistle from the Eternal Jehovah, or Jesus, unto that noble Christian gentleman, styled by the name of the Earl of Pembroke*, in Reeve 1856: 53–68.
- (1724?) *A Discourse between John Reeve and Richard Leader*, London?
- (1856), *Sacred Remains*, London, 3rd edn.
- Reeve, J., and Muggleton, L. (1653), *A General Epistle From the Holy Spirit*, London.
- (1660?), *The prophet Reeve's epistle to his friend, discovering the dark light of the Quakers written in the year 1654. September the 20th*, London: s.n.
- (1661), *A Divine Looking Glass: or, The third and last Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ*, London.
- (1751), *Joyful News from Heaven*, London.

- (1758), *A Stream from the Tree of Life*. n.p.
- (1832), 'A General Treatise of the Three Records, or Dispensations', in J. Frost and I. Frost (eds.), *The Works of John Reeve and Lodowicke Muggleton*, III, London, pp. 73-93.
- Sanders, E.P. (1977), *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Smith, N. (1989), *Perfection Proclaimed: Language and Literature in English Radical Religion 1640-1660*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tinsley, B.S. (2001), *Pierre Bayle's Reformation: Conscience and Criticism on the Eve of the Enlightenment*, Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press.
- Underwood, T.L. (ed.) (1999), *The Acts of the Witnesses: The Autobiography of Lodowick Muggleton and Other Early Muggletonian Writings*, New York: Oxford University Press.

#### AUTHOR DETAILS

Richard Bailey is Assistant Professor of History at Queen's University (Kingston). He teaches courses in intellectual history including German Reformation and utopian studies. His scholarly interests range from the history of radical religious dissent to nineteenth and early twentieth century missionary activity in North West Canada.

Mailing address: Department of History, Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada K0K 3J0. Email: [baileyr@queensu.ca](mailto:baileyr@queensu.ca).