

THE JOURNAL OF THE FRIENDS HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Communications should be addressed to the Editor of the *Journal*
c/o 44 Seymour Road, London SW18 5JA, U.K.

THE FUTURE OF QUAKER HISTORY

Two decades ago Christopher Hill, one of the great historians of the English-speaking world, explained that 'History ... offers a series of answers to which we do not know the questions.'¹ That comment and its implication that historians seek questions and not ready-made answers have had a major influence in shaping my perspective on Quaker history and its future. It forms a text for this paper.

Two other points of Hill's need also to be mentioned as an introduction for our thinking: 1) As anyone who has worked in the records of the 17th Century becomes quickly aware, what we can know about the lives of the common people who became Children of the Light is very limited indeed; hence the student who desires to explore their past must work diligently to construct the context that shaped their lives. 2) Hill avers that we are likely to produce better history if we think it matters, that is, if we are interested in the topic because it speaks to some need we think exists. In this light, I want to look at the past and future of Quaker history.

Quaker historical writing is in a period of transition, one that both promises to liberate it from too much of an 'in-group' historiography and also leads those who read our work to a higher level of

understanding of the past. Most people who explore religious history are tempted to think that those who lived in other times responded only to theological questions when they acted religiously. This priority may seem as natural as it is alluring, for in dealing with religions people naturally rely on theological language to express their experiences. Understandably then, students of the Quaker past inevitably have tended to dwell on theological issues and controversies. Or, in some ways worse, they have assumed that controversies rooted in personal or political differences are of necessity theological. In so doing, they inadvertently perpetuate past disputes by projecting them into the present and tying down tomorrow's agenda.

Scholars of Quaker history are no different from those who write about Anglican history; it is just that rather than concentrating on, say, answers regarding the monarch's rule in the affairs of the church they want to seek the responses that people in long ago offered about the import of the Inward Light. The difference, in short, is one of subject matter. But the result remains the same: important questions boil down to matters of authority. Because questions of faith are by definition unprovable, the political decision of who defines the faith forces each generation to struggle over some aspect of the same old issues. As interested observers, we should not be surprised, therefore, when out-of-date partisanship re-emerges to bedevil us in the present. Nor should we be surprised when we fail to advance very far beyond those issues of the past. Fighting old battles leads to no new victories but only to more casualties. One might hope that pacifist Quakers could avoid repetition of this old pattern. Our record in this regard is not encouraging.

Modern historians of Quakerism are aware of the problem, but current concerns entice them to let their awareness slip. In the course of a single paragraph, Hugh Barbour, one of the best modern Quaker historians, aptly demonstrated the problem. In his 'Preface' to his *Quakers in Puritan England*, he rightly admonished Quaker 'liberals' and 'fundamentalists' – both his terms – to avoid seeking out past Friends to bolster their modern points of view. But by the time he reached the end of his paragraph, he apparently forgot what he has just written and concluded with the hope that his 'book may open the way for deeper discussions between liberal and conservative Friends...'² Likewise, Douglas Gwyn, whose theological concerns have led him to delve into history, devoted the first two sentences of his *Apocalypse of the Word* to underscoring the modern interest in rediscovering the original message of early Quakerism; he sought to

sate a 'gnawing' hunger for the 'powerful spirituality considerably beyond the scale experienced among Friends today.'³ Gwyn made no secret of his intention to bring scholarship to the support of the strongly sectarian message of Lewis Benson, a diligent student of history, whose own 1966 book, *Catholic Quakerism*, at once sharpened the divisions between various Quaker groups and inspired Gwyn's exploration of the past.⁴ More recently, Gwyn's *The Covenant Crucified* explored the relationship between the earliest Friends and capitalism, but it did not purport to be a history: its Quaker publisher deigned not to classify it as a work of history but one dealing with religion and social concerns, presumably because it sought to synthesize the author's 'theological and political concerns' into what Gwyn referred to as a 'theology of history' and a 'historical theology.'⁵

A more satisfying if less daring approach to Friends' thinking is Rosemary Moore's 1993 thesis, 'The Faith of the First Quakers,'⁶ for unlike other theologically orientated scholars she grounds her analysis in a world where events actually occurred. Ideas are important, yes, but people, immersed in a real world of passion and partisanship, are too, because they think and speak those ideas. Not only is Moore acutely aware of the context, but her conclusions are also logical outgrowths from her sources and possess a credibility that only a mastery of the sources can lend them. (It only adds to her achievement to note that her use of the computer enabled her to exploit her deep base of sources). As a historian, to an audience of people interested in history, I must say that such theological explorations are the only kind we can finally trust. With such a superb study as a model, the future of Quaker history is rosy indeed.

Sometimes non-Friend historians have explored Quaker doctrines, as Geoffrey Nuttall did in his now classic *Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Practice* in 1946. In surveying the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the seventeenth century, Nuttall depicted Quakers as the logical extension of Puritanism, who pointed to, as he phrased it, 'the direction of the Puritan movement as a whole'; they did 'repeat, extend, and fuse' so much in radical separatism that he bestowed on them the name of their 'Puritan' foes.⁷ This interpretation amounted to the opening of a major attack on Rufus Jones, whose identification of Quakerism with medieval European mysticism had captured the field of Quaker historical studies since the beginning of the century.⁸ Nuttall dismissed Jones' approach as 'primarily of academic interest,'⁹ while Wilmer Cooper, a scholar among American programmed Friends naturally distrustful of any such subversive

emphasis, later accused Jones of importing mysticism into Quaker history because of his personal predilections.¹⁰ Quaker scholars put Nuttall's work immediately to use by appropriating his identification of George Fox, Quaker's principal founder, and his followers with the Puritans, as the very title of Barbour's work testifies. One wanted Quakers understood 'as one of the variant expressions of the dominant and all-pervasive Puritanism of the age.'¹¹ Benson, more aggressively sectarian and evincing a bit of paranoia,¹² charged that Friends enamoured of Nuttall's approach would reduce to Quakerism to one Puritan group among others and hijack them into the ecumenical mainstream, where, of course, he feared for them to go.¹³

Even that now oft-used term for the early Quaker mission, 'the Lamb's War,' has been drafted into contemporary service, representing a bit of conscious contriving to link the first Friends with the saints of Revelation.¹⁴ Although the term does not appear in Fox's *Journal* – Joseph Pickvance in his *Reader's Companion* to the *Journal* carefully tries to explain away this embarrassing oversight by the founder¹⁵ – and was probably first used by the apostate James Nayler in 1657,¹⁶ the idea itself was present almost from the beginning. In 1652, Fox announced that 'the Lamb had and hath the kings of the earth to war withal, ... who will overcome with the sword of the spirit, the word of his mouth.'¹⁷ Still, it was not a term that Friends embraced generally, and now it seems as much as an effort to legitimize present day concerns as to accurately reflect the past.¹⁸ Somewhat ironically, when coming from the pen of Nayler and Edward Burrough, one of the most radical of the earliest Friends and the one Barbour cites for his purposes, the phrase can be read as an implicit criticism of Fox's more accommodationist stance towards political activity.¹⁹ However useful politically, the phrase and its meaning remain to be explored in depth.

Another related problem is the one Quaker scholars seemed compelled to express their gratitude to the forebears in the faith by glossing over their foibles, ignoring differences that sometimes soured relations between them. Even the usually cautious Nuttall, a non-Quaker, could fall victim to the temptation of elevating his subject to levels that seem almost worshipful. One looks in vain in his introduction to John Nickalls' edition of Fox's *Journal* to find a shortcoming or limitation greater than 'unduly magnifying his own share in the convincing of others' – and Nuttall explains that one away by reminding us that the apostle Paul also claimed to have discovered his gospel independently²⁰: not bad company, that. One

expert on William Penn, one of Fox's closest associates, wrote of their friendship, for example, and failed to mention differences that developed between them over the proper relationship with the royal house of Stuart.²¹ It is the reverential and celebratory tone of such histories as much as their words that causes one to wonder if the subjects are people who live in a world marked by the kind of human failures we all know exists in ours.

Given this checkered record, it may not be surprising that it required a scholar of Marxist rather than Quaker antecedents to shine an outward light on the scene and reveal what many had missed.²² In his *World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution*, published in 1972, Christopher Hill demonstrated that Quakerism represented a major part of the radical thrust of the English civil wars and their aftermath.²³ Like Jones, Hill was interested in the history of ideas, but unlike his forerunner, Hill grounded them in the native soil that nurtured the upheaval called the English revolution. Hill's agenda sought a precedent for revolutionary popular opposition to the unfolding of capitalism; his interests were not in religion as theology, but in religion as an expression of discontent with a new and untried economic and social system. The high water mark of this effort was his well-received volume exploring how English revolutionaries, Puritans and otherwise, used the Bible to justify determined opposition to the establishment.²⁴ Although the word 'Puritan' does not appear in Hill's index, individual Puritans emerge from its pages looking strikingly different from Nuttall's and to a lesser extent Barbour's.

Hill's more well-rounded approach has swept the field, especially among non-Quaker historians. One of Hill's students, Barry Reay, has produced the best recent introduction to Quaker history down to 1660.²⁵ Phyllis Mack, in her study of those she calls 'visionary women,' has demonstrated how women, many of them Quaker, pushed the limits of the revolution to prophesy and call for ending limitations based on traditions of gender.²⁶ Despite concentrating on theology in her exploration of Quaker women, Catherine Wilcox avoids the pitfall of isolating them from their social and political context. In commenting on how events led them to modify their view of the Inward Light, she stresses that one should not 'assume that their understanding of it remained unchanged', and she challenges students not to ignore the period during which Quaker theology was being expounded by apologists William Penn and Robert Barclay.²⁷ Although he deals with the years after 1660, Nicholas Morgan assumes that Quakers carried a reputation for Hillsian radicalism

with them into his period.²⁸ My own biography of Fox endeavours to place its subject squarely in this context of revolutionary radicalism.²⁹ Doug Gwyn's *Covenant Crucified* does Hill's point of view one better in suggesting that the first Friends not only reacted to their sense of capitalism's destructive potential but also challenged the 'liberal' marketplace metaphor that underlay it. Gwyn is, it is safe to say, as present-minded as Hugh Barbour was three decades ago, though in another direction.³⁰

If Quaker history's emancipation from its former focus on theology is salutary, as I believe it is, there yet remains another aspect of 'in-group' stroking that needs modification. Here I am referring to the emphasis many of our predecessors have given to institutional history. As much as every student of the Quaker past needs to pay daily obeisance to the ever careful William C. Braithwaite, we need to keep in mind that his main focus was the history of the Society of Friends as an institution. In his two volume history covering the seventeenth century, he described the development of an organization and concentrated on showing how the people who had control at the end of the century arrived at their supremacy. Hence he seldom considered the roads not taken or the people who travelled them. In this fashion, we have been denied a well-rounded picture of Quakers, not only in the period but also for the whole sweep of Quaker history.³¹ It is rather like the labour historian who concentrates on the history of trade unions instead of the workers struggle.³² Or to take an example from the field of church history, this technique has not given us a work comparable to Arrington and Bitton on Mormon history.³³ We need a Quaker history that is as acutely aware of the back as the facing benches.

I need to emphasize that the older institutional approach tends to be self-satisfied and self-congratulatory, assuming that the religious establishment that emerged after 1660 within the Society of Friends was a natural and logical development. It should therefore be exempt from scrutiny and criticism, even by someone as innocuous and far removed from the scene as a historian. As recently as 1986, American historian Edwin Bronner could write of the evolution of London Yearly Meeting's discipline without ever mentioning how it grew out of the effort to suppress dissent.³⁴ In my opinion, such a position amounts to a repudiation of the task of writing history itself – discovering the questions people of the past were answering – and undercuts the fundamental Quaker assumption that Christ speaks to his people at any time and through one's experiences of the real world. Inevitably such an approach, however understandable for

believers, produces a filiopietistic and hagiographic view of the past, one falling short of the serious and sober people George Fox believed his followers called to be.

Because historians like Bronner have avoided the so-called 'Wilkinson-Story' separation, my biography of Fox contains the only account we have of it, since Braithwaite wrote nearly 80 years ago.³⁵ (Tying this division to Wilkinson and Story rather than the better known William Rogers of Bristol, its principal originator, illustrates how yesterday's definitions live on into the future). It was not until 1971 that we finally had a close look at that other Quaker schismatic, John Perrot, in Ken Carroll's excellent introduction.³⁶ The only study of perhaps the most accomplished of all the separatists, George Keith, is more than fifty years old and disappointing in its depiction of the politics of the schism;³⁷ no book length examination of the Keithan separation exists. My work in seventeenth century Quaker history thus confirmed what I first came to realize during my research on the Hicksite Reformation³⁸ – that those who run out from the faith are certain to get written out of the histories. We thus remain ignorant of the options presented to our forebears as well as why they chose the path they finally trod.

The only exception to this studied ignoring of those who helped mould the Quaker past is, of course, James Nayler, but his exploits grabbed the attention of people other than Quakers and represent an episode important in secular English history. Not only did his followers' use of the symbolism of Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem focus attention on him, but Parliament debated his fate for the better part of three weeks.³⁹ Thomas Carlyle, the nineteenth century's foremost champion of 'heroes,' had a heyday with the spectacle of such a lesser man convulsing what he exaggerated as the 'James Nayler Parliament':

Four hundred gentlemen of England, and I think a sprinkling of Lords among them, assembled from all counties and boroughs of the three nations, to sit in solemn debate on the terrific phenomenon – a mad Quaker fancying or seeming to fancy himself, what is not uncommon since, a new incarnation of Christ. Shall we brand him, shall we whip him, bore the tongue of him with hot iron; shall we imprison him, set him to oakum; shall we roast, or boil, or stew him; - shall we put the question whether this question shall be put; debate whether this should be debated; – in Heaven's name, what shall we do with him, the terrific phenomenon of Nayler.⁴⁰

In the face of such ridicule, Quaker scholars always seemed a bit embarrassed by their fallen leader and quite willing to blame his fall on a handful of hysterical women, as Christine Trevett has reminded us.⁴¹

Which brings us to one of the most exciting developments in recent Quaker historiography, the attention afforded women Quakers. Quaker history is, of course, replete with important women figures, but it is also clear that male Friends found ways to maintain their control of the instruments of power despite resourceful women. Unfortunately the tendency to celebrate women's achievements has not been matched by the kind of critical study that would reveal the concrete reach of these advances or, more significant, continuing male control. Phyllis Mack, at her most creative, concluded that her 'visionary' Quaker women often insisted on the validity of their insights even as they deferred to men when it came to making general policy for the Society,⁴² a position that a woman as close to the leadership as Mary Penington embraced.⁴³ It is a fact that one of the principal, and heretofore overlooked, sparks for the Rogers schism was its leader's distrust of the expanded role for women that the London leadership in the 1670s promoted, partially, at least, for political purposes. The same men knew how to give with one hand and take with the other, as Jean Simcock of Chester learned to her chagrin in 1672. At a quarterly meeting her proposal from the women's meeting was filibustered by a travelling Friend from London until the men reached their adjournment hour.⁴⁴

This explanation of our historical writing underscores the transitional nature of this period in Quaker historiography. Those who have worked in the archives of other religious groups know how much the Friends' tradition of careful record keeping has assisted our efforts. The sources are more plentiful for Quakers because our ancestors preserved their records better. Still much remains to be done, not only in neglected topics but also in moving our studies to higher levels of sophistication by exploring themes that will offer clearer answers to the questions our predecessors were responding to. Let me list some of the areas that need attention – and I want to stress that my listing is not exhaustive.

1) I know that British Friends have long produced histories of local meetings, many of them quite good. The enthusiasm that has produced these accounts is a signal achievement of amateur historians, who, to use Hill's phrasing, believe the stories they have to tell really matter. (It also underscores my conviction that good history can be written by folk with no special academic training, only a willingness to submit oneself to the discipline of looking at the

sources. In this respect writing history is like Quaker ministry – it is open without restriction to all.) There is more than antiquarianism involved here, for local histories, particularly of the seventeenth century, can offer insight into the social, economic, and political context of people's decision to join those 'in scorn called Quakers.'⁴⁵ Any may disagree with the current view of Quakerism as a part of the English revolution, but the only way to disprove this interpretation is to examine the sources and read through the language of religion and discover if other forces in fact played a role. People who look at the growth of Quakerism at the local level are in a strategic position to do this. Good local history is always in vogue.

2) Numerous early Friends need biographies. From Margaret Fell Fox,⁴⁶ to William Penn and George Whitehead among the leading Friends, to second echelon leaders like Isaac and Mary Penington, Richard Hubberthorne, and Edward Burrough, to name only a few, there are simply no adequate studies. And, as we have already noted, an examination of the careers of those who 'ran out' – people of the prominence of Ann and Thomas Curtis, Anthony Pearson, William Rogers, John Wilkinson, and Thomas Story – would offer revealing insights into why people became Friends and what caused them to come to a position of opposition later. Even an important early figure like George Bishop, who objected to some of the strong measures taken against dissenters, has not received adequate treatment.⁴⁷

3) Gaps exist even in institutional history. We know too little about the origins and role of Meeting for Sufferings, the Second Day Morning meeting, and the shadowy meeting of the twelve – it remained hidden in obscurity because it did not survive under that name; it surely played an early important role, as a kind of executive committee of Meeting for Sufferings.⁴⁸ Also lacking is an exploration of the implications of the *Testimony from the Brethren*, a virtually forgotten document that served both as an expression of the power of those at the centre and as a kind of charter for those who exercised authority in London.⁴⁹

4) The current interest in social history has not led much beyond women's public roles. The subtle and complex interplay between men and women and the power they vied for – if they vied at all – has not yet claimed its historian. Moreover, the matter of marriage, one of the most divisive features of the life and reputation of Friends until the 1670s and after, has never been researched in any systematic way. While the subject of the Quaker family, including the way Friends reared their children, has attracted scholars of the reputation of J. William Frost⁵⁰ and Barry Levy,⁵¹ the subject remains a

controverted one, so much so that reviews of Levy's work elicited a level of pointed criticism not customary among Friends.⁵² My guess is that we will see much more on this matter, particularly extending its coverage into later periods. We also need much more research on Quakers and blacks, as a way of determining if Friends were indeed relatively more willing than other Christians to answer the endemic racism that existed among whites.⁵³

5) As Nicholas Morgan's path-breaking monograph on Lancaster Friends from 1660 to 1730 reminds us, no one in better than three-quarters of a century, since Rufus Jones, has carried the story of Quakerism forward into the eighteenth century.⁵⁴ Usually denominated the 'quietist' period, a term that I find questionable, the eighteenth century as a whole is overlooked in Quaker history. (It would be interesting to know, for instance, exactly when and why the word 'quietism' began to be used to describe those years). There is not even a good biography of John Woolman, hardly a quietist, if that term means one who sits out the controversies of his time and ignores the spirit of the age.⁵⁵ So most historians, including this one, have accepted rather uncritically what Morgan refers to as the John Stephenson Rowntree interpretative framework, that is, that the "decline" in the vitality of Quakerism occurred because of the effort to build a hedge around the Society of Friends after 1660. Morgan counters with evidence from Lancaster to suggest that Quakers there saw the discipline as a way both to maintain the old ways and revitalize the evangelistic impulse that impelled Friends forward in the first place; any decline in vigour, he concludes, did not occur until at least the fourth decade of the century.⁵⁶

6) Hence from the end of the seventeenth century to the very end of the nineteenth, English Quaker history is pretty much a void. Only Elizabeth Isichei's volume surfaces,⁵⁷ even though the reasons for the success of evangelicals in preserving London Yearly Meeting from the kind of schisms that convulsed meeting in the United States must be a notable tale indeed. And we know next to nothing of the social implications of evangelical control. The North American splits have had their historians, attracted by the drama of disagreement and change, including my own on the Hicksites and Tom Hamm's fine prize-winning look at those called "Orthodox."⁵⁸

7) For the twentieth century – and it has been nearly a hundred years since its beginning - there is even more of a void. Here Britain Yearly Meeting is ahead of its sisters in the United States, thanks to contemporary Friends like Alastair Heron and Ben Pink Dandelion, who are concerned enough with the fate of authentic Quakerism to

think it matters.⁵⁹ If these concerns seem to loom very large in Heron's and Dandelion's eyes, they have, at least, led to engagement with history and trying to find explanations for the situation they think we find ourselves in.

The list of topics that needs doing for our century is longer than my time here, but let us begin: there is no history of the American Friends Service Committee, the Friends Service Council, or Quaker Peace and Service (a fact that may suggest that Quaker involvement with the broader world is less than when evils like slavery and denial of women's rights were more obvious and engaging); our most distinctive testimony, our witness for peace, in a century marked by war after war, has not been chronicled, even though the United Methodist Church in the United States has a history of its peace efforts;⁶⁰ no one has written a history of Quaker missionary activities, efforts that have made the average Friend today a good many shades darker than most of us here; no history of evangelical Quakerism or pastoral Friends has seen the light of day – or even those called 'liberal' Friends or their umbrella groups, such as Friends General Conference. Some biographies exist, but the lives of such seminal figures as Walter Malone, Joel and Hannah Bean, Anna and Howard Brinton, Lewis Benson, the Rowntrees, even William C. Braithwaite lie unprobed.

It is a truism that Quakerism has produced few theologians. A religion of ineffable and ultimately individual experience, with no scriptures to embody final authority in matters of faith, has had little need for people who explore what Fox dismissively referred to as 'notions'. Historians have filled that void, and Friends on the benches have recognized the value of the efforts of William Braithwaite, Rufus Jones, and Henry Cadbury – an important consideration for those of us who write and want to sell books. From the earliest days, Friends kept journals of their experiences or, as Fox did, produced memoirs to illuminate the paths they had taken. These accounts of past careers have been valuable sources for us, and we gainsay them at our peril. But we do great disservice both to those in the past and those moderns who seek guidance from a lamp of experience if we strip the full context from our subjects' lives, if we reduce their many faceted experiences to narrow religious ones only. We all struggle to allow our faith, ultimately unspeakable and by definition unprovable, to inform every part of our lives; we need to recognize that people in the past did the same thing so we can approach them with a due sense of humility.

The future of Quaker history is encouraging if we remain aware of what scholars from the past have bequeathed us, but we need not rest

on their laurels. Full of answers, the past is populated by people who faced the same range of complex choices that we do, even if their record remains incomplete. The histories we write will of necessity reflect our own answers, ones informed by our grasp of the past; our success in speaking to our generation will depend on our ability to be consciously aware of these requirements.

Lit by the lamp of experience, fuelled with the burning questions that people of the past were struggling to answer, we search the residue they left behind to compose their replies. What we find after shifting through their responses will not – can not – be our answers, for we live in a different time, one demanding different replies. Yet for their struggle, complex and never fully recoverable, offers glimmers of the Truth. ‘The Lord’s power’, Fox wrote confidently from Swarthmoor Hall to Friends at Danzig in 1676, ‘is over [your adversary’s] head, and you within his power, then nothing can get betwixt you and God [not even a historian, we might add]; and in the power of the Lord is the city set upon his hill, where the light shines, and the heavenly salt is, and the lamps burning, and trumpets sounding forth the praise of God of the eternal joy, in his eternal word of life, that lives, and abides, and endures forever.’⁶¹

Despite the fact that he well understood the value of history and manipulated the sources for political purposes,⁶² George Fox did not often use the term itself. In perhaps the only time he did, in a 1678 epistle, his words suggest that he, like Christopher Hill, was aware that the questions to which those in the past were responding could only be dimly seen at best. “And so the faith that Christ is the author of, and the worship that he hath set up,” Fox wrote, “and his fellowship in his gospel, is above all historical faiths, and the faiths that men have made, together with their worships and fellowships, under the whole heaven.”⁶³ Or, if I may be so presumptuous – as Fox clearly was about his Friends – the spirit of Christ, the ultimate Historian, stood in final judgement over even the best efforts of human beings and their institutions.

H. Larry Ingle
Presidential address given at the
University of Aberystwyth, 7 August 1997

NOTES AND REFERENCES

- ¹ Christopher Hill, *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill, Volume Three: People and Ideas in 17th Century England* (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986), 14. The essay, ‘Answers and Questions’, originally written for *History and Culture* (New York: Random House, 1977), comprises pp. 10-18.

- 2 Hugh Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1964), x-xi.
- 3 Douglas Gwyn, *Apocalypse of the Word: The Life and Message of George Fox (1624-1691)* (Richmond, Ind.: Friends United Press, 1986), ix. I have explored at some length the problem occasioned by such approaches. See H. Larry Ingle, 'On the Folly of Seeking the Quaker Holy Grail', *Quaker Religious Thought*, 25 (May 1991), 17-29.
- 4 Lewis Benson, *Catholic Quakerism: A Vision for All Men* (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 1973).
- 5 Douglas Gwyn, *The Covenant Crucified: Quakers and the Rise of Capitalism* (Wallingford, Penn.: Pendle Hill, 1995), ix-x. For classification, see back cover.
- 6 Rosemary A. Moore, 'The Faith of the First Quakers: The Development of their Beliefs and Practices up to the Restoration', (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 1993).
- 7 Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Practice* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946), viii, 13.
- 8 The clearest statement of Jones' position can be found in his 'Introduction' to William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1923; originally published in 1912), xxv-xliv, an essay that was to become extremely controversial in the next generation and a half. See also Rufus M. Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1923; originally published 1909) and *Spiritual Reformers in the 16th and 17th Centuries* (London: Macmillan, 1914). When a second edition of Braithwaite's seminal volume appeared in 1955, Jones' 'Introduction' was dropped with the bland explanation that studies since 1912 had 'put Quakerism in a rather different light.' See William C. Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism* (York, Eng.: William Sessions, 1955; 2nd ed.), vii. In one recent idiosyncratic work, Jones' mystical interpretation has been coupled to a 'radicalism' from the late middle ages and given a new lease on life, at least in the mind of its author. See Richard Bailey, *New Light on George Fox and Early Quakerism: The Making and Unmaking of a God* (San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1992), 20.
- 9 Nuttall, *Holy Spirit*, viii.
- 10 Wilmer A. Cooper, 'The Legacy of Rufus M. Jones', in D. Neil Snarr and Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, *Practiced in the Presence: Essays in Honor of T. Canby Jones* (Richmond, Ind.: Friends United Press, 1994), 20.
- 11 Frederick B. Tolles, *Meeting House and Counting House: The Quaker Merchants of Colonial Philadelphia* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1948), 52.
- 12 For Barbour's critique of Benson's sectarianism, see Hugh S. Barbour, 'Lewis Benson - Called Out', *Quaker Religious Thought*, 22 (1987), 40-43.
- 13 Benson, *Catholic Quakerism*, 8-11.
- 14 See Barbour, *Quakers in Puritan England*, 40; Hugh Barbour and Arthur Roberts, eds., *Early Quaker Writings* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1973), 104; and Michael L. Birkel and John W. Newman, eds., *The Lamb's War: Quaker Essays to Honor Hugh Barbour* (N.p.: Earlham College Press, 1992), 13.
- 15 Joseph Pickvance, *A Reader's Companion to George Fox's Journal* (London: Quaker Home Service, 1989), 132.

- ¹⁶ James Nayler, *Lamb's Warre against the Man of Sinne* (London: no publ. 1657). Barbour cites Edward Burrough's use of the concept from his 1659 Preface to Fox's *Great Mystery of the Great Whore in Works of George Fox* (Philadelphia: Marcus T.C. Gould, 1831), III, 14.
- ¹⁷ George Fox, Epistle 9, *A Collection of Many Select and Christian Epistles*, in *Works of Fox*, VII, 20.
- ¹⁸ See Hugh Barbour's 'Response' to Ingle, 'On the Folly', 35. Despite the promise of its title, a recent essay by David Loewenstein does not so much explicate the War of the Lamb as to re-emphasize carefully Fox's millenarian rhetoric. See 'The War of the Lamb: George Fox and the Apocalyptic Discourse of Revolutionary Quakerism', 25-41, in Thomas N. Corns and David Loewenstein, eds., *The Emergence of Quaker Writings: Dissenting Literature in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Frank Cass, 1995).
- ¹⁹ Undeveloped elsewhere, this difference between Nayler and Fox is referred to in H. Larry Ingle, *First Among Friends: George Fox and the Creation of Quakerism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 131.
- ²⁰ Geoffrey F. Nuttall, 'Introduction: George Fox and his Journal,' in *Journal of George Fox*, ed. John L. Nickalls (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952), xix-xxxvii, quotation from xxv.
- ²¹ Edwin B. Bronner, 'George Fox and William Penn, unlikely yokefellows and friends,' *Journal of the Friends Historical Society*, 56 (1991), 78-95.
- ²² In truth, this interpretation predated Hill's work: see James F. Maclear, 'Quakerism and the End of the Interregnum: A Chapter in the Domestication of Radical Puritanism', *Church History*, 19 (1950), 240-70. For a fuller survey of the historical literature, see H. Larry Ingle, 'From Mysticism to Radicalism: Recent Historiography of Quaker Beginnings,' *Quaker History*, 76 (1987), 79-94.
- ²³ Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas in the English Revolution* (New York: Viking Press, 1972). See his *Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries* (Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin Books, 1985). Gwyn's *Covenant Crucified* also forms part of this approach.
- ²⁴ Christopher Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (London: Penguin Press, 1993).
- ²⁵ Barry Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (London: Temple Smith, 1985).
- ²⁶ Phyllis Mack, *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth Century England* (Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1992). See also Christine Trevett, *Women and Quakerism in the 17th Century* (York, Eng.: Ebor Press, 1991).
- ²⁷ Catherine M. Wilcox, *Theology and Women's Ministry in Seventeenth-Century English Quakerism: Handmaids of the Lord* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1995), 8-9.
- ²⁸ Nicholas Morgan, *Lancaster Quakers and the Establishment, 1760-1830* [sic], (Halifax, Eng.: Ryburn Publishing, 1993), 15.
- ²⁹ Richard Bailey, *New Light on George Fox and Early Quakerism: The Making and Unmaking of a God* (San Francisco, Cal.: Mellen Research University Press, 1992) is so idiosyncratic that it is difficult to fit it into any interpretative framework, but its author is clearly indebted to Hill and his emphasis on radicalism. See Bailey's first chapter.
- ³⁰ Gwyn, *Covenant Crucified*, 20-22.

- ³¹ Both John Punshon's fine *Portrait in Grey: A Short History of the Quakers* (London: Quaker Home Service, 1984), and the more recent book by Hugh Barbour and J. William Frost, *The Quakers* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988) fall short in this regard and seem content to tell many aspects of the same old story in much the same old way.
- ³² My thinking of this matter has been helped by the writings of Staughton Lynd, an American Quaker labour activist, historian, and attorney. See his *Living Inside Our Hope: A Steadfast Radical's Thoughts on Rebuilding the Movement* (Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR Press, 1997), esp. ch. 12: 'The Webbs, Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg.'
- ³³ Leonard J. Arrington and Davis Bitton, *The Mormon Experience: A History of the Latter-Day Saints* (New York: Vintage Books, 1980).
- ³⁴ Edwin W. Bronner, 'Quaker Discipline and Order, 1680-1720: Philadelphia Yearly Meeting and London Yearly Meeting,' in Richard S. Dunn and Mary M. Dunn, eds., *The World of William Penn* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 323-35.
- ³⁵ See *First Among Friends*, chps. 15-16. The only previous study – and it, naturally, concentrating on theological issues – is John S. Rowntree's essay, 'Micah's Mother: A Neglected Chapter of Church History,' ch. 2 in *John Stephenson Rowntree: His Life and Work* (London: Headley Brothers, 1908).
- ³⁶ Kenneth L. Carroll, *John Perrot, Early Quaker Schismatic*, suppl. 33, *Journal of the Friends Historical Society*, 1971.
- ³⁷ Ethyn W. Kirby, *George Keith: (1638-1716)* (New York; D. Appleton-Century Co., 1942).
- ³⁸ H. Larry Ingle, *Quakers in Conflict: The Hicksite Reformation* (Knoxville, Tenn.: University of Tennessee Press, 1986).
- ³⁹ The most recent study of the Nayler incident (and arguably the best) is Leo Damrosch, *The Sorrows of the Quaker Jesus: James Nayler and the Puritan Crackdown on the Free Spirit* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996); the title and subtitle reveals how expertly Damrosch melds the religious and secular themes.
- ⁴⁰ Quoted in William G. Bittle, *James Nayler, 1618-1660: The Quaker Indicted by Parliament* (York, Eng.: William Sessions, 1986), 118.
- ⁴¹ Christine Trevett, 'The Women Around James Nayler, Quaker: A Matter of Emphasis,' *Religion*, 20 (1990), 249-73.
- ⁴² Mack, *Visionary Women*, 405.
- ⁴³ H. Larry Ingle, 'A Quaker Woman on Women's Roles: Mary Penington to Friends, 1678', *Signs*, 16 (1991), 587-96.
- ⁴⁴ Ingle, *First among Friends*, 252-54.
- ⁴⁵ Nearly any such study should begin with Joseph Besse, *An Abstract of the Sufferings of the People call'd Quakers* (London: J. Sowle, 1733-38), 3 vols.
- ⁴⁶ There have been four studies of this seminal figure, none of them wholly satisfactory: Maria Webb, *The Fells of Swarthmoor Hall* (London: Alfred W. Bennett, 1865), Helen G. Crosfield, *Margaret Fell of Swarthmoor Hall* (London: Headley Brothers, [1913]), Isabel Ross, *Margaret Fell: Mother of Quakerism* (London: Longmans, Green, 1949), and Bonnelyn Y. Kunze, *Margaret Fell and the Rise of Quakerism* (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1994).
- ⁴⁷ The recent study of Bishop, good as it is, does not take him beyond 1660. See Maryann S. Feola, *George Bishop: Seventeenth-Century Soldier Turned Quaker* (York, Eng.: William Sessions, 1996).

- 48 On this body, see Ingle, *First Among Friends*, 257.
- 49 On this power-play, see *ibid.*, 222-23.
- 50 J. William Frost, *The Quaker Family in Colonial America* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973).
- 51 Barry Levy, *Quakers and the American Family* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).
- 52 For the two most striking examples, see Craig Horle's review in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 113 (1989), 277-82, with Levy's response following on pp. 282-84, and J. William Frost's review in *Quaker History* 79 (1990), 40-42.
- 53 Non-Quaker historians have been more wont to bestow on early Friends a somewhat better record on the question of slavery and racism than the facts would permit. For an example, see Winthrop Jordan, *White Over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550-1812* (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Book, 1969), 194. For a more recent reading of some of the evidence, see J. William Frost, "George Fox's Anti-Slavery Legacy," paper delivered at George Fox Conference, Lancashire, England, March 1991, and Ingle, *First Among Friends*, 235-36.
- 54 Rufus M. Jones, *The Later Periods of Quakerism* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1921), 2 vols.
- 55 There has been one attempt: Janet Whitney, *John Woolman: American Quaker* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1942), but it is less useful than a literary study, Nicholas Edwin H. Cady, *John Woolman* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1965).
- 56 Morgan, *Lancaster Quakers*, ch. 7, esp. 263 and 269.
- 57 Elizabeth Isichei, *Victorian Quakers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970).
- 58 Thomas D. Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends, 1800-1907* (Bloomington Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1988).
- 59 Alastair Heron, *Quakers in Britain: A Century of Change, 1895-1955* (Kelso, Scot.: Curlew Graphics, 1995) and Ben Pink Dandelion, *A Sociological Analysis of the Theology of Quakers: The Silent Revolution* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1996).
- 60 Herman Will, Jr., *A Will for Peace: Peace Action in the United Methodist Church, A History* (Washington D.C.: General Board, 1984).
- 61 Fox, Epistle 337, *Collection of Epistles*, in *Works of Fox*, VIII, 127-128.
- 62 H. Larry Ingle, 'George Fox, Historian,' *Quaker History*, 82 (1993), 28-35.
- 63 Fox, Epistle 348, *Collection of Epistles*, in *Works of Fox*, VIII, 147. Arthur Windsor found no other use of any form of the word 'history' in Fox's epistles. See Arthur Windsor, comp., *George Fox Epistles: An Analytical Phrase Index* (Gloucester, Eng.: George Fox Fund, 1992), 114.