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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the hypothesis that, in view of some similarities in theology and practice, early Quakers, or proto-Quakers had knowledge of, or direct contact with continental Anabaptists prior to their first documented visit to the Netherlands in 1655.

The five main findings of this research are: there is no evidence of contact between proto-Quakers and continental Anabaptists before 1655; there is evidence of much contact between early Quakers and English Baptist congregations in England, but uncertainty exists as to the theology of those Baptist groups; there is no evidence that the first Quaker visitors to the Netherlands had any prior knowledge of Dutch Anabaptist groups; alleged similarities between the writings of the Quaker leader George Fox and Jacob Böhme are coincidental; and it is likely that Fox’s ‘Uncle Pickering’ was not a General Baptist as had previously been proposed.

Subsidiary findings of this research are: there is no evidence that Fox’s mother was ‘of the stock of the martyrs’; Margaret Fell was not related to the Maryan martyr Anne Askew; Fox did positively acquire some of his theology from his parish priest Nathanial Stephens; ‘Priest Boys’ was either William Boys, perpetual curate at Goathland, or Roger or Thomas Boys of Lockton.
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CHAPTER 1

OVERVIEW OF THESIS

This research explores the hypothesis that, in view of some similarities in theology and practice, the early Quakers or proto-Quakers, had knowledge of, or direct contact with continental Anabaptist groups prior to the first well-documented visit of Quakers to the Netherlands in 1655.

Previous writers on the subject of Quakerism’s beginnings have commented on the similarity of beliefs and practices of Quakers and those of other continental European religious groups, and some of them have briefly mentioned, almost in passing, the direct contact between them. However, no previous research has investigated the depth and scope of those contacts and so previous authors have not had the authority to comment on the possibility of actual transference of underlying theology and practices.

This thesis argues that, prior to the emergence of Quakerism in England in 1652, the only contact that the first Quakers had with continental European religious groups was indirectly through the medium of the English General Baptists.

I establish, in 1.1 the objectives of the current research, and define terms used in this thesis in 1.2. In 1.3, I set out the previous scholarship in this area, and I discuss the methods adopted in undertaking this research in 1.4. This latter section includes comments on the attitude adopted when analysing the evidence obtained and the problems encountered in reviewing foreign and

---

1 See 1.3 below. A Quaker, Michael Wright, writes in The Friend, ‘The Anabaptist tradition, via the Mennonites, influenced early Friends’ and makes this assertion ‘by reading Stuart Murray’s book The Naked Anabaptist.’ In his book, Murray makes no such assertion but he does set out the beliefs of a group of current English Anabaptists, some of which are similar to those held by modern day Quakers. Michael Wright, ‘Presence in the midst.’ The Friend 170, no. 34, 24th August 2012, p. 14. Stuart Murray, The Naked Anabaptist: The Bare Essentials of a Radical Faith (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2011).
seventeenth-century English evidence. A discussion of the three main strands of the research: chronological, geographical and theological is set out in 1.5, with 1.6 documenting the structure and contents of this thesis. The chapter is summed up in section 1.7.

1.1 Research Objectives

The objectives of this research were: to identify personal contacts made by the early Quakers with continental Anabaptists and English Baptists and to establish possible theological influences on proto-Quakers and the first Quakers having determined the religious backgrounds of prominent early Quakers. These objectives are considered in turn. Research on this topic has not been undertaken previously and so this research makes an original contribution in this area of scholarship.

1.1.1 Identification of personal contact amongst Anabaptists, English Baptists and Quakers

The contacts investigated are direct personal contacts and contacts through literature issued by British and European ‘Anabaptists’ and available to proto-Quakers and early Quakers.  

Evidence used in this research, described in 1.4 below, focuses on four distinct areas:

a. George Fox – his personality, personal contacts and personal reading,

b. George Fox’s followers – their theological backgrounds and personal contacts,

---

2 See 1.2 below for a discussion on the meaning of the term ‘Anabaptist.’
3 George Fox was the initial leader of the religious movement called ‘Quakerism’, and ‘Quaker’ was a term used to define those individuals who, thereafter, accepted Fox’s teaching. See Chapter 4 and 5.2 below.
4 See Chapters 5 and 7.
c. Similarities shown in the written material of Quakers in the seventeenth century and the extant writings of earlier continental Anabaptists, and

d. Evidence contained in non-Quaker and anti-Quaker tracts of direct contact between Quakers and ‘Anabaptists’ which would have presented opportunities for the transmission of ideas and theologies.

In order to give authority to this evidence, Chapters 2 and 3 of this thesis establish the Continental-European and English religious contexts leading up to the contacts made by the early Quakers and proto-Quakers with continental Anabaptists.

The first well recorded Quaker visit to the Netherlands was that of William Caton and John Stubbs. Caton, in his Journal quotes the date of that visit as 1655, and these two, and later, Quakers targeted Collegiants for conversion, as they saw them as kindred spirits. The first visit occurred within a few years of the establishment of Quakerism in England and was to be the forerunner of many others by English Quakers in subsequent years, leading to the founding of Dutch Quakerism by Caton and William Ames.

---

5 See 4.7 below.
6 See Chapters 6 and 7.
7 Throughout this thesis I use the term ‘the Netherlands’ to denote the area in continental Europe which, during the seventeenth century, comprised the seven provinces of the United Provinces: Friesland, Gelderland, Groningen-Drente, Holland, Utrecht, Zeeland and Overijssel along with the provinces of Ijsselmeer Polders, now called Flevoland, and Noord-Brabant. It will be seen in this thesis that a number of authors have used the term ‘Holland’ to denote this same area. See 7.4.1 below regarding the possible earlier visit to the Netherlands by Jane Wilkinson.
9 Rufus M. Jones, Spiritual Reformers of the 16th and 17th Centuries (London: Macmillan and Co., 1928), p. 194. In 2.3.3 below I set out the beliefs and practices of the Dutch Collegiants, sometimes known as Rijnsburgers or Rijnsburger Collegiants.
The question must be asked: ‘Why did Quakers target the Netherlands, and the Dutch
Collegiants in particular, for conversion so soon after Quakerism’s establishment in
England?’

Lucinda Martin claims that there was ‘a rich exchange between reform-minded parties all
over the continent’,¹¹ and that in the mid seventeenth century, following the intolerant rule of
Charles V, religious toleration existed in the Netherlands.¹² David Loades documents that
there had existed a great deal of trade contact between England and the Netherlands at that
time and in the years leading up to 1655;¹³ but in themselves these are insufficient reasons for
Quakers to have devoted significant resources, in such a precise way, in the Netherlands at
that time.

Chapter 7 investigates the background to this targeting and the exchange of views between the
two groups.

Having established the authenticated contact of Quakers and proto-Quakers with English
religious groups in Chapter 5 and personal contacts between Quakers and Continental
Anabaptists in Chapter 7, it is demonstrated that all documented contact with continental
Anabaptist groups took place in the years following 1655 and that there is no documented
evidence of direct contact between proto-Quakers and continental Anabaptists leading up to

¹¹ Lucinda Martin, ‘Female Reformers as Gatekeepers of Pietism: The Example of Johanna Eleonora Merlau and
William Penn.’ Monatshefte 95, no. 1, 2003, p. 33.
¹² David Loades, Revolution in Religion: The English Reformation 1530-1570 (Cardiff: University of Wales
¹³ Loades, Revolution in Religion, pp. 65-66. ‘The south east of England was in constant contact with the trading
centres of Flanders and Brabant.’ See also p. 66, ‘Alarmed by the great Peasants’ Revolt...in [1525] the
authorities everywhere clamped down on radicalism, and no one more vigorously than Charles V in the
Netherlands. This had the effect of forcing some of the radicals back into Germany...Others took refuge in
England...Consequently hundreds, perhaps thousands of Dutch and Flemish artisans and craftsmen lived and
worked in London, Norwich and other towns within easy reach of their original homes.’
the establishment of Quakerism in 1652. However there is much documented evidence of indirect contact between the Continental Anabaptists and the proto-Quakers prior to 1652 through the medium of numerous English Baptist and Independent congregations.

1.1.2 Identification of possible influence on emergent Quaker theology and practices.

Much has been written of the life and personal history of George Fox, and some of those writings touch upon his state of mind during the period of ‘seeking’ in his early years. However, it must be remembered that the accounts of Fox’s life, used by these authors to form their opinions, are those written by Fox himself in his Journal. Chapter 4 of this thesis concentrates on the investigation into the theological, social and family backgrounds of George Fox and explains the foundation of Fox’s theological seeking.

The contacts of the early Quakers, including George Fox, with representatives of other religious sects in England are investigated in depth. As William Sewell and Rufus Jones have commented, Fox had dealings with Baptists, or Anabaptists, in his years of seeking up to 1652 and, according to Jones ‘he [Fox] must have learned something from them.’

---

14 The remote possibility of earlier contact between Fox and continental Anabaptism is outlined in 5.3.1 below, which considers the background to ‘Priest Boyes.’
15 See 5.3 and 5.4 below.
16 See Chapter 5.
18 See 6.2 below for an account of the writing of Fox’s Journal, and the publishing of its various editions.
19 See 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 below.
shown in Chapter 5 below that contacts between Quakers (or proto-Quakers) and other religious groups were numerous, and attempts were made to identify the specific groups or congregations with which contact, at some times extensive, occurred. In this way, it is possible to identify the theologies that could have transferred from those groups to Quakerism, and the routes taken.

John L. Nickalls asserted that George Fox held, during his life, several thousand books in his library,\(^{21}\) and Beck wrote that Fox was familiar with the teachings of other churches.\(^{22}\) Unfortunately, documentation of that library does not exist but Nickalls, based on the research of Theodor Sippell, gave details of 108 books that Fox owned.\(^{23}\) These books are documented in *The Annual Catalogue of George Fox’s Papers*.\(^{24}\) There is, unfortunately, no evidence to indicate the dates on which Fox acquired his books, in particular, whether they were obtained by him towards the beginning or at the end of his life. That information would indicate: whether he read them, whether he accepted their contents, or the influence they possibly had on his developing theology. It must be remembered that Fox himself admitted only to reading the Bible: ‘My desires after the Lord grew stronger...without the help of any man, book, or writing. For though I read the Scriptures...’\(^{25}\)

It was suggested by Brayshaw that Fox was acquainted with the writings of the German mystic Jacob Böhme and other mystical writers pre-dating the rise of Quakerism.\(^{26}\) H.G. Wood noted that Fox used many of Böhme’s words and experiences to describe his own

\(^{21}\) John L. Nickalls, ‘George Fox’s Library.’ *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 28, 1931, p. 4. ‘there must have been several thousand works in the collection.’


\(^{23}\) Nickalls, ‘George Fox’s Library’, pp. 3-21. This article resulted in further work on Fox’s library by Henry J. Cadbury, the results of which were contained in volumes of *The Friend* and *The Journal of the Friends Historical Society*.

\(^{24}\) *The Annual Catalogue of George Fox’s Papers* held as Mss vol 304 in Friends House Library, London.


\(^{26}\) Brayshaw, *The Personality of George Fox*, pp. 36-37.
experiences. For example, Böhme, who died in 1624, the same year that Fox was born, and whose writings were known to be circulating in England in the 1630s, referred to ‘the stone houses of the churches’, a term similar to ‘steeple houses’ used by early Friends. Böhme also introduces, in his writings, the notion of ‘the light of truth.’ Quakers, from the earliest days referred to ‘the light, which Christ the great heavenly prophet hath enlightened every man.’ In 4.6.4 below I consider the possibility that that knowledge of Böhme’s writings came to Fox via Durant Hotham, who met Fox in 1651 and who has been described as ‘one of the foremost English disciples of Jacob Boehme.’

Menno Simons, an Anabaptist who led its Mennonite sub-grouping after the Münster debacle in 1534, had, as the foundation of his theology ‘the Bible as interpreted through Christ’, and putting ‘trust in Christ alone’ – beliefs held by early Friends. Examples of common ‘themes’ can also be seen when comparing the writings of Menno with those of the Quaker William...

27 H.G. Wood, ‘George Fox and his Religious Background.’ The Holborn Review 15 (New Series), 1924, p. 357. However, Wood continues on p. 358 by writing: ‘but he [Fox] probably had not read anything that Behmen wrote, and he was not conscious of any debt to earlier religious teachers.’
29 George Fox, Journal, p. 16. The leading protagonist of the notion of the influence of Böhme on Fox was Rufus Jones. The views of Jones are examined in 4.6 below, but it is worth noting here the comments on Jones of more modern writers on Quakerism. Doncaster, in his ‘Introduction’ to the second edition of Braithwaite’s The Beginnings of Quakerism explains the removal of Jones’ ‘Introduction’, which had been contained in the first edition, because, with regard to Jones’ assertion as to the mystical roots of Quakerism, ‘recent studies have...put Quakerism in a rather different light.’ W.C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism. Second Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), p. vii. David J Hall also expresses reservations on Jones’ understanding of the link between mysticism and Quakerism. David J. Hall, ‘The Study of Eighteenth-Century English Quakerism: From Rufus Jones to Larry Ingle.’ Quaker Studies 5/2, 2001, p. 107. ‘In the United States reservations about Jones’s understanding of the relationships between mysticism and Quakerism began to be expressed after his death in 1948.’ Donald F Durnbaugh suggests that Jones promoted a connection between the mystics and Quakers on the sole basis of a ‘similarity of beliefs.’ Donald F Durnbaugh, ‘Baptists and Quakers – Left Wing Puritans.’ Quaker History 62. no. 2, Autumn 1973, p. 69.
29 George Fox, Journal, p. 75.
Dewsbury.\textsuperscript{33} A detailed comparison of Menno’s writings with those of early Quakers is set out in 4.7 below.

It can be seen that there are some similarities in the themes underpinning the writings of Fox, and other early Quakers, with those of earlier ‘Anabaptists’ and that there was every opportunity for these early Quakers to receive influence from books and tracts and, perhaps more particularly, from the people with whom they came into personal contact.\textsuperscript{34} However, there is no recorded evidence of this influence in Fox’s \textit{Journal}, nor in letters or tracts produced by Quakers at that time.

Chapter 4, investigating the available influences on the emerging theology of George Fox, considers the subject from four different perspectives:

a) That Fox believed he had received his message directly from God, as he writes in his \textit{Journal}.

b) That Fox had read about the kindred movements in Europe, and those emerging in England, and had met and discussed their beliefs with members of those groups, particularly with various English Baptists. However, Fox did not consciously associate those prior contacts with his received message.

c) As b) above, but in the light of the intolerance experienced in England in the seventeenth century to Continental ideas and the linking, by the State and the public,


\textsuperscript{34} See 4.7 below, where these similarities are explored in detail.
of those ideas with subversion,\textsuperscript{35} Fox decided that it would not be appropriate to link his ideas, or give credit, in any way, with those of Continental mystics or Anabaptists.

d) As b) above, but that in writing the history of the establishment of Quakerism, some 47 years after the events took place, Fox decided, at the time of writing, to take the credit for himself.

As set out in Chapter 8, this research concludes that a), with elements of b) and d) above, is the most likely conclusion.

As is stated in 1.3 below, a significant part of this research focuses on the direct contacts that George Fox and his followers had with Anabaptist sects of the early seventeenth century and the search for evidence, in the writings of those early Quakers, of the direct influence of those contacts.

The conclusions of these lines of research are set out in Chapter 8.

1.1.3 Determination of background of named Quaker contacts.

Fox’s Journal records, admittedly many years after the events took place, details of the contacts Fox had during his seeking years leading up to the establishment of Quakerism in 1652. However there exists little definitive information on the background of some of the people he met. Three examples of note are Nathanial Stephens, ‘Uncle’ Pickering and ‘Priest Boys.’

Nathanial Stephens was the parish priest at St. Michaels Church, Fenny Drayton during Fox’s upbringing in that village.\textsuperscript{36} In his Journal, Fox records many meetings with Stephens

\textsuperscript{35} See 6.4 below.

\textsuperscript{36} In his Journal, Fox records many meetings with Stephens
between 1646 and 1655. It is also recorded that Stephens was ejected from his living at Fenny Drayton in 1662 for non-conformity. In 4.3 below I give some background to those meetings and explore issues that may have given some direction to Fox’s seeking.

In Fox’s *Journal* it is recorded that Pickering meets Fox in London in 1644 and that Pickering is described as being a Baptist. Results of research into the identity of Pickering are set out in 4.4 below.

During 1651 in Pickering, Yorkshire, Fox met a ‘priest’ by the name of ‘Boys.’ Fox’s account suggests that the two men spent some days together, travelling together in the countryside in Yorkshire, before arriving at the priest’s ‘steeplehouse in the moors.’ In 5.3.2 below, I propose possibilities for the identity of ‘Priest Boys’, but only the most remote of the four possibilities shown would establish any form of direct link between Fox and the continental Anabaptists.

Important documentary information on the establishment and growth of Quakerism, other than Fox’s *Journal*, exists in the form of the writings of his early followers. Many tracts, written in the years following Quakerism’s beginnings in 1652, exist and a number of these are investigated in 6.4 and 6.5 having previously considered, in 4.6 and 4.7, the content and style of those produced by members of Anabaptist sects.

---


38 In his *Journal*, p. 4, Fox only refers to his uncle as ‘Pickering.’ The suggestion that his full name is William Pickering was made by an unknown author, ‘The Jacob-Jessey Church, 1616-1678.’ *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society* 1, 1908-09, p. 255.


40 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 88.
Authors have previously commented on the link or contacts that some early Quakers had with English Baptist or ‘Anabaptist’ communities. William Dewsbury, an early Quaker was identified by Edward Smith as being associated with Anabaptists, and Francis Howgill was described by Ernest E. Taylor as having, at one stage, joined the Anabaptists, but left them as ‘he again became dissatisfied.’ In Chapter 5 I examine the religious backgrounds to a number of the early Quakers, including Dewsbury and Howgill, with emphasis being placed on their non-Quaker, particularly Baptist or Anabaptist, backgrounds. However, extant primary literature by these Quakers is shown to concentrate on their actions following conversion to Quakerism or ‘convincement’, and not on their religious background prior to becoming Friends. The extant journals written by Fox’s followers make scant reference to their prior beliefs.

It was considered essential to investigate these followers’ backgrounds in order to assess the impact of their backgrounds on the development of Quakerism.

In the next section I explain the definitions of terms that I adopted in this research.

---

43 According to Fox’s Journal, his theology was fully formed by the time he preached at Firbank Fell in 1652, and so, for the purposes of this research, I have investigated the background of those early Quakers who first had contact with George Fox before 1652. George Fox, Journal, p. 107.
44 See Chapter 5. Also, as Moore explains, at the beginnings of Quakerism, ‘To call them ‘Quakers’ at this stage is anachronistic. They always called each other ‘Friends’.” Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences: The Early Quakers in Britain, 1646-1666. (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University, 2000), p. 5.
1.2 Definitions of terms used in current research

1.2.1 Anabaptist

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there was such a proliferation of religious groups in England that it was difficult for the population to separate them theologically: as explained by Barry Reay, it was difficult to distinguish the Anabaptists from the Lollards, and that ‘By the 1640s Familism [the sect better known as the Family of Love] was a term vague enough to be all but totally meaningless.’

In this thesis, the term Anabaptist is specifically used to denote members of those groups, founded in sixteenth century Switzerland that advocated, as a means of gaining membership to their congregation or church, the practice of adult water baptism. This baptism of believers, at the time of Anabaptism’s beginnings, a re-baptism following infant baptism within the established churches, was an outward sign of an earlier spiritual baptism. Anabaptist groups include, amongst others, Mennonites, Waterlander Mennonites, and Collegiants (sometimes called Rijnsburgers). Whenever the term Anabaptist is used in this thesis it is qualified by reference to a specific group. This is particularly the case when the term is applied in England.

---

46 See 2.2 below.
47 Franklin Hamlin Littell, *The Anabaptist View of the Church* (Boston: Starr King Press, 1958), p. xv, ‘The word ‘Anabaptist’ is a Latin derivative of the Greek original, *anabaptismos* (re-baptism)...infant baptism did not constitute true baptism...[therefore] they were not in reality re-baptizers.’
48 See 2.2 and 2.3 below.
1.2.2 Baptist

The term ‘Baptist’ describes the congregations that emerged in England at the beginning of the seventeenth century whose belief in believer’s baptism followed that of the continental Anabaptists but which denied the necessity of infant baptism.49

1.2.3 Quaker

The term ‘Quakerism’ is used to define the movement led by George Fox after he heard a voice in 1647; ‘There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition,’50 and the terms ‘Quaker’ and ‘Friend’ are used to define those individuals, who accepted the teachings of Fox.

1.2.4 Ordinance and Sacrament

In discussing the beliefs and practices of continental Anabaptists and English Baptists in Chapters 2 and 3, references are made to the act of water baptism and to the Eucharist or Lord’s Supper.

The established churches in each country considered in this thesis viewed these acts as ‘sacraments’, religious ceremonies which were regarded as imparting divine grace on the participant. The Anabaptists and English Baptists viewed these same acts simply as

---

49 Chapter 3 of this thesis includes a summary the evolution of the General Baptists in Britain and the very strong links that its founders, John Smyth and Thomas Helwys, had with the Waterlander Mennonites, an Anabaptist grouping in Amsterdam in the years leading up to 1609. See also Stephen Wright, The Early English Baptists, 1603-1649 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), p. 1.

50 George Fox, Journal, p. 11.
‘ordinances’, purely an outward rite which displayed membership, or entry into membership, of their respective congregations.\(^{51}\)

1.3 Overview of previous research

In Rosemary Moore’s words, ‘There are no contemporary records of the beginning of Quakerism. The only sources of information are the early pages of Fox’s *Journal* together with a few fragmentary notes.’\(^{52}\) This point is reinforced by Hugh Barbour: ‘Fox’s summary of Quaker origins, quoted from a fragment of manuscript makes tantalizing references to many events before 1650 about which it seems impossible to recover a clear picture.’\(^{53}\) As a consequence, because of the absence of definitive material by Quakers, and the difficulty in attempting to verify influence, no research has yet been undertaken on the possible influence on Quakers by other Christian groups, prior to, or contemporary with, the time of Quakerism’s founding.\(^{54}\) Some writers have suggested that any further research on this topic is likely to be fruitless or at least difficult.\(^{55}\) Lucinda Martin has commented on the lack of

---

\(^{51}\) See definitions in Oxford English Dictionary.


\(^{54}\) Zemaïtis’ recent research identifies nine characteristics common to Lollards, Hussites and Early Quakers. He establishes evidence of the transfer of those beliefs from the Lollards to the Hussites but no direct transfer to the Early Quakers. He concludes that there was only ‘a close correspondence’ with respect to the ‘nine characteristics’ common to those three groups. Daniel Staley Zemaïtis, ‘Convergent Paths: The correspondence between Wycliffe, Huss and the Early Quakers.’ Unpublished ThD thesis: University of Birmingham, 2012, Abstract and p. 283.

\(^{55}\) W.C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (London: Macmillan, 1923). Rufus M. Jones writes in the ‘Introduction’ to this book, p. xxv, ‘probably never be proved that Fox consciously adopted the ideas of others.’ John W. Graham, *The Faith of a Quaker* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920), p. 95. ‘the extent to which, if at all, George Fox owed his gospel to predecessors...is not likely to be seriously corrected by later and more difficult research.’
research on this topic, and Larry Ingle suggests that research into the influence of Anabaptists and other religious groups is pointless, and is a ‘parlour game.’

The beginnings of Quakerism, as proposed by twentieth and twenty-first century writers, are many and various. Rufus Jones maintained that Quakerism was based on the theology of the continental mystics, in particular Jacob Böhme. As Southern points out, this was not based on any hard evidence, a conclusion also reached by Reay, Durnbaugh and Wood. In 4.6.4 below I examine the publications of Böhme in order to identify any points of similarity with words written by Fox and conclude that there is no evidence to support the view that Fox was conversant with Böhme’s writings.

However, there was one statement by Jones that is self evident from published works, ‘Many of the first members of the Society of Friends [Quakers] arrived at their peculiar religious views and their way of life before they met George Fox, so that it is evident that the fundamental ideas of the movement were more or less ‘in the air’ in the Commonwealth period.’ This same point was brought out by Reay and by Barbour, suggesting that Fox

---

56 Martin, ‘Female Reformers as Gatekeepers of Pietism’, p. 41.
57 H. Larry Ingle, First Among Friends: George Fox & the Creation of Quakerism (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 313, Note 3. ‘Thus the Quaker scholars’ parlour game of trying to determine whether Fox was influenced by the Family of Love, the Anabaptists or medieval mystics, to point out only three examples, is a bit beside the point except as an academic exercise.’
58 See 1.1.2 above.
60 Barry Reay, The Quakers and the English Revolution, p. 16. ‘A twentieth-century devotee of Boehme has described George Fox’s Journal as ‘full of Boehme’s ideas and terminology’, but it is difficult to be certain of influence as both authors drew upon the imagery of the Bible.’ Donald F. Durnbaugh, ‘Baptists and Quakers – Left Wing Puritans.’ Quaker History 62, no. 2, Autumn 1973, p. 69. ‘Rufus Jones…demonstrable evidence of interconnection…is quite thin…finding interdependence because of a similarity of beliefs.’ See also Wood, ‘George Fox and his Religious Background’, p. 358. ‘So far as any formative influence on George Fox himself is concerned it is difficult to trace any actual acquaintance on the part of Fox with the writings of the men whose names we have just passed in review.’ [Behmen, or Böhme, and Roger Brerely, the founder of the Grindletonians.]
62 Barry Reay, The Quakers and the English Revolution, p. 17. ‘As we have seen, some of the early Quakers were what have been called Seekers, those who taught that people should ‘sit still, in submission and silence,
was not the midwife of Quakerism but more the shepherd of individuals who had already arrived at the Quaker position.

Russell suggested that a whole batch of English sectaries of the seventeenth century were established in England by ‘refugees from persecution [in Europe]’, with a common desire to simplify and ‘purify’ the church.63 He maintained that the sects that influenced Quakers most were the Baptists, Seekers and Ranters. Durnbaugh extends this list to include Familists.64 It is shown in Chapter 5 below that a significant proportion of the early Quaker leaders had, at one time in their spiritual seeking, been associated with Baptist congregations and Reay claims that some early Quakers were Seekers.65 However, it cannot be assumed that these ‘transferees’ brought their pre-existing beliefs and practices with them and that they had a direct influence on the way in which Quakerism developed. Neither can it be assumed that these ‘transferees’ were seeking sanctuary with Quakers, and threw away their previous beliefs. This point is developed in Chapter 4, particularly in relation to Fox and his contact with Baptists from whom, according to Hugh Barbour, Fox ‘perhaps learned more than he records’,66 and in Chapter 5 when I consider the religious backgrounds of other leading early Quakers.

64 Donald F. Durnbaugh, ‘Baptists and Quakers – Left Wing Puritans’, p. 76. In this article Durnbaugh refers to Theodor Sippell’s research from which he states that those who became Quakers came to Quakerism from Baptism via the Seekers. In 5.3 below, it is seen that this was the route taken by a number of early Quakers, but by no means all of them, as is suggested by Sippell.
66 Hugh Barbour, The Quakers in Puritan England, p. 36. Barbour does not determine whether Fox learned supportive theology from the General Baptists or conflicting theology from the Particular Baptists. In Chapter 3 I set out the background and development of the two branches of Baptism in seventeenth century England, the Calvinist Particular Baptists and the Arminian General Baptists. There has been a universal assumption, as demonstrated in 4.4 above, that the Baptists that Fox met in 1644 with his ‘Uncle Pickering’ were General
William Tallack, writing in 1868, suggested that Quakerism was part of a ‘steady continuity and successive advance’ rather than a sudden appearance. Tallack also presented a comprehensive summary of the similarities of beliefs and practices of the General Baptists in England in the seventeenth century and those of Quakers at that time. The points of similarity, identified by Tallack, are summarised as follows:

1. The adoption of monthly, quarterly and yearly meetings for business and spiritual regeneration.
2. The use of ‘queries’ to question actions and beliefs. (Wright also refers to the use by the General Baptists of their ‘Faith and Practice’, a term adopted by Quakers.)
3. The maintenance of poorer members of the group
4. A preference for small congregations.
5. The ‘priesthood’ of all believers.
6. Disapproval (initially) of singing and instrumental music – except, in some cases, for the singing of hymns by an individual voice.
7. The form of the marriage service.
8. Discipline regarding marrying out of the group.
9. The disuse of the names of days and months.
10. The use of ‘thee’ and ‘thou.’

---

Baptists. See George Fox, The Journal, p. 4. That has not been proved, and it may have been the case that Fox then flew away from the Calvinistic ideas of the Particular Baptists as represented by his Uncle.


As explained in Chapter 3 of this thesis, there were very strong links between the Waterlander Mennonites in Amsterdam and the emergence of General Baptists in England. In 3.2 below I establish the commonality of beliefs and practices of those two groups

11. The rejection of infant baptism (and the rejection of baptism by water in the case of Quakers).

12. Simplicity in dress and living.

13. The refusal to swear oaths and pay tithes.

14. Objections to war.

15. No paid ministry.

16. No need for learned ministers.

17. Recognition of spiritual gifts in members of the group.

18. Objection to the ‘Trinity’ and the ‘Sacraments.’

19. Inward revelations from God.

20. Denial of the authority of civil powers in matters of conscience.  

From this, Tallack concluded that George Fox, having studied the beliefs and practices of the General Baptists and the Anabaptists, must have based Quakerism on them, but that neither Fox, nor his followers, acknowledged this fact.  

Payne comments on the similarities that exist between the theology and practices of Quakers and those of other sects of, and prior to, their time, and Underwood writes that the Quakers and Baptists ‘shared a devotion to the primitive model of Christianity.’ McLaughlin comments on Schwenckfeld’s ‘concentration on the inner reception of the Eucharist’ and the rejection of water baptism and on Sebastian Franck’s teaching of the ‘inner word’ and ‘Christ,

---

70 Tallack, *George Fox, the Friends and Early Baptists*, pp. 160-161.
71 Tallack, *George Fox, the Friends and Early Baptists*, p. 79 and p. 84.
present in all men from birth.” Williams agrees with this view of Schwenckfeld and remarks on the similarity of Schwenckfeld’s fellowship with the meetings of Quakers, and further suggests that, in his opinion, in common with some ideas expressed by Tallack, there was a steady transition from Anabaptism to Quakerism, but that the English Familists represented an intermediate step. Conversely, Wright suggests that, perhaps, the picking up of ‘the continental tradition’ may have happened independently of those continental sects and were ‘relearned’ by Quakers ‘in English conditions.’

As shown above, similarities in theology and practices of Anabaptists and Quakers have been remarked upon by many writers. Contemporary with the early Quakers was the tract written by Francis Higginson who argued, in the words of Kate Peters that ‘the origins of the Quakers lay in the excesses of the Münster Anabaptists.’ However, Estep in support of Durnbaugh’s opinion, correctly raises the warning that it would be wrong to assume that Quakers were direct descendants of the Anabaptists purely because of a similarity of belief.

Some authors, including Williams, have commented on the similarities of practice and theology of the early Quakers with those of the continental Anabaptists and concluded that Quakerism is dependent upon earlier beliefs expounded by European baptismal groups possibly, as suggested by Durnbaugh, through the intervention of the English Baptists.

---

74 R. Emmet McLaughlin, Caspar Schwenckfeld. Reluctant Radical His Life to 1540 (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1986), pp. 73, 136 and 205 respectively.
75 Williams, The Radical Reformation, p. 716.
76 Williams, The Radical Reformation, p. 1209. This aspect of the link is developed in Chapter 4 of this thesis.
77 Wright, The Early English Baptists, p. 225.
80 Williams, The Radical Reformation, p. 716. Durnbaugh, ‘Baptists and Quakers – Left Wing Puritans’, p. 75. ‘If evidence exists for General and Particular Baptist links with continental dissenters, and if a line may be drawn from Baptists to Quakers, the thesis of Quaker relationships with the Continent is strengthened...a study of the early history of the Friends shows repeated evidence of Baptist involvement.’ In Chapter 5 I examine the contacts that the early Quakers had with English Baptist communities and, in Chapter 7, the contacts made with
Contact with European Anabaptists in England should not be discounted out of hand. It is well documented that, prior to the founding of Quakerism in Britain, many refugees from continental Europe settled in England. Estep writes that by the year 1534 Dutch Anabaptists had arrived in England and were actively propagating their faith, and that some 40 years later there were approximately 3,000 ‘Dutch and Walloon or Protestant’ people in Norwich alone. Campbell goes further in suggesting that in England in 1560 there were ’10,000 refugees from Flanders’ and that by 1562 that number had increased to ‘over 30,000.’ Reay writes that there are many accounts of Quakers being linked with Anabaptists, and whereas some descriptions of Anabaptists, such as the one by Willington were accurate, when it came to attacking non-conformist views, the term ‘Anabaptist’, associated with memories of the events at Müntster, was readily linked to the other hated group of the time, the Quakers. Possible contact with Anabaptist groups in England is discussed in Chapters 5 and 7.

continental Anabaptist groups in the Netherlands. When considering contacts made by the early Quakers in England, it is essential to understand, in view of the use of term ‘Anabaptist’ in seventeenth century documents, see 1.2 above, whether the authors were referring to continental Anabaptists, English Baptists, or any other hated religious congregation. Several authors have commented upon the development of Quakerism from within the English Puritan environment. See for example Horton Davies, Worship and Theology in England (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 495, ‘The ancestors of Quakers...might more easily be found among the so-called Spiritual Puritans.’ and Durnbaugh, ‘Baptists and Quakers’, p. 67, ‘the Friends are to be considered ‘a natural extreme to the whole spectrum of English Puritan thought’ – in short, as left-wing Puritans.’ See Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, p. 3. J. De Hoop Scheffer, (William Elliott Griffiths Ed.), History of Free Churchmen called the Brownists, Pilgrim Fathers and Baptists in the Dutch Republic 1581-1701 (Ithica, N.Y.: Andrus & Church, no date shown, but Biographical Notice dated 1921), p. 8 and Reay, The Quakers and the English Revolution, p. 13.


Reay, The Quakers and the English Revolution, p. 100.

See Geo. Willington, The Second Part of the Thrice Welcome and Happy Inauguration of our most Gracious, and Religious Sovereign, King Charles II (London: Printed by R.D. and are to be sold at the Holy Lamb in S. Pauls Church-yard, near the School, 1660), p. 21 where he correctly describes the continental Anabaptist view which, see Chapter 3 below, is different to the English Baptist view that ‘a Christian may [not] execute the office of a Magistrate; so also they deny, that any man may be put to death by him.’

Willington, The Second Part of the Thrice Welcome, p. 40, ‘And in honesty, that the Name of the Lord be not blasphemed among the Gentiles (amongst the Anabaptists, Quakers and Sectaries).’ Also see T. Smith, A Gagg for the Quakers (London: Printed by J.C. and are sold neer the North-Door of S. Pauls Church, MDCLIX), un-numbered second page of text, ‘In September 1659 there was a strange discovery made of divers Witches...most of them Quakers and Anabaptists.’ See 2.2.4 below for a description of the events at Müntster.
Nuttall’s comment that ‘no other religious movement is so well documented in its earliest years as is Quakerism’ is surprising.\textsuperscript{87} To that statement should be added the qualification that it could only reasonably be applied to the development of Quakerism in the years following 1652 and not to the events and happenings in earlier years, the years leading up to the Quakerism’s beginning and the years to which this research is directed. Moore’s assertion that ‘It is noticeable [in the Journal] that Fox adapted the history to suit later needs’\textsuperscript{88} is taken further by Bailey. Bailey writes of the editing of some sources to the Journal after Fox’s death,\textsuperscript{89} as does Cadbury when he wrote of the changing of language used in the first edition of Fox’s Journal edited by Ellwood as the originals could ‘easily be objected to as blasphemous.’\textsuperscript{90} Peters states that the first account of Quakerism’s beginnings was written by the Quaker, Edward Burrough, in his Preface to George Fox’s tract \textit{The Great Mistery of the Great Whore unfolded} published in 1659.\textsuperscript{91} However, Burroughs’ account of the beginning of Quakerism, despite his statement that it is ‘a true account of our first beginning and coming forth in the world’ is non specific.\textsuperscript{92} Burroughs stated that Quakers ‘went through and tried all sorts of teachers’ and that they ‘saw not only the performance and practice in Church state,\textsuperscript{87} Geoffrey F. Nuttall, \textit{Studies in Christian Enthusiasm} (Wallingford, Pennsylvania: Pendle Hill, 1948), p. 20. 
\textsuperscript{88} Rosemary Moore, \textit{The Faith of the First Quakers}, p. 1. 
\textsuperscript{89} Richard Bailey, ‘A New Light on George Fox and early Quakerism: The making and Unmaking of a God’ in Michael Mullett, Ed., \textit{New Light on George Fox 1624-1681} (San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1992), p. xvi. ‘Much of this dimension of Fox’s life [referring to avatar/magus status] was edited out of the sources shortly after his death, under the supervision of the Second Day’s Morning Meeting which censored Quaker publication.’
\textsuperscript{91} Kate Peters, \textit{Print Culture and the Early Quakers}, p. 19. 
\textsuperscript{92} George Fox, \textit{The Great Mistery of the Great Whore unfolded} (London: Printed for Tho. Simmons at the Bull and Mouth near Aldersgate, 1659), first unnumbered page of text. The preface written by Burroughs is dated ‘the 9 Mo, 1658.’
and in Religious orders were corrupted, but also Government and Magistracy.⁹³ No other information contained in Burroughs’ account is relevant to this research.

Winthrop S Hudson wrote in an essay pointedly entitled ‘A suppressed chapter in Quaker History’, that Fox’s Journal is ‘the only record we have’ and that this fact ‘is a rather astonishing (and suspicious) circumstance.’⁹⁴ Hudson was of the same mind as Nuttall when he referred to the ‘wealth of material for the entire movement back to 1651’,⁹⁵ and Hudson’s and Moore’s views coincide when considering available documentation for the years leading up to 1651.⁹⁶ The reasons put forward by Hudson for the absence of that pre-1651/2 information are fourfold:

1. To disguise the fact that George Fox’s ideas were not as original as Fox had claimed.
2. Fox took over leadership of, rather than founded, the Quaker movement.
3. Other people, working contemporaneously with Fox, should have been given equal credit with Fox.
4. These ‘facts’, 1-3 above, were, ‘deliberately suppressed by Quaker editors and historians to enhance Fox’s authority and reputation.’⁹⁷

Henry J. Cadbury accepted Hudson’s first three claims without presenting an argument, ‘One has little reason to quarrel with the first three of these points.’⁹⁸ However, Cadbury did take issue with Hudson’s fourth claim, that facts had been deliberately suppressed to enhance

---

⁹³ George Fox, The Great Mistery of the Great Whore unfolded, seventh and eleventh unnumbered pages of text respectively.
⁹⁶ Winthrop S. Hudson, ‘A suppressed chapter in Quaker History’, p. 110. ‘but when one moves back beyond that year [1651], one enters barren country.’
⁹⁸ Henry J. Cadbury, ‘An Obscure Chapter of Quaker History’, p. 202. It is interesting to note that Cadbury, in the title of his article, changed Hudson’s ‘Suppressed’ to his own ‘Obscure.’
Fox’s reputation. Cadbury claimed that Hudson’s contention that relevant documents were missing did not mean that they had been deliberately destroyed, nor was there any evidence in Cadbury’s eyes that extant documents were censored by the Second Day Morning Meeting in order to enhance Fox’s reputation.\(^9\) In his response to Cadbury, Hudson restated his claim that documented events were changed in order to credit Fox with the founding of Quakerism.\(^1\)

Ingle writes that, according to Tolles, Cadbury and Nuttall, Quakerism was an ‘English’ phenomenon, with no links to continental Europe, with Nuttall and Como placing Quakerism at the ‘radical wing of puritan sectarians.’\(^1\) However, Ingle criticises these authors for not considering the social context within which Quakerism emerged, leaving his main criticism for Hugh Barbour from whose account of early Quakerism, according to Ingle, ‘it is nearly impossible to detect that there existed sharp and divisive social upheavals during the civil war period.’\(^1\)

In view of the sparcity of relevant documentation contemporaneous with the beginning of Quakerism, and the severe editing of subsequent Quaker produced documents, see 6.2 below, the findings of this thesis must, of necessity, involve a degree of speculation.

---

\(^9\) Henry J. Cadbury, ‘An Obscure Chapter of Quaker History’, p. 207. The Second day Morning Meeting was the Quaker body given the task of editing, or censoring, Quaker documents after 1673. See Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Consciences*, p. 227.

\(^1\) ‘Letter from ‘Dr. Hudson’ in *Journal of Religion* 24, no. 4, October 1944, p. 280 regarding the above Cadbury article. ‘To do this [to affirm the independent origin of Fox’s views] it was necessary to suppress those items which indicated his connection with a movement which antedated his own illumination.’


\(^1\) H. Larry Ingle, ‘From Mysticism to Radicalism’, p. 83.
The next section considers the sources of information used in this research, the location of these sources and the methods adopted in undertaking the research.

1.4 Methodology

‘Philosophers have long pondered the fact that history has no meaning – the past has no existence – except in the way it is recorded in the present.’

The heading of this section is used by John Gribben in his exposition on the history of research into quantum mechanics. In view of the time elapsed between the events at the dawn of Quakerism and the first recording of those events, this heading is equally true when researching the beginnings of Quakerism in Britain and the effect, if any, that pre-existing Christian groups, in particular the Continental Anabaptists, had on Quakerism’s emerging theology and religious and business practices.

The sources of information, and methods employed in the current research are set out in the next sub-section and it is appropriate, at the same time, to set out the considerations that apply when investigating the available material.

1.4.1. Quaker and non-Quaker publications

The only record of the days leading up to the establishment of Quakerism in 1652 is the Journal dictated by George Fox, Quakerism’s acknowledged founder. Although it was based on Fox’s Great Journal, written between the years 1674 and 1676, of which the pages

---

103 John Gribben, In search of Schrödinger’s Cat (London: Black Swan, 1994), pp. 210-211.
104 George Fox, Journal.
relating to Fox’s early years are missing, the Journal was first published in 1694, after Fox had died.

The extent to which the gap in time between the events occurring, and the effect of that gap on memory, influenced the recording of those events cannot be estimated nor established. Rosemary Moore refers to the editing of the first published edition of the Journal by Thomas Ellwood, that Quaker history, as documented by Fox in his Journal, was adapted by Fox to meet future needs, and that ‘The manuscripts...built in bias towards Swarthmoor...[to] provide opinions agreeable to Margaret Fell and George Fox.’ And it was not only the Journal that was subjected to such editing. It is also recorded that other important documents of the time were edited, either before publication or after publication and prior to subsequent reprinting. This editing of early Quaker Journals and tracts means that any worthwhile research into the beginnings of Quakerism necessitates an investigation into documents contemporaneous to the period of study, and produced by as large a population as possible, both by Quakers and by non-Quakers.

Nevertheless, Quaker publications, including Fox’s Journal, are the starting points in this research. These publications comprise tracts expected to be read by Quakers or written in response to anti-Quaker publications, and letters and legal records which were issued contemporaneously with the events they describe. Within the heading of ‘legal records’, I

---

105 See above for the discussion between Winthrop S. Hudson and Henry J. Cadbury on their views on these missing documents.
106 George Fox, Journal, p. xxxix. See also 6.2 below.
107 Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 42.
109 Moore, The Faith of the First Quakers, p. 16.
110 Christopher Hill, ‘Quakers and the English Revolution’ in Michael Mullett (ed.), New Light on George Fox 1624-1691, A Collection of Essays (York: Ebor Press, 1993), p. 22. ‘Our first problem is that of sources. Quakers re-wrote their own history. They edited earlier texts...Many tracts of the 1650s either were not reprinted or were reprinted only in modified form.’ See also Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, p. xi. ‘while the printed “Journal” of [William] Caton’s life, partly composed by himself and edited by George Fox, omitted most of the letters written by him.’ In this research, reference was made to extant letters in order to expand on comments made in Journals.
include Parish Records and Bishops Transcripts which were used to investigate family backgrounds and, in the case of the Waterlander Mennonites, the contemporaneous minutes of their meetings.

It is essential to decide at the outset the intended audience for these documents along with the background to the documents’ authors. Then an opinion can be formed as to the degree of factual accuracy that can be ascribed to each document. This issue becomes more important, and increasingly difficult to apply correctly, when reviewing the tracts issued by non-Quakers, and in particular those which could be described as ‘anti-Quaker.’ As is shown in 6.4 below, some of the tracts issued by one-time Quakers against Quaker practices and beliefs could be described as fanciful. Nevertheless, they must not be discounted on those grounds alone; closer examination is required and, if possible, a corroboration of the facts or events described in them must be obtained from tracts issued by Quakers.\(^{111}\) This process is made somewhat easier when a ‘pamphlet war’ was undertaken – for example during 1655/6 between the ex-Quaker John Toldervy and the Quaker James Naylor.\(^{112}\) It can be seen in such ‘wars’ that claim and counter-claim are made and disputed, but that a ‘theme’ emerges which is based on recent events or on fundamental theologies.\(^{113}\)

Within a pamphlet war, as mentioned above, a single theme can be seen to emerge and be argued by both parties. Difficulty is encountered when considering the Quaker responses to individual non-Quaker or anti-Quaker tracts, and in 6.5 below there are illustrations of how

---

111 This process is explained by John Tosh as follows: ‘historical research is not a matter of identifying the authoritative source and then exploiting it for all it is worth, for the majority of sources are in some way inaccurate, incomplete or tainted by prejudice and self interest. The procedure is rather to amass as many pieces of evidence as possible from a wide range of sources – preferably from all sources that have a bearing on the problem in hand. In this way inaccuracies and distortions of particular sources are more likely to be revealed.’ John Tosh, *The Pursuit of History: Aims, methods and new directions in the study of modern history*. Second Edition (London: Longman, 1991), pp. 65-66.

112 See 6.5 below.

113 As explained by Moore, the number of anti-Quaker tracts peaked in the years 1655-56, the years of the first expansion of Quakerism, and then again in 1659-60. Moore, *The Light in Their Consciences*, p. 88.
the language used by Quakers in these responses changes from the language used in their ‘lone-standing’ tracts. In lone-standing tracts or letters, i.e. those which are not issued in response to ‘attacks’ by non-Quakers, the language used is their own; describing concepts and beliefs in their own language, a language with which, despite writing not being ‘an inherent part of being a Quaker’, I suggest, they are comfortable. That language, as Moore points out, is seen to change in responsive documents to those issued by non-Quakers, where the Quakers attempt to adopt the ‘conventional’ language of their protagonists. In these cases, it is argued in 6.5, the Quakers’ use, or interpretation, of that common language is different from that of their protagonists and this leads, as explained by Roger Pooley, to confusion by both parties.

In examining primary sources, it is essential to consider the extent to which the published documents were edited prior to publication and the degree to which reliance can be placed upon the evidence that they contain. This issue is outlined above, and leads to the warning as described by Moore: ‘The Journals need to be used with care as evidence for the 1650s, although they are essential for the early years of Quakerism before mid-1652, for which contemporary evidence is rare or non-existent.’ In this research Fox’s Journal was only used to identify the early personal contacts made by Fox.

The next sub-section considers: the locations of the sources of information that have been used in the preparation of this thesis, the methods adopted in obtaining that information, the difficulties encountered and the questioning process applied to all information obtained.

114 Kate Peters, Print Culture and the Early Quakers, p. 18.
116 Roger Pooley, ‘Plain and Simple: Bunyan and Style’ in N.H.Keeble, ed. John Bunyan: Conventicle and Parnassus, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 103. ‘His [Bunyan] inexperience as a writer does show up in the sometimes repetitive and rambling structure of Some Gospel-Truths Opened (1656); but when it is compared with the writings of Edward Burrough, his Quaker opponent, it becomes clear that the differences between the two in doctrine and spirituality result in differences in language.’
117 Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 230.
1.4.2 Locations of resources

Libraries

The two libraries that are indispensible when researching any aspect of Quaker history are the Friends House Library, London and the Quaker Library at Woodbrooke Quaker Study Centre, Birmingham.

Each library contains original editions of tracts and pamphlets issued by Quakers, and this researcher made extensive use of the secondary sources, books and theses held at the Quaker Library, Woodbrooke. In addition to the material held at Woodbrooke, Friends House Library, London holds the extant letters and other personal documents produced by Quakers which are retained in England. Both of these libraries were visited.

In researching the background to Margaret Fell, later Margaret Fox, the library of Swarthmoor Hall, Cumbria, Margaret Fell’s home and later the focal point of letters between travelling Quakers, was visited. It was discovered that no books held there at the time of the Fell and Fox still remained there. Although the letters held by Margaret Fell, which now reside in the Friends House Library, London, are catalogued, the non-Quaker books from her library are not catalogued. The only documented reference to the books she owned is the brief note in her will, ‘Her books £10.00.00.’ Henry J. Cadbury has undertaken further research on this topic, with little success.

---

118 See 5.3.6 below.
In undertaking research relating to the travels of Quakers in Europe, invaluable information is available in the Friends Library held at Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania, in particular the research papers of William I. Hull, a prolific writer on the evolution of Quakerism in the Netherlands in the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{121} This library was visited.

Primary sources of Anabaptist material relating to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are available in the libraries of the Universities of Amsterdam and Leiden. English Baptist publications, and some English ‘Anabaptist’ publications, are held at the library of Regents Park College at the University of Oxford. Other essential documents relating to non-conformism in England are held at the Dr. Williams Library in London. All relevant secondary sources are held at the Bodleian Library at the University of Oxford. With the exception of the library at the University of Amsterdam all these libraries were visited, in some cases, on many occasions.

The research undertaken on the identity of ‘Priest Boys’ necessitated research of the York Diocese documents held at the Borthwick Institute at the University of York.\textsuperscript{122} In connection with that same research and research into the possible links of Fox’s mother’s family, the Lagos, with the Maryan martyrs, numerous visits were also made to the County Records Offices of North Yorkshire, Leicestershire and Warwickshire.\textsuperscript{123}

\textsuperscript{121} It should be noted that Hull’s extensive research on this subject related to the establishment and growth of Quakerism in the Netherlands from 1655. None of his research refers to possible contacts between continental Anabaptists and Quakers or proto-Quakers before that date. See 7.4 below.

\textsuperscript{122} See 5.3.2 below.

\textsuperscript{123} See 4.5 below.
People

It could be argued that the greatest resource used in this research has been that of people – employees of the various libraries visited, but more particularly the many ‘amateur’ historians who have an interest in a particular aspect of this research and, in the course of that research, have obtained copies of relevant primary documents which were readily made available to me. These people have also been invaluable in introducing others, known to them, who have undertaken research in related areas – either geographically or historically. This networking has been of greatest help in Yorkshire and in Amsterdam.

Part way through this research, it was decided to present its findings to two separate, and very different academic audiences – Baptist studies and Quaker studies scholars. In July 2009, a synopsis of the information contained in Chapter 5 and in 7.2 below was presented to the International Conference of Baptist Studies held at Whitley College, Melbourne, Australia, and in October 2009 the same, but updated, information was presented to the Quaker Studies Research Association conference in Woodbrooke Quaker Study Centre, Birmingham. In both cases, valuable feedback was obtained from participants.

1.4.3 Approach to evidence

Knowledge of the background of the author of a book or article is essential in order to form an opinion on the views they present. An example of this is Rufus Jones.\(^{124}\) For many years his views on the basing of Quakerism on the theology of the Continental mystics were accepted

---

\(^{124}\) See 1.1.2 above.
without undue questioning. In this, he was following the views put forward earlier by Robert Barclay of Reigate. This acceptance was despite the lack of any proof put forward by Jones for his view. And yet, none of these concerns are apparent in Jones’ major work on the subject, *Spiritual Reformers of the 16th and 17th Centuries*, published in 1928, nor in the ‘Introduction’ that he wrote to the first edition of Braithwaite’s *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, published in 1923. Doubts concerning this theory had already been expressed by Wood in his article published four years before Jones’ book, and they were also expressed by Doncaster, some twenty-seven years after the publication of Jones’ book. As Southern points out, having researched the correspondence between Jones and his research assistant, Theodor Sippell, ‘they both seem totally convinced of the link between Quakerism and those they have identified as its predecessors. They note some concerns about hard evidence.’

This research has been undertaken with an attitude of positive scepticism and questioning of the material presented, and not one of blind acceptance.

125 Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, p. 220. ‘The question has naturally been raised whether Boehme exercised any direct influence upon the early Quaker movement...no careful student of both writers [Boehme and Fox] can doubt that there was some sort of influence, direct or indirect, conscious or unconscious.’

126 R. Barclay, *The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, MDCCCLXXVI), p. 222. Here Barclay notes the similarities in theology and practice between the General Baptists and Quakers. On p. 223 Barclay suggests that the differences in theology between the General Baptists and the Quakers can be traced back to internal controversies within the Waterlander Mennonites of Amsterdam. See also Thomas D. Hamm, ‘George Fox and the Politics of Late Nineteenth-century Quaker Historiography’ in Pink Dandelion, ed., *The Creation of Quaker Theory: Inner Perspectives* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), p. 14. ‘Much of Barclay’s work is simply accepted truth amongst historians of Quakerism today...Other interpretations, such as Barclay’s emphasis on the influence of the Continental Anabaptists and mystics, such as Jacob Boehme, would become cornerstones of the historiography of the Jones-Braithwaite school.’ Throughout this thesis, Robert Barclay, the author of *The Inner Life* is referred to as ‘Barclay of Reigate’, in order to differentiate him from Robert Barclay, or Barclay the apologist, the author of *Apology for the true Christian Divinity* (Glenside, P.A.: Quaker Heritage Press, 2002), the first English publication of which was in 1678.

127 Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*. See also W.C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, 1923 edition, in the ‘Introduction’ to which Jones wrote, p. xxv, ‘The researches of recent years conclusively show that the movement, known in History as Quakerism, was part of a very much wider religious movement’ and on p. xxxiv, ‘Quakerism, as a type of Christianity, is deeply mystical and also deeply prophetical.’

128 H.G. Wood, ‘George Fox and his Religious Background’, p. 358, ‘it is difficult to trace any actual acquaintance on the part of Fox with the writings of the men whose names we have just passed in review [Behmen and Roger Brerely, the founder of Grindletonians].’


1.4.4 Resolution of practical obstacles

During this research, problems encountered fell into three broad categories: access to information, language and scope of research.

Access

The nature of the research is widespread in a geographic context. This meant a careful use of time and resources. Places visited in England in order to research available documentation were: Birmingham, Oxford, London, York, Leicester, Warwick, Lichfield, Pickering, Leversham, Lockton, Whitby and Swarthmoor. Places visited abroad to research available documentation were Leiden, the Netherlands and Swarthmore, Pennsylvania. For most locations it was not possible, in advance of the visit, to identify the exact document required, although the required information had been identified in advance – the sought-after document only emerged during the visit. However, that problem did, in many cases, turn into an advantage by uncovering in the search previously unknown, and relevant documents and facts which have aided this research. This was particularly relevant when visiting the County Records Offices.
Language

The linguistic problems encountered were of two types: the language and script used in the writing of sixteenth and seventeenth century English documents, and documents written in foreign languages.

Problems of the first type were overcome by reference to secondary resources, such as available transcripts, or using the specialist relevant knowledge of colleagues at Woodbrooke Quaker Study Centre. Care was taken when examining transcriptions of primary sources. These were used when the original document is difficult to understand, due to damage or to handwriting style. In all such cases, where the text is relevant to the research, the transcriptions, which were easier to read than the original, were compared with the original document and a judgement applied as to the accuracy of the transcription. Where discrepancies arose, then all likely possibilities of interpretation were noted. Examples of the use of transcriptions and comparisons made to original documents are the Parish Church Register of Fenny Drayton for the years 1570 to 1850 \footnote{As described in Chapter 5, this Register is kept at Leicester Records Office. It has been meticulously transcribed by W.T Hall, but once certain events had been found in the transcription, such as the reference to ‘Christopher ffox, Churchwarden’ in 1638 the original document kept on microfiche was investigated.} and The Annual Catalogue of George Fox’s Papers.\footnote{The Annual Catalogue of George Fox’s Papers. This document is dated 1691 and is kept in the Friends House Library, London along with a typed transcription. It was noted that the typed transcript was not complete, as a number of pages of the original had not been transcribed.}

Problems of the second type, those where documents were written in foreign languages, were overcome by self-translation (in the case of York Diocesan documents at the Borthwick Institute which are written in Latin, and some of the papers in the collection of William Hull in the Friends Library, Swarthmore College, written in French), or the assistance of experts in the respective languages (a Dutch national living in England when investigating documents...
written in Dutch, and a teacher of the German language in England when looking at
documents written in German). The main documents that required such translation were the
minutes of the Waterlander Mennonites during the period 1612 to 1660.133

**Breadth of research**

In pursuing a particular topic within the research, it was necessary to decide the relevance of
that topic to the main theme of the overall research, and the extent to which the further,
detailed research of that topic should continue or be curtailed. A particular example of this
problem was the research into the identification of ‘Priest Boys.’134 In view of the time that
Fox records as having spent with Boys in 1651, during the formative years of Fox’s theology,
it was judged important to understand Boys’ background fully. The lack of available
information brought that research to an apparent end on four occasions. After each of those
occasions, additional relevant information emerged when following a completely different
line of investigation. On each occasion a decision had to be made on whether or not to re-
open Boys’ research; re-opening the research would entail spending unplanned additional
time on that line of investigation. On each occasion the new information emerging was
considered to be significant to the whole research, and so the subsidiary investigations were
followed with each one producing significant results.

---

133 *Memoriaal van de handelingen bij de Gemeenke voor Reynier Wybrantzen, ‘A’ 1612-1641 and Memoriall van de handelingen bij de Dienaren voor Reynier Wybranzen ‘B’*. Transcribed from the original by Frank Mertens and Peter van der Lee. In these cases, I did not have access to the original document, a transcription had been sent to me by a researcher at the University of Amsterdam and following a search for relevant names in that
document, a personal friend, who is a Dutch national, interpreted the sections that I had chosen. Those
interpretations were then discussed with the interpreter prior to their inclusion in the research – see 7.2.1 below.
134 See 5.3 below.
Conversely, although of great personal interest, the background to the emergence and growth of Anabaptism in Europe and the Baptist congregations in England only have a tangential impact on this research: the thrust of this thesis is the identification of contacts between them and the emerging Quakers and not the evolution of the non-Quaker groups themselves. In these cases, as the development of these groups is comprehensively documented in scholarly secondary sources, research was stopped when it was considered that future research would not add to the pool of knowledge relevant to this research.

The chronological, geographical and theological boundaries that were placed on this research are outlined in the next section.

1.5 Parameters of the Thesis

1.5.1 Chronological

An overview of the emergence of the Anabaptists sects in Europe is discussed in 2.2 below. The acknowledged birth date of Anabaptism is 21st January 1525, the day on which it is recorded that Hans Grebel baptized Georg Blaurock in Switzerland. Although the thesis makes reference to earlier reformers and the German mystics, the effective timeline for this research begins in 1525.

The development of Anabaptism in the Netherlands beginning with Melchior Hoffmann in 1530, and Menno Simons’ emergence there in 1537, following the events in Münster, is investigated in 2.2.3 and 2.3 below. The birth of the Collegiants or Rijnsburgers in Warmond

---

is recorded as having taken place much later, in 1619.\textsuperscript{138} During this span of years there is evidence of English infiltration into the Netherlands,\textsuperscript{139} and well-documented approaches to the Waterlander Mennonites in Amsterdam by John Smyth in 1609.\textsuperscript{140} This contact in the Netherlands was followed, in 1611, by the return to England of one of Smyth’s congregation, Thomas Helwys, with his subsequent formation of the first General Baptist congregation in London.\textsuperscript{141} The development of the General Baptist congregations in England is discussed in 3.2.2 below and the foundation of the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey congregation in London in 1616,\textsuperscript{142} which later evolved into the Particular Baptist movement, is discussed in 3.2.4 below.

It has already been stated that the beginning of Quakerism can be traced to 1647, with Fox’s vision, followed in 1652 with the first ‘great meeting’ of Quakers at Firbank Fell.\textsuperscript{143} There then followed the first continental European ‘missionary’ journey in 1655, a brief visit to Calais by William Caton with a subsequent, longer, visit to the Netherlands when he was accompanied by John Stubbs.\textsuperscript{144} These visits to the Netherlands are described in Chapter 7.

The main thrust of this research is the specific contact that Quakers had with the Continental Anabaptists that could have had an influence in Quakerism’s emerging theology and practices. Therefore, the end-date for this research coincides with the beginning of the Quaker overseas ‘missionary’ journeys in 1655.\textsuperscript{145}

\textsuperscript{138} Jones, \textit{Spiritual Reformers}, p. 115.
\textsuperscript{139} See 7.3.2 below.
\textsuperscript{140} See 2.4 below.
\textsuperscript{142} Unknown author, ‘The Jacob-Jessey Church 1616-1678’, p. 246.
\textsuperscript{143} See 1.2 above, and George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 108.
\textsuperscript{144} Caton, \textit{The Life of William Caton}, pp. 30-1.
\textsuperscript{145} This end date coincides with the start date of Hull’s researches, see 7.4 below.
1.5.2 Geographical

The geographical focus for this research is England. However Anabaptism emerged initially in Switzerland and travelled, via Germany to the Netherlands and to Eastern Europe.\(^{146}\) It is shown in 7.4 below, that it is with the Dutch Anabaptists, primarily the Waterlander Mennonites and Collegiants, that the first Quakers made contact in continental Europe in 1655 and subsequent years. In addition the late sixteenth century and the early seventeenth century was a period of tremendous immigration of Dutch people into England, principally to its eastern counties.\(^{147}\) It is recorded that, prior to travelling to the Netherlands, both Caton and Stubbs attended meetings of Baptists and ‘Anabaptists’ in Kent.\(^{148}\)

In looking for evidence of contacts between the two groups, evidence was sought, initially using Quaker sources in England. Using Anabaptist sources, in order to trace possible contacts between Anabaptists and proto-Quakers, the search focused on the Netherlands. The investigation then returned to England where the search was widened to cover Quaker contact with the Baptist congregations in England that had possibly evolved from their Dutch parents. There is no recorded contact between Quakers and Anabaptists prior to 1656 in any countries other than England and the Netherlands, albeit such contacts were possible in America with the first journey of Quakers there in 1655.\(^{149}\) There is recorded contact between these two

\(^{146}\) See 2.2.1 below.

\(^{147}\) See 1.3 above.


\(^{149}\) Moore, *The Light in their Consciences*, pp. 34.
groups in wider Europe during subsequent years. Such contact would have been unlikely in Ireland during the Quakers’ first journey there in 1654.

The search for contact, therefore, was confined to possible contacts in England and the Netherlands.

1.5.3 Theological

Although this thesis is not concerned with an in-depth analysis of the similarities, or differences, between the theologies of the groupings under consideration, an understanding of their basic concepts is vital in attempting to identify the possible effect of contact between these groupings, and so the theologies of various mystics and Anabaptist groupings are briefly analysed.

Effects of contact can be both positive and negative and, as exemplified in the case of ‘Uncle Pickering’, may lead to incorrect conclusions. This issue is addressed by investigating the identity of Fox’s uncle as well as researching the question as to whether Fox was positively influenced by an Arminian General Baptist uncle, or negatively influenced by a Calvinistic uncle, a member of the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey congregation.

---

151 Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 34.
152 These analyses are undertaken in 2.1 below, in relation to the mystics, with the theologies of the Dutch Anabaptist groupings being discussed in detail in 2.2 below. English Baptist theologies, for both Particular and General Baptists, are considered in 3.2 below and early Quaker theology is reviewed in Chapter 6.
This thesis outlines the theologies of the Continental Anabaptists, including Mennonites, and compares them with those of the first English Baptists. A direct comparison is then made between these theologies of the Anabaptists and Baptists and those of the early Quakers. This was undertaken by analysing the pamphlets issued by the non-Quakers and those issued in response by Quakers. This analysis took due regard to the issue that in responses to pamphlets by non-Quakers, Quakers would adopt the same language as that used by their protagonists, a language with which they were uncomfortable.

It could be argued that the major difference in theology between the Anabaptists/Baptists and Quakers relates to water baptism. However, it is considered that there is a close affinity between some baptismal beliefs of the continental Anabaptists, in particular the Waterlander Mennonites and Collegiants, and the first Quakers. Anabaptists held to a threefold baptism ‘by the spirit, by water and by blood’, whereas English Baptists only recognised the first two. It could be argued, as Dandelion does, that Quakers would only recognise the baptism of the spirit. However, it is argued by Spencer, that Quakers also recognized the third baptism, that of blood or persecution. This places the first Quakers theologically closer to the continental European ‘baptists’ than to the English ‘baptists’.

In the next section I describe the content of this thesis.

---

154 See 3.1 below.
155 See 3.2 below.
156 See Chapter 6.
157 See 1.4.1 above and 6.5 below.
158 See 5.3 below.
159 Clasen: Anabaptism. A Social History, p. 100.
161 Pink Dandelion, The Liturgies of Quakerism (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2005), p. 45 ‘There are not two baptisms, one by water, one by Spirit.’ In this book, Dandelion makes no reference to the possibility of a third baptism, that of blood or martyrdom.
162 Carole Spencer, ‘James Naylor: Antinomian or Perfectionist.’ Quaker Studies 6/1, 2001, p. 109 ‘I would suggest that Naylor’s greatest pain and disappointment resulted from him...not [being] martyred.’
1.6 Content of thesis

Having set the objective and parameters for this research in Chapter 1, Chapter 2 follows with a brief overview of the theological evolution in Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. That chapter pays particular attention to the growth of the Anabaptist communities in Europe and ends by investigating the emergence of the various English congregations in Continental Europe and their direct contacts with the Anabaptist congregations based there.

The religious groups emerging in England during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries are described in Chapter 3, and particular attention is paid, in 3.2, to the development of Baptist congregations. That chapter includes detailed comparisons of the ‘confessions’ made by the English Baptists with those of their Continental European counterparts.

The possible influences on the emerging theology of Quakerism’s founder, George Fox, are established in Chapter 4. These influences range from social issues at a time of great upheaval in England, to the influences of family, including his mother being, in Fox’s words, ‘of the stock of the martyrs.’ In 4.5, the theme of Fox’s connection with martyrs is further explored in considering the backgrounds of those Maryan martyrs of the sixteenth century who lived only two miles from Fox’s birthplace. In 4.6 and 4.7 the writings of the continental radicals and later Anabaptists are reviewed and consideration is given to their availability to Fox and whether Fox, and other early Quakers, drew anything from them when producing their own publications.

164 Pickvance, George Fox and the Purefeys, p. 9. A more tentative connection with another Maryan martyr is explored later in 5.3.6, from the investigation into the genealogy of Margaret Fell, Fox’s wife.
Chapter 5 then investigates the religious backgrounds to a number of early Quakers and establishes the multitude of contacts that these early Friends had with members of Baptist congregations; contacts that are verified by primary documentation. In addition to investigating the contacts made by Fox with early Quakers, other personal contacts of Fox are explored: the identity of the mysterious ‘Priest Boys’, whose church was ‘in the moors’\textsuperscript{165} and the background of Fox’s parish priest in his childhood, Nathaniel Stephens.\textsuperscript{166} It is established that both of these priests held non-conformist views, and both spent significant time with Fox prior to 1652.

Chapter 6 looks at the evolution and development of Quakerism in England in the early seventeenth century by investigating the Quaker and anti-Quaker tracts of the time. Chapter 7, possibly the most important chapter in this thesis, comprises a detailed investigation into the contacts that were made by early Quakers with Anabaptist communities in England and in the Netherlands.

Chapter 8 draws together the threads of this research, sets out the conclusions reached and identifies related areas for future research.

\subsection{1.7 Chapter summary}

This chapter has outlined the focus and purpose of the research and its main arguments. It has defined the key terms, outlined previous scholarship in the area, outlined the nature of the sources consulted and the difficulties they posed, as well as the methods adopted. It has also

\textsuperscript{165} See 5.3 below and George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 88.
\textsuperscript{166} See 4.3 below and George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 5.
been stated that research on this topic has not been undertaken previously and that this research makes an original contribution in this area of scholarship.

The next chapter identifies the theology and practices of European theologians and mystics that were subsequently adopted by the early Quakers. The research into the theology and practices of European theologians followed, in Chapter 3, by a similar investigation into theology and practices of religious groups in England in the seventeenth century is necessary in order to give authority to any evidence of the possible transfer of theology and practices to the early Quakers.
In this chapter I investigate those aspects of theological evolution in Europe that possess similarities to those that were adopted by Quakers in the seventeenth-century. The greater part of this chapter concentrates on post-Reformation Europe, from the date of preparation of Luther’s 95 theses, 31st October 1517,\(^1\) and in particular, in view of the aim of this research (see 1.1 above), the evolution and growth, from 1525, of the Anabaptist movement in Switzerland, Germany and the Netherlands.\(^2\)

The areas of similarity that are considered, for the purpose of this thesis, are those identified by Tallack\(^3\). This list of elements is considered to be the most relevant as it identifies the main beliefs of the early Quakers which are shared with the English General Baptists who, it is demonstrated in 2.4.2 and 3.2 below, had significant contact with the Dutch Anabaptists in their formative years.

It is seen in this chapter that not all of the twenty similarities set out by Tallack are evident in the beliefs of the pre-reformation religious radicals, nor of the much later Dutch Anabaptists. It is demonstrated in this chapter that those beliefs, common to these earlier groups, are:

- The ‘priesthood’ of all believers
- Discipline regarding marrying out from the group
- The rejection of infant baptism (and the rejection of all water baptism by Quakers)

---


\(^3\) See 1.3 above.
- The refusal to swear oaths (and the refusal to pay tithes in the case of Quakers)
- Objections to war (with some exceptions within Anabaptists groups)
- The rejection of paid ministry
- The lack of perceived need for learned ministers
- The recognition of spiritual gifts in members of the group
- Inward revelation from God
- The denial of the authority of civil powers in matters of conscience (taken further by Anabaptists by refusing to accept civil appointments).

Chapter 7 establishes the contacts that the proto-Quakers and the first Quakers made with the continental Anabaptists and considers the possibility that these similarities of belief and practice could have transferred to the Quakers as a result of those contacts.

2.1 The Radicals

In this section I consider the beliefs of those pre- and post-reformation ‘radicals’ that can be observed within the beliefs of the early Quakers.

2.1.1 Pre Reformation

As far back as the twelfth century, it is seen that Hildegard of Bingen (1098 - ?) talked of ‘a fiery light of exceeding brilliance’ which ‘gave her immediate knowledge and the meaning of
the Bible.’ In later years, this same view was expressed by the Dutch Anabaptist Menno Simons and by George Fox. In the thirteenth century, Amaury of Bene and his followers could no longer see the need for any sacraments since ‘the Holy Spirit Himself was now present’ and that ‘God was not far off in the sky. He was here with us.’ Ortlieb (d 1215), a follower of Amaury, believed that all true Christians ought to ‘abstain from everything external’ with Ortlieb’s followers rejecting ‘sacraments, priests, orders and external authorities.’

In the fourteenth century, a recorded experience of Rulman Merswin (b. circa 1307), does bear some similarity to one of George Fox’s, in which Merswin passed through ‘the vices which Christianity submitted and the woes with which God must afflict it for its correction.’ He saw, through this vision, that he was made ‘the representative of corrupt and sinful humanity’, resulting in him developing a violent hatred of his body which pushed him into a phase of self-mutilation. This was seen by Merswin as an act of the devil. Whereas Fox’s vision, in 1647, was similar to Merswin’s, being of the natures of ‘dogs, swine, vipers, of Sodom and Egypt’, unlike Merswin, it was seen by Fox as a vision from God which would

---

5 See 2.3.1 below and George Fox, *The Journal of George Fox*, ed. John L. Nickalls (London: Cambridge University Press, 1952; reprinted Philadelphia and London: Philadelphia and Britain Yearly Meetings of the Religious Society of Friends, 2005), p. 32, ‘And I saw that none could read John’s words aright and with a true understanding of them, but in and with the same divine Spirit by which John spoke them, and by his burning, shining light, which is sent from God.’
8 Rufus M Jones, *The Flowering of Mysticism*, pp. 132-133. According to Jones in *The Flowering of Mysticism*, pp. 104-132, Merswin used some of his acquired wealth to create a quiet retreat on an island he bought, subsequently known as ‘The Green Isle.’ This island attracted people who wished to retreat from the world into a community devoted to a religious life without the need to enter a monastery. This community became known as ‘The Green Isle Community’ and its inhabitants produced many writings. However, Jones’ account of this community suggests that the great majority of those writings were produced by Merswin himself and that they were difficult to interpret.
enable him to deal with people who had shown these natures.\textsuperscript{11} Through this vision, Fox saw ‘the infinite love of God.’\textsuperscript{12}

In the fourteenth century in England John Wycliffe, (c 1330-1384) questioned the Church’s teaching on the nature of the Eucharist and transubstantiation.\textsuperscript{13} He believed that the Bible was the only true source of authority, and so should be available to all in England to read in English.\textsuperscript{14} He also expressed a view, similar to that of Fox, on the authority of priests,\textsuperscript{15} although Heinze suggests that this view only related to popes and cardinals and not to parish priests.\textsuperscript{16}

Walter Hilton (d. 1396) expressed a view, some two to three hundred years before being expressed by Fox and Menno, ‘The mystery of holy Scripures is closed...without his [Jesus or the Holy Spirit] love and his leave, no one may come in.’\textsuperscript{17}

\section*{2.1.2 Post Reformation}

In this sub-section I consider some of the beliefs of the first Quakers that can be seen to have been held by three post-reformation theologians, Caspar Schwenckfeld, Sebastian Franck and Jacob Boehme, and consider evidence of a direct transfer of those beliefs from these theologians to the early Quakers.

\textsuperscript{11} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 19. ‘And the Lord answered that it was needful I should have a sense of all conditions, how else should I speak to all conditions.’
\textsuperscript{12} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{14} Rudolph W. Heinze, \textit{Reform and Conflict}, p. 64.
\textsuperscript{16} Rudolph W. Heinze, \textit{Reform and Conflict}, p. 64.
\textsuperscript{17} Tarjei Park, \textit{The English Mystics}, p. 51. See 2.3.1 below for comment on the view taken by Menno, and George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 32 for Fox’s view.
Caspar Schwenckfeld (1489-1561)

Schwenckfeld was born into an aristocratic family in Germany and, although he received an extensive education, he did not receive a university degree.18

Schwenckfeld became a Lutheran in about 1518. He was an active promoter of the Reformation in Germany and an avid proponent of the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone.19 Additionally, Schwenckfeld acknowledged an inner baptism of the Spirit and the inner reception of the Eucharist.20 This belief resulted, in 1526, of the ‘Stillstand’, Schwenckfeld’s cessation of participation in the Eucharist, or Lord’s Supper, until such time as a proper understanding of God’s will in this regard is revealed.21 This ‘Stillstand’ continued throughout the remainder of Schwenckfeld’s life.22

It is seen later in this chapter that Schwenckfeld’s views agreed with many of those of the Anabaptists, who had emerged during the latter part of his life. Although he felt kindly towards them, he was unable to join them in view of their use of the ordinance of outward water baptism.23

There are three other views, held by Schwenckfeld, that were later held by the first Quakers: that God is available to all who seek him, that it was only possible to understand the

---

20 McLaughlin, *Caspar Schwenckfeld*, p. 137 and p. 73. See also McLaughlin, *Caspar Schwenckfeld*, p. 47 where McLaughlin quotes an extract from Schwenckfeld’s *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum*. ‘You should...not seek the salvation of your soul through external things.’
Scriptures when it was read ‘in the Spirit’, and that the Scriptures were not the ‘Word’ of God.

The first view suggests that there is no need for the interposition of a priest or minister in leading a religious life, and this view, along with the second, that it was only possible to understand the Scriptures when read ‘in and with the spirit of Christ’ are beliefs that Walter Hilton had expressed in England over a century earlier and then by Fox a century later.

Schwenckfeld’s belief that the Scriptures are not the ‘Word of God’ was a view propounded by Fox, a century later in his Journal, ‘So Christ, the Word of God.’

Jones talked of ‘slight evidence’ of the spread of Schwenckfeld’s views in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but in the same paragraph states that those views were ‘in evidence.’ Although Williams cites evidence of Schwenckfeld’s views being held by some in England during those years, no evidence is produced by Jones or Williams to suggest that those views emanated directly from Schwenckfeld or his followers.

---

24 McLaughlin, Caspar Schwenckfeld, p. 72.
25 McLaughlin, Caspar Schwenckfeld, p. 80. See also Tarjei Park, The English Mystics, p. 51. ‘The mystery of holy Scriptures is closed...without his [Jesus or the Holy Spirit] love and his leave, no one may come in.’ Also see 4.7.2 below and George Fox, Journal, p. 32, ‘And I saw that none could read John’s words aright...but in the same divine spirit by which John spoke them.’
26 Rufus M. Jones, Spiritual Reformers, p. 73. ‘He who has read only that [the Scriptures] and not the inner Word, has not heard the Gospel of Christ.’ Also see George Fox, Journal, p. 13.
27 Rufus M. Jones, Spiritual Reformers, p. 84. Being ‘in evidence’ does not suggest a direct knowledge of the source of those views.
28 George H. Williams, The Radical Reformation, p. 716, note 91. Gwyn quotes Selina Gerhard Schultz’s view that the influence of Schwenckfeld’s writings ‘can be traced only as far as the Collegiants in Holland’ but suggests that Schwenckfeld’s ideas, along with knowledge of religious diversity in the Netherlands, could have subsequently transferred to England ‘along with commercial trade between Holland and England.’ Gwyn, Seekers Found, p. 64.
Sebastian Franck (1499-1542)

Franck was born in Germany to a family of weavers and, whilst receiving a theological education from the Dominicans, attended a disputation in Heidelberg at which Luther was a major contributor.\textsuperscript{29} From that point, Franck became a Lutheran and was ordained a priest. McLaughlin suggests that Franck was an influence on the developing theology of Schwenckfeld, in particular, the belief that the ‘sacraments’ were in the control of the devil and should not be practiced.\textsuperscript{30}

Henry Cadbury, based on the recording of George Fox holding a copy of an English translation of Franck’s writings in his Library, claimed that this ‘seemed to justify the attention of Rufus Jones [who] had called Franck as a forerunner of Quakerism.’ Cadbury recorded the date of publication of the translation as 1640.\textsuperscript{31} As with other books held in Fox’s library, there is no evidence as to when it was acquired by him.

Jones set out Franck’s main religious views as follows:

- ‘man’s soul possesses a native capacity to hear the inward word of God.’\textsuperscript{32}
- ‘The true church is... a spiritual and indivisible body of all the members of Christ...but not gathered in any one external city or place.’\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{29} George H. Williams, \textit{The Radical Reformation}, p. 394.
\textsuperscript{30} George H. Williams, \textit{The Radical Reformation}, p. 696. ‘He [God] leaves it to devil, who seeks nothing other than the externals, to misuse the externals and control the sacraments.’
\textsuperscript{31} Henry J. Cadbury, ‘Tracing the Influence of Sebastian Franck.’ \textit{Journal of the Friends Historical Society}, 52, no. 3, 1970, p. 168. The English translation of Franck’s book to which Cadbury referred is August Elutenius, \textit{The Forbidden Fruit or a Treatise of the Tree of Knowledge of Good or Evill...Translated out of Latine into English} (Printed in the yeare, 1640. No other publishing information shown). The name of the translator of this document is not shown within it. As Cadbury stated, August Elutenius was a pseudonym for Sebastian Franck. In a letter dated 1676, Hilary Præβ wrote, ‘Recently I had put from German into English Sebastian Franckens book “The Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil” in order that Friends might have it to read, because it agrees with their positions.’ This would suggest that the earlier translation of this book suggested by Cadbury to be by John Everard (1575-1650), was possibly unknown to early Quakers. Unknown Author, ‘Letter of Hilary Præβ to John G. Matern.’ \textit{Journal of the Friends Historical Society} 16, no. 1, 1919, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{32} Rufus M. Jones, \textit{Spiritual Reformers}, pp. 52-53.
\textsuperscript{33} Rufus M. Jones, \textit{Spiritual Reformers}, p. 58.
‘religion is not knowledge, but a way of living, a transformed life, and that
involves an inward life-process, resident creative power.’

Other views of Franck that can be traced in those held by the first Quakers were: ‘the inner
word, Christ, was present in all men since birth’, and that baptism is inward by the Spirit
and by fire to ‘all who are obedient to the inner Word.’ This latter view, the inward nature of
baptism, was one of the baptisms that were held by the Anabaptists. Robert Friedmann sums
up Franck’s views on Anabaptists as: ‘Nearly all Anabaptists consider children to be of pure
and innocent blood and they do not consider original sin as a sin which of itself condemns
both children and adults. They also claim that it does not make anyone unclean except the one
who accepts this sin.’

Williams describes Franck as a pacifist, a trait that emerged in the embryonic Quaker
movement. He was also, according to Williams, an exponent of the ‘celestial flesh of
Christ’, the argument that attempted to reconcile the ‘divine and human natures of Christ.’

Although important to the established churches, this topic was not seen as crucial in the
theology of the later Anabaptists, the Dutch Mennonites, nor of the early Quakers. However,

---

34 Rufus M. Jones, _Spiritual Reformers_, p. 58.
36 George H. Williams, _The Radical Reformation_, p. 696.
37 George H. Williams, _The Radical Reformation_, p. 695. Williams quotes Franck as follows: ‘I believe that the
outward church of Christ, including all its gifts and sacraments...went up into heaven and lies concealed in the
Spirit and in truth.’
39 George H. Williams, _The Radical Reformation_, p. 695.
40 George H. Williams, _The Radical Reformation_, p. 695. See also Rudolph W. Heinze, _Reform and Conflict_, p.
461, Note 9. See also 2.2.2 below relating to the _Augsberg Confession_, the Lutheran doctrinal articles which
include, in Article III, a definition of the nature of Christ, ‘there are two natures, the divine and the human,
inseparably enjoined in one Person, one Christ, true God and one man.’
41 See 2.3.2 below for the Mennonite view on this. There is no reference to this subject in Fox’s _Journal_ and only
a brief and oblique reference in Barclay’s _Apology_, Robert Barclay, _Apology for the true Christian Divinity_
(Glenside, P.A.: Quaker Heritage Press, 2002). p. iv. The first English publication of the _Apology_ was in 1678.
The only reference to the nature of Christ is on page 457: ‘the Son, who is the substance, Eternal Word, and
essential oath and Amen.’
it is seen in Chapter 6 that ‘the celestial flesh of Christ’ became a major point of dispute between the early Quakers and non-Quakers during the seventeenth century.

**Jacob Böhme (or Boehme) (1575-1624)**

Böhme was born in Germany to parents ‘of the poorest sort’ and, after a rudimentary education, became a shoemaker. It is reported that he had ‘visionary tendencies when young.’ He was a follower of Luther, reputed to be a regular churchgoer and that he educated himself. Unlike Fox, he did not preach nor set out to convert, but did write many books based on his own experiences which, according to Martensen, he wrote down immediately they occurred. In particular, W. Scott Palmer claims Böhme learnt from Paracelsus the ‘doctrine of humanity as the sum of three orders – the natural, the astral and the divine.’ It is important to note that a significant amount of Böhme’s writings related to alchemy and to the physical nature of the world, topics that did not appear in Fox’s writings. This aspect of Böhme’s writings, is discussed in detail, and compared with Fox’s writings, in Chapter 4.

---

44 Hans L Martensen, *Jacob Boehme (1575-1624)*, p. 3. Martensen records that Böhme retained his membership of the Lutheran church up to his death in 1624.
45 Hans L Martensen, *Jacob Boehme (1575-1624)*, p. 8. Martensen reports that Böhme did not publish any of his books himself. They were published, perhaps without his knowledge or agreement, by friends. See also Hans L. Martensen, *Jacob Boehme (1575-1624)*, p. 6.
Some literature produced by Jacob Böhme was available in England, in English, in time for Fox to have studied it and to have incorporated its theology within his own. As stated in Chapter 1, this was a belief of the Quaker academic and writer Rufus Jones, a conviction held and expounded without the production of firm evidence. However, H.G. Wood explained the position more accurately when he said that the ideas of Böhme and Fox ‘coincided.’ According to Peter Erb, Böhme’s complete works were not available in English until 1661, after Fox had begun to form his theology. If Fox had read Böhme’s work then, as Sharp stated, ‘The writings of Boehme may have had a fleeting influence over Fox and his early disciples, but this influence is a mere episode in the history of Quakerism.’

It is possible that similarities have been drawn between Fox’s and Böhme’s theologies in view of the similarities in their upbringing: both of parents of modest means, both receiving education typical of their station in life and both apprenticed to shoemakers. Mention has also been made that Fox was born in the year of Böhme’s death. Comment has been made regarding the use of phases by Fox in his writing which had been used earlier by Böhme.

---

48 Robin Waterfield, ed., *Jacob Boehme, Essential Readings*, p. 43. ‘We know that manuscripts of Boehme’s writings were circulating in England possibly as early as 1630. Also see 4.6.4 below in which is described Durant Hotham’s knowledge of Böhme’s works and Hotham’s meetings with Fox in 1651.


52 Isaac Sharp, ‘On the origin of Quakerism.’ *Friends’ Quarterly Examiner* 175, Seventh Month 1910, p. 293.


55 H.G. Wood, *George Fox and his Religious Background*, p. 357 ‘The writings of Jacob Boehme, or Behmen, the inspired shoemaker of Gverlitz, also contained fundamental ideas that coincided with the message of George Fox... Many expressions which Fox uses to describe his own experiences are the same as those used by Jacob Behmen. In particular the whole idea of the Divine element in man as a seed is characteristic of the teachings of Behmen as it was of the teaching of George Fox.’
but, as Barry Reay points out, both authors drew extensively in their writings from the ‘imagery of the Bible.’

According to Jones, Böhme was influenced in his thinking by both Schwenckfeld and Franck. Like Fox he disliked calling the place of worship a church and ‘he would not admit that a building is anything but a building.’ He declared that the sacraments did not remove sin, and that ‘It depends not on what ceremonies and manners we do use.’ Whereas Fox claimed that an understanding of the Scriptures could only be obtained by their reading in the Spirit in which they were written, Böhme claimed, according to Jones, ‘without the Spirit he could not even comprehend even his own writings.’ Böhme’s writings, generally, are considered difficult to understand, and it is reported that, in reply to his presentation at a conference in Dresden in 1624 to Lutheran theologians, one of his protagonists declared ‘How can we judge what we have not understood?’

As explained by Christopher Hill, Böhme believed in the existence of God in all believers and ‘preferred the spirit in them to the letter of the Bible.’ This suggests that Böhme’s view was close to that of Fox’s, ‘the Seed of God in man and in me.’

---

59 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 32. ‘And I saw that none could read John’s words aright...but in the same divine Spirit by which John spoke them.’
60 Rufus M. Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, p. 251.
61 Hugh MacGregor Ross, *George Fox. Christian Mystic*, p. 181. Quotation given by Lewis Benson. Martensen, *Jacob Böhme (1575-1624)*, writes on p. xxi, that Böhme’s works were written ‘often in obscure language’ and in a form of ‘such a bewildering though fruitful chaos’ and then on p. xxii, that Böhme ‘invented some words, and others he used in a peculiar sense.’ Also see Hans L Martensen, *Jacob Boehme (1575-1624)*, p. 9.
The next section deals with the birth and growth of Anabaptism in Europe in the early part of the sixteenth century. It is followed by an account of its development, later in the sixteenth century, into different strands in the Netherlands and the relationship of those strands with the emergence of the Rijnsburg Collegiants in the early seventeenth century.

2.2 European Anabaptism

2.2.1 Theological background in Europe

The Reformation, begun in 1517 with the posting of Luther’s 95 theses, was, in effect, an attempted reformation of the established Catholic Church from within. McGinn argues that the Catholic Eucharist and sacraments came under pressure much earlier than this, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries when ‘heretics...denied the validity of the sacraments performed by unworthy priests.’

unfortunate that nowhere in this book is a reference to the origin of these ‘Confessions.’ It seems as though Palmer has collated them from a number of Böhme’s writings, but he gives no references.


The main reforms promoted within the 95 theses were the selling of indulgences as outlined in its paragraphs 21, 28 and 37, see ‘Disputation of Doctor Martin Luther on the Power and Efficacy of Indulgences’ published in Ed. Adolph Spaeth, L.D. Reed, Henry Eyster Jacobs et al., *Works of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia: A.J. Holman Company, 1915), accessed from www.ctsfw.edu/etext/luther/theses/theses_e.asc on 25th June 2008, pp. 29-38.

Para. 21, ‘those preachers of indulgences are in error.’ Para. 28, ‘when the penny jingles into the money box, gain and avarice can be increased.’ Para. 37, ‘Every true Christian, whether living or dead, has part in all the blessings of Christ and the Church; and this is granted him by God, even without letters of pardon.’ It also referred to the value of images within the church, see ‘Disputation of Doctor Martin Luther’, Para. 79, ‘To say that the cross, emblazoned with papal arms, which is set up [by the preachers of indulgences], is of equal worth with the Cross of Christ, is blasphemy’, and to the financial exploitation of the populace in the building of the Vatican Church in Rome, see ‘Disputation of Doctor Martin Luther’, Para. 86, ‘Why does not the pope, whose wealth is today greater than the riches of the richest, build just this one church of St. Peter with his own money, rather than with the money of poor believers?’ See also Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, Third Edition, 2003), p. 62.

Bernard McGinn, *The Flowering of Mysticism: Men and Women in the new mysticism (1200-1350)* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1998), p. 10. This view, according to McGinn was taken to an extreme by the Cathars with their total rejection of the material world, a view subsequently taken by the Anabaptists who fled to Münster in the 1500s. (See 2.2.3 below).
Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531) was born in Switzerland and became a priest there. He developed his own theological ideas based on those of the humanist Erasmus and maintained that his views were not influenced by Luther, ‘I started preaching the gospel [1516] before I had even heard Luther’s name.’ In 1523 Zwingli published his *Sixty-seven Theses* which followed Luther’s teachings, particularly on church institutions, but diverged from Luther on the role of the State in church affairs and the nature of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist.

Whereas Luther’s aim, as established above, was to transform the established Roman Catholic Church from within, John Calvin (1509-1564) disputed many of the fundamental beliefs of that church. Although he agreed with Luther’s view that church ‘rites’ were a human invention, he argued against the ideology of Erastianism; the concept that the State should have supremacy over the church. Calvin believed that the sacraments were simply an outward sign of God’s promise of his good will and not actions that conferred grace on those who received it. Calvin is best remembered, and perhaps condemned, for his doctrine of predestination, and like the Anabaptists and Quakers that came after him, he advocated church discipline. This advocacy was set out in his book *Ordonnances ecclésiastiques* which

---

67 Rudolph W. Heinze, *Reform and Conflict*, p. 123. But see Note 8 on p. 443, ‘Zwingli may not have been as independent of Luther in his theological development as he maintained. It is clear that Zwingli knew about Luther and had read his writings by late 1518.’
69 Rudolph W. Heinze, *Reform and Conflict*, p. 126. See also Rudolph W. Heinze, *Reform and Conflict*, pp. 127-130. Zwingli quoted John 6:63 ‘It is the spirit that gives life, the flesh is of no avail’ and so, in Zwingli’s opinion, it was unnecessary to receive the blood and body of Christ in the Eucharist. In fact, Zwingli went further and proposed that, as Christ’s body had ascended to heaven as stated in Acts 1:9, then it could not be present in the Eucharist.
70 Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation*, p. 167.
72 Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation*, p. 157.
73 See Patrick Collinson, *The Reformation*, p. 86. ‘Like most religious signifiers, it [Calvinism] originated as a term of abuse’, also p. 82. ‘It is true that Calvin believed that God ‘elected’ those whom he intended should be saved...Only when we reach Chapter Twenty-one of his third book (Chapter fifty-six of the whole) [Institutio Christianae Religionis] do we come to ‘Of the Eternal Election’ and p. 78, ‘discipline was a necessity...Calvin put it...Where there is no discipline, God is not honoured.’
defined the roles of office holders within the church,\textsuperscript{74} and his book \textit{Institutio Christianiae Religionis}, which set out a complete explanation of his doctrine and discipline, and led to his branch of the Lutheran church being named after him.\textsuperscript{75}

The Anabaptist movement, as shown in the following sub-section, was part of the ‘Radical Reformation’, a rebellion against the reformed theologies of Luther, Zwingli and Calvin that existed at that time.\textsuperscript{76}

\subsection*{2.2.2 The birth of Anabaptism in Switzerland}

In 1517 Zwingli left his home in the Swiss town of Einsiedeln, where he was the ‘people’s priest’, and travelled to preach in Zurich where, in 1521 he was joined by the humanist turned Christian, Conrad Grebel.\textsuperscript{77} In 1525 there was a breach between them over a number of issues, including the authority of the State over the Church and of the nature of the Mass.\textsuperscript{78} That dispute also focussed on the act of baptism, with Zwingli’s opponents maintaining that baptism, as well as the Eucharist as argued by Zwingli, should be administered strictly in accordance with the New Testament.\textsuperscript{79} Grebel’s view on baptism was that it should require a

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{74}Patrick Collinson, \textit{The Reformation}, p. 78. ‘It [\textit{Ordonnances ecclésiastiques}] defined the normative ministry of pastors, doctors, elders and deacons, and their functions; provided for weekly meetings of a company of pastors; …and set up the consistory, a meeting of ministers and elders to oversee church attendance and morals.’
  \item \textsuperscript{75}David Loades, \textit{Revolution in Religion. The English Reformation 1530-1570} (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1992), p. 64.
  \item \textsuperscript{76}George H. Williams, \textit{The Radical Reformation}, p. xxx.
  \item \textsuperscript{78}W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 11.
  \item \textsuperscript{79}John Bossy, \textit{Christianity in the West} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p. 105, ‘the Eucharist ...was a commemorative event which should follow as exactly as possible the New Testament sources – ought self-evidently to be also true of the other surviving sacrament, baptism...the qualifications for baptism were repentance and belief in Christ...Since infants had obviously not the qualifications they could obviously not receive the benefits.’
  \item Underhill noted that on 30\textsuperscript{th} November 1525, the magistrates at Zurich issued a proclamation forbidding re-baptism stating that all young children should be baptised. Failure to comply with this proclamation would result in severe punishment. Edward Bean Underhill, ed., \textit{Martyrology of the Churches of Christ commonly called Baptists during the era of the reformation}. Translated from the Dutch of T.J. van Braght. Vol. 1 (London: Hanserd Knollys Society, 1850), p. 5.
\end{itemize}
‘personal relationship to God’ and that it was solely an outward sign of discipleship. It is reported that Zwingli had criticized Grebel for his view that ‘the Messiah had already come.’

Grebel was joined by Felix Mantz, an illegitimate son of a Roman Catholic Priest, and along with George Blaurock, an ex-priest of the Roman Catholic Church, they led the drive for converts in Switzerland. At a meeting of these ‘converts’ on 25th January 1525, Grebel baptized Blaurock with water ‘signifying believers baptism.’ Blaurock then baptized the others present.

As a result of their belief, that the authority for their actions was taken from the Bible, and not from secular authorities, these ‘Anabaptists, it seemed, challenged and undermined all [secular] authority,’ and, unlike Luther and Zwingli, rejected civil authority, in particular in relation to military service. Mantz declared that ‘no Christian could be a magistrate, nor could he use a sword to punish or kill anyone.’ It was a strongly held view of these first Anabaptists that the true church must be totally separate from ‘the world’ and, as the world

---

82 Eberhard Arnold, *The Early Anabaptists* (New York: Plough Publishing House, Hutterite Brethren, 1970), p. 51. Arnold also records that Grebel had written to Zwingli on Zwingli’s retraction of his condemnation of tithes after Zwingli had made friends with the Zurich City Council, see Eberhard Arnold, *The Early Anabaptists*, p. 42. ‘All of Zwingli’s friends reproached him, saying that so far he had preached against tithing but that since making friends with the Council he was retracting everything he had said against tithing.’ See also C. Arnold Snyder, *The Life and Thought of Michael Sattler* (Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1984), p. 68 where he quotes Zwingli as stating: ‘so long as the Council demands payment of the tithe, it is the civil duty of the Christian to pay it.’
84 W.R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story*, pp. 9-10, and p. 32. See also Eberhard Arnold, *The Early Anabaptists*, pp. 34-35. Arnold says that, at this stage in their evolution, the name adopted by these participants was not ‘Anabaptists’, meaning ‘re-baptizers’ but simply ‘Christians and brothers.’
85 W.R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story*, p. 147
was seen to be totally corrupt, ‘believers’, i.e. Anabaptists, should not be part of it.\textsuperscript{89} Deppermann suggests that the Anabaptists ‘had intended to restore early Christianity in its purest form, being more consistent and, as well, more radical than either Zwingli or Luther, who had both compromised with an unchristian world.’\textsuperscript{90}

It is not surprising, therefore, that by holding these anti-authoritarian views, they were seen to be revolutionaries and were subject to great persecutions.\textsuperscript{91} Clasen argued that they sought suffering for their faith.\textsuperscript{92} Following the first execution of an Anabaptist, Eberli Bolt, on 29 May 1525 by the Roman Catholic authorities in Switzerland,\textsuperscript{93} Grebel was imprisoned in October 1525 and died of the plague in 1526.\textsuperscript{94} Mantz suffered many imprisonments and was executed in 1527,\textsuperscript{95} and Blaurock too suffered many imprisonments and was banished from Basle in Switzerland to Germany where he was executed in 1529.\textsuperscript{96} Clasen claims a total of seventy-three Anabaptists were executed in Switzerland between 1525 and 1618 (although few took place after 1549) with in excess of eight-hundred taking place over the same period in Germany.\textsuperscript{97}

\textsuperscript{91} Anon, \textit{The Anabaptist Network}, p. 4. ‘Anabaptists were not surprised by persecution. They knew they would be seen as revolutionaries...They regarded suffering...as unavoidable and biblical; suffering was a mark of the true church.’
\textsuperscript{92} Clasen, \textit{Anabaptism: A Social History}, p. 55. ‘The early Anabaptists commonly believed that the true apostle wandered from place to place, preaching and suffering persecution as the Apostle Paul had done.’ In this way, I argue, these Anabaptists can be identified with the Quakers of the seventeenth century.
\textsuperscript{93} W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 20. Anabaptism, or re-baptism, was seen by those authorities as a treasonable act.
\textsuperscript{94} W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{95} W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, pp. 29-30. Part of the charge brought against Mantz was, ‘since such doctrine [professed by the Anabaptists] is harmful to the unified usage of all Christendom, and leads to offense, insurrection and sedition against the government.’ Underhill wrote that Mantz was executed on 5\textsuperscript{th} January 1527 by drowning. Edward Bean Underhill, ed., \textit{Martyrology of the Churches of Christ}, p. 15.
\textsuperscript{96} W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 33. See also Edward Bean Underhill, ed., \textit{Martyrology of the Churches of Christ}, p. 88.
\textsuperscript{97} Clasen, \textit{Anabaptism: A Social History}, p. 437.
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As stated by Clasen, ‘Anabaptist groups...were totally decentralised with a minimum of organisation.’ However, some form of ‘regulation’ was drawn up by Michael Sattler. Sattler was born around 1490 at Staufen in Germany, and after becoming a Lutheran he was expelled from Germany and, via Austria, arrived in Zurich where he became an Anabaptist. After returning to Germany, and whilst attending an Anabaptist conference at Schleitheim on 24 February 1527, he wrote a book of discipline for Anabaptists, subsequently known as The Schleitheim Confession. Friedmann argued that early Anabaptist confessions were not theological documents, but solely covered church discipline and that each statement in the Schleitheim Confession would have been a consensus view.

As with his predecessors, Sattler was imprisoned many times and wrote many epistles in prison. He was tried, and executed on 20 May 1527, along with Margaretha, his wife.

The Schleitheim Confession comprises seven articles, some of the contents of which would not be unfamiliar to Quakers of the seventeenth century. They are outlined in brief as follows (references in brackets relate to the points of similarity between Quakers and General Baptists scheduled by Tallack in 1.1.2 above):

---

98 Clasen, Anabaptism: A Social History, p. xvii.
100 W.R. Estep, The Anabaptist Story, p. 38.
101 Robert Friedmann, The Theology of Anabaptism, p. 128. See also C. Arnold Snyder, The Life and Thought of Michael Sattler, p. 99. ‘The Articles do not offer a complete outline of Christian beliefs, but rather delineate essential Anabaptist practices.’
103 W.R. Estep, The Anabaptist Story, pp. 41-44. See also Snyder, The Life and Thought of Michael Sattler, p. 28. Underhill recorded that sixteen men and eleven women companions of Sattler were also arrested, and those that did not recant their beliefs were executed, ‘the brethren…by the sword, and the sisters were drowned.’ Edward Bean Underhill, ed., Martyrology of the Churches of Christ, p. 27.
Article 1 – ‘Notice concerning baptism’

Baptism by water offered to all believers who request it. (Point 11 – as regards the rejection of infant baptism, but the acceptance of baptism of the Spirit of all believers)

Article 2 – ‘We have been united as follows concerning the ban’

If members ‘fall in error’, they are given two private warnings then, if no correction, a final admonishment or ban. (Point 8 – action taken in the event of marrying-out from the group)

Article 3 – ‘Concerning the breaking of bread’

Those baptized as believers within the group may take bread as a remembrance of Christ.

Article 4 – ‘We have been united concerning the separation that shall take place’

Members shall be separate from evil-doers. Also to be separated from weapons of violence. (Point 14 – objections to war)

Article 5 – ‘We have been united as follows concerning shepherds in the church of God’

The ‘shepherd’ in the Church is chosen by the congregation.

Article 6 – ‘We have been united as follows concerning the sword’

Within the church, the ban, and not the sword, is used, church members must not to pass judgements in disputes, not become magistrates and not confuse worldly and

---

105 In Article 5 of Michael Sattler, Confession, ‘the shepherd’ is described as ‘a person...to read and exhort and teach, warn, admonish, or ban...and preside...in the breaking of bread, and in all things to take care of the body of Christ.’
spiritual matters. (Point 14 – regarding the objection to war. Point 2 – the use of
‘queries’ to question actions and beliefs. Point 20 – denial of authority of civil powers
in matters of conscience.)

**Article 7 – ‘We have been united as follows concerning the oath’**

Christ forbids the swearing of oaths. ‘Your speech shall be yea, yea; and nay, nay’
(Point 13 – Refusal to swear oaths. In particular see Fox’s *Journal*, p. 244.\(^{106}\))

The closing letter to the *Confession* confirms that all things unknowingly done wrong, if
confessed, will be forgiven.\(^{107}\)

In the next sub-section I trace the expansion of Anabaptism from Switzerland into Southern
Germany.

### 2.2.3 Progress of Anabaptism in Germany

Following its birth in Switzerland in 1525, Anabaptism crossed into Austria and Germany.\(^ {108}\)

I now consider the theology preached by those individual Anabaptists in and around Germany.

---

\(^{106}\) George Fox, *Journal*, p. 244. ‘for Christ our Lord and master saith, ‘Swear not at all...but yea, yea, and nay, nay.’

\(^{107}\) Possibly in retaliation to the publication of the Anabaptist *Schleitheim Confession*, three years later, in 1530, the Lutheran *Augsberg Confession* was published. It was drafted by Philip Melanchthon and based on earlier articles prepared by Martin Luther, its final version being presented to a ‘diet’, or meeting, at Augsburg on 25 June 1530. The *Augsberg Confession* comprised twenty-eight Articles on Lutheran beliefs and practices. Unlike the *Schleitheim Confession* it included details of the underlying theology of Lutheranism. Articles 1-21 dealt with basic Christian doctrines - ‘Of God’, ‘Of Original Sin’, ‘Of the Son of God’ etc., none of which were dealt with in the *Schleitheim Confession*. Articles 22-28 dealt with the abuses that Lutheranism had attempted to correct – ‘Of both kinds [bread and wine] in the Sacraments’, ‘Of the marriage of Priests’, ‘Of the mass’ etc. Nowhere in this *Confession* was there any comment on church discipline. However, it must be noted that Articles 16 and 17 specifically condemned Anabaptists for not accepting civil office, for not swearing oaths and for suggesting that there will be an end to punishments of condemned men. See ‘Augsberg Confession’ in *Triglot Concordia: The symbolic books of the Ev. Lutheran Church*. Translation by F. Bente and W.H.T. Dau (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), pp. 37-95. The translation has pages re-numbered 1-19.

\(^{108}\) W.R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story*, p. 67. ‘Driven from their native cantons...the Brethren fled into South Germany and Moravia. From Moravia they went into Poland, North Germany and the Netherlands.’
at this time before moving on to the progress of Anabaptism into the Netherlands and the
 eventual contact between Dutch Anabaptists and the early Quakers.109

Balthasar Hubmaier (c.1480-1528)

A prominent example of ‘cross-border’ movement is Balthasar Hubmaier, described by Estep
 as the first Anabaptist theologian.110 Born in Friedberg, Germany in 1480/1, he became an
 ordained Roman Catholic priest, and after travelling to Switzerland he underwent adult
 believers’ baptism in April 1525.111 Jones referred to Hubmaier’s study of the apostle Paul’s
 epistles and how, through that study, he ‘came into a personal experience of salvation through
 Christ.’112 Hubmaier accepted the need for water baptism, but solely for ‘submission to the
 Church’,113 and he rejected the notion of community of goods, although he accepted the view
 of sharing with those in need.114 Hubmaier’s views on adult believer’s baptism with water
 were the constituents of his main tracts published in 1525.115 However, Hubmaier moved
 away from the established Swiss Brethren’s view on the use of the sword. He argued that it
 was not un-Christian to use the sword in the maintenance of civil order.116

Estep writes that Hubmaier was forced to flee to Zurich in December 1525 where he was
 arrested and recanted his Anabaptism. He then retracted his recantation and, after being re-

109 The contact between Dutch Anabaptists and the early Quakers is described in Chapter 7 below.
112 Rufus M. Jones, Studies in Mystical Religion, p. 379.
113 W.R. Estep, The Anabaptist Story, pp. 55-56. Estep quotes from Hubmaier’s tract The Christian Baptism of
 Believers, ‘...water baptism is not necessary for salvation, only for submission to the Church and Christian
 commitment.’
116 Clasen, Anabaptism: A Social History, p. 178. Clasen suggests that had Anabaptists generally accepted
 Hubmaier’s teaching on the sword and its place in maintaining civil order then their movement might not have
 incurred suppression.
arrested, again recanted his Anabaptist views. Hubmaier then fled to Austria, where he was arrested, sent to Vienna and tried for treason. He was executed by burning on 10 March 1528. His wife, Elizabeth Hugeline, was executed by drowning three days later.

Hans Denck (c1500-1527)

An analysis of the writings of Hans Denck and a comparison with those of the early Quakers is described in 4.7 below. However, in order to provide chronological continuity, it is important to make brief reference here to his works.

Denck was born in Southern Germany and based his early career in Nürnberg. In 1525 he was asked to present his theological views to the town council. During that presentation he made a distinction between the ‘inner’, spiritual, baptism and the ‘outer’ baptism with water and also promoted the concept of the baptism of believers. He also discussed the desirability, but not necessity, of water baptism. As a result of him expressing his views, which conformed to those of the Anabaptists, he was ordered to leave Nürnberg. He arrived at Strasbourg, from where he was expelled and then moved to Worms and subsequently to Augsburg. It was at Augsburg that he met both Franck and Schwenckfeld.

---

118 Edward Bean Underhill, ed., Martyrology of the Churches of Christ, p. 74. See note 93 above regarding the charges brought against the first Anabaptist Martyr, Eberli Bolt.
119 George H. Williams, The Radical Reformation, p. 348.
120 George H. Williams, The Radical Reformation, p. 350. In the text of his book, Williams refers to Hubmaier’s wife only as ‘his wife.’ In the Appendix to this work, p. 1459, Williams refers to her simply as ‘Mrs Balthasar Hubmaier.’ However, see Anon, ‘Hubmaier, Balthasar (1480?[sic] -1528)’ in The Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online. Accessed from www.gameo.org/encyclopedia/contents/1H8358.html#life on 18th February 2010 where her name is quoted as Elizabeth Hugeline.
121 George H. Williams, The Radical Reformation, p. 248.
122 George H. Williams, The Radical Reformation, p. 251.
124 George H. Williams, The Radical Reformation, p. 254.
126 W.R. Estep, The Anabaptist Story, p. 70.
these meetings he produced his major works in which elements of Franck’s and Schwenckfeld’s theologies can be identified. In his works, he stated that water cannot wash away sin, sacraments have no objectives in themselves, and that there was hope that even the most wicked of people could obtain salvation. Whilst at Augsburg, in about May 1526, Denck also met with Balthasar Hubmaier, and there is a record of Denck being baptized there by Hubmaier.

Denck died of the plague in around 1527.

**Hans Hut (d. 1527)**

Before his death, Denck had baptised Hans Hut, a Lutheran who had questioned the validity of infant baptism, and who, with some similarities to Hubmaier, accepted the validity of swearing oaths, carrying weapons and fighting in wars. Hut’s view on baptism was similar to that of Thomas Müntzer’s, who stated that the only true baptism was that of the spirit, but saw no objection to the use of the sword in the furtherance of his ideas. On baptism, Hut’s views are summed up by Liechty when he quotes from a translation of Hut’s works: ‘The baptism of John in water is incomplete...they must be baptized again in Christ’, and

---

129 George H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, pp. 255-6. Williams, in recounting the story of Denck’s baptism, says ‘It is now, however, no longer at all clear that Hubmaier baptized Denck in the Waldshut mode.’ Williams is not clear what is meant by this statement. On p. 231, Williams describes the baptism of Hubmaier by William Reublin at the Swiss town of Waldshut, and that Hubmaier then baptized ‘over three hundred, using a milk bucket with water.’ It is not possible to discern from Williams’ account whether he was referring to baptism with the sprinkling of water, whether he was referring to baptism with the use of the milk bucket, or whether he was referring to Denck not being baptized at all.
130 W.R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story*, p. 73.
‘Baptism...is not that which makes a person godly. It is a sign only.’\textsuperscript{134} However, Hut had a deeply held conviction on the imminent arrival of Christ and had forecast Christ’s second coming for 1529.\textsuperscript{135}

As a result of his Anabaptist mission in Southern Germany and Austria, Hut was arrested in Augsburg on 15 September 1527, tried, tortured and died whilst in prison on 6 December 1527. Nevertheless, his body was brought into court where he was formally condemned and his body burned at the stake on 7 December 1527.\textsuperscript{136}

**Pilgram Marpeck (c. 1495-1556)**

Born in Austria, Pilgram Marpeck became an Anabaptist sometime around 1527/8.\textsuperscript{137} During his wanderings in Switzerland and South Germany between 1532 and 1544,\textsuperscript{138} he taught the necessity of a personal trust in Jesus Christ, argued for the separation of Church and State,\textsuperscript{139} and understood that the Scriptures were written ‘by the Holy Spirit’ and therefore could only be understood by a reader ‘found in the spirit.’\textsuperscript{140}


\textsuperscript{138} Johann Loserth, John C. Wenger, Harold S. Bender and Stephen B. Boyd, ‘Marpeck, Pilgram (d. 1556).’ 1957 Article, Chapter iii, no page number shown.

\textsuperscript{139} W.R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story*, p. 165 and p. 79.

It is suggested by Estep that, as Menno united the Anabaptist movement in North Germany and the Netherlands, Marpeck did the same work in Southern Germany.\textsuperscript{141} However, unlike Menno, Marpeck took a less rigid attitude towards the application of the ‘ban’ and the ‘community of goods.’\textsuperscript{142} Marpeck moved to Augsberg during 1544 and was allowed to remain there by the city authorities until he died in 1546 because, as recorded by Clasen, ‘he administered the city’s magnificent water supply.’\textsuperscript{143}

The next sub-section considers the move of Anabaptism into the Netherlands where, as is shown in 2.4 below, there was significant contact between the Mennonites and exiles from England.

\section*{2.2.4 Anabaptist expansion into the Netherlands and ‘the Münster affair.’}

Estep records that the first person to bring Anabaptism to the Netherlands was Melchior Hofmann in about 1530,\textsuperscript{144} with Horst crediting Hofmann with ‘shaping the early theology of Anabaptism in Northeast Europe.’\textsuperscript{145} Hofmann was born in 1495 and was a follower of Martin Luther. In that capacity he confirmed Luther’s message of justification by faith, preached against the ‘spectre’ of the Roman Catholic Mass and against the images used in the Church.\textsuperscript{146}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{141} See 2.2.4 below and W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 80.
\textsuperscript{142} Johann Loserth, John C. Wenger, Harold S. Bender and Stephen B. Boyd, ‘Marpeck, Pilgram (d. 1556)’, 1957 Article, Chapter xi, no page number shown.
\textsuperscript{143} Clasen, \textit{Anabaptism: A Social History}, p. 391.
\textsuperscript{144} W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 104.
\textsuperscript{146} Klaus Deppermann, \textit{Melchior Hoffman}, p. 36.
\end{flushright}
After travelling around Denmark and Sweden he spent some time in Strasbourg,\(^{147}\) which he considered to have been chosen as the new Jerusalem.\(^{148}\) Having become an Anabaptist in Emden during 1530 he travelled to the Netherlands where, as reported by Jones, he did not differentiate between the clergy and laity, opposed the taking of oaths and upheld the Swiss Brethren’s view that it was inconsistent for Anabaptists to be magistrates.\(^{149}\) Two members of what was considered to be Hoffman’s more peaceful wing were Dirk Philips and Menno Simons.\(^{150}\)

Dirk Philips (1504-1568) was considered to be one of the leading theologians amongst the Dutch and North German Anabaptists.\(^{151}\) Philips confessed that the ‘Word’ was not the Scriptures but ‘The Son of God’,\(^{152}\) and argued against Hans Denck’s and Sebastian Franck’s toleration of other faiths.\(^{153}\) He maintained the fundamental belief within Anabaptism: the baptism of the Spirit and with fire, followed by believers’ baptism with water.\(^{154}\) However, in his desire to maintain the church as pure and separate from the world, he was a strict advocate of the ban, with sinners being excluded from the congregation and then shunned.\(^{155}\) This view

---


\(^{150}\) Horst, *The Radical Brethren*, p. 171.


\(^{154}\) Daniel Liechty, *Early Anabaptist Spirituality*, pp. 206 and 210. This view is quoted by Liechty from the tract of Philips ‘Concerning the New Birth and the New Creature: Brief Admonition and Teaching from the Holy Bible (1556)’ as contained in Philips’ collection of works: ‘Enchiridion oft Hantboecxken van Christelijke Leer ende Religion, 1564 Edition.’ Also see Robert Friedmann, *The Theology of Anabaptism*, p. 136 where he refers to this three-fold baptism being a common theme throughout Anabaptist tracts, and to Walter Klaasen, *Anabaptism in Outline*, p. 162, ‘we encounter the teaching of the threefold baptism, the inner baptism of the Spirit, water baptism, and the baptism of blood...the experience of tribulation and suffering.’ However Friedmann also states, *The Theology of Anabaptism*, p. 17, that ‘Anabaptists were allegedly simple, unlearned people who were eager to live out their primitive-Christian way of life in tension with the surrounding “world”, ready to suffer martyrdom for the sake of their faith.’ This suggests that Anabaptists, perhaps, suffered out of ignorance rather than as part of their theology.

\(^{155}\) Nanne van der Zijpp, ‘Dirk Philips (1504-1568)’, no page reference shown.
on the ban was shared by his colleague, Menno Simons, upon whom Philips is said to have exerted influence.156

Two of Hofmann’s followers at this time, considered by Horst to have been members of his ‘revolutionary wing’,157 were Jan Matthys, known as Jan of Leyde or Jan van Leiden, and Jan Brockelson.158 Like Hofmann, these two anticipated a transformation of the world, and in March 1534, along with between 14,000 and 15,000 followers, they set up this new world, the ultimate separation from ‘the World’, in the city of Münster in Germany.159 The community in Münster soon fell under the control of Bernard Rothmann who proclaimed the restitution of the primitive church in Münster.160 Rothmann also proclaimed the community of goods within the city and defended polygamy as ‘divinely sanctioned’.161 Eventually, the city was besieged by Bishop Francis of Waldeck and, after a number of battles, the city was re-taken on 25 June 1535 and almost all its inhabitants were killed.162

The events at Münster were not supported by the greater body of European Anabaptists.163 Nevertheless, the vision of Münster was seen by society at large as the social consequence of Anabaptism,164 and following the ‘Münster affair’, as Bossy claims, Anabaptists in the north of Europe kept a low profile.165

---

156 Nanne van der Zijpp, ‘Dirk Philips (1504-1568)’, no page reference shown. I outline the beliefs and practices of Menno in 2.3.1 below and compare his writings with those of the early Quakers in 4.7 below.
157 Horst, The Radical Brethren, p. 171.
159 Klaus Deppermann, Melchior Hoffman, p. 341.
160 George H. Williams, The Radical Reformation, p. 574.
161 George H. Williams, The Radical Reformation, p. 577.
162 George H. Williams, The Radical Reformation, pp. 581-582.
163 W.R. Estep, The Anabaptist Story, p. 107. Estep reports that the participants of Münster were all excommunicated by the Swiss Brethren.
164 Ernest A. Payne, ‘The Anabaptist impact on Western Christendom’, p. 306. ‘Anabaptism appeared to them to be linked with a dangerous challenge to the accepted order of society. Nor... were most people ready to face the challenge of the doctrine of non-resistance which many Anabaptists adopted.’
165 John Bossy, Christianity in the West, p. 107. ‘The northern brethren kept their heads down until the States-General of the Netherlands offered them toleration in 1578, and they succeeded in passing on an acceptable model of the gathered Church to England and America.’ See also W.R. Estep, The Anabaptist Story, p. 107.
In the next section I describe the growth of Anabaptism in the Netherlands, following Münster, under the guiding hand of Menno Simons. I then consider its subsequent, more liberal offshoot, the Waterlander Mennonites and the emergence of a sect which some authors have identified as a Mennonite offshoot, the Collegiants.

2.3 History, theology and practices of Dutch Anabaptists

It is interesting to note the propensity of Anabaptists, both on the continent of Europe and the later Baptist movement in England, to separate into smaller congregations when disagreements arise within a group. Clasen notes that, in his view, Anabaptism itself was no more than a ‘small separatist movement’, and that by the middle of the sixteenth century that movement itself had split into ‘not less than twenty groups.’ Clasen’s view was that this splintering was to be expected in view of the large geographical area over which Anabaptism was spread and the lack of a hierarchy within the movement to supervise the congregations as a whole.

Nevertheless, Clasen claims that the major groupings within the movement did maintain common views on the baptism of believers, separation from the world, a life of discipleship and the use of ‘the ban’, or excommunication, in order to maintain the purity of the group.

---

During the Münster affair, Hofmann was arrested, although he had no links to the affair, and he died in prison in 1534. It is argued in Chapter 4 below, that the ‘Naylor affair’ had the same affect on the perception of Quakerism in seventeenth-century England that the ‘Münster affair’ had on the perception of Anabaptism in sixteenth-century Europe, and for centuries thereafter.

167 Clasen, *Anabaptism. A Social History*, p. 36. See also James R. Coggins, *John Smyth’s Congregation* (Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1991), p. 150. ‘The final result could be that absurdity, the church with only one member. The proof of this is the example of the Mennonite Jan van Ophoorn of Emden; after being expelled by his church, he ‘excommunicated’ that whole congregaion and established a church ‘without spot or wrinkle’, composed of himself and his wife.’
next consider two influential groups of Anabaptists that took opposing views on discipline and, in particular, the use of ‘the ban.’

### 2.3.1 Mennonites

Menno Simons, after whom the Anabaptist congregation he founded was named, was born in Witmarsum in the Netherlands in 1496.\(^{170}\) During the period of the development of his theology, his brother was one of about 300 Anabaptists executed in 1535, and it was the event of these executions that profoundly influenced Menno.\(^{171}\) Menno was baptised by Obbe Phillips, the brother of Dirk Phillips in about 1537.\(^{172}\) In that same year Menno established his own ‘movement’ or congregation either, as suggested by Barclay of Reigate, in protest against the ‘violent and fanatical party’ led by Thomas Münzer who was prepared to use violence to further his ideas\(^ {173}\) or, as Lumpkin proposed, following the Münster debacle, rather than founding his own congregation, simply gathering together the fragments of the Dutch Anabaptists.\(^ {174}\)

Menno advocated many of the beliefs that had been established by his Anabaptist forebears: no swearing of oaths, no carrying of arms nor waging war, and obeying the civil authorities but only to the extent that does not conflict with ‘the Word of God.’\(^ {175}\) These same beliefs

\(^{170}\) W.R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story*, p. 110. Also see 1.1.2 above in which it was noted that in much academic literature, Menno Simons is referred to as ‘Menno.’ See Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, p. 581.


\(^{172}\) W.R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story*, p. 116. See also 2.2.4 above.


were used as charges against five Mennonites, or followers of Menno, sometime between 1555 and 1561 at Ghent in Belgium.\textsuperscript{176}

Estep maintains that the foundation of Menno’s theology was the interpretation of the Scriptures ‘through Christ.’\textsuperscript{177} This view, I maintain, could be seen at variance with a sentence taken from Menno’s work, \textit{Foundation of Christian Doctrine}. That sentence is ‘The Word is plain and needs no interpretation.’\textsuperscript{178} However, it could be argued that, in this sentence, Menno was using the word ‘Word’ in the same way as Schwenckfeld and Dirk Philips – the ‘Word’ is not the Scriptures but ‘The Son of God.’\textsuperscript{179} Indeed, Menno was following the teachings of the Swiss Anabaptists who declared the Scriptures to be the ‘Outer Word’ with the Holy Spirit being the ‘Inner Word’, and that it was necessary, in understanding the Scriptures, to have ‘inner enlightenment.’ In fact, the Bible remained ‘a dead letter’ without the ‘Inner Word.’\textsuperscript{180}

Menno also held a particular view on the human nature of Christ. Contrary to the then currently held belief, he believed that Christ was ‘a new creation of the Holy Spirit within the body of Mary’ and so did not receive his human form from Mary.\textsuperscript{181} Verhayden confirmed that this view was subsequently held by the Flemish Mennonites and, in common with the

\textsuperscript{176} A.L.E Verhayden, \textit{Anabaptism in Flanders, 1530-1650} (Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1961), pp. 122-124. Verhayden describes these charges as ‘not permitted to swear oaths...all days are equal...need not...believe anything but what is expressly taught or commanded by Holy Scriptures...there is only one person in the Holy Trinity, that is, Jesus Christ.’

\textsuperscript{177} W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 129.


\textsuperscript{179} Walter Klaasen, \textit{Anabaptism in Outline}, p. 36.

\textsuperscript{180} Klaasen, \textit{Anabaptism: A Social History}, p. 121

\textsuperscript{181} W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 120. Underhill noted that the the topic of the flesh of Christ ‘was seldom referred to in his [Menno’s] public teaching.’ Edward Bean Underhill, ed., \textit{Martyrology of the Churches of Christ}, p.308.
early Quakers some one hundred years later, they ‘refrained from going on into theological fine points on this subject.’

Menno established a church discipline, and as a co-author of the Wismar Articles of 1554, placed great emphasis on the use of the ban in order to maintain the purity of the congregations. Although Menno is quoted by Klaasen as saying ‘we do not want to expel any...rather to receive not to amputate, but rather to heal, not to discard but rather to win back’, it was the rigorous use of the ban that, following divisions in his congregation, resulted in 1555 in the breakaway of a less extreme group led by Hans de Ries. This group became known as the ‘Waterlander Mennonites’ or ‘Doopsgezinden.’

Menno’s three main written works were *True Christian Faith*, *Christian Baptism* and *Foundation of Christian Doctrine*, and a comparison of Menno’s works with those of Fox is made in 4.7.2 below. A synopsis of Mennonite beliefs and practices, as set out in another of Menno’s books, *The New Birth*, is:

> ‘Their doctrine is the unadulterated Word of God...Everything that is contrary thereto, they consider accursed. Their baptism they administer to the believing according to the

---

182 A.L.E Verhayden, *Anabaptism in Flanders*, p. 7. See also Robert Friedmann, *The Theology of Anabaptism*, p. 55, ‘Turning to the doctrine of the nature of Christ, we again find among the Anabaptists almost no interest in such speculation.’


186 W.R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story*, p. 123. This group is discussed in 2.3.2 below.

commandment of the Lord...Their Lord’s Supper they celebrate as a memorial...Their ban or excommunication descends on all the proud scorners...until they repent.’\footnote{188}

It is interesting to read Robert Barclay of Reigate’s views on the theology and practices instituted by Menno. ‘We have now seen, that some of the principle points of doctrine and practice, which occupied the mind of [George] Fox were advocated by Menno.’\footnote{189} However, Barclay of Reigate did not suggest that Fox was aware of Menno’s views before he formed his own.

Menno died in 1561 and his position as leader of his congregation was taken by the equally strict disciplinarian, Dirk Philips.\footnote{190}

\subsection*{2.3.2 Waterlander Mennonites (Doopsgezinden)}

During the lifetime of Menno, the congregation that he had established began to fragment, and at the time of his death in 1561 there existed four groups that had been formed from his original congregation.\footnote{191} One of the groups so formed was set up in 1555, some six years before Menno’s death, and was led by Hans de Ries.\footnote{192}

This new group, with its emphasis on reconciliation rather than judgement, took its name from the Waterlander region of the Netherlands situated between Purmerend and Amsterdam.\footnote{193} It was more liberal than the group from which it seceded and it is interesting to

\begin{footnotes}
\item See Walter Klaasen, \textit{Anabaptism in Outline}, p. 110.
\item Robert Barclay, \textit{The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth}, p. 82.
\item W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 122.
\item William L. Lumpkin, \textit{Baptist Confessions of Faith}, pp. 41-44.
\item W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 123.
\end{footnotes}
note that the Waterlanders seceded from the Mennonite congregation only one year after
Menno had introduced the ban in 1554.194

Although no Mennonite Confession of Faith had been prepared during Menno’s lifetime,
Menno had, as described in 2.3.1 above, established a mode of discipline within his
congregation and, in his numerous writings, had promoted his own beliefs. Van der Zijpp
stated that Anabaptists, prior to the emergence of the Mennonites, did not produce any printed
confessions of faith and further suggested that the reason for this was that ‘they did not want
any.’195 However, Waterlander Mennonites did produce a number of written confessions.
These were either personal confessions of individuals or were produced to induce a reunion of
Mennonite groups or union with outside groups.196

The first written and agreed Confession of a Mennonite congregation was that written by the
Waterlanders in 1577 in order to help Mennonite unity.197 One of the authors of this first
Confession was Hans de Ries who produced a subsequent, personal confession in 1578 when
he was in prison in Middleburg.198 De Ries, with his colleague Lubbert Gerrits, was the author
of a further Confession in 1610 which, it is suggested by Dyck, was for the purpose of
unification of the Waterlanders with non-Mennonites.199

---

194 See 2.3.1 above.
197 W.R. Estep, The Anabaptist Story, p. 123. Estep confirms that this Waterlander Confession was the first to be
199 Cornelius J. Dyck, ‘A short confession of faith by Hans de Ries.’ The Mennonite Quarterly Review 38, 1964, p. 6. See also William L. Lumpkin, Baptist Confessions of Faith, pp. 41-43. Finger, in Confessions of Faith in the Anabaptist/Mennonite Tradition records two Confessions of Faith having been drawn up by the Waterlanders and published around this time. He records the first being drawn up in 1577 by ‘five pastors’ of the congregation, and a subsequent one written by de Ries when he was in prison in 1578. Lumpkin also referred to a later Confession published, he maintains, in 1580. Finger also refers to a further Confession, probably written by de Ries and published in 1610 specifically to aid the acceptance of the English Separatists into the Waterlander congregation in 1610, (see 2.4.2.below). Neither Dyck nor van der Zijpp makes reference to the 1580
The 1610 Confession comprised forty Articles. For the purposes of this thesis I first set out below a synopsis of those Articles whose contents can be seen to be similar to early Quaker practices and theologies. I also indicate, in footnotes, similarities and differences between the Articles quoted and corresponding Articles in the two earlier Confessions, the 1577 Confession and the 1578 Confession.

As quoted by Lumpkin:

**Article VII**

‘He did not, therefore, predestinate, ordain or create any one of them that he should be condemned...universal grace...announced and offered...to all creatures and peoples. All who...admit or accept...and are remain...the elect.’

**Article XVI**

‘Through living faith of this kind we acquire...pardon or remission of all our past, as well as present, sins.’

Confession. This confusion of the date of the later confession is explained in the Global Anabaptists Encyclopedia Online. Accessed from www.gameo.org/encyclopedia/contents/M36856.html on 29th March 2010. This article states that the 1580 date had been erroneously quoted in various German and Dutch editions of the Confessions, and that this later Confession was written in 1610, to aid the unification of the Waterlanders with the English Separatists.


201 William L. Lumpkin, Baptist Confessions of Faith, pp. 44-65.

202 These Arminian beliefs are followed through, possibly by means of Thomas Helwys (see 2.4.2 below), to the General Baptists in England (see 3.2.1 below) with whom Fox and some other early Quakers may have had significant contact (see 4.1 below). Predestination is not covered in the 1577 or the 1578 Confessions, although Article VI of the 1577 Confession states ‘We confess also that though He foreknows all things, that which happens is not all His will nor work.’ See ‘Confession of Faith (Waterlander, 1577)’, no page number shown.
Article XX

‘This faith is a most certain cognition or knowledge acquired through the grace of God from the sacred scriptures.’

Article XXIV

‘Such believing and regenerated man...are the true people of God or Church of Jesus Christ in the earth.’

Article XXX

‘Jesus Christ instituted in his church two sacraments..namely Holy Baptism and Holy Supper.’

These ‘sacraments’ are then dealt with in detail in following Articles.

Article XXXI

‘Holy Baptism is an external, visible and evangelical action.’

Article XXXII

‘The whole action of external, visible baptism...testifies and signifies that Jesus Christ baptises internally.’

203 Articles XVI, XX and XXIV therefore propose justification by faith alone, a theological trait of the early Quakers as described by Barclay in his *Apology*. See Robert Barclay, *Apology*, pp. 167-205. ‘The Seventh Proposition – Justification.’ In summary, p. 186, ‘And also where it is said ‘We are justified by faith’ it may be very well understood of being made just’, and p. 198, ‘but faith, which worketh by love, but the new creature, this is that which availleth, which is absolutely necessary.’ These Articles follow the contents of Article XV of the 1577 Confession, ‘proclaiming the blessing of eternal salvation...upon condition of faith’, and Article VI of the 1578 Confession, ‘we...believe salvation and life to come alone through faith in Christ Jesus.’

204 This Article refers to water baptism which early Quakers believed, in line with the Waterlanders, to be ‘figurative’ but unlike the Waterlanders, believed that it was ‘not to continue forever.’ See Robert Barclay, *Apology*, p.344. Both Waterlanders, as part of the Anabaptist tradition, see 2.2.1 above, and Quakers rejected infant baptism as ‘a human tradition.’ See Robert Barclay, *Apology*, p. 344.
Article XXXIII

‘The Holy Supper...is an external...action in which...we partake of bread and wine...all these things are done in commemoration of him.’\textsuperscript{206}

Article XXXVII

There is partial agreement between the Waterlanders and the early Quakers with regard to their views on the scope of civil authorities. Barclay the apologist sets out the Quaker view as ‘Since God hath assumed to himself the power and dominion of the conscience, who alone can rightly instruct and govern it, therefore it is not lawful...to force the consciences of others.’\textsuperscript{207} Article XXXVII of the 1610 Confession expresses this same view, but goes further in refusing to allow any of its members to take up any such civil office because the powers attached to such offices include ‘the waging of war, the destroying of life and property of the enemy.’\textsuperscript{208}

\textsuperscript{205} This Article confirms one of the three baptisms within the Anabaptist tradition; by the Spirit, by water and by fire. See also Walter Klaasen, \textit{Anabaptism in Outline}, p. 162, ‘In several selections we encounter the teaching about the threefold baptism, the inner baptism of the Spirit, water baptism, and the baptism of blood.’ This compares with the one baptism, spiritual, of the early Quakers. See Robert Barclay, \textit{Apology}, pp. 343-344 where there is also reference to baptism by ‘fire’, ‘this baptism is a pure and spiritual thing, to wit, the baptism of the Spirit and by fire.’ It is interesting to note that neither the 1577 nor the 1578 \textit{Confessions} make any reference to the act of baptism by water as an ‘external’ action.

\textsuperscript{206} Robert Barclay, \textit{Apology}, p. 373. Barclay confirmed that, from an early Quaker viewpoint, ‘the breaking of bread by Christ with his disciples was a figure...used in the Church for a time’, and that, p. 374, ‘they cease in such as have obtained the Substance.’ In Article XVII of the 1577 \textit{Confession}, the Lord’s Supper is described as ‘a visible ordinance of ceremony’, and in Article IX of the 1578 Confession as ‘served as Christ taught...in remembrance.’ Again, as with baptism by water, the word ‘external’ was not used in the earlier Confessions.

\textsuperscript{207} Robert Barclay, \textit{Apology}, p. 407.

\textsuperscript{208} William L. Lumpkin, \textit{Baptist Confessions of Faith}, pp. 44 ff. ‘Article XXXVII...hence we withdraw ourselves from such offices and administration.’ This is in line with Article 6 of the Schleitheim Confession 1527, see 2.2.1 above, but goes further than Article XI of the 1578 \textit{Confession} which confirms that secular authorities have no jurisdiction over ‘the church of Christ’ but does not prohibit Christians taking up civil offices, possibly because Article XII of the 1578 \textit{Confession} specifically set out de Ries’ pacifist position. The 1577 \textit{Confession} is totally silent on these subjects.
Article XXXVIII

‘Jesus Christ....has forbidden to Christians every oath and for this reason all oaths are unlawful to the believers of the New Testament.’

I now consider those Articles of the 1610 Confession that appear to be at variance with early Quaker beliefs. Again, as quoted by Lumpkin:

Article XXVI

‘For although every believer is a member of the body of Christ, not everyone is for that reason a teacher, bishop or deacon.’ This view is contrary to the Quaker view as explained by Barclay the apologist.

Article XL

‘Lastly we believe and teach that Jesus Christ...will return from heaven.’ A somewhat different view is taken by Barclay the apologist when he says of the return of Christ ‘this coming is understood of Christ’s last outward coming, and not of his

---

209 The early Quaker view is set out by Fox, in his Journal, p. 244. ‘Swear not at all, but let your communications be yea, yea, and nay, nay.’ It should be noted that the earlier Confessions did allow some swearing of oaths. The 1577 Confession, Article XXIII, ‘all rash oaths are forbidden...However...we permit that one call upon God as witness to the truth’, and Article XIII of the 1578 Confession states ‘Christians may affirm the truth...with such references to the name of God as Paul used when he said, I take God, whom I serve, as my witness.’ Finger states that the 1610 Confession followed the 1580 Confession and totally rejected the taking of oaths. See Thomas Finger, Confessions of Faith in the Anabaptist/Mennonite Tradition.

210 This follows, to some extent, Article V of the Schleitheim Confession which deals with the selection of ‘shepherds in the church of God’, Sattler, The Schleitheim Confession, and to Article XIII of the 1577 Confession which refers to ‘He [God] alone can send the right servants...who will proclaim His holy Word truthfully.’ The 1578 Confession is silent on this subject.

211 Robert Barclay, Apology, p. 230. ‘As by the Light a gift of God...so by the same...every true minister of the Gospel is ordained, prepared and supplied in the work of the ministry...Moreover, who have this authority may and ought to preach the Gospel, though without human commission or literature as, on the other hand, who want the authority of this divine gift, however learned or authorized by the commission of men and churches, are to be esteemed as deceivers and not true ministers of the Gospel.’

212 This same view is implied in both the 1577 and 1578 Confessions.
inward and spiritual: that remains to be proven.213 This latter view appears to follow the view expressed earlier by Grebel that ‘the Messiah had already come.’214

The 1610 Confession makes no reference to the nature of the ‘flesh of Christ’ although both the 1577 and 1578 Confessions refer to Jesus ‘born in her [Mary]...the seed of woman, the seed of Abraham, Issac and Jacob’ and ‘born of the flesh and seed of Abraham and David through the power of the Almighty and the working of the Holy Spirit...became the seed of woman’ respectively. Finger suggests that de Ries’ view was that knowledge of the origin of Christ’s flesh was not necessary for salvation and that, as a result, he was not willing to ‘disrupt brotherly relations’ in arguing this issue.215 Verhayden notes the same attitude taken by the Flemish Mennonites.216 This ‘absence’ is reflected in Barclay’s Apology and is explained by Moore by the early Quaker experience of Christ which ‘led them to blur the distinction between Christ and themselves, [and so it] was difficult to reconcile with a belief in Jesus as a man.’217 This is an issue that would continually follow Quakers and was brought to an inconclusive head in the dispute between the Baptist John Bunyan and the Quaker Edward Burrough in 1656.218

Wright suggests that ‘From about 1580 the Waterlander leaders softened their commitment to pacifist positions. They replaced the oath with a vow...[and] permitted their members to hold government office.’219 However, from the extracts of the 1610 Confession shown above, and comparison with the earlier Confessions, see Articles XXXVII and XXXVIII of the 1610

---

213 Robert Barclay, Apology, p. 401. Moore suggests that ‘Quaker beliefs in the mid 1650s ranged from expectation of the imminent coming of the Day of the Lord to the belief that the Kingdom of God had already come in the spirits of the believers...‘the Kingdom is come and coming’ was the typical Quaker phrase.’ Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences: The Early Quakers in Britain 1646-1666 (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), p. 68.
214 See 2.2.2 above.
215 Thomas Finger, Confessions of Faith in the Anabaptist/Mennonite Tradition.
216 See 2.3.1 above
217 Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 105.
218 Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 105. See also 6.5 below.
Confession above, it appears that, in fact, the Waterlander position on each of these issues hardened over time.\textsuperscript{220}

I return to the part played by the Waterlander Mennonites in the evolution of theology in England in section 2.4.3 when reviewing the contact between them and the early English Baptist congregations in Amsterdam.

\textbf{2.3.3 Collegiants/Remonstrants}

There are contrary views on the birth of the Collegiant movement in the Netherlands. Robert Barclay of Reigate and Rufus Jones referred to them as ‘a branch of the Mennonites’,\textsuperscript{221} but other, more recent authors, such as Fix and Voogt, ascribe their origins to the Dutch Remonstrants of the early seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{222}

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the national Dutch church was splitting in two – an Arminian grouping objecting to the Calvinist beliefs of the Church, known as ‘Remonstants’ in view of the protests they made against the Church, and the Calvinist or ‘Contra Remonstrant’ grouping, that argued for the maintenance of the Calvinist beliefs of the

\textsuperscript{220} There is no reference in either the 1577 or 1578 Confessions to the relationship between Mennonites and the State. The 1610 Confession, Article XXXVII, see above, states ‘Government or the Civil Magistrate is a necessary ordinance of God...show it honour and obedience...we withdraw ourselves from such offices and administration.’ With regard to the swearing of oaths, the 1577 Confession states, Article XXIII, ‘We confess that all rash oaths are are forbidden...we permit that one call upon God as witness to the truth’ and Article XIII of the 1578 Confession states ‘Christians may affirm the truth...with such references to the name of God as Paul used.’ The 1610 Confession takes a much harder line when it states, Article XXXVIII ‘all oaths are unlawful to the believers of the New Testament.’


Church.\textsuperscript{223} Fix describes the Remonstrant grouping as having been born around 1610 professing ‘anticonfessionalism, anticlericalism and freedom of conscience.’\textsuperscript{224} In order to overcome this rift, the civil authorities convened a synod to establish the approved theology within the Dutch church. This synod, held on 13\textsuperscript{th} November 1618, became known as the Synod of Dort,\textsuperscript{225} and it denounced Arminianism within the Dutch church as ‘heretical’ and ‘proclaimed Calvinism’ as its established creed.\textsuperscript{226} This action led to the condemnation of Arminianism and the installment of preachers who adhered to Calvinistic doctrine. Preachers with Arminian beliefs were removed from office, including the professors of Theology at the University of Leyden.\textsuperscript{227}

In all, 200 Remonstrant or Arminian ministers were dismissed.\textsuperscript{228} One of the dismissed ministers was responsible for the congregation in the small village of Warmond. In his absence the congregation, led by one of its elders Gijsbert van der Kodde, a brother of one of the dismissed professors at Leiden University, decided to continue to meet, in informal gatherings or ‘colleges’ without a minister.\textsuperscript{229}

Fix confirms, as is suggested above, that the Collegiants, as these Remonstrants became known, rejected predestination, confessionalism and any rigid doctrine, but favoured


\textsuperscript{224} Andrew C. Fix, \textit{Prophecy and Reason}, p. 33.


\textsuperscript{228} Gernt Voogt, ‘Sixteenth-century roots of the Collegiants’, p. 411. Voogt also states that, of these 200 dismissed ministers, 100 were banished, but he does not state whether they were banished from their neighbourhoods or from the country.

‘theologically tolerant and morally upright religion.’ Voogt states that the Collegiants also practiced adult believer’s baptism by full immersion and total open and free ‘prophesy’ or ministry, a practice that was introduced to the Collegiants by Jan Evertszoon in about 1620. As a result, Collegiants were attractive to Mennonites who, according to Fix, joined them in large numbers. However, Fix suggests that adult baptism, along with pacifism and millenarianism, came across with the Mennonites and were not practiced by Collegiants at their inception. Jones suggested that Collegiants, like the Quakers later in the century, ‘encouraged the custom of silent waiting...as a preparation for ‘openings’.’ Neither Voogt nor Fix refer to this form of silent worship existing as part of Collegiant practices, although all three authors agree that a major influence on Collegiant practices and theology was the writings of Dirk Coornhert (1522-1599).

Coornhert was a friend of the Waterlander leader de Ries and advocated that, in order to avoid ‘the proclamation of speculative truths’, everyone can become a preacher. Like the Waterlanders, Coornhert avoided dealing with contentious issues, such as the virgin birth and the nature of the Trinity. Voogt says of Coornhert that he retained baptism and the Eucharist. However, Jones argued that Coornhert rejected it, per se, as an ecclesiastical ceremony, but retained it solely as a means of fellowship and group worship. Coornhert’s association with de Ries, see Article XXXIII of the 1610 Waterlander Confession above, and

---

230 Andrew C. Fix, Prophecy and Reason, p. 41.
233 Andrew C. Fix, Prophecy and Reason, p. 41.
234 Andrew C. Fix, Prophecy and Reason, p. 41.
235 Andrew C. Fix, Prophecy and Reason, pp. 167-8, and Rufus M. Jones, Spiritual Reformers, p. 115.
240 Rufus M. Jones, Studies in Mystical Religion, p. 116. See 1.2.4 above for definitions of ‘Ordinance’ and ‘Sacrament.’
the attraction of the Collegiants to the Mennonites would suggest that Jones’ view may have been the more correct. Voogt proposes that Coornhert would have preferred to have done away with all ceremonies if that preserved unity within a group, suggesting that Coornhert did not wish to retain the Eucharist with its connotation of transubstantiation.\textsuperscript{241} In fact Jones proposed that Coornhert was critical of reformers for ‘having put far too weighty emphasis on externals.’\textsuperscript{242} Fix is silent on this subject.

Coornhert translated into Dutch the works of Jacob Acontius (c1500-1566), who proposed freedom to prophesy and non-reliance on a pastor as intermediary.\textsuperscript{243} It is likely that these works, therefore, would have been available to the Collegiants and so may have influenced their theology.

The Collegiants expanded from Warmond to nearby Rijnsberg and then later to Leiden, Rotterdam and Amsterdam, and with that geographical expansion came the need for all to meet together, on an annual basis.\textsuperscript{244}

At a much later date, in 1657 and following years, the Quakers came into contact with the Collegiants in Amsterdam. That contact is discussed in Chapter 7.

In the following sections of this chapter I describe the arrival of English religious communities into the Netherlands in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and the contacts that they had with the Dutch religious groups that I have described above.

\textsuperscript{241} Gernt Voogt, ‘Sixteenth-century roots of the Collegiants’, p. 422.
\textsuperscript{242} Rufus M. Jones, \textit{Studies in Mystical Religion}, p. 111.
\textsuperscript{244} Rufus M. Jones, \textit{Studies in Mystical Religion}, pp. 116-117.
2.4 The English in the Netherlands

2.4.1 The Separatists.

Various dates have been put forward for the date from which Separatism, or worship outside the established Church, The Church of England, emerged in England. Coggins sets the date no later than 1581, and Estep puts it as early as 1550. Routley sets the date between these two, specifically at nineteenth of June 1567 at the Plumber’s Hall in London. The reasons for this first separation, according to Routley, were the objection to the use of surplices within the Church and the ‘defiance of the sovereign’s authority to make them conform.’

According to White, members of this first separation considered that ‘membership with the Elizabethan Church of England…[was] little, if at all, better than membership with the Church of Rome itself.’ Routley also refers to a letter from Bishop Grindal to Henry Bullinger which contains reference to a ‘secret church’ in London, but Routley does not specify whether this was the same Plumber’s Hall congregation to which he previously referred. However, Routley does set out three major theological reasons for that congregation’s dissent: the need for a free preaching of the Scriptures, for the sacraments to be delivered without man-made inventions, and freedom from canon law. According to

---

246 W.R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story*, p. 204. Estep states that, around 1550 the two first ‘Separatist conventicles’ existed in Bocking in Essex and Faversham in Kent led by Henry Hart and Humphrey Middleton. The Oxford English Dictionary defines ‘conventicle’ as ‘a secret or unlawful religious meeting, typically of non-conformists.’ This, perhaps, suggests an informal gathering rather than a formal congregation.
249 B.R. White, *The English Separatist Tradition*, p. 27.
250 Erik Routley, *English Religious Dissent*, p. 49. ‘First and foremost, the glorious word and Evangel preached, not in bondage and subjection, but freely and purely. Secondly, to have the sacraments administered purely only...without any tradition or invention of man: and last of all, to have not the filthy canon law.’ Estep, in *The
White, although radicals existed in England at this time, see 3.1.1 below, there is no evidence of direct influence on the emerging Separatists by continental Anabaptists before John Smyth and Thomas Helwys arrived in Amsterdam, see below.\textsuperscript{251}

I now discuss specific, identifiable groups of English Separatists that are shown to have had direct contact with the Dutch Anabaptists.

**Brownists**

Robert Browne (c1550-1633), described by Payne as the ‘father of English Separatism’,\textsuperscript{252} was an ordained cleric in the Church of England but found the ordained ministry ‘a bondage.’\textsuperscript{253} Margaret Spufford describes Browne as ‘the arch-separatist' and records his nine years evangelising in Cambridgeshire and Norfolk.\textsuperscript{254} As a consequence, he was removed from his living in Cambridge during 1580 and moved to Norwich.\textsuperscript{255} With Norwich as his base, he travelled throughout East Anglia and was arrested and imprisoned many times for his Separatist preaching.\textsuperscript{256} In Norwich he met one of his contemporaries from Cambridge, Robert Harrison, and both decided that the only way to pursue the true Reformation was through complete separation from the established Church.\textsuperscript{257} No doubt, having had contact

\textsuperscript{251}B.R. White, \textit{The English Separatist Tradition}, p. 163. White also suggests that, p. 163, ‘The most that can be reasonably argued in this context, is that the Separatist position arose from an appeal to the same Biblical authority and in somewhat similar circumstances to that of the early Anabaptists.’

\textsuperscript{252}Ernest A. Payne, ‘The Anabaptist impact on Western Christendom’, p. 313.

\textsuperscript{253}Erik Routley, \textit{English Religious Dissent}, p. 53. White also states Browne’s opinion that ‘the bishop had no right to appoint pastors and that …each local congregation had that right.’ B.R. White, \textit{The English Separatist Tradition}, p. 46.


\textsuperscript{255}Erik Routley, \textit{English Religious Dissent}, p. 53.


\textsuperscript{257}Erik Routley, \textit{English Religious Dissent}, p. 53.
with the many Dutch merchants living and trading in Norwich and, according to Routley, those Dutch people receiving Browne’s message more eagerly than the native English, Browne decided to move in 1582, with his followers, to Middleburg in the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{258} It is possible that, during his stay in Norwich, some of the Dutch people with whom he came into contact were Mennonites, as at the time that Browne travelled to the Netherlands, in 1581 or 1582, his theology was, according to Estep, dependent on that of the Mennonites. In fact, Estep states, Browne had become ‘addicted to Anabaptist ideas’, except for the ordinance or sacrament of baptism.\textsuperscript{259} Whereas de Vries agrees with Estep,\textsuperscript{260} Payne doubts that Browne met with these Dutch merchants in East Anglia and suggests that Browne may have obtained knowledge of Mennonite theologies from available publications; in Payne’s words, ‘Ideas have wings as well as legs.’\textsuperscript{261} Payne, nevertheless, also argues that contact with Mennonites would have been made whilst Brown and Harrison were at Middleburg,\textsuperscript{262} Scheffer gave no suggestion as to the source of Browne’s Mennonite knowledge.\textsuperscript{263} Whilst at Middleburg, Browne and Harrison met an English Puritan, Cartwright and, after initially joining his congregation, Browne then decided to form a congregation of his own.\textsuperscript{264} According to Clark, there was dissention between Browne and Harrison.\textsuperscript{265} Perhaps this

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{258} Erik Routley, \textit{English Religious Dissent}, p. 54. B.R. White, \textit{The English Separatist Tradition}, p. 49. Browne and Harrison’s followers attracted the name of Brownists, particularly by their opponents. It should be noted that Clark in \textit{History of Non-conformity}, p. 179, suggests that the first group of Brownists travelled to the Netherlands in 1581 under the care of Harrison, to be followed by Brown having been freed from one of his periods of incarceration.
\textsuperscript{259} W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, pp. 202 and 207.
\textsuperscript{260} Tiemen de Vries, \textit{Holland’s influence on English Language and Literature} (Chicago: C. Grentzback, 1916), p. 263.
\textsuperscript{261} Ernest A. Payne, ‘The Anabaptist impact on Western Christendom’, p. 313.
\textsuperscript{262} Ernest A. Payne, ‘The Anabaptist impact on Western Christendom’, p. 313.
\textsuperscript{263} J de Hoop Scheffer, \textit{History of Free Churchmen called Brownist, Pilgrim Fathers and Baptists in the Dutch Republic 1581-1701} (Ed William Elliott Griffiths. Ithica, New York: Andrus & Church, no date shown, but Biographical Notice dated 1921), p. 8. Scheffer agrees that Browne acquired his theological views from the Mennonites, but gives no explanation as to how or where he learned of them.
\textsuperscript{264} Erik Routley, \textit{English Religious Dissent}, p. 54. Routley refers only to ‘ex-Professor Cartwright’, giving no further information on his identity.
\end{flushleft}
‘unease’, as described by Routley, was because Browne found it difficult to accept a role subordinate to Harrison in the same way as Browne had experienced difficulty when joining with Cartwright. Following his break with Harrison, the congregation is then reported to have turned against Browne, resulting in Browne’s return to England. In Browne’s words, ‘Instead of one Pope there, I found a thousand.’ The congregation remaining in Middleburg continued in the care of Harrison and, according to Clark ‘dying with him [Harrison]...in 1594.’ It is reported that some Brownists moved from Middleburg to Amsterdam and Leiden, but Routley does not confirm whether this was before or after Harrison’s death in 1594. Fix suggests that a Brownist congregation settled near Warmold in the Netherlands and was still in existence as late as 1609.

On Browne’s return to England in 1585, he recanted his Separatist views and in 1591 took up again priestly duties in the Church of England. However, he appears not to have completely given up his Separatist views as he was arrested and imprisoned in 1632 for preaching to a dissenting congregation. Browne died in Northampton jail in 1633.

I now examine another group of Separatists leaving England for the Netherlands at about the same time as the Brownists.

---

266 Erik Routley, *English Religious Dissent*, p. 55. See also p. 54. ‘[Browne] finding it difficult to remain subordinate for long even to such a leader as Cartwright.’
270 Erik Routley, *English Religious Dissent*, p. 77. ‘Leyden, Middleburg and Amsterdam had cheerfully received the exiled Brownists...leading teacher was Henry Ainsworth...who became minister to the exiles in Amsterdam in 1596.’
271 Andrew C. Fix, *Prophecy and Reason*, p. 167. Although there is no further reference to this congregation, it could have been influential in the establishment of a Collegiant congregation in the same small village in 1618. Also see 2.3.3 above.
273 Erik Routley, *English Religious Dissent*, p. 55. White writes that, at this time, Browne ‘affirmed that the magistrates had authority over individual church members as citizens of the State but ‘to compel religion...belongeth not to them’.” B.R. White, *The English Separatist Tradition*, p. 59.
The Ancient Church

About five years after Browne left England for the Netherlands, another Separatist congregation was established in London. This was established under the joint leadership of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow and became known as the ‘Ancient Church of English Separatists’ or simply the ‘Ancient Church.’ Clark is uncertain as to whether the Ancient Church was founded or was pre-existing and so ‘found’ by Greenwood in 1587 during a preaching journey in Essex. In 1591, the Ancient Church published a covenant, which was closely mirrored by the later covenant agreed by John Smyth’s Separatist congregation in Gainsborough in about 1606.

It appeared to the authorities that it was easier to exile Separatists than to suppress them and so the Conventicle Act, introduced in 1593, decreed that Separatists, when found, were to be banished and if found having returned to England, were to be executed. However, Greenwood and Barrow were not banished; they were arrested as Separatists and executed at Tyburn in 1593. Shortly after these executions, the members of the Ancient Church fled to the Netherlands, with the greater part settling in Amsterdam. Estep records that a part of this group settled at Campen and that by 1594 it had, effectively, become Anabaptist.

---

277 Henry W. Clark, History of Non-conformity, p. 182.
278 James R. Coggins, John Smyth’s Congregation, p. 34. The 1591 Ancient Church covenant, as quoted by Coggins, reads: ‘Wee doe willinglie joynge together to live as the Churches of Christe...To this ende wee doe promise henceforth to keep what soever Christe our Lorde hath commanded us, as it shall please him by his holie spirit out of his worde to give knowledge thereof and abilitie there unto.’ The John Smyth congregation is discussed in 2.4.2 below.
279 Henry W. Clark, History of Non-conformity, p. 185.
282 W.R. Estep, The Anabaptist Story, p. 209. ‘Once in Holland, some of the Barrowists evidently were influenced by the Mennonites to adopt believer’s baptism.’ Henoch Clapham, as quoted by Estep, then describes how this event caused a schism in the Barrowist congregation resulting in the ‘Anabaptist’ grouping being ‘excommunicated by the rest.’
Clark writes that the Amsterdam Ancient Church was to have a long history and under the leadership of Francis Johnson, subscribed to ideals established by Barrow. Nevertheless a degree of internal dispute was evident. This is exemplified by the disagreement with an exiled group of Independents from England under the leadership of John Robinson. The Robinson group, called ‘The Pilgrim Church’, left England in 1608 and met with the Ancient Church in Amsterdam. As a result of internal undisclosed ‘disturbances’ within the Ancient Church, the Robinson group moved on to Leiden. Coggins records that a later division within the Ancient Church led to some of its members moving to Leiden and joining John Robinson’s congregation.

Coggins records that the Ancient Church issued many publications, some of which were read in England, but that, according to Clark, none of its members, nor any of the Robinson congregation, returned to England.

The Ancient Church in the Netherlands declined during the latter years of Johnson’s leadership probably, according to White, as a result of the move towards Anabaptism of ‘Johnson’s own disciple, John Smyth,’ but continued in existence until 1701, at which time it was absorbed into the English Presbyterian church.

At about the time of the existence of the Ancient Church in Amsterdam, another group of one-time Separatists had set up an English Church under the leadership of John Paget. This congregation, the English Reformed Church in Amsterdam, was officially part of the Dutch

---

284 See 2.4.2 below
286 James R. Coggins, John Smyth’s Congregation, p. 60.
287 James R. Coggins, John Smyth’s Congregation, p. 34.
288 Henry W. Clark, History of Non-conformity, p. 187
290 Henry W. Clark, History of Non-conformity, p. 186.
In her book, Alice Carter makes no reference to members of this Church having had any meaningful contact with Anabaptist congregations or with other English separatist groups.

In the next section I consider the arrival in the Netherlands of John Smyth, a colleague in England of John Robinson, who had considerable contact with the Waterlander Mennonites in Amsterdam.

2.4.2 English ‘Baptists’ in the Netherlands

In 1602 John Smyth, an ordained priest of the Church of England and the city lecturer at the city of Lincoln, was dismissed from his position for reasons, according to Estep, that were ‘political.’ Whilst Smyth was at Cambridge between 1594 and 1598, he was identified as part of the Puritan grouping there but was not deemed a Separatist at that time. Sometime after his dismissal from Lincoln, Smyth moved to Gainsborough and again fell foul of the Church authorities for preaching without a license. After discussing the state of the Church of England with his followers and considering whether to seek the advice of the pastor of the Ancient Church in Amsterdam, Smyth decided, during 1606/7, to establish his own Separatist congregation in Gainsborough.

294 James R. Coggins, *John Smyth’s Congregation*, p. 32. Coggins further suggests, p. 34, that if Smyth did visit Amsterdam at this time he could have brought back with him the 1591 Covenant of the Ancient Church (see 2.4.1 above). See also John Smyth, *Parallels, Censures, Observations. Apercteyning to Three Separate Writings* (No publishing information shown, Printed 1609), p. 34. This tract was issued in 1609 at a time when Smyth was at Gainsborough, but illustrates Smyth’s belief in an inner baptism, ‘true profession of the true faith and true baptism is discerned & judged to be inwardly called.’ This suggests that, prior to writing this tract Smyth had
Four years after the establishment of this Separatist Church, a second Church, an offshoot of the Gainsborough Church, was formed in Scrooby under the guidance of its minister John Robinson. As with the other Separatist Churches, following persecution from the State, both the Gainsborough and Scrooby congregations moved to Amsterdam, the former possibly in 1607 and the latter in 1608. There is some uncertainty as to whether, on arriving in Amsterdam and coming into contact with the Ancient Church there, Smyth’s congregation formally joined that Church. According to Coggins, there was initially a degree of theological consensus between the two but divisions soon began to emerge. These divisions related to Smyth’s views on the use of books within worship, his belief that the Calvinist basis for the structure of the pastorate in Ancient Church was wrong, and that the church should only receive income from its membership.

As a result of this disagreement, Robinson and about 100 others in the Smyth congregation, whose views largely coincided with those of the Ancient Church, moved to Leiden. This split left approximately 150 members with Smyth who, at about this time, moved his congregation into a bakehouse in Amsterdam rented from a Mennonite, Jan Munter. This suggests, as proposed by Wright and Dyck, some form of contact between Smyth and the

been in contact with religious groups based in the Netherlands. White states that the organisation of the Gainsborough and Scrooby congregations followed that of Johnson’s Ancient Church in Amsterdam. B.R. White, *The English Separatist Tradition*, p. 124.

297 Henry W. Clark, *History of Non-conformity*, p. 188.
298 Henry W. Clark, *History of Non-conformity*, p. 188. Coggins, *John Smyth’s Congregation*, p. 48 records that some early historians had suggested that a formal joining did take place, only for the Smyth congregation to leave at a later date, but that later historians had declared that the earlier historians were incorrect, and that no unification had taken place.
299 James R. Coggins, *John Smyth’s Congregation*, p.50. Smyth’s view was that ‘human’ books, including translations of the Scriptures, were out of place in worship.
Mennonites, or Waterlander Mennonites, soon after Smyth’s arrival in the Netherlands but, White states, ‘his [Smyth] contact with them was not a very close one.’\textsuperscript{302} This contact could have had some influence on persuading Smyth that ‘only believers should be baptized and that infants could not believe’, and that ‘the validity of baptism in the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches [was denied] and insisted that converts from these churches be rebaptized.’\textsuperscript{303} Sometime during 1609 Smyth baptized himself as, according to Wright, he had not been sufficiently convinced that the Waterlander Mennonite Church was a valid church with the authority to exercise believer’s baptism.\textsuperscript{304} After baptizing himself, Smyth then baptized the whole of his congregation.\textsuperscript{305} This action is similar to that taken by the first Anabaptists in 1525.\textsuperscript{306} Although there is no evidence that Smyth was aware of the same action taken by Grebel in 1525, it is reasonable to assume that Grebel’s story would have been communicated to Smyth by means of his contacts with the Ancient Church, or more likely the Waterlander Mennonites. Estep suggests, however, that Smyth may have arrived at his position on believer’s baptism solely from his reading of the Scriptures.\textsuperscript{307}

Over a period of time, Smyth’s views tended towards those of the Waterlanders. This resulted in him doubting the efficacy of his self-baptism and asking the Waterlanders for admission to their Church.\textsuperscript{308} Estep suggests that by the time of this application, Smyth had led his congregation into acceptance of Arminianism, he had accepted the whole of Waterlander

\textsuperscript{302} Stephen Wright, \textit{The Early English Baptists}, p. 34. Cornelius J. Dyck, ‘A short confession of faith by Hans de Ries’, p. 7. ‘Actually Smyth’s knowledge of Anabaptism must have been minimal for it was only after contact with Jan Munter, a Mennonite from whom he rented a meeting hall, that he began to question the validity of his self-baptism.’ B.R. White, \textit{The English Separatist Tradition}, p. 134. See also Keith Sprunger and Mary Sprunger, ‘The Church in the Bakehouse’, p. 228. ‘Munter and the Amsterdam Mennonite congregation ‘welcomed’ the Smythites and established them in the Bakehouse as a fraternal act.’

\textsuperscript{303} James R. Coggins, \textit{John Smyth’s Congregation}, pp. 61-62.

\textsuperscript{304} Stephen Wright, \textit{The Early English Baptists}, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{305} James R. Coggins, \textit{John Smyth’s Congregation}, p. 62.

\textsuperscript{306} See 2.2.1 above.

\textsuperscript{307} W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 213.

\textsuperscript{308} W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 214.
 theology, and had recognised the Waterlander Church as ‘the true church.’ As stated in 2.3.2 above, Dyck states that the Waterlander Confession of 1610 was written ‘with the express purpose of exploring common ground with non-Mennonites.’

One member of Smyth’s congregation, baptized by Smyth, was Thomas Helwys. According to Estep, as a result of Smyth’s application to the Waterlanders, a grouping within the Smyth congregation, led by Helwys and John Murton, split away, excommunicated Smyth and wrote a letter of protest to the Waterlanders. Whereas Estep suggests that the split between Smyth and Helwys occurred after Smyth’s application to the Waterlanders, Coggins claims that the split had occurred at an earlier date as a result of Smyth’s altered opinion on the authority of the Waterlander’s baptism and Smyth’s acceptance of the Waterlander Church as a true church. White asserts that, along with Smyth, Helwys did accept the Waterlander Church as a true church, but saw no reason not to exist as a separate church even though a ‘true Church already existed.’ It is also interesting to note three other differences in views between Smyth and Helwys. Firstly, Smyth accepted the Mennonite belief that Christ’s flesh came from heaven whereas Helwys’ view was that Christ took the

---

311 Helwys and Smyth had known each other in England since about 1606 with Helwys travelling to Amsterdam sometime in 1607, shortly after Smyth’s departure from England. Stephen Wright, ‘Helwys, Thomas (c.1575–c.1614)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004) [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12880, accessed 14 Sept 2012]. See also W.R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story*, p. 212. Estep quotes from a letter, dated 1617, written by John Robinson of this action taken by Smyth, ‘Mr. Smith, Mr. Helw: & the rest...came together to erect a new Ch: by Baptism; unto which they ascribe no great virtue...And after some streyning of courtesy, who should begin...Mr Smith baptized first himself, & next Mr Helwis, & so the rest.’
312 W.R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story*, p. 215. See also James R. Coggins, *John Smyth’s Congregation*, p. 77. At the time of the split with Smyth, it is reported that Helwys maintained ‘cordial relations’; at least for a short time, with the Waterlanders. Stephen Wright, ‘Helwys, Thomas (c.1575–c.1614.)’
flesh of Mary. Secondly, Helwys, unlike the Mennonites, did not reject the taking of oaths and thirdly, Helwys did not object to a closer relationship between the State and the church than had been proposed by the Mennonites.

Following Smyth’s excommunication, Helwys and Murton returned to England in about 1611 and established their own congregation separate from the Calvinist Particular Baptists. Coggins records that whereas Smyth’s application to merge his congregation into that of the Waterlanders was made in 1610, the application was not accepted until 1615, three years after Smyth’s death. This did not mean that negotiations to join took place over the whole five year period. During the interim, Smyth’s congregation occasionally worshipped with the Waterlanders. However, as Coggins records, ‘Under the strain of hardship and bitter division, some seem to have dropped out of the Smyth congregation’ and those remaining with Smyth continued to meet separately in the bakehouse.

After Smyth’s death, a number of his congregation applied again for membership of the Waterlander Church. According to the minutes of the Waterlanders, written by one of its preachers, Reynier Wybrands, this application was made on 6th November 1614, and it is further recorded by Wybrands that applications by five of them were accepted on 21st

---

317 W.R. Estep, *The Anabaptist Story*, pp. 217-218. See also 2.3.1 above.
322 Memoriel van de handelingen bij de Dienaren voor Reynier Wybrantzen, ‘B’. Transcribed from the original by Frank Mertens and Peter van der Lee, folio 13 r. ‘Den 6ou Nouemb[er] is geaccordeert bij de Dienaren de saecke der Engelschen en haer v[er]soeck om metter Gemeente te v[er]eenigen den br[oder]s de naestcomende sondach voor te stellen, en haer daerop 14 dagen offe 3 weeken haer beraet te geuen.’
December 1614. It is also recorded that the applications by approximately a further thirty were accepted on 20th January 1615. It is interesting to note that Memoriael ‘A’ records the baptism, by Hans de Ries on 1st January 1614 of ‘Maritien Jans’ an English widow from the bakehouse. This would suggest that Jans was baptized, presumably following an individual application, almost one year before the bulk acceptances of the Smyth congregation.

Sprunger claims that the remnants of the bakehouse congregation occasionally applied for membership with the Waterlanders, and were granted membership some with and others without the requirement for re-baptism. The separate bakehouse congregation had ceased to exist by the 1640s.

2.5 Chapter summary

In Chapter 2 I have discussed the beliefs, thinking and publications of those pre-Reformation radicals that bear similarities with those of the later Continental Anabaptists and English Quakers. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the early Quakers had any knowledge of the earlier radicals’ work. And so as suggested by Payne, and inferred by Martensen, the

---

324 Memoriael van de handelingen bij de Gemeente voor Reynier Wybrantzen, ‘A’. Transcribed from the original by Frank Mertens and Peter van der Lee. Folio 12v. The names of those accepted are shown as Swithune Grindall, Thomas Odell, Anthoni Thomassen and Lijsbetie his wife and Thomas Huijberson.
325 Memoriael ‘B’, folio 13v. See also Keith Sprunger and Mary Sprunger, ‘The Church in the Bakehouse’, p. 235. ‘But in 1615 the English merged with the Waterlander Mennonites...at which point the Waterlanders took control of the Bakehouse congregation. It became the ‘English section’ (Engelsche afdeeling) of the Waterlander church.’
326 Memoriael ‘A’, folio 8v.
327 Keith L. Sprunger, ‘English Puritans and Anabaptists in Early Seventeenth-Century Amsterdam.’ The Mennonite Quarterly Review 46, no. 2, April 1972, p. 121. See also See also Keith Sprunger and Mary Sprunger, ‘The Church in the Bakehouse’, p. 255. ‘After 1640 the English members were so well assimilated into the flow of Amsterdam life they were hardly recognizable...they became ‘wholly Dutchified’.’
route of the ideas from the continental radicals to Quakers may not have been direct but
indirect, via the European Anabaptists and the English Baptists. 328

Chapter 2 continued to review the birth of European Anabaptism in Switzerland in 1525, its
expansion into Germany, including an overview of the events at Münster in 1534, and then to
the Netherlands. In this latter country I investigated the beliefs and practices of the
Mennonites, the Waterlander Mennonites and the Collegiants. The first two groups, it was
shown, had substantial contact with the Separatists who left England at the end of the
sixteenth century to escape persecution, some of whom subsequently returned to England to
set up separatist ‘Baptist’ congregations.

In Chapter 3 I investigate the development and growth of those Baptist congregations in
England in the early seventeenth century where direct contact with the Dutch Mennonites is
established. In particular I consider the development of the two branches of English Baptism
with which, as shown in Chapter 4, the early Quakers had considerable contact.

328 Ernest A. Payne, ‘The Anabaptist impact on Western Christendom’ in Ed. Guy F Hershberger, The Recovery
of the Anabaptist Vision: A sixtieth anniversary tribute to Harold S. Bender (Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald
Press, 1957), p. 314. ‘The early English Baptists, however, provided only one of the many bridges by which the
ideas of the continental radicals passed over into Britain and into the new lands across the Atlantic...Behind the
Quakers, for example, stand the English representatives of the Seekers and Familists, groups whose spiritual
ancestry carries us back to Schwenckfeld, Denk and Müntzer.’ See also Martensen, Jacob Boehme (1575-1624),
p.2. ‘Although Boehme’s doctrine...found no slight echo even beyond the limits of Germany e.g. in England,
when the unfortunate Charles I was greatly interested in it...it has never become the foundation of a religious
sect.’
In Chapter 2, I charted those beliefs and practices that emerged in continental Europe that are similar to the beliefs and practices of the early English Quakers. I also highlighted the contacts that were made in the Netherlands between the Waterlander Mennonites and those English Separatists that found refuge in the Netherlands. That contact was shown to have had a significant impact on the theological direction taken by those Separatists who remained in the Netherlands and on the beliefs of the Separatist, Thomas Helwys, who returned to England from the Netherlands in 1611.

In this chapter I consider the timeline of the emergence in England of those sects that have been associated with the birth of Quakerism. The aim is to place Quakerism within the religious context of the time. In particular, in 3.2, I review the growth of the various Baptist congregations in England from about 1611, with particular reference to the congregation established by Thomas Helwys following his return from the Netherlands. This review is particularly important in this thesis because of the many and close contacts between some influential early Quakers and established Baptist congregations in England.  

3.1 Timelines in England

In this section I outline, in chronological order, the background to a selection of non-conformist sects and congregations that preceded Quakerism in England. Because of the main

---

1 See 5.3 and 5.4 below.
focus of this thesis, the groups and congregations reviewed are those whose origins can be traced back to Continental Europe and those where elements of their theologies can be traced as filtering into early Quakerism.

3.1.1 Anabaptists

Although it is difficult to trace the flow of Anabaptist thought into England,\(^2\) Punshon maintains that elements of their ‘radical’ theologies can be traced arriving in England and possibly influencing the early Quakers.\(^3\)

The earliest date ascribed to the arrival of Anabaptism in England is around 1521. De Vries refers to the arrival of Dutch refugees, ‘most of whom were Anabaptists’, following the 1521 edict of Worms.\(^4\) This date is substantiated by the reported introduction, and widespread circulation, of an unnamed Anabaptist book in England sometime before 1530.\(^5\) By 1532 a group of English and ‘Flemish’ men, described as ‘Anabaptists’ was discovered in London,\(^6\) and John Foxe records the persecution of Dutch Anabaptists during 1533 and the execution of ten of them in ‘sundry places’ in 1535.\(^7\) Horst states that the ‘heresies’ of the Anabaptists


\(^3\) John Punshon, *Portrait in Grey: A short history of the Quakers* (London: Quaker Books, 1984), p. 26: ‘What is remarkable about them [the European Anabaptists] is the close similarity between some of the ideas they put forward and the message later preached by the Quakers. In Hans Denck (c1500-1527) and Sebastian Franck (c.1499-c.1542), for example...we can observe a preoccupation with certain themes which certainly antedated, may well have influenced, and arguably even caused, Quakerism to take the course it actually did.’


\(^7\) John Fox [sic], *The Second Volume of the Ecclesiastical History Containing the Acts and Monuments of Martyrs* (Printed for the Company of Stationers, London, 1641), p. 325. Underhill recorded two proclamations having been issued by Henry VIII in 1534 against ‘Baptists and followers of Zuingle [sic].’ Edward Bean Underhill, ed., *Martyrology of the Churches of Christ commonly called Baptists during the era of the*
were proclaimed to the English populace in March 1535, the same year in which the city of Münster was retaken by the State authorities and its Anabaptist inhabitants executed.

By 1540 some Anabaptist beliefs were listed in English State documents. These beliefs were recorded as including: baptism of believers and not children, refusal to accept civil office, not swearing oaths, Christ not existing as a physical person and the common ownership of goods.

In the mid sixteenth century Anabaptism in England was not collectively organised, resulting in banishment notices being issued only in the names of individuals and families. Organised groups or congregations, according to Davies, were not established in England until 1612.

It is difficult, when reading English publications of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, to be certain whether any reference to ‘Anabaptist’ in England refers to any particular congregation or individual linked to the continental Anabaptists. Routley suggests that the term was applied to any grouping that shared a ‘violently enthusiastic temper’, presumably referring to those continental Anabaptists that took possession of the city of Münster.

---

9 See 2.2.4 above. It is possible that news of this event had reached England with the Dutch merchants and so encouraged the English authorities to consider all Anabaptists as subversives. Braithwaite records that in about 1538 there was a specific policy of the State to ‘repress and utterly extinguish these [Anabaptist] people.’ William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1923), p. 5.
10 Irvin Buckwalter Horst, *The Radical Brethren*, pp. 91-92. Horst records that these beliefs were recorded in a general pardon issued by Henry VIII in July 1540.
12 Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*, p. 337. The date quoted by Davies is approximately the same year that Helwys returned to England from the Netherlands and set up the first General Baptist Congregation. See 3.2.1 below. It is possible therefore that Davies was confusing the continental Anabaptists with the English Baptists.
Katherine Firth asserts that, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the term ‘Anabaptist’ was used, when not specifically referring to the sects that practiced adult baptism, to refer to any grouping that was deemed to be a threat to the State or to public order.¹⁴ Ernest A. Payne reiterates this opinion, as a result again, perhaps, of the violent events in Münster in Germany,¹⁵ and Erik Routley supports this view when he writes: ‘Anabaptists is a compendious term for a number of sixteenth-century movements on the Continent which shared a violent enthusiastic temper and a reformed piety which was at some points virtually revolutionary.’¹⁶

It is seen, in 6.4 below, that a similar view was taken of Quakers in the mid seventeenth century. It was common, during the seventeenth century, for tracts to be issued against non-conformist sects, and for those sects to be grouped together for condemnation. An example is the tract of 1660 by Richard Blome entitled The Fanatick History or an exact Relation and Account of the Old Anabaptists and New Quakers.¹⁷ An earlier tract, issued in 1653, specifically linked Quakers with ‘the Turbulent Exorcists of Germany’ and likened George Fox to David George of Delft.¹⁸ As a result of such tracts, Quakers issued their own tracts,

---

¹⁸ Francis Higginson, A Brief Relation of the Irreligion of the Northern Quakers (London: Printed by TR for HR at the signe [unreadable] in Pauls Church-yard, 1653), p. 20. ‘But where are such ungodly Murtherous Fasts as these prescribed in the Word? David George of Delfe, a blasphemous imposter, whom George Fox resembles as much as one Egge another.’ David George or Joris was a ‘spiritual’ Anabaptist who was ‘the most significant leader’ of Anabaptists during a short period following the Münster affair and who made apocalyptic prophesies. Stuart Murray, The Naked Anabaptist: The Bare Essentials of a Radical Faith (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2011), pp. 128-129.
either to refute those allegations or, as in the case of Edward Burrough in 1656,\(^1^9\) to distance themselves from Anabaptists and their ways.\(^2^0\) This topic is developed in 6.5 below where there is an analysis of tracts written by Quakers and non-Quakers of 1650s and 1660s as well as a review of distinctly anti-Quaker tracts of the same period.

Hill writes that the term ‘Anabaptist’ although well defined and used in continental Europe was more loosely applied in England.\(^2^1\) It is interesting to note that, in confirmation of Hill’s view, the second Confession of Faith of the seven Particular Baptist congregations in London, dated 1646, states that the seven congregations are ‘commonly (but unjustly) called Anabaptists.’\(^2^2\) This same wording was used in the first confession written by the General Baptists fourteen years later in 1660.\(^2^3\) This distancing of the Particular Baptist and the General Baptist congregations from the English or Continental Anabaptists could have been because, as Firth says, ‘To many, the term ‘anabaptist’ was one that could be used to describe any person who preached social or civil disruption’, a view confirmed by Underwood.\(^2^4\) Hill writes that the term ‘Anabaptist’ was used to define extremists of all colours,\(^2^5\) something from which, I suggest, the embryonic Baptist churches would wish to be dissociated.\(^2^6\)

---


\(^2^0\) See 6.5 below.


\(^2^2\) No author shown, *A Confession of Faith of Seven Congregations or Churches of Christ in London* (London printed by Mark Simmons and are to be sold by John Hancock in Popes-head Alley. 1646). No author is shown, but the Confession is signed on behalf of the seven London congregations and on behalf of one French congregation. See 3.2 below.

\(^2^3\) A Brief Confession or Declaration of Faith set forth by many of us who are (falsely) called Ana-baptists. (Printed by C.D. for F Smith at the Elephant and Castle, near Temple-Barr, 1660).


\(^2^6\) It is interesting to note that, even in more modern times, authors have given a confused message with regard to Anabaptists in England. Despite the evidence, as shown above, of the existence of continental Anabaptists in England from as early as 1521, Rufus Jones, in 1923, described the Anabaptists in England as ‘more properly named General Baptists.’ Rufus M. Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1923), p.
This grouping together of ‘extremists of all colours’ can be seen in publications of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A 1551 publication by William Turner contains an example of a broad grouping of ‘extremists.’ In that publication, Turner referred to the ‘monster of our tymes’ and likened it to the one body and seven heads of the Hydra, the seven heads consisting of ‘Anabaptists, Adamites, Loykemistes [sic], Libertines, Swengfeldianes, Davidianes [or Familists], and the Spoylers.’

A similar, but a more reasoned example is the tract written by Richard Blome. In that single tract he set out, and argued against the beliefs of both the Anabaptists and Quakers and, whilst not comparing the two groups directly, Blome set out what he believes to be their respective eccentric behaviours: the Quakers ‘show their tongues to be set on fire of Hell, railing, cursing and blaspheming’ and the Anabaptists ‘ride naked upon sticks and hobby horses like children.’

A similar anti-Anabaptist tract had been issued in 1645 by an anonymous author. As with the Blome tract, this earlier tract set out some of the specific beliefs of Anabaptists, described as ‘ten priviledges’, some of which are accurate, e.g. ‘free from all oaths’, ‘will not kill’ and ‘all the goods...and any of the Congregation have is in common to all’, and others purely scaremongering, e.g. ‘No man is to lye with his brothers wife, whilst her husband is in presence, except hee be fast asleep, or dead drunk.’

---

396. See 3.2 below and the desire of the English Baptists to distance themselves from the Continental Anabaptists.


3.1.2 Familists

The Family of Love, or Familists, was founded in the 1540s in the Netherlands by Hendrik Niclaes. Niclaes was born in Münster in 1502, but moved to Amsterdam in 1530, and so is unlikely to have had first hand experience of the ‘Münster affair’ in 1534/5. According to Jones, Niclaes was a ‘questioning child’ and, like Böhme at about the same time, he had visions, but unlike Böhme, his account of these visions were possibly written down by him some years after he had received them. According to Marsh, Niclaes’ beliefs were: a profound inward theology, an ‘implanting of God and human where the individual became ‘godded with god’’, acceptance or knowledge of one’s own sins and not, as was suggested by their detractors that, as they were free of sin, they were free to commit sins in the future. Jones suggested that Niclaes stressed the need for spiritual, rather than water baptism.

Although Wootten states that the Familists believed that they were without sin and were divine, both Jones and Marsh wrote that Niclaes questioned whether sin had been destroyed.

---

34 See 2.2.3 above.
37 Christopher W. Marsh, The Family of Love in English Society, 1550-1630 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 19-22. See also David R. Como, Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2004), p. 39 where Como describes Familist belief as ‘the faithful had been ‘Christed with Christ and Godded with God.’ By virtue of their union with Christ, believers were returned to a state of prelapsarian perfection and were…free from the Law and sin.’
with Christ’s death. Marsh also suggests that Niclaes’ views came from two sources: Sebastian Franck and the Dutch Anabaptist, Melchior Hofmann.

Familism was brought to England in the 1570s by Christopher Vittels, a disciple of Niclaes, and although, as claimed by Marsh, it was difficult to translate Niclaes’ ideas into English, by 1575 Niclaes’ texts were available in English in England. In 1585, according to Marsh, the Familist message was being preached in Wisbech in Cambridgeshire by John Bourne and Spufford asserts that Familism flourished in the same areas in England in the 1570s as Quakerism in the 1650s.

Jones claimed that the English Familists lacked any system or method as a group and, according to Marsh, they kept no membership records. In line with Niclaes’ own views, they conformed outwardly to the established Church. They continued to attend Church of England services and as a result they were ‘a rather elusive phenomenon.’ Although they knew each other, they were difficult to identify by outsiders. It is possible that these (in)actions were a means to maintain anonymity and personal safety in England. Marsh describes their meetings

---

41 Christopher W. Marsh, *The Family of Love in English Society*, p. 28. See also 2.1.2 above for reference to Franck’s suggested influence on Jacob Böhme. Marsh suggests, p. 28, that Niclaes’ ideas on spiritual regeneration, followed by adult baptism, came from those propounded earlier by Melchior Hoffmann
48 Christopher W. Marsh, *The Family of Love in English Society*, p. 29 and p. 100.
as ‘small scale’ and usually consisting of ‘an exchange of ideas between individuals and households.’

Several authors have quoted those Familist beliefs that were later taken up by the early Quakers; Barclay of Reigate referred to the Familist belief, ‘That those that be doctors or learned cannot preach the word truly because Christ sayeth it is hidden from the wise and prudent’, and ‘That the Bible is not the Word of God…but ink and paper.’

Gwyn confirms Barclay of Reigate’s reference to the university educated when he writes: ‘Familists taught …that university education does not itself equip a person to interpret Scripture.’

Reay confirms the Familist view of the Bible as described by Barclay of Reigate, and that Familists believed that ‘the spirit was above the Bible.’

Reay then claims that, according to Familists, ‘Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Judgement were all internal spiritual stages on the road to perfection.’

Smith writes that the Familists ‘challenged predestination theology’, and Gurney sets out the Familist beliefs of the common holding of goods within the community and the rejection of an outward heaven and hell. Gurney further suggests that these beliefs may have been a confused fusion of Familist and Anabaptist ideas that were held by the populace of the time.

---

49 Christopher W. Marsh, *The Family of Love in English Society*, p. 89.
52 Barry Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (London: Temple Smith, 1985), p. 13. Hill agrees with the views set out above and in particular quotes the Familist belief that ‘The dead letter is not the Word, but Christ is the Word.’ Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down*, p. 185. Hill ascribes this statement to John Everard, an English Familist who also confirmed, see p. 264, that ‘university knowledge’ was inferior to the experience of those who ‘know Jesus Christ experimentally.’
54 Nigel Smith, *Perfection Proclaimed*, p. 4.
56 John Gurney, *Brave Community*, p. 96.
Wootten writes that, following the arrival of Familism into England in the 1570s, Familism then fragmented with some offshoots continuing to exist up to the 1620s. It is difficult to accept this assertion of fragmentation when one considers the lack of methodology within English Familism, as described above. However, even if Wootten’s statement is correct, then it would be most unlikely that the early Quakers would have had direct contact with Familists.

Nickalls confirms George Fox possessing one of Niclaes’ books, 

Speculum Justitia. Durnbaugh quotes Henry Cadbury’s belief that Fox had possessed Niclaes’ books, The Looking Glass of Righteousness from which, according to Durnbaugh, Cadbury suggested, that Fox found some of his ideas. However, this claim by Durnbaugh is misleading as he omits some vital words from the Cadbury article. Cadbury had confirmed that Fox had possessed the Niclaes book, but that it was ‘(in German),’ and as stated by Nickalls, ‘he [Fox] cannot have read the volume himself, but if he used it must have made use of a translator.’ In addition, Cadbury wrote that ‘I think he [Fox] also subsequently found them

---

57 David Wootten, ‘The Family of Love in England, 1555-1687.’ See also Francis Freeman, Light Vanquishes Darkness (London: No publisher information given. Printed in the year 1650), p. 1 where Freeman appears to rank sectaries of the day, with Seekers at the top, but ‘Seekers are at a stand...yet they know that there is something above these forms...then shall they be of that rich family of love.’ If Freeman’s final comment was referring to Familists then that would suggest that Familists still existed in England as late as 1650.

58 John N. Nickalls, ‘George Fox’s Library.’ Journal of the Friends Historical Society 28, 1931, p. 4. See also 5.2.3 below.

59 Donald F. Durnbaugh, ‘Baptists and Quakers – Left Wing Puritans.’ Quaker History 62, no. 2, Autumn 1973, p. 80. See also Richard Bailey, ‘New Light on George Fox and Early Quakerism: The Making and Unmaking of a God’ in Michael Mullett, Ed., New Light on George Fox 1624-1681 (San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1992), p. 244 where Bailey records words of Henry More in 1675 ‘hope that Quakers were now emerging from ‘that low beginning of an heartless and hopeless Familism’”, and p. 246, when Bailey refers to Lady Conway’s concern to clear Quakers ‘of the charge of Familism.’ Neither of these statements would suggest any direct contact between Familists and Quakers, more likely, in my view, a linking together of ‘fanatical sects.’ In More’s own words, ‘For though the depth of the Mystery of Familisme, and I doubt of Quakerism too, be that which every good Christian ought from his very heart to detest and abhorre.’ H. More, An Explanation of the Grand Mystery of Godliness (London: Printed by J. Fisher, for W. Morden Bookseller in Cambridge, 1660), p. xi.

60 Henry J. Cadbury, ‘An Obscure Chapter of Quaker History.’ The Journal of Religion 24, no. 3, July 1944, (reprinted for private circulation), p. 203. ‘How otherwise shall we account for the presence in Fox’s limited library of the Looking Glass of Righteousness by Henry Nicholas [sic] (in German).’

[his religious ideas] in pre-Quaker writers like Boehme.'\(^62\) This statement by Cadbury makes no direct reference to Niclaes and suggests that Fox found similar ideas to his own in pre-Quaker writers, but only 'subsequently, i.e. after Fox had firmed up his own theology. Although Nickalls and Durnbaugh are likely to be referring to the same Niclaes book Durnbaugh, by adopting the English translation of its title, and omitting some words used by Cadbury, places greater emphasis on the place of this book in the development of Quaker theology.\(^63\)

Hill suggests that Familist belief: ‘only the spirit of God within the believer can properly understand the Scriptures’, was adopted by the early Quakers.\(^64\) However this same view had been propounded some six hundred years earlier by Hildegarde in continental Europe who received ‘a fiery light of exceeding brilliance’ which ‘gave her immediate knowledge and the meaning of the Bible’,\(^65\) and in the early fifteenth century in England by Walter Hilton, ‘The mystery of holy Scriptures is closed...without his [Jesus or the Holy Spirit] love and his leave, no one may come in.’\(^66\) This same view was expressed, in the early sixteenth century in the Netherlands in Menno Simons’ belief in the interpretation of the Scriptures ‘through Christ.’\(^67\)

Although there is agreement between some of the beliefs of Familists and those of the early Quakers, there is no evidence to show that those beliefs were transferred from one to the other, either through direct contact between the two groups or by the reading of Familist books by Quakers. Payne refers to the link between the early Quakers and the Familists, but

\(^63\) A simple translation of the Latin title, ‘Speculum Justiia’ is ‘Mirror of Justice.’
\(^64\) Christopher Hill, The World Turned Upside Down, pp. 94-95.
\(^67\) W.R. Estep, The Anabaptist Story (Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1963), p. 129. See also 2.3.1 above.
only by reference to a common ‘spiritual ancestry’: the post-reformation mystics and the Dutch Anabaptists.\textsuperscript{68}

3.1.3 Baptists

In 3.2 below I describe, in detail, the birth and evolution of the Baptist congregations in England. In this section, in order to maintain the chronology of events, I give an overview of their emergence.

The beginning of the separatist movement in England can be traced to Robert Browne in around 1580, followed by the establishment of other separatist congregations in London, led by Greenwood and Barrow in 1586, and in Gainsborough by Smyth in 1598. At the time of the existence of these separatist congregations in England, adult believer baptism was not practiced, but it would have been observed taking place in the Netherlands during the exile of a number of the Separatists.\textsuperscript{69}

The ideas returning to England with a number of exiles resulted in the setting up of two distinct streams of English Baptists.\textsuperscript{70}

The first branch of Baptism was established on the return to England of Thomas Helwys and John Murton in 1611. Both Helwys and Murton had undergone adult believers’ baptism at the hands of John Smyth when they were in the Netherlands, and the congregation that they

\textsuperscript{68} Ernest A. Payne, ‘The Anabaptist impact on Western Christendom’, p. 314. ‘Behind the Quakers, for example, stand the English representatives of the Seekers and Familists, groups whose spiritual ancestry carries us back to Schwenckfeld, Denk and Müntzer.’

\textsuperscript{69} See 2.4.1 above.

\textsuperscript{70} See 3.2 below.
subsequently set up in London is the first recorded English Baptist congregation.\textsuperscript{71} Barclay of Reigate also recorded that the beliefs of this first congregation ‘coincided in all the views of the Waterlander Mennonites’,\textsuperscript{72} although Estep records that Helwys did not object to the taking of oaths, nor to the link between the church and the state.\textsuperscript{73}

The second branch did not emerge immediately as a Baptist congregation. Tolmie argues that in 1616, a puritan clergyman, Henry Jacob, returned to England from exile in Middleburg and established an ‘Independent’, not ‘Separatist’, puritan congregation in London.\textsuperscript{74} It is recorded that the sympathies of this congregation were ‘rather with the Puritans within the Church of England, than with either of these [Ancient Church and Helwys’ Baptist congregation].’\textsuperscript{75} After Jacob’s death in 1624, separatists within the congregation pressed for total separation from the Church of England.\textsuperscript{76} From that time onwards, the congregation split into many offshoots, some remaining Independents, some Separatists and others adopting adult believer’s baptism.\textsuperscript{77} One of these congregations had adopted adult believer’s baptism and retained contact with the Collegiants in the Netherlands. It sent one of its members,

\begin{footnotes}
\item[71] Robert Barclay, \textit{The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth}, pp. 72-73. ‘The first Baptist (non-immersionist) church formed in London by Helwys.’ It should be noted that an anonymous author of the article ‘The Jacob-Jessey Church, 1616-1678.’ in \textit{Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society}, 1, 1908-09, p. 246, wrote that the establishment of the first Baptist congregation by Helwys took place in 1609. This date is contradictory to the date given by authoritative writers.
\item[76] Murray Tolmie, \textit{The Triumph of the Saints}, p. 16.
\item[77] Murray Tolmie, \textit{The Triumph of the Saints}, p. 20. Wright suggests that up to 1644 the only grouping together of congregations was based on a common mechanism for the formation of a church or congregation, and not along theological lines. Stephen Wright, \textit{The Early English Baptists. 1603-1649} (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), p. 110.
\end{footnotes}
Richard Blunt, to the Netherlands in 1641 in order to discuss with the Collegiants baptism by full immersion, at that time a practice unknown in England.\footnote{Stephen Wright, \textit{The Early English Baptists}, p. 103. William L. Lumpkin, \textit{Baptist Confessions of Faith} (Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1959), p. 143. ‘No English Christians were known to practice believers baptism by immersion.’ For the existing method of baptism see Horton Davies, \textit{Worship and Theology in England}, p. 338, ‘Helwys made believer’s Baptism, by sprinkling or pouring.’ See also 3.2.4 below.}

In 3.2 below, I discuss the theologies of these two groupings of Baptists and, in Chapter 5 I establish the contacts that were made by members of these two groups with the early Quakers. In particular, in 4.4 below, I investigate the link between George Fox and a Baptist congregation in London in 1644/5 as a result of Fox visiting his uncle, ‘one Pickering, a Baptist.’\footnote{George Fox, \textit{The Journal of George Fox}, ed. John L. Nickalls. (London: Cambridge University Press, 1952; reprinted Philadelphia and London: Philadelphia and Britain Yearly Meetings of the Religious Society of Friends, 2005), p. 4.}

\section*{3.1.4 Seekers and Ranters}

The Seekers and the Ranters are two of the many non-conformist religious groups that existed during the seventeenth century and whose existence overlapped that of the Quakers. It is claimed that members of both of these groups had contact with the early Quakers and that many early Quakers had been Seekers.\footnote{Barry Reay, \textit{The Quakers and the English Revolution}, p. 17. See also 5.3 and 5.4 below.} Hill suggested that they may have had an influence on nacent Quakerism when he asserted that ‘they [Seekers] may bridge the gap between Familism and Quakerism.’\footnote{Christopher Hill, \textit{The World Turned Upside Down}, p. 77.} Gwyn goes further and suggests that ‘the Quaker movement was the major convergence among English Seekers’, a view supported by Peters.\footnote{Douglas Gwyn, \textit{Seekers Found}, p. 10. Kate Peters, \textit{Print Culture and the Early Quakers} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 1-2, ‘The genesis of the Quaker movement consisted of the linking up of puritan sects and Seeker congregations across Yorkshire, Lancashire and Westmorland.’ It is possible that Fox’s vision on Pendle Hill in 1652 of ‘a great people to be gathered’ was his image of the waiting Seekers group referred to by Gwyn. George Fox, \textit{The Journal}, p. 104.}
Anne Baines describes the Seekers as a group trying ‘to discover the will of God by waiting in silence’ but, perhaps more correctly, Brinton described them as a disillusioned people, not finding any satisfaction with any of the churches, congregations or sects that existed at the time and so ‘waited silently in small groups for a new revelation.’ William Penn, in his Preface to Fox’s *Journal* described them as having ‘left them and all visible churches and Societies, and Wandered up and down as Sheep without a Shepherd...but could not find Him...These people were called Seekers by some and the Family of Love by others.’ However, there is no confirmation that any early significant Quaker, prior to becoming Seekers, had any meaningful contact with Baptist congregations.

It is difficult to decide whether Ranters existed as a unified group or, as in the case of Seekers, as individuals expressing similar views to each other. Hill suggests that it is doubtful whether a Ranter organization existed at all in the sixteenth century and that the name came into existence as a term of abuse, a view expressed most strongly by Davis. Jones agreed that no Ranter organisation or sect existed and that, in common with Seekers, Ranters were ‘more a

---

85 George Fox, *A Journal or Historical Account of the Life, Travels, Sufferings, Christian Experiences and Labour of Love in the Work of the Ministry of that Ancient, Eminent and faithful Servant of Jesus Christ, George Fox, The First Volume* (London: Printed for Thomas Northcott in George-Yard, in Lombard Street, MDCXCIV), Preface by William Penn, 7th and 8th pages. It is possible that in writing this, Penn was not speaking from personal knowledge, as at Quakerism’s beginning in 1652, Penn would only have been eight years old. *Quaker Faith and Practice, The book of Christian discipline of the Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) in Britain.* London: The Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) in Britain, 1999, p. 654.
86 See 5.3 and 5.4 below for information on the religious backgrounds to the prominent early Quakers.
87 Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down,* p. 203. Davis’ opinions are that Ranters ‘existed rather as a projection of the fears and anxieties of a broader society’, that ‘the basis of its [Ranterism] manufacture was severely limited to a handful of printers, publishers and their hack writers’ resulting in the populace ‘taking much of the sensational literature seriously’ with the objective of ‘illustrat[ing] …the dangers of religious toleration.’ J.C. Davis, *Fear, Myth and History: The Ranters and the historians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. x, 109, 6 and 123 respectively. This view is supported by Peters but Davis’ opinions were dismissed during a personal communication with Ariel Hessayon, a doctoral candidate under the supervision of Davis. Hessayon believes that the formulation of Davis’ views was based on investigating too narrow a selection of available contemporary literature. See also Kate Peters, *Print Culture and the Early Quakers,* p. 96.
tendency than a sect’, a view confirmed by Gwyn. Routley describes Ranters as a group that ‘denied outright the authority of Scripture, Christ, the Creeds and the Ministry’ and only relied on ‘individual conscience.’ Routley then identifies ‘conscience’ with ‘Inner Light’, but he does not state whether this term was familiar to Ranters or whether it is his own usage. McGregor writes that, according to Ranters, ‘All acts were inspired by God’, and as a consequence, in the view of the Ranter Laurence Clarkson, ‘Sin...hath its conception only in the imagination.’

It had been claimed that Quakers had either been in contact with, or even were the same as Ranters. This was denied by the Quaker James Parnell in 1655, although William Penn, in his Preface to Fox’s Journal, wrote of a Ranter wing within Quakerism. As in the case of the Seekers, see above, there is no documented evidence of a Baptist background to any known and confirmed Ranter.

---

90 Erik Routley, *English Religious Dissent*, p. 95. In later years, Quakers would use the word ‘light’ in many ways including the use of ‘the light in your conscience.’ Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Consciences: The Early Quakers in Britain, 1646-1666* (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), p. 81. See also George Fox, *Journal*, p. 16. Quotation from Fox dated by him as 1647: ‘And they that walk in this light’ and ‘These things were opened to me in the light.’
93 James Parnell, *A Shield of the Truth or The Truth of God cleared from Scandalls and Reproaches cast upon it* (London: Printed for Giles Calvert, and are to be sold at his shop at the Black Spread-Eagle at the West end of Pauls, 1655), p. 39. ‘We [Quakers] are accused to be one with the Ranters. I answer, it is false.’ Davis suggests that the identification of Ranters with Quakers by Baptists was a means of ‘control and discipline and the policing of moral boundaries’, and that ‘For John Bunyan, Ranters and drunkards were almost always associated with Quakers; a useful stick with which to beat a detested foe.’ J.C. Davis, *Fear, Myth and History*, pp.89 and 92.
94 George Fox, *A Journal of the Life, Travels, Sufferings, Christian Experiences and Labour of Love of George Fox* (London: Friends’ Tracts Association, 1891), p. xlix. Preface by William Penn: ‘They would have had every man independent, that as he had the principle in himself, he should only stand and fall to that, and no-body else.’
3.1.5 Levellers

It is more accurate to describe the Levellers as a political sect rather than a religious movement although Davis posits that religion was a primary influence on them and that it was from Christianity that they drew their intellectual inspiration despite, according to Foxley, their anti-clerical and anti-scholastic views. Woolrych notes that in early 1647, ‘The Levellers had made a few converts in the [Parliamentarian] army’ and that later that year the Levellers made a positive move to promote their ideas within five or six regiments in that army. Bell records that the three most prominent Leveller leaders were ‘close to the London Baptist congregations but that this relationship ended with Baptists then becoming openly critical of the Levellers.’ Gwyn describes the Levellers as demanding ‘wider suffrage’ and ‘an end to the enclosure...of common land by the wealthy’ and Foxley describes their ‘politics of active citizenship’, a view supported by Gleissner, whereas Hill describes the Levellers as


98 Douglas Gwyn, Apocalypse of the Word, p. 17. Rachel Foxley, ‘The wilderness of Tropes and Figures’, p. 276. Richard A. Gleissner, ‘The Levellers and Natural Law: The Putney Debates of 1647.’ Journal of British Studies 20, no. 1, Autumn 1980, p. 76. ‘The Levellers had proposed...the enfranchisement of all freeborn Englishmen over the age of twenty-one who were not servants, and regardless of property holdings.’ In support of this assertion, Gleissner quotes the Leveller, Richard Overton in his tract An Arrow Against all Tyrants, in which Overton wrote, p. 3, ‘To every Individual in nature, is given an individual property by nature, not to be invaded or usurped by any’, and p. 5, ‘For by nature we are the sons of Adam, and from him have legitimately derived a natural propriety, right and freedome, which only we require.’ Richard Overton, An Arrow Against All Tyrants (Printed at the backside of the Cyclopian Mountains by Martin Claw-Clergy, Printer to the reverend Assembly of Divines and are to be sould at the signe of the Subjets Liberty, right opposite to persecuting Court, 1646).
reflecting ‘agrarian communist ideas...reinforced by Anabaptist theories.’ If Hill is correct in his description then it is possible that these ‘communistic’ ideas were transferred from Münster to England, and to the nascent Leveller community, by Richard Overton. Sprunger posits that the Richard Overton who applied for membership of the Waterlander Mennonites congregation in 1615 was the same Richard Overton who later became a Leveller in England, and as a result ‘provided a link between Amsterdam Anabaptism and radical English politics.’

Barbour asserts that the early Quakers were often accused of being Levellers despite not taking part in any of the Levellers protests or agitations. Barbour further states that most of the Leveller leaders were ‘ardent Baptists.’ Smith notes a link between a leading Leveller, John Lilburne, and the Netherlands. Smith asserts that Lilburne studied puritan writings when he was a youngster and was imprisoned on many occasions for his anti-establishment tracts. In 1651 he was banished to the Netherlands, returning to England sometime before

---

99 Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down*, p. 114. This would certainly be true if one identified ‘Anabaptist’ ideas with the actions at Münster which were not supported by the majority of European Anabaptists, see 2.2.4 above. Although not described by Hill, it is likely that one of the Anabaptist principles he refers to is, as stated by Foxley, ‘the self-authentication of scripture through the operation of the Holy Spirit.’ See 2.2.3 above and Rachel Foxley, ‘The wilderness of Tropes and Figures’, p. 274. Davis writes that two of the beliefs held by Levellers were those of a freedom of conscience and that magistrates had no authority in matters of religion – two of the beliefs propounded by Continental Anabaptists. See J.C. Davis, ‘The Levellers and Christianity’, pp. 243 and 247. Also see Article 6 of the Schleitheim Confession, 2.2.2 above.

100 Keith L. Sprunger, ‘English Puritans and Anabaptists in Early Seventeenth-Century Amsterdam.’ *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 46, no. 2, April 1972, p. 122. Sprunger quotes No. 1353, Doopsgezind Archief, Amsterdam, as evidence of Overton’s application for membership of the Waterlander Mennonites in 1615. However, there is no reference to an ‘Overton’, or similar name, applying for such membership contained in Reynier Wybrandtz, *Memoriael van de handelingen bij de Gemeenke voor Reynier Wybrantzen, ‘A’ 1612-1641*. The original is held at the StadsArchief, Amsterdam and this researcher used a transcription from the original by Frank Mertens and Peter van der Lee at the University of Amsterdam. See Chapter 7 for the relevance of this document which, according to Sprunger’s article, was also known to him.


103 A typical tract was John Lilburne, *An Agreement of the Free People of England Tendered as a Peace-Offering to this distressed nation* (London: Printed for Gyles Calvert at the black spread-Eagle at the West end of Pauls. No date shown, but shown as written on 30th April 1649). This tract was written by imprisoned Levellers, and proposed a new, democratic structure to Parliament with the power to enact new laws but that, p. 5, ‘it shall not be in the power... to punish... any person or persons for refusing to answer to questions against themselves in Criminall cases.’
1655. It is possible that Lilburne’s stay in the Netherlands at this time may have influenced his theology, however it would have been too late to influence his Leveller activities, as the Leveller movement ended in 1649 at Burford. It is noted by Boulton that Lilburne became a Quaker in 1656 ‘shortly before his death.’ According to Gwyn, the more extreme Levellers became Diggers, a movement that came to the fore in around 1649.

3.1.6 Diggers

According to Hill, the aim of the Diggers, who initially called themselves ‘True Levellers’, was to promote the Leveller ideas of opening up common land to all by occupying that common land. The Diggers’ first action, taken at St George’s Hill, near Walton-on-Thames in April 1649, was digging up the ‘waste land’ there as a symbol of the public ownership of common land. This ‘digging community’ was followed by others in Northamptonshire, Kent, Buckinghamshire, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, Bedfordshire, Leicestershire, Gloucestershire and as far north as Nottinghamshire. Because of the dispersal of these communes, each was unable to call for help, particularly financial, from

---

105 Boulton records that in 1656, shortly after Lilburne’s return from the Netherlands, he briefly became a Quaker, but Moore writes that ‘he died before he could have had any real influence on the movement.’ See David Boulton, *Gerrard Winstanley and the republic of heaven* (Dent, Cumbria: Dales Historical Monographs, 1999), p. 109 and Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Consciences*, p. 33.
other communes, and as a result the movement, from about 1650, declined and finally disappeared in 1651/2.

Gerrard [or Gerard] Winstanley, a Digger leader along with John Everard, saw that ‘Jesus Christ was the Head Leveller’ and wished to progress from the freeing up of common land to the turning over of church and crown property to the poor. In his early life Winstanley worshipped in a parish church and at some later date joined a Baptist congregation, possibly a Particular Baptist congregation as he had ‘gon through the ordinance of dipping.’

Winstanley then rejected the preaching of paid ministers and described members of such congregations as ‘those that worship Christ at a distance…the most bitterest enemies to the ministration of Christ in Spirit and in truth.’ In a number of respects, Winstanley held theological views which were very similar to those of the early Quakers. Winstanley wrote of ‘a God within himself’ and that ‘Priests…tell people that they must be content with their poverty, and they shall have their heaven hereafter.’ Again, in common with the Quakers, Winstanley objected to the view that clergy had a monopoly of interpreting the Bible and

112 Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down*, p. 126
115 Thomas N. Corns, Ann Hughes and David Lowenstein, eds., *The Complete Works of Gerrard Winstanley*, p. 52. See also Gerrard Winstanley, *Truth Lifting up its head above Scandals* (London: Printed in the year 1649. No other publishing information shown), p. 65 (incorrectly shown as p. 68). See also 3.2.4 below.
116 Thomas N. Corns, Ann Hughes and David Lowenstein, eds., *The Complete Works of Gerrard Winstanley*, p. 51. See also Gerrard Winstanley, *The New Law of Righteousness* (London: Printed for G. Calvert and are to be sold at the black-spread-Eagle at the West end of Pauls, 1649), p. 12. During a time of worshipping within a congregation, Winstanley describes his experience as having ‘worshipped a God, but I neither knew who he was nor where he was, so that I lived in the dark, being blinded by the imagination of my flesh.’ Gerrard Winstanley, *The Saints Paradise or, The Fathers Teaching* (London: Printed for G. Calvert and are to be sold at the black-spread-Eagle at the West end of Pauls, no date [EEBO sets the date of publication as 1648]), first printed page of text.
118 Gerrard Winstanley, *The Saints Paradise*, p. 89. Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down*, pp. 140-141. See also Hilary Hinds, *George Fox and Early Quaker Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), p. 19. ‘The Digger, Gerrard Winstanley…was in 1649 already conceiving of the divine as an inward illumination…Theologically, therefore, Quakerism stood on ground already well-trodden by both earlier and contemporary radical religious groups.’
rejected the ordinances of the church. In addition, he had a view similar to the Quakers and the Familists with regard to the interpretation of Scriptures, ‘The Scriptures were not appointed for a rule to walk by without the spirit’, but Quakers did not share his beliefs on the evils of holding private property. In common with the later behaviour of Quakers, Winstanley refused to remove his hat to a ‘fellow creature.’ It is possible that Winstanley’s views were transmitted to the early Quakers. Hill suggests that Quakers adopted Winstanley’s phrase ‘the children of light’ but recognises the fact that that phrase was also used by Familists. There is a recorded meeting in about 1654 between Winstanley and the Quakers Edward Burrough and Francis Howgill, and Gwyn records that Winstanley attended Quaker meetings in London during 1654. Nevertheless, it is recorded that Winstanley, after his ‘Digging’ days and attending the Quaker meetings in London, undertook civil and church offices in his village which reflect some level of status within his community. It is not certain whether he became a Quaker, although a Gerrard Winstanley, ‘Quaker and corn

119 Christopher Hill, The World Turned Upside Down, pp. 261-262. Gerrard Winstanley, The Saints Paradise, pp. 16-17, ‘God…let me see that I rested first upon outward helps and means, and such as you call Ordinances, though I thought not so, but was offended at any that told me I rested thereupon.’ It is interesting to note that Gurney writes of Winstanley’s contact with Baptists and that at some ‘unspecified date gone through the ‘ordinance of dipping.’ John Gurney, Brave Community: The Digger movement in the English Revolution (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), p. 95
120 Gerrard Winstanley, Truth Lifting up its head above Scandals, p. 66, ‘I owne the Scripture and Ordinances of God in the spiritual power of them,’ See also 3.1.2 above and Christopher Hill, The World Turned Upside Down, pp. 261-262. Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 64.
123 David Boulton, Gerrard Winstanley, p. 103. ‘In a letter to Margaret Fell, undated but apparently sent in August of that year [1654] Burrough wrote: ‘Wilstandley says he believes we are sent to perfect that worke which fell in their hands hee hath bene with us.’ It is the only apparent reference to Winstanley so far found (by historian Barry Reay)...though it could mean no more than that he had passed the time of day with Burrough and Howgill, seems more likely to imply that Winstanley had attended at least one Quaker meeting in London.’ Douglas Gwyn, Seekers Found, p. 150.
chandler’ who died in 1676 had a Quaker burial.\footnote{See David Boulton, Gerrard Winstanley, p. 104, where Boulton notes that the burial of Gerrard Winstanley is recorded by the Quakers’ Westminster Monthly Meeting. See also R.B. Schlatter, ‘WINSTANLEY, Gerrard (c. 1609-1676?)’ in ed. Richard L. Greaves & Robert Zaller, Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century (Brighton, Harvester Press. 1983). Vol. 3, p. 330. Gurney writes, ‘The significance of Winstanley’s burial by the Quakers has often been questioned by scholars since evidence of his active involvement in the Society of Friends was thought to be lacking.’ John Gurney, Brave Community, p. 221.} Uncertainty on the identity of the Gerrard Winstanley who underwent a Quaker burial exists as little is known of the Digger Winstanley’s life after 1660.\footnote{R.B. Schlatter, ‘WINSTANLEY, Gerrard (c. 1609-1676?)’, p. 330.} Based on research undertaken by James Alsop, Hill writes, ‘I think, that the man who died a Quaker in 1676 was our Gerrard Winstanley.’\footnote{Christopher Hill, ‘The Religion of Gerrard Winstanley’, p. 50.} In Alsop’s first publication of his research he states, ‘Everything points to the conclusion that there was only one Gerrard Winstanley’, and ‘Hence it is not unreasonable to maintain that Winstanley adopted Quakerism.’\footnote{James Alsop, ‘Gerrard Winstanley’s later life.’ Past and Present, 82, February 1979, p. 77 and p. 81.} In a later publication of Alsop, he writes, ‘Even if Quakerism was for Winstanley merely the best possible alternative in the 1670s...his silence as a writer may indicate a lack of wholehearted commitment.’\footnote{James Alsop, ‘Gerrard Winstanley: Religion and Respectability.’ The Historical Journal, 28, no. 3, September 1985, p. 708. In this article, Alsop further suggests that, in order to avoid Winstanley’s burial within the established church, his second wife Elizabeth, ‘who was closer to the Quakers than her husband’ arranged for the Quaker burial. James Alsop, ‘Gerrard Winstanley: Religion and Respectability’, p. 708. See also Thomas N. Corans, Ann Hughes and David Lowenstein, eds., The Complete Works of Gerrard Winstanley, p. 23 where Elizabeth is described as ‘clearly a committed Quaker.’ Gurney records that a number of Diggers did become Quakers. Those named by Gurney are Nathaniel Yates of Kingston and Uriah Worthington of Surrey. He also asserts that a number of ‘other Surrey Diggers’ and at least one of ‘the Iver Diggers’ may have become Quakers. John Gurney, Brave Community, pp. 131, 134 and 187.} Hill suggests that any Digger influence on the emerging Quaker theology may have been intentionally suppressed by the early Quaker writers.\footnote{Christopher Hill, The World Turned Upside Down, p. 128. ‘It has been pointed out that much of the evidence for early Quaker history from those midland counties in which there were Digger settlements or Digger sympathizers was suppressed or ignored when the Quaker First Publishers of Truth was compiled. Mr Hudson speculates that this may have been to remove traces of of Digger influence.’}
3.1.7 Fifth Monarchy Men

The Fifth Monarchists were, according to B.S. Capp, ‘a political and religious sect, expecting the imminent Kingdom of Christ on earth’, an idea that came to the fore with the breaking out of the English Civil War in 1642 and the execution of Charles II, ‘making way for King Jesus.’ Moore asserts that most of the Fifth Monarchists were ‘Calvinists with Baptist origins’ and Braithwaite noted that they originated amongst the Baptists. In confirmation of this, Capp records early Fifth Monarchy men as the Calvinist Particular Baptist, William Kiffin, and a Baptist Minister, James Troppe. Capp also notes that the Independent, Henry Jessey, was a lecturer at Fifth Monarchist meetings. Bell writes that the majority of the Fifth Monarchists accepted the Baptist practice of believer’s baptism and that they made concerted efforts to recruit from Baptist congregations, with some recruits coming from Presbyterian congregations.

Braithwate recorded that following the 1661 Fifth Monarchy uprising in London, despite an earlier declaration by Quakers to distance themselves from the Fifth Monarchists, there followed ‘the most wholesale of all imprisonments of unoffending Quakers.’ There are documented meetings between Quakers and Fifth Monarchists. George Fox, in his Journal,

---

134 Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, p. 59. See 3.2.4 below: ‘The Jacob-Lathrop Jessey congregations and the Particular Baptists.’ Capp also records that of the 233 Fifth Monarchists whose occupations were known, 34 were identified as ‘ministers’ with no religious denomination associated to them. In Appendix I, pp. 239-270, Capp lists the names of 245 known Fifth Monarchists, of which 35 are shown as being ‘Baptist.’ Capp records two Fifth Monarchs being executed in 1660 as regisides and a further twenty executed in 1664 following a Fifth Monarchy rising in Yorkshire in 1663. See Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, p. 196 and pp. 209-210.
135 Mark Bell, ‘Freedom to form’, p. 196. A report issued in May 1658 by John Cooke, who was sent by Sir John Copleston to observe the occurrences at a Particular Baptist meeting in Dorchester, states ‘amongst other things there debated, a great contest arise aboute there joyninge with fifth monarchy men, but for that time not concluded by reason of captaine Kiffin’s opposing it.’ Ed. B.R. White, *Association Records of the Particular Baptists of England, Wales and Ireland to 1660* (London: The Baptist Historical Society, 1971), pp. 96-97.
136 Moore, *The Light in their Consciences*, p. 72.
records meeting the Fifth Monarchists Richard Overton in 1652\textsuperscript{138} and John Wigan in 1658 and again in 1664 whilst in prison in Lancaster Castle.\textsuperscript{139} Fox also records that in 1661, ‘And many...disputes we had with...other sects as...Fifth Monarchy Men’,\textsuperscript{140} and Moore writes of a debate between Richard Goodenough, ‘a Fifth Monarchist’ and the Quaker Edward Burrough.\textsuperscript{141}

Capp suggests that, by 1672, disillusioned with the non-appearance of the Millenium, a number of Fifth Monarchists became Quakers, but he does not quote any names.\textsuperscript{142}

None of these contacts with Fifth Monarchists would suggest any degree of positive influence by them on the early Quakers who ‘did not care to class themselves with fringe bodies such as...Fifth Monarchists.’\textsuperscript{143}

3.2 The Baptists in England

3.2.1 Introduction

In 3.1.3 above, I gave a timeline of the birth of the Baptist movement in England and a brief outline of the emergence of its two branches. In this section I consider the development of each separate branch of Baptism in more detail. This is essential in the context of this thesis for two reasons.

\textsuperscript{138} George Fox, \textit{The Journal}, p. 92. ‘And...came to Colonel Overton’s house and had a great meeting.’ Note 1, by Nickalls on the same page notes that ‘Richard Overton was imbued with Fifth Monarchism.’ Capp writes that Overton was ‘One of the most prominent 5\textsuperscript{th} Monarchists.’ Capp, \textit{The Fifth Monarchy Men}, p. 256. See also 3.1.5 regarding the ‘Leveller’ background of Overton.

\textsuperscript{139} George Fox, \textit{The Journal}, p. 351 and p. 471. See also Moore, \textit{The Light in their Consciences}, p. 97.

\textsuperscript{140} George Fox, \textit{The Journal}, p. 419.

\textsuperscript{141} Moore, \textit{The Light in their Consciences}, p. 94. It is noted that Capp does not record the name of Richard Goodenough in his list of Fifth Monarchists. Capp, \textit{The Fifth Monarchy Men}, pp. 239-270.

\textsuperscript{142} Capp, \textit{The Fifth Monarchy Men}, p. 233. On p. 253, Capp records the name of ‘Rice Jones’ as being a Fifth Monarchist. See 4.6.3 below.

\textsuperscript{143} Moore, \textit{The Light in their Consciences}, p. 217.
1. In Chapter 5 below I establish the contacts that were made between Baptists and Quakers in the mid seventeenth century. It is necessary, in advance of that chapter, to understand the theologies underlying the Baptist groupings at this time in order to identify those elements that can be traced as transferring to the Baptists from the continental Anabaptists, and those elements that can be traced as subsequently appearing in early Quaker theology.

2. The theologies of the two general groupings of Baptists in the seventeenth century had some similarities, but also some very significant differences. As will be shown in Chapter 5 below, available documents do not identify with any certainty the Baptist groupings with which the early Quakers had contact. However it is essential to identify, where possible, the Baptist groups with which these Quakers had contact as each group could have influenced the individual Quakers very differently – both positively and negatively.

In broad terms, the Particular Baptists were Calvinist evolving from a branch of the Jacob church which had sympathies with puritans in the Church of England, and the General Baptists were Arminian and strictly separatist. They attracted the names ‘Particular’ and ‘General’ in broad reflection of their views on atonement. In this thesis I consider the possibility of Quakers accepting or rejecting the theologies they may have experienced in the Baptist congregations with which they had contact.

---

144 Personal communication with Professor D.W. Bebbington. Also see A.W. Harrison, *Arminianism* (London: Duckworth, 1937) for a description of the life and theology preached by Jacob Arminius. The theology was described by Harrison as, see pp. 48–49, ‘God...determined the elect from the fallen and sinning...who, through his grace, believe in Jesus Christ and persevere in faith and obedience...That in consequence of this, Christ the Saviour of the world died for all and every man.’ This contrast with the Calvinist doctrine of predestination, see 2.2.1 above. Also see 3.1.3 above.
Fox, in his *Journal*, makes reference to his visit to his uncle ‘Pickering, a baptist’,\(^{145}\) and Ingle identifies the congregation to which Pickering was associated in two contradictory ways. He describes Pickering as being associated with a General Baptist congregation,\(^{146}\) having earlier described Pickering as a ‘Baptist’ and citing the article ‘Records of the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey Church 1616-1641’ as evidence.\(^{147}\) It is demonstrated below that these statements are mutually exclusive as the successors of the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey congregation comprised three of the seven London Baptist congregations that formed the Particular Baptist church and were signatories to the Confessions of that church in 1644 and 1646. It is shown in the next sub-section that there was no discernable connection between the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey church and its successors and offshoots with the General Baptist church which succeeded the Helwys/Murton congregation following their (Helwys and Murton) return from the Netherlands. Despite this confusion, having established the history and theology of the two Baptist groups, I consider, in 4.4. below, the available evidence for the theological background to ‘Uncle Pickering’ and the possible influence he had on his nephew’s enquiring mind.

### 3.2.2 Thomas Helwys and the General Baptist congregations

I have outlined the split within the Smyth congregation in Amsterdam.\(^{148}\) The split arose, according to Estep, as a result of Smyth’s application for his congregation to join the Waterlanders.\(^{149}\) However, according to Coggins and Hudson the split occurred prior to

---

\(^{145}\) George Fox, *Journal*, p. 4.


\(^{147}\) H. Larry Ingle, *First Among Friends*, p. 35.

\(^{148}\) See 2.4.2 above.

Smyth’s application to the Mennonites, and was a result of Helwys disagreeing with Smyth’s view on the authority of the Waterlanders’ baptism.\textsuperscript{150} The result of the split was the return of Helwys and his ‘small congregation’ to England.\textsuperscript{151} On his return to England, Helwys established, in Pinners Hall in London, the first Baptist church, or congregation, on English soil.\textsuperscript{152} Barclay of Reigate wrote that, despite their break with Smyth, the Helwys congregation in England accepted the views propounded by the Waterlanders, and that the two congregations, the Helwys and Waterlander congregations, ‘corresponded one with another.’\textsuperscript{153}

At the time of Helwys’ return to England, Helwys was ‘mainly Arminian’ with some of his beliefs not corresponding exactly with those of the Waterlanders.\textsuperscript{154} According to Estep, two of Helwys’ beliefs were that:

‘Christ took the flesh of Mary.’\textsuperscript{155} The Waterlander leader de Ries held the view that knowledge of the origin of Christ’s flesh was not necessary for salvation.\textsuperscript{156} There is no reference to this topic in the Waterlander Confession of 1610.

‘Magistracy is not forbidden to church members.’\textsuperscript{157} Wright suggests that this was a view adopted by the Waterlanders from about 1580.\textsuperscript{158} However, the extract of Article

\textsuperscript{153} Robert Barclay, \textit{The Inner Life of the Religious Societies}, pp. 72-73.
\textsuperscript{154} This view is possibly contrary to Barclay’s view expressed above.
\textsuperscript{155} W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 215.
\textsuperscript{156} See 2.3.2 above.
\textsuperscript{157} W.R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 215.
\textsuperscript{158} See 2.3.2 above.
XXXVII of the 1610 Waterlander Confession quoted in 2.3.2 above does not substantiate that view.

Estep records that Helwys died in prison in 1616, and that the leadership of his congregation then fell to his colleague, John Murton. It is reported by Bell that it was shortly after Murton took over from Helwys that the correspondence between the Helwys congregation and Waterlanders took place, and Bell further suggests that that correspondence revealed ‘a desire to join in communion with the Waterlanders.’

Bell proposes that, because of the absence of a hierarchy within the Baptist congregation to resolve theological issues, and the ability within the congregation for every individual to interpret Scripture for themselves, the only way to resolve any differences within a congregation was for dissenting members to leave the congregation and to form a new one.

One such new congregation was established in Bell Alley, in London which by the 1640s, Bell writes, came under the leadership of Thomas Lambe. Lambe is described by Bell as ‘possibly the most significant General Baptist Leader after Helwys.’ It is possible that Lambe undertook preaching duties outside London and Wright records the baptism, by Lambe, of Samuel Oates, referred to by Wright as ‘the notorious Samuel Oates.’ Fox, in his

---

160 Mark R. Bell, Apocalypse How? Baptist Movements during the English Revolution (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 2000), p. 41. According to Bell, these letters were written in 1620, by which time Murton had taken over responsibility for this congregation.
161 Mark R. Bell, Apocalypse How?, p. 48.
163 Mark R. Bell, Apocalypse How?, p. 42.
164 Stephen Wright, The Early English Baptists, pp. 244 and 120 respectively. This Samuel Oates (bap. 1614, d. 1683) must not be confused with Samuel Oates (or Otes), a Church of England Parson in Sowthrips, Norfolk,
Journal, writes of his meeting with Oates in Leicestershire in 1649, and describes his discussion with Oates and his followers. After the discussion, ‘we [Fox and Oates with his followers] parted, and some of them were loving to us [Quakers].’ It can be seen, therefore, that Oates travelled away from his native Norwich, preaching the Baptist message. Wright records that Oates’ influence extended to Essex, Rutland, Lincolnshire and Northamptonshire as well as Leicestershire, where he met Fox. Wright also suggests that Oates was a leading Leveller.

Bell records that the Bell Alley congregation conducted a ‘simplified marriage ceremony’ without the need for an officiating minister, and Jones suggested that female preachers were allowed there. After the act of believer’s baptism, there should be a ‘laying on of hands.’ This act, the laying on of hands, caused some dispute, resulting in the breaking...
away from the Bell Alley congregation of John Griffith and a small group of his followers to set up another congregation in Dunning’s Alley.\textsuperscript{171} Although not recorded as belonging to the Bell Alley congregation, Bell records another large congregation being set up in Bishopsgate in London by Edward Barber,\textsuperscript{172} and one set up in Fenstanton, Huntingdonshire, by Henry Denne who had been baptized by Lambe, possibly at Bell Alley.\textsuperscript{173}

It can therefore be seen that, whenever members of a General Baptist congregation, could not agree with a particular theological point promoted by the leader of that congregation, one solution was for those disagreeing to leave that congregation and to set up a new congregation under a new leader.\textsuperscript{174}

The debt owed by the General Baptists to the continental Anabaptists is disputed. Kliever asserts that the distinctive beliefs of the General Baptists, ‘rejection of infant baptism, affirmation of believer’s baptism only, constitution of the visible church on the basis of believer’s baptism, a modified Calvinism and religious liberty’ were derived from the English phrase ‘to lay hands on’ in the sense of accepting someone of themselves.’ This suggests a use of the phrase as a concept compared to the Baptists physical laying on of hands.

Mark R. Bell, \textit{Apocalypse How?}, p. 46.

Mark R. Bell, \textit{Apocalypse How?}, p. 46.

Mark R. Bell, \textit{Apocalypse How?}, p. 48. Bell refers to the location of this congregation as ‘Fenstation.’ Up until 1676 or 1677, Henry Dunne’s eldest son, John Denne, was reported as undertaking the role of elder at the Fenstanton church. Ed. Edward Bean Underhill, \textit{Records of the Churches of Christ gathered at Fenstanton, Warboys and Hexam 1644-1720} (London: Haddon Brothers and Co, 1854), p. xx. These \textit{Records} also note instances of members being excommunicated, p. 8, but of greater interest to this researcher are the records of members leaving General Baptist congregations to become Quakers. The first recorded defection is dated ‘26th of eleventh month 1654’ by ‘Will. Custons…John Dring and Thomas Rosse’ from the Fenstanton church, p. 115, with the record dated 13\textsuperscript{th} March 1655, and of twelve further members of that church becoming Quakers, p. 146. These \textit{Records} also note defections continuing from other General Baptist congregations until ‘Alex Robson’, whose defection from the Hexham church is recorded in a letter dated 12 May 1678, pp. 299-300. These \textit{Records} also note the efforts of Quakers to recruit members from General Baptist congregations. At Fenstanton, Quakers were reported as preaching at the house of ‘sister Sneesby’ a member of the Fenstanton church, p. 120, and at Hexham, ‘many deceivers…even swarm in these northern parts especially of those called Quakers whose pernicious ways many do follow’, pp. 315-316, and where ‘those deceived souls, called Quakers, have been very active in these parts, and have seduced two of our society and six of Newcastle church’, pp. 352-353. Spufford asserts that Denne’s Fenstanton church was specifically targeted for converts by the Quaker James Parnell in 1655. Margaret Spufford, \textit{Contrasting Communities}, p. 284.

This is a practice that was also adopted by the second branch of the Baptists, the Particular Baptists, discussed in 3.2.4 below.
Puritan Separatist background of the first English Baptists. Kliever also suggests that the differences in the beliefs between the English General Baptists and the European Anabaptists indicate an absence of influence of the latter over the former. However, as noted above, the first ‘English Baptists’ were members of the Arminian Helwys congregation following their return from the Netherlands, which, I suggest, throws doubt on Kliever’s statement. Hudson maintains that English Baptism emerged from English congregationalism evidenced ‘by the fact’ that ‘practically all of them had been congregationalists before they became Baptists.’ Hudson further records that it was the Baptists themselves, in the nineteenth century, who claimed descent from the Anabaptists in order to justify their claim of ‘unbroken succession’ from the primitive church. It could be argued that the nineteenth century was the first time that such a claim could be made by the Baptists without fear of persecution or prosecution. Bell is definite in his view that ‘The forerunners of the English Baptists were the Anabaptists of the Continental Reformation.’ This statement could only be correct, I suggest, if the reference to ‘English Baptists’ is changed to reference to the ‘English General Baptists.’

Confusion over the beliefs of the General Baptists, as mentioned above, with regard to the reported views of Helwys, is exemplified by two tracts. In 1642, Thomas Lambe, a leading General Baptist, see above, wrote a tract in answer to letters from three separate people identified by their initials, T.S., R.H. and [unreadable] W., on the subjects of predestination,
universal or elect redemption and original sin respectively.\textsuperscript{180} The tract appears contradictory in places, and the arguments it sets out can be difficult to follow.\textsuperscript{181} For example, on the subject of predestination, Lambe states: ‘Predestination is absolute not conditional’,\textsuperscript{182} followed by ‘the gift of God, not in common…but in special and peculiar as the Election is…given only to some and not to others.’\textsuperscript{183} These statements suggest absolute, Calvinist, election. In answer to a question suggesting there is a contradiction between the idea of Christ dying for all, and God’s election of some,\textsuperscript{184} Lambe answers: ‘Christ hath made, or purchased a way of recovery for all men, if they doe not reject him and it also; but election is a fore-appointment that such persons are elected, shall believe and be recovered.’\textsuperscript{185} This answer initially suggests that salvation is available to all believers in Christ, but continues in stating that it is foreordained who those believers are to be. This latter view is in Lambe’s concluding statement that ‘if God work Faith in some in time and not in others, then hee did appoint so to doe before, and consequently did elect them and not others.’\textsuperscript{186} Lambe sets out his opponent’s view that ‘all persons are free from sin till they commit actions of sinne.’ He answers that, if his opponents view was accurate then, ‘there are many of the sonnes of Adam which should need no redemption by Christ…and then should Christ die in vaine and to no purpose at all.’\textsuperscript{187} This final statement would indicate an acceptance of the potential for salvation to all who believe in Christ, with no hint of any pre-election of those believers.\textsuperscript{188}

\textsuperscript{180} Thomas Lambe, \textit{A Treatise of Particular Predestination wherein is answered three Letters} (London: no publisher shown, 1642).
\textsuperscript{181} In the words of Bebbington, ‘Perhaps his language is opaque?’ Personal communication with Professor David Bebbington.
\textsuperscript{182} Thomas Lambe, \textit{A Treatise of Particular Predestination}, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{183} Thomas Lambe, \textit{A Treatise of Particular Predestination}, un-numbered fourth page.
\textsuperscript{184} Thomas Lambe, \textit{A Treatise of Particular Predestination}, un-numbered fourth page.
\textsuperscript{185} Thomas Lambe, \textit{A Treatise of Particular Predestination}, un-numbered fifth page.
\textsuperscript{186} Thomas Lambe, \textit{A Treatise of Particular Predestination}, un-numbered ninth page.
\textsuperscript{187} Thomas Lambe, \textit{A Treatise of Particular Predestination}, p. C2.
\textsuperscript{188} Stephen Wright, ‘Lambe, Thomas (fl. 1629–1661)’ where it is recorded that ‘Lambe himself was anxious to stress that Christ died for all men…But…he also defended the orthodox view that God had predestined an elect to salvation…’
A similar, and equally confusing tract is dated 1645. The tract is unsigned and has no ascribed author. Early English Books Online ascribes the tract to John Saltmarsh, an independent minister in a parish church with views in sympathy with the Seeker movement, whereas Wright and Tolmie ascribe authorship to Lambe. The tract is written as a series of questions and answers, perhaps in similar style to Lambe’s earlier Treatise, and the tract’s opening words, ‘To the impartial Reader’, are very similar to the opening words of Treatise, ‘To the unpartial Reader.’ The author advocates his view of ‘Christ suffering for the sins of all’, suggesting no election. This is confirmed later where the question ‘Shall every one that believeth in Christ be saved?’ is answered ‘Yea surely, for so it is written.’ However the next question is: ‘But hath God elected some persons before the world began which only shall be saved?’ to which the answer presented by the author is: ‘Yes certainly.’ This answer raises the following question on the same page ‘But doth not the doctrine of Christs dying for all contradict this doctrine?’ The answer is unequivocal, but ‘opaque’, ‘No surely because it is the means to worke faith effectually in the Elect according to the eternal decree.’ This final answer follows one of the arguments presented in Treatise, that it is foreordained who are to be the believers in Christ.

Whereas these two tracts are presented here as confusing and contradictory in places, in 1660 the General Baptists met as a group and produced their first Confession. This meeting of the General Baptists took place eighteen and sixteen years after the publication of the two tracts ascribed above to Lambe.
Confession and, as described in the next sub-section but one, far fewer than the fifty-two articles of the two earlier confessions in 1644 and 1646 of the Particular Baptists.

As with the earlier Particular Baptist confessions, the Confession refers to them being ‘(falsely) called Ana-baptists’ and concludes by distancing themselves from ‘those wicked, and divillish reports and reproaches, falsely cast upon us’, particularly the building up and use of weapons. It is possible therefore, that this Confession, was to serve two purposes: to set out the beliefs of all General Baptists in England as a means of unifying that group, as was one of the purposes of the Waterlander confessions, see 2.3.2 above, and perhaps additionally to identify themselves as a distinct group from the Particular Baptists, and to distance themselves from the continental Anabaptists and, in particular, from any links with the events at Münster.197

In the next sub-section, I review the General Baptistts’ confession and compare it with the earlier Waterlander confession.198

3.2.3 Comparison of Waterlander Short Confession with General Baptist Confession

There are some similarities between the General Baptist Confession of 1660 and the Waterlander Confession of 1610, but there are a number of significant differences. In comparing these two confessions I have used, for the General Baptist confession, the first confession they wrote, A Brief Confession of Faith (shown below simply as ‘Brief

197 Anthony R. Cross, ‘The Adoption of Believer’s Baptism and Baptist Beginnings’ in Anthony R. Cross and Nicholas J. Wood, eds., Centre for Baptist History and Heritage Studies. Vol. 1. Exploring Baptist Origins (Oxford: Regents Park College, 2010), p. 16. ‘Following the horror of the radical Anabaptist debacle at Münster in 1534-35, being labelled as an “Anabaptist” became a sure route to persecution and even death.’ See also 2.2.3 above. See 3.2.4 below for a discussion on the Particular Baptist Confessions of 1644 and 1646.

198 In 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 I compare both the above confessions with those of the Particular Baptists, the other branch of the English Baptist movement.
as described above, and for the Waterlander confession I have used the 1618 edition, believed by S. B. ten Cate to be the third edition, of *Short Confession of Faith and the Essential Elements of Christian Doctrine* (shown below simply as ‘*Short Confession*’) and so possibly the latest version available to the General Baptists.\(^{199}\)

I look first of all at the similarities between the two documents. Both confessions are Arminian in outlook; the *Brief Confession* states, Article III, that ‘Lord Jesus Christ...freely gave himself a ransome for all...tasting death for every man’, and the *Short Confession* states, Article VII: ‘he [God] neither predestined, determined, nor created anyone for damnation...he created all men for salvation.’ Neither confession discusses the origin of Christ’s flesh, and both confessions, *Brief Confession*, Article VI and *Short Confession* Articles XX and XXI, agree that faith is necessary for justification and salvation. Both confessions, Articles XXV and XXXVII respectively, accept the need to obey civil authority in civil matters but only to the extent that those civil matters do not conflict with the ‘Word of God.’ However, the *Short Confession*, in Article XXXVII, goes much further than Article XXV of the *Brief Confession* in denying its membership the holding of any civil office and takes a definitive pacifist stance in denying war and the taking of life. Whereas neither confession advocates common ownership, either within the congregation or universally, both stipulate, Articles XIX and XXV respectively, the requirement to help the poor, with the General Baptists limiting this help to ‘the poor Saints belonging to the Church of Christ’ and not to the general population.

However, there are some significant differences between the two confessions. Topics covered by the General Baptists’ *Brief Confession* and absent from the Waterlanders’ *Short Confession* as described above, and for the Waterlander confession I have used the 1618 edition, believed by S. B. ten Cate to be the third edition, of *Short Confession of Faith and the Essential Elements of Christian Doctrine* (shown below simply as ‘*Short Confession*’) and so possibly the latest version available to the General Baptists.\(^{199}\)

I look first of all at the similarities between the two documents. Both confessions are Arminian in outlook; the *Brief Confession* states, Article III, that ‘Lord Jesus Christ...freely gave himself a ransome for all...tasting death for every man’, and the *Short Confession* states, Article VII: ‘he [God] neither predestined, determined, nor created anyone for damnation...he created all men for salvation.’ Neither confession discusses the origin of Christ’s flesh, and both confessions, *Brief Confession*, Article VI and *Short Confession* Articles XX and XXI, agree that faith is necessary for justification and salvation. Both confessions, Articles XXV and XXXVII respectively, accept the need to obey civil authority in civil matters but only to the extent that those civil matters do not conflict with the ‘Word of God.’ However, the *Short Confession*, in Article XXXVII, goes much further than Article XXV of the *Brief Confession* in denying its membership the holding of any civil office and takes a definitive pacifist stance in denying war and the taking of life. Whereas neither confession advocates common ownership, either within the congregation or universally, both stipulate, Articles XIX and XXV respectively, the requirement to help the poor, with the General Baptists limiting this help to ‘the poor Saints belonging to the Church of Christ’ and not to the general population.

However, there are some significant differences between the two confessions. Topics covered by the General Baptists’ *Brief Confession* and absent from the Waterlanders’ *Short Confession* as described above, and for the Waterlander confession I have used the 1618 edition, believed by S. B. ten Cate to be the third edition, of *Short Confession of Faith and the Essential Elements of Christian Doctrine* (shown below simply as ‘*Short Confession*’) and so possibly the latest version available to the General Baptists.\(^{199}\)

I look first of all at the similarities between the two documents. Both confessions are Arminian in outlook; the *Brief Confession* states, Article III, that ‘Lord Jesus Christ...freely gave himself a ransome for all...tasting death for every man’, and the *Short Confession* states, Article VII: ‘he [God] neither predestined, determined, nor created anyone for damnation...he created all men for salvation.’ Neither confession discusses the origin of Christ’s flesh, and both confessions, *Brief Confession*, Article VI and *Short Confession* Articles XX and XXI, agree that faith is necessary for justification and salvation. Both confessions, Articles XXV and XXXVII respectively, accept the need to obey civil authority in civil matters but only to the extent that those civil matters do not conflict with the ‘Word of God.’ However, the *Short Confession*, in Article XXXVII, goes much further than Article XXV of the *Brief Confession* in denying its membership the holding of any civil office and takes a definitive pacifist stance in denying war and the taking of life. Whereas neither confession advocates common ownership, either within the congregation or universally, both stipulate, Articles XIX and XXV respectively, the requirement to help the poor, with the General Baptists limiting this help to ‘the poor Saints belonging to the Church of Christ’ and not to the general population.

However, there are some significant differences between the two confessions. Topics covered by the General Baptists’ *Brief Confession* and absent from the Waterlanders’ *Short Confession* as described above, and for the Waterlander confession I have used the 1618 edition, believed by S. B. ten Cate to be the third edition, of *Short Confession of Faith and the Essential Elements of Christian Doctrine* (shown below simply as ‘*Short Confession*’) and so possibly the latest version available to the General Baptists.\(^{199}\)

I look first of all at the similarities between the two documents. Both confessions are Arminian in outlook; the *Brief Confession* states, Article III, that ‘Lord Jesus Christ...freely gave himself a ransome for all...tasting death for every man’, and the *Short Confession* states, Article VII: ‘he [God] neither predestined, determined, nor created anyone for damnation...he created all men for salvation.’ Neither confession discusses the origin of Christ’s flesh, and both confessions, *Brief Confession*, Article VI and *Short Confession* Articles XX and XXI, agree that faith is necessary for justification and salvation. Both confessions, Articles XXV and XXXVII respectively, accept the need to obey civil authority in civil matters but only to the extent that those civil matters do not conflict with the ‘Word of God.’ However, the *Short Confession*, in Article XXXVII, goes much further than Article XXV of the *Brief Confession* in denying its membership the holding of any civil office and takes a definitive pacifist stance in denying war and the taking of life. Whereas neither confession advocates common ownership, either within the congregation or universally, both stipulate, Articles XIX and XXV respectively, the requirement to help the poor, with the General Baptists limiting this help to ‘the poor Saints belonging to the Church of Christ’ and not to the general population.

However, there are some significant differences between the two confessions. Topics covered by the General Baptists’ *Brief Confession* and absent from the Waterlanders’ *Short Confession* as described above, and for the Waterlander confession I have used the 1618 edition, believed by S. B. ten Cate to be the third edition, of *Short Confession of Faith and the Essential Elements of Christian Doctrine* (shown below simply as ‘*Short Confession*’) and so possibly the latest version available to the General Baptists.\(^{199}\)

199 Hans de Ries, ‘Confession of Faith (1618).’ *Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online*. Accessed from [http://www.gameo.org/encyclopedia/contents/C66531.html](http://www.gameo.org/encyclopedia/contents/C66531.html) on 19 April 2010. No page numbers shown. It is noted by this downloaded document that the original manuscript of the *Short Confession* ‘seems to have been lost’ and that after 1618 other printed editions in Dutch were issued up to 1740, with a French edition being issued in 1684, a Latin edition being issued in 1723 and an edition in German in 1741. It is noted that John Smyth had produced an English translation for his followers, presumably between 1610 and his death in 1612.
Confession are: Article X, children dying in infancy shall be saved, Article XVI, ministers to minister ‘freely to others’ without the need for compulsory maintenance, and Article XXIV, advocating freedom of conscience without persecution.

It can also be seen that a number of significant theological issues, present in the Waterlander Short Confession, are absent from the General Baptist Brief Confession: Article VI, God commands good and forbids evil, Christ as mediator between man and God in Articles IX and XII, as prophet in Article XI, as teacher in Article XVII, as ruler of hearts in Article XVIII. Article XIV refers to the establishment of a spiritual kingdom on earth, Article XIX states that Christ is ‘born within us...healing us of the sickness of the soul’, and Article XXII states that ‘the new birth is necessary for salvation.’ It is interesting to note that Article XXXVIII of the Waterlander Short Confession specifically forbids the swearing of oaths, a topic not covered in the General Baptist Brief Confession, and that Article XXXIX of the Waterlander Short Confession states that marriage is an ordinance and that ‘marrying out’ is forbidden, again, a topic not covered by the General Baptist Brief Confession.

This brief comparison of the two confessions would suggest that the General Baptist Brief Confession owed a little to the earlier Short Confession of the Waterlanders, and that on some contentious matters, such as the holding of public office, waging war and the taking of life, the General Baptists were silent. It is improbable that, in view of their heritage and particularly as John Smyth had prepared an English translation for his own group in Amsterdam, the General Baptists of 1660 were unaware of the earlier Waterlander Short Confession when drafting their own confession.\(^{200}\) The omission by the General Baptists of some of the contentious Articles from the Waterlander Shorter Confession may, I suggest, have been the consequence of the General Baptists possibly being aware of the importance of

\(^{200}\) See above in this sub-section.
not identifying themselves closely with the continental Anabaptists and the events at Münster, and so allaying the fears of the population and, perhaps more particularly, the King and Government of the day. Whereas both the General Baptists and the Waterlanders wrote their respective confessions in order to bring unity to their respective groups, the Waterlanders, unlike the General Baptists, were not concerned about the possible opprobrium that their confession might attract from the authorities.

In the next sub-section I outline the establishment and growth of the second branch of the English Baptists, the Particular Baptists and in 3.2.6 below I compare the confessions of these two English Baptist groups.

3.2.4 The Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey congregations and the Particular Baptists

Henry Jacob was an ordained priest in the Church of England. As a Puritan he objected to the ritual within that church and as a consequence ‘found it convenient to go abroad.’ On his return to England in 1616, Jacob established, in London, an independent, but not separatist ‘puritan congregation.’ Accompanying Jacob from Middleburg in the Netherlands, were a number of other English exiles. This group included ‘Sabine Staresmore’ or Staismore, who, at one time, had been a member of John Robinson’s Calvinist congregation of English

---

201 Anonymous author, ‘Records of the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey Church 1616-1641.’ Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society 1, 1908-09, p. 206, Note 2. The document indicated includes a transcript of papers held in the Repository of Benjamin Stinton. The title given to the papers by Stinton is ‘The Records of an Ancient Congregation of Dissenters from wch many of ye Independant & Baptist Churches of London took their first rise: ex MSS of Mr H. Jessey, wch I recd of Mr Rich Adams.’ References to this latter document will indicate the page number of the article in which the transcription is presented.

202 Murray Tolmie, The Triumphs of the Saints, p. 7. As explained by Tolmie, Jacob’s congregation was not separatist as Jacob believed that ‘it was wrong to separate the people who ‘in simplicity’ partook of corrupt traditions but who were ‘true Christians nevertheless’.’

Separatists in Leyden in the Netherlands. This returning group formed a ‘non-separatist congregational church’ which attracted, according to Stassen, members of existing congregational groupings in England. Stassen describes the church, at this stage, as ‘Congregationalist’, and it is suggested that it had sympathies with the puritans within the Church of England rather than with separatist congregations such as the Ancient Church in London or with the nascent General Baptist congregations. It is reported by Tolmie that, during Jacob’s leadership of the congregation, Jacob and his followers professed to ‘obey Christ rather than man’ in matters of the church, agreed that the pastor would be supported by voluntary offerings from the congregation and, unlike the General Baptists, any member of the congregation, except women, could preach the Scriptures.

Jacob made a general plea for toleration for his congregation, without success, and after leading his congregation in London for about eight years, Jacob left London and settled in New England where he died shortly afterwards in 1624.

For a period of ‘a Year or two’, the congregation remained leaderless, but continued as a single congregation, supporting each other. During this leaderless period, the congregation was joined by John Lathrop, a ‘Preacher from Kent’ who was elected as Pastor for the group

---

205 Glen H. Stassen, ‘Anabaptist Influence in the origin of the Particular Baptists,’ Mennonite Quarterly Review 36, no. 4, October 1962, p. 325. See also p. 324 where Stassen claims that Congregationalists appear to have been attracted to both the Calvinistic views of the Jacob congregation and to the Arminian views of the earlier General Baptist congregation.
207 See 2.4.1 above and Anonymous author, ‘The Jacob-Jessey Church, 1616-1678’, p. 246.
210 Anonymous author, ‘Records of the Jacob-Jessey Church 1616-1641’, p. 212. This account of the duration of Jacob’s leadership of his congregation differs slightly from that of Tolmie, The Triumphs of the Saints, p. 16, and Anonymous author, ‘The Jacob-Jessey Church, 1616-1678’, p. 246, which suggest that Jacob resigned his leadership of his congregation in 1622 intending to move to New England, and that during the two year period before he finally left England in 1624, his congregation was leaderless, a role taken up by Lathrop in 1624.
in 1624.\textsuperscript{212} It was under Lathrop’s leadership that dissension first emerged within the congregation over the degree of contact that members of the congregation had with the local parish churches; in particular, the event of the baptism of a child of a member of the congregation at a parish church in 1630.\textsuperscript{213} Over the next few years, as a result of these disputes, members of the congregation left and formed their own congregations, or joined other separatist congregations.\textsuperscript{214}

During the early 1630s, the Lathrop congregation came under pressure from outside authorities, with the result that in April 1632, according to Tolmie, ‘the whole church was detected and arrested.’\textsuperscript{215} Following their release, after about eighteen months in prison, Lathrop, along with a number of his congregation, ‘agreed to emigrate’ to New England.\textsuperscript{216}

Records indicate that following the departure of Lathrop to New England, there were a number of defections, either to other congregations or to establish congregations of their own.\textsuperscript{217} These defections did not end with the appointment of Henry Jessey as pastor in 1637.\textsuperscript{218} Although Jessey remained in charge of the congregation until he died in 1663, defections continued, some occurring over Jessey’s introduction of baptism by full immersion, and others over the question of baptism of infants.\textsuperscript{219} It is possible, although not recorded, that a number of defections from Jessey’s congregation were as a result of Jessey’s

\begin{flushright}

\textsuperscript{213} Murray Tolmie, \textit{The Triumphs of the Saints}, p. 16.

\textsuperscript{214} Anonymous author, ‘The Jacob-Jessey Church, 1616-1678’, p. 246.

\textsuperscript{215} Murray Tolmie, \textit{The Triumphs of the Saints}, p. 16.

\textsuperscript{216} Anonymous author, ‘The Jacob-Jessey Church, 1616-1678’, p. 246.

\textsuperscript{217} Anonymous author, ‘Records of the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey Church 1616-1641’, pp. 220-221. At this time, 17 members are recorded as leaving, including Richard Blunt.

\textsuperscript{218} Anonymous author, ‘The Jacob-Jessey Church, 1616-1678’, p. 246.

\textsuperscript{219} Anonymous author, ‘The Jacob-Jessey Church, 1616-1678’, pp. 246-247. The numbers of defecting members at each event is not recorded, but over the period 1638 to 1640, in excess of fifty members left the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey congregation. Tolmie records the defection of a group of six members under the leadership of John Spilsbury in 1638 because they were ‘convinced that baptism was not for infants, but professed believers.’ Murray Tolmie, \textit{The Triumphs of the Saints}, p. 24. See also Figure 1 below.
\end{flushright}
liberal outlook. This liberality is evidenced by Jessey’s willingness to accept into membership people who had not undergone believer’s baptism, suggesting that he was ‘outside the mainstream of Particular Baptists and close to Independents.’

It is interesting to note that, possibly in confirmation of this ‘Independent’ stance, Jessey was not a signatory to either of the Particular Baptist confessions of 1644 and 1646.

The most significant defection, for the purposes of this thesis, is that of Richard Blunt. It is recorded that Blunt left the Lathrop congregation, and possibly underwent believer’s baptism at the hands of John Spilsbury in 1633. Later, in 1640, according to Stassen, Blunt formed a congregation under his own leadership having been convinced that baptism was for believers alone, and when that congregation sought information on the process of baptism by full immersion, Blunt was sent to the Netherlands to investigate. Blunt visited the Collegiants in Rijnsburg. It is also proposed by Lumpkin that Blunt undertook the task of going to the Netherlands because he could speak Dutch. If, as stated by Lumpkin, Blunt could speak Dutch, knowledge of the Collegiants could have been acquired either in the Netherlands or by

---

221 See below in this sub-section.
224 W.T. Whitley, ‘The Revival of Immersion in Holland and England.’ Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society 3, 1912-1913, p. 32. See also 2.3.3 above. It is not certain whether the congregation knew of the existence of the Collegiants before Blunt’s arrival, as suggested by Stassen, or whether, as Jones wrote, their existence and practices were discovered when they needed help in deciding on the process of water baptism. See Glen H. Stassen, ‘Anabaptist Influence in the origin of the Particular Baptists’, p. 327 and Rufus M. Jones, Studies in Mystical Religion, p. 417. It is possible that knowledge of the baptismal practice of the Collegiants was brought back to England, and specifically to the Jacob congregation, by those members of the congregation who came back from the Netherlands with Jacob in 1616, but there is no record of Richard Blunt having been one of that returning congregation. See Anonymous author, ‘Records of the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey Church 1616-1641.’ See pp. 208-209 where there is a list of those first members of the Jacob congregation. It is possible that Blunt was one of ‘divers others’ referred to on p. 209, however, from Anonymous author, ‘The Jacob-Jessey Church, 1616-1678’, p. 250, it is seen that Blunt is recorded as a member of the Jacob church ‘after [16]33.’ This appears to contradict the statement on p. 246 of that same article which suggests that Blunt was already a member of that congregation by 1633.
constant dealing with Dutch nationals in England. Lumpkin further suggests that, during Blunt’s visit to the Netherlands on behalf of his congregation, he may have been baptized by the Collegiants.  

Tolmie records at least thirty separatist churches in London in 1644, comprising: ten Independent congregations originating from the congregation first set up by Jacob, eight Separatists with lay pastors, some of which were defections from the Jacob congregation, seven Particular Baptist congregations, some of which had evolved from the Jacob congregation and seven General Baptist congregations, none of which emanated from the Jacob congregation.  

Tolmie sets out a graphical representation of the evolution of some of the separatist/independent congregations in London. I have extended that chart, see Figure 1, to indicate: those congregations that developed, according to Stassen, from the Blunt and Spilsbury congregations into Particular Baptist congregations, and the descent of the General Baptists from the Helwys congregation.  

In confirmation of these names, I use the signatories on the first Particular Baptist Confession of Faith, written in 1644, see below.
Figure 1

Representation of evolution of Baptist Congregations
Stassen states that Particular Baptists, as a church, began in 1638 or 1640 and were led by Blunt and Spilsbury. Stassen does not differentiate the Particular and General Baptists on the basis of their Calvinistic views, but on their respective interpretations of the act of baptism; Particular Baptists viewing water baptism as ‘a testimony to the death, burial and resurrection of Christ’ and the General Baptists’ view that baptism was ‘a sacramental washing and purifying’, but ‘shifting the emphasis to the inner washing of the heart or the conscience of the individual.’ A topic not covered in the confessions of either Baptist group is the position of women within the group. As stated earlier, Jones noted that female preachers were allowed at the Bell Alley congregation in London, a General Baptist congregation, whereas Tolmie recorded that in the Jacob congregation ‘any understanding member of the church (but women)...[are permitted the] exercise of expounding and applying the Scripture.’

It is of interest to note another early member of the Particular Baptist church who had documented links with the Netherlands, although not necessarily with religious groups there. William Kiffin is recorded as being a member of the Jacob congregation in 1633, and then leaving that congregation in 1643 over the question of infant baptism, to establish his own congregation. It is recorded that in 1643 Kiffin travelled to the Netherlands where he established a successful business. However, it can be assumed that he was back in England

232 Rufus M. Jones, Studies in Mystical Religion, p. 419.
233 Murray Tolmie, The Triumphs of the Saints, p. 14. See 3.2.6 below for a comparison of the confessions written by the General and Particular Baptists. By the 1650s, the position of women within Particular Baptist congregations differed by location. In the Midlands and South Wales in 1656, ‘women in some cases may speak in the churches, and in some cases may not’ but in the West Country and Ireland in 1653, ‘a woman is not permitted to speak in the church neither by way of praying, prophesying or enquiring...but...we judge they may exercise it in private.’ Ed. B.R. White, Association Records of the Particular Baptists, pp. 28 and 55 respectively.
in 1644 as his signature appears on the Particular Baptists’ Confession of that year, see below, in addition to signing the later 1646 Particular Baptist Confession.

Wright suggests that, prior to the writing and publication of the first Particular Baptist Confession of Faith in 1644,\textsuperscript{237} there was little evidence of a cohesive group of congregations that could have been defined as ‘Particular Baptist’, and that prior to that date any ‘alignment...proved unstable and temporary.’\textsuperscript{238} It is possible, therefore, that the 1644 Confession was prepared for two purposes: to provide a common platform of belief and practice for those congregations in London that wished to be identified as a single church, as possibly suggested by Wright above and, as with the General Baptists, to ensure that their identification by the outside world should be distanced from the continental Anabaptists.\textsuperscript{239} White suggests that, in addition to the two purposes set out above, the 1644 Confession was written in order to ‘manifest their substantial agreement with the prevailing forms of Calvinistic orthodoxy’ which would have the intention of positioning them close to the established Church.\textsuperscript{240}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{237} The Confession of Faith, of those Churches which are commonly (though falsely) called ANABAPTISTS (London: Printed by Matthew Simmons in Aldersgate-street, 1644).
\textsuperscript{238} Stephen Wright, \textit{The Early English Baptists}, p. 110 and p. 141.
\textsuperscript{239} William L. Lumpkin, \textit{Baptist Confessions of Faith}, p. 144. The Association Records of the Particular Baptists show that aspects of the Confession of Faith were discussed regularly at meetings and reported to members in the form of questions and answers. Ed. B.R. White, \textit{Association Records of the Particular Baptists}, pp 19-34 and 55-61. White also asserts that the 1644 Confession set out the basis for co-operation between individual churches, but that co-operation only applied, initially, among London-based churches. The first outreach from London to provincial-based churches was to South Wales in 1649, followed by a mission to churches in Northumberland in 1651. In 1652 regional churches in Abingdon, Reading and Henley met together to discuss co-operation and a Midlands Association was established in 1655. B.R White, ‘The Organisation of Particular Baptists, 1644-1660.’ \textit{Journal of Ecclesiastical History} 18, no. 2, October 1966, pp. 225, 209, 214, 216 and 223 respectively.
\textsuperscript{240} B.R. White, ‘The Doctrine of the Church in the Particular Baptist Confession of 1644’, p. 571. According to Tolmie, this objective was attained in 1649 when leading Particular Baptists presented a petition to the House of Commons. ‘For the [Particular] Baptists a long campaign was over, the stigma of ‘Anabaptism’ removed.’ Murray Tolmie, \textit{The Triumphs of the Saints}, pp. 182-183.
\end{flushright}
The 1644 Confession was followed by a new edition published in 1646.\textsuperscript{241} The only indications, in the 1646 confession, as to why this second confession was needed so soon after its predecessor are: its title referring more specifically to the ‘seven Congregations or Churches of Christ in London’ and not the more general reference to ‘Churches’ in the 1644 confession, and a suggestion in the introductory paragraph of the 1646 Confession that this later confession was written to answer a specific, unidentified book that had been written with ‘many heinous accusations unjustly and falsly laid against us.’\textsuperscript{242} Tolmie suggests that the 1646 Confession was needed because of the ‘failure of the first edition to convince any but already sympathetic Independents of the doctrinal orthodoxy and social responsibility of the [Particular] Baptists.’\textsuperscript{243} It should be noted that the 1646 Confession broadly follows the 1644 Confession although, according to Tolmie, the doctrinal articles were ‘rephrased in a stricter Calvinist sense’ in order to differentiate themselves from the General Baptists.\textsuperscript{244} Each comprises fifty-two articles, although the 1644 Confession has two articles numbers LII, and both are Calvinistic: Article V of the 1644 Confession stating that ‘the elect, which God hath loved...are redeemed’, a statement repeated in Article VI of the 1646 Confession. There is little difference in the contents of the articles of the confessions, although the ordering of topics in the 1646 Confession differs slightly from that of the 1644 Confession, and there are small, but possibly significant, additions to some articles of the 1646 Confession: Article II of the 1644 Confession refers to God ‘the Father, the Son, and the Spirit’ and Article II of the 1646 Confession refers to God ‘the Father, the Word and the holy Spirit’,\textsuperscript{245} Article XXXVI

\textsuperscript{241} A Confession of Faith of seven Congregations or Churches.
\textsuperscript{242} A Confession of Faith of seven Congregations or Churches, page ref. A 2.
\textsuperscript{243} Murray Tolmie, The Triumphs of the Saints, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{244} Murray Tolmie, The Triumphs of the Saints, p. 63. Although both confessions were signed on behalf of the seven churches in London, with two or three signatories for each congregation it is noted that: the signatories for two of the congregations in the 1646 confession were totally different to those in the 1644 confession, that one of the signatories for one congregation had been replaced by another member of that congregation and that one member, Tipping, appears to have changed congregations in the intervening two years.
\textsuperscript{245} See 2.1.2 above for the same use of ‘Word’ by Schwenckfeld and Fox.
of the 1644 Confession states that the church has the power to choose the Pastor, Teacher, Elder and Deacon, whereas Article XXXVI of the 1646 Confession limits this to choosing Elder and Deacon. Both the 1644 and 1646 Confessions, in Article XXXIX, define baptism as ‘an Ordinance’ to be dispensed on those ‘upon profession of faith’, with Article XL of both Confessions stating that baptism is by ‘dipping or plunging’. Both Confessions, in Article XLVIII, refer to the role of the Magistrate in civil matters but it appears that between 1644 and 1646 the attitude towards accepting the role of Magistrate changed, with Article L of the 1646 Confession introducing the ability for a ‘Christian to be a Magistrate.’ Whereas there is no reference to the taking of oaths in the 1644 Confession, by 1646, Article L states: ‘also it is lawful to take an Oath.’

Stassen writes that the Particular Baptist confessions were based, partially on the True Confession of Faith written for the Congregationalists by Francis Johnson in 1596, and White notes that twenty-six of the articles of the 1644 Confession repeat the teaching in the corresponding sections of the 1596 Confession. Stassen also suggests that they were ‘probably’ influenced by a 1539 tract written by Menno Simons, Foundation of Christian Doctrine.

---

246 This method of baptism is confirmed in Association Records as ‘not by sprinkling but dipping.’ Ed. B.R. White, Association Records of the Particular Baptists, p. 19.
248 B.R. White, ‘The Doctrine of the Church in the Particular Baptist Confession of 1644’, p. 576. White also comments, p. 579, on the intention of the 1596 Confession to undermine the Established Church, which, as discussed above, was contrary to the Particular Baptists’ intention. See also Anon, A True Confession of Faith and Humble Acknowledgement of the Allegiance which we, his Majesties Subjects, falsly called Brownists, doo hold towards God. Downloaded from www.voxdeibaptist.org/1596_true_confession.htm on 20th August 2012. Article 29 states, ‘That the present ministerie, reteyned & used in England…are a strange & Anti-christian ministerie’ and Article 31 states ‘That these Ecclesiasticall Assemblies, remaining in confusion and bodage under this Antichristian Ministerie.’
249 Glen H. Stassen, ‘Anabaptist Influence in the origin of the Particular Baptists’, p. 348. This proposition is not investigated further in this thesis. However, see 4.7 below for a comparison of the contents of Menno’s Foundation of Christian Doctrine with early Quaker theology.
3.2.5 **Comparison between Waterlander Short Confession and Particular Baptist Confessions**

There is little to suggest that either of the Particular Baptist confessions owe anything to the earlier Waterlander Confession of 1610. The Waterlander Confession is Arminian in outlook, and the Particular Baptist confessions are Calvinistic. The Waterlander Confession, Article XXXIX, specifically forbids the swearing of oaths, whereas Article L of the 1646 Confession, possibly to allay the fears of the State, allows that practice, the 1644 Confession not having referred to this topic. The Waterlanders preached pacifism, Article X, whereas the Particular Baptists only reference is when referring, in Article XLVIII of both the 1644 and 1646 confessions, to the role of the magistrates and that under them ‘we [Particular Baptists] may live a peaceable and quiet life.’ However, there is some similarity between the Waterlander and Particular Baptist views on the nature of Baptism. In their Confession, the Waterlanders describe baptism as a ‘sacrament’ in Article XXX, as external in Articles XXX and XXXI with a recommendation not ‘to rely on the external’ in Article XXXII. These latter two statements, but not the first, are similar to those of the Particular Baptists: Article XXXIX of their 1644 Confession states that baptism is ‘an Ordinance’ and Article XL states that baptism by water is ‘a sign,’ thus indicating the external nature of water baptism.

Shortly after the time of writing the 1644 Confessions, Daniel Featley wrote, ‘it appears that the Masters of our Anabaptists [Particular Baptists]…of the Sect in Switzerland…and the Low-Countries, held such erroneous tenets as are above mentioned…[and] they are Anabaptists but in part, not in whole.’ This suggests, to White, that Featley believed that

---

250 See 2.3.2 above, Article VII of the 1610 Confession of the Waterlanders.
251 Article V of the 1644 Confession and Article VI of the 1646 Confession.
252 See 1.2.4 above for definitions of ‘Sacrament’ and ‘Ordinance.’
the writers of the 1644 Confession had been ‘inadequately instructed by their continental
masters.’\footnote{B.R. White, ‘The Doctrine of the Church in the Particular Baptist Confession of 1644’, p. 571, note 3. In his note, White quotes the date of publication of Featley’s tract as 1645 which suggests to White that Featley was referring to the 1644 Confession and not the 1646 Confession.}

I now compare the 1660 confession of the General Baptists and the earlier 1644 and 1646
confessions of the Particular Baptists.

### 3.2.6 Comparison between General Baptist Confession and Particular Baptist
Confessions

From the preceding sub-sections, a comparison of the confessions of the two groups of
English Baptists can be made. There is some similarity between the contents of the articles of
the 1660 General Baptist Confession and the articles in the earlier Particular Baptist
confessions although the General Baptist Confession did not follow the same structure as the
Particular Baptist confessions. Differentiators of the General Baptists from the Particular
Baptists are seen to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Baptist Confession</th>
<th>Particular Baptists Confessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article IV ‘God is not willing that any should Perish, but that all should come to repentance’</td>
<td>Article V ‘yet the elect...are redeemed.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{B.R. White, ‘The Doctrine of the Church in the Particular Baptist Confession of 1644’, p. 571, note 3. In his note, White quotes the date of publication of Featley’s tract as 1645 which suggests to White that Featley was referring to the 1644 Confession and not the 1646 Confession.}
Article V  All ‘rightly qualified and considerably gifted’ may preach and Article XV  ‘the Elders or Pastors which God hath appointed.’

Article X  ‘All Children dying in infancy...shall all be raised by the second Adam [Christ].’

Article XII  This article refers to baptism of believers, but not the method of such baptism.

Article XXXVI gives the power to appoint ‘Pastors, Teachers, Elders and Deacons’ to the congregation.

There is no reference to this topic in either Particular Baptist Confession.

As has already been stated above, one major difference between the General Baptist and Particular Baptist confessions is the question of the taking of oaths. The General Baptist confession is silent on the subject as is the 1644 Particular Baptist confession. However the 1646 Particular Baptist confession, Article L, specifically allowed that practice. It is possible that this provision was included to allay the fears of the authorities even more than had been achieved by the 1644 confession.255

255 Evidence of its success in this regard can be seen in the words of Oliver Cromwell in 1654 when he places Baptists under the umbrella of ‘Orthodox Ministry.’ Oliver Cromwell, His Highness Speech to the Parliament in the Painted Chamber at their Dissolution upon Monday the 22nd of January 1654 (Published to prevent Mistakes and false copies. Re-Printed at Dublin, by William Bladen, 1654), p. 10. Also see Ann Hughes, ‘The public profession of these nations’: the national Church in Interregnum England.’ Religion in Revolutionary England Eds. Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), pp. 98-99 where Hughes records the appointment of triers ‘properly the Commissioners for the Approbation of Public Preachers’ including ‘men from a range of views from Calvinist Baptists to Presbyterians.’
The confessions of both the General and Particular Baptists end by referring to the authority of magistrates in civil matters but not in matters of conscience or religion, despite the punishments that that may incur. In addition, the General Baptist Confession, unlike the Particular Baptist counterparts, instructs all, in Article XIV, to act honestly and in a godly manner, in Article XVII, to reject all heretics and, possibly the only direct link with their Anabaptist forebears, Article XIX instructs on the maintenance of the poor in the congregation. However, unlike the Anabaptists, neither the Particular nor the General Baptists confessions advocate common ownership of goods or refer to any pacifist stance.

With regard to Baptism, Stassen writes of the General Baptists that ‘they retained the prevalent meaning of baptism as a sacramental washing and purifying of the recipient, while shifting the emphasis to the inner washing of the heart or the conscience of the individual.’ Article XI of the 1660 General Baptist Confession suggests that water baptism is ‘the right and only way of gathering Churches’ and that baptism by water should take place to ‘such only of them, as profess repentance to God.’ Article XII states that after baptism members may ‘receive the promise of the holy Spirit’ by the ‘Laying on of Hands.’ This order of baptism by water and by the Spirit is seen to be different to that suggested by Stassen above, and also different to the order as advocated by the Anabaptists: ‘(a) first and foremost is the baptism by the Spirit, (b) then follows baptism with water, and finally (c) the gruesome baptism with blood or fire.’ The Articles of the 1660 General Baptist Confession would therefore seem to be at odds with both Stassen’s statement and the earlier views of the Anabaptists.

The Particular Baptists’ view on water baptism is explained by Stassen as follows: ‘as a testimony to the death, burial and resurrection of Christ.’ This can be compared to Article XXXIX of the 1646 Particular Baptist confession which describes baptism by water as ‘an Ordinance...to be dispensed only upon persons professing faith.’ These definitions would suggest a very similar meaning given to water baptism by both General and Particular Baptists, an ordinance and not a sacrament, whereas Stassen suggests that this non-sacramental view to baptism applies solely to the General Baptists.

### 3.3 Chapter summary

In this chapter, in order to locate the beginning of Quakerism within the national religious environment of the time, I have outlined the theologies and backgrounds to those sects or religious groups that existed prior to and at the birth of Quakerism in the mid seventeenth century and with whom it is recorded that the early Quakers had direct contact. In this outline, I have highlighted those beliefs and practices that are seen to exist both in the early Quaker movement and in the earlier religious groups: not swearing of oaths advocated by the Anabaptists, baptism of the Spirit advocated by the Anabaptists and both English Baptist groups, interpretation of Scripture through the Spirit and not by learning advocated by Anabaptists, Seekers, Familists, and both English Baptist groups, not accepting the authority

---

259 Glen H. Stassen, ‘Anabaptist Influence in the origin of the Particular Baptists’, p. 322. Tolmie agrees with Stassen when he writes, ‘This [the doctrine of general redemption] rather than believer’s baptism was their [General Baptists] fundamental tenet, and as a result General Baptists had no sense of common purpose with the Particular Baptists.’ Murray Tolmie, *The Triumphs of the Saints*, p. 72. Underwood also writes ‘even though General Baptists affirmed its initiatory significance, baptism was apparently to many of them of no greater importance than the laying on of hands.’ T. L. Underwood, *Primitivism, Radicalism and the Lamb’s War*, p. 72. Underwood further notes that there was a ‘rare act of cooperation’ between the General and Particular Baptists when they issued a joint condemnation of the Fifth Monarchist uprising in 1661. T. L. Underwood, *Primitivism, Radicalism and the Lamb’s War*, p. 13.
of the State on matters of religion, advocated by the Anabaptists and the English Baptists, allowance of all members of the congregation to minister advocated by the Anabaptists and English General Baptists, the Bible was not the ‘Word’, advocated by the Anabaptists, English Baptists, Familists, and Seekers, and the implied, if not explicitly propounded belief, in egalitarianism.

In the next chapter I discuss the birth and growth of the Quaker community in England in the seventeenth century with particular reference to the possibility of transference of theology and practice through the contact that its early members had with the extant religious groups of that time in England and in continental Europe.
CHAPTER 4

BACKGROUND TO THE THEOLOGY OF GEORGE FOX

4.1 Introduction

As established in 1.2 above, Quakerism was the term used to denote the religious movement initially led by George Fox, and the term ‘Quaker’ was used to define the group of individuals who, thereafter, accepted Fox’s teachings.¹ In this chapter I explore the environment in which Fox developed his theology. In 4.2 below, I outline the background to Fox’s early life during a time of significant social and religious upheaval in England. I then review the religious environment within which Fox grew up and consider Fox’s family background within the established social and theological arena of that time. My investigation then focuses on the individuals that Fox met during his years of seeking. In 4.3 I examine the background and history of Nathaniel Stephens, the Rector of the church in the Fox family village, with whom Fox records a number of meetings,² and in 4.4 I investigate the religious background of Fox’s ‘Uncle Pickering’ with whom Fox spent some time, in London, in 1644. In 4.5 I investigate a particular aspect of Fox’s family history which arises from Fox’s statement in his Journal that his mother was ‘of the stock of the martyrs’,³ and I conclude this chapter by reviewing the ecclesiastical contacts that Fox, in his Journal, confirms having made in his early life.

¹ See Pink Dandelion, An Introduction to Quakerism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 29. ‘Quakers’ was initially an insult coined by Justice Bennett at Fox’s blasphemy trial in Derby in 1650 but its usage spread, and it was soon adopted by the group...The Religious Society of Friends did not emerge as the formal name of the group until the early nineteenth century.’
4.2 The Fox Family

4.2.1 National social context

The only contemporary document that exists that refers to the beginning of Quakerism and the early life of George Fox is his *Journal*.\(^4\) In his *Journal*, Fox records his birth as occurring in 1624,\(^5\) and then records the events in his life occurring between the years 1647 and 1652 that led up to the beginning of the Quaker movement.\(^6\) Nowhere in his *Journal* does Fox describe wider events occurring in England during the early part of his life, such as the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642 leading to the execution of the King in 1649,\(^7\) nor the proliferation of non-conformist religious groups (see Chapter 3). As a consequence of these omissions, Fox does not give any indication of how these national social and religious events affected his theological development. Fox must have been aware of these events and it is most likely that they had a deep influence on him for, as Moore writes, this was a time ‘of much speculation about the end of the present world order and the reign of Christ that was to come.’\(^8\)

During the one-hundred years leading up to 1650, the population of England almost doubled, with a consequent trebling of trade into London.\(^9\) This led to a relative prosperity in England

---

\(^4\) See 1.3 above and 6.2 below for a discussion on this point and on the reliance that can be placed on the information contained in the *Journal*.


\(^6\) See 6.3 below and George Fox, *Journal*, pp. 11 and 105. Fox’s own account, told in his *Journal*, continues up to the year 1676, but years up to 1652 only are considered in this research.


\(^8\) Rosemary Moore, *The Light in Their Consciences*, p. 60. In his paper, Larry Ingle was most critical of Hugh Barbour’s account of the background to Quakerism because ‘From his [Barbour] account...it is nearly impossible to detect that there existed sharp and divisive social upheavals during the civil war period, upheavals that could only have had a profound impact on average English people.’ H. Larry Ingle, ‘From Mysticism to Radicalism: Recent histiography of Quaker beginnings.’ *Quaker History*, 76, no. 2, Fall 1987, p. 83.

during the years of the Commonwealth, 1649-1653. In order for an individual to be successful in trade, it was necessary to be trusted by neighbours and customers. It can be assumed that these same attributes can be applied to George Fox’s father, Christopher, in order for him to satisfactorily provide for his family through his trade as a weaver.

Wrightson writes of English society in the seventeenth century as ‘a single hierarchy of status and occupational groups’, but that ‘categories were ill defined and that the membranes that separated them were permeable.’ These separations were made more defined, according to Everitt, as a result of the Civil War.

The reasons for the outbreak of the English Civil War were many, some social and some religious, and are beyond the scope of this thesis. However it is important to note Braddick’s

---

10 Craig Muldrew, ‘Economic and Urban Development’, p. 160. This point is disputed by Hill who writes ‘The years from 1620 to 1650 were bad; the 1640s were much the worst decade of the period...disastrous harvests...cost of living rose significantly...widespread hunger and unemployment...many were starving.’ Christopher Hill, The World Turned Upside Down (London: Penguin Books, 1991), pp. 107-8.
12 George Fox, Journal, p. 1. Fox describes his father as a weaver, but does not indicate whether he was a weaver on his own account or whether he applied his trade for another employer. Nevertheless, Fox describes his father as ‘an honest man’ and that his neighbours described him as ‘Righteous Christer.’ I suggest that these comments alone indicate that Christopher Fox was self employed and successful in business in view of the high regard in which he was held, as suggested by George Fox, by his neighbours. If that proposition is correct, then it is likely that the whole Fox family would have been involved in the Fox weaving business. See Craig Muldrew, ‘Economic and Urban Development’, p. 154. ‘Both husbands and wives as well as older children...were all active members of the household economy.’
15 See Christopher Hill, ‘Recent Interpretations of the Civil War’, in Christopher Hill, Puritanism & Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century (London: Martin Secker & Warburg Ltd., 1958), p. 28. ‘Large numbers of men and women were drawn into political activity by religious and political ideals as well as by economic necessities.’ It is possible also that this combination of religious and political ideals went deeper if it was perceived by the population that the ruling classes were using the church in order to restore their senior position within society. Christopher Hill, ‘Recent Interpretations of the Civil War’, p. 6. See also F. Engels, ‘The Bourgeois Revolution’ in H.F. Kearney, ed. Problems and Perspectives in History (London: Longman Group Limited, 1965), p. 5. ‘From that time, the bourgeoisie was a humble but still recognized component of the ruling classes of England...He was himself religious...this same religion offered him [opportunities] for working upon the minds of his natural inferiors and making them submissive to the behests of the masters it had pleased God to place over them.’ Other reasons cited by Hill are, p. 9, to redress the balance of property, p. 5, resulting from the decline in a section of the gentry, p. 24, suffering caused by high prices.
view that ‘It was not a war of religion in the sense that the two sides were members of a different church….It was a war about the identity of a single church.’

4.2.2 Local social background

In his Journal, Fox records very little of his early life, possibly, as suggested by Whitney, because he did not regard these years as important. According to Ingle, ‘the family was well off financially, well above the degree associated with people of their class in the village and nation.’ To some extent, this is confirmed by Wrightson when he places ‘independent craftsmen and tradesmen’ amongst the ‘middle sort of people’ in the local community standing between ‘the civic elite and the urban poor.’ Muldrew takes an opposite view when he places weavers, such as Christopher Fox, very much in the labouring category. It is possible that the Fox family had remained in the area around George Fox’s birth for a number of preceding generations, and, although unlikely because of the distance involved, they may have had contact with the Dutch in Norwich, the city which was, according to Mudrew, ‘a

(Reiterated by Hill in The World Turned Upside Down, p. 107 when referring to the disastrous harvests during the 1640s leading to price inflation and lower wages) and p. 24, the proposed increases to tithe payments. Nicholas Tyacke asserts that ‘The signs are that religion was a major contributory cause of the English Civil War.’ Nicholas Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 245.


H. Larry Ingle, First Among Friends: George Fox & the Creation of Quakerism (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 21. Ingle bases this statement on the suggestion that ‘they were able to leave money to each of their children.’ Unfortunately, Ingle does not confirm the amount of money left nor whether this was left on the death of Christopher Fox, sometime before 1670 (see p. 292, Note 24) or on the death of Fox’s mother, Mary Fox in 1673 (see 4.4 below).


Alan Everitt, ‘The Changing Pattern of Labouring Life’, p. 89. ‘In these fielden areas labourers often tended to remain rooted in the same district from one generation to the next.’ It could be argued that Fox’s father, as a weaver, was not strictly speaking a ‘labourer.’ However Wrightson would place him in that wide social group. Keith Wrightson, ‘The Social Order of Early Modern England’, p. 179, Note 2.
centre of cloth weaving.’

Other than recording his father as a weaver and ‘an honest man, and there was a seed of God in him’, Fox gives no further information about him. The Parish Church Registers for Fenny Drayton record Christopher Fox as being a churchwarden there in 1638, suggesting that he was well regarded within the local community.

In his *Journal*, Fox records his mother as Mary Lago, ‘an upright woman’ and ‘of the family of Lagos, and of the stock of the martyrs.’ The only other contemporary comment made about Mary Fox is one made by William Penn in the Preface to the *Journal*. Penn writes that ‘his [Fox’s] Mother, who was a woman accomplished above most of her degree in the place where she lived’ and that ‘she was Tender and indulgent over him [Fox].’ There is no record of Penn visiting Mary Fox, and so I suggest that it is likely this description of Mary Fox is one given to Penn by Fox himself. In 4.5 below I investigate in depth the ancestry of Mary Lago and the possible reasons for Fox describing her as ‘of the stock of the martyrs.’

In his *Journal*, Fox makes reference to only two other family members, a cousin called ‘Bradford’, and ‘Uncle Pickering.’ In relation to this current research, Uncle Pickering is the most relevant in view of his possible connection with a Baptist congregation in London and

---

22 Craig Muldrew, ‘Economic and Urban Development’, p. 153. Also on p. 151 Muldrew describes how English cloth manufacturers, especially in East Anglia, learned their trade from the Dutch immigrants.

23 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 1. See also Craig Muldrew, ‘Economic and Urban Development’, p. 152. Muldrew states that in order to run a successful business at the time of Fox’s father, trust and reputation were essential character traits.

24 *Fenny Drayton Parish Church Register & c 1570 to 1850*, transcribed by W.T. Hall and held in Leicester Records Office.

25 See Craig Muldrew, ‘Economic and Urban Development’, p. 155 where he describes the not inconsiderable responsibilities and powers of Churchwardens at the time, which suggest that the role was undertaken by men who acquired the highest respect within the local community.


28 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 3 and p. 4.
his meeting with Fox at the early stages in Fox’s religious development. As a consequence I investigate Pickering’s religious background in 4.4 below.

Little is documented with regard to Cousin Bradford. Fox met him in 1643, possibly at Atherstone, approximately two miles from Fox’s home of Fenny Drayton, (See Fig. 2). The meeting had a great impact on Fox as he could see how people who profess to be religious had no qualms in becoming drunk. ‘I was grieved that any that made profession of religion should offer to do so.’ It was shortly after this encounter with Bradford that Fox ‘left my relations and brake off all familiarity or fellowship with young or old.’ There is no firm information from which Bradford can be identified. W.T Hall has noted that there were one or two families of that name living, at the time of Fox’s meeting with Cousin Bradford, at Dadlington which is about three miles from Fenny Drayton and five miles from Atherstone. (See Fig. 2). Other than suggesting that someone in the Bradford family may have married someone in the Lago family (surprisingly, Hall does not suggest that a Bradford married into the Fox family), Hall gives no further information on the background to Cousin Bradford.

---

29 George Fox, Journal, p. 4. ‘And I had an uncle there [London], one Pickering, a Baptist (and they were tender then).’
30 George Fox, Journal, p. 3. ‘I being upon business at a fair, one of my cousins, whose name was Bradford, being a professor.’ Fox does not identify the location of this meeting. Atherstone is the place suggested by Nickalls in Note 1 on p. 3.
31 George Fox, Journal, p. 3.
32 George Fox, Journal, p. 3.
33 Fenny Drayon Parish Church Register & c 1570 to 1850, transcribed by W.T. Hall. Introductory Notes, p. ii.
Figure 2 represents a map of the area around George Fox's birthplace, Fenny Drayton in Leicestershire.
In the next sub-section I outline the religious fervour sweeping England at the time leading up to and including the Civil war (also see Chapter 3 above). Richard Baxter, writing in 1646, suggested that the young people of that time began to form religious opinions of their own.\(^34\) The young George Fox is likely to have been aware of these issues and, as a consequence, formed his own religious views.

### 4.2.3 National religious background

In Chapter 3 I outlined the growth of non-conformist religious denominations in England during the first half of the seventeenth century. It must also be remembered that, during this time, as is shown below, the established church was in a state of flux. This would have contributed to religious uncertainty amongst the general population leading to the proliferation of non-conformist groups. Following the break with Rome under Henry VIII, the established church had retained a Calvinist doctrine.\(^35\) However, under the influence of James I, anti-Calvinist tracts began to appear,\(^36\) and this move towards Arminianism within the church continued under James’ successor Charles I.\(^37\) The promotion of people, considered by

---

\(^{34}\) Matthew Sylvester, *Reliquiae Baxterianæ or, Mr Richard Baxter’s Narrative of the most memorable Passages of his Life and Times* (London: Printed for T. Parkhurst, J. Robinson, J. Lawrence and J. Dunton, MDCXCVI), p. 26. ‘For the young and raw sort of Christians are usually prone to this kind of Sin; to be self-conceited, petulant, wilful, censorious, and injudicious in all their management of their Differences in Religion, and in all their Attempts of Reformation.’ Christopher Hill quotes William Dell writing in 1646 along the same lines, ‘the young as being the most free from the forms of the former age, and from the doctrines and traditions of men.’ Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down*, p. 189. However, using the reference given by Hill I have been unable to trace that comment that he attributes to Dell. The reference quoted by Hill is p. 79 of William Dell, *Several Sermons and Discourses of William Dell, Minister of the Gospel* (London: Printed for Giles Calvert at the sign of the Black-Spread-Eagle, at the West-end of Pauls towards Ludgate. 1652).


\(^{37}\) This move towards ‘Arminianism’ was a furtherance of the views on the importance of prayer and the sacraments and against the Calvinist views on the importance of preaching. It has been suggested that a better name for this group within the church is ‘anti-Calvinist’ rather than ‘Arminian.’ Rudolph W. Heinze, *Reform and
Calvinists in Parliament to be Arminians, to positions of power within the church led to a proclamation in 1626 by Charles I effectively outlawing Calvinism. Tyacke claims that this proclamation had the effect of antagonising Parliament which was exacerbated by a Privy Council ruling during the 1630s which resulted in Arminianism becoming ‘manifest throughout every parish in England.’ This, along with Charles’ perceived ‘obliquely Catholic sympathies together with the decadence of his court’, resulted in a hardening of the views of the Calvinists in Parliament, or Puritans as they were branded by their Arminian opponents. The theological effect of this move from Calvinism to Arminianism, was to alter the means of achieving grace, replacing the grace of predestination conveyed by the preaching of the priest to acceptance of universal grace received via the sacraments at the altar. An Order issued in 1641 reinforced this transfer of achieving grace from preaching to the sacraments by allowing preaching to take place more than the previously permitted once on a ‘Lords Day’ and allowing preaching on one further day in the week. A Bill was read in the

---

38 Rudolph W. Heinze, Reform and Conflict, p. 378. See also Nicholas Tyacke, ‘Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter Revolution’, p. 136.
42 Nicholas Tyacke, ‘Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter Revolution’, p. 141. Tyacke describes, p. 134, the change of the ‘communion table’ into an altar and placed at the east end of the church. Webster describes this change as enabling the re-enactment of the Last Supper in line ‘as far as possible, from the Catholic mass.’ Tom Webster, ‘Religion in Early Stuart Britain’, p. 260. This change may have had an influence on the story related by Nathaniel Stephens, see 4.3 below. See also Nicholas Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists, p. 165. It must be noted that to the Arminian General Baptists, these ‘sacraments’ were not a means of achieving grace, they were simply ‘ordinances’ signifying membership of a congregation. See 1.2.4 above.
43 An Order Made by the House of Commons for the Establishing of Preaching Lecturers throughout the Kingdome of England and Wales (London: Printed by B. Alsop dwelling in Grubstreet, 1641), p. 3 and p. 5.
House of Lords in 1641 to overturn some of these Arminian doctrines, but it was not enacted in law. It is apparent that Calvinism was not totally abolished within the established church as evidenced by a tract written in 1646 by Thomas Whitefield, ‘Minister of the Gospel at Great Yarmouth in Norfolk’ in which he argues against the opinions put forward by lay-preachers, and argues against ‘Arminian Heresie.’

During this period of change within the established church, there was an increase in the incidence of people travelling in the ministry and visiting rural areas. These people are described by Everitt as ‘travelling badgers and tinkers’ peddling their ‘vagrant religion of the Independents.’ Although this increase in travelling ministry was supported in certain circles, it is possible that it alarmed the authorities to such an extent that in 1642 they printed and distributed a series of papers, previously issued in 1622 during the reign of Charles’ predecessor, James. These papers contained a letter from James I to the Archbishop of Canterbury in which the King informed the Archbishop of ‘divers young students...doe broach many times unprofitable, unsound, seditious and dangerous Doctrines to the scandal of this Church, and disquieting of the State, and present Government.’

---

45 Thomas Whitefield, A Refutation of the Loose Opinions, and Licentious Tenets wherewith those Lay-preachers which wander up and down the Kingdome, labour to seduce the simple people...As Also A full Answer to the other Arminian Tenets concerning Election, Redemption, Conversion & Perseverance (Printed at London for John Bellamie, 1646), title page.
47 Right Honourable Robert Lord Brooke, A Discourse opening the nature of that Episcopacie, which is exercised in England (Printed by R.C. for Samuel Cartwright, and are to be sold at the signe of the Hand and Bible in Ducke-Lane, 1642), p. 108 but incorrectly numbered p. 106. In this tract, Brooke gave his arguments in support of ‘lay preachers and criticised the selection of priests in the church by ‘One Lord Bishop and his ignorant (perhaps Drunken) Chaplain; who make scruple of admittance to any Orders.’
48 James Stuart, King James His Letter and Directions to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury...And not that every young man should take to himself an exorbitant Liberty, to preach what he listeth, to the offence of his Majesty, and the disturbance and disquiet of the Church and Common-wealth (Printed for Thomas Walkeley, 1642), p. 1.
Reprobation, or of the universality, efficacity, restibility or irresistibilty of Gods grace. 49 The re-issuing of James’ letter, therefore, was aiming to quell all preaching contrary to that of the established church. Three years later, in 1645 during the Civil War, an instruction was issued by ‘the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled’ that ‘no person be permitted to preach who is not ordained a Minister either in this or some other Reformed Church.’ 50 As this Order specifically refers to its implementation within the army and was sent to Sir Thomas Fairfax, it appears that the influence of travelling lay-preachers was of a concern to the predominantly Calvinist parliamentarians. 51

Tracts, issued anonymously to counter the preaching of travelling lay-preachers, emphasised the trades practiced by those preachers, which suggested to the readers that they were untutored in theological matters and, as a consequence, that their theologies were suspect. 52 Ann Hughes suggests that Thomas Edwards in his Gangraena, written in 1646, went further and urged the suppression of lay preaching and ‘sectarian congregations...if necessary through force.’ 53

---

49 James Stuart, King James His Letter and Directions to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, p. 3.
52 Examples of these are Anon author, Preachers New. Greene the Feltmaker, Spencer the Horserubber, Quartermine the Brewer...which many ignorant Coxcombes call Preaching...Whereunto is added the last Tumult in Fleetstreet raised by the disorderly preaching, pratings and prating of Mr Barebones the Leather-seller. (No publishing information shown. EEBO ascribes authorship to John Taylor and ‘Printed for G.T in the year 1641’) and Anon Author, These Trades-men are Preachers in and about the City of London. A Discovery of the Most Dangerous and Damnable Tenets that have been spread within this few years: By may Erronious, Hereticall and mechannick spirits. By which the very foundation of Christian knowledge and practice is endeavoured to be overturned (Printed and Published to order, 1647). In this latter tract, the preachers are not named but only identified by their trades, and it sets out forty-nine ‘damnable tenets.’ A number of these tenets could have affected Fox’s emerging theology had he read this tract or if he had listened to the preachers who preached these views: namely: para 7, ‘That the Scriptures cannot be said to be the Word of God, because there is no word of God but Christ’; para 32, ‘That Universities is of the Devil, and humane learning is of the flesh’; and para 44, ‘That there is no Originall sin in us.’
53 Ann Hughes, Gangraena and the struggle for the English revolution (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. v. According to Hughes, Edwards was, ‘an exiled English minister’ who ‘found refuge with the staunchly Presbyterian English church in Amsterdam.’ In his Gangraena Edwards expressed his views on the dangers of religious liberty, ‘such liberty...had to be fervently opposed.’ Hughes, Gangraena, p. 1, p. 416 and p. 106. Again
4.2.4 Theological background of Fox’s parents

With Fox’s father identified as a churchwarden at Fenny Drayton parish church in 1638, it is reasonable to assume that George Fox was baptized there as an infant. According to Gerard Croese, the early historian of Quakerism, ‘[the Fox family] lived devoutly and piously, [and] were of the Reformed Religion.’ It is likely, however, that the only knowledge that Croese had of the Fox family came from the first publication of Fox’s Journal in 1694, two years before Croese wrote his history. During his likely attendance at his local church, Fox would have been aware of, if not read, John Foxe’s Book of Martyrs. C.E. Welch claims that there had been a long tradition of non-conformity in the parish of Fenny Drayton, firstly from about 1608 under the rector, Robert Mason, and then, in Fox’s early days, under Nathaniel Stephens, ‘[a] Presbyterian who took refuge in Coventry during the civil war.’ Fox makes no reference in his Journal to Mason, but he does record many meetings and conversations with Stephens. Taylor suggested that it was during this period of Stephens’ tenure at Fenny

---

4.2.2 above and 4.5.1 below.
55 George Fox, A Journal or Historical Account.
56 The main document recording the names of martyrs in England up to the mid seventeenth century was John Foxe’s Book of Martyrs. See also Douglas Campbell, The Puritan in Holland, England and America (London: James R. Osgood, McIlwaine & Co., 1892), p. 442. ‘[Foxe’s Book of Martyrs] published abroad in Latin in the year 1559...in 1563 he published an English translation...an order was issued [in 1570] directing copies of the book to be placed in the churches for public perusal...the common people had almost no reading matter except for the Bible and Foxe’s Book of Martyrs we can understand the deep impression that this book produced.’
57 C.E. Welch, ‘Early Nonconformity in Leicestershire.’ Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society. 37, 1961-2, p. 32. Damrosch suggests that this tradition of non-conformity in Fenny Drayton may have gone back further than Welch states as a previous incumbent at the church, Anthony Nutter, was ejected from his living there in 1605 ‘leaving a legacy of independence and seriousness.’ Leo Damrosch, The Sorrows of the Quaker Jesus (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996), p. 279, Note 15. However, in view of the date of Nutter’s ejection, it is likely that if Christopher Fox had known him at all, it would only have been when Fox Snr was a child and so unable to comprehend the implications of Nutter’s theology or circumstances surrounding his departure.

160
Drayton that Fox ‘rebelled against the Calvinistic theology of the Presbyterian Church’, a Calvinism that possibly Stephens had reintroduced into his church.  

Joseph Pickvance wrote a comprehensive study of the religious events occurring in Fenny Drayton in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. He recorded the objection of thirteen Fenny Drayton villagers to taking communion in 1607 ‘because they refuse to take the same kneeling’, with similar events, at least one resulting in excommunication, occurring in the years up to 1638. According to Pickvance, the situation changed in 1638 with the appointment of Stephens ‘a zealous Presbyterian’ so that, from that time on, ‘the Puritans [i.e. Calvinists] in the village were assured of their rector’s encouragement and support.’

Other than the statements, already quoted, that Fox made with regard to his mother, nothing further is known of her religious background.

In the next section I investigate the life and background of Nathaniel Stephens who, as Fox’s parish priest, was known to Fox during his theologically formative years and some of whose meetings with Fox prior to 1647 were recorded by Fox.

---

60 See 4.2.3 above and 4.3 below.
63 Joseph Pickvance, *George Fox and the Purefeys*, p. 29.
64 After his description of her at the beginning of his Journal, see 4.2.2 above, his only other direct reference to her relates to her death in 1673 when Fox records that, on her deathbed, she sent word to Fox that she wanted to see him before she died. George Fox, *Journal*, pp. 672-3. The record of this in Fox’s Journal indicates that Fox was unable to see his mother before she died and that, possibly, her knowledge of Fox’s imprisonment at that time hastened her death. See George Fox, *Journal*, p. 673, Note a.
4.3 Nathaniel Stephens (or Stevens)\textsuperscript{65}

Born around 1606 to a Church minister, Richard Stephens, in Staunton-Barwood, Wiltshire, Stephens received a traditional education at Magdalen College, Oxford for entry into the ministry of the Church.\textsuperscript{66} He became Curate at Staunton-Barwood in 1628, Curate at Charburron in 1630 then Rector of St Michael’s Church, Drayton-in-the-Clay (now Fenny Drayton) sometime before 1638 where he remained until he was ejected in 1662 due to non-conformity.\textsuperscript{67} He died in 1678.\textsuperscript{68} His appointment to the living at Fenny Drayton was made ‘at the insistence of’ George Purefoy (sometimes spelled Purefey), the Squire of Fenny Drayton,

\textsuperscript{65} Fox in his Journal, p. 5, refers to ‘Stephens’; whereas Palmer refers to ‘Stevens.’ Samuel Palmer, The Nonconformist’s Memorial: Being An Account of the Ministers who were ejected or silenced after the Restoration, particularly by the Act of Uniformity, which took Place on Batholemew-day, Aug. 24, 1662. Originally written by the Reverend and learned Edmund Calamy, D.D. (London: for J. Harris, MDCCCLXXVII), p. 112.


\textsuperscript{67} See www.theclergydatabase.org.uk and Joseph Pickvance, George Fox and the Purefys, pp. 26 and 29. It is recorded that, following his ejection from Fenny Drayton, Stephens moved to Hinckley then to Stoke Golding where ‘his house was licensed for Presbyterian worship…’ Stephen’s son, Nathaniel, is recorded as being ‘an active nonconformist in 1672.’ Alexander Gordon, ‘Stephens, Nathaniel (1606/7–1678).’ Calamy recorded that after moving to Hinckley, Stephens was ‘so molested, that he was forced to remove Seven Times for his Peace. At last he fix’s at Stoke-Golding…’ A.G. Matthews, Calamy Revised. Being a revision of Edmund Calamy’s Account of the ministers and others ejected and silenced, 1660-62 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934), p. 462.

\textsuperscript{68} Samuel Palmer, The Nonconformist’s Memorial, pp. 112-114. See also Joseph Foster, Alumni Oroniensis. The Members of the University of Oxford 1500-1714 (Oxford: Parker & Co., 1891), p. 1419. In neither of these account is any indication given as to the nature of Stephens’ ‘non-conformity.’
who was recorded by Pickvance as ‘a Puritan patron.’\textsuperscript{69} It can be assumed that Purefoy would have appointed a Rector with Puritan or Calvinist views similar to his own.\textsuperscript{70}

The only records of Stephens’ meetings with George Fox are contained in Fox’s \textit{Journal}, the first recorded meeting and discussion having taken place in 1646, and the last recorded meeting and discussion taking place in 1655.\textsuperscript{71}

There are a number of issues to be considered concerning the relationship between Fox and Stephens, and the nature of their meetings and discussions:

1. Their first recorded meeting in 1646 appears to have ended amicably with Fox having been complimented by Stephens on his ‘very good full answer’ to the question posed by Stephens.\textsuperscript{72} But then Fox writes that, following that meeting, Stephens used the contents of that discussion during his sermons, for which ‘I did not like him’ and that afterwards Stephens became ‘my great persecutor.’\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{69} Alexander Gordon, ‘Stephens, Nathaniel (1606/7–1678)’. See also George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 48, Note I. In this edition of Fox’s \textit{Journal}, p. 71, Fox refers to ‘George Purefoy’, whereas Pickvance refers to ‘George Purefey.’ See also Joseph Pickvance, \textit{George Fox and the Purefeys}, p. 26. ‘About the Puritan opinions of the third George Purefey...we are in no doubt.’ Pickvance, p. 12, writes that Fenny Drayton had a Puritan Rector from as early as 1586 or 1587. After he appointed Stephens, George Purefoy joined the Parliamentarian cause in the English civil war, during which he commanded a garrison near Banbury, Oxfordshire until about 1646. Joseph Pickvance, \textit{George Fox and the Purefeys}, pp. 27/8. Thereafter, he entered parliament, representing Berkshire from 1655 to 1656 and died in 1661. Joseph Pickvance, \textit{George Fox and the Purefeys}, p. 32.

\textsuperscript{70} Braddick confirms this view, ‘the propagation of the faith…was coloured by local lay preferences.’ Michael Braddick, \textit{God’s Fury, England’s Fire}, p. 74.

\textsuperscript{71} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 5. See also George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 185. In his tract \textit{Vindicæ Fundamenti Or a threefold defence of the Doctrine of Original Sin} (London: Printed by T.R. and E. M. for Edmund Paxton in Pauls Chain, right over against the Castle-Tavern, near Doctors Commons, 1658), Stephens confirms, on the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} unnumbered page of the ‘Preface’, his belief with regard to original sin ‘Original sinne (in the sense as we define it) cannot be denyed’, and refers to a discussion that he held on 22\textsuperscript{nd} February 1654 (possibly 1655) with ‘Brethren of the separation’ regarding this theology, and the disruption that took place surrounding the debate. He does not name the person with whom the debate took place, and although Fox reports a discussion taking place with Stephens in 1655, \textit{Journal}, p. 184, Fox’s report of that meeting makes no reference to the theology of original sin.

\textsuperscript{72} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 5. The question raised by Stephens was ‘why Christ cried out on the Cross, ‘My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me’.’ The end of Fox’s reported reply was ‘This I spoke, being at that time in a measure sensible of Christ’s suffering.’

\textsuperscript{73} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 5.
At this time Fox was aged around twenty-two. It seems unlikely that this recorded meeting was the first between the Rector of Fox’s local Church and one of his parishioners. The record of this meeting, as has been suggested, was friendly, and at that time Stephens had a high opinion of Fox, having reputedly said of him to Stephens’ Patron, George Purefoy, ‘that there never was such a plant bred in England.’

It is open to conjecture as to what transpired between Fox and Stephens between 1646 and their next meeting in 1649 when Stephens said of Fox that ‘[Fox] was mad.’

Two possibilities are:

a) Fox had recorded that Stephens had taken some of Fox’s ideas from their discussions together and that Stephens had used them in sermons, see above. Fox could equally have taken Stephens’ ideas from his sermons and claimed them as his own. This could push Stephens into claiming Fox to be mad in Fox claiming Stephens’ ideas as his own.

b) Fox recorded that, when he arrived in Fenny Drayton to visit his family in 1647, Stephens had previously visited them and informed them that ‘he was afraid of me [Fox] for going after new lights.’ Again, this is a possible reason for Stephens thinking Fox to be ‘mad.’

---

74 George Fox, Journal, p. 48.
75 George Fox, Journal, p. 48. The likely interpretations of the word ‘mad’ are, from Oxford English Dictionary, ‘Foolish, unwise’ or ‘Carried away by enthusiasm or desire; wildly existed; infatuated’ rather than ‘Suffering from mental disease.’ These definitions, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, were in use in the seventeenth century.
76 George Fox, Journal, p. 8. The term ‘new lights’ could be interpreted as Fox’s newly professed theology.
At their final recorded meeting in 1655, relations between the two appear to have ameliorated, despite some obvious differences of opinion. Stephens had suggested that Fox ‘is come to the light of the sun, and now he thinks to put out my starlight.’ 77 Fox reports that he then said to Stephens ‘Nathaniel, give me thy hand’, 78 almost as a sealing of the contract that Fox ‘would not quench the least measure of God in any, much less put out his starlight.’ 79 According to Fox, the two men did shake hands, but when Fox stated that Stephens ought to preach ‘freely and not take tithes from the people’, Stephens ‘plucked his hand out of my hand and said that he would not yield unto that’. 80

2. It has been stated that Stephens was ejected from his living in 1662 due to his non-conformity. 81 This ejection could be the result of the Act of Uniformity of 1662 which added Presbyterians to the ranks of nonconformists, or as a result of Stephens acquiring nonconformist or independent views prior to the enactment of that Act. 82

For a period of time from the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642, Stephens left Fenny Drayton and took up preaching in Coventry where it is reported that he met, and

---

77 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 184.
78 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 184.
80 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 184.
81 Ed. Richard L. Greaves & Robert Zaller, *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1983). There is no reference in this book to Nathaniel Stephens (or Stevens), and so it can be assumed that he was not so radical as to receive that label. See p. viii, Greaves and Zaller define, for the purposes of their book, ‘radicals’ as ‘those who sought fundamental change by striking at the very root of contemporary assumptions and institutions.’ Around the time of meeting Fox, Stephens still held some conformist views. See Footnote 71 above regarding Stephens’ views on original sin contained in his tract *Vindicæ Fundamenti* and his tract *A Precept for the baptisme of Infants Out of the New Testament Where the matter is first proved from three severall Scriptures that there is such a word of Command* (London: Printed by T.R. and E.M. for Edmund Paxton, Nathanael Webb and William Grantham; and are to be sold in Pauls Chaine neer Doctors Commons, and at the Greyhound in Pauls Church-yard, 1650/1) regarding his justification for infant baptism.
formed ‘a lasting friendship’ with Richard Baxter, the ‘reluctant nonconformist’ who, in later years wrote twenty-one anti-Quaker tracts.\(^{83}\)

On his return to Fenny Drayton, Stephens was subjected to ‘trouble with the Baptists’ (or, as described by Calamy, ‘Anabaptists’).\(^{84}\) Although neither account is specific about the period of time spent by Stephens in Coventry, nor when it took place, he must have returned in time for his first meeting with Fox in 1646.\(^ {85}\) It can only be pure conjecture as to the effect that these ‘troubles’ with Baptists/Anabaptists had on Stephens, and the extent to which they were conveyed to Fox. The effect would depend on the theology of the group of ‘Baptists’ encountered by Stephens, whether the Calvinist Particular Baptists or the Arminian General Baptists. It is unfortunate that neither Palmer nor Calamy give any indication of their theology. Similar consideration should be made as to the influence that Baxter had on Stephens’ theology in advance of Stephens’ first reported meeting with Fox. Less than twenty years after his return to Fenny Drayton, as explained above, Stephens was ejected for his non-conformist ideas and although ejected from ‘Calvinist’ Fenny Drayton, Palmer records that Stephens continued ‘the exercise of his ministry’ at Stoke-Golding, approximately two miles due west of Fenny Drayton, until his death in 1678.\(^ {86}\)

---

\(^{83}\) Alexander Gordon, ‘Stephens, Nathaniel (1606/7–1678).’ See also 6.4.1 below regarding Baxter’s anti-Quaker tracts.

\(^{84}\) Samuel Palmer, The Nonconformist’s Memorial, pp. 112-114. See also Edward Calamy, The Account of the Ministers, Lecturers, Masters and Fellows of Colleges and Schoolmasters, who were Ejected and Silenced after the Restoration in 1660, by or before the Act of Uniformity (London: Printed for R Ford at the Angel, R Hett at the Bible and Crown and J Chandler at the Cross-Keys all in the Poultry, MDCCXIII), p. 419.

\(^{85}\) See Samuel Palmer, The Nonconformist’s Memorial, pp. 112-114. Where Palmer refers to this period in Coventry as: ‘There during the continuance of the war.’ See also Alexander Gordon, ‘Stephens, Nathaniel (1606/7–1678)’ which records Stephens leaving Fenny Drayton ‘by the outbreak of the civil war in 1642’ and returning in 1645.’

\(^{86}\) Samuel Palmer, The Nonconformist’s Memorial, pp. 112-114. See also Thomas Hodgkin, George Fox (London: Methuen & Co., 1896), pp. 12-14. ‘The reverend Nathaniel Stephens...to spend the remaining fifteen years of his life in obscurity as a Nonconformist preacher.’ See also Alexander Gordon, ‘Stephens, Nathaniel
Fig. 2). I suggest that, as Stephens was granted authority to preach at Stoke-Golding, his non-conformity was not sufficiently extreme as to attract total condemnation by church authorities, and so the effect of Fox and the Baptists on his theology was only sufficient to attract the condemnation of his patron and parishioners, as indicated below.

3. Although Stephens was an ordained minister in the established Church, according to Calamy, ‘he had a great Aversion to that Ceremoniousness which was carried so high by some.’ It is possible Stephens’ opinions on some of the forms of the church ceremonials were expressed to Fox during their many discussions, and had some bearing on Fox’s developing views on forms of worship.

4. Calamy records a story that Stephens would ‘often tell’ relating to the happenings in a church ‘in the West.’ The story relates to a clergyman who, on entering a church where the altar was missing, bows to the communion-table at the east wall of the church. A boy was sitting on that table, and seeing the priest bow, stood in front of the table and bowed towards the clergyman. This was repeated twice more. The question as highlighted in the story was to whom was the priest bowing? The story

---

(1606/7–1678)’ where it is noted that one of Stephens’ four sons, Nathaniel ‘was recorded as an active nonconformist in 1672.’


88 Samuel Palmer, *The Nonconformist’s Memorial*, pp. 112-114. It is not recorded in this story whether Stephens witnessed the events that took place. If the events did not take place in Fenny Drayton, as is suggested as one of the possibilities in this section, then I suggest that they took place in Stephens’ father’s church in Wiltshire.

89 Spufford describes the reason for the change in position of the altar ‘from the east end…to the midst of the people in the nave…symbolises the difference in the way the relationship between people and God is demonstrated.’ Margaret Spufford, *Contrasting Communities: English Villagers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), p. 239. Another version of this story states that the priest bowed to where the altar used to be and that the boy, on seeing the priest bow, went across and stood in front of the priest and bowed back to him. See Edward Calamy, *A Continuation of the Account of the Ministers*, p. 577.
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continues that the boy knew that ‘the God whom the Christians worship is no more in
the East than in the West, no more in the Chancel than in the Church; nor no more
there than in the House or Field, unless when his People are there worshipping him, in
Spirit and in Truth at which times he is with them by his Spirit and Grace.’

It is possible that the story was told by Stephens to Fox at the time that Fox lived at
Fenny Drayton and attended Stephens’ church. Hearing this story could have led to
Fox’s ‘opening’, recorded in his Journal as occurring in 1647, that ‘God...did not
dwell in temples made with hands...but in people’s hearts...This opened in me as I
walked in the fields to my relations house.’ It is also possible that, as the recording
of this story was by Calamy in 1727, up to one hundred years after the suggested
events occurred, the events took place in Fenny Drayton with Fox being the boy with
established ideas of the nature of the church, and Stephens being the priest. This
interpretation is, I suggest, less likely as the church is recorded in Stephens’ story is
‘in the West.’

5. During the seventeenth century there was much speculation about the end of world
order with particular reference, in arguments, to the Book of Revelation. Although,
according to Moore, Quakers, other than Nayler, made less specific use of that Book
in their tracts than millenarians, Nuttall suggests that Quakers, perhaps
unconsciously, used the imagery from the Book of Revelations in their writings. It is

---

92 Rosemary Moore, *The Light in Their Consciences*, p. 60.
93 Rosemary Moore, *The Light in Their Consciences*, p. 67. See also p. 61, ‘Quakers generally...[used] less
specific texts from the Book of Revelations.’
This book is based upon lectures given by the author at Woodbrooke Quaker Study Centre during 1945.
possible that Fox’s own interest in that Book, as indicated by Gwyn, was ignited by Stephens.\footnote{Douglas Gwyn, \textit{Apocalypse of the Word} (Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 1984), p. 186. To some extent Gwyn’s assertion is countered by the information supplied by Murer. See Esther Greenleaf Murer, \textit{Quaker Bible Index} (CD format. Philadelphia: Quaker Press, 2002). Tables 1A and 1B on pp. 412-437 set out the number and description of the biblical references used by Fox in all his writings. In all, Fox used 3,375 different quotations, of which the most frequent were 414 from the Gospel of John and 323 from the Book of Isaiah. T. Edmund Harvey, \textit{The Rise of Quakers} (London: Headley Brothers, MCMV), p. 16. ‘He [Nathaniel Stephens] took much pains in studying the book of Revelation; and some apprehended that few ever did it to better purpose.’} In 1656, a year after Fox’s last recorded meeting with Stephens, Stephens wrote a tract on the Book of Revelations\footnote{Nathaniel Stephens, \textit{A Plain and Easie Calculation of the Name, Mark and Number of the Name of the Beast} (London: Printed by Ja: Cottrel, for Matth: Keynton, at the Fountain; Nath: Heathcoat, at the gilded Acorn; and Hen: Fletcher, at the three gilt Cups in S. Pauls Church-yard, 1656). The header page for this long, 305 page tract shows the dedication to ‘The Conscientious Reader, Whoever he be, that hath a Minde given to him to calculate the Times, and to search into the sense of the most admired Book of the Revelation.’} and, although not recorded, I suggest that the contents of that Book would have been discussed by Stephens with a person with an inquiring mind of the nature of Fox’s.\footnote{Appendix 1 shows the meetings that Fox describes in his \textit{Journal}, has having held between his birth in 1624 and 1652. Many of these meetings, it is seen, involved theological arguments which indicate Fox’s theologically inquiring mind of that time.}

6. There is one personality trait that Stephens shared with Fox. Calamy wrote of Stephens: ‘his Thoughts would be sometimes so close and intense, that he would strangely forget himself.’\footnote{Edward Calamy, \textit{A Continuation of the Account of the Ministers}, p. 577.} This character trait is one shown on many occasions by Fox,\footnote{George Fox, \textit{Journal}. Examples of this trait, quoted early in his life by Fox are, p. 4: ‘I kept myself retired in my chamber and often walked solitary in the Chase’, and p. 10, ‘[I] travelled up and down as a stranger in the earth...I kept myself much as a stranger...and was brought off from outward things.’} and so it can by surmised that either Fox and Stephens were of a similar, introspective character, or Fox used Stephens as a role model in his seeking.

\section*{Conclusions}

Nothing in this section produces direct evidence of the effect of Baptists or Anabaptists on the thinking of Fox, or any evidence of direct influence of Stephens on Fox during his formative
years. It is recorded that they held discussions with each other during 1646, (only one year before Fox had an ‘opening’ and ‘heard a voice’).  

It is inconceivable that, living in the same small village, they did not have close contact for many years leading up to that time.  

In some respects they appear to be kindred spirits, and followed similar paths, albeit Fox’s path developed before Stephens followed his own path to non-conformity and eventual ejection from Fenny Drayton church in 1662. This could suggest that Fox was correct in that Stephens did take notice of Fox’s arguments and use them to develop his own theology and, as reported by Hodgkin, Stephens became ‘a true man, and willing to suffer for conscience’s sake.’  

In the next section I investigate the religious background of Fox’s baptist ‘Uncle Pickering’ with whom Fox spent some time in London during 1644.

### 4.4 ‘Uncle Pickering’

Fox makes reference, in his *Journal*, to the time that he spent in London in 1644 with his Uncle Pickering who Fox describes as a Baptist.  

Members of the Baptist community with which Pickering was associated encouraged Fox to join them but he refused as ‘I saw all, young and old, where they were’, and ‘I was fearful and returned homewards.’  

Fox does not state what he found objectionable in that Baptist congregation or what made him fearful.

---

100 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 11. Fox’s ‘opening’ was that ‘to be bred at Oxford or Cambridge was not sufficient to fit a man to be a minister of Christ’, and the voice that he heard said ‘There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition.’  

101 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 5. In Fox’s own words, ‘Then the priest of Drayton, the town of my birth, whose name was Nathaniel Stephens, would come often to me, and I went often to him.’ Croese suggests that, despite these frequent meetings, ‘Stevens would nevertheless leave him [George Fox] to himself, as being neither grieving nor angry at him.’ Gerard Croese, *The General History of the Quakers*, p. 19.  


103 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 4.  

104 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 4.
It is possible that his fear did not directly relate to the theology preached by the Baptists, who Fox describes as ‘tender.’ Alternatively it could have referred to the effect on his family of Fox’s meeting with Baptists, his family being members of the local established church and the family continuing to run its weaving business without the help of the eldest son. This suggestion is reinforced when Fox continues that sentence by saying that he was ‘having regard upon my mind unto my parents and relations, lest I should grieve them, who, I understood, were troubled at my absence.’

The *Journal* gives no indication on the length of time that Fox spent with the Baptists in London, but, however short or long that period it is likely that, in the words of Jones ‘he [Fox] must have learned something from them.’ As a consequence, it is important to identify the congregation with which Uncle Pickering was associated in order to ascertain to what theology Fox was subjected.

Despite the earliest version of Fox’s *Journal* referring to Pickering as a Baptist, Braithwaite refers to Pickering as being an ‘Anabaptist.’ Jones had earlier referred to Pickering being a

---

105 See Joseph Pickvance, *A Reader’s Companion to George Fox’s Journal* (London: Quaker Home Service, 1989), p. 119 where Pickvance shows the seventeenth century definition of ‘tender’ as ‘Sensitive (usually); sometimes sympathetic.’ In quoting Fox’s use of the word, the *Oxford English Dictionary*, interprets a ‘tender people’ as people ‘susceptible to moral or spiritual influences, impressionable, sympathetic, sensitive to pious emotions.’ This would indicate that, if Fox used the word in these ways, the Baptist congregation sensitively received Fox’s views, not necessarily accepting them, or that they were sympathetic to them as they may have largely coincided with their own.

106 See 4.2.4 above and Craig Muldrew, ‘Economic and Urban Development’, p. 154, ‘Both husbands and wives as well as older children and servants and apprentices were all active members of the household community.’ However it is noted that at a young age Fox was apprentice to a shoemaker in the neighbouring village of Mancetter and so, at that time, would not have been helping in his family business. See George Fox, *Journal*, p. 2.

107 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 4.


109 It is unfortunate that one of the earliest Quaker historians, Gerard Croese, makes no reference to Pickering or to Fox’s visit to London in 1644.

110 George Fox, *A Journal or Historical Account*, p. 3. ‘I had an uncle there, one Pickering, a Baptist.’

111 William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (London: Macmillan And Co. Ltd., 1923), p. xxvi. ‘We know that George Fox, through his uncle Pickering, had some personal connection with the Anabaptists.’
Baptist, but qualified the statement by writing ‘after called Anabaptists.’ It has been suggested by Barclay of Reigate that the Baptist congregation that Fox met was of the Arminian General persuasion, and this conjecture has been taken up without, I suggest, sufficient justification by more recent authors.

Barclay of Reigate, above, referred to the four congregations of General Baptists in London in 1643, and this appears to be sufficient reason for him to suggest that Pickering was associated with one of them. However, it is noted by Tolmie that in 1643/4, along with the four General Baptist congregations in London there were seven Particular Baptist congregations and eighteen other ‘Independent’ congregations that had evolved from the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey congregation out of which some Particular Baptist congregations had been born. Using the same argument as Barclay of Reigate, on the grounds of probability alone, I suggest that Pickering was associated with a Calvinist Particular Baptist congregation and not an Arminian General Baptist congregation.

Unlike Fox and Barclay of Reigate, Ingle refers to Pickering as ‘William Pickering.’ One of the references used by Ingle to associate Pickering to a Baptist congregation is the record of membership of the Jacob-Jessy Church, as shown in the Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society which records a ‘William Pickering’ as joining that congregation in 1631. A
William Pickering, a member of the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey church, is recorded in a later edition of the *Transactions* having been in prison in 1635.\footnote{118} One further note in the article relating to the Jacob-Jessey Church makes particularly interesting reading, and which may reinforce the suggestion that William Pickering was indeed ‘Uncle Pickering’ and that Fox did visit the Jacob-Jessey congregation or a Calvinist Particular Baptist offshoot of it in 1644. A member of the Jacob-Jessey congregation, recorded as having joined that congregation in 1641 was ‘Jone Toldervy.’\footnote{119} The entry also notes that ‘George Fox in [16]55 knew a John Toldervy, who in [16]56 renounced the Friends and published ‘The Foot out of the Snare.’\footnote{120} Taking these entries as a whole could suggest that Fox’s uncle was William Pickering, a member of the Calvinist Jacob-Jessy congregation, or a Particular Baptist offshoot of it; during Fox’s visit to London in 1644 he met with members of that congregation and, although its members were ‘tender’ towards him, he was fearful of their ‘Calvinist’ and ‘Baptist’ doctrines and so returned home; that, within that Jacob-Jessey congregation, he met and left a positive impression on the Baptist, John Toldervy who, at some unknown later date became a Quaker, only to leave them sometime before 1656 when he began to write anti-Quaker tracts;\footnote{121} that what Fox learned of the Calvinist theology of the Particular Baptists convinced him that his own religious path lay in a completely different direction.

\section*{Conclusions}

Based on current available evidence, the only credible theory on the identity and background of Fox’s Uncle Pickering is that he was William Pickering, a member of a Particular Baptist

\begin{footnotes}
  \footnotemark[120]\ See 6.4.2 below regarding the tracts written by Toldervy.
  \footnotemark[121]\ See 6.4 below.
\end{footnotes}
congregation in London in 1644 and that, on visiting that congregation, Fox was not convinced of the Calvinist theology preached within it. On returning to his home, after the visit, Fox began his own religious journey towards Quakerism. Whilst in London it is possible that he learned of the history of the Particular Baptists and, via them, of the General Baptists, although the information on the latter may have been slanted against them. Fox is likely to have learned of the theology of baptism as practiced by both Baptist groups, and the predecessors of the General Baptists, the Dutch Waterlander Mennonites (see 3.2.2 above). Whilst not accepting the need for baptism with water, Fox possibly heard and accepted the Baptist theology of the initial spiritual, inward baptism of the spirit and the Anabaptists’ final baptism of blood.

4.5 ‘Of the stock of the martyrs’

In this section I consider the family background of Fox’s Mother, Mary Fox, née Lago from two perspectives: direct family descent and direct or indirect links with martyrs local to Fox’s home. I also consider other reasons for Fox including a reference to martyrs in his *Journal*.

---

122 One theory, proposed by W.T. Whitley, was that William Pickering was indeed Fox’s Uncle Pickering and that he may have been the son of an Edward Pickering who travelled to Leiden in the Netherlands in 1612. Whitley recorded that Edward Pickering was dead by 1636 and that he may have had a son, William, born in 1614 who might have married a woman of the Lago or Fox family. The connection between William and Edward Pickering is based by Whitley solely on the fact, as suggested by Whitley that ‘the name [Pickering] is not so common but that we may suppose the two to be related.’ W.T. Whitley, ‘George Fox’s Uncle Pickering.’ *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 7, no. 1, First Month [Jan] 1910, p. 34. If this connection can be proved, it would give a possible reason, by virtue of the knowledge gained by his father in the Netherlands, for William Pickering to join a non-conformist, independent congregation, possibly Particular Baptist, in London in 1631 and to pass on to George Fox his knowledge of the Dutch-based religious groups. More research is needed in order to identify, unequivocally, ‘Uncle Pickering’ and the London Baptist group with which he was associated.

4.5.1 Direct family descent of Mary Lago

Fox’s family’s home was in the village of ‘Drayton-in-the-Clay in Leicestershire’, now called Fenny Drayton. Fenny Drayton is situated approximately three miles due east of the village of Mancetter and about ten miles south-east of the town of Lichfield. It should also be noted that Fenny Drayton lies in the County of Leicestershire, Mancetter lies in the county of Warwickshire and Lichfield lies in the county of Staffordshire, see Fig. 2 above.

There is evidence of Lago families living in the neighbourhood of Fenny Drayton in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Parish Records of Mancetter record an Elizabeth Lago being buried in the churchyard of St. Peter’s Church, Mancetter, in the year 1579 and a Robert Pickerill marrying Elizabeth Lagoe in April 1627. Also, extant grave-stones in that churchyard record the deaths of members of the Lagoe family in the nineteenth century. Ingle states that there were a large number of Lago families in North Warwickshire, and there is other evidence of Lago families existing during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Leicestershire and during the sixteenth century in Staffordshire. However, there is no record of a Lago family in Fenny Drayton at any time during the sixteenth and

---

124 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 1. See also Note 2 on p. 1.
125 Each of these three places is relevant to my investigation and so it was necessary to investigate papers held in the county records offices of each of the three named counties.
127 The Parish of St. Peter, Mancetter. Register of Baptisms 1576-1654, Marriages 1576-1653 and Burials 1576-1654, held on microfilm Doc. Ref. DRO130/1 at Warwickshire County Records Office.
128 The words on the grave-stone are ‘Sacred to the Memory of Willm Harrington Lagoe who died April 17th 1845 in the 86th Year of his Age. Also of Ann Lagoe his Wife who died March 21st 1846 in the 65th Year of her Age. Also of John Drayton Lagoe Second son of the above who died March 25th 1828 in the 15th year of his Age’. Visit to St. Peter’s Church, Mancetter on 16th January 2009.
seventeenth centuries. The Bishop’s Transcripts relating to the Parish Church at Fenny Drayton solely record the burial of ‘Mary ffox’, George Fox’s mother on 7th January 1673. Unfortunately, the Parish Records of the Fox family’s church, St Michaels and All Angels in their home village of Fenny Drayton, no longer exist.

An intriguing suggestion, made by Hall, is that Mary Lago may have come to Fenny Drayton from Dadlington, see Fig. 2, one of the locations that he listed as having held a Lago family, and thus possibly creating the link with Fox’s cousin ‘Bradford’. However, Hall produced no evidence for this link.

From the above it can be deduced that it is equally possible that Mary Lago was a member of a family local to Fenny Drayton or moved to Fenny Drayton from a nearby village or town to marry Christopher Fox.

Further detailed research is needed in order to identify the true location of Mary Lago’s upbringing. In the next subsection I consider the speculations made, by Braithwaite for

---

131 Fenny Drayon Parish Church Register &c 1570 to 1850. Transcribed by W.T. Hall. This document, and its Index, does not include any entry for ‘Lago’ or ‘Lagoe.’
132 Bishops Transcripts, Co. Leicester, p. 103. Held on microfilm record, ref. MF315, at Leicester Records Office.
133 It was suggested by a member of staff at the Leicestershire County Records Office that those records were destroyed by an incumbent at that church who became irate with the number of enquiries he was receiving for sight of them in connection with research into the Fox family.
134 See 4.2.2 above, and Bishops Transcripts, Co. Leicester, Transcribed by W. T. Hall in 1931. ‘Introductory Notes’, p. ii. ‘We have found a slender clue which may be helpful. George Fox in his Journal mentions a cousin called Bradford who tempted him to drink beer. There were one or two families of that name at Dadlington [about 5 miles due east of Mancetter, the note in the Journal says the meeting took place in Atherstone about 2 miles due north of Mancetter] at the time, into which the Lago family might have married, making George Fox’s tempter his cousin Bradford.’ Transcripts held at Leicester Records Office. Also see 4.2.2 above.
135 Craig Muldrew, ‘Economic and Urban Development’, p. 156. ‘We know that many people migrated between villages and local market and country towns within roughly a 25-mile radius to get married.’
example, that Mary Lago was associated with sixteenth-century Maryan martyrs of Mancetter.136

4.5.2 Association of Mary Lago with local Maryan martyrs

Foxe’s Book of Martyrs, does not record the name of Lago (or any of its similar spellings, such as Lagoe) as belonging to a martyr up to the the mid seventeenth century, 137 neither does a more modern martyrological collection edited by Freeman and Mayer.138

As a consequence, those writers who assume a direct family connection between the Lago family and the family of a Maryan martyr have suggested a link by marriage: for example Braithwaite suggested possible links with the family of Robert Glover who was burned at Coventry in 1555 or with Mrs Joyce Lewis (alternatively spelled ‘Lewes’, and commonly referred to simply as ‘Mrs Lewis’) who was burned at Lichfield in 1557.139 Both the Glover family and Mrs Lewis were resident in Mancetter at the times of their martyrdoms, as is recorded on the plaques inside the Church of St Peter in Mancetter.140 Jones also suggested

136 William C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism, p. 29. ‘of the stock of the martyrs’ – a pregnant phrase which may denote descent from one of the martyrs out of the next parish of Mancetter, Robert Glover, burnt at Coventry in 1555, or Mrs Joyce Lewis, burnt at Lichfield in 1557.’
137 John Fox (sic), Acts and Monuments.
139 William C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism, p. 29. For background information on Glover and Lewis see The Rev. B. Ritchings, Narrative of the Persecutions and Sufferings of the Two Martyrs, Robert Glover and Mrs Lewis of Mancetter, Warwickshire (London: L & G Seeley. MDCCCVI), and John Fox [sic], The Third Volume of the Ecclesiastical History Containing the Acts and Monuments of Martyrs (Printed for the Company of Stationers, London, 1641), pp. 838-9 relating to Mrs Joyce Lewes and pp. 420-427 relating to Robert Glover.
the same link to the Glover family,\textsuperscript{141} whereas Barbour suggests a link with Mrs Lewis, ‘perhaps Fox’s ancestress.’\textsuperscript{142} Pickvance merely refers to the descent as being ‘collateral.’\textsuperscript{143}

I investigated the possible link between the Lago family and either the Glover or Lewis families by marriage. The Parish Records of Mancetter record various marriages of people with the family names of ‘Lago’, ‘Lagoe’, ‘Glover’ and ‘Lewis’ but none of them connect Lago with Glover or Lewis families.\textsuperscript{144}

As described in 4.5.1 above, the Parish Records of the Fox family’s church, St Michaels and All Angels in their home village of Fenny Drayton, no longer exist. Nevertheless, the Bishops Transcripts of that Parish whilst incomplete, with records for many years between 1570 and 1692 missing, presumed destroyed, are otherwise extant.\textsuperscript{145} Those Bishops Transcripts do not record any marriages involving the Lago family, or the marriage between Christopher Fox and Mary Lago, George Fox’s parents. It is possible that a Glover/Lago or Lewis/Lago marriage did take place in Fenny Drayton or Mancetter at dates earlier than 1570 or 1576 respectively, or within a Parish other than the two most obvious ones already researched. Without further evidence of a possible location of the relevant branch of the Lago family around the year 1620, it is not possible to investigate this issue further.\textsuperscript{146}

\textsuperscript{141} Ed. Rufus M. Jones, \textit{George Fox, An Autobiography}, p. 66. Note 8. ‘The martyred ancestor of Mary Lago was probably a member of the Glover family, of Mancetter.’
\textsuperscript{142} Hugh Barbour, \textit{The Quakers in Puritan England}, p. 117.
\textsuperscript{143} Joseph Pickvance, \textit{A Reader’s Companion to George Fox’s Journal}, p. 17. Pickvance does not explain the term ‘collateral’ but one of the definitions given in \textit{Oxford English Dictionary} ‘a person descended from the same ancestor or another but through a different line’ is, I suggest, an appropriate interpretation here.
\textsuperscript{144} The marriages recorded are those between Robert Pickerill and Elizabeth Lagoe in April 1627, Tho Lewis and Jane Boubly in 1585, Valentine Huet and Marjory Glover in 1588 and between John Glover and [possibly, personal communication with Dr. Edwina S.L. Newman] Janet Whark on 26\textsuperscript{th} December 1586. Also recorded is the burial of ‘Elyza Lago’ on 20th December 1581. The earliest date for which such records exist is 1576.
\textsuperscript{145} The years missing from the Bishops Transcripts relating to Fenny Drayton Church are 1570/1, 1576, 1585, 1604, 1606, 1608/9, 1624. Microfilm ref. MF315 held at Leicester Records Office.
\textsuperscript{146} The suggestion made by Hall, see above, that Mary Lago came from Dadlington requires further investigation, but is not relevant to this current research.
I suggest that, irrespective of the lack of evidence of a marriage between a Lago and a Lewis or Glover, such a marriage would have been unlikely. The Marian martyrs discussed in the preceding paragraphs belonged to the ‘landed gentry’\textsuperscript{147} or ‘minor nobility’\textsuperscript{148} sections of society in the sixteenth century, typically of the ‘better sort of people.’\textsuperscript{149} Conversely, the Fox family, as weavers, would have been, at best, of the ‘middling sort.’\textsuperscript{150} Moore suggests that at that time there was a degree of social mobility, and that it was occasionally possible for women to marry into a higher social class or ‘sort.’\textsuperscript{151} Wrightson maintains that there exists an element of uncertainty over this premise,\textsuperscript{152} whereas Earle contends that in London it was possible to achieve upward mobility only at the lower levels of ‘sort’, whereas ‘Further movement up the social ladder...was less easy.’\textsuperscript{153}

It seems unlikely, therefore, that it would have been possible, based on currently available information, for a member of the Lago family, very much of the ‘middling sort’, to have married into the Glover or Lewis families, typical of the ‘better sort.’

A direct link between the Lago family and the Glover or Lewis families cannot currently be proven.

\textsuperscript{147} The Rev. B. Ritchings, \textit{Narrative of the Persecutions and Sufferings of the Two Martyrs}, p. vii. ‘Robert Glover, married a niece of Bishop Latimer...his eldest son, named Hugh, who inherited the Mancetter property.’

\textsuperscript{148} John Fox, \textit{Acts and Monuments}, p. 420, ‘Robert Glover, gentleman.’

\textsuperscript{149} Bibliotheca Staffordiensis, Compiled by Rupert Simms (Litchfield, Printed for the compiler by A.C. Lomax, The “Johnson’s Head”, 1894), p. 278 ‘Lewis, Joyce...dau of Thomas Curzon...and Anne (dau of Sir John Aston...)...m, (1) Sir George Appleby...(2) Thomas Lewis, of Mancetter, Warks.’

\textsuperscript{150} Keith Wrightson, ‘Sorts of People’, p. 35 ‘the better sorts of people...in Warwick, in 1628...were defined as ‘...men of estate and generally best affected to religion and of the discrete sort of inhabitants’.’

\textsuperscript{151} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 1. See also Keith Wrightson, ‘Sorts of People’, p. 49 ‘In the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it ['middling sort'] was routinely adopted as an established mode of summing up the tradesmen, manufacturers, and farmers.’ It is possible, however that the Fox family fell into a lower ‘sort’ of people as, as described by Muldrew, ‘weaving was done by labourers.’ Craig Muldrew, ‘Economic and Urban Development’, p. 152.

\textsuperscript{152} Craig J. Muldrew, \textit{The Social Order of Early Modern England}, p. 181.

4.5.3 George Fox’s martyrlogical conscience

Reference has been made in 4.5.2 above to the martyrs within the Mancetter/Fenny Drayton locality. Pickvance recounts the martyrdoms of Robert Glover and ‘Mrs Sarah Lewis’ (sic.) in addition to that of Lawrence Saunders.¹⁵⁴ Harvey gives some more information on the Robert Glover martyrdom as well as the persecution of his brothers, John and William.¹⁵⁵ A complete account of the Glover and Lewis martyrdoms is given by Ritchings in his violently anti-Catholic publication.¹⁵⁶ Undoubtedly these stories would be familiar to Fox, living in such close proximity to where the events recounted took place.

Comments have been made on the reaction of Fox to ‘the bloody city of Lichfield’,¹⁵⁷ the city where Mrs Lewis was executed.¹⁵⁸ Barbour claims that Fox retained ‘an unconscious memory of the martyrdom...of Mrs Joyce Lewis...and that of Wightman, the Unitarian.’¹⁵⁹ A similar comment was made by Brayshaw to Braithwaite, particularly in relation to the execution of Wightman in 1612 which occurred only twelve years before Fox’s birth.¹⁶⁰ Other, perhaps

¹⁵⁴ Joseph Pickvance, *George Fox and the Purefeys*, p. 9. Laurence Saunders, b. 1538, spent his early years in Harrington, Northamptonshire, approximately thirty miles from Fenny Drayton. He was descended from ‘an opulent family’ and was a scholar at Kings College, Cambridge then Prebendary at York in 1552-1554. He then moved to Leicestershire in 1554 shortly before his trial for heresy and subsequent burning at Coventry on 8th February 1554/5. In view of his family background, as in the cases of Robert Glover and Mrs Joyce Lewis, Saunders would have been of the ‘better sort’ and so his family is unlikely to have married into the ‘middling sort’ of the Lago family. See www.apuritansmind.com/the-reformation/memoirs-of-the=reformers-laurence-saunders, accessed on 12th August 2011, and John Venn and J.A. Venn, compilers, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (Cambridge: University Press, 1922), Part I, Volume IV, p. 14.

¹⁵⁵ T. Edmund Harvey, *The Rise of Quakers*, p. 11.

¹⁵⁶ Ritchings, *Narrative of the Persecutions.*


¹⁵⁸ See 4.5.2 above.

¹⁵⁹ Hugh Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England*, p. 117. Edward Wightman, b. 1566, lived in Burton-on-Trent, Staffordshire, approximately twenty miles from Fenny Drayton. He was married to Frances Derbye and was executed by burning at Lichfield in April 1611. According to the warrant for his execution the only belief that he held in common with George Fox was his disagreement with the ‘ordinances’ and ‘sacraments’ of the established church. Wightman’s other beliefs were far more extreme than Fox’s. According to the warrant: Wightman considered himself to be the promised messiah of the Old Testament, he believed himself to be the Holy Ghost, he believed that souls die and that he was sent by God to save the world. There is no record of the Wightman family marrying into the Lago family. See Robert Wallace, *Antitrinitarian Biography or Sketches of the Lives and Writings of Distinguished Antitrinitarians* (London: E.T. Whitefield, 1850), Vol. 1, p. 107 and pp. 565-566.

¹⁶⁰ William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, Note 2, on p. 56.
less likely, suggestions as to Fox’s reaction to Lichfield have been made, including that by
Beatrice Saxon Snell. She refers to an undisclosed ‘pamphlet of 1645’ which records
Garenden Pool waters turning ‘blood red.’ 161 However her description of the location of
Garenden Pool, which she describes as a ‘pond’, places it some 20 miles east of Lichfield.

In his Journal, the only direct reference made by Fox to martyrdom in his time was the
reference to his mother, already discussed. The single indirect reference was to the likely
‘hurt’ that would befall him during conversations with ‘professor and profane’ and his desire
not to stay long in that place in order to avoid that hurt. 162 This comment could be referring to
mental as opposed to physical hurt, but nevertheless, indicates Fox’s desire not to be hurt in
any way and so not to become a martyr. 163 It is additionally possible to interpret Fox’s desire
to ‘forsake all’ and to be ‘a stranger to all’ as a form of self-imposed and personal
martyrdom. 164

There are many references to the word ‘martyr’ in tracts written by Fox. In twelve of his tracts
there are one hundred such references, but none of them relate to him or fellow Quakers, and
only indirect references are made to un-named Maryan martyrs. 165 Moore concludes that
martyrology was not explored much by early Quakers, citing works by Ellis Hookes. 166 These

162 George Fox, Journal, p. 10.
163 In the index to George Fox, Journal, p. 771, there are eleven references to Fox being ‘roughly handled, and
thirty-five references to his ‘escapes from injury or arrest.’
164 George Fox, Journal, p. 3.
165 This investigation was undertaken by using the on-line facilities available through Early English Books
Online (EEBO), by searching through all available tracts authored by Fox, and searching on variations of the
word ‘martyr.’ The search produced 100 ‘hits’ in 12 ‘records’ relating to tracts issued by Fox during the years
1653 to 1679. Typical of such a hit was G.F., To you that are crying, what is become of our fore-Fathers, if the
Light be the way which you be in, and what is become of the Martyrs that suffered (London, Printed for Thomas
Simmons. No date [But EEBO suggest 1657]) where ‘martyrs’ refer to the martyrdom of the Apostles.
166 Personal communication with Dr Rosemary Moore. See also 5.3.4 below and the possibility, as suggested by
Spencer that in James Nayler’s act of riding in to Bristol he, but not the main body of Quakers, was seeking
martyrdom in his actions. Carole Spencer, ‘James Nayler: Antinomian or Perfectionist.’ Quaker Studies 6/1,
works by Hookes compare the reasons for the sufferings of early Quakers with those of the Marian martyrs, but does not compare their actual sufferings or ‘martyrdom.’\textsuperscript{167}

These examples suggest that Fox, unlike the Continental Anabaptists, was not aiming to become a martyr for his beliefs despite his later persecutions and imprisonments.\textsuperscript{168} Nor did he deliberately compare himself with martyrs of an earlier age. This leads to four possible reasons for Fox making his reference to the ‘martyr’ stock of his mother in the opening page of his \textit{Journal}.\textsuperscript{169}

a. Despite the lack of evidence discussed above, Fox was told that there was a direct family connection between the Lago family and that of a martyr, and so Fox included reference to that in his \textit{Journal} purely as a matter of historical accuracy. Research has been unable to trace that direct connection, and further research is required to trace the origin of Mary Lago and her family, perhaps through her, currently unknown, matrilineal line, in order to confirm that link.

b. The reference to ‘stock’ is purely geographical, rather than genealogical and refers to the well known stories of the martyrs from his family’s locality. Reference which Fox included, again, for historical, but sadly misleading, accuracy.

c. Fox was eager to place himself within the same mould as earlier persecuted individuals and, having given a full account of his suffering at the hands of the

\textsuperscript{167} See, for example, EH TR [Quoted as being Ellis Hookes], \textit{The Spirit of the Martyrs is Risen} (London, Printed for Thomas Simmonds at the Bull and Mouth, no date shown [Moore suggests 1664]).

\textsuperscript{168} Balthasar Hubmaier, \textit{A Short Justification}, 1526 as quoted in: Ed. Walter Klaassen, \textit{Anabaptism in Outline}, p. 166, ‘that [the third baptism] of blood in martyrdom or on the deathbed.’

\textsuperscript{169} I have not considered the possible link, as suggested by Bennis that George Fox was the grandson of Anne Askew. See J.T. Bennis, ‘Correspondence’ in \textit{The Friend}, 46, no. 3, 19\textsuperscript{th} January 1906. He appears to have confused this argument with that, see 5.3.6 below, of the possible descent of Margaret Fell.
populace and magistrates in his *Journal*, included the ‘martyr’ reference either as an afterthought, or as a premonition, thus demonstrating that his actions must lead to persecutions which he was prepared to endure for ‘Truth’s sake.’

This argument can be taken further, by suggesting that Fox was not only aware of the sufferings of the Maryan martyrs, but also of the martyrdoms experienced by the Continental Anabaptists. Although not wishing to align himself with them for political reasons, he was eager not to place himself devotionally below them, in the perception of the populace.  

**d.** Being made aware of the possible ancestry of Margaret Fell, who Fox married in 1669, Fox decided to include in his *Journal* reference to a similar martyrological ancestry for himself.

### 4.6 Meetings with members of English religious groups

In this section I investigate the contacts, as described by Fox in his *Journal* that Fox made with church clerics and members of various religious groups up to the time of his meeting at Firbank Fell in 1652. The first documented contact with clergy of some form occurs in 1646, and that is with the priest at Fox’s church in Fenny Drayton, Nathaniel Stephens. It is improbable that Fox had no contact with clergy at an earlier time than when he was in his twenties. Thus, it is not possible to surmise the degree of non-conformity that had already

---

170 This subject was discussed in 2.2 above when considering the stated and accepted third baptism of the Continental Anabaptists, the baptism of blood or martyrdom, see Klaassen, *Anabaptism in Outline*, p. 166, and in 3.2 above when reviewing the lower key approach undertaken by the General and Particular Baptists in England.

171 Douglas Gwyn, *Seekers Found*, p. 357. See also 5.3.6 below.

172 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 108.

173 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 5. Also see 4.3 above.
arisen in his mind, although, some early passages in his Journal do exhibit puritan, but not non-conformist tendencies in his theology.  

It can be seen from the information contained in the schedule appended as Appendix 1, that Fox documented a total of fifty-two meetings with ‘priests’ and ‘professors’ from his birth and up to his meeting at Firbank Fell. Fox, or Nickalls, gives the names of only eleven of those ‘priests’ and ‘professors’ who Fox met in thirteen of his meetings (Fox writes of meeting two priests, Stephens and Abel, each on two occasions), and no names are ascribed to the ‘priests’ or ‘professors’ that Fox met in the other thirty-nine meetings. In addition to these fifty-two meetings with ‘priests’ and ‘professors’, Fox writes of sixteen other meetings with members of other specified denominations. In describing all of these contacts, Fox does not suggest that in any case did he receive any view or opinion from those that he met that had any impact on his evolving theology.

---

174 See George Fox, Journal, p. 2, when he writes of his beliefs when he was between the ages of eleven and nineteen, ‘But people being strangers to the covenant of life with God...make themselves wanton...living in all filthiness, loving foul ways...without God...I was to shun all such’, and p. 3 in relating his meeting with his cousin Bradford, when he was aged nineteen. Also see 4.2.2 above.

175 In Appendix 1 I have taken all the contacts quoted by Fox in his Journal, between the years 1624, the year of Fox’s birth, up to 1652. The Appendix quotes, where available, the names of the contacts and describes, again where available, their religious backgrounds.

176 From the information supplied by Fox, Nickalls identifies four of Fox’s un-named ‘priests.’ See George Fox, Journal, p. 5, Note 1, Richard Abel, p. 74, Note 1, John Pomroy, p. 98, Note 1, John Gosfield and p. 100, Note 4, Christopher Marshall.

177 It should be noted that, according to Nickalls, Fox would apply the term ‘priest’ to ‘all professional preachers, ministers and clergy, irrespective of the particular sect to which they belonged.’ George Fox, Journal, p. 2, Note 1. Moore disagrees with this interpretation when she writes, in connection with the identity of ‘Priest Boys’ that ‘a priest is definitely a parish minister.’ Personal communication with Dr. Rosemary Moore. Moore’s statement is, I believe, substantiated when it is seen that Fox would use alternative words to describe members of non-conformist congregations. Fox regularly uses the word ‘professor’ when, I suggest, the word ‘priest’ is not appropriate. Nickalls confirms that a professor ‘is one who makes profession of religious faith.’ See George Fox, Journal, p. 3, Note 2.

178 See ‘Comments’ column in Appendix 1.
4.6.1. Named ‘priest’ contacts

Of the eleven named priests with whom Fox had meetings, the two contacts which I have investigated in detail are Nathaniel Stephens and Priest Boys. I concluded that, in both cases, there is no evidence of any theological influence on Fox, but that Fox is likely to have influenced both Stephens’ and Boys’ religious thinking.

In his *Journal*, the most positive comment made by Fox on any of the other contacts with named ‘priests’ was in relation to John Pomroy. Fox writes that when Pomroy had finished preaching, ‘I was moved to speak to him’ with no adverse consequence. In the course of each of three of the meetings with other named priests, Fox describes how he was assaulted and thrown out of the churches where the meetings had taken place.

Fox keeps his strongest comments for the meetings he had with the remaining five named priests. At his first meeting with Richard Abel in Mancetter in 1646, Abel suggested that Fox ‘take tobacco and sing psalms’ which Fox was not inclined to do. Fox then describes Abel, after their second meeting which occurred a short time after the first, as ‘angry and pettish.’ Abel also appears to have discussed his conversation with Fox with his servants which ‘grieved me [Fox].’ After his meetings with Abel, Fox travelled to Coventry and met with

---

179 See 4.3 above with regard to Stephens and 5.3.2 below with regard to Boys.
180 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 74. Calamy recorded that Pomroy was ‘ejected’ at the restoration and died at Beverley, not long after his ejection. A.G. Matthews, *Calamy Revised*, p. 394.
181 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 78, following his meeting with Edward Bowles, ‘they hurled me out and threw me down the stairs’; pp. 98-99, after speaking in John Gosfield’s church, ‘they fell upon me...hit me in the face...they punched me...and threw me over a hedge and there beat me and threw me over again’, and p. 101, after speaking in Christopher Marshall’s church, ‘they rushed me out...and fell a-punching and beating of me.’ Fox describes Marshall on p. 101 as ‘the greatest professor in Yorkshire’ and confirms that the actions he describes took place at the church attended by James Nayler, see 5.3.4 below. Nickalls notes that at some time after this meeting, Marshall was ejected from his church, see *Journal*, p. 100, Note 4. It is possible that Marshall’s theology was changed as a result both of his meeting Fox and his association with Nayler, to the extent that his views could no longer be accepted within the church.
182 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 5. It is noted by Hill that ‘Baptist services were the occasion of pipe smoking...the use of tobacco and alcohol was intended to heighten spiritual vision.’ Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down*, p. 199.
183 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 6.
Doctor Cradock. Fox’s account of the meeting suggests that they had a meaningful conversation until Fox accidentally stepped on a flowerbed, when Craddock ‘was in such a rage as if his house had been on fire’ so that ‘all our discourse was lost’ and ‘I went away in sorrow, worse than I was when I came.’\textsuperscript{184} At his next recorded meeting, with ‘Macham’, Fox was advised to take medicine and to have some blood let from him.\textsuperscript{185} However, Fox’s description of the events surrounding his meeting with Macham and his colleagues was such that ‘I could have wished I had never been born to see such vanity and wickedness.’\textsuperscript{186}

Fox’s meetings in 1648 with ‘priest Kellet’ and in 1649 with Thomas Bretland appear to have progressed well, with Kellet’s objection to parsonages agreeing with Fox’s views,\textsuperscript{187} and Bretland ‘who was above the priests’ having been ‘partly convinced.’\textsuperscript{188} However, Fox’s opinion of these two priests changed when they were both subsequently offered livings of their own. Kellet, according to Fox ‘turned a persecutor’\textsuperscript{189} and Bretland had ‘choked himself.’\textsuperscript{190}

There is no evidence, from Fox’s accounts of these meetings with named priests, that he had acquired any insight or knowledge that positively affected his religious seeking. It is possible that Fox benefited from his meeting with Bretland who had ‘been partly convinced’ before Fox met him. It can be said, with confidence, that all of the meetings that Fox had with the

\textsuperscript{184} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{186} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{187} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{188} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 49. There is no indication from where Bretland had obtained his Quaker views. It could be assumed that, in view of the early date of his meeting with Fox, he had developed his Quaker views independently as Fox writes that Bretland had ‘spoken much in behalf of Truth before he was priest there.’ It is possible, therefore, that this was an unrecorded instance of Fox developing his theology during conversations with another person.
\textsuperscript{189} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{190} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 50. The chronology of events, as written by Fox, is uncertain at this point. It is not certain whether Fox had met Bretland before he was awarded his living and then again afterwards when he noted the change in him, or whether he had heard of Bretland’s partial convincement before meeting him only to see a changed person at their meeting by which time Bretland had ‘got the parsonage.’
named priests added to his conviction that ‘to be bred at Oxford or Cambridge was not enough to make a man fit to be a minister of Christ.’

4.6.2 Un-named ‘priests’ and ‘professors’

The information given by Fox in his *Journal* with regard to his many meetings with un-named priests and professors is insufficient to enable definite conclusions to be drawn on the content of the discussions that took place. Except in the case of the ‘Papist’, see below, there is no information on the theological background of the people that Fox met. Typical entries in the *Journal* of these meetings are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recorded year of meeting</th>
<th>Fox’s record of the meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1644</td>
<td>‘professors took notice of me...but I was afraid of them for I was sensible that they did not possess what they professed.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>‘I heard of a priest...an experienced man...I found him but like an empty, hollow cask.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>‘professors at Duckinfield...in a rage...could not endure to hear talk of perfection.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

192 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 4.  
194 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 18.
‘priest...I spoke to him and the people...generally pretty quiet, only some few raged.’\textsuperscript{195}

‘officers...priests and preachers...I spake to them...they were pretty quiet...and an officer...took me by the hand and said I must go before the magistrates.’\textsuperscript{196}

‘a raging, wicked professor had an intent to have done me a mischief, but the Lord prevented him.’\textsuperscript{197}

‘a Papist overtook me and told me of his religion...I went to his house and declared against his religion...this put the Papist in such a rage that he could not endure to stay in his own house.’\textsuperscript{198}

‘I warned the priest that was in the street and the people to repent...Some heard and others said that I was mad.’\textsuperscript{199}

In these contacts with ‘priests’ and ‘professors’, Fox concentrates on preaching his message to them, and in no instance does he suggest that the people that he met had anything of interest to say to him, or that he picked up any of their religious views.

### 4.6.3 Members of other religious groups

The people in this category that Fox met fall into two main groups: those named and those unnamed. Of the sixteen meetings in this category documented by Fox the greatest number of

\textsuperscript{195} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 48.  
\textsuperscript{196} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 51.  
\textsuperscript{197} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 70.  
\textsuperscript{198} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 78.  
\textsuperscript{199} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 91.
contacts, five, are described by Fox as being ‘Baptists.’ The two named Baptists are Samuel Oates who Fox records as meeting in 1649, and Rice Jones who Fox records as meeting in 1651.

The meeting with Oates appears to have been a friendly affair, with Oates and his colleagues discussing, amongst other issues, water baptism. After their discussion, Fox records that ‘we parted, and some of them were loving to us.’ The meeting with Jones, from Fox’s account, appears to be more antagonistic and is discussed in 5.2.2 below.

The meetings with the remaining un-named Baptists are recorded by Fox as consisting of his preaching his message to them and discussing issues with their leaders. Although Fox records that at two of the meetings a number of those present were ‘convinced’ of the Truth that Fox was preaching, it is evident that the meetings did not help in his own personal religious journey. In particular, after his meeting with Baptists in Leicestershire, Fox writes that ‘my inward sufferings were heavy; but I could find none to open my condition but to the Lord alone, unto whom I cried night and day.’

Fox met with Fifth Monarchists, who Fox records as being ‘generally convinced’ during his meeting with them, and Ranters, who were condemned by Fox, ‘ranking them with the old Ranters in Sodom.’ At one Ranter meeting, although Fox condemns their practice of

---

200 See Appendix 1.
201 George Fox, Journal, p. 45. See also 3.2 above and 5.2.2 below.
202 George Fox, Journal, p. 63. See also 5.2.2 below and R.L. Greaves, ‘JONES (or Johns), Rice (or Rhys) (fl. 1650-1663)’ in Ed. Richard L. Greaves & Robert Zaller, Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century, Vol. 2, p. 145, ‘[Jones] was a Baptist soldier prior to joining the Quakers about 1650[?]’. By 1651 he had acquired Rant tendencies...Like the Ranters Jones used profanity.’
203 George Fox, Journal, p. 46.
204 George Fox, Journal, p. 63.
205 George Fox, Journal, pp. 18-19, a meeting with Baptists in Leicestershire, and p. 25, a meeting with ‘shattered Baptists’ in Nottinghamshire.
207 George Fox, Journal, p. 93. See also 3.1.7 above relating to the Fifth Monarchy Men movement.
208 George Fox, Journal, p. 81.
‘[taking] tobacco and drank ale in them and so grew light and loose’, after Fox’s preaching to them ‘the people came to be convinced and received God’s everlasting Truth and’, at the time the Journal was written, ‘stand a meeting to this day.’

As with other meetings, Fox does not record any message that he acquired from the people that he met which helped in his religious search.

Other groups that Fox met are described by him as ‘a friendly people’, ‘tender people’, a woman whose father was ‘one high in profession’, and a people who believed that ‘women have no souls’. One un-named group that Fox met in 1648 is described by him as believing that there was no God and that ‘all things came by nature.’ This description suggests that this was a group of Behemist, followers of the teaching of Jacob Böhme, from whom it is possible that Fox learned of some of Böhme’s theology or philosophy, albeit that Fox writes that, during his discussions with them, ‘I overturned them.’

4.6.4 Durrant Hotham

Fox records a meeting with Durrant Hotham taking place in 1651. Fox describes Hotham as ‘a pretty tender man’ and that Hotham, in private, confessed to Fox that ‘he had known the

---

209 George Fox, Journal, p. 79.
210 George Fox, Journal, p. 9 and p. 70.
211 George Fox, Journal, p. 23.
212 George Fox, Journal, p. 18.
213 George Fox, Journal, p. 9. It is possible that this group were Muggletonians, a religious group contemporaneous with early Quakers who, in later years were seen by Quakers as rivals and who had a song that describes heaven consisting ‘All males.’ See Rosemary Moore, The Light in Their Consciences, p. 13 and Christopher Hill, The World Turned Upside Down, p. 314. Hill notes that early Muggletonian theology was influenced by the writings of Jacob Böhme. Christopher Hill, The World Turned Upside Down, p. 176.
214 George Fox, Journal, p. 25.
215 George Fox, Journal, p. 25. See also 2.1.2 above for an outline of Böhme’s life and theology.
principle [God’s working in his heart] this ten year.’

Fox does not indicate from where Hotham had learned of this ‘principle’, but Fox suggests that Hotham was in contact with ‘some great high priests and other doctors in the country.’ In Fox’s words ‘[Durrant Hotham was] very loving and civil to me’, and ‘a well-wisher to Friends and one that had been tender unto me at the first.’

A fact, not quoted in Fox’s account of his meeting with Hotham, is that Hotham was familiar with the writings of Jacob Böhme and in 1653, only two years after his meeting with Fox, Hotham wrote and published *The Life of Jacob Behman*. That publication shows that not only was Hotham familiar with Böhme’s life, but that he was also knowledgable of the thirty-one books written by Böhme. It is not known at what time Hotham became familiar with the works and theology of Böhme, but I believe it is reasonable to surmise that, due to the proximity of his meeting with Fox and the publication of his substantial book, and the ‘discipleship’ of his brother Charles, he was aware of both at the time of his meeting with Fox. This would explain how Hotham was familiar with some of the theology being preached

---

216 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 75. At about the time of this meeting, Hotham drafted a response to ‘twenty religious queries of ‘Georg’ (probably George Fox), no date, but probably c.1651.’ The draft response does not list the ‘queries’, but all answers relate to the requirement to submit to man-made laws even when they would appear to be contrary to ‘God’s will.’ There is no reference in this draft response to any works of Böhme. Andrew Hopper, ed., ‘The Papers of the Hothams, Governors of Hull during the Civil War.’ *Camden Society, Fifth Series* 39, 2011, pp. 163-174.

217 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 75.

218 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 118.

219 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 533.


221 Durand Hotham, *The Life of Jacob Behmen*, un-numbered pages 26 and 27. It is recorded that Durand Hotham’s elder brother, Charles Hotham, was an early disciple of Böhme in England and that he had published a transcription in English of Böhme’s *A Consolatory Treatise of the Four Complexions* in 1654. Richard L. Greaves, ‘Hotham, Charles (1615–1672)’ (*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008) [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13847, accessed 14 Sept 2012]. In that transcription, Charles Hotham recorded that at the time of its publication, 1654, a number of Böhme’s ‘larger volumes’ had already been translated by a ‘publick spirited gentleman’ and that that gentleman was ‘in travell with more.’ Jacob Behmen, *A Consolatory Treatise of the Four Complexions, that is, an Instruction in the Time of Temptation* (London, Printed by T.W. for H. Blunden, and sold at the Castle in Corn-hill, 1654), un-numbered pages 7 and 8.
by Fox, that part which was similar to Böhme’s, but there is no indication, from Fox’s account of the meeting whether Hotham added to the theology existent at the time within Fox nor whether Böhme and his theology and philosophy were discussed at all. It seems unlikely, to me, that such a discussion did not take place, but it is not possible to ascertain whether that discussion changed the direction of Fox’s religious seeking.

An early suggestion of Fox’s dependence upon the writings of Böhme was made by Barclay when he wrote, in 1876, ‘It can hardly be contended that this, which is one of the most curious and unintelligible passages in Fox’s Journal was written by a person who had never read Boehmen’s works.’\(^{222}\) The passage in Fox’s Journal to which Barclay refers also contains another passage that Barclay links to the writings of Böhme. The complete passage in Fox’s Journal is ‘Now was I come up in the spirit through the flaming sword into the paradise of God. All things were new, and all the creation gave another smell unto me than before, beyond what words can utter...The creation was opened to me, and it was showed me how all things had their names given them according to their nature and virtue.’\(^{223}\) The passages in Böhme’s writings, with which Fox’s passage is compared are, firstly from his epic work The Second Book concerning the Three Principles of the Divine Essence of the Eternal, Dark, Light and Temporary World, where Böhme writes ‘Now if anybody would come into the Garden, he must presse [sic] in through the sword of Death’,\(^{224}\) and secondly from Hotham’s account of Böhme’s life, where Hotham, not Böhme, writes ‘and viewing the Herbs and Grass of the field, in his inward Light, he saw into their Essences, use and properties...In like manner did he behold the whole of Creation.’\(^{225}\) It can be seen that the first quotation

\(^{222}\) See R. Barclay, The Inner Life, p. 214, note *.

\(^{223}\) George Fox, Journal, p. 27.


from each author refers to the Book of Genesis, 3:24, ‘Then at the east side of the garden he put living creatures and a flaming sword which turned in all directions.’ I contend that it would not be unusual for religious and theological publications of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by any author, which would have contained many references to biblical passages, to have at least one reference to a common biblical passage, particularly in view of its apocalyptic connections. This, I suggest, is more likely to be the case with Fox and Böhme, in view of the number and, particularly in the case of Böhme, the length of the publications produced. Hotham lists the names of the thirty-one publications by Böhme with Böhme’s *Three Principles* alone consisting of three hundred and ninety-six pages.\(^{226}\) Moore quotes one hundred and forty-five publications by Fox between the years 1652 and 1666, not including his *Journal*, published in 1694, which, in the Nickalls edition runs to seven hundred and nine pages of text ascribed to Fox.\(^{227}\) I conclude, therefore, that the use of a common biblical theme by Böhme and Fox was coincidental.

After Fox’s statement, ‘The creation was opened to me’, Fox makes no further reference to this vision, whereas a great part of Böhme’s writings attempt to place the revelation made to him into a series of what could be described as scientific tables. This is best shown in Böhme’s *Four Tables of Divine Revelation*.\(^{228}\)

In addition to the writings of Böhme noted above, his other major publication *The High and Deep searching out of the Threefold Life* comprising five hundred and forty-seven pages,\(^{229}\) a

---


\(^{228}\) Jacob Böhme, *Four Tables of Divine Revelation signifying what God in himself is, without nature, according to the Three Principles, Also What Heaven, Hell, World, Time and Eternity are; Together with all creatures visible and invisible; and out of what all things had their Original* (London: Printed for H. Blunden, and sold at the Castle in Corn-hill, 1654).

smaller publication of ninety-eight pages, *Mysterium Magnum*, and two modern compilations of his work were read. It was noted that, other than the two ‘similarities’ noted above, there were no themes contained in them that could be traced in Fox’s major works, particularly in his *Journal*. As Erb comments, ‘Alchemical images shaped the form of his [Böhme’s] arguments in his works.’

There does not appear to be any degree of commonality in the biblical references used by Fox and Böhme. Also see Hans L Martensen, *Jacob Boehme (1575-1624): Studies in his Life and Teaching*, where Martensen describes how Böhme ‘tried to live by Luke xi, ‘How much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him.’’ This passage from Luke, Chapter 11:13, is only used once in the five thousand, two hundred and sixty-three biblical quotations used by Fox in all his writings.

This research indicates to this writer that Fox was not overly influenced by Böhme’s writings or by the story of his life. I also suggest that this research confirms Southern’s findings that ‘Jones and his research assistant, Theodor Sippell...note some concerns about hard evidence’ of the link between Quakerism and its predecessors, Böhme in particular. This conclusion is confirmed in a personal communication from Ariel Hessayon, a scholar on Böhme.

---


I describe in 3.1.2 above and in 5.2.3 below the information known about the contents of George Fox’s library. There is no evidence that Fox owned any of Böhme’s publications, again confirmed in a personal communication from Hessayon, nor can it be proven that Fox read any of Böhme’s works. I show, above, that there is little correlation between the works of Fox and Böhme and I conclude that the similarities in the two passages quoted by other authors are either coincidental, or occurred as a result of conversations between Hotham and Fox.

4.7 Fox’s knowledge of Anabaptist publications

I can find no definitive evidence to suggest that any publication containing the works of continental Anabaptists and translated into English were circulating in England at any time during the seventeenth century. In this section I consider the writings of two Anabaptists which show similarities in theology with that preached by Fox.

---

236 Moore suggests that John Everard had translated the works of Böhme, Nicholas of Cusa, Sebastian Franck and Hans Denck into English. Moore, *The Light in their Consciences*, p. 244, Note 3, and Gwyn writes that ‘During the 1620s and 1630s, John Everard...translated Denck, Franck, and others...into English.’ Douglas Gwyn, *Seekers Found*, p. 65. A similar list is given by Nigel Smith and by Melvin B. Endy when he notes that the works of those same authors, along with works by Castillo and Weigel, were used by the Seekers. Nigel Smith, *Perfection Proclaimed*, pp. 112-114. Melvin B. Endy, ‘The Interpretation of Quakerism: Rufus Jones and his critics.’ *Quaker History* 70, Spring 1981, p. 18. Endy does not indicate from where his list was constructed, Gwyn uses Rufus Jones as his source and Moore ascribes her list to Theodor Sippell, Rufus Jones’ research assistant. However, Sippell’s list does not include Denck but does include ‘einem unbekannten Mystiker’, translated as ‘an unknown Mystic.’ Theodor Sippell, *Werdendes Quäkertum* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1937), p. 6.
4.7.1 Hans Denck

An overview of Denck’s life is set out in 2.2.2 above, and various authors have placed different labels on his theology, ranging from ‘contemplative Anabaptist’ to ‘Quaker.’ In a number of Denck’s works, he advocates that outward ordinances are unnecessary for salvation, and that Jesus himself did not condone the practice of outward baptism. Denck also makes reference to the ‘Word’ as not being scripture, but something ‘higher’, equating it to God and not ‘letter.’ These theological traits were expressed by Quakerism over one hundred years after they were expressed by Denck.

As stated above, there is no record of Denck’s works being available in English in England during the seventeenth century, and so it is not possible for Fox to have read them at that time. Nevertheless, it is possible that he, or other early Quakers, may have heard of Denck’s teachings from the Dutch residents in England.

---

237 Edward J. Furcha and Ford Lewis Battles, Selected Writings of Hans Denck (Edited and translated from the text as established by Walter Fellmann. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: The Pickwick Press, 1975), pp. 8-9. ‘In reformation histories Denck has been given numerous labels. To some scholars he appeared as ‘contemplative Anabaptist’...In the extensive and thoroughgoing studies of Rufus Jones, F.L. Weiss and A. Coutts he appears to be a Quaker.’ This final comment can only be made when comparing Denck’s theology with that of the early Quakers. See below in this sub-section.

238 Extracts taken from Edward J. Furcha and Ford Lewis Battles, Selected Writings of Hans Denck. ‘Confession addressed to the city council of Nuernberg (1525)’, p. 20, ‘Outward baptism is not essential to salvation’ and p. 22, ‘One can live without this outward bread...without the inward bread no one can live.’ Also see ‘Divine Order’, pp. 94-5, ‘I will not have any part of your celebrating and sacrifices. Take away from me your flesh and bread and all ecclesiastical pomp.’

239 Hans Denck, ‘Concerning genuine love’ in Edward J. Furcha and Ford Lewis Battles, Selected Writings of Hans Denck, pp. 109-110, ‘For this reason Jesus...was silent on that score [outward baptism]...as if He wanted to intimate that one may come to this Love without any of the customs.’

240 Hans Denck, ‘Recantation (1528)’ in Edward J. Furcha and Ford Lewis Battles, Selected Writings of Hans Denck, pp. 123-124, ‘I hold the Scripture...not as high as the Word of God which is living, strong...inasmuch as it is God Himself, it is spirit and not letter.’

241 Edward J. Furcha and Ford Lewis Battles, Selected Writings of Hans Denck, p. 2, ‘We feel that a translation of the work of this seminal thinker is long overdue so that English speaking students may avail themselves at first hand of the ideas of this Christian scholar. Admittedly, one of his writings is already available in English.’ It is unfortunate that the authors do not quote the name of the extant English translation, or when it was available. There is no record of any of Denck’s works in England listed on EEBO.

242 See Chapter 7 below.
4.7.2 Menno Simons

In 2.3.1 above, I quoted the words of Barclay of Reigate, ‘We have now seen that some of the principle points of doctrine and practice, which occupied the mind of [George] Fox were advocated by Menno.’\(^{243}\) I outlined those points of doctrine as: not swearing oaths, not carrying arms nor waging war and obeying the civil authorities but only to the extent that it does not conflict with ‘the Word of God.’ It was also noted that Menno, in common with the early Quakers, ‘refrained from going on into theological fine points on the subject [of the origin of human nature of Christ].’\(^{244}\) The suggestion that Fox had some knowledge of Menno’s works is given great weight when comparing Menno and Fox’s written views on war. In 1539, Menno wrote ‘Our weapons are not weapons with which cities and countries may be destroyed... But they are weapons with which the spiritual kingdom of the devil is destroyed... We have and know no other weapons besides this.’\(^{245}\) In 1654, Fox wrote to Oliver Cromwell to reassure Cromwell of his peaceful intentions as follows. ‘I...do deny the carrying or drawing of any carnal sword against any... My weapons are not carnal but spiritual, and ‘my kingdom is not of this world’, therefore with a carnal weapon I do not fight.’\(^{246}\)

The similarities in these views and words of Menno and Fox are striking. However, according to Verduin and Wenger, the first translations of Menno’s works into English did not occur until 1871, with editions up to that date being available only in Latin and Dutch.\(^{247}\)

---

\(^{243}\) R. Barclay, *The Inner Life*, p. 82.


\(^{246}\) George Fox, *Journal*, p. 198.

\(^{247}\) Menno Simons, *Complete Writings of Menno Simons*, p. viii, schedule headed ‘Location of Menno’s writings in various editions.’ It should be noted that EEBO does not record any of Menno’s works being published in English in England.
I conclude, therefore, that it is not possible for Fox to have had first hand knowledge of Menno’s works. Knowledge of them and of Menno’s theology, if acquired at all by Fox, could either have been transmitted to him by the Baptists with whom Fox had considerable contact in his years of seeking, or by those early Quakers that had direct contact with the Dutch. There is no evidence to suggest that the Baptists that Fox had met had been able to read Menno’s works in Dutch or in Latin. It must also be noted that the direct contacts between the early Quakers and the Dutch, as described in Chapter 7 below, were not sufficiently early to have influenced the contents of Fox’s letter to Cromwell in 1654.

It is possible that Fox’s theological views were affected by those of Menno, but this, I suggest, could only have occurred indirectly by means of discussions that Fox held with Baptist congregations.

4.8 Chapter summary

In this chapter I have set out the social and religious background to Fox’s religious journey. I have considered the family environment within which Fox was raised and made particular reference to his mother’s suggested martyrological descent, the possible identity and background to his Baptist ‘Uncle Pickering’ and I briefly mentioned Fox’s meeting with his Cousin Bradford.

---

248 This argument would hold greater weight if it could be shown that the Baptist congregations with which Fox had contact were of the General Baptist persuasion, with their heredity directly linked to the Waterlander Mennonites of Amsterdam. See 3.2 above.

249 As seen in Chapters 5 and 7 below, the only early Quaker that is known to have had a working knowledge of the Dutch language was William Ames. However, he was not ‘convinced’ as a Quaker until 1655, see 5.4.1 below, and there is no record that he ever met Fox.
I then explored the many meetings that Fox wrote about in his *Journal*. I looked in detail at the meetings he is reported as having with his local parish priest, Nathaniel Stephens and with other ‘priests’ and ‘professors.’ I also considered the meetings that Fox held with members of other religious groups and also with Durrant Hotham, the biographer of Jacob Böhme.

Fox’s reports of all these meetings suggest that the transmission of knowledge was always one-way: from Fox to the people he met. It is likely that, during the course of these many meetings, Fox increased his knowledge of the theology of other people and other religious groups. In particular, it is reasonable to assume that he gained a valuable insight into the theology of the Baptists from his Uncle Pickering and from his meetings with Samuel Oates and members of other Baptist groups.

I looked briefly at the sentences written by Böhme and Fox which, some authors have stated, bear evidence of knowledge by Fox of Böhme’s works. I concluded that there is no evidence that such knowledge existed. Similarly, I compared some of the writings of Denck and Menno with those of Fox. Similarities in views expressed, and in language used, are evident, but the absence of editions of Denck and Menno’s works in English in the seventeenth century indicates that any knowledge of those people’s works by Fox could only have been acquired indirectly through contact with the early General Baptist or Dutch Anabaptist congregations in England.

It is not possible to say whether the outcome of the meetings that Fox had with these many family members, ‘priests’, ‘professors’ and representatives of non-conformist congregations confirmed Fox in his already determined religious views, or whether they enabled Fox to modify his own theology into that which he propounds in his *Journal*.
In the next Chapter I investigate those contacts that Fox made in his formative years with people who accepted his teaching and became the first Quakers.
5.1 Introduction

In this chapter I review the early life of George Fox with particular emphasis being placed upon the people he met. I also investigate the various claims made with regard to the composition of Fox’s library in order to ascertain what information, if any, he may have acquired from other authors. I then investigate, in detail, available information concerning the first converts to Quakerism including some of its early leaders. These Quakers are considered in the order in which Fox claimed that he met them.

I conclude this chapter by investigating, in alphabetical order, the lives and backgrounds of other early Quakers. Many of these, it is shown, had previous contacts with Baptists/Anabaptists before arriving at their Quaker position, and all had a significant influence on the promulgation of the Quaker message in England and in continental Europe.¹ Nevertheless, because of the impact these people had in the years following 1652, I consider it is important that reference to them is included in this thesis.

¹ It will be shown in this chapter that a number of these contacts, e.g. James Naylor and Richard Farnworth, had arrived at their Quaker position before George Fox.
5.2 George Fox

5.2.1 Early Contacts

I described, in Chapter 4, the background to the lives of the first known contacts of George Fox, paying particular attention to the people who, it could be considered, would have had the greatest outside influence on his growing theological awareness. Other than his immediate family, and its background, I investigated, in detail, the religious backgrounds to Fox’s parish priest, Nathanial Stephens, and Fox’s ‘Uncle Pickering.’ It was noted that the time that Fox spent with his Baptist uncle could have directed Fox in one of two ways, either to accept some of the Arminian theology and Waterlander Mennonite history of the General Baptists, or to reject the Calvinism of the Particular Baptists. It is not possible, with any certainty, to decide which of the two possible outcomes is correct as the Baptist group with which ‘Uncle Pickering’ was associated cannot be categorically identified.

None of the people researched in Chapter 4 are known to have become Quakers. In the following sections I concentrate on early Quakers, paying particular attention to those with known prior Baptist connections.

5.2.2 Meetings with eventual Quakers

After ‘Uncle Pickering’, the first named Baptist that Fox tells of meeting is Elizabeth Hooton in 1647.² Hooton could be considered to be the first Quaker, and because of her undoubted

² George Fox, The Journal of George Fox, ed. John L. Nickalls (London: Cambridge University Press, 1952; reprinted Philadelphia and London: Philadelphia and Britain Yearly Meetings of the Religious Society of Friends, 2005), p. 9. Although not recorded as such, prior to meeting Hooton, Fox met a parish priest, Richard Abel, with possible Baptist sympathies, see 4.6.1 above. Fox recounts in his Journal three meetings with unnamed Baptists up to the end of 1652, see 4.6.3 above. Fox describes the arguments that he had with the individuals or groups of Baptists but discounts the significance of them within the meaning of his theological
Baptist background, it is therefore essential that her life and contacts, to the extent that they are recorded, are investigated in detail.\(^3\) The result of that investigation is set out in 5.3.1 below. It is also important to note that this meeting with Hooton is recorded in the *Journal* as occurring shortly before, possibly days or weeks before Fox had a revelation that gave him total direction to his life: people could have direct access to Christ without the need of an intermediary, and that academic learning is not necessary for a person to be a ‘minister of Christ.’\(^4\) Both of these views are expressed in the Waterlander Mennonites’ *Short Confession*\(^5\) and the General Baptists’ *Brief Confession*\(^6\) respectively. It is possible that Hooton was aware of the Waterlander *Short Confession* when she met Fox in 1647.

The next recorded meetings of Fox and named Baptists took place in 1649. The first of these was at Elizabeth Hooton’s house, where the main issue related to the presence of a possibly demented woman that Fox had met whilst in prison in Nottingham.\(^7\) The second meeting with development. Up to the end of 1652, Fox refers to two other meetings with Baptists who he admits not having convinced to become Quakers. During 1652, see *Journal* pp. 126-127, having been asked to speak at a gathering by John Sawrey who Fox describes as a Justice of the Peace, and who Nickalls, in a footnote, describes as a Baptist, Fox is then handed over by Sawrey to the gathering and then to the authorities to be whipped and sent on his way. The second confrontation with a Baptist, see *Journal*, pp. 144-146 was with, according to Nickalls, Richard Stookes, who Fox describes, unusually as ‘priest [who] was a Baptist.’ Fox records discussions with Stookes, accompanied by a number of Stookes’ followers that took place on separate days. According to Fox this ended with Stookes speaking strongly against Fox in such a way as to stir up the emotions of Stookes’ followers against Fox. However, in Fox’s words ‘Friends were established in Christ, and the people that were his [Stookes] followers saw the folly of their teacher.’

---


\(^4\) See 1.2.3 above. George Fox, *Journal*, p. 11.

\(^5\) See 3.2 above, also Hans de Ries, ‘Confession of Faith, 1618,’ *Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online*. Accessed from [http://www.gameo.org/encyclopedia/contents/C66531.html](http://www.gameo.org/encyclopedia/contents/C66531.html) on 19th April 2010. Article XX, ‘This faith is a most certain cognition or knowledge acquired through the grace of God from the sacred scriptures’ and Article XXV, ‘In this his holy church God has ordained the evangelical office of teaching the divine Word,’ and Article XXVII ‘The calling or selecting of servants....takes place through the ministers of the church together with the congregation.’

\(^6\) See 3.2 above, also *A Brief Confession or Declaration of Faith set forth by many of us who are (falsely) called Ana-baptists*. (Printed by C.D. for F Smith at the Elephant and Castle, near Temple-Barr, 1660), Article VI ‘That the way set forth by God for men to be justified in, is by faith in Christ...most worthy of their constant affection...so to subject unto him all things’, Article XV ‘the Elders or Pastors which God hath appointed’ and Article XVI ‘the Ministers of Christ, that have freely received from God, ought freely to Minister to others....’

\(^7\) George Fox, *Journal*, p. 43.
Baptists in 1649 occurred in Leicestershire with the General Baptist preacher Samuel Oates. Robert Barclay of Reigate suggests that, prior to meeting Oates, Fox was aware that the views of the General Baptists were very close to his own, and that Fox had sought the meeting in order to convince Oates as ‘Had he [Fox] succeeded in his object, a young, able and resolute preacher would have been secured to the Society.’ It is also possible that, along with Oates, a significant number of others would have joined Fox. Fox records that he was unable to convince these Baptists of their error of baptism with water. But after their discussion, ‘we parted, and some of them were loving to us.’ Although Fox records that at that time his views on faith and the nature of baptism, spiritual or inward and not external, were already formed, he does not record whether any other Baptist beliefs or principles were discussed.

In 1651, Fox records his meeting with the one-time Baptist, Rice Jones. Nuttall writes that at the time of that meeting, Jones had become a Familist after his move away from the Baptists. Fox records that Jones argued with him, Jones saying that Christ had not died outwardly and then denying the outward sufferings of the prophets and apostles. However, Fox writes that ‘I brought the power of the Lord over his imaginations and whimsies, and he

---

8 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 45. Also see 4.6.3 above.
11 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 46.
12 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 63. Also see 4.6.3 above.
13 Geoffrey Nuttall, ‘James Nayler: A Fresh Approach.’ *Supplement No. 26 to Friends Historical Society*, 1954, p. 1. It has been recorded that Jones also exhibited ‘Ranter tendencies’ and that he had been in contact with the Muggletonians. See R.L. Greaves, ‘JONES (or Johns), Rice (or Rhys) (fl. 1650-1663)’ in Ed. Richard L. Greaves & Robert Zaller, *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1983), Vol. 2, pp. 145-146. All that can be deduced from these comments is that Jones followed a varied and wide ranging theological path. If Wootten’s contention is correct, that the Familist movement only continued up to the 1620s, see 3.1.2 above, then it would be more correct to say that Jones retained some Familist convictions rather than that he was a Familist.
14 See also George Fox, *Journal*, p. 178 where Fox records that, in 1654, Jones made other accusations in writing against Quakers, but that soon after this ‘their prophecy came upon themselves ... they fell to pieces.’ Nevertheless Fox writes, see pp. 337-338, that four years later, Jones was still associated with a religious group and that Fox was prepared to argue with Jones and accuse him of misleading his group. For the second time, after this meeting, Fox records that Jones’ group were ‘scattered to pieces.’ See also H. Larry Ingle, *First Among Friends: George Fox & the Creation of Quakerism* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 68 where Ingle describes Jones challenge to Fox’s leadership of the Quakers.
Although Fox suggests that he disagreed with all that Jones preached, there is no reference to any conversation which referred to their common belief: the knowledge of their own sins and the need for inward and not outward, or water, baptism. Therefore, it cannot be shown that Fox acquired his beliefs on these issues from anything that Jones said to him, particularly as Fox had set out in his *Journal* his position on these matters, at times, according to Fox, preceding his meeting with Jones.

The next meetings recorded by Fox are those with people who became leading Quakers at its beginnings. These meetings took place after Fox heard a voice, but before his vision on Pendle Hill and subsequent meeting at Firbank Fell. At one meeting in Balby in Yorkshire he met and, according to Fox, convinced Richard Farnworth, Thomas Killam, John Killam and Thomas Aldam. Possibly within a few days of that meeting, Fox records that he met and convinced James Nayler, Thomas Goodaire and William Dewsbury. Fox does not record whether at those meetings the people that he met had contributed or added anything to his beliefs or theology. However, it is shown in the next section of this thesis that a number of them had had contact, sometimes significant contact, with Baptist congregations, and maybe Anabaptist congregations, before meeting Fox and that some of them had arrived at their

---

15 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 63. See also Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Consciences: The Early Quakers in Britain, 1646-1666* (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), p. 7. Moore asserts that Jones’ group existed as an independent group and were known as ‘Proud Quakers’ or the ‘Castle Group’ and that ‘they permitted greater laxity of conduct than the mainstream Quakers.’

16 See 3.1 above.

17 See, George Fox, *Journal*, p. 46 for Fox’s view on water baptism, and p. 14, with regard to his selfknowledge of his sins.

18 It must be noted that the accounts of some of these meetings, as recounted by the individuals concerned, differ from Fox’s accounts. See 5.3 below.


20 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 73.
‘Quaker’ position in advance of that meeting. It seems reasonable to suggest that the meetings described by Fox were not as ‘one-way’ as he suggests in his Journal.

A ‘priest’ who Fox met in 1651 and who is recorded as being associated with Quakerism for some years after the meeting is referred to by Fox as ‘Mr Boys.’ According to Fox’s Journal, Boys and Fox spent some days together and travelled together, and at a later date Boys spent some time with the Quaker Richard Farnworth. I have been unable to find any information that identifies, without doubt, the background of Mr Boys, although, as is shown in 5.3.2 below, a number of unsubstantiated and contradictory statements have been made about him. In view of the time that Boys and Fox spent together, such a short time before Fox’s vision on Pendle Hill, I believe that research into Boys’ background is important.

Shortly after his vision on Pendle Hill, and during the week preceding his attendance at the large meeting at Firbank Fell, Fox’s preaching at Sedbergh was defended by ‘a Separate preacher’, Francis Howgill. According to Fox’s account, Fox possibly followed Howgill to Firbank Fell, where Howgill had already been preaching. Again, the stated influence appears to have been one-way, from Fox to Howgill, as Fox records: ‘he [Howgill] thought...that I might have killed him with a crab-apple, the Lord’s power had so surprised him.’ Shortly after that meeting, Fox records that Howgill, along with John Audland, John Camm and ‘several others’ became ‘faithful ministers.’ As with other meetings, Fox does not recount what, if any, theological views had been discussed with Howgill. In particular, no mention is

21 George Fox, Journal, p. 88.
22 George Fox, Journal, pp. 86-89.
23 George Fox, Journal, p. 89. See also a letter from Richard Farnworth held as Swarthmore mss 4/229 in Friends House Library, London, in which Richard Farnworth describes ‘Oulde Boys’ accompanying him to York in 1653.
26 George Fox, Journal, p. 108.
27 George Fox, Journal, p. 124. On p. 107, Note 2, Nickalls records Howgill as being ‘an early publisher of Quakerism.’
made of Howgill’s background which, as Howgill describes, included association with ‘they whom they called Anabaptists.’

Accounts are given in Fox’s *Journal* of his various visits to Swarthmoor Hall in Ulverston. His first visit is recorded by Fox as taking place in 1652 at a time when the residents of the Hall, Judge Thomas Fell and his wife Margaret Fell were absent. However, Margaret Fell returned that same evening and Fox writes that ‘I declared the Truth to her and her family.’

Moore records that Swarthmoor Hall was a place where ‘travelling preachers were often welcomed’, and so it can reasonably be assumed that residents of the Hall were familiar with the religious ideas flowing around England at the time, including those proposed by Baptists, and perhaps Anabaptists. However, there is no written evidence in support of this.

During Fox’s first visit to Swarthmoor Hall, he records meeting William Lampitt, the Curate of the local church at Ulverston and described by Hilary Hinds as ‘Fox’s bête noir.’ Lampitt is recorded as having been educated at Oxford and that, locally, he was ‘well respected.’ However, Fox found him ‘a Ranter in his mind’, suggesting that his views disagreed with those of Fox, and not necessarily that he was a supporter of the Ranter movement. Lampitt is recorded later by Fox as being ‘relentless against Quakers until near the end [of Lampitt’s

---

28 Francis Howgill, *The Inheritance of Jacob Discovered after his return out of Egypt* (London: Printed for Giles Calvert at the Black Spread Eagle, at the West end of Pauls, 1655/6), p. 9. I describe, in 5.3.12 below, Howgill’s theological journey leading up to his meetings with Fox.
29 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 113. Nickalls, Note 2, records the visit as occurring during June 1652.
30 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 114. According to Fox, Judge Fell did not return to Swarthmoor Hall and meet Fox until a few days after his first visit, p. 118, and his return was specifically at the request of Margaret Fell for Fox to meet her husband.
34 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 113. In this way Fox was using the word ‘Ranter’ as an insult.
life in 1677]. It is interesting to note that, at the time of this first visit of Fox to Swarthmoor, Fox suggests that Margaret Fell had not been sufficiently convinced by the arguments put forward by the other itinerant preachers that she had met. Fox says: ‘she [Margaret Fell] was in profession with him [Lampitt].’ The following day, Margaret Fell was shown the error of her ways by Fox when she ‘discerned the priest clearly’ and ‘a convincement came upon her and her family [but not Judge Fell who had not yet returned] of the Lord’s Truth.’

In view of the important place that Margaret Fell takes within the early Quaker movement, I discuss her background in detail in 5.3.6 below. I also believe that it is most important to undertake this investigation into Margaret Fell’s life in view of the statements made with regard to her possible descent from the martyr, Anne Askew, a ‘fact' that Fox may have picked up and, not wishing to be upstaged by the lineage of his eventual wife, led to his claim that his mother, Mary Lago, and hence Fox himself, was ‘of the stock of the martyrs.'

In this section, and in Appendix 1, I set out the names of Fox’s contacts, as quoted in his Journal, during his formative years. As stated, in 5.1 above, I investigate the backgrounds of those contacts with particular emphasis on their Anabaptist/Baptist connections. Those possible connections are also investigated in the lives of John Stubbs and William Caton. Although Fox did not acknowledge meeting these early Quakers until 1655 (or possibly

35 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 717. Also see Ed. Elsa F. Glines, *Undaunted Zeal. The Letters of Margaret Fell*, p. 428. This lifelong opposition by Lampitt to Quakers is likely, according to Glines, to have been the result of the defection of ‘all but one (Judge Fell) of the most prominent family in the parish.’
39 George Fox, *Journal*, pp. 554-555 and p. 714. The marriage is recorded by Fox as taking place in 1669 following Judge Fell’s death in 1658.
40 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 1. See 4.5 above.
earlier) and 1653 respectively, those two early Quakers were the first Quakers to visit the Netherlands. It is therefore important to identify what connections they had, if any, with Anabaptists and Baptists in England prior to their European travels.

Before investigating the backgrounds of these early Quakers I consider, in the next subsection, the evidence for the possibility that Fox acquired some of his theology from books/tracts/pamphlets that he may have read as evidenced from the known contents of his library.

5.2.3 George Fox’s Library

If Fox did not develop his theology from discussions he held with contemporary priests and ‘professors’, as he suggests in his Journal, the other source of that knowledge could have come to Fox from publications that he read, a subject of scholarly debate.

The greatest protagonist of Fox’s widespread reading is Rufus Jones. As explained in 2.1 above, it was Jones who made the strongest claims of Quakerism being essentially, and historically, mystical in its tradition, and who claimed that this knowledge of European mysticism influenced Quakers. Jones wrote that ‘Fox was plainly indirectly influenced by Boehme’ but acceded that he ‘knew the Silesian mystic’s writings only slightly.’ However, Jones went on and stated that ‘There can be no question, I think, that he had seen and read

41 George Fox, Journal, p.209. Fox states, p. 176, that John Stubbs was convinced when Fox was in prison in Carlisle in 1653, but he does not record whether he met Stubbs at that time, although he does record a number of un-named convincements, see Journal, p.162, and the convincement of a young James Parnell, aged ‘about 15 years old’, see Journal p. 163. Nuttall states that Stubbs was convinced by Fox in 1653. See Geoffrey Nuttall, From Early Quaker Letters. Swarthmore MSS Calendar to 1660 (Friends House: The Library, 1952), p. 73. George Fox, Journal, p. 171. It is likely that Fox met Caton sometime in 1652 during one of Fox’s journeys to Swarthmoor Hall as Caton, as described in 5.3.11 below, was a companion of Margaret Fell’s son, George.

42 See 7.4 below.

some of their [Denck, Frank, Schwenckfeld, Castellio, Coornhert, Boehme, Everard, Dell and Saltmarsh] little books, which existed in large numbers and were being circulated.\textsuperscript{44} However, Jones does concede that ‘Fox...arrived at his position not by reading...but...by a flash of insight.’\textsuperscript{45} Nevertheless, Jones had set the seed of the possibility of Fox’s widespread reading, a point that had already been promoted fifty years previously by William Beck.\textsuperscript{46} However, this possibility is discounted by the ‘Testimony’ signed by Fox’s six surviving step-daughters.\textsuperscript{47} Graham agreed with this latter view when he wrote: ‘Books, except the Bible, he does not appear to have studied.’\textsuperscript{48}

Nickalls suggests that Fox held ‘several thousand works’,\textsuperscript{49} but this conjecture is based solely on the average contents of ‘seventeenth-century bound volumes in the Library at Friends House’\textsuperscript{50} and not on hard evidence. The only ‘evidence’ relating to the contents of Fox’s Library that does exist is the \textit{Annual Catalogue of Papers of George Fox}.\textsuperscript{51} The final two pages of that document, pp. 959 and 960, are headed ‘G. Ff’s Books at W.M’s.’ Nickalls describes these pages as referring to the books of George Fox that were held by William Rufus M. Jones, \textit{The Life and Message of George Fox}, p. 11. Also see 4.7, Note 236 above relating to evidence substantiating Jones’ statement.\textsuperscript{45} Rufus M. Jones, \textit{The Life and Message of George Fox}, p. 13.\textsuperscript{46} William M. Beck, \textit{Six Lectures on George Fox and his Times} (London: Saml Harris & Co., 1877), pp. 12-13, ‘Fox...deeply learned in the written Word.’ It should be noted here that Beck uses the capital W at the beginning of the word ‘word.’ It is possible, although I would suggest unlikely, that Beck was identifying the ‘written Word’ solely with the Bible.\textsuperscript{47} George Fox, \textit{The Journal of the Life, Travels, Sufferings, Christian Experiences and Labour of Love of George Fox} (Eighth (and Bi-Centenary) Edition, London: Friends Tract Association, 1891), Vol. 2, p. 520, ‘though of no great literature, nor seeming much learned as to the outward’ with this testimony having been written by ‘John Rous, Margaret Rous, William Mead, Sarah Mead, Thomas Lower, Mary Lower, William Ingram, Susanna Ingram, Daniel Abraham, Rachel Abraham, Abraham Morrice and Isabel Morrice.’\textsuperscript{48} John Graham, \textit{The Faith of a Quaker} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920), p. 96. This absence of a wide reading experience could be explained by Nuttall’s assertion on Fox’s rudimentary education, ‘[Fox’s] little schooling can be seen at a glance from the big, bold scrawl and erratic spelling.’ Geoffrey F. Nuttall, \textit{The Puritan Spirit} (London: Epworth Press, 1967), p. 181.\textsuperscript{49} John L. Nickalls, ‘George Fox’s Library.’ \textit{Journal of the Friends Historical Society} 28, 1931, p. 4.\textsuperscript{50} John L. Nickalls, ‘George Fox’s Library’", p. 4.\textsuperscript{51} Anon, \textit{The Annual Catalogue of George Fox’s Papers, compiled in 1694-1697}. Held as Mss vol. 304 in the Friends House Library, London.
Meade for disposal. That *Catalogue* lists one hundred and twelve publications, and from the numbering of those documents, Nickalls suggested that there were a further two hundred and twenty seven documents not listed, not the ‘several thousand’ he suggested earlier. Over the following two years, Nickalls and Henry Cadbury attempted to identify the actual publications held, using the information contained in the *Catalogue*. Nickalls identified sixty-nine documents written, or likely to have been written, by Quakers. This number is not surprising in view of Fox’s editing of Quaker publications up to 1673. However, Nickalls also identified thirty non-Quaker documents, some of which were written in German, in Dutch and Welsh. There is no evidence to suggest that Fox could speak any of these three languages, and it can only be conjecture as to when he acquired them and the other books in English, and whether he actually read any of them.

In view of the note written by his step-daughters, and that Fox was continually travelling in his early years, I concur with John Graham when referring to Fox’s limited reading and suggest that, in view of Fox’s limited formal education, it is unlikely that he read many, if any, of the non-Quaker publications that he possessed.

---

52 John L. Nickalls, ‘George Fox’s Library’, p. 4. ‘George Fox’s instructions regarding the disposal of his books and papers at William Meade’s and elsewhere.’ William Meade was George Fox’s step son-in-law through marriage to Margaret Fell’s daughter, Sarah. George Fox, *Journal*, p. 747.
54 John L. Nickalls, ‘George Fox’s Library’, p. 3.
55 See 1.3 above.
56 John L. Nickalls, ‘George Fox’s Library’, p. 4. The first quoted example of such a document is *Spiegel dr. Gerechtigt*, roughly translated as ‘Reflections on Justice’ is shown as part of ‘H.N’s folio’ identified, p. 9, by Nickalls as ‘Henry Nicholas’, the founder of the Family of love, see 3.1 above.
57 John L. Nickalls, ‘George Fox’s Library’, p. 6. The first quoted example of such a document is *Apocalypse*, identified by Henry Cadbury as a discussion of the Book of Revelation and written in 1675 by Jan Stevensz. See Henry J. Cadbury, ‘George Fox’s Library Again.’ *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 30, 1933, p. 69. I would suggest that, even if it can be shown that Fox could understand Dutch, or had the document translated, the date ascribed to the publication of this book is far too late to have had any influence on George Fox’s evolving theology.
58 John L. Nickalls, ‘George Fox’s Library’, p. 6. The only Welsh document in Fox’s possession is seen to be a Bible in Welsh. Again there is no evidence that Fox could understand Welsh, and it can be surmised that he was given that book during one of his five journeys into Wales. See George Fox, *Journal*, p. 774 which sets out the dates of Fox’s journeys into Wales.
I also agree with Braithwaite when he says that it will ‘probably never be proved that Fox consciously adopted the ideas of others.’\(^{59}\) This latter quote from Braithwaite can be seen to be accurate when considering, as I have done above, the credit awarded by Fox in his *Journal* to others for the formulation of his views.

In the next sections, I look in detail at the lives of the early Quakers, identified above as coming into contact with Fox in the years leading up to 1652, laying greatest emphasis on the lives of those early Quakers with, as shown below, documented contact with Baptists or Anabaptists of the time and with a view to ascertaining their theology prior to meeting Fox. Some of them, as Braithwaite noted, and summarised by Evans, ‘had reached the Quaker experience before Fox came among them.’\(^{60}\).

### 5.3 Early Quakers

#### 5.3.1 Elizabeth Hooton

Little is written by Elizabeth Hooton from which it is possible to unravel her background at the time of meeting Fox in 1647.

She is reported as being born around the year 1600,\(^{61}\) and according to Braithwaite, it is probable that she was a Baptist preacher before she became a Quaker.\(^{62}\) Manners recorded

---


\(^{61}\) W.G. Bittle, ‘HOOTON, Elizabeth (c.1600-1672)’ in Ed. Richard L. Greaves & Robert Zaller, *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century*, Vol. 2, p. 112. See also Emily Manners, *Elizabeth Hooton: First Quaker Woman Preacher (1600-1672)* (London: Headley Press, 1914), p. 2. Manners recorded the maiden name of Oliver Hooton’s wife as ‘Carrier’ but states that she is uncertain that this Elizabeth Hooton was the convert to Quakerism. The dates quoted seem to make this possibility likely as does, see below, the inclusion of an ‘Oliver Hooton’ with ‘Elizabeth Hooton’ in a tract written in 1670. See also Phyllis Mack, *Visionary*
that the Hootons lived in Ollerton, in Nottinghamshire and it was in that county, but at an un-
named town, that Fox first met Elizabeth Hooton in 1647. There is no evidence to suggest that
Fox acquired any of his theology from Hooton at their meeting but that remains a possibility
because, as Fox states, he was not preaching to Hooton’s group but ‘had some meetings and
discourses’ with them. It is likely, therefore, that during these ‘discourses’ Fox learned more
of the Baptist views which would be added to the knowledge he had acquired earlier from
‘Uncle Pickering.’

Two years later, according to Fox, he met Hooton for the second time at her house at Skegby
in Nottinghamshire. Skegby is situated approximately six miles due west of Ollerton and so
the place names quoted by Manners and Fox are consistent with each other.

Firm evidence of her life as a Quaker again comes from Fox’s Journal. He records a voyage
to America in 1671 with Elizabeth Hooton as one of his co-travellers. Fox then records her
death and burial in Jamaica in 1672.

There is some uncertainty over the identity of Elizabeth Hooton’s husband and family.
Manners recorded Elizabeth Hooton’s husband’s name as Oliver. She also recorded that

---

62 William C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism, p. 44. Braithwaite suggests that Hooton may have been a Baptist preacher because ‘the Baptists...allowed women to preach’ and that becoming ‘the earliest woman-preacher among Friends’ would not have been daunting to her.
63 George Fox, Journal, p. 9. ’And travelling on through some parts of Leicestershire and into Nottinghamshire, there I met with a tender people, and a very tender woman whose name was Elizabeth Hooton; and with these I had some meetings and discourses.’
64 George Fox, Journal, p. 43.
65 See Emily Manners, Elizabeth Hooton, p. 3. Manners wrote: ‘sometime between the years 1633 and 1636 Oliver and Elizabeth Hooton appear to have migrated to Skegby’, but she gave no authority for this statement.
66 George Fox, Journal, p. 580. Nickalls reports that the entry in the Journal was not written by Fox himself but by John Hull, a fellow passenger, and placed in the first edition of Fox’s Journal by Thomas Ellwood as if Fox had written the account himself.
67 George Fox, Journal, p. 611 and p. 628 respectively.
‘possibly’ he died in 1657.\textsuperscript{69} However, in 1671, a tract was published giving a ‘Brief Relation concerning the Life and Death’ of one William Simpson.\textsuperscript{70} One of the testaments in that tract was written by Oliver Hooton ‘in Barbados the 16\textsuperscript{th} of the 12\textsuperscript{th} Month 1670.’\textsuperscript{71} Following the testimony written by Oliver Hooton is one written by ‘G.F.’ followed by one from ‘Elizabeth Hooton.’ It is interesting to note that in Fox’s \textit{Journal}, when confirming the names of some of his co-travellers in 1671, he did not record the name of Oliver Hooton. One must also consider whether the Oliver Hooton who wrote the testimony to William Simpson was Elizabeth’s husband, in which case Manners was wrong when she cited his death in 1657, whether he was her son, also named Oliver (see below in this sub-section), the record of whose birth was not found by Manners, or whether he was related to Elizabeth at all.

Manners also wrote that there is a record of the Hootons’ son, Samuel being baptized at Ollerton in 1633.\textsuperscript{72} This latter statement would suggest that, in 1633, following the birth of their son, Oliver and Elizabeth Hooton were members of their local church, and that at that time they believed in infant baptism.\textsuperscript{73}

At the time that Fox met Elizabeth Hooton, he records her as being associated with ‘tender people’ with no specific mention of Baptists.\textsuperscript{74}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[69] Emily Manners, \textit{Elizabeth Hooton}, p. 16.
\item[70] William Fortescue, Oliver Hooton, George Fox, Elizabeth Hooton, and William Simpson, \textit{A Short Relation concerning the Life and Death of that man of God, and faithful minister of Jesus Christ, William Simpson} (No publisher shown, Printed in the Year 1671).
\item[71] William Fortescue et al., \textit{A Short Relation}, p. 12.
\item[72] Emily Manners, \textit{Elizabeth Hooton}, p. 80.
\item[73] If the date of their marriage is correct then it is unlikely that Samuel was above the age of 4 when baptized.
\item[74] George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 9. See also 4.4 above. The current interpretation of the word ‘tender’, taken from \textit{Oxford English Dictionary} is ‘gentle and sympathetic.’ If used in this way it would suggest that Fox received a sympathetic hearing from Hooton’s group. This view is the one taken by Joseph Pickvance in \textit{A Reader’s Companion to George Fox’s Journal} (London: Quaker Home Service, 1989), p. 119. However, an alternative meaning, given in the \textit{Oxford English Dictionary}, is ‘requiring tact or careful handling.’ This alternative interpretation would give rise to a very different attitude expressed by Fox about this group.
\end{footnotes}
Elsa Glines describes Hooton, prior to her meeting with Fox, as ‘a respected Baptist preacher’, and to some extent this view is corroborated by Hooton’s son, Oliver, when he wrote in 1686/7 ‘And my mother Joyned with ye Baptists but after some time, finding them yt they were not upright...Left ym.’ In her book, Manners cited a report to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1669 in compliance with the Conventicle Act of 1664. That report, according to Manners, places Elizabeth Hooton still in Skegby, Nottinghamshire, in 1669 and records ‘a conventicler of Quakers’ at her house. That report to the Archbishop of Canterbury also records, at Skegby in 1669, ‘another conventicler, reputed Anabaptists and fifth monarchy men.’ In view of the use made, in the seventeenth century, of the word Anabaptist, see 1.1.1 above, it is likely that these ‘Anabaptists’ were English Baptists, either of the General or Particular strain and was possibly the group with which Hooton was associated in the years leading up to 1647.

According to Barbour and Roberts, in addition to the many letters she wrote, Hooton wrote one tract for publication. The one tract referred to by Barbour and Roberts was issued in

---

76 Oliver Hutton’s Certificate Concerning G:ff read as Second Day Meeting 16 xii 1686/7. p. 42 of Portfolio 10 – Manuscripts held in Friends House Library, London. Oliver Hooton (or Hutton) disagrees with Glines with regard to the first use of the word, ‘Friends.’ On p. 352 of Glines, *Undaunted Zeal*, Glines writes: ‘her [Hooton’s] separate group called themselves ‘Friends before she met George Fox in 1646.’ On a related subject, over three hundred years before Glines’ book, Oliver Hutton wrote, p. 46 of Oliver Hutton’s Certificate Concerning G:ff, ‘Soe here you may see yt they were called Baptists and separates not Children of ye Light till after :G:ff: had preached ye light of ye Gospel to them & they borrowed it.’
77 Emily Manners, *Elizabeth Hooton*, pp. 3-4.
78 Emily Manners, *Elizabeth Hooton*, pp. 3-4.
79 Ed. Hugh Barbour & Arthur O. Roberts, *Early Quaker Writings 1650-1671* (Wallingford, Pennsylvania: Pendle Hill Publications, 2004), p. 597. See also Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Consciences*, pp. 8-9 where Moore displays a reproduction and a transcript of a letter from Hooton to George Fox dated 1653. I am grateful to Rosemary Moore for giving me access to the background material she had assembled in producing the ‘Table of Publications by Quakers between the years 1646 and 1666’ in Appendix III of Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Conscience*. That information is in the form of an Excel spreadsheet, and it does not record any publication being issued under the authorship of Elizabeth Hooton during the period under review. See Caroline L. Leachman, ‘Hooten, Elizabeth (d. 1672)’ where it is recorded that, other than the publications set out above, ‘she published little.’
1652 under the authorship of Thomas Aldam and referred to the act of preaching for hire. In addition to Aldam, there are five other authors credited in the document including Elizabeth Hooton. Nothing in this tract gives any further information on Hooton’s background or her seeking amongst the Baptists other than the fact that the authors who wrote the document described themselves as ‘Prisoners of the Lord at York Castle 1652.’

Two, much later, documents exist which contain Hooton’s name. Both were written in 1670/1. Possibly the first of these was in the form of a letter to the King, informing him of the effects on people, not just Quakers, of the passing of ‘the late Act’, likely to be the Conventicle Act of 1670. The second publication was her testimony to the life of William Simpson, referred to above. That publication is dated 1671 and was written by Hooton after her arrival in Barbados. Neither of these two later documents gives any clue as to Elizabeth Hooton’s pre-Quaker background.

In the next sub-section I investigate the identity and possible background to ‘Priest Boys’ who met, and travelled with Fox in 1651.

81 Thomas Aldam et al., *False Prophets and False Teachers described*, p. 8, gives the names of the six authors as Thomas Aldam, Elizabeth Hooton, William Pears, Benjamin Nichalson, Jane Holmes and Mary Fisher.
82 Thomas Aldam et al., *False Prophets and False Teachers described*, p. 8.
83 Elizabeth Hooton, *To the King and both Houses of Parliament* (No publisher or date shown), p. 6. Along with Hooton’s letter, in this tract, is one by T. Taylor on the same subject. The date shown after Taylor’s signature, p. 3 is ‘1st of 10th Month 1670.’ John Punshon, *Portrait in Grey*, p. 103. The effects of the 1670 Conventicle Act which Hooton refers to are described by Punshon as follows: ‘there was rapid distraint on the property of anyone fined for an offence...and...an attempt was made to ruin the nonconformists.’ Barrie White explains the reason for the 1670 Conventicle Act, and its predecessor Act of 1664. It was feared that those meetings provided an opportunity for ‘Dissenters’ to plan insurrections. Barrie White, *John Bunyan and the Context of Persecution, 1660-1688.* In Eds. Anne Lawrence, W.R. Owens and Stuart Simm, *John Bunyan and his England 1628-88.* (London: The Hambleton Press, 1990), p. 60.
84 William Fortescue et al., *A Short Relation concerning the Life and Death of that man of God, and faithful minister of Jesus Christ, William Simpson*. The testimony written by Oliver Hooton contained in this document ends on p. 12, as follows, ‘Written in Barbados the 16th of the 12th Month 1670 by Oliver Hooton.’ The short testimony written by Elizabeth Hooton does not show her location when she wrote it.
5.3.2 ‘Priest Boys’

This sub-section considers the contact between George Fox and ‘Priest Boys’ and the possible effect that one had on the other’s theological seeking.

During Fox’s travels around the North of England in 1651 he conducted many meetings with ‘professors.’ He also met a ‘priest’ who accompanied Fox on his travels for a number of days. They met in a schoolhouse in Pickering, North Yorkshire where Fox had held one of his meetings with ‘professors.’ After the meeting, the priest is referred to as having been ‘overthrown and convinced’ and wished to pay for Fox’s dinner at an inn and that he ‘would have wiped my [Fox’s] shoes.’ The priest, at this point unnamed in the Journal account, then offered up his ‘steeplehouse’ in which Fox could preach ‘if I would come.’ But Fox refused as ‘I came to bring them off from such things to Christ.’

Fox left Pickering and then travelled ‘into the country with the priest that called me brother (in whose school house I had declared)’ and again refused to enter an unnamed steeplehouse to preach, eventually reaching the town or village ‘in the moors’ where the priest’s steeplehouse was located. At this point in the Journal, the priest is named as ‘Boys’ when some people they met called out, ‘Mr. Boys, we owe you twenty shillings for tithe’, but the priest would not take it. This event would indicate a formal association between ‘Priest Boys’ and the local parish church.

---

85 George Fox, Journal, p. 4. Nickalls notes, in Footnote 2, that Fox refers to ‘professors’ as ‘one who makes a profession of religious faith.’
86 George Fox, Journal, p. 2, Footnote 1, ‘Fox applied the term priest to all professional preachers, ministers and clergy, irrespective of the particular sect to which they belonged.’
87 George Fox, Journal, p. 86.
88 George Fox, Journal, p. 86.
89 George Fox, Journal, p. 86.
90 George Fox, Journal, p. 87.
91 George Fox, Journal, p. 88.
92 George Fox, Journal, p. 88.
Despite Fox’s earlier refusals to enter steeplehouses to preach, Boys, by holding open the ‘pulpit door’ of his steeplehouse, invited Fox to enter.\(^{93}\) Again Fox refused, and commented on the steeplehouse as being ‘exceeding much painted’ and that ‘the painted beast had a painted house.’\(^{94}\) Together, Fox and Boys travelled on to another meeting at ‘one Burdett’s house.’\(^{95}\) At this point in the *Journal*, Fox describes Boys’ behaviour before he was ‘convinced’ and that Fox had had ‘several discourses with him before he came to be convinced’,\(^{96}\) thus suggesting that Fox knew Boys before their first recorded meeting in the schoolhouse at Pickering.

Following the meeting at Burdett’s house, mentioned above, there is no further reference to Boys in the *Journal*, with Fox then, apparently, journeying on his way alone.\(^{97}\) However, Boys does reappear in a letter, written about two years later by the Quaker, Richard Farnworth, describing a journey to York and ‘Ould Boys the priest he came on the way with us.’\(^{98}\)

Whoever Boys was, Fox spent some days with him and therefore information on his identity and background is important.

All the events set out above are described as having taken place in Yorkshire and so investigations have been undertaken in order to ascertain more background to this mysterious priest and the places where these events took place.

---

93 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 88.
94 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 89.
95 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 89, Note 3. Nickalls places Burdett’s house at Egton Bridge, approximately three miles from Goathland and approximately twenty miles from Pickering.
96 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 89.
97 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 89, ‘And after this I came up through the country towards Cranswick.’
The information supplied by Fox in his *Journal*, and set out above, indicates that ‘Priest Boys’ was associated with the Anglican church of the day, that he was responsible for the collection of tithes in his location and that he lived reasonably close to Pickering in North Yorkshire. At the time of the meeting between Boys and Fox, the incumbent at the Parish Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, Pickering was Edward Bright. This is confirmed by a notice hanging on a wall, close to the bell-tower, in that Church.\(^9^9\)

Research, allowing for possible variations on the spelling of the name Boys, such as Boy, Boyes, Boys, Boyis and Boice, has not been able to identify any ordained priest in the Anglican Church either within the Parish of Pickering or within the wider Diocese of York between the years 1561 and 1642.\(^1^0^0\) However there were twenty-eight entries for ordained priests with such names in the Clergy Database in the Diocese of Winchester, Canterbury, Norwich, Winchester, Oxford and Cambridge,\(^1^0^1\) but none, in the same Clergy Database, associated with any parishes, parish schools or schools surrounding Pickering during the years 1580 to 1660. Neither is there evidence of any priest, with the name of Boys (or variations) being ejected from his ministry between 1559 and 1735.\(^1^0^2\)

In addition to the references in his *Journal*, Fox makes one further reference to Boys in other papers, adopting the spelling ‘Boice.’\(^1^0^3\)

---

\(^9^9\) Field visit to Pickering Church, 14\(^8\) August 2008.

\(^1^0^0\) *York Clergy Ordinations 1561-1642*, (University of York, 2000).

\(^1^0^1\) ‘Clergy of the Church of England.’ Database accessed from [www.theclergydatabase.org.uk](http://www.theclergydatabase.org.uk) on 11\(^8\) July 2008.

\(^1^0^2\) Box of resignation papers from the Diocese of York, 1559-1735, held at the Borthwick Institute, and Samuel Palmer, *The Nonconformist’s Memorial: Being An Account of the Ministers who were ejected or silenced after the Restoration, particularly by the Act of Uniformity, which took Place on Batholewem-day, Aug. 24, 1662. Originally written by the Reverend and learned Edmund Calamy, D.D.* (London: for J. Harris, MDCCCLXXVII).

This research suggests that either Boys was not an ordained priest, or that he was living in an area remote from Pickering. It may be that both of these possibilities apply. The following paragraphs record the research relating to the area surrounding Pickering.

**Locations investigated**

**Pickering**

As has already been shown, the place referred to by Fox as being connected with ‘Priest Boys’ is Pickering in Yorkshire. Fox states that the first meeting he held in the town of Pickering was ‘in the schoolhouse.’ Thereafter, *The Journal* records travelling ‘into the country’ and ‘in the moors’ where the priest’s ‘steeplehouse’ was located.

Nickall notes in his edited version of Fox’s *Journal* that, in relation to Fox’s comment that Boys’ church was ‘exceedingly much painted’, the church referred to was ‘Probably Pickering where there are noted frescoes.’ The recorded history of those frescoes would indicate that they were not on display in 1651/2 when Fox was with ‘Priest Boys.’

---

104 Henry Bougham Gubby, *Home of Family Names in Great Britain* (London: Harrison and Sons, 1890), p. 460. Gubby records that the North and East Ridings of Yorkshire have the highest incidence of the family name Boys or Boyes in Great Britain.

105 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 86.

106 George Fox, *Journal*, pp. 87-88.

107 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 89, Note 1.

108 Christopher Ellis, *St. Peter & St. Paul Parish Church Pickering* (Derby: Heritage House Group Ltd, 2004), p. 5. Ellis claims they were, ‘probably first commissioned in 1450 and were painted in the following decade. Yet only 100 years later, they had been covered as part of the general process of the Protestant Reformation. The paintings were first accidentally rediscovered in 1852 during restorations.’
**Kirkbymoorside**

The possibility exists, therefore, that Boys’ church was not in Pickering, a suggestion made by Penney in his edited version of Fox’s *Journal*. In that version of the *Journal*, Penney suggests that the church was ‘Said to be Kirkbymoorside, Kirk-by-moorside.’ However, that church, All Saints Church, Kirkbymoorside, does not currently have any frescoes displayed, nor is there any record of it ever having had on display during the seventeenth century.

No further light is cast on this issue in the edition of the *Journal* published in 1709, as there are no notes supplementing the text on this point.

**Levisham**

An entry in *Alumni Cantabrigiences* records one William Boyse, ‘son of Nathaniel Boyse, clerk of Levisham near Pickering matriculating in 1670-1.’ However, there is no record of a Boyse family (again allowing for spelling variations) living in Levisham at that time. The Muster Roll records a Thomas Boys of Levisham as a ‘bylman’ in 1539, and an entry in

110 Recorded conversation with the Rev. Canon David Purdy, on 15th September 2008, vicar of All Saints Church, Kirkbymoorside. The Rev Purdy also confirmed that the incumbent in the church from 1638 was Thomas Strother followed by Thomas Harwyke from 1660.
111 George Fox, *A Journal or Historical Account of the Life...of that Ancient, Eminent and Faithful Servant of Jesus Christ, George Fox* (London: J. Sowle, 1709).
113 *Bishops Transcripts* held in the Borthwick Institute, York, transcribed by Levisham Local History Group, 1993-4, transcripts of *Yorkshire Lay Subsidies from 1301*, transcripts of *Levisham Hearth Tax from 1662*, transcripts of *Levisham Wills between 1428 and 1805* and transcript of *Medieval Muster Roll, Levisham, 1539*.
114 Transcript of *Medieval Muster Roll, Leversham, 1539*.
The Victorian History of the County of York records the ‘family of Boie (Boye), hereditary foresters’ in nearby Middleton in the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{115}

In the seventeenth century, the parish church of Levisham was the church of St. Mary, situated in the bottom of a valley, approximately one mile from the centre of Levisham. The church dates from the twelfth century,\textsuperscript{116} and was completely renovated in 1802 leaving only the chancel arch from the original church untouched.\textsuperscript{117} The church is now derelict. In 1977, an archaeological investigation of the church was undertaken, and it is recorded that there is evidence of red pigmentation at various places within the church.\textsuperscript{118} A site visit by the author on 25\textsuperscript{th} June 2009 disclosed paint on the chancel arch facing the nave. The paint was located at various places over the whole of the arch and consisted of patches of red and orange paint.

The church of St. Mary therefore fits the criteria set out in Fox’s Journal, viz. ‘in the moors’ and ‘much painted’, however there is no evidence of a Boys family in Levisham in 1651.

**Lockton**

There are records however, of a Boyes family living in the village of Lockton, approximately two miles distant from Levisham.\textsuperscript{119} Strong reported that the Diocesan Court Books held at the Borthwick Institute record a Thomas Boyes of Lockton being arraigned in front of the Court in 1636 possibly, according to Strong, for non-attendance at church services, and that

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
Parish Records recorded a Thomas Boyes as being Churchwarden at St. Giles Church, Lockton but only during the years 1669-1675. With Thomas Boyes’ connection with the parish church at Lockton as late as 1669, it is, I suggest, unlikely that he is the ‘Priest Boyes’ who met Fox in 1651. Of greater interest to this research is the record, noted by Strong, in the Ecclesiastical Court Records, also held at the Borthwick Institute, York, of one James Boyes being fined in 1667 at the Church Court, York, for separating from the church and for being a Quaker.

Strong had also investigated the Bishops Transcripts for the parish of Lockton and noted that a James Boyes’ baptism was recorded in 1639, with James’ father being Roger Boyes. James would be too young to be the ‘ould Boys’ referred to by Farnworth, see above, but Roger could have been that person.

Parts of the parish church of St Giles in Lockton date from the fourteenth century, but there is no evidence that any part of the inside walls of the church had been decorated by frescoes. The ceiling, however, does still contain some painted decoration and there does still exist an entrance door to the church opposite the pulpit, see above.

---

121 Meeting on 25th June 2009 with Ruth Strong.
122 The Bishops Transcripts, as noted by Strong, record the following ‘Boyes’ baptisms in Lockton Church: 1608-9 Mary daughter of Robert, 1628-9 Bryan son of Thomas, 1632 Elizabeth daughter of Thomas, 1636 Robert son of Roger, 1638 Mary daughter of Thomas, 1639 James son of Roger. At the time of meeting Fox, if it occurred, Roger Boyes would have been about 45 years old.
123 Strong, Lockton, People and Places, p. 25.
124 Strong does not make reference to any internal decoration in the church, but on the day that the author visited the church, 25th June 2009, the internal plasterwork was in the course of being repaired. Various layers of plasterwork were exposed, as far down as to the original stonework, showing either white or light green wash on the plaster. There was no evidence of any paintings or frescoes, and this was confirmed by the workman undertaking the work. See also George Fox, Journal, p. 88 where Fox refers to Boys opening the ‘pulpit door’ for Fox to enter.
Goathland (or Goatland)

Goathland is situated approximately six miles north of Lockton on the North York Moors. Marchant records a ‘perpetual curate’ at the village church named William Boyes, and that he was ‘one of the few puritan ministers who welcomed Fox.’ Hollings also suggests that this William Boyes was the ‘Priest Boys’ of Fox’s Journal and that he brought Fox to Goathland Church.

Information regarding William Boyes is somewhat confusing as, according to information collected on the village of Goathland by Hollings, there were at least three ‘William Boyes’ living in Goathland during the years 1620 to 1685. Marchant records a William Boyes being brought before the church High Commission in 1620 and ‘iudicialle monishhed to reforme their manner...and to submit themselves touching opinions in matters of religion.’ Marchant also records a later accusation against William Boyes in 1627 for ‘failure to exhibit

125 Ronald A. Marchant, The Puritans and the Church Courts in the diocese of York 1560-1642 (London: Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd., 1960), p. 45. Marchant states, on p. ix, that the confirmation of this, and other facts, was obtained from ‘the archives of the Diocese of York’, however he gives no specific information on its location. On a Field Trip to the Borthwick Institute on 24th May 2010, I was not able to confirm this information.


128 Field Trip to Whitby Museum, on 25th May 2010 to investigate the research papers of Alice Hollings. Box 2 of her papers contained folder Ref 2/9/--- which held the Hearth Tax records for Goathland which record a William Boyes (or Boyse) resident in the village in 1664, p. 17, 1674, p. 19 and during 1685, p. 21. Item 163 in Folder 2/2 --- record a William Boyes appearing before the ‘Court Leet’ in 1675 for what appears to be drunken behaviour. In Box 3 of Hollings papers, there are references to wills of Goathland residents with the family name Boyes occurring from the year 1628.

129 Ronald A. Marchant, The Puritans and the Church Courts, p. 41. This is the same event recorded by Como, above, when Boyes was a layman in Kirkby Moorside. Also see Alice Hollings, Goathland, p. 84 where she states that William Boyes was ‘a young and vigorous pastor...at his induction in 1626.’
same [letters] or his answers’ and then in 1632 for showing no formal certificate ‘that he had been lic[enced]’.  

A field trip to Goathland Church, disclosed that the church of the 1650s was demolished in 1821, and a completely new church built on the same site in 1896. The Record of Marriages, Burials and Births 1600-2005 held within the church show a number of members of the Boyes family, including a William Boyes, married on 21st November 1662, who would, I suggest, be too young to be Priest Boyes of this search. The gravestones in the churchyard record the deaths of other members of the Boyes family, the most recent occurring in 1781. Other than a general description of the old church as having ‘thatch and stalls’ no description of the old church exists, and so it is not possible to confirm the interior decoration of the original church.

**A further possibility**

As has been seen, Boys or Boyes is not an uncommon name in Yorkshire and so, despite the reference to ‘tithes’ by Fox, the possibility of Boys being associated with a church of another denomination must be considered.

A review of the list of students studying at the University of Leiden in the Netherlands may support that contention. It would also suggest that Boys could have had a significant

---

130 Ronald A. Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts*, pp. 231-232. A record exists of the 1632 event in Box C.V/CB, *Visitations of the Archdeaconry of Cleveland*, held at the Borthwick Institute. That record also refers to the three visitations of the archdeaconry of Cleveland to Boyes in that year. Those records do not include any reference to the 1627 transgression by Boyes.


134 Consideration of this further possibility is only appropriate if Fox’s account in his *Journal* of his meeting with Boys is inaccurate.
influence on the emerging Quaker theology in view of the fact that, according to Fox’s
Journal, the meeting between Fox and Boys occurred before Fox’s vision on Pendle Hill,\textsuperscript{135}
before his preaching at Firbank Fell,\textsuperscript{136} and before his subsequent first meeting with Margaret
Fell, all in 1652.\textsuperscript{137}

The religious freedom offered to individuals and to congregations in the Netherlands is
extensively covered elsewhere in this thesis where it is recorded that, in the late sixteenth and
early seventeenth centuries, the Netherlands was the centre of non-conformist gatherings and
that the University of Leiden was the centre of scholarship in the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{138}

As recorded in Chapter 2 above, the Ancient Church of English Separatists, having been
formed in England in 1587, fled to Amsterdam in 1593,\textsuperscript{139} to be followed in 1607/8 by the
founders of English Baptism, John Smyth and Thomas Helwys.\textsuperscript{140} These congregations
worshipped and debated openly and had regular contact, Smyth in particular, with
Waterlander Mennonite (Anabaptist) congregations.\textsuperscript{141} It is probable, therefore, that any
student at the University of Leiden at that time, particularly a student of theology, would be
subjected to the religious ferment and disputes of the time.

It is recorded that an Abraham Boy from England was a student, studying theology, at the
University of Leiden sometime around the year 1591.\textsuperscript{142} The date 9 May 1591 is shown as the

\textsuperscript{135} George Fox, Journal, p. 103.
\textsuperscript{136} George Fox, Journal, p. 108.
\textsuperscript{137} George Fox, Journal, p. 114.
\textsuperscript{140} Wright, The Early English Baptists, p. 19.
\textsuperscript{141} Wright, The Early English Baptists, p. 39.
date of his matriculation. This date represents either the date of his entry or leaving the university. That person, if he was still alive in 1651, would be well into his 70s, a remarkable age in those days, and sufficiently advanced in years to be referred to as ‘old priest’ or ‘Old Boice’ by Fox or ‘oulde Boys’ by Farnworth.¹⁴³ If this is, in fact, the ‘Priest Boys referred to by Fox, it is possible that he would have recounted his experiences in Leiden, and shared with Fox the theologies being discussed in the liberal Netherlands at that time.

There is no evidence, from the records investigated, previously referred to, that an Abraham Boy (or Boys) lived in Levisham, Lockton, Goathland or Pickering. However, the Alumni Cantabrigiences does record a Samuel Boys, born around 1667, the son of Abraham Boys of York, being granted a BA in Pembroke College, Cambridge in 1687-8.¹⁴⁴ The dates would suggest that the Abraham Boy of Leiden would, if he was still alive, be approximately 90 years old at the birth of Samuel, and so is unlikely to be the father of Samuel. Nevertheless, Abraham Boy of Leiden could have been the grandfather of Samuel Boys of York.

Conclusions

There is little hard evidence to place Boys (or Boyes or Boice or Boy) accurately in a place in history. The only available evidence is that supplied by Fox in his Journal, with a short postscript added by Farnworth’s letter. One could surmise that if Boys was an ordained priest in the Anglican church when he met Fox, it is unlikely that he would have developed at that time a theology sufficiently different to the prevailing Anglican/Presbyterian theology of that time.

¹⁴³ David Coleman and John Salt, British Population, Patterns, Trends and Processes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), p. 29. Life expectancy at birth in 1660 was thirty-eight years, and in 1650 was thirty-five years. See also p. 42, as late as the 1800s, the average age at death for professional people ranged from thirty-five to fifty depending on location.
¹⁴⁴ John Venn and J.A. Venn, Alumni Cantabrigiences, p. 196.
so as to have an effect of Fox’s developing theology. The influence would have undoubtedly been by Fox on Boys, as is suggested in the *Journal*. This argument would be completely reversed if it could be proved that ‘old Boys’ was, in fact, Abraham Boy, late of the University of Leiden. However, no evidence exists to prove the argument either way.

The available evidence would suggest that ‘Priest Boys’ was either Thomas Boyes, churchwarden, or Roger Boyes both of Lockton, with Roger being the father of James Boyes who is recorded as becoming a Quaker. Alternatively, he could be William Boyes of Goathland, as suggested by Marchant. In each case it is likely that any theological influence was of Fox on ‘Priest Boys’, and not vice versa.

In the next sub-section I look at the life and theological background of one of the first people that Fox met and convinced and who had a documented Baptist/Anabaptist background, William Dewsbury.

### 5.3.3 William Dewsbury

Fox, in his *Journal*, made little of his first meeting with William Dewsbury in 1651 other than stating that Dewsbury was ‘convinced.’\(^{146}\) Shortly before Fox’s vision on Pendle Hill leading to his great meeting at Firbank Fell, Fox records his second meeting with Dewsbury in Yorkshire at ‘a great meeting’ where ‘The Truth was mightily declared amongst them’ and that Dewsbury was present at that meeting.\(^{147}\) However Fox wrote, in 1688, that Dewsbury’s convincement, along with that of his wife, Ann, happened on ‘a moonshine night’ when Fox

---

\(^{145}\) Fox records that in 1655, about four years after meeting Boys, Fox met a ‘Friend, Humphrey Smith, that had been a priest.’ George Fox, *Journal*, p. 225.

\(^{146}\) George Fox, *Journal*, p. 73, ‘and went into the country about Wakefield where James Nayler lived, where he and Thomas Goodaire and William Dewsbury and many more were convinced.’

\(^{147}\) George Fox, *Journal*, p. 100. ‘William Dewsbury that had been convinced the year before.’
‘walked into the field’ and Dewsbury and his wife ‘confessed to the Truth and received it.’

This later account would suggest a somewhat longer meeting between Fox and William and Ann Dewsbury than Fox originally had documented, during which there may have been an exchange of views.

Dewsbury was born in Yorkshire in 1621 and from an early age, according to Dewsbury, ‘the word of the Lord came unto me.’ Jones asserted that Dewsbury was not a great reader, a trait not accepted by Dewsbury himself. During his ‘seeking’, Dewsbury records that, after returning from Scotland to England, he ‘went amongst those...called by the names Anabaptists and Independents’ but that he ‘could not joyn with them’ as he could not accept their ‘outward observances.’ His account of his association with the ‘Anabaptists’, written in 1655, is described in factual terms with no sign of any contempt for their views. However, an earlier publication of Dewsbury, dated 1653/4, does pour scorn upon them and likens them, amongst others, to ‘painted Beasts bewitched with the mother of Harlots...full of the abominations of the earth.’

---

148 Extract quoted by Nickalls in George Fox, Journal, p. 73, Note 2, taken from Dewsbury, Works, 1688, p. x.
150 William C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism, p. xxv, Introduction by Rufus M. Jones, ‘Fox was not a great reader, neither Dewsbury, Nayler, Howgill, Burrough nor Hubberthorne.’ See also William Dewsbury, The Discovery of the great enmity of the serpent, p. 13, ‘then I ceased from vaine conversation which I had lived in, and began to read the Scriptures and books.’ In his testimony at the Northampton Assizes, Dewsbury stated that ‘When I was thirteen years of Age, I was bound Prentice to a Cloath-Maker [sic], in the West part[sic] of Yorkshire’ suggesting a limited formal education. William Dewsbury, A Discovery of the ground from whence the Persecution did arise (London: No publisher information shown, 1655), p. 11.
151 William Dewsbury, The Discovery of mans return to his First Estate by the Operation of the Power of God in the great Work of Regeneration (London: Printed for Giles Calvert at the Black Spread-Eagle at the west end of Pauls, 1653/4), p. 21. The passage quoted above continues for a further twenty one lines in a similar vein.
Shortly before this time, Dewsbury is recorded as being in the army.\textsuperscript{153} He records the beginning of the English Civil War, in 1642, and that shortly after rejecting the ‘Anabaptists and Independents’, the Lord instructed him to ‘put up thy sword into thy scabbard’ and that ‘the Kingdom of Christ was within’.\textsuperscript{154}

Dewsbury does not record his marriage to Ann, which, according to Rowntree took place in York in 1645.\textsuperscript{155} Whilst not stated by Dewsbury, it was suggested by Rowntree that Ann was ‘associated with Anabaptists’,\textsuperscript{156} and asserted by Smith that Dewsbury possibly met her whilst she was in prison.\textsuperscript{157} The marriage is reported by Smith to have taken place during an Anabaptist meeting.\textsuperscript{158} This latter assertion would be accurate if it could be proved that Ann was one of their number when Dewsbury first met her. It is possible that Ann was associated with ‘Anabaptists’ in view of Dewsbury’s own interest in that group. However, with Dewsbury recording that he could not join them and that he did not accept their ordinances, it seems unlikely that he would have undertaken a marriage ceremony at one of their meetings. This whole account of his marriage must therefore be treated as speculative.

\textsuperscript{153} Rosemary Moore, \textit{The Light in their Consciences}, p. 12. See also William Dewsbury, \textit{A Discovery of the ground}, p. 11, in which Dewsbury wrote ‘and then the Wars begun in this Nation and I did go into the service for the Parliament.’ Shortly after the outbreak of the Civil War, the Grand Jury in Worcester declared its commitment to the King and to defend the ‘true protestant religion…against popish recusants, Anabaptists and all other separatists.’ This declaration is likely to have encouraged individuals linked to either branch of English baptism, such as Dewsbury, Nayler, see 5.3.4 below and Stubbs, see 5.4.8 below, to join the parliamentary army. Michael Braddick, \textit{God’s Fury, England’s Fire} (London: Penguin Group, 2008), p. 212.


\textsuperscript{155} Arthur Rowntree, ‘Quakerism on Moor and Wold’, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{156} Arthur Rowntree, ‘Quakerism on Moor and Wold’, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{157} Edward Smith, \textit{The Life of William Dewsbury} (London: Darton & Harvey, 1836), pp. 45-46. Smith also cast some doubt over whether the woman that Dewsbury met in prison was in fact the same woman that Dewsbury later married.

\textsuperscript{158} Edward Smith, \textit{The Life of William Dewsbury}, p. 46. Smith gave no evidence in support of his claim that the marriage took place during an ‘Anabaptist meeting.’ Smith simply wrote that, 'The narrative goes on to say’ without identifying ‘the narrative.’
Whilst accepting Dewsbury’s interest in the ‘Anabaptist’ group in Yorkshire, it is important to identify whether that group was associated with a continental Anabaptist grouping or was an English Baptist group. Although not confirmed by Dewsbury, I suggest, as does Mock, that particularly in view of the geographical concentration of Dutch nationals and continental Anabaptists in the south of the country, the group referred to by Dewsbury was a Baptist group, of either the General or Particular persuasion.

The stages, common to most early Quakers, through which Dewsbury travelled before arriving at his Quaker position are set out in his publication *The Discovery of the great enmity of the Serpent*. At an early age, possibly as a young teenager, Dewsbury wrote that he could find no value in listening to the ministers of the church as they did not speak from their own experiences. He then came to the conclusion that, in his view, the outward ordinances of the church meant nothing, but that the ‘Spirit of Christ’, or as described by Dewsbury, ‘the light in my conscience’ was all. In 1642 or shortly after, he came to understand that the Scriptures were not the ‘Gospel’ but a ‘dead letter’, that ‘the Gospel, which is Christ.’ He also decided that he should no longer listen to the words of ministers, but should ‘wait in his [the Lord’s] counsel, the light in my conscience, to hear what the Lord would say.’ In his view, ‘The Kingdom of Christ was within.’ Dewsbury also wrote that he had arrived at his

---

159 The popular common identification of Anabaptists with English Baptists has been referred to above in this thesis. In particular see 3.2 above and the 1644 *The Confession of Faith, of those Churches which are commonly (though falsely) called ANABAPTISTS* (London: Printed by Matthew Simmons in Aldersgate-street, 1644), and the 1660 General Baptist confession, *A Brief Confession or Declaration of Faith*.


161 William Dewsbury, *The Discovery of the great enmity of the serpent*, p. 14 ‘I met with none that could tell me what God had done for their soules.’

162 William Dewsbury, *The Discovery of the great enmity of the serpent*, p. 15.

163 William Dewsbury, *The Discovery of the great enmity of the serpent*, p. 16.

164 William Dewsbury, *The Discovery of the great enmity of the serpent*, p. 16.

165 William Dewsbury, *The Discovery of the great enmity of the serpent*, p. 17.
theological position in 1645.  

This publication, in particular, if the timescales indicated in it can be accepted, shows that Dewsbury had arrived at the Quaker position before his meeting with Fox in 1651, the year, according to Dewsbury, that ‘it pleased the Lord to manifest his power to free me, which was in the year, according to the account, 1651.’ Although Dewsbury makes no reference to his meeting with Fox in 1651, it is possible that the meeting was the event that set him ‘free’, acknowledging, however, that it is ‘God alone’, and not Fox, who was his teacher. I suggest the role of Fox at that meeting was to reassure and confirm Dewsbury’s beliefs.

A major contribution made by Dewsbury to the early Quaker movement was his influence in setting out a basis for church discipline. It is possible that his earlier army training and instilled discipline may have helped in this task. This establishment of early Quaker discipline is set out in two documents. The first is a letter, undated but probably written in 1653 to ‘Friends’ and initialled by ‘W.D.’ and by ‘G.ff.’ This document establishes the basis for weekly meetings for worship and for regular meetings with nearby ‘frinds...one in tow [sic] or three weeks’ and to ensure that scattered Friends have the opportunity to meet for worship ‘three or four hours as ye lord orders.’ It also sets out the process of disciplining wayward ‘fronds’, and follows closely church discipline as set out in the Gospel of Matthew. Initially, there is to be a gentle conversation, followed by informing two or three others who are ‘grown in ye thruth [sic]’ of the problem. If there is no change in the miscreant behaviour then the Friend is to be ‘reproved’ openly at a meeting of Friends and finally, if the miscreant’s

---

166 William Dewsbury, *The Discovery of the great enmity of the serpent*, p. 18.
169 Kate Peters, *Print Culture and the Early Quakers*, p. 24. ‘This document [Swarthmore MS Vol 3/19, see below] has been seen as important in laying down a basic structure for church discipline.’
171 *Holy Bible (AV)*. Matthew, 18: 15-17.
behaviour does not change then ‘so cast ym out...until they Repent.’ This same action is recorded by Dewsbury in another publication issued over thirty years later.\textsuperscript{172} It is interesting to note how closely this disciplining process follows Article 2 of the \textit{Schleitheim Confession} which sets out the process as ‘If members ‘fall in error’, they are given two private warnings then, if no correction, a final admonishment or ban.’\textsuperscript{173} Similar processes to enforce church discipline were set out in the \textit{Short Confession of Faith} of the Waterlander Mennonites and the 1646 \textit{Confession of Faith} of the Particular Baptists as follows:

\textbf{The Short Confession of Faith of the Waterlander Mennonites}\textsuperscript{174}

Article XXV puts the onus of admonishing the brethren on the Ministers of the church, Article XXXV states that the unrepentant sinner is admonished and exhorted and then, if still unrepentant, is banned with, according to Article XXXVI, total avoidance.

\textbf{The 1646 Confession of Faith of the Particular Baptists}\textsuperscript{175}

Article XLVI allows for members to be separated from the congregation for unspecified ‘faults and corruptions’, but only after ‘...in due order and tendernesse, fought redresse thereof.’\textsuperscript{176}

\textsuperscript{172} George Fox, George Whitehead, Francis Camfeild, Richard Pinder, Steven Crisp, Richard Richardson, James Parkes, and William Dewsbury. \textit{The Faithful Testimony of that Ancient Servant of the Lord and Minister of the everlasting Gospel William Dewsbury} (London: Printed and Sold by Andrew Sowle at the Crooked Billet in Holloway Lane, Shoreditch; And at the Three-Keyes, in Nags-Head-Court, in Grace-Church-Street, 1689), p. 1.

\textsuperscript{173} See 2.2.2 above.

\textsuperscript{174} Hans de Ries, ‘Confession of Faith.’

\textsuperscript{175} \textit{A Confession of Faith of seven Congregations or Churches of Christ in London, which are commonly (but unjuestly) called Anabaptists} (London: Published according to Order. Printed by Mark Simmons and to be sold by John Hancock in Popes-head Alley, 1646).

\textsuperscript{176} A similar disciplining process is included in the 1660 General Baptist Confession, written seven years after Dewsbury’s letter of 1653. See \textit{A Brief Confession or Declaration of Faith}.
As Dewsbury was in some degree of contact with Baptists and, as stated above ‘began to read the Scriptures and books’, it is possible that, prior to him writing his publications on discipline within the Quaker group, he had read or heard about the disciplinary codes within the Waterlander Mennonite, or more likely, the Particular Baptist congregations and adapted them to meet the needs of the Quaker movement. (He would not, until at least seven years after writing his letter, have had sight of the 1660 General Baptist Confession).

I now consider an early Quaker who was one of the group, along with Dewsbury, that was convinced by Fox in 1651, James Nayler.

5.3.4 James Nayler

James Nayler was born in Yorkshire around 1617 and, according to Punshon ‘had arrived at an essentially ‘Quaker’ position while still a soldier.’ In his Journal, Fox records his first meeting with Nayler in 1651, and merely states that ‘he [Nayler]...and many more were convinced.’ Dewsbury, who was present at that meeting, recorded that Nayler’s convincement occurred ‘after some discussion’ but there is no record of what was discussed at that time. I suggest that Nayler’s possible martyrlogical theology, see below, was discussed at that meeting and that this did have an effect on the attitudes of Quakers from that

---

177 John Punshon, Portrait in Grey, pp. 88-89. See also William C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism, p. 519, where Braithwaite lists the early Quakers who had been soldiers prior to their convincements. These were Nayler, Dewsbury, Hubberthorne, Stubbs, Whitehead, George Fox the Younger, Ames and Edmondson. See also Leo Damrosch, The Sorrows of the Quaker Jesus (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996), p. 18. ‘...it is likely that Nayler reached independently a position very similar to Fox’s at a time...[when] freedom of the press...[and] antinomian ideas were widely circulated.’ Nayler’s military service is confirmed in an early tract of 1653. ‘Likewise our dear Brother, James Nayler, lies in prison in Appleby, who served the Parliament under the Command of Major General Lambert, betwixt eight and nine years.’ James Nayler, Several Petitions Answered That were put up by the Priests of Westmorland (London: Printed for Giles Calvert, at the Black spread Eagle at the West end of Pauls, 1653), pp. 63-64. It is noted that pages 62 and 63 are mistakenly shown as 10 and 11 respectively.

178 George Fox, Journal, p. 73.

179 Extract quoted by Nickalls in George Fox, Journal, p. 73, Note, 2, taken from Dewsbury, Works, 1688, p. x. See also 5.3.3 above.
time on. In particular, I suggest that it could have influenced Fox when writing, many years later, of his own martyrological heritage.

Before his meeting with Fox, Nayler had been a member of an Independent congregation in Yorkshire and Nuttall suggests that that congregation was a Congregational group. There is no evidence to illustrate the theological position at which Nayler had arrived prior to meeting Fox, other than his general non-conformity. However, I suggest below that he was aware of the theological views of the continental Anabaptists, but not necessarily the English Baptists, and that this knowledge became apparent in the following years.

One of the first of many of Nayler’s tracts was published in 1653 and is largely a diatribe against ‘pride, wantonness, covetousness…all them who profess the truth, and live in unrighteousness…drunkards…conceited ones who are wise in their own eyes.’ It is possible that this tract was also written against those people who had put him in prison, where this tract was written.

Possibly at the same time as A Discovery of the First Wisdom was written, Nayler, whilst still in prison, contributed to a short tract, A Discovery of Faith Wherein is laid down The Ground

---

180 I. Breward, ‘NAYLER, James (c1618-1660)’ in Ed. Richard L. Greaves & Robert Zaller, Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals, Vol.2, p. 257. See also Geoffrey F. Nuttall, Studies in Christian Enthusiasm (Wallingford, Pennsylvania: Pendle Hill, 1948), p. 67. It is not clear whether it was at this congregation that Nayler and three others, all becoming Quakers at a later date, caused a commotion and were, as a result ‘turned out of their communion.’ See Anon, ‘The convincement of James Nayler.’ Journal of the Friends Historical Society 18, no. 3, 1921, p. 88. It is unlikely that the church referred to was the established church of the time as it is suggested in the article that the church referred to had only existed since about 1648.


of True Faith, subtitled ‘The difference Betwixt The Living Word and the Letter.’ This tract contains a number of early Quaker beliefs that are evident in later Quaker tracts: differentiating between ‘Scripture’ and the ‘Word’, being ‘patterns’ to others, letting ‘your yea, be yea, and your nay, nay in all things’, ‘your Baptisms, which are invented from the letter…the Saints baptisme is with one Spirit’ and ‘you have been told that Learned men and Scholars must open the Scriptures, which is a thing contrary to the Scripture.’ A later Nayler tract, A Vindication of Truth, sets out, in answer to a tract issued earlier by Francis Higginson, aspects of belief ascribed to Quakers which Nayler forceably denies as ‘a heap of falsehoods and deceits.’

In 1654, Nayler, along with George Fox and the Quaker Richard Farnworth wrote separate sections contained in an open letter aimed at the English Baptists. The first part, written by Farnworth is, I believe, a reasoned argument against the practice of water baptism, and is discussed in 5.3.5 below. The section of the letter written by Nayler is somewhat confusing. The combined letter was written to ‘Baptists’ but the arguments put forward in Nayler’s portion appear to be more directed at the established church. Nayler argues against

---

183 James Nayler and Richard Farnworth, A Discovery of Faith Wherein is laid down The Ground of True Faith: The difference betwixt the Living Word and the Letter (London: Printed for Giles Calvert, at the Black Spread Eagle at the west end of Pauls, 1653). No author is ascribed to this tract on its fronticepiece. The introduction is signed by Farnworth and a letter, at the end of the tract, is signed by Nayler. From the style of writing in the tract, this researcher concludes that the main text of the tract was written by Farnworth. In a private communication, Dr. Rosemary Moore has agreed with this conclusion.

184 James Nayler and Richard Farnworth, A Discovery of Faith, pp. 6, 9, 6,11 and 12 respectively. The examples taken from this tract can all be found in Fox’s Journal, pp. 146, 263, 244, 134 and 7 respectively, with references to baptism of the spirit, ministry without the need for teachers and defining the ‘Word’ as not being ‘Scripture’ also being contained in a tract issued in 1653 under the joint authorship of Nayler and George Fox. James Nayler and George Fox, Saul’s Errand to Damascus (London: Printed for Giles Calvert, at the Black Spread Eagle at the West end of Pauls, 1653), pp. 16, 18 and 33 respectively. Nayler’s portion of Saul’s Errand is repeated, almost verbatim in Nayler’s tract Truth Cleared from Scandals, issued the year after Saul’s Errand.

185 James Nayler, A Vindication of Truth (London: Printed for Giles Calvert, and are to be sold at the Black-Spread-Eagle at the West End of Pauls, 1656), p. 1.

186 Richard Farnworth, James Nayler and George Fox. To you that are called by the name of Baptists, or the Baptized people that do what you do by Imitation from John the Baptist, Christ and the Apostles (No publishing information shown. Dated by Thomason, Aug 28 1654). George Thomason was a London Bookseller and collector of pamphlets who wrote on each pamphlet he bought the date of purchase. See Ed. Licia Kuenning, The Works of James Nayler (1618-1660) (Glenside, P.A.: Quaker Heritage Press, 2003), p. 5.
‘Sacrament, there is no such Scripture which speaks of a Sacrament’, whereas, as shown in 3.2 above, the Baptists would use the word ‘ordinance’ and not ‘sacrament.’ The Particular Baptist *Confession*, Article XXXIX refers to ‘the Lords Supper’, and is explicitly described in the General Baptist *Confession* as ‘assembling together, in fellowship, in breaking of Bread and Prayer.’ In these Articles, there is no suggestion that the ‘Lords Supper’ or the ‘breaking of bread’ are sacraments within those congregations, but Nayler, when referring to these practices wrote: ‘and you who eats and drinks it, doth not discern the Lords body, for it is spiritual, and your Sacrament is carnal.’

The final section of the letter was written by George Fox. It is headed ‘The light in your conscience the true Teacher.’ There is no reference in Fox’s portion of the letter to the Baptists, or of any of their ordinances. Fox’s message to the addressees of the letter, who could just as reasonably have been the established Church or any non-conformist, non-Quaker congregation, was ‘you must own that the light in your consciences which Christ has enlightened you with.’

If this letter was intended as a complete document, to be addressed to Baptists as its title suggests, then these extracts would suggest that Nayler was not totally familiar with the theology or practices of either branch of the English Baptists. However, it is possible that a specific aspect of his theology was influenced by the theology of the continental Anabaptists.

---

187 Richard Farnworth et al. *To you that are called by the name of Baptists*, p. 4.
188 *A Confession of Faith of seven Congregations or Churches of Christ in London*, Article XXXIX
189 *A Brief Confession or Declaration of Faith*, Article XIII.
190 Richard Farnworth et al. *To you that are called by the name of Baptists*, p. 5. The paragraph referred to above ends: ‘and so we deny your Sacrament to be an Ordinance of Christ, or the Supper of Christ.’ In his later tract, *A Vindication of Truth*, Nayler does not use the word ‘Sacrament’ when arguing against the issues on baptism and ‘the Lords Supper’ raised by Higginson. James Nayler, *A Vindication of Truth*, pp. 28-30.
191 Richard Farnworth et al. *To you that are called by the name of Baptists*, p. 8.
192 Richard Farnworth et al. *To you that are called by the name of Baptists*, p. 8.
193 In a personal communication with Dr. Rosemary Moore she puts forward another possibility. That is that the three portions of the letter were independently written by the three authors and that they were not meant to be
The continental Anabaptists had at the core of their theology the concept of the threefold baptism: the baptism of the spirit followed by the baptism by water and finally the baptism of blood.\textsuperscript{194} Klaasen describes the baptism of blood as an acceptance by the Anabaptists of persecution, and this did lead, in many cases, to death. In this way, the Anabaptists were following the ‘baptisms’ of Jesus and so were becoming one with him, even to accepting physical death as an inevitability. As described by Carole Spencer, ‘Anabaptists...had a strong spirituality of martyrdom.’\textsuperscript{195} Although it is not recorded, it is likely that Nayler underwent water baptism as an infant under the auspices of the established church. He then underwent a spiritual baptism, at the time of, or sometime before, his meeting with Fox in 1651 and, I would suggest, sought the third baptism of the Anabaptists, that of blood or martyrdom by means of his entry into Bristol in 1656.

In 1656, Nayler rode into Bristol in the same manner of Jesus’ entry to Jerusalem, ‘in circumstances that suggested that he was claiming to be Christ.’\textsuperscript{196} In his Journal, Fox refers to this incident when he wrote ‘James ran out into imaginations...they raised up a great darkness in the nation.’\textsuperscript{197} The result of this action was that Nayler was arrested by the authorities, pilloried, whipped, had his tongue bored through, his forehead branded with the letter ‘B’ and imprisoned indefinitely.\textsuperscript{198} As exemplified by Fox’s statement and noted by Punshon above, most of the Quaker movement was horrified by Nayler’s action and, judging by the severity of his punishment, so were the authorities. This episode shows two similarities

\textsuperscript{194} See 2.3.2 above. Also Walter Klaasen, Anabaptism in Outline (Stockdale, p.a.: Herald Press, 1981), p. 162.
\textsuperscript{196} Holy Bible (AV), Matthew, 21:1-10. See John Punshon, Portrait in Grey, pp. 89-90, where Punshon claims that Nayler ‘took leave of his senses.’
\textsuperscript{197} George Fox, Journal, p. 268. Punshon also writes that, when this incident took place, ‘Every member of the thousand strong Quaker community [in Bristol] remained behind closed doors.’ John Punshon, Portrait in Grey, p. 90.
\textsuperscript{198} John Punshon, Portrait in Grey, pp. 90-91. Nayler was released after three years.
with the events at Münster, in 1534. Firstly, action in both cases was taken by a small proportion of the group to which they belonged, the members of which believed that they were preceding the second coming of Christ or the establishment of the Kingdom of Christ on earth. Secondly, each event was condemned by the majority of the members of the respective religious groups, by the authorities and by the population at large. The condemnation by society of these actions was followed, in both cases, by a period of hostility against each religious group, with each group, as a result of the respective events, being identified both as anti-establishment, and possibly anti-State.

In a tract published shortly after Nayler’s Bristol affair, the charge is made by its author that the Quakers had set up Nayler ‘to be the true Christ’, suggesting, perhaps, that the Quakers were expecting Nayler to be executed. I agree with Spencer when she suggests that Nayler, when entering Bristol, had sought ‘identification with the suffering of Christ’ and that possibly Nayler himself, and not the main Quaker body, was seeking martyrdom from his actions, and thus fulfil the requirement for the third Anabaptist baptism. If this theory is accepted, then the theology of the three Anabaptist baptisms could have been discussed by

---

199 See 2.2.4 above.
200 See Christopher Hill, The World Turned Upside Down (London: Penguin Books, 1991), p. 345, where he suggests that, in the case of the Quakers, the outcome of the Nayler affair was to break ‘the radical back of Quakerism’ with the result that ‘the men of property seemed secure from the perils that had environed them since 1647.’
201 Thomas Collier, A Looking-Glasse for the Quakers. Being an answer to James Nayler’s pretended answer to Thomas Collier’s Book, called, A Dialogue between a Minister and a Christian (London: Printed for Thomas Brewster, at the sign of the three Bibles at the West end of Pauls, 1656/7), p. 9. As appeared to be common in anti-Quaker tracts of the time, see 6.4 below, it was common practice to identify Quakers with other radical groups. In the case of Collier’s tract, he identified Quakers with the Ranters. p. 7. ‘That their [Quakers] principles are but the principles of the old Ranters.’ Thomas Collier was a member of a Particular Baptist congregation and is seen to be the main author of the Association Records of the Particular Baptists in the West Country and a regular signatory to their ‘Messages’. Ed. B.R. White, Association Records of the Particular Baptists of England, Wales and Ireland to 1660 (London: The Baptist Historical Society, 1971), pp. 88-98. See also Underwood who writes that ‘his [Naylers] followers had persuaded him that the inner light of Christ burned more brightly in him that in others.’ T. L. Underwood, Primitivism, Radicalism and the Lamb’s War. The Baptist-Quaker Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England (New York. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 87. Peters identifies the main protagonist in this affair as Martha Simmonds, ‘widely portrayed as the eccentric and malignant force in the whole affair’ and who ‘regarded Nayler…as the Messianic figure.’ Kate Peters, Print Culture and the Early Quakers, pp. 236 and 247 respectively.
Nayler and Fox at their meeting some five years earlier in 1651 leading, possibly, either to the need for Fox to illustrate his martyrrological pedigree through his mother’s family, or for Nayler himself to match Fox’s martyrrological views. It could also have led to the acceptance of the early Quakers, following Fox’s example, to suffer persecution and imprisonment for their faith; a form of ‘third baptism’, although the early Quakers are not recorded as having used those words. Moore writes that the early Quakers in England did not say that they accepted suffering because they sought martyrdom. However, some of the first Quakers in America, in deliberately ignoring banishing orders placed upon them, were possibly seeking martyrdom.

I now consider the life and background of a Quaker, Richard Farnworth, reported to have been convinced by Fox in 1651 shortly before the convincements of Nayler and Dewsbury.

### 5.3.5 Richard Farnworth

As recorded by Nuttall, there is very little written about Farnworth’s birth and upbringing. An anti-Quaker tract published in 1657 by an Essex-based Anglican Priest, John Stalham, refers to a Certificate he had received from a ‘Minister in Yorkshire’, which stated that

---

203 Although there are no recorded executions of Quakers in England, there were many imprisonments and many deaths of Quakers in prison resulting from poor conditions and harsh treatment: e.g. Edward Burrough recorded in George Fox, *Journal*, p. 111, Note 1, James Parnell recorded in George Fox, *Journal*, p. 163, Jane Ingram recorded in George Fox, *Journal*, p. 268 and Francis Howgill recorded in George Fox, *Journal*, p. 107, Note 2.

204 Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Consciences*, p. 161. Although no early Quakers admitted to seeking martyrdom, it is possible that, as I suggest in the case of Nayler, it was something that they believed could be inevitable and were prepared to accept.

205 Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Consciences*, p. 162. Moore records that this ‘deliberate seeking of martyrdom’ by American Quakers resulted in four executions. See also William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 404 where Braithwaite refers to the fierce persecution of the first Quakers in America and the execution of two Quakers, William Robinson and Marmaduke Stephenson who ‘gave up their lives in order to test the bloody laws of Boston.’

Farnworth was born in Tickhill in Yorkshire, but it gave no date of birth. According to Josiah Cole, Farnworth was a man of ‘great abilities, and parts, and knowledge...excelling many of his equals.’ The suggestion that he was a man of knowledge, and therefore possibly well read, is supported by Stalham when he refers to Farnworth’s reading of the works of John Saltmarsh, the Seeker sympathizer. In the same publication, Stalham may indicate further theological reading of Farnworth when he refers to the Quakers’ spirit ‘follows these men as acted H.N. in Flanders’, and that the Quakers were haunted by a spirit ‘as professed Jacob Bohme in Germany.’ Although Stalham refers to ‘Quakers’, it is possible that, as his publication solely refers to Farnworth, he is referring to attributes of Farnworth’s ministry and not those of Quakers in general.

Other than the reference, already made, to Farnworth’s abilities, the publication by Cole gives no further relevant information on Farnworth, and neither does the ‘Testimony’ to Farnworth’s life contained in a single paragraph in the same publication.

Farnworth’s own account of his seeking also gives little insight into his upbringing. It records the path he took towards his Quaker beliefs which follows the same process as

---

207 John Stalham, *The Reviler Rebuked: or a Re-inforcement of the charges against the Quakers [so called]* (London: Printed by Henry Hills and John Field, Printers to His Highness, 1657). All pages in this publication are un-numbered. The reference to Farnworth’s birth is on the fourth page of the section headed ‘To the Reader.’ The ‘Certificate’ to which Stalham refers is dated ‘November 26,[16]55 and has the initials ‘S.K.’ appended at its end with no indication in the text as to the author’s identity. In ‘Notes on Richard Farnworth’, p. 80, Nuttall states that ‘with some assurance’, S.K. can be identified as Samuel Kendall, the vicar of Warmsworth with Eddington which was a parish close to Farnworth’s place of birth. Hoare notes two possible dates for Farnworth’s year of birth, 1625 and 1627, but quotes inconclusive evidence that suggests the year of birth to have been 1627. Richard J. Hoare, ‘The Balby Seekers and Richard Farnworth’, p. 203.
210 John Stalham, *The Reviler Rebuked*, eighth page in section headed ‘To the Reader.’ ‘H.N’ being Hendrik Niclaes, the founder of the Family of Love or Familist movement in the Netherlands in the sixteenth century. See 3.1.2 above.
211 John Stalham, *The Reviler Rebuked*, ninth page in section headed ‘To the Reader.’
recorded by other Quakers.\textsuperscript{214} However it does not record when the various stages in the process took place other than ‘the Lord began to work’ when he was about sixteen years old,\textsuperscript{215} and that by the time he was twenty, he had doubts about the authority of the Priests and the definition of ‘Church, not being a Steeplehouse.’\textsuperscript{216} Farnworth describes, in the same way as Fox, discussions he had with Priests, in particular with an unnamed one who ‘showed much outward love.’\textsuperscript{217} Farnworth wrote that that Priest had said that Farnworth had answered the Priest’s questions as if he ‘had been at Cambridge’,\textsuperscript{218} which drew criticism from Farnworth ‘as if God could not teach his truth without Cambridge or Oxford helps.’\textsuperscript{219} This is the same conclusion that Fox had reached, according to Fox, in 1647.\textsuperscript{220} Without knowing Farnworth’s date of birth, it is not possible to say which of the two, Farnworth or Fox, had come to this conclusion first, and whether one had possibly made this suggestion to the other at their first meeting in 1651, prior to either Farnworth’s tract or Fox’s \textit{Journal} being published.\textsuperscript{221}

Farnworth sets out in his tract his objections to the ‘carnality’ of what Priests preached, the ‘sprinkling of infants’, the singing of psalms and ‘Communion.’\textsuperscript{222} It is interesting to note that, in this publication, Farnworth specifically objects to the ‘sprinkling of infants’ and not to the baptism of believers with water when he says ‘For in reading the Scripture...that all that

\textsuperscript{213} Richard Farnworth, \textit{The Heart opened by Christ, or, The Conditions of a troubled soul} (no place or publisher shown. Written in the year 1654, in the third Moneth, commonly called May, by R.F.)
\textsuperscript{214} See 5.3.3 above for the path followed by Dewsbury.
\textsuperscript{215} Richard Farnworth, \textit{The Heart opened by Christ}, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{216} Richard Farnworth, \textit{The Heart opened by Christ}, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{217} Richard Farnworth, \textit{The Heart opened by Christ}, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{218} Richard Farnworth, \textit{The Heart opened by Christ}, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{219} Richard Farnworth, \textit{The Heart opened by Christ}, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{220} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{221} According to Hoare, Farnworth’s first meeting with Fox may have taken place in 1650, slightly earlier than stated by Fox. Richard J. Hoare, ‘The Balby Seekers and Richard Farnworth’, pp. 204-205. If Hoare is correct in stating that Farnworth’s year of birth was 1627, then Farnworth’s arrival at his conclusion regarding the need for qualification for teaching could have taken place as early as 1647/8 when Farnworth was ‘about 20 years or 21 of my age’ or as late as 1649/50 as Farnworth had arrived at his conclusion ‘For a year or very nigh’ before he met Fox in 1650 or 1651. Richard Farnworth, \textit{The Heart opened by Christ}, p. 3 and p. 9.
\textsuperscript{222} Richard Farnworth, \textit{The Heart opened by Christ}, pp. 4-6.
were baptized with water...were believers, and not infants’, suggesting that he was taking the Baptist’s position on believer’s baptism. In a later publication, see below, Farnworth appears to have taken a stronger position on baptism.

During his seeking, Farnworth wrote that he ceased attending Church worship, but that he was encouraged to attend church again. However, he does not confirm whether he went back to his original Anglican church, or whether he had visited another, non-conformist congregation as he only refers to the people that he joined as ‘some professing people.’ In writing about Farnworth, Barbour and Roberts state that ‘he had been a Puritan, Separatist and virtual Quaker before enlistment by Fox.’ Farnworth does not confirm that he had aligned himself with any congregation or party within the Anglican Church, but does admit that because of his professed views ‘I was called a Puritan’ and called ‘Independent, Brownist, Separate and the like.’

Eventually, but again there is no indication of the date, Farnworth discovers the Quaker message that ‘the eternal word and power of God were preached in me by Christ Jesus my Lord.’ Nowhere, in his tract, does Farnworth refer to his meeting with Fox in 1651 and whether, other than Farnworth’s decision to throw in his lot with Fox, that meeting had any influence on Fox’s or Farnworth’s theology. Neither is there any reference to the identity of any non-conformist groups with which Farnworth had contact.

---

223 Richard Farnworth, The Heart opened by Christ, p. 5.
224 Richard Farnworth, The Heart opened by Christ, p. 11.
225 Richard Farnworth, The Heart opened by Christ, p. 11. The term ‘some professing people’ would suggest members of a non-conformist gathering.
227 Richard Farnworth, The Heart opened by Christ, p. 3 and p. 5. See 2.4.1 above for an account of the Brownists.
228 Richard Farnworth, The Heart opened by Christ, p. 12.
Possibly the first publication written by Farnworth was *A Discovery of Truth and Falshood* [sic]. It is shown as being written in 1652 in advance of its publication in 1653. This publication sets out, in Farnworth’s eyes, the requirements of Justices of the Peace. They need to be ‘Just men’, ‘Faithful and just’ and that ‘they...be merciful, and to walk humbly before the Lord.’ Farnworth then accuses the Justices that they ‘waxed great and rich and then forgot the Lord their God.’ The publication ends with an unrelated accusation, that ‘the Church is an Harlot and rides upon the scarlet coloured Beast.’ This publication gives no indication of Farnworth’s theological background.

Farnworth, along with Nayler and Fox issued a publication, in 1654, in opposition to the Baptists. Farnworth’s arguments are well structured and lucid, but they do show, possibly, a misunderstanding of the role of water baptism within the Baptist community and suggest that its significance to Baptists is the same as it is to Anglicans. Farnworth asks, when baptism takes place, ‘When did ever the heavens open to any of you?’ This, I believe, shows that Farnworth was viewing the act of baptism as a sacrament, and not, as viewed by the Baptists and the Anabaptists before them, as an ordinance which follows the baptism of the spirit or, as Farnworth might have said ‘the opening of the heavens.’ Farnworth continues in the same vein, ‘Where is your confirmation...to accompany your baptism’, ‘You that imitate the Apostles way of baptizing with water, but cannot give the Holy Ghost’ and ‘When

---

230 Richard Farnworth, *A Discovery of Truth and Falshood*, page headed 15, but follows page 33 and precedes page 35, also pp. 35-36.
231 Richard Farnworth, *A Discovery of Truth and Falshood*, p. 36.
232 Richard Farnworth, *A Discovery of Truth and Falshood*. Page headed 49, but would be page 41 if following the earlier numbering in the publication. It is, in my mind, uncertain as to which church Farnworth was referring. The ‘scarlet coloured beast’ is likely to refer to the Roman Catholic church, and the ‘Church of Babylon’ could be referring to the same, or to the Anglican church which, in some respects, has followed the practices of the Roman Catholic church.
233 See 5.3.4 above. Richard Farnworth et al. *To you that are called by the name of Baptists.*
234 Richard Farnworth et al. *To you that are called by the name of Baptists*, p. 1.
did any receive the Holy Ghost and power from on high.” 235  He then asks the question, ‘You dippers and sprinklers, why do you differ?’ 236  These questions and statements suggest to me that Farnworth was aware of the practices of the Baptists, the General Baptists ‘sprinkling’ and the Particular Baptists ‘dipping’, 237  but was not familiar with the theology behind them or the necessity, in the minds of Baptists of both persuasions, for spiritual baptism to precede water baptism.

There is nothing in his publications, or in the publications referring to him and written at the time, which indicates any contact with either English Baptist community of the day. In fact, I conclude that his uncertainty over, or lack of knowledge of the theology of Baptists with regard to their ordinance of water baptism shows that Farnworth had neither discussed their theologies with Baptists, nor read about them or those of their predecessors, the continental Anabaptists. It is probable that he had arrived at his Quaker position sometime before his meeting with Fox in 1650/1, but that cannot be confirmed because of the absence of any firm dates in available publications to pinpoint when he received his revelations. It cannot therefore be said with any confidence that Farnworth contributed anything theologically meaningful or original which he may have obtained from any earlier contact with an ‘Anabaptist’ group, to the early Quaker movement.

I now investigate, in depth, the life and background of Margaret Fell who met Fox in 1652, shortly after his vision on Pendle Hill and his great meeting at Firbank Fell. In this investigation I make particular reference to her family history.

---

235 Richard Farnworth et al. *To you that are called by the name of Baptists*, p. 2.
236 Richard Farnworth et al. *To you that are called by the name of Baptists*, p. 2.
237 See 3.2.4 above relating to Richard Blunt’s visit to the Collegiants in the Netherlands to investigate the act of baptism by full immersion or ‘dipping.’
5.3.6 Margaret Fell

The ancestry of Margaret Fell is uncertain. She was born in 1614 to John Askew of Marsh Grange in Dalton Furness, Cumbria. Glines claims that she was ‘unusually intelligent’ but also writes ‘We know nothing of her education.’ Very little is known about the books that she read as her grandson, John Abraham, is recorded as having given away a large part of her library on the sale of her home, Swarthmoor Hall. Several volumes of books ascribed to the library of Margaret Fell have been found, and they consist solely of bound volumes of Quaker tracts. It is suggested by Kunze that Margaret Fell retained a copy of John Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs* but unfortunately she gives no authority for this statement.

In 1632 Margaret married Thomas Fell, described by Punshon as ‘landowner, Judge of Assize, member of the Long Parliament and Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster.’ Thomas Fell was obviously a significant person in the area, and although he and his wife Margaret would have been members of the local Anglican church, they have been described as ‘Independents.’ Evidence of the Fells’ continuous seeking with open and receptive minds is their willingness to retain an open house policy at Swarthmoor Hall for

---

244 John Punshon, *Portrait in Grey*, p. 68.
visiting ministers of all religious persuasions. This is confirmed by Margaret Fell when she wrote ‘and [I] was inquiring after the way of the Lord...the best Ministers that came to our Parts, which we frequently entertain’d at our House.’ This confirmation by Margaret Fell suggests that she and her husband were ‘seeking’ at least from the time of their marriage in 1632 as it had continued ‘about twenty Years’ up to the time of meeting Fox in 1652. Glines writes of Margaret Fell that ‘her writings show that she was well versed in the theological controversies of the day.’ Sally Bruynell Padgett asserts that ‘Fell’s theology was biblically based, and surprisingly orthodox’, and that she held a belief in the ‘triune Godhead’ which she retained after her convincement by Fox. This knowledge and belief would have been obtained from a combination of her readings and the meetings with travelling ministers. Presumably Margaret Fell’s seeking ended when she met Fox in 1652. Fell admits that, up to the time that she met Fox in 1652, ‘we had not so much as heard of the people called quakers’, nor was she familiar with the message that Fox was bringing. She continues in the same letter by writing that, after Fox had preached at the church in Ulverston a few days later ‘I saw perfectly just then that wee were all wrong, that we were but thieves...And I sat down in my chair and wept all the while that the sd [said] Lampitt preacht and I did not know what he said, for I saw that we had done before was nothing worth.’ From that time onwards, Margaret Fell became a central figure within the early Quaker

246 Isabel Ross, Margaret Fell. Mother of Quakerism, p. 6.
247 Margaret Fell, ‘A relation of Margaret Fell. Given Forth by her self’ contained in A Brief Collection of the Remarkable Passages and Occurances Relating to the Birth, Education, Life, Conversion, Travels, Services and Deep Sufferings of that Ancient Eminent and Faithful Servant of the Lord, Margaret Fell (London: Printed by J. Sowke, 1710), p. 2. It is noticeable that the tract relating to her life consists of 533 pages, with only the first one and a half pages relating to her life before she met Fox.
248 Margaret Fell, A Brief Collection, p. 2.
252 George Fox, Journal, p. 113. Margaret Fell, ‘Letter to a Friendly Reader.’
movement and was able to provide to the travelling Quaker ministers a safe address for their letters and, as Peters suggests, ‘an organisational headquarters.’

Hill writes that, in his opinion, the role of Fell within the early Quaker movement was as an organizer and not as a theological innovator. However Kunze believes that, although Fox had a great, long lasting influence on Fell, she did play a significant part in the development of the Quaker movement and, in particular, that she ‘had considerable psychological and intellectual influence on him [Fox].’ In confirmation of this view, Kunze cites the ‘borrowing’ by Fox of Fell’s peace testimony and, in view of Fell’s expressed views on gender equality, the setting up of ‘Women’s Meetings.’ Padgett agrees with Kunze in placing Fell as a ‘formative leader of the first order of importance’ and not solely an organiser. Padgett identifies in Fell’s writing elements of her pre-Quaker theology, in that they display ‘the same key terms and themes one would find in, say, Puritan or Independent authors of her time.’

I suggest that there is no evidence that, up to the time of her convincement by Fox in 1652, and possibly even for some time afterwards, Margaret Fell had any deep understanding of the theology of the English Baptists, nor of the continental Anabaptists. Her background is Anglican whilst maintaining an independent, open and seeking mind.

---

253 Kate Peters, *Print Culture and the Early Quakers*, p. 60.
256 Bonnelyn Young Kunze, *Margaret Fell and the Rise of Quakerism*, pp. 230-231. In this regard, see Punshon, *Portrait in Grey*, p. 100, where the credit for giving women a specific role in meetings is given to Fox alone.
257 Sally Bruyneel Padgett, *The Eschatology of Margaret Fell*, p. 34.
258 Sally Bruyneel Padgett, *The Eschatology of Margaret Fell*, p. 311. This would suggest that Fell was displaying Calvinist tendencies in her writings.
259 Sally Bruyneel Padgett, *The Eschatology of Margaret Fell*, p. 311. Padgett describes Fell as ‘broadly Christian, and held many of the same key terms and themes one would find in, say, Puritan or Independent authors of her time.’ Braithwaite describes Fell as ‘clearly not a separatist and continued diligent in her attendance at the Ulverston church.’ William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 100. See also Isabel Ross, *Margaret Fell. Mother of Quakerism*, p. 132 where there is transcribed a letter from Margaret Fell’s
I have discussed the possible background to Fox’s reference to ‘martyrs’ in his *Journal.* In that context it is relevant to consider here the possible ancestry of Margaret Fell and whether it influenced what Fox had to say on the subject of his own martyrrological descent.

Ross states ‘Of Margaret Fell’s ancestry little of certainty is known’, and refers to Webb’s genealogical investigation of Margaret Fell, née Askew, which places her in direct descent from Anne Askew, the sixteenth-century martyr. Robert Barclay of Reigate made the same connection, referring to Margaret Fell as the ‘great grand-daughter of the celebrated martyred lady, Anne Askew.’ Doubts on this claim have been expressed by Ross and by Helen G. Crosfield as, in their view there is no proof of that specific descent, nor proof of any alternative, less direct, descent from Anne Askew. Taylor, however, was convinced that Fell and Anne Askew were not related as he had seen ‘evidence (supplied by a descendent of Daniel Abraham who married Rachel Fell [Margaret Fell’s daughter]) which convinces him [Taylor] that Margaret Fell and Anne Askew were not related to one another.’ It is unfortunate that Taylor did not show that evidence nor explain what it was.

daughter, Bridget to her mother in 1660, in which she passes on a message from George Fox during his imprisonment in Lancaster gaol. In that letter, Fox asks Margaret Fell to look for a ‘book’ relating to Quakers and Anabaptists so that ‘some Friend might look for it, and answer it.’

260 See 4.5 above.
261 Isabel Ross, *Margaret Fell. Mother of Quakerism,* p. 5.
262 Maria Webb, *The Fells of Swarthmoor Hall and their Friends with an account of their ancestor Anne Askew, the Martyr* (London: George Unwin, MDCCCLXV), pp. 5-6.
264 Isabel Ross, *Margaret Fell. Mother of Quakerism,* p. 6, ‘the direct descent is still non-proven.’ See also Helen G. Crosfield, *Margaret Fox of Swarthmore [sic] Hall* (London: Headley Brothers, no date shown, but preface dated 1913), pp. 2-4 ‘It has been asserted, and the view has until recently been generally accepted, that Margaret Askew was a descendent of Anne Askew...history gives us no justification for so doing.’
It is likely that Margaret Fell was aware of the story of Anne Askew as her story is recounted in Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*, a book that Fell may have possessed. See Appendix 2 below for the recorded history of Anne Askew.

In many ways Fell and Askew were alike, women of strongly held and unbreakable beliefs and undoubted courage. If Fell had read Askew’s story in Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*, she may have found views similar to her own, particularly the relevance of the church building, and the presence of the spirit of God within; views that Fell had confirmed when meeting Fox.

It is not known whether Margaret Fell believed that she was descended from Anne Askew, or whether that possibility had been discussed with Fox. But I suggest that, over the forty years that Fell and Fox knew each other, and being married to each other for the latter twenty-three years, that possibility would have been discussed. I further suggest that these discussions may have put in Fox’s mind the possibility of his own martyrological descent which he records in his *Journal* (whilst not providing any evidence for that statement).

In the following sub-sections I consider, in alphabetical order, other early Quakers that Fox records as having met before his public meeting at Firbank Fell, with particular emphasis being placed, where it can be ascertained, on their religious backgrounds prior to meeting Fox.

---

266 See above and John Fox [sic], *Acts and Monuments of matters most special and memorable, happening in the Church, with an Universall Historic of the same. The second volume of the Ecclesiastical History Containing the Acts and Monuments of Martyrs* (London: Printed for the Company of Stationers, 1641), pp. 572-580. It has been asserted that this book contains errors. See G.A. Williamson, ed., *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1965), p. xxix where Williamson suggests that ‘Falsification is of course one of the numerous vices of which Foxe has been accused.’ Even if Fell did not possess a copy of *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, she would have been able to read a copy at her local church, see 4.2.4 above.

267 See Appendix 2 for evidence of the courage of Anne Askew. Events which illustrate Margaret Fell’s courage are set out in George Fox’s *Journal*. Examples are Fell’s support for Fox after his beating at Walney Island, p. 131, her attempt to rescue Fox from arrest at Ulverston, p. 376, speaking to the King and ‘offered her life...to stand as a pledge for the peace and quietness of all Friends’, p. 383 and p. 398, her tireless travelling in support of Fox, ‘we travelled some weeks eight or nine score miles a week and had meetings every day’, p. 443 and her imprisonment in Lancaster for refusing ‘the oath’, p. 469.
5.3.7 Thomas Aldam

Peters states that Thomas Aldam’s history is ‘rather obscure’, but writes of his leadership, in 1651, of a ‘gathered church’ at Balby in Yorkshire, less than two miles from his home at Warmsworth.\(^\text{268}\) This leadership role is also referred to by Frost,\(^\text{269}\) but is not confirmed by Aldam’s son who refers to his father becoming separate from the established church but then suggests a period of ‘seeking’ up to the time that he met Fox in 1651.\(^\text{270}\) Given this, I suggest that his leadership role at Balby is not certain.\(^\text{271}\) Aldam’s son wrote that during his father’s period of seeking he was ‘in a desolate land’ and that he was ‘not yet knowing where to meet that which he had been seeking after.’\(^\text{272}\) I propose from this account that Aldam may have been in contact with the Balby group in 1651, but that his own theological position was too uncertain for him to assume any leadership role within it.

It is noted by Nickalls that Aldam was in Balby at the time of Fox’s visit in 1651 and that he was convinced by Fox along with Thomas Killam, John Killam and Richard Farnworth.\(^\text{273}\)

\(^{268}\) Kate Peters, *Print Culture and the Early Quakers*, p. 27, Note 51.


\(^{270}\) Thomas Aldam, *A Short Testimony Concerning that Faithful Servant of the Lord, Thomas Aldam By Thomas Aldam, Son to the above said Thomas Aldam* (London: Printed for Thomas Nothcott, 1690), p. 3.


\(^{272}\) Thomas Aldam, *A Short Testimony Concerning that Faithful Servant of the Lord, Thomas Aldam*, p. 3.

\(^{273}\) George Fox, *Journal*, p. 73. Note 1. This account would throw doubt on the belief, even at the time of publication of the *Journal*, and the date on which Dewsbury records the events at Balby, in the equal position of women in the early Quaker movement. Fox and Dewsbury only record the names of the men who were convinced by Fox at Balby in 1651. Thomas Aldam, son, wrote that his mother Mary was convinced by Fox, at the same time as his father, see Thomas Aldam, *A Short Testimony Concerning that Faithful Servant of the Lord, Thomas Aldam*, p. 12, and Frost records that Aldam’s two sisters, Margaret and Joan Killam, were convinced by
However, other than his son’s very short account of his father’s life prior to meeting Fox, there appears to be no more relevant information about Aldam. From about 1652, Aldam was the author of a number of publications but none of them refer to his life before 1652.274

Both Fox and Aldam’s son record Aldam’s convincement by Fox in 1651, but it appears that, even for a short while after his convincement, he was still a respected member of his local church. Fox wrote of a visit that he made to the ‘steeplehouse’ at Warmsworth. Warmsworth was Aldam’s home, see above, and Fox wrote that on his visit to Warmsworth, ‘some friends followed me’ and that although Fox was refused entry to the church, Thomas Aldam was allowed in ‘to his seat’.275 This indicates to me that, although Aldam had been convinced by Fox shortly before this visit, and that Aldam had, up to that time, been seen as a separatist and ‘seeker’, he still held a position in his community, sufficient enough to have an identified seat at his local church. As a result of this visit, at which Fox was eventually allowed access to the church and at which Fox argued with the local priest, Aldam was arrested and sent to prison in York, where he remained for two years.276 It was during this time in prison that Aldam, possibly shortly after his arrival there, wrote a tract entitled *False Prophets and False Teachers described.*277 That tract credits five other authors besides Aldam. One of the authors is shown to be Elizabeth Hooton, and it is very likely that, during the time that they spent

---

274 I have taken information on the contents of Aldam’s publications from the background information Rosemary Moore had assembled to produce the table of early Quaker publications, see Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Consciences*, Appendix III. Of the six tracts listed by Moore to which Aldam contributed, only two of them have Aldam as sole author, of which Moore notes that the tract *Few Words of Exhortation and Reproof* is missing. The remaining Aldam tract is *The Searching out the Deceit* (No publisher information shown, 1655). In this tract Aldam replies to five ‘slanders’ made against Quakers and makes no reference to his own seeking.

275 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 97.

276 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 97.

277 Thomas Aldam, et al., *False Prophets and False Teachers described*. According to Fox, Aldam was sent to prison in 1652, and the date shown on page 8 of the tract, under the names of the authors, is 1652. See 5.3.1 above.
together in prison, they would have discussed their own religious beliefs, including Hooton’s own Baptist background.\textsuperscript{278}

There is no evidence that during his seeking years he had contact with local Baptist communities that was sufficiently close as to influence his own theology. His publications, from 1652 onwards, give no hint of any contact with Baptists during his seeking years.

\subsection*{5.3.8 John and Ann Audland}

The great majority of secondary sources relating to the life of John Audland pick up his story from his preaching at Firbank Fell chapel with Francis Howgill on the day that George Fox arrived and convinced Audland and others.\textsuperscript{279} Moore suggests that as well as the preachers Howgill and Audland, it is likely that their congregations were also convinced and became Quakers at the same time.\textsuperscript{280} Following his convincement, Audland with his friend, John Camm, travelled around England preaching the Quaker message.\textsuperscript{281} By 1654, Camm and Audland had arrived at Bristol, where, writes Gwyn: ‘The large Seeker community...eagerly beset the two.’\textsuperscript{282}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\item \textsuperscript{278} See 5.3.1 above for Elizabeth Hooton’s religious background.
\item \textsuperscript{279} Ed Norman Penney, \textit{The First Publishers of Truth. Being early records (now first printed) of the introduction of Quakerism into the counties of England and Wales} (Supplements 1-5 of the \textit{Journal of the Friends Historical Society}, London: Headley Brothers, 1907). Article No. 75, titled ‘Westmorland’ was written by Thomas Camm, the son of Audland’s friend and travelling companion John Camm, see 5.3.10 below. See also, John Punshon, \textit{Portrait in Grey}, p. 67, where the same event is reported and followed up by Fox’s befriending by John Audland and his wife, Ann. See also George Fox, \textit{Journal}, pp. 107-109.
\item \textsuperscript{280} Rosemary Moore, \textit{The Light in their Consciences}, p. 14.
\item \textsuperscript{281} John Punshon, \textit{Portrait in Grey}, p. 76.
\item \textsuperscript{282} Douglas Gwyn, \textit{Seekers Found. Atonement in Early Quaker Experience} (Wallingford, P. A.: Pendle Hill publications, 2000), p. 252. By the time that they reached Bristol in 1654, Camm was aged forty-nine, and Audland was aged twenty-two.
\end{thebibliography}
The most reliable account of Audland’s life was written in 1680, and published in 1689, by John Camm’s son, Thomas. Camm describes Audland as being born near Camsgil, the birthplace of Camm’s father, and at the age of seventeen or eighteen ‘inclined his heart to Sobriety, and reading the holy Scriptures.’

He is described as having a good memory and was able to retain much of the Scriptures that he read. Camm recorded that Audland sought the company of people who he considered ‘the best and most Religious in that day’ and that he found them ‘amongst a Society gathered, or separated from the common worship, he became an eminent teacher, and highly esteemed amongst them.’

Camm recorded that whilst teaching amongst the separatist group, or Seekers, Audland also visited ‘Chappels or the Parish Steeple-house’ to preach. Camm does not record the religious background of the people at these ‘Chappels’, and so it can only be surmised that they were non-conformists, possibly Baptists or Congregationalists but Camm wrote that ‘People was [sic] taken and affected with him’ and that they ‘would have flocked after him.’

It cannot therefore be determined what, if anything, Audland took from these congregations or whether any such acquired knowledge had been passed by him to Fox. Camm, in his *Testimony* also records that the Audlands ‘received George Fox into his House’ after the meeting at Firbank Fell, and

---

283 Thomas Camm and Charles Marshal, *The Memory of the Righteous Revived* Being a brief collection of the Books and written Epistles of John Camm & John Audland (London: Printed and sold by Andrew Sowle, at the Crooked-Billet in Holloway-Lane in Shoredich, and at the Three-Keys in Nags-Head-Court in Grace-Church-Street, 1689). Un-numbered pages 1 to 41 contain the testimony to the lives of Camm and Audland, written by Thomas Camm and described on the forty-first un-numbered page ‘From Apleby [sic] Goal the place of my present confinement for the Testimony of Jesus, This 14th of the 12th Month, 1680.’


285 Thomas Camm and Charles Marshal, *The Memory of the Righteous Revived*, un-numbered page 22. Moore records that in 1655, in a dispute at Bristol, Audland queried the accuracy of Biblical translations and stated that ‘Spirit was before many languages.’ See Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Consciences*, p. 58 and John Audland, *The Innocent Delivered out of the Snare and the Blind Guide Fallen into the Pit* (London: Printed for Giles Calvert, and were to be sold at his shop at the Black Spread-Eagle, near the West end of Pauls, 1655), p. 22, ‘...the Scriptures is not the ground of faith, but that which was before the Scripture.’

286 Thomas Camm and Charles Marshal, *The Memory of the Righteous Revived*, un-numbered page 22. This group or Society is likely to be the group to which he was preaching on the arrival of Fox in 1652.


records that Audland was ‘several times in Prison for his Testimonies sake; as at New-Castle in the North, and Bristol.’ Audland died in 1663 at the age of thirty-one, and although he died of ‘natural causes’, it is likely that his imprisonments did much to worsen his health and advance his death.

It is noticeable that very little has been written about the early life and work of Audland’s wife, Ann. She does not appear in Fox’s Journal until 1663, and then only in passing. Gwyn’s only reference to her is in conjunction with her husband and them being Seekers in the Sedburgh area. Braithwaite makes only a passing reference to her, and Moore makes reference only to the letters that she wrote to Margaret Fell, and to her trial at Banbury in 1655.

Trevett notes that Ann spent seven years in London with an aunt before returning to the north of England and becoming a member of the same ‘seeking’ group as John Audland. She married John Audland, and, although not recorded by Camm or by Fox in his Journal, Ann is likely to have been convinced by Fox at Firbank Fell in 1652; Camm noted that ‘His dear Wife [Ann Audland] was not long after him, called forth into the same work and Service.’

This service is intimated by Moore when she refers to a letter from Ann Audland to Margaret

---

290 Thomas Camm and Charles Marshal, The Memory of the Righteous Revived, un-numbered page 34.
292 George Fox, Journal, p. 453, ‘and then I returned to Anne Audland’s, where they would have had me to have stayed.’
294 William C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism. On p. 93 Braithwaite refers to Ann Audland’s presence with the community of Seekers in Lancashire, on p. 199 he refers to her travelling in England in 1655 with Mabel Camm, and on p. 205 he refers to Ann’s imprisonment in the winter of 1655/6.
295 Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 27 and pp. 77-78.
296 Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 32 and p. 157.
298 Thomas Camm and Charles Marshal, The Memory of the Righteous Revived, un-numbered page 23, ‘Now being [John Audland] grown upward of twenty years of Age, he took to Wife a Sober, Vertuous [sic], and Religious Maid, of the same Separated Society, called Ann Newby of Kendal.’
Fell saying that she had ‘some drawings to go to Bristol.’ Camm also reported that Ann travelled ‘into several Parts of the North Countrey, and after into the South’, and that she was arrested and imprisoned in Banbury for over a year, presumably, but not stated, for her preaching the Quaker message. The only other fact written about Ann Audland was that after the death of her husband John, she married Thomas Camm, the son of her husband’s companion in his travels around England. The absence of any credit given to the work of Ann Audland is noticeable, and her life deserves more research.

5.3.9 Edward Burrough

Burrough’s life, before he met Fox and was convinced by him, is not documented and, as confirmed by Gwyn, little is known of his years of seeking. Howgill, who claimed to know Burrough ‘from a youth’ wrote of his honest parents who afforded their son as ‘good Education as the Countrey doth afford’, suggesting that Burrough came from a high ranking family within the local community. It seems reasonable to assume that Burrough was brought up as a member of the established church and that as a result, according to Moore, he displayed remnants of his acquired Calvinist beliefs throughout his life. I can find no

---

300 Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Consciences*, p. 27. It could be that Ann’s ‘drawings’ were not to undertake Quaker work, but to be with her husband who, possibly, was there.

301 Thomas Camm and Charles Marshal, *The Memory of the Righteous Revived*, un-numbered page 35. See also W.C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 199 where Braithwaite writes that the charge laid against Ann Audland was ‘blasphemy.’

302 Thomas Camm and Charles Marshal, *The Memory of the Righteous Revived*, un-numbered page 23. See also Christine Trevett, *Women and Quakers in the 17th Century*, p. 98 where it is recorded that, although travelling with husband or wife was discouraged, Ann travelled around England with her second husband, John Camm, on occasions.


305 Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Consciences*, p. 100. See also Edward Burrough, *A Warning from the Lord to the Inhabitants of Underbarrow* (London: Printed for Giles Calvert, and are to be sold at the Black-
justification in any account of Burrough’s life or his publications that substantiate Hill’s assertion that at one time Burrough ‘seems himself to have had Ranter leanings.’

Fox records his first meeting with Burrough at Underbarrow in 1652, following Fox’s preaching at Firbank Fell, but Braithwaite wrote that Fox travelled to Underbarrow ‘reasoning in the way with his companions, especially with young Edward Burrough.’

Braithwaite’s view is corroborated by Thomas Camm, when he wrote that Fox had met with, and convinced Burrough either at the Firbank Fell or at the Preston Patrick meeting before travelling to Underbarrow.

The meeting at Underbarrow, referred to by Fox, was a ‘great disputing’, but Fox does not record the substance of that ‘dispute’, neither does Fox record in his Journal whether Burrough was convinced by him at, or before, that meeting. There is no publication produced by Burrough that records that meeting. It is possible that the ‘dispute’ may have concerned Burrough’s ‘Calvinist’ tendencies although, I suggest, existence of proof of his professed Calvinist views is rather uncertain.

spread-Eagle, in the West end of Pauls, 1654), p. 31, where Burrough writes that, whilst still in his early teens, ‘I got up to be Presbyterian.’

Hill takes the phrase, written by Burrough in A Trumpet of the Lord Sounded out of Sion (London: Printed for Giles Calvert, 1656), p. 27, ‘their [Ranters] house had once been the house of prayer.’ This sentence, quoted by Hill, is contained in a two page section of Burrough’s tract headed ‘To you that are called Ranters.’ It is a total condemnation of the Ranter theology, including phrases such as p. 26, ‘your seat is in the mysterie of Iniquity’ and ‘yourselves have been impudently polluted with the spiritual wine of whoredom’ and p. 27, ‘[you] now are become enemies to the Cross of Christ’ and ‘Jezebel is your prophetess and the Dog that is turned to the Vomit again, is your example.’ I suggest that Burrough may have, at one time, understood Ranterism to be an upright Christian denomination, but that his view changed when he came into possession of all the facts. This would not indicate a ‘Ranter leaning’ as suggested by Hill.

Hill, The World Turned Upside Down, p. 238. Hill takes the phrase, written by Burrough in A Trumpet of the Lord Sounded out of Sion (London: Printed for Giles Calvert, 1656), p. 27, ‘their [Ranters] house had once been the house of prayer.’ This sentence, quoted by Hill, is contained in a two page section of Burrough’s tract headed ‘To you that are called Ranters.’ It is a total condemnation of the Ranter theology, including phrases such as p. 26, ‘your seat is in the mysterie of Iniquity’ and ‘yourselves have been impudently polluted with the spiritual wine of whoredom’ and p. 27, ‘[you] now are become enemies to the Cross of Christ’ and ‘Jezebel is your prophetess and the Dog that is turned to the Vomit again, is your example.’ I suggest that Burrough may have, at one time, understood Ranterism to be an upright Christian denomination, but that his view changed when he came into possession of all the facts. This would not indicate a ‘Ranter leaning’ as suggested by Hill.

Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism, p. 86.

Camm and Marshal, The Memory of the Righteous Revived, un-numbered page 8. Camm records Burrough being convinced at the same time as John Camm, John Audland, Francis Howgill and Robert Hubberthorn.

Fox, Journal, p. 110.
On reading one of Burrough’s theological publications, it is difficult to be certain as to what he was preaching with regard to predestination. In his publication *A Declaration to all the World of our Faith, and what we Believe*, Burrough first speaks of Christ as being ‘a free gift unto the whole world’, that ‘every man might believe and be saved.’ This promise is then repeated, and later in the document the promise is made stronger when Burrough writes ‘the love of God manifested to all mankind, and that none is shut out by him before they were born into the World.’ However, Burrough then writes ‘we believe that there is a Crown of eternal glory...to be enjoyed for evermore by all that believe and are chosen of God’ and ‘We believe...there is a State of election’ followed by ‘they that are chosen by God are delivered from Wrath for they believe in the light.’ As with Thomas Lamb’s publication on the same subject, Burrough’s tract can be seen to be ambiguous in places. It could also be argued that it depends on a circular argument; salvation is open to all, those that believe in Christ will be saved, and God predetermines those who will believe in Christ. I suggest that it is possible, but most unlikely, that Burrough was aware of the arguments put forward fifteen years earlier by Thomas Lambe. It could be that, with Burrough’s likely established church background so recent in the past, and that he was only aged ‘16 or 17 years of age’ when he met Fox, the ‘dispute’ that he had with Fox at Underbarrow contained some discussion on the subject of predestination.

Francis Howgill was a leader of the group of Seekers that Fox preached to at Firbank Fell, and it is possible that the young Burrough was a member of that group at the time that Fox

---

312 Edward Burrough, *A Declaration to all the World of Our Faith*, p. 3.  
313 Edward Burrough, *A Declaration to all the World of Our Faith*, p. 4. [mistakenly typed as p. 15]  
316 See 3.2.2 above.  
317 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 108. See 5.3.12 below regarding the life of Francis Howgill.
visited them. Howgill described how ‘we waited on him [Fox] in pure silence,’ suggesting that he was including Burrough in that statement. It is possible that, if Burrough was associated with Howgill’s Seekers, he was still a regular attender at his local church, for it was after he had listened to Fox at ‘16 or 17 years of age’ that ‘his nearest Relations, even his own Parents cast him off as an Alien, and turned him out from their House.’

Following his convincement, Burrough became a travelling minister within the Quaker movement, and with Richard Hubberthorn ‘took on the Baptists’ in London in 1654. In the years 1656 and 1657, Burrough was involved in an argument, carried out through printed publications, with the eminent Baptist leader, John Bunyan. This argument revolved around the perceptions of ‘Christ within’ and ‘Christ without’ and is discussed in some detail in 6.5 below.

Burrough was imprisoned in London in June 1662, where he remained until his death in February 1663 at the age of twenty-nine. It cannot be shown, possibly as with the case of Nayler, that Burrough sought a martyr’s death, but Moore quotes from a letter sent by Burrough to Francis Howgill during 1657 whilst Burrough was in prison in Kingston-upon-Thames: ‘I have no cause of trouble in it, but rather of joy and peace, knowing that it shall be

---

318 Francis Howgill, George Whitehead, Josiah Coale and George Fox, A Testimony Concerning the Life, Death, Trials, Travels and Labours of Edward Burroughs, p. 5.
320 George Fox, Journal, p. 174. See also Hugh Barbour, The Quakers in Puritan England (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1964), p. 46 where Barbour describes Burrough as ‘a thundering young preacher and the best tract writer among early Friends.’ It is not clear from where Barbour obtained the first of Burrough’s quoted qualities but, in relation to his second quoted quality, it is noted that Burrough was a prolific tract writer, writing sixty-three tracts between the years 1655 and 1660. See Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences, Appendix III, Table of Publications.
322 Elizabeth Brockbank wrote that Burrough had been in contact with a Baptist community before he entered into his argument with Bunyan and that, although he did not know Bunyan, Burroughs was chosen to respond to Bunyan as ‘he was considered one of the ablest champions of Friends.’ Elizabeth Brockbank, Edward Burrough: A Wrestler for Truth (London: The Bannisdale Press, 1949), p.57 and p. 105.
323 Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 184.
for the furtherance of the gospel...my name is assuredly written in the Lamb’s book of Life." 324 This letter, I believe, suggests an acceptance, rather than a seeking of death.

5.3.10 John Camm

According to his son, John Camm had a basic education ‘as any of that degree in that part of the Country’ and had religious inclinations from a very young age. 325 It is reported that Camm was ‘strict and upright’ in his life and religious beliefs, 326 possibly suggesting a leaning toward the Puritan tendency within the established church. Camm eventually separated from the church and, again according to his son’s account ‘with many others, who were under the same sense of hunger, often met together amongst themselves.’ 327 This group that Camm joined was certainly Separatists, and considered by Gwyn to be Seekers. 328 A suggestion made by Moore is that Camm may have been a Grindletonian. 329 This possibility seems remote in view of the distance between Camm’s home at Preston Patrick near Kendal in

324 Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 161. A similar view is expressed by Howgill when signing his section in A Testimony Concerning the Life, Death, Trials, Travels and Labours of Edward Burroughs, p. 14. ‘By one who hath chosen rather to suffer with the people of God called Quakers, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, or to be reckoned as a Prince amongst the uncircumcised.’
328 John Punshon, Portrait in Grey, p. 67. See also Douglas Gwyn, Seekers Found, p. 233.
329 Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 14. This suggestion had been made some years previously by Craig Horle. See Craig W. Horle, ‘John Camm: Profile of a Quaker Minister during the interregnum.’ Quaker History 70, no. 2, Fall 1981, p. 70, ‘He [Camm] may have later become a Grindletonian.’ Although no reference is made to Camm, Como records that Thomas Barcroft was a ‘Grindletonian-turned-Quaker’ and that because of the overlap in geography of the areas of operation of the Grindletonians and Quakers, ‘several authors have explored the possibility that Brearley’s followers may have served as a sort of seedbed for…the earliest Friends.’ David R. Como, Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2004), pp. 319 and 268. Grindletonian was the name given to the congregation of Roger Brearley (or Breereley) who was curate of Grindleton, Lancashire between 1615 and 1622 and who preached and held conventicles there for about fifteen years. The main beliefs of this group were ‘the priority of the spirit over the letter of the bible, the denial of the significance of ordination, the possibility of living without sin and attaining heaven in this life.’ See Christopher Hill, The World Turned Upside Down, pp. 81-83. Margaret Spufford, Contrasting Communities: English Villagers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), p. 258. See also David R. Como, Blown by the Spirit, pp. 482-484 for confirmation of Hill’s statement contained in the charges levelled against Brearley in 1616/17.
Westmorland and the location of Roger Brereley’s group at Grindleton in Lancashire, approximately fifty miles through the Forest of Bowland.  

After Fox’s meeting at Firbank Fell, John Audland took Fox to meet John Camm at Camm’s home. It is recorded that both Camm and Audland were members of ‘seeking’ communities but there is no record that they were members of the same group. In view of the proximity of their homes, it is likely that they were members of the same group, although Camm was not reported as being one of the large number of the ‘seeking’ group present at Fox’s preaching at Firbank. Fox does not record his visit to Camm’s house, but does record a meeting that he attended at Preston Patrick with, again, no mention of Camm. That meeting is reported to be one of a series of regular monthly ‘Genrall’ meetings of Camm’s seeking group and ‘several hundreds, were Effectually reached to the heart, & convinced.’ It is interesting to note that, although Fox makes reference to the separate meetings at Firbank Fell and at Preston Patrick, and records the convincement of Audland at the former, Camm’s son does not separate the meetings and suggests, perhaps inadvertently, that Audland and John Camm were convinced at the same time and at the same meeting. From that time onwards, Audland and Camm paired up and travelled around England preaching the Quaker message. It is likely that, through his contact with a Quaker convert in Bristol, Charles Marshall, Camm would have had contact with Baptists in that city from 1654 onwards.

---

331 See 5.3.8 above. Also Ed Norman Penney, *The First Publishers of Truth*, pp. 242-243. See also H. Larry Ingle, *First Among Friends*, p. 84.
332 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 110.
334 Thomas Camm and Charles Marshal, *The Memory of the Righteous Revived*, un-numbered page 8. ‘into Westmoreland....and met together as aforesaid....and the aforesaid John Camm my dear Father, with John Audland, Francis Howgil, Edward Burrough, Richard Hubberthorn, and many Hundreds more were convinced.’ See 5.3.8 above.
335 Douglas Gwyn, *Seekers Found*, p. 252. ‘Charles Marshall...Eager Seeker...raised in Bristol...went with his mother to Independent and Baptist meetings.’
5.3.11 William Caton

When Fox first came to Swarthmoor in 1652 Margaret Fell’s son, George, had a companion, William Caton.\(^{337}\) At that time, Caton was aged about seventeen or eighteen and had been with the Fell family for about three years.\(^{338}\) Caton is not mentioned in Fox’s *Journal* as being present at any of the meetings that were held at Swarthmoor Hall.\(^{339}\) Fox’s first reference to him was in 1653 when Fox recounts his travels to Hawkshead, ‘and there was a young Margaret Fell with me and William Caton.’\(^{340}\) There is no record of Caton’s religious background, but I would assume that whilst he was at Swarthmoor, from the age of about fourteen, he was subsumed within the religious life there, influenced by the Independent views of his patrons, Thomas and Margaret Fell, and possibly by the many ministers who took advantage of the open-door policy there. There is no record of any meetings that Caton held with English Baptists or Anabaptists prior to his meeting with them in Dover in 1654 shortly before his visit to the Netherlands.\(^{341}\) I discuss, in Chapter 7 below, Caton’s first visit to the Netherlands in 1655 with John Stubbs who Caton records as meeting for the first time at Dover prior to their visit to the Netherlands.\(^{342}\)

---

\(^{337}\) Geoffrey Nuttall, *From Early Quaker Letters*, p. 55.


\(^{339}\) See, Geoffrey Nuttall, *From Early Quaker Letters*, p. 55 where Nuttall states that Caton was convinced by Fox during Fox’s visit to Swarthmoor Hall in 1652.

\(^{340}\) George Fox, *Journal*, p.171. As Margaret Fell is referred to as ‘young’, I assume that this person accompanying Fox and Caton, who would be eighteen or nineteen years old, was Margaret Fell, the daughter of Thomas and Margaret Fell.


\(^{342}\) William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, pp. 14-15. At this meeting Caton refers to Stubbs as ‘my dear brother’, but there is no record of any previous meeting between them. Fox records Stubbs’ convincement as having taken place whilst Fox was in prison in Carlisle in 1653, see George Fox, *Journal*, p. 176, but Fox does not record whether Stubbs met Fox there, or whether he was convinced by another Quaker at that time. Nuttall, in Geoffrey Nuttall, *From Early Quaker Letters*, p. 73, notes that Stubbs had been associated with Baptists prior
5.3.12 Francis Howgill

A clear description of Francis Howgill’s religious life prior to meeting Fox in 1652 is given in his publication of 1655/6, *The Inheritance of Jacob Discovered.* Born in 1618 near Grayrigg in Westmorland, Howgill decided from the age of about twelve that he would ‘set my heart to know that God which the world professed.’ He then described his search for ‘that God’ over the next twenty-two years until he received Fox’s message at Firbank Fell in 1652. During that search he was aligned initially with the Puritan element within the established church, an insecure or uncommitted alignment as he appears to have wavered in his rejection of ‘sports and pastimes.’ He wrote that he read much during this time and that, a few years later with ‘all the money that I could get I purchased books.’

Still as a young man, at the age of about fourteen or fifteen, he travelled some distances to hear ‘some more excellent means (as they called it)’ and to listen to sermons given by ‘eminent Christians.’ It is probable that the people who gave these sermons were non-conformists or Independents of some form, as this travelling caused Howgill to be despised by his parents and ‘great reproach came upon me.’

According to Howgill he was in a

---

343 Francis Howgill, *The Inheritance of Jacob Discovered,* pp. 5-6. It is not possible, from Howgill’s account of his life, to ascertain the dates when events occurred as he does not quote dates other than the time when he decided to ‘know that God’, 1630, and then the beginning of his travelling and seeking amongst non-conformist communities, 1633.

344 James Backhouse, *Memoirs of Francis Howgill with extracts from his writings* (York: W. Alexander & Son, 1828), un-numbered page, but logically is p. 13. Grayrigg is within a distance of five miles of the birthplaces and homes of John Audland and John Camm. See also Francis Howgill, *The Inheritance of Jacob Discovered,* p. 5.

345 George Fox, *Journal,* p. 108. Fox met Howgill a few days before his preaching at Firbank Fell, see *Journal,* p. 107, where Howgill disputed with authority to allow Fox to speak even though, according to Fox, ‘[Howgill] had not seen me before.’


sorrowful state for ‘foure or five years’,³⁵⁰ taking him up to the age of nineteen or twenty. It is difficult to reconcile these statements of Howgill with Backhouse’s claim that he received a University education and became an Episcopalian minister,³⁵¹ or as Glines suggests, he was educated to be an ‘Anglican Minister’.³⁵² It is possible that, although unreported by Howgill, part of his unhappiness was his education leading into a church position for which he believed he was unsuited.

Howgill then underwent a period of self-recrimination for his sins, and in his seeking he ‘walked mournfully in sorrow and thought none was like me.’³⁵³ During his physical and spiritual travels over the following years, Howgill encountered Independents, hoping that they walked ‘separate from the world’, but left them when he found that not to be the case and joined, what he referred to as, ‘Anabaptists.’³⁵⁴ Although there was something within that group that he liked, he could not accept their ordinances, their distancing themselves from Christ, a total dependence on the Bible and some internal arguing on the question of free will.³⁵⁵ This latter problem encountered by Howgill suggests that he came into contact with both elements within the English Baptist movement, the Calvinist Particular Baptists and the Arminian General Baptists. In view of his admitted ‘great reading’ during these years, I would surmise that he would be well aware of the underlying theologies of these two Baptist groups, but as there is no record of the date of his association with them it is not possible to be certain that he had read either the 1644 or the 1646 Confessions of the Particular Baptists.³⁵⁶ From what Howgill wrote, it is likely that he spent only a short time with the ‘Anabaptists’, and so

³⁵¹ James Backhouse, Memoirs of Francis Howgill, un-numbered page, but logically is p. 13.
³⁵² Ed. Elsa F. Glines, Undaunted Zeal, p. 23. There is no reference to Howgill’s training for the Anglican ministry in W.C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism.
³⁵⁶ See 3.2 above.
may not have accepted believer’s baptism from them. Moving on from the ‘Anabaptists’, Howgill encountered those who preached ‘free-grace’, who believed that ‘all sin was done away, past, present and to come’ but soon moved on from them. The brief description of this group suggests that they were of the Ranter persuasion. From Howgill’s own account, he spent only a short time with this group, but Gwyn suggests that their teaching remained with Howgill up to the time he met Fox.

Howgill’s next encounter was with a group that preached ‘Christ within’ but that ‘they themselves were without.’ He also wrote of this group that they were in the practice of ‘reviling one another’, and that they would ‘smite one another.’ From Howgill’s following comment that he had a ‘true love...to all that walked honestly in what profession soever’, I believe that he saw this group as not resorting to in-fighting, but that they had hatred for all non-members. The description of the group as believing in ‘Christ within’ would point to them being Familists, but their apparent hatred of other denominations, and the likely date that he met them, would not, in my opinion, confirm that proposition.

The group mentioned in the previous paragraph is the last one that Howgill describes as having met prior to meeting Fox. He then appears to have given up in his search for knowledge from others as ‘the Lord would teach his people himself’, and then ‘went up and down preaching against all the Ministry.’ The arrival of Fox is mentioned, though not by name, and ‘I believed the eternal word of truth, and that of God in my conscience sealed to it;

---

358 See 3.1.4 above.
359 Douglas Gwyn, Seekers Found, p. 232. ‘Note that Howgill’s Quaker convincement led him through the Ranter territory of utter distraction.’
360 Francis Howgill, The Inheritance of Jacob Discovered, p. 10.
361 Francis Howgill, The Inheritance of Jacob Discovered, p. 10.
362 See 3.1.2 above. It has been suggested by Wootten that the Familists ceased to exist as a group by the 1620s.
and so not onely I, but many hundreds more.\textsuperscript{364} This statement supports Moore’s statement that Howgill’s congregation became Quakers at the same time as Howgill himself.\textsuperscript{365}

Following Howgill’s convincement by Fox, he became an ardent preacher of the Quaker message until his death after a five year period in prison in Appleby in the ‘11\textsuperscript{th} moneth, 1668.\textsuperscript{366}

Testimonies to the life of Francis Howgill are contained in the publication \textit{The Dawnings of the Gospel-Day and its Light and Glory Discovered}.\textsuperscript{367} This publication shows Howgill as the author on the titlepage, but it does include testimonies to his life from George Fox, Richard Pinder, Thomas Langhorn and Thomas Carlton. In his testimony, Fox confirms Howgill’s ‘convincement’ as occurring in 1652 but neither this, nor the other testimonies give any more information on Howgill’s early life.\textsuperscript{368}

There is, unfortunately, no record of meetings of any length between Howgill and Fox during which Howgill could have discussed the knowledge he had acquired during his seeking over the previous twenty years, although there are similarities in some of their expressed views: the place of teachers within the church or group, the direct access to Christ or God without the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[364] Francis Howgill, \textit{The Inheritance of Jacob Discovered}, p. 11.
\item[365] See 5.3.8 above.
\item[366] George Whitehead and sixteen others, \textit{A Brief Account of some of the Late and Present Sufferings of the People called Quakers for Meeting together to Worship God in Spirit and Truth} (London: Printed by Andrew Sowle, and are sold at his Shop in Devonshire New-buildings, without Bishops’ Gate, 1680), p. 121.
\item[367] Francis Howgill \textit{[sic]}, \textit{The Dawnings of the Gospel-Day and its Light and Glory Discovered} (No publisher information shown, 1676).
\item[368] Francis Howgill, \textit{The Dawnings of the Gospel-Day}. Section headed ‘George Fox’s Testimony concerning Francis Howgill.’ Unnumbered page. This publication also includes a copy of Howgill’s Will in the section entitled ‘The unchangeable Testament, and Will, and Council of Francis Howgill left to his Daughter Abigail Howgill. The account of Howgill’s ‘Dying words’ also does not add to the information already given on Howgill’s early life. John Bolton, Edward Guy, Anthony Pinder, Thomas Longhorn, Richard Pinder and Thomas Carleton, \textit{A Short Account of the Latter End and Dying Words of Francis Howgill \textit{[sic]}} (This is printed and Published in the Year 1671 for Friends, at the desire of some, because many have not seen it (nor could so well have it) in Manuscript).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
need for intermediaries, and the phrases ‘the light in my conscience’ and turning to ‘the light.’

5.4 Later Quaker contacts of George Fox

In the following sub-sections I describe, for completeness, those Quakers who were prominent in the early Quaker movement, in England and in the Netherlands, who were associated at one time with Baptist or Anabaptist groups and who may have met Fox at some time in their life but, I would contend, at a time when Fox’s theology was already established. These are taken in alphabetical order.

5.4.1 William Ames

In his 1656 tract entitled *A Declaration of the Witness of God* Ames describes how, from an early age he was aware of sin ‘but I knew not God’ to the extent that he was ‘refrained many times from accompanying with my familiers.’

He describes how his ‘wickedness’ grew over the years but that as he began to hear what the priests preached to him he considered himself to be ‘safe’ whilst ‘takeing pleasure in unrighteousness.’ Although Ames does not admit it, and it has not been suggested by other writers, this sounds as though he had reached

---

369 Francis Howgill, *The Inheritance of Jacob Discovered*, p. 6. Although Howgill wrote the phrase ‘the light in my conscience’ with regard to his thoughts when he was fifteen years old, as the tract was published in 1655 there is no confirmation that it was a phrase that he had created or whether he had heard it from Fox in 1652. See also Francis Howgill, *The Inheritance of Jacob Discovered*, p. 10.


the position of the Ranters.³⁷² At this time, Ames records that he encountered a group that he
describes as ‘Anabaptists’, that he was baptized with water by them and that he became a
preacher and an elder with them even though he continued with the ‘violence of lust...[and] carried away to Commit it.’³⁷³ He records how ‘one was sent by the Lord to declare his name whose Ministry I witness to be of God’³⁷⁴ and eventually ‘I came to witness through the Light and I had no more need to be taught of men.’³⁷⁵ Ames does not record when these events occurred but it has been suggested that his convincement took place in 1655, a year before he wrote his tract.³⁷⁶ In his tract, Ames does not name the person sent by God to speak to him. It could be inferred from this that Ames had heard a voice similar to the one heard by Fox in 1647.³⁷⁷ However William I. Hull suggests that Ames was convinced following a meeting he had with Francis Howgill and Edward Burrough.³⁷⁸ There is no reference to Ames in Fox’s Journal, and no indication that he met Fox. Hull, who researched and wrote extensively on the growth of Quakerism in the Netherlands, refers to Ames’ knowledge of the Dutch language, his contact with Dutch immigrants in England and his first visit to the Netherlands in 1656.³⁷⁹ I discuss the contribution that Ames made to Dutch Quakerism in 7.4 below.

³⁷² See 3.1.4 above.
³⁷⁴ William Ames, A Declaration of the Witness of God, p. 5.
³⁷⁶ No ascribed author, ‘The Life of Wiliam Ames.’ The Friends’ Library 11, 1847, p. 476. See also Geoffrey Nuttall, From Early Quaker Letters, Swarthmore MSS Calendar to 1660, p. 50.
³⁷⁷ George Fox, Journal, p. 11.
³⁷⁸ Research papers of William I. Hull held at Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania, Box 23, Folder ‘People typescript’, pp. 1-35. Hull does not, unfortunately, confirm from where he obtained this information.
5.4.2 William Bayly

Bayly is recorded as meeting Fox in 1655 in Poole in Dorset.\textsuperscript{380} Fox wrote that, at the time of their meeting, Bayly was a ‘Baptist teacher’,\textsuperscript{381} having previously, according to Bayly’s own account of his life, been a soldier.\textsuperscript{382} Bayly records how at one time he was in despair at what priests, presumably of the established church, were saying to him.\textsuperscript{383} Before his recorded meeting with Fox, Bayly records that he ‘was so smitten by God’s witness, the light in my conscience.’\textsuperscript{384} It is likely that these words had not occurred to him at the time, but that he acquired them after meeting Fox and other Quakers, and before he wrote his \textit{Short Relation and Testimony} in 1659. He records that he was dissatisfied religiously after he had become a Baptist,\textsuperscript{385} and when he heard of Quakers for the first time, being ‘in a dungeon at Suefham...something in me did arise...which drew tears from mine eyes.’\textsuperscript{386} Bayly records that at the time he heard about the Quakers he started to read Jacob Böhme’s books which did not help him in his ‘seeking.’\textsuperscript{387} Bayly then records that he was ‘eternally convinced’ when he heard a ‘Minister...[who] preached to the spirit in prison.’\textsuperscript{388} Fox refers to this meeting as the time that Bayly was convinced.\textsuperscript{389} Moore records that in 1662 Bayly married Mary Fisher who is best known for her travels to Turkey to preach to the Sultan.\textsuperscript{390}

\textsuperscript{380} Hugh Barbour, \textit{The Quakers in Puritan England}, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{381} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 231.
\textsuperscript{382} William Bayly, \textit{A Short Relation or Testimony of the working of the light of Christ in me}. William Bayly (London: Printed for Mary Westwood in the 6\textsuperscript{th} Month, 1659), p. 2.
\textsuperscript{383} William Bayly, \textit{A Short Relation or Testimony}, p. 3. ‘[I] was weary to hear them [the Priests] and longer, and from no other ground did I at first deny them.’ In this passage Bayly does not state specifically that the ‘Priests’ were of the established church.
\textsuperscript{384} William Bayly, \textit{A Short Relation or Testimony}, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{385} William Bayly, \textit{A Short Relation or Testimony}, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{386} William Bayly, \textit{A Short Relation or Testimony}, pp. 8-9.
\textsuperscript{387} William Bayly, \textit{A Short Relation or Testimony}, pp. 8-9.
\textsuperscript{388} William Bayly, \textit{A Short Relation or Testimony}, pp. 8-9.
\textsuperscript{389} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 231.
\textsuperscript{390} Rosemary Moore, \textit{The Light in their Consciences}, p. 13.
5.4.3 Stephen Crisp

Crisp is recorded as being born in Colchester in Essex, a ‘man of education’, whose parents, following their repeated failure to attend communion in their local church, were excommunicated. He is reported to have joined the Baptists in Colchester prior to his convincement to Quakerism there by James Parnel in ‘about the fourth month, 1655.’ According to Barbour, Crisp had arrived at the Quaker position some months previously. Fox makes no reference to meeting Crisp in his Journal, nor to Crisp’s journeying to the Netherlands, his first journey taking place in 1663.

5.4.4 Samuel Fisher

Fox records meeting Fisher in Romney, in Kent, in 1655, and that Fisher had been ‘a parish priest’ and latterly ‘an eminent preacher amongst the Baptists.’ Hull writes that, at the time that Fox met Fisher, Fisher had already been converted to Quakerism by Ames and John

---

392 William C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism, p. 382.
396 Samuel Tuke, Memoirs of the life of Stephen Crisp, p. xix. See also Gerard Croese, The General History of the Quakers. Being written originally in Latin (London, Printed for John Dunton, at the Raven in Jewen-Street, 1696), Book III, p. 168. Croese is less specific about the date of Crisp’s visit to the Netherlands, only saying that it was ‘not long after’ the visit of Stubbs and Caton in 1655.
397 George Fox, Journal, p. 209. Braithwaite described Fisher as ‘a man of learning and controversial skill.’ William C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism, p. 187. The latter claim is substantiated by the book that he published in 1653 which included a chapter entitled ‘Anti Babism Or the Babish disputing of the Priests for Baby-Baptism disproved’ preaching against the practice of infant baptism. See Samuel Fisher, Babybaptism meer Babism or an answer to nobody in five words, to Every-body who finds himself concern’d in’t (London: Printed by Henry Hills, and are to be sold by Will Larner in the sign of the Blackmore at Fleet-bridge, and Richard Moon at the Seven-stars in Pauls Church-yard, 1653).
However Fox’s account suggests that Fisher’s, and his wife’s, convincements took place at Fox’s meeting with them and with other Baptists in 1655. Following his convincement Fisher travelled to the Netherlands and, according to Fox, on to Rome.

5.4.5 Benjamin Furly

According to Hull, Benjamin Furley’s father, John Furly, and the whole of his family accepted Quakerism following the preaching of James Parnel in Colchester in 1655. The only record of Fox’s meeting Benjamin is given by Henry J. Cadbury when he records that Benjamin Furly, and a number of other Dutch-based Quakers, met Fox and his travelling party at Briel in 1677 and they were accommodated at their homes in Rotterdam. It is likely that at an earlier date, sometime around 1660/1, Fox had met Benjamin’s older brother, also called John, as both Fox’s and John’s signatures are appended to a Declaration, dated ‘21st of the 11th Month, 1660’, sent to the King reassuring the King that ‘all occasion of suspicion may be taken away and our innocency cleared.’

---

398 William I. Hull, *The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam*, p. 179. See William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 288, where Braithwaite writes that Fisher was convinced by Caton and Stubbs and not Ames and Stubbs as stated by Hull.

399 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 210. At Fox’s meeting with the Baptists, including Fisher and his wife, Fox writes ‘And Samuel Fisher denied all and came to be a faithful and free minister and preacher of Christ and his Truth.’


401 William I. Hull, *Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam* (Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Swarthmore College Monographs, 1941), p. 6. According to the account in Fox’s *Journal*, p. 163, Parnel would only have been aged eighteen at the time of his preaching to the Furly family in Colchester.

402 Henry J. Cadbury ‘George Fox’s later years’ in George Fox, *Journal*, p. 724.

403 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 403. Fox quotes the name as ‘John Furley Junr.’ indicating John the son and not the father.
5.4.6 John Gratton

It is recorded in the Testimony written after his death, that John Gratton had much contact with ‘Anabaptists’ before he became a Quaker, almost joining them on two separate occasions.404 He was also most critical of the Muggletonians, who he encountered during his seeking years,405 and in most respects, as described in his Testimony, and confirmed by Brinton, he followed the same stages in his seeking as followed by earlier Quakers.406 He became a Quaker in 1671 at the age of 29.

Although Gratton records that his first contact with Quakers was in 1664,407 and Fox does not record ever meeting him, this initial contact with Quakers occurred at, I would suggest, too late a date to have influenced any of the Quakers’ early religious thinking. This brief account of Gratton’s seeking is included in view of his significant contact with ‘Anabaptists’ or I would suggest more likely, English Particular Baptists, prior to him becoming a Quaker.

---

404 No author shown, A few Words of Testimony Concerning our Dear Friend John Gratton with some account of his following Journal (London: Printed and sold by J. Sowle, 1720), p. 14 and p. 26. After his rejection of the Anabaptists, Gratton is then recorded as having witnessed the baptism, by full immersion, of his sister. This suggests that the group that his sister joined were Particular Baptists, the first in England to adopt baptism by full immersion sometime around 1641. See 3.2 above. See also Richard L. Greaves, ‘Gratton, John (1642/3–1712)’, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford University Press, 2004) [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11305, accessed 14 Sept 2012] where it is recorded that in his early years Gratton was troubled with the doctrine of predestination and if correct this, along with his belief that ‘baptism was a lifeless rite’, would explain his reason for not joining his sister’s Baptist congregation.

405 Anon, A few Words of Testimony Concerning our Dear Friend John Gratton, p. 23. See also 4.6.3 above regarding the Muggletonians.


5.4.7 John Killam

Very little is written about, or by, John Killam one of the Balby group, the first group to be convinced by Fox in 1651.\(^{408}\) The only direct reference to him by Fox is dated 1660 when he attended ‘Yearly Meeting’ in Killam’s orchard.\(^{409}\) In their books on early Quakerism, Killam is not mentioned at all by Gwyn or Moore,\(^ {410}\) and only fleetingly mentioned by Barbour and Braithwaite. Barbour describes Killam as one of the four men that Fox met and whose ‘friendship’ he won in Balby,\(^ {411}\) and in relation to the many letters sent by travelling Quaker ministers, including John Killam, to Swarthmoor Hall.\(^ {412}\) Braithwaite wrote of Killam’s convincement at Balby by Fox and that of his wife, Margaret, at the same event.\(^ {413}\)

Although Moore does not record any publication issued by Killam in his own name between 1652 and 1666,\(^ {414}\) he is shown as the author of a tract in a group of papers published in 1654 also containing tracts written by George Fox, James Nayler and James Parnel.\(^ {415}\) In his tract, Killam refers to ‘the light of God in thy conscience’,\(^ {416}\) a phrase in common usage by Quakers at that time. It is also noted by Killam that his tract was written whilst he was ‘a prisoner of the Lord in York Castle.’\(^ {417}\)

\(^{408}\) George Fox, Journal, p. 73. Even here, Fox does not mention Killam’s name, it is set out in footnote 2 produced by John Nickalls.

\(^{409}\) George Fox, Journal, p. 370.

\(^{410}\) See Douglas Gwyn, Seekers Found. Atonement in Early Quaker Experience, Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences.


\(^{413}\) William C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism, p. 59. Braithwaite suggested, see p. 369, that Margaret Killam ‘travelled and suffered much’ and quotes a letter, p. 295, of her experiences whilst travelling in Cambridge.

\(^{414}\) Background material to Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences, Appendix III made available by the author.

\(^{415}\) George Fox, Several Papers. Some of them given forth by George Fox, others by James Nayler. (No place of publication: Gathered together and Published by A.P. that the Truth may be spread abroad, and deceit discovered. Printed in the year, as the world accounts, 1654), pp. 36-37.

\(^{416}\) George Fox, Several Papers, p. 36.

\(^{417}\) George Fox, Several Papers, p. 37.
It is unfortunate that so little is known or written about John Killam. He met Fox at an early stage in the development of the Quaker theology and may have contributed towards that development. Further research may be appropriate at a later date.

5.4.8 John Stubbs

I set out in 7.4 below the contacts that Stubbs had with continental Anabaptists in the Netherlands during his visit there in 1655 and 1656 with Ames and Caton. Fox recorded that there were a number of soldiers who refused to swear an oath of loyalty to Oliver Cromwell in 1654 at the end of the Long Parliament, and that John Stubbs was one of them. Fox also writes that Stubbs, who Nuttall confirms as a Baptist, was convinced, in 1653, ‘when I was in Carlisle prison.’ It had been intimated by Braithwaite, that Fox, although Fox himself does not confirm this, was the person who convinced Stubbs in 1653. This would mean, presumably, that Stubbs was in prison in Carlisle at the same time as Fox, and that Stubbs remained in the Army after his convincement until 1654 ending with his refusal to take the oath proffered to him. The timing of these events should be subject to further study as it is unlikely that Stubbs would have returned to the Army after his ‘convincement.’

I contend that Fox did not meet Stubbs in 1653. Possibly, the first time they did meet was in 1660 when they both signed a ‘Declaration to the King.’ If Fox and Stubbs were not

---

419 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 176.
420 Geoffrey Nuttall, *From Early Quaker Letters*, p. 73.
422 William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, p. 186. Braithwaite’s words are ‘Stubbs...who had been convinced while Fox lay in Carlisle gaol’, thus referring to Fox’s own words quoted from his *Journal*.
423 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 403.
together when they signed the Declaration, which is possible, the only recorded meeting of
the two, by Fox, is in London in 1662.\footnote{George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 425.}

Despite Stubbs’ Baptist background before becoming a Quaker, it is unlikely, in view of
timing and hard evidence of their meeting, that Stubbs had any influence on Fox’s emerging
Quaker theology.

5.5 Chapter summary

After considering, in Chapter 4 above, Fox’s early family, social and religious contacts in the
years prior to 1652, in this Chapter I have investigated the other sources from which Fox may
have obtained his theology. Although his ‘substantial’ library has been referred to by some
authors, there is no proof as to when that library was acquired nor that Fox had read many, or
any, of the non-Quaker books it contained. Consequently I looked at the contacts that Fox had
made, according to the account in his \textit{Journal}, with people who had varied religious
experiences and who became Quakers. In particular I reviewed the backgrounds to those
leading Quakers who had documented contacts with, or even membership of, Baptist
congregations: Hooton, Dewsbury and Howgill who Fox met before or during 1652, and
Crisp, Ames, Stubbs, Bayly, Fisher and Gratton who either met Fox some years after 1652, or
are not recorded as meeting Fox at all, but nevertheless played a significant part in the growth
of Quakerism in England and in the Netherlands.

In addition to those people that he met with a Baptist, or sometimes described an ‘Anabaptist’
background, Fox records meeting people with varied religious background, such as Nayler
and Howgill; those with only established church, albeit open-minded, backgrounds such as Farnworth, Fell and Caton; and those that were recorded as belonging to a community of Seekers in the north of England, namely Aldam, Audland, Howgill and Camm. In this Chapter I have also investigated the available evidence to attempt to identify ‘Priest Boys’ who Fox met and journeyed with during 1651. However, that investigation failed to produce a definitive answer.

The information contained in this Chapter indicates that, leading up to the establishment of a Quaker identity in England, Fox had contact with individuals who had significant knowledge of Baptist theology and practices and even greater contact with such people within a few years of Quakerism’s establishment. However, from the accounts written of these contacts it is not possible to ascertain what, if anything, Fox took from them and what coloured his theological thinking.

In the next chapter I investigate the establishing of the Quaker identity in England by reviewing some of the tracts and letters published by Quakers in the 1650s and the variety of anti-Quaker tracts of that period. This investigation is aimed to identify whether there was a transition of Baptist beliefs and practices to the early Quaker movement.
CHAPTER 6

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUAKER IDENTITY IN ENGLAND

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter I establish the events leading up to the appearance of Quakerism in the seventeenth century. This is achieved by reference to those events as set out in secondary sources, in Fox’s *Journal*\(^1\) and by reference to contemporaneous Quaker and anti-Quaker tracts.

Research for this thesis has adopted, in this and later chapters, the process adopted by Barry Reay, described by Ingle as using ‘a wide variety of ‘secular’ sources...to see...subjects from the standpoint of their enemies.’\(^2\) In this way, it may still not be possible to identify actual events and processes, but, in Ingle’s words, it is possible to identify ‘the perception [of those events] however wrong-headed, by those in a position to shape events.’\(^3\)

Despite the reservations propounded by some authors,\(^4\) I also use the information contained in Fox’s *Journal* as a starting point for the research into early Quakerism and, whenever possible, substantiate statements made by reference to documents issued which are contemporaneous with the events described in the *Journal*.

---

2. H. Larry Ingle, ‘From Mysticism to Radicalism: Recent historiography of Quaker beginnings.’ *Quaker History*, 76, no. 2, Fall 1987, p. 91.
3. H. Larry Ingle, ‘From Mysticism to Radicalism’, p. 92, Note 43. See also 4.2 above.
4. This reservation is not made by Hugh Barbour in his book *The Quakers in Puritan England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1964), where he appears to take information set out in Fox’s *Journal* and uses it unquestioningly.
6.2 Fox’s Journal

In 1675, or possibly the beginning of 1674 Fox dictated to Thomas Lower, his stepson-in-law, an autobiography down to the year of writing, but the pages dealing with the years before 1650 are missing. This autobiography is called the Spence MS and it, bound with numerous letters, pastoral epistles, other papers and a number of notes on early Quaker history was published verbatim and literatim in 1911 as The Journal of George Fox, and is known as the Cambridge Journal. Whilst in prison in Lancaster in 1664 Fox wrote, or dictated, detailed accounts of a number of experiences at various times between 1647 and 1664. This manuscript is known as The Short Journal. Presumably Fox used it to help his recollections when he was dictating his autobiography.

Working under the instructions of the Second Day Morning Meeting, Thomas Ellwood produced the first published edition of Fox’s Journal in 1694 which, according to Hinds, was ‘heavily edited, re-ordered and rewritten.’ This is a composite work in which Ellwood adopted or omitted many of Fox’s own vigorous phrases, his picturesque details, his apparent overvaluation of praise, claims to psychic powers and matters thought liable to cause political or theological protest, besides doubtful or unverifiable statements.

---

7 George Fox, Journal, p. viii.
9 George Fox, Journal, p. x. Ayoub and Roeltgen confirm the ‘drastic’ editing of the Journal by Ellwood and, by analysing writing style, confirm additions by other authors. Raymond Ayoub and David Roeltgen, Lexical Agraphia in the writing of George Fox (No publishing information shown. Foolscap typed essay in the Quaker Library, Woodbrooke. No date shown). p. 11, ‘The evidence is that the narrative portion of the Journal was dictated by Fox to Thomas Lower, his son-in-law, when they were in Worcester prison in 1673-74...It is very likely that he added letters...and other papers when he was in Swarthmore Hall in 1675-77...in which about 50 different hand writings are identified...Ellwood’s editing was very drastic.’
The standard edition has for long been that of John Nickalls, first published in 1952. It is as complete as Ellwood’s edition and it expresses the story in Fox’s own words. Another edition, edited by Nigel Smith and published in 1998, is a transcript of the narrative portions of the Spence MS.

Many books and articles in academic journals have been written on the life, theology and psychology of George Fox. What appears to be common to many of them is the use made of Fox’s Journal, and the acceptance, as fact, of all that is written in it, followed by an interpretation of, or speculation on, events presented therein.

Ingle refers to Fox’s meeting with his uncle ‘Pickering’ described in five lines of his Journal. In Ingle’s words, ‘Fox...spent most of his time with those sectarians called Baptists, because his uncle, William Pickering, was a second echelon leader among them.’ Ingle is then specific when he says that Pickering was a ‘General Baptist.’ There is no reference in Fox’s Journal to the length of time Fox spent with the Baptists and it is speculation, and not established facts, as is shown in 4.2 above, that a) William Pickering was ‘Uncle Pickering’ mentioned by Fox, that b) William Pickering was a ‘second echelon leader’ amongst Baptists and that c) he was a General Baptist and not a Particular Baptist.

---

10 Rosemary Moore, The Light in Their Consciences, p. 229. George Fox, The Journal, p. x. Nickalls notes that the main source for his edition of the Journal was the Spence MS as printed in the Cambridge Journal, supplemented by events taken from Ellwood’s edition and from the Short Journal. A few other sources were drawn upon e.g. a number of letters from Fox to his wife. George Fox, The Journal, p. xi.

11 Rosemary Moore, The Light in Their Consciences, p. 229. Hinds notes that the Smith edition ‘retains the pitch, tone and pace of Fox’s retrospective narrative...However...[it] only includes the Narrative portion of the Journal.’ Hilary Hinds, George Fox and Early Quaker Culture, p. xi.


13 George Fox, The Journal, p. 4.


15 H. Larry Ingle, First Among Friends, p. 36.
Whilst Bailey records the editing of Fox’s *Journal* prior to its publication,\textsuperscript{16} there is an unquestioning acceptance by him of the accuracy of the events described therein and the repeating of an unsubstantiated suggestion that Fox may have descended from a Maryan martyr. This latter issue was investigated in detail in 4.5 above.

Another major work on early Quakerism again appears to accept, without question, Fox’s words as set out in his *Journal*. In his book, Douglas Gwy\textsuperscript{n} makes no reference to the time gap between the happening of the early events described in the *Journal* and its publication.\textsuperscript{17} In addition, there is no caution expressed as to the accuracy of the description of those events. That unquestioning acceptance of the *Journal* may be a result of observers’ accounts of Fox’s memory; as noted by Ross, ‘we know that he [Fox] had a phenomenal memory.’\textsuperscript{18} This appears to present a circular argument proposing that Fox’s memory was so good that he could recount the exact events in his life with great accuracy, and accepting all that he wrote in his *Journal* as factually correct then this was evidence of his ‘phenomenal memory.’ There is no suggestion by Gwyn that some of the ‘facts’ in the *Journal* are inaccurate, or any statement confirming that those ‘facts’ had been edited after recounting by Fox. A contrary view is expressed by Watts, ‘he [Fox] was unwilling to acknowledge, even if he could remember, what he must have owed to the religious radicals with whom he met’,\textsuperscript{19} and by Hinds who writes, ‘Fox’s memory would not have allowed him precise recall.’\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item\textsuperscript{17} Douglas Gwyn, *Apocalypse of the Word* (Richmond, Indiana: Friends United Press, 1984).
  \item\textsuperscript{19} Michael Watts, *The Dissenters from the Reformation to the French Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 188.
  \item\textsuperscript{20} Hilary Hinds, *George Fox and Early Quaker Culture*, p. 88.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Nuttall concedes that ‘Fox’s early itinerary in the Midlands and in Yorkshire have never been very clear’ and that they were ‘not, it may be, very clear to Fox himself as he sought to recover them.’21 This lack of clarity in Fox’s mind can be seen, to some extent, when comparing the sequence of events as depicted in Fox’s Journal, first published in 1694, with the chronological sequence of the same events as depicted in Fox’s Short Journal.22 A single example of this change in order of events will suffice. In the Short Journal, Fox records the following events:

To ‘Tickell’

To ‘Warnsworth’

To Mansfield Woodhouse and a beating

Meeting Priest Boyes, but Fox does not give his name here.23

Whereas in the Journal, the events are related as taking place in the following order

To Mansfield Woodhouse and a beating

To Bagworth

Meeting Priest Boyes, now named

To ‘Warmsworth’

To ‘Tickhill’24

23 George Fox, The Short Journal, pp. 10, 11, 12 and 14 respectively.
24 George Fox, Journal, pp. 44, 46, 86, 97 and 98 respectively. Other examples of the transposition of events are seen in relation to ‘Doomsdale’ and Col. Rous. These are recounted in the Journal, pp. 250-252, with
As described by T. Edmund Harvey in the ‘Introduction’ to the 1926 edition of the *Short Journal*, the drafting of the *Short Journal* was undertaken by Fox during 1663-64, and could be seen as ‘a preliminary draft of the greater work [Fox’s *Journal*].’\(^{25}\) Smith suggests, in the ‘Introduction’ to the version of Fox’s *Journal* that he edited, that apparently ‘erroneous’ dates are possibly a result of the editing of the *Journal* at different times, with ‘better’ available evidence.\(^{26}\) Smith concedes that the reason for the changes of dates ‘is a matter seldom investigated’,\(^{27}\) although Moore writes that ‘George Fox’s *Short Journal* ‘is not an ordered story.’\(^{28}\)

It is also apparent that the *Short Journal*, although written closer in time to the events it depicts than the *Journal*, is less explicit with regard to the people that Fox met than the *Journal*; the *Short Journal* makes no reference to the names of the people he met or accompanied him on his journey. It could be that Fox did not wish, on the grounds of safety to his colleagues, to write their names at this early date. If so, even though Fox is known not to have been able to write easily,\(^{29}\) could he have kept separate, unpublished notes, which included names for later publication in the *Journal*? It is also possible, and in my view more likely, that no other notes were kept and that names were added later solely from memory.

Nuttall points out that it would be a valuable research project to identify the events as portrayed in the *Journal* and *Short Journal* and compare them with those same events as they

---

\(^{25}\) George Fox, *The Short Journal*, p. ix. This same suggestion is made by Nickalls, see above.


\(^{27}\) George Fox, *Journal*, Nigel Smith, ed., p. xxvi.

\(^{28}\) Rosemary Moore, *The Light in Their Consciences*, p. 5.

are portrayed in contemporary accounts by other authors. In this thesis, where events, which could have a bearing on the primary research, are set out in Fox’s Journal, they are researched using other publications which, as far as possible, are independent from Quaker edited material.

There are inconsistencies evident between the different editions of Fox’s Journal. When using any edition of the Journal as a starting point for research, these inconsistencies must be acknowledged and, when necessary, corroborating and contemporary evidence should be obtained to support, or otherwise, statements made by Fox in his Journal.

6.3 Early Quaker Tracts and Letters

The only source of information on the beginnings of Quakerism is, as stated in 6.2 above, Fox’s Journal. Hudson argued that, as Fox himself was the self-appointed editor of Quaker tracts up to 1673, he allowed no other interpretation of Quakerism’s beginnings than his own. Fox’s own description of Quakerism’s beginnings was set out in Chapter 4 above. Fox does confirm, in his Journal, the many meetings, discussions and arguments that he had with churchmen, ‘professors’ and members of independent congregations before he heard a voice

31 This is confirmed when reviewing the sources used by Ingle in his book, First Among Friends. Events relating to Fox’s early life are taken from various editions of Fox’s Journal and the Short Journal. It is interesting to note that, when discussing the status of Fox’s father within the local community, p. 290, he quotes information from a secondary source, Joan Allen, Our George: The Early Years of George Fox, the Quaker. 1624-1645 (Nuneaton, England: Bethany Enterprises, 1990) but completely discounts it as, in his opinion, ‘No evidence supports such suppositions.’
32 Winthrop S. Hudson, ‘A suppressed chapter in Quaker History.’ Journal of Religion 24, no. 2, April 1944, p. 116. See 6.2 above for an account of the editing of early Quaker documents. From 1673 Quaker tracts for publication were edited by the Second Day Morning Meeting. See 6.2 above. Peters notes that by 1656 a total of 291 Quaker tracts had been produced and that ‘The tight control exercised by leaders over the tracts is the salient feature of their production, underlining that pamphlets were an integral part of the Quaker ministers’ proselytising campaign’ and that this editing by ‘a handful of Quaker leaders…was a crucial feature of its [Quakerism] development.’ Kate Peters, Print Culture and the Early Quakers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 21, 43 and 234 respectively.
in 1647 and received the vision on Pendle Hill in 1652. It is noticeable that nowhere in the telling of the events at those many meetings, nor in his reflections on those meetings shortly afterwards, did Fox suggest that any of his views were instilled in his mind or confirmed by any of the people that he met. It is implied by Fox that he was the sole bearer of the Quaker message at its inception (and possibly at its conception).

It would be of great value if any tracts issued by the early Quakers at or soon after 1647 could throw additional light on Quakerism’s birth. However, as confirmed by Moore, and by Hudson, no such material exists. Examples of early Quaker writing indicate, at best, the personal paths taken by the writers in achieving their ‘convinced’ state. Alternatively they relate to external issues affecting Quakers and Quakerism with some of them written in answer to the anti-Quaker tracts published during the same period.

According to Fox’s Journal possibly the first person that Fox met who is recorded as becoming a Quaker is Elizabeth Hooton. An account of that meeting by Hooton would be of immense value, but it appears not to exist. Hooton is accredited as a joint author, with Thomas Aldam and four other Quakers, of a publication in 1652. It is claimed by Barbour

33 George Fox, Journal, pp. 3-105.
34 This aspect of Fox’s writings was investigated in depth in Chapters 4 and 5 when considering the many contacts that Fox made during his years of seeking. See also 1.3 above regarding Hudson’s views on Fox. Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 26. In Appendix III to her book, Moore places each of the Quaker Publications into one of five categories, Q = Expositions of the Quaker faith for the general public, D = Doctrinal disputes, G = Those addressed to the Government, S = Descriptions of Quaker sufferings and E = Epistles to the Quaker faithful. Winthrop S. Hudson, ‘A suppressed chapter in Quaker History’, p. 110. See also Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 245, Note 14 where she refers to other ‘fragments’ held as ‘scraps’ of paper that exist in Friends House Library, London.
35 See Chapter 5 above where these tracts are used to illustrate individual Quaker journeys.
36 Perhaps the most comprehensive of these answering tracts was The Great Mistry of the Great Whore which Moore records as being compiled by Fox in the years 1657 and 1658, see Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 46, and was produced to answer a total of one hundred and four anti-Quaker tracts and ‘various manuscripts and oral sources.’ Rosemary Moore, The Light in their Consciences, p. 47.
37 George Fox, Journal, p. 9. See also 5.3.1 above which describes Hooton’s life and religious background.
and Roberts that this is possibly the earliest Quaker tract to appear.\textsuperscript{40} It concentrates its arguments on the Quaker views on paid ministry, parish churches and tithes, whilst not referring to any past history of Quakerism.

It is recorded by Nickalls that in 1651 at the same time that, according to Fox, Richard Farnworth met Fox and became a Quaker,\textsuperscript{41} an ‘early publisher of Quakerism’, John Killam, also met Fox and was convinced by him.\textsuperscript{42} Killam wrote a paper, included in a publication of 1654 along with papers by Fox and James Nayler.\textsuperscript{43} Killam’s paper does not refer to his meeting with Fox, nor throw any light upon Quakerism’s beginnings.

In 1655, whilst in Northampton gaol, William Dewsbury wrote and published a tract, \textit{The Discovery of the great enmity of the serpent against the seed of the Woman}.\textsuperscript{44} The second part of that tract describes Dewsbury’s life, his religious experiences and his search leading to his convincement as a Quaker. That tract makes no reference to Dewsbury’s meeting with Fox but it does set his date of convincement as 1651,\textsuperscript{45} the same year that Fox sets for his meeting with Dewsbury in his \textit{Journal}.\textsuperscript{46} It is interesting to note that, according to Dewsbury’s tract, Dewsbury may have come, independently, to the same conclusion as Fox regarding the direct

\textsuperscript{41} See 5.3.5 above which sets out Farnworth’s religious journey and meeting with Fox.
\textsuperscript{42} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 73, Note 1. See 5.4.7 above for a description of Killam’s religious journey.
\textsuperscript{43} George Fox and James Nayler, \textit{Several Papers. Some of them given forth by George Fox; others by James Nayler...Gathered together and published by A.P. that the Truth may be spread abroad, and deceit discovered} (No place of publication, A.P., 1654).
\textsuperscript{44} William Dewsbury, \textit{The Discovery of the great enmity of the serpent against the seed of the Woman, which witnesseth against him where he rules, both in Rulers, Priests and People...From the common Goal in Northampton the 25\textsuperscript{th} day of the 4. Month 1655} (London, Printed for Giles Calvert as the West end of Pauls, 1655). See Gerald R. Cragg, \textit{Puritanism in the period of the Great Persecution. 1660-1688} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), p. 123 where Cragg writes that the practice adopted by many Quakers of writing whilst in prison was initiated by Fox who would use those opportunities to restate his innocence and to point out the errors of the ways of the magistrates. See also 5.3.3 above which documents Dewsbury’s ‘convincement’ by Fox in 1651.
\textsuperscript{45} William Dewsbury, \textit{The Discovery of the great enmity of the serpent}, p. 18, ‘until it pleased the Lord to manifest his power to free me, which was in the year according to the account, 1651.’
\textsuperscript{46} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 73.
access to Christ without the need of a church minister, some two years before Fox.\textsuperscript{47} According to Dewsbury, this revelation came shortly after he ‘went amongst those...called by the names Anabaptists and Independents.’\textsuperscript{48} However, in an earlier tract, Dewsbury claims that ‘There is nothing but confusion in the kingdom of Babylon; so come you to be divided into so many particular forms, as Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists and diverse others.’\textsuperscript{49} Here, therefore, is an indirect link, via Dewsbury, between the beliefs preached by Fox and those of the ‘Anabaptists’ in England, although Fox makes no reference in his \textit{Journal} to this link or to any possible influence by them on him.

In the next section I review some of the early anti-Quaker publications. However it is interesting to note that there is evidence of non-Quakers possibly supporting Quakers and their views. In 1654 a tract was issued, written by ‘an Eminent Hand.’\textsuperscript{50} The tract was published by Giles Calvert who was a major publisher of Quaker works, and so it is possible that this tract was, in fact, written by an un-named Quaker or a non-Quaker having some sympathy with Quaker beliefs and practices.\textsuperscript{51} The tract refers to the arrest, questioning and

\textsuperscript{47} William Dewsbury, \textit{The Discovery of the great enmity of the serpent}, pp. 16-18. See 5.3.3 for quotations from these pages of this publication. See also p. 19, ‘the knowledge of eternall life I came not to by the letter of the Scripture nor hearing men speak of the name of God, I came to the true knowledge of the Scripture and the eternall rest...by the inspiration of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.’

\textsuperscript{48} William Dewsbury, \textit{The Discovery of the great enmity of the serpent}, p. 16.

\textsuperscript{49} William Dewsbury, \textit{The Discovery of Mans Returne To His First Estate by the Operation of the Power of God in the great Work of Regeneration} (London: Printed for Giles Calvert at the Black-Spread-Eagle at the west end of Pauls, 1653/4), pp. 20-21. In a tract of 1656, William Dewsbury, \textit{A Trumpet of the Lord Sounded out of Sion which sounds forth the Controversie of the Lord of Hosts} (London: Printed for Giles Calvert at the Black-spread-Eagle near the West end of Pauls, 1656), p. 20, Dewsbury shows distinctly anti-Anabaptist views when he wrote: ‘you [Anabaptists] are children of the same seed, more purged in the fire of a blind zeal, and begotten in the transforming of the Serpent, into more secret hypocracie’ and, on p. 23 ‘and while you say the Scripture is your Rule, your lives are squared by the spirit of the Devill, and hewn out into Pride and Hypocrisie, and the love of the world, contrary to that Spirit that gave forth the Scripture.’

\textsuperscript{50} Anon, \textit{The First Persecution or a True Narrative of the Cruel usage of two Christians by the present mayor of Cambridge} (London: Printed for G. Calvert, 1654).

\textsuperscript{51} See Kate Peters, \textit{Print Culture and the Early Quakers}, p. 51. ‘In order to organize printing...initially by Giles Calvert, nationally renowned as a radical publisher’, and p. 54, ‘the [Quaker] tracts...until 1656 were published in the main by Giles Calvert with little competition from other publishers.’ Peters also notes, p. 57, that another ‘radical’ publisher was Thomas Simmonds, ‘probably actually a Quaker’ who married Calvert’s sister Martha ‘herself an outspoken Quaker leader.’ See 5.3.4 above for the role taken by Martha Simmonds in the ‘Nayler affair.’
punishment of two un-named women, identified by Braithwaite as the Quakers Mary Fisher and Elizabeth Williams.\textsuperscript{52} The writer, after confirming the women’s actions in Cambridge, describes the way in which they underwent their punishment. ‘They sang and rejoiced’ and said ‘If you think you have not done enough, we are here ready to suffer more for our Saviour Christ.’\textsuperscript{53} This tract gives no further background to beginnings of Quakerism but does illustrate the degree of physical suffering that early Quakers expected and, perhaps, sought.

Support for the Quaker stance on the refusal to take oaths and their right to preach without church authority, came from the General Baptist Henry Denne in his publication \textit{The Quaker no Papist}.\textsuperscript{54} This publication was produced following a dispute between Thomas Smith of Cambridge University, George Whitehead, a Quaker and, indirectly, John Bunyan the Baptist ‘preaching Tinker.’\textsuperscript{55} Rather than taking up his argument on behalf of his Baptist colleague and distancing himself from the Quaker Whitehead, Denne forcefully defended the Quakers’ belief with regard to the taking of oaths, with particular regard to the Oath of Abjuration. He also defended the right to preach without the same authority that Smith had received ‘from his Church.’\textsuperscript{56} I suggest that it was unusual for Baptists to defend the beliefs of Quakers in the

\textsuperscript{52} William C. Braithwaite, \textit{The Beginnings of Quakerism}, p. 159.
\textsuperscript{53} Anon, \textit{The First Persecution or a True Narrative}, p. 6.
\textsuperscript{54} Henry Denne, \textit{The Quaker no Papist in Answer to The Quaker Disarmed} (Printed, and are to be sold by Francis Smith at the signe of the Elephant and Castle without Temple Bar, 1659). See also 3.2.2 above.
\textsuperscript{55} Henry Denne, \textit{The Quaker no Papist}, un-numbered third page.
\textsuperscript{56} Henry Denne, \textit{The Quaker no Papist}, un-numbered third page. Hughes asserts that Smith had presented himself as an underdog in the dispute with Whitehead and that in doing so his argument ‘backfired’. Ann Hughes, ‘The Pulpit Guarded: Confrontations between Orthodox and Radicals in Revolutionary England.’ In Eds. Anne Lawrence, W.R. Owens and Stuart Simm, \textit{John Bunyan and his England 1628-88}. (London: The Hambleton Press, 1990), p. 38. It is interesting to read the tract issued in 1644 by Samuel How who argued that an ‘unlearned man’ who was ‘indued [sic] with grace from God’ should be chosen over a ‘learned man’ similarly indued [sic] with grace from God’ to minister in church because, ‘That such as are taught by the Spirit of God, destitute of human learning, are the learned ones that truly understand the Scriptures according to Peters minde.’ Samuel How, \textit{The Sufficiency of The Spirits Teaching Without Human Learning} (London: Seen Allowed, and Printed, by us, &c, 1644), un-numbered pp. 23 and 12 respectively. This is the only Tract written by How although, according to EEBO, it was reprinted and reissued on at least four occasions. There is no entry in \textit{Oxford Dictionary of National Biography} for How, however the reprint of the same tract in 1655 included a Postscript written by the Particular Baptist, William Kiffin, who wrote that he was ‘well acquainted’ with How. This would suggest some association between How and the Particular Baptists and explain a similarity in views between How and Denne on the authority to preach. Samuel How, \textit{The Sufficiency of The Spirits Teaching Without Human Learning}
seventeenth century, and it could have been considered dangerous for Denne to be seen defending them. However his defence can be seen to serve another purpose; whilst questioning the reasoning for the attack against the Quakers, it questioned the reasoning for the attack levelled against the Baptists’ authority to preach. Denne wrote ‘It cannot be denied, but that such reports are spread; but does it follow therefore that they are true? It ought rather to be examined by whom they are spread, and to what ends.’

6.4 Anti-Quaker Tracts

In this section I investigate those tracts that were issued between 1652 and 1660 which contain an anti-Quaker content in order to ascertain whether they contain information relevant to the birth of Quakerism. Moore states that between 1652 and 1660 there were 220 known anti-Quaker publications, of which only 74 are extant. Barbour notes that despite this number of anti-Quaker tracts in these years, only six went without a Quaker response. Cherry notes that the harshest critics of Quakers in its formative years were, quite

---

57 The defence of Quakers by Baptists would also have been unexpected when consideration is given to the significantly large number of early Quakers that had once been Baptists. See Chapter 5 above.
59 Occasionally I refer to later anti-Quaker tracts where they contain information relevant to the research.
60 Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Consciences*, Appendix III.
understandably, ministers of other denominations that had lost members to Quakerism.\textsuperscript{62} However, Clapham minimises these losses by referring to the converts to Quakerism as ‘ungrounded and unstable Christians.’\textsuperscript{63} It will also be seen, below, that other strong criticisms came from ex-Quakers.\textsuperscript{64}

For the purposes of reviewing these anti-Quaker tracts I place them in the following three broad categories: publications that link Quakers, rightly or wrongly with other ‘feared’ sects, publications that I call polemical or ‘fanciful’ in that they contain descriptions of events that appear fictional or imaginary, and publications that contain thoughtful arguments, clearly presented and requiring a response.

6.4.1 Linking Quakers with other suspect groups

It was common practice in some anti-Quaker publications not just to condemn Quakers for their beliefs, but to link some of those beliefs accurately, or sometimes maliciously, with the beliefs of other suspect and hated sects of the time. This can be seen to apply, in particular, to the Anabaptists of Continental Europe (following the Münster debacle of the 1530s).\textsuperscript{65} This is the theme of Francis Higginson’s tract from 1653, \textit{A Brief Relation of the Irreligion of the}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{62} Charles L Cherry, ‘Enthusiasm and Madness: Anti-Quakerism in the seventeenth century.’ \textit{Journal of the Friends Historical Association} 73, no. 2, Fall 1984, p. 23.
\item \textsuperscript{63} Jonathan Clapham, \textit{A Full Discovery and Confutation of the damnable Doctrines of the Quakers} (London: Printed by T.R. & E.M. for Adonirem Byfield at the Bible in Pope-head Alley, near Lumbard-street, 1656), p. 74.
\item \textsuperscript{64} Although too late to be of value in this research, the anti-Quaker tract by Henry Pickworth is of interest. It is a very long tract, 407 pages, and in places very critical of Quakers, referring to, p. 406, their ‘Blasphemous Absurdities and Tyrannical Imposition.’ However, on p. 402 of the tract, Pickworth describes himself as ‘still...a Dear Brother, Father, Elder and Overseer of their Society.’ Henry Pickworth, \textit{A Charge of Error, Heresy, Incharity, Falshood, Evasion, Inconsistency, Innovation, Imposition, Infidelity, Hypocrisy, Pride, Railery, Apostacy, Perjury, Idolatry, Villany, Blasphemy, Abomination, Confusion, and Worse than Turkish Tyranny Most Justly exhibited, and offered to be proved against the most noted Leaders, &c of the People called Quakers} (London: Printed for S. Noble in the Long-Walk, hear Christ’s-Hospital, 1716).
\item \textsuperscript{65} George Huntston Williams, \textit{The Radical Reformation} (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2000), pp. 553-588.
\end{itemize}
Northern Quakers, in which he likened Quakers to ‘the turbulent Exorcists of Germany revived in England.’ A similar connection was inferred between Quakers and the Roman Catholics in England, particularly those during the reign of Mary between 1553 and 1558. This claim was made by William Prynne in 1654 when he wrote of information that he had received that ‘two persons were of the same Franciscan order and company…were now become chief speakers amongst the Quakers.’ This can also be seen in Francis Bugg’s later tract of 1697 The Picture of Quakerism where he says: ‘nor do I certainly know that the Jesuits had a hand in their [Quakers] forming.’ Any connection that could be made between Quakers and either of these denominations could enhance the argument being made, a device used by Burrough when he likened the practices of ‘the Protestant Church’ to ‘the Romish Church, Ministry and worship’ because it ‘is sprung out thereof as a branch out of the same root.’ Ephraim Pagitt linked Quakers both to Anabaptists, describing Quakers as ‘an upstart branch of the Anabaptists, lately sprung up’, and to Ranters, ‘The Ranter is an unclean beast,
much of the make with our Quaker, of the same puddle.’\footnote{Ephraim Pagitt, \textit{Heresiography}, p. 259.} Other connections were made to ‘more fanciful’ but perhaps less dangerous, denominations, some of which, however, such as ‘Libertine, Divorcist and Soul-sleeper’ were, according to McGregor ‘phantom sects.’\footnote{J.F. McGregor, ‘Ranterism and the Development of Early Quakerism.’ \textit{Journal of Religious History} 9, Issue 4, December 1977, p. 349.}

One publication from 1645, anti-Anabaptist rather than anti-Quaker, may have set the scene for later anti-Quaker tracts. Entitled \textit{The Anabaptists Catechism}, it was printed in 1645 for an anonymous author and mixed actual Anabaptist beliefs with a few fictitious statements. The expectation of this strategy, I suspect, was that it would be the fictitious ones that would prove the argument that ‘There is more difference between us and you, than between you and the Papists.’\footnote{Anon, \textit{An Anabaptists Catechisme} (Printed for R.A., No place of publication shown, 1645), p. 13.} It sets out actual Anabaptist theology: freedom from all oaths, freedom from bowing down, giving no honour, not killing, and the commonality of goods.\footnote{Anon, \textit{An Anabaptists Catechisme}, p. 5.} It then intersperses these factual statements with the fictitious statement of Anabaptist belief that ‘No man is to lye with his brothers wife, whilst her husband is in presence, except hee be fast asleep or dead drunk.’\footnote{Anon, \textit{An Anabaptists Catechisme}, p. 7.} This ploy was later included in anti-Quaker tracts, as Moore confirms, ‘Accusations of sexual misbehaviour were frequent in anti-Quaker pamphlets.’\footnote{Rosemary Moore, \textit{The Light in Their Consciences}, p. 117.}

A prolific writer of the seventeenth century was the ejected minister and reluctant nonconformist Richard Baxter of Kidderminster.\footnote{See N. H. Keeble, ‘Baxter, Richard (1615–1691)’, \textit{Oxford Dictionary of National Biography} (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009) [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1734, accessed 14 Sept 2012], where it is also noted that Baxter aspired ‘to the creation of a more liberally established national church.’ Early English Books Online accessed 22 March 2011 records 371 publications with Richard Baxter as author. Investigation of this list shows that a number of the entries record different editions of the same tract, but records Baxter to have written a total of approximately 300 tracts during his lifetime. According to Calamy, Baxter was arrested many times and on one occasion he was charged with ‘seditious’ along with the claim ‘thou hast written books enow to fill a cart.’ See Edmund Calamy, \textit{The Nonconformist’s memorial: Being An Account of the Ministers who were ejected or silenced after the Restoration} (Abridged and corrected, and Author’s Additions}
number of tracts that Baxter wrote, twenty-one were anti-Quaker tracts. Baxter’s publication of 1657, *One Sheet against the Quakers*, argues that any Church must have a catechism and fabric i.e. a building. He sets out the main Quaker beliefs with which he disagrees, namely the Quakers’ stance against church ministers and seniority, and their belief in the role of Scripture being ‘the dead letter.’ Baxter then links what he sees as some Quaker beliefs with those held by Catholics and ‘their German Brethren, the Parcelsians, Behemists and Seekers’ because, in Baxter’s words, ‘They [Quakers] rose from among the Papists, Seekers, Ranters, and Anabaptists but awhile ago.’ The argument used by Baxter in this publication is that, in effect, all those who are against the established church must be of the same persuasion. Baxter first used this theme in his tract of 1655, *The Quakers’ Catechism or The Quakers Questioned*. Baxter states ‘I could tell you of abundance of Popery that the Quakers and Behemists maintain’ and ‘All this the Papists have taught the Quakers.’ Baxter also writes ‘And for the doctrine of personal sinless perfection...I think that is a part of the Papists’ dung which they have taught you to feed upon.’ Baxter also linked Quakers with ‘their Brethren the Rantors [sic].’ This tract was then answered by Nayler in a tract of the same year.

---

80 Richard Baxter, *One Sheet against the Quakers*, p. 8.
82 Richard Baxter, *One Sheet against the Quakers*, p. 2. See also Rosemary Moore, *The Light in Their Consciences*, p. 90. Moore writes that ‘Baxter...believed the tales that were circulating about Quakers being Papists in disguise, or likely to behave as the Anabaptists of Münster.’
83 Richard Baxter, *The Quakers’ Catechism or The Quakers Questioned* (London: Printed by A.M. for Thomas Underhill at the Anchor and Bible in Pau’s Churchyard and Francis Tyton at the Three Daggars in Fleetstree, 1655), eleventh un-numbered page in section headed ‘An Answer to a Young unsettled Friend.’
84 Richard Baxter, *The Quakers’ Catechism*, p. 7, in the section headed ‘An answer to the Quakers’ Queries.’
85 Richard Baxter, *The Quakers’ Catechism*, p. 11, in the section headed ‘An answer to the Quakers’ Queries.’
86 James Nayler, *An Answer to a Book called the Quakers Catechism put out by Richard Baxter* (London: no publisher shown August 6, 1655/6).
I described, briefly, in 6.3 above, one carefully argued anti-Quaker tract that found an unexpected defendant of some Quaker views. The background to that tract is that Thomas Smith, the Reader in Rhetoric at Cambridge, took part in a debate with the Quakers George Whitehead, George Fox the Younger and W Allen at Cambridge in 1659. His main arguments were that Quakers were ‘heretics’, that people who did not take the Oath of Abjuration must have been ‘papists’, preachers must have written authority from the church to preach, and that Quakers denied the existence of the Trinity. The publication by Smith was his account of that debate. It includes, at great length, Smith’s arguments, but either reduces or completely omits the counter arguments of the debating Quakers. Attached to the tract, as an addendum, is a copy of a letter sent by Smith to a Mr E of Taft, again arguing that God forbids people who are not ordained by the established church to preach, in particular the ‘Tinker.’ As stated in 6.3 above, the defence of the Quakers’ views came from Henry Denne, one of the first General Baptists, in his paper *The Quaker No Papist*. In his paper, Denne suggests that the debate was unequal because George Whitehead was ‘a person wholly unverst in all manner of Learning...such an undermatch’, and puts forward arguments against Smith that he believes that Whitehead could, or should have used. However, it appears that the main reason for arguing against Smith was not simply to support Quakers, because, as is demonstrated later, there was no unity between Quakers and Baptists on theological issues,

---

88 Thomas Smith, *The Quaker Disarmed* (Printed by J.C. and are sold neer the Little North-Door of S. Pauls Church, 1659), page following A2.
89 Thomas Smith, *The Quaker Disarmed*, page immediately preceding B.
90 Thomas Smith, *The Quaker Disarmed*, page immediately preceding B.
91 Thomas Smith, *The Quaker Disarmed*, page immediately preceding B3.
but because Smith had condemned the ‘Tinker’, otherwise John Bunyan, a fellow Baptist preacher. 94

*The Fanatick History or an exact Relation and Account of the Old Anabaptists and New Quakers*, 95 written in 1660 by Richard Blome, calmly argues against Quakers’ views on water baptism, perfection and ‘Of Light within’ but also recalls the acts of John Gilpin and John Toldervy, sometime Quakers who wrote tracts in 1653 and 1656 respectively of their experiences whilst Quakers (see 6.4.2 below). Blome’s tract then sets out well-constructed arguments against the beliefs of Anabaptists (or perhaps English Baptists), such as believer’s, and not infant baptism, refusal to take oaths and that all may minister if inspired to do so.

Although publications in this category link Quakers with pre-existing groups, no evidence is produced to prove the proposed links.

### 6.4.2 Polemical tracts

It would be all too easy to dismiss tracts that I have put in this category as not carrying an authoritative account of early Quakerism. Nevertheless, they did secure circulation and must have influenced their readers – albeit negatively towards Quakerism. In reading these tracts, it is necessary to heed the advice of Tolmie, ‘we must learn to distinguish the blur in the mind of the percipient [a hostile contemporary] from the sectarian activities we are attempting to reconstruct.’ 96

---


Possibly two of the most extreme sorts of example of anti-Quaker attacks were written by ex-
Quakers. The first is by John Gilpin. Gilpin is mentioned in Fox’s *Journal* in 1654 as having
‘sometimes come amongst us at Kendal who ran out from the truth and vain imaginations.’
In his tract of 1653, *The Quakers Shaken*, Gilpin refers to a number of Quakers by name –
two of which are Christopher Atkinson, who is said by Fox to be ‘that dirty old man...judged
and denied by Friends’, and Cotten Crosland ‘a professed Quaker’ again distanced by Fox
as ‘no more a Quaker than the priest that printed it.’ During one Quaker meeting that he
attended, Gilpin describes how he was ‘drawn from the chair upon which I sat, and throwne
upon the ground...where I lay all night.’ When he arose he went into the town with two
Friends, Dodding and Audland, and knocked on the door of a fiddler. Gilpin writes that he
then heard someone inside say ‘Behold, Christ stands at the door and knocks.’ When Gilpin
was let in, he picked up the ‘Bace-violl’ and began to play on it and dance ‘which I seldom or
never in all my life did before.’ He relates that he heard a voice offering him two Angels to
look after him, and then saw two swallows that he identified as his guardian angels. Later
in the tract he describes these events as ‘Devil’s work’, and that ‘my Quaking and
Trembling was of the devil.’ This tale was retold, almost verbatim, in a 637 page tract, by

97 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 176.
98 John Gilpin, *The Quakers Shaken* (London: Printed for Simon Waterson, and are to be sold at the Crowne in
Pauls Church-Yard, 1653).
notes Atkinson’s ‘illicit love affair’ with the servant of a Norwich Friend, Thomas Symonds. The affair became
public knowledge and as a consequence Atkinson was disowned by Norwich Friends, signed a confession and
then publicly denied by leading Friends. This affair, Moore notes, was the reason given by Friends for the poor
growth of Quakerism in the east of England.
100 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 96, and p. 96, Note 1.
102 A reference to *The Holy Bible (AV)*, Revelation 3:20. ‘Behold, I stand at the door and knock.’
Samuel Clark in 1654, entitled *A Mirrour and Looking Glasse Both For Saints, and Sinners.*

It is likely that, in view of the date of publication of Fox’s *Journal*, see 6.2 above, Fox was aware of Gilpin’s tract before he condemned Gilpin in his *Journal*. But the question remains as to whether this was a totally malicious tract, or whether Gilpin, in his imagination, lived the events he retold.

My second example is a series of ‘fanciful’ tracts by an ex-Quaker written by John Toldervy. Fox wrote of Toldervy as having ‘run out, who had been convinced; and the priests took occasion to make a book of it to render Truth odious in people’s eyes and minds...and died in the Truth.’

This extract from Fox’s *Journal* suggests that as Toldervy returned to Friends Fox took the authorship of the anti-Quaker tracts away from Toldervy and ascribed them to the ‘priests.’

Toldervy’s first tract, dated 24 December 1655, *The Foot out of the Snare*, describes events after he came into contact with Quakers. The spirit in him commanded him to ‘light a fire with dead Coals and Sticks...there should heat proceed with my breath’, then to ‘put my right hand in the pan of hot water’ and ‘to hold my right leg to the Fire.’

The spirit then took the form of ‘a great Fly.’ Toldervy wrote that he then stuck a needle through his two thumbs and stood on a box with his hands outstretched so that ‘I was liken a Death upon the Cross.’ Two months later, he says, he understood that the past events were a delusion and

---


as a consequence he left the Quakers.\textsuperscript{113} This tract was answered in January 1656 by James Nayler who, in his tract \textit{Foot yet in the Snare}, said that Toldervy had ‘caused the truth to be blasphemed’,\textsuperscript{114} which in turn was answered by Toldervy’s \textit{The Snare Broken} published on 31\textsuperscript{16} January 1656. In this latter tract Toldervy asserted that he did not leave Quakers but ‘Quakers did separate from me because of my following a bewitched spirit.’\textsuperscript{115} This was followed up on 22 February 1655/6 with his final tract, \textit{The Naked Truth}, in which Toldervy reflected over his actions and, after reading Nayler’s tract, ‘There was given me clearly to see the right mind in which James Nayler was led’ and that ‘I am sorry...that I should be so foolishly led forth.’\textsuperscript{116} By that time, possibly the damage to Quakers was done!

Although not in itself a ‘fanciful’ tract, one entitled \textit{Strange and Terrible News from Cambridge} recounts the events of a trial of two Quakers at Cambridge.\textsuperscript{117} At the trial, William Allen and ‘Widdow Morlin’ were accused of changing a neighbour, Mary Philips, into a horse and riding her to a meeting of Quakers.\textsuperscript{118} At the trial, the two Quakers were cleared of the charges but the writer of the tract used the trial as proof of the existence of ‘Magicians and Witches’,\textsuperscript{119} and by inference, linking Quakers with those practices. This tract was answered, presumably by a Quaker.\textsuperscript{120} The answering tract linked the events at Cambridge with an un-

\textsuperscript{113} John Toldervy, \textit{The Foot out of the Snare}, pp. 40 and 42.
\textsuperscript{114} James Nayler, \textit{Foot yet in the Snare} (London: Printed for Giles Calvert, at the Black-Spread-Eagle near the West end of Pauls, 1655/6), p. 16.
\textsuperscript{115} John Toldervy, \textit{The Snare Broken or Light discovering Darknesse} (London, Printed for N. Brooks, and are to be sold at the Angel in Cornhill, and at the three Bibles near the West end of Pauls. 1656), pp. 6-7.
\textsuperscript{116} John Toldervy, \textit{The Naked Truth Laid open, Against what is amiss} (London: Printed for G. Calvert, at the Black-Spread–Eagle at the West-end of Pauls, 1655/6), pp. 9-10. It should be noted that for this final tract, Toldervy had resorted to the publisher of Nayler’s tract previously mentioned.
\textsuperscript{117} Un-known author, \textit{Strange & Terrible News from Cambridge being a true Relation of the Quakers bewitching of Mary Philips out of the Bed from her Husband in the night and transformed her into the shape of a Bay Mare} (London: Printed for C. Brooks and are to be sold at the Royal Exchange in Cornhill, 1659).
\textsuperscript{118} Un-known author, \textit{Strange & Terrible News from Cambridge}, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{119} Un-known author, \textit{Strange & Terrible News from Cambridge}, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{120} Un-known author, \textit{A Lying Wonder Discovered and The Strange and Terrible Newes from Cambridge proved false} (London: Printed for Thomas Simmons at the Bull and Mouth near Aldersgate, 1659). As will be seen from many other Quaker publications cited in this thesis, Simmons is the printer of many of them, and so it is
named anti-Quaker paper produced by John Bunyan in which Bunyan is alleged to have recounted the tale of Mary Philips.\textsuperscript{121} William York Tindall suggested that Bunyan wrote his paper on ‘that deplorable affair of the Quakers...in reprisal’ against Quakers, and possibly against Burrough in particular.\textsuperscript{122}

Although falling outside the timescale I set for reviewing anti-Quaker tracts it is, I believe, valuable to consider examples of the anti-Quaker sentiments published in continental Europe. Figure 3 shows a German cartoon contained in the research papers of William Hull at Swarthmore Library, papers that were to be used as the basis for his remaining books in the series relating to the history of Quakerism in the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{123} The only note with the cartoon, in Hulls’ handwriting, suggests that the cartoon relates to ‘Quaker Matricide’, the title shown in the cartoon, and that it was taken from a publication called \textit{Anabaptisticum et Enthusiasticum Pantheon} dated 1702.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{Figure 3: German Cartoon from William Hull's Research Papers} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
Anti-Quaker cartoon contained in the research papers of William Hull held at Swarthmore Library.
I am informed that the ‘poem’ under the picture reads:

‘And so the murder of one’s mother is common among enthusiast/zealots
Here, too, the excuse is the urging of the spirit
Original sin will ruin this son
So the mother herself must die at his hands.’

So, it was not only in England that Quakers were identified with ‘feared sects’, and the book on the table, in the cartoon, appears to link Quakers with Anabaptists.

It is shown that publications in this category that were written by ex-Quakers illustrate extraordinary events in their lives following their convincement to Quakerism. However these publications do not refer to the authors’ pre-Quaker lives.

6.4.3 Reasoned publications

On investigating the well-argued, calm, anti-Quaker Tracts, authors consistently raised the same arguments against Quakers. Baxter talks of ‘their unsound Doctrines about the Trinity & Christ in speciall, & the Scriptures’; Clapham says that Quakers ‘deny the Scriptures to be

---

124 I am indebted to John Dunston, ex-Head of Leighton Park School, and Sünne Juterczenka for the translation of the poem. The theme of matricide by Quakers appeared in an English tract written by William Kays in 1654. In an ‘answer’ to questions purported to having been raised by the Quaker John Whitehead, Kays wrote, ‘they [Quakers] being taught to follow the light in their Consciences…their Conscience telling them that they were to destroy original sin, did therefore, apprehending that their Mother was the fountain thereof, in obedience to the light thats in them…did sacrifice or kill their own Mother.’ William Kays, *A Plain Answer to the Eighteen Quaeries of John Whitehead Commonly called Quaker* (London: Printed for N. E., 1654), p. 5.

125 It is possible that the cartoon was originally anti-Anabaptist, as suggested by the book shown on the table in the cartoon, but acquired and adapted at a later date to refer to Quakers.

the Word of God’, 127 ‘they will confess no other Christ but...Christ in their flesh’; 128 ‘they dare maintain equality with God’; 129 ‘hold no other resurrection, judgement, heaven and hell, but what is now in men’; 130 ‘are enemies to all the Ordinances of Jesus Christ’; 131 and ‘are enemies to Civility and good manners.’ 132

In *A Looking Glasse for the Quakers*, 1656/7, Thomas Collier, tells that Quakers ‘see no need of the flesh of Christ, but must have it all in spirit’, 133 ‘Nayler...calls the ordinances of Christ in contempt’, 134 ‘levelling all conditions’, 135 and in reference to Nayler’s entry into Bristol, ‘they would not own nor believe in any other Christ then that within them; and now they have found one without them.’ 136

These very same arguments, with the exception of the Nayler incident, were the main topics discussed in the debate between Bunyan and Burrough in 1656-7, summarised by Holland as ‘Christ without v Christ within’, ‘Light of Christ, Conscience and the Holy Spirit’, ‘Salvation and Holiness’ and ‘Eschatology.’ 137 These same arguments are also contained in the tract of 1693/4, by Francis Bugg, *Quakerism Withering*. 138

An example of the answers to these claims can be found in Burrough’s *Truth Defended or Certain Accusations Answered* where Burrough sets out Quaker beliefs of the time: ‘no other

---

136 Thomas Collier, *A Looking-Glasse for the Quakers*, p. 16. See 5.3.4 above.
138 Francis Bugg, *Quakerism Withering and Christianity Reviving or A brief Reply to the Quakers Pretended Vindication* (London: Printed for the Author, and sold by J Dunton at the Raven in the Poultry and J. Guillam, Bookseller in Bishopsgate-Street, 1694).
Christ do we declare forth, which we witness to be manifest within, but that Christ which dyed at Jerusalem...which said, he was the light of the world’, 139 ‘no other gospel do we preach but that which the apostle preached, which they received not from nor by man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ’, 140 ‘we deny all such...conforming the outward man to the outward letter...we deny all baptisms which are imagined...communion we live in, which is in the light by the spirit’, 141 ‘And we deny all the worlds Churches, whereof they were made members by visible things without, and gathered by tradition.’ 142 In this response, Burrough appears to be accepting the arguments put forward by opponents, and simply restating the Quaker position but using his opponent’s language.

Publications in this category are theological in content, and publications in all three categories discussed refer to the ‘arrived at’ Quaker position and not the path followed to arrive there.

Publications of reasoned documents relating to Quaker beliefs were not confined to England. In Chapter 7 below I discuss the contact made by Quakers with individuals and groups in continental Europe, and in that chapter I consider the history of Quakerism written by Gerard Croese (sometimes Kroese) in the Netherlands in 1695/6. 143 Although, as described by Clark, Croese’s book deals with the history of Quakersim ‘from a hostile standpoint’, 144 it is

---

143 Gerard Croese, *The General History of the Quakers* (Being written originally in Latin, London: Printed for John Dunton, at the Raven in Jewen-Street, 1696). At about the same time as Croese’s book was published, a book appeared in France. P. Francois Catrou, *Histoire des Anabaptistes* (Paris: Chez Charles Clouzier, various dates shown, but likely to be 1695). A transcript of a section of this book is contained in the Papers of William Hull, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania. Box 29, Folder ‘Research and miscellaneous research notes’ and relates to the advent of Quakerism in England. On p. 635, Quakers are likened to Anabaptists and on p. 646 Catrou refers to the ‘Familists who joined with him [Fox].’ In the same tract, Fox is described in unflattering terms as ‘the pig keeper’, p. 636, and ‘the big and fat visionary’, p. 637. As with Croese’s book, despite its invective, Catrou’s presentation of early Quaker beliefs is accurate when compared with published Quaker material of the period.
apparent on reading it that its only source is Fox’s *Journal* which had been published in England only a year or two before Croese’s book. In effect, Croese’s book is a summary of Fox’s *Journal* along with Croese’s commentary.

### 6.5 Pamphlet Wars

In this section I investigate the exchange of publications between Quakers and non-Quakers that continued beyond a single response to either of them. By looking at these documents as a separate category of publication it is seen how the exchanges relating to elements of Quaker belief with which the non-Quaker protagonist disagreed developed.

During the 1650s, it has been shown above, many Quaker and anti-Quaker tracts were published that were individual and self-contained. The great majority of anti-Quaker tracts, as shown in 6.4 above, were countered with a single Quaker response. I would not include such tracts under the heading of ‘Pamphlet Wars.’ Moore suggests that the first ‘Pamphlet War’, or perhaps more correctly titled, a ‘pamphlet battle’ took place in 1653 between James Nayler and Thomas Weld. The schedule underlying Moore’s statistics contained in Appendix III in

---

145 Nor would I include in this category such Quaker tracts as Fox’s *The Great Mistry of the Great Whore* which was a single response to one hundred and fourteen anti-Quaker tracts. Moore records this tract as being compiled by Fox in the years 1657 and 1658, and was produced to answer a total of one hundred and fourteen anti-Quaker tracts and ‘various manuscripts and oral sources.’ Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Consciences*, pp. 46-47. I also exclude in this sub-section, but include in Chapter 7 below, the Pamphlet War that took place in the Netherlands between Quakers and the Collegiants and Mennonites as they took place after the date following Quakers’ first visit to the Netherlands and so occurred too late to have influenced Quakerism’s beginnings in England. See also William I. Hull, *The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam* (Philadelphia: Swarthmore College Monographs on Quaker History, 1938), p. 232. The catalyst for many anti-Quaker publications in the Netherlands was the same as one of the reasons for them in England, see 6.5 above, because it was those congregations in the Netherlands ‘out of which came so many converts to Quakerism.’ Smith also records in *Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana*, pp. 1, 2, 11, 168, 257, 391 and 396, a number of anti-Quaker tracts written in the Netherlands between the years 1657 and 1662, and some undated publications, which were answered in the Netherlands by the Quaker William Ames.

her book shows that Nayler was involved with the writing of three pamphlets arguing against
the propositions put forward by Weld in his publications. 147

In considering the publications constituting these battles, it is noticeable that many of the
arguments were a result of misunderstanding the language used by the opponents. Although
Quakers were immersed in the language of the Bible, 148 they exhibited an inability to express
their beliefs in language that their adversaries could, or would, understand. For example,
Moore argues that most of the authors who argued against Quakers could not understand the
Quaker concept of the ‘light in the conscience’, 149 and Quakers did not help when they
refused ‘even to pay lip service to traditional Christian formulations.’ 150 In tracts written in
the years before 1656, theological differences resulted in the two sides adopting different
usages of language. 151 At about the time of the Bunyan/Burrough debate, 1656/7, Moore
suggests that as Quakers were, by then, beginning to consider their public image, Burrough
adopted ‘conventional language.’ 152

The battle that Nayler had with Weld, mentioned above, resulted in Nayler writing three
responses to Weld’s misunderstanding of the Quaker concept of the ‘light in their
consciences.’ Nayler took up the battle again about two years later with John Toldervy, a

147 See below in this sub-section. I am grateful to Rosemary Moore for giving me access to the background
material in the form of Excel spreadsheets she had assembled in producing the Table.
149 Rosemary Moore, The Light in Their Consciences, p. 103.
150 Rosemary Moore, The Light in Their Consciences, p. 109. According to Hughes, not arguing by the accepted
rules of debate was common to sectaries in general, not just Quakers, and that both radicals and orthodox
disputants believed that ‘the truth would emerge inevitably through honest debate, although they differed over
what that truth was.’ Ann Hughes, ‘The Pulpit Guarded’, pp. 35 and 40.
151 Roger Pooley, ‘Plain and Simple: Bunyan and Style’ in Ed. N.H. Keeble, John Bunyan: Conventicle and
152 Rosemary Moore, The Light in Their Consciences, p. 105. Como records that this same problem existed with
the writings of the Grindleton, Roger Brearley. ‘Brearley repeatedly suggested that what his opponents had
objected to was his tendency to use ‘new words’ to describe the formal truths of protestant doctrine’ and
‘Brearley conceded that he had used unfamiliar phrases…they were the medium of a new message.’ David R.
Como, Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War
England (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2004), pp. 283-284. See also 5.3.10 above for an
overview of the Grindletonians.
battle that Nayler appears to have won following his single publication *Foot yet in the Snare* which he wrote in answer to Toldervy’s two earlier publications.\(^{153}\) Nayler’s publication resulted in Toldervy’s apology contained in his final publication.\(^{154}\)

According to the dates of publication, shortly after his ‘success’ over Toldervy, Nayler responded to a book by Thomas Collier, referred to by Nayler as ‘A Dialogue between a Minister and a Christian.’ Collier’s book, according to Nayler, set out fifty-four allegations regarding Quaker beliefs.\(^{155}\) Of relevance to this research, Nayler quotes one of Collier’s statements, ‘That our [Quaker] principles are but the principles of the Old Ranters.’\(^{156}\) In his tract, although he does address Collier’s theological accusations, Nayler does not address the Ranters’ charge directly, nor affirm that he had any contact with Ranters. In the preamble to his response Nayler refers to the ‘abominable falsehoods’, and ‘thy lies’ to all of Collier’s allegations. In his response to Nayler’s document, Collier notes the all-embracing response by Nayler when he writes: ‘The manner of Nayler’s pretended Answer, is...what I have writ, and saying they are all lies; this is the substance of his Answer.’\(^{157}\) Collier then reasserts his belief ‘That their [Quakers] principles are but the principles of the old Ranters, that is true, I need not prove in this place.’\(^{158}\) The charges in this later publication by Collier were not taken up by Nayler. However, in the following year, 1658, the Quakers John Pitman and Jasper Batt made a detailed rebuttal to Collier’s charges, including that of sharing the Ranters’

\(^{153}\) See 6.5.2 above, and James Nayler, *Foot yet in the Snare*. The frontispiece of this publication shows that Nayler had written it in response to Toldervy’s tracts as well as those by Matthew Pool, William Jenkin, John Tombs, John Goodwin, William Adderley, George Cockain, Thomas Jacob and Thomas Brooks.

\(^{154}\) John Toldervy, *The Naked Truth Laid open*, p. 10. ‘I am sorry (as I have said) that I should be so foolishly led forth’.

\(^{155}\) James Nayler, *Deceit Brought to Daylight in answer to Thomas Collier, What he hath declared in a book called, A Dialogue between a Minister, and a Christian* (London: Printed by T.L. for Giles Calvert at the black-Spread-Eagle neer the West end of Pauls, 1656), pp. 2-7.

\(^{156}\) James Nayler, *Deceit Brought to Daylight*, p. 5.


principles.\textsuperscript{159} In this tract, Pitman and Batt adopt the same stance as Collier. In responding to the charge of sharing the Ranters’ principles, as well as in their responses to many other charges, they begin ‘Another lye by him charged upon us.’\textsuperscript{160} After condemning Collier for not providing proof of his claim, Pitman and Batt list seven Ranter principles and demonstrate where they differ from those of the Quakers.\textsuperscript{161} There is no record of Collier responding to Pitman and Batt’s publication.\textsuperscript{162}

It has been suggested that John Bunyan, one of the eminent Baptists of the seventeenth century, had been impressed in his youth by the theology and practices of the Ranters and that these thoughts remained with him and enabled him to incorporate them in his pamphlet battle with the Quaker, Edward Burrough, over the years 1656 and 1657.\textsuperscript{163} Holland sets out the theological arguments used by both sides of this debate,\textsuperscript{164} but I concentrate in this section only on the links that Bunyan argued had existed between Quakers and other ‘feared’ sects of the time.

In the opening tract by Bunyan he refers to the ‘pernicious Doctrines’ of the Quakers,\textsuperscript{165} and then suggests that the theology preached by the Quakers was attractive to the Ranters and

\textsuperscript{159} John Pitman and Jasper Batt, \textit{Truth Vindicated and The Lyars Refuge swept away: Being an Answer to a Book by Thomas Collier called a Looking glasse for Quakers} (London: Printed for Thomas Simmons, at the Bull and Mouth near Aldersgate, 1658).
\textsuperscript{160} John Pitman and Jasper Batt, \textit{Truth Vindicated}, p. 21.
\textsuperscript{161} John Pitman and Jasper Batt, \textit{Truth Vindicated}, pp. 22-23. The text of the tract does not make it clear from where Pitman and Batt obtained the list of Ranter principles however, in quoting the list they refer to publications by George Bishop, Ralph Farmer and Thomas Collier. Briefly, the seven principles quoted are, (1) No Christ but within, (2) No Scripture to be a rule, (3) No Ordinances, (4) No Law, (5) No heaven nor glory ‘but here’, (6) No sin, and (7) No condemnation for sin.
\textsuperscript{162} There is no record on Early English Books Online of publications by Collier from 1658 that refer to any dispute with Quakers. It is interesting to note that up to and including 1652, all bar one of Collier’s publications were printed by Giles Calvert who, it is seen in this thesis, was the printer for the majority of early Quaker tracts. From 1653 onwards, Collier used a number of different printers, and Calvert was used on only one occasion.
\textsuperscript{164} Richard James Holland, \textit{The Debate between John Bunyan and Edward Burrough}.
\textsuperscript{165} John Bunyan, \textit{Some Gospel Truths opened according to the Scriptures} (London: Printed for J. Wright the younger at the Kings Head in the Old-bailey, 1656), thirty-third un-numbered page.
‘light Notionists’ who Bunyan describes as ‘Unstable Souls.’\(^{166}\) In his response Burrough, in referring to the ‘lyes’ put forward by Bunyan,\(^{167}\) counters Bunyan’s accusation by stating that there is no more union and likenessee [between Quakers and Ranters] then between light and Darknesse, good and Evill’ and claims not to know much of Ranters’ beliefs although he does ‘know better their [the Familists’] principles.’\(^{168}\) Later, in this tract, Burrough does not deny that a number of former members of these ‘feared sects’ had become Quakers and treats this as a compliment that ‘the wicked should be turned from his wickednesse’, but that these conversions do not provide ‘evidence against us, that we are deceivers’ but conversely provides evidence against Bunyan’s ‘wicked slander.’\(^{169}\) Whilst accepting ex-Ranters and ‘light Notionists’ into the Quaker body, Burrough is unequivocal in his condemnation of their former, and Bunyan’s current beliefs.\(^{170}\) On two later occasions within his tract, Burrough appears to have grown tired of defending Quakers against Bunyan’s arguments linking Quakers with other groups, ‘I passe by also, lest thou shouldst say I justifie the Ranters.’\(^{171}\) He finishes his tract in a similar vein denying any link between Quakers and the Ranters, ‘I find thee making up the sum of thy wickednesse with this, numbering the Quakers with Ranters, Sin, Death and the Devil’, and taking the moral high ground, declines to make any accusations against Bunyan but ‘the Lord [will] rebuke thee thou unclean spirit.’\(^{172}\) The two

---

\(^{166}\) John Bunyan, *Some Gospel Truths opened*, thirty-fourth un-numbered page. It is possible that, in attacking Quakers, Bunyan was expressing his views on all sects and not just Quakers. See John Bunyan, *The Life of John Bunyan*, p. 93. ‘I am a Christian...And for all those factious titles of Anabaptists, Independents, Presbyterians, or the like, I conclude they come...from Hell...for they naturally tend to divisions.’


\(^{170}\) Edward Burrough, *The True Faith of the Gospel of Peace*, p. 9. ‘But the Ranters, and light Notionists and Thee we doe deny, in that state wherein they and you doe stand till you turn to the Lord by repentence...if you turn from your iniquity, we dare not deny you.’


tracts that followed, Bunyan’s *Vindication* and Burrough’s *Truth (the stongest of all) Witnessed*, dropped any discussion on the linking of Quakers to other groups and reverted to theological discussions. These discussions are summarised in the following categories by Holland: ‘Christ without v Christ within’, ‘Light of Christ, Conscience and the Holy Spirit’, ‘Salvation and Holiness’ and ‘Eschatology.’ It is interesting to note that, during the period covered by this exchange of publications by Bunyan and Burrough, Burrough published another tract that can be described as a general declaration of Quaker principles. This latter tract makes no specific reference to the Bunyan tracts, nor any accusation of Quakers’ associations with other groups.

6.6 Chapter summary

It is important, when looking at the early stages of Quakerism, to review a wide scope of Quaker publications, and similarly to consider all types of anti-Quaker tracts. It has been suggested by Moore that it would not seem to be appropriate to accept all Quaker material, at face value, and similarly, this thesis suggests that it is not appropriate to deride all anti-Quaker material, even that which I have described as ‘fanatical’ or polemical. They all add to the overall picture.

---

179 Edward Burrough, *Truth Defended*. 
In this Chapter I reviewed the publications that describe the early days of Quakersim: Fox’s *Journal*, Quaker and anti-Quaker tracts, and some of those publications that comprised the pamphlet war between Quakers and non-Quakers. In all the documents reviewed, there is no evidence, although there are unsubstantiated claims made by non-Quakers, that Fox and his colleagues acquired their Quaker position by consciously adopting beliefs and practices from members of pre-existing religious groups. It was acknowledged, however, that a number of leading early Quakers were previously members of some of those groups, and this was investigated in detail in Chapter 5.

In Chapter 7, I review the documented contacts that Quakers made with Anabaptists in continental Europe and with English Baptists.
CHAPTER 7

THE DUTCH CONNECTION: EARLY QUAKERS’ TRAVELS

IN THE NETHERLANDS

7.1 Introduction

In Chapter 5 I examined the early life of George Fox with particular reference to the people that he met during his years of religious seeking. I also investigated the lives of the other early Quakers, with particular emphasis being placed upon the contact that they had with Baptist or Anabaptist groups in England prior to them arriving at their Quaker positions.

In this chapter I look more closely at the Baptist/Anabaptist contacts made in England by those first Quakers who travelled to the Netherlands. The contacts investigated are those made immediately in advance of their travels to the Netherlands. I then examine evidence for possible contact between the proto-Quakers and Dutch religious groups prior to the first Quaker visits to the Netherlands. A brief overview then follows, of the social and religious environment facing those first Quaker travellers in the Netherlands and I conclude this chapter by outlining the recorded events of those first Quaker visits to the Netherlands.

The objectives of this chapter are to identify the personal contacts made by the proto-Quakers and the early Quakers with Anabaptists in England and in the Netherlands, and to establish reasons for the first Quaker targeting of the Netherlands as a suitable place to deliver their religious message. In particular, I examine the possibility that the early Quakers had identified

---

1 See 1.1.1 above for the definition I have adopted for ‘the Netherlands’ in this thesis.
a commonality between their theology and that of certain Dutch religious groups and, if that
was the case, consider the period during which, and the ways in which that knowledge had
been obtained.

7.2 Quaker contacts with Anabaptists/Baptists in England

7.2.1 Contacts pre-convincement

In Chapter 5 I described the contacts that a number of early Quakers had with Anabaptists and
Baptists in England leading up to the time of their convincement to Quakerism and, in some
cases, after their convincements. Peters notes that the early Quakers targeted Baptists and
Independents for conversion, and evidence of this was set out in 3.2.2 above.\(^2\) In Chapters 4
and 5 I outlined the many contacts that George Fox had with members of Baptist
congregations.

It was shown in 2.4.2 above that an approach was made in 1615 by the congregation of John
Smyth in Amsterdam to join with the Waterlander Mennonite congregation in that city.
Thomas Helwys, who was baptized by Smyth, had contact with that same group of
Mennonites in Amsterdam prior to his return to England in 1611 to establish his own
congregation.

Reynier Wybrands (or Wybrantz), a preacher in the Waterlander Mennonite congregation
approached by Smyth,\(^3\) maintained a record of the social, or municipal events of the
Waterlander Mennonite congregation in Amsterdam between the years 1612 and 1641,

referred to in this thesis as Mem. A. Wybrands also produced a record of the proceedings of that same congregation, including applications for membership and baptisms between 1612 and 1660, referred to in this thesis as Mem. B.

In Appendix 3, I explain the procedure that I adopted in order to identify any possible correlation between the names of potential English people recorded in Mem. A and Mem. B, along with English people associated with the congregations of John Smyth, Thomas Helwys and John Robinson, which I call the ‘Dutch list’, set out in Appendix 4, and the names of early Quakers and early contacts of Fox, which I call the ‘English list’ set out in Appendices 5 and 6 respectively.

It is found that there is no correlation, even allowing for spelling variations, between the names on the Dutch list with those on the English list.

I suggest that this part of the current research indicates no direct contact between proto-Quakers and the Amsterdam Waterlander Mennonite congregation.

---

4 Memoriael van de handelingen bij de Gemeenke voor Reynier Wybrantzen, ‘A’ 1612-1641. The original is held at the StadsArchief, Amsterdam and this researcher used a transcription from the original by Frank Mertens and Peter van der Lee at the University of Amsterdam.

5 Memoriael van de handelingen bij de Dienaren voor Reynier Wybrantzen, ‘B’. The original is held at the StadsArchief, Amsterdam and this researcher used a transcription from the original by Frank Mertens and Peter van der Lee at the University of Amsterdam.

6 It is noted that there are 20 people on the Dutch list with the same or similar family names as families on the English list but with different first names. For example, the English list shows Thomas Briggs and the Dutch list shows Joane Briggs, the English list shows John and James Dickinson and the Dutch list shows Bettoris Dickenson. Sprunger records that an Englishman, Richard Overton, applied for membership of the Amsterdam Waterlander Mennonites in 1615. Keith L. Sprunger, Dutch Puritanism: A History of English and Scottish Churches in the Netherlands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1982), pp. 86-7. There is no record of anyone of that name in Mem. A or in Mem. B applying for membership, but there are references in January 1615 to un-named ‘Engelschen’, Mem. A, folio f. 13r, and to ‘engelsen’, Mem. B, folio 13v.
7.2.2 Contacts prior to travelling to the Netherlands

The first recorded visit of Quakers to the Netherlands was that of John Stubbs and William Caton in 1655, and this visit is recorded by Caton in his Life of William Caton.\(^7\)

Documentation describing Caton’s life indicates no likely contact between Caton and Baptists prior to his travels from Swarthmoor where he was living with the Fells.\(^8\) A possible contact at Swarthmoor would be as a result of the Fells’ open door policy to travelling ministers.\(^9\) It has been shown that John Stubbs was a member of a Baptist congregation prior to his convincement in 1653.\(^10\)

After meeting up in London sometime around 1654,\(^11\) Caton and Stubbs travelled together to Dover where Stubbs went to a ‘meeting of the Anabaptists (so called)’ and later they both had a meeting ‘in the Baptists Meeting-place.’\(^12\) Stubbs records that ‘I [Stubbs] have as much liberty amongst the Baptists as I would desire’,\(^13\) and Caton records that during that visit to Dover, they were instrumental in the convincement of Luke Howard ‘who hath been a Baptist.’\(^14\) Travelling approximately twelve miles due west to Hythe in Kent ‘the Baptists

---


\(^8\) A background to Caton’s life is set out in 5.3.11 above.

\(^9\) See 5.3.6 above.

\(^10\) See 5.4.8 above.

\(^11\) William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, pp. 14-15. Caton does not record having met Stubbs before this time, but he records his meeting with Stubbs as ‘with my dear brother’, suggesting either prior acquaintance or, possibly, a meeting arranged by Fox or Margaret Fell.

\(^12\) William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 18. See also letter from John Stubbs to Francis Howgill and Edward Burrough, Dover 19\(^{th}\) day 12\(^{th}\) Month 1654, MSS 151 held at Friends House Library, London, in which Stubbs describes his visit to ‘a steeplehouse of Independents...There was a captain in that Baptist meeting.’

\(^13\) Letter from John Stubbs to Francis Howgill and Edward Burrough. Access to Baptist meetings was possibly a result of Stubbs’ previous membership of a Baptist congregation, see 5.4.8 above.

\(^14\) William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, pp. 19 and 22. See also Letter from John Stubbs to Francis Howgill and Edward Burrough, where Stubbs records that Howard ‘hath been a Baptist and his wife...this 10 or 11 years but hath no rest.’
allowed us the use of their meeting room’, and then a further nine miles due west to Romney and Lydd, where Stubbs was allowed to speak at a Baptist meeting. At some time, it is not certain from Caton’s account whether it was before or after their visit to Lydd, they were welcomed by the ‘Baptists and Independents so called’ in Canterbury, approximately thirty miles north of Lydd. Caton then records that at Sandwich, in Kent, they met ‘Dutch people at their Steeple House.’ Caton does not describe the theology of those Dutch people, whether they were Mennonites or members of the Calvinist Dutch Reformed church. I suggest that, as Caton describes their place of meeting as a ‘Steeple House’ then that congregation would have been affiliated to the established church in the Netherlands, the Dutch Reformed church. Caton says of that meeting ‘the truth could get but little entrance to that place.’ Although neither Caton nor Stubbs had any knowledge of the Dutch language, it is probable that, in order to undertake business in England, the Dutch people that Caton and Stubbs met had some proficiency in the English language and so could understand Caton and Stubbs. It seems more likely, I suggest, that ‘little entrance’ could be obtained into that congregation because of the very different theology being preached by Caton and Stubbs.

---

15 William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 23. It is suggested, in Caton’s account, that during this visit to Hythe he and Stubbs had a friendly meeting with the Baptists there but that afterwards, I suggest as a result of acquiring a number of converts ‘[the Baptists became] our great opposers.’


19 See 2.3.3 above.

20 See Keith L. Sprunger, ‘Mennonite Debates about Church Architecture in Europe and America: Questions of History and Theology,’ p. 314, John M. Janzen, ‘Anabaptist-Mennonite Spaces and places of Worship,’ p. 154, and Piet Visser, ‘Wherever Christ is among us we will gather’: Mennonite Worship Places in the Netherlands,’ p. 226, all articles in *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 73, no. 2, April 1999. These articles describe the lack of ‘steeples’ in early Mennonite church architecture and the simple and functional exterior design of such buildings in England and in the Netherlands. It is interesting to note that Bulteel, writing in 1645, refers to Dutch Reformed church congregations in Sandwich and Maidstone in Kent. Thus, I suggest, adding weight to my suggestion that the congregation that Caton met in Sandwich was Dutch Reformed and not Mennonite. J.B. [John Bulteel], *A Relation of the Troubles of the three foreign Churches in Kent* (Imprinted at London for Sam. Enderbie at the Starre in Popes head Alley, 1645), p. 4.


which adds weight to my suggestion that the congregation was Dutch Reformed rather than Mennonite.

It is recorded that, for a short time, Caton and Stubbs then went their separate ways, as Caton says that ‘it was upon me to go over to Calais.’\(^{23}\) After witnessing the French practicing their Roman Catholicism and, I suggest, not being able to understand each other’s language, Caton returned to Dover, meeting up again with Stubbs.\(^{24}\) Caton writes, at that time, ‘it was upon John Stubbs to go to Holland, and I was made very free in the Lord to accompany him.’\(^{25}\) Caton does not indicate a logical or strategic reason for Stubbs deciding to go to the Netherlands. A number of reasons are possible:

1. After France, it was the next closest country to visit with ships regularly sailing there.
2. With so much trade existing between the two countries, it seemed only sensible for religion to take the same course.\(^{26}\)
3. During their meetings with the expatriate Dutch and the native English Baptist communities in Kent, Caton and Stubbs came to realise that in the Netherlands there existed a number of religious communities with beliefs that overlapped those of the Quakers, and so would be fertile ground for convincements.
4. Caton and Stubbs could see the established English and Scottish churches in

---


‘The [Dutch] States General passed an Act, on the 9\(^{th}\) January 1587, encouraging the introduction into the Netherlands of British manufactured cloth and woollen stuffs.’ Martin takes this further when she describes ‘a rich exchange between reform-minded parties all over the continent [of Europe, including England in this context].’ Lucinda Martin, ‘Female Reformers as Gatekeepers of Pietism: The Example of Johanna Eleanor Merlau and William Penn.’ *Monatshefte* 95, no. 1, 2003, p. 33.
the Netherlands as fertile ground for converts,\textsuperscript{27} or, more speculatively,

5. Caton and Stubbs already knew of a pre-existing connection between the early proto-Quakers and Dutch non-conformist congregations, and their meetings with the Dutch exiles in Kent confirmed their desire to learn more of that connection.

There is no surviving evidence in support of Hull’s claim that ‘it [travelling to the Netherlands] originated in the wise and devoted circle of Swarthmore Hall.’\textsuperscript{28} It is interesting to note that similar words, again without authentication, were subsequently used by Tolles when referring to possibility of guidance emanating from Swarthmore Hall on the travels of Quakers to the Americas.\textsuperscript{29}

In the next section I review the relationship that existed between England and the Netherlands in the period leading up to the first visit there by Caton and Stubbs in order to help identify a reason for Caton and Stubbs’ decision to visit there. That and subsequent visits are investigated in 7.4 below.

\textsuperscript{27} See 7.3.2 below for an account of the growth of these churches in the Netherlands.

\textsuperscript{28} William I. Hull, \textit{The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam}, p. 17. See Ed. Elsa F. Glines, \textit{Undaunted Zeal: The Letters of Margaret Fell} (Richmond, Indiana: Friends United Press, 2003). In her book, Glines includes transcriptions of ‘all her [Margaret Fell] known letters’, a total of one hundred and sixty-four, p. xvii. Glines also concludes that, as there is evidence that many more letters had been written to her, then ‘many others [letters from Margaret Fell] have been lost.’ p. xvii. The transcripts of the extant letters written by Margaret Fell in the years up to and including 1655, a total of forty-seven letters, pp. 9-169, make no reference to Quakers travelling, or intending to travel, to the Netherlands. None of the letters are addressed specifically to Ames, Caton or Stubbs. The only possible reference by Fell to Quakers being overseas is made in Letter No. 36, p. 126, addressed ‘To all Friends, Brethren and Sisters’ and dated, with some reservation by Glines as 1655. The reference is to ‘the Brethren beinge [sic] gone into soe farr & remote places.’

\textsuperscript{29} Frederick B. Tolles, \textit{The Atlantic Community of the Early Friends} (London: Journal of the Friends Historical Society, Supplement No. 24, 1952), p. 19. ‘No executive body planned it [the visits of Quakers to the Americas in the period 1655-1662]...If there was any planning and guidance it came from Swarthmore Hall.’
7.3 Society and Religion in the Netherlands leading up to 1655

7.3.1 The English view of the Netherlands

For many years, in Hull’s words, ‘there had been a rapprochement and mutual assimilation between Dutch and English.’ In addition to the Dutch exiles in Kent, it is recorded that there were many Dutch merchants based in Norwich, and whereas this was perceived as good for trade, it had not been seen, in England, as beneficial on religious grounds. Dutch religious views were available in England. Jeremy Bangs records the visit to England in 1642 of Johan Heinrich Hottinger who, although not a Mennonite himself, was ‘familiar with the Dutch theological climate and with the conditions of Dutch society in which Mennonites could be, and were, tolerated.’ Two years later, John Durie returned to England having studied at Saumur, Leiden and Oxford to work on achieving unity amongst the churches of ‘Switzerland, Sweden, Germany, England and the Netherlands.’

Despite the knowledge of the Netherlands and the Dutch circulating in England by means of the contacts mentioned above, Owen Felltham, in 1659, painted an unflattering picture of the Netherlands, describing it as ‘The Great Bog of Europe’ where the ‘people are generally Boorish.’ One aspect of Amsterdam that Felltham describes, and had been observed by previous visitors, was that ‘Tis an University of all Religions, which grow here...without

31 See 7.2.2 and 4.2.2 above. Also Keith L. Sprunger, Dutch Puritanism, p. 30, ‘the Bishop of Norwich complained in 1530 that erroneous religious beliefs most infected ‘merchants and such that hath their abiding not far from the sea.’
33 Jeremy Depertuis Bangs, Letters on Toleration, p. 28.
34 Owen Felltham, A Brief Character of the Low-Countries under the States. Being three weeks observation of the Vices and Vertues of the Inhabitants (London: Printed for H.S. and are to be sold by Rich. Lowndes, at the White Lion in St. Pauls Church-yard, neer the little North-door, 1659), pp. 1 and 26.
either order or pruning. If you are unsettled in your Religion, you may here try all.\(^{35}\) Hull confirmed this tolerant attitude existing in Amsterdam, ‘except [for] the Papists, to encourage trade there’, \(^{36}\) and for that reason, and the variety of sects located there, it may have attracted the first Quakers.\(^{37}\)

With this knowledge of the Netherlands, and its atmosphere of religious toleration, it is not surprising that it attracted the attention of members of various religious denominations in England.

### 7.3.2 The English (and Scottish) in the Netherlands

In Chapter 2 I outlined the travels to the Netherlands of various English non-conformist groups, beginning with the Brownists in 1581-2, in search of tolerance and freedom of worship.\(^{38}\) That chapter concentrated on the contact made by those English groups with Mennonite communities. In addition to those non-conformist travellers to the Netherlands, Anglicans sought permission from the Rotterdam authorities to build a church in Rotterdam. Hull recorded the first approach being made in 1611 with eventual permission being granted in 1627.\(^{39}\) Hull offered no explanation for the reason why the Anglican Church made this application, but I suggest that the establishment of this church was to meet the religious needs

---

\(^{35}\) Owen Felltham, *A Brief Character of the Low-Countries*, p. 45.


\(^{37}\) William I. Hull, *The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam*, p. 9. Possibly unknown to the first Quakers was the instruction given by William the Silent to his magistrates in Middleburg in the Netherlands in 1577 that ‘the Yea’ of his Mennonite petitioners must be received by the magistrates instead of an oath. See William I. Hull, *The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam*, p. 231. Thus, Mennonites in Middleburg achieved what the Quakers in England achieved over one hundred years later following the passing of the Affirmation Acts 1695-6.

\(^{38}\) See 2.4.1 above.

\(^{39}\) William I. Hull, *Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam* (Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Swarthmore College Monographs, 1941), p. 180. See also 4.2.3 and 4.2.4 above.
of the expatriate English people in the Netherlands. As such, and being Calvinist Presbyterian in character, it would be perceived by the Dutch authorities as no threat to the Calvinist Dutch Reformed Church.

The foothold planted by the English established church was followed, in 1642, by the established Scottish Church which constructed a church building, under Dutch state sponsorship, in Rotterdam. From that time onwards, other Church of England and Church of Scotland churches were set up across the Netherlands to meet the needs of the increasing English and Scottish population there. Again, as these churches were built with the permission and sponsorship of the relevant city and State authorities, there is no record of any animosity existing between these churches and the State or the Dutch Reformed church.

It has been suggested that Quakers ‘emerged’ in the Netherlands before the first recorded travels there in 1655 by Caton and Stubbs. Hull wrote of the confusion that existed in the minds of some who identified Quakers with the Collegiants, a sect that established itself in the Netherlands in 1619. Hull recorded that this confusion was exacerbated by Petrus Rabus ‘the Rotterdam Critic and editor’ who confirmed the Collegiants as ‘these forerunners of

---

40 Fred. Oudschans Dentz noted that, prior to 1611, Anglican church services were held for English expatriates by Chaplains of the British Ambassadors at their residences. From 1585 permission was granted for the use of a former Roman Catholic Chapel in Noordeinde in order to conduct Anglican services for English soldiers based in the Netherlands. Fred. Oudschans Dentz, History of the English Church at the Hague 1586-1929 (Delft (Holland): W.D. Meinema, 1929), p. 13 and p. 16.
41 See 2.3.3 above.
42 William Steven, The History of the Scottish Church, Rotterdam, p. 2.
43 William Steven, The History of the Scottish Church, Rotterdam. See pages 269-344 which set out the history and locations of each of the churches. The cities and towns listed are Amsterdam, Arnhem, Bergen-op-zoom, Breda, Bruges, Brussels, Campvere, Delft, Dordrecht, Flushing, Gorinchem, Haarlem, The Hague, Hertogenbosch, Heussden, Leyden, Middleburg, Ostend, Rotterdam, Utrecht and Zwolle. See next section where this list is compared with the list of places in the Netherlands visited by the first Quakers.
44 Dentz wrote of actual co-operation between the English churches in the Netherlands and the Dutch Reformed Church following the break within the Reformed Church between the Remonstrants (Collegiants) and the Contra-Remonstrants. Dentz, History of the English Church at the Hague, p. 17. See also 2.3.3 above for information on this break within the Dutch Reformed Church.
45 William I. Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, p. 200. ‘George Fox refers in his Journal to Jane ‘Willinson’ as having ‘passed over into Holland to preach ye gospel’ in the year 1654...anticipated both Ames and Caton.’ See 7.4.3 below.
46 William I. Hull, Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam, p. 182. See also 2.3.3 above.
Quakerism. Rabus also identified Quakers with a group, led by Izaac Furnier, that Rabus called ‘the half-baked Quakers.’ Both Croese and Rabus claimed that the group led by Furnier was commonly, and incorrectly, believed to belong ‘to the Society and Communion of Quakers.’ Perhaps in view of Furnier’s group having had some contact with the Quakers, the perceived link between the two groups continued in some quarters into the nineteenth century.

47 William I. Hull, Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam, p. 185.
48 William I. Hull, Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam, p. 185. ‘Furnier, who made comical grimaces, and had given himself out as a Quaker; although afterwards, having wasted his substance in riotous living, he turned Papist, and died as such.’ Claus Bernet, ‘Quaker Missionaries in Holland and North Germany in the Late Seventeenth Century: Ames, Caton and Furly.’ Quaker History 95, no. 2, Fall 2006, p. 3, ‘the half baked Quakers, had made themselves hated and ridiculous.’ Hull explains that the name of ‘half-baked Quakers’ was first adopted by the Dutch Poet and critic Petrus Rabus who described them as ‘a parcel of obstinate fools who scarcely admitted the name of Quakers.’ William I. Hull, Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam, p. 186. The use of the term ‘half-baked’ is, according to Hull, p. 186, an allusion to one of the members of this group, Willem Gerritsz who was a pastry cook.
49 Gerard Croese, The General History of the Quakers: Being written originally in Latin (London: Printed for John Dunton, at the Raven in Jewen-Street, 1696), p. 168. ‘But these men were no ways belonging to the Society and Communion of Quakers, as was then generally believed.’ See also William I. Hull, Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam, p. 185, where he quotes again from the work of Rabus, De Boekzaal van Europa, 1695, as follows: ‘In the year 1655 several of that kind of people [Quakers] came to Amsterdam and to my native Rotterdam, and concealing themselves within their ranks were a number of others who carried on strange extravagances...Among these was one Izaak Furnier.’
50 William I. Hull, Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam, p. 195, ‘Furnier evidently received Ames and Caton with open arms when they came to Rotterdam and claimed them as his own...his conduct was [subsequently] found to be unacceptable to Friends...they [members of Furnier’s group] were disowned by the General Meeting of Friends in Amsterdam.’ See also p. 183 where Hull states that the ‘half-baked Quakers’ formed ‘the nucleus of their [Quaker] Society in that city [Rotterdam].’
51 William Steven, The History of the Scottish Church, Rotterdam, p. 337. Steven, in 1832, describes the actions of Furnier’s group’s actions in Rotterdam along with their consequences, and incorrectly describes Furnier’s group as ‘members of the Society of Friends.’ See also William I. Hull, Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam, pp. 190-191 in which he lists the incorrect linking, by historians, of Furnier’s group with Quakers and on p. 190, where Hull refers to a Dutch pamphlet of 1657 which was a Dutch translation of the English tract Anonymous Author, The Devil turned Quaker (London: Printed for John Andrews, at the White Lion in the Old Baily, 1656). The English pamphlet was an account of James Nayler’s entry into Bristol in the form of Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem. The Dutch translation, according to Hull, was prefaced by a statement which linked Nayler’s actions with those of the ‘half-baked Quakers’ in Rotterdam. This Dutch pamphlet appears to be a follow up to an earlier one regarding the exploits of James Nayler in England referred to in a letter from William Caton to Margaret Fell in 1656 which added to the ‘many stumbling blocks [in the Netherlands] is laid in the way.’ See letter from William Caton to Margaret Fell, dated 19th January 1656, London, held as MS 1.314 at Friends House Library, London.
7.4 Quaker travels to the Netherlands – 1655 onwards

A researcher and author who devoted a considerable portion of his academic life to researching the introduction and growth of Quakerism in the Netherlands was William I. Hull. As explained below, Hull’s work related to Quaker travels and the emergence of Quakerism in the Netherlands from 1655 onwards. He did not make any reference to possible contact between extant Dutch religious groups and proto-Quakers or Quakers in England before that year. This same chronological targeting of the progress of Quakers in the Netherlands has been adopted by other authors on this subject.

Hull’s most relevant comment, in relation to this thesis, is made in a book, *Children of Light. In honor of Rufus M. Jones,* to which Hull contributed a chapter. In his chapter Hull wrote:

‘the writer [Hull] went to Holland and England in 1907-08 to discover if possible actual links connecting the origins of Quakerism in England with the Mennonites of

---

52 William I. Hull was onetime Howard M. Jenkins Research Professor of Quaker History in Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania. See William I. Hull, *Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam,* title page. Hull had intended to publish a series of twelve books to cover Dutch Quakerism from its beginnings in 1655 up to the nineteenth century, see page headed ‘Monographs in this series by the same author’ in William I. Hull, *Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam.* Hull died in 1939. See Hull, *Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam,* p. vii. Only five of the intended twelve books were published. Hull’s papers are retained and stored at the Friends Historical Library of Swarthmore College. The book, planned by Hull, that would have been of the greatest interest to this researcher was to be entitled ‘A History of Quakerism in Holland’ and would have been the tenth book in Hull’s series of twelve. All of Hull’s research papers relevant to that book, along with handwritten and typed drafts of some of the intended sections of the book, are held in Boxes 18 to 29 inclusive of his papers at Swarthmore. See ‘An Inventory of the William Isaac Hull Papers, 1843-1939’, accessed from http://www.swarthmore.edu/library/friends/ead/5069hull.xml on 25th March 2008. The author visited the Friends Historical Library at Swarthmore during November 2008 and examined Hull’s papers relating to his tenth intended book.


54 William I. Hull, ‘The Mennonites and the Quakers of Holland.’
Holland. The result of his researches led him to believe that there was no direct [sic],
personal or hereditary connection of predecessor and successor between them.55

7.4.1 Possible Quaker visitors before Caton and Stubbs

Although the first recorded visit to the Netherlands by Quakers was by Caton and Stubbs in
1655, there is reference in Penney’s edition of Fox’s Journal of a visit by a ‘Jane Willinson’
or Jane Wilkinson to the Netherlands. In that edition of Fox’s Journal, under the section
heading ‘Missions at Home and Abroad 1655’, Fox writes: ‘About this yeare Jane Willinson
past over into Holland to preach ye Gospel.’56 In his comment on this passage, Hull set the
date of Wilkinson’s visit to the Netherlands as 1654, which would pre-date Caton and Stubbs’
visit.57 There is confirmation of Wilkinson’s visit to the Netherlands with an item in the
Swarthmoor Accounts Book which states, for 1655, ‘Jane Wilkinson, when shee [sic] went for
Holland - £2. 4s.’58 This entry suggests that either after her visit to the Netherlands, Wilkinson
returned and collected some expenses for the trip, or she collected the allowance in advance
of her visit. Only the first suggestion would substantiate a visit in 1654 with Wilkinson
collecting her expenses on her return sometime in 1655. No further information is available
regarding the life of Jane Wilkinson and neither is there any reference to her in Wybrands’

nor give any proof of his findings.
331.
58 William I. Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, p. 200. The date shown in the Swarthmoor Accounts
for that payment is 1655. Hull also records, p. 200, the visits to the Netherlands by three other women Quakers,
Hester Biddle, Elizabeth Cox and Ann Gargil but gives no details of the dates of their visits there. Fox makes no
reference to this visit by the three Quaker women, but Phyllis Mack notes an undated visit to the Netherlands by
Elizabeth Cox and Ann Gargill and that in 1657 Ann Gargill was ‘disowned by London Friends for ‘Ranterish’
or unruly behaviour.’ Phyllis Mack, Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England
Mem. A or Mem. B.\textsuperscript{59} It cannot be proved, therefore, that Jane Wilkinson had made any contact with the Amsterdam Waterlander Mennonites during her reported trip there in 1654/5.

Hull summed up the position when he wrote ‘Jane Wilkinson’s name does not appear among ‘the first Publishers of Truth’ nor in the other early Quaker records, and the story of her career, if ever written, has been lost to sight.’\textsuperscript{60}

\subsection*{7.4.2 Caton and Stubbs’ first visit to the Netherlands – 1655}

Sometime after ‘the fourth month’ 1655 Caton and Stubbs arrived at ‘Flushing’, modern day Vlissingen, in the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{61} Caton’s next comment is surprising in view of what he must have learned of the Netherlands from his contacts with the Dutch in England: ‘Flushing, where we came among a people of strange language.’\textsuperscript{62} At Flushing, after the master of the ship on which they travelled to the Netherlands had found them lodging,\textsuperscript{63} Caton and Stubbs proclaimed their message ‘in and through their streets, whether they could understand or no.’\textsuperscript{64} Possibly this difficulty with the language led to a change in their tactics as they then

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{59} In these documents there are references to women with family names Willems, see Memoriael van de handelingen bij de Gemeenke voor Reynier Wybrantzen, ‘A’, folio 12r, 19\textsuperscript{th} September 1614, and Willemsdr, see Memoriael van de handelingen bij de Gemeenke voor Reynier Wybrantzen, ‘A’, folio 33r, 23 January 1619. There are references to a number of men with the second name Willemsen, see Memoriael van de handelingen bij de Gemeenke voor Reynier Wybrantzen, ‘A’, folio 25v, 10\textsuperscript{th} September 1617 for example, but there are no women with that name.

\textsuperscript{60} William I. Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, p. 201. In this account, Hull continues: ‘[Wilkinson] either returned to England...or...became a member of the unruly group who gave Caton so much trouble later.’ See also 7.4.3 below. A search of the records on Early English Books On-line and investigation of Joseph Smith, A Descriptive Catalogue of Friends’ Books (London: Joseph Smith, 1867), show no publications with Jane Wilkinson or Jane Willinson as author.

\textsuperscript{61} See William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 33, where Caton describes his visit to the Netherlands with Stubbs and notes that visit as occurring after his short visit to Calais, described on p. 30, which occurred ‘Upon the 12\textsuperscript{th} of the Fourth month, 1655.’ See also William I. Hull, Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam, p. 201 where he describes Caton and Stubbs as ‘the first heralds in [Rotterdam].’


\textsuperscript{63} Letter, undated, from John Stubbs kept as ARB MSS No. 12 at Friends House Library, London.

\textsuperscript{64} William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 33.}
decided to seek out ‘the English and Scotch, which accordingly we did.’ These first English and Scottish groups are not described in any sort of detail by Caton, but it can be deduced that, as they remarked on Caton and Stubbs’ ‘non-conformity to them’, it is likely that the congregations they visited were those of the English and Scottish established churches. As shown above in 7.3.2 there was a recorded Scottish Church at Flushing at the time of Caton and Stubbs’ visit there.

Not having received a friendly reception at Flushing, ‘some violence was offered to us’, Caton and Stubbs travelled inland, approximately four miles, to ‘another great city called Middleburgh’, see Figure 4.

---

65 William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 33. See also undated letter written by John Stubbs, ARB MSS No. 12, where Stubbs writes: ‘enquired [of a Scots man who took Caton and Stubbs into his house in Flushing] where the meeting of the English and Scotch people...wee went alonge...and after all was ended...one of us stood up to speak.’ See also Gerard Croese, The General History of the Quakers, p. 168 ‘When Ames, Stubbs and Caton were come over to Holland they mov’d some of their own Countrymen with their new doctrines to such a degree that they raised some little Disturbance in the Reformed English Church’, and Keith L. Sprunger, Dutch Puritanism, p. 350 ‘Quaker missionaries went first to the British churches but made little headway among the English-Scottish settlers.’


Map illustrating William Caton and John Stubbs’ first visit to the Netherlands in 1655
Again, they went to visit the English and Scottish congregations in that city where, as in Flushing, ‘some especially were very violent, and did beat me much.’$^{68}$ Caton and Stubbs then took a boat to travel to Rotterdam, approximately forty miles from Middleburgh. $^{69}$ At Rotterdam, as in Flushing and Middleburgh, they again appeared to concentrate on delivering their religious message to the English community there. $^{70}$ On visiting an English merchant, during which visit some Dutch people were present, Caton and Stubbs found great difficulty in promoting their message ‘for want of a good interpreter.’$^{71}$ Caton does record that ‘forasmuch as there had been no Friend before to declare the truth among them in that city’, $^{72}$ confirming that his and Stubbs’ visit to Rotterdam was the first there by Quakers, but not indicating whether there had been a visit by Quakers to any other part of the Netherlands.

Following the lack of success in achieving converts to Quakerism, Caton and Stubbs left Rotterdam, ‘returned again for Zealand’ and then caught a boat to return to England. $^{73}$ However, it is of interest to note that between the time that Caton and Stubbs left Middleburg for Rotterdam and them returning there prior to catching a boat to England, Stubbs records some collusion between the Dutch and English churches in that city to ‘incense the people against us.’$^{74}$

---

$^{68}$ William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 34. See also 7.3.2 above for confirmation of the existence of a Scottish church in Middleburg.

$^{69}$ William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 34.


$^{71}$ William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 35, ‘we got a meeting at an English merchant’s house, unto which many merchants (especially) came, both Dutch and English: but oh! How did we suffer for want of a good interpreter.’


$^{73}$ William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 35. Caton does not state to which town they ‘returned’ to catch the boat to England. Zealand is the province in the Netherlands (see 1.1.3 above) in which Caton and Stubbs travelled, but it can be surmised that they ‘returned again’ to Flushing where they first disembarked in the Netherlands.

$^{74}$ Letter, undated, from John Stubbs kept as ARB MSS No. 12.
7.4.3 Subsequent Quaker visits to the Netherlands in the 1650s

William Ames

There are contradictory accounts of the next visits to the Netherlands by Quakers when a comparison is made between primary and secondary sources.

According to Croese, Caton and Stubbs’ next visit took place in the same year as their first visit, 1655, and they were accompanied by William Ames, a Dutch speaker and recently convinced Quaker. However, an account given by Ames, in a letter dated 2nd September 1656, when he was back in England, describes an unaccompanied visit there, only meeting up with John Stubbs in Middleburg at about halfway through his visit. According to Ames he did not meet up with Caton at all during this trip, see below.

Bernet describes Ames as ‘apparently [having]...a special calling to go to Holland’, and first arriving in the Netherlands in ‘the spring of 1656.’ This date ties in with the date of Ames’ letter to Margaret Fell which confirms the visit described by Ames as being his first to the Netherlands. See Figure 5.

---

75 Gerard Croese, The General History of the Quakers, Book III, p. 168. Although Croese states that this visit took place ‘in the year 55’, it is possible that it took place in the early months of 1656 by today’s calendar. See below. Hull suggests that Croese’s history is not totally accurate as it is ‘marred by the natural prejudice of a Dutch Reformed clergyman’ and that he ‘censures the Government of Dort for not heeding the clergy’s demand for the suppression of Quakerism in that city.’ See William I. Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, p. 19, ‘he [Ames] acquired knowledge of that [Dutch] language.’ Claus Bernet, ‘Quaker Missionaries in Holland’, p. 2, ‘Ames...had a special calling to go to Holland because he was acquainted with the language having been in the navy under Prince Rupert on whose own ship there were many Dutch.’

76 Letter from ‘William Ames to Margaret Fell, from Bristol 2.vii.1656’, ARB MSS No. 3 held in Friends House Library, London.

77 Claus Bernet, ‘Quaker Missionaries in Holland’, p. 2.

78 Claus Bernet, ‘Quaker Missionaries in Holland’, p. 2.
Map illustrating William Ames' first visit to the Netherlands in 1656
Hull suggested that Ames’ first visit to Rotterdam in 1656, a city previously visited by Caton and Stubbs, was a result of, according to Hull, Caton and Stubbs’ report of the large number of English merchants that lived there, and that Ames was aware ‘of reports they [Caton and Stubbs] had given of a people there who had some resemblances to Quakers.’ It is interesting to note that Caton makes no reference to that latter group in his account of his first visit there and neither does Ames, although Ames does refer to a meeting held in Rotterdam with ‘Contenders’ who, after the meeting ‘were so made manifest that a separation began to be made.’ It is not possible, with any confidence, to identify the groups to which Hull and Ames refer. Two possibilities are the ‘half-baked Quakers’ or congregations of Mennonites or Collegiants.

In his letter to Margaret Fell, Ames writes: ‘in that City [Amsterdam] there was a woman who was a friend of mine...but she was gone on...towards England.’ The only record of a woman, possibly a Quaker, visiting the Netherlands before Caton, Stubbs and Ames, is that relating to Jane Wilkinson.

Despite Ames’ knowledge of the Dutch language, this second visit of Quakers to the Netherlands still involved meetings there with the English and Scots. Ames records, in his letter to Margaret Fell, to a meeting he had at Middleburg at ‘ye meeting place of ye

---

80 Letter from ‘William Ames to Margaret Fell.’
81 See Claus Bernet, ‘Quaker Missionaries in Holland’, p. 3, where Bernet describes the significant opposition experienced by Caton, Stubbs and Ames in Rotterdam as a result of them being confused, in the minds of the local inhabitants, with the ‘half-baked Quakers’ who already existed in that city. For this information, Bernet uses as his source William I. Hull, *Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam*, pp. 183-189, and so is not, in itself, authoritative. See also 7.3.2 above for a description of the ‘half-baked Quakers.’
82 Letter from ‘William Ames to Margaret Fell.’
83 See William I. Hull, *The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam*, p. 24 where Hull asks whether the ‘friend’ to whom Ames refers is Jane Wilkinson. See also 7.4.1 above.
English. From Ames’ account, he appears to have received a friendlier reception than Caton and Stubbs had received in the previous year. Ames also describes a meeting he held with ‘English brownists’, who, Ames describes as ‘a people...very neere ye truth.’ This attempt to obtain converts from the English and Scottish churches in the Netherlands was largely unsuccessful, although Steven does suggest that converts were obtained from the Brownists in Amsterdam.

Hull wrote that, during this visit, Ames decided to target his message on the Mennonite congregations in the Netherlands, and that this was done in conjunction with his ‘pursuit of the English.’ In his letter to Margaret Fell, Ames makes no direct reference to this targeting of the Mennonites, but according to Bernet, this targeting was specific in that ‘they [Quakers] focussed on towns with Protestant rulers and...where Mennonite groups were already present.’ Sprunger describes the Mennonite groups as ‘a richly fertile field’ for

84 William I. Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, p. 24. See also letter from ‘William Ames to Margaret Fell.’
85 William I. Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, p. 24. See also letter from ‘William Ames to Margaret Fell’, where the meeting with English Brownists is recorded as taking place in Amsterdam.
86 Keith L. Sprunger, Dutch Puritanism, p. 350. ‘Quaker missionaries went first to the British churches but made little headway among the English-Scottish settlers.’ This lack of success was, according to Sprunger, p. 197, repeated in 1657 when Christopher Birkhead, described by Sprunger as a Quaker, interrupted a Scottish minister mid-sermon and was imprisoned as a consequence. See also Joseph Smith, A Descriptive Catalogue of Friends’ Books, in which Smith notes that Christopher Birkhead wrote a Quaker tract in Dutch in 1657, and also records his imprisonment.
87 William Steven, The History of the Scottish Church, Rotterdam, p. 272. One member of the Brownist congregation, noted by Steven, p. 272, was the grandfather of Willem Sewell, described by Hull as ‘the first real Quaker historian.’ See William I. Hull papers at the Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore, Box 18, folder 3, typescript p. 35. It appears that Sewell’s parents, John and Judieth (née Zinspenning), were members of the Mennonite community and were converted to Quakerism by Ames in 1657, see Hull papers, Box 18, Folder People Typescript, p. 400 and William Steven, The History of the Scottish Church, Rotterdam, p. 272.
88 William I. Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, p. 205. See also p. 267, where Hull is ambiguous in his statement that the group that Ames tried to convert were ‘Mennonites...who were known as Collegiants.’
89 William I. Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, pp. 27-8. The places visited by Ames were, as stated by Hull, Haarlem, Amsterdam, Leiden, Rotterdam, Vlaardingen, Flushing and Middleburgh. These places largely correspond with the locations of the Scottish Churches in the Netherlands. See 7.3.2 above.
90 Letter from ‘William Ames to Margaret Fell.’
91 Claus Bernet, ‘Quaker Missionaries in Holland’, p. 15. See also William I. Hull, ‘The Mennonites and the Quakers of Holland’, p. 192, where Hull describes the hopes expressed by the Quakers on obtaining converts from the Mennonites because of their resemblance, in some ways, to Quakers.
conversion and was a source of many converts.\textsuperscript{92} Hull confirmed the targeting of the Mennonite communities by Quakers,\textsuperscript{93} but disagreed with Sprunger by suggesting that few Mennonites and Collegiants became Quakers, as true Quakers had been confused, in the minds of the Mennonites and Collegiants with the ‘half-baked Quakers’ led by Furnier.\textsuperscript{94} It is known, however, that some years later, in 1665 in Leiden, Ames did make a direct approach to the Collegiants,\textsuperscript{95} and this may have been the result of him gaining knowledge of that group from Judieth Sewell. Formerly Judieth Zinspenning, Judieth Sewell had been convinced by Ames in 1657 and visited a Collegiant group after her convincement as she had ‘formerly been a frequenter of that meeting.’\textsuperscript{96}

\textbf{William Caton}

After his visit to the Netherlands with Stubbs in 1655, Caton records two further visits he made to the Netherlands during the 1650s. On both occasions he began his travels alone.\textsuperscript{97}

\textsuperscript{92} Keith L. Sprunger, \textit{Dutch Puritanism}, p. 351.
\textsuperscript{93} William I. Hull, \textit{The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam}, p. 11. Hull suggests that as the Mennonites grew in numbers they would split into factions with Quakers then aiming to assimilate individual factions into Quakerism. See also William I. Hull, ‘The Mennonites and the Quakers of Holland’, p. 197. ‘It is abundantly clear, however, from the history of Dutch Quakerism, that the founders of Quakerism in Holland sought to draw the large community of Mennonites into the Quaker fold.’ The same picture is shown to emerge in 1661 in Germany where Ames and Caton again targeted the Mennonites for convincement. See John A. Kelly, ‘Review of Wilhelm Hubben’s ‘Die Quäker in der deutchen Vergangenheit’.’ \textit{Bulletin of the Friends Historical Association} 18, no. 2, 1929, p. 112.
\textsuperscript{94} William I. Hull, \textit{Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam}, p. 186. See also 7.3.2 above for a description of the ‘half-baked Quakers.’
\textsuperscript{95} William I. Hull, \textit{The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam}, p. 171. See 2.3.3 above for information about the Collegiants.
\textsuperscript{96} See William I. Hull papers, box 18, Folder People Typescript, p. 400. See also Keith L. Sprunger, \textit{Dutch Puritanism}, p. 351. ‘Among the earliest Mennonite converts were Jakob Willemszoon Sewel and Judith Zinspanning of Amsterdam, the parents of historian William Sewell.’
\textsuperscript{97} William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 54. Relating to the first of Caton’s visits in 1656 ‘I went finally alone’ and p. 59, relating to his next visit in 1656 ‘it was upon me to return to Holland...I arrived well at Rotterdam.’
During the first of these subsequent visits, in 1656, see Figure 6, he was joined by ‘a young man’ from England who could speak Dutch.\footnote{William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 55. Although Caton does not name this ‘young man’, it is possible that he was Humble Thatcher as suggested by Hull. See William I. Hull, \textit{The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam}, p. 198, where Hull describes Thatcher as a Dutch speaker who visited the Netherlands in 1656.}
Map illustrating William Caton’s second visit to the Netherlands in 1656
During that visit it is possible that Caton encountered the ‘half-baked Quakers’ when he describes people that he met as ‘unruly spirits that were convinced but who ran out into extremes.’

During his stay in Amsterdam, Caton refers to meeting ‘priest’s proselytes’, and both in Amsterdam and in Rotterdam to meeting ‘conceited professors’. Caton gives no further information on these people who he met, but Hull identified them as members of the Dutch Reformed Church and ‘probably the so-called Collegiants’ respectively.

Caton and his companion were arrested later in Middleburg where ‘the rude multitude did rage as if they would have torn us to pieces’ and placed on a boat to return to England.

Returning to the Netherlands again in 1656, see Figure 7, Caton had heard that Ames was already there and went to Utrecht to meet up with him.

---

101 William I. Hull, *The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam*, p. 268. Hull gives no indication as to the evidence he used in order to make these identifications of the groups concerned.
103 William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 59. As stated above in 7.4.3, Ames recorded that during one of his visits to the Netherlands, he met up with John Stubbs in Middleburg. He does not record having met up with Caton during that trip, and so I believe that Ames made at least two separate visits to the Netherlands, meeting up with Stubbs during his first visit and with Caton during his second visit, but that he only recorded his first visit in his letter to Margaret Fell, of 1656.
Map illustrating William Caton’s third visit to the Netherlands 1656-1658
Caton and Ames then travelled together and it is in Caton’s account of these travels that he makes his first reference to visiting a Mennonite meeting place. It is of interest to note that this apparent first targeting of the Mennonites took Caton and Ames far away from their usual circuit of towns that the Quakers had visited on their travels. The Mennonite meeting to which Caton and Ames attempted entry was in the town of Zutphen. It was from this town that, according to Caton, Ames had been banished on a previous visit. According to Caton, Caton arrived at Rotterdam and then travelled to Utrecht where he met up with Ames and together they visited Zutphen. Caton then records his travels to Amsterdam, the Hague, Dort (modern day Dordrecht), Utrecht, Leiden and back to Amsterdam. On two occasions, Caton visited Utrecht, which conceivably could be considered as a half-way house between Rotterdam and Amsterdam, albeit approximately fifteen miles east of the direct route between those two cities. However, it is noted that the town of Zutphen is approximately sixty miles due east of Utrecht, see Figure 7, and is seen to be over one hundred miles away from what is recorded as the area within which the first Quakers in the Netherlands normally travelled. It is likely that during Ames’ first, unrecorded, visit to Zutphen, he encountered Mennonites,

104 William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 64. Caton records that the meeting with the Mennonites was not successful as ‘they [the Mennonites] bolted the door to us and would not suffer us to enter in among them’ and ‘[they were a] baser sort of people were very rude in throwing stones and clods at us.’

105 William Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, p. 40. ‘Just why they went thither [to Zutphen] is not stated; perhaps as a former soldier in the English Army, Ames knew the story of Sir Philip Sydney’s death in the battle of Zutphen.’ See also Piet Visser, ‘Wherever Christ is among us.’ In his article, Visser describes the architecture of Mennonite Meeting Houses in the Netherlands but makes no reference to a Meeting House in Zutphen. After further guidance in a personal communication with Prof. Visser I observed that, although there is little information available, Zutphen did not possess a Mennonite Meeting House until 1697, up to that time the number of Mennonites in Zutphen was few, possibly meeting, prior to 1697, in members’ houses. It is recorded that, in Zutphen, the local Mennonites were persecuted by the local magistrates, at the instigation of the clergy of the Dutch Reformed Church. Nanne van der Zipp, ‘Zutphen (Gelderland, Netherlands). Global Anabaptist Encyclopedia Online. 1959. Accessed from http://www.gameo.org/encyclopedia/contents/Z907.html on 9th December 2010. With few members, and no Meeting House, it is difficult to ascertain the reason for Caton and Ames’ decision to visit that town.

106 William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 64. Also see letter from ‘William Ames to Margaret Fell’ in which Ames makes no reference to a previous visit to Zutphen.

107 William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 59. Caton may have made reference to Stubbs already being in the Netherlands at this time when he refers to ‘Ames...had been in prison in Amsterdam with another Friend.’ There is no existing account written by Ames of these travels with Caton.
possibly for the first time, see above, and considered a return visit as potentially profitable, despite its remote location from the Quakers’ usual area of operation.

Caton recorded that, after this visit to Zutphen, Caton and Ames went their separate ways as ‘I [Caton] returned to Amsterdam.’\textsuperscript{108} Caton then writes that he continued his travels around the major cities of the Netherlands where ‘[I] met no small opposition, especially from the Papists and Baptists’,\textsuperscript{109} but that despite this opposition he remained in the Netherlands ‘above a year’ returning to England in around 1658.\textsuperscript{110}

\subsection*{7.4.4 Contact with the Collegiants and the eventual pamphlet war}

Contact was made with Mennonites and Collegiants by Ames, sometime during 1656 and, according to Hull, he achieved some success in obtaining converts to Quakerism.\textsuperscript{111}

Undoubtedly, this success would have antagonised the leaders of those groups, especially if the work of the Quakers was identified with the behaviour of the ‘half baked Quakers’ or, as described by Hull, the ‘pseudo-Friends’.\textsuperscript{112} Eventually, in 1657, this antagonism came to the surface with the beginnings of a pamphlet war between Quakers and Collegiants.

By 1650, the leadership of the Collegiants in Amsterdam fell to a Mennonite preacher, Galenus Abrahamsz.\textsuperscript{113} Fix describes Galenus as a spiritualist and who passed on his

\textsuperscript{108} William Caton, ‘The Life of William Caton’, p. 64. See also William Hull, \textit{The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam}, p. 124, where Hull refers to Ames’ possible desire to visit Germany, suggesting that Zutphen was a stopping-off point.
\textsuperscript{111} William I. Hull, \textit{The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam}, p. 267.
\textsuperscript{112} William I. Hull, \textit{The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam}, p. 278.
\textsuperscript{113} Andrew Fix, ‘Radical Reformation and Second Reformation in Holland: The Intellectual Consequences of the Sixteenth-Century Religious Upheaval and the Coming of a Rational World View.’ \textit{The Sixteenth Century Journal} 18, no. 1, Spring 1987, p. 69. See also William I. Hull research papers, Box 23, Folder – People typescript pages 1-35, where Hull suggests that Galenus may have led his congregation into Quakerism had it not been for a ‘fundamental difference’ between him and Stubbs. Also see J. Trapman, ‘Erasmus seen by a
spiritualistic ideas to his followers, Pieter Serrarius and Peter Balling. Galenus had determined that all extant institutional churches were corrupt and ‘ignorant of the true inner light of religious truth.’ This ‘inner light spiritualism’ of the Collegiants was seen by them to represent ‘the indwelling of the Holy Spirit within the soul of the individual believer.’ However, according to Fix, in the years following 1650, this ‘Inner Light’ of the Collegiants evolved from a spiritual notion to one consisting solely of rational conscience.

It was during these years of change within the Collegiant movement, and the approaches made to its members by the Quakers, in particular by William Ames, that between 1657 and 1661 there was an interchange of tracts, all written in Dutch. The Collegiant tracts were written by a number of their members including Galenus and Serrarius, but each one was addressed solely by William Ames, presumably because of his knowledge of the Dutch language. The subjects of these tracts included the nature of the ‘Light’, the literal use of the Bible for Collegiant worship, the Quaker claim to have restored the primitive Christian community and clarifying misunderstandings of Quakerism held by the Collegiants. One of

Dutch Collegiant; Daniel de Breen (1594-1664) and his posthumous Compendium Theologiae Erasmiae.’ Dutch Review of Church History 73, 1993, p. 162, where Trapman quotes the alternative names given to the Amsterdam Collegiants as ‘Breeniston’, ‘Boreelisken’ and ‘Galenisten.’

Andrew Fix, ‘Radical Reformation and Second Reformation in Holland’, p. 69 and p. 73.

Andrew Fix, ‘Radical Reformation and Second Reformation in Holland’, p. 72.

Andrew Fix, ‘Radical Reformation and Second Reformation in Holland’, p. 76.

Andrew Fix, ‘Radical Reformation and Second Reformation in Holland’, p. 77. Juterczenka notes that, in his article, Fix sees the pamphlet war between the Quakers and the Collegiants as a catalyst in the Collegiants’ move towards rationalism. Sünne Juterczenka, ‘Crossing Borders and Negotiating Boundaries’, p. 41.

William I. Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, pp. 232-237. Hull lists the ten anti-Quaker tracts issued by the Collegiants and suggests, p. 234, that the chief question under discussion was the claims of the respective groups relating to the restoration of the primitive Christian community. However, it can be seen from Ames’ responses that ‘The true light’ was under dispute. It is difficult to understand, from Hull’s account, the order in which the tracts were issued as, according to Hull, it would seem that a number of Collegiant tracts were answered by a single Ames tract. The order of tracts is not clarified following references to Joseph Smith’s two reference books, A Descriptive Catalogue of Friends’ Books and Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana: A Catalogue of Books Adverse [but not necessarily against] the Society of Friends (London: Joseph Smith, 1873).

William I. Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, pp. 232-237. Hull does ascribe one Quaker tract to John Higgins, Eenige Waerdige ende gewichtige Aenmerckingen voor Galenaus Abrakamsz ende Adam Boreel, ende haere Aenhangers (Amsterdam: No publishing information shown, 1660). This tract was not in answer to any previous Collegiant tract but, according to Hull, Higgins’ tract set off another stream of Quaker and anti-Quaker tracts in which Higgins took no further part. William I. Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, p. 234.
Ames’ tracts widened the arguments to draw in the Calvinist Reformed Church, along with, as suggested by Hull, the Lutherans (described by Ames as ‘Biblemen’) and Roman Catholic priests. From Hull’s account of this exchange of tracts it is not possible to establish the exact chronology of events. Hull did not ascribe dates to all of the tracts and, although he indicated the order in which tracts were issued and answered, that order is put in question when compared with the dates actually shown on some tracts.

In 1662, Pieter Balling, a Collegiant, wrote a tract entitled Het Licht op den Candelaar. Fix suggests that the contents of that tract show the transition of the Collegiant thinking from a spiritual Light to a light of reason. However, Fix does admit that the tract is ambiguous and that either interpretation of ‘Light’ can be made. However, on looking at the English translation of this tract, see below, it is the opinion of this researcher that Fix has used abbreviated quotations from the tract in order to confirm his proposition. During the year after Balling’s tract appeared in the Netherlands, an English translation was published, and the

---

120 William Ames, *Eenige Vragen*, Gedaen aen die gene die haer selven van de Gereformeerde Religie noemen, dewelcke onderhouden di insettingen voormaels van Calvinus uytgegeven. Als mede eenighe Vragen voorgestelt alle die gene die beleyden dat de Schrift haren Regel ende Leyds-man is. Met noch eenige Vragen aen de Paepsche Priesters in Hollandt, Vlaenderen, Brabant, etc. (No publishing information shown, 1658).


122 Hull describes Ames publishing a tract entitled ‘Twenty three questions’ in 1656 which was answered by a Collegiant ‘F.D.’ in 1657. However, Hull states that ‘[F.D.]...had published some ‘Questions’ directed to the Quakers, which Ames took note of in his ‘Twenty-three Questions.’ William I. Hull, *The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam*, p. 235. This would suggest that ‘F.D.’ had issued a tract prior to Ames’ tract of 1656, but Hull gives no confirmation of this.

123 Andrew Fix, *‘Radical Reformation and Second Reformation in Holland’*, p. 77. Fix describes Balling as ‘a Mennonite-Collegiant.’ Hull suggests that the original tract was written in Latin by Adam Boreel, a founder member of the Collegiants in Rijnsburg, and was translated into Dutch by Pieter Balling. William I. Hull research papers, Box 23, folder – people typescripts pp. 36-74 and Box 23, folder – people typescript pp. 133-163.

124 Andrew Fix, *‘Radical Reformation and Second Reformation in Holland’*, p. 77.

125 See Andrew Fix, *‘Radical Reformation and Second Reformation in Holland’*, p. 78, where Fix uses the quote, in justification of his view on the ‘rationalising’ of the light, ‘The light...is a clear and distinct knowledge of the truth in the understanding of every man.’ However he does not use quotations such as ‘This Light then, Christ the Truth &c.’ or ‘This Light is also the first Principle of Religion...and no knowledge of God without this light.’ See *Will. Ames, The Light upon the Candlestick* (London: Printed for Robert Wilson, 1663), p. 4.
authorship was ascribed to William Ames.\textsuperscript{126} There is no record as to how this change in stated authorship occurred. One possibility is that Ames ‘stole’ the tract and published it as his own as the views it presented were close to those of Quakers.\textsuperscript{127} If that was the case, it is likely that the appropriation of a Collegiant tract by the Quakers would have worsened the already poor relations between the two groups, as evidenced by the exchange of tracts in the previous four years.

### 7.5 Chapter summary

In this chapter I examined the contacts made, both in England and in the Netherlands, by the first recorded Quaker travellers to the Netherlands, William Caton, John Stubbs and William Ames. I have also looked at the possibility of an earlier, undocumented, visit to the Netherlands by Jane Wilkinson and of contact by other proto-Quakers with the Waterlander Mennonites of Amsterdam.

The only set of Mennonite documents that this researcher has been able to investigate relating to the possible contact between Waterlander Mennonites and proto-Quakers produced no firm evidence of any such contact.

Immediately preceding the first documented visit to the Netherlands in 1655, Caton and Stubbs had much contact with the Baptist communities in Kent. There is no documentation

\textsuperscript{126} Will. Ames, \textit{The Light upon the Candlestick}. The frontispiece of this tract notes ‘Printed in Low-Dutch for the author, 1662, and translated into English by B.F.’ B.F. is thought to refer to Benjamin Furly, who, according to Hull, accepted Quakerism in Essex, England in 1655 and, as he was a Dutch speaker, moved to the Netherlands in about 1658 to carry on his family business there and, perhaps, persuaded by his Quaker friends ‘to assist William Ames and William Caton.’ See William I. Hull, \textit{Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam}, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{127} See William I. Hull, \textit{The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam}, pp. 214-5 where Hull suggests that the original tract was in Latin and translated into Dutch by Balling. It is also suggested that, although not necessarily agreeing to be awarded authorship of the English translation, Ames would have approved of its content. Hull, p. 261, ascribes authorship of the original Latin original tract to Adam Boreel.
that indicates what they learned from those Baptists and whether their acquired knowledge
directed their subsequent journey. The accounts of those first journeys into the Netherlands
show that Caton, Stubbs and, slightly later, Ames, began by targeting the expatriate English
and Scottish communities in the Netherlands, possibly because of Caton and Stubbs’
ignorance of the Dutch language. They were not well received by those expatriate
communities and a contributing factor to this lack of success would have been the linking of
the Quakers, as represented by Caton, Stubbs and Ames, with the eccentric group, led by
Izaac Furnier, and subsequently named ‘the half-baked Quakers’ by Petrus Rabus.

Hull suggested that possibly the first Quaker contact made with the Collegiant community
was that by Caton during his second visit to the Netherlands, in 1656. However, the first
authenticated meeting between Quakers and Mennonites took place, along with Ames, during
Caton’s third visit to the Netherlands. Caton records that meeting taking place in the town of
Zutphen which is located far to the east of the area within which Caton, Stubbs and Ames
regularly travelled. Caton records that Ames had previously visited Zutphen and was banished
from that town. I suggest that, as there is no record of an expatriate English or Scottish church
being based in that town, Caton and Ames deliberately travelled there in order to meet that
group of Mennonites rather than any expatriate community. It is possible that the later
success in securing converts from Mennonite congregations was one of the catalysts for the
pamphlet war that took place between the Collegiants and the Quakers during the years 1657
to 1662.

It is this researcher’s view that the possibility of taking the Quaker message to the
Netherlands emerged in the minds of Caton and Stubbs during their stay in Kent and

---

128 See 7.3.2 above which contains a list of the locations of Scottish churches in the Netherlands. The nearest
established Scottish churches to Zutphen were in Arnhem, approximately seventeen miles south-west of Zutphen
and in Zwolle, approximately thirty miles due north of Zutphen.
following their discussions with local Baptists and Dutch merchants based there and that they are unlikely to have known of the existence of Mennonite and Collegiant groups in the Netherlands in advance of their visits there. The reasons for this conclusion are:

a. There is no evidence to suggest that any such knowledge was gained from contacts made in England with Quakers who had previously been in contact with those Dutch groups.

b. Their initial targeting for conversion was aimed at the English and Scottish expatriate communities, and their targeting of Mennonites and Collegiants only occurred when they were unsuccessful in their endeavours with the expatriate communities.\footnote{Hull appears to suggest that the targeting of the Mennonites was deliberate, but he does not indicate that this targeting only occurred after the attempts to convert members from the expatriate English and Scottish churches had failed. William I. Hull, ‘The Mennonites and the Quakers of Holland’, p. 197.}

c. There is no evidence to suggest that any proto-Quakers had been in contact with Dutch Mennonite or Collegiant congregations who had passed on acquired information to later Quaker travellers to the Netherlands.

As a consequence to these conclusions, I contend that there is no evidence of any direct Dutch influence on the theology and practices of the early Quakers.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter outlines the key findings of this research and explores their implications for previous and future research. The research described in all previous chapters of this thesis is summarised in 8.1, with 8.2 paying particular attention to its key original findings. The implications of these findings for previous scholarship are set out in 8.3, and 8.4 establishes the new research agenda that this thesis creates.

8.1 Summary of previous chapters

The objective of this research, as explained in Chapter 1 of this thesis, was to identify those personal contacts that were made by the early Quakers and proto-Quakers with members of the continental European Anabaptist movement. This was to indicate whether the contacts were made at such an early stage in Quakerism’s beginnings that, as argued in particular by Barclay of Reigate\(^1\) and de Vries,\(^2\) those contacts provided direction to the theological development of Quakerism and to the subsequent expansion of Quakerism into continental Europe.

---

\(^1\) R. Barclay, *The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, MDCCCLXXVI), p. 222. Here Barclay notes the similarities in theology and practice between the General Baptists and Quakers. On p. 223 Barclay suggests that the differences in theology between the General Baptists and the Quakers can be traced back to internal controversies within the Waterlander Mennonites of Amsterdam.

\(^2\) Tiemen de Vries, *Holland’s influence on English Language and Literature* (Chicago: C. Gruntzeback, 1916), p. 266. ‘The movement of the Friends, or, as they soon were called, the QUAKERS began several year later, but was no less under the influence of Holland than were the first Congregationalists and Baptists.’
Many authors, including Payne, Estep, Tallack, Williams, Underwood, Jones and Durnbaugh, without investigating the possible means of transference, have commented upon the similarities of practice and theology of the Quakers with those of the continental Anabaptists and, as discussed in Chapter 3, with those of their English derivatives, the General Baptists. However, similarity of belief or practice cannot in themselves prove existence of their transfer to the nascent Quaker movement nor prove prior knowledge of those beliefs and practices by proto-Quakers.

Although research has been undertaken into the spread of Quakerism in Europe in the years following 1655, no research had previously been undertaken into the contacts that Quakers had with continental European religious groupings prior to that year.

One great difficulty, outlined by previous researchers, in researching the very early stages of Quakerism, is the lack of definitive and relevant early Quaker publications. The publication

4 William R. Estep, The Anabaptist Story (Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1963), p. 197. ‘To claim that Baptists or Quakers are direct descendants of the Anabaptists is to assume that similarity of belief proves causal relationship.’
5 William Tallack, George Fox, the Friends and the Early Baptists (London: S W Partridge & Co, 1868), p. 66. ‘But these and other kindred principles had, with little exception, been previously the characteristics of the Baptist Theology and more particularly of the ‘General’ as distinguished from the ‘Particular’ Baptists.’
6 George Hunston Williams, The Radical Reformation (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, Third Edition, 2000), p. 716, note 91. ‘The Schwenckfeld fellowships were closer to Friends meetings in the century of Enlightenment much more than they were like the Familists who became a tributary to Quakerism.’
7 T. L. Underwood, Primitivism, Radicalism, and the Lamb’s War: The Baptist-Quaker Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 73. ‘Nevertheless, Baptists and Quakers...shared a devotion to the primitive world of Christianity before the gospels were written.’
8 Rufus M Jones, Spiritual Reformers of the 16th and 17th Centuries (London: Macmillan and Co., 1928), p. 194. See also p. 84, ‘One of the most obvious signs of his influence in the seventeenth century, both in England and in Holland, appears in the spread of principles which were embodied in the “Collegiants” of Holland and the corresponding societies of “Seekers” in England.’
9 Donald F Durnbaugh, ‘Baptists and Quakers – Left Wing Puritans.’ Quaker History 62, no. 2, Autumn 1973, p. 75, ‘a study of the early history of the Friends shows repeated evidences of Baptist involvement.’ Durnbaugh continues: ‘William Tallack and Robert Barclay, contended that the Baptists were the direct ancestors of the Quakers...If evidence exists for General and Particular Baptist links with continental dissenters, and if a line may be drawn from Baptists to Quakers, the thesis of Quaker relationships with the Continent is strengthened.’
10 See 7.4 above relating to the researches undertaken by William I. Hull, Sünne Juterczenka, J. Z. Kannegieter and Gerardinal L. Van Dalsen.
which is the general starting point for such research is George Fox’s *Journal*,\(^{12}\) which, in view of the time delay between the events it describes and the date of its original publication, and its editing before publication, has to be treated with care.\(^{13}\) This careful treatment of the contents of Fox’s *Journal*, has been remarked on by writers on the subject, but its contents have, invariably, as stated in 6.2 above, been taken at face value.\(^{14}\) It was an important aim of this research to corroborate, where possible, relevant events described in the *Journal* by reference to contemporaneous publications by Quakers and non-Quakers and, where possible, to fill in the gaps, particularly the notions and theologies that Fox may have heard and acquired from his contacts.

Chapter 2 outlined the beliefs running through a number of early pre- and post-Reformation European religious radicals, the first Swiss Anabaptists of the sixteenth century and the later Anabaptist congregations in the Netherlands, in particular the Waterlander Mennonites of Amsterdam. My research shows that these common themes were a result of direct contact among the various groupings, and some themes can also be seen to transfer, through direct contact in the Netherlands, to the early English Baptist communities in England in the seventeenth century.

Chapter 3 documented the growth of non-conformist religious groups in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and highlighted throughout the beliefs of those groups that can be seen to emerge within Quakerism. A significant part of Chapter 3 is devoted to describing the evolution of the Baptist movements in England. The considerable contact that

---


\(^{14}\) See Rosemary Moore, *The Light in their Consciences* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University, 2000), pp. 229-230 for the reservations she places on the accuracy of Fox’s *Journal*. 
members of both streams of the Baptist movement, the Generals and Particulars, had with the Waterlander Mennonites and a related Anabaptist group, the Collegiants, is established in Chapter 3. This is followed by a detailed comparison of the various written Confessions of the Waterlanders, the General Baptists and the Particular Baptists. The establishment of this direct contact is of crucial importance in terms of the contact that Fox and other early Quakers had with members of Baptist communities in the years leading up to the birth of the Quaker movement.

References have been made throughout this thesis to the beliefs of the early Quakers. These can be best summed up as follows:

- Reconciliation and communion with the Father through Jesus Christ by means of the Light of Christ within or the Light in their Consciences
- What they sought was not to be found in outside or external observances, thus outward rites and observances are not necessary
- The worship of God is essentially spiritual
- Meetings for Worship are a reverent waiting upon the Lord in solemn stillness
- Spiritual worship may be with or without words
- There is no distinction between clergy and laity
- Ministry should be freely given
- No one present is restrained from exercising the gift of the spirit
- Civil authorities have no control over individual conscience
- The Scriptures are not the ‘Word’
• No swearing of oaths.\textsuperscript{15}

It can be seen, in confirmation of Payne’s view quoted in 1.3 above,\textsuperscript{16} that each of these attributes, with the exception of the use of the terms ‘the Light of Christ within’ or ‘the Light in their Consciences’, had been professed by other English and continental European sectaries prior to the advent of Quakerism. I set out below in Table 1, those attributes, in columns, and the individuals or groups, in rows, that had also held and promoted them. Table 1 also shows the sections in this thesis that ascribe the attributes to the individuals or groups.

\textsuperscript{15} This list can be compared with that produced in Edward Marsh, \textit{Tracts Illustrating the History, Doctrine and Discipline of the Society of Friends} (London: Edward Marsh, 1848), pp. iii-vi which sets out a useful schedule of nineteenth century Quaker beliefs. Included in Marsh’s list are those, set out above, that can be traced back to the seventeenth century. No authorship is ascribed to any of the tracts contained in this book, and the summary of beliefs to which I refer is taken from the Introductory ‘Remarks’ to the book, again with no credited author. See also Rosemary Moore, \textit{The Light in their Consciences}, p. 238, where Moore confirms some of the items in the above list.

\textsuperscript{16} Ernest A. Payne, ‘An Anabaptist impact on Western Christendom’, p. 314. Payne writes: ‘Behind the Quakers, for example, stand the English representatives of the Seekers and Familists, groups whose spiritual ancestry carries us back to Schwenckfeld, Denck and Münzer.’
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reconciliation Through Christ</th>
<th>Outward Rites Unnecessary</th>
<th>Spiritual Worship</th>
<th>Reverent Waiting</th>
<th>Worship With or Without Words</th>
<th>Clergy and Laity</th>
<th>No restraint on preaching which is free</th>
<th>No swearing of Oaths</th>
<th>Word is not Scripture</th>
<th>Scope of Civil Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grebel</td>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubmaier</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marpeck</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwenckfeld</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franck</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Böhme</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sattler</td>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denck</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwingli</td>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hut</td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofmann</td>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coornhert</td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familists</td>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seekers</td>
<td>3.1.4</td>
<td>3.1.4</td>
<td>3.1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiants</td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beliefs held by early Quakers that were professed by earlier

English and Continental European sectaries.
However, as stated by Estep, a commonality of belief cannot prove, by itself, a direct descent from an earlier group,\textsuperscript{17} and so, as set out in Chapter 1 above, direct descent is being investigated in this thesis through individual, personal contact.

Chapter 4, as well as considering the contacts that Fox had with members of the Baptist communities, investigated his many other personal contacts that he recorded in the years leading up to the birth of the Quaker movement in 1652. The possible reasons why Fox had placed his mother in the direct line of martyrs and the relationship that Fox had with his parish priest, Nathaniel Stephens, are also discussed in that chapter. Fox made reference in his Journal to the time that he spent with his Baptist uncle ‘Pickering’,\textsuperscript{18} and although Fox did not confirm that he learned anything from Pickering or his Baptist congregation, the background to Pickering’s Baptist congregation was investigated in order to assess to what theology and practices Fox would have been exposed during those meetings. This investigation into contacts made by Fox continued in Chapter 5 which established Fox’s contacts with the first Quaker converts along with a detailed analysis of their religious backgrounds. Chapter 5 also investigated, in particular, the religious backgrounds of other early Quakers who have documented links to, or membership of, English ‘Anabaptist’ and Baptist congregations, paying special attention to those early Quakers who had a Baptist background and were the first travellers taking the Quaker movement to the Netherlands.

Because of the time spent with Fox in 1647 during Fox’s travels around Yorkshire, the identity of ‘Priest Boys’ was investigated in Chapter 5. This was considered to be an important investigation in order to learn more of Boys’ background and theology, as nothing has been previously written about him. Also explored, in Chapter 5, was the possible

\textsuperscript{17} William R. Estep, \textit{The Anabaptist Story}, p. 197.
\textsuperscript{18} George Fox, \textit{Journal}, p. 4.
martyriological descent of Margaret Fell who Fox met in 1652 and subsequently married in 1669. It was suggested, in that chapter, that one possible reason for Fox’s comment regarding the martyriological descent of his mother was a direct consequence of his knowledge of the possible ancestry of Margaret Fell and Fox’s wish to place himself, martyriologically, on the same level as Margaret Fell.

Chapter 6 explored the birth and development of Quakerism from the standpoint of the tracts that were issued by the early Quakers and from the tracts issued by non-Quakers. The contents of this latter group of tracts was seen to range from carefully constructed theological debates to anti-Quaker diatribes usually linking Quakers with other hated sects of the day. None of these tracts throw any light on the lineage from which the Quakers emerged, whether from the mystics as suggested by Jones, sectaries of the day as suggested by Russell, Durnbaugh and Barbour, or from the radical puritan end of the established church as suggested by Nuttall. The tracts published by some early Quakers did set out their own personal journeys to their Quaker position. It is possible from these personal tracts to identify early Quaker beliefs and to link some of them with the beliefs of the groups through which these early Quakers had travelled.

Chapter 7 investigated in depth, using Quaker and Waterlander Mennonite documents, the possibility of contact between proto-Quakers and members of the Waterlander Mennonite community in the Netherlands. Also investigated there were the contacts made by the first

---

19 Rufus M Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, p. 227. ‘Enough, however, is presented to show that this spiritual leader in England [Fox] was distinctly a debtor to the Teutonic seer [Boehme] who died the same year in which the former was born.’


21 Donald F. Durnbaugh, ‘Baptists and Quakers’, p. 76


documented Quaker travellers to the Netherlands, Caton, Stubbs and Ames, with expatriate Dutch communities in England and whether those contacts were likely to have directed the Quaker travellers to meet with Collegiants and Mennonites who may have been considered ripe for receiving the Quaker message. By tracking the journeys of those first Quakers in the Netherlands, and identifying the groups with whom contact was made, and the order of those contacts, a reason for those first excursions into the Netherlands, to seek converts to Quakerism from members of the expatriate English and Scottish churches, was proposed.

The next section sets out the key and original findings of this research.

### 8.2 Key findings and original contributions

The key findings of this research fall into two distinct categories: those findings that directly relate to the stated objectives of the research, and those findings which are subsidiary to the main objectives but which are original and are of potential value to other researchers of Quaker history. It should be noted that this research is unique and is the first research into the possible contact of proto-Quakers and early Quakers with continental Anabaptists in the years before 1655. All previously published research on those contacts has concentrated on contacts by Quakers from 1655 onwards.²⁴

---

²⁴ See 7.4 above where reference is made to the published works of Hull, Juterczenka, Kannegieter and Van Dalfsen.
8.2.1 Findings directly relevant to the stated objectives

Contact of proto-Quakers with Waterlander Mennonites

The key finding of this research is that, despite some noted similarities in theologies and practices (see Chapter 2), there is no evidence to support the theory that the proto-Quakers had any direct contact with continental Anabaptists, in particular with the Waterlander Mennonites and with the Collegiants, in the years leading up to the beginnings of Quakerism (see 7.2.1 and 7.4 above).

Contact of Quakers with English Baptists

There is evidence of much contact between the early Quakers and representatives of various English Baptist communities (see Chapters 4 and 5), and there are noted similarities in the theologies and practices of the Quakers and the General Baptists (see Chapter 1). Significant similarities, but some differences, were noted when comparing (in 3.2 above) the confessions of faith produced by the Waterlander Mennonites and the English General Baptists. The only similarity, amongst many differences, found when comparing the confessions of the Waterlanders and the English Particular Baptists related to the nature of water baptism. This suggests that, as would be expected from the noted backgrounds to the establishment of each English Baptist group (see Chapter 3), the authors of the General Baptist confession of 1660 would have been conversant with the earlier Waterlander confessions but that there is little to show that the authors of the Particular Baptist confessions had any knowledge of the earlier Waterlander confessions.
**Caton and Stubbs’ prior knowledge of the Mennonites in the Netherlands**

It was noted in Chapter 7 that the first visit of Quakers to the Netherlands, by Caton and Stubbs, occurred in 1655. Research shows that, prior to that first visit, neither Caton nor Stubbs had identified any indigenous Dutch religious grouping as being a suitable target for conversion to Quakerism. The first efforts for conversion in the Netherlands were directed towards the emigrant English and Scottish people, with attempts to meet the Mennonites only occurring in the following year, in 1656. That attempt to meet the Mennonites was possibly as a consequence of the futile attempts at conversion on the English and Scottish communities. Nevertheless, it seems unlikely that Caton and Stubbs, as a consequence of their contact with members of the immigrant Dutch communities in Kent (see 7.2.2 above), had no knowledge of the Mennonite and Collegiant congregations prior to their visit to the Netherlands in 1655. However, whatever knowledge was acquired in England by Caton and Stubbs, there is no evidence to suggest that they used that information when undertaking their first visit to the Netherlands.

The first documented meeting between Quakers and Mennonites took place in Zutphen in 1656 (see 7.4.3 above). Further research is required with regard to events leading up to that meeting as (a) Zutphen was remote from the routes travelled by Caton, Stubbs and Ames when visiting the English and Scottish communities and (b) there is no record of the Mennonites having had a Meeting House in Zutphen.

**Fox’s knowledge of the writings of mystics**

In view of the lack of printed material contemporaneous with Quakerism’s beginnings, it is not possible, with any accuracy, to pin-point any areas of influence on George Fox’s
awakening theology. All that can be said with confidence is that, despite Fox’s own lack of
acknowledgement, Fox met many people during his religiously formative years from whom
he would have learned much about the developing theological climate of the time, and that
during his lifetime he built up a substantial library. A significant number of the people that
Fox met at that time had reached the Quaker position at the same time as, if not before, Fox
(see 5.2 and 5.3 above). I suggest that Fox should be seen as the shepherd of Quakerism and
not its midwife.  

There is no evidence to support Robert Barclay of Reigate and Rufus Jones’ claims that Fox
was conversant with the writings of the pre- and post-Reformation mystics, in particular with
the writings of Jacob Böhme, although Fox is likely to have heard about them during his
meetings with Durant Hotham (see 4.6.5 above). A comparison of the writings of Fox and
Böhme (see Chapter 4), which had not previously been seriously undertaken by any
researcher, indicates no correlation between the considerable writings of the two men other
than the two brief passages quoted by some authors that prove, in their minds, that Fox had
read Böhme’s works.

Identity of Fox’s ‘Uncle Pickering’

There is much evidence of Fox meeting members of various Baptist communities, in
particular with the congregation in London to which his ‘Uncle Pickering’ belonged. It has
been indirectly suggested by some authors that Pickering’s Baptist group was of the Arminian

---

25 Moore writes: ‘It is unlikely that without Fox there would have been any Quakerism.’ Rosemary Moore, *The
Faith of the First Quakers*, p. 256. To this researcher this suggests more of a ‘midwife’ role.
27 See 4.6.5 above. This finding confirms the view taken by Wood and quoted in 6.2 above.
General branch of Baptists, and as such that would have confirmed Fox’s own theological position. This research indicates (see 4.4 above), that Uncle Pickering was a member of the Calvinist Jacob-Jessey congregation from which a number of Particular Baptist congregations emerged. This would therefore suggest that, far from supporting Fox’s developing theology, Fox soon left them because they were preaching a brand of Calvinist theology with which he could not agree, thus reinforcing Fox’s previously acquired Arminian theology (see 4.7 above).

8.2.2 Subsidiary original findings

Martyriological descent of Fox’s mother

Chapter 4 considered the statement made by George Fox relating to the martyriological descent of his mother. As stated in that chapter, authors, including Braithwaite, Jones, Pickvance, and Barbour, have referred to that statement and have made unsubstantiated claims as to the reason why it was included by Fox in his Journal. This research has established that there is no link between Fox’s mother and the Maryan martyrs who had lived close to Fox’s home. I conclude that the reference to martyrs was included by Fox either in error, solely as reference to a local geographical link with the sixteenth-century Maryan

martyrs, to place Fox himself in the same mould as a martyr or, see below, to place him alongside Margaret Fell in view of her suggested martyriological descent.

Martyriological descent of Margaret Fell

Some authors, (see 5.3.6 above) the most notable being Robert Barclay of Reigate,\(^{34}\) had placed Margaret Fell, née Askew, as the great grand-daughter of the Maryan martyr, Ann Askew. Other authors have discounted that claim, perhaps the most compelling being Ernest E. Taylor who was confident that he had seen evidence that the two women were not related.\(^{35}\) Unfortunately, that evidence was not produced by Taylor. Based on available information, discussed in 5.6 above, it seems most unlikely that the two women were related.

Fox’s acquired knowledge from Nathaniel Stephens

Fox writes in his *Journal* of his many meetings with his parish priest, Nathaniel Stephens, but no research has investigated the content of the discussions that took place during those meetings, or into the background of Stephens. This research (see 4.3 above), concludes that, despite Fox’s claims that Stephens did not like him and that, in later years Stephens became a persecutor of Fox, Fox and Stephens were, to some extent, kindred spirits with Stephens using some of Fox’s words in sermons, developing an aversion to Church ceremonies and eventually being ejected from his living due to his acquired non-conformity. According to Fox, the transfer of views during meetings with Stephens was one way, from Fox to Stephens. However, the underlying theme of the story, told by Stephens, of the happening in a ‘Church


in the West’, that ‘the God whom the Christians worship is no more in the...Chancel than in
the Church...he is with them by his Spirit and Grace’, is one that Fox and the early Quakers
took up in later years. Fox’s own statement in his Journal, ‘God...did not dwell in temples
made with hands...but in people’s hearts’, suggests that Fox did, contrary to his own
account, learn much from Stephens during Fox’s theologically formative years.

**Possible identities of ‘Priest Boys’**

Fox writes in his Journal of the time that he spent with ‘Priest Boys.’ Although some
authors have placed Boys’ church variously in Pickering or Kirkbymoorside in North
Yorkshire, there is no extant research which attempts to identify Boys’ background or the
location of his church. This thesis shows that, because of the recorded interior decorations of
those churches, the absence of any documentation linking a ‘Priest Boys’ to those churches
and that neither church can be considered as ‘in the moors’, neither of the two previously
cited possible locations of Boys’ church is correct (see 5.3.2 above). However, it is not
possible with any certainty, because of alterations undertaken to churches in the area of North
Yorkshire, to give Boys’ church a definite location. This research shows that likely locations
for the church are Lockton or Goathland, both ‘in the moors’ in North Yorkshire. If the
church was located at Lockton then ‘Priest Boys’ could have been either Roger Boyes, a
resident at Lockton and the father of James Boyes who had become a Quaker by 1667, or

---

36 Samuel Palmer, *The Nonconformist’s Memorial: Being An Account of the Ministers who were ejected or silenced after the Restoration, particularly by the Act of Uniformity, which took Place on Batholemew-day, Aug. 24, 1662. Originally written by the Reverend and learned Edmund Calamy, D.D.* (London: for J. Harris, MDCCCLXXVII), pp. 112-114.
38 George Fox, *Journal*, pp. 86-89.
41 George Fox, *Journal*, p. 88.
Thomas Boyes, of similar age to Roger Boyes, who was a churchwarden at Lockton and who had displayed possible non-conformist tendencies. Alternatively, if Priest Boys’ church was at Goathland, then Priest Boys is likely to have been William Boyes. William Boyes was a puritan minister at Goatland some years before the time of Fox’s meeting with Priest Boys, and in the years between 1620 and 1632 had been brought in front of church authorities for various ‘non-conformist’ actions. One further, and more intriguing possibility, is that Priest Boys was Abraham Boy, a one time student at Leiden University, a centre of religious scholarship in the Netherlands. However, no evidence was found to show that Abraham Boy, although shown as being English in the records of Leiden University, had any connection with, or lived at any time in, North Yorkshire.

This research suggests that if Priest Boys was Roger, Thomas or William Boys, who all lived ‘in the moors’, then it is likely that any transfer of theological ideas would have been from Fox to Boys. Conversely, it could be argued that if Priest Boys was Abraham Boy, the ex-student of Leiden University, then such transfer could have been reversed with Fox acquiring detailed knowledge of the theology of non-conformist groups existing in the Netherlands.

8.3 Consequences for scholarship

Whilst proposing influences on the early Quakers by members of various other religious denominations, no previous research has objectively investigated the personal contact of the first Quakers with the individuals and organisations which are purported to have influenced them.
Rufus Jones set the Quaker movement squarely on the plinth of the mystics in particular, and without producing direct evidence, likened Fox’s theology to that of the German mystic Jacob Böhme. In forming this view it can be seen that he was following Robert Barclay of Reigate who wrote, in 1876, of the similarity of some of Fox’s statements in his Journal, with the writings of Böhme. Despite Wood’s contrary statement written in 1924, (see 1.3 above), this theme was taken up in 1933 by Brayshaw when he wrote of dependence of some of Fox’s writing and thought on ‘the writings of the German mystic, Jacob Boehme.’ An analysis of the writings of Böhme and Fox (see 4.6.5 above) showed, without doubt, that Fox’s writings were not dependent in any way upon those of Böhme, and so, as explained by Doncaster, the removal of Jones’ ‘Introduction’ to the 1912 edition of Braithwaite’s The Beginning of Quakerism from the 1955 edition was totally justified.

Other authors have placed the development of Quakerism within the Puritan environment of the seventeenth century, and so, perhaps, have suggested a dependence of the former on the latter. Barbour writes: ‘The radical puritans linked the Spirit with direct ‘leadings’...just as did the Quakers.’ This link with Puritanism was made stronger by Cadbury and Horton

---

42 See 4.2.2 above, and Rufus M. Jones, Spiritual Reformers, p. 220. ‘The question has naturally been raised whether Boehme exercised any direct influence upon the early Quaker movement...no careful student of both writers [Boehme and Fox] can doubt that there was some sort of influence, direct or indirect, conscious or unconscious.’
45 W.C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism.
48 See Cadbury’s note in W.C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism. Second Edition, p. 514. ‘He [Nuttall] shows how Quakerism is a natural extreme of the whole spectrum of English Puritan thought.’ Also see the same conclusion quoted by Durnbaugh, ‘Baptists and Quakers’, p. 67. ‘the Friends are to be considered ‘a natural extreme to the whole spectrum of English Puritan thought’ – in short, as left-wing Puritans.’
Davies, with Pickvance and Welch commenting on the local Puritan environment in which Fox was raised. Marchant describes the growth of Quakerism in areas where Puritans once flourished, whilst at the same time disagreeing with Nuttall’s view that ‘Quakers [were]... the logical development of certain aspects of Puritanism.’ Quaker behaviour can, to some extent, be identified with that of the Puritans, but it cannot be identified, I believe, with the strict interpretation of Puritanism: strict Calvinism within the established church. I agree with Barbour when he describes one aspect of Quakerism as a ‘reaction against Puritanism.’ Barbour suggests that all the early Quakers ‘were individuals who had known Puritanism and rejected it.’ This same point was made, in respect of the religious seeking of Fox, by his near contemporary Calamy, who stated that Fox ‘learnt not his Quakerism’ from his Puritan parish.

There is a general consensus amongst authors that the early Quakers arrived at their Quaker position having travelled through a religious hinterland, but they give no indication as to the

---

52 Ronald A. Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the diocese of York 1560-1642* (London: Longmans Green & Co. Ltd., 1960), p. 39. See also Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992 edition), p. 2 where, in Nuttall’s synopsis of his first chapter, he writes ‘The Quakers the conservatives’ fiercest foes but extend and fuse much in radical Puritanism.’ However, on p. 14, Nuttall appears to suggest that that belief was not necessarily held by himself when he writes ‘Others may hold that Quakerism is true Puritanism, purged of extraneous elements and carried to a conclusion not only logical but desirable.’
53 Hugh Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England*, p. 42. See also Melvin B. Endy, ‘The Interpretation of Quakerism: Rufus Jones and his critics.’ *Bulletin of the Friends Historical Association* 70, Spring 1981, pp. 13-14. ‘First, the Puritan drive toward immediacy in the relationship between God and man and its impatience with the indirectness and ambiguity of sense knowledge was not tempered in Quakerism, as it was among Puritans, by the Calvinist emphasis on the awful distance between the sovereign Lord of being and his lowly creatures.’
55 Edward Calamy, *The Account of the Ministers, Lecturers, Masters and Fellows of Colleges and Schoolmasters, who were Ejected and Silenced after the Restoration in 1660, by or before the Act of Uniformity* (London: Printed for R Ford at the Angel, R Hett at the Bible and Crown and J Chandler at the Cross-Keys all in the Poultry, MDCCXIII), p. 419. This same view was expressed by Taylor, who described Fox as having ‘rebelled against the Calvinistic theology of the Presbyterian church.’ Ernest E. Taylor, ‘Episodes in the life of George Fox.’ *The Friend* 46, no. 1, 5th January 1906, p. 9.
beliefs and theology that they acquired on their journeys. Various Quakers were shown to have had contacts with Grindletonians,\textsuperscript{56} English Separatists,\textsuperscript{57} Diggers,\textsuperscript{58} Ranters,\textsuperscript{59} Levellers,\textsuperscript{60} Familists,\textsuperscript{61} and, according to Hill, ‘Presbyterianism, Independency and Anabaptistry before ending as Seekers ... Ranters... or as Quakers.’\textsuperscript{62} Along with Hill, other authors, such as Gwyn,\textsuperscript{63} Reay,\textsuperscript{64} Durnbaugh,\textsuperscript{65} and McGregor\textsuperscript{66} show Seekers as a transitional stopping-off point for many Quakers with Hill, correctly in my view, likening the Seekers to the Quakers without placing dependence of the latter on the former, and no causal link between them.\textsuperscript{67}

Although it was a requirement for all members of seventeenth-century society to be baptized in infancy into the established Church, many of the early Quakers, including Fox himself, arrived at their Quaker positions having spent a period of their religious ‘seeking’ life amongst various English Baptist congregations (see Chapter 5). I have proposed that the early Quakers, including Fox, would have been positively directed in their theological development by their associations with the Arminian General Baptists, and negatively directed by their associations with the Calvinist Particular Baptists. However, when discussing the contacts

\textsuperscript{58} Thomas Comber, \textit{Christianity no Enthusiasm: or, the Several Kinds of Inspirations and Revelations Pretended to by the Quakers} (London: Printed by T.D. for Henry Breme, at the Gun at the West end of St. Pauls, 1678), p. 181.
\textsuperscript{60} Christopher Hill, \textit{The World Turned Upside Down}, p. 240.
\textsuperscript{61} Ernest A. Payne, ‘The Anabaptist impact on Western Chistendom’, p. 314.
\textsuperscript{62} Christopher Hill, \textit{The World Turned Upside Down}, pp. 190-191.
\textsuperscript{65} Donald F. Durnbaugh, ‘Baptists and Quakers’, p. 76.
\textsuperscript{67} Christopher Hill, \textit{The World Turned Upside Down}, p. 72.
made by the early Quakers with the Baptist communities, authors have either assumed, sometimes erroneously, (see 4.4 above), that they were communities of General Baptists, or had not identified the Baptist grouping at all. Without that specific knowledge it is not possible to identify the elements of each Baptist group’s theologies and practices that positively and negatively directed the first Quakers.

Chapter 7 established that there is no evidence to confirm any contact between proto-Quakers or Quakers with continental European Anabaptists prior to the visit of Caton and Stubbs in 1655. This confirms Ingles’ view that Quakerism was an ‘English’ phenomenon, with no links to continental Europe. This finding runs counter to the views expressed by Robert Barclay of Reigate, Horton Davies, and de Vries. However, the indirect contact between Quakers and continental Anabaptists, via the English General Baptists did, I propose, have a significant effect on the evolution of Quaker theology and practice.

This research therefore concludes that authors claiming a direct link between Quakerism and mysticism, puritanism or continental anabaptism were, and are, mistaken, as are those who infer, without detailed research, a direct reliance by the first Quakers upon the theology and practices of the English Baptists.

68 H. Larry Ingle, First Among Friends, p. 36, ‘the ‘General Baptists’ with whom Fox’s uncle Pickering was associated.’
71 R. Barclay, The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth, p. 222. However, Barclay does not state whether he believed that the Quakers ‘stemmed’ directly from the Waterlander Mennonites, or indirectly via the General Baptists.
72 Horton Davies, Worship and Theology in England, Section II, pp. 61 and 497.
73 Tiemen de Vries, Holland’s influence on English Language and Literature, p. 266.
8.4 Future research agenda

One of the outcomes of this thesis is the identification of areas requiring further research; areas that will further aid the understanding of the background to the beginning of Quakerism in England. Future research, as originated by this thesis, falls into two distinct categories: ‘Research in the Netherlands’ and ‘Research in England.’

8.4.1 Research in the Netherlands

It was stated in 7.2.2 that the only non-Quaker documents containing possible evidence of contact between Quakers or proto-Quakers and Dutch religious bodies that this researcher was able to trace related to the Amsterdam Waterlander Mennonite community. It could be argued that those documents are the ones that are the most likely to include reference to such contacts in view of the previous, significant, contact with them by the founders of the English General Baptist movement, see Chapters 4 and 5. As described in 7.4 above, a major researcher into the rise of Quakerism in the Netherlands was William I. Hull. It is surprising that, in his books and research papers, he made no reference to these Waterlander Mennonite minutes. Neither did he refer to any other documents produced by Dutch religious communities that could possibly contain reference to contact with those communities by the first Quakers in the Netherlands or by proto-Quakers travelling in the Netherlands before Caton and Stubbs’ first journey there in 1655.

74 Memoriael van de handelingen bij de Gemeenke voor Reynier Wybrantzen, ‘A’ 1612-1641 and Memoriael van de handelingen bij de Dienaren voor Reynier Wybrantzen, ‘B’. Transcribed from the original by Frank Mertens and Peter van der Lee.
75 See, William I. Hull, The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam (Swarthmore College Monographs on Quaker History, Philadelphia. 1938) and William I. Hull, Benjamin Furly and Quakerism in Rotterdam (Lancaster,
In order to complete the picture of early Quaker-Mennonite/Collegiant contact in the Netherlands further research is required in the Netherlands. That research should ascertain whether any Dutch based documentation written prior to the documented pamphlet wars between William Ames and the Collegiants in 1657, other than the minutes produced by Wybrands, and which pinpoints contact between the early Quakers and the Collegiant communities in the Netherlands, exists. In addition, that research needs to identify, again from Dutch-based documents, possible Quaker contact with Mennonite communities other than the Amsterdam Waterlander Mennonites. This latter research needs to focus on the meeting between Quakers and the Mennonite congregation in Zutphen, (see 7.4.3 above), of which only passing reference is made by Caton. That research must seek evidence to prove, or disprove, the theory that the Quaker Jane Wilkinson, (see 7.4.1 above), had been in contact with Dutch Mennonite groups ahead of the first Quaker-documented contact by Ames and Caton.

8.4.2 Research in England

This thesis has identified a number of questions that have been explored as far as necessary for the purpose of this research, but have not been satisfactorily resolved: the identity of ‘Priest Boys’ and the religious background to Fox’s ‘Uncle Pickering.’ Neither of these issues had been thoroughly investigated by previous researchers.

Pennsylvania: Swarthmore College Monographs, 1941). Also investigated were the research papers of William I. Hull held at Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania.

76 See 7.4.4 above.
77 See 7.2.2 above.
Of particular relevance to this thesis is the religious background of ‘Uncle Pickering’ and identification of the Baptist congregation to which he was affiliated in the 1640s when he was visited by George Fox. Further research on this topic will add to the knowledge of the theology to which Fox was exposed on his visit to London in around 1644/5, which could then identify those elements of Baptist theology that Fox accepted and those that he rejected in later years. This research into Baptist congregations should be extended to include, using Baptist sources, the identity and theology of the Baptist congregations to which the early Quakers, with documented Baptist backgrounds, were associated. As shown in Chapter 5 above, Quaker-produced documentation relating to those contacts referred to the congregations as being ‘Baptist’ or ‘Anabaptist.’ Further research is essential in order to identify the positive and negative effects that those contacts had on the development of subsequent Quaker theology and practice.79

In 5.3.2 above, the results of the research into the identity of ‘Priest Boys’ was described, and reference made to the research of others into Boys’ identity. Neither this research, nor that of other researchers has been conclusive, and further work is required in order to establish categorically, the identity of ‘Priest Boys.’

For the purposes of this thesis, I consider the research I have undertaken to date into the identities of Boys and Pickering to be necessary and sufficient. However, I do consider that further research on these topics, in their own right, is desirable.

79 Without producing any evidence, Tallack suggested that the contact that the early Quakers had was with the General Baptist community. This suggestion was based solely on some commonality of theology and practice. See William Tallack, George Fox. The Friends and the Early Baptists, p. 87, ‘it could be argued that Friends are the modern representatives of the General Baptists.’ Durnbaugh more correctly expands the question to possible contact with General and Particular Baptists. Donald F Durnbaugh, ‘Baptists and Quakers’, p. 75.
There are three further, subsidiary topics covered in this thesis which have, to some extent,
been left open-ended. Those topics are: the identity of the Lago family, George Fox’s
matrilineal ancestry and its possible link with Maryan martyrs, the identity of ‘Cousin
Bradford’, Fox’s cousin, whose behaviour, it is considered by some, was a significant factor
in directing Fox’s religious thinking, and the identity of Nathaniel Stephens, Fox’s parish
priest, both in the years leading up to his many meetings with Fox, and in the following years
up to the time of his death. Research into each of these topics would, I believe, add
significantly to the overall understanding of the factors that led George Fox in his theological
thinking.

8.5 Chapter summary
This chapter of my thesis restated the objectives of this research, summarised the main
findings of the research and highlighted its original contribution. This latter aspect of the
research has been used to identify propositions regarding early Quakerism made by authors
that are not now borne out by available evidence: dependence upon the ‘mystics’,
identification with Puritanism, and direct influence from continental Europe. This chapter also
identified topics for further research.
APPENDIX 1

Named contacts of George Fox

This Appendix shows all the named contacts that George Fox noted in his *Journal*,¹ as having between the years 1624 and 1652. This was a working document, and is a sub-set of a larger schedule that included, in addition, references to all contacts made and noted by Fox with unnamed people.

The schedule shows the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The date, shown in the <em>Journal</em>, of the contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The number of the page in the <em>Journal</em> on which the contact is described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The name of the people contacted by Fox.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Names in <strong>BLUE</strong> denote the only recorded meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Names in <strong>RED</strong> denote the first of a number of recorded meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Names in <strong>BLACK</strong> denote subsequent recorded meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A brief description of the circumstances of the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Comments made by the writer and reference to notes, included at the end of Appendix 1 by:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Who met</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>Circumstances</th>
<th>Comments, Ingle refs, Moore refs, Short journal refs, Penny refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Christopher Fox – father</td>
<td>Fenny Drayton</td>
<td>Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mary Lago - mother</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>’of the stock of martyrs’ only other reference is to her death. Note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>George Gee (Name in notes only)</td>
<td>Mancetter</td>
<td>Apprenticed to him as shoemaker</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1630s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pages 7/8 of Ingle&lt;br&gt;Robert Mason was rector at Drayton in the Clay...one of Mason’s catechists would have been George Fox...[in the late 1630s].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pages 13 to 16 of Ingle&lt;br&gt;Anthony Nutter was priest in Drayton-in-the Clay from October 1582. Displayed reformist principles over 20 years there. He contributed his share to the mix that made religious reformers like George Fox and James Naylor possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cousin Bradford + 1 other (no name given)</td>
<td>Atherstone near Drayton</td>
<td>Drinking at a fair</td>
<td>Bradford was a ‘professor’ of religion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1644</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Uncle Pickering + others</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Baptist ‘They were tender then’– but was fearful – why? Note 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Priest Nathaniel Stephens</td>
<td>Fenny Drayton</td>
<td>Visited Fox with another Unnamed priest with whom Fox debated</td>
<td>What he picked up from Fox.&lt;br&gt;He preached on a Sunday. Fox did not like this – Why? No credit?&lt;br&gt;Priest eventually became a persecutor of Fox.&lt;br&gt;Note 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Who met</td>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Circumstances</td>
<td>Comments, Ingle refs, Moore refs, Short journal refs, Penny refs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Richard Abel (Name only in notes)</td>
<td>Mancetter in Warwickshire Despite being in a different county, very close to Fenny Drayton across the border.</td>
<td>Priest visited by Fox</td>
<td>Suggested Fox took tobacco and sang. ‘I could not sing’ and told others of his conversations with GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dr Craddock</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>Visited</td>
<td>Discussed, trod on flowers and priest. raged. Met again in 1665 in Scarborough?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>John Macham (Machin or Machen)</td>
<td>Lichfield/Atherstone (see ref in Hodgkin)</td>
<td>Visited</td>
<td>Suggested blood letting, but couldn’t obtain any. See JFHS ii9 (1903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hooton</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>One of a number of tender people – but he [Fox] fasted much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>20/21</td>
<td>‘..one Brown..’</td>
<td>Mansfield (?)</td>
<td>Not met</td>
<td>Did not meet Fox, but prophesied about him on his death bed. Seems as though people then turned to GF after Brown’s death. Note 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Priest Kellet</td>
<td>Mansfield (?)</td>
<td>Met him</td>
<td>One of the ‘tender priests’ – against parsonages, until he obtained a ‘great one’ and then became a persecutor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Priest Nicholas Folkingham</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>‘ ‘</td>
<td>‘God did not dwell in temples.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mayor (William Nix) Sheriffs (John Reckless and Richard Watkinson)</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>After being taken out of prison (from above event)</td>
<td>Sent him back to prison but John Reckless then sent for him as he and his wife were convinced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Who met</td>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Circumstances</td>
<td>Comments, Ingle refs, Moore refs, Short journal refs, Penny refs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>43</td>
<td><strong>Elizabeth Hooton</strong></td>
<td>Skegby</td>
<td>Meeting at which the woman (above) was present</td>
<td>Met the woman on a later day and seemed to have healed her. Kept her for two weeks then sent her back to her friends. Note 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>But text suggests he was still in prison at this time!</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>44</td>
<td><strong>Sir John Digby</strong> Magistrate</td>
<td>Mansfield-Woodhouse</td>
<td>Following on from previous event</td>
<td>Freed Fox – but threatened him with guns not to return.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Baptists and <strong>Samuel Oates</strong></td>
<td>Barrow, Leicestershire</td>
<td>Discussed sin and baptism</td>
<td>Parted – ‘some were loving to us.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>46/7</td>
<td>Prisoners in Coventry Gaol</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>Heard of them and had discussions with them as they said they were God</td>
<td>He perceived they were Ranters and so left them. He says that he had not previously met with Ranters. One of them, Joseph Salmon then wrote a paper recanting ‘Heights in Depths and Depths in Heights’, 1651. Then he was set free. Note 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>48</td>
<td><strong>Nathaniel Stephens</strong> and many priests and professors</td>
<td>Market Bosworth, Leicestershire</td>
<td>Moved to go there</td>
<td>Stephens told the people that Fox was mad. Stoned by the people. Reference to Colonel George Purefoy, Squire of Drayton, but no mention of Fox meeting him. Note 8 re Purefoy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649</td>
<td>49/50</td>
<td><strong>Priest Thomas Bretland</strong></td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Minded to go there</td>
<td>Bretland had already been partly convinced. Became a priest when the incumbent died then he ‘choked.’ Later the ‘judgement of the Lord’ came on him and he died. Spoke in church then ejected. Note 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649/50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td><strong>Major Ralph Clark</strong></td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>After ejection from the church</td>
<td>Ejected from the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Who met</td>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Circumstances</td>
<td>Comments, Ingle refs, Moore refs, Short journal refs, Penny refs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/10/1650</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Officers, priests and preachers</td>
<td>Derby [steeplehouse?]</td>
<td>A lecture meeting</td>
<td>He spoke to people there and was taken to the magistrates – Gervase Bennet Note 10 and Nathaniel Barton Note 11 * ‘I told them also, all their preaching, baptism and sacrifices would never sanctify them.’ Sent to prison in Derby for six months along with John Fretwell (although there were two people with him in Derby). Fretwell obtained his release and may have testified against Fox.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Noah Bullock</td>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>Wrote to him as Mayor</td>
<td>No suggestion that they met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Gaoler Thomas Sharman</td>
<td>Derby Gaol</td>
<td>A professor who saw he had done wrong to Fox.</td>
<td>Stayed with Fox in his cell and criticised Fretwell who did not ‘stand to his principle.’ Then went to the justices to obtain Fox’s freedom. Later convinced. One of the justices was Gervase Bennet who first named the Quakers. At meeting * above?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Rice Jones - soldier and Baptist</td>
<td>Derby Gaol (or nearby)</td>
<td>Visited Fox on the way to Worcester to fight</td>
<td>Discussed outward suffering of Christ and left. Note 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Soldiers</td>
<td>Derby Gaol</td>
<td>Sent by Justice Bennet to get him to enlist in the Army</td>
<td>Taken to ‘Sergeant Hole’ – whatever or whoever that is!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Richard Farnworth Note 13 and Note 41</td>
<td>Balby, Yorkshire</td>
<td>Travelling and Preaching</td>
<td>Farnworth, Thomas Killam, John Killam, Thomas Aldam (Note 14 and Note 40) convinced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>John Leek</td>
<td>At Captain Pursloe’s (Richard Pursglove (Note 18) at Cranswick by Selby)</td>
<td>Had visited Fox in prison and had been convinced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Who met</td>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Circumstances</td>
<td>Comments, Ingle refs, Moore refs, Short journal refs, Penny refs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>John Pomroy</td>
<td>Beverley</td>
<td>Pomroy preaching at steeplehouse and then Fox preached</td>
<td>Mayor came to ‘reason’ with Fox and then Fox left.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>74/5</td>
<td>Durant Hotham</td>
<td>Near Cranswick</td>
<td>Visited Hotham after staying at Capt Pursloe’s again</td>
<td>Hotham said that he had ‘known the principle this ten year.’ Priest came but was soon quiet. Woman visited Hotham and Fox to talk of a visitation at her Church. After she had left Fox explained that it was him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Priest Edward Bowles</td>
<td>York Minster</td>
<td>Commanded by the Lord to go there</td>
<td>Spoke in the Minster after the Priest. Thrown out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Professors and Ranters and Priest Philip Scafe (Scarth)</td>
<td>Staithes</td>
<td>A great meeting and great convincements. Priest had become ‘a pretty minister’ but on page 83 is described as convinced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>81/2</td>
<td>Ranters, Thomas Bushel and ‘Levens a Scot’</td>
<td>Staithes (but not at the steeplehouse)</td>
<td>A discussion arranged by the Ranters</td>
<td>All the Ranters forced by Fox’s arguments to stop speaking. Went for a walk with Levens and his brother-in-law, William Ratcliffe as witness to the discussion. Very angry after leaving Fox and Fox suspected that Levens would have done Fox harm had Ratcliffe not been with them. Levens and his wife became convinced some years later and Fox visited them around 1663.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>82/3</td>
<td>A High Priest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Came to dispute with Fox, Scafe there as well</td>
<td>Scafe and high priest disputed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Priests and professors</td>
<td>Pickering School house</td>
<td>Visited</td>
<td>Some convinced including Justice Luke Robinson’s priest Robinson’s priest wanted to buy Fox’s dinner. Offered his steeplehouse for Fox to preach in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Justice Luke Robinson</td>
<td>Thornton Risedale (not shown on maps)</td>
<td>Met him in his ‘chamber’</td>
<td>Opened with the Truth. Note 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Who met</td>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Circumstances</td>
<td>Comments, Ingle refs, Moore refs, Short journal refs, Penny refs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Mr Boys</td>
<td>In the country</td>
<td>People called to the old priest</td>
<td>‘Mr Boys, we owe you twenty shillings for tithe’ – but he would not take it. Note 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Mr Boys</td>
<td>Pickering Church (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>'much painted'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Burdett</td>
<td>Egton Bridge</td>
<td>A meeting</td>
<td>Boys still with him ‘he had been looked upon as a great high priest above Common Prayer men and Presbyters and Independents.’ People complained about Boys to Justice Hotham. It seems as though at this point Boys and Fox parted company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651/2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Capt Pursloe and Justice Hotham</td>
<td>Cranswick</td>
<td>Discussion with Hotham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651/2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tender woman at Justice Pearson’s</td>
<td>Holderness (not on map)</td>
<td></td>
<td>She said she would leave all and follow Fox. Pearson later convinced. Note 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>George Hartas’s [home?]</td>
<td>Ulrome</td>
<td></td>
<td>Many convinced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Col. Robert Overton (a fifth monarchist)</td>
<td>Ulrome</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Many convinced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>93/4</td>
<td>A professor</td>
<td>Ulrome</td>
<td>In steeplehouse</td>
<td>Pushed Fox out of the church. Professor then arrested by Hotham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Priest – maybe Thomas Rookby</td>
<td>Warmsworth</td>
<td>Steeplehouse with Thomas Aldam</td>
<td>In dispute with priest then thrown out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>98/9</td>
<td>Priest John Gosfield</td>
<td>Tickhill</td>
<td>At a meeting with Friends then to steeplehouse</td>
<td>Badly beaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Who met</td>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Circumstances</td>
<td>Comments, Ingle refs, Moore refs, Short journal refs, Penny refs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>100</td>
<td><strong>Lieutenant Roper</strong></td>
<td>York (?)</td>
<td>Taken with Aldam (Note 14) to justices under arrest then to Roper’s hous for a meeting</td>
<td>Present at the meeting were James Naylor, Thomas Goodaire, William Dewsbury [convinced the previous year] and Richard Farnworth. Note 16 Aldam then imprisoned for 2 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>100/1</td>
<td>Priest Christopher Marshall (‘the Lord cut him off in his wickedness not long after [ejected?]’)</td>
<td>Wakefield at an Independent Church</td>
<td>Went to steeplehouse and preached after the priest had finished</td>
<td>Taken out and beaten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>101/2</td>
<td>With Richard Farnworth</td>
<td>Not sure where from text</td>
<td>Farnworth preached in the steeplehouse</td>
<td>Then met up with Fox in Bradford. Offered food but ‘Eat not thy bread with such as has an evil eye’ ‘The woman was a Baptist.’ However Farnworth was already there so presumably he knew she was a Baptist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Widow Green</td>
<td>Liversedge</td>
<td>Knew a murderer</td>
<td>Murderer was to do harm to Fox and on Green’s say so, but he missed them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>103/4</td>
<td>Pendle Hill</td>
<td>Just saw it whilst travelling and moved to go to the top.</td>
<td>‘I was moved to sound the day of the Lord….he had a great people to be gathered.’ ‘for I had eaten little and drunk little for several days.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>An alehouse – no information on where it was</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘And the Lord had opened to me at that place, and let me see a great people in white raiment by a river’s side and the place was near John Blaykling’s where Richard Robinson lived (Sedbergh, West Yorks). **Note 21 This is the first mention of these two people. How did Fox know them or where they lived?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Kinsman of John Blaykling</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Came to his house</td>
<td>Offered Fox money, but he would not take it. Was this the Thomas Blaykling mentioned later?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Who met</td>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Circumstances</td>
<td>Comments, Ingle refs, Moore refs, Short journal refs, Penny refs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>106</td>
<td><strong>James Tennant</strong></td>
<td>Scarhouse, Langstrothdale</td>
<td>Came to his house</td>
<td>He and family convinced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Major Bousfield</td>
<td>Garsdale</td>
<td>Came to his house</td>
<td>Some were convinced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Richard Robinson</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td></td>
<td>Had to ask the way, despite ** above. He was convinced, but thought that Fox had come to rob him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 June 1652</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Gervase Benson</td>
<td>Sedburgh</td>
<td>Went to a Seeker’s Meeting</td>
<td>‘This was the place that I had seen people coming forth in white raiment.’ Not according to ** above. Notes 21 &amp; 22 See note 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Francis Howgill, a Separate preacher</td>
<td>Sedburgh</td>
<td>At the town fair</td>
<td>Supported what Fox preached. Note 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Captain Henry Ward</td>
<td>At Thomas Blaykling’s at Draw-well*</td>
<td>Came to the house</td>
<td>Remarked on Fox’s piercing eyes, and was convinced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>John Blaykling and others</td>
<td>Firbank Chapel</td>
<td>A great meeting</td>
<td>Howgill and Audland (Note 23) had preached in the morning. Fox sat on a rock and preached. More than 1,000 people. Separate teachers convinced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>John Story</td>
<td>At John Audland’s house at Crosslands</td>
<td>Offered Fox tobacco</td>
<td>Took a smoke of Story’s pipe to prove a point – but no indication of what the point was! Later convinced. Note 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1652</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>‘One Cocks’</td>
<td>Kendal</td>
<td>Met in the street</td>
<td>Offered Fox tobacco but he did not take it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>110/1</td>
<td>Miles Bateman (Note 25) and Edward Burrough (Note 26)</td>
<td>Bateman’s house in Underbarrow</td>
<td>Disputed with several people</td>
<td>Priests and professors also came at night. Asked priests to arrange a meeting the following day in the steeplehouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Miles and Stephen Hubbersty</td>
<td>Near Underbarrow</td>
<td>The meeting, above, did not take place</td>
<td>These two wanted the meeting, above, to take place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

376
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Who met</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>Circumstances</th>
<th>Comments, Ingle refs, Moore refs, Short journal refs, Penny refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>John Dickinson</td>
<td>Went to his house at Crosthwaite</td>
<td>Was convinced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>James Taylor</td>
<td>His house at Newton, Cartmel, Lancs</td>
<td>Meeting at his house</td>
<td>Many convinced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 June 1652</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Priest Gabriel Camelford</td>
<td>His chapel at Staveley</td>
<td>Spoke after the priest had finished</td>
<td>Thrown out and beaten. Church warden, John Knipe, threw Fox over a wall, but ‘the Lord cut him off.’ Spoke to a young man, John Braithwaite, who became convinced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Captain Adam Sandys</td>
<td>Bouth, Ulverston</td>
<td>Fox said they were hypocrites</td>
<td>His son was dying, he thought his father ‘lightness and jesting’ but he was ignored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Priest William Lampitt</td>
<td>Swarthmore</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Lampitt was, and still is, a Ranter ‘so full of filth.’ Note 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Margaret Fell</td>
<td>Swarthmore</td>
<td>Returned and told that Fox and Lampitt had disagreed</td>
<td>She was ‘in profession with him.’ Fox discussed with her. Lampitt returned, she saw through him and was convinced. Note 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Priest Lampitt</td>
<td>Ulverston steeplehouse</td>
<td>Asked to go there by Margaret Fell</td>
<td>Fox spoke to Lampitt and other people. Justice John Sawrey shouted for Fox to be taken away. Margaret Fell said to leave him, but Sawry had him removed. Note 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Priest Thomas Lawson</td>
<td>Chapel at Rampside</td>
<td>Spoke to the people after the priest had finished</td>
<td>Priest convinced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Priest Soutweke</td>
<td>Walney Island</td>
<td>Spoke after priest had finished</td>
<td>Priest left then hid, but Fox spoke to the people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>James Lancaster</td>
<td>His home on Walney Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>Was convinced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Margaret and Sarah Fell</td>
<td>Swarthmoor</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘The Lord’s power seized upon’ them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Leonard Fell</td>
<td>Baycliff</td>
<td>Visited him</td>
<td>Was convinced. Note 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Who met</td>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Circumstances</td>
<td>Comments, Ingle refs, Moore refs, Short journal refs, Penny refs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>James Dickinson and professors</td>
<td>Dickinson’s home at Crosthwaite</td>
<td>Lampitt had raised the people against Fox</td>
<td>Were convinced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>John Audland, Gervase Benson, John Blaykling, Richard Robinson</td>
<td>At their homes</td>
<td>Visited</td>
<td>Had ‘great’ meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Judge Thomas Fell</td>
<td>Swarthmoor</td>
<td>Margaret Fell asked Fox to return</td>
<td>Justice Sawry had ‘incensed’ Fell and Capt Sandys against Fox (but Sandys not present at this meeting). Fell asked Fox to visit Judge John Bradshaw to convince him. Note 31 Sandys then visited and created as did Justice Sawry. Fox argued with them. Other people came as did Farnworth and Naylor (who had been fasting for 14 days). Note 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Robert Widders</td>
<td>His house at Over Kellet</td>
<td>Many people came</td>
<td>Many convinced and many later references to him. Note 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Priest William Marshall</td>
<td>Steeplehouse at Lancaster</td>
<td>Thrown out and stoned, then went to John Lawson’s house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Priest Thomas Whitehead</td>
<td>Steeplehouse at Halton</td>
<td>Spoke after the priest had finished</td>
<td>Doctor – could run him through with his sword – but later convinced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Miles Bateman and people</td>
<td>Bateman’s house at Underbarrow</td>
<td>Went there and had a ‘mighty meeting’</td>
<td>Many convinced. Used similar words as 4 years earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Many priests</td>
<td>Ulverston</td>
<td>Heard of a meeting of priests there</td>
<td>All joined with Lampitt against Fox. Priest Philip Bennet spoke to Fox – he saw the steeplehouse shake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Priest Thomas Taylor</td>
<td>Swarthmoor</td>
<td>Meeting of several priests with Fox</td>
<td>Taylor admitted he had never heard the voice of God, but only spoke of the experiences of those who had. Became convinced and a minister and travelled with Fox.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Who met</td>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Circumstances</td>
<td>Comments, Ingle refs, Moore refs, Short journal refs, Penny refs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Priest Christopher Taylor (Note 33) Thomas Taylor’s brother</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Was convinced and became a minister</td>
<td>No record of whether he met Fox. Also stated as becoming ministers John Audland, Francis Howgill, John Camn, Note 34, Richard Hubberthorne, Note 43, Miles and Stephen Hubbersty, Miles Halhead and James Naylor. Also see Note 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Lampitt and many priests and professors</td>
<td>Lampitt’s house (Ulverston?)</td>
<td>Gathered for a lecture, Fox disputed with them</td>
<td>Mixed reception. Lampitt raged against Quaker meetings being held in houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>126/7</td>
<td>Lampitt and Justice Sawrey (a Baptist)</td>
<td>Steeplehouse at Ulverston</td>
<td>Dispute with Sawrey</td>
<td>People wanted to get hold of Fox to beat him. Sawrey let them. He then took Fox out of the steeplehouse and handed him to the constables to be whipped. Struck by a man on his arm, numbed but recovered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Leonard Pearson</td>
<td>Ulverston market</td>
<td>Met him, a soldier with a sword</td>
<td>Wanted to help Fox. Fox told him to put his sword away if he were to follow him. Said days later the soldier was beaten by seven men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>James Lancaster</td>
<td>Went by boat to his home (?)</td>
<td>He was a Friend, but his wife wasn’t. She organised a group to beat up Fox</td>
<td>People rushed to beat him up when he came ashore, James Lancaster lay across Fox to save him. They then set on James Nayler. Wife later convinced, and several of those who beat him fell under 'judgement of God.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Priest Thomas Lawson</td>
<td>Thomas Hutton’s house at Rampside where Lawson lodged</td>
<td>Lawson already convinced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th Oct 1652</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>John Sawrey and Justice George Thompson</td>
<td>Lancaster Sessions</td>
<td>Taken there by Judge Fell</td>
<td>Appeared at the sessions where he then met Col William West, another Justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th October 1652</td>
<td>133 and 136</td>
<td>Priest Dr William Marshall</td>
<td>Lancaster Sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td>The priest chosen to put the case against Fox, but later says ‘George, if thou hast anything to say to the people, thou mayest freely declare it in the open Sessions.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Who met</td>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Circumstances</td>
<td>Comments, Ingle refs, Moore refs, Short journal refs, Penny refs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th October 1652</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Priest <strong>John Jacques</strong> (vicar of Bolton-le-Dands)</td>
<td>Lancaster Sessions</td>
<td>Argued with Fox in the Sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th October 1652</td>
<td>137</td>
<td><strong>Justice Gervase Benson</strong> and <strong>Thomas Rippon</strong>, mayor of Lancaster</td>
<td>Lancaster Sessions</td>
<td>‘There was Justice Benson of Westmorland who was convinced [already as per Ingle Note 22, or on that day contrary to Ingle?] and Mayor Rippon...who was convinced also.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th October 1652</td>
<td>137</td>
<td><strong>Thomas Briggs</strong></td>
<td>Lancaster Session</td>
<td>Convinced that day and ‘declared against his priest Jacques.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>140</td>
<td><strong>John Sawrey and George Thompson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘And this persecuting John Sawrey at last was drowned; and the vengeance of God overtook the other justice, Thompson, that he was struck with the dead palsy upon the Bench and carried away off his seat and died.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>141</td>
<td><strong>Sir Robert Bindloss’ servants</strong></td>
<td>Robert Widder’s house</td>
<td>Attacked the meeting and took away Richard Hubberthorne and others. One of them then went to Francis Fleming’s house to attack the occupants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>141</td>
<td><strong>Justice William West</strong></td>
<td>At his home</td>
<td>Travelled there with <strong>Richard Hubberthorne</strong></td>
<td>Rode across the dangerous sands, people accused him of being a witch as he was not drowned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Fox wrote to <strong>John Sawrey</strong>, <strong>William Lampitt</strong>, <strong>Priest Richard Tatham</strong> and <strong>Adam Sandys</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not a meeting, but why write to Sawrey who Fox says was drowned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Wrote to <strong>Leonard Burton</strong> priest of Sedburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘he being in the same evil ground, nature and practice which the other priests were in.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>144/6</td>
<td><strong>Priest Richard Stookes</strong></td>
<td>A meeting at <strong>Alexander Dixon’s</strong> house at Thursgill and other subsequent meetings nearby and in his own parish, Grayrigg.</td>
<td>Stokes was a Baptist who disputed with Fox that the Scriptures were the Word of God. Fox said they were ‘the words of God’ and that ‘Christ was the Word.’ Stokes challenged Fox and they met in Grayrigg. Some baptized there and ‘intended to have done mischief.’ Some convinced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>146</td>
<td><strong>Priest Philip Bennett</strong></td>
<td>His steeplehouse in Cartmel</td>
<td>Bennett had issued a challenge to dispute with Fox.</td>
<td>Spoke to Bennett and his people after he had finished preaching but Bennett would not argue with Fox and went home. Fox followed, but Bennett would not come out. One of Bennett’s ‘bitterest professors’, <strong>Richard Roper</strong> was convinced and became ‘a fine minister.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>291, note 20</td>
<td>‘Northern Warwickshire contained a large number of Lago families, but it has proved impossible to connect any of them directly with Mary. The economic status of the Lagos ranged from substantial landowners to penniless waevers (Joseph Pickvance, letter to the author, 22 April 1989).’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>294, note 52</td>
<td>‘The tradition that Gee was Fox’s master cannot be absolutely confirmed, but it goes back a long way.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>297, note 47</td>
<td>‘While Fox did not mention his uncle’s given name, referring to him only as ‘Pickering’, the most obvious candidate for this designation was the Pickering named William.’ (Ref to the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey church in Baptist Historical Transactions (1910) p. 214. Uncle Pickering – what was his relationship to the Fox/Lago families?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37/8</td>
<td>Nathaniel Stephens. ‘A staunch Presbyterian...well to do Oxford Master of Arts...Bookish Stephens...authority on the Book of Revelations...single[d] out Fox’s exegeses and adapt[ed] them for his Sunday sermons, no doubt to rebut the Baptist position [on predestination].’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>‘Brown...A Fifth Monarchist preacher.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Amor Stoddard. Only ref to a later meeting in 1654.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Joseph Salmon. ‘A New Model Army soldier on his way to becoming a Baptist.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>George Purefoy ‘the Purefey or Purefoy family were...staunch Presbyterians.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Thomas Bretland ‘choking himself on the parish tithes’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Bennett ‘applied the label Quaker.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>301.</td>
<td>Nathaniel Barton ‘a Presbyterian preacher in Derby.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Rhys Jones ‘formerly a soldiering Baptist and an early and enthusiastic convert to Fox’s beliefs...took Fox’s ideas more literally than Fox intended...inward Christ made belief in the historic Jesus initially unnecessary...Jones and his followers (called by Fox) ‘Proud Quakers’ [label unclear].’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Farnworth ‘At a meeting in Wellingborough [when?] Richard Farnworth...found a Ranter...coming to disrupt it.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Adlam ‘in custody on his way to York jail...escort allowed him to attend Fox’s meeting.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 &amp; 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ingle seems to be mixing up/combining the meeting on page 73 of the <em>Journal</em> at Note 15 with a later meeting on page 100 of the <em>Journal</em> at Note 16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>‘Found there [Wakefield] former weaver and soldier William Dewsbury.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>‘Richard Pursgrove [sic] accompanied [Fox] to the local Sunday church service...without wearing the ruffled collar.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>‘Luke Robinson ...one of the regicides and a member of the Council of State.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>‘The Roundhead judge, Anthony Pearson of Durham, had just been convinced and brought his wife to Bootle to meet and travel with Fox [obviously a later event].’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>‘The next Sunday, he arrived at Borrat, on a hill above Sedburgh, in the tow of Richard Robinson who escorted him the last few miles to meet Gervase Benson, an army colonel, justice of the peace and a man on the make.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>‘Disillusioned enough... to allow a group of dissenters to gather in his house that day...He [Fox] converted Benson on the spot...put his legal expertise...at the service of the Children [of the Light].’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>‘John Audland, only twenty-two years old but already enjoying a wide reputation for his preaching skill, and invasion of the churches in the region.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>‘Margaret Fox…in late January 1673…took on the men of the area who opposed a broadening of women’s roles in the Quaker movement, particularly John Story, their acknowledged leader. A Westmorlander who had suffered imprisonment while working as an evangelist in the South.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>‘Miles Bateman, a Friend who had gone abroad [in 1656].’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>‘Pre-existing network of dissenters…Naylor…Farnworth…Dewsbury…Howgill…Camm and Edward Burrough.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>‘Lampitt had entered Oxford in 1621. A friend of the notorious Baptist lieutenant colonel Paul Hobson…ejected [from Aikton] when…authorities…refused,…congregation right to name its own minister…perhaps what pulled him [Fox] forward was the parish’s [Ulverston] reputation for dissent.’ [See notes in Sect 5 of Thesis under Fox.] See also comment in ‘Undaunted Zeal’ filed under Fell for more on Lampitt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>‘[Margaret Fell] Having heard of the Children of the Light when Fox had earlier travelled within twenty miles of her home’ [Margaret Fell to Priest Camelford Spence MS 3:135]. The actual document is to ‘A Friendly Reader’ and not to Camelford, and the numbers written on the document render it difficult to decide what is the correct number. However, Elsa Glines refers to as Spence 3/135, 124 and the actual reference to Fox is ‘we had not so much as heard of the people called quakers till wee heard of Geo: Fox Coming towards us. It may be when he was 20 miles off.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 cont’d</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>‘Fell promised to post a letter to Richard Farnworth, inviting him to Swarthmore. [admitted extrapolation on behalf of Ingle] The stage was thus arranged for important decisions in the brief life of the movement…the Children of the Light was just beginning to take shape.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>‘John Sawrey, a local justice of the peace who had witnessed Fox’s invasion of St Mary’s Church, had also told Judge Fell that his [Fell’s] family had succumbed to Fox’s wiles.’ In a note at the end of a Letter from Margaret Fell, Spence 3/14, ‘Sawrey; called a Just[ice] whoe was droned [drowned] in a pudle soone after 1652.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>‘Leonard Fell, a longtime [in March 1677] Lancashire Friend.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>‘The chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, the regicidal John Bradshaw. Fell’s superior and close friend.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>‘One such Quaker outlaw, the strong-minded Robert Widders of Upper Kellet in Lancashire, had an estate large enough to be assessed fines of £143 for not paying tithes.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>‘Christopher Taylor [in 1684] one of Fox’s oldest Friends.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>‘Audland escorted his guest [Fox] southward to the Preston Patrick home of John Camm, a well-to-do Seeker since about the time Fox was born.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Francis Howgill…a Baptist farmer-preacher, formerly an Independent, and before that educated for the Anglican priesthood.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 36   | 279, Note 4 | Re page 17 of the *Short Journal*  
‘This meeting of Seekers [organised by Gervase Benson] was held on Sunday 6th June 1652.’  
‘This crowded fortnight was the creative moment in the history of Quakerism. In the freshness of his powers and of his experience Fox had a living message, which he uttered with prophetic authority, and both the message and the messenger answered the yearnings and the hopes of a strong community of earnest-hearted Seekers’ (Braithwaite, Beginnings of Quakerism, p. 86). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Penny Notes</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>321</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refers to Thomas Richardson ‘in ye ffen country’ as becoming a minister at the same time as Elizabeth Hooton in 1649, but no reference to meeting Fox.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>321/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reference also to Boyes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>321/2 and 464 Note 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refers to Roger Hebden preaching in 1651, and JFHS, vol 33, p. 33 refers to Hebden having been already convinced by Fox sometime in/before 1652. Also reference to Christopher Halliday and William Pearson being convinced at this time, but no mention of either having met Fox.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>‘Aldam] was strongly antagonistic to the established church.’ Also p. 13 reference to him being imprisoned in York with Mary Fisher. Did she meet Fox?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>‘[Farnworth]...who already knew Fox by correspondence.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>‘Dewsbury, like Farnworth, had found his way to Quaker-type faith before he met Fox.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>‘Hubberthorne described his experiences ‘In my trouble I cried in the evening would God it were morning, and in the morning would God it were evening.’ The same words were used by Fox, Nickalls p. 9, written 20 years later!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>‘In 1653, the leading London Quaker was probably Amor Stoddart’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

The recorded history of Anne Askew

See 5.3.6 above

Anne Askew was the subject of an unhappy marriage and sought a divorce from her Roman Catholic husband, possibly Thomas Kyme, after she was disowned by him following her refusal to attend Confession. Because of her professed protestant views, which she is likely to have shared with her siblings, she was imprisoned, released then re-arrested and underwent a series examinations. The events at the examinations were recorded by John Bale.

During her first examination, conducted in 1545 or 1546, Askew is recorded as stating that ‘God was not in Temples made with hands’, ‘if I had not the sprete [spirit] of God in me...if I had not, I was but a reprobate or cast awaye’, and ‘God hath given me the gyfte of knowledge, but not of utterance.’ During her second examination, taking place in 1546, she is reported as stating that ‘I...do receive breade in reembraunce of Christes deathe’, and referring to one of the questions and her answer in the first examination ‘God dwelleth in

---

2 Helen G. Crosfield, Margaret Fox of Swarthmore [sic] Hall (London: Headley Brothers, no date shown, but preface dated 1913), pp. 2-4.
3 Ed. Elaine V. Beilin The Examinations of Anne Askew, p. xviii.
5 May E.T. Sterling, A short life of Anne Askew (London: Chas J. Thynne, 1913). ‘The First Examination’, line 47. This book contains a full transcription of both examinations, and references made will show the line number within that transcription.
nothyng materyall. 9 A major issue of both examinations was Anne Askew’s attitude to transubstantiation within the Eucharist and her view that, as stated above, ‘I...do receive breade in remeabraunce of Christes deathe.’ She was also accused of asking a question, that she denied ever asking. The question was ‘whether a mouse eatynge the hoste, received God or no?’ 10 This line of questioning was a major part of both examinations.

Following these examinations, Anne Askew was executed on 19th June 1546 at the age of 25. 11 It is reported that the record of her examinations was published in 1546/7 and that the record was taken to the Netherlands by Dutch merchants who had witnessed her execution. 12

11 John Fox [sic], Acts and Monuments of matters most special and memorable, happening in the Church, with an Universall Historic of the same (No location listed, Printed for the Company of Stationers. 1641).
12 Ed. Elaine V. Beilin The Examinations of Anne Askew, p. xxxiii.
APPENDIX 3

Method adopted in comparing the English names recorded by Reynier Wybrands in his Memorandum A and Memorandum B and the names of members of English non-conformist congregations in Amsterdam with the names of early Quakers.

Reynier Wybrands (or Wybrantz), a preacher in the Waterlander Mennonite congregation maintained a record of the social, or municipal events of the Waterlander Mennonite congregation in Amsterdam between the years 1612 and 1641 referred to in this thesis as Mem. A,¹ and a record of the proceedings of that same congregation, including applications for membership and baptisms between 1612 and 1660, referred to in this thesis as Mem. B.² Mem. A and Mem. B are divided chronologically into folios, seventy in Mem. A and forty-seven in Mem. B, covering one hundred and sixty-one and one hundred and seven pages of text respectively. In addition, Wybrands included in Mem. A an alphabetic index of names occurring in Mem. A, but on investigation this was found to be incomplete. Both in Mem. A and Mem. B there are references to ‘engelsche’ [English] people, some being named, others not named. I investigated these documents to ascertain whether there was any record of a proto-Quaker having had contact with this congregation during the years for which minutes were kept. One major difficulty is to identify English people solely from their names. In many

¹ Memoriael van de handelingen bij de Gemeenke voor Reynier Wybrantzen, ‘A’ 1612-1641. The original is held at the StadsArchief, Amsterdam and this researcher used a transcription from the original by Frank Mertens and Peter van der Lee at the University of Amsterdam.
² Memoriael van de handelingen bij de Dienaren voor Reynier Wybrantzen, ‘B’. The original is held at the StadsArchief, Amsterdam and this researcher used a transcription from the original by Frank Mertens and Peter van der Lee at the University of Amsterdam.
cases, names have been ‘translated’ into Dutch, and so for the purposes of this research I extracted names in two ways:

1. From the Index, I extracted those names which, with a minimum of change, could be identified as being of possible English origin, and
2. From the text of each document I extracted those names where the text indicates that the people are English.

To this list of possible English people associated with the Amsterdam Waterlander Mennonite congregation I added the names of English people, listed by Coggins, as having been members of, or associated with John Smyth’s congregation in Amsterdam, members of the John Robinson Congregation, and members of the Thomas Helwys congregation. These names were placed in an Excel spreadsheet, now referred to as the Dutch listing, and sorted alphabetically by family name. This list is reproduced in Appendix 4.

I then compared the names in the Dutch listing, in the Excel spreadsheet above, against two other sets of data:

a. The names of the one hundred and sixty-eight named Quakers who are recorded by Joseph Smith as having written books between the years 1652 and 1660. This list is reproduced in Appendix 5.

---

3 See for example Mem. B, folio 40r, 23rd May 1652 where there is reference to ‘engelsche Marritge Pieters.’
4 For example, Ann Willems and Anthoni Jacobs. Hull notes the translation, by Dutch authors, of English names into Dutch equivalents, such as William Bayly translated as Guiljemus Balaaeus. William I. Hull research papers at the Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore, Box 23, folder – People typescripts pp. 36-74. Such total translations of names have not been considered in this research.
6 James Robert Coggins, John Smyth’s Congregation, pp. 167-9, Appendix 3.
7 James Robert Coggins, John Smyth’s Congregation, p. 170, Appendix 4.
8 Joseph Smith, A Descriptive Catalogue of Friends’ Books or Books written by Members of the Society of Friends. In Two Volumes (Whitechapel, London: Joseph Smith, 1867). In a personal communication with Dr.
b. The list of names of the early contacts of George Fox that I produced, see Appendix 1, was entered into an Excel spreadsheet and sorted alphabetically by family name. This list is replicated in Appendix 6.

This combined list of a. and b. above is referred to as the English list.

Rosemary Moore, she confirmed that the list prepared by Smith was ‘very reliable’ and that the lists used in her own researches were based upon Smith’s listing.
APPENDIX 4

Schedule of ‘English’ names contained in Reynier Wybrands’ Memorandum A and Memorandum B and members or associates of the Smyth, Helwys and Robinson congregations.

Index to sources of names in the schedule below:

A = Mem. A text
B = Mem. B text
I = Mem. A Index
S = Members of the Smyth congregation
O = Associated with the Smyth congregation
R = Members of the Robinson congregation
H = Members of the Helwys congregation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Year listed</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberts</td>
<td>Trijntge</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annes</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armfelt</td>
<td>Abigael</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnefeld</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnefeld</td>
<td>Alis</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnefeld</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blauwer</td>
<td>Johan</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blauwer</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>Pieter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentis</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewster</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewster</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brewster  Jonathan  1614  R
Briggs     Joane     1614  S
Bromhead   Hugh      1614  S
Bromhead   Anne      1614  S
Bywater    Ursulay   1614  S
Bywater    Thomas    1614  O
Canadyne   Thomas    1614  S
Clifton    Richard   1614  R
Cullandt   Henry     1614  R
Dickenson  Bettoris  1614  S
Dickenson  Mary      1614  S
Dirrickdr  Ursula    1615  A
Dolphin    Thomas    1614  S
Druw       Alexander  1634  A
Druw       Jan       1634  A
Druw       Phebe     1639  A
Druw       Jan       1639  A
Fleming    Alexander  1614  S
Grindall   John      1614  S
Grindall   Mary      1614  S
Grindall   Swithinus 1614  O
Grindall   Swithune  1614  A
Grindall   Swithune  1615  A
Grymsdiche Margaret  1614  R
Halton     Samuell   1614  S
Halton     Joane     1614  S
Hamach     Grindall  I
Hamand     Dorothe   1614  S
Hankin     Edward    1614  S
Hardy      John      1614  S
Helwys     Thomas    1614  H
Helwys     Joan      1614  H
Hendricks  Judith    I
Hendricks  Tomas    I
Hodgkin    Alexander 1614  S
Hodgkin    Alexander 1615  A
Hodgkin    Alexander  A
Horsfield  Edward    1614  R
Horsfield  Rosamund 1614  R
Huijbtsen  Thomas   1614  A
Huijbtsen  Thomas   1620  A
Huijbtsen  Tomas    I
Huijbtsen  Thomas   1614  O
Jackson    Richard   1614  R
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Given Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacoba</td>
<td>Neel</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Anthoni</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Abram</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Hester</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Jed</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Jav</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Lijsbeth</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Marri</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>Sijmon</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Maritien</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jans</td>
<td>Maritge</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jansen</td>
<td>Swithien</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasperson</td>
<td>Egmont</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jebis</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jelis</td>
<td>Lijsbet</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jepson</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jepson</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessop</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessop</td>
<td>Edmond</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessop</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessop</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessop</td>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenartsen</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritze</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morice</td>
<td>Margrett</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murton</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murton</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevill</td>
<td>Jevase</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Dorothie</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odell</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odell</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odell</td>
<td>Tomes</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ</td>
<td>Maritge</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouertoom</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouertoom</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtoom</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandert</td>
<td>Robbert</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td>Ales</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paynter</td>
<td>Ellyn</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieters</td>
<td>Maritge</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieters</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piggott</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piggott</td>
<td>Margarett</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pijgot</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proot</td>
<td>Anthoni</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pygott</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pygott</td>
<td>Ales</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pygott</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pygott</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pygott</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Bridget</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seamer</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sijmens</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyth</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyth</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southworth</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southworth</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stavely</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stavely</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>Maaijke</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamassen</td>
<td>Lijsbetie</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theunis</td>
<td>Annetge</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theunis</td>
<td>Maritge</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Salomon</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Salemon</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomassen</td>
<td>Anthoni</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomassen</td>
<td>Saloman</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td>Isabell</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td>Salomon</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td>Dorothea</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td>Salemon</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomassen</td>
<td>Anthoni</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomes</td>
<td>Dirckge</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomes</td>
<td>Annetge</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomson</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomson</td>
<td>Antoni</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Hoeck</td>
<td>Anthoni</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallis</td>
<td>Machiel</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallis</td>
<td>Michiel</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallis</td>
<td>Machiel</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willems</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willems</td>
<td>Lijsbeth</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willems</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willems</td>
<td>Lijsbet</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willemsen</td>
<td>Eduard</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willemsen</td>
<td>Adriaen</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchingen</td>
<td>Aeltgen</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchacker</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no name)</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;&quot;&quot;)</td>
<td>Fylis</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;&quot;&quot;)</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;&quot;&quot;)</td>
<td>Saertie</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;&quot;&quot;)</td>
<td>Alis</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5

List of Quaker authors from Joseph Smith’s Catalogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Abell</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Adams</td>
<td>1653 &amp; 1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Adamson</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Aldam</td>
<td>1652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Ames</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Anderson</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon (23)</td>
<td>up to 1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Atkinson</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Audland</td>
<td>1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey Bache</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Baiteman</td>
<td>1654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Baker</td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susana Bateman</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bayly</td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gervase Benson</td>
<td>1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Berd</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Bettis</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hester Biddle</td>
<td>1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Billing (Byllynge)</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Birkhead</td>
<td>1657 (in Dutch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bishop</td>
<td>1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Blackborow (or Blackberry)</td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Blackley</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Bourne</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Bradly</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Braithwait</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Britten</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Burrough</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Burstow</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Buttivant</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Camm</td>
<td>1654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Caton</td>
<td>1655 (Married Annekin Dirricke 1662)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John Chandler 1659
Christopher Cheesman 1651
Thomas Chilton 1659
Henry Clark 1655
Richard Clayton 1655
Samuel Clift 1657
Josiah Coale 1660
John Crook 1659
John Collins 1658
Edward Cooke 1658
John Copeland 1659
Priscilla Cotton 1655
Thomas Coveney 1660
Roger Crabb 1659
Richard Crane 1659
Stephen Crisp 1658
Samuel Curtis 1659
Thomas Curtis 1655
Jonas Dell 1646
William Dell 1653
William Dewsbury 1654
Francis Ellington 1651
Thomas Ellwood 1660
George Emmot 1655
Albertus Otto Faber 1660
Lydia Fairman 1659
Richard Farnworth 1653
Henry Fell 1660
Leonard Fell 1656
Margaret Fell 1655
Mary Fisher 1652
Samuel Fisher 1653 (ex Baptist minister)
Elizabeth Fletcher 1660
Thomas Forster 1659
Robert Fowler 1659
George Fox 1652
George Fox the younger 1656
Francis Freeman 1657
Joseph Fuce 1659
Benjamin Furly 1660
Ann Gargill 1656
Francis Gawler 1659
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry Gill</td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gilpin</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Goodaire</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Gotherson</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Gould</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gould</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Grassingham</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Grayes</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Green</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Halhead</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hart</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harwood</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Helling</td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Hendrick</td>
<td>1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hiscock</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Higgins</td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Hodgkin</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hodgson</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Holder</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denys Hollister</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Howard</td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Howgill</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Howsegoe</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hubberthorn</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Humphreys</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthbert Hunter</td>
<td>1654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Hutchins</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Killam</td>
<td>1654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Killam</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lancaster</td>
<td>1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Lavor</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lawson</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Mason</td>
<td>1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Mellidge</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Minter</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Nicholson</td>
<td>1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Osborne</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Overton</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with William Payne)</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Payne (Pain)</td>
<td>1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Pinder</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pitman</td>
<td>1658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
James Potter    1659
Edward Punch    1654
Edward Pyot      1657
Robert Rich     1655
Thomas Rawlinson no date
Ambrose Rigge    1657
Gerard Roberts   1659
Thomas Robertson 1658
George Rofe      1655
John Rous        1656
Richard Sale     1657
William Salt     1660
George Salter    1659
Thomas Salthouse 1656
Edward Sammon    1659
James Sicklemore 1657
Thomas Simonds   1656
Martha Simmonds  1655
William Simpson  1655
John Slee        1655
Humphrey Smith   1655
William Smith    1658
Thomas Speed     1656
Amos Stodart     1660
John Story       1660
James Strutt     1659
John Stubbs      1655
Thomas Stubbs    1655
Christopher Taylor 1655
Thomas Taylor    1657
John Toldervy    1656
William Tomlinson 1653
Anna Trapnel    1654
Rebeckah Travers 1658
Robert Westfield 1647
Morgan Watkins   1659
Samuel Watson   1660
George Weare     1657
Christian Webb  1659
Mary Webb        1659
Robert West     1658
Nathaniel Weston 1660
Dorothy White 1659
George Whitehead 1655
John Whitehead 1653
Thomas Wight 1659
Bryan Wilkinson 1659
R. Wilkinson 1650
Lawrence Willyer 1659
Humphrey Woolrich 1659
Thomas Woodrove 1659
Thomas Zachary 1657
Judith Zinspenning 1660
**APPENDIX 6**

Early Quakers, and non-Quaker contacts of George Fox

Index to sources:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Christian Name</th>
<th>Year Met Fox</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldam</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audland</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>Nathaniel</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bateman</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet</td>
<td>Gervase</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>Gervase</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bindloss</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaykling</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaykling</td>
<td>(poss) Thomas</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaykling</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bousfield</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowles</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>‘Cousin’</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradshaw</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braithwaite</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bretland</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1649/50</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullock</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burdett</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Given Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrough</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushel</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camelford</td>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camm</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocks</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craddock</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewsbury</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digby</td>
<td>Sir John</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnworth</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fell</td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fell</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fell</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fell</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkingham</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fretwell</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gee</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodaire</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosfield</td>
<td>Kohn</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halhead</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartas</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooton</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotham</td>
<td>Durant</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howgill</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbersty</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbersty</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubberthorne</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutton</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellet</td>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killam</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killam</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knipe</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lago</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampitt</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawson</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawson</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawson</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaper</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leek</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levens</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macham</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>1630s</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naylor</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nix</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oates</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overton</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>‘Uncle'</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomroy</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursglove</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratcliffe</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reckless</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rippon</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>1652</td>
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