

THE PERSECUTION OF 'AN INNOCENT PEOPLE' IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND¹

Raymond Ayoub

Penn State University, USA

ABSTRACT

This article gives an outline survey of the beliefs and practices of seventeenth century Friends, the spiritual-religious basis of these, the existing or enacted laws with which these came into conflict, and the ensuing penalties inflicted on Friends for disobeying these strictures. While there is an abundance of relevant material in print, this account endeavors to give a comprehensive and systematic summary of the pertinent laws and some of their consequences to Friends. Though the penalties were not of equal frequency or severity, they point to limitations placed on Friends in their effort to be faithful to their beliefs.

KEYWORDS

Friends, law, persecution, suffering

1. INTRODUCTION

The goal of this article is to probe the scriptural-spiritual basis of Friends' religious convictions and practices and the manner in which these came into conflict with the English legal system of the seventeenth century, resulting in extreme suffering and hardship. Although there is an abundance of material in print related to this topic, it does not always set forth, in a systematic way, the religious basis of the faith, practice, and testimony of Friends, or the relevant laws which gave rise to their sufferings.

In the seventeenth century the legal system in Britain was (and undoubtedly still is!) a complex mixture of civil and ecclesiastical courts, of written and unwritten laws, many dating from the Magna Carta, and others added over the centuries. Civil and ecclesiastical courts were numerous, both locally and nationally.² The English Reformation created a partnership between parliament and the monarch became the head of the church. Thus, membership in the church became a prerequisite for full citizenship rights. A consequence of this fact is that all individuals were recorded by

the church warden as members of the church of the parish in which they resided. Hence, a dissenter could be prosecuted by the church or by the state through civil or ecclesiastical laws (Horle 1988: 34-38).

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

New religious movements have frequently come into conflict with the social milieu in which they arose and participants have frequently, if not invariably, been subjected to persecution. It can be surmised that the level of persecution was, in general, proportional to the degree of threat that the movement was thought to pose to the existing order.

This supposition is no less true of the Quakers. One feature, however, which sets Quakers apart from many movements, is the fact that early in the evolution of the Religious Society of Friends, its members were directed to keep careful accounts of their sufferings since these hardships were unusually frequent and widespread. Accordingly, there is a substantial amount of material relating to their history.³

Quakerism was but one of innumerable religious movements arising from about 1620 to 1700. These included (but are not limited to) Behemists, Seekers, Diggers, Familists, Fifth Monarchists, Grindletonians, Muggletonians, Levellers, and Ranters. Of the numerous sects that arose in the seventeenth century only the Quakers have survived (although there is of the survival of the Muggletonians into the twentieth century). Quakers, however, were among the most severely persecuted. As will be seen below, this may be accounted for, in part, because of the refusal of Friends to swear an oath and to pay tithes. The suffering was derived not only from the existing laws but from often brutal prejudice on the part of the authorities, who, rather than protecting the rights of Friends, encouraged outright violence. Although there may have existed a law under which the Friend could be indicted, the magistrate frequently imposed fines or prison sentences without adequate legal process. The Friend was, generally, powerless to do anything about it.

3. ONSET OF PERSECUTION

Persecution began virtually from moment of Quakerism's inception. George Fox dates the 'rise of the truth' to the year 1644 (Fox 1698: 2-3), and the persecution was not essentially fully relieved until about 1695. The Act of Toleration in 1689 in the reign of William and Mary did not exonerate Friends fully from the requirement of taking a modified form of oath until 1695 (Braithwaite 1961: Chapter 7). Even then remained the opposition to payment of tithes, an issue which was largely resolved in the early part of the eighteenth century, but not fully until recent times. To be sure, there was a temporary relief from persecution after restoration of Charles II; this was the 'declaration of Indulgence' promulgated in 1674, which resulted in the release from prison of about 500 Friends.

Nevertheless, a concerted effort was made after 1664 essentially to destroy Quakerism and other religious dissidents. Quakerism, however, survived and flourished

notwithstanding the hardships and sufferings. It is not too difficult to account for this: the second half of the seventeenth century was a period of religious upheaval, and while many dissident groups vied for the hearts and minds of the people, there was a certain camaraderie that arose among the Quakers. Moreover, the relatively non-belligerent behavior of Friends won the sympathy and support of many who were not in agreement with their theology. This is not to say that Quakers' pacifism extended necessarily to their language, for it is widely known that Friends could give their opponents a thorough tongue-lashing and that their attitude towards ministers, or what they pejoratively called 'hireling priest' (or 'priests' for short), was uncompromising, if not highly quarrelsome.

There are many documented instances of the support accorded them by neighbors, bystander, and even magistrates. Perhaps the most noted example is the refusal of the jury to convict William Penn and William Mead, Margeret Fell's son-in-law, despite the hardships inflicted upon the jury by the decidedly antagonistic presiding judge who was determined to obtain a conviction.

Much has been written to account for differences in success among various religious and social movements. In the case of religious movements, perhaps the quotation attributed to Tertullian (speaking of the Christian martyrs) is pertinent: 'the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church'. This idea seemed especially germane to Quakerism.

There is, however, another aspect of Quakerism which is worth examining and which may have contributed to its success. George Fox, regarded by many as the founder of the movement, was imbued with what one might call a powerful 'crusader's complex'. By this is meant that the 'enemy' is confronted without regard to the individual costs in physical and financial sacrifice. This zeal was true of many convinced Friends. Fox and his followers phrased their preaching in military metaphor and talked about waging the 'Lamb's War', an expression coming from the book of Revelations (17:14), and indeed James Nayler wrote a pamphlet with this precise title (Nayler: 1973 [1657]). Not content with establishing a closed community of believers, Fox and his first followers, the so-called 'valiant sixty',⁴ were determined to bring about the Kingdom of Christ on Earth – not only in the British Isles, but throughout the world. They traveled generally in pairs, on analogy with the first apostles at the beginning of the Christian era, and they based their calling on passages in the Scriptures. They were aided in this by the firm belief that the Scriptures were to be interpreted not literally but through 'the spirit which gave them forth' (Barclay 2002: Proposition 3). They were apocalyptic in their language – reminiscent of the prophets of old – and uncompromisingly anti-clerical. Finally, they felt strongly that Jesus of Nazareth ushered in a new covenant; when the old and the new were in conflict, the new covenant took precedence (Barclay 2002: Proposition 3). The suffering they endured was severe; Friends were subjected to imprisonment in filthy, cold dungeons, a treatment which was state sanctioned, as were unofficial whippings and beatings, and confiscation of goods and property. Indeed, under Fox's leadership, given their mission and goal, suffering was to be expected.

The early Friends were fully aware that their crusade would result in persecution. In fact, suffering was almost welcomed as a sign that their cause was righteous since it identified their treatment with that accorded Jesus of Nazareth. Among other biblical passages, they could point to 2 Tim. 3:12: 'Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution' and 'it is not only given to you to believe in Christ but to suffer in his name'. 'They that suffer with Christ shall reign with him'. 'The patient sufferer shall wear the crown and hath victory at last'. Besse⁵ reports the case of a noted Friend of that period, Ann Blagdon, who, during the flogging that had been ordered upon her, praised God for the privilege of suffering in his name. In the preface to his cited work, Besse quotes additional passages, such as Ecclus 2:5: 'God is tried in fire and acceptable men in the furnace of adversity' (Besse 1753: iii).

Although Friends experienced great hardship and many died from intolerable conditions either in prison or as a consequence of imprisonment or ill treatment, there was no instance of capital punishment in England. To be sure, while there was a law that could technically have resulted in execution,⁶ this punishment was never actually carried out. That extreme measure was to be left to the Massachusetts Colony where four Quaker martyrs were executed, among them Marmaduke Stephenson, William Robinson, and Mary Dyer.

4. PLAN

The plan of the present article is therefore as follows. First, a tenet of Quakers will be cited, following which I will endeavor to find its religious or scriptural basis. Next will come an account of how this conviction or practice brought Friends into conflict with one or more of the many applicable laws and oaths whose *general* statements may be found in the above-cited references. For *detailed* and *explicit* statements and the associated penalties, the reader is referred to the preface to Besse 1753, as well as the work of Scobell (1658), Blackstone (1869), Harbury (1907–17), and Cay (1739). These works all have excellent indices and the interested reader will find it easy to locate a given topic.

Before proceeding, a few remarks concerning the level of persecution in numerical terms are in order. In addition to imprisonments for a variety of reasons, there was confiscation of goods for the payment of fines (which in the literature is referred to as 'spoiling' or 'distress' or 'distrain' of goods), transportation to the colonies (i.e. banishment, primarily to Barbados and Jamaica), confiscation of estates under the statute of *praemunire* (which literally means 'forewarning'), and physical abuse, etc. For a variety of reasons, it is not always possible to pin-point the exact reason for imprisonment. As a simple example, a Friend may be apprehended under the conventicle act (see below) but be imprisoned for refusing to swear an oath. Indeed, in many instances, tendering an oath was the quickest way for the magistrates to imprison the Friend.

Several authors have given a numerical estimate of the extent to which Friends were persecuted. There were imprisonments, fines, distraint of goods and property, physical and emotional abuse. These abuses are documented with alarming

frequency. As noted, various numerical counts are available. These are as follows: in the single year 1662 in the city of London, over 200 Friends were imprisoned (Spurrier 1976: 111). Of these, twenty are listed as having died either in prison or as a direct result of their imprisonment (Besse 1753: xxxviii-xliv). Braithwaite quotes an old Quaker tract as stating that prior to the Restoration, in the year 1660, 3170 Friends suffered a variety of hardships and abuses (Spurrier 1976: 112). In 1680 William Penn and two other Friends presented to the king and to parliament a statement that between 1650 and 1680, 10,000 had been imprisoned and that 243 had died (Spurrier 1976: 111-56). Thus, by any measure, the level of suffering was very high (Braithwaite 1961: Chs 2, 3, 4.)

5. SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF FRIENDS

Before proceeding, it would be helpful to describe, even if very briefly, the socio-economic status of Friends during this period. Among other things, this will put into perspective the severity of the fines inflicted.

It is not easy to depict with accuracy the economic or social status of Friends. The problem is not made easier by the fact that historians are not in agreement. We have, however, some evidence in the form of a fairly accurate cross-section of Friends in the vicinity of Banbury. This was compiled from the registry of marriages in which the profession of the groom is given (Ward 1991: 142-44). The records of the Banbury monthly meeting cover the period up to 1699, and note roughly six categories: (1) gentleman, (2) artisans, (3) land owners or leasers, (4) merchants, (5) professionals, (6) labourers.

Ward finds that of 68 marriages recorded in the period, 19 or 28 per cent were in category 3, 41 or 68 per cent in category 2 or 4, and 8 or 12 per cent in category 5 (Ward 1991: 142-44). Using these figures, we surmise that Quakers were predominantly from the 'middle class' both socially and economically even if at the lower end. As for incomes, they ranged from 40 to 60 pounds per year (Ward 191: 16-17), this being approximately one 500th of current average UK income. Thus, a fine of £10, which would be equivalent to £5000 in modern-day terms, represented a severe financial penalty, one which in many cases proved confiscatory. It is interesting to note that the proportionality of the punishment. In one recorded case a cow was confiscated and said to be worth £3; as a comparative measure, a cow currently costs roughly £1500. Thus we see the same approximate relative severity of the punishment when compared to average income.

6. FRIENDS 'ILLEGAL' PRACTICES

The various activities which provoked this persecution will now be enumerated followed by details of the spiritual-scriptural basis for an action or its refusal. The relevant law under which prosecution and persecution took place will be stated. As the reader will note, the list of alleged infractions is long and it is possible that some have been overlooked. For some infractions, the number of Friends who were

reported to have suffered is small. If one case is reported, for example in Besse's account, it is very likely that there have been other cases which are not documented.

Within the following list, the first five were among the most frequent reasons for conviction. The list reads:

1. Refusal to *swear an oath*.
2. Refusal to *pay tithes*.
3. Refusal to *pay 'rates'*, i.e. taxes for the upkeep of the churches as well as other church 'obligations'.
4. '*Recusancy*' or the refusal to attend the Established Church.
5. Determination to hold meetings or worship at any time or place, which was contrary to the Conventicle Act.
6. Travelling and preaching in the countryside and in cities contrary to the *vagrancy* laws.
7. Refusal to remove hats to 'superiors' (except when praying to God). This is often referred to as refusing to practice '*hat honour*'.
8. Determination to use the '*plain language*' to everyone including magistrates.
9. Determination to *conduct marriages* 'after the manner of Friends'.
10. Likewise with *funerals and burials*.
11. *Disrupting ministers* during church services.
12. *Ignoring 'holy days'*, including the Sabbath, for instance, by travelling, conducting business, etc., on such days.
13. Proclaiming beliefs, orally or in print, which are contrary to the *laws on blasphemy*. Friends spoke of publishing 'the truth'. The law in question comprises a large list of behaviors considered blasphemous – including, in particular, a rejection of any component of the accepted creed. In addition, many other assertions were deemed to be blasphemous. For example the contention that one is not compelled to believe anything incompatible with one's conscience.
14. *Urging others to refuse to take an oath*.
15. *Publishing the 'truth'*, i.e. publishing books and pamphlets.
16. *Refusing to serve in the armed services or finding a substitute*.
17. Ignoring the '*five-miles*' act.
18. Behaving in public in such a way as to '*provoke a riot*'.
19. *Withholding priests fees*, thereby resulting in excommunication and its consequences.
20. Going '*naked as a sign*'.

A remark is pertinent. Many Friends wrote tracts asserting that civil government was to be respected. Although they advocated changes when it came to religious practices, by and large they respected the civil authorities. Indeed, they never advocated the overthrow of the government, although there were some extremists among them. They claimed, on the other hand, that civil authorities had no right over religious practice, and that 'wicked' laws limiting their freedom to practise their religion, need not be obeyed. In 1656, Edward Burrough, in the pamphlet *Truth Defended*, wrote as follows '...we cannot be subject to corrupt laws but, rather than

transgress the law of God, ...we choose to suffer by the corrupt wills of men under corrupt laws' (Burrough 1656). There was no ambiguity in Friends' determination to seek and proclaim the 'truth'. Below are details of these practices.

a. Swearing an Oath

The first belief to be considered is the refusal to swear or take an oath. While oaths of various forms have been used for millennia, they have, on the other hand, the religious legitimacy has also been debated and indeed continues to be a controversial issue. The essence of an oath is to invoke the punishment of God upon oneself if the swearer is not telling the truth; as such, oaths are self-imprecatory. Friends were unalterably opposed to the practice of swearing an oath and were uncompromising in adhering to this conviction.

The justification for their unyielding prohibition is straightforward, and was based on a biblical precedent. Matthew 5:34-37 records Jesus' own words:

But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne: Nor by the earth for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil (KJV translation).

The prohibition is as explicit as anything can be. Over the centuries, theologians have argued that Jesus did not mean to prohibit the taking of an occasional oath but intended that his listeners should not make it a habit. The prohibition is repeated in Jas. 5:12.

This constraint gave Friends untold difficulty and placed severe restrictions upon them. To understand this we have to go back to the English Reformation.

Although oaths of various forms have existed throughout history, the ones that concern us here are those affirming that the English king or queen was the only head of the realm in matters *spiritual* as well as temporal. It was a way, after the declaration of Henry VIII, of helping to outlaw Roman Catholicism and to affirm unequivocally that foreign authorities, pope or monarch or prince had no power in England.

The first 'oath of supremacy' was introduced by Henry VIII. This oath was repealed by his Catholic daughter Mary but was reaffirmed by his Protestant daughter Elizabeth I when she became queen. It was then called the 'Oath of Royal Supremacy' (Besse 1753: viii). In the reign of James I, a further oath was enacted called the 'Oath of Allegiance' and explicitly mentioned the Pope. The king is acknowledged as the lawful king and neither the Pope nor any of his representatives has any power either to depose the English monarch or to absolve the citizen from this oath (Besse 1753: x).

Finally there was a further oath called the 'Oath of Abjuration', which was enacted first in 1643 and in a more detailed form in 1655. Its purpose was to rout out the Roman Catholics, or 'papists' as they were pejoratively called, and was tendered to anyone suspected of being a Roman Catholic. Presiding jurists were authorised to administer it at their discretion. A later form called the 'Test Oath', which came into effect in 1672, required that the individual renounce any allegiance to the Pope,

acknowledge the English monarch as the supreme head in all matters spiritual as well as temporal. It also required the renunciation of the doctrine of transubstantiation, among other things (Besse 1753: x). (The 'Oath of Abjuration' was also the name given to an oath enacted in the 1690s, which, after the accession of William and Mary, required the individual to deny under oath, that the house of Stuart had any legitimate claim to the throne of England.)

In reality, Friends had no quarrel with the provisions of these oaths – by and large, as mentioned above, they accepted the legitimacy of the authorities in England and they were vehemently against the Roman Catholic Church and its members. It was not the content of the oaths to which they took exception; it was on the issue of *swearing* that they steadfastly refused to compromise.⁷ Since they shared with the authorities the opposition to the 'papists', and since the oaths were designed to rout out the 'papists', why was the administration of the oaths to Friends ever an issue? The answer lies in two directions. The first is relatively minor: at this time of religious upheaval, some Quakers were often accused of being 'closet' Catholics, and indeed one rumor had it that George Fox was a Jesuit in disguise.⁸ Secondly, and more significant however, is the fact that Quakers were known by jurists to oppose the swearing of an oath. If a legal case against a Friend were weak or inconclusive, the judge did not need to bring in additional evidence. He could simply tender one of the standard oaths. Since the Friend could not swear, the Friend suffered the consequences of refusing to swear the oath. Such was the case, for example, during the trial of Margaret Fell. Brought up ostensibly for holding meeting for worship in her home (we shall see below that this was strictly illegal, being contrary to the 'Conventicle Act'), the case appeared weak and the judge resorted to the practice of tendering the Oath of Allegiance. Margaret Fell steadfastly refused and the jury found her guilty of refusal. Though she pointed out that the oath was intended for 'papists', her pleas were to no avail. It is not to their credit that Friends (almost invariably) used the pejorative term 'papist' when referring to Roman Catholics. Margaret Fell was found guilty and was imprisoned for four years under severe conditions (Moore 2000: 185).

The oaths had a fairly standard wording. Here is the beginning of the oath of abjuration of 1565: 'I, A,B, do truly and sincerely, abjure etc. ...so help me God' (Besse 1753: x).

The penalties for refusing to swear an oath of allegiance were severe. A first refusal resulted in imprisonment until the next session of the court (courts were not in continuous session). A second refusal resulted in a *praemunire*. This legal instrument originated in the fifteenth century and was seldom used on account of its severity. *Praemunire facias* meant literally, that the defendant was *forewarned* that all lands and goods would be forfeited to the king, that the defendant would remain a prisoner at the king's pleasure and was out of the king's protection (Moore 2000: 179, 185). This last provision meant that the guilty party could not invoke any legal protection as defense against any misdeed committed against the person or property. The victim was powerless against theft of possessions or physical assault. A second or possibly third refusal was deemed treasonable and was theoretically punishable by execution. In actuality, execution was never carried out. The sentence of *praemunire* was fre-

quently invoked. A notable case is that of the Francis Howgill who was praemunured in 1664 and sentenced to life imprisonment (Moore 2000: 185). Moreover, confiscation was seldom put into effect. Indeed Margaret Fell's estate was eventually restored to her through the intercession of friends in high places. Nevertheless lengthy and harsh imprisonments were common.

In 1692, a law was passed easing the wording of the oath, so that it now read: 'I declare in the presence of Almighty God the Witness of the truth of what I say' (Braithwaite 1961: Chapter 7). While this satisfied most Friends, some were still hesitant, objecting to the use of the word 'God' in the phrasing.

b. Tithes

Biblically, a tithe was defined to be the payment of a tenth of the holders *increase* in assets during the previous year – what would now be called 'capital gains'. Historically, this was to be paid to support the priestly class, that is, the biblical Levites. If the owner's flock gave birth to ten animals, *one* was given as part of the tithe. In addition, a tenth of the harvest was to be ceded.

In England the payment of tithes dates back to the thirteenth century and the statutes governing the imposition and payment of tithes is very extensive (Braithwaite 1955: 136, 346, 458). Basically the country was divided into parishes, priories, and so on, under the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical *appropriators* – bishop, prior, prioress – and tithes were collected from landholders in the parish.

However, after the dissolution and expropriation of the monasteries under Henry VIII, rectories and tithes belonged to the crown and many were sold or given to laymen. About a third of all significant tithes were held by such 'impropriators', as they were called. Such tithes could be sold more or less at will. Quakers made no distinction between 'appropriator' and 'impropriator' and refused payment in either case.

Quakers' opposition to the payment of tithes will now be examined. This opposition was shared by other religious dissenters as well. Indeed, tithes were a source of opposition on the part of many sects. Why should they give support to a Church with which they were in strong disagreement? Quakers, however, found justification for their opposition in the Scriptures. Their primary basis was Mt. 10. 7–10: 'Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils: *freely ye have received, freely give*. Provide neither gold nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey.' In other words, the word of Christ was not a commodity to be bought and sold.

Friends also quoted: 'Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God: that we might know the things that are *freely* given to us of God' (1 Cor. 2:12).

In their writings and letters, Friends repeated this phrase, or a variant, with great frequency, and this opposition became an uncompromising dogma. We may wonder why Friends were so strongly opposed to that which has sanction in the Hebrew Scriptures. The reason may lie in the fact that the injunction to pay tithes occurs *nowhere* in the New Testament. The word 'tithe' does occur but only with reference to an event in the Hebrew Scriptures. For example, Mt. 23: 'Woe unto you...ye pay

tithe of mint, anis and cumin and have omitted the weightier matters of law, justice, mercy and faith...' Since the New Testament represents the 'new covenant', there is no compulsion to adhere to any decree, promulgated before the coming of Christ, which was not sanctioned by him.

Many were the laws with which this came into conflict. It is widely recognised that possessors of wealth generally either initiate or support (or both) laws tending to maintain their wealth (a tendency that does not seem to have changed over the centuries) and tithes were no exception. Accordingly, laws governing the payment of tithes were enacted in the reigns of Edward III, Henry IV, Henry VIII. The ones which especially concern us here, however, were enacted in the reign of Edward VI. These called for the possibility for the delinquent to be tried in ecclesiastical court. If the delinquent behaved stubbornly, to say nothing of *contumaciously*, the ecclesiastical judge could excommunicate the delinquent. The judge could then request the king (through the courts) to issue an order to capture and imprison the wrongdoer. The legal term for this was *de excommunicato capiendo*. The court could then issue a decree confiscating up to three times the amount of the tithe which was due the tithe holder. The tithe holder could sometimes sue in civil court.

Friends' determination to refuse the payment of tithes was among the most frequent cause for imprisonment and the confiscation of good and property.

I end this section with a final note: since tithes owned by impropiators had nothing to do with the Church, one may wonder why Friends refused to pay these. This was, indeed, a point of contention among Friends, but it was finally decided that no distinction would be made – a tithe is a tithe.

A side remark is also pertinent: in order to support the 'missionary work' of Friends, a fund was set up called the 'Kendal Fund' (Moore 2000: 24). Friends saw no inconsistency in this practice; to be sure, contributions to the fund were voluntary.

c. Refusal to Pay 'Rates' and 'Obligations'

Residents of a geographic parish were *de facto* members of that parish church whether or not they attended church. Accordingly they were assessed 'rates' as well as tithes. 'Rates' were an assessment used for the upkeep of the fabric of the church. Parishioners were expected to pay their share and they were also expected to pay parish 'duties' and 'offerings' on prescribed days, such as Easter, etc. While this was a small sum, convinced Friends refused to pay either of these assessments.

The word 'church' is derived from the Greek *ekklesia*: the sense is not that of a public place of worship but of the Christian society or assembly. In the New Testament, the word *never* refers to a structure. Fox is on solid theological ground when he rejects the use of the term as referring to a structure and sees no justification for worshiping in a designated building. He used the pejorative term 'steeplehouse' when referring to the building used as a place of worship. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the term was first used in 1644 by Francis Quarles. The law governing the payment of 'rates' was an ecclesiastical one and is covered in the same statutes that govern tithes. Specifically, it is covered by statute 27 in the reign of Henry VIII, which read: 'every subject...according to ecclesiastical laws...shall pay

tithes, obligations and other duties of holy church...' (Cay 1739: Tithes) and this was repeated in the reigns of subsequent monarchs.

As in the case with tithes, refusal could result in excommunication and the offender could be apprehended under the abovementioned principle of *de excommunicato capiendo*. The offender could then be captured, fined, and imprisoned.

Many instances where this statute was invoked may be found (Besse 1753).

d. Recusancy

'Recusancy' was the failure, indeed refusal, to attend the Established Church on Sundays.

Quakers' basis for non attendance is readily found. As noted above, Quakers were convinced that a structure was not a 'church' and worshipping in the manner of the established church was a form of idolatry. They absented themselves from the Established Church services 'for conscience's sake and in obedience to the Lord'. They looked to history to certify that the apostles worshiped in the manner of Friends and, they asserted, that since that time, there has followed a disintegration of true worship. (They were not reluctant to attribute the decline to the rise and influence of 'papists'.) The penalty for abstention is governed by a statute established in the twenty-third year of Elizabeth's reign, which reads in part: 'Every person above the age of sixteen years, which shall not repair to some church...but forbear the same, contrary to statute I Eliz. Cap 2. for uniformity, shall forfeit for every month £20...' (Cay 1739: Recusants). Further penalties were imposed for recalcitrant persons.

The primary target of this statute was Roman Catholics, but its use was extended to all non-conformists which, of course, included Quakers.

The act begins by stipulating a fine of twelve pence for each Sunday abstention and, as noted above, twenty pounds per month. (The arithmetic seems a bit curious!) The fine was divided into three parts: one for the Monarch, one for the poor, and one for the informer. The penalty for non-payment was imprisonment. Furthermore, if the recusant refused to pay the fine, the same law (28 Elizabeth 1, Ch6 [see Cay 1739: Recusants]) stipulated that the monarch could expropriate two thirds of the recusant's property. There were other provisions of this statute which, in general, did not affect Quakers. One such provision was that you could not convey any property if the conveyance were revocable. The reason for this provision is fairly clear.

Quakers experienced great hardship under this law. Besse enumerates many such cases affecting Quakers and gives figures reflecting the financial penalties.

e. Holding Meetings for Worship at any Time or Place

Friends' deep convictions impelled them to spread the word widely; they therefore felt compelled to preach at any time or place of their choosing. They found justification for this throughout the New Testament. A couple of citations will suffice. In Lk. 4:18, we read: 'And he said unto them, "Go ye unto all the world and preach the gospel to every creature".' They were to preach the gospel among the Jews and the Gentiles. From Lk. 4:45: 'I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also; for therefore am I sent'. From Rev. 14:6: 'And I saw another angel fly in the midst of

heaven having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth every nation and kindred tongue and people'.

These practices, however, collided with the law in two ways. First there was the 'Conventicle Act'. This was passed in 1664 in the reign of Charles II (after the restoration), and was a continuation of an act passed in the reign of Elizabeth I. The early act provided for severe penalties while that passed in 1664 provided for a fine of five to ten shillings for the first and second offense. In the event that an offender were impoverished, a fine of up to ten pounds could be levied on any 'other person convicted of the like offense at the same meeting'. Once again, the fines were divided into three parts, one to the king, one to the poor, and one to the informer, or the one discovering the offense. Penalties were also imposed on anyone preaching or teaching at such a conventicle, as well on persons willingly allowing such a conventicle to take place in their homes. This provided an opportunity for informers to profit from the 'conventicles'; they could also benefit by informing on recusants. (Sewel 1795: II, 267-75). The penalty invoked on the Friend was, in some cases, 'transportation' (i.e. banishment) to the colonies, although this was not carried out with any frequency.

The Conventicle Act of 1664 was one of a series of four acts bearing the name 'Clarendon Code' after the Earl of Clarendon. These came on heels of an uprising, called 'Venner's Uprising', which was instigated by the 'Fifth Monarchy' men, and were designed to suppress dissidents. It is alleged that some Quakers joined in this demonstration (Horle 1988: 68). The other acts in the 'Code' were the 'Corporation Act' requiring all officers of incorporated municipalities to take communion according to the Anglican rites. This later became the 'Test Act' which effectively excluded dissidents from Universities. The other components were the 'Five Miles Act' and the 'Act of Uniformity'. The Conventicle Act was reaffirmed in 1670.

The second way in which travelling ministers were persecuted is described in the next section.

f. Travelling and Preaching in the Countryside

The scriptural justification is essentially the same as that in Section e. In this case, however, the law invoked is the law against *vagrancy*. This law was established as a corollary to the 'poor laws', an act that was passed in 1601 making the parish responsible for the relief of the poor, and dictating that the collection of the poor rates was done by parish overseers. The original assessment was a sort of income tax, but this evolved into a tax on property. In order to limit the practice of some 'vagrants' and 'vagabonds' who went from one parish to another simply to collect poor relief, the vagrancy laws were enacted. The law included 'all wandering persons wandering with out sufficient cause although not necessarily begging'. A house of correction was established to which vagabonds could be sent. The governor of the house of correction was to set them to work and had the power to punish them 'by putting fetters or gyves upon them and by moderate whipping them'. Many Friends travelling in the ministry were apprehended and punished as 'rogues, vagrants and vagabonds' (Cay 1739: Vagrants). This was especially hard on the Valiant Sixty, the convinced pioneers who took the message of Quakerism to the countryside. The

odyssey of these Friends is a very interesting one (Penney 1907: *passim*; Taylor 1988: *passim*; Foulds 1975: *passim*).

g. Refusing 'Hat Honour'

'Hat Honour' was the name given to the practice of removing one's hat in the presence of a 'superior', such as a magistrate, a minister, or anyone considered socially superior.⁹ George Fox felt very strongly on this point and could find no biblical justification for removing one's hat except when praying to God. He quotes Jn 5:44: 'How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only?' Again, from his journal incorporating the biblical citation, we read: 'It was an honour which proud flesh look for but sought not the honour which comes from God only'. The book of Daniel was also cited: '...three children were cast into fiery furnace with their coats, their hose and their hats on...' (Dan. 3:21). It is very likely that Fox sought diligently in the Scriptures to justify his convictions concerning 'hat honour' and found that this is the only instance of the word 'hat' in the King James Bible.

There does not seem to have been an explicit law which was contravened if the Friend kept his hat on in court. However, the justices could consider the affront to be an act of contempt of court. It could also be viewed, and in some cases was viewed, as an act of blasphemy since the magistrate could consider himself as a representative of the ministry. However, in practice, neither of these more subtle invocations was needed. The justice could simply administer an oath – say, that of allegiance – and the Friend could then be punished for refusing to swear the oath. Often too, the offender was simply imprisoned without legal cause and when the imprisonment was challenged, the person would be released. This could frequently take several months. A vindictive justice could, at this stage, administer the Oath of Allegiance and send the Friend back to prison.

h. Using the 'Plain Language'

Using the 'plain language' refers to the use of 'thee' and 'thou' when addressing a single individual. It was common practice – indeed mandatory – for a socially 'superior' individual to be addressed with the plural 'you'. A servant, for example, could be severely punished if he/she failed to use the correct form of address. On this point again, Fox felt very strongly. He wrote: 'When the Lord sent me into the world, he forbade me to put off my hat...and I was required to thee and thou all men and women...' (Fox 1952: 36). In a letter of 1669 (Fox 1698) he wrote: 'All Friends that do believe in the light, as Christ hath commanded you, and are become children of the light, keep to the proper speech; that is, thee and thou to a singular, and you to many'. He found no scriptural justification whatsoever for the use of the plural pronoun to address a single person. Indeed, he gave many citations where, for example, Moses addresses God as 'thou'. His conviction went so far as to ask some Friends to co-author a sort of comparative grammar citing about 24 languages in which the singular is used to address one person and the dual or plural to address more than one person. The book is entitled *Battle-door for Teachers & Professors to Learn Singular and Plural* (Fox, Stubbs and Furley 1968). The co-authors are John

Stubbs and Benjamin Furly, two learned Friends. From the introduction, we learn (among other things) that 'Moses thou'd God in Exodus 32, and spoke plural to him and bade him to remember how he said he would multiply *your* seed referring to Abraham and Isaac'. The book is a real *tour de force* and is a testimony to the scholarship of Furley and Stubbs. Once again, we find no specific law prohibiting the use of the singular. But the judges and magistrates first relied upon the 'contempt of court' law; in addition, they considered themselves 'vicars on earth' and as such they appealed to the laws on blasphemy. They could also simply imprison the offender without any indictment. The offender would then have to remain in prison till the next session of court. When these tactics proved inadequate, they appealed, once again, to the device of tendering an oath to the recalcitrant Friends. As the Friends could not swear, the justice could then fine and imprison them.

i. Marriages

Prior to 1653, English law required a contract between the parties being married; moreover, the celebration of the marriage was to take place in church. Friends were very firm that they would conduct marriages according to a procedure described by Fox. In 1653, however, Cromwell passed a law permitting marriages to be solemnised before the justice of the peace (Braithwaite 1955: 145–47).

In a letter written in 1669 (Fox 1990), Fox writes:

For the right joining in marriage is the work of the Lord only, and not the priests or magistrates; for it is God's ordinance, and not man's. And therefore Friends cannot consent, that they should join them together. For we marry none, it is the Lord's work, and we are but witnesses. But yet, if a Friend through tenderness have a desire that the magistrate should know it (after the marriage is performed in a public meeting of Friends and others, according to the holy order and practice of Friends in truth throughout the world, and according to the manner of the holy men and women of God of old,) he may go and carry a copy of the certificate to the magistrate; Friends are left to their freedom herein. But for priests or magistrates to marry or join any in that relation, it is not according to the scripture; and our testimony and practice hath been always against it. It was God's work before the fall, and it is God's work online in the restoration.¹⁰

Fox then points out that in the Old Testament marriages were *never* solemnised by priests. He gives a directive as to how the Quaker marriage is to be solemnised; it is essentially the practice that is currently in effect among Friends in non-programmed meetings.

The validity of the Quaker marriage was established in Nottingham in 1661. Thus, after 1661, Friends were never compelled to have the marriage certified.

It does not appear that Quaker weddings were ever a source of *significant* persecution or hardship (see, however, Section q, below).

j. Funerals and Burials

One of the more arcane statutes enacted in the reign of Charles II was the 'Burial in Wool' act of 1667, which was also reaffirmed in 1678. This required that all persons to be buried were to be clothed in wool and the coffin lined in wool. Certification

to this effect was to be made by two witnesses (Cay 1739: Burials). A special woollen shroud was used for the purpose. The penalty for not adhering to this requirement was £5. The law was passed as the result of lobbying by the wool industry. This law did not lead to serious hardship. Several cases of Quakers paying fines are recorded in (Besse 1753). Whether this was the result of burials in garments other than wool or from the refusal of Friends to certify to the adherence (which may have required that they swear) is not clear from the records.

k. Disrupting Ministers during Church Services

During the reign of Mary Tudor, the Catholic queen, it was not uncommon for Protestants to disturb the mass on Sundays. Accordingly, a law was passed, during Mary's reign, making 'the malicious disturbance of a minister in his sermon or when celebrating a mass', a crime punishable by a fine and imprisonment.

In the reign of subsequent monarchs the law was not repealed and indeed in 1656 the 'Lord's Day Act' was passed. This law had a broader scope and in particular applied to any religious service. Since the law used the word 'during the service', Friends sometimes endeavoured to circumvent the law by *waiting until after the service had ended*. Many Friends however became impatient and could not wait until the service had ended and accordingly were apprehended and imprisoned.

The law stipulated that any individual causing a disturbance was subject to a fine of £5 and imprisonment. Even when Friends waited until the end of the service, they were subjected to whippings and beatings by the parishioners.

It is not difficult to find religious justification for Friends' behaviour; they could find no biblical sanction whatsoever for the current practices and considered the priests' utterances to be iniquitous and therefore corrupting. It should be kept in mind that Friends claimed that outward sacraments had no biblical justification.

l. The Sabbath

The Sabbath was but one of the 'holy days and fasting days' governed by ordinances. These included dietary restrictions as well as other activities. In the reign of Charles I, a statute was passed as follows 'No carrier with horses or wagons nor cart-men with carts, nor drovers with cattle, shall travel upon the Lord's day upon pain to forfeit 20s...' (Cay 1739: Holy-Days and Fasting-Days).

In Fox's journal we read as follows:

they (the Jews) kept market and fairs on that which was the Sabbath day, for that was the seventh day of the week; whereas that day which the professed Christians now meet on, and call their Sabbath, is the first day of the week. The Jew's rest was on the seventh day of the week, which was given to them as a sign of the eternal rest of the Lord, sanctifying them, after they came out of the land of Egypt: for before that time the Lord had not given to man and woman his outward Sabbath day to keep, neither in the old world, nor after in Abraham's time, nor in Isaac's, nor in Jacob's time; until the Jews came out of Egypt to Mount Sinai in the wilderness. Then the Lord gave the law, and his Sabbath, as a sign in the old covenant, of Christ the eternal rest in the new covenant (Fox 1990: 362).

Thus, Fox sees no justification whatsoever for giving Sunday special consideration since it is clearly not the Sabbath of the Scriptures. (Fox, however, is not consistent, for he never advocated the observance of Saturday, the authentic Sabbath, whose observance is sanctioned in the New Testament.)

As for other 'holy days', the argument is that every day is the Lord's Day and need not be singled out for special treatment. Friends suffered considerably for ignoring this statute. (As an aside, we note that a statute was passed in the reign of Elizabeth I which makes it unlawful to eat meat on Fridays [Cay 1739: Holy Days and Fast-Days, 35 Eliz cap 7, Sec. 22]. There was a forfeiture divided three ways: one third to the queen, one third to the poor, and one third to the informer. Anyone who wrote or preached that 'eating fish or abstaining from meat was necessary for saving the soul' on the days stipulated in the statute, was subject to punishment. (Friends were not in any way affected by this statute.)

m. Blasphemy

The law on blasphemy, which was invoked, was passed in August of 1650 and was a renewal of a law passed in 1648 entitled 'Against atheistical, blasphemous and execrable opinions, derogatory etc.' (Scobell 1658: II, 124). Among other things, claiming to be God or the son of God was regarded as blasphemy. George Fox claimed on one occasion to be 'a son of God' with the indefinite article. In 1651 he was tried under this law and imprisoned for six months (Braithwaite 1691: 54). Blaspheming God, swearing falsely in the name of God, claiming that there is no such thing as heaven, preaching that persons are not compelled to believe anything that is contrary to their conscience, all of these were denounced as blasphemy.

Denying civil and moral righteousness is also an act of blasphemy. This provision was occasionally appealed to by justices when Quakers used the plain language or refused to remove their hats in court. Blasphemy called for six months imprisonment for the first offense, and banishment for subsequent convictions.

The most notable example of conviction for blasphemy was the case of James Nayler who, with a large following, re-enacted the entrance of Jesus to Jerusalem. So renowned was the case that it found its way to the newspapers in Paris.¹¹

Furthermore, Friends' interpretation of the Scriptures could easily expose them to a charge of blasphemy, especially Fox's well-known assertion '...answering to that of God in everyone'.

n. Urging Others to Refuse to take an Oath

The religious or scriptural basis is the same as that for refusing to swear an oath. Friends felt it an obligation and responsibility to alert people to the sinfulness of swearing an oath.

The law in this case is referred to as the 'Quaker Act', passed in the year 1661, which made it a crime to proclaim that the taking of an oath is unlawful and contrary to the word God. The penalty was a fine of £5 for the first offense and £10 for the second offense. Failure to pay resulted in imprisonment.

o. Publishing the 'Truth', i.e. Publishing Books and Pamphlets

Friends were ardent printers and publishers – they felt it lay upon them to publish the 'truth' as they saw it. They appealed once again to the scriptural injunction to 'preach the gospel in all the lands'. An illustration of their eagerness to publish is the assertion by John Whiting that in the first 50 years of Friends, 3000 titles by 440 writers could be counted (Whiting 1708). One of the early Quaker publishers was Andrew Sowle. When his sight declined, his daughter Tace Sowle took responsibility for the printing (Mcdowell 1998: 35)

Laws were passed in 1643 and 1647 making it a crime to print 'scandalous books'. The term 'scandalous' was interpreted broadly and included deviations from accepted religious belief. Some books were subject to the blasphemy laws.¹²

This law was reiterated in 1662 under the title 'An Act for Preventing the Frequent Abuses in Printing Seditious Treasonable and Unlicensed Books and Pamphlets and for Regulating Printing and Printing Presses' (Braithwaite 1961: 418). Moreover, *all books* were to be licensed. Unlicensed books were to be seized and a fine of £10 imposed. If not paid, imprisonment followed until payment. Furthermore, fines were imposed even for the purchase of such books. It is not surprising that Quakers were denied licence to print and publish and some went 'underground' (Moore 2000: 187-88). Braithwaite (1961: 418-19) lists some Quaker publishers in the period 1662 to 1664 who were apprehended for printing without a license.

p. Refusing to Serve in the Armed Services or Finding a Substitute

It is somewhat surprising that during that period in question there was no standing army. The civil peace was maintained with the help of militia.

The 'Militia Act' was passed in 1661 during the reign of Charles II. It required an able bodied young man to serve in the militia. However, it also provided that a Quaker or anyone could decline to serve, in which case he was required to pay for the imputed cost either by providing a substitute or paying for one provided by the authorities. If the Friend refused, there was a penalty: the authorities could seize and sell that individual's possessions (Horle 1988: 52, 81).

The 'testimony against war' was promulgated by Friends in January of 1661 (new calendar). Thereafter, Friends refused to serve in the armed services and in some instances refused to provide funds for a substitute. Besse records several instances of distraint of goods for such refusal. There undoubtedly were many such cases not recorded by Besse.

q. Ignoring the 'Five Miles Act'

The 'Five Miles Act' was enacted in 1665 and directed primarily against those who had been in holy orders. Its principal aim was to impose a restriction on Catholics. The act, however, was interpreted broadly to include those 'pretending' to holy orders, a phrase which enabled the law to be applied to Quaker ministers such as those among the 'valiant sixty', that is, the 'missionary' Friends who travelled and preached throughout the land. In order to be able to preach, such individuals were to subscribe to the *Act of Uniformity*, that is, the law compelling the use of the Book of Common Prayer as the basis for religious assemblies. In addition they were to swear

an oath stating that it is unlawful to take up arms against the monarch. Friends never advocated anything but essential loyalty to the existing authorities: monarch, commonwealth etc. If they failed to swear the oath, then any such person who had 'preached in a conventicle' was prohibited from coming within five miles of any corporation or borough sending a member to parliament, that is, a community which was 'incorporated'. Nor was the person to come within *five miles* (hence the name of the act) of any locality where he had, since 1660, either held holy orders or *preached in a conventicle* (Horle 1988: 51, 72, 80, 91). It would have been relatively simple to check on the status of someone in holy orders, less so for a dissident such as a Friend.

Needless to say, Friends could not 'swear' to anything nor were they to be deterred from carrying the word of God anywhere they chose as enjoined in the Scriptures. The consequences were apprehension and punishment.

r. 'Behaving in Public in Such a Way as to Provoke a Riot'

This transgression was based on a law passed in the reign of Elizabeth I.

This law was, in principle, the same as the Conventicle Act with one significant difference. The penalties under the Conventicle Act allowed for paying a fine in lieu of going to prison. Although the fines were severe – £5 or £10 – and although, in principle, repeat offenders could be 'transported' to the colonies (i.e. banished), this severe penalty was not enforced.

As the level of suppression of non-conformists increased, the courts appealed to the Elizabethan act which, among other things, called for ways of 'preventing tumults and riotous and unlawful assemblies'. Quaker Meetings could be construed as such assemblies and the participants could be charged accordingly. The penalties using the Elizabethan act could be very severe. The 'riot' part of the Elizabethan law was reaffirmed in 1719 under the name the Riot Act, hence the phrase (in current common usage) 'to read the riot act'. In the trial of Penn and Mead mentioned above, the indictment was 'provoking a riot' but the explicit statute was not cited in the indictment. The defendants were found innocent by the jury after a tumultuous trial.

s. Withholding Priests' Fees

Ministers were entitled to fees for various functions performed by them. They could also claim a fee for a function not performed by them but which would normally come under their jurisdiction. An example might be a wedding. An instance cited by Besse is the case of Susanna Rose who was sued for 1s 4d for a marriage fee by Thomas Marsden. For refusal to pay she was imprisoned for 17 weeks in Lancaster.

As noted above, every resident of a parish was a member of that parish and subject to ecclesiastical and well as state laws. Disobeying these laws could result in excommunication with its potentially severe consequences. The church warden kept careful account of the residents of the parish.

t. Going 'Naked as a Sign'

This is one of the oddest practices in which Friends engaged. The practice is based on the book of Isa. 20:2: 'Spake the Lord to Isaiah: "go loose the sackcloth from off thy loins and put off thy shoes from thy feet", and he did so walking naked and barefoot for three years'. A similar directive is given in the book of Ezekiel.

A noteworthy practitioner of this idiosyncratic behaviour was Solomon Eccles, the eccentric musician and instrument maker who, in a dramatic incident (unrelated to nudity), destroyed the musical instruments he had painstakingly built since he had concluded that music was 'carnal'.¹³ Nor did Friends condemn the practice of nakedness. Such noted Friends as Robert Barclay and Isaac Pennington did not censure it. It was viewed as a symbolic stripping of the power of the existing church and clergy. The most common form of persecution was at the hands of bystanders who frequently whipped and beat these transgressors.

In addition, however, there was a law against indecent exposure and Friends engaging in such practices were prosecuted under this law. The law was applicable to all citizens.

7. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Even in very difficult circumstances, Friends during this period behaved, for the most part, with probity and integrity. Eschewing *physical* violence in response to outrageous persecution, their courage earned the respect and admiration of a significant number of their fellow citizens. This was true even of some magistrates who, though they imposed fines and sentences, often did so reluctantly. An incident will help to affirm this sympathetic attitude on the part of some: in 1660 in Herefordshire, 23 Friends were brought before Judge Blagney for holding an illegal assembly (against the Conventicle Act, thereby disturbing the peace). The justice dismissed the case on the grounds that they were brought in by *only two* guards. How can they have been a threat, said the judge, if *two* guards sufficed to bring in 23 Friends (Spurrier 1976: 164)!

An equally interesting case is one in which Fox and his step-son-in-law Thomas Lower are apprehended. The sheriff *deputised* Lower to conduct Fox to the King's Bench in Worcester (Sewel 1795: II, 319)!

By the end of the seventeenth century, many Friends had become successful entrepreneurs providing products and services, and their honesty and industriousness as well as their inventiveness, were widely appreciated (Raistrick 1968: Chapter 3). In short, they had taken their place among the most respected members of English society. The label 'Quaker' became a badge of respectability. They had been 'tried in the fiery furnace' and, despite the loss of life and great suffering inflicted upon them, they emerged victorious.

NOTES

1. This phrase was used frequently by Fox and his associates. Using a concordance of Fox's journal constructed by the writer, the words 'innocent*' are found about 95 times, while the words 'persecut*' are used 330 times. The asterisk denotes possible endings.
2. For relevant or collateral material, the reader may consult Horle 1988: *passim*; Braithwaite 1961: Chapters 2, 3, 4; Moore 2000: 155-66, 180-90; and Cay 1739: *passim*. Note that the references to Cay are by topic since the original has no page numbers. The topics are arranged alphabetically.
3. In 1657, George Fox issued a directive asking Friends to keep a record of all their sufferings. The interested reader will find a comprehensive list of relevant books and documents in Smith 1970 [1867] under the heading 'Sufferings'. See, in addition, Braithwaite 1961; Horle 1988; Moore 2000, who give detailed accounts.
4. The 'Valiant Sixty' is the modern name given to the early Friends who traveled in Britain and abroad to 'convince' listeners. See Penney 1907; Foulds 1975; and Taylor 1988.
5. Joseph Besse (1683-1757) is known primarily for his monumental work (Besse 1753). His profession is described as that of a 'writing master'. Besse was a convert from the Anglican Church and a measure of his dedication to Friends is the fact that he refused, from the Anglican Church, a 'living' of £400 per year. He was a vigorous 'controversialist' and edited numerous works of Friends. He had a son of the same name who emigrated to Pennsylvania.
6. A second refusal to swear the 'Oath of Allegiance' resulted in 'Praemunire' and a third refusal was treasonable.
7. There are frequent references in Fox's journal.
8. In Wm. Penn's introduction to G. Fox's journal 1694 edition, there is the appropriate reference to Jesuits. The Introduction may be found at <<http://www.geocities.com/quakerpages/1694foxtoc.htm>>.
9. The issue of 'hat honour' is one on which Fox felt very strongly; it occurs over thirty times in his journal.
10. The passage is from the letter numbered 264 in the year 1669. Fox had earlier (1653) written a letter on the subject (Braithwaite 1955: 146).
11. *Nouvelles Ordinaire* published in Paris, news from Britain in the French language. The Nayler incident appeared in 1656 and was quickly copied to other Parisian newspapers.
12. It will be recalled that John Milton wrote his famous article 'Areopagitica' in 1643 pleading for freedom of the press.
13. Solomon Eccles was a gifted musician. He wrote an interesting essay entitled 'A Musik-Lektor' which is a dialogue about music among a musician, a Baptist and a Quaker. It is available online at <<http://www.qhpress.org/texts/eccles.htm>>.

REFERENCES

- Barclay, R., *Apology for the True Christian Divinity*, Glenside, PA: Quaker Heritage Press, repr., 2002.
- Besse, J., *A Collection of the Suffering of the People called Quakers*, London: L. Hinde, 1753.
- Blackstone, W., *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Philadelphia: J.P. Lippencott, 1869 (1st edn 1765).
- Braithwaite, W.C., *Beginnings of Quakerism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd edn, 1955.
- , *The Second Period of Quakerism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd edn, 1961.
- Burrough, E., *Truth Defended*, London: Thomas Simmons, 1656.

- Cay, J., *An Abridgement of the Publick Statutes in Force and Use from Magna Carta to George II*, London: Gosling, 1739.
- Foulds, E., *George Fox and the Valiant Sixty*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1975.
- Fox, G., *A Collection of Many Select and Christian Epistles*, London: T. Sowle, 1698.
- , *The Journal of George Fox*, ed. Nickalls, J.L.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952.
- , *Works of George Fox*, State College, PA: New Foundation Publications, 1990.
- Fox, G., Stubbs, J., and Furley, B., *A Battle-door for Teachers and Professors*, York: Scholar Press, 1968.
- Harbury, E., *Laws of England*, 46 vols.; London: Butterworth, 1907–17.
- Horle, C., *Quakers and the English Legal System, 1660–1688*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.
- Mcdowell, P., *The Women of Grub Street*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Moore, R., *The Light in their Consciences: Early Quakers in Britain, 1646–1666*, University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2000.
- Nayler, J., ‘The Lamb’s War’, in Barbour, H., and Roberts, A., (eds), *Early Quaker Writings*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973, pp. 102–16.
- Raistrick, A., *Quakers in Science and Industry*, Newton Abbot: Latimer Trend, 1968.
- Penney, N. (ed.), *The First Publishers of the Truth*, Philadelphia and New York: Headley Bros, 1907.
- Scobell, H., *Collection of Acts and Ordinances*, London: Hills & Field, 1658.
- Sewel, W., *History of the Rise, Increase, and Progress of the Christian People Called Quakers*, 2 vols.; London: Phillips, 1795.
- Smith, J., *A Descriptive Catalogue of Friends’ Books*, Vol. II, New York: Krauss Reprint Co., 1970 (1867).
- Spurrier, W.W., ‘The Persecution of the Quakers in England, 1650–1714’, unpublished PhD thesis, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina, 1976.
- Taylor, E.E., *The Valiant Sixty*, York: Sessions, 1988.
- Ward, J.V., *Some Rural Quakers*, York: Sessions, 1991.
- Whiting, J., *A Catalogue of Friends Books*, London: J. Sowle, 1708.

AUTHOR DETAILS

Raymond Ayoub is Professor Emeritus of mathematics from Penn State. He has been a convinced Friend for over 50 years, having married into a Quaker family. He and his wife have spent their post-retirement years teaching in the Middle East. His interest in Quaker history stems from a natural curiosity, but more importantly from a conviction that Friends of the seventeenth century have an important message for contemporary Quakers and others, even across three and a half centuries.

Mailing address:

Raymond Ayoub, Dept. of Mathematics, University Park, PA. 16802, USA. E-mail: rga1@email.psu.edu