

TOWARDS A REVISION OF  
*THE SECOND PERIOD OF QUAKERISM*

Rosemary Moore  
University of Birmingham, England

ABSTRACT

W.C. Braithwaite's *The Second Period of Quakerism* is over ninety years old, and remains the standard work on Quakerism in the later seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth. This paper suggests possible contents for a new book on the Quaker history of that period. It would deal with Quakerism as it was on both sides of the Atlantic. It would draw on the many books, articles and theses now available on particular aspects of this time, but its authors would also need to undertake new research. In particular, there is archive material requiring exploration, and a study of George Whitehead is urgently needed.

KEYWORDS

Braithwaite, Fox, Penn, toleration, persecution, meeting, dispute, peace, tithes, oath.

Most Quakers know the Rowntree Histories, if only by sight as a row of large solid dark blue books on the shelves of the meeting house library. They were named in memory of John Wilhelm Rowntree, a bright and rising star of British Quakerism in the 1890s, the first to conceive the idea of writing a history of Quakerism that would be suited to the *Zeitgeist* of the coming twentieth century. John Wilhelm died suddenly in 1905, and the series was eventually authored by Rufus Jones, a noted American Quaker philosopher, and William Charles Braithwaite, by profession a lawyer and banker but also an excellent historian. The first of the seven volumes was published in 1909, and the last in 1921, and discussions about their revision or replacement have been in the air for some time.<sup>1</sup> This article is itself the product of some years gestation.<sup>2</sup> It does not consider a whole new series, but concerns what may need to be done to provide a replacement for William Charles Braithwaite's *The Second Period of Quakerism*, the story of Quakerism in the later part of the seventeenth century.<sup>3</sup> At the time when this paper assumed its present form, in the autumn of 2011, this 'new book' was barely a twinkle in the eyes of certain Quaker historians, though hopefully, by the time of

its publication, the project may have begun to move forward. It would be out of order to try to finalise a plan for it at this stage, but an indication can be given of possible contents.

Why *The Second Period*? Why not go back to Braithwaite's *The Beginnings of Quakerism*? The reason is that so much has been published in recent years on the early period, both by Quakers and general historians, that another book on the first years of Quakerism is not a priority. The later seventeenth century has been much less thoroughly trawled over, and there is no modern Quaker history dealing with this period as a whole, though it is covered in general books such as John Punshon's *Portrait in Grey*.<sup>4</sup> There have been several books dealing with particular aspects of the time, but no-one since Braithwaite has written the full Quaker story of the latter part of the seventeenth century, and *The Second Period* remains the standard work. (Nor, one might add, has anyone written a Quaker history for the eighteenth century, but let us take one thing at a time.)<sup>5</sup>

Braithwaite's first book, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, ended in 1660, the usual finishing point for books on early Quakerism, though when I was working on that period I thought it made more sense to end in 1666, just before Fox set important administrative reforms in motion, and, by coincidence, just before Penn and Keith and Barclay arrived on the scene.<sup>6</sup> In the course of the 1670s Quakerism became a very different entity from what it had been ten years earlier. However, in order to understand the 1670s, it is also necessary to understand the 1660s, when, following the restoration of the monarchy, laws were passed severely restricting the activities of Quakers and others who would not conform to the national Church. The putative new book, therefore, would probably begin in 1660–61, as did Braithwaite's *The Second Period*. Braithwaite finished up in the early eighteenth century, but for the moment, the question as to exactly where the new book is going to end can be left open.

Reading *The Second Period* today, one is immediately struck by its tone.<sup>7</sup> Braithwaite, like all liberal Quakers of his period, did not like what was happening to Quakerism towards the end of the seventeenth century. The increasing institutionalism of Friends led, he wrote, to the 'declension into Quietism'.<sup>8</sup> This was to be followed later by the evangelicalism from which slough the Rowntree historians and their ilk had made it their work to rescue the Religious Society of Friends. A hundred years on, one can view this period with less personal baggage and, hopefully, in a more unbiased manner.

Braithwaite divided *The Second Period* into three parts. The first deals with Quakers in relation to the political situation up to the passing of the Toleration Act in 1679, and thereafter with the struggle to obtain the right to affirm instead of taking an oath, ending with the Affirmation Act of 1722. The second part covers the internal history of Quakerism over the same period, and is mainly a tale of administrative reform and the resulting controversy, with some account of Quaker colonisation and ending with the deaths of the original leaders, the last of them, George Whitehead, surviving to 1723. The third part is a general discussion of the state of Quakerism at the beginning of the eighteenth century. This gives the impression that Quaker internal history and Quaker history in relation to

British general history were two separate things, whereas in fact, they were continually intersecting. It would be desirable, therefore, to arrange the new book as far as possible chronologically.

The Rowntree histories also kept American and British Quaker history separate, treating them in parallel volumes. Actually, at least to the end of the seventeenth century and perhaps afterward, they were two sides to the same story. Quakers were settling along the eastern seaboard of America from the 1650s, and at least to the end of the century they kept close ties with their relations in Britain. There was continual intercourse between the two groups, and people went to and fro. Some aspects of early American Quaker history, as can be shown, illuminate what was happening in Britain. A major internal upheaval in British Quakerism, concerned with the activities of George Keith, began in America. As Frederick B. Tolles, author of the introduction to the second edition of *The Second Period*, wrote, 'Friends on both sides of the Atlantic came to feel that they were members of a single community, an Atlantic community of Friends'.<sup>9</sup> The new book should, if possible, cover both sides of the Atlantic.

It would begin, as did Braithwaite's *The Second Period*, by telling of the fierce persecution of all dissenting bodies instigated by the Cavalier parliament in the early 1660s.<sup>10</sup> Unlike *The Second Period*, this could be linked to an account of the split in the Quaker movement concerning the right holding of Quaker meetings, which was inspired by the teaching of a noted Quaker travelling minister named John Perrot. Why put the two together? Because George Fox was in prison from 1663 to late 1666, and for much of this time prevented from having any contact with his followers. The absence of the main Quaker leader had a crucial effect on the course of the dispute and its consequences.

To update Braithwaite's description of the persecutions it will be necessary, first, to set them in the context of recent works of general British social and political history. Notably, this means looking at the activities of the radical underground, Quakers and others, and especially samizdat printers, during these years.<sup>11</sup> Secondly, account must be taken of the work of the many local historians who have been active since Braithwaite's time, which may give a clearer picture of how persecution varied from place to place, and for what reasons. It is already clear that such local records give a more accurate assessment of 'sufferings' than Besse. Persecution was patchy, the high periods being the early 60s and the early 80s. Fortunately for the Quakers, the laws were unevenly applied. Judges, justices and individuals varied in their enthusiasm for law enforcement, the legal situation was complicated and the attitude of the crown ambivalent. There were periods and places where Quakers were allowed to get on with normal life.<sup>12</sup> The application of the Second Conventicle Act in particular varied considerably, depending on local circumstances. One magistrate might prosecute Quakers enthusiastically, other authorities preferred to look the other way. Non-payment of tithes and church rates could lead to distraint, but again, not in every place all the time. There was a good deal of local variation in the prosecution of Quakers for this cause, and in some cases it appears that church ministers thought that pursuing

Quakers was not worth the trouble.<sup>13</sup> Similarly, when it was a matter of business, there were ways of avoiding the requirement to take legally binding oaths.<sup>14</sup>

The first wave of persecution eased off in 1667 when there was a change of government ministers, allowing Quakers and other dissenters to regroup. Despite the Second Conventicle Act of 1670, dissent was never in serious danger again. And it was then that things began to happen that were to change the nature of Quakerism. George Fox, now released from Scarborough castle, undertook a major reorganisation of the movement. He met with John Perrot's followers and most of them returned to what we may call Establishment Quakerism. Fox now wanted to strengthen the movement to make it difficult for future dissidents to gain support, and to provide assistance in times of persecution. For the next few years he was mainly occupied in setting up the Quaker structure which still exists in essentials today. Again, Braithwaite has much detail, and again, local historians accessing Quaker records located in county records offices may be able to supplement him.

Ad hoc local arrangements which had proved their worth were built into a strong national organisation. Monthly meetings for business had been an early development in some areas, following the existing practices of separated churches, and Fox extended them to the whole country in 1667–68. County meetings, mirroring local government areas for the purpose of monitoring persecution, had been originally set up in 1658, and now were revived and reinvigorated, becoming known as Quarterly Meetings. Fox coined the term 'Gospel Order' for these arrangements. Meetings were required to keep proper records, and a number of Quaker minute books survive from this time, generally containing a copy of Fox's instructions as the first item. Unfortunately, in their zeal, meetings seem to have destroyed all earlier minute books, as only some records of births, marriages and deaths have survived from the earlier period. The London area needed special arrangements, and Six Weeks Meeting, which still manages the property of all London meetings, was set up in 1671 and from the beginning included both men and women.<sup>15</sup> The practice of holding regular annual meetings of leading Friends was revived.

From 1671 to 1673 Fox was in America, for the purposes of consolidating the Quaker position in the various colonies and establishing a similar organisation to that now operating in Britain. At this point one will need to update Braithwaite and Rufus Jones on the early history of Friends in America. Books have been written and there are many journal articles to be considered, most of them in the American journal *Quaker History*.

Meanwhile, Quakers of a new kind and quality were arriving on the scene. In 1663, a small but important Quaker meeting had appeared in Aberdeen. One of the first members was the academic George Keith, and in 1666 Robert Barclay joined them. Keith and Barclay gave a new intellectual rigour to Quaker writing. Keith, like Nayler before him, has been marginalised in Quaker history. He ultimately left the movement after a serious controversy, but for thirty years he was at least as important as Barclay, whom he probably influenced.<sup>16</sup> Unfortunately,

there are no good modern studies of either Keith or Barclay. This will be a difficult gap for the new book to fill.

And then in 1667 a young man by the name of William Penn threw in his lot with the Quakers. He was the wealthy son of an admiral, with access to the corridors of power. During the brief reign of James II and VII he played an important role in British politics, and he is well known as a major figure in early American history. For many years he was the main publicist for Quakerism, his works including theology, devotion and political theory. He was outstanding in debate. He is noted as being the defendant, along with William Meade, in the Bushell trial of 1670 which established the right for English juries to come to their verdict independently of the wishes of the judge. There is no good modern biography of Penn, though there are a number of studies of his work and influence. Such a many-sided person is going to be difficult to deal with adequately. Due weight must be given to his place in Quaker history while not diminishing his national and international importance.

An important part of the maintenance of discipline was the control of publications. This had been recognised very early on, but the practice of having Fox check publications had never been entirely practicable.<sup>17</sup> The national meeting of 1672 appointed ten Friends to oversee publications, and the following year Fox replaced this group with the Second Day Morning Meeting, with the duties of supervising book production and also arranging ministry in the London area. They decided to keep two copies of all books written by Friends, and also one copy of adverse publications, so that they could be more effectively answered.<sup>18</sup> This is the origin of the Library of the Society of Friends at Friends House. The committee took its duties seriously, on one occasion even daring to turn down a paper by Fox.<sup>19</sup> Its policy was to reject anything that might bring the movement into disrepute, particularly apocalyptic prophecy which was seen as incompatible with the ethos of the times. Poorly written work was also turned down if it could not be revised. Christine Trevett's work has shown how this made it more difficult for less educated sections of the movement, such as many of the women and the Welsh, to have their works published.<sup>20</sup> Further study of the records of the Second Day Morning Meeting will be needed, and arrangements for publications originating outside Britain must be researched. It will also be desirable to make as full a study as possible of the publications themselves, which Braithwaite did not attempt. Because of their numbers, it will probably be necessary to be content with samples, and consideration will be needed as to how to make them representative. The same will apply to anti-Quaker books of this period. Quaker publishers and book production should also be investigated.

The final piece of the national organisation was put in place in 1676. From their beginnings, Quakers had run athwart the law in a number of ways, and even before the Restoration many had been fined or imprisoned, and some had died. While Quakers accepted that they must be willing to suffer for their faith, many of them took the view that there was no need to suffer illegally or unnecessarily, and even before 1660 they had devised means of reducing the effects of persecution.<sup>21</sup>

It may have been as a result of Fox's last imprisonment from 1673–35 that they decided to create a new committee, whose meetings would correspond with the law terms, to monitor prosecutions of Friends and take legal advice to minimise them.<sup>22</sup> It was known as the Meeting for Sufferings. In *The Second Period* Braithwaite suggested that Friends were reluctant to take legal action against persecutors, but while this was true in the case of some individuals, it was not the case generally, as later scholars have made clear, and Quakers became known as awkward customers in the courts.<sup>23</sup>

The separate business meetings for women were a distinctive feature of Quaker organisation. There were women's meetings in London from about 1658, but early development of other women's meetings is unclear. Epistles of Fox encouraging the establishment of such meetings are undated, but probably come from the later 1660s, and were connected with Fox's general reorganisation of that time.<sup>24</sup> One purpose of Fox's visit to America in 1671–73 was to encourage a similar organisation on that side of the Atlantic, and there the women's meetings appear to have been set up without controversy, though this will need checking.<sup>25</sup> However, in Britain they met with some resistance. The root of the problem was the men's meetings dislike of the proposal that the women's meetings should have power to enquire into the fitness of men as well as women in connection with proposed marriages. This had been the practice in London at least since 1663, but was a novelty elsewhere.<sup>26</sup> Fox was imprisoned in Worcester after his return from America, but after his release he used his authority to require the establishment of women's meetings with the powers he wanted. A wave of internal disruption followed, known as the Wilkinson–Story separation after two of the chief agitators, and it was probably occasioned as much by resentment at Fox's authoritarianism and, maybe, by Margaret Fell's interference, as by the institution of women's meetings as such. In Bristol, it appears that a women's meeting was acceptable, but a women's monthly meeting was not.<sup>27</sup> This is a confused episode which will need careful examination. Since Braithwaite's time there has been much work done on the position of women in seventeenth-century Quakerism, which will all need to be taken into consideration.<sup>28</sup>

Other dissenters besides Quakers took advantage of the freer atmosphere of the later 1660s and early '70s. Set disputes and pamphlet wars, of a kind not seen for some years, again became the order of the day, although ignored by Braithwaite. Two public disputes took place in Essex between George Whitehead and the Presbyterian Stephen Scandrett in 1669, followed by the publication of several related pamphlets. In the 1660s and early '70s there was a long-running dispute with Lodovic Muggleton. But most of the controversy was with Baptists, who had time and energy to renew their ancient feud with the Quakers. As Luke Howard of Dover put it: 'The Baptists began first with us: as soon as the King gave Liberty, they fell on us'.<sup>29</sup> Besides Howard's problems in Dover, there were disputes with Baptists in Lincolnshire, and a major set piece at the Baptists' Barbican Meeting House, consisting of four meetings between 1672–74, attended at times, it is said, by three thousand people, and at one time adjourned because a crack appeared in the building. It led to the publication of fifteen Quaker tracts

by Whitehead, Penn and others in answer to the Baptists. No detailed account of these disputes has been published, and it would be good if our treatment of them could be buttressed by input from Baptist historians.<sup>30</sup>

Braithwaite's histories are more concerned with institutional Quakerism than with Quakers in their meetings. This was inevitable, given the lack of information when Braithwaite was writing. The first book to investigate the life of local Friends was Richard T. Vann's *Social Development of Early Quakerism*, published in 1969, a pioneering book in its day.<sup>31</sup> This dealt with Friends in Buckinghamshire. Since then there have been major studies of Friends in Lancashire and Essex, at least two sets of monthly meeting minutes have been transcribed and published, while others are available in typescript at Friends House.<sup>32</sup> In addition, Quaker libraries have a number of recent unpublished PhD and Masters theses that deal with the development of Quakerism in particular localities, there have been small books written by local historians on behalf of particular meetings, and there are no doubt many more papers hidden in local history journals and local conference reports. These studies use various kinds of local archives as well as Quakerly records. And it is also worth looking at local histories not written for or about Quakers. A recent history of Aberdeen published for the municipality is very informative on the early Quaker meeting there, and there may well be other such books.<sup>33</sup> So the new book will include a chapter on 'the Friend on the bench', though a considerable amount of work will have to be done in collating all this information, and identifying and filling gaps.

Minutes of business meetings give useful information about ordinary Quakers. There were problems with 'walking disorderly', such as drunkenness or sexual misbehaviour, at the same time as much care for Friends in difficulties, and records are similar on both sides of the Atlantic. Plainness in dress was expected, though the traditional Quaker style did not become universal until the eighteenth century in England, earlier in Ireland. There are records of contacts between American and British meetings, and on two occasions, the Baltimore Women's Meeting, having received presents of books from the London Women's Meeting, agreed to send them two hogsheads of tobacco.<sup>34</sup>

A study of Quaker dissidents must be included. Some made themselves well-known, because they published pamphlets setting forth their views. William Mucklow, of London, and William Rogers, of Bristol, were major protagonists in the struggle against Fox's administrative reforms, the latter having a sparring match in bad verse with Thomas Ellwood, who later edited Fox's *Journal*.<sup>35</sup> Then there were wealthy eccentrics, like Robert Rich the Barbados merchant and John Pennyman the London draper, who both caused considerable annoyance to 'Establishment' Quakerism. But there must have been others, who just slipped quietly away. Rufus Jones's work on early Quakerism in America mentions some people leaving meetings because they did not like the formalism introduced by Fox. And probably the same happened on this side of the Atlantic.

As the years passed, Quakers adapted their practices just sufficiently to be tolerable to their contemporaries.<sup>36</sup> They continued to address everyone as 'thou' and

to refuse hat honour, they dressed plainly and took no part in sports, but eventually they became known as taciturn and gloomy, rather than rude and strident.<sup>37</sup> Relations with their neighbours, if not warm, were not necessarily hostile.<sup>38</sup> Evidence is accumulating that Quakers took their share in local parish duties, even on occasion acting as churchwardens.<sup>39</sup> This is in accordance with early Quaker thinking, for the first Quaker disciplinary document, the 'Epistle from the Elders of Balby', composed in the autumn of 1656, advised Friends 'that if any are called to serve the commonwealth in any public service, which is for the public good, that with cheerfulness it be undertaken, and in faithfulness discharged'.<sup>40</sup>

There is evidence that Quaker efforts to present themselves as harmless were beginning to take effect during the 1660s, and were well established by the 1670s. As early as 1668 one author warned his readers to be 'no longer imposed on by the Quakers' seeming innocence', while a work of 1674 describes the common view of Quakers as, 'Very demure in their carriage, very austere in their lives, sober and temperate, very punctuall and just in their dealings...and if any man shuld strike them on the cheek, these poor innocent soules were so far from revenge that they would turne the other.'<sup>41</sup> In the long run, many Quaker practices became accepted as mere eccentricities. Indeed, there is a suggestion that the falling into disuse of 'thou' as a means of addressing inferiors may have occurred because people did not want to be viewed as possible Quakers.<sup>42</sup>

Early Quaker tracts had denounced a social system that allowed some people to live in riches while others were in penury, and made proposals to mitigate the situation. Restoration England was not fertile soil for such opinions, but Quaker concern for social justice re-surfaced towards the end of the century in the works of John Bellars, who many years later influenced Robert Owen.<sup>43</sup> When Fox first encountered slavery he was not happy about it, though he did not denounce it outright. Slave-owning Quakers were told to treat their slaves well, and give them opportunities for worship.<sup>44</sup>

From the beginning, Friends were expected to demonstrate their faith by their way of life, and the seeds of their reputation for philanthropy, honesty and hard work go back to the 1650s. A preliminary look at the evidence shows that the typical male Friend worked for himself in a small way of business, though some were poor, especially in rural areas, and some, especially in the big towns, were wealthy. An ability to make money was a known characteristic of Quakers from an early date. In 1656, Fox issued a warning that those Friends whose businesses were doing well should beware not to take it for granted, and should continue to attend meetings regularly.<sup>45</sup> The Balby Epistle advised, 'That all Friends that have callings and trades, do labour in the thing that is good, in faithfulness and uprightness; and keep to their yea and their nay in all their communications: and that all who are indebted to the world, endeavour to discharge the same'. Thomas Symonds of Norwich wrote, also in 1656:

We doing unto all men what we would that all men should do unto us, not defrauding cozening, or cheating any, nor using deceitful words, to make any believe a lie... Where the truth of God is made manifest in the light of Jesus, and



lived in the life and power, none can or dare take liberty to idleness, and slothfulness in business, but every man in their power must be faithful and honest therein.<sup>46</sup>

Thus Friends gained a reputation for strict honesty in business, and it worked to their advantage. The evidence from anti-Quaker writings is that, despite many fines and restraints, some Friends were doing very well.<sup>47</sup> In 1671 the alleged fair dealing of Quakers was described as a falsity, for 'he cheats worse than a Long-Lane broker, by pretending to deal at a word, and the Hooke whereby he draws his Customers, is a far-fetched sigh, and a "Plainly I tell thee, Friend"'. Quakers, said this author, were 'as a People generally subtle, frugal, industrious and wary in their dealing; by which and their large pretensions to a punctual Honesty, they have engrossed a large part of the Nations trade'. In 1674 it was said that 'whereas many of them have been known to have been persons of mean fortune at first, they are now rich and wealthy, and none of them (though very poor before they turned Quaker) in a necessitous condition'.<sup>48</sup> There is little contemporary evidence as to why this was happening, but at a slightly later date, information from diaries and correspondence shows that many Quakers in a small way of business found that their regular attendance at meetings was also a good way of increasing trade, and could lead to advantageous marriages so that small trading units might grow and coalesce into larger ones. Boys were sent to do their apprenticeships in other Quaker businesses, thus making further contacts.

Nowadays the best known characteristic of Quakers is their peace testimony. The traditional Quaker view, that the peace testimony was part of Quakerism from the beginning, has become untenable, for there is much evidence that there were early Quakers who were proud of their army service and others who were involved with the militias raised in 1659, while examples of very militaristic language on the part of George Fox have been uncovered. He never condemned those Friends who had fought in the army, and was at least ambivalent about foreign wars, but he was always strongly against Quaker participation in domestic plots and insurrections. Yet not all Quakers were in agreement with the 'Peace Testimony' declaration of 1661, and some Quakers were certainly involved in the Northern plot of 1663.<sup>49</sup> After that, Fox's view largely prevailed in Britain.<sup>50</sup> The principle of avoiding participation in military matters caused them some difficulties regarding the requirement to supply or pay for men for the militia, and Quaker records contain several instances of restraint for this cause.<sup>51</sup>

Secular historians from Alan Cole on, have assumed that this acceptance of the peace testimony came largely for political reasons, and certainly, political factors were at work.<sup>52</sup> But between the Northern plot and the Monmouth rebellion matters relating to the peace testimony were a minor consideration in Britain. Not so in America, where Rufus Jones's account suggests that when Quakers were involved in violence, it was because circumstances were beyond their control. In fact, what happened was much more nuanced, and events in the American colonies were more illuminating than events in Britain, another reason for making our book cover both sides of the Atlantic. Quaker authors, notably Isaac Pennington, had suggested that Quakers were forbidden by God to take part in fighting, but

that no such rule, in an imperfect world, applied to non-Quakers, for according to St Paul (Rom. 13:4) it was the duty of magistrates to 'bear the sword' and to keep the peace.<sup>53</sup> Braithwaite, following Jones, did not consider the situation faced by Quakers in a position of authority in time of war, who were themselves the magistrates. A detailed study of Rhode Island during the events known as King Philip's War, 1675-76, when Quakers formed the government in Rhode Island, showed considerable differences in the reactions of Quakers to the situation.<sup>54</sup> Those in positions of governmental responsibility, although they did not personally command troops, took the view that their duty was to see to the defence of the citizens. Social responsibility over-rode individual preferences. The extent to which individual Quakers felt free to participate in war or preparations for war, when they were responsible only for themselves or their families, was a matter between them and their God, and it varied. Less strikingly, but clearly, there are instances in inland Britain showing that the same situation obtained, particularly with regard to the arming of ships. In Britain, there were political reasons for emphasising that Quakers would not fight or become involved in civil disturbances, and very largely they kept clear of the Monmouth rebellion.

How did the Quaker faith develop in this period? Early Quakers had been fiercely attacked for doctrinal unorthodoxy. Quakers, it was said, denied the authority of the Bible and of ordained ministers, disbelieved in the Trinity, the Incarnation and the Atonement, took as their authority the Light Within which appeared to other people to be no more than conscience, and asserted themselves to be united with Christ and therefore capable of moral perfection. Fox, Nayler and others were tried for blasphemy, and Quakers became aware that they were vulnerable to such accusations. They became more careful to base their teachings on Scripture and to use slightly less provocative language. They published a number of pamphlets explaining that they did believe in the Bible, but thought it the Words, rather than the Word, of God and that it should be understood 'in the spirit that gave it forth'. The Word of God, after all, was Christ himself. Ministers were called by God, and being 'bred at Oxford and Cambridge' was not necessary (common ground with many dissenting groups). Together with Baptists, they declared that Trinity, Incarnation and Atonement were not biblical terms, but said that they believed in the facts behind the words in so far as they could be found in the Bible. Definitely, they said, they believed in the Christ that 'died at Jerusalem', but that it was necessary to know Christ the Light within, and not just believe in the historical facts. Thus they did not accept 'imputed righteousness', salvation obtained by simply believing in Christ's sacrifice. As for the Light Within, this was not merely conscience, not a 'natural light', but Christ himself, by which those who possessed it might be brought into the state in which 'Adam was before he fell'. Fox and most of the first Quakers were not systematic theologians, and their writings, being attempts to express a profound religious experience in words, were considered theologically inadequate by their opponents.<sup>55</sup>

Braithwaite has a chapter on Quaker faith in the Second Period, in which he deals mainly with Pennington and Barclay and concludes that their theology is inadequate for modern Quakers. The new book will be more concerned with the

actual situation from 1670 to 1700, when the urgent problem was to convince the authorities of Quaker theological respectability, and when the main protagonists were Keith, Penn and Whitehead. Robert Barclay's work was indeed of great long-term importance, but probably less immediately so during the actual controversies of the '70s, '80s and '90s.

Quaker theological writing changed emphasis. There was now little about union with Christ, and the return to prelapsarian innocence. Quakers gave no ground on the need to receive Christ in Spirit, insisting that there could be no justification by imputed righteousness, but at the same time they tried to make clear that they really did believe in the work of the historic Jesus.<sup>56</sup> Thus Keith and Penn in 1670:

Though we say Reconciliation, and Justification, and Redemption is wrought in us by Christ, yet not without respect to Christ, even as outwardly manifest, born and crucified etc. for our justification...we do believe that he took upon him the form of a servant even in the outward, and died even in the outward, and offered up his very flesh, in the outward, through the eternal Spirit, in the outward, as a sacrifice ...and atonement unto God, in order to [bring about] our justification and reconciliation to God...though our justification was not simply and absolutely thereby wrought, as if no more was to be done by him and his spirit in us.<sup>57</sup>

The next year came a remarkable statement of faith, the 'Letter to the Governor of Barbados', produced to smooth Fox's way on the occasion of his visit in 1671. It was published with other papers relating to this journey, and Fox later included it in his *Journal*.<sup>58</sup> The first part is in the form of a creed, expressing belief in 'God who is the Creator of all things', and in Jesus Christ, 'his beloved and only-begotten Son...who was conceived by the Holy Ghost and borne of the virgin Mary: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins'. It explains why Quakers call the Scriptures the Words, rather than the Word, of God, and makes no mention of the Light Within, restating this idea as 'he it is that is now come and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true...which makes us free from the law of sin and death, and we have no life but in him'. This letter is entirely different from any other statement of belief produced by seventeenth-century Quakers and is not in Fox's usual style, so that some scholars think that Fox did not write it himself, but it needs noting as an important part of the developing Quaker tradition.<sup>59</sup> It has since been used in many official Quaker pronouncements,

Robert Barclay's *Apology for the true Christian Divinity*, which was first published in Latin in 1676, with an English translation following in 1678, was a scholarly text intended for the educated. It is arguably the most important and influential statement of Quaker faith ever published, but it was probably not immediately recognised as such, for the first English editions were not printed in London and were not vetted by the Morning Meeting.<sup>60</sup> It was some years before the *Apology* became a necessary part of every meeting house library. However, the necessary intellectual framework for Quakerism had now been supplied. The *Apology* is a positive affirmation of the possibility of universal salvation, as evidenced by the Bible, written from a Quaker viewpoint:

We can confidently affirm, and clearly evince, according to the testimony of the holy Scriptures, the following points:

First, That God, who out of his infinite love sent his Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, into the world, who tasted death for every man, hath given to every man...a certain time or day of visitation, during which day or time it is possible for them to be saved, and to partake of the fruits of Christ's death.

Secondly, That for this end God hath communicated and given to every man a measure of the Light of his own Son, a measure of grace, or a measure of the Spirit...

Thirdly, That God, in and by this Light and Seed, invites, calls, exhorts and strives with every man in order to save him.<sup>61</sup>

Quaker teaching on worship, the ministry and the Christian way of life followed logically, according to Barclay, from these facts. Barclay made an important shift in the definition of the Light, saying that it came from Christ, rather than being Christ himself. The first Quakers had not made such a distinction, and James Nayler at his trial is reported as saying that he was of the same nature as Christ, though not of the same stature, for which he suffered. Barclay, by contrast, described the Light as being like a seed, which 'draws, invites and inclines to God', and he carefully distinguished between Christ and human:

We do not at all intend...to equal ourselves to that holy man the Lord Jesus Christ... For though we affirm that Christ dwells in us, yet not immediately, but mediately, as he is in that seed, which is in us: whereas he, to wit, the Eternal Word, which was with God, dwelt immediately in that holy man [Jesus].<sup>62</sup>

Scholars have raised the question as to whether George Fox was in agreement with such new expressions of Quaker beliefs, which certainly differed in important respects from the earliest Quaker writings.<sup>63</sup> It is a fact that he remained on very good terms with their authors, to the extent of travelling with Barclay, Keith and Penn on an expedition to Holland and Germany in 1677. Quakers had to be seen to be orthodox Trinitarian Christians if they were to be acceptable in seventeenth-century British society, and Fox was a realist.<sup>64</sup> And Fox knew that some change was essential, for there are items in the collection of Quaker letters known as the Swarthmore manuscripts that show signs of tampering by Fox himself, as he tried to remove evidence that he had been addressed by Quakers in near divine terms. As has been shown, the expression of the Quaker faith had already shifted a little during the 1650s in response to public pressure, and it looks rather as if its exact verbal formulation was not considered of prime importance. Disownments were for offences against church discipline, not for irregular belief. The cabbalist Mercury van Helmont was accepted as a Quaker for some years, and there is no record of him ever being formally disowned, although Fox indicated his disapproval of van Helmont's beliefs.<sup>65</sup> George Keith, on the other hand, was later disowned as a result of his very public advocacy of a credal test for would-be Quakers. Credal statements issued by Quakers were intended for the general public and for the government, not for themselves.<sup>66</sup> So Penn and Barclay could be permitted to rewrite the Quaker faith, and if Fox had doubts about the way his

movement was going, he kept them to himself. In 1675–76 he dictated his *Journal*, which gave his view of Quaker beginnings as seen from his own perspective and he followed this by compiling his ‘Book of Miracles’, which emphasised his position as charismatic leader. He did not attempt to have these works printed during his life time, but instead made provision under his will for their publication. In the event, the *Journal* was drastically edited and the ‘Book of Miracles’ never published.<sup>67</sup>

These were the main developments in the Quaker movement during the 1670s. Since the Restoration it had been fairly detached from British politics, but this was about to change, and the new book will need to look at the Quaker movement in relation to British political history. When Braithwaite wrote, the Whig interpretation of history derived from Macaulay still held sway, but the understanding of British history has changed considerably since then, especially with regard to the reign of James II and the revolution which followed, when one Quaker, William Penn, was for a time very close to the centre of power.

Briefly, this is what happened. The heir to the throne was Charles II’s brother, the Duke of York, later James II. He caused a furore in 1673 by announcing his conversion to Catholicism. The king attempted to defuse the crisis by sending his brother to Scotland, but a move to have him excluded from the succession gained strength, exacerbated by the Popish Plot engineered by Titus Oates. Elections were in the air, and as early as 1675 the Morning Meeting advised Friends to consider their attitudes, and be prepared to support candidates who favoured religious toleration.<sup>68</sup> A factor in the background was the wish of Quakers to have their own tract of America, and William Penn, courtier and aristocrat, already was thinking about a possible colony, and was networking with politicians who might be useful to him. He threw his weight behind what was becoming known as the Whig interest in the first of the two elections of 1679, but later that year, as events progressed, he began to think that the king’s party might be more useful in attaining his ends.<sup>69</sup> The king was willing to meet some of his more useful opponents half way, and Penn got his colony. Pennsylvania was founded in 1681, and many British Quakers emigrated during the following years, so many that some meetings, especially in Wales, were weakened to the point of destruction.<sup>70</sup>

Back in Britain, the king, a very skilful politician, succeeded in resisting Parliament’s demands for his brother’s exclusion, and like his father before him proceeded to reign without Parliament. But, angry with the Whigs, he instigated a severe persecution of dissenters, exacerbated by the attempt to assassinate him known as the Rye House Plot. Quakers, as before, bore the brunt of it. This was the situation when Charles II died in 1685, to be succeeded by his brother as James II.

How far one can take the suggestion that Penn and James II were friends, one does not know, but certainly, they were useful to each other. Penn wanted toleration for dissenters, and James wanted toleration for Catholics. James realised that, to obtain it, it would help to have dissenters on side, and Penn moderated his own objections to relief for Catholics. For a time in 1686–87 Penn was

effectively James's right-hand man, and encouraged dissenters to take advantage of James's declaration of toleration, which in many quarters was received with suspicion as it had been issued under royal prerogative, not by parliament. Friends were wary of James's intentions, and of Penn's activities, and were not united. This will need a good deal of investigation.<sup>71</sup>

Neither Penn nor James anticipated the invasion of William of Orange until it was almost upon them, and both have been described as foolish utopians.<sup>72</sup> In the aftermath, Penn was inevitably looked on with suspicion. He was arrested several times and charged with treason. There was a suggestion that he was helping James, as he had estates in the area where James landed in Ireland.<sup>73</sup> Penn was in hiding from January 1691 to November 1692, and his colony was taken from him.

All this made things uncomfortable for Friends. A Master's thesis has been written on disaffection towards Penn among Friends in the years after 1691, and it appears that many influential Friends thought that Penn was no longer an asset.<sup>74</sup> William Meade's opposition to the inclusion of Penn's preface in the first edition of Fox's *Journal* may have been due to this; Penn had brought the society into disrepute, and it was not the right time to give him publicity.

Penn soon began to try to mend fences with the new regime. Kinsale, on his Irish estates, was becoming a major port, and Penn arranged supplies for William's armies.<sup>75</sup> In 1694 his colony was returned to him. Quakers were a large and increasingly wealthy minority group, and William needed them on side. They had benefited less than other dissenters from the Toleration Act of 1689. They could now worship freely and build meeting houses (and maybe the book should include a look at early meeting-house architecture), but the questions of oaths and tithes were still causing them major problems. Two practices, on which the Quakers insisted they would not compromise, were their refusal to take oaths and pay tithes. These had been important characteristics of Quakers from the beginning, and important to George Fox personally.<sup>76</sup> Tithes remained payable till the twentieth century, but the government proved willing to meet Friends on the matter of judicial oaths. The Affirmation Act of 1696 was the first attempt to give relief on this matter, and there was much discussion as to the wording that Friends could accept. Several other Acts followed, the final one in 1722, when Friends were at last satisfied with the agreed formula. However, even before these acts were passed, there was a certain amount of compromise in practice. There are many records of courts agreeing to accept a Quaker's word without a formal oath, or of allowing someone else to swear for him.<sup>77</sup>

The legal situation of Friends was now improved, but their position was by no means secure. The ex-Quaker Francis Bugg was in full flight against them in the 1690s, and there were also attacks from other quarters. Only Trinitarians could benefit under the Toleration Act, and Friends' Trinitarian credentials were considered doubtful. George Whitehead's credal statement of 1693 was intended to settle this matter, and the last thing Friends needed at this time was an attack from inside on their theological respectability. Yet this was what happened. George Keith, at this time working as surveyor in Pennsylvania, became concerned at the

lack of basic Christian knowledge among the emigrants, and, being tactless and arrogant, was disowned by Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting. The dispute transferred to England, and occupied much of the YM of 1695. Like other problem Quakers before him, Keith's main sin was 'bringing the society into disrepute'. It will be necessary to look further at Keith, who ended his days as an Anglican vicar, and was one of the founders of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

Braithwaite does not deal with the origins of the great Quaker family businesses of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that had their roots in the late seventeenth century. His book predates the modern interest in economic history and in industrial archaeology. The new book must say something about this. The first of the Lloyds, who were ironmasters before they were bankers, joined Friends in 1663. John Gurney, Norfolk wool merchant and progenitor of a great banking business as well as ancestor of Elizabeth Fry, came to Friends in 1683. Abraham Darby I was born to a Quaker family in 1678, and sent as apprentice to a Quaker millwright. His key assistant in his experiments with iron smelting came to him from the Lloyds. The London (Quaker) Lead Company was formed at the very end of the seventeenth century by a Quaker consortium, after the Affirmation Act of 1695 had eased their legal position.<sup>78</sup>

So the seventeenth century came to its end. Fox was dead, and a suitably edited selection of his works was being published. George Whitehead was now the leading Friend, Penn never having entirely recovered his status after the events of 1688–92. What remains to be considered, and how should the book end?

A full study of George Whitehead would be very desirable. He was involved in every major development in Quakerism from the early 1660s onward, though as a personality he was outshone by the flamboyant personalities of Penn and Fox.

It would be good to have a chapter on Ann Conway and her circle. There is much new material published since Braithwaite was writing. We should include here a look at one of the roads Friends did not take; it is known that George Keith was much attracted at one time by the theory of transmigration of souls, as propounded by the 'fringe' Quaker, Mercury von Helmont.<sup>79</sup>

The mass of manuscript material at Friends House needs to be gone through, together with American archives.

So where to end? The next distinctive date in Quaker internal history is 1737, when a formal membership system was introduced. That is too far into the eighteenth century. The new book will probably have to follow Braithwaite and end with an account of Friends as they were at the beginning of the eighteenth century, with a nod to the journal writers, John Gratton, John Kelsall, Thomas Story and others, and a look ahead to the death of Whitehead in 1723.

First, the book has to be written and published...

## NOTES

1. Summarised by Sylvia Stevens in an unpublished paper to the QRSA/Quaker Historians and Activists' joint conference in 2008. For an earlier comment on the state of Quaker history see Ingle, H.L., 'The Future of Quaker History—1997', Presidential address to the Friends Historical Society, *JFHS* 58/1 (1997), repr. in Fager, C. (ed.), *Stirring the Pot: A Book for H. Larry Ingle*, Fayetteville, NC: Kimo Press, 2011, pp. 321–32.
2. It originated as a short paper on developments in Quakerism in its immediate post-charismatic phase which was presented at the 2006 summer conference of the Ecclesiastical History Society.
3. Braithwaite, W.C., *The Second Period of Quakerism*, London: Macmillan, 1919; 2nd edn prepared by Cadbury, H.J.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.
4. Punshon, J., *Portrait in Grey*, London: Quaker Home Service, 1984.
5. The nineteenth century has been well served recently, with excellent books on both American and British Quaker history: Hamm, T.D., *The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends 1800–1907*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992; and Kennedy, T., *British Quakerism 1860–1920: The Transformation of a Religious Community*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
6. Moore, R., *The Light in their Consciences: Early Quakers in Britain 1644–1666*, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000.
7. Southern, A., 'The Rowntree Histories and the Growth of Liberal Quakerism', *Quaker Studies* 16/1 (2011), pp. 7–73, gives numerous examples of the Rowntree historians' evident disapproval of later Quaker developments.
8. Braithwaite, *Second Period*, p. 635.
9. Tolles, F.B., *The Atlantic Community of the Early Friends*, London: Friends Historical Society, 1952, p. 14.
10. Horle, C.W., *The Quakers and the English Legal System, 1660–1688*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988, pp. 80–81.
11. See the trilogy by Greaves, R.L., *Deliver us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660–1663*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986; *Enemies under his Feet: Radicals and Nonconformists in Britain, 1664–1677*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990; *Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution of 1688–89*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992. The first two are particularly relevant to Quaker history.
12. Horle, C., *The Quakers and the English Legal System*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988, pp. 73–80.
13. Horle, *Quakers and the English Legal System*, pp. 264–66, 281–84.
14. Horle, *Quakers and the English Legal System*, pp. 238–44.
15. Beck, W., and Ball, T.F., *The London Friends Meetings*, London: Bowyer Kitto, 1869, facsimile reprint with introduction, illustrations and index, Dixon, S., and Daniels, P., London: Pronoun Press, 2009.
16. For the influence of Keith on Barclay see J. Philip Wragge, 'The Debt of Robert Barclay to George Keith', Typescript, 1946, in Quaker libraries. Braithwaite, *Second Period*, pp. 333–34, admits Keith's ability but quickly passes on to Barclay. Kirby, E.W., *George Keith*, New York and London: American Historical Association, 1942, deals mainly with Keith's later life and the circumstances of his break with Quakerism, as does Martin, C.J.L., 'Tradition versus Innovation: The Hat, Wilkinson–Story and Keithian Controversies', *Quaker Studies* 8/1 (2003), pp. 5–22 (15–18).
17. Moore, *Light*, pp. 26, 29, 65, 125–26, 194.
18. First minute of the Second Day Morning Meeting, 15 September 1673, in Friends House Library.
19. Braithwaite, *Second Period*, p. 280.



20. Trevett, C., ‘“Not fit to be printed”: The Welsh, the Women and the Second Day’s Morning Meeting’, *JFHS* 59/2 (2001), pp. 115–44.

21. Moore, *Light*, pp. 157–61, see also pp. 185–89.

22. Horle, *Quakers and the English Legal System*, pp. 173–74; ‘Changing Attitudes towards Legal Defense: The George Fox Case and the Establishment of Meeting for Sufferings’, in J.W. Frost and D. Moore (eds.), *Seeking the Light: Essays in Quaker History in Honour of Edwin B. Bronner*, Wallingford, PA: Pendle Hill, 1980, pp. 17–39.

23. Braithwaite, *Second Period*, pp. 283–25, but see 2nd edn additional notes, pp. 676–78, listing works published up to 1955 that give another viewpoint.

24. Fox, *The Works of George Fox*, 8 vols., Gould: Philadelphia, 1831, repr. New Foundation: Philadelphia, 1990, II, Epistles 248, 251, 263, 264. Later epistles on this subject can be dated more definitely to the 1670s.

25. Impression gained from a reading of Rufus Jones, *The Quakers in the American Colonies*, London: Macmillan, 1923.

26. Moore, *Light*, p. 140 and pp. 276–77 n. 61.

27. Mortimer, R. (ed.), *Minute Book of the Men’s Meeting of the Society of Friends in Bristol*, Bristol: Bristol Record Society, vol. XXVI, 1667–86, 1971, pp. 4, 27, 54.

28. Notably, Mack, P., *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth Century England*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford: University of California Press 1992; Garman, M., Applegate, J., Benefiel, M., and Meredith, D., *Hidden in Plain Sight: Quaker Women’s Writings, 1650–1700*, Wallingford, PA: Pendle Hill, 1996; Trevett, C., *Women and Quakerism in the Seventeenth Century*, York: Sessions, 1991 and *Quaker Women Prophets in England and Wales 1650–1700*, New York: Mellen, 2000.

29. Howard, L., *The Seat of the Scorned Thrown Down*, 1673, Epistle to the Reader.

30. Underwood, T.L., *Primitivism, Radicalism, and the Lamb’s War: The Baptist–Quaker Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997 is an account of the issues involved, not the details of the debates.

31. Vann, R.T., *Social Development of Early Quakerism, 1655–1755*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969.

32. Morgan, N., *Lancashire Quakers and the Establishment 1660–1730*, Halifax: Ryburn Academic Publishing, 1993; Davies, A., *The Quakers in English Society 1655–1725*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000; Snell, B.S. (ed.), *Minute Book for the Upperside of Bucks 1669–1690*, Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society, 1937; Morland, S. (ed.), *The Somersetshire Quarterly Meeting of the Society of Friends 1668–99*, Somerset Record Society, 1978; Mortimer, *Bristol Minutes*.

33. Dennison, E.P., Ditchburn, D., and Lynch, M. (eds.), *Aberdeen before 1800: A New History*, East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2002.

34. Records of Baltimore Women’s Yearly Meeting, microfilm in the Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, 10.1 and 10.4. 1679, with note of accompanying letter addressed to Rebecca Travers and Ann Whitehead. Further work on minutes would be much more easily done in America, using these microfilms, whereas in Britain the monthly meeting minutes are distributed in local record offices.

35. Rogers, W., *A Second Scourge for George Whitehead* and Ellwood, T., *Rogero Mastix, or a Rod for William Rogers* (both 1844/85).

36. Leachman, C.L., ‘From an “Unruly Sect” to a Society of “Strict Unity”: The Development of Quakerism in England c. 1650–1689’, Ph.D. dissertation, London, 1997, pp. 245–85.

37. Moore, *Light*, p. 119 for several examples of early Quaker ‘railing’. This reputation still clung to them in the 1670s, see e.g. R.H. *The Character of a Quaker*, 1671, pp. 1–5. For their success in giving a more positive impression, Good, T., *Firmianus and Dubitientius*, 1674, p. 91.

38. Miller, ‘A Suffering People’ found a number of instances of hostility, but the overall picture in Davies, A., *The Quakers in English Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000,

and Morgan, N., *Lancashire Quakers and the Establishment*, Halifax: Ryburn Academic Publishing, 1993, is of fairly normal relationships, and some instances of friendliness.

39. Davies, *The Quakers in English Society*, pp. 203–11 (relating to Essex). Morgan, *Lancashire Quakers and the Establishment*, pp. 257–69, found Lancastrian Quakers holding more closely to early Quaker practices.

40. For this epistle see Moore, *Light*, pp. 137–38. Full text online at [www.qhpress.org/texts/balby](http://www.qhpress.org/texts/balby).

41. Danson, T., *A Synopsis of Quakerism*, Epistle to the Reader; Good, T., *Firmianus and Dubitentius* (both 1674), p. 91.

42. This was discussed in an email exchange late in 2005 among several Quaker scholars, arising from an enquiry about the disappearance of ‘thou’ in English speech. A reference to the possible cause being Quaker usage was found in Finkenstaedt, T., *You und Thou: Studien Zur Anrede Im Englischen (Mit Einem Exkurs Über die Anrede im Deutschen)*, Berlin: W. de Gruyter & Co., about 1963.

43. Clarke, G. (ed.), *John Bellars, his Life and Times*, London and New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.

44. Braithwaite, *Second Period*, pp. 436, 596.

45. Swarthmore mss. 2.95 (printed with variations in Fox, *Works*, VII, Epistle 131, p. 126; Moore, *Light*, pp. 121–22).

46. Symonds, T., *The Voyce of the Just Uttered*, 1656, p. 6.

47. There are references to seriously wealthy Friends in Ingle, *First among Friends*, pp. 255, 267, 283.

48. *The Character of a Quaker*, Epistle to the Reader, pp. 4, 6, 14; *Firmianus and Dubitentius*, p. 95.

49. The traditional view is restated in two recent books by Gerard Guiton (*The Growth and Development of Quaker Testimony, 1652-1661 and 1960-1994: Conflict, Non-Violence, and Conciliation*, Lewiston: Mellen, 2005 and *The Early Quakers and the ‘Kingdom of God’*, San Francisco: Inner Light Books, 2012), but in the opinion of the present author the arguments presented are not convincing.

50. Moore, *Light*, pp. 181–85. Richard L. Greaves’ trilogy, *Deliver us from Evil, Enemies under his Feet*, and *Secrets of the Kingdom*, shows a marked reduction in the number of references to Quakers as time passed.

51. Braithwaite, *Second Period*, pp. 616–17, and ‘Penal Laws Affecting Friends’, appended to Penney, N. (ed.), *The First Publishers of Truth*, London: Headley, 1907.

52. Cole, W.A., ‘The Quakers and the English Revolution’, *Past and Present* 10 (1956), pp. 39–54.

53. Pennington, I., *Somewhat Spoken to a Weighty Question*, 1661. See Moore, *Light*, pp. 183–84 and note.

54. Weddle, M.B., *Walking in the Way of Peace: Quaker Pacifism in the Seventeenth Century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

55. Moore, *Light*, pp. 10, 15, 20, 23, 30, 32, 75–87, 89, 157.

56. Underwood, T.L., *Primitivism, Radicalism, and the Lambs War*, describes the main points of division, which applied also to differences between Quakers and many other dissenters.

57. Keith, G., and Penn, W., *The Light of Truth Triumphant*, London, 1670, p. 5.

58. Penney, N., *The Journal of George Fox*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911, II, pp. 197–202, and note; first printed in George Fox, *To the Ministers, Teachers and Priests...in Barbados*, 1672.

59. I have been twice advised by scholars of Fox not to use this letter as an example of Fox’s thinking. For a different view see Bailey, R., *New Light on George Fox and Early Quakerism: The Making and Unmaking of a God*, San Francisco: Mellen Press, pp. 180–85. Bailey thinks, that

'Fox made a confession of faith wrung from him under the fire of vicious critics' (p. 184). Endy, M.B., 'George Fox and William Penn: Their Relationship and their Roles within the Quaker Movement', *Quaker History* 93 (Spring 2004), pp. 1-39, thinks that Bailey exaggerates.

60. Barclay, R., *Apology for the True Christian Divinity*, ed. Peter D. Sippel, Glenside, PA: Quaker Heritage Press, new edn, 2002. This follows the first 1678 English language edition which is believed to have been printed in Aberdeen.

61. *Apology*, Fifth and Sixth propositions para. XI, QHP edn pp. 115-16.

62. *Apology*, Fifth and Sixth propositions, para. XIII, QHP edn pp. 120-21.

63. There is a full discussion of the relationship between Fox and Penn, with reference to a number of other scholars' opinions, in Endy, 'George Fox and William Penn'. For a subsequent consideration see Palmer, Jr, T.V., 'Did William Penn Diverge Significantly from George Fox in his Understanding of the Quaker Message?', *Quaker Studies* 11/1 (2006), pp. 59-70. I would not agree with Palmer's suggestion that Fox was too unsophisticated to notice that Penn had significantly changed the formulation of the Quaker faith. More likely, he thought that Penn's terminology was not of prime importance.

64. Bailey, *New Light*, pp. 219-29; Ingle, *First among Friends*, pp. 244-46.

65. Coudert, A., *The Impact of the Kabbalah in the Seventeenth Century: The Life and Thought of Francis Mercury van Helmont (1614-1691)*, Leiden: Brill, 1999, pp. 171-92, 208-22, 257-69. Fox's letter is in LSF, 'Memorial from George Fox to the Second Day Morning Meeting, 19 January 1684'.

66. The 'Letter to the Governor of Barbados' has been quoted. The most important of such statements was probably *The Christian Faith and Profession of the People commonly called Quakers*, issued in 1693 by George Whitehead and other members of the Second Day Morning Meeting, in response to suggestions that Quakers were not true Trinitarian Christians.

67. Cadbury, H.J., *George Fox's 'Book of Miracles'*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948; Moore, R., 'Late Seventeenth Century Quakerism and the Miraculous: A New Look at George Fox's "Book of Miracles"', in K. Cooper and J. Gregory (eds.), *Signs, Wonders, Miracles: Representations of Divine Power in the Life of the Church*, Studies in Church History 41, Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2005, pp. 335-44. See Endy's critique of Bailey, where he does not consider the problem of the 'Book of Miracles', in 'George Fox and William Penn'.

68. Braithwaite, *Second Period*, p. 90, also see p. 95 for a similar statement in 1681.

69. Geiter, M., *William Penn, Profiles in Power*; Edinburgh: Pearson Education, 2000, p. 58. Braithwaite, *Second Period*, p. 95, quotes a minute of the Morning Meeting suggesting that Friends were unhappy with Penn's political activities.

70. Allen, R.C., *Quaker Communities in Early Modern Wales: From Resistance to Respectability*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2007, pp. 182-85.

71. Braithwaite, *Second Period*, pp. 141-45, mentions these events, but has not enough detail. It will be advisable to check local minutes.

72. Macaulay, T.B., *The History of England from the Accession of James the Second*, 5 vols., London, 1848-61, I, pp. 297-300, for adverse comments on Penn.

73. Geiter, *William Penn*, p. 68.

74. Jani Kurki, 'The Not-that Holy Experiment? Disaffection towards William Penn due to his Actions amongst Fellow-Quakers in England, 1691 to 1710', Masters thesis, University of Helsinki, 2004.

75. Geiter, *William Penn*, p. 72.

76. Moore, *Light*, pp. 117-19.

77. Horle, *Quakers and the English Legal System*, pp. 238-44.

78. Walvin, J., *The Quakers: Money and Morals*, London: John Murray, 1997, pp. 2, 29-36, 48-49, 61, 71, 105-108; Raistrick, A., *Quakers in Science and Industry*, London: Bannisdale, 1950, repr. Newton Abbott: David & Charles, 1968, pp. 42-50, 53-56, 107-13, 122-24,

166-71; Ackrill, M., and Hannah, L., *Barclays: The Business of Banking 1690–1996*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. 1-11; Lloyd, H., *The Quaker Lloyds in the Industrial Revolution*, London: Hutchinson, 1975, pp. 3, 9-12, 16-36; Thomas, E., *Coalbrookdale and the Darbys*, York: Sessions, 1999, pp. 1-4.

79. Advice some years ago from J. William Frost.

#### AUTHOR DETAILS

Rosemary Moore is an independent scholar attached to the Centre for Post-graduate Quaker Studies at Woodbrooke Quaker Centre, Birmingham. Her publications include *The Light in their Consciences: Early Quakers in Britain 1646–1666* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), an edition of *The History of the Life of Thomas Ellwood, Written by Himself* (International Sacred Literature Trust, 2004), and (with R. Melvin Keiser) *Knowing the Mystery of Life Within: Selected Writings of Isaac Penington in their Historical and Theological Context* (London: Quaker Books, 2005). She was a co-operating editor for *Protestant Nonconformist Text. Vol.1, 1550–1700* (ed. R. Tudur Jones, Ashcroft, 2007).

Mailing address: 25 Beech Drive, Shifnal, Shropshire TF11 8HJ, England.  
Email: dandrmoore@care4free.net.