

From Bond Slave to Governor

THE STRANGE CAREER OF CHARLES BAYLY

(1632?–1680)

UNTIL the summer of 1966 Charles Bayly, one of the earliest American converts to Quakerism, was little more than a name to me. Bayly, whose name is found in several other forms [Baily, Bailey, Bayley], was convinced by the preaching of Elizabeth Harris during her 1656 visit to Maryland.¹ Several works which mention Bayly's conviction suggest that this was the same Charles Bayly who went to Rome with Jane Stokes in 1660 or 1661, and who sought the release of John Perrot from prison.² None of these writers however, offers *evidence* that these two Charles Baylys were the same person.

During the summer of 1966, while I was engaged upon research on John Perrot,³ I found it necessary to track down all the available material on Charles Bayly—one of Perrot's strongest supporters in the great schism produced by Perrot in the 1660's. As a result of this search, Charles Bayly not only emerged from the shadows as a living figure but suddenly appeared as one of the more colourful figures of the seventeenth-century world.

Charles Bayly was the son of Roman Catholic parents who were connected with the English Court, even though they themselves were of French origin. Born about 1632 and reared around London, Charles was carefully brought up a Roman Catholic by his parents who spared "neither cost nor pains, for anything which might tend unto my

¹ Concerning Elizabeth Harris and her work see my article, "Elizabeth Harris, the Founder of American Quakerism", *Quaker History*, LVII (1968), 96-111.

² Rufus M. Jones, *The Quakers in the American Colonies*, 1923, p. 267; William C. Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, 1923, p. 426; William Sewel, *The History of . . . Quakers. 1795*. I, 490; J. Reaney Kelly, *Quakers in the Founding of Anne Arundel County, Maryland*, 1963, pp. 21-22.

³ A monograph on John Perrot is to be published as a Supplement to *Journal F.H.S.*

edification, and . . . [brought] me up in that way.”¹ In spite of the love, concern, and encouragement of his family and friends, Bayly could never “heartily embrace” this religious approach but actually developed a secret dislike for it. A time of real religious doubt and rejection of the Roman “ways and worship” began when Bayly was about twelve or thirteen.

From this time forward Charles Bayly says he “was ever seeking for to separate myself from my natural Parents”. The accomplishment of this desire was soon aided by the “wars [Civil War] coming on in England, [which] did enlarge my opportunity, for to fulfill my intended purpose”—for most of the Court Officers were dismissed from their positions and lost their homes. The young lad of thirteen began to wander about, “not being kept at School, nor at Board, as formerly I had been”.²

Charles Bayly’s parents, having fled to France, desired that he join them in their native land. When the King of France sent his “Extraordinary Ambassador . . . (called the Prince *Deicourt*)” to England, young Charles was drawn under his care and even served as the Ambassador’s interpreter while he was still in England. Soon, however, the Ambassador returned to France, taking the wayward lad with him. Here he fed “at the table of Princes” and was “in their love and favour” but felt that he was “without the love and favour of God”.³

The inner search and struggle which had begun in Charles Bayly some months before continued to grow—so that his restless condition made him leave France and return to England without the knowledge or consent of family or friends. Having landed at Gravesend, it was his intention to travel overland to London. Unfortunately, however, Charles met with a man named Bradstreet “who was commonly called a *Spirit*, for he was one of those who did entice Children and People away for Virginia”. Bradstreet engaged the boy in conversation, so that Bayly later wrote

¹ Charles Bayly. *A true and faithful Relation of some of the sufferings, tryals, sorrows, and travels of . . . C.B.*, p. 7. This is at the end of his, *A True and Faithful Warning to the Upright-hearted & unprejudiced Reader*, 1663.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 7–8.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 8. The Prince Deicourt [perhaps d’A’court?] has not been identified.

“and I being tender in years, he did cunningly get me on Board of a ship, which was then there riding ready for to go to those parts, and I being once on Board, could never get on Shoar, untill I came to *America*”.¹

The kidnapped youth, upon his arrival in “Virginia” [a name used for the whole area opening off the Chesapeake Bay] was sold as “a bond-slave for seven years”. His treatment during this period, like that of many indentured servants or “bond-slaves”, was rather inhuman:

it would be too hard for me to shew (in every particular) the hardship and misery that I did undergo (in that time of hunger, cold and nakednesse, beatings, whippings, and the like;) for many times I was stripped naked, and tied up by the hand, and whipped; and made to go bare-foot; and bare-legged in cold and frosty weather, and hardly [had] cloths to cover my nakednesse, besides the soare and grievous labour which I was continually kept at.²

The outward misery which the once-pampered youth now underwent was accompanied by the suffering that is experienced by one on an inward pilgrimage. Bayly writes that, during these seven years of untold hardship at the hands of a member of an Independent Church:

my poor soul would be often bemoaning itself (every way) concerning my soar captivity and misery; and something I can indeed say did in secret answer and refresh my tender soul; in the feeling of which, I could in truth of heart say, I did forgive my then persecutors: And when grief would be ready to swallow me up, I would consider how that that which did then befall me, was surely for my good; and would rather judge myself than others, beleiving that I indeed did deserve it, and much more for my disobedience, though of a truth it was very grievous and hard for me to bear, as to the very natural, what I did, and surely had not the secret hand of Gods love upheld me, I could never have supported my burden, there being such an alteration with me, when I came to eat my bread in the Ash heap, when as before I had been in the presence of Princes; and also the alteration both of food and everything else; for instead of a well-stringed Lute in my hand, I had hard labour, and my daily exercise was beyond the common manner of Slaves, for mine was often night and day: I say, had it not been the very hand and love of God which had supported me, my very outward man would have been laid in the dust, as several

¹ *Ibid.*

² *Ibid.*

of my then fellow Labourers were, in a most sad and deplorable condition.¹

It must have been about 1645 or 1646 when Charles Bayly, a youth of thirteen, was sold to an "approved" member of an Independent Church in "Virginia". Church membership of this Puritan owner not only did not seem to lead him to love his neighbour as himself but also seem to have little effect on the man—for Bayly some years later wrote that "he was unconverted, as to the Lord . . . for indeed, I never saw any change or alteration in the man at all."²

The name of Bayly's "owner" or master and the scene of his sufferings are unknown today. Even though Bayly, in various places, speaks of his connection with "Virginia", we cannot be sure that this means *Virginia*, since—at the time of his experiences in the 1640's and 1650's and the time of his writings in the 1660's—this title also was used for *Maryland*. It seems probable, however, that it was to Virginia the youth was first carried and sold into "bond-slavery" for seven years. If this be true, then his Puritan master, carrying Bayly with him, moved to Maryland as a part of the Virginia Puritan migration to Lord Baltimore's colony in 1650 (following Maryland's Act of Religious Toleration in 1649).

Until recently there has been a real question as to whether or not Charles Bayly ever lived in Maryland. Such a question was raised by the fact that (1) there are no extant Maryland records (wills, land records, etc.) which mention him; (2) Bayly almost always refers to "Virginia" rather than Maryland—although this, of itself, means little; (3) there is no mention of Bayly in the 1657–60 sufferings of Maryland Quakers as listed by Besse, Howgill, and others.³ The one suggestion that Charles Bayly ever lived in Maryland is found in the 1658 letter of Robert Clarkson of Severn [Annapolis], Maryland, to Elizabeth Harris⁴—as Clarkson reports on the present state of those

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 8–9.

² *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³ Concerning these accounts (which are not complete, it would seem), see my article "Persecution of Quakers in Early Maryland (1658–1661)," *Quaker History*, LIII (1964), 67–80.

⁴ Swarthmore MSS. (Friends House Library), III 7.

who had been convinced by her in 1656. All of the places named in the letter are recognizable Maryland localities, and all the other people listed are known to be Marylanders. For this reason it has generally been surmised that Maryland *alone* was the scene of Elizabeth Harris's proclamation of "the Truth" and that Bayly therefore was an inhabitant of Maryland. Only recently, however, has there been unearthed a document which shows that Bayly lived in "Maryland in Virginia".¹ Thus we now know that he was a Marylander—at least in the second half of his American stay.

Bayly lived in "Virginia", probably in *both* of the Tidewater colonies, for fourteen years [1646–1660]—first as a "bond-slave" and then as a freeman. During the first ten years of this period his religious search continued. He found himself unable to return to the faith of his childhood and parents. The initial success of the "Parliament Party" for a time drew him towards the Puritan approach. In a "short time", however, he discovered that

the chiefest of those [Puritan] people, who were amongst us, lost their first integrity, soon especially, when the Lords hand had given their Brethren great rest and victory from their enemies, and so soon turned that little they had gotten to a wrong end, and made use of it as an occasion to the flesh, by which means they became as much in bondage as ever, every one seeking his own, and not anothers good.²

When Charles Bayly's seven years of service was completed, he decided to remain in America rather than seek out his nearest relations ["for I said in my heart, their sorrow is over concerning me"]. He chose, instead, to "labour with my hands, and so get my bread with painfulnesse" among his Puritan neighbours rather than "to return unto the *Romish* stuff"—even though he saw little but rioting, drinking, singing, and dancing amongst the best of the people around him.

In the midst of all of this, his "soul in secret did mourn after a holy life of love", although he could not see the existence of such a life among any of those he knew and had dealings with. Charles's own condition often caused him to

¹ *The Second Part of the Cry of the Innocent for Justice*, 1662 [Wing *Short-title catalogue* . . . 1641–1700, S 2303], pp. 19–20.

² Bayly, *A true and faithful Relation*, p. 10.

lament in secret, "say[ing] unto the Lord, 'Hast thou created me thus to destroy me?'" Even though this youth, now in his early twenties, outwardly attempted to lose himself in the "laughter, lightness, and vanity" of those around him, he still looked for a "man of love" or a people in whom he might place his confidence—for this was what his inner yearning drew him to.¹ Bayly was convinced that God, who had raised this yearning in him, soon answered his seeking,

by sending one of his dear servants into those parts, whose name was Elizabeth Harris, who soon answered that which was breathing after God in me; by which means I came with many more to be informed in the way and truth of God, having a seal in my heart and soul of the truth of her message, which indeed I had long waited for: And then when I had found this beloved life and people, I was like a man over-joyed in my heart; not onely because I heard that God had raised up such a people in *England*,² but also because I saw the sudden fruits and effects of it, both in my heart, and in others, insomuch that in a short time we became all to be as one entire family of love, and were drawn together in his life, (which was his light in us) to wait upon him in the stillnesse and quietnesse of our spirits, like so many people which desired nothing but the pure teachings of Gods Spirit, in which we were often refreshed together, and one in another.³

Having undergone his own spiritual pilgrimage (much as St. Francis, Luther, George Fox, John Wesley, and others have done), Charles Bayly underwent his religious conviction when he was about twenty-three—some ten years after having arrived in "Virginia". With him it was a moving and lasting experience, so that there was no back-sliding. More than a year later, Robert Clarkson wrote to Elizabeth Harris that "Charles Balye [Bayly] ye yonge man who was with us at our parting abides convinced & several others in those parts where hee dwelt".⁴

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 10–11.

² The birth of Quakerism in England is usually dated 1652. It spread to the West Indies in 1655 and to the Chesapeake Bay area in 1656.

³ Bayly, *A true and faithful Relation*, p. 11.

⁴ Swarthmore Manuscripts, III, 7 [Transcripts IV, 197], 14th January, 1657 [1658], Friends House Library, London. Where were "those parts where hee dwelt"? The letter gives no real hint as to the location, although it seems likely that it must not have been too far from the Annapolis area. The term "yonge man" simply refers to Bayly's tender age rather than distinguishing him from an older man of the same name as suggested by Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

What did Charles Bayly do in the four years between the time of his conviction in 1656 and his early 1660 departure for England? His name does not appear in Francis Howgill's or Besse's listings of those Maryland Friends who were whipped, fined, or imprisoned for their Quaker testimonies during the period 1658 to 1660.¹ This does not necessarily mean that Bayly was either outside the area for any or all of that period of time or that he was unwilling to stand up for his new-found beliefs (which seems most unlikely, given what we know of his life in the early 1660's). One should remember that Howgill's list of Quaker sufferings in Maryland, slightly fuller than that of Besse, contains the statement, "these are not all of the Sufferings *by much* which this poor people have undergone".²

Quite possibly during this period Charles Bayly may have been a missionary to the Indians—the first Quaker to work among them. It is known that some Indians in the Maryland-Virginia area accepted the Quaker message quite early, and that one Indian Quaker preacher (and, it would seem, four or five more shortly thereafter) was hanged in 1659 or 1660.

Richard Pinder, writing 17th August, 1660 [O.S.], says,

And friends is wel in Maryland and in Virginia & y^e power of y^e Lord is entred among y^e Indians and one of them was moved to go abroad in y^e power to minister & they did hang him, & since 4 or 5 of them is moved to go forth & we here as if they should have hanged them. So y^e power of y^e Lord is stired up mightily among them.³

Charles Bayly in 1663 wrote that "the Lord . . . called me from the *Indians in America*" to minister unto the Protestants in France.⁴ John Perrot, shortly *after* the arrival of Charles Bayly in Rome, wrote, "the sound of New-England Sufferers, and the fame of the *Indian Martyrs* in the Continent of *Virginia*, hath pierced to my bottoms

¹ Francis Howgill, *The Deceiver of the Nations Discovered and His Cruelty Made Manifest*, 1660 [Wing H3158], and Joseph Besse, *Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers*, 1753, II, 378–380.

² Howgill, *op. cit.*, p. 24. Italics added.

³ Swarthmore MSS., IV, 39 [Transcripts, IV, 293]. Pinder's language leaves uncertain the site of such a development which could easily have happened in Virginia and possibly in Maryland (given the treatment of both Indians and Quakers in the two colonies in 1659).

⁴ Charles Baily [Bayly], *A Seasonable Warning to such who profess themselves Members of Reformed Churches*, 1663 [Wing B1473B], p. 62.

within me".¹ It seems likely that Perrot heard of these Tidewater atrocities from Bayly who had just arrived in Rome from "Virginia" where they took place. These three small items, buried in the writings of Pinder, Bayly, and Perrot, suggest the possibility of Bayly's working among the Indians during the final three or four years of his stay in the Chesapeake Bay area.

Sometime early in 1660 Charles Bayly felt *led* to leave "Virginia" and return to Europe. He was convinced that this was a divine leading. In one place he writes "the Lord . . . hath called me from a far country, where I was an inhabitant".² Elsewhere he says, "God separated me outwardly from my Brethren in *Virginia*, who were more and dear to me than all my outward kindred, because they were such as did the will of my father".³

It may be that Bayly knew Charles II who had just recently been placed upon the throne of England. Possibly, in the days of his childhood in England where his parents were attached to the Court or through some contact during Bayly's brief stay in "princely" circles in France, a friendship had developed between them. It is known that Charles Bayly (who later shows other signs of influential connections) was shortly "moved" to go to Rome to try to rescue John Perrot from the prison in which he had suffered terribly since his arrest by the Inquisition in 1658. Quite probably Charles Bayly took letters from Charles II to aid his cause, for Perrot later said that he owed his life to letters which had come from King Charles while Perrot was in his Roman prison.⁴

Probably armed with these letters from Charles II and fired with the enthusiasm of one who believes that he has received a God-given task, Bayly set out for Rome. Just as his

¹ John Perrot, *Glorious Glimmerings of the Life of Love, Unity, And pure joy*, 1663 [Wing P1618]. Perrot says this was written in 1660 [which lasted until 24th March, 1661, according to the Old Style Calendar], but not published until 1663. Perrot speaks of these Indian deaths in the plural, implying that the later four or five were also killed.

² Charles Bayly, *Seasonable Warning*, p. 62.

³ Bayly, *A true and faithfull Relation*, p. 13. Bayly, *A True And Faithful Warning to the Upright-hearted & unprejudic'd Reader*, p. 6, suggests that he arrived in Bristol from "Virginia" about May or June, 1660.

⁴ State Papers, C.O.I, 18, item 65 [Public Record Office, London]. The original manuscript contains this passage which is omitted in the printed *Calendar of State Papers*.

journey was beginning, he met Jane Stokes who had also experienced the same moving or prompting to go to Rome to aid Perrot. The two travelled overland through France to Marseilles, took a ship to Genoa, travelled by land to Leghorn (arriving penniless) where they met William Ward, master of a vessel, and two other Quakers who took them in for a while until they were able to proceed onward to Rome.

Immediately upon their arrival in Rome, Bayly and Stokes went directly to the prison where Perrot was incarcerated, but they were refused admission. After having met with this rebuff, Charles Bayly went to the Inquisition, saw the Inquisitor, and told him that:

“I was come from England for to see my brother J[ohn] P[errot] to which he answered I should see him, and appointed me to come to a certain place called Minerva, and there saith he, I will procure you liberty of the Cardinals to see him.”¹

Shortly after this Bayly himself was brought before the Inquisition. While Charles Bayly was being questioned by the Inquisition, he offered to take the place of Perrot in prison (very much as many of his fellow religionists in England had offered themselves in the place of their brethren suffering in English prisons). Bayly even tried to meet with and speak to the Inquisition each time it met (twice a week—once at Minerva and once at Monte-Cavallo, the Pope’s residence). Many Jews and other people, sensing Bayly’s danger, tried to persuade him to save himself rather than continue with his concern for Perrot. Finally, as they had foreseen, Bayly was arrested at Minerva and carried “to the Pazzarella which was the Prison or Hospital of madmen where our dear Brother was a prisoner”.² While he was being taken to this prison, Bayly came face to face with the Pope who was being “carried in great pomp” with “the people being on their knees on each side of him”. Bayly then called out to him in Italian “to do the thing that was Just and to release the Innocent”.³

While in this prison Charles Bayly engaged in a twenty-

¹ [John Perrot], *A Narrative of some of the Sufferings of J. P. in the City of Rome*, 1661 [Wing P1627], p. 15. Pp. 11–16 contain a letter written by Charles Bayly in August, 1661, describing these events.

² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

³ *Ibid.*

day fast—believing that God required this action on his part as a sign¹ of the church officials' guilt in bringing about the death of John Luffe (Perrot's fellow Quaker and fellow Irishman who had been arrested with Perrot and who had died in prison sometime earlier). Church officials claimed that Luffe had fasted nineteen days and died on the twentieth, having starved himself to death. Perrot and Bayly both believed that he had been hanged and that church officials invented the fasting and starvation story to cover up his murder.² It was as a result of this belief that Bayly fasted twenty days, showing that a person might live through such a period.

Jane Stokes, who had accompanied Bayly on his dangerous journey to Rome, was also arrested and taken before the Inquisition. From the Inquisition she was then carried to the same prison in which Perrot and Bayly were being held. Apparently any Quaker who came to Rome and sought out either the Pope or the Inquisition was thought to be insane and quickly deposited in the "Prison of Madmen" or Bedlam!

The presence of Charles Bayly and Jane Stokes gave John Perrot the spiritual help and consolation he so much needed:

Moreover the everlasting mercies of my God did stir up the bowells [of compassion] of [an]other two of his tender babes, named . . . Jane Stokes and Charles Baylie to come to visit me whilst I was as forsaken of all men, who in the uprightness of their hearts and perfect faith in my god of wonders, came travelling through land towards me, bruised in their righteous souls in abstinence and fasting, in weekness and sore pains, yet spared not their bodies to the utmost, but in their faith persevered in their pilgrimage until they arrived to *Rome*, where C. B. offered his life to ransome me, and both of them entered into captivity for the love which they bore to my life; and *Charles* wore the irons of my bonds in fastings and sore sufferings, which melted my heart like wax and made me drop

¹ Bayly was steeped in the life and thought of the Bible, where the Old Testament prophets often performed "signs" to act out their message.

² Perrot, *Narrative* p. 16; *John Perrot's Answer to the Pope's feigned nameless Helper: or a Reply to the Tract Entitled, Perrot against the Pope*, 1662 [Wing P1610], p. 1; Charles Baily [Bayly], *A Seasonable Warning and Word of Advice to all Papists, But Most especially to those of the Kingdom of France*, 1663 [Wing B1473A], p. 6. William Penn later expressed this same view that Perrot and Bayly had voiced.

down the tears of mine eyes, which pretious visitations of my Father's eternal love manifested unto me in tender compassions through the yerning bowels of these his beloved babes must never be forgotten by me.¹

At the very end of May or the 1st June, 1661, all three Quaker prisoners were released—bringing to an end three years of imprisonment for Perrot and a relatively short period for Stokes and Bayly.² The three Friends must have left Rome almost immediately, for they faced the threat of “being condemned to perpetual gally-slavery if ever [they] returned again to Rome”.³ The return journey of Bayly, Stokes, and Perrot to England was under way by 2nd June, 1661, when Perrot wrote his letter “from without the gates of Rome”.⁴ As they made their way through France, Bayly was arrested for speaking to two priests—“desiring them that I might have the liberty either in a public Market place, or some convenient place, where the people might hear, and I should prove what I said to them to be the truth of God”. He was then imprisoned in “Bourg de Ault” near “Deept” [Dieppe] and Abbeville,⁵ which was about thirty leagues from Dover.⁶ Joseph Fuce reports that he heard Perrot, after his arrival in England, refer to Charles Bayly's arrest and imprisonment near Calles [Calais] for “speaking to a Cupell of priests that bowed to an Image as they passed ye streets”.⁷ These two accounts probably refer to the same experience in the summer of 1661.

Bayly's return to England, delayed by his two months' French imprisonment, did not take place until the autumn of 1661—when the Perrotonian schism was already beginning to develop. John Perrot, during his imprisonment in Rome and the intense physical and mental suffering and persecution which he experienced in those three years, had come to

¹ Perrot, *Narrative*, pp. 9–10.

² Swarthmore MSS., V, 42 [Transcripts, VII, 189] contains a letter written 2nd June, 1661, by Perrot “upon delivery from his long imprisonment”. Concerning Bayly's treatment in Rome, see Bayly, *A True and Faithful Warning to the Upright-hearted & unprejudic'd Reader*, pp. 2–3.

³ Perrot, *Narrative*, p. 16.

⁴ Swarthmore MSS., V, 42.

⁵ Ault, arrondissement of Abbeville in the department of the Somme, France.

⁶ Bayly, *A Seasonable Warning and Word of Advice to all Papists*, p. 6. Cf. Perrot, *Narrative*, p. 11.

⁷ Swarthmore MSS., IV, 224 [Transcripts, II, 249].

believe that *all* religious forms must be put aside. First he attacked the removal of the hat in time of prayer. Next, he rejected the shaking of hands (with which Friends' meetings ended). It was only a question of time before he and his followers went the next step and rejected holding meetings for worship at a *pre-arranged* time, saying that true worship came only when people were led by the Spirit.¹ Perrot's view that one should follow the leading of the Spirit—and that alone—led to many excesses. Charles Bayly, who had risked his life to rescue John Perrot from prison in Rome, became one of his chief supporters in England.

The time of Charles Bayly's liberation from his French imprisonment and the exact date of his return to England are unknown, but it is clear that he had already become a prisoner in Dover prison for his Quaker beliefs some months before March, 1662. It was at this time that he wrote a letter from prison to the "Deare Lambs of my Fathers fould", urging his fellow Quakers to remain in unity and not to give up hope—for the persecuting enemy would be overthrown.² Bayly himself says that he had been in Dover less than twenty-four hours before he was arrested as a Jesuit!

It was during this seven months' period of imprisonment, beginning late in 1661 it would seem, that Charles Bayly began to express certain beliefs and to engage in certain practices which brought him into disrepute with his fellow Quakers. His continued championing of John Perrot in 1661 and 1662, when the final rupture of relations between George Fox and Perrot took place, led an increasing number of Friends to question their unity with Bayly. Equally as disturbing was his inclination toward "visions, prophecies, and miracles".

¹ For a brief discussion of these views see Kenneth L. Carroll, "Thomas Thurston, Renegade Maryland Quaker", *Maryland Historical Magazine*, LXII (1967), 184-87. My forthcoming monograph on John Perrot treats them in much greater detail.

² Humphrey Smith, *To the meek and open hearted Lambes, and Flock of Heaven, in meekness of Love with Greetings of Peace from the Seat of Infinite Mercy* [1662] [Wing S4081], p. 7, contains this letter written by Bayly, 15th day of 1st month, 1661 [O. S.]. Concerning Bayly's account, see Bayly, *A True and Faithful Warning to the Upright-hearted & unprejudic'd Reader* [Wing B1473D], p. 4.

Quaker records are relatively silent concerning this aspect of Bayly's career, except in so far as they attempt to defend Friends against the attacks of their adversaries. Several anti-Quaker documents by Richard Hobbs are much more detailed and descriptive. These, however, must be read with care—for "anything goes" is the rule of seventeenth-century religious controversy, and they did not appear in print until a decade later.

Hobbs claims that Quakers "owned" [accepted, countenanced] Bayly and were in fellowship with him at the time of his Dover imprisonment.¹ He then states that Bayly "did prophecie, see false Visions, and pretend to work Miracles". Bayly developed such a reputation as possessing an extraordinary gift of healing—having been said to have cured Anne Howard's eyes, convulsion fits of Katherine Fern, and a sore leg of Edward Salisbee (who "threw away all his plaisters, and clouts that formerly he used")—that great numbers of people sought him out. Hobbs says that Bayly had success only with Quakers (such as the above three) and not with all of them. Bayly failed to cure the swelling in William Williams's face and the weakness and lameness of Samuel Tavenor's wife. His greatest failure (caused by the presence and opposition of some Baptists, according to Bayly), as Hobbs tells the story, was in casting out the Devil from Christopher Woollet [Wollit] of Alkham.

Richard Hobbs was a Baptist minister who was so anti-Quaker that he would visit the prison room where Bayly, some of his fellow Quaker prisoners, and Quakers from Dover (who had freedom to come in for these meetings!) gathered for meetings—in order that he might dispute Bayly's message. This should be kept in mind as one reads his somewhat coloured account of the events of 22nd October, 1661.

The next Project was . . . upon one Mr. *Christopher Wollit* of *Alkham*, a man that had lived well and being decayed in his

¹ Richard Hobbs, *The Quakers Looking Glass Look'd upon, And turned towards Himself*, 1673 [Wing H2271], p. 1, says "the Quakers did own *Baily* for an eminent *Quaker* amongst them before and after his pretended Vision, Prophecie, and Miracles . . . by their affirming and justifying him to be led by the true Light, as they did by hearing him preach, and devoutly joyning with him in Prayer."

estate, was sometimes a little Frenzie[d] in his brain, but had the use of his reason, and well read in the Scriptures. This man coming to visit the Prisoners, as his manner was, did in Discourse tell *C. Baily*, that he thought him to be one of the *Locusts*, that came out of the bottomless Pit, the hair of his head and beard for length being like the hair of Women; *Charles Baily*, with two *Female* Quakers, got this man into their Chamber, and takes in with him five of the Baptist Prisoners . . . and shuts the door upon them, bidding them sit still, and they should see the great Power of God; All men silent, *Charles Baily* after a little time fell a quaking, and his Belly working and his body swelling, with a strange bubbling in his throat, striving, as if he had been choak'd, and then was by that Power that wrought in him, thrown down from a chest whereon he sat, flat on his face, to the amazement of the people; in this posture he uttered some words as if he prayed with his Hat on; Mr. *Woolit* thereupon reproved him for praying covered, and quoted *I Cor.* where *Paul* forbids it, at which *Baily* stands up, and takes hold of *Woolit's* Garment, and with an audible voice in the Name of God, commandeth the Devil to come out of him; afterward adjuring him several times in the name of *Jesus of Nazareth* to come out of him: In like manner comes one of the Females with strange rattling and swelling in her throat, crying, thou *Beelzebub*, thou *Fiend*, thou Legion come out of him; and thus she stood gaping eight or nine times together; and she being spent, a younger Female comes swelling and rattling in her Throat, and foaming at her Mouth: Note, till this last came *Wollit* was patient: he seeing her come rattling and foaming at him, said *What will this young Jezebel do? What hast thou to belch out?* But she, like the others, cried out with a loud voice, *Thou Lucifer, Son of the Morning, come out, come out, I adjure thee to come out, thou must come out, and thou shalt come out:* with such like words she stood gaping nine or ten times, to the amazement of the Spectators. In this fearful manner they stood about him till they raised the man so much, that he went and called out of the Window to the people that passed by, to come and let him out, telling them that the Quakers had shut him in their room, and would not let him out, and that he did not know, but that they were minded to murder him.

Whereupon *Baily* said, Now the devil rages, now he is mad, keep him in, and you shall see the Devil flie out of the window: but, some of the *Baptists* would let him out, which being done, Mr. *Wollit* went away the same Man he was, and so continued, affirming that *Baily* was a false Prophet and a Deceiver.¹

Hobbs reported that those who had observed this episode believed that Bayly and his female followers, rather than

¹ [Richard Hobbs], *A True and Impartial Relation of some Remarkable Passages of Charles Bailey a Quaker, who profest himself a Prophet, and that he was sent of God*, pp. 3-4. (This is printed at the end of Hobbs, *The Quakers Looking Glass*.)

Woolet, were possessed by the Devil.¹ Before viewing the Quaker response to Hobbs's attack upon them through his account of Charles Bayly, it should be noted that Hobbs was writing *twelve* years after the events discussed, that Hobbs himself seems to have been greatly influenced by the language of the Revelation of John in the words of description for Bayly which he put in Woolet's mouth, and that he mistakenly dated the episodes in 1667 rather than 1661.

Quaker writers, such as Luke Howard and Thomas Rudyard, were quick to reply to Richard Hobbs's writing, and within a few months each of them produced answers. Luke Howard reported that Hobbs had neglected to say that among the men Friends in Dover prison and among the Quakers outside many "did not own *C. Bayly* so much as R. Hobbs reporteth of, though to him it was not declared".² He also stated that:

Anne Howard my Wife (I being then a *Prisoner* in the Castle) did so far disown him [Bayly], that she sent up to *London*, to the Elders of Friends, and gave them an Account of his *mad Actions*, who sent down *two Friends* to look after him and they testified against him, when they saw him; this [act] *Friends* did not acquaint the *Baptists* with, who we knew waited for *Mischief*: but *Friends Care* was of him, to preserve him, if possible, and to restore him in the Spirit of *Meekness* and *Love*, as our *Duty* is according to Scripture, but when no *Recovery* can be, then deny'd, as he was and is to this day.³

Luke Howard continued by saying that those Quakers with Bayly were "young Convinced, and tender, and could not easily discern, and afraid to judge, not knowing what to say". When they acquainted Luke Howard and the other older Quakers in the Castle Prison with accounts of Bayly's acts, Luke Howard said, "this we did not see meet to acquaint the *Baptists* with, but rather endeavoured to get him to *London*, which was done in order to his recovery". He then concluded, "so that Friends are clear of him in the sight of God, and according to Scripture, although the *Baptists* in envy seek to lay *Stumbling-blocks* in the way of

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

² Luke Howard, *A Looking Glass for Baptists*, 1673 [Wing H2986], pp. 32-33.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 33. Luke Howard also denied that his wife had been cured by Bayly.

the *Simple* by it".¹ In another pamphlet Luke Howard said that because many of the accounts of Charles Bayly's "Mad Actions" were true ["for which he must bear his own burden"], the Baptists thought they could add still other stories to these.²

Thomas Rudyard also reacted to Hobbs's sectarian attack, and pointed out three facts. First, that the story was one of eleven years' standing. Second, that the events mentioned took place half a dozen years before the 1667 date given by Hobbs. Third, that five of the nine "witnesses" whose names were attached to Hobbs' account were dead before the account was drawn up.³ He also reports that Charles Bayly had been "disowned" by Friends:

And [God] hath raised True Prophets in this Age to cry against the False Prophets, and particularly against Charles Bayly, who was *many years ago* judged and denied by the Prophets and Servants of the Lord, because he prophesied Lyes and false Divinations by the leadings of his own unclean spirit, which ruled in his own deceitful Heart: and because of these things he hath been shut out of the Assemblies of God's People (in Scorn called Quakers) for many years, although he sometimes appeared amongst them, as the false Apostles and deceitful workers did in the dayes of the true Prophets and Apostles appear amongst them; and as the true then judged, and denied the false; so have we done unto C. B. in and with the Light, Life, and Spirit of God.⁴

George Fox in 1661 produced a paper which "denied" both Charles Bayly and John Perrot. Fox, in his Journal, writes that both Perrot and Bayly [Bailey] "ran out from Truth. But I was moved to give forth a paper how the Lord would blast them all, both him and his followers, and that they should wither like grass on the house-top, and so they did. But others returned and repented."⁵

Although Charles Bayly was "disowned" or testified

¹ *Ibid.*

² Luke Howard, *The Seat of the Scorner Thrown Down: Or, Richard Hobbs his Folly, Envy and Lyes in his late Reply to my Books, called, A Looking Glass &c, Manifested and Rebuked*, 1673 [Wing H2987], p. 4.

³ Thomas Rudyard, *The Water-Baptists Reproach Repeld, Being A further Reply Answering a Defence of R. Hobbs to his pretended Impartial Narrative of one C. Bayly, hereto a pretended Quaker: A story of 11 years standing*, 1673, pp. 44, 48.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 58. Italics added.

⁵ George Fox, *Journal*, ed. John L. Nickalls, 1952, p. 411.

against by Quaker leaders such as Fox, he still considered himself a Friend and—as pointed out by Thomas Rudyard—he “sometime appeared among them”. On 27th June, 1662, after only a short period of freedom, Bayly and three other Friends took themselves to the Old Bailey in London to hear “the cause of our innocent Brethren”. All four were arrested as a result of this and were questioned. Bayly later reported “but I being a Foreigner was free in myself to tell my Name and place of abode, which was in Maryland in Virginia”. Because he would not take an oath, he was sent to Newgate Prison.¹ Bayly was a prisoner in Newgate for about four months “until I was so weak that I was carried out in a chair”. Following his recovery from this weakness, Bayly attended a Friends’ meeting in London near Aldersgate and was arrested again. Many Quakers suffered death at this time, and Bayly himself was a “deep sufferer”.²

Two other imprisonments in London in 1662 and 1663 preceded his sentencing to Newgate Prison in Bristol in 1663, after being in the city just three days. This time he was jailed for being unable to take an oath. From this prison, on 13th May, 1663, Bayly wrote a “warning” unto the people of Bristol,³ and there, on 4th September, 1663, he wrote his *Causes of God’s Wrath*.⁴

Charles Bayly appears to have been transferred to the Tower of London and spent the next six years as a prisoner there. During this period he wrote several letters to Charles II, admonishing him to avoid rioting and excess, chambering and wantonness.⁵ Sometime in 1669 there was a temporary break in Bayly’s imprisonment, so that he was released on parole in order that he might make a trip to France

¹ *The Second Part of the Cry of the Innocent for Justice*, pp. 19–20. Cf. Besse, *Sufferings*, I, 381–82. Besse says Bayly was accompanied by two other Friends rather than three.

² Bayly, *A True And Faithful Warning to the Upright-hearted & unprejudic’d Reader*, pp. 4–5; William C. Braithwaite, *The Second Period of Quakerism*, 1921, pp. 9–13.

³ Charles Baily [Bayly], *A True and Faithful Warning Unto the People and Inhabitants of Bristol*, 1663 [Wing B1473D].

⁴ Charles Bayley [Bayly], *The Causes of God’s Wrath Against England; And a Faithful Warning From the Lord to Speedy Repentance*, 1665 [Wing B1472]. This was published two years after it was written.

⁵ *Ibid.*

on a special mission.¹ Upon his return, he was again imprisoned for a brief time—only to be released once more on the surety of the Governor of the Tower, John Robinson.² These last two developments once again remind us that Charles Bayly must have been a person of ability, striking personality, and influential connections which time, absence, and imprisonment had not completely destroyed.

Shortly after his return from France, Bayly was released once more, this time for service with the Hudson's Bay Company. Once again one sees Bayly's influence, for his release "stipulated that he must be assured of such conditions and allowances as should be agreeable to reason and the nature of his employment".³ Bayly, therefore, was not only an employee but also a stockholder (with a full share of £300 to his credit) when he joined the Company! Even more than that, he was to be the Governor.

In late Spring 1670, Charles Bayly sailed on the *Wivenhoe*, which was accompanied by the *Rupert*. It was quite obvious that the exploration and trade were not the only tasks to which Bayly was to give his attention—for the ship took bricks and building materials, as well as "great Gunns to be left in the Bay". The Company hoped to establish a new post on the Nelson River.⁴

The efforts of Bayly and his party met with great misfortune, tragedy, and death, so that no permanent post or settlement was made on Nelson's River. Instead, the whole expedition began its return to England on 1st July, 1671, with Bayly being forced to navigate the *Wivenhoe* (since both the captain and the mate had died). Finally the survivors arrived back at Plymouth in England on 26th October, carrying many beaver skins with them.⁵ A second expedition set out for Hudson Bay in June, 1672. Bayly was to build a fort at Moose and leave half of his thirty or forty men there.

¹ If Charles Bayly is the Bayly who was "an old Quaker with a long beard" in September, 1669, *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, XIII (1916), 67, he was "old" because of his imprisonment and suffering rather than in "age".

² E. E. Rich, *The History of the Hudson's Bay Company, 1670-1860*, 1958, I, 65; Henry J. Cadbury, "The End of Another Schismatic" [Letter from the Past—183], *Friends Journal*, VI (1960), 256. Robinson was active in the formation of the Hudson's Bay Company.

³ Rich, *op. cit.*, I, 65.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 66.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 68-69.

Bayly himself spent the winter of 1672-73 at Rupert River, trading for furs. The next two years appear to have been spent in trading and in jockeying for position with the French.¹

There must have been some dissatisfaction with Bayly, for a new Governor was sent out from London and arrived in Canada on 15th September, 1674. Bayly, however, stayed on at the Company post, since it was too late for ships to leave for England that winter. By the time the ice broke in the spring, the whole expedition was ready to return to England. Charles Bayly and three other men stayed on, while William Lydall (who had failed as Governor) and the rest sailed for England as soon as possible. With Lydall's failure, Bayly became Governor once more.²

Charles Bayly remained as Governor in the Bay until the summer of 1679, when he was called home by the Company to answer certain charges which had been lodged against him. It has been suggested that probably the old charge (in 1671) of conducting private trade may have risen up to haunt him once more. More important, though, was the criticism of general mismanagement and lack of discipline.³ Although he was credited with doing much "to establish the Company's posts and practices", he was accused of doing so "in a slipshod and unbusiness-like way, with much kindness but without any great driving force of personality or conviction to make up for his lack of attention to detail."⁴ There was no question of his honesty, and his relations with the Indians appear to have been both friendly and successful.⁵ Bayly, we are told, "had taught the Indians to trust him and to expect steady terms of trade".⁶

Charles Bayly's return trip to England was a difficult one, for he was so abused and mocked by Captain Nehemiah Walker of the *John and Alexander* that he was sometimes brought to the point of tears.⁷ Shortly after his return to

¹ *Ibid.*, I, 70-78.

² *Ibid.*, I, 78-79.

³ *Ibid.*, I, 79.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 80. Bayly's successor was ordered to hold prayers, homilies, and readings from the Bible regularly, and Bayly was censored for not doing this. If he was still a follower of Perrot, he would have looked upon this as form.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 80-81.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 107.

⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 92.

England, Bayly died on 6th January, 1680. The officials of the Hudson's Bay Company, probably with a twinge of conscience, gave him an elaborate funeral at St. Paul's, Covent Garden, and also repaid his widow Hannah Bayly certain expenses and back salary.¹ The Company also sent out a plaque in his memory, to be erected in the Hudson's Bay Country. This plaque, says Rich, was designed to let the Indians know that Bayly "was dead and that the Company had used him well". His policy of "making treaties with the Indians was to be preserved".²

Thus the strange career of Charles Bayly came to an end in England, just as it had begun there. Between birth and death there had come two trips to the New World: one as a kidnapped youth sold into bond-slavery, and the second as Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company. Henry Cadbury has spoken of "the last chapter" of Bayly's life as "both useful and romantic".³ We can go beyond that and say that Bayly's whole life, in so far as we have been able to uncover it, has proved to be highly colourful or romantic.

KENNETH L. CARROLL

¹ *Ibid.*, I, 93; Cadbury *op cit.*, 282. Nothing is known of his widow.

² Rich, *op. cit.*, I, 109. Cf. I, 93.

³ Cadbury, *op. cit.*, 282.