

The Controversy Between
Puritans and Quakers to 1660

A Thesis
Presented to the Post-Graduate School of Theology
University of Edinburgh

In partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the
Doctor of Philosophy Degree

by
Ralph Paul Bohn

1955



ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate Ralph Paul Bohn
Degree Doctor of Philosophy Date July 23, 1955.
Title of Thesis The Controversy between Puritans and Quakers to 1680.

The Quaker-Puritan controversy began as soon as George Fox started preaching, in 1647, but the major part of the polemical writings date from 1653. All of the early Quaker leaders were engaged in the disputes, and all but the radical left wing of Puritan thought is represented. Most of the anti-Quaker writers can be classified as Congregationalists, Baptists, or Presbyterians. The basic issues under dispute centered on theological and ecclesiastical differences, but these were complicated by political and social conflicts. The Quaker refusal to pay tithes, to take oaths, or to give magistrates and others the customary tokens of respect, caused the Quakers to be frequently regarded as enemies to the State. During the Commonwealth, the persecution of Quakers was local and spasmodic, but this political and social opposition gave a sense of practical urgency to the controversy.

The theological differences stemmed from a basic divergence on the problem of authority. To the Quakers, the ultimate authority in religion was immediate revelation; to the Puritans, it was the Holy Scriptures. The Quaker doctrine of the "anointing within" held that God's teaching was and is immediate, and the doctrine of the contemporary inspiration of the Spirit held the Spirit's inspiration in present times to be similar to that of biblical times. Both of these positions were rejected by the Puritan controversialists.

The debate on immediacy continued in the discussion on the light within. In Quaker thought, the light within was given to all men, it was sufficient for salvation--if obeyed, and it was unambiguously the Light of Christ. The Puritans viewed the universally-given light as the light of Christ as Creator only, and therefore not a saving light. The definition of the light within as a natural light, or reason, or conscience, was flatly rejected by the Quakers, who held the light within to be the supernatural Light of Christ as Saviour.

The keystone of the Puritan position was their doctrine of the Scriptures, which they defined as the "Word of God". To this the Quakers replied that only Christ is the Word of God, while the Scriptures are the words of God. The latter the Quakers called the "Letter", which had no necessary conjunction with the Spirit, and therefore needed the Spirit to interpret it correctly. There were inconsistencies in both Quaker and Puritan views on the use and interpretation of Scripture, but the Quakers always gave primacy to the Spirit, the Puritans to the Scriptures, as the ultimate authority for Christian faith.

The Christological and eschatological disputes dealt with the doctrines of the humanity of Christ, His Crucifixion, Atonement, Resurrection, Ascension, Second Coming, and the Kingdom of Heaven. In all of these areas the Quaker emphasis on "Christ within" was criticized as excluding or undercutting the objective, historical aspects of these doctrines. The Puritans also opposed the Quaker treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity. On soteriological questions, both Puritans and Quakers were agreed in viewing sin as a fundamental and fatal reality, and in viewing salvation as coming only from Christ. Division arose over the Quaker insistence that a perfect victory over sin was possible in this life, that sanctification was inseparable from justification, and that the justification wrought by Christ must be witnessed within.

There was little explicit discussion on the nature of the Church, although the Quakers insisted that all had been in apostasy since apostol^Sic times. The main Quaker polemic was against outward forms of worship, which were said to be merely "temporal", and to be lacking in spiritual validity and vitality. This argument applied especially to baptism and the Lord's Supper, the outward observance of which the Puritans vigorously upheld. The Quaker emphasis on the Spirit also undergirded their rejection of Puritan ordinations, and of the necessity of human learning for the ministry. The many-sided Quaker criticism of Puritan ministers culminated in the attack on the maintenance of the ministry by tithes.

In evaluating the controversy, many semantic, logical, and practical difficulties can be seen, and neither side was completely successful in their arguments. The basic cleavage between Quakers and Puritans may be analyzed in terms of the opposition between "immediate" and "mediate", and between "within" and "without".

FOREWORD

I have become indebted to many people during the course of this study, and to them I wish to express my gratitude. My advisers have been Principal Charles S. Duthie of the Congregational College, Edinburgh, who has given me much friendly and helpful counsel, and the Rev. James S. M'Ewen of New College, Edinburgh. I have greatly benefited by the generous advice and suggestions of Dr. Geoffrey F. Nuttall of New College, London. My Edinburgh neighbor, the Rev. Philip N. Williams, kindly assisted me in translating John Owen's rather prolix Latin. I am indebted to the librarians of the University of Edinburgh, the Signet Library, Edinburgh, the National Library of Scotland, the British Museum, to Miss E. R. Leslie and Dr. J. A. Lamb of New College Library, and especially to John Nickalls and Muriel Hicks of Friends House Library, London. Miss Hicks has graciously and efficiently answered my many requests for books and information. During the writing of this thesis, I have been the recipient of endless kindnesses from Mrs. Jessie Barrie and her family, with whom we have resided while in Edinburgh. Miss Joyce Barrie has cheerfully assisted in the long task of proofreading. This task was shared by my wife, Jeanne, who also served as my indefatigable and exacting typist. She has been a constant source of patient encouragement and perceptive criticism, and the dedication of this work

to her is only a small token of my gratitude.

Throughout the thesis the spelling has followed Standard American usage, according to Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Fifth Edition. In quotations from seventeenth-century writings, the original spelling and punctuation has been retained, unless otherwise noted. The only exceptions to this are the omission of the frequent italics, the correction of obvious typographical errors, and the alteration of "then" to "than" where the latter was meant. The titles of five works have been abbreviated: B.Q., for W. C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism; D.N.B. for the Dictionary of National Biography; G.M., for G. Fox, The Great Mistery of the Great Whore Unfolded; Jnl., bi-cent.edn., for G. Fox, Journal, Bi-Centenary Edition; and Jnl., Camb.edn. for the Cambridge edition of Fox's Journal.

R.P.B.

Edinburgh
June 22, 1955.

TABLE OF CONTENTS AND OUTLINE

Chapter	Pages
FOREWORD	iii-iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS AND OUTLINE	v-viii
HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION	1-26
The use of the term "Puritan".	
The dramatis personae of the controversy.	
The chronological distribution of the polemical literature.	
The seeds of controversy in George Fox's early thought and experience.	
The first disputes between Fox and Puritan ministers.	
Method of treatment to be employed in this work.	
I IMMEDIATE REVELATION AND THE INDWELLING SPIRIT	27-69
The problem of authority.	
The Quaker answer: immediate revelation.	
The Puritan answer: the Scriptures; other arguments against the Quaker view.	
The method of religious knowledge:	
God's teaching immediate versus mediate;	
The Quaker doctrine: the "anointing within".	
The Quaker doctrine of the contemporary indwelling of the Spirit.	
The Puritan rebuttal: emphasis on Scripture.	
The dispute on spiritual infallibility.	
'Extraordinary' versus 'ordinary' inspiration.	
Secondary Puritan criticisms of the Quaker doctrine of the Spirit.	
The mode of the Spirit's indwelling: personal versus mystical union.	
Summary statements on the indwelling Spirit.	
II THE LIGHT OF CHRIST WITHIN	70-123
General Puritan attacks against this Quaker doctrine.	
The expanded argument on the light as given universally, and as being sufficient for salvation.	
The basic question: is the light given to all the Light of Christ?	
The light within as a light of nature:	
a created light;	
identified as reason;	
identified as conscience.	
The Quaker rejection of subjectivism.	
Nature versus grace: the light within as a supernatural light.	

Chapter	Pages
III THE DOCTRINE OF THE SCRIPTURES Nature and definition of Scripture: Scripture as the "Word of God", keystone of Puritan position. Quaker rebuttal: Christ the Word of God, Scriptures are the words of God. Dispute on the conjunction of "Letter" and "Spirit". Interpretation and Use of Scripture: The role of the Spirit in interpreting Scripture. Need of human learning for interpretation. The Quakers' use of Scripture. Scripture versus the Spirit as the ulti- mate criterion. Conclusion on the conflicting answers to the problem of authority.	124-170
IV CHRISTOLOGICAL AND ESCHATOLOGICAL DISPUTES The doctrine of "Christ within". The Humanity and Divinity of Christ. The Doctrine of the Trinity. Dispute on distinction of persons. "The Christ who died at Jerusalem". The Doctrine of the Atonement: Atonement within versus without; Differing emphases on "flesh" versus "spirit". The Resurrection and Ascension of Christ. The Resurrection of the Body; Debate on the immortality of the soul. The Kingdom of Heaven. The Second Coming of Christ.	171-218
V SIN, SANCTIFICATION AND SALVATION. The relative importance of these soteriologi- cal issues. Disputes on Sin: original sin, the "body of sin", the Fall. The question of perfection; Secondary issue of degrees of perfection. Justification: perfectly wrought by Christ. Relationship of Justification and Sanctifica- tion: Are they separable and distinct? Justification within; Sanctification necessary for justifica- tion? Imputed versus Inherent Righteousness; Justification by works; the Christocentric views of salvation. The debate on election and predestination.	219-265

Chapter	Pages
VI THE CHURCH AND ORDINANCES	266-296
The Nature of the Church:	
Apostacy and error on all sides;	
The doctrine of the Church.	
The Worship of the Church:	
General question of "forms";	
Specific Quaker protests;	
Puritan criticism of quaking.	
The Ordinances:	
The general argument;	
Water baptism and infant baptism;	
The Lord's Supper.	
VII THE OFFICE OF THE MINISTRY	297-323
Preparation of ministers by a university education.	
Nature of the call to the ministry:	
immediate versus mediate.	
The Ordination of ministers.	
The Lay ministers and the preaching of women.	
Quaker criticism of Puritan preaching.	
Immediate teaching as a goal and fruit of the ministry.	
Quaker attack against ministers: "railing" or Scriptural?	
Maintenance of the ministry by tithes:	
moral and Scriptural arguments.	
VIII THE CHURCH AND THE STATE	324-351
Upholding tithes by law.	
Persecution of Quakers during the Commonwealth.	
The role of the State in upholding religion:	
Nature and duty of the magistrate.	
Question of Civil Obedience:	
Is a corrupt magistrate to be obeyed?	
Quakers suspected as enemies to the State:	
The charge of being papists;	
The refusal to take oaths.	
The issue of Civil respect:	
Quaker refusal to give customary tokens of respect;	
The Quaker polemic against ministers being called "Master".	
Indication of the mundane factors in the Quaker- Puritan antipathy.	
CRITICAL CONCLUSION	352-366
The historical and polemical boundaries of the data.	
The problem of continuity and discontinuity between Puritans and Quakers.	

Complicating factors in the controversy:
 continual entanglement of abstract and
 concrete practical issues.
 semantic difficulties, especially on
 the term "within".
 logical difficulties:
 tendency toward artificial bifurcation;
 ad hominem arguments;
 'religious' versus 'theological' state-
 ments.
The basic cleavage between the Puritans and
Quakers:
 within versus without,
 immediate versus mediate,
Evaluation of the relative success of the oppos-
ing arguments.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY 367-384
 Primary Sources
 Secondary Sources

1914

TO MY WIFE

TO MY WIFE
TO MY WIFE

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

The topic, The Controversy between Puritans and Quakers to 1660 could easily become the subject of a controversy in itself. A number of often debated questions immediately arise. Are not the Quakers properly thought of as a section of the Puritan movement? Cannot they be classified as radical Puritans, far out on one extreme perhaps, but still basically within the elastic bounds of Puritanism? And if this classification is broken, and the Quakers are set apart from the Puritans, what are the criteria for thus distinguishing the two as distinct entities? On what grounds are those here selected as advocates of the Puritan position entitled to the designation "Puritan"? Indeed, getting to the ultimate root of the problem, what are the identifying characteristics of those called "Puritans"?

While a clear-cut answer to these questions, based on a concise definition of the term "Puritan", is most desirable, it is also, unhappily, impossible. Since its inception in the late sixteenth century, this term has been the varied object of popular contempt, logical and theological abuse, widely diverse definition and exposition, and occasional relegation to the semantic

junk yard as an outworn term devoid of any value or meaning whatsoever. The absence of a universally accepted definition of the word Puritan, and hence of an agreed and concise list of the essential features of those called Puritans, may be unfortunate, but it is readily understandable, especially in the period dealt with in this work. By 1647, when the Quaker message was beginning to take shape in the preaching of George Fox, the Puritan movement had already broken into a number of differing factions. About all that remained of the original Elizabethan Puritan attempt to stimulate a further reformation in the Church of England was an undiminished zeal for reform. But with regard to the specific nature, as well as the particular methods of that further reformation there was serious disagreement among the Commonwealth Puritans. In this period, Puritanism was an extremely diverse and heterogeneous movement and thus cannot be delineated in neat abstract categories, nor comprehended in an a priori definition applicable to any supposed Puritan. Trevelyan, in a chapter on the Great Civil War, succinctly describes the situation:

Now popular Puritanism in England, during this period of its most rapid expansion, was markedly unorthodox, full of fresh individual vigour and

variety, and breeding a hundred different forms of doctrine and practice. 1

In this splintering period of Puritanism it becomes almost impossible to speak of it in the singular: Puritans now speak with many differing voices. It takes a number of Puritans to present the Puritan position in its entirety; a single Puritan represents only his own side, and the Puritan controversial literature of the period shows that the other side (or sides) was not long in making itself heard.

Therefore, the word "Puritans" is not meant to connote an exclusively homogeneous body of opposition to the Quakers, nor one which can be comprehended within a concise definitive formula. It is used (in the title and throughout this work) as an omnibus term referring collectively to those opponents of the Quakers who are classified individually, by the consensus of historical scholarship, as "Puritan". It should be added that the juxtaposition of Puritans and Quakers as opposing parties is not meant to prejudge the question whether or not the Quaker is basically a Puritan. These terms are not used in a mutually exclusive sense. Indeed, the controversy between these two groups may well be considered as a type of family feud, the Quaker

I. G.M. Trevelyan, History of England, Reissue, 1952, p. 412.

being the youthful member whose radical enthusiasm for the principles inherent in the family tradition provokes the antagonism of the rest of the family, especially that of the elders. In such a quarrel, there is always the chance that the youthful member will go so far as to disown, and be disowned by, his own family. In this extremity, it is often a highly debatable question whether the young disowned radical is still entitled to the family name. Because we are operating on the border line of such a family feud, and because of the complicating factors of intra-family quarrels between the elders, the claim of any faction to the family name must be left open, and not decided beforehand by any abstract formulation of qualifications for family membership.

From an analysis of the entries in Smith's Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana, it appears that almost all the anti-Quaker writers through 1660 can be classified as Puritans. However, the most generous conception of the term "Puritan" is needed if all the adverse writers are to be included within this classification, for the whole gamut of Commonwealth religious thought is represented. Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists occupy the center of the stage, flanked on one

side by non-Separatist Puritans, and on the other by Manifestarians, Fifth Monarchists, Muggletonians, and Ranters. Our attention will be focused mainly on the groups in the center, for the writers on the right are relatively few in number, and those on the left are so far out on the periphery of Puritanism that they require separate investigation.¹ But the center is wide enough, embracing a diverse collection of thinkers and personalities: laymen and clergy, the uneducated and the university trained, the obscure and the renowned. The majority of the writers were ordained ministers, however, and an indication of their importance is given by the fact that of the approximately one hundred and twenty-five adverse authors through 1660, fifty are recorded in the Dictionary of National Biography.

Since brief biographical notes on the less well-known Puritan writers have been given as they appear throughout this work, mention need be made here only of the three most famous, Richard Baxter, John Bunyan, and John Owen. Baxter's defense of "The Worcestershire

1. Thomas Moore and John Horne both wrote several tracts against the Quakers. Only one of Muggleton's many adverse writings dates from before 1660. The only adverse writing by Christopher Feake listed in Smith is, A Faithful Discovery; but Feake's name appears only after the "Advertisement", and the tract itself was written by three other men. It contains no reference to Fifth Monarchy.

Petition" was one of the earliest Puritan-Quaker disputes to find its way into print,¹ and for several years Baxter's ministry at Kidderminster was interrupted by controversy with the Quakers. At one point Baxter is driven to complain, "I seldom preached a lecture but going and coming I was railed at by a Quaker in the Market Place",² and although the pace slackened, Baxter's opposition to Quakerism continued well into the Restoration period.³ Bunyan encountered Quaker teaching within three years of his baptism, and the first products of his pen were the two tracts written in controversy with Edward Burrough. We shall be continually impressed by the ferocity of both Puritan and Quaker writers, but in Bunyan's case it is helpful to note the explanation given by Henri Talon. Pointing out that Bunyan was a "new convert" when he wrote against Burrough, Talon goes on to say that

-
1. Baxter's The Worcester-shire Petition...defended was an answer to T. Aldam, et.al., A Brief Discovery, to which some queries on the Petition were appended. Baxter was answered by B. Nicholson, Truth's Defence against Lies.
 2. R. Baxter, Reliquiae Baxterianae, ed. M. Sylvester, Part I., p. 180.
 3. Baxter's last tract directed solely against the Quakers was written in 1660; thereafter Quakers are mentioned only briefly in several other works, especially his autobiography. Baxter signed the epistle to J. Faldo, Quakerism no Christianity (1675).

in 1656 and 1657 the slightest assault from anyone seemed to him to threaten the whole Kingdom of God: whence the bitterness and false-sweetness of his pamphlets. There was no room in that passionate century for shades of charity! ¹

Even the Vice-chancellor of Oxford could often dispense with charity in his refutation of the Quakers, and Owen's Pro Sacris Scripturis does not lose vigor by being written in Latin. Owen, however, was writing not so much to protect his own faith as to guard his young scholars from the "abominations" and Satanic errors prevalent among "the poor, deluded, fanatical souls amongst us, commonly called Quakers".²

Although such figures as Owen, Baxter, and Bunyan, along with other leading Puritan ministers, constituted a most formidable opposition, none of these critics of Quakerism were deemed too high to be immune from Quaker counter-attack.³ The early Friends carried the defense of their faith into all walks of English life, from the Lord Pro-

1. H. Talon, John Bunyan, p. 95.

2. J. Owen, Works, XVI.292, in the Epistle Dedicatory to The Divine Original of the Scripture, with which Pro Sacris Scripturis and another tract were bound. Only Pro Sacris Scripturis is written explicitly against the Quakers.

3. Of the approximately 125 adverse writers listed in Smith through 1660, excluding the Anonymous section, only six received no written answer from the Quakers. Three of these were books containing only a brief reference to Quakerism, another was apparently German, and another from New England. The one remaining author, Thomas Rosewell, was replying to a list of Queries propounded by some Quakers.

teetor to the local magistrate, the cathedral to the chapel, the city market place to the open field. In this apologetic and evangelistic task all the contemporary forms of communication were utilized, private and public debates, spoken and written queries, broadsides, tracts, and books, and to this task all the "First Publishers" put their hand.

These Quaker writers, like their opponents, represented many different religious traditions and social strata, although once they became Friends they embraced a common and remarkably homogeneous theology and way of life. The most scholarly among them was Samuel Fisher, an Oxford graduate, and successively an Anglican rector, a Puritan lecturer, and a Baptist minister. Francis Howgill and James Nayler, coming from yeoman families, both received a good education; Howgill was an eminent preacher among the Seekers, and Nayler, an Independent when he joined the Quakers, had preached to great effect during his service in the army. George Whitehead, whose parents were Presbyterians, was also well-educated, and had been a teacher for a time. Richard Farnsworth and Edward Burrough had both been Puritans and Roundheads, and like most of the early converts to Quakerism, both went through a period of doubt and disaffection before their "convincement".

The primary name on the list of Quaker protagonists is, of course, that of George Fox, whose background and re-

religious development we shall trace shortly. For our purposes, however, Fox is of central importance not only as the founder of Quakerism but because prior to 1652, when Farnsworth, Nayler, and William Dewsbury began their work as "Publishers of Truth",¹ Fox was the only outstanding spokesman and defender of the Quaker message. During the earliest years, from the beginning of Fox's preaching in 1647 until the formation of the Quaker movement in 1652,² the history of the controversy is almost entirely embodied in the individual skirmishes of Fox with various Puritan opponents. However, we must also go to--and beyond--the year 1652 in order to find especially notable leaders on the Puritan side. Fox did not encounter the more distinguished Puritan figures during the course of his pioneering work in the northern counties; while there was opposition enough in these areas where the Quaker message was first proclaimed, Fox and his fellow workers met their most formidable opponents only when they began to carry

-
1. This is a common name for "the itinerating Friends with the gift of ministry who spread the Quaker message". W. C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism, p. 26, note 1. Farnsworth, Nayler, and Dewsbury were convinced late in 1651, but began their traveling ministry the following year.
 2. We take 1652 as the date for the beginning of Quakerism as an organized movement. This was the year of Fox's Pendle Hill vision; in this year Fox gained his first large group of followers, the Westmorland Seekers, as well as the support of Swarthmore Hall; the first General Meeting was established in December, in East Riding.

their message to the South, in 1654 and thereafter.

Moreover, the less distinguished disputants of these early years apparently argued only orally; aside from several short tracts and letters written by Fox and Nayler in 1652, neither Puritan nor Quaker took up the pen until 1653. Thus we must rely almost entirely on Fox's Journal for the reports of the earliest debates,¹ and we may designate the year 1653 as the starting point for the major and more widely documented phase of the Puritan-Quaker controversy. The flow of anti-Quaker literature began gradually, with about seven tracts in 1653 and thirteen in 1654; it reached the highest point in 1656,² The next two years witnessed a fairly sharp decline in Puritan polemical output, but the curve rose upwards again in 1659 and 1660. The Restoration marked a clear-cut end of the first period of controversy, for Puritans and Quakers now faced a common opponent in the Anglican establishment and under the pressure of persecution obviously had little time for mutual polemics. The Puritans' loss of political power completely obviated the many Quaker criticisms involving the issue of "Church

-
1. For the account of Fox's youth and early religious experiences our sole source is Thomas Ellwood's edition of the Journal; from the year 1650 the Cambridge edition is taken as the primary edition, with supplementation from the Bi-Centenary Edition.
 2. Nayler's extravagance in Bristol in October, 1656, roused many antagonistic voices, but it was dealt with in detail by only three or four anti-Quaker writers. Reference to it in the polemical literature as a whole is surprisingly infrequent.

and State" (See Chapter Eight), and it was now no longer the Puritans who were to view the Quakers as dangerous enemies not only of established religion, but also of the established government. But the most effective cause for the sudden break in the Puritan-Quaker controversy was the Licensing Act of 1662, which severely restricted all branches of the nonconformist press. It is, therefore, not surprising that the years 1662 through 1669 produced a smaller number of anti-Quaker writings than the single peak year of the Commonwealth, 1656. These factors, plus the wealth of polemical literature from 1653 through 1660, also readily explain why the Restoration year was taken as the terminus ad quem for this thesis.

While the main part of our investigation begins with the year 1653, the previous years cannot be entirely ignored, for the germs of the later controversies already appear in the early disputes between George Fox and the relatively less prominent Puritan clergy of northern England.

The remainder of this Introduction deals primarily with the development of Fox's relationships with the Puritans, and for this we must go back to his boyhood when, with his devout parents, Fox was regularly in attendance at the parish church. This church was then served by a Presbyterian, Nathaniel Stephens, and since Stephens was a thorough-going Calvinist, the youthful Fox was exposed

to a rigorous presentation of Calvinistic theology. His acquaintance with the Bible was constantly cultivated both at church and at home and in years of solitary study, and he later was well-known for his minute and extensive knowledge of the Scriptures. Although his parents once thought of sending George into the ministry, they changed their plans and apprenticed him to a shoemaker and wool merchant, and in this service Fox acquired a strong reputation for honesty and integrity and "innocency". A keen moral and religious sensitivity had been an early and ever-growing characteristic of his personality, and he had become deeply critical of the worldliness, wantonness, and hypocrisy which he seemed to observe all about him. In his nineteenth year, this welling sensitivity burst to the surface, inflamed by the commonplace incident of an invitation to a friendly glass of beer, which, however, soon turned into a drinking bout. The participants on this occasion were "professors" (church-going, professing Christians), and the seeming gross hypocrisy of such behavior so shocked and grieved the earnest lad that he left the scene in protest, and on returning home, spent a sleepless night in much prayer and agitation. While in this frame of mind and spirit, he received a command from the Lord, pointing out to him the vanity of both young and old, and directing him to "forsake all, both young and

old, and keep out of all, and be as a stranger unto all."¹ Thus, on the ninth of September, 1643, Fox left home and began his religious quest, which did not find fulfillment until four years later, in 1647.

During these years Fox traveled widely, seeking out people who seemed to possess a vital religious faith, and who could thereby aid him in finding the full and sincere spiritual life for which he sought. Although many of these "professors" were friendly and "tender", and often evidenced a real interest in him, he inevitably reached the conclusion that "they did not possess what they professed".² His many discussions with the "priests" (Fox's term for the clergy) produced a similarly negative result, for, he reports, "I went to many a priest to look for comfort, but found no comfort from them".³ His relationships with the clergy during this period were wholly unsatisfactory and discouraging. Nathaniel Stephens was at first commendatory of the religious earnestness of the youth, but when Fox stopped attending the parish services, Stephens warned his parents that the boy was going after "new lights", and it was not long before the staunch Calvinist began a

1. Jnl. bi-cent.edn., I.3.

2. Ibid., I.4.

3. Ibid.

strong and forceful opposition to Fox.¹ Other clergymen whom the young seeker consulted were even less helpful; one prescribed tobacco and the singing of psalms as a remedy, and broke confidence by relating Fox's troubles and anxieties to his servants; another priest recommended physic and blood letting; on making a special trip to meet with a priest in Tamworth, Fox disappointingly "found him only like an empty hollow cask".² Again, discussing his troubles with a Dr. Cradock of Coventry, Fox, walking with the minister in his garden, accidentally stepped on the man's flower bed, whereupon he flew into a rage which immediately terminated the interview. Small wonder that Fox concluded they were all "miserable comforters", and became increasingly critical and independent of "priests" and "professors" alike, until he finally broke with both the Established and the Dissenting churches.³

In this context of disillusionment with and separation from the prevailing Puritan faith and practice of his day, Fox developed his own individual spiritual life, which was built up through his Bible reading, prayer, re-

1. Ibid., I.5, 48, 200.

2. Ibid., I.6.

3. The Established Church was in a state of great confusion at this time. Not only Presbyterians but Independents and Baptists had become incumbents, and the "priests" of the Established Church against whom Fox and the Quakers inveighed were, for the most part, Puritans. Cf. BQ, p. 15ff.

flection, and based, above all, on his "openings"--as he called the revelations of the Divine Will which came to him. One of his earliest "openings" gave a fundamental turn to his view of the ministry: the Lord opened to him "'That being bred at Oxford or Cambridge was not enough to fit and qualify men to be ministers of Christ;'"¹ From another, Fox concluded that if all Christians are believers, then "they were all born of God, and passed from death to life, and that none were true believers but such".² A further opening which had negative consequences for established and popular doctrine was that "'God, who made the world, did not dwell in temples made with hands.'"³ These revelatory moments were, of course, separated by periods of despondence and misery, but they were inherently interrelated, for, as Fox says, his openings "answered one another". They also "answered the Scriptures", and Fox always considered them as completely consonant with Scriptural teachings.

The central, pivotal revelation, which became the basis of his own religious faith, as well as that of Quakerism itself, came to him in 1646 or 1647⁴ (aged

1. Jnl. bi-cent.edn., I.7.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., I.8.

4. Braithwaite puts these revelatory experiences in 1646, see BQ, p.34. Russell dates them in 1647, E. Russell, The History of Quakerism, p.24. The account in the Journal (bi-cent.edn., I.11) is ambiguous as to date.

twenty-two or -three), when he had given up discourse with all priests and professors:

for I saw there was none among them all that could speak to my condition. When all my hopes in them and in all men were gone, so that I had nothing outwardly to help me, nor could I tell what to do; then, O! then I heard a voice which said, "There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition;" and when I heard it, my heart did leap for joy. ¹

Fox adds that the failure of all human counselors was necessary in order that he might give all the glory to the Lord, since all men are under the condition of sin and therefore helpless and impotent; but nothing can hinder the work of God, and, as Fox concludes, "this I knew experimentally".²

While this opening brought his long quest to an end, Fox continued to have spiritual struggles and temptations, but the unshakable foundation remained: Christ alone was the source of all his life and thought, and because Christ had vanquished the Devil, Christ would conquer all temptations and troubles which might beset him. Fox also continued to have openings and insights into the Scriptures, developing such conceptions as the centrality of the inward life for religious faith, the essential importance of the Holy Spirit, the victory of Christ over Satan, the Christian believer's victory over sin, the power of God working in him, and several other key points in his theological outlook.

1. Jnl. bi-cent.edn., I.11.

2. Ibid.

All of these positions will be dealt with in the following chapters. We are now interested only in the origins of the conflict between Fox and the Puritans, and we have already uncovered the elementary roots of the struggle. Given these early fundamental views of Fox, the mutual opposition and antagonism between Quakers and Puritans was inevitable.

The implications and consequences of his openings were not long in presenting themselves to the mind of Fox. The basic principle, as seen above, was the believer's immediate and absolute dependence on Christ. There is no third party involved: the believer alone can reach God and Christ, and Christ alone is able to guide and sustain the believer. No assistance in the process either of revelation or of salvation is needed from Pope, minister, Dissenting teacher or preacher, institutionalized church, congregation, sacraments, or (ultimately) from the Scriptures themselves. Quakerism could well be styled as "the fag-end of Reformation",¹ at least with regard to its conclusive removal of all intermediate agencies standing between the believer and God. Whether or not it was a final reformation, it was certainly a revolution, for this doctrine of immediacy challenged at once the dominant Puritan doctrines of the Church, of sacraments and the ministry, of the role of

1. R.H., The Character of a Quaker, p.1, quoted in G.F. Nuttall, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience, p.13.

Scripture, of the nature of man, and of the nature of salvation. Theologically, the controversy could not be expected to be either mild or limited; all the major doctrines were involved, and there was no area where ground could be given by either side without fatal results.

But the views of Fox did not constitute simply a theological reformation or revolution. Equally as strong as the doctrinal challenge was his moral protest. His early judgments concerning the vanity and corruption of the people in general, together with his sensitiveness to the apparent hypocrisy of professing Christians, steadily increased during the years of his quest; and from the standpoint of a profound and actualized spiritual life, the vanity and hypocrisy seemed all the greater. He relates that as he was passing a "steeple-house" (as he called the church building) he received a word from the Lord: "'That which people trample upon, must be thy food.'",¹ meaning that the professors trampled on the life of Christ, contenting themselves with words only; but Fox must set himself in opposition to such a hypocritical practice of religion, and base his faith upon the actual possession and experience of the divine life. Furthermore, he felt a divine command to bring this vital faith into the world; he was sent to "proclaim the day of the Lord". A few sentences

1. Jnl. bi-cent.edn., I,20.

may suffice to convey the intensity of his evangelistic mission and message.

I was sent to turn people from darkness to the light, that they might receive Christ Jesus:....I was to direct people to the Spirit, that gave forth the Scriptures, by which they might be led into all truth, and so up to Christ and God,....I was to turn them to the grace of God, and to the truth in the heart, which came by Jesus; 1

This fundamental, positive aspect of his message had its critical and negative side, however: the evangelistic task cannot be separated from the prophetic work.

But with and by this divine power and Spirit of God, and the light of Jesus, I was to bring people off from all their own ways, to Christ, the new and living way; and from their churches, which men had made and gathered, to the church of God,....; and off from the world's teachers, ...; and off from all the world's worships, to know the Spirit of Truth in the inward parts, and to be led thereby; 2

This list of practices and customs antithetical to true religion continues: Fox is to bring people off from "all the world's religions, which are vain", from all "fellowships, and prayings, and singings, which stood in forms without powers", and from "Jewish ceremonies" and "men's inventions and windy doctrines", from the attempt to make ministers of Christ in schools and colleges, and "from all their images and crosses, and sprinkling of infants, with

1. Ibid., I.35.

2. Ibid., I.36,37.

all their holy days (so called) and all their vain traditions".¹ As if this were not enough, the next paragraph relates his resolve not to put off his hat to anyone, "high or low", to always use Thee and Thou in addressing all people, and to refrain from other customary civilities which to him implied basic distinctions between men which were not intended by the Creator.

In view of these avowed aims for the reform of religion, doctrine, manners and morals, it is hardly surprising that Fox follows these passages with the comment:

But O! the rage that then was in the
priests, magistrates, professors, and
people of all sorts; but especially in
priests and professors! ²

It is not an exaggeration to sum up the aim and direction of Fox's evangelistic and prophetic message thus:

Fox and his followers set themselves the revolutionary and complex task of revising the whole life of a half-pagan society in conformity with the mind and power of Christ as revealed within--a task vastly more radical than the purifying of the ecclesiastical and moral life proposed by the Puritans. ³

To be sure, the entire scope of the reformation and revolution involved in Fox's religious outlook was not realized

1. Ibid., I.37.

2. Ibid., I.38.

3. E. Russell, op.cit., p.25.

or developed immediately. But "the rage of the priests and professors" which confronted Fox almost from the moment he began preaching was not without foundation, for the Puritan clergy and the Puritan segment of the populace were quick to see the challenge constituted by the declarations of the young reformer, and they joined issue with him at once. In the preface to Fox's The Great Mystery, Edward Burrough gives a graphic description of the instantaneous character of the opposition:

And in the beginning we were but few in number,...; and no sooner did the Lord appear to us, and with us, but the Devil and his power rose up against us to destroy us, and it wrought in Rulers, Priests, and people,...to quench the work of the Lord, and to stop our passage in what we were called to; 1

The early disputes and controversies between Fox and his opponents are only sketchily described in the Journal, but a glance at some of the first of these engagements will serve to indicate their general nature, and give a flavor^u of the specific situations in which they arose. Soon after he had experienced the decisive openings upon which his new found faith was built, Fox began his informal itinerant preaching--"declaring the truth" among the people. The first record of any opposition to his message apparently coincided with his first attempt to declare it. On this occasion, some were "convinced" (Fox's term for accepting

1. G.M., "To the Reader", 13th page. (Pages unnumbered).

the Quaker message), but "the professors were in a rage, all pleading for sin and imperfection, and could not endure to hear talk of perfection, and of a holy and sinless life".¹ A second dispute occurs at a meeting of priests and professors, when Fox succeeded in persuading the "more sober" among them that when Paul spoke of the law by which he had known sin, he was referring not to the outward but to the inward law--"the law of God in his mind".² Again, he attended a debate in which "Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and Common-prayer-men" were all participating. Fox remained silent until a "priest" rebuked a woman who had asked a question, remarking that he would not permit a woman to speak "in the church". At this Fox stepped up and asked the clergyman whether he called "this (the steeple-house) a church? Or dost thou call this mixed multitude a church?"³ The young man then proceeded to expound his views on the true nature of the church, an exposition which "set them all on fire" brought everybody to their feet, and completely "marred" the dispute. The next incident recorded in the Journal centered around another remark made by a minister, but this time the offending statement came in the middle of a Sunday morning

1. Jnl. bi-cent.edn., I.19.

2. Ibid., I.23f.

3. Ibid., I.25.

sermon. In most churches it was the custom that following the sermon anyone so desiring could rise and address the congregation.¹ On this occasion, however, when the preacher identified "a more sure Word of prophecy" as the Scriptures themselves, Fox immediately interrupted, fervently pointing out that the Word was not the Scriptures, but the Holy Spirit.² This untimely outburst had as its consequence Fox's first term of imprisonment, which lasted "some weeks"³ at Nottingham.

Between this first imprisonment and the second one, at Derby, there are only brief references to a few controversies--one with some Baptists, another with some imprisoned Ranters, a third with his former minister, Nathaniel Stephens, who now stirred up a crowd against Fox. The difficulty at Derby was caused when Fox, speaking quietly at a public lecture in a church, was sent to the magistrates for questioning. During the long and inconclusive examination, Fox upheld his views on the church, and on sanctification, affirmed that Christ abided in him by his Spirit, but denied that he or his two companions were themselves Christ. Although no specific point is mentioned, the opinions of Fox

1. Cf. R. Barclay, The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth, Chapter XII, p. 274-293.

2. Jnl. bi-cent.edn., I. 42f.

3. A. N. Brayshaw, The Personality of George Fox, p. xvi. Brayshaw noted that J. Besse, Sufferings, i. 552, says "for a considerable time". The Journal (bi-cent.edn.) I. 45, merely says "some time". Fox was released without standing trial.

were sufficiently abhorrent to the magistrates for them to commit him for six months as a blasphemer. While in gaol, the controversy regarding perfection continued, as several professors visited Fox and argued against his position that the believer could have victory over sin in this life. Another point of divergence between Fox and the Puritans emerged when he refused an offer of a captaincy in the Commonwealth army. Holding firmly to a pacifist position, Fox so infuriated the commissioners and soldiers that they had him put in the dungeon, where he remained another six months.

In reviewing these events attending the first years of Fox's preaching, it should, of course, be noted that his message was not always polemical, nor was he always received with either vocal or violent opposition. There were many "quiet" meetings during this period, and many people were convinced. However, Fox was ready to defend his position at any time, whether in a church, private home, or field, and his reforming zeal against what he considered to be a lifeless and worldly religion soon became widely known. The following passage may be taken as a summary statement of Fox's own view of his relationship with the Puritan clergy and congregations.

Yea, the Lord's everlasting power was over the world, and reached to the hearts of people, and made both priests and professors tremble. It shook the earthly and airy spirit, in which they held their profession of religion and

worship, so that it was a dreadful thing unto them, when it was told them, "The man in leather breeches is come." At the hearing thereof the priests, in many places would get out of the way; they were so struck with the dread of the eternal power of God; and fear surprised the hypocrites. ¹

Having concluded the outline of the beginnings of the controversy between the Puritans and the Quakers, a final word needs to be said concerning the method of treatment employed in the following chapters. The controlling interest throughout is theological, and the attempt is made to analyze the controversy in terms of the theological issues involved, whether implicitly or explicitly. Most of the historical aspects of the struggle have been confined to the Introduction. This approach is, of course, based on the premise that the controversy between Puritans and Quakers was basically a theological one, and that differences in politics and in manners and morals, etc., stemmed ultimately from conflicting theologies. It is commonly agreed that this period was one of unprecedented interest in Christian doctrine, throughout all walks of English life.² It was a period of innumerable dogmatic, self-assured, and exceptionally vocal

1. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I.89. Fox wore leather garments because of their durability, but this garb became a popular and often lampooned personal trademark.

2. Cf. BQ, p.17.

doctrinal protagonists, both lay and clerical. Thus almost the entirety of the Quaker-Puritan controversy centered on doctrinal positions and viewpoints. Since, however, the battles that make up this controversy were largely uncoordinated and unrelated engagements, the problem is to bring them into some workable and analyzable order. It is to be emphasized, however, that this ordering process may result in a false and artificial picture of coherence, which did not obtain in the positions as originally stated. Among neither the Puritans nor the Quakers under discussion can there be found a systematic theologian, in the sense of a writer who systematically treats of the entire circle of Christian doctrine. (Even Owen and Baxter, the most likely candidates, do not fully meet this qualification.) In an individual writer, or in a particular dispute, there is little explicit ordering and relating of issues involved. This was a doctrinal age, to be sure, but doctrinal thinking and discoursing did not consist of dispassionate, methodical and systematic theological reflection. These theological issues were burning problems to their protagonists, and it can be said without exaggeration that more than once they were matters of life and death. In imposing a more logical order on these controversies, the danger of lifeless abstraction and artificial systematization is ever present, and it is hoped that where this cannot be avoided it will at least be quickly recognized.

CHAPTER ONE

Immediate Revelation and the Indwelling Spirit

The primary question which any controversy revolves upon is the question of authority. Sooner or later the advocate of a contested position is asked for his credentials: How do you know that your position is true? What right have you to uphold that particular viewpoint? What authority do you adduce for your arguments? In a religious discussion these questions are usually asked sooner than later, and this is especially true with the present controversy. The Quakers and the Puritans never ceased demanding from each other an acknowledgment of the authority by which they spoke, and they continually challenged the epistemological basis of each other's position. This challenge is sharply put in a typical speech of George Fox; describing the Scripture as "the prophets' words, and Christ's and the apostles' words", which were given them from the Lord, Fox goes on to demand:

then what had any to do with the
Scriptures, but as they came to
the Spirit that gave them forth?
You will say, Christ saith this,
and the apostles say this; but
what canst thou say? Art thou a

child of Light, and hast thou
walked in the Light, and what
thou speakest, is it inwardly
from God? ¹

Here we have both the Quaker and the Puritan view of the problem of authority. As will be seen, the basic Puritan answer to the Quaker question, "What canst thou say?" is the counter demand, "What do the Scriptures say?"

This argument concerning the ultimate court of appeal, the underlying authority for religious tenets, is the hub upon which all the other disputed points of doctrine turn; controversies in the fields of Christology, soteriology, eschatology, and ecclesiology, all presuppose the conflicting Quaker and Puritan answers to the question of authority. Each side builds up its position on the basis of its own epistemology, its own view of the nature of our knowledge of God. Moreover, while this problem of authority is thus interwoven into the various strands of the entire controversy, it contains within itself a number of closely related elements. As can be seen from Fox's argument above, the question of authority involves at once the doctrines of the Scripture, of the Holy Spirit, and of Revelation. Each one of these three subjects needs to be examined before a complete and meaningful answer can be given, by either Quaker or Puritan, to Fox's question, "But what canst thou say?" The first three chapters

1. As quoted by Margaret Fox in her Testimony, in the Jnl., bi-cent.edn., II.512.

are, therefore, to be taken as a logical unity, each depending on the other, and each only a partial exposition of the problem of authority.

In the Introduction we have already seen how George Fox answered his own question. He claimed that his right to speak of things religious was based on immediate revelation. His openings were his authority; for him, revelation as the sine qua non of religion. "All that ever come to know Christ...it must be by revelation; for no man knows Christ but by revelation".¹ And this revelation is "immediate"; it is not something read about--even in Scripture, nor something spoken about--even from the pulpit, but it is something personally received and experienced. Fox and the Quakers would admit of no other principle for the knowledge of God than the principle and the experience of immediate revelation. An early Quaker writer argues that whoever denies this denies Christ and the Spirit of God, knows not the Son of God, nor the Father, is no minister of Christ, and runs contrary to the Scriptures.² Fox pronounces a similar verdict upon another Puritan disputant who disavows immediate inspiration and says he does not wait

1. G.M., p. 74.

2. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, pp. 9, 16.

for it:

So shewing himselfe to be of them that God never sent; [who are like the Jews, who said that Moses and the prophets heard God's voice] But their own eares [are] stopt to the voyce. ...and you that deny immediate inspiration, have denied the powers and the spirit, for that's immediate, and the Ministers of Christ witness it. ¹

Thus, from the Quaker viewpoint, the crucial question was, "Whether you have heard the voice of the liveing God of Heaven and Earth?"² The First Publishers believed they could answer this in the affirmative; Fox was not alone in stating that he knew the revelation and grace of God "experimentally".³ From all of the early Quaker writers endless evidence of similar testimony can be gathered. They all felt that the "Word of the Lord" had come directly to them, and that what they had to say was given to them immediately from God. The keen assurance of revelation resounds again and again in their pro-

1. G.M., p. 3.

2. "The Quakers Queries", printed in S. Eaton, The Quakers Confuted, (pages not numbered). The Queries were sent anonymously by some Quakers to the church in Stockport, Cheshire. Samuel Eaton (1596?-1665), B.A. and M.A. from Magdalene College, Cambridge; took orders and was beneficed; became a vigorous Independent; silenced in 1662. He was a teacher in the Stockport church when he wrote this pamphlet. Cf. D.N.B.

3. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I.11.

nouncements, "This is the Word of the Lord"--and their audience for this might be Oliver Cromwell, the People of England, or the Church of God.¹ One of the most graphic examples of the Quaker view of the immediacy of revelation is James Nayler's description of his "call", which he related at Appelby in January, 1653, "to the astonished Puritan magistrates...who had not believed such an experience possible".²

J.N. I was at the Plow, meditating on the things of God, and suddainly I heard a Voice, saying unto me, Get thee out from thy Kindred, and from thy Father's House. And I had a Promise given in with it. Whereupon I did exceedingly rejoyce, that I had heard the Voice of that God which I had professed from a Child, but had never known him.

Col. Brigs. Didst thou hear that Voice?

J.N. Yes, I did hear it; [Nayler sold his property, and after some unwillingness, obeyed a command to go into the West, not knowing what he should do there;] but when I had been there a little while, I had given me what I was to declare; and ever since I have remained, not knowing to Day, what I was to do to morrow. ³

The Quaker answer to the question of authority is, therefore, the principle and the experience of immediate revelation, and for this they claim the support of Bibli-

1. Cf. Wm. Dewsbury, Testimony, pp. 1, 4, 27, 66, etc.

2. BQ., pp. 61-62.

3. J. Nayler, A Collection, p. 12-13. The year is given as 1652, but here and throughout this study all dates will be altered to New Style.

cal religion. The Quakers held that the prophets and the apostles received their "word from the Lord" directly, and that it was this immediacy which characterized primitive Christianity. Nayler argues that even his opponents (whom he styles "Antichrist") would maintain that in the "primitive Times" Christ's followers "had their immediate Call from God himself, and they heard his Voice";¹ but "Antichrist" will not admit that any such immediate call is to be looked for today.² This discrepancy between Apostolic Christianity and the current Christian doctrine and practice can lead to but one conclusion, according to Quaker reasoning. "That which the Apostles received, they received from God; so ye receiving it not by the same means, have received it from men, and not from God."³ Since the clergyman against whom Fox wrote these words cannot claim the same knowledge, gifts, or immediate revelation that the apostles had, he shows that "he is in the Apostacy, not to have the Gospel the Apostles had".⁴ Sooner or later, the Quakers demanded that their opponents show their credentials, and any authority short of immediate

1. Ibid., p. 204.

2. Cf. below, Chapter Seven for the dispute on the qualifications for the ministry. The Puritans argued that an immediate call was not a necessary qualification.

3. G.M., p. 242.

4. Ibid.

revelation would be ruled out of court, deemed by the Quakers to be inadequate and incapable of supporting the cause of true Christianity.

Obviously, the Puritans could not for a minute accept this verdict, and they presented their case with equal vigor and forthrightness, attacking the principle of immediacy and supplying their own answer to the question of authority. This answer was embodied in the Puritan doctrine of the Scriptures, which they held to be the only medium of revelation available to men in the present day.

The Puritans would hardly accept the Quaker conclusion that their disavowal of immediate revelation entailed a denial of all revelation, and Baxter's answer to a Quaker query whether or not he owned "Revelations" could be supported by all of his co-religionists:

I own all divine Revelations, and dis-
own all diabolical ones, so farre as
I know them....I own all those blessed
Revelations contained in the Scriptures. ¹

Since we must defer discussion of the doctrine of the Scriptures for the moment, these words may serve to indicate the positive side of the Puritan opposition to the principle of immediate revelation: the authoritative basis of religion lies not in immediate but in Scriptural revelation.

1. R. Baxter, The Quakers Catechism, p. 12.

At this point we are concerned only with the negative side of the Puritan attack on the principle of immediacy per se. The chief contention was that the principle was incapable of proof: those who claimed immediate revelation were, according to Puritan judgment, unable to prove their claim. Jeremiah Ives records two disputes with Nayler, in which he successively refutes all of Nayler's attempts to prove he is immediately sent by God. Nayler first maintains that proofs are not necessary and that he need not give signs to unbelievers, or to an "adulterous generation". Ives replies that Christ did and so must he. On mentioning his call from the plow, Ives tells him he must prove it was true. As such proof, Nayler says that he can prophesy, for example, of the divisions in the church; but Ives insists he must "tell us when these will come", or else it is no prophecy.¹ On a second occasion, Nayler adduces the deeds and practices of Quakers as proof that they are immediately sent from God: the Quakers leave home and travel about preaching, they deny themselves "in point of apparel", they do not give respect to persons. But Ives replies that such things are also practiced by the Franciscans and other

1. J. Ives, The Quakers Quaking, pp. 9-12. Jeremiah Ives, (d. 1674), a General Baptist; self-taught; apparently pastor of a baptized congregation meeting in the Old Jewry. He at first refused, but later took, the Oath of Allegiance in 1661. Cf. D.N.B.

"Antichristians". When Nayler says that the Quakers make proselytes, turning people from darkness to light, Ives retorts that if all England turned Quaker, it would not prove that the Quakers were sent from God.¹

But the main demand for proof of immediate revelation was the demand for miracles. In his controversy with Nayler, Ives states:

That God did never immediately send any, but he did either from heaven demonstrate the truth of their authority, or else gave them power to work miracles upon the earth. 2

It would not do for the Quakers to argue that immediate revelation was self-authenticating, and needed no external proof, for it was against such an argument that Baxter complained that:

the way by which they prevail, is not by producing any evidence; For they renounce that, and offer you all on the Authority of the Spirit within them; and therefore they must prove that Authority, and their Revelations and Divine Mission by Miracles, or such supernatural means, before any reasonable man can believe them: Unless you will believe every man that saith, he is sent of God. 3

Again, Eaton insists that those who say that God speaks to them, and that the Spirit immediately suggests what they

1. Ibid., pp. 12-18.

2. Ibid., p. 9.

3. R. Baxter, One Sheet Against the Quakers, pp. 12-13.

Speak or pray in their meetings should

confirm Gods speaking or the Spirits speaking to them by signs and wonders and by diversitie of Miracles as Christ and his Apostles did, Heb. 2.3,4. else they must of necessity be accounted Imposters and Deceivers of the People. 1

The Quaker rebuttal of this demand for miracles is given chiefly in two types of argument. The first attempts to show that in Biblical times miracles were not, in fact, taken as proof of immediate inspiration. Emphasis is laid on those passages decrying the insistence on "signs", e.g., Mt. 12:39, I Cor. 1:22; and Henry Stubbe, a Puritan writing in defense of the Quakers, argues that many prophets, e.g., Obadiah, Nahum, and John the Baptist, did no miracles. Stubbe points out that we are warned about false prophets who perform miracles, and concludes that miracles "cannot satisfy a rationally curiosity about a call or spiritual endowments".² George Whitehead, replying to Ives, makes a similar point by asking whether the apostles were required to give such proofs to their enemies, or only to God? Another query is put by Whitehead, in which he implies that the requiring of such proof is tantamount to requiring

1. S. Eaton, op.cit., p. 14.

2. H. Stubbe, A Light Shining out of Darknes:, p. 86. Henry Stubbe (Stubbs, Stubbes), (1606?-1678). B.A. and M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford; took Covenant during the Civil War; ejected from Dursley, 1662. In 1672 his house was licensed for a Presbyterian meeting house. Cf. D.N.B.

that the Quakers prove themselves Christians.¹ Furthermore, Whitehead doubts that anyone can judge of immediate revelation in another person, when he does not admit of it in himself.² Nayler also rules out Ives as a competent judge of the matter, since he argues that he who denies that faith is the direct gift of God would not be likely to believe in God's messengers with or without miracles.³ The Quakers thus defended the principle of immediate revelation as not only self-authenticating, but also as incapable of being judged by anyone who did not admit it in himself.

A second main line of Puritan criticism of immediacy centered on the charge of subjectivity. Nayler lists, among the "lies" found in an anti-Quaker book, the charges:

That we turn from the light of Christ shining in the Scriptures, to follow our imaginations and fancies instead of Christ. 4

That we call the voice of Satan in our own deceitful hearts the Voice of Christ. 5

Hubberthorne also notes that the Quakers are charged with making men lean on their own understanding, and with placing

1. "Twenty Questions to Ives", in G. Whitehead, A Serious Search, pp. 68-72.

2. Ibid.

3. J. Nayler, Weaknes above Wickednes, pp. 5-6.

4. J. Nayler, Deceit Brought to Day-Light, p. 5.

5. Ibid., p. 3.

"all their Godliness in following their own supposed Light".¹
 The argument of subjectivity, however, is also used by the Quakers against their Puritan opponents, for Fox maintains that those who deny having an immediate voice speaking within them show that they never knew the Spirit of the Father speaking in them, "but follows their own dreams and spirits".²

A final objection to the principle of immediacy per se is the question:

Whether or no...this very Principle doth not lay all other Precepts waste, and excuse the observance of them till I am immediately inspired thereto? I believe, if a man did owe a Quaker a sum of money, he would be loth to be served as he would have men serve Christ: 3

Ives notes that the Quaker would not like his debtor to refrain from paying his debt until the man could feel the text, "Owe nothing to any man" immediately witnessed to within him; "yet in this manner would they have men deal with the commands of our Lord Jesus:"⁴ This argument is not as facetious as it seems, for it will be seen that the application of the principle of immediate inspiration to many social, civil, and ecclesiastical customs did indeed lay many of these traditions waste in Quaker practice.

-
1. R. Hubberthorne, The Light of Christ within, p. 10.
 2. G.M., p. 5. For a fuller discussion of the problem of subjectivity cf. below, pp. 117 ff.
 3. J. Ives, op.cit., pp. 26-27.
 4. Ibid., p. 27.

The Puritans thus found the Quaker interpretation of the principle of immediate revelation to be erroneous, and argued that the knowledge of God was to be obtained mediately, through the study and teaching of the Scriptures. This argument on methodology, the means to be used in learning about things divine, is stated clearly by Sherlock:

We preach the same Gospel the Apostles preached, but do not attain the knowledge and understanding of this Gospel by the same means; the Apostles were eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses of the sayings and doings of Christ, (which is the sum of the Gospel) the mysteries whereof they understood by immediate revelation from heaven,....But we do neither pretend to any such sublime and eminent gifts, neither do we, or ought we to depend upon any such immediate and miraculous revelation from heaven; but do use those ordinary means and helps, which God in his merciful providence hath in all ages afforded his people, viz. by study and industry in the Schools of the Prophets. ¹

To this George Fox had an equally clear-cut reply: "An external opens not the eternal".² The Quakers would allow no dilution of the principle of immediacy, and if the discussion shifted from revelation itself to the subsidiary theme of the role of human teaching as a method of religious

1. R. Sherlock, The Quakers Wilde Questions, pp. 5-6. Richard Sherlock, (1612-1689). M.A., Trinity College, Dublin; entered holy orders; had unsettled career until 1662, when he received a rectory in Lancashire. He was chaplain to Sir Robert Bindloss at Borwick Hall when the above was written. He is an example of a firm Royalist and Anglican whose theology was largely Puritan. Cf. D.N.B.

2. G.M., p. 242.

knowledge, the Quakers were ready to affirm that the teaching of God was immediate. The sum of Fox's message on one occasion was a declaration "that God was come to teach his people himself, and to bring them off from all their man-made teachers to hear his Son".¹ Fox's insistence that "All the people of the Lord shall be taught of the Lord"² may indeed be taken as one of the leitmotifs of Quaker theology.

The phrase, "the anointing within", was the usual expression used to denote this immediate teaching of God, although the inward teacher is also identified as the Light, Christ, and Christ Jesus, the Grace of God, the Spirit of God, and, of course, God himself. "The anointing" was perhaps the favorite term, however, and even before the end of his spiritual quest Fox asks of his critical relatives, "Did not the apostle say to believers, that 'they needed no man to teach them, but as the anointing teacheth them?'"³

Against this doctrine of the anointing the Puritans set their doctrine that God teaches by the use of external means, and that "our outward teaching...is the ordinary way by which a people that are in darkness are brought to

1. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I.48.

2. G.M., p. 3.

3. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I.7. Fox no doubt was referring to I John 2:27, which was the text for the Quaker doctrine of the anointing.

light: Mat. 4.13,14."¹ The same writer argues that outward teaching is not distinct from, or opposed to, the inward teaching of the Spirit, but rather that the former is a means of conveying the latter. Those "who are drawn off from the external Means and Ministry, by which the Spirit is given, and Faith is wrought", are most likely "seduced", and have not "the Spirit of Truth, but of Delusion".²

Matthew Caffyn presents a similar argument against the Quaker contention that faith is a "gift of God" coming to the believer directly from God, without the aid of human teaching. Caffyn maintains to the contrary, holding that "faith commeth by hearing, and hearing by the word of God; now the Quaker may not say that word is Christ", or the light within, for Rom. 10:17-18 proves that preaching was necessary for "that Faith which comes by hearing".³ Furthermore, Caffyn argues, outward teaching has the sanction of Christ, for Jesus chided people for their ignorance of the Scriptures, "shewing plainly, that the will of Christ was, that men should learn from outward discoveries".⁴

1. S. Eaton, op.cit., p. 44.

2. Ibid., p. 41.

3. M. Caffyn, The Deceived...Quakers Discovered, p. 4. Matthew Caffyn, (1628-1714). Expelled from Oxford for advocating Baptist tenets; became minister of a General Baptist congregation in Horsham, Sussex; suffered under Conventicle Act; in the '90's and later was the center of a schismatic dispute among Baptists. He held a latitudinarian view on the doctrine of the Trinity. Cf. D.N.B.

4. Ibid., p. 9.

John Owen comes to the core of the dispute by attacking two of the basic Quaker texts for their doctrine of the immediate teaching of God. The first is Isaiah 54:13, "And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord", from which, Owen says, the Quakers conclude that other instruction or doctrine is not needed. In reply, Owen contends that Holy Scripture itself is a doctrine which God teaches us; and secondly, this promise in the text, according to Owen, was given only to the children of the Church, and does not apply to all people. Lastly, he points out that the immediate teaching through God's Spirit does not exclude other mediate means used by God:

3. Causa principalis instructionis, quae rem ipsam effectam dabit, non excludit alias, quibus ipsa uti velit; Deus nos docet, sed per Spiritum et verbum, Matt. xxviii. 19,20, 2 Cor. iv.6,7. 1

This Puritan insistence on the conjunction of Spirit and Word will be treated more fully in Chapter Three.

The second text which was frequently quoted in support of the Quaker position was Jeremiah 31:33,34, in which the key phrase is "they shall teach no more every man his neighbor,...saying, Know the Lord; for they shall know me". Explaining this text, Owen notes

1. J. Owen, Works, XVI, 464. (Pro Sacris Scripturis)

that if it were to be understood absolutely, there would be no need for the Quakers themselves to go about crying, "Know the Lord". Owen and the Puritans were quick to emphasize the apparent inconsistency between the Quaker principle of immediate teaching and the energetic activity of the First Publishers in preaching, teaching, and exhorting the people to turn to God. Again, Owen insists that the promise of "richer grace, clearer knowledge, and readier observance" is not coupled with a condemnation of the ordinances and instruction of God. Finally, Owen argues that the external method of teaching is rejected only for those on whose hearts the inward law was written by grace, whereas teaching is necessary for those on whose hearts the inward law is not written.¹

This last argument is paralleled by Caffyn's refutation of the Quaker interpretation of another key text, I John 2:27, which they cited as the basis for their doctrine of the anointing. The Quakers took this text to mean that whoever had the anointing was so taught by God that he needed no man to teach him. Caffyn, however, contends that John knew that the church to which he was writing was so unusually furnished with spiritual gifts that there was no absolute necessity for John to teach or instruct them by writing letters. Caffyn continues:

1. Ibid., p. 465. For the Quaker view of the need for preaching and teaching, cf. below, pp. 313-315.

Furthermore, the anointing abode indeed in them, John saith, but that every particular person had the anointing so in them, as that not any of them needed to be taught, John saith not: the anointing Spirit abode in them (in the Body, the Church) so as that there was (it seems) several able (through the anointing) to teach and instruct the rest, which is the Will and Mind of the Lord, even for spiritual men so to do,....¹

Thus, he concludes that although there were some in New Testament times who did not need any external teaching, these were precisely the ones who were already regenerate and had a saving knowledge of God, as well as having spiritual gifts.

This question of spiritual gifts and the "anointing Spirit" brings us to the central issue at stake in the controversy about immediate revelation, for underlying the problem of the means of God's teaching are the conflicting Quaker and Puritan doctrines of the Holy Spirit. The Quaker view of the method of the teaching of God as direct and immediate stemmed from their doctrine of the contemporary indwelling of the Spirit. Likewise, it was the Puritan rejection of the Quaker formulation of this doctrine which under-girded the Puritan view that the teaching of God in the present time was not immediate, but mediated through the preaching and teaching of the Scripture. This convergence of the question of means and of the

1. M. Caffyn, "The great Error and mistake of the Quakers" in Faith in Gods Promises, pp. 50-51.

doctrine of the Spirit is vividly illustrated by Fox, in a letter reprimanding some "priests and professors" whom he thinks are opposing "the pouring forth of the Spirit". Emphasizing Joel 2:28, Fox expostulates:

Look, ye deceivers: here the Lord saith,
 he will pour out of his Spirit; mark the
 word, of the Lord's Spirit upon all flesh.
 What! young men, old men, sons and daughters,
 and maidens, all these to have the Spirit of
 God poured forth upon them? Here, say they,
 these deny the means then: nay, that is the
 means. ¹

Here is the basis of the Quaker principle of immediacy: the Spirit is the means, and the Spirit is effectively at work in the present day. The issue of immediate revelation is the issue of the continuing revelation of God through the indwelling of the Spirit in present-day believers, and to this fundamental question we now turn.

It seems almost redundant to lay special emphasis on the centrality of the doctrine of the Spirit in Quaker thinking, for this doctrine will be found at the root of the Quaker position in nearly all of the following chapters. Fox is sounding the dominant theme of early Quakerism when he affirms that "The life of Religion is the spirit that gave forth the Scripture",² and as we shall see, the First Publishers would allow nothing--neither Scripture,

1. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I.351.

2. G.M., p. 150.

the ministerial office, nor the sacraments--to be set in the place of the Spirit as the essential, life-giving element in the Christian religion. To the Quakers, the Christian life is wholly impossible without the work of the Spirit upon the believer. Thus Fox finds the following viewpoint untenable, and answers it sharply:

Principle]. ...A man may be a Christian, a believer, a converted soule, he may be in Christ, and yet not have received the spirit of sealing and establishing,...

Answer]. This is like to the rest of thy Doctrine who are out of it themselves;... For they that are in Christ have the spirit; and they that are converted, are converted by the spirit: And he that believeth cometh to be sealed with the spirit of promise. ¹

Fox himself testifies that he received the direct guidance of the Spirit; for in the Journal, after relating a series of his openings, he states:

These things I did not see by the help of man, nor by the letter, though they are written in the letter, but I saw them in the light of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by his immediate Spirit and power, as did the holy men of God, by whom the Holy Scriptures were written. ²

It was this claim of the immediate inspiration of the Spirit that Fox and his followers insisted upon as the sole authoritative basis of true Christianity.

This view of the Spirit clearly implies a comparison

1. Ibid., p. 95.

2. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I.36.

of the work of the Spirit in Biblical times with that in the present time, and the Quakers made it plain that they considered the contemporary indwelling of the Spirit to be just as effective as it was in apostolic days. Samuel Fisher puts the point graphically:

For there are many in England at this very day, Speaking, Reproving, Writing, and Prophecyng from the same Light, and by the same Spirit, that the Scriptures came forth from, and as themselves have received and heard from the Voice and Mouth of God, and seen, felt and handled of the Word of Life, as the Prophets, Amos 7. and the Messengers and Ministers of God and Christ of old, Acts 26.16,17,18....The Spirit of the Lord, is not more straitned in these dayes from blowing where it lists, than it was in the dayes of old; 1

William Dewsbury is equally insistent, and forcefully rejects an opponent's view that since God "hath committed his whole Will unto writing by the Prophets, and Apostles," the former means, such as Visions, Angels, and God's voice, are now ceased. To this opponent, Dewsbury replies:

Thou vain Man, who dare to say, the Lord hath ceased making himself known to his People, by Voice, Vision or Inspiration; holy men of God did speak, and do speak, as Inspired by the Spirit of God, and moved by the Holy Ghost, 2 Pet.1.21. 2

While they noted that their view of present-day inspiration

1. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 557.

2. W. Dewsbury, Testimony, p. 130. Dewsbury also quotes the standard Quaker text on this point, Joel 2:28,29.

did not exclude the Spirit speaking through the Scriptures, the Quakers were quick to deny any view of the Scriptures which excluded the contemporary indwelling of the Spirit. Thus Francis Howgill admits that the Spirit may, if it please, reveal eternal life through the Scriptures which it gave forth, but he adds the characteristic Quaker protest:

but to limit Life, or the Spirit to this or that or the other thing, true Believers dare not do: For God, who is eternal Life, manifesteth his Mind to the Creature, how, when, where, and by what he will; who art thou that would'st limit him? ¹

Limiting or "quenching" the Spirit was a common Quaker accusation against the Puritans, and the exhortation, "Quench not the Spirit" was one of the watchwords of Fox and the First Publishers. We shall see that, to the Quaker mind, there could be no more serious charge than that some viewpoint or statement was a limiting or quenching of the Holy Spirit.

The above-quoted assertion of George Fox that "The life of religion is the spirit" was made in reply to the counter-affirmation of John Stalham, who held that "the life of their [Stalham's] Religion is the rule of the holy Scriptures".²

-
1. F. Howgill, Works, p. 266. (Misnumbered 260).
 2. G.M., p. 150. John Stalham, (d. 1681). Probably educated at Oxford; began his ministry in Edinburgh; became vicar of Terling, Essex, 1632, from which he was ejected in 1662; remained as pastor until his death. He was apparently of Presbyterian sympathies. Cf. D.N.B.

Although the Puritans also had a strong and often emphatic doctrine of the Spirit, in their controversy with the Quakers they placed the primary emphasis on the doctrine of the Scriptures, and with this doctrine opposed the Quaker view of the contemporary indwelling of the Spirit. Thus John Owen, agreeing with the frequent Quaker contention that the Spirit will lead into all truth, adds a characteristically Puritan qualification: "Recte. Sed per media a Deo in eum finem instituta", namely, the Word of God.¹ We must defer a full discussion of the doctrine of the Scriptures, and in particular the Puritan view of the conjunction of Spirit and Scripture, until Chapter Three. At this point we will deal with the doctrine of Scripture only as it was used by the Puritans in their rejection of the Quaker view of immediate inspiration.

Some of the Puritan arguments against the Quaker principle of immediate revelation have already been reviewed. The argument based on Scripture as the full and final revelation of God, however, brings us to the main bulwark of the Puritan attack on this issue. Eaton, referring to the knowledge of God given to the apostles, expresses the general Puritan viewpoint:

It hath been delivered, that is, immediately from Heaven, and that cuts off all expectations of any other

1. J. Owen, Works, XVI.463. Owen adduces Isaiah 59:21 for his argument. The Quaker text is John 16:13.

delivery from Heaven, and of all other immediate voyces thence; But all Saints must hold what they have once had, 2 Thes. 2.15. 1

The issue of the Scriptures and the Spirit is drawn more sharply by another Puritan writer:

God is not pleased to use this way of immediate revelations now; nor indeed is it the work of Gods holy Spirit to discover things to us now immediately, having already made a full discovery of them in the Scriptures, but to open our eyes to see the wonderful things of his Law,... 2

Again, following the same line of argument, Baxter writes:

I believe that the Scriptures or Laws of Christ being finished and sealed, we must hold these till the coming of Christ, I Tim.6.13,14....and that these are able to make men wise to salvation, without any more additions, and therefore no more is to be expected. 3

This view that the revelation in Scripture is the complete and final manifestation of God's will, and therefore excludes the necessity or possibility of direct revelation or inspiration in the present times, receives its fullest exposition in Owen's treatise against the Quakers. Arguing for the "perfection of Scripture", Owen maintains that God

1. S. Eaton, op.cit., p. 16.

2. J. Clapham, A Discovery of the Quakers Doctrine, pp. 5-6. In a tract written in 1656, Jonathan Clapham follows his signature with "M.A. and Minister of Christ there", i.e. in Wramplingham, Norfolk. He conformed after the Restoration, and his sermon, Obedience to magistrates recommended, published in 1683, shows him to be "Rector of W.N."

3. R. Baxter, The Quakers Catechism, p. 12.

has declared in Holy Scripture everything which is necessary for our salvation; that there is no further need for either ancient tradition, new revelation, or the authority of any church, to reveal that which is necessary for us or acceptable to God; that it is presumption to demand for faith or worship that which is not revealed in Scripture; and that new revelations, if opposed to Scripture, are blasphemy, and if different from it, useless.¹ The core of his argument on this point is given in the following passage:

Scripturam itaque sacram ita regulam esse perfectissimam, in eum finem a Deo nobis traditam, ut ad ipsius gloriam, aeternam salutem assequeremur, ut post completum quem vocant ejus canonem, nullae novae revelationes circa fidem communem sanctorum, aut Dei cultum, aut exspectandae sint, aut admittendae, credimus et profiteamur. ²

Thus, from the doctrine of the perfect revelation of the divine will in Scripture, Owen concludes that any other revelation by the Spirit and light within are wholly unnecessary for our knowledge of God, and those immediate ways of knowing God claimed by the Quakers are to be flatly rejected. For, Owen concludes:

...tum incerta, periculosa, inutilia,
minime necessaria ea omnia media ad
cognoscendum Deum atque voluntatem

1. J. Owen, Works, XVI. 458.

2. Ibid.



ejus, ideoque rejicienda atque detestanda esse, quae simulant fanatici, apparet. 1

From the outline of the Quaker position given above, most of the defensive arguments in support of the doctrine of immediate revelation and the present-day indwelling of the Spirit can readily be surmised. One such rebuttal is that given by Fox to an adversary who stated, "that immediate Revelation or inspiration is not to be expected in these daies".

Ans. Then you are from the spirit, that saith so, which the spirit of God doth reveale, you are them that have ravened, the false prophets and ante-christ, that inwardly ravened from the spirit of God, having the sheeps cloathing,...for none knowes the Son, but the father, and he to whom he doth reveale him,...and the Son of God is now witnessed, and revelations is now witnessed, in our daies as it was in the Apostles, but not amongst you, who have inwardly ravened from the spirit of God, which hath Apostatized from the Apostles. 2

To Fox and other Quaker controversialists, the denial of immediate inspiration was proof only that he who denied it was "inwardly ravened" from the Spirit, and so was lost to the cause of true Christianity. Thus Fox replies to Eaton's assertion that the faith once delivered cuts off all further immediate revelation:

So he hath shut out Christ who is the Author of every mans faith,...That which was once delivered to the Saints, and

-
1. Ibid., p. 459. "Fanatici" is the term used by Owen to designate the Quakers throughout his treatise.
 2. G.M., p. 321.

given to the Saints, the Saints now must know their giver, and deliverer, and must know from whence the faith comes in this age, as well as in the other age. ¹

This Quaker line of defense is neatly summarized in a couplet by Fisher which dismisses categorically those opponents who reject present-day inspiration. Writes Fisher:

Say ye that God's inspir'd Ones are all gone?
Then ye of God's inspired Ones are none. ²

Furthermore, the restriction of revelation to Scripture alone brings the charge of "limiting the Spirit", as noted above. The contention that "The holy Ghost is to help us in keeping that which is committed to us, and not to reveal more", meets with an energetic response from Fox:

How art thou exalted in this above all that is called God,...who would be a teacher of the holy Ghost,...and who tells what it must reveal, and what it must not reveal? Thou must be stopt for thy presumption....and the spirit reveals the things of God, and thou saith it reveals no more; which shews thou doth not know Scriptures, nor God, nor spirit. ³

Similarly, Farnsworth records the opinion that "without Scripture the word of the Lord could not be spoken", and to this he replies:

1. Ibid., p. 4.

2. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 576.

3. G.M., p. 53.

...here he would limit the spirit of God:
 And if Samuel and the rest of the Prophets
 might have spoken nothing to the people but
 what was in Moses writings before them, they
 might not many times have spoken the word of
 the Lord to the people, because they spoke
 that which Moses had not written; ¹

Farnsworth runs the same argument regarding Christ and the apostles, vis-a-vis Moses' and the prophets' writings, and concludes that "the spirit and power of God is the saints ground of acting, now, as it was both in the Prophets and Apostles".² In his voluminous reply to Owen, Fisher likewise demands of his opponent, "what ground hast thou thus to forbid the Spirit of the Living God?", and he asks where God has prohibited his Spirit from acting, now, anymore than in former times before Scripture was written.³ Elsewhere, Fisher controverts Owen's argument concerning the perfection of the Scriptures, for, says Fisher, no one denies that "God hath given out a perfect Revelation of his Will". The question under dispute is whether this revelation is made so certainly and perfectly "by a meer Letter without", so that God's "Light and Spirit within is superfluous, needless, uncertain" in man's knowing and doing the will of God.⁴ This perfection of the written

1. R. Farnsworth, The Scriptures Vindication, first page of "To the Reader".

2. Ibid., second page of "To the Reader".

3. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 567.

4. Ibid., p. 473.

Scripture, which renders further inspiration needless, is the "lye" which Fisher accuses Owen of defending, and it is this which the Quakers deny.

The Quaker view of the Scripture as the "meer Letter" which cannot be known without the inspiration of that "same Spirit which gave it forth", will be discussed in Chapter Three. We may note here a similar argument against the doctrine of the perfection of Scripture, as given in the following exchange between Baxter and Fox:

Pr. He [Baxter] saith, The Scriptures are able to make men wise unto salvation without any more additions, and there is no more to be expected,...

Answ. Contrary to the Scripture it selfe, and the Apostles doctrine, who saith, through faith they are able to make wise unto salvation. So there is an addition which the Apostles adds,...which is the faith which thou art reprobated from,...1

On the other hand, the Quakers could argue that the present-day inspiration and revelation for which they were contending was nothing new or additional at all, but was from that very same Spirit which inspired the writers of Scripture. Thus Nayler reprimands an opponent of the view that Christ speaks to men today, charging his adversary: "as though God had now found some new Way to speak to his People, and not by his Son"; for "The same Christ who spoke in Paul and the rest" is he who "reveals himself now to be the Eternal Son of God in them", that is, in them who know and will hear

His voice.¹

The full force of their claim that they remain within the bounds of genuine Christian revelation comes to the fore in the query which the Quakers frequently addressed to their opponents:

Whether you have the same Spirit as was in the Apostles, and Christ, and the Prophets, which gave forth the Scriptures,...²

While few, if any, of the Puritan controversialists would hesitate to give an affirmative although qualified answer to this question in its present formulation, they unanimously denied the Quaker description of the Spirit given to the apostles, for the Quakers defined it as an infallible Spirit. The Puritans in reply both questioned this definition and disclaimed any application of it to themselves, and to the Quakers as well. Fox records and answers the following assertion:

Prin. He saith, The Children of God never assumed to themselves an infallible spirit.
Ans. Did not the Apostles say, they that had not the spirit of Christ were none of his? and was not that infallible? And was not all the Scriptures given forth from the spirit of God, and is not that infallible? ³

The denial of such infallibility met with a sharp rebuff from the Quakers, as another passage from the pen of Fox demonstrates:

1. J. Naybr, A Collection, pp. 81-82.

2. G. Fox and R. Hubberthorne, Truth's Defence, p. 42.

3. G.M., p. 118.

Pr. He saith, We do not pretend to infallibility as you do, which is lying and hypocriticall, &c.

Ans. We do believe you, that in the infallible spirit of God you are not, but in the false fallible spirit gone out into the world, that went forth from the Apostles, who had the spirit of Christ: And so how can you be Ministers of the Spirit, and not the Letter, if ye be not infallible; For who be in the spirit, are in that which is infallible. ¹

Perhaps one of the strongest statements of the Quaker judgment on this point is given by Francis Howgill:

...and all who were made Ministers of Christ, were spiritual and infallible; that which is not infallible is carnal; and all who are guided by the Spirit of Christ are infallible, and they that are not guided by it are none of his, nor the Sons of God, nor Ministers of Christ; ²

However forcefully the Quakers might put this doctrine of infallibility, it was, nevertheless, somewhat ambiguous, for they allowed that a man could be guided infallibly if he had only a partial possession of the Spirit. Thus Fox counters the view that although all may have the Spirit "in some measure", they do not have it in the same degree as the writers of Scripture, and therefore cannot teach infallibly:

Ans. Every man that hath a measure of the spirit of God in the least measure or degree, it is infallible, and so far may they teach infallibly, and know Scriptures;

1. Ibid., p. 82.

2. F. Howgill, Works, p. 22.

but they cannot know all Scriptures,
but as they attain to the full measure
of the spirit of the Prophets and
Apostles,... 1

Quaker reasoning started from the premise that the Holy Spirit was itself infallible, and proceeded to the conclusion that the "least measure" of the infallible Spirit gave the believer an infallible discernment of spiritual truth. Yet Fox and his fellow Quakers would not stop short of the conviction that the true believer could and must receive the full measure of the Spirit, and at this point Puritan opposition presented a solid front. Thus Eaton admits to the infallible spirit dwelling in the saints, but draws a clear line excluding its absolute efficacy. Eaton's argument is quoted and answered by Fox:

...he saith, though all the Saints have the spirit of Christ dwelling in them, which is eternall and infallible; yet that this spirit should do all that Saints do, and should say all that Saints say, and should judge for them both for persons and of things after an infallible manner,...all this we deny.

Ans. Which is contrary to the Apostle, who saith, As many as are the sons of God, are led by the spirit of God. And Christ acts all in them, and for them;...and you that have not that which is infallible to judge in you, know not the spirit of Christ,.... Neither have you the word of God in your hearts, nor Christ which is eternall and infallible, all which the Quakers have to judge persons and things,... 2

1. G.M., p. 212.

2. Ibid., p. 5.

Fox's reply, however, borders on the Quaker doctrine of perfection, into which the entire dispute on infallibility ultimately merges, and hence we must refer further discussion to the treatment of the vigorous controversy on perfection and sanctification, (cf. Chapter Five).

The basic issue at stake in the dispute on the contemporary indwelling of the Spirit as comparable with the Spirit's indwelling in the apostles and prophets emerges in a discussion between Owen and Fisher. This discussion centered on the question of whether the inspiration of present-day believers was "extraordinary" or "ordinary", and since most of the Puritans regarded the inspiration of the Biblical writers as "extraordinary", the Quakers had either to deny this premise or claim that the Spirit's guidance in the present day was also "extraordinary".¹ In either case the Quaker view would be antithetical to the Puritan, for the latter firmly denied that the contemporary indwelling of the Spirit was "extraordinary". In this Owen speaks for the main body of Puritans:

Omnes fideles acceperunt Spiritum regenerantem, sanctificantem, consolantem; sed non respectu donorum extraordinariorum,

1. The Quakers could, with the more radical Puritans, define both the Biblical and contemporary indwelling as "ordinary". But in the following dispute, which is one of the rare Quaker discussions of these terms, Fisher seems to adopt the more conservative premise, viz. that the inspiration of Biblical writers was "extraordinary".

prophetiae scilicet, infallibilitatis,
 peculiaris inspirationis ad declarandam
 voluntatem Dei immediate, et infalli-
 biliter ab ipso Deo. ¹

Owen and his co-religionists were far from denying the present-day activity of the Spirit; their objection was only to the designation of the mode of this indwelling which they term "ordinary", as opposed to the Spirit's "extraordinary" guidance in Biblical times.

Such a distinction was wholly foreign to Quaker thinking, and in rejecting it, Fisher gives a characteristically Quaker argument:

Hath God any other than that infallible Spirit: and if he meant to direct his People at all by his Spirit in the dismal times that were to come, must it not be by that infallible Spirit continuing his infallible (which thou callest extraordinary) Guidance and Direction, or else by none at all? or hath God two spirits to direct his own by at sundry times, one extraordinary and infallible, the other fallible and ordinary? ²

The Quakers insistently maintained a simple and uniform conception of the Spirit: the Holy Spirit is always infallible and extraordinary. Moreover, there is only one kind of guidance by the Spirit, viz. infallible and extraordinary guidance, and Fisher likens the dual view of ordinary and extraordinary inspiration to the "Popish" practice of having "ordinary Ornaments, Lessons, Anthems,..." that must serve for every Ordinary Day, and Extraordinary

1. J. Owen, Works, XVI, 463.

2. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 571.

Shews, and Sing-songs, ... as on some great Saints Holy Day". Again, he compares this view with the custom of poor people who have "one Fine Suit for Sundayes and Holy Dayes, and a Cheaper and Less Costly One for Working Dayes:". These similes graphically emphasize the Quaker rejection of the fundamental Puritan distinction between "ordinary" and "extraordinary" inspiration. To the Quaker, all manifestations of the Spirit, whether in the present or in Biblical times, were "extraordinary" and infallible. Thus Fisher insists that "all that are in Christ Jesus" live, walk, pray, sing, and serve in the Spirit,¹ and that whoever is led and guided by the Spirit is guided infallibly. Thus, referring to the Spirit, Fisher demands of Owen:

And he that speaks, sees, writes, acts, by it (as all Saints should do, though fallible in themselves) [does he not] do all this infallibly? And is not he that is moved by it, whether he obeys its motions yea or no, moved infallibly into that which is assuredly the Truth and no Lye? ²

For the Quakers, such "infallible guidance by the Spirit of God in these dayes" was no "fancy, delusion, fanaticism", as Owen and the Puritans might contend; it was an affirmation that the Spirit could and does dwell in present-day believers in the same manner as it moved in the apostles and prophets. In both cases, the Quaker viewed the inspi-

1. Ibid., p. 573.

2. Ibid., p. 574.

ration of the Spirit as "extraordinary" and infallible.

While Owen's argument against this position represents the basic Puritan criticism of the Quaker view of the contemporary indwelling of the Spirit, we may note in passing several of the more important secondary objections raised by Puritan writers. Owen is not the only controversialist to raise the charge of blasphemy, for several other writers apply this term to the Quaker claim of immediate revelation and infallibility in the Spirit. Baxter views this claim as sheer impiety, and refuses to consider it as genuine or true, as the following vividly indicates:

And to make all their delusion a more odious wickedness, they father it upon the holy Ghost, and would perswade the world that they speak all their most wicked speeches by his inspiration or command; and say (Thus saith the Lord) and (the Spirit of God within me saith thus or thus.) ¹

Baxter also rejects the Quaker contention of possessing the infallible Spirit, arguing that there are only two who make such a claim, viz. the Pope and the Roman church, and the Quakers:

But we hear the croakings of your Papist Guides in that word (infallible;) that's the pillar of their Kingdom,...That their Church is Infallible; ²

Allowing that the writers of Scripture were infallibly inspired, Baxter asserts that he has "no such Infallibility",

-
1. R. Baxter, One Sheet Against the Quakers, p. 11.
 2. R. Baxter, The Quakers Catechism, p. 9.

and concludes that although every true Christian "is infallible in the Essentials of Christianity"--in the sense of being subjectively certain of what he knows--yet Baxter will side with those who confess, "We believe, help thou our unbelief", or "we know but in part".¹

Another Puritan criticism proceeds on a different tack, stressing not the "blasphemous" claim of infallibility but the manifest errors, aberrations, inconsistencies, and uncertainties of Quaker doctrine. Clapham, for one, concludes with regard to "special and immediate revelations of the spirit", that "the woful miscarriages of such Enthusiasts that have pretended thereunto", may sufficiently convince us that God would have us heed the Scriptures more than such revelations.² Owen goes further, and makes his scepticism of immediate inspirations into a general principle: "Enthusiasmorum omne genus incertitudo"; he supports this conclusion by three considerations: the evilness of men, the deception of Satan, and the contradictions of the enthusiastic spirit.³ Baxter carries the attack directly to his adversaries, contending: "No wise man can be a Quaker, because their religion is an uncertain thing", which is composed of "but a few broken scraps of Doctrine",

1. Ibid., p. 10.

2. J. Clapham, op.cit., p. 5.

3. J. Owen, Works, XVI, 461.

never set together in a consistent or settled form. Baxter's conclusion is well representative of the attitude of the Puritans to this new Quaker religion: "We know not but the fag-end of it that is yet out of sight, may be so abominable as to shame all the rest."¹

A final common criticism is again expressed most forcefully by Baxter. In view of the fervent claim of the Quakers to be genuinely and directly inspired by Spirit, it is not surprising that they were frequently accused of gross pride and presumption. Doubting the superiority of the Quakers, since they are "so notoriously proud", Baxter elaborates on his charge:

The greater the matter is that men are proud of, usually the greater is their pride: It is the supposed Spirit of God, and extraordinary holiness and inspiration and abilities that they are Proud of. ²

This allegation of spiritual pride will be encountered with regard to other Quaker doctrines, such as their censure of the Puritan ministers, and especially with regard to their doctrine of perfection. With regard to the doctrine of immediate and infallible inspiration, however, it had particular force, for the Puritan could conceive of such a doctrine only in terms of an abhorrent conceit, and as a light which "brags of an infallible spirit".³ To the Puri-

1. R. Baxter, One Sheet against the Quakers, p. 3.

2. Ibid., p. 9-10.

3. G. Firmin, Stablishing against Shaking, p. 46.

tan, this Quaker claim could be but a vain boast.

These various charges were not left unanswered, of course, and the First Publishers stoutly denied them all. Fox answers another writer who disclaims infallibility, and who states that "None pretends infallibility but the Pope." Replies Fox:

and we say the Pope is not infallible
neither, though he be your Father, the
Ancient. Yet we say, he and you are
apostatized from the infallible spirit
that the Apostles was in,....¹

The objection that "it is blasphemy to tell us that what ye deliver is by revelation from heaven" is also countered by Fox:

You have received your Gospell another
way than Paul did I do believe, who are
apostates from them: And is it not blasphem-
y for you to speak, and preach that which
ye have not received from heaven? ²

The same argument is put more sharply in Fox's rejoinder to the accusation that it is presumptuous to expect an immediate revelation similar to that enjoyed by the apostles. To this the Quaker retorts:

Are not ye in the presumption & usurp
authority to preach or to teach that
have not the immediate revelation, as
the Apostles had, but have got their
words, and usurps the authority, and
are out of their power, is not this
usurping? ³

-
1. G.M., p. 105.
 2. Ibid., p. 72.
 3. Ibid., p. 241.

As would be expected, the Quakers firmly renounced any implication that their claim to the immediate and infallible inspiration of the Spirit stemmed from spiritual pride or self-glorification. This denial of such false motivation, however, did not entail a diminishing of the original claim, and the Quakers continually insisted that immediate revelation, or the contemporary indwelling of the Spirit, was the sine qua non of true Christianity. As will appear in the sequel, this insistence applied to the interpretation and use of the Scriptures, to the observance of divine worship, the qualifications for the ministry, and to the Christian life generally.

Given this emphasis on the necessity of possessing the Spirit, it remains for us to consider the dispute regarding the manner or mode of the Spirit's indwelling in present-day believers.¹ The key issue in this question was whether or not the Spirit dwelt in the believer in a "personal or essential union". To this the Quakers gave an affirmative answer, and the Puritans replied in the negative. Thus John Stalham reasons that the Holy Spirit does not dwell in the saints personally, so as to make the Spirit and a saint one person; rather, the Spirit dwells in the believer "mystically, as in his spiritual Temple".² Perhaps the fullest exposition of the Puritan

1. For the debate on the Spirit's dwelling in all men, believers and non-believers, cf. Chapter Two, pp. 95ff.

2. J. Stalham, Marginall Antidotes, p. 5.

position is given by Samuel Eaton:

But we do not believe that there is any substantial, essential, or personal union, betwixt this Eternal Spirit [of Christ] and such Believers; for such Unions would either make the Spirit and Believers some third thing, ...or else there will be a confounding of substance which cannot be; for God cannot mix with the Creature. And else such Union if it should be Personal, as betwixt the two Natures in Christ, would make Believers God, and equal with Christ, and consequently equal with God himself; ¹

This argument of Eaton is noted briefly and answered by Fox:

...the Scripture saith, the Spirit dwells in the Saints, I Cor. 6. and he that is joyned to the Lord is one spirit, I John 1. As though the Saints had not union with God, which the scriptures saith they have. ²

A similar reply is made by Fox to the assertion of Clapham that it is not "an essential in-dwelling of the Divine nature in God's people":

Answ. Doth not the Apostle say the Divine nature the Saints was made partakers of? and God dwells in the Saints, and Christ in them, except they be reprobates? And doth not the Saints come to eat the flesh of Christ? and if they eat his flesh, is it not within them? ³

As appears from this statement, the question of the indwelling of the Spirit involved the parallel Quaker doctrines of unity with God and Christ, and since the most dominant of

1. S. Eaton, op.cit., p. 1-2.

2. G.M., p. 1.

3. Ibid., p. 100.

these three doctrines was that of "Christ within", we shall return to this question of indwelling in the chapter on Christology. We may conclude this section with two exchanges which epitomize the contrasting positions on the indwelling of the Spirit. The first comes from Howgill's rejoinder to an anti-Quaker book written by one R.I.; replying to the "lye" that some Quakers had said "they were equal with God", Howgill asserts:

...he that hath the Spirit of God is in that which is equal, and he that is joynd to the Lord is one Spirit; there is Unity, and that Unity stands in Equality, and these Expressions saith R.I. offer Violence to God and his Glory. ¹

Once again, the Quaker doctrine seems blasphemous and grossly presumptuous to the Puritan, for it is seen as an impious assertion of equality with God. But while the Quaker flatly denies that he or any of his fellow Quakers said "that the Creature is Equal to the Creator, in Power, or in Glory", Howgill still maintains that:

the Spirit of the Father and the Spirit of Truth is an equal Spirit, and they that are led by it, and are in it, are in that which is Equal, and so are joynd to the Lord, and are nearly related to him; ²

Eaton, on the other hand, is willing to affirm the indwelling of the Spirit, but with an important qualification. On both counts Eaton well represents the central Puritan view,

1. F. Howgill, Works, p. 359.

2. Ibid.

and Fox gives the characteristic Quaker response to Eaton's argument, which he quotes and answers:

Prin. He saith, Though we believe that the spirit of Christ dwells in the Saints, yet we assert the spirit of Christ to be distinct from the Saints, &c.

Answ. How are they led by the spirit, how are they led into all truth? And how are they sanctified by the spirit, and their unity in the spirit? by which spirit they have unity with God; by which spirit the Saints worship him; And he that is joyned to the Lord is one spirit; He that hath not the spirit of Christ is none of his. And so they are distinct from it; but they are not so that have it, and be in unity with it, and one with another with God. ¹

The Puritan was always anxious to guard his assertion of the Spirit's indwelling from any implication of an unqualified union between the Holy Spirit and man's spirit. The Quaker could propose a doctrine of the Spirit which had no such reservation, and which affirmed that all true Christians had a full and personal union with the Spirit. It would not be misleading to consider the development of the Quaker-Puritan controversies in all the succeeding chapters as a working out of this fundamental divergence between the Quaker and the Puritan conception of the contemporary indwelling of the Spirit.

1. G.M., pp. 1-2.

CHAPTER TWO

The Light of Christ Within

In the preceding chapter, the discussion turned primarily on the question of the mode or means of God's revelation of himself to man; the main problems were those involving the doctrines of the immediacy of revelation and the indwelling of the Spirit. In the present chapter the controversy shifts from the question of the mode of revelation to the issue of the substance and content of revelation. The term now at the center of dispute is the pivotal Quaker phrase, "the Light of Christ within", which could be taken as the Quaker definition of revelation. By this phrase the First Publishers designated both the source and the essential content of that teaching or revealing of God which they claimed was immediate. We have seen the strong Puritan opposition to the Quaker view of the means and mode of revelation and of the Spirit's indwelling. We shall now see an even more fierce opposition to the Quaker doctrine of the light within, since the Quakers described its essential content as nothing else but the "Light of Christ", and insisted, moreover, that this light was given to every man, and that, if heeded and obeyed, it was sufficient to lead the believer to salvation.

How abhorrent this doctrine was to Puritan thinking already appears in the broadside charges against it. Puritan writers referred to the doctrine in general with labels such as "a dark delusive light", "seducing", "miserable darkness", "corrupt", "an intoxicating notion and bewitching". Frequently the charge was more explicit, and the doctrine of the light within was denounced as a "delusion of the Devil". Thus Bunyan describes it,¹ and Eaton gives a similar verdict: "we declare against it as a Satanical delusion".² The belief in the personal operation of the Devil was widely and fervently held, by Puritans and Quakers alike, and one of the most common expressions of this belief was the portrayal of Satan as an angel of light. Many writers held that Satan was especially active in this guise at that time. Hence it is not surprising that the repeated charge that the Quaker doctrine was a "delusion" would be often expanded to "a delusion of the Devil". Perhaps the most rigorous exposition of the view that Satan transformed himself into an angel of light is contained in the pamphlet by Giles Firmin, which is devoted to proving that the Quakers' doctrines are this transformed Satanic light. Twelve syllogisms are employed for this purpose, and since the logical structure is the same in each, one example will suffice:

1. Cf. J. Bunyan, Works I. 65f, 95f.

2. S. Eaton, The Quakers Confuted, p. 12.

Major. That light which will not admit of, nor endure the triall, that light is Satans light, and not the light of Christ.

Minor. But the light of the Quakers will not admit of, nor endure the triall.

Ergo. the light of the Quakers is the light of Satan, and not the light of Christ.¹

Since, however, the Quakers shared the basic premise of such accusations regarding Satanic activity, it is not surprising that they replied to these arguments in kind, and designated their Puritan opponents as the ones who were led by the Devil. Thus Fox answers Bunyan:

And they be in the dangerous doctrine, and the delusions of the Devill that draws people from the Light within, and thus he doth oppose the foundation of God, the light, which lighteth every man...²

And that's the Devill and the Lyar that leads people from the Light, for he abode not in it.³

Furthermore, while Satan may (and does) transform himself into an angel of light, he cannot transform into the Light of Christ, for "the devill fell from the Light, from the holiness, and so he cannot transform into that".⁴ Nor can Satan deceive the elect, as an anonymous writer argued;

1. G. Firmin, Stablishing against Shaking, p. 20. The reference is to the trial of Quaker doctrine by Scripture. Giles Firmin, (1614-1697). Educated at Cambridge; emigrated to New England; ordained deacon in John Cotton's church; returned to England; ordained a presbyter at Shalford; ejected in 1662. He was strongly Presbyterian and followed Baxter in ecclesiastical politics. Cf. D.N.B.

2. G.M., p. 9.

3. Ibid., p. 206.

4. Ibid., p. 46. Cf. also pp. 244, 26.

Fox presents the opposite view:

all that hates the Light which Christ the Light hath enlightened them withall, hath not the Father, and the Son, in such the man of sin reigns, and in such the Devil may transform; but the Elect he cannot deceive, ¹

Fox is more explicit in answer to another opponent, against whom he declares that "you that be out of the Light,...in you may Satan transform".² Finally, Fox repudiates even the very principle that "there may be much fallacy and delusion in Revelation", arguing strongly to the contrary:

And there is no fallacy nor delusion in the Revelation of God, but all fallacy and delusion is out of it. ³

Because the Quakers defined the light within as the Light of Christ, they could not conceive of any delusion or Satanic influence in it. Burrough sums up the Quaker reaction to the argument that the Devil deceives by means of the light within:

Wo unto thee that callst good evil, and evil good;...doth the Light of Christ within deceive? or is not this Christs Doctrine, I am the Light of the World, he that follows me shall have the Light of Life; and he that walks in the Light stumbles not? and this shamelesly hast thou called the Doctrine of the Devil; ⁴

Another general objection to the doctrine of the light within was the charge that it was a "forsaking of the Scrip-

1. Ibid., p. 258.

2. Ibid., p. 244.

3. Ibid., p. 3.

4. E. Burrough, Works, p. 145. Burrough was writing against Bunyan.

tures". Various Puritan writers impugn the Quaker doctrine on the grounds that it makes Scripture "uselesse" or unnecessary, is a "disparaging [of] the Scriptures", results in "dispising the word", and is "the means whereby Scriptures are slighted".¹ The argument regarding the use and authority of Scripture will be dealt with in detail in the following chapter, but the Quaker reply to these charges may be briefly noted at this point. Fox and his co-religionists insisted that the light within was consonant with Scripture, and indeed that the former was a prerequisite for truly understanding the latter. Fox argues characteristically that:

The light was before Scripture was given forth:...and all that ever had the Scriptures, and are not in the light that doth enlighten every man...He knowes neither the word of God, nor Father, nor Son, nor Christ, nor the Lord, nor Scripture;... And many may have the Scriptures, and yet never know God, till they come to the light which comes from the Son who reveals him. ²

The Scriptures, and even God and Christ, can be known only through "the light that comes from Christ",³ and without this light the Scriptures are ultimately of no avail. Thus to the accusation that the light within was "opposite to the Scriptures" the Quakers replied that

1. G.M., p. 259. Cf. also pp. 225, 81, 74.

2. Ibid., p. 155.

3. Ibid., p. 56.

it was the opponents of the light within who were contrary to the Scriptures, and unable to correctly use and interpret the Bible.

A third general criticism directed against this doctrine paralleled the objection regarding Scripture, and consisted in the assertion that the light within was a "forsaking of Christ". Fox had to formulate a reply to such statements as: This doctrine, the light within, draws us from Christ;¹ "The light of revelation renders Gods Christ odious";² if all have a sufficient light for salvation, "then there is no absolute need of a Saviour, and this is to offer violence to Christ";³ "To call that light in every man Christ, is to slight Christs glorious person in heaven, and to nullifie it".⁴ The replies given by Fox contravening these charges are very emphatic:

None comes to Christ, nor is drawn unto Christ but with the light, and that's within, and gives them to know what they are come from, and what they are come to, for it gives them the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus. 5

The text quoted, 2 Cor. 4:6, ranked second only to Johannine passages (John 1:9, 3:19ff., 8:12) as a Quaker text for the

1. Ibid., p. 292.

2. Ibid., p. 207.

3. Ibid., p. 174.

4. Ibid., p. 94.

5. Ibid., p. 292.

identification of the light within with Christ. As we shall see in detail shortly, the Quaker view of the light within as the teaching or self-revealing of God to all men was thoroughly Christocentric. The position of the early Friends is put succinctly by Brayshaw; speaking of that "principle of God" which Fox held to be in everyone, he points out that Fox

and the early Friends identified this principle--the Light, as they called it--with Jesus Christ. It was not for them an impersonal abstraction, a substitute for God or Christ; for them it was Christ, manifesting himself in the hearts of men; ¹

The phrase "light within", or "inner light", is an ambiguous abbreviation of the complete formulation of the Quaker doctrine; the First Publishers insisted on the full meaning--"the Light of Christ within".²

One other criticism of a general nature may be noted, although it is a variation of the same theme. This is the relatively less conspicuous objection that the doctrine of the light within is a forsaking of the gospel of the apostles. The apostles, it is argued, did not direct people to a light within them, or "bid them look to the light within them" when they were "prickt in their hearts" by the Christian

1. A.N.Brayshaw, The Quakers: Their Story and Message, p. 35.

2. The phrase "inner light" was rarely used in the early years of Quakerism. It became prevalent with Robert Barclay and the second generation. Among the First Publishers the most common phraseology was "the light within", which was often expanded to "the Light of Christ within".

message. To this Fox replies that "that which pricks them is within them", and refers to the light giving the knowledge of God "in the heart".¹ The more customary Quaker answer to this criticism was that the apostles "turned people from darkness to light", and that they were to go into all nations to preach the Covenant of Christ the light of the world. Once again, 2 Cor. 4:6 is the chief text adduced as Scriptural and apostolic sanction for the Quaker doctrine. Finally, there is the typical counter-assertion that any other gospel than that of the Light of Christ within is not the gospel of the apostles. Thus Fox replies to the suggestion that we "leave leaning on the light within for direction" by asserting, "Then you turn your selves from the Apostles doctrine", which Fox designates by quoting 2 Cor. 4:6.²

The arguments considered thus far have been concerned chiefly with the general principle of the light within, questioning its validity and orthodoxy as a basis for religious knowledge and authority. This question of the epistemological foundation of Quakerism did not, however, form the major part of the controversy regarding the light within. The factor which most antagonized the Puritans was not the "Light of Christ within" which the Quakers claimed for themselves, but the Light of Christ which the Quakers claimed to be in all men. It was the universal application of the

1. G.M., p. 291.

2. Ibid.

doctrine of the light within that most sharply cut across the grain of the Calvinistic Puritan theology. The Quakers took their key Johannine texts literally, and the real center of conflict was the phrase, "Christ hath enlightened every man that's come into the world". But since this universal light comes from Christ himself, the Quaker doctrine implied a (potentially) universal salvation, as well as a universal revelation: the Light of Christ given to all men was a "saving light", and if heeded, was sufficient for salvation, according to the First Publishers.

Thus the dispute is no longer confined to the nature of the light which the Quakers themselves claimed to possess as "Children of Light". The Puritans, as well as the Quakers, now concentrate on the universal application of the light within, both agreeing that there is a light given by God to all men, but radically disagreeing on the definition of this universal light. The Quakers maintain that the light given to every man is the "Light of Christ". The Puritans insist it is the "light of nature". The remainder of this chapter will be concerned with the arguments concerning these two positions.

The main line of Puritan attack was based on a denial of the universalistic doctrine of salvation contained in the Quaker conception of the Light of Christ within. Although a later chapter will be devoted wholly to soteriological questions, the issue of universal salvation must be briefly dis-

cussed at this point, since it is the presupposition underlying the opposition to the doctrine of the light within. The Puritans, of course, flatly denied that all men are saved. "All men have not salvation by Christ, and there are many that have no share in salvation purchased by Christ";¹ the Scripture does not teach of a "general Redemption of all".² Bunyan asserts that "all men have not faith", and supports this statement by noting that "all do not attain salvation, which they must needs do if they had true justifying faith".³ In so far as the Puritans took John 1:9 as referring to a saving light, rather than the light of nature, they insisted that it was to be understood "with limitation", as applying only to the elect, or the Church, or the "children of the new Covenant". The Puritan doctrine of election could brook no thought of a universal salvation. One of John Owen's key propositions against the Quaker doctrine aptly illustrates the Puritan position. "Christus nullâ sub consideratione lumen salutare omnibus et singulis hominibus indulsit".⁴

The Quakers, however, while far from holding that universal salvation was an actual fact, were equally in-

1. G.M., p. 265. Fox is quoting two Puritan adversaries, S. Palmer and R. Hooke.

2. Thomas Collier, as quoted in G.M., p. 122.

3. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 48.

4. J. Owen, Works, XVI.470.

sistent that it was a theoretical possibility, and that the means for salvation were accessible to all. The Atonement of Christ was interpreted universally, and all men were offered the means of salvation through the Light of Christ within, for it was saving to those who believed in it, and condemning to those who rejected it. Fox outlines this position early in the Journal:

I saw that Christ died for all men, and was a propitiation for all; and enlightened all men and women with his divine and saving light; and that none could be a true believer, but who believed in it. ¹

Those who hated the light, and did not believe in it, "were condemned by it, though they made a profession of Christ".² But whoever obeys the divine light of Christ, believes in it and follows it, comes "out of condemnation to the light of life" and is led to God. Nor are John 1:9 and 8:12 meant with limitation, as several Scottish Friends pointed out to their Scottish Presbyterian opponents:

so Christ doth not say I am the light of the Saints, of the elect onely, but I am the light of the world, Jo.8.12. and saith, light is come into the world, and this is the condemnation of the world, that light is come into the world, and men love darkness rather than it, because their deeds are evill, Jo.3.19. So its unbelief that shuts out, Rom.11.20. ³

1. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I. 36.

2. Ibid., I. 34.

3. G. Weare, et.al., The Doctrins...of the Priests of Scotland, p. 26. It is apparent from the Journal, Camb.edn., I. 293, that Fox collaborated in at least the initial stages of the composition of this pamphlet. It was reprinted with minor alterations in The Great Mistry, pp. 327-354.

As will be seen shortly, the Quakers held a strong doctrine of the Covenant, but they gave it an interpretation far different from that of Puritan theology, for they described the New Covenant as Christ, the light to the Gentiles and to the house of Israel and Judah, and thus to all the world.

While the doctrine of election per se was rarely discussed explicitly in connection with the dispute regarding the light within, it constituted the underlying basis for the Puritan argument that all men do not have a "saving light", i.e., a light sufficient to bring salvation. Accepting the universalism contained in John 1:9, 8:12, and related passages, the Puritans kept their view of election completely intact by making a clear and sharp distinction between revelation and salvation. They held that God indeed manifested himself to all men, and Christ gave a light to every man, but this universal light had no efficacy with regard to salvation. At best it was a natural light, conscience, or reason, which came from Christ as Creator, but was able only to show the existence of God, man's duty to God, and his failure to fulfill that duty. Thus Bunyan argues:

Christ hath given to every one the law,
and conscience within him; yet these are
not able to save him; 1

Therefore, as the Apostle saith, (Rom.i.20,) they are left without excuse; that is, they

1. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 118.

have their own conscience, that doth show them there is a God, and that this God is to be served and obeyed;¹

Yet Christ, as he is God, doth not give unto every man that Spirit that doth lead to eternal life, for all men have it not. ²

Similarly, Christopher Feake and his associates contend that however much the light within, as taught by the Quakers, may be attended to, even though it may bring one to a "marvellous Reformation", it is unable to effect "the work of Regeneration". The light in all men only shows them moral and legal sins, or "sin-denial"; but it cannot discover "Self-denial", or "the greatest evill, which is unbelief".³ Fox records a statement by Thomas Weld which epitomizes the Puritan position: "Its error to say the light that discovers sin, justifies."⁴

1. Ibid., I. 65.

2. Ibid., I. 115. Cf. below, p. 114-118 for Bunyan's view of conscience as a light of nature.

3. C. Feake et al., A Faithful Discovery. He was a Fifth-Monarchy Man; earlier an Independent minister, holding a sequestered vicarage in Hertford. A Faithful Discovery was actually written by John Pomroy, Paul Glissen, and Joseph Kellet, but it is listed in Smith's adverse catalogue under Feake, and we will refer to it under his name. For Feake, cf. D.N.B.

4. T. Weld, as quoted in G.M., p. 230. Thomas Weld (Welde, Wells), (1590?-1662). Educated at Cambridge; became vicar in Essex, 1624; deprived by Laud for Nonconformity, 1631; emigrated to New England, became pastor of a church in Roxbury, Mass.; worked with John Eliot and Richard Mather; returned to England on business and stayed (apparently) in London; from 1649-1657 he was rector of St. Mary's Gateshead. He may be classified as an Independent. Cf. D.N.B.

All men, therefore, according to the Puritans, may have a moral or natural light, but there is no salvation through this light. The Puritan writers insist on distinguishing the saving light from that light which, although coming from Christ, has no saving efficacy. Samuel Hammond puts the point emphatically:

I never denied that Christ is the light of all saints, as the Mediatour, and the light of all men as the Creator; but that he is in all in a saving manner, that I deny againe; For Christ to be the righteousnesse of a man in justification, differs exceedingly from his being in all men; ¹

This assertion of the insufficiency of the light within is variously expressed: "It flatly contradicts the whole Scripture, to say, that the light wherewith Christ hath enlightned every man, &c. will save";² "Men are not converted by the light within them";³ the light in every man "teacheth not the way to the Kingdome of God, nor giveth the hope of eternall life".⁴ The full flavor of the Puritan viewpoint receives perhaps its best exposition in a series of queries addressed by Baxter to the Quakers:

-
1. S. Hammond, The Quakers House Built upon the Sand, p. 17. Samuel Hammond, D.D. (d. 1665). Educated at Cambridge; after several short posts, appointed preacher and lecturer at Newcastle; ejected at the Restoration. He settled finally in London. Cf. D.N.B.
 2. Joshua Miller, as quoted in G.M., p. 47.
 3. G.M., p. 279. Fox is quoting a "Priest Bushel".
 4. Timothy Trevers, as quoted in G.M., p. 324.

Is not he a Pagan and no Christian, that thinks that the light which is in all the Indians, Americans, and other Pagans on earth, is sufficient without Scripture?

Was that Light in Paul which perswaded him, that he ought to do many things against the name of Jesus, sufficient to convert him to the Faith of Jesus? Or did Christ give him needlesly a Light from Heaven, and by Ananias his Doctrine? Or had Cornelius sufficient Light within him before Peter preached to him? Or had all the world sufficient Light within them before Christ sent abroad his Apostles to preach the Gospell to them? Or did Christ send them a needlesse Light by his Apostles? ¹

If all have sufficient Light within them, what need there any converting Grace?... I pray you do not disdain to tell me when you have rub'd your eyes, if all men have sufficient Light within them, Why you got up into the Judgement-seat, and pronounced me so oft to be in darkness, and to be void of the Light, and to have none of the Spirit? If all have it, why may not I have it? ²

Baxter could well complain of the harsh judgment pronounced against him as an opponent of the doctrine of the light within. The Quakers made a forceful distinction between "loving and hating the light", and classified their opponents among those who "hated" and opposed the light. Fox declared that all who were out of the Light of Christ were "in ignorance", and again, that "All they that hate the light, sees not Christ the fountain of teaching".³ His answer is even stronger against another opponent, whom

1. R. Baxter, The Quakers Catechism, p. 30.

2. Ibid., p. 8.

3. G.M., p. 138.

he quotes as saying:

Pr. I have taken upon me as my duty to forewarn all men of the Doctrine, that teach men to look at the Light within them.

Answ. We do believe thee, here thou art not only Ante-Christ, but Anti Apostle, thats against him, who taught people to look to the light within them,... 1

To Fox and the First Publishers, opposition to the Quaker doctrine of the light within was treated as opposition to the Light of Christ itself, and over and over again it is argued that because an opponent is "out of the Light" he is ipso facto unable to understand the Scriptures, or even Christ Himself.

In addition to such ad hominem arguments, the Quakers strongly defended themselves against the Puritan objections discussed above. Flatly denying that the light which condemns is unable to justify, the Quakers maintain the sufficiency of the light given to every man. Fox insists against Feake that the light which comes from Christ reproveth for all sin, "branches, and roots, and originall, and unbelief".² This light, which manifests sin, is the New Covenant, and it can both condemn and justify.

The light which is the Covenant of God that doth enlighten every man that cometh into the world, discovers sin, makes it manifest,

1. Ibid., p. 290. "Anti Apostle" refers to 2 Cor. 4:6, which Fox quotes.

2. Ibid., p. 168.

blots it out, justifies, sanctifies,
redeems, and condemns them that hate
it. ¹

Fox also finds fault with the doctrine that the universal light leaves men "without excuse", while it is insufficient for their salvation.

Yet thou saith, every one hath so much light as shall leave all men without excuse before the great tribunall of Jesus Christ. And yet thou saith, that which leaves them without excuse is not sufficient, and so would make God unjust and unrighteous; and the light is sufficient, which doth enlighten every man in the world to lead them to eternall life, believing in it, and receiving it, which not believing is sufficient to condemn them, who all believing in it shall see and receive their salvation. ²

To the Quakers, the condemning and the saving light were one and the same, viz. the Light of Christ within.

But the Quaker argument continued: the light within was not only sufficient for salvation, it was absolutely necessary for salvation. Both Puritans and Quakers were, of course, heartily agreed that there is no way to God but through Christ, but Fox and his co-religionists held that no one can come to Christ but through the Light which Christ gives to all men. Fox quotes John 14:6, "Doth not Christ say, I am the way, the truth, and the life", and designates Christ as "the Door", the only way to the Father; but he adds the Quaker description of Christ as

1. Ibid., p. 230.

2. Ibid., p. 19.

"the new Covenant in the heart".¹ Again, he says,

None opens the Kingdom of heaven to
all men, but who turns people to the
light which Christ Jesus hath en-
lightned every man withall that cometh
into the world. ²

In a reply to Hammond, Fox is even more explicit: "no man knowes a Saviour, nor sees salvation, but as every man comes to the light"; the characteristic and central Quaker doctrine of the Covenant follows in Fox's interpretation of Jer.31:31-34:

I will give him for a Covenant of light
to the Gentiles; and I will make a New
Covenant with the house of Israel and
Judah, them that had the old; (and here's
all the world,) and he shall be my salva-
tion to the ends of the earth; ³

Here, indeed, is the basis for the Quaker doctrine of election.

Soe all y^t beleives in ye light of Christ
as hee commands are in ye election & setts
under ye grace of Gods teachinge y^t bringes
there salvation ⁴

It has already been pointed out that the Quakers did not hold that the light within did, in fact, have the result that every man was saved. The light was sufficient, even necessary, for salvation, but it did not operate automati-

1. Ibid., p. 223.

2. Ibid., p. 95.

3. Ibid., p. 184.

4. Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 294-5.

cally. Christ enlightened every man with a saving light, but no man was saved until he believed in and obeyed this light. Hubberthorne replies to an assertion by John Tombes on the insufficiency of the light with the counter-assertion:

But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withall, I Cor. 12.7. Which manifestation being obeyed is able to lead man to God, so that there is no insufficiency in the Spirit or Light,...and therefor if every man be not guided by it unto God, it is because he doth not sufficiently obey and follow it. 1

This light did not obviate Christ's teaching, for:

He preached that they might believe and obey the Light which they had,....although Christ was given a Light both to the Jews and Gentiles,...yet their minds were to be turned to it, and they obey and follow it as the way to salvation; otherwise it was their condemnation. 2

This distinction between merely having and fully obeying the light within was a pivotal point in Quaker doctrine, and was used to explain all objections such as those raised by Baxter regarding Paul and Cornelius in their pre-conversion state. Nayler replies to Baxter that the task of Christ and all the apostles was not to "give them eyes, but to open the blind eyes", and to turn people from Darkness to Light; it was not Light but Darkness that per-

1. R. Hubberthorne, The Light of Christ within, p. 9.

2. Ibid., p. 18.

sued Paul (and Baxter as well) to be a persecutor.¹ On the same issue, Hubberthorne insists that:

Paul in these Scriptures doth not say that he followed the light within him, but he followed his thought which led him to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus; ²

The Quaker answer to the query, "Why do you teach, if the Light within is sufficient?" was based on the same principle: the Quakers "turn men to that Light which is sufficient to lead them to God".³ Thus, the Quaker doctrine of the sufficiency of the light within contained the important qualification that it must be turned to and obeyed in order to have religious value or efficacy.

In view of the repeated emphasis which the Quakers put on obedience as a necessary prerequisite of the sufficiency of the light within, it is surprising that the following question by Baxter was so rarely asked: "Whereas they say the light within is sufficient if obeyed, the question is, whether it be sufficient to make men obey it?"⁴ Hubberthorne's answer is ambiguous, and at one point he simply begs the question:

-
1. J. Naylor, An Answer to a Book called The Quakers Catechism, p. 55.
 2. R. Hubberthorne, op.cit., p. 13. The texts referred to were Acts 26:9, and I Tim. 1:13.
 3. Ibid., p. 19.
 4. As quoted in Ibid., p. 20.

The light is sufficient, and hath sufficient power in it to make men obedient if received and obeyed, yet by the power of self no man either receives or obeys it, but the command is of it, and the power from it by which men do believe and obey; so that though this be a Mystery and Parable to the Ignorant, yet it is plain to him that understands the leadings and power which is in the Light. ¹

Fisher gives a clear reply, but one differing from Hubbertorne. He says that Baxter is here

beside the Question, for that's not the Grace we are speaking of, that is sufficient to cause men to obey, but that which is sufficient if obeyed, that's the Testimony the Quakers bear to the Light of God, it is saving to such as walk in it; ²

Fisher's answer, and his additional reply that Baxter should not ask for more grace to compel him to follow the light which is sufficient if obeyed, may be taken as representing the Quaker tendency to reject the doctrine of prevenient grace.

With these disputes regarding the saving efficacy of the light within, the stage is now set for the decisive question: is the light given to every man the Light of Christ? The answers to this question are predetermined by the positions discussed above. Since the Puritans deny that the universal light is a saving light sufficient for salvation, they naturally deny that the universal light is the Light

1. Ibid.

2. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 693. (Misnumbered 695).

of Christ, at least of Christ as Saviour. Since the Quakers, on the other hand, affirm the saving efficacy of the light given to all men, they naturally affirm that it is the Light of Christ, and of Christ as Saviour. To be sure, the argument often ran the other way round, and the question of the saving nature of the light was answered by the affirmation or denial of the identity of the light with Christ as Saviour. It is difficult to determine which sequence of reasoning was most prevalent, but the weight of the evidence would seem to favor the soteriological premise. To the Puritans, the soteriological claims of the Quaker doctrine were perhaps more abhorrent than the Christological claims. Even the Puritans could admit that the universal light came from Christ, but they flatly denied that this light had any saving efficacy. But the problem of the relative predominance of soteriology and Christology is ultimately an academic problem, for the two were inseparable in both Quaker and Puritan thought. A saving light could be nothing else but the Light of Christ, while a light which was insufficient for salvation could never be the Light of Christ--in His essential role as Saviour or Mediator.

Thus the Puritans argued that the light given to all men was not the Light of Christ, and was, indeed, "not sufficient to lead up to Christ".¹ It is contended that

1. R. Hubberthorne, The Quakers House Built Upon the Rock of Christ, p. 45. Hubberthorne lists this as a principle of several of his adversaries.

to bring men to the light within "is to bring them from the Mediator, and to draw men from eying his death, resurrection, and intercession, &c."¹ We have seen the charge that the doctrine of the light within is a "forsaking of Christ", and this is supplemented by the objection that it is unable to reveal anything of the nature or life of Christ. Jeremiah Ives asks, in a series of questions, whether the light within can, by itself, teach men of a Virgin who had a Son, or that Christ died and rose again in three days, or that Christ was to be born in Bethlehem; in short, "can it teach all men to know the Name of Christ?"² It seemed quite obvious to the Puritans that since all men are not cognizant of the existence of Jesus Christ, all men could not have the "Light of Christ". Says Hammond, referring to the Quakers:

If they say, that light, beside nature, which every man hath, is the Knowledge of Christ; then they must affirme, That the Jewes, Indians have it, which nothing but ignorance will affirme; 3

If the Light of Christ was in all men, the Puritans reasoned, it would surely reveal Christ to all in both His human and divine nature.

However, if all men do not possess a knowledge of Christ, it is equally apparent that all do not possess the

1. G.M., p. 22.

2. J. Ives, The Quakers Quaking, pp. 19-20.

3. S. Hammond, The Quakers House Built upon the Sand, p. 6.

presence or indwelling of Christ. Ives argues: "if every man hath received this Light, Joh.1. then every man hath received Christ; for he is that Light, ver. 9"; but many Scriptures teach that every man "hath not received Christ", e.g., Mt.21:42, John 11:10.¹ Bunyan sharply distinguishes "conscience" from "the Spirit of Christ", and adds:

every one hath conscience, yet every one hath not the Spirit of Christ: for Jude speaks of a company of men in his days, who had not the Spirit of Christ. 2

At this point, however, the discussion of the doctrine of "the Light of Christ within" passes over to the doctrine of "Christ within", and will be dealt with in the chapter on Christology.

This charge of the insufficiency of the light within for revealing or leading up to Christ was clearly antithetical to Quaker doctrine, which held that Christ could be revealed by nothing but by the light within. Fox answers Bunyan's argument that the light will not show man "the blood of Christ" by asserting:

There's nothing makes manifest but light; Nor none knowes the blood, death, righteousness, and resurrection of Jesus Christ but with the light which comes from Jesus Christ who hath enlightened every man... 3

1. J. Ives, op.cit., pp. 36-37.

2. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 65.

3. G.M., p. 210.

Again, in a sermon reported in the Journal, Fox says:

I declared to them, that every one that cometh into the world was enlightened by Christ the life; by which light they might see their sins, and Christ, who was come to save them from their sins, and died for them. And, if they came to walk in this light, they might therein see Christ to be the author of their faith,...; their Shepherd to feed them, their Priest to teach them, and their great Prophet to open divine mysteries unto them, and to be always present with them. ¹

Furthermore, for the Quakers, the revealing of Christ involves a moral as well as a cognitive function. Nayler, replying to Ives, argues that the name of Christ is not known by the "letter", but through "righteousness, mercy, judgement". To Ives' queries regarding the ability of the light to reveal Jesus' birth, death, and other aspects of His earthly existence, Nayler answers that "all these things and much more was made known by the Light before they was written in the letter", and since such things are "believed generally" in England, the primary necessity is that the light

should Minister the substance (to wit) Christ in Spirit, which none can know without this Light though they have the letter, no more than they could know Christ when he came, who read in the letter that he was to be born at Bethlem... ²

The First Publishers were willing to carry this argument

1. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I. 165.

2. J. Nayler, Weaknes above Wickednes, pp. 10-11.

even further, and affirm that those who "hated" the light could know little or nothing of Christ, even though they read the Bible. Hubberthorne, in reply to Baxter's assertion that the heathens in America have no light to tell them Christ was born, died, or risen, insists that:

the Light of Christ is the same in America which it is in England, and those Heathens in America who love the light of Christ and walk in it, although they have not the Scriptures, doth know more of Christ, his Life, Death, Intercession and Teaching, than those Heathens in England, which have the Scripture of those things, yet hate and despise the Light which gives the Knowledge of Christ,... 1

We shall see the full development of the Quaker view of the Scriptures in the following chapter, but this quotation vividly illustrates the Quaker emphasis on the sufficiency and absolute necessity of the Light of Christ for the revelation of Christ's person and work. According to the early Friends, the sufficiency of this light was all-important, and was second to none, even the Scriptures.

Finally, the Quakers would not allow any distinction between the Light of Christ and the Spirit of Christ. For them, the light "that enlightens every man that cometh into the world" came from Christ in His fullest nature as "Saviour" or "Spirit", as well as "Creator". Here again there is the dual argument that although the Spirit is given to all men, it is not universally obeyed, heeded, or received.

1. R. Hubberthorne, The Light of Christ within, p. 20.

The Puritans dealt critically with both parts of this argument, rejecting the assertion that the Spirit is given to all, and denying the validity of the Quakers' distinction between being given and receiving the Spirit. Thus Bunyan lists among his charges against the Quakers the following:

The Quakers are deceivers, because they say, that every one hath that which is like the Spirit of Christ, even good as the Spirit of Christ,...which is desperate blasphemy. The Scripture saith plainly, that "some are sensual, having not the Spirit." 1

Elsewhere, Bunyan adduces another text, John 14:17 to prove that the Spirit cannot be received by the world, and this point is developed by Matthew Caffyn in his exegesis of I Cor. 2:10-16. Caffyn allows that the Spirit teaches the "corruption of the heart", mortification for sin, and also forgiveness, redemption, the future glory, etc., but he insists that such things

the naturall man receives not, for they are foolishness to him; wherefore he is required in the first place to repent, and to be baptized for the remission of sins, and then is he under the promise of the holy Spirit, Acts.2.38. through which he may discern these things, for they are spiritually discerned. 2

According to Puritan thought, the Spirit was given only to the Church--to those who obey God. Caffyn stresses

1. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 95. The text is Jude 19.

2. M. Caffyn, The Deceived...Quakers Discovered, pp. 19-20.

the teaching of Christ that the world cannot receive the Spirit, and goes on to contend that Paul taught that faith precedes the Spirit, the latter being a seal of belief; therefore, it is argued that spiritual gifts are given only to those who already believe.

This Puritan argument is summarized by another writer, whose statement is quoted and answered by Fox:

Pr. ...the manifestation of the spirit is given to every man in the Church to profit withall, and not to every man in the world.
Answ. The manifestation is given to every man to profit withall, without distinction, I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh, for the spirit of truth shall lead the Saints into all truth, and he shall reprove the world, and that which doth reprove the world, is manifest to the world. ¹

The Quaker distinction of "loving" versus "hating" the light is also used with regard to the Spirit. Against Bunyan's quotation of Jude 19 to prove that every man did not have the Spirit of Christ, since some were "sensual", Fox contends that Jude here "proves they had it, but went from it". ² Burrough answers Bunyan along similar lines:

Some men are sensual, and have not the Spirit, because they received it not, and some cannot receive it, because they believe not in him from whence it comes, yet is the measure of the Spirit given unto every man to profit withal, as the Scripture saith. And it is given to within him, to reprove him of sin, but few do receive it; ³

1. G.M., p. 326.

2. Ibid., p. 208.

3. E. Burrough, Works, pp. 148-149.

Burrough remarks that when his opponent can "learn to distinguish between a thing being given, and a receiving of such a thing", he will be able to understand the issue.

For, writes Burrough:

It is one thing in God to give the Spirit,
and another thing in the Creature to receive it: He gives it to many that receive it not, to follow it and to be guided by it: 1

The Quaker position is most clearly stated by Fisher, whose argument could be applied to the Spirit of Christ as well as to the Light of Christ:

though the World hates Christ the Light,
and comes not to him, yet he is come a
Light into the World;...it follows not
because men come not into Christ's Light,
that therefore it is not come into them,
it being...one thing for the Light to be
in men, another for them to be in it: 2

Bunyan, in his reply to Burrough, may be taken as the spokesman for the Puritan criticism and rejection of this distinction:

But you would make a difference between
having and receiving: but I tell thee,
he that hath it hath received it, (Gal.iii.2,)
and he that hath not received it, hath it
not. (Jude 19.) 3

Thus, while the Puritans denied the Quaker distinction between having and receiving, the Quakers denied the Puritan

1. Ibid., p. 149.

2. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 685.

3. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 111.

distinction between the light and the Spirit of Christ. Fox asserts that in refusing to identify these two, Bunyan "makes that which comes from God and Christ not Spirit (as he is God) and thus the man is beating the ayre",¹ since he had said that the light came from "Christ (as he is God)". To Fox it was sheer self-contradiction to assert that the light came from God and Christ, and yet was not the Spirit of Christ. Bunyan's view is equally repugnant to Burrough, who affirms that

that same Spirit of the Father, and of
the Son, who is the Comforter of the
Saints is the same, and not another,
that doth reprove the World; ²

and with this he challenges Bunyan to prove that the Light given by Christ to all men and the Spirit of Christ "are contrary or divided one against the other". Again, when John Tombes draws a similar distinction between lights given universally and the light which is spiritual, he is reprimanded by Hubberthorne on the grounds that he thereby "goes about to prove many Lights under several names and distinctions".³ In Quaker thought, there were not "many

1. G.M., p. 11. Cf. Bunyan, Works, I. 65.

2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 283.

3. R. Hubberthorne, op.cit., p. 4. John Tombes (Tombs), (1603?-1676). B.A. and M.A., Magdalen Hall, Oxford. He took orders; lectured at Oxford; was vicar of Leominster, 1630-43; moved to Bristol, then to London; was in controversy and debate with Baxter. At the Restoration, he conformed in a lay capacity and communicated as an Anglican. He was presbyterian on church government, but became a stout opponent of infant baptism.

Lights", but one, viz. the Light of Christ within. To Burrough, Bunyan's entire argument seemed to imply an opposition between John 1:9 and 8:12, and he insists that both passages refer to "the same Christ Jesus". It is the same Light of Christ which enlightens all men and also "will lead all that believes into the Kingdome", for, Burrough concludes, "there is not many Christs, but one Christ".¹ It is this conception of the unity of the Light of Christ and the identity of the Spirit and Light of Christ which underlies the Quaker refusal to distinguish between a "natural light" coming from Christ as Creator, and a spiritual light coming from Christ as Saviour. To this question of the light within as a "light of nature" we now turn.

In the dispute on the light in every man as the light of nature, three separate conflicts may be distinguished: the light of nature in itself, as a "natural" or "created" light, the light of nature regarded as "reason", and the light of nature regarded as "conscience". We have seen that the Puritans flatly refused to allow any identification of the universal light with Christ as Mediator, since this would mean that all men had a saving light. However, they did not thereby intend a total isolation of Christ from the light given to every man. So long as the doctrine of election was safe-guarded by the separation of revelation and

1. E. Burrough, Works, pp. 285-286.

salvation, so long as natural light never claimed to be saving light, and so long as the role of Christ as Mediator was distinguished from his role as Creator, the way was clear for attributing the universal light to Christ. Once these distinctions are made, the Puritans are anxious to do justice to both sides. Hammond can, as we have seen, insist that he

never denied that Christ is the light of all saints, as the Mediatour, and the light of all men as the Creator; but that he is in all in a saving manner, that I deny again; 1

Hubberthorne quotes Tombes as saying: "That light from Christ as Creator, is conferred upon all men without exception of any person".² One of the best statements representing this position is given by Jonathan Clapham, in which he introduces the further element of reason:

There is a light which God hath enlightned every man in the world withal, even the light of understanding and reason...; and this light may be called the light of Jesus Christ, because coming from him as Creator, and thus may the light of the Sun be called the light of Christ, for he made it; 3

Clapham goes on to deny that this light has anything to do with the "sanctified saving light" given by Christ as

1. S. Hammond, op.cit., p. 17.

2. R. Hubberthorne, op.cit., p. 5.

3. J. Clapham, A Discovery of the Quakers Doctrine, p. 55.

Redeemer to His people. He also states that

it is of this common light of understanding (which Christ as Creator gives to all men) that that Scripture, John 1.9. speaks of; ¹

This idea, that the light in every man is given to him by Christ as Creator, is expanded in the arguments that all men receive a knowledge of God from the creation, and that the universal light may be referred to as a "created" light. It is through the works of creation, and not through the light within, that "that which may be known of God is manifest in (or to) man".² Caffyn continues:

for Paul tells us that God hath shewed it unto man by the things that are made, whereby is clearly understood his eternall power, and God-head from the Creation, for day unto day, night unto night it sheweth knowledge, Psal.19.2. and so is man without excuse, Rom.1.20. ³

Another writer also quotes Romans 1:20, but is even more explicit:

The light that Adam was qualified with before the Fall and which every man (as a man) hath a spark of since the Fall, was and is given from the Creation, and by things that are made. ⁴

It is with reference to such a light given by Christ as

1. Ibid., p. 56.

2. M. Caffyn, op.cit., p. 5.

3. Ibid.

4. J. Stalham, Marginall Antidotes, p. 5.

Creator through the creation that the term "created light" is used. The phrase "a created word" occurs in the same context, but more often the light in every man is called a "created light by Christ", and the implication is made clear in the statement that "the best light that every man hath, is but created".¹ The universal light is looked upon as something derivative, coming indirectly from God or Christ, and thus not to be identified as itself the Light of Christ. Thus, in this context, the adjective "created" carries strong derogative overtones of being once or twice removed from the Creator himself, and we shall see that the Quakers refused to call the universal light a created light. On the contrary, Fox insisted that "the light was before the Created lights was, and makes manifest all created lights: for all created lights, was created by it."²

It is obvious that the description of the light in every man as the knowledge of God given through the creation and created things is merely a rather extended statement of the view that the universal light is the light of nature. One sentence sums up the long and short of it: "the eternal word enlighteneth all men with the common light of nature".³ On this definition of the light that is in all men the Puritan writers are basically in complete agreement, at least vis-a-vis the Quaker position to the contrary. "Natural

1. J. Stalham, as quoted in G.M., p. 155.

2. Ibid.

3. G.M., p. 172.

light" and "light of nature" occur over and over again in the Puritan discussion of the essential character of that light possessed by all men, and on this point we may take almost any Puritan as a representative spokesman for them all. Perhaps Owen and Baxter will serve best, as could be expected. Says Owen:

Lumen internum omnibus commune, aliquali principiorum veritatis notitiâ, et vi conscientiae consistens, naturale est, atque ita dicendum; hoc est, naturae humanae a primâ creatione inditum fuit, atque eteamnum ab ipsis naturae principiis fluit: itaque lumen hoc a Christo non esse mediatore, quâ est novi foederis mediator, affirmamus, multo minus esse ipsum Christum. ¹

Baxter, in reply to a Quaker query whether Christ enlightens every man, answers in the affirmative, and explains:

All that come into the world of nature, he enlighteneth with the light of Nature (so called, because that it is a knowledge gotten by the Book of the Creatures and natural means, without supernatural Revelation, though it be of grace also, as it is freely given after a forfeiture;) And all that come into the world of grace, he enlighteneth with the light of supernatural Revelation. ²

In the Puritan view, then, every human being possesses some knowledge of God which is given to him from God (in this sense Baxter allows that it is of grace) but it comes from God only indirectly through the works of creation, i.e. through nature.

1. J. Owen, Works, XVI. 470.

2. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 7.

In view of the Quakers' conception of the universal light as none other than the light of Christ, there can be no doubt of their radical opposition to this Puritan position. What is surprising is that several Puritans took the Quaker view as, in fact, identifying the light of nature with the light of Christ. One writer charges that "the naturall light the Quakers call Christ within";¹ another thinks that they put natural light on a par with Scriptures, and he demands:

Is the light of Nature, the light of Christ as Mediatour, nay Christ himself, and the strength that accompanies that light, the strength of Christ? Then how is man become the Author of his own salvation, while you change the name and call it Christ? ²

Again, the Quakers are charged with deluding people in saying that "There is a pure Light of God and Christ in every man and woman by nature".³ All such views were, of course, abhorrent to the Quakers, and Fox replied to the author of the last charge by saying that it was he who deluded people, by telling them that the light in every man is a natural light.

The basic Quaker argument against the Puritan doctrine of the light of nature has already been noted: all

1. J. Stalham, as quoted in G.M., p. 151.

2. C. Feake, et.al., op.cit., p. 12.

3. G.M., p. 65.

natural lights, or created lights, were created by the light that has enlightened all men. It existed prior to any natural light, and all created lights depend on this light for their own existence. The light given to every man thus has both a temporal and a logical priority in relation to the light of nature. Such a position follows naturally from an identification of the universal light with Christ, and once John 1:9 is taken not as a natural light, but as Christ the light, the following passage gives all the main elements of the Quaker rebuttal on this point.

...the Light which doth enlighten every man that comes into the world, Christ Jesus the gift of God, him by whom the world was made, this light was before any naturall light was made, Sun, Moon, or Stars, for all things that was made was made by the Light, which came a light into the world, that all through him might believe,... 1

One of the very few variations on this theme may, however, be noted, as it deals with the question of the knowledge of God through the creation. In a reply to Owen, Samuel Fisher argues:

The Heavens, &c. declare the Glory of God only passively, as Books, on which by the Light within men may see and read it..., but not so actively as Tutors, that make a verbal Discourse upon it, for that is done by the Light within...;...that which most powerfully...teaches daily

1. G. Weare, et.al., The Doctrins...of the Priests of Scotland, p. 7.

what the other [works of creation, the outward Letter, etc.] in their respective more obscure and inferiour wayes do declare, ad extra, must be something ad intra, ...even the Spirit of God in the faculty of mans Understanding and Conscience... 1

The Quakers could be expected to approve the derogatory connotation of merely "created" light, and as always gave clear primacy to that which was immediate, direct, and within. To them, the light given to all men from Christ was not mediated by nature.

We have already noted one Puritan writer who described the light of nature which was in all men as "the light of understanding and reason whereby man is distinguished from the beasts and irrational creatures".² Another writer equates the terms, light of nature, reason, and sense, and several controversialists state or imply that the light within is natural reason, the wisdom of the world, or a "notion". However, the references to reason are relatively sparse in both the Puritan and Quaker controversial literature, and it is difficult to find a consistent and developed view of reason within the controversial writings themselves. Both the Quaker and Puritan positions vascillate between a negative and a positive view of the role of reason, sometimes embracing and some-

1. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 601.

2. J. Clapham, op.cit., p. 55. Cf. above p. 101, n. 3.

times rejecting it. The Puritans, on the one hand, treated reason as a form of the light of nature, and as such, beneficial in giving a general knowledge of God to all men. Clapham, as we have seen, goes so far as to say that it is the common light of understanding that is meant in John 1:9. On the other hand, Puritans criticize the Quakers on the grounds that the universal light is but a "notion", or "the corrupt spark of reason", or because their doctrine of the light within sets up "themselves and their common candle-light of reason" in the place of Christ.¹ Again, there is the assumption that the Quakers themselves equate reason and the light within, as appears most sharply in a query of Baxter to the Quakers, the answer to which gives the central Quaker position--also sharply.

Why did not the World believe in Christ,
even Generally before his coming, if
reason was then a sufficient light?

Ans. This is an Ignorant and unlearned
question, who hath said that reason was
then a sufficient light; or who doth say
that reason now is a sufficient light,
but thy self? 2

Actually, this was merely a provocative exchange of mutual misunderstanding, for Baxter and the Puritans were as far from asserting that reason was a sufficient light as were the Quakers themselves.

The main brunt of the disputes regarding reason,

1. J. Stalham, op.cit., p. 2.

2. R. Hubberthorne, op.cit., p. 17. Baxter's query is quoted from J. Tombes and R. Baxter, True Old Light.

however, focused not so much on reason as a universal natural light, but the seeming Quaker disavowal of reason in the sphere of religious knowledge. Thus Samuel Clarke reports of a Quaker speaker that his drift

was to deny all Ministerial Teaching, and Ordinances, together with all Notional knowledge gained by the use of such means, and to become as if they never learned anything, & now to be taught of God within themselves: ¹

"Notional knowledge" and "notions" were looked on as a more arid form of "fleshly knowledge", and all alike were deemed by the Quakers to be ultimately ineffective in establishing a relationship between God and man. Dr. G. F. Nuttall has pointed out that the more radical Puritans had already developed a similar critical view of reason, and that when Fox made his distinctions between the Holy Spirit or the light within and reason (and conscience as well), "he was but carrying forward a line of development already well established within Puritanism".² Bunyan typically disclaims several times against "Notionists" and "notions", and a fellow Baptist commends Bunyan's book, informing the reader that

in this book thou wilt not meet with high-flown airy notions,...but the sound, plain, common, and yet spiritual and mysterious truths of the gospel; ³

-
1. S. Clarke, A Mirror...for Saints and Sinners, p. 258.
 2. G. F. Nuttall, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience, pp. 41-42.
 3. "The Epistle writ by Mr. Burton" for Some Gospel Truths Opened, Bunyan, Works, I. 54.

Another writer makes his attack directly against the light within, charging that it is a notion. To this Fox replies that "all notions be among such that be out of the Light",¹ and in denying the light within to be a notion, Fox shares the negative view of reason implicit in the accusation of his Puritan opponent.

The primary basis for such a view was, of course, the doctrine that reason participated in the corruption brought by the Fall. William Dewsbury makes it quite clear:

Corrupt reason of Man doth not present
to the Conscience things good and evil;
a corrupt Tree cannot bring forth good
Fruit, Mat.7.18. There is nothing makes
manifest Darkness but Light, Ephes.5.15.
which all men in the Fall is gone from... 2

Again, a Puritan writer argued that the Quakers have made the Light of Christ "the corrupt spark of reason". This Fox flatly denied, quoting John 1:9 as showing that the light was not corrupt, but true. Fox broadens the argument, however, by adding (referring to the true light): "there is no corruption in it, but it leads to true reason, and there is no true reason but in it; and thy corrupt spark of reason is out of it, and to be condemned with it".³ Here a positive view is combined with a negative view of reason: Fox is not willing to reject reason totally and ab-

1. G.M., p. 95.

2. Wm. Dewsbury, Testimony, p. 145.

3. G.M., pp. 20-21.

solutely. In this he is joined by Fisher, who in reply to Baxter's query regarding reason as sufficient, states that "this Light we testifie to...is not against, but according to right Reason", and even implies that the two may be "Synonimous".¹ Burrough puts the point more strongly: he allows that his opponent has spoken truly in saying that Christ lighteth every one with reason and understanding, and explains:

it is the purest reason that every man should serve his Maker, and act nothing contrary to his Maker; this the light of Christ lights unto, and leads unto; and it is the best understanding that gives a man to understand the Way of eternal Peace..., if he love the Light, and lets him understand when he acts against his Maker, &c. and this hath Christ lighted every man unto; 2

Finally, in reply to an unusually forthright affirmation of the role of reason, Fox pulls his punch, and answers circumspectly. His Puritan adversary had stated:

Pr. That Ministers may exhort men to walke by the light of Reason, as well as the light of the Gospell.

Ans. No man walks by the light of reason, but who be in the faith, are in the light of the Gospell, and all other reason is as the beasts of the field, that which makes men reasonable is faith, and all that be in the faith are in the light of the Gospell, and this is one, which all unreasonableness is out of it, in

1. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 691.

2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 161. (Misnumbered 169).

the transgression,...and such as be
reasonable walks by the light of the
Gospel. ¹

The attitude of both the Quakers and the Puritans toward reason is clearly ambivalent, and while both are far from rationalism, neither unanimously or wholeheartedly embrace an anti-rationalism or irrationalism. For the early Quakers, however, the anti-rational element may be said to predominate, as will be seen when we come to the Quaker protest against education and learning as qualifications for the ministry.

In the disputes dealing with the light within as a light of nature, conscience proved a somewhat more dominant theme than reason, for the Puritans treated the universal light more often as a moral than a rational light. Ives gives a typical statement of the Puritan position:

God [may] send light among the heathen,
which may not be within every individial
man of them. And whereas you ask me,
what light it is? I say, it is the light
of nature which taught them to do by na-
ture the things contained in the Law. ²

As proof that it was God who showed this to the heathen, Ives quotes the usual text on this point, Romans 1:9. Hammond puts the case more succinctly; speaking of the Quakers, he says,

the light which they say is in every man,
must be meant of the light of naturall
conscience; unlesse they will say, all men
have saving Faith. ³

1. G.M., p. 278. (Punctuation altered for clarity).

2. J. Ives, Innocency above Impudency, p. 45.

3. S. Hammond, op.cit., p. 18.

The most thorough exposition of conscience as the universal light is given by Bunyan:

Now every man as he comes into the world receives a light from Christ, as he is God, which light is the conscience, that some call Christ, though falsely. This light, or conscience, will show a man that there is a God, and that this God is eternal....This light also will reprove of sin, or convince of, and make manifest sins against the law of this eternal God:

Therefore,...(Rom.i.20,) they are left without excuse; that is, they have their own conscience, that doth show them there is a God, and that this God is to be served and obeyed: ¹

Of course, as we have seen, this conscience is not for Bunyan the Spirit of Christ, nor the work of grace: conscience is merely a faculty of the soul, "in which is the law of nature" which teaches all men of the existence of God and their sins against their Maker.²

Once again, part of the Puritan argument rests on the assumption that the Quakers equate the light within with conscience, whether unintentionally or on purpose. Christopher Feake and his friends argued that the Quaker doctrine of the light within left men to "be guided by Conscience, whether rightly or wrongly informed", with no recourse to a "standing, certain rule without",³ but

1. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 64-65.

2. Ibid., I. 96.

3. C. Feake, et.al., op.cit., p. 3.

Feake's pamphlet intends to show the true way of discovering

those secret sinnes, especially unbelief, which are not discoverable by the Candle-light of conscience as it comes into the world. ¹

Again, Bunyan asks incredulously whether natural conscience must be

idolized, and made a God of? Oh, wonderful! that men should make a God and a Christ of their consciences, because they can convince of sin. ²

Such an identification of conscience and Christ was as repellent to the Quakers as it was to the Puritans, and the First Publishers flatly denied that they embraced such a principle. The usual argument was that already used against the association of the light within with the light of nature. The Light of Christ existed before conscience, and conscience owes its existence to the light:

The light which every one that cometh into the world is enlightned withall, is not conscience, for the light was before any thing was made, or conscience named: ³

Again, Fox asks Bunyan whether conscience was "eternal", and charges Bunyan with calling Christ "conscience". Indeed, the two sides simply exchanged the accusation of giving "new

1. Ibid., p. 11.

2. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 96.

3. G. Weare, et.al., op. cit., p. 7.

names": the Quakers charged the Puritans with giving the Light of Christ (in John 1:9) new names such as light of nature and conscience; the Puritans accused the Quakers of giving the light of nature in all men the new name of Christ, or the Light of Christ.¹

In the important conflict between Bunyan and Burrough, the argument regarding conscience is expanded, and several interesting points of disagreement arise. Bunyan has said that the light in every man comes from Christ as he is God, yet it cannot be called the "Spirit of Christ"; in comparison with the Spirit of Christ, conscience is "but a poor dunghill creature".² To Burrough, such an idea is a glaring self-contradiction, for if the light comes from Christ as God, it "must needs be of the nature of God pure, and not impure", and he demands of Bunyan whether that which he admits to be the Light of God is to be considered "but a dunghill-Creature, and low, and empty".³ Equally "horrible" in Burrough's eyes is the tinker's identification of conscience, as the Light of God, with nature.

And to confound thy self, thou sayst,
Conscience, which is the Light of God,
is Nature it self; then it must needs
by that every mans nature (which is
sinful say I) it [is] the Light of God; 4

1. Cf. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 121.

2. Ibid., p. 96.

3. E. Burrough, Works, p. 286.

4. Ibid.

Nor can the Quaker understand Bunyan's charge that the Devil may deceive people by bidding them follow the light within, for this seems incompatible with the assertion that this light comes from God. Also, for Burrough, nothing can convince of sin but the Light (and Spirit) of Christ. Bunyan, however, adduces the story in John 8:1-11 as proof to the contrary, claiming that the Pharisees acted solely by "their own consciences", and noting that John did not say "by the light of Christ in their consciences".¹ To this Burrough replies that John 1:9 applies to the Pharisees, and, therefore, they "were lighted with the Light of Christ", and this it was that convicted them of sin.²

Again, Bunyan gives three points to prove that conscience "is not of the same nature of the Spirit of Christ". He lists three attributes of conscience which cannot be predicated of the Spirit of Christ: conscience is "defiled"; conscience "may be hardened or seared with a hot iron" (I Tim.4:3) and "our consciences naturally are evil...(Heb. x.22). But so is not the Spirit of Christ".³ Burrough heartily agrees that these attributes do not apply to the Light of Christ as God, but concludes that it is "great Ignorance and Blasphemy" to say that conscience, as the Light of Christ as God, is in fact "seared; and heardened, and evil".⁴ The

1. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 96.

2. E. Burrough, Works, pp. 286-287.

3. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 107.

4. E. Burrough, Works, p. 300.

mutual misunderstanding is obvious. To Burrough, calling conscience the light coming from Christ as he was God meant an immediate identity between the light and Christ, and there was no distinction between the Light of Christ and the Spirit of Christ. To Bunyan, there was a clear distinction between the work of Christ as Creator and as Saviour, and Christ as Creator was related mediately and indirectly to man as creature. The Quaker, conceiving of the relation of God and man as immediate, could not understand the conception of a natural light, reason, or conscience, which was said to come from Christ and yet could not be explicitly called the Light of Christ himself. The Puritan, conceiving of the relation of God and man as mediate, could not understand the conception of a light given to all men so directly by Christ that it could be called the Light of Christ. The argument was deadlocked from the start.

There was, however, one more issue which complicated and confused the dispute regarding conscience, and this may be analysed by distinguishing between conscience as the locus, rather than the genesis, of the light given by Christ (either as Creator or Saviour). Fox and the Quakers were fond of speaking of "the light of Christ in thy conscience", "the witness in all men's consciences", "that in thy conscience", and so forth. We have noted their doctrine of the Covenant of Light established in the hearts

of the Gentiles, and of the law written in their hearts. Fox speaks of the light within which convinces as answering "to something in their particulars";¹ again he refers to the light as "something in your Consciences" which informs people of evil; and he often climaxes an exhortation with: "To that in your Consciences do I appeal".² In using such expressions, the Quakers were referring to conscience not as the cause or origin of the light within, but solely as the place of residence of the light within.

Thus, although this "something in the conscience" was for the Quakers nothing else but the Light of Christ, for many Puritans it could be nothing else but merely the light of man. The issue of subjectivism arises again. To the Puritans, the Quaker doctrine seems to make conscience the sole guide: only that which is a product of one's own mind is now the rule and court of appeal. The Quakers are "adoring their own light, magnifying the light of nature".³ Their doctrine implies that the believer "should turne his eye into himselfe to looke for counsell and direction",⁴ and looking at the light within means for a man "to look at his deceitful heart".⁵ In short,

1. G.M., p. 63.

2. G. Fox, Gospel-Truth Demonstrated, pp. 11-12.

3. John Stilhom [Stalham], as quoted in G.M., p. 306.

4. G.M., p. 133, quoting Thomas Moore.

5. Ibid., p. 290, quoting Enoch Howet.

the Puritan objection is that "there is nothing in man to be spoken to but man".¹

The Quakers defended their view of conscience against the charge of subjectivism with a twofold argument: it was not just man himself that was spoken to, and it was definitely not man that did the speaking. In answer to the last quoted Puritan objection, Fox asks,

How then ministred the Apostle to the
spirit: And Christ spake to the spirits
in prison;...and the spirit of the
Father speaks within them, and the light
shines in the heart,...²

The frequent admonition of Fox to Friends that they speak "to that of God in every man", is based on the Quaker conviction that there is some God-given element in man to which the message or revelation of God is addressed. But if that in man which responds to divine truth is not wholly of man himself, it is even more clear that that to which he responds is not of man but of God. The conscience is only the locus, the place where the Light of Christ is received; it is not the source or originator of that light. "The Quakers light is Christ the truth", says Fox,³ and it is only this light within "that discovers a mans thoughts, a mans counsels of his heart".⁴ Far from being a product

1. Ibid., p. 15, quoting Enoch Howet.

2. Ibid., p. 15.

3. Ibid., p. 306.

4. Ibid., p. 290.

of a man's own mind, the light within opposes the "vanities" of men's minds; indeed, only by coming to the Spirit of God within and to the light within can one hear the counsel of God and turn from his own human counsel. This view of conscience forms one of the main themes in the writings of William Dewsbury, who uses the term with the meaning of "the counsel of God within you", and often contrasts it with "your own hearts".

This is the Word of the Lord God to you;
That you lend not your Ears to the counsel
of your own Hearts, or to the counsel of
any without you, that tempt you to draw
your minds from the pure Counsel of God,
which is the Light that comes from Christ
Jesus, and calls on you in your Consciences, ¹

...this Light in thy Conscience, which discovers unto thee the evil of thy Heart, is of the eternal Word of God, and was from the beginning,....Every one arise out of your earthly wisdom, and mind the Light in thy Conscience, and wait on the Power of the Lord in it,... ²

This "Power of the Lord" in the conscience, continues Dewsbury, will manifest all sin, and if heeded, bring the soul to "live in the Lord" and in the New Covenant of Christ. Indeed, so far did the Quakers go from making conscience a faculty or function of man that Bunyan could make the opposite charge and accuse them of elevating conscience to the place of God or Christ, thereby giving

1. Wm. Dewsbury, Testimony, p. 57.

2. Ibid., p. 279.

to mere natural and moral conscience a saving efficacy. Both readings of the Quaker position, either as viewing the light within as purely subjective, or as an "idolizing" of the conscience, stemmed from a failure to regard the Quaker view of conscience as only the locus, and not the genesis of the light within.

The entire controversy about the Quaker doctrine of the Light of Christ within may be summed up by the Puritan, Henry Stubbe, who maintained that the opinion of Owen is not, after all, radically opposed to the Quakers' view of Scripture and the light within. Stubbe explains his contention:

The difference is only whether the Quakers do not mistake nature for grace, and esteem of that to be a light of Christ which is a light of nature: I professe I think they do not, and they have numerous defendants and learned, which avow the universall light resulting from the death of Christ, dwelling in every man, which will, if attended to, bring him to salvation; and that this is not nature but grace. ¹

Here Stubbe has incisively analysed the basic point at issue between the Puritans and Quakers with regard to the doctrine of the light within, and from what we have seen of the dispute, it can be said that he has also correctly delineated the Quaker argument. The same analysis is obtained when the key terms "nature" and "grace" are translated into the traditional terminology of revelation, and it is

1. H. Stubbe, A Light Shining out of Darknes, p. 84.

asked whether the Quakers do not mistake "supernatural" for "natural" revelation. To this query a clear answer is given by Farnsworth, who upholds the Quaker refusal to call "that in John 1.9...a naturall Light," since, says Farnsworth, "it is the Light supernaturall".¹ Likewise, Fox rejects Tombes' reference to John 1:9 as a natural light, arguing that the light there spoken of "is not natural life or light, but [is] of the Divine nature, which is above nature".² Fox and the First Publishers rarely used the term "supernatural", but the word "spiritual" often seems to convey the same meaning. Thus Hubberthorne opposed a writer who distinguished between spiritual and natural light, and who, therefore, received the following reproof from Hubberthorne:

But in the light of Christ, which is but one, which is not natural but spiritual, is he seen to be natural, and his distinction to be natural; and so in the light the natural man with his natural doctrine and natural distinction is denied; 3

The Quakers clearly shared the dualistic conception of the universe, in which the realm of nature was sharply differentiated from the realm of grace, but they would not go

1. R. Farnsworth, The Scriptures Vindication, p. 26.

2. G. M., p. 317.

3. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 51. His opponent here is Frederick Woodall, an Independent.

on, with the Puritans, to make such a distinction with regard to the light within. To the Quakers, the light within could not be divided into a natural and a spiritual light, or a light of nature and a Light of Christ: the light within is "but one", viz. the Light of Christ--and of Christ as Saviour as well as Creator. However, while the Puritan critics of the Quakers denied all this, and claimed that the light within every man was only a natural light, their weightiest argument was not yet brought to the fore. The Puritan rejection of the light within as a supernatural light was preliminary to their rejection of it as consonant with, or superior to, the revelation of God through Scripture. As will be seen in the next chapter, it was this which gave the ultimate basis for the Puritan rejection of the Quaker identification of the light within as the Light of Christ.

CHAPTER THREE

The Doctrine of the Scriptures

While the Quaker answer to the problem of authority was given in their doctrine of immediate revelation as the Light of Christ within, the Puritan answer to the question of authority was embodied in the doctrine of the Scriptures. In the first two chapters we have been dealing primarily with the negative side of the Puritan position, viz., the attack against the Quaker view of revelation. We come now to the more positive side of the Puritan argument: the affirmation and defense of the Scriptures as the authoritative basis of Christian doctrine and practice. The negative and critical role now falls to the Quakers, who attack the Puritan doctrine of the Scriptures with a rigor at least equal to that with which the Puritans had attacked the Quaker doctrine of the light within. In this dispute two main areas of conflict may be distinguished, the first dealing with the nature or definition of Scripture, the second with the use or interpretation of Scripture.

The Puritans unanimously defined the Scriptures as "the Word of God". This phrase resounds as a repeated refrain in the Puritan controversial literature, and may be regarded as the citadel of Puritan doctrine vis-a-vis

the Quaker position. Just as the identification of the light within as the Light of Christ constituted the foundation of Quaker theology, so the definition of Scripture as the Word of God formed the keystone of Puritan theology. The parallel continues in that both Quakers and Puritans quickly and clearly recognized that these definitions were indeed the pillar upon which the opponent's position rested, and each saw that they could not prevail unless that pillar were overthrown. Since the question of authority was logically the decisive issue, neither side could afford to give ground here, and the Puritans defended their pivotal doctrine of the Scriptures with as much tenacity as the Quakers preserved their central principle of immediate revelation. The Puritan attitude on this matter was forcefully expressed in a declaration of some Scottish Presbyterians:

Cursed be all they that say the Scripture is not the Word of God, and let all the People say Amen. ¹

We shall see that all the Puritan controversialists shared the substance, if not the accompanying tone, of this pronouncement.

The basic argument supporting this view of Scripture is given in the opening sentence of an outstanding Puritan treatise on the subject:

That the whole authority of the Scripture in itself depends solely on its divine original, is confessed by all who acknowledge its authority.²

-
1. As quoted in G. Weare, et al., The Doctrins...of the Priests of Scotland, p. 17.
 2. J. Owen, Works, XVI, 297. (The Divine Original of the Scripture).

The Holy Scriptures are authoritative for revelation because they have their origin in God himself; they are the Word of God because they are the Word from God. In an earlier treatise, Owen expands this argument, adducing three senses in which the Scripture is the Word of God:

Primò, ideo, respectu ortûs, hoc nomen sibi vindicat Scriptura sacra. Originem suam a Deo habet....Secundò, respectu subjectae materiae, seu divinae veritatis in ea revelatae, sacra Scriptura est verbum Dei; quatenus nempe est revelatio voluntatis divinae ab ipso Deo profecta....Tertiò, respectu ipsorum verborum in linguis istis quibus ex mandato et ordinatione Dei scripta est; etenim ea verba et concepta et disposita sunt per Spiritum Sanctum,... 1

The last statement gives the Puritan description of the specific way in which the Scriptures are of divine origin: they come from God through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. We shall return later to Owen's further contention that it is the "testimony of the Spirit" which authenticates the Scripture as God's Word, for on this point the Puritan position is more ambiguous. On the divine inspiration of the "penmen" of Scripture, however, there is complete agreement on the Puritan side. The belief in the Holy Spirit's inspiration of the writers of Scripture "is axiomatic among Puritans".²

-
1. Ibid., XVI. 434. (Pro Sacris Scripturis). Although published with The Divine Original in 1659, this treatise was apparently written the previous year.
 2. G. F. Nuttall, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience, p. 22.

The controversy on the Scriptures as the Word of God did not, however, hinge on the issue of the divine inspiration of the penmen of Scripture, since in the last analysis the Quakers were at one with the Puritans on this point. Over and over again Fox insists that "the spirit spoke in them that gave forth the Scriptures".¹ But in Quaker thought the inspiration of the writers of Scripture did not necessarily mean that the writings themselves were the voice of the Spirit. Fox contends that the Scriptures said only that "the holy Ghost moved in them that gave forth Scriptures,...and did not say, the holy Ghost moved in the Scriptures".² The Quakers sharply distinguished between the "Spirit" and the "Letter", and stoutly refused to allow either an identification or a necessary conjunction of the two. They accepted the office of the Holy Spirit in inspiring the Scripture writers, but they added that the further work of the Spirit in inspiring the readers of Scripture was necessary in order to make it the authoritative word of God. Thus Nayler can deny the accusation that the Quakers refuse to call the Scriptures the Word of God:

for we own the Scripture where it is given to any by the inspiration of God to be the word to such, but to others who have it not of God, they may read the letter and not hear the word, and have a Bible and be without the word... 3

1. G.M., p. 150.

2. Ibid., p. 280.

3. J. Nayler, Weaknes above Wickednes, p. 4.

Hence our division of this chapter into the "definition" and "interpretation" of Scripture would be condoned by the First Publishers only, if at all, on methodological grounds, for they defined Scripture on the same basis as they "owned" and interpreted it, viz., through the inspiration of the Spirit.

Although the Quaker doctrine of the Scripture thus presupposed their doctrine of the Spirit, the dispute concerning the Scriptures as the Word of God revolved not solely on pneumatology, for a Christological issue was involved. The core of this argument is contained in a brief answer by Fox to an oft-repeated Puritan charge:

Pr. He saith, We deny the Scripture to be the Word of God.

Answ. The Scriptures are the words of God, and Christ is the word in which the words end. ¹

The Quakers were regularly charged with refusing to call the Scriptures the Word of God, and they regularly replied that the Scriptures were not, in fact, properly called the Word of God, for this term could be applied correctly only to Christ. Thus Burrough writes against Eaton:

And thou sayst, The Scriptures are the Word of God, given by immediate Inspiration of God;...

Answ. Christ is the Word of God, and his Name is called, The Word of God; and the Word of God was in the Beginning, and shall endure forever: and this Word is not the

1. G.M., p. 43.

Scriptures,...but the Scriptures are the words of God, given forth from the Word, which was in their Hearts; that spake forth the Scriptures, which were wrote as the Holy Men of God were moved by the Holy Ghost, 1

This argument is repeated throughout The Great Mistery whenever the question of the Scriptures as the Word of God is raised, and the following instance shows its underlying motivation:

Christ's name is called the Word of God; his name is above every name, and over all things he must have the preheminnence, words and names. 2

Owen, among others, granted that the Quakers claimed that their refusal to give the title Word of God to Scriptures stemmed from a reverence for Christ, but he regarded this claim as "meer sham, delusion, and fraud":

...non enim tantum Scripturas omni sua auctoritate spoliare, easque loco suo movere, sed et ipsum Christum personalitate sua atque divina existentia exuere, hoc unico stratagemate intendunt et conantur. 3

The Puritans reacted strongly to the Quakers' restricted use of this phrase, and they adduced two main considerations to support their definition of the Scripture as the Word of God. The first was the contention that the

1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 485.

2. G.M., p. 110.

3. J. Owen, Works, XVI. 428.

Scriptures call themselves by that very name. Thus Baxter puts this query to his Quaker opponents:

Do you believe the Scriptures to be true or not? If you do, then you must believe what they say of themselves; But they call themselves the Word of God, Mar.7.13. Rom.10.8. 2 Cor.2.17. & 4.2. I Thes.4.15. I Pet.1.25. ¹

Owen categorically rejects the Quaker assertion that sacred Scripture never asserts that it is the Word of God, replying to this claim: "Hoc falsum esse allatis testimoniis evicimus, quibus innumera alia addi possint."² Similarly, Jonathan Clapham argues that the Scriptures frequently call "the Commandments, promises, threatnings, &c., recorded in the Scriptures the Word of God." Clapham's conclusion follows:

Yea, this is the most usual acceptation of this title (the Word of God) for its not given to Jesus Christ by any of the holy pen-men of the Scriptures, but by the Apostle John only... ³

This observation paves the way for the second Puritan argument: Christ is called the Word in a different way than is Scripture, and the term may, therefore, be applied both to Christ and to Scripture. Thus Jeremiah Ives argues that it is an error in Quaker doctrine that they "allow nothing to be call'd God's Word, but Christ", for God "hath but one

1. R. Baxter, The Quakers Catechism, p. 12.

2. J. Owen, Works, XVI. 436.

3. J. Clapham, A Discovery of the Quakers Doctrine, p. 2.

only-begotten Son Jesus Christ; but he hath many words".¹ Although nothing can be called the Word in the same sense as Christ, the term does not apply to Christ exclusively. The fallacy in Quaker reasoning is that "Jesus Christ is called the Word; Ergo, Nothing else must be called the Word but Jesus Christ".² Another writer distinguishes between "the Essential word, and the declarative word", and adds that he owns "Christ to be the Essential, and the Scripture to be the Letter".³ Clapham insists that the title "the Word of God" applies with greater propriety to the Scriptures than to Christ, "for Jesus Christ is only figuratively called the Word of God", in that he is the "expresse image of his Fathers person", much as a word is the image "of ones minde".⁴ Baxter makes the same distinction more specifically:

1. Only Jesus Christ is the co-essential, co-eternal Word of the Father, being one with the Father. 2. But the holy Scriptures are the temporal expressed Word, that is, the signs of Gods minde to man, so that Christ and the Scriptures are not called the Word in the same sense. 5

Finally, the case is put most thoroughly by Owen, who dis-

1. J. Ives, The Quakers Quaking, p. 5.

2. Ibid., p. 6.

3. P. Taverner, as quoted in G.M., p. 283.

4. J. Clapham, op.cit., p. 3.

5. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 11.

tinguishes three separate meanings and usages of the term *λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and goes on to meet the restricted Quaker usage with a twofold rebuttal:

Resp. 1. Fallacia est ex homonymiá vocis. Christus est verbum Dei essenziale, verbum Deus, *λόγος οὐσιώδης* : Scriptura verbum Dei scriptum, *λόγος προφορικός*.
 2. Mentio fit verbi Christi, Col.iii.16; Act.xix.10; at verbum Christi non est ipse Christus; etiam verbi evangelii; et quamvis apud ipsos evangelium sit Christus, at verbum evangelii Christus esse non potest. 1

To these arguments the Quakers replied in several ways. Their answer to the first argument is embodied in an answer to the ministers who had pronounced the "curse" against anyone who denied that the Scripture is the Word of God. To this the Quakers reply:

Here they have cursed Luke, who calls the Scripture a Declaration of the Word, Luke 1.1. and Acts 1.1, where it is called a Treatise; and they have cursed their own company, who say the Scriptures signifies writings; and they have cursed John, who said, In the beginning was the Word, John 1.1. 2

The first of John was the standard Quaker text for calling Christ (or God) the Word, and the first of Luke was the standard Scriptural reference for calling the Scriptures something other than the Word, viz., a declaration, "a true Declaration or Testimony of those things that are certainly believed".³ Furthermore, the Quakers reasoned,

1. J. Owen, Works, XVI. 435-436.

2. G. Weare, et.al., op.cit., p. 17.

3. E. Burrough, Works, p. 19.

there are many Scriptural descriptions of the Word which cannot be predicated of the Scriptures. Burrough argues that "the Word of the Lord endures for ever", but the Scripture "doth not say the Letter endures for ever". Likewise, "the Word sanctifies", but the Letter does not sanctify. Again,

the Scripture had a beginning, and was declared in time, and Prophesie shall cease, but the Word is from everlasting to everlasting; And the Word of the Lord is as a Hammer, and as a Fire, but the Scripture doth not say that it is as a Hammer and a Fire; and yet the Word that he spoke was Spirit and Life, yet the Scripture is not Spirit and Life; 1

As this quotation demonstrates, the Quakers used the terms "Scripture" and "Letter" synonymously, and it was partly upon this basis that they refused to call the Scriptures the Word of God. Says Fox, "Scriptures signifies writings, and writings are not God".² Fisher, in his lengthy reply to Owen, makes this point a central issue. He distinguishes three meanings of the term Scriptures: first, "The individual and immediate Manuscripts of Moses, the Prophets, and Apostles", (the copy of which we have in the Bible); second, "the transcribed Copies" of these first manuscripts, (either the originals or copies of those copies); and third, the various "Translations" of those transcriptions, into the many languages.³ Fisher insists that by Scripture

1. Ibid.

2. G.M., p. 246.

3. S. Fisher, Testimony, pp. 194-195.

he means all three of the above, unless some one meaning is clearly specified, and thus

'tis the Letter, and not the Matter; the Writings, and not the Subjects, Things, Truths, Doctrines, or Word written of, that is the Subject to come under Consideration between us; ¹

While Owen is ambiguous, predicating the Word of God sometimes of the writings themselves, sometimes of the doctrines contained in the Bible, Fisher is one "who shall ever put a difference between the Writing of the Word, and the Word it self Written of".² Fisher and his fellow Quakers called Scripture the Word of God only in the latter sense, never in the former. Owen and the Puritans held that both the writings and the subject matter could and should be called the Word of God, arguing that when the Word was written as Scripture it did not cease to be the Word of God.³ The impasse was complete, since the Quakers would not accept a twofold definition or "sense" of the Word. Says Burrough, epitomizing the Quaker position,

no other Word I own but Christ; and the Scripture speaks of no Word of God, but one; and thou that wouldst make the Letter the Word, it self shall judge thee; ⁴

It may be noted in passing that this Quaker objection remained undiluted even in the case of more moderate state-

1. Ibid., p. 196.

2. Ibid.

3. J. Owen, Works, XVI. 436.

4. E. Burrough, Works, p. 19.

ments of the Puritan viewpoint. To that statement that "The word of God is contained in the Scriptures", Fox answers, "The Scripture saith God is the word, and the heaven of heavens cannot contain him".¹ Nor can Scripture be called the "mediate word of God", for that phrase is nowhere in the Bible, and the Word of God is not mediate, but endures forever.² Again, Fox rejects the term "the temporall word", considering this to be "an undervaluing [of] the Scriptures of truth, and the words of God and Christ, and the Prophets and Apostles, which cannot be broken".³ The early Quakers thus never deviated from their insistence that nothing but Christ may be called the Word of God.

With the dispute about the Scriptures as writings or the Letter, the discussion returns again to the problem of the doctrine of the Spirit, for the Quaker derogation of the "meer Letter" was based on their antithetical juxtaposition of Letter and Spirit. As noted above, the Quakers refused to call the Letter the Word of God partly because they held that there was no necessary conjunction between the Spirit and the Letter. This argument is continued in the assertions that the Letter is "carnal" and that it "killeth". During the trial of Fox at Lancashire in 1653,

1. G.M., p. 232.

2. Ibid., p. 247.

3. Ibid., p. 29.

the following charge was brought against him:

That he did dissuade men from reading the Scriptures, teaching them that they were carnal.

Answ. For dissuading men from reading the Scriptures, it is false; for they are given forth to be read as they are, but not to make a trade upon, but the Letter is carnal and killeth, but that which gave it forth is eternall, spirituall, and life, and this I witness. ¹

Fox clarifies the issue in The Great Mistery: "The Letter [is] written in paper and inke; now paper and inke is not spirituall, but that which it speaks of is spirituall".² The phrase "written in paper and inke" vividly illustrates the Quaker conception of the Scriptures as "writings" which cannot be called the Word; but since this viewpoint was neither shared nor fully comprehended by the Puritans, the Quaker use of a word such as "carnal" was inevitably misunderstood. Thus Jeremiah Ives charges Fox with the error of saying, "The Scriptures are carnal", and supports his accusation by noting that Fox never flatly denied the charge, "but in stead thereof, evades the charge, by saying, The Letter of the Scripture is carnall?"³ But Nayler insists against Ives that the charge is false precisely because

1. T. Aldam, et.al., A Brief Discovery, p. 19. Fox's phrase, "making a trade upon" embodies the Quaker criticism of the clergy for making a living by the ministry. For this charge of "preaching for hire" cf. Chapter Seven.

2. G. M., p. 68.

3. J. Ives, Innocency above Impudency, p. 22.

of this last statement by Fox, and he stoutly affirms that the Quakers do not say that the Scriptures are carnal. Nayler maintains that the Quakers own the Scriptures, but, he explains: "a Scripture is known before the letter was, and that Scripture we own".¹ While Nayler thus guards against mistaking any of the Quaker aspersions regarding the Letter for an unqualified derogation of the Scriptures, Ives on the other hand withdraws from an absolute identification of the writings of the Scriptures as the Word of God, remarking: "do not I say, ...the writings may be burned, but the Word of God contained in them, cannot".² We shall see that in this the Nayler-Ives dispute is indicative, for on the problem of the Scripture and the Spirit neither the Quakers nor the Puritans presented an unequivocal argument.

On the basis of the conception of the Scriptures as the writings or the Letter, however, the Quakers are emphatically clear in their view that the Letter is to be sharply distinguished from the Spirit. In answer to the contention that "that which is contained in the Bible is spirit and life", Fox says, "That which the Bible declares of, is spirit and life which is Christ, which you are ignorant of that hath the letter".³ Elsewhere, the same

1. J. Nayler, op.cit., p. 13.

2. J. Ives, op.cit., p. 34.

3. G.M., p. 80.

contention is again rebutted by Fox:

This is as much as to say that spirit is in the letter, and life is in the letter; now hadst thou said, that which is declared of, is spirit and life, these words had been true; and the letter it selfe [is] death, and the life was in them that gave it forth, that is sound; ¹

A similar point is involved in the Puritan assertion that "the Spirit is given by the Letter", to which Fox rejoins, "God gave the Spirit before he gave forth Scriptures".²

The two conflicting positions are put succinctly by Farnsworth, writing against the "Scottish contradictors" (of the Scriptures):

the Spirit is not in the letter, nor given by it, as the Scots affirme, but the letter declares of the spirit, and it was before the letter was, and given by the Lord,... ³

The letter proceeded from the spirit, but the spirit did not proceed from the letter; ⁴

To the Quaker, the Spirit was neither contained in, nor given by, the Letter.

The implication of this position was obvious, and the Quakers brought their argument to its logical conclusion: the Letter was not inseparable from the Spirit. This conclusion was antithetical to Puritan thought, and Fox has to give answer to the opposite view:

1. Ibid., p. 253. (Punctuation slightly altered).

2. Ibid., p. 151.

3. R. Farnsworth, The Scriptures Vindication, second page of "To the Reader".

4. Ibid., p. 2.

...the letter and the spirit were inseparable.
Answ. Contrary to the Apostle, 2 Cor. The letter kills, and the spirit gives life:...and men may have the letter, and not the spirit,

To this Fox adds a query which was more often directed against the Quakers:

and if every one which hath the letter, have the spirit, what need you teach? your teachings are at an end, for the spirit will open to you the scriptures. ¹

The First Publishers could put their point more sharply: Farnsworth chides Stalham with the remark, "so thou would have the Spirit to be bought and sold, if it were in the Letter, and to be given by it", ² and Fox, similarly, reproves an adversary who said that

ye letter & ye spiritt was Inseperable.
 And I saide if soe then every one y^t has ye letter has ye spiritt & they may then buy ye Spiritt with ye letter of ye scriptures. ³

The mere possession or reading of the Scripture did not, according to the Quakers, necessarily entail the possession or presence of the Spirit, for the Spirit was not in the written words: it was only in those who gave forth the words of Scripture.

Such a distinct separation of Letter and Spirit could not be accepted by the Puritans, since their doctrine of

1. G.M., p. 294.

2. R. Farnsworth, op.cit., p. 28.

3. Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 71.

plenary inspiration applied not only to the writers of Scripture but to the writings themselves. Thus, as we have seen, one of Owen's arguments for calling the Scriptures the Word of God was with respect to the words themselves, which were conceived and set forth through the Holy Spirit.¹ Indeed, Puritan thought could be more insistent on the inspiration of the words than of the writers. Fox quotes Stalham as saying:

The spirit is in the Letter, or the whole Scripture. And they that writ forth the Scriptures were imperfectly holy; but Gods Word was holy. 2

This argument was forcefully rejected by Fox, for as we have seen, the infallible and perfect manifestation of the Spirit in the Biblical writers was fundamental in Quaker thought.

Thus Fox refutes Stalham:

The holy men of God...gave forth the Scriptures as they were moved by the holy Ghost; but the Apostle said they were holy, and we shall believe him before we believe any of you apostate Teachers, which say they were not holy. And the spirit was in them that gave forth the Scriptures, 3

Thus while the Quakers could allow no qualification of the Spirit's operation in the prophets and apostles, the Puritans could permit no undermining of the authority of

1. Cf. J. Owen, Works, XVI. 434.

2. G.M., p. 167.

3. Ibid.

Scriptural writings. The issue is summed up in an interchange between Nayler and a Puritan opponent, whom Nayler quotes as saying:

It hath been an old Project of the Devil, to destroy the Letter, the supream Authority of the Scripture. [Nayler replies,] Thou art blind, who sayst That the Letter is the Supream Authority of the Scriptures; for that which gave it forth..., and opens it again in the Saints,...is the Supream Authority of the Scriptures, which is not the Letter, but the Spirit, 2 Cor.3.6. 1

This Pauline text was the chief Scriptural reference used by the Quakers in support of their doctrine of the Letter and the Spirit, but the Puritans could hardly agree with the Quaker interpretation. Clapham writes:

It is a grosse perverting of that Scripture, 2 Cor.3.6. to alledge it for to prove the Scriptures to be a dead letter; for the Apostle there compares the doctrine or ministration of the Law and the old Covenant, with the ministration of the Gospel Covenant,... now the Law was but a dead killing letter,...; but in the same place he commends his Ministry, for the Ministry of the Spirit and of Life; 2

Dealing with the same text, Owen likewise opposes the Quaker assertion that no one would wish to adhere to a dead letter-- unless he himself was dead. To this Owen gives a twofold reply:

1. Falsissima est ista assertio: Scriptura est verbum Dei, quod vivum est et efficax, Heb.iv.12, neque usquam litera esse mortua

1. J. Nayler, A Collection, p. 114.

2. J. Clapham, op.cit., p. 8.

dicitur: occidit quidem, sed idea viva est.

2. Litera occidit, quatenus litera legis est, ab evangelio separata, et quatenus a Spiritu, et vero sensu voluntatis Dei destituuntur, qui literae adhaerent, quae Judaeorum conditio fuit, contra quos eo loci disputat apostolus. ¹

Thus against this opposition of the Letter and the Spirit, whereby the former was regarded as "dead" without the Spirit, the Puritans stoutly insisted upon the conjunction of Scripture and Spirit, maintaining that they are inseparable. But while the Quakers would not deny the charge that they "divide the Spirit from the Scripture",² they reacted differently when the term involved was not Letter or writings, but Word. Farnsworth flatly denied that the Quakers "set the word at distance from the spirit", for, he asserts:

The word and spirit cannot be set at (difference nor) distance except God could be devided, and that cannot be, for God is the word, John 1,1. and God is that spirit, 2 Cor.3,17. Therefore the word and the spirit are inseperable, but the Letter is not God, nor the letter is not the spirit; ³

The contrasting positions are summed up in an exchange between Fox and a Puritan opponent, whom Fox quotes as stating that "His Word is not his spirit". Fox replies:

1. J. Owen, Works, XVI. 464.

2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 160. Burrough admits the charge, reasoning that "every one that hath the Scriptures hath not the Spirit".

3. R. Farnsworth, op.cit., p. 7.

The Word and the Spirit are one, which was before the written words were declared forth, in which word they all end, given forth by the spirit of God; ¹

Once again the problem is a semantic one, since the Quaker does not use the term Word to refer to the written Scriptures, and thus maintains the conjunction of Spirit and Word in an entirely different sense from the Puritan meaning. The Quakers consistently refused to define the Scriptures as the Word of God, describing them instead as the Letter or writings, and their sharp distinction between Spirit and Letter may be regarded both as cause and consequence of their rejection of the traditional Puritan definition of the Scriptures as the Word.

When the discussion shifts from questions of the nature and definition of Scripture to the problem of the interpretation and use of Scripture, the Quaker emphasis on the doctrine of the Spirit becomes even more insistent, for, as has already been noted, the Quakers held that the Scriptures can be known only through the Holy Spirit. Throughout The Great Mystery occur such statements as: "none knows the Scriptures but by the spirit";² "man without the spirit cannot interpret scriptures";³ "the spirit of God in the Apostles being witnessed, it opens the Scriptures".⁴ The Quaker position is epitomized in Fox's reply

1. G.M., p. 308.

2. Ibid., p. 137.

3. Ibid., p. 277.

4. Ibid., p. 153.

to a rejection of the Quaker conception of "the Scripture within":

Answ. Was not all the Scriptures from the spirit within? and was it not there before it came out? And must not all upon the earth have the spirit within that gave it forth, before they can understand the Scripture without, given forth from the spirit of God within others? ¹

We have also seen the argument of Nayler in which he affirmed that the Scripture could become the Word of God, but only through the inspiration of God, and Fox argues in a similar vein when he denies that the Quakers forsake the Scriptures, since the Quakers have received "the spirit of God;...and with the same spirit the Scriptures is owned again".² According to Quaker thought, the Scriptures were brought to life and authenticated by the Spirit: the Scriptures, just as the Light of Christ, must be appropriated by the believer, the Word must become immediate. To the Quaker, following this emphasis on immediacy, it was an easy step from the idea of the light within and the indwelling Spirit to the concept of the indwelling Word, and this was the basis of the above dispute on "the Scripture within". Thus Fox meets another critic of the same Quaker tenet with the affirmation:

All they that have not the unwritten word in their hearts, which is immediate, knowes not the word of faith,...knowes not the In-grafted word that is able to save their souls, ³

1. Ibid., p. 207.

2. Ibid., p. 116. Cf. above p. 127.

3. Ibid., p. 106.

As Fox says elsewhere, "The Scripture as it lies, and is in it selfe, is a dead letter", and is given life only "as the words is raised up within".¹ The Spirit, according to Fox and his followers, holds the key to the Scriptures: only through the Spirit can the Scriptures be known.

Given the Puritan insistence on the conjunction of Word and Spirit, it is not surprising that the Puritan criticism of this Quaker view of the Spirit opening the Scriptures was a qualified and somewhat ambivalent one. The Puritans themselves had too strong a doctrine of the Spirit to permit any absolute rejection of the Quaker viewpoint in principle. Baxter, for example, takes his Quaker opponents to task for misrepresenting his position, noting that he perceived

1. That you falsly intimate that we deny the necessity of an inward Light, when as we maintain, that the external Light of the Word alone is not sufficient without the inward Light of the Spirit.²

Later, Baxter elaborates on this point, when, after arguing that there are many kinds of light, such as the Sun, the inward light in the eyes, etc., he concludes:

So God in Christ is the Sun, Mans Reason is the Eye, The Gospel or Word of God is the external Light flowing to us from the Sunne, The Spirit closeth these two to-

1. Ibid., p. 166.

2. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 8.

gether, even the Gospel and our Reason,
and by its powerfull work in that closure,
breedeth a special illumination in the
soul which the Word alone could not pro-
duce. ¹

Eaton also lays stress on the necessity of the Spirit in knowing the Scripture, and after a characteristically Puritan pronouncement he adds a statement no less Puritan:

The conclusion is, That the Scripture is the foundation of an infallible judgement concerning things contained in them, and not the Spirit; but both Scripture and the Spirit must concur to give in the certainty of those things that are there contained, that they may become a sure rock to be built upon; for no one can say assuredly, and by a spirit of Faith, that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost, I Cor.12.3. ²

Finally, we may also adduce the argument of Owen in which he maintains that a "twofold efficacy of the Spirit" is needed in order for the Scripture to "be received as the word of God". The first concerns the subject, the mind of man, and is a work whereby the Spirit removes men's blindness and enables them to receive the Word of God. But, says Owen, this is not an immediate and vocal testimony in which the Spirit tells every individual that the Bible is the Word of God: "We say not that the Spirit ever speaks to us of the Word, but by the Word".³ Indeed, the

1. Ibid., p. 12.

2. S. Eaton, The Quakers Confuted, p. 10.

3. J. Owen, Works, XVI. 325-326. (The Divine Original of the Scriptures).

Spirit's testimony concerning the object, the Word itself, is more important than the subjective and private testimony, and this "public" testimony Owen describes as follows:

The Holy Ghost speaking in and by the Word--imparting to it virtue, power, efficacy, majesty, and authority--affords us the witness that our faith is resolved into....The Spirit's communication of his own light and authority to the Scripture, as evidence of its original, is the testimony pleaded for. ¹

In these affirmations of work of the Spirit in authenticating Scripture, the Puritan writers are careful to keep the emphasis on the Spirit in balance with that on the Word, and the former never receives the exclusive stress that is implied in Quaker writings. The weight begins to be shifted in the direction of the Scriptures, however, in Owen's contention that the Spirit's testimony by and through the Scriptures gives them a self-authenticating character, which he outlines explicitly:

In the same Word, we have both the authority of the testimony of the Spirit and the self-evidence of the truth spoken by him; yea, so that both these are materially one and the same, though distinguished in their formal conceptions. ²

This same line of reasoning is pursued by Eaton when he asserts that "Scripture it self ought to be its own interpreter", for the sense and meaning has been placed in the

1. Ibid., p. 328.

2. Ibid.

Scriptures by the prophets and apostles. Thus, although "they gave out the sense in some places more darkly, in other places more clearly", it is possible that

the sense and meaning may be taken up (at least in all the great Points of Faith) if Scriptures be compared with each other; And they have not left them to us, nor to any others, to give the sense of them,...but that which is left to us, is, to find out the sense and meaneing which they have put, ¹

From the premise that the Spirit spoke by the Scriptures, and gave its testimony through the Word, the conclusion naturally followed that the best interpreter of Scripture was Scripture itself.

The necessity and method of interpretation were, therefore, cardinal points in the Puritan position, and both factors are concisely outlined by Richard Sherlock:

The sense and meaning of the Scripture is involved and infolded in it, even as the kernel of a nut is within the shell, to finde out which sense, and declare it, and make it appear from under those several kindes of metaphorical and figurative expressions which commonly clothes and cover it, is part of our task and duty; ²

Sherlock says that this task is carried out by a serious weighing and pondering of the texts, "and also [by] flying unto God by prayer and devotion for assistance in the work".³

1. S. Eaton, op.cit., p. 4.

2. R. Sherlock, The Quakers Wilde Questions, pp. 6-7.

3. Ibid.

While the need for spiritual guidance in interpreting Scripture was generally assumed by the Puritans as an integral part of interpretation, in the controversy with the Quakers the more rational side of the exegetical task seemed to receive greater emphasis. Sherlock adduces several Scriptural examples of learned men interpreting Scripture, (Neh.8:4-8, Luke 4:17-22, Acts 8:30-37) and points out that those who only know English came to "know anything in the Scripture" through men who have studied the original tongues in which the Bible was written. Therefore, on the issue of knowing the Scriptures, Sherlock concludes:

as by learned men they are translated; so
by learned men, who understand both the
Translation and the Original, are most
fully and clearly understood. ¹

To the Puritan, the acceptance of divine assistance in the work of interpreting the Scripture does not obviate the necessity of human learning, especially with regard to the knowledge of the Biblical languages.

While these arguments of Sherlock, Eaton, and Owen, represent the general norm in the Puritan position on the interpretation of Scripture, the more exclusive emphasis on the sufficiency of Scripture alone for its own interpretation should also be noted. The end-point in the progressively exclusive emphasis on the self-authenticating character of Scripture is unequivocally stated in the

1. Ibid., p. 23.

assertion by Jeremiah Ives that "a man might understand the Scriptures without the Spirit of God". In explaining this statement, however, Ives points out that he was not here referring to the whole of Scriptures:

...though all the Mysteries of the Kingdom of God and Christ could not be understood without Gods Spirit, which the Scripture saith shall lead into all truth; yet much of the Scripture might be understood by men that had not the Spirit; ¹

As examples of such passages that could be understood without the Spirit, Ives mentions some of the Commandments, e.g., "Thou shalt not kill", and the prophecy that Christ would be born in Bethlehem. Although Ives insists that the sum total of the things contained in the Scripture cannot be known without the Spirit, the principle that some portions could be understood without the Spirit was a marked deviation from the normal Puritan view of the conjunction of Spirit and Word. When the issue became one of the primacy of Spirit or Word, however, the direction of Ives' argument is indicative of the main section of Puritan thought, as will be seen shortly.

From the outline already given of the Quaker view of the Spirit as essential for knowing the Scriptures, the Quaker reply to these various Puritan arguments can readily be surmised. For the Quakers, human learning was not a necessary supplement to the inspiration of the Spirit, and

1. J. Ives, op.cit., pp. 11-12.

no Scripture could be understood without the Spirit. The Puritan and Quaker views are succinctly expressed in a reply by Fox to a Puritan opponent:

Prin. He saith, The Scriptures may be understood by the helpe of Tongues,...

Ans. All Scriptures was given forth by inspiration; and so without the same inspiration it is not understood again. Pilate had the Tongues, and yet did not understand the Scripture, nor Christ the substance of it. ¹

Hubberthorne makes a similar point in replying to Sherlock:

The Scribes and Pharisees were learned men, and they could not open the Scriptures; Peter an unlearned man, he opened the Scriptures. ²

The Quaker view of human learning and reason as mere "fleshly knowledge" has been noted in the previous chapter, and a similar criticism is directed against the study of the ancient languages. To an opponent who contended that "No man can be a good text man unlesse he have attained to the Languages which hath cost us so much", Fox replied: "let them get all the Languages upon the earth, they are still but naturalists; and men learning another mans natural Language". ³ The dispute is aptly summarized in Fox's quotation and rebuttal of Sherlock's argument:

Pr. ...The Scripture was given forth in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latine,...and to attain spiritual wisdom by depending upon miraculous Revelations from heaven, is

1. G.M., p. 84. Cf. Ibid., p. 242: "Pilate was a learned man, and had Hebrew, Greek and Latine, and knew not the sence of the Scripture".

2. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 9.

3. G.M., p. 114. (Misnumbered 154).

attempting [sic] the good Spirit of God.
Answ. And here he is contrary to the
 Apostle, what he had received from the
 Lord he declared, ...no one knowes the
 Son but by Revelation, nor the Father,
 nor the Scripture, not a Hebrew, nor a
 Greek, nor a Latinist, but they that
 think to find it out by natural Languages,
 are in the temptation from the Spirit of
 God... 1

Fox also rejects Ives' contention that some parts of Scrip-
 ture can be known without the Spirit:

The Scriptures was given forth from the
 spirit of God,...and they are not known
 nor understood, but by the spirit of God
 again, for there is a spirituall under-
 standing. Neither can they understand
 any of the Scripture of truth,...but by
 the spirit of God within that gave them
 forth, which is of God of whom they were
 learned. 2

Nayler gives an even more forthright answer to the principle
 that Scripture is to be interpreted by Scripture:

The Holy Ghost, where he is, needs no
 Scripture to interpret Scripture by,
 who give forth all the Scripture, and
 opens it again; for the Holy Ghost did
 not give out the Scripture in Parables
 to its own Seed, but to them that are
 without: 3

According to Nayler, the sense of Scripture is dark and un-
 certain only to those who do not have the Spirit; those
 who have the Spirit do not need to explain difficult pas-
 sages, for to such persons the Spirit speaks through the

1. Ibid., p. 244.

2. Ibid., p. 62.

3. J. Nayler, op.cit., p. 122.

Scriptures clearly and unambiguously. Thus Nayler concludes:

And when any, in whom the Spirit was, have made Use of Scripture in such like Cases, [i.e., to interpret Scripture] it hath not been to open the Meaning to themselves, but to convince others, who had not the Spirit, or would not own it. ¹

From this it appears that, while the Puritans tended to disrupt the balance of Word and Spirit in favor of the Scriptures, the Quakers clearly tended toward an exclusive emphasis in the other direction. If a Puritan could argue that Scripture can sometimes be understood without the Spirit, the Quaker could contend that Scripture need not be compared with and interpreted by other Scriptures. Thus the Quakers tended to look askance at the work of interpretation per se, as the following query by some anonymous Quakers indicates:

Querie 2. Whether the Apostles did give a right meaning to the Scriptures when they gave them forth, or left them to you to give a meaning to them, yea or no? ²

Another anonymous Quaker strongly reprimands Eaton for saying that men must interpret the sense of Scripture:

...the Scriptures were of no private interpretation, nor came by the will of man,

1. Ibid.

2. "The Quakers Queries", in S. Eaton, op.cit., pages unnumbered.

which thou in thy will art giving senses
unto, who sayest, it is left to you to
find out the sense and meaning, ¹

The same writer also rejects Eaton's statement that "the letter contains contradictions", replying that "there is no contradictions in it, but the contradictions is in thy self".² This Quaker attitude regarding interpretation is illustrated in a second query: "Whether the Plagues be not added to him, that adds to the Prophecy of the things written in this Book",³ for, as an early anti-Quaker writer noted, Quaker doctrine held that the exposition and expounding of the Scripture was an adding to it.⁴ From the principle that the understanding of the Scripture comes solely through the Spirit, the Quaker concluded that the task of interpretation--by human learning--was unnecessary.

This conclusion was, of course, firmly denied by the Puritans. Eaton insists that "the interpreting of Scripture is not adding to it, so long as it is not any private interpretation that is given",⁵ and another Puritan writer elaborates on the same point when, agreeing that adding to the Bible is forbidden, he goes on to deny that

1. Anon., An Answer to...Samuel Eaton, p. 10.

2. Ibid.

3. G. Fox and R. Hubberthorne, Truth's Defence, p. 9.
Cf. Rev. 22:18-19.

4. F. Higginson, A Brief Relation of the Irreligion of the Northern Quakers, p. 4.

5. S. Eaton, op.cit., p. 5.

this injunction is to be applied to the exposition of Scripture:

...the expounding and opening of it, by the Light of the Spirit of God given in, comparing it with other Scriptures, is not that which brings the curse, for then the Apostle himself would have been under it. 1

Perhaps the most thoroughgoing defense of the necessity of interpretation is that contained in Owen's treatise against the Quakers, whom he describes as rejecting all interpretation, regardless of the method employed.² According to Owen, the Quakers are not only against such methods of interpreting as comparing diverse places, examining words and phrases, etc., but they begin by rejecting interpretation in itself:

Primò ideo, ulli homini, sacras Scripturas interpretari, vel ullam earum partem, vel sensum ejus exponere, vel quae sit mens Spiritus Sancti in verbis quae scripta legimus, aliis verbis enarrare, fas esse negant. 3

Against this Quaker viewpoint Owen outlines a series of arguments for the propriety and necessity of the task of interpreting the Scripture. These arguments may be summarized as follows: the need for translation is obvious, hence a study must be made of the words themselves ("verborum");

1. G. Camelford, as quoted in G. Fox and R. Hubberthorne, op.cit., p. 9. Camelford cites I Cor.9:9f, Rom.4:3,6, Rom.11:3ff.

2. J. Owen, Works, XVI. 440.

3. Ibid., XVI. 445.

the interpretation of the subject matter ("rerum") contained in the Scripture is needed in order to show forth the declaration of the divine mind contained in Scripture; since we are rational creatures, able to acquire and use words, we must study it carefully and assiduously; not all have immediate revelation, for even in Biblical times not all were apostles or prophets; Timothy and the early Christians were urged to meditate on and study the Scriptures; for this work Christ himself appointed ministers; God has revealed his will by means of the Scriptures "ut necessitatem interpretationis in ecclesia continuandae, quamdiu ipsum verbum continetur",¹ Finally, Owen grants that since all Scripture is "Θεόπνευστος", "Scripturam interpretari posse, si modo interpretes sint Θεόπνευστοι", but he explains that the Spirit is not needed in the same degree for the interpreting as for the original giving forth of Scripture.² In the latter case, only he who was born by the Holy Spirit could reveal the depths of God's mind and will; but after the original revelation has been set down in Scripture, and only the interpretation of it is involved, the matter stands otherwise: "ut quis, autem, veritatem in scripturis revelatam aliis exponat, satis est, si *χαρίσματι* aliis πνευματικοῖς sit instructus".³ To

1. Ibid., XVI. 450. Cf. XVI. 446-451.

2. Ibid., XVI. 451.

3. Ibid.

Owen and his fellow Puritans, the possession of the Spirit did not render the interpretation of Scripture needless, for, as we have seen, the Puritans firmly maintained that present-day believers do not possess the Spirit in the same degree as did the writers of Scripture. Interpretation of Scripture was, therefore, permissible, indeed an essential and God-given task, according to Puritan thought.

When the main facets of the Quaker doctrine of the Scripture are brought together, the Puritan charge that the Quakers do not properly "own" Scripture comes as no surprise. From the Quaker refusal to call Scripture the Word of God, the opposition between Letter and Spirit, the insistence that Scripture can be understood only through the Spirit, and the discarding of human interpretation, the Puritans quickly concluded that the Quaker attitude toward Scripture was dangerously defective. We have discussed the accusation that Quaker doctrine is a direct forsaking of the Scriptures; we now note the more complex charge that the Quakers used the Scriptures hypocritically and deceptively. One Puritan pamphlet begins by announcing:

It is not denied but the Quakers are pretended friends to the Scriptures, and do often tell us that they own them:... [But I shall demonstrate that] the Quakers are indeed real enemies to the Scriptures, whilst they would seeme to be friends; 1

Baxter puts the case more forcefully in a query to the

1. J. Clapham, op.cit., p. 1.

Quakers:

Is it not damnable Hypocrisie in these wretches, to prate so much of Scripture, and call for Scripture, while they thus deny it to be Gods Word? 1

Jeremiah Ives gives even stronger vent to his feelings, asking whether it is not plain that

...the designe of this generation is, to do by the Scriptures as Judas did by Christ, viz. betray them with a kiss, even by making men believe they do own the Scriptures, when indeed it is, that they may have the fairer opportunity to crucifie them in the croud [sic] of their pernicious Pamphlets? 2

The reference to the Quakers' "pernicious Pamphlets" involves the Puritan assertion that the Quakers "equal their books and pamphlets...to the holy Scriptures".³ One of the earliest anti-Quaker tracts says that the Quakers call their own speakings a "declaration of the word (Christ) in them", and put them on "equall Authority with the holy Scriptures".⁴ Caffyn expostulates, "Oh how great are the self-exaltations of these men!", for they deny Scriptures, and set up their own writings as a discovery of the will of the Lord.⁵ Ives similarly charges that the Quakers devalue the Scrip-

1. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 30.

2. J. Ives, The Quakers Quaking, p. 9.

3. J. Clapham, op.cit., p. 8.

4. F. H [igginson], op.cit., p. 4.

5. M. Caffyn, The Deceived...Quakers Discovered, p. 19.

ture in order "to raise up the honour of their own Pamphlets", and in support of this contention, Ives lists Quaker writings bearing such titles as "The Royal law and Covenant of God", "The Word of the Lord", "A Word from the Lord". All of these titles, says Ives, are "equipollent [sic] to the Title we give the Scriptures, viz. The Word of God".¹ To the Puritan mind, the Quaker use of Scripture was only a pretense, which concealed an enmity to the Scripture that would not even stop short of putting Quaker writings on a par with the Scripture.

The Puritan criticism of the Quaker doctrine of the Scriptures culminates in the dispute concerning Scripture as the criterion and "standing Rule" by which all doctrines, controversies, and religious matters of any nature are to be judged. The Quaker assertion which created the deepest cleavage between the Puritan and Quaker doctrines of the Scripture was that quoted by Caffyn: "The Quaker saith that the Scriptures are not a touchstone to try Spirits withall".² This statement heralds the crucial battle in the struggle over the problem of the ultimate authority for religion. The decisive question for the epistemological basis of both Quaker and Puritan theology was whether the final criterion and "touchstone" was to be the Spirit or the Scripture. The

1. J. Ives, op.cit., pp. 7-8.

2. M. Caffyn, op.cit., p. 27.

various arguments outlined in these first three chapters may be regarded as a preparation for this question, and the contrasting Puritan and Quaker answers represent the logical outcome of the controversy traced thus far. The main direction of these answers may be indicated in a brief exchange between Fox and a Puritan opponent whom he quotes as saying:

...the Scriptures must try the spirits.
Answ. The spirit was before the Scriptures was; and the Jewes had the Scriptures, yet knew not Christ,...and that must try the spirits that gave forth Scriptures. ¹

In the juxtaposition of Scripture and Spirit, the Puritans generally gave primacy to the former, the Quakers generally to the latter.

While the issue of ultimate authority is a fundamental problem for the religious thought of any period, this problem assumed somewhat greater urgency for the controversialists with whom we are dealing because of the unsettled and schismatic nature of religious life in mid-seventeenth century England. As we have seen, both Quakers and Puritans held that Satan was especially active in the present time, and both traced the other's delusions largely to Satanic influence. In the context of the possibility and prevalence of error, Eaton voices a typically Puritan warning:

1. G.M., p. 245.

Upon this account it is that the Apostle John would not have every Spirit believed, but would have the spirits tryed whether they be of God; but how must they be tried unless by the Scriptures? for every one will pretend the Spirit, and there are many false Prophets who have the spirit of delusion, and are gone forth into the world; I Joh.4.1. 1

Bunyan is likewise concerned to distinguish the Spirit of Christ from the spirit of error, and he also appeals to Scripture as the proper criterion:

Therefore believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God, ...therefore have a care how thou receivest the voice that speaks to thee, but try whether they are according to the truth of God's word, as it is written, "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isa.viii.20.) 2

When we recall the Puritan doctrine of the perfection of Scripture, especially as it was developed by John Owen, it appears that such a doctrine could admit of nothing else but Scripture as the ultimate court of appeal, since nothing but Scripture perfectly declares the mind and will of God. Owen also runs the inverse argument, however, contending that the Scriptures are proven to be the perfect rule of faith partly because they are the touchstone by which we are commanded to try the spirits. In this argument, Owen also states that we have the freedom, indeed

1. S. Eaton, op.cit., p. 9.

2. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 85.

the absolute necessity of rejecting anything which does not agree with the Scriptures.¹

Further evidence of the Puritan emphasis upon the Word as the criterion comes from their criticism of the Quaker view to the contrary. Owen complains that the Quakers reject any legitimate end or purpose of the interpretation of Scripture, such as that of making truth manifest, and refuting heresies, errors, and false doctrines.² Owen also makes the following objection regarding the Quakers:

...negant Scripturas ordinariam, immotam,
perfectam, et stabilem cultus divini,
atque obedientiae nostrae ita regulam esse, 3

Baxter likewise brings the charge of devaluing the Scripture and finds in this a close parallel between Quakers and Papists:

The Papists say, It is not fit to be the Judge of Controversies, and so say the Quakers;...Could the Papists but get down the Regulating Authority of Scripture, they would think they had won the field; For they will not endure that all Spirits should be tried by the written Word, no more will the Quakers. 4

To the Puritan mind, there were few charges which could more readily disqualify the Quaker position than the accusa-

1. J. Owen, Works, XVI. 461.

2. Ibid., XVI. 445.

3. Ibid., XVI. 456.

4. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 26.

tion that the Quakers did not appeal to Scripture as the ultimate authority.

The Puritans could well be sensitive on this point, for the Quakers flatly rejected the characteristic Puritan portrayal of the Scriptures as the "rule". To all such descriptions of the Bible as the rule of life, the Saints' rule, or the rule for faith and doctrine, Fox gave essentially the same answer:

The Saints rule was the spirit that gave forth Scriptures; and the Word of God which fulfills the Scriptures, without him they can do nothing, if they have all Scriptures....And all they that have the Scriptures, and not the spirit that gave them forth, they are on heaps about words, and wants the rule. ¹

This argument that the Spirit is the rule is often supported by the contention that the saints who lived before the Scriptures were written "had a rule,...and they knew Christ more than the Pharisees that had the Scriptures"; and the Spirit which was the rule then is the rule now, for "that which ruled the Saints before the Scriptures was written, is the Saints rule after the Scriptures is written".² The first clause of this quotation recalls the frequent Quaker assertion that all may have the Scriptures, but all do not thereby have the Spirit, and from this it is argued that Scripture is not the rule to try spirits by, since both

1. G.M., p. 152.

2. Ibid., p. 120.

the true and the false minister may have the Scripture--
"the Form and letter".¹

In denying the Scriptures to be the rule whereby religious matters are to be judged, the Quakers went on to claim the sanction both of Christ and the Scripture itself. Thus Fox quotes and rejects the following statement:

Pr. ...Christ himselfe sent his hearers to the Scriptures, as the chiefe judge of Controversie, and of Faith.

Answ. Christ did not put the Scriptures above himselfe; he said, All judgement was committed to the Son, and for judgement he was come into the world. ²

Similarly, Burrough, on being told that he will "be judged by the word that Christ spake", replies:

...here thou sets the Scripture in the room of Christ,...for the Scripture saith, all judgement is committed to the Son, and the Scripture is not the Son; and thou didst say..., that the Scripture shall judge the world;...thou art a Blasphemer, who exalts the Scripture above the Son of God, and shalt be judged by the Son... ³

This Quaker contrast between Christ and the Scriptures is, however, relatively infrequent in comparison with the opposition between Scripture and Spirit. Thus Fisher is giving the dominant Quaker view when he says,

1. T. Lawson, An Untaught Teacher Witnessed against, p. 14.

2. G.M., p. 127.

3. E. Burrough, Works, p. 57.

...the Scripture it self bids us walk in,
 by, after, or according to the Spirit,
 therefore the Scripture sends us to another
 besides it self as our Rule, and consequently
 is not (it self) the only standing Rule of
 Faith and Life: ¹

We have seen in the Introduction that this viewpoint caused one of Fox's earliest controversies, when he fervently denied a preacher's statement that the sure word of prophecy was the Scripture, by which all opinions were to be tried, and declared, instead, that it was the Holy Spirit, "whereby opinions, religions, and judgments were to be tried".² This particular dispute was to be repeated many times, with Fox and the First Publishers insisting again and again that the touchstone by which the spirits were to be judged was not Scripture but the Spirit. On being exhorted to "Try their own hearts by Scriptures", the Quakers would habitually answer with Fox, "They that tryed their hearts, it was by the spirit of the Lord".³

While this was the customary Quaker answer, it did not represent the Quaker position in its entirety, for their emphasis on the primacy of Spirit did not entail a complete rejection of Scripture as a criterion for things religious. Burrough stoutly contradicts the argument that the Quakers "deny the Trial" (by Scripture), insisting:

1. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 449.

2. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I. 43.

3. G.M., pp. 252-253.

for we deny not a Trial, but exhort People thereunto, that they search the Scripture, to see whether these things be not so, and [we] are tried by the Scriptures in Doctrine and Conversation, and proved to be simple thereby, to be in the Truth as it is in Jesus,... 1

Nor is this a rare point with Burrough, for in one of his earliest writings he asserts,

But...I say, let any try us, in our lives and in our practices, and if we speak or act contrary to the Scripture, judge us by it; 2

Furthermore, the Quakers themselves often brought their opponents to trial by the Scriptures. Nayler complains that Baxter will not let himself be tried by his own standing rule, viz, the Scriptures,³ and Fox sends the following challenge to the "priests and professors" who were opposing the "light of Christ Jesus", and "the pouring forth of the Spirit":

I offer you some Scriptures to read, which will prove your spirits, and try them, how contrary they are to the apostles' spirit, the Spirit of Christ and of the saints. 4

Fox goes on to give several pages of quotations and expositions of texts, all of which are intended to disprove his opponents' position. Again, Burrough uses the same tactic in a query to one of his disputants:

1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 159.

2. Ibid., p. 24.

3. J. Nayler, An Answer to a Book called The Quakers Catechism, p. 37.

4. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., p. 350.

Whether wilt thou stand to be tried in thy Ministry, in thy Call to it, Practice in it, and Maintenance of it, by and according to the Scriptures of the old and new Testament? and wilt thou admit of tryal of thy Church, and Worship, and Ministry thereby? ¹

Burrough adds that if this is agreed, the Quakers will "suffer the like tryal in any part, and every part of our Religion".

We have seen that the Puritans noted and criticized this Quaker use of Scripture, contending that although they were really "enemies" to the Scripture, nevertheless the Quakers "prated" much about it, and called for Scripture to prove their point. To the Puritan, the Quakers not only used Scripture hypocritically, but they perverted and "wrested" its meaning to suit their own ends. This prevalent Puritan contention may be summed up in the following statement about the Quakers:

And though they often quote the Scriptures, Yet, 1. it is but partially, And 2. not as the ground of their faith, But 3. chiefly as a staff to beat others with, or to shoot with them in their own bow. ²

For their part, however, the Quakers were not so hostile or indifferent to the Scriptures as to let such criticism pass uncontested, and to a writer who reproves the Quakers for "wresting the Scripture", Burrough replies:

Wresting is thy own, and not ours, for we take the Scripture in plain words, without adding or diminishing, as our enemies shall witness for us. ³

1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 634.

2. C. Feake, et.al., A Faithful Discovery, p. 7.

3. E. Burrough, Works, p. 143.

Throughout these chapters it has been seen that on key points of doctrine the Quakers could cite their Scriptural texts as intransigently as did the Puritans, and when we come to such Quaker practices as using "plain" language, refusing to take oaths, to give or sanction church tithes, or to call anyone "Master", we shall see that the opponents of the Quakers again witnessed the insistent and unequivocal Quaker advocacy of the Scriptures. In this we may conclude with a Quaker scholar that "in their controversial use of the Bible, they [the early Quakers] practically accepted the position of their opponents".¹

As we have seen, however, the Puritan position itself was not unambiguous with regard to the issue of the Scripture and the Spirit as the ultimate basis of religion, for the importance of the Spirit was never completely neglected by the Puritan writers. Therefore, in summing up the dissimilar Quaker and Puritan answers to the problem of authority, it is to be noted that while the two views were dissimilar and largely antithetical, they were not mutually exclusive. The Quaker and Puritan views of the nature of religious authority both started from the same presupposition, viz., that the primary requisite for any such authority was that it have a supernatural basis. Quakers and Puritans alike rejected any revelation or mode of knowing God which was only "natural",

1. A. N. Brayshaw, The Quakers: Their Story and Message, p. 46.

and both insisted upon supernatural revelation as the only valid method of knowing God. Given this common presupposition, the conflict began when the Quakers maintained that immediate and supernatural revelation is possible in the present day; this the Puritans denied, holding that the teaching of God is now mediated through the Scriptures, which thus become the standing rule for faith and doctrine, as well as the touchstone by which spirits are to be judged. But although the Quakers affirmed that without the inner presence of the Light or Spirit of Christ, any religion--and the Scriptures themselves--were dead and useless, nevertheless they also rejected any doctrine or practice which they deemed to be contrary to the Scriptures. If not the primary authority, the Scriptures were, for the Quakers, a valid and essential secondary authority, and neither their opponents nor they themselves were allowed to contradict this authority. On the other hand, while the Puritans upheld the Scriptures as the primary authority, this view was based upon the insistence that God spoke in the Scriptures by the Holy Spirit: the Word was authoritative because it was the vehicle of the Spirit.

We may conclude with two quotations which give the characteristic and dual nature of both the Puritan and Quaker answers to the problem of authority. Fox writes in his Journal, speaking of his openings:

These things I did not see by the help of man, nor by the letter, though they are written in the letter, but I saw them in

the light of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by his immediate Spirit and power, as did the holy men of God, by whom the Holy Scriptures were written. Yet I had no slight esteem of the holy Scriptures, but they were very precious to me, for I was in that Spirit by which they were given forth; and what the Lord opened in me, I afterwards found was agreeable to them. ¹

From such Quaker emphasis on the primacy of the Spirit, Baxter concludes that the Quakers "give us their Doctrine on a new Authority within them" which is either "above or before the Scripture Authority". But Baxter bases his teaching on the "Authority of Scripture":

And therefore whether we were Ministers or no, you have reason to believe us, when we prove our Doctrine to be from God, as delivered by Apostles in Scripture, and Sealed by the Spirit: ²

We have seen that in the course of the vigorous and often virulent controversy, the Puritans tended to lay more exclusive emphasis on the Scriptures, the Quakers on the Spirit. Thus, the Puritans could affirm simply that the touchstone was the Scripture; the Quakers could affirm with equal tenacity that the touchstone was the Spirit.

1. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., p. 36.

2. R. Baxter, One Sheet Against the Quakers, p. 12-13.

CHAPTER FOUR

Christological and Eschatological Disputes

Throughout the entire discussion on the problem of authority and the nature of revelation the Quaker arguments usually resolve themselves into a single theme: the Quaker position constantly proclaims the withinness of religion. Divine revelation must be received and appropriated by the believer, it must be recognized as being "within"; revelation, or the Divine Presence in any form, must ultimately find a dwelling place in the inner man, else religion is dead and lifeless. This dominant motif has several variations, as we have seen. The Quakers can speak of the anointing within, the teaching of God within, the Word within, the Light of Christ within, the indwelling Spirit. All of these phrases could be concluded under such a term as the Divine Presence within, and all point to some kind of a union between God and the individual believer. Thus far in the discussion, however, this union of the believer with God has been expressed rather indirectly by the Quakers: the teaching of God, the word of God, the Light of Christ, the Spirit of God. We now come to the explicit affirmation of immediate unity with God and Christ Himself. The theme of withinness will now express

itself in terms of the key phrase, "Christ within".

To the argument regarding Christ within, the question of God within appears as a brief but significant prelude, for it sounds a note that will be heard frequently in the sequel. This is the Puritan insistence on the transcendence of God, the radical otherness of the Divine, the essential and inviolable distinction between the Creator and his creatures. Viewed in the light of such conceptions, the Quaker affirmation that God dwells in the saints readily becomes suspect. The Puritan verdict, and the Quaker reply, is given succinctly in an exchange noted in Fox's The Great Mystery:

Pr. ...He saith, It is an expression of a darke deluded minde, to say that God is not distinguished from the Saints.

Ans. But God and Christ is in the Saints, and dwell in them, and walk in them; ¹

The more detailed argument of another opponent draws a fuller response from Fox:

Pr. He saith God is distinct in his being, and blessedness from all Creatures; And that God who is the Creator is eternally distinct from all creatures....

Answ. God is a spirit, and he dwells in his Saints, and the heaven of heavens cannot contain him; In him we live, and move, and have our being, who is in all, and through all, and over all, God blessed for ever. And the spirit of the Father speakes in the Saints, and he makes his abode with them; And the Saints have fellowship with the Father, and the Son, so not distinct; so these keep people from unity with God, and out of his knowledge,... ²

1. G.M., p. 16.

2. Ibid., p. 174.

Unity with God was, for Fox and his followers, the lifeblood of religion, for "while any are separated from the Lord it is their misery"; but "they that have unity with God, they have unity with his blessing" and know God's blessedness.¹ The Puritan, of course, was hardly advocating the opposite opinion, and would sincerely commend the realization of fellowship with God. But the Puritan, holding a strong doctrine of God's transcendence, could not but protest at the simple Quaker assertion that God is in the saint.

The issue of God's indwelling, however, was raised as such by only a few voices, and was quickly over-shadowed by the correlative issue of Christ within. Here the Puritan pointed to the essential distinction existing between the human believer and the person of Christ. Fox found this viewpoint expressed by Bunyan and his Baptist colleagues, whose argument Fox quotes and answers:

Pr. And they say, God hath a Christ distinct from all other things whatsoever, whether they be spirits or bodies.

Answ. Gods Christ is not distinct from his Saints, nor his bodies, for he is within them: nor distinct from their spirits, for their spirits witness him. ²

To Bunyan, the Quaker doctrine of Christ within was a "false faith",³ and to other Puritans it was delusion, deception, and "a bewitching of the mindes".⁴ A similarly negative judg-

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid., p. 207.

3. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 49.

4. G.M., p. 17.

ment is recorded and rebutted by Fox:

Pr. He saith, It is blasphemy to say that Christ is in them as God and man, &c....

Ans. How are they of his flesh and bone? And doth not the Scripture say, Christ in you, and God will dwell in you, and walk in you? And are not the Saints of his flesh and of his bone? And are they not partakers of the divine nature? ¹

To the Quaker there was nothing blasphemous or false about the doctrine of Christ within, and Fox was so far from conceiving Christ as essentially "distinct" from Christian believers that he could affirm them to be "of his flesh and of his bone".

But the above quotation carries the argument beyond the question of the possibility of Christ's indwelling, and raises a twofold problem regarding the manner or nature of the union of Christ and the saints. Is it the bodily Christ, as "God and man" that dwells within the believer? And is it in the flesh and body of the believer that Christ dwells? The conflicting Puritan and Quaker answers to the first question are summed up in the following interchange:

Pr. He saith, Christ is without his Saints in respect of his bodily presence.

Answ. How then are they of his flesh and of his bone, and eat his flesh, and drink his blood? And how have the Saints his minde and spirit, and he with them, and they with him, ...Ye poor Apostates from him, who feels not Christ with you, but he is with the Saints, and they feel him. ²

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid., p. 222.

The Quaker was ready to affirm both that Christ was within the saints as regards His bodily presence, and that the flesh as well as the spirit of the saints was united with Christ. Thus Fox describes the twofold nature of Christ's indwelling in a reply to another opponent:

Pr. He saith, It is not properly, and absolute in a full sense that God is manifest, or glorified in the flesh of his Saints,...

Ans. The Saints are the Temples of God, and God dwels in them, and walks in them; and they come to witnesse the flesh of Christ, and they glorifie him in their souls and bodies,... 1

Finally, a brief verbal clash between the same writer and Fox gives the opposing answers to the second question alone:

Prin. He saith, Christ is absent from us while wee are in the mortall body.

Answ. Contrary to the Apostle, who saith, the life of Christ is manifest in their mortall flesh. 2

The Puritans thus rejected this conception of bodily union between Christ and the believer, and upheld instead a union which they conceived to be solely spiritual. Christ is not united with the saints' bodies in His bodily presence. The union is between the Spirit of Christ and the human spirit. "Christs dwelling in his people now is by his Spirit, and not according to his humane nature", wrote Jonathan Clapham,³ and in this opposition to Quaker doctrine he is joined, among others, by John Bunyan. Taking a favorite Quaker text as

1. Ibid., p. 135.

2. Ibid.

3. J. Clapham, A Discovery of the Quakers Doctrine, p. 14.

his own, Bunyan explains that "the cause of believers' hope is this, Christ, or the Spirit of Christ, in them, the hope of glory".¹ Where Fox and the Quakers took "Christ in you" simply and fully as "Christ within", Bunyan and the Puritans took it as "the Spirit of Christ within". Fox held that those were reprobates who did not have Christ within; Bunyan defined a reprobate as one who did not have the Spirit of Christ.² The Puritan viewpoint is perhaps best expressed by John Burton's introductory epistle to Bunyan's first treatise against the Quakers:

In this book thou hast also laid down from the Scriptures, how Jesus Christ is without the saints as man, and yet dwelleth within them; that is, something of his divine nature or his blessed Spirit dwells within them, which spirit is sometimes called the Spirit of Christ, (Rom.viii.9,) "He that hath not the Spirit of Christ," &c.; and sometimes called Christ, "If Christ be in you," &c. (Rom.viii.10.)³

It need only be added that vis-a-vis the Quaker conception of Christ within, Bunyan constantly emphasized the terminology of Romans 8:9.

Although the Quakers could also refer with equal vigor to the Spirit of Christ dwelling within the believer, they did not hesitate to join issue with the Puritan rejection of the bodily aspect of Christ's indwelling. Burrough gives an emphatic answer to one of Bunyan's queries:

1. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 50. Cf. Col.1:27.

2. Ibid., pp. 49-50.

3. Ibid., p. 54.

Qu. 5. Is that very Man, with that very Body, within you, yea or nay?

Answ. The very Christ of God is within us, we dare not deny him; and we are Members of his Body, and of his Flesh, and of his Bone, as the Ephesians were: ¹

Similarly, Thomas Lawson insists that the Quakers own no other Christ to be in them than He who stood before Pilate: it was not his Spirit, but Christ Himself, who was in Paul and in the saints, and in all who are not reprobates.² The Quaker viewpoint is well expressed by the fact that Hubberthorne lists the following among the erroneous principles of a Puritan writer: "That Christ may dwell in his people by his special spiritual preference and have no union with them".³ The Quaker was not satisfied with a purely spiritual conception of Christ's indwelling; he insisted on expressing the union between Christ and believer in terms of body and flesh, as well as of soul and spirit.⁴

1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 149. Cf. Eph. 5:30.

2. T. Lawson, An Untaught Teacher Witnessed against, p. 11.

3. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, pp. 44-45.

4. It is questionable whether the Quakers were here using the terms "flesh" and "body" in a strictly literal sense, since this would be inconsistent with their polemic against the terms "humane", "fleshly", "carnal body", all of which they strongly opposed to "spirit". Hence, while Fox repeatedly speaks of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, his basic meaning is contained in his rhetorical question, "And is it an earthly body the Saints eats, when they eat the flesh of Christ?" (G.M., p. 102, my italics.) The Quakers' chief concern was with the realization and acknowledgment of a vital, full, and all-embracing union with Christ. This concern would allow no qualifications or restrictions, not even that of "spiritual" union: the real Christ, body and spirit, was fully present within the believer. In this early period, the logical implications of this religious affirmation were never worked out by Quaker writers.

In view of this Quaker insistence on the bodily aspect of Christ's indwelling, it seems rather strange that the Quakers were frequently charged with denying the Humanity of Christ. But to many of the Puritan controversialists this denial was a logical consequence of Quaker doctrine: "To say, Christ is within, is never to mention Christ without".¹ This argument is repeated in many forms, but its basic thesis is best expressed by Bunyan writing against Edward Burrough. Says Bunyan:

You profess you own Christ within, but withal, with that doctrine you will smite against the doctrine of Christ Jesus in his person without, and deny that, though that is a truth, as is also the other. 2

Such a charge was, of course, sharply resented by the Quakers. In his reply to the above, Burrough calls it a "deceitful Slander", and goes on to affirm that the Quakers own Christ "which was, is, and is to come, who is within us, and without us".³ Fox also gives answer to Bunyan, insisting that "to witness Christ within, is not to deny him come in the flesh, but to witness him".⁴ Nevertheless, Fox and the First Publishers continued to be accused of denying the Humanity of Jesus, and to the Puritan this error was only one of many to be found in Quaker Christology. Thus Clapham writes, "The

1. G.M., p. 217.

2. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 113.

3. E. Burrough, Works, p. 282.

4. G.M., p. 205.

Quakers deny Christ come in the flesh, as also his Death, Resurrection, Ascension, Intercession, and coming to Judgment".¹ In each of these areas, as we shall see, the Puritan judged the Quaker view to be fatally infected by the doctrine of Christ within.

With regard to the problem of the Incarnation per se, however, the controversy was beset by a difficulty which was partially semantic and which tended to bring discussion to an impasse. The Quakers asserted their belief in the Humanity of Christ, but objected strongly to the word "humane". On the mention of "Christ's humane nature", Fox on one occasion retorts:

Where doth the Scriptures speak of humane, the word humane? where is it written? tell us that we may search for it. Now we do not deny that Christ according to the flesh was of Abraham, but not the word humane. And Christ's nature is not humane, which is earthly, for that is the first Adam. 2

Fox elsewhere gives further reason for his derogation of the word under dispute, this time in response to the statement that "Christ hath a humane reasonable soul".

And is not a humane soul, earthly? for you say that Christ had a humane soul, and is not humane earthly? and hath a humane body, and is not a humane body an earthly body? Is not his body of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh? and is not his body a glorified body? was not the first man of the earth, earthly, and had an humane body, the second man the Lord from heaven? 3

1. J. Clapham, op.cit., p. 10.

2. G.M., p. 71.

3. Ibid., p. 99. On Christ's "glorified body" cf. below pp. 198-203.

The sharp dichotomy between flesh and spirit, earthly and heavenly, which is implicit in Fox's reply will emerge much more forcefully in the Quaker interpretation of the Crucifixion, Resurrection and Ascension. This assumed incompatibility between the human and the spiritual is already evident, however, in Fox's answer to the following assertion:

Pr. That Christ hath a carnall humane body, united to his divinity.

Ans. And carnall humane is from the ground, humane earthly, the first Adams body, and Christ was not from the ground,...but he was from heaven, his flesh came down from above,...his flesh came downe from heaven. 1

This conception of the Humanity of Christ was shared and expressed by other early Quakers as well as by Fox. In the long Nayler-Ives dispute, Ives accuses Nayler of trying to cover up his "heresy" of denying the flesh of Christ by making a distinction: "viz. That it was one thing for Christ to be born after the flesh, and another thing to be born according to the flesh."² Nayler supports his case by arguing that Christ was born not of the flesh, but of the Spirit, since that which is born after the flesh is flesh:

Neither was Christ as he was born of Mary, born after the flesh, but by promise begotten and brought forth, though he was true and holy flesh in the likenesse of sinfull flesh, but not sinfull flesh being begotten not of sinfull flesh, but of the Holy Ghost, by the word of the promise, which word became flesh, but is not after the flesh, 3

1. Ibid., p. 322.

2. J. Ives, The Quakers Quaking, p. 53.

3. J. Nayler, Weaknes above Wickednes, p. 26. Nayler, like Fox, also speaks of Christ as he "that came down from Heaven".

But to Ives, Nayler's distinction is invalid, for "it is all one to deny Christ to be born after the flesh, as it is to deny him to be born according to the flesh".¹ Therefore, Ives concludes regarding Nayler, "what doth he less, than deny Christ to be made flesh, by the perverting those Scriptures, Joh.3. and Gal.4 whatever he saith to the contrary?"² To the Puritan, the refusal to predicate the word "humane" of the man Jesus Christ, and the implicit opposition between flesh and spirit, always seemed to render the Quaker affirmation of the Humanity of Christ both insincere and unreal.

If the derogation of "earthly" and "humane" seemed to undercut the Quakers' avowal of the Humanity of Christ, it appeared to leave little doubt regarding their assertion of Christ's Divinity. The statements, "Christs body is not carnall, but spirituall, the first man was of the earth earthly, the second man is the Lord from heaven heavenly",³ may seem to have docetic overtones, but they hardly point to an adoptionist Christology. The Quaker reluctance to describe Christ as human did not apply to the assertion of His Divinity; on the latter issue, Fox can give an emphatic and positive answer:

Pr. He saith, God the Father never took upon him humane nature.

Answ. Contrary to the Scripture, who saith, God was in Christ reconciling the world unto

1. J. Ives, op.cit., p. 53.

2. J. Ives, Innocency above Impudency, pp. 54-55. Cf. Joh.3:31, Gal.4:23.

3. G.M., p. 322.

himself, and art ignorant of the great mystery, God manifest in the flesh, and his name is called the everlasting Father. As for the word Humane,...it comes from thy own knowledge which is earthly; ¹

Another parry between an anti-Quaker writer and Fox leaves the Quakers' affirmation of the Divinity of Christ in no doubt whatsoever.

Pr. And you say, Far be it from you to say that Christ is equally God, &c....

Ans. And the Scriptures saith, He is the everlasting Father, and his name is called the Emmanuel, God with us: and his name is called the word, which is God, John 1. ²

Apart from these two quotations, the controversial literature, both Puritan and Quaker, is almost entirely silent with regard to the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ. This silence is nowhere more significant than in the Bunyan-Burrough exchanges, which represent perhaps the most extensive Christological discussion coming under our consideration. Although Bunyan devotes several pages to showing that "he, Christ, is very God, co-eternal, and also co-equal with his Father",³ he does so without making any reference to the Quakers; throughout both treatises against Burrough there is no sign of any allegation that the Quakers deny the Divinity of Christ. For Bunyan, the key Christological statement was the assertion, "God's Christ was, and is, true God and true man".⁴ Bunyan

1. Ibid., p. 246.

2. Ibid., p. 22.

3. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 61.

4. Ibid., I. 49.

and other Puritan writers severely criticized Quaker pronouncements dealing with the last phrase of this formula. The doctrine of Christ as "true God", on the other hand, was practically an undisputed issue.

This rapport, however, was short-lived, for while all agreed in affirming that God was in Christ, a sharp division arose over how this belief was to be expressed. Once again the Puritans spoke of distinction, while the Quakers spoke of oneness.

Pr. He saith, That Christ is a distinct being from the Father....

Answ. Christ is not distinct from the Father, for he and the Father is one; the Father is in him, and he is in the Father,.... 1

On the one hand it was said that "It is blasphemy to say the Son is one with the Father, and not distinct from him".² On the other hand, the Quaker could list among the erroneous opinions of his opponent, the proposition, "That Christ the eternal Son of God is distinct from the Father eternally".³ Moreover, the same argument applied to the Holy Spirit, for immediately following the above proposition, Hubberthorne notes two more questionable principles:

4. That the Spirit was distinguished from the Father and Son from eternity.

5. That the Father, Son, and Spirit, are three substances. 4

The Christological dispute thus merges into the Trinitarian problem.

1. G.M., p. 142.

2. Ibid., p. 293. Fox is quoting a "Priest Ferguson".

3. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, pp. 44-45.

4. Ibid.

In Quaker thought, the concept of oneness or unity was applied to the doctrine of the Trinity as well as to the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ. The Father, Son, and Spirit are not considered as three distinct beings, as Fox makes clear in his reply to an advocate of such a theory:

Pr. He said, The Father is a distinct incommunicable being from the Son, and the Son a distinct incommunicable being from the Father, and the holy Ghost a distinct incommunicable being from the Son.

Ans. The Son is one, and in unity with the Father, and not distinct, but equall, and thought it not robbery: The holy Ghost is in unity with the Son and the Father, which proceed from them, and they are one in unity, and not distinct. ¹

Furthermore, the Quakers also objected to the description of the Trinity in terms of three persons. Burrough states well the opposing Puritan and Quaker views:

The first thing that I take notice of, is this, thou sayst, God is a Spirit, and he is one in Beeing, and is to be distinguished into three Persons; and the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are Personal Relations;

Ans. The Father, Son, and Spirit is one; this we believe and know, according to the Scriptures; but as for thy word, Person, that is carnal and too low a word to denominate God by, who is Infinite; for God and the Spirit hath no Person, nor cannot truly be distinguished into Persons; for a person has relation to Place, Time and Change, and is not in all places at all times at once; ²

Burrough holds that God is omnipresent, ubiquitous, and infinite, "without Person, or confined Beeing"; he concludes

1. G.M., p. 293.

2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 484.

that the Scriptures nowhere designate God, Christ, and the Spirit as persons or personal beings, nor does Scripture "distinguish them into three Persons".¹

In the light of such statements it is not surprising that the Quakers were charged with denying the doctrine of the Trinity. Clapham, in making this charge, declares that it "will not be denied by the Quakers", for they openly state "they acknowledge not one God subsisting in three persons".² Another Puritan writer quotes Fox and Whitehead as saying, "We deny the term of three distinct Persons, which you call God the Father, God the Son, and God the holy Ghost".³ John Owen also brought this charge against the Quakers, and apparently came to view it as their fundamental error, the "fatal miscarriage" which underlay all other Quaker doctrines: "Convince any of them of the doctrine of the Trinity, and all the rest of their imaginations vanish into smoke".⁴

For their part, the Quakers were, in fact, quite prepared to admit that they denied the doctrine of the Trinity, but they would not classify this denial as error, blasphemy, or "fatal miscarriage". In addition to the rejection of the concept of three distinct persons, the Quaker view also rejected the word Trinity: "the Scriptures know no such word";⁵

1. Ibid.

2. J. Clapham, op.cit., p. 16.

3. T. Underhill, Hell broke loose, p. 45.

4. J. Owen, Works, III. 66.

5. E. Burrough, Works, p. 515.

"we have not read it in the Bible, but in the Common-prayer Book or Masse-book which the Pope was the Author of".¹ This assertion that the word Trinity--as well as the doctrine itself--is non-scriptural was, of course, forcefully resisted by the Puritans. Clapham devotes several pages to proving--albeit rather indirectly by "gradations or steps"--that the doctrine has its basis in Scripture,² but the Puritan argument here is best summarized by another writer:

If we find the word (Person) in one place, and the word (Three) in another; where Father, Word and Spirit are spoken of, it is enough to justify the use of the word (Trinity) and to prove the thing. ³

We may take as the Quaker conclusion to this discussion the reply given by Hubberthorne to Clapham's argument.

Answ. For a Trinity of persons, there is no such doctrine in the Scriptures, neither the word three Persons, nor Trinity,...This is a Tradition of men taught for a doctrine, but no doctrine; and in denying that, we do but deny Claphams tradition; but as for the Father, Word, and Spirit, which bear record in heaven, these three are one and was never separated eternally: ⁴

When we turn from the Trinitarian problem and the question of the Nature of Christ to the doctrine of the Work of Christ, the issue of Christ within is again at the center of the discussion. The charge that Quaker Christology

1. G.M., p. 99.

2. J. Clapham, op.cit., pp. 16ff.

3. J. Stalham, Marginall Antidotes, p. 5.

4. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 29.

fails to affirm the full Humanity of Christ now converges on the Crucifixion, and the Quakers are said to repudiate the objective reality of Jesus' death on the cross. Baxter speaks for many Puritans when he describes the Quakers as denying "that there is any such Person as Jesus Christ who suffered at Jerusalem;...and only somewhat within themselves by the Name of Christ".¹ Such an outright denial of the historical event of Calvary, however, was as abhorrent to the Quaker as it was to the Puritan, and Nayler bluntly calls Baxter's allegation "a lying slander".² Elsewhere, Nayler says that it is the Devil who teaches that "to wait for the Testimony or Witness within, is to deny Christ at Jerusalem", and that "to wait for...Christ within the Hope of Glory, is to deny the Person of Christ, and his Blood and Sufferings".³ Probably the most conclusive example of the Quaker view comes from a conversation in which Fox reproves and refutes a soldier who had said to him "thy faith stands in a man y^t dyed att Jerusalem & there was never any such thinge". Fox replied, "if hee did confesse there was a chiefe preist & Jews there outwardely: then hee must needs confesse y^t Christ was persecuted & suffered there outwardely under y^m". Fox then adds an explanatory note:

1. R. Baxter, The Quakers Catechism, p. 30.

2. J. Nayler, An Answer to a Book called The Quakers Catechism, p. 47.

3. J. Nayler, A Collection, p. 284.

& from this man & his Company was the
 slaunder raised upon us y^t ye Quakers
 shoulde deny Christ y^t (dyed &) suffered
 att Jerusalem: which was all utterly
 false: & never ye least thought of it
 in our heartes 1

Puritan criticism, however, was not silenced by the mere affirmation that the Quakers owned the Christ who died at Jerusalem, for it was contended that in this assertion the Quakers were referring not to the fleshly body of Jesus, but to the Spirit within Him. Matthew Caffyn is the chief proponent of this argument:

'tis owned by the Quakers, (and as to me hath plainly been declared) that the Eternal Spirit of Light and Power which dwelt in the Man whom the Jews Crucified, is the Christ,...and not the Man that was Crucified, that was seen with visible or carnal eyes; 2

Against such a spiritualized conception of the Crucifixion Caffyn places his own view, for which he claims apostolic sanction:

Now we cannot but know, that it was a fleshly, substantiall body of Christ, that they slew, murdered, and crucified upon the tree, and in so doing, the Apostles unanimously affirm that they slew Jesus, (which in English is saviour)... 3

Caffyn was answered by Whitehead and Fox, and again it was argued that the Quaker position had been misrepresented. Whitehead describes as a "slander" the charge that Quakers

1. Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 10-11.

2. M. Caffyn, "The Great Error and mistake of the Quakers", p. 38.

3. M. Caffyn, The Deceived...Quakers Discovered, p. 38.

deny Christ crucified in the flesh, maintaining to the contrary that "they confess that Christ was crucified, and died, as concerning the flesh, but was quickened by the Spirit".¹ But Fox's reply to the charge that the Quakers "owne Christ that suffered, meaning the Spirit within", leaves the issue of the physical nature of Christ's suffering unsettled--or simply assumes that "suffering" means physical suffering.

Answ. There is none knows Christ nor his suffering, but with the spirit of God within; for with the spirit of God in the Prophets,...they knew Christ that was to come to suffer; with the spirit of God in the Apostles, they knew that was the Christ that did suffer; 2

Once again, the persistent Quaker emphasis on the Spirit seemed to jeopardize the objective basis of Christian faith and doctrine. From the pronouncement that the Christ who suffered can now be seen and received only through the "spirit of God within people"³ it was inferred that Christ's crucifixion itself is a subjective reality, something that takes place "within". Thus the Quakers were accused of holding forth a Christ "crucified within". Assuming this to be genuine Quaker doctrine, Bunyan asks of his opponent, "What Scripture have you to prove that Christ is, or was crucified

1. G. Whitehead, The Pernicious Way of the Rigid Presbyter... Detected, p. 27. Cf. I Pet.3:18.

2. G.M., p. 142.

3. Ibid.

within you, dead within you, risen within you, and ascended within you?"¹ In his reply to Bunyan, Burrough gives answer to this query:

There is no Scriptures that mention any one of our particular names; and thy Query is raised from thy mis-understanding of us, so I judge; but Christ is within us, that we dare not deny; and he is the Lamb that was slain in the streets of the great City, which is spiritually called Sodom and Aegypt, (mind spiritually)... 2

The last phrase is taken up in Bunyan's counter reply to Burrough:

Now from the word "spiritually", thou wouldst willingly infer also, that Christ is and was crucified within, dead within, and risen within you, and therefore thou sayest, "mind, spiritually." 3

To Bunyan, this word reveals the Quaker's "spiritual wickedness", which would cover up his "heresy", for although Burrough "dare not speak plainly in so many words", his thoughts are evident from what he has said.⁴ Christ crucified within was judged by Bunyan to be a "new gospel",⁵ and one promulgated chiefly by the Quakers. From the tone of Fox's answer on this point, it can be seen why his denial of this charge would not entirely satisfy the demands of the Puritan controversialists.

1. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 86.

2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 149.

3. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 112.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., I. 49.

Answ. If Christ that's crucified be not within,...I say that you all are Reprobates;...and you have not eaten his flesh, neither are you of his bone, and this is not opposite to Jesus Christ without, that dyed at Jerusalem, but the same; for who eats his flesh has it within them, and this is not a new Gospel. 1

Given this dissatisfaction with the Quaker treatment of the Crucifixion, the Puritan criticism with regard to the Atonement follows automatically. If the Quakers held forth Christ crucified within, would they not thereby be affirming that the Atonement of Christ was also effected "within" and not "without"? Another query from Bunyan neatly delineates the question which the doctrine of Christ within raised from the Puritan viewpoint:

What is the church of God redeemed by, from the curse of the law? Is it by something that is done within them, or by something done without them? 2

If by something "that worketh in them", then Bunyan will ask:

Why did the man Christ Jesus hang upon the cross on Mount Calvary, without the gates of Jerusalem, for the sins of the people? And why do the Scriptures say, that through this man is preached to us the forgiveness of sins; that is, through his blood, (Eph. 1.7,) which was shed without the gates of Jerusalem? (Heb.xiii.12.) 3

Bunyan's own view of the Quaker answer to this query is given in his listing of "delusions of the devil", which

1. G.M., p. 206.

2. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 86.

3. Ibid.

Quakers are alleged to believe:

1. That salvation was not fully and completely wrought out for poor sinners by the man Christ Jesus, though he did it gloriously, (Acts xiii.38,39,) by his death upon the cross, without the gates of Jerusalem. 1

This strongly critical analysis of the Quaker conception of the Atonement is summed up comprehensively by another Puritan writer:

It is further observable, that there is no mention made in any of their papers we have yet seen, of eternall salvation from the wrath to come, or condemnation of Hell, by any Atonement, price, or purchase, or blood-sacrifice of our Mediatour without us, but of an Eternal salvation from the Dominion of evil, by Jesus Christ, who is eternal life in us which we partake of as we abide in him... 2

Here again the Quaker answer was rendered ambiguous by their ever present emphasis on the experiential side of religion. This concern with the work of Christ within the believer permeates every Quaker statement on the Atonement, and is clearly evident in Burrough's reply to the above quoted query by Bunyan:

Answ. The Church of God is redeemed by Christ Jesus, which is revealed within all that believe; and Christ Jesus wrought in them mightily, and it was he that wrought in them to will and to do;...And the Scriptures say, That through this man is preached the forgiveness of sins, because there is no other that

1. Ibid., I. 47. Bunyan cites Heb.13:12 and John 19:20.

2. C. Feake, et al., A Faithful Discovery, p. 13.

can forgive sin, nor the blood of any
other thing that can take away sin;
but the Blood of God, as it is written. ¹

Burrough gives a similar answer in response to the statement that "Salvation was not fully and completely wrought out...by the man Christ Jesus", a belief which Burrough says was falsely attributed to the Quakers:

for there is not salvation in any other,
nor is it wrought by any other, but by
Jesus Christ fully and compleatly it is
brought forth by him unto every one that
believes, who receives the Testimony of
it in themselves; ²

As Burrough insists against another writer, "none are justified by his Death and Suffering and Blood without them, but who witness Christ within them", ³ and the same viewpoint informs Fox's reply to a principle quoted from Bunyan.

Pr. He saith, They were sealed by Christs
death at his offering upon the Crosse.
Ans. And yet Christ must come to save them
at the last day: And the Saints witnessed
their salvation while they were upon earth,
and said Christ was in them except they
were reprobates. ⁴

It thus appears that the question of the Atonement as a work of Christ "without", i.e., in his bodily death on the cross, was characteristically answered by the Quakers with a 'Yes, but...', in which the qualification

1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 149.

2. Ibid., p. 140. (Misnumbered 137).

3. Ibid., p. 515.

4. G.M., p. 8.

of the believer's inner acceptance often over-shadowed the basic affirmation of the event of Calvary. The fundamental cause of misunderstanding, however, stemmed from the initial formulation of the issue, in which the historical and the experiential aspects of the Atonement were set up as opposites, or as mutually exclusive alternatives. It is this implied dichotomy which underlies Burrough's counter query to Bunyan, "Whether is it possible that any can be saved without Christ manifest within".¹ Bunyan's reply may be taken as the Puritan 'yes, but...', which completely reverses the Quaker emphasis.

Ans. There can none be saved but they that have the Spirit of Christ given unto them. But it is not the Spirit of Christ given to the elect that doth work out the salvation of their souls within them, for that was obtained by the blood of the man Christ Jesus on the cross. 2

The issue is stated even more succinctly in Bunyan's justification of his first book against the Quakers, for among his aims in writing he lists the following:

1. To show souls where salvation is to be had; namely, in Christ without.
2. To show souls how they should lay hold of this salvation; namely, by the operation of the Spirit of Christ, which must be given within. 3

Here the question is not considered in terms of an 'either/or';

1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 151.

2. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 116. Bunyan cites Heb.9:12, 13:12.

3. Ibid., I. 97.

the problem is not whether redemption is "by something that is done within them, or by something done without them", as Bunyan had queried in his first book.¹ Yet although Puritans and Quakers alike could allow that the Atonement involved the work of Christ both "without" and "within", each side tended to hold to its own emphasis, and in the fervor of controversy, what was originally 'both/and' tended to become 'either/or'. Thus, when Bunyan mentions the Spirit of Christ within, in addition to "Christ without", Burrough charges him with "contradiction", and says that he has thereby confessed to the Quaker argument, "without Christ within no Salvation".²

The same tendency to emphasize one side of a question to the exclusion of the other also underlies the discussion which centered on the terms "flesh" and "spirit". This dichotomy emerges in every aspect of the Christological debates, but at this point we need only recall the dispute over the nature of the Crucifixion, and the parallel polemic on the Atonement. Caffyn's charge that the Quakers believed that it was the Spirit within Jesus, and not the fleshly body, which suffered on Calvary is at one with his allegation that the Quakers often believed "that the spirit suffering within that Person of Jesus, was the Christ".³ For Caffyn,

1. Ibid., I. 86. Quoted above, p. 191, n.2.

2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 289.

3. M. Caffyn, op.cit., p. 37. Cf. above, p. 188.

the question was whether Jesus was Christ and Saviour in His body of flesh, or whether he was Christ by virtue of the Spirit within Him, and he endeavors to prove from Scripture

that the Eternal Spirit which dwelt in the Man, whom the Jews Crucified; which Spirit the Apostles afterwards received in them, is not the Christ, the Saviour of the world; but the visible man, to whom the Spirit was given, John 3.34. ¹

Caffyn argues in part that the Eternal Spirit could never die, nor be crucified, nor could the necessity of sacrifice in God's plan apply to a Spirit. This last point is emphasized by Bunyan, in his proof of the proposition that "He that was of the Virgin, is he that is the Saviour".

Affirming at the start that

it is not by Spirit only by and of itself, without it do take the nature of man, that can be a Saviour of man from eternal vengeance.

Bunyan insists that a spirit alone could not have made satisfaction for mankind's sin.²

However, just as the Quaker concentration on the Spirit seemed to the Puritan to undercut the human aspect of Jesus as the Christ, so the Puritan concern with the flesh seemed to the Quaker to endanger the relationship between Christ and the Spirit. Thus in opposition to Caffyn's argument that the Spirit within Jesus is not the Christ, Whitehead

1. M. Caffyn, "The great Error and mistake of the Quakers", p. 38.

2. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 57.

writes:

Here he seems to divide the man Christ from the eternal Spirit, and so hath denied the eternal Spirit to be Christ; but saith, the visible man is Christ, when as the Apostle saith, The last Adam was made a quickning Spirit, and the Lord is that Spirit, I Cor.15.

...we own the true Christ, both as he was of the seed of David, according to the flesh, and in the dayes of his flesh, that he was the true Christ (but not without the eternal Spirit) ¹

Although Whitehead, in the context of Caffyn's argument, cannot affirm Christ's Humanity without adding the qualification about "the eternal Spirit", Dewsbury can answer another controversialist in a formulation which might even satisfy Bunyan's proposition:

we...declare as followeth, that benefit came to the Church by Christ's suffering, in that Body God gave, which was born of the Virgin Mary; and with one Offering hath Christ perfected for ever, them that are Sanctified, Heb.10.14. ²

Yet Dewsbury goes on to describe the "Sanctified" as Christ's "Saints in whom he is now revealed",³ thus reverting from the problem of flesh and spirit to the correlative issue of Christ without and Christ within. In both cases, the disagreement was essentially one of emphasis, and the divergent Puritan and Quaker interests may be best summarized in the following exchange between a Presbyterian writer and Fox:

1. G. Whitehead, op.cit., p. 27.

2. Wm. Dewsbury, Testimony, p. 141.

3. Ibid.

Pr. He saith, ... And that God is more pleased with that which Christ works without for them, than that which he worketh within them....

Ans. ... And such as wnesse their Sanctification & Justification wrought within them, they wnesse in this they please God, by the faith in the blood of the Son of God. Now they feel not the comfort, nor the benefit, but by the faith of Christ Jesus, the one offering, in which God is pleased withall, which is acceptable, which is Christs offering, his sacrifice, his flesh, his blood, his life, his mind must be manifest, and received within, before they come to Justification, Sanctification, and Redemption, and the serving of God in the new life. ¹

With the disputes on the Resurrection, Ascension, Kingdom of Heaven, and Second Coming, we begin another series of variations on the same two themes, "without" vs. "within", and "flesh" vs. "spirit". Bunyan's query on the Scriptural basis for Christ "risen within you" has already been noted, and the following extract gives the answers of both Bunyan and Fox, respectively.

Pr. He saith, To say that Christ is risen within, there is no Scripture to prove it....

Answ. Doth not the Apostle say, Christ formed in you? And Christ in you the hope of glory? ... And Christ within, doth he not arise there before all waves be still? and shall he not arise with healing under his wings? ²

In the light of a reply such as that given by Fox it is not surprising that Bunyan addressed another question to the Quakers:

Was that Jesus, that was born of the Virgin Mary, a real man of flesh and

1. G.M., p. 171.

2. Ibid., p. 12. Cf. above, p. 189f.

bones, after his resurrection from the dead out of Joseph's sepulchre, yea, or no? For the scripture saith he was, as in Luke xxiv. 39. ¹

To this query Burrough replies, "What the Scriptures speak of Christ we own to be truth, and own him to be what the Scriptures speak of him".² Bunyan, however, while conceding that "This answer hath some pretended fairness in it", adds immediately that his opponent can "wrest the Scriptures" by pitting one part of Scriptural truth against the other, "as, for instance:"

2. You do use that truth of the resurrection of saints from a state of nature to a state of grace, to fight against that truth of the resurrection of the bodies of saints out of their graves; ³

The charge that the Quakers deny the bodily resurrection in general will be dealt with shortly, but the issue is already implied in Burrough's answer to another writer who accuses the Quakers with "A denying of the Ascension and Beeing of the Body of Christ". Protesting that the Quakers do not deny but actually "witness" the risen Body of Christ by "being Members of it", Burrough expounds the Quaker testimony:

and every one that reads the Scripture is not witnesses of the resurrection of the body of Christ; and all whose witness is onely without them, [in] other mens words,

-
1. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 86. Bunyan also cites Luke 24:39f, 50f, and Acts 1:9-11.
 2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 149.
 3. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 113.

which had the Witness within them,...
are found false Witnesses of the Resur-
rection, and of the Ascension, and knows
not Christ, nor his body but by hearsay; 1

To the Quaker, Christ must arise within before His Resur-
rection is truly known.

This emphasis on the Resurrection as an experienced
reality was applied by the Quakers with equal vigor to the
Ascension of Christ, and it was resisted by the Puritans
with corresponding forcefulness. Bunyan again sees his own
doctrine as one that is opposed by the Quakers:

In the next place, I am to prove that this
very man, Christ Jesus, the Son of the Virgin,
in his very body, the same body that was
crucified, is above the clouds and the heavens,
...though this is made light of by those men
called Quakers,..... 2

Burrough could denounce this allegation as false, and in-
sist that the Quakers "bear witness to the truth of that
Scripture, that a Cloud received him out of their sight",³
but other Quaker statements would not be so clear. The
General Baptist, Matthew Caffyn insists:

The Quaker...also saith, and indeed cannot
but say, that Christ ascended not into
Heaven, with that body which God raised
from the dead, and glorified, and Thomas
Laucock being several times asked by mee,
where that Heaven was that Christ ascended
up into, and now was in, he answered, clap-
ping his hands upon his breast, saying,
within mee, within mee. 4

-
1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 22.
 2. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 71.
 3. E. Burrough, Works, p. 283.
 4. M. Caffyn, The Deceived...Quakers Discovered, pp. 40-41.

Such a view was judged as flatly contrary to the Scriptures, for Caffyn holds that the Bible teaches that Jesus rose and ascended into heaven in "flesh and bones".¹ Indeed, the Puritan argued that Christ could not be "within" precisely because He had ascended into heaven. Christ is "afar off in his bodily presence";²

...he hath a body that is absent from his church, which body is ascended from his disciples, above the clouds into heaven. ³

This argument is elaborated by Samuel Eaton, who maintains that we have not seen Christ "with our bodily eyes",

for Christ is in Heaven in his humanity, and not on Earth; and therefore not to be seen, heard, or handled by us or any other that live on Earth; ⁴

When we recall the Quaker censure of those who denied immediate inspiration, it is not surprising that Fox contends that Eaton's statement "shews that they were never made Ministers by him, who never saw him, nor heard him".⁵ Nor was Fox's opposition to Bunyan's argument any less severe:

Pr. They say Christ went away into heaven, from his Disciples and so not within them.
Answ. Did not he say he would come again to them, did he not say he was in them, I in you; and did not the Apostle say Christ was in them, except they were reprobates, the

1. Ibid.

2. J. Bunyan, as quoted by G. Fox, G.M., p. 8.

3. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 86.

4. S. Eaton, The Quakers Confuted, p. 19.

5. G.M., p. 4.

hope of glory;...and did not the Apostle
Preach Christ within, and you Preach
Christ with out? ¹

To the Quaker, there was no incompatibility between the doctrines of the Ascension and the indwelling of Christ. Nayler speaks in the same sentence of Jesus Christ who "ascended into Heaven, and is set at the Right Hand of God;" and "who did, and doth dwell in the Saints". The incompatibility is nonexistent partly because Nayler can also speak of Christ "who filleth all Places".² Elsewhere, Nayler develops this point:

But where Christ is revealed and known,
he is known to be spiritual, and not
carnal, not limited to one Place, but
filleth Heaven and Earth, is all, and
in all his; ³

The primary bulwark of the Quaker position rests, however, on the distinction of "spiritual" vs. "carnal", and Nayler underscores this argument in his rebuttal of the proposition, "Christ is in Heaven with a carnal Body".

To which said James, Christ filleth Heaven
and Earth, and is not carnal, but spiritual:
for if Christ be in Heaven with a carnal
Body, and the Saints with a spiritual Body,
that is not proportionable (or agreeable)... ⁴

Fox makes the same point against another controversialist:

Pr. He saith, We shall have incorruptible,
powerful, glorious and spiritual bodies;
and yet they say Christ is in heaven with

1. Ibid., p. 210

2. J. Nayler, A Collection, p. 20.

3. Ibid., p. 81.

4. Ibid., p. 7.

a humane body....
Answ.And if the Saints sat in
 heavenly places with Christ Jesus;
 And if the Saints in heaven must have
 a glorious body, and Christ an humane
 body (which I say is earthly) how doth
 this agree with Scripture, that says
 Christs is a glorious body? 1

According to Fox and the First Publishers, "Christs body is a glorified body, and the Scripture doth not speak any where that Christs body is a carnall body in heaven".²

Once again, the "flesh" is set in opposition to the "spirit", with the result that the Quakers are charged with denying the resurrection of the body. Bunyan, in accordance with his opinion that the Quakers mean by resurrection only that "the saints are raised from the state of nature to a state of grace",³ demands of his Quaker opponent:

What say you, Do you believe the resurrection of the body after it is laid in the grave? Do you believe that the saints that have been this four or five thousand years in their graves shall rise, and also the wicked, each one with that very body wherein they acted in this world;...Answer plainly, and clear yourselves; but I know you dare not, for you deny these things. 4

Caffyn is another who brings this charge, supporting it as follows:

The Quaker also fully denieth the Resurrection of the body, which they have often to me acknowledged, and Thomas Lawson,

-
1. G.M., pp. 101-102.
 2. Ibid., p. 71.
 3. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 87.
 4. Ibid., I. 109.

John Slee (Quaker-teachers) gave me their understandings thereof in writing (namely) that nothing that goes into the Grave shall rise again; ¹

Against this alleged Quaker opinion that "the grave is the conquerer (having got the bodies of men in it, and so holds them fast for ever...)",² Caffyn and the Puritan controversialists stoutly maintained the doctrine of the bodily resurrection. Nor were they put off by the Quaker objection that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God". Caffyn allows that this is true, agreeing that it is the "incorruptible" body which is raised to glory; but this changed body was just that fleshly body which had been sown into the earth; God "raises the body which was sown corruptible, in an incorruptible condition".³ Bunyan's interpretation of I Cor.15:50 puts a similar emphasis on the changing aspects of the same body: it is "sinful flesh and blood, or the sin, with any imperfection" in the saints' bodies that is barred from the Kingdom. The resurrected body is

not the same in respect of sin, or bodily infirmities, but the very same in respect of substance: for, saith he, it is our vile body that must be changed; and it is the very same, it shall be "fashioned like to his glorious body." ⁴

1. M. Caffyn, op.cit., p. 43.

2. Ibid., p. 47.

3. Ibid. Cf. I Cor.15:35ff.

4. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 84.

On this emphasis on the necessity of the change from the "corruptible" to the "incorruptible", the Quakers could have made common cause with the Puritans. Thomas Lawson insisted as strongly as did his Baptist opponent that "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body", and he complains that if he is to be accused of denying the resurrection because he denied that flesh and blood could inherit the Kingdom, then Caffyn might as well bring the same accusation against Paul.¹ Lawson's affirmation of belief in the resurrection of the dead, "both of the just, and unjust",² is repeated by the other Quaker writers, for whom Nayler may here be taken as spokesman:

Concerning the Resurrection. That all shall arise to give an Account, and receive at the last Day, according to their Works done in the Flesh, whether Good or Evil: these Bodies that are Dust, shall turn to Dust, but God shall give a Body as pleaseth him.

Nayler goes on to cite the above quoted verses from I Cor.15, but then adds a characteristic and controversial Quaker statement:

But they who cannot witness the first Resurrection within themselves, know nothing of the second, but by Hear-say: 3

Just as Fox held that the Resurrection of Christ must be

1. T. Lawson, op.cit., p. 22. Lawson also refers to I Cor.15.

2. Ibid. Cf. Acts 24:15.

3. J. Nayler, A Collection, p. 22.

witnessed within, and not known by "hearsay", so Nayler states the parallel Quaker insistence that the believer's resurrection from spiritual death to life must be witnessed in anticipation of his resurrection from physical death to Eternal Life.

This treatment of the resurrection of the dead as (in part) an experienced, spiritual reality clearly implies a similar Quaker treatment of the Kingdom of Heaven. Before coming to this issue, however, one further conflict relating to the bodily resurrection must be noted. This is the relatively infrequent dispute on the nature of the soul, the main outline of which is given in an exchange between Clapham and Fox:

Pr. He saith, It is a wretched doctrine to say men have not a humane soul in them, and to say that the soul is a part of the Divine Essence.

Ans. Is not that of God that come out from him? and is not the earthly and humane of the ground? and is not that mortal; and is that which is immortal humane? ¹

Fox complained that "many of the Priests" said that the soul is "appetite, lust and pleasure", and that the soul of Christ is "humane".² Such allegedly "earthly" conceptions of the soul were no doubt in the background of a query to Baxter asking, "What's the soul of man...", and it is evident that Baxter's answer would not entirely satisfy Quaker scruples.

1. G.M., p. 100.

2. Ibid., p. 228.

The soul is that spiritual substance which causeth by its lower power, your life, growth, and nourishment, by its next power your feeling, and by its highest power...your Reasoning, Intellective knowledge and rationally willing and affections; which together with the Body, constituteth the whole man. ¹

Although Baxter's definition of the soul was answered only in part,² the basic issue involved emerges full-blown in Howgill's reaction to another anti-Quaker writer, who is quoted as saying that "human Nature may be understood both of Soul and Body", and also of the "regenerate Part" of man. To this Howgill objects that if these three aspects of man's being may be understood in terms of human nature,

then they are all one, and then the Soul is Human and earthly, but the Soul is spiritual and immortal, and Flesh and Blood inherits not the Kingdom of God, ³

The Quakers insisted that the soul derived directly from God, and was in no sense "Human and earthly"; and since the soul is of divine origin, it cannot but be immortal. In the light of this conception of the nature of the soul, Fox makes perhaps the strongest Quaker assertion of the soul's immortality:

Pr. He saith there is a kinde of Infinite-ness in the soul; and it cannot be Infinite-ness in it self.

Answ. Is not the soul without beginning coming

1. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 13.

2. Nayler merely criticizes Baxter for saying that the soul is the cause of our life, when the true cause of life is God. J. Nayler, An Answer to a Book called The Quakers Catechism, p. 26.

3. F. Howgill, Works, pp. 359-360.

from God, returning into God again, who hath it in his hand,And Christ the power of God, the Bishop of the soul, which brings it up into God which came out from him; hath this a beginning or ending? And is not this infinite in it self, and more than all the world? ¹

From the dispute on the resurrection as an inward reality it was an easy and, indeed, inevitable step to the charge that the Quakers maintained a belief in "heaven within". Thus Fox has to reply to the following judgment:

Pr. He saith to witnesse heaven within and hell within, and the resurrection [within], is the mystery of Iniquity.

Ans. Which shews thou never knew heaven in thy self, nor hell there, nor Christ the resurrection and the life, which they are blessed that are made partakers of the first resurrection, on them the second death shall have no power. And the Scriptures doth witnesse heaven within. ²

Fox develops this reference to Scripture in another exchange:

Pr. He saith, It is a known error to say that a man was in hell, and in heaven, &c....

Ans. Who in this shews his ignorance of Scripture; for it gives testimony of men that did witnesse, that they had been in hell, in the nethermost hell; and witnessed again they were in heaven, and sate in heavenly places in Christ Jesus; and such were in heaven as is spoken of in the Revelations. ³

Such a conception of heaven within immediately raised the question of whether or not there is "a Locall Place of

1. G.M., p. 90.

2. Ibid., p. 101.

3. Ibid., p. 64.

Heaven and Hell, to be inhabited and dwelt in", by the saints and the wicked, "with their bodies".¹ To this query, and more specifically to its author, the Quaker could make an unambiguous reply: "and there's a Hell, thou shalt finde it, and there thy sinfull body shall suffer".² It would appear that such a rebuttal would sit rather loosely with Clapham's charge that the Quakers "believe no resurrection, judgment, heaven, or hell, but what men have now in their consciences."³

But the dispute continued, for the Quakers reference to heaven within men clearly implied the belief "that they are NOW in possession of the Kingdome of Christ, and have eternall life really in POSSESSION".⁴ Lawson, to whom this view was attributed, holds his ground in reply, insisting:

He that confesses, that Jesus is the Son
of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in
God, and he that dwells in God, dwells in
eternall life, God is eternall life, 5

Fox argues similarly in answer to the same proposition, for he holds that "he that hath the Son of God, hath life eternall, really in possession".⁶ To the Puritan, such a

1. A query sent to Fox, quoted in G. Fox and R. Hubberthorne, Truth's Defence, p. 81.

2. Ibid. As evidence for the "torments", Fox cites Rev.20:13,14.

3. J. Clapham, op.cit., p. 37.

4. M. Caffyn, op.cit., p. 42. (Capitals retained as in the original).

5. T. Lawson, op.cit., p. 10. Cf. John 6:54.

6. G.M., p. 142.

view was "gross falsehood", since Scripture testifies that "the Saints inheritance was reserved in Heaven for them".¹

The Scriptural evidence shows, according to Clapham,

that Heaven is a place of perfect blisse and happinesse, not upon earth, but above the visible Heavens, not to be enjoyed whil'st we be in the flesh here (though we have some foretastes or earnestes of it, in which respect it may be said the Kingdome of Heaven is now within us) but into which the souls of the righteous shall be translated, presently after their departure out of the body; 2

The Quaker, however, would not treat the Kingdom of Heaven within by way of a parenthesis, and Hubberthorne described Clapham's view simply as the principle, "That heaven is not to be enjoyed while men are here".³ Such a principle was far from the Quaker outlook:

And the Kingdome of heaven is within them, is in righteousnesse, in peace, in joy in the holy Ghost, and in power, and they were changed from glory to glory; and they rejoyced with joy unspeakable and full of glory; and that was in the Kingdome, and this was while they were upon the earth. 4

When this statement by Fox is supplemented by Dewsbury's discovery from Mt.26:52,53, "that the Kingdom of Christ was within; and the Enemies was within, and was spiritual, and my Weapons against them must be spiritual,

1. M. Caffyn, op.cit., p. 42. The reference is to I Pet.1:4.

2. J. Clapham, op.cit., p. 37.

3. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, pp. 44-45.

4. G.M., p. 136.

the Power of God",¹ we may readily expect the charge that the Quaker denied "Christ's coming in person to Judgement", and held instead that Christ "is no where to be looked for, but within".² Bunyan sets forth this accusation in detail:

They [the Quakers] will say, they do own the second coming of Christ to judge the world; but search them to the bottom, and you will find them only to own him in his coming in spirit, within, in opposition to the glorious coming of the Lord Jesus, the Son of Mary, from heaven in the clouds, with all his mighty angels, to raise the dead, and bring them to judgment, according to the Scripture.³

Later, Bunyan argues that the coming of Christ in the Spirit is not his second coming, "partly, in that the coming of Christ in Spirit was before that called in Scripture his first coming".⁴ A second argument is that "he that comes the second time is he that came the first time", namely Jesus, the Son of Mary, "very God and very man".⁵ The implication in this last argument of Bunyan is brought out by Caffyn when he relates his charge that the Quakers deny the humanity of Christ to the charge that they deny Christ's second coming as an objective event.

1. Wm. Dewsbury, Testimony, p. 50.

2. T. Underhill, op.cit., p. 19.

3. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 87.

4. Ibid., I. 119. Cf. I. 107, where Bunyan brings I Pet.1:10f as a proof text.

5. Ibid., I. 119.

Now as their perswasions concerning Christ being a Spirit, and not man, leads them to expect the coming of Christ in them: so contrariwise our Faith and full perswasions, that Christ is a visible glorified man, leads us to expect his second coming as a distinct appearance from, and not in, his People; 1

As we have seen with regard to the doctrines of the Incarnation, the Crucifixion and Atonement, the Resurrection, and the Ascension, the Quakers sooner or later protested that they were not holding forth Christ solely as "spirit" or as "Christ within", and the same protest is made regarding the doctrine of the Second Coming. However, it is noticeably weaker and less frequent here, and Burrough answers Bunyan on this point only in a few brief paragraphs. The charge that the Quakers "beat souls off" from believing that Christ shall "so come again to Judgment, as he went away", is another of Bunyan's "Lyes", against which Burrough affirms the true Quaker view:

I further say,...that Christ Jesus that was crucified, and rose again, shall come (as he went away) to Judgement, and the dead shall be raised, and every man shall receive according to their deeds; 2

Whitehead's reply to Caffyn, however, leaves the question of the physical return of Christ unsettled; indeed, Whitehead even rejects Caffyn's argument that the elect were waiting for Christ's visible body from Heaven.³ He then goes on

-
1. M. Caffyn, "The great Error and mistake of the Quakers", p. 43.
 2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 283.
 3. Whitehead argues that if this were so, the elect waited in vain "in their dayes", and thus their hope of Christ was

to say that "the Apostles made known unto men, the power and coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, which power wrought in them". Thus the saints had a knowledge of the coming of Christ, "which was known in the Saints, and not carnally expected afar off", as Caffyn expects it, "who would shut Christ and his coming out of his People".¹ For the Quaker, the chief emphasis continued to be on the coming of Christ into the hearts of His people, and this priority of interest is clearly stated by Nayler, in reply to the plea that the most glorious revelation was to see Christ in the flesh, for example, at His ascension:

I answer: Whether is it a more Glorious Discovery and Manifestation of Christ, to see him appearing in them the second time in the Spirit, without Sin unto Salvation, or that to see him depart in the Flesh, seeing Christ tells them, It is necessary that he go away, in the Flesh, that he may come in the Spirit? ²

Moreover, if the Quakers could speak of Christ coming in the Spirit, they could obviously also speak of Christ appearing in the present time. Indeed, early Quaker literature abounds in such phrases as "the Lord hath appeared", "the Lord is come", "the mighty Day of the Lord is come", and in controversial writing especially, "The day is at hand that their judgement is come". The last phrase is the most in-

of no effect; but he brings I Thes. 1:9, 4:15, and 2 Cor. 3:18 to prove the contrary.

1. G. Whitehead, op.cit., p. 29.

2. J. Nayler, A Collection, p. 120.

dicative, for in their polemical works the Quakers pictured the Lord's appearing more in terms of His powerful workings against "Antichrist", the Devil, and the opponents of Quakerism, than in terms of His coming into the hearts of believers. Thus Burrough begins a pamphlet against a Puritan minister:

The Lord from Heaven, in this his day, is risen and come forth, to make War with all his Enemies, being the fulness of time, wherein his purpose is to cut down, and destroy the man of sin, by the power of his coming; 1

Similarly, another Quaker pamphlet states:

and now is the judgement of the great whore come; and now is the vyals of wrath to be poured upon her,....and now is the seed of God risen, which overthrows all the excommunicators upon the earth, both beast and false Prophets and Jews... 2

This overwhelming sense of being on 'the Lord's side', of manifesting the "seed of God" in the victorious struggle against the "seed of the Serpent", can be found fully developed in all the early Quaker writers, and it readily explains the apocalyptic title of Fox's controversial magnum opus, part of which reads:

The Great Mistery of the Great Whore Unfolded; and Antichrists Kingdom Revealed unto Destruction. In Answer to many False Doctrines and Principles which Babylons Merchants have traded with,... 3

-
1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 153.
 2. G. Weare, et.al., The Doctrins...of the Priests of Scotland, p. 53.
 3. G.M., title page. Cf. Rev. 17.

However, while speaking of the Day of the Lord as now present, the Quakers never viewed the victory of Christ as completed in the present time, and thus often spoke in terms of the future, as well as the present. Very often the two tenses are combined in a single sentence, and this gives perhaps the most accurate portrayal of the Quaker viewpoint. Fox writes, "The mighty day of ye Lord is come, & coming";¹ Burrough pronounces, "and now the Lord of Heaven and Earth is proclaiming War with the Dragon and his Angels, and they shall be cast out";² Dewsbury warns, "Fear God, and give glory to him, for the hour of his Judgments is come, and his dreadful terrible Day will come speedily upon all Nations and People".³ Yet the Quaker could also occasionally say, "The day of Judgement was past", a statement which Lawson was said to have tried to prove from Mt.12:20. But Jeremiah Ives explains this "Error" as the result of "that devilish Doctrine" that the resurrection was already past: "For if the Judgement-day be past already; Resurrection, that goes before Judgement, must be also past".⁴ Caffyn gives a fuller report of Lawson's view:

The Quaker also saith, that the eternal
Judgement is Past already as to them,
having (as they say) given an account to

-
1. Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 206.
 2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 18.
 3. Wm. Dewsbury, Testimony, p. 181.
 4. J. Ives, The Quakers Quaking, p. 21.

God already, for all that they have done,
and received the reward for their sins,
even wrath, and condemnation; that is,
the wounds of Conscience, and the like; 1

Against this, Caffyn puts the basic Puritan view that judgment is in the future, for "It is appointed unto men once to dye, but AFTER THIS the Judgement".² But if the Quakers used the past, present, and (imminent) future tenses, they also spoke of the day of Judgment "after this" life: "we believe that the Dead shall arise again after death, and everyone shall receive according to the Deeds done in the Body".³ In fact, it is to the future Judgment Day that the Quakers most often referred their opponents. The last phrases of Fox's replies to Bunyan are sounded repeatedly throughout The Great Mistry:

And abundance of lyes is their Book stuff
with,...which will turn upon themselves,
in the day of fire and judgements they
shall feel their works: 4

...the witsesse in thy conscience shall wit-
nesse against thee for all thy hard speeches,
and let thee know that you and thou had
better have been silent, than to fight a-
gainst the Lord, the Lamb and his Saints,....
When ye are judged, the witsesse in all your
consciences shall answer. 5

Finally, the Puritans themselves often spoke of the

-
1. M. Caffyn, The Deceived...Quakers Discovered, p. 50.
 2. Ibid. (Capitals retained as in the original).
 3. E. Burrough, Works, p. 518.
 4. G.M., p. 26.
 5. Ibid., p. 211.

imminence of Christ's coming. We saw in Chapter Two that Puritans and Quakers alike held that the Devil was especially active in the present time, and many looked on this as a sign of Christ's coming. Bunyan sets out to show "that his coming will be shortly", and among the signs of His coming he notes that "there shall come scoffers in the world", adding, "if ever this scripture was fulfilled, it is fulfilled on these men called Quakers".¹ Both sides, as we have seen, identified the other as the "false prophets", "deceivers", "mockers" and the like, who will precede Christ's coming. To such views, Caffyn gives expression to another widespread sentiment:

I say, that there is a good ground for us now to beleieve that distress and perplexity of Nations; the Sea, and waves roaring, mens hearts failing them for fear, the powers of Heaven being shaken, are signes of Christs comming; 2

These millennial expectations culminated in the designation, by Baptists and the Fifth-Monarchy-Men, of the year 1656 as the beginning of the chiliastic reign of Christ. Although this view is too much on the periphery of the Puritan movement to justify detailed description in this thesis, the underlying eschatological expectation was a genuine feature of the Puritanism of Fox's day. And it is in Fox's reply

1. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 75. Cf. Mt. 24.

2. M. Caffyn, op.cit., p. 31.

to the chiliastic prophecy that the contrast between the Puritan and Quaker eschatology is most clearly summarized, albeit with the characteristic Quaker animus.

...the Baptists and Fifth-monarchy-men prophesied, "That this year Christ should come, and reign upon earth a thousand years." And they looked upon this reign to be outward; when he was come inwardly in the hearts of his people, to reign and rule there, and these professors would not thus receive him....But Christ is come, and doth dwell in the hearts of his people, and reign there. ¹

1. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I. 314. (Italics retained).

CHAPTER FIVE

Sin, Sanctification, and Salvation

A systematic discussion of the issues relating to the problem of soteriology might usually be expected to include a treatment of man's sin, his justification and sanctification, and his hope of eternal salvation. The soteriological controversy between the Quakers and Puritans, however, was concerned almost entirely with the single question of sanctification--the overcoming of sin in this life. There was basic agreement on the acknowledgment of man's sinfulness and its origin in the Fall of Adam, and on the assertion of salvation by grace through faith in Christ and His Atonement. The Puritans and Quakers were at one in pointing to the sin of man, in viewing it as rebellion against his Maker, and in describing this sinful rebellion as a fundamental fact of man's character. The divergence of opinion emerged with the Quaker qualification that sin was not necessarily a permanent fact of man's earthly existence: it was possible to overcome sin in this life. These elements of concord and dissension are finely sketched by Nayler:

That Sin is in the World, and that all are thereby become Children of Wrath, is generally believed and confessed by all; but how Sin is strengthened..., or how it is overcome, few there be that have learned or mind to know; ¹

1. J. Nayler, A Collection, p. 361.

From the Quaker viewpoint, sin must not be strengthened by accepting it as universal and unavoidable, for the Christian faith offers a way of overcoming sin during man's life on earth.

Likewise, the problem of salvation enjoyed a basic area of agreement. We have already discussed two disputes regarding Christ as Saviour, viz., the question of the saving efficacy of the light within, and the question of witnessing Christ's atoning death within. The common presupposition of these conflicts was that salvation came only by Christ, and both Quakers and Puritans sharply denied any allegations to the contrary. This same Christological premise is maintained in the following debates on justification. The disagreement centers only on the relative importance of witnessing the justifying righteousness of Christ within-- in the believer's mind, heart, and entire life. The Quakers' chief emphasis is again on sanctification, and because they viewed justification as inseparable from sanctification, the traditional order of these two doctrines was reversed in the controversy at hand. The doctrine of perfection clearly took an emotional priority for the Puritans, to whom it was an anathema; but the doctrine of witnessing a perfect victory over sin held a logical, as well as an emotional, priority for the Quakers. We will find that, like the doctrine of sin, the doctrine of salvation was seen primarily from the perspective of sanctification.

The discussion on the nature of sin began with the differing interpretations of the doctrine of original sin. One of the most frequently disputed texts relating to this doctrine was Psalm 51:5, and Fox meets a reference to it with his own explanation:

Pr. You say, you are conceived in sin, and brought forth in iniquity, Psal. 51.1.
Answ. David doth not say, you who were conceived in sinne, but (I) and W.P. saith, John was sanctified from the womb; and the Scripture speaks of such as were sanctified from the womb, and children that were clean: 1

The issue concerning the sinful state of children or infants seldom appears in the controversial literature, but Burrough's reply to the charge that "the Quakers deny the sin of Infants" amply elucidates the divergent views:

As for the sin of Infants, we do not say, That Infants in general, that is to say, every particular Infant that is or hath been born into the World, has Sin; for some were filled with the holy Ghost, and some were sanctified from their Mothers Womb; and what Sin had such? And the Scripture speaks, That the Unbelieving Wife is sanctified by the Believing Husband, else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy: And what sin had these? 2

The last text in the above quotation (I Cor.7:14) forms the basis of another answer given by Fox to the principle, "I am conceived in sin, and borne in iniquity". To this, Fox

-
1. G.M., p. 214. Psalm 51:1 is no doubt a misprint for Psalm 51:5.
 2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 637, misnumbered 636. The charge was made by Christopher Fowler, and is quoted on p. 635.

retorts:

Then thy Parents were not believers, so children unholy;...for they who by nature are children of wrath, are not borne of the believers; for the unbelievers are sanctified by the believers, else were their children unholy, but now are they clean. ¹

In these statements on original sin we are already able to detect the fundamental direction of the Quaker position: sin possesses most men from birth, but sin is not such an inherent part of man that all men are born in a sinful state. Some there are who are born "clean" and "holy".

This Quaker view of sin is carried a step further in the argument on the constitution of "the body of sin". Of what does man's sinful estate consist? In what part of his being does sin reside? These questions are answered in sharply contrasting ways by John Stalham and George Fox:

Pr. He saith, The body of sin is the naturall body, consisting of flesh and blood, and bones,.....

Answ. The Saints after they witnessed the body of sin put off, and made free from sin, they glorified God in their bodies, souls, and spirits. And so the body of sin is not the creature,.... And the naturall body which is flesh, blood, and bone, is not the body of sin, it was never read so in the Scripture, that that was the body which was to be put off; ²

Yet while Fox thus refuses to equate the "naturall body" with "the body of sin", the Quaker position here is ren-

1. G.M., p. 263.

2. Ibid., pp. 159-160.

dered somewhat ambiguous by the insistence that by nature all men are children of wrath, and that they are redeemed from this state by Christ. Fox writes that the Light of Christ

leads the natural man from his natural state that believes in it, For all by nature are the children of wrath; who believes in it, it leads from the nature; ¹

Likewise, Burrough qualifies his rejection of the doctrine of the sin of infants by adding, "...there is a nature whereby all are Children of Wrath, in Degeneration".² However, we have already encountered this Quaker derogation of nature and the natural state of man in the fierce insistence that the Light of Christ within was not a "natural light", and the same bias comes to the fore in Fox's conception of the innocent Adam:

The light Adam had before the Fall, did not come by the Creation, nor by the things that are made; If it were given from the Creation, it comes by nature. This word is contrary to the Scripture; for God made man in his image,....³

The Quakers could not designate the fleshly human body as the intrinsic dwelling-place of sin, for that would immediately undercut their doctrine that sin could be overcome in the present earthly life. Yet they shared the dualism of

1. Ibid., p. 57.

2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 637.

3. G.M., p. 307.

Puritan theology, and viewed the natural order as basically distinguishable and foreign from the realm of the Divine. They therefore also shared the Puritan view that man as sinner was living in the natural order or condition. The Quakers differed from the Puritans in holding that man could escape from this natural state of sin.

The Quaker exposition of the doctrine of perfection begins in their interpretation of the Fall, and of the sinlessness of Adam and Eve before the Fall. Fox's report of his discussion with "ye preists & professors pleadinge for Imperfection" gives the main outline of the argument:

but I did lett them see howe Adam & Eye was perfect before they fell: & all y^t God made hee said (y^t it) was good & hee blest it. And howe ye Imperfection came by ye fall: & man & womans hearkninge to ye Divell y^t was out of truth: 1

Fox and the First Publishers gave a straightforward account of the Fall, following the Genesis story without deviation, and in this they of course met no criticism from the Puritans. The point of divergence arose only with the Quaker teaching that Adam's condition in the Fall does not necessarily apply to all people today, and that it is possible for us to possess anew the image of God lost in the Fall. Thus Fox declares:

But now Christ was come to redeeme translate convert & regenerate man all out of all these thinges y^t hee hath sett uppe in ye fall:...& out of death & darknesse uppe Into ye light & life & image & likeness of God againe as man & woman was in before they fell. 2

1. Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 351.

2. Ibid.

Such a conception of man's fallen estate as one of two possible conditions--man in the Fall, and man out of the Fall--is perhaps best elaborated by Nayler in his description of the "two Ways which Men walk in, viz. The Spiritual and the Carnal". He writes:

Now, all People, try your selves, whether you be in the first Birth, or you be born again: There is a first Adam, and there is a second Adam; and they who are in the First, bear his Image; and they who are in the Second, bear his Image:....And these are contrary the one to the other;...the one the Seed of God, the other the Seed of the Serpent,... 1

Nayler goes on to explain that "The first Man is of the Earth, earthly;" he is engrossed solely in "earthly Things". They are his God, he knows no other, and thus his way is continually "to oppose God, and [to] seek to destroy his Seed where it appears". But the "second Man", the new-born man, is spiritual, "is begotten by the Spirit, of the immortal Seed, into the Image of the Father"; in him the Devil is vanquished, and he grows in grace into unity with God and Christ.² Thus the Quaker viewed sin and the Fall not as the inherent and unchangeable state of man, but as a condition which one could be "in" or "out of". The question of the nature and manner of the second birth must await further discussion, but the insistence that redemption from the Fall is a possibility which can be, and is, realized by believers stands at the foundation of Quaker soteriology.

1. J. Nayler, A Collection, pp. 70-71.

2. Cf. Ibid., pp. 70-78.

The confession of William Dewsbury is repeated in essence by all the early Friends; beginning with the words, "I Was conceived in Sin, and brought forth in Iniquity, and in that state lived and delighted in pride and pleasures", he relates his long spiritual struggle, and concludes by affirming, "...through the righteous Law of life in Christ Jesus, I was made free, and am [free] from the body of Sin and Death...; I witness I am regenerated and born again of the immortal Seed".¹

While only a few critical voices were raised regarding the Quaker view of the sin of infants, or the nature of the "body of sin", the denial of the universality and finality (during this life) of the Fall evoked a flood of Puritan protest. Stated in its mildest form, the Puritan position was "that some persons are come up out of the fall, is an error: I do not own a perfection without sin".² But much stronger answers were given to the frequent Quaker query, "Whether do you say you shall be free from the body of sin while you are on the earth, and whether shall any be perfect yea or nay?"³ Baxter replies that as for "the Doctrine of personal sinlesse perfection here, I beleeve the devil, the greatest sinner bred it;" the Pharisees, "Herticks and Papists" held it, "Christ detesteth it", and no

1. Wm. Dewsbury, Testimony, pp. 44-54.

2. An anonymous writer (probably a Peter English), quoted in G.M., p. 258.

3. Quoted in R. Baxter, The Quakers Catechism, p. 24.

intelligent Christian ever believed it of himself.¹ Several other Puritan protagonists also attributed the doctrine of perfection to the devil or to the Papists; the writers whom Fox quotes in The Great Mistery variously express their rejection of the doctrine by describing it as an error, i.e., fancy, delusion, self-deception, and an assertion which "makes God a liar".² Furthermore, "the declaring against all sin is nothing of the mystery of the Gospell of Christ";³ likewise "an overcoming of the body of sin, such as delivers from all sin in this world is expresly against the Scriptures".⁴

The Puritans elaborated their opposition to the principle of perfection by maintaining that it was never proposed or accepted by the apostles and the saints. Fox quotes an opponent as saying,

The greatest of the Apostles were never exempted from the remnants of sin, and the Saints pilgrimage is a continual warfare to heaven while they be on this side [of] the grave, &c. 5

Another writer is cited as holding that "David never boasted of perfection, nor Paul, nor John",⁶ and Fox has to answer

1. Ibid.

2. G.M., p. 38.

3. Ibid., p. 34.

4. Ibid., p. 4.

5. John Deacon, quoted in G.M., p. 41.

6. Ibid., p. 251.

the frequent assertion that Paul neither claimed perfection, nor do the Scriptures say he was perfect. Similarly, the Quaker has to deal with the several writers who affirm that sin resides even in the saints and those who witness the second birth. In reply to the query, "'Do they that are born of God commit sin?'" John Bunyan adduces I John 5:16-18 to show that "that wicked one, the sin unto death" does not touch the saints; but he continues:

but they that are born of God, notwithstanding, do daily sin, as it is evident, (Jas.iii.2:). . . .and, again, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and," instead of having no sin, "the truth is not in us." (I John i.8.) ¹

While the Quaker text for the Scriptural basis of his doctrine was I John 5:18a, the Puritan opposed this with a text from the same epistle, I John 1:8.

Finally, the Puritan extended his contention that sin cannot be completely overcome by even saints, to the argument that "there is no perfection to be attained to, while people live upon earth".² Richard Sherlock gives a typical elaboration of this viewpoint:

'Tis not possible wholly and altogether to subdue the body of sin whilst we are in this world; for 'tis therefore called the body of sin, because there will be some reliques of sin, some rebellions of the flesh against the spirit, whilst we

1. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 115.

2. "Priest Fergison", as quoted in G.M., p. 293.

carry this body of flesh about us,
and are composed of flesh and spirit. 1

It may be added that although the discussion centered primarily on the issue of a "perfection in holiness", the question of a "perfection in glory" was raised occasionally, and was likewise steadily denied by the Puritans. Fox records the opinions that "the time of perfection will be when Christ comes from heaven, and not before",² and "for a perfection in glory to be attained to, on this side of the grave, I utterly disown".³ Baxter chided his Quaker antagonists by asking them, "If you think you are perfect without sin, whether do you also think that you are already in Heaven or perfect glory?" He points out that nothing but sin prevents the perfect enjoyment of God, "And to enjoy God perfectly, is to be glorified perfectly". But Baxter reminds himself that the Quakers "think Heaven and hell is only within men", and we have reviewed the discussion on this point.⁴ Returning to the primary question of a perfection in holiness, we may continue to use Baxter as the Puritan spokesman, and allow him to sum up the Puritan argument in graphic terms:

Christs Kingdom is an Hospitall, he hath
no Subjects in it but diseased ones. The
Fathers Kingdom before had perfect Subjects,

-
1. R. Sherlock, The Quakers Wilde Questions, p. 12.
 2. Thomas Collier, quoted in G.M., p. 39.
 3. Thomas Pollard, quoted in G.M., p. 80.
 4. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 25. Cf. above pp. 208-210.

and so shall it have again, when Christ hath perfected us:...But now, In many things we offend all, Jam.3.2. and there is no man on earth that doth good and sinneth not; And if we say, we have no sin, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us, therefore the truth is not in you Quakers. 1

The query "whether shall any be perfect yea or nay?" was thus answered with a resounding "nay" by the Puritans. But the Quakers responded with an equally emphatic "yea". To them, the overcoming of sin was neither fancy, delusion, nor error, and to the opponent who described the view that some are come up out of the Fall as "an error" Fox replied:

All erring is in the fall, and that which is come up out of the fall is come out of the error into the second Adam where no error is, which many witness,...for all sin and imperfection is in the first Adam in the earth; And perfection is in the second Adam, Christ Jesus, who bruise the Serpents head, the Author of imperfection. And who be in him, are in a perfection without sin,... 2

Again, the doctrine that sin can be overcome is not foreign or contrary to Scripture or Christ, but is an integral part of New Testament religion. Fox sharply rejects the view that perfection is anti-Scriptural, describing this opinion as

Contrary to Rom.6. Contrary to the Apostle to the Colossians, where he had put off the body of sin. And contrary to Christ, who saves & cleanseth from all sin by his blood, blots out all sin; And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin. 3

1. Ibid., pp. 24-25.

2. G.M., p. 258.

3. Ibid., p. 4.

As we have seen, Fox held that Christ came to redeem men from their fallen condition. Christ himself had conquered Satan, He was sinless and perfect, and so those in whom Christ dwelled could and should witness the vanquishing of the Devil and the overcoming of sin. Those "who are in Christ the second Adam, are in perfection, and in that which is perfect, and makes free from sin" and from the Satanic power of sin.¹

Furthermore, this argument cut two ways: if the work of Christ was to redeem men from sin in this life, whoever does not attempt to preach and possess this perfection is not a true minister of Christ. Writing against John Owen and Thomas Danson, Fisher contends:

Again, the Perfecting of the Saints is the very end of Christs Ministry to the Church-ward, Ephes.4.11,12,13. which end it must accomplish in this Life,...and if it be not here attainable, and freedom from Sin not possible to be accomplished, then ye make Christ's Ministry as imperfect as your own.... 2

Indeed, it was a frequent Quaker charge that the Puritan clergy were "pleading for Imperfection" and sin, and early in his ministry Fox complained that "as I preached down sin the priests raged and preached up sin".³ Later, in The Great Mistery, Fox upbraids several opponents for similar reasons:

1. Ibid., p. 277.

2. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 730.

3. The Short Journal...of George Fox, ed. N. Penney, p. 5.

All Physicians to sick men are to make them perfect; And do yee say, make none whole, make none perfect, make never a man perfect?...for the Ministry of God was to bring people to the perfect man, to present them perfect....These are Physicians of no value...for yee are pleading while men be upon earth they must have a body of sin,.... 1

When we come to the discussion on the qualifications for, and tasks of, the ministry, we shall see this argument again.

Since the Quaker viewed perfection as a genuine teaching and work of Christ, he also argued that it was upheld and witnessed in the apostles and saints. Fox insists that "Paul did not deny perfection to himself nor others; but his work was to the perfecting of the Saints".² Elsewhere he develops this point in more detail:

...and God said, Job was a perfect man and eschewed all evil (mark all) and David said he had seen the end of all perfection, and Paul spoke wisdom among them that were perfect,...though the Apostle had cryed out of a body of sin, ye the [i.e. yet he] saith he was manifest in his flesh to condemn the sin in his flesh, and through Christ he hath victory... 3

According to Quaker thought, Paul had been in the sinful fallen state; but this was not a permanent condition, and the apostle was redeemed from it by Christ.

And Paul did not always groan under that body of sin and Law in his members, but witnessed a redemption from it, for which

1. G.M., p. 231.

2. Ibid., p. 7.

3. Ibid., p. 251.

he thanked God that made him more than a conqueror, and others as well as he, and such did not commit sin,... 1

Once again, the Puritans and Quakers could find Scriptural texts for their opposing positions within a single epistle, setting, for example, Rom.5:12 against Rom 6:2, or more often, Phil.3:12 against Phil.3:15. From one viewpoint, Paul had not completely attained, and from the other viewpoint, Paul had attained and was conqueror. In the mutual antagonism of controversy, each side was able to offer an explanation to neutralize or negate the opposing texts adduced by the other.

The underlying presupposition which energized the Quaker argument comes out clearly in the dispute on whether or not sin dwells in the saints. The Puritans had defended the affirmative, but the Quakers stoutly maintained the negative proposition, as the following interchanges show.

Pr. He saith, Sin is in the Saints, &c.

Ans. Sin is not in the sanctified, but in the unsanctified. 2

Ans. The Saints are sanctified, and washed, and cleansed, body, soul, and spirit, and they are made free from sin, and then can live no longer therein; and the body of sin is put off;....And he that is in Christ is a new creature. 3

1. R. Farnsworth, The Scriptures Vindication, pp. 12-13. I John 3:9 is cited.

2. G.M., p. 38.

3. Ibid., pp. 156-157.

A writer who argued that "Though Saints Sin not Devil-like unto Death" yet even the best men sin, is reproved by Howgill for making a "strange kind of Saints", who "at the best... are still but sinners, and unsanctified".¹ The Quaker principle is put succinctly by Fisher: "...no Sinner is a Saint while sinning, nor is any Saint a sinner, while a Saint, or Holy One".² Sin, from the Quaker viewpoint, is incompatible with the new life in Christ, for "he that is born of God doth not commit sin".³ We recall one of George Fox's earliest openings, that "'all Christians are believers'", and "if all were believers, then they were all born of God, and passed from death to life";⁴ sin is death, and from this all who are in Christ have passed to a life of victory over sin.

Furthermore, the Quakers insisted that this victory is to be had in the present life. The tenent that "there is no perfection to be attained to, while people live upon earth" receives a direct rebuttal from Fox:

Ans. Then by thy doctrine Christ is not attained to while man lives, which is contrary to the Apostles and Christs own doctrine, who said, I in you, and you in me; and Christ in you the hope of glory; and then none abides in the Vine by thy account,...⁵

1. F. Howgill, Works, pp. 361-362.

2. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 40.

3. G.M., p. 157.

4. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I. 7.

5. G.M., p. 293.

Sherlock's argument that it is not possible to overcome sin completely while we are in this world receives a similar reply from Hubberthorne, who maintains that "As he is, so are we in this present world".¹ Not only was Christ perfect during His earthly life; I Cor.2:5 shows, according to Burrough,

that some were perfect upon Earth in the dayes of the Apostles; and if they were so, the same is to be waited for and witnessed in this Age;...the Saints may wait for, and witness upon Earth, to have power over sin, and over its Temptations, and free from the committing of sin, by the Power of the second Adam living and dwelling in them: 2

From the Quaker perspective, Christ's kingdom "is not an Hospitall, nor his subjects diseased ones, for he heals them, and converts them, and washeth them".³ The apostles and saints partook of Christ's victory over sin and the Devil in this life, and all true Christians are to witness the same perfection.

Finally, the Puritan arguments against a "perfection in glory" in this life meet with similarly strong Quaker opposition. Nayler responds to Baxter by saying that one need not be in heaven to perfectly enjoy God, since both

1. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 14.

2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 447.

3. G.M., p. 30. Fox is replying to R. Baxter.

Adam in his innocency and Christ on earth had perfect enjoyment of God.¹ We may take the following exchange as a summary statement of the differing positions on this issue:

Pr. He saith for a perfection in glory to be attained to, on this side the grave, I utterly disown....

Ans. Where glory is in the least degree it is in perfection, and who have not glory, and doth not attain to glory on this side the grave, they are in a sad condition; For the Saints rejoiced with Joy unspeakable, and full of glory, and they witnessed the hope of glory within them while they was upon earth,...and they saw the glory of God,...and so came to be changed from glory to glory till they were come into the Image of God. 2

Throughout the major part of the discussion on the doctrine of perfection the Quaker and Puritan positions were irreconcilable; the one side steadily affirmed the possibility and realization of perfection, the other flatly denied it. But on the relatively less discussed issue of degrees of perfection, the two opponents tended to draw together in a portion of agreement. Both Quakers and Puritans can admit that there is a perfection which is not complete or absolute, but which proceeds by degrees. Referring to a favorite Puritan text, Phil.3:12, Samuel Eaton writes:

There is a comparative perfection which some attain unto, which the Apostle intends in that place: There are some that are in their way towards it, and have made

1. J. Nayler, An Answer to a Book called The Quakers Cate-
ism, p. 39f.

2. G.M., pp. 80-81.

a good progress, and are still passing thitherward; these are perfect in comparison of the rude wild world, and of such who are onely babes in Christ: 1

Eaton holds that the word "Perfect", as used in the Bible, never means perfect without sin, or absolute perfection; he adds that "in Scripture there is mention made of a Comparative perfection".² Arguing in a similar vein, Baxter complains that the Quakers "most impudently pretend to a sinless perfection":

They are not content that we allow of a perfection in kind, which is our sincerity, or a perfection of parts, which is our integrity, or a perfection of eminency or high degree; all these we do allow of; and we desire an absolute sinless perfection, and confess it is our commanded duty. But they maintain that many of them are without sin altogether. 3

For their part, however, the Quakers could at times add certain qualifications to their doctrine of perfection, and these are nowhere more carefully worked out than by Fisher in his Rusticus ad Academicos. Complaining that the Quaker position is often maliciously misrepresented, Fisher stresses the following points:

-
1. S. Eaton, The Quakers Confuted, p. 11.
 2. Ibid., p. 60.
 3. R. Baxter, One Sheet against the Quakers, p. 8. In his statement that "absolute sinless perfection" is a desire and commanded duty, Baxter goes beyond the bounds of the Puritan position as expressed by the other anti-Quaker writers. This statement seems inconsistent with his own views, cf. pp. 8 and 10. But see also the following argument on complete perfection with regard to justification, which Baxter upholds.

1st, That the Quakers themselves hold not out, as attainable, such a Perfection of Holiness, Grace or Glory (as to degree) here as admitteth of no Addition of a greater Degree of it hereafter;....

2dly, That we hold not out a Condition of full Freedom from Temptation,....

3dly, That we hold not...and Impossibility of those mens sinning, who, while they Sin not, are Saints...but a possibility only not to sin, as men take heed to themselves by the word, and Light: Non posse peccare is one thing, and Posse non peccare is another,....

4thly, That we Doctrinally hold not out such a full Freedom, and Attainment of Power over Sin... at once,...so that after once Converted to the Light only, and to wait in it, there's a full Deliverance witnessed without any more ado.... 1

In Fisher's exposition, there is no end to the increase of "Christ's Image, Glory and Kingdom"; what is witnessed in this life is a "perfect Defacing and Destroying" of the works and image of the Devil. We cannot expect to escape from being tempted, but we can overcome the sin which presents itself to us; through God's power, we witness freedom "from Transgression, though not from Temptation". Men ought not to sin, and it is possible for them not to sin, depending on whether or not they keep to the Light. Victory over sin is not, "the work of meer Man, nor of a day, but the Work of Christ, which in due time, he will, without failing...perform and bring to pass".²

It is clear that the Quaker position here is rather ambiguous, for on the one hand perfection in this life is said to be gradual and, as compared to that of the next life,

1. S. Fisher, Testimony, pp. 39-41.

2. Ibid.

incomplete; on the other hand it is asserted that a full victory over all sin is possible and witnessed. However, we have encountered a similar duality of argument before, in the Quaker defense of spiritual infallibility. In both places the basis of the Quaker viewpoint lies in the assertion that what the believer receives is perfect or infallible in itself. On the issue at hand, Nayler puts this point clearly:

God is perfect, and so are all his Works
and all his Gifts; and whoever receives
his Gifts, receives that which is perfect.
And by receiving and joining to that which
is perfect, is the Creature gradually made
perfect. ¹

The victory of Christ over sin, temptation, and the power of the Devil was perfect; he who receives Christ thus becomes able to enjoy a similar victory, even though it comes "gradually" and by degrees. Indeed, the smallest measure of that which is perfect is able to give perfection to the believer who accepts it. Again, Nayler brings the issue into clear focus; in a query to Baxter, he asks:

Whether is the least measure of saving faith
present power against the greatest power of
darknesse, and able to keep out of all sin
whatsoever, if the creature abide in it. ²

The Quakers would answer with a resounding yes, and it is in the context of this attitude that we are to take Fox's affir-

1. J. Nayler, A Collection, p. 292.

2. J. Nayler, An Answer to a Book called The Quakers Catechism, p. 60.

mation that where the cleansing blood of Christ is known, the "seed" that destroys the power of Satan, there "the fulnesse is known which is above degrees, that which degrees ends in".¹ To the Quaker mind, a perfect cause could not produce an imperfect result: the least degree of divine perfection, received and accepted by a human being, was sufficient to give perfect victory. We remember that in Quaker thought, there was no belief in an inherent and enduring human sinful state which would hinder or prevent the full reception and acceptance of this divine perfection.

Although the Puritan controversialists could speak occasionally of a "comparative perfection" with regard to holiness, there was a perfection which they were much more ready to assert and defend. This was the perfect justification wrought by Christ. Thus Eaton holds that "there is a perfection that respects Justification, and not Sanctification",² and points out that the deliverance which Paul had in Christ "was from the Curse of such a state, rather than from the state it self".³ Baxter is putting forward a simi-

1. G.M., p. 281. Cf. the parallel Quaker argument on the least degree of the infallible Spirit making him who possesses it infallible. Below, pp. 57-59. It seems that Fox tends to lay noticeably less stress on the doctrine of "measure" or degrees of perfection than Fisher or Nayler.

2. S. Eaton, op.cit., p. 61. Cf. Heb.10:14, James 1:4, which Eaton adduces for his position.

3. Ibid., p. 18. Eaton is discussing Rom.7:14, 24f.

lar view when he says, "I beleeve that all true Converts are free from the dominion of sinne, but not from the remnants of it"; although "our grace is of a perfect kinde", it will not "scatter away all the darknesse".¹ In the proposition of another Puritan writer, the concepts of comparative sanctification and perfect justification are delineated succinctly:

The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin;
the guilt of it instantly and perfectly,
from the stain and power of it gradually. ²

This, of course, runs counter to the Quaker point of view on both counts: "Christ is perfect, and therefore Sanctification is perfect", says Burrough in answer to Eaton,³ and the entire Quaker argument on the perfect overcoming of sin and the "New Man" in Christ reinforces this reply. The early Quakers might talk of degrees and measures, but this never diminished their insistence that "true Holiness" was to be attained in this life.

The question of perfect justification, however, introduces several further considerations into the argument on perfection and sanctification. The basic issue is the relationship of justification and sanctification, and the question of whether or not they are distinct and separable. Since

1. R. Baxter, The Quakers Catechism, p. 24.

2. G.M., p. 281. Fox is quoting a Daniel Gaudry. Punctuation slightly altered.

3. E. Burrough, Works, p. 487.

the Quakers hold that the two are inseparable, a number of additional questions arise: must justification be witnessed within, or is it a purely external, objective entity? Is sanctification necessary for justification, and if so, is not this close to a covenant of works? Is the righteousness of Christ "inherent" or "imputed"; how does Christ work for our salvation and victory over sin? These problems, and ones relating to them, constitute the major part of the remainder of this chapter.

A brief skirmish taken from the pages of The Great Mystery sharply draws the main lines of battle:

Pr. That Justification and Sanctification differs.

Answ. Justification and Sanctification is one; for Christ who is the justification and sanctification is one,.... 1

The disputes which follow revolve upon the principle given in this answer by Fox, and the same tenet informs much of the Quaker rejection of a perfection with respect to justification only. Burrough notes Eaton's contention that "Justification admitteth not of any Degree", and to this he opposes the Quaker doctrine of measures:

Answ. Grace and Faith, and Truth, and Christ himself admitteth of Degrees, or Measures, which are one; and there are several Measures of Life, of Light, of Grace and Faith, of Sanctification, and of Justification also; for, according as every man hath received Christ, so hath he received Sanctification and Justification,... 2

1. G.M., p. 293.

2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 487.

One part of the Quaker rebuttal on perfect justification consisted in the argument that if there were degrees of sanctification, then there also were degrees of justification, since the two were inseparable. The argument, of course, could easily be reversed, and as we shall see presently, the Quakers could argue that if justification were complete and perfect, then so also was sanctification, for both come together from Christ. Fox approaches this line of reasoning in his rejoinder to the idea that Christ cleanses from the guilt of sin perfectly, but from the power of sin gradually:

Answ. Where sin is, there the guilt of it is felt at that instant; but whoever feels the sin, shall feel the guilt of it;... And the blood of the seed it cleanseth from sin, the power and stain of it, and then the guilt is gone of it; ¹

Whoever knows that which frees completely from the guilt of sin, knows the freedom from the power of sin.

In addition to the concept of perfect sanctification, however, this quotation from Fox verges on another principle, that of the inward aspect of justification. This emerges more clearly in a reply by Fox to a statement antithetical to Quaker thought:

Pr. And the righteousness of Christ by which we are justified (he saith) is not within us....

Answ. You that are not justified by that Christ that suffered without, manifested within you shall never know Justification; if the Justification be not within, you are reprobates. ²

1. G.M., p. 281.

2. Ibid., p. 108.

It is Fox's contention that "none owneth justification but who witnesseth justification within, faith in the heart, and Christ being within, there is justification".¹ Again, the Quaker argument centers on the withinness of religion, and there are many echoes of Quaker tenets which have been discussed in the foregoing pages. On the one hand, there is the insistence on immediate revelation and the experiential knowledge of Christ. Fox writes:

Now that which we say God and Christ is not the Author of (but gathered from the letter) is a dead faith and righteousness, and there is your justification that stands in the unbelieving state and is condemned: ...[you have Christ only from the Letter,]& have not heard his voice, nor received faith from him; who is the author of it through which men is justified... 2

On the other hand, there is the entire dispute on "Christ within", which is fought out again in the following exchange between Bunyan and Fox:

Pr. He saith, To be justified by Christ is not to be justified by the spirit within, and that Christ within doth not work out justification for the soule, but must look out for salvation unto that man, that is now absent from his Saints on earth,....
Ans. Corrected by the Apostle, who saith, he works all in us, & for us,...and Christ is in the Saints, who is their justification, ...and where he is, there is justification; 3

All the various facets of the controversy on "within" versus "without"--the Quaker emphasis on the experiential, receiving

1. Ibid., p. 49.

2. Ibid., pp. 36-37.

3. Ibid., p. 9.

side, and the opposing Puritan emphasis on objectively given aspects of Christian doctrine--are inseparable and interdependent. The Quaker and Puritan arguments on immediate revelation, the indwelling Spirit, the Scriptures, and the Nature and Work of Christ both support and are reinforced by their respective positions regarding justification and sanctification.

We return to the doctrine of justification, however, with the Quaker interpretation of justification by faith. This affords the Quakers one of their most direct arguments for the contention that justification has an inward, as well as an outward, objective side. The clearest exposition of the problem again comes from The Great Mistry:

Pr. He saith, It is an error to say, we are justified by that which Christ doth in us, &c.

Ans. Contrary to the Apostle, who saith, we are justified by faith in his blood; and the faith is in the heart, and the blood is in the heart that purifies it, ...: And the word of faith is within, Rom. 10. ¹

Fox insisted that "We are justified by faith,...and this is within".² The "blood of Christ", His atoning sacrifice, must be appropriated by the believer in faith. The Quakers' plea is again for a vital religion, for "possession" as well as "profession", and Fisher puts the case vividly:

1. Ibid., p. 47.

2. Ibid., p. 83.

Yet if the blood of that immaculate Lamb,...and the sacrifice of himself, by which he purges away sin, and that righteousness, and those perfect good works, and holy spiritual operations of his be not witnessed nearer to us in time, and place than 1600 years since at Jerusalem, (viz.) within us now as I Joh.1.7. it avails us not to our salvation. ¹

There is an "operation" and righteousness of Christ "without", to be sure, but justification is not complete unless Christ's Atonement is accepted in faith, and His righteousness is fulfilled in us. And "where Christ is within, there is sanctification, and there is justification, & there is salvation known;...Faith evidenceth it, the spirit witnessing,...& this is within". ²

As can readily be expected, the Puritans did not attack the Quaker emphasis on witnessing justification within by impugning the doctrine of justification by faith. Indeed, as will appear presently, the Puritans turned the latter against their opponents in the charge that the Quakers upheld a doctrine of salvation by works. We have seen in previous pages that the Puritans were far from denying the experiential side of various Christian doctrines. Their objection was that the Quakers emphasized withinness to the neglect or exclusion of withoutness: the external, historical, and objective basis of Christian faith was held to be sub-

1. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 154.

2. G.M., p. 241.

merged and made secondary to the inner, personal religious consciousness. With regard to the issue at hand, Puritan protest arose because the Quakers made justification inseparable from sanctification, and Puritan criticism reached its height on the charge that sanctification seemed to be made prior to and necessary for justification. Fox quotes the Congregationalist Stalham as declaring:

And they that [i.e., that they] are justified by their sanctification, it is a falshood. And that none are justified but Saints perfect in holiness, is a notorious contradiction.... 1

Another anti-Quaker writer is cited as stating that "God justifieth them that are not sanctified".² Jonathan Clapham complains that the Quakers "destroy the proper end of Sanctification", which is not justification but the believers' glorification of God:

the end of God in Sanctifying his people is not, that by setting up a righteousness in them, they might thereby be justified before God...but that being reconciled to God through Christ, their natures being sanctified,...they might be fit to glorifie God, and to enjoy communion with him for ever,.... 3

In Puritan reasoning, the believer is to witness the sanctifying presence of Christ within him, but it is not this inner

1. Ibid., p. 157.

2. Ibid., p. 294.

3. J. Clapham, A Discovery of the Quakers Doctrine, p. 60.

experience of Christ that saves. The Puritan argument on the Atonement reappears, and Bunyan's statement of it is sufficient to reinforce the case for the external basis of justification:

There can none be saved but they have the Spirit of Christ given unto them. But it is not the Spirit of Christ given to the elect that doth work out the salvation of their souls within them, for that was obtained by the blood of the man Christ Jesus on the cross. ¹

This emphasis on the external aspect of justification, as centered in the atoning death of Christ on the Cross, was set against the Quaker emphasis on sanctification and witnessing justification within, and the slogan of this dispute was "imputed" versus "inherent" righteousness. To the Puritan's mind, the Quakers were upholding the latter and denying the former, or subsuming both categories under the one, "inherent righteousness". Bunyan again may be taken as spokesman for the Puritan side when he declares that "Christ Jesus hath obtained everlasting righteousness, ...and doth impute this righteousness to poor man".² True, "it is imputed to so many as shall by faith lay hold on it",³ but Bunyan and his co-religionists, when disputing with the Quakers, were primarily concerned to stress that righteousness is some-

1. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 116. Cf. above pp. 191-198.

2. Ibid., I. 60.

3. Ibid., I. 68.

thing imputed to man; it does not come from anything inherent in man's nature. On the contrary, according to another writer, "Justification by Inherent Righteousnesse, is a Damnable Doctrine"--but this is one of the Quakers' "maine Principles".¹ Samuel Hammond continues his argument, contending that imputed righteousness is the "matter, and formall cause of our justification"; this is without us, for it is "inherent in the Person of Christ at the right hand of God".² A basic cause of the Quakers' delusion is

Their not being able to distinguish
(through the hood-winkings of Satan)
betwixt the righteousness imputed upon
the account of the Blood of Christ; and
the righteousnesse, or holinesse wrought
in us by the Spirit: 3

The Puritan verdict is brought forward in a final form by an early anti-Quaker pamphlet listing and refuting Quaker doctrines. Two of these are given as follows:

That men are not justified by that righteousnesse of Christ, which he in his own person did fulfill without us.
That men are justified by that righteousness which Christ within us enabled us to perform, or (which is in effect, and some of them have expressed) by inherent holinesse. 4

-
1. S. Hammond, The Quakers House Built upon the Sand, p. 7.
 2. Ibid., p. 9. In their denial of imputed righteousness, Hammond compares the Quakers with "the Socinian".
 3. Ibid., p. 4.
 4. T. Weld, et.al., The Perfect Pharisee, pp. 9-10.

The accusation that the Quakers held a doctrine of "inherent righteousness" was, of course, almost synonymous with the charge that they held to a "Justification by works", and these two phrases were used interchangeably in one of the earliest anti-Quaker tracts.¹ Frequently this charge was related to the Quaker doctrine of the light within, as in Hammond's argument:

And indeed, what ever a man may call the light within him (if he call it, the life of Christ in us,...) yet if he live upon it, as his righteousnesse for justification, it is a plaine covenant of works. 2

Earlier in his pamphlet, Hammond had complained that the Quakers think of grace as "that naturall light" which is "improved",³ and Clapham describes as the Quakers' "great and principal doctrine, the sufficiency of the light in the conscience to lead men to Justification, Sanctification and Salvation".⁴ The discussion here hinges on the disputes dealt with in Chapter Two, especially the questions of the light within as a light of nature, or reason, or conscience, as opposed to its identification as the Light of Christ, and the resultant problem of the saving efficacy of the light within. Since the Puritans viewed the light within as a

1. F. Higginson, A Brief Relation of the Irreligion of the Northern Quakers, p. 6.

2. S. Hammond, op.cit., pp. 18-19.

3. Ibid., pp. 4-5.

4. J. Clapham, op.cit., p. 55. Both Clapham and Hammond describe the Quakers as Pelagian and Papist on this issue.

natural light, having no supernatural character, and therefore no saving efficacy, they automatically condemned reliance on the light within as a covenant of works, not of grace. Nor would an "improvement" or increase of this light ever make it the grace of salvation, for such an idea was seen founded on

another rotten Romish doctrine, to wit, that men before conversion and regeneration have power to improve the common light and grace they have, so as to obtain of God special and saving grace; ¹

Clapham rejected such a doctrine as contrary to the Scriptures, and the Puritans universally rejected any statement which made the light within sufficient for salvation.

Looking at Quaker doctrine as a whole, the Puritan could not but conclude that "these men propose such a way to salvation, as is in the compass of a man's own ability, even works of righteousness done by him".² Against such an alleged doctrine of salvation by works, the Puritans opposed a firm insistence on the doctrine of justification by faith. Among the principles advocated by anti-Quaker writers, Fox notes the proposition, "That he is justified by faith alone without good works",³ and again, that "Men are presented perfect to God,...before any work done, or good whatsoever".⁴ Bunyan asserts that those who do not believe that the "merits"

1. Ibid., p. 58.

2. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 122.

3. G.M., p. 44.

4. Ibid., p. 55.

of the life and sacrificial death of Christ are sufficient to save them, and who "expect that salvation should be obtained by something that worketh in them" cannot possibly be saved. And "Wherefore? Because they seek it not by the faith of Christ, but, as it were, by the works of the law".¹ Admittedly, works are a proper aspect of the Christian life, but our salvation does not depend on works. Perhaps the best Puritan exposition of the relationship of faith and works is given by Bunyan:

What, then, is it faith and works together that doth justify? No, it is only faith in the blood of the man Christ, ... that doth justify in the sight of God and the soul; and it is the fruits of faith, good works, which doth justify in the sight of men.²

When God alone is the judge, it is faith--apart from works--that justifies; works justify a man's faith only before the world, and even then works can give a false impression of a person's faith.

Thus the Puritan argued that justification and sanctification are distinct and separable, and that the latter is not a necessary condition of the former. The Quaker view, which tied the two inseparably together, was condemned as a doctrine of "inherent righteousness"; it denied the imputation of Christ's righteousness, and held out the light within as saving grace. Therefore, salvation was proposed

1. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 114-115. Rom.9:30, 31, is referred to here.

2. Ibid., I. 101.

as a development of something within man himself, and a covenant of works was substituted for the covenant of grace. The final indictment of Quaker soteriology repeats a fundamental line of Puritan reasoning: if the emphasis falls exclusively on that which is within, what need is there of the external, historical event of Christ? "For if righteousness come by the obedience to the law, or by the conscience either, then Christ is dead in vain".¹ To Bunyan and other Puritan controversialists, Quaker doctrine dangerously undercut the Christian's basic dependence on the atoning work of Christ.

All of these Puritan arguments received a direct response from the Quaker writers, who worked from the principle that justification and sanctification were "not two things really distinct in their nature, but really one, for Christ [is] our sanctification, and justification".² On the one hand, Fox argues that "He that is justified is sanctified, for he that justifieth, sanctifieth".³ On the other hand, Fox reverses the order and contends that whoever is sanctified is also justified:

They that are not compleat in sanctification, they are not compleat in justification, for they are one; they that are compleat in the one, are compleat in

1. Ibid., I. 97. Bunyan cites Gal.2:21.

2. G.M., p. 310.

3. Ibid., p. 294.

the other; and so farre as a man is sanctified, so far is he justified, and no farther; for the same that sanctifies a man, justifies him; ¹

Those who speak of justification and sanctification as solely "without", are still "in the first Adam", and in "the sin and transgression".² This point of view is basic to Quaker thought, and is perhaps expressed most clearly and forcefully by Edward Burrough:

This all the Children of God believe, and know, That none are justified by Christ's Righteousness without, but who are converted to God, and have received Christ; and he is in them, for else they are Reprobates, and not justified:....Neither do I confound Justification and Sanctification,...for they are one in Christ; for he is made unto us Sanctification and Justification; and the man that is in the Pollution of the World, unsanctified, is not justified, but condemned; so none are justified by a Righteousness without them, but them that are sanctified by him within; ³

Justification was something wrought by Christ not only "without" but also "within", and the process of redemption could not be complete until Christ's righteousness was received and witnessed in the life of the believer.

Although such a doctrine was at once termed "inherent righteousness" by the Puritans, and set in contrast to "imputed righteousness", the Quakers did not accept either of these attitudes. Fox begins his reply to Hammond on this

1. Ibid., p. 284.

2. Ibid., p. 157.

3. E. Burrough, Works, p. 449.

point by charging that "Inherent righteousness is a word of thy own and the Papist inventing",¹ and against another opponent he declares, "you tell us of humane and inherent righteousness, which the Scripture tells us no such words".² The term under dispute was, in fact, proposed by the Puritan controversialists, for it appears in Quaker writings only when it is denied or rejected as non-Scriptural. The dispute on inherent righteousness was more than a semantic quarrel, however, for the Quakers claimed that their position had been grossly misrepresented: they stoutly declared that righteousness comes not from anything within man, but from Christ Himself. Thus Hubberthorne denies Hammond's charge, for "we never denied any righteousness of Christ imputed unto us",³ and Quakers hold nothing else but Christ to be the cause of our righteousness:

...that righteousness which is wrought by Jesus Christ in us, is to us a seale of that righteousness which was wrought in the Person of Christ, and of that which in his blood is imputed to us for justification.⁴

Fox argues in a similar fashion, contending that "Christ works in us Faith, and is the Author of it, and by faith is every one justified in the blood of the seed"; the be-

1. G.M., p. 182.

2. Ibid., p. 216.

3. R. Hubberthorne, The Quakers House Built Upon the Rock of Christ, pp. 18-19.

4. Ibid., pp. 8-9.

liever's life in Christ is "wrought within" by this faith in the atoning death of Christ, and hence Fox concludes:

And whosoever witnesseth Christ within, they witness the end of Imputation, they witness the thing it selfe, the end of their belief, and they possess the sanctification, and such comes to know faith and love. ¹

This interpretation of "imputation" is later given a fuller expression by Fox:

The imputation to a believer is owned; and this imputation is within, for he that believes is born of God, and hath the witness in himself; now Abraham believed, and the Romans, and to such the imputation was spoken in the belief;... so such as hath Christ in them, they have the righteousness it self, without imputation, the end of imputation, the righteousness of God it self Christ Jesus; ²

Once more the Quaker emphasis is on immediacy--the direct relationship of the believer with Christ, the actual and unqualified possession of divine righteousness. The Quaker was never satisfied with any statement that might seem to break this immediacy or undercut the fullness of the divine indwelling. Thus Burrough can describe the charge that the Quakers "utterly renounce the Doctrine of Justification by the imputation of the Righteousness of Christ", as being "partly true, and partly a Lye":

we do indeed renounce the profession of Justification by the Imputation of Christ or his Righteousness performed without men, by [i.e., in] men while they are in the de-

1. G.M., p. 159.

2. Ibid., p. 183.

generated estate, ...and unborn again;
 ...but yet we say, that Righteousness
 is imputed to us, and reckoned unto us
 who believe in Christ, and we have re-
 ceived him, even the Obedience and
 Sufferings that he performed without
 us, is ours, who have received him with-
 in us, and witnesseth Christ in us, and
 therefore we are not Reprobates; ¹

Certainly we own the justification "without", that which was wrought by Christ's life and death, argued the Quakers; but they insisted that this must be witnessed "within", or else it is not effective for salvation.

Since Fox and the First Publishers denied that they held a doctrine of inherent righteousness, they also denied that they advocated salvation by works, or more accurately, by the mere works of man alone. The accusation that grace was equated with an "improved" light was discarded as another misrepresentation of Quaker doctrine, and Hubberthorne, in his reply to Hammond, declares that the Quakers never said that reconciliation to God came about by improving the light within.² He maintains that the Quakers always distinguish between "the justifying Grace, and the naturall light", and he states that the latter could never be called grace, whether it was an improved natural light or not.³ As we have seen, the Quakers defined the light within not as a natural

1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 516. In answer to a tract by "Priest [Thomas] Jackson", a nonconformist minister in Sussex.

2. R. Hubberthorne, op.cit., p. 19-20.

3. Ibid, p. 12.

but as a spiritual or supernatural light, the Light of Christ as Saviour. And as no one could know Christ but by the light within, so Fox also asserted, "There's no one comes out of the covenant of works, but by the Light within".¹ The Quaker rebuttal to the charge that the natural light within, "being improved", is called the grace of God, is epitomized in Fox's answer to Hammond:

...the Covenant of grace is one, that which was wrought without is within in the soul, for Christ in you, &c.,...: and none knowes him without, nor Justification by grace, but who knowes it in the heart, and it is the one and the same thing, it is not another grace, nor another Covenant, nor another Christ, but the same Christ in you: ...he thats the Covenant of light is the Covenant of grace; 2

Furthermore, "Gods work in the soul leads to the end of the Covenant of works".³ Fox could sometimes argue that he who has faith in Christ has brought all works to an end, and he brings this argument in reply to the accusation of "hoping to be saved by your own works":

Answ. He that believes hath ceased from his own works, so not saved by them, and he that believes is saved, and this belief is within him in Christ. 4

More often, however, in reaction to the frequent Puritan emphasis upon justification by faith alone, Fox advances a

1. G.M., p. 186.

2. Ibid., p. 183.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p. 319.

different viewpoint and contends that works are done in God's power, and are necessary for salvation. To the proposition that "Men are presented perfect to God,...before any work done", Fox replies:

There is none doth the work of God but who believes; and he that believes overcomes the world, and his works are wrought in God,....and men are not presented to God while they do evill, and afore they are sanctified and holy. ¹

Nor was Bunyan's argument that works and faith justify only before men and not before God allowed to go uncontested.

Says Fox:

Abraham was not justified to men only by his obedience, but to God, and where there is faith, there is justification, which works by love; And the Saints faith and works was not only to justifie them in the sight of men, for the work of God is to do what he saith; ²

The presence of sin and the presence of God were deemed by the Quakers to be unqualifiedly incompatible.

This conclusion was made possible by the Quaker conception of man's fallen sinful nature as something from which man could free himself. It was made inevitable by the Quaker conception of the realization of perfection in this life, and by the doctrine of the inseparability of justification and sanctification. The directly opposite positions which the Puritans took on these issues, as well

1. Ibid., p. 55.

2. Ibid., pp. 10-11.

as on the questions of immediacy, the indwelling of the Spirit, and "Christ within", mutually reinforced their emphasis on justification by faith alone. To the Puritan mind, it was sheer boasting and self-deception for anyone to claim he had become free from the body of sin in this life, and had been as completely sanctified as he was perfectly justified by Christ. To the Quaker mind, it was a pleading for sin to say that sin could never be overcome in this life, or that since only justification was complete, sinful men only partially sanctified could come into God's presence. The full weight of the many conflicting viewpoints analysed in these first five chapters comes to bear on the issue of sin and the overcoming of sin, and the divergent Puritan and Quaker answers on this issue mutually reinforce those previously discussed.

Throughout the entire controversy, a recurrent and, in many ways, the fundamental Puritan objection to Quaker doctrine was the question, "is this not a forsaking of Christ?" The Quakers' doctrine of immediate revelation, of the light within, of the Spirit and the Scriptures all seemed to the Puritans to set up the individual believer in direct relation to God, and thus to render Christ the Mediator unnecessary. We have seen this objection with regard to the charge that the Quakers substituted a covenant of human works for the covenant of grace through Christ. The First Publishers well realized the decisive importance

of this accusation, and their answer has already been given in the constant refrain of Fox and others that it is the same Christ who is both the justification and the sanctification, and who gives the believer power to overcome sin. The First Publishers strongly rejected the charge that they "boasted" of perfection and overcoming sin, and Nayler's statement is only one of many:

And this is no self-work, nor can it be wrought in any but where Self is denied, and a Cross to Self taken up; so Boasting is excluded, the Creature having nothing but what he hath received,... 1

Likewise, all the early Quakers solemnly affirmed that their soteriological position was thoroughly Christocentric, and we may let Fisher conclude the discussion on this point:

I shall shew whom and whose good Works and Righteousness, Life comes by, and is given upon, yea, I here positively affirm that by none but Christ alone Justification unto Life can come; nor is their either Title to the inheritance, or fitness to possess it by any other good Works or Righteousness save those of the Lord Jesus only, whose only, and all whose works, even in the very least degree thereof,...are perfectly good, when the best of meer man's are as T. [Danson] says, but imperfectly good,... 2

If the Puritans and Quakers could not agree about the efficacy or necessity of works for salvation, they could heartily agree about the origin of good works. Whether by faith, or by faith and works, the disputants on all sides asserted that

1. J. Nayler, A Collection, p. 307.

2. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 152.

justification was not by man, but by Jesus Christ.

One disputed soteriological issue remains to be treated, and that is the relatively infrequent discussion on the doctrine of election. In Chapter Two, it was seen that the Quakers held that all men had been given the saving light of Christ, and that, if obeyed, this was sufficient for salvation. The Puritans, on the other hand, described the universal light as merely a natural light, ineffective for salvation, whether heeded or not.¹ Furthermore, we have noted that the Quakers maintained that Christ "was the offering for the sins of the whole world", His sacrificial death was a propitiation for all men.² These Quaker views seemed to run counter to the Puritan doctrine of election, and Fisher makes the following complaint:

And because we talk of an Universal Redemption by Christ's coming intentionally to save all men, though (through their own Default) all are not, but few only actually saved; they pittifully propound us as denying God's eternal unchangeable Decree, and his Praedestination, Election, Reprobation, and such like. ³

Fisher and the Quakers could indeed affirm that "The Doctrine of Election and Reprobation we do own according to the Scriptures";⁴ for they believed that some were saved and some con-

1. Cf. above, pp. 78-90.

2. G.M., p. 63. Cf. above, pp. 80-81.

3. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 36.

4. E. Burrough, Works, p. 516.

demned; but they sharply denied that an individual was predestinated by God to one or the other of these states.

Although Bunyan develops a strong predestinarian view, stating that God foreordained that Christ should come as Saviour, and "did before [creation] choose some of those that would fall, and give them to him that should afterward purchase them actually",¹ he is one of the few controversialists who urges this view in their anti-Quaker writings. For a clear picture of the Quaker opposition to predestination we must go beyond English Puritanism to the more rigorous Calvinism of Scotland. Here Fox found occasion for clearly expressing himself on this point, for he found that people had been frightened "with the doctrine of election & reprobation", and had been told that

ye greatest part of men & women God had
ordained y^m for hell lett y^m pray or
preach or singe & doe what they coulde
Itt was all nothings if they was ordained
for hell. 2

Against this idea that "ye fault was not att all in ye creature lesse or more but God had ordained it soe", Fox argues from Jude that "there was a fault in Cain Core & Balam", and as it was the fault in them which brought their condemnation, so it is man's sins and not God's ordination

1. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 55.

2. Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 293-294. One of the chief texts adduced by the predestinarians was Jude 4.

that brings reprobation. The grace of God, the manifestation of the Spirit, the Light of Christ, the propitiation of Christ, all were given to all men for their salvation. It is man's response to this divine grace that determines his eternal destiny:

Soe all y^t beleives in ye light of Christ
as hee commands are in ye election & setts
under ye grace of Gods teachinge y^t bringes
there [their] salvation & such as turnes this
grace Into wantonnesse are in ye reprobation
& such as hates ye light are in ye condemna-
tion. ¹

Thus according to Fox, election and reprobation are not predestined by God, but depend on the individual's belief in and obedience to the saving Light of Christ. Just as the Fall was viewed not as a permanent state, but one from which one could "come out of", so election was viewed by the Quakers not as a state to which one was ordained even though he continued in sin, but a state which one was in only when he overcame sin. The early Friends contended that the elect do not commit sin: "he that is borne of God doth not commit sin, neither can he, because his seed remains in him, I Jo. 3.9."² If the seed of Satan dwells, or is allowed to dwell in a person, he is in the reprobation; if the seed of God, or of Christ the second Adam dwells in the believer, he is in the election. Burrough gives a pre-

1. Ibid., I. 294-295.

2. G. Weare, et.al., The Doctrins...of the Priests of Scotland, p. 24.

cise summation of Quaker doctrine on this point:

...so in the first Adam all are reprobated, and all that are in the second Adam are elected; and the Election and Reprobation stands not in the Persons, but in the Seeds, and yet the Persons are blessed or cursed, ..., according as the Seed of God, or the seed of the Serpent lives and dwells and bears rule in the Persons; ¹

With this we come back again to the major issue in the soteriological controversy: can man overcome the body of sin in this life? Because the Quakers could answer in the affirmative, they could reject the doctrine of predestination: if one could overcome and eject the seed of the Devil by accepting and obeying the seed of God, one's salvation was determined by the nature of his earthly life, and his election or reprobation was not irrevocably predestined by divine decree before the world began. Once again the problem of perfection and sanctification dominates the scene, and if the English Puritans did not attack the Quakers on predestination, it was partly because they were concentrating on the foundation of Quaker soteriology.

1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 516.

CHAPTER SIX

The Church and Ordinances

We now leave the disputes involving the fundamental theological doctrines of the Christian faith and turn to the application of these doctrines to concrete situations in the life of the Church. The remaining chapters take up the ecclesiological debates centering on the nature and worship of the Church, the office of the ministry, and the relationship between Church and State. With this shift in subject matter comes a change in the method and tone of the controversy: it is no longer general propositions and principles, but specific customs and practices that are called in question, and as the issues become more practical, the arguments become more fragmentary, sporadic, and diffuse. Both Quakers and Puritans seized upon every questionable act or custom of their opponents, and as a result much of the polemic--especially that about ministers--becomes largely a personal and ad hominem argument. The more abstract theological conflicts discussed above undergird these ecclesiological and personal disputes, but these ideational antagonisms were, at the same time, powerfully reinforced by the fervent and sometimes bitter antipathies engendered over practical issues.

The debate on the nature of the Church may be opened by the Quaker pronouncement that the true Church has been

lost in apostasy since apostolic times. Fox contends that the "false Prophets and Antichrists" foretold by Jesus came even before the "Apostles decease; And they went forth from the Church, and departed from the faith"; these false prophets are "inwardly ravened from the Spirit", their Church is "made up by the Letter", and is "against the light which comes from Christ where the Church stands". "But now", Fox concludes, Christ "is redeeming and recovering that which hath been lost since the dayes of the Apostles, in this night of Apostacy".¹ The Quakers directed a relentless and thoroughgoing criticism against the existing churches, describing them as the "Idols Temple", made with hands, and composed of "Hypocritical professors" and led by a "false Ministry".² In contrast to such false churches, the true Church was defined as the temple not made with hands, where the worship and the ministry were directed by the Spirit, and from which all hypocrisy and evil doing was excluded.

The charge of "apostacy" was immediately supported by the charge that the Protestant churches were under the shadow of Rome. The Quakers viewed the history of the church edifice, the "steeple-house", as clear proof of this accusation, for, says Fox:

1. G.M., pp. 92-93. Much of Fox's argument stems from I John 2:18f.

2. Cf. T. Aldam, *et.al.*, A Brief Discovery, "Epistle", and pp. 1-11. One of the earliest Quaker tracts, this pamphlet vividly illustrates the fervor and intensity of the Quaker attack.

...the steeple-house is no Church, but the old Masse-house set up since the daies of the Apostles, since they lost the true Church, ¹

In a more extended reference to the steeple-house, Fox develops this contention:

Was it not a place for the Masse, set up for the Masse, with a Crosse at the end of it? Look, is it not on yet? And is the Masse-house become thy Church? thou mayst thank the Papists for that. Was not the Pope and the Papists the setters up of all your Masse-houses,...which have gotten up since the dayes of the Apostles, among you inwardly ravenors from the Church which is in God,... ²

Samuel Fisher is even more explicit, and gives a long list of "Popish trash" yet remaining in the English church; the list includes, "Educations in Colledges", "silly superfluities" such as scarlet gowns, various liturgical practices, the use of bells, the singing of Psalms, the maintenance of the ministry by tithes. The Quakers could only conclude with Fisher that "the business of rooting out all Romish Relicks yet remaining, remains yet reeling to and fro", and is far from having been completed.³

For their part, however, the Puritans were also far from satisfied with the present state of religion. The prolific Presbyterian pamphleteer, William Prynne, voiced the ancient complaint that "we now have as many faiths as

1. G.M., p. 278.

2. Ibid., p. 125.

3. S. Fisher, Testimony, pp. 590-591.

wills, and as many Doctrines as manners", and described the people as

Subverting their old Church,...with a New one, that New, with a Newer, that Newer, with the Newest and last broached, ...till they have utterly lost all Faith, Piety, Religion, Conscience; and made the Church of Christ a meer Mockery; yea Christ himself, a Fable. ¹

Baxter likewise deplores the rapid growth of sects, each condemning its predecessor and in turn being condemned; in this wild parade Baxter considers it no surprise that the Quakers too "step in and take their turns in the game; who will come down with greater shame than most that have gone before them, when they have plaid [i.e. played] their part".² Indeed, the Puritans can also claim that error has been abroad since apostolic times, and in a pamphlet subtitled, "An History of the Quakers Both Old and New", Quaker doctrines are traced back to Simon Magus and the false apostles against whom Paul wrote the epistles to the Romans and Galatians.³

But perhaps the primary objection to the Quaker charge of apostasy is Baxter's argument that if the Quakers are the only true Church, then there was no Church before

-
1. Wm. Prynne, A New Discovery, pp. 2-3. William Prynne (1600-1669). Educated at Oriel College, Oxford, he became a lawyer and a prolific Puritan pamphleteer; he was imprisoned by the Star Chamber and again by the Commonwealth government; he supported the return of Charles II, and in religion was a conservative Presbyterian. Cf. D.N.B.
 2. R. Baxter, One Sheet against the Quakers, p. 1.
 3. T. Underhill, Hell broke loose, pp. 1-13.

they arose a few years ago. But if this is so, then Christ did not establish His "Catholick Church"--of which Baxter counts himself a member--and after His Ascension, Christ has never been "Christ in Office, the Head and Saviour of the Church".¹ The Kidderminster pastor complains that the Quakers "cannot tell us of any Church or Ministry which is indeed the right", and he demands, "If they be of the Church, let them tell us which is the Church that they are of".² Elsewhere, he summarizes these objections in another query to his Quaker opponents:

Seeing you cry down our Ministry and Churches, tell us which is the true Ministry and Church, and when yours begun, and where it hath been since Christs abode on earth till now? Speak plainly, and let us know whether you are indeed Papists or Pagans? ³

This query received a direct answer from Nayler:

The true Ministry and Church is those who abide in the doctrine of Christ, guided by his Spirit, in the way of his worship,...⁴

Since the time of Christ's life on earth, this Church has been attacked and persecuted by "Cains generation", and Christ is now coming to "be avenged of that bloody Generation".⁵ Nayler argues that the nearest to Christ's Church

1. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 2.

2. Ibid.

3. R. Baxter, The Quakers Catechism, p. 31.

4. J. Nayler, An Answer to a Book called The Quakers Catechism, p. 57.

5. Ibid., p. 57f.

are those who cry down false worships, and Burrough similarly contends that the Quakers do not deny the Church, but only witness against the hypocrisy of those "who professeth themselves to [be] a Church, and yet are in the pride,...and in the evil of this World, and not redeemed" and cleansed from its iniquity. Burrough, therefore, claims that the Quakers do not deny the Church of Christ:

The Church of Christ we own, and are of it, which are gathered out of the World through the preaching of the Gospel, and seperated from the World,...and are joynd to Christ the Head, in the Spirit, and one to another, as Members of Christ; 1

The Quakers clearly held to a doctrine of the "gathered Church": the Church is not the steeple-house, "for the Church is the people of God, the elect seed, which Christ is the head of"; unlike the steeple-house church, it is perfect "without spot or wrinkle".² The Quaker doctrine of perfection has its echoes in their doctrine of the Church, as the following exchange of opinions indicates:

Pr. ...the prince of darkness is transformed into an Angel of light, [and] he walketh in the Churches....

Answ. The Church of Christ is the pillar, and ground of truth, which truth, the Devil is out of, and abode not in it:....And the Devil..., though he transform himself into an Angel of light: yet he doth not walk in the Church....³

Just as the true Christian is one who witnesses Christ's vic-

1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 311.

2. G.M., p. 213.

3. Ibid., p. 116.

tory over sin and the Devil, so the true Church is that from which evil-doing, hypocrisy, persecution, and Satan himself are excluded.

Furthermore, according to Quaker thought, this Church which is separated from the world, has its foundation in Christ. On this point it is the doctrine of "Christ within" which undergirds Quaker ecclesiology: Christ is not distinct or afar off from His saints, nor is He "absent from his Church", as Bunyan had argued. That is "Contrary to Christs words, I in them, and they in me:....And Christ said, where two or three meet together in my name, I will be amongst them".¹ So Fox argued; nor will Burrough allow Bunyan's contention that the Quakers deny the humanity of Christ by saying that Christ hath "no other body but his Church". Burrough denies that the Quakers ever make such a statement, and he makes another affirmation:

but we say the Church is Christ's Body;
And it is sufficient for Salvation to
know Christ Jesus to be head in us, and
over us, and our selves to be Members of
his Body, 2

The Quaker doctrine of the Church was never seriously challenged for not being thoroughly Christocentric.

The Church, according to the early Friends, was clearly separated from the world, it was the Body of Christ, and it

-
1. Ibid., p. 9. Cf. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 86. On the issue of Christ within, cf. above, pp. 173ff.
 2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 150. Cf. J. Bunyan, Works, I. 86, 113f; on the humanity of Christ, cf. above, pp. 178ff.

was primarily a spiritual and invisible Church. The emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in forming and guiding the Church was the most important aspect of Quaker ecclesiology. Questions such as "Is God worshipped in Temples made with hands? Is not he worshipped in the spirit and in the truth?"¹ are repeated continually by the First Publishers. "God is a Spirit and his Church is spirituall", writes Farnsworth in a statement which epitomizes the Quaker position, and from this it is concluded that "it was a spirituall order, and rule or government in the Church".²

An integral part of the Quakers' spiritualized conception of the Church was, of course, the contention that the "officers & overseers" in Christ's Church were "made by the holy Ghost", but this involves the question of the ministry, which will be taken up in the following chapter. But not only was the ministry and organization of the Church grounded upon the direct operation of the Spirit; divine worship was also viewed as a work of the Spirit. God need not be worshipped in "Temples made with hands", in buildings especially set apart as a "holy place",³ nor with visible forms which are devoid of the Spirit. A Puritan writer might say that

1. G.M., p. 68.

2. R. Farnsworth, The Holy Scriptures...cleared, p. 17.

3. The conception of the church edifice as one more holy than any other building was deemed by Fox to be from the Pope. Cf. G.M., p. 14.

"God hath made man to serve him in an outward and visible way of worship", but the Quaker would reply that Christ commanded us to worship God in spirit; "and", adds Fox, "is the Spirit without, and visible?"¹ As will be seen shortly, this principle was applied to the sacraments as well as to worship in general. With regard to the ministry, the government, the worship and ordinances, the invisible and spiritual was opposed to the visible and purely human, and the Church in all its aspects was seen as a spiritual entity: a people called by God's Spirit and redeemed from the world by the Head of the Church. The promise of God was not said to be "to the visible Church, but to the seed, and who are of the seed are of the Church of Christ".² Perhaps the most typical Quaker statement on the nature of the Church is the reply given by Fox to a minister who referred to the steeple-house as a church. Said Fox:

The church was the pillar and ground of truth, made up of living stones, living members, a spiritual household, which Christ was the head of; but he was not the head of a mixed multitude, or of an old house made up of lime, stones, and wood. ³

In their controversies with the Quakers on ecclesiological questions, the Puritan writers spent most of their

1. G.M., p. 172.

2. Ibid., p. 254.

3. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I. 25.

energies in refuting the attack against the ordained ministry; aside from the discussion on ordinances, Puritan polemical literature contains almost no explicit treatment of the doctrine of the Church. This silence may be attributed partly to the fact that the diversity within Puritan thought was more obvious regarding the nature of the Church than it was in regard to the more abstract problems of revelation, the Scriptures, Christology, or soteriology. The Puritans could more easily unite in opposing the Quaker doctrines of immediate revelation, Christ within, or perfection in this life, than they could unite in opposition to the Quaker rejection of infant baptism or the ordination of ministers. Furthermore, the Puritans were limited here to an essentially defensive argument, since in this early period there was still a general uncertainty about the actual nature of the Quakers' own church organization. Baxter could well wonder whether the Quakers were themselves a Church, and if so, which Church were they of? It was difficult to mount a vigorous attack against the ecclesiology of a group of people who met in the open fields or in private houses, and had no visible system of worship or of church government. The Puritans could hardly deny the Quaker description of the Church as the Body of Christ, unless this formula was embodied in a tangible form which might, like the Church of Rome, be measured by Scriptural standards and found wanting.

Again, much of the Puritan criticism of the Quaker

doctrine of the Church was contained in the rejection of the underlying Quaker doctrines of perfection and immediate inspiration. The Puritan churches, as well as the infant Society of Friends, viewed church discipline as an essential function of the Church, but the major section of Puritan thought would not contend that the Devil could be completely excluded from a human, earthly Church. Having argued that even the best of saints are still imperfect and sinful in this life, the Puritan was only being consistent if he said that "The greatest part of professors in the visible Church were, and are always earthly minded".¹ The prince of darkness, transformed into an angel of light, could indeed walk in the Churches.² Likewise, since immediate revelation is not to be expected in the present age, we are justified and, in fact, compelled to use outward forms and visible means in worshipping God:

have not we still need of Ordinances, wherein to enjoy communion with God? we have no such immediate converse with God now, as to see him face to face, but only as we behold him in the glasse of his Ordinances,...only while we are waiting on him in his Ordinances he promises to meet us and be with us spiritually,...³

In this statement Jonathan Clapham has recalled again the

-
1. "W.P.", as quoted in G.M., p. 212. It has not been possible to identify this author or his book. Smith's Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana, p. 317, lists it as Wm. Prynne, A New Discovery, but this does not accord with Fox's reply in G.M., pp. 212ff.
 2. Cf. G.M., p. 116. Quoted above, p. 271.
 3. J. Clapham, A Discovery of the Quakers Doctrine, p. 42.

argument against immediacy, and sharply demonstrated its relevance to the defense of Puritan forms of worship.

The more direct Puritan criticism of the Quaker view of the Church begins with the discussion on worship. The basic question was whether or not "forms" were compatible with the spiritual worship of God. The major part of the dispute centered on the practical application of this question to various elements of worship, and especially to the two ordinances or sacraments. The Puritans, of course, did not consider forms to be antithetical to the life of the spirit: "though the form be but the shell, yet it preserves the kernel; the power is put forth in a form". Eaton continues this argument by contending that once the form is discarded devotion and duty to God will soon vanish with it.¹ Previously, Eaton had condemned in strong words the Quakers' opposition to ordinances and other liturgical practices:

But these men shew what spirit they are of, by their arguing against the most religious and holy Exercises, and spiritual Performances which the Saints use, and which the Devil and the Flesh have always much opposed. ²

To the Puritan, forms and ordinances had been used since apostolic times, and no denial of spiritual power was involved in their continued use. Forms were a simple necessity, an integral part of the devotional life: "the worke...and the growth of faith is by the naturall use of Ordinances".³

1. S. Eaton, The Quakers Confuted, p. 37.

2. Ibid., p. 36.

3. J. Deacon, as quoted in G.M., p. 39.

The Quakers, on the other hand, took a far different view of the relationship between form and spiritual power:

...many have the form, but deny the power.
The power preserves the forme, sees the end
of forms, and destroys them, and brings to
see before forms was, where forms is not.
For the Apostles who lived in the power,
denyed the Jewes forms, and Gentiles both,
as we do now deny the Popish forms, and
yours which you have invented and set up. ¹

A Puritan writer might maintain that "Our Worship doth not differ...from the Saints Worship in the Primitive Times", but his Quaker opponent would adduce a long list of practices which were held as originating not in Biblical times but in the rule of the Pope.² But while the First Publishers rejected the customary forms as being anti-Scriptural, they insisted that the ultimate criterion was still the Spirit; the assertion that "the scripture is an infallible rule of worship" meets the usual Quaker objection that the Pharisees and the apostates after them have had the Scripture and still lacked "the rule which is the spirit".³ True worship, and that which is agreeable with the Scriptures, is worship in the Spirit, and this is opposed to worship in man's will:

Now will-worship is among them that have
the Scriptures...in their owne wills,...;
and can sing, pray, preach, read in their
own wills, and be out of the spirit that
gave it[Scripture] forth; ⁴

1. G.M., p. 5.

2. "R.I.", as quoted by F. Howgill, Works, pp. 349f. Howgill's list of Popish practices ranges from infant baptism and the Lord's Supper as sacraments to church bells, taking money for marriages and funerals, and enforcing tithes by law.

3. G.M., pp. 255-256.

4. Ibid., p. 162.

All the traditional forms and ordinances were viewed as stemming from human will, and not from the divine will; they stood in that which was "natural", the invention of man since the Fall. But God is worshipped in Spirit, and, therefore, concludes Nayler:

all Man's Ways, Man's Times and Forms,
National Customs, Man's Decency, and
Orders by Men devised and added, are
all shut out, and condemned with that
Spirit in which God alone is Worshipped,...¹

We have already noted the application of this spiritualized conception of worship to the steeple-house, the church building. The Quakers rejected the setting aside of a special place or edifice, and they also rejected the setting aside of a permanent time for worship. Eaton has to answer a query demanding whether God commanded him "to set times, dayes, and hours",² and he replies that Christ and His disciples observed set times of worship. Moreover, he adds that "the first day of the week as a time for worship has Apostolic usage", and particular hours are arranged for the sake of expediency and convenience.³ Such arguments were not accepted by the Quaker Publishers, however. Burrough tells an advocate of the "Christian-Sabbath" (i.e., the first day of the week) that he has "neither binding Example, nor express Command in Scripture for that practice".⁴ A

1. J. Nayler, A Collection, p. 273.

2. "The Quakers Queries", in Eaton, op.cit., pages unnumbered.

3. Ibid., pp. 37-38.

4. E. Burrough, Works, p. 638.

proponent of the seventh-day Sabbath is answered by Fox with another Quaker principle:

The Apostle sayes, the body was Christ, and the Sabbath was a signe and a shadow of good things to come:...: So the good things being come, [viz] Christ, it ends the shadow, the signe, [for] that [Christ] is the substance; 1

One day of the week need not be set apart for minding "the things of Eternity", for those who have communion with God "do mind the things of Eternity every day".²

Having denied set places and set times, the early Friends went on to deny set prayers, insisting that none should pray unless the Spirit move them. Fox sounds a favorite theme when he says that "such as prays without the spirit, prays without understanding".³ Again, "they who go when the Spirit doth not move them, they are they that run and the Lord never sent them".⁴ But once more the Scriptures were brought in as a criterion, and a frequent Quaker query was, "Shew me what Scripture you have to stand praying in the Synagogues before Sermon, and after".⁵ Because of their protests against the alleged hypocrisy of ministers standing "in the Synagogues" giving long prayers, praying

1. G.M., p. 194. In answer to T. Tillam, The Seventh-day Sabbath.

2. F. Howgill, Works, p. 287.

3. G.M., p. 118.

4. Ibid., p. 42.

5. Quoted in R. Sherlock, The Quakers Wilde Questions, pp.1-2. The queries were by R. Hubberthorne. (Cf. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 27.)

regularly before and after the sermon, and supposedly not praying with the moving of the Spirit, the Quakers were sometimes accused of being "against publick prayer".¹ But this charge was firmly denied: "for praying in the spirit, and by the spirit, and in publick and private too, we own, and do practice".² Hubberthorne puts the Quaker case clearly:

...before any can truly pray, they must receive the Spirit of the Father (and them we know who are not led by the Spirit of the Father) them and their prayers are to be declared against by the Saints, and are condemned in the sight of God. ³

Perhaps the specific aspect of Puritan worship which was most severely criticized by the Quakers was that involved in the query, "Shew me by the Scriptures where the Apostles...gave the world David's Psalms to sing in Meeter?"⁴ The early Friends argued that "to sing Davids Psalms, without Davids spirit"⁵ was false and hypocritical; and since the Puritan churches were admitted to contain worldly people who would be "ignorant of Davids conditions",⁶ the Psalms could not possibly be sung in the Spirit, or by the Spirit which gave them forth. The Quaker declared that

1. S. Eaton, op.cit., p. 32.

2. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 125.

3. Ibid., p. 126.

4. G. Fox and R. Hubberthorne, Truth's Defence, p. 18.

5. G.M., p. 69.

6. Ibid., p. 162.

...singing with the spirit and with understanding we own, of such as are redeemed out of the World,...; but singing of David's experiences, sung in the World by such who are of the World, this singing we do deny,... 1

Furthermore, the Psalms were not originally sung in "Rhime and Meeter"; Fox declares that "your Poetry, and setting them in a frame and a musicall way, these are come up since the Pope". But "Psalms are spirituall songs", and are seen only with the "spirit of God".²

This attack on singing the Psalms was vigorously repulsed by the Puritans. Clapham's first dispute with the Quakers centered on his tract, A short and full Vindication of that sweet and Comfortable Ordinance, of singing of Psalmes, in which he argued that Jesus and the Apostles probably sang Psalms, that they are an ordinance commanded by Christ, and that they are a custom and common duty of all men.³ The Quaker objections are answered more directly, however, by Eaton, who holds that "Davids conditions and experiences are many times our own conditions and experiences", in which case we do sing them as our own, applying them "by

1. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 127. The early Friends were not adverse to singing, "even with audible voices". Jnl., bi-cent.edn., II. iii. Cf. also, I. 37, 171f, 406.

2. G.M., p. 162. Several of these arguments were shared by many Congregationalists and Baptists. Cf. H. Davies, The Worship of the English Puritans, pp. 169-174.

3. All of these points were contested by G. Whitehead and C. Atkinson in David's Enemies discovered. Whitehead wrote a further reply, Cain's Generation Discovered, pp. 1-9, in which he heatedly asserted that all Clapham's worships were visible and not in the life and doctrine of the apostles.

a spirit of Faith" to ourselves. When they do not happen to correspond with our own experience, no difficulty is raised, since the Psalms are intended and enjoined upon us by the apostles for "instruction".¹ Sherlock similarly argues that although everything in the Psalms is not always applicable to every person, there is always something in them that is profitable, "either by way of instruction or devotion". Furthermore, "they are not properly called Psalms, if not sung in verse and meeter".² To the Puritan, the singing of Psalms had apostolic sanction, and they were a proper part of genuine worship.

Although most of the disputes concerning worship involved the Quakers' criticism of Puritan practices, we may note at this point the Puritan criticism of the act which was responsible for the name, Quakers. Puritan worship might seem to be lifeless, formal, and devoid of the Spirit, but when it came to quaking and trembling, Quaker worship could be considered by its opponents to be a dangerous excess of a spirit which was more demonic than divine. In their attack against quaking, the Puritans held up Scripture as the unambiguous criterion, and Eaton gives the verdict:

Now concerning quaking and trembling, there is a multiplying of many Texts of Scripture without knowledge; for none of them can be applied to justify the practice of those whom they call Quakers. 3

-
1. S. Eaton, op.cit., p. 25.
 2. R. Sherlock, op.cit., pp. 11-12.
 3. S. Eaton, op.cit., pp. 62-63.

Jeremiah Ives continues the argument by pointing out that although the Bible says that many good men quaked, "this doth not prove that all were good that did quake and tremble: for the devils were quakers and tremblers".¹ Such trembling, indeed, might "rather argue a man to be possess'd with the devil, than with the Spirit of God".² We may allow Baxter to sum up the Puritan opposition on this point:

And I think that Perfect love casteth out fear, and that those shakings and quakings that come not from the humble sense of sin or judgement, or the like, but in violent motions of the body affectedly, are either Papisticall tricks of deceit, or effects of Phantasticall conceit, or the motions of the great deceiver within you.³

The early Friends defended both the name, or "Nick-name",⁴ which the world gave them, and the act which it signified. Fox answers a Puritan critic in strong words:

Habakkuk his lips quivered, Davids flesh trembled, Daniel trembled, Paul trembled, Davids bones quaked;....You must know trembling, thou and all thy generation, before the Devill be dispossessed out of your earthly Tabernacles:⁵

Burrough denies that the Quakers only pretend to tremble, and affirms that "oft do we, and have we witnessed it, by

-
1. J. Ives, The Quakers Quaking, p. 3. Cf. Heb.12:21, versus James 2:19.
 2. Ibid., p. 5. Cf. Luke 9:39.
 3. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 24. Baxter brings I Sam.14:15, Deut. 28:65, and Ps. 69:23 against the Quakers.
 4. J. Ives, op.cit., pp. 2f. Cf. G.M., p. 110, where Fox gives the Quaker objection to the term: it is used in scorn, as a "nick-name", whereas the cause of quaking is the power and Spirit of God.
 5. G.M., p. 87.

the mighty Power and Dread of the Lord upon us"; the same power which moved the "holy Men of God" in Biblical times moves in the Quakers today: "the same Spirit by which they were acted, acts us the same way according to its measure".¹ As for the relationship between the Devil and quaking, which was an issue raised by John Owen as well, Fisher admits that the Devil may sometimes delude souls into quaking, but this does not invalidate all quaking. Owen's argument, says Fisher, is really the fallacious proposition, "some Quaking is of the Devil, therefore none of God himself".² To the Quaker mind, trembling and quaking was an honest expression of the movings of the Spirit, and it was far more genuine than worship in mere forms; its origin was in the "power of God", and no one who knows this power will disown quaking. Fox can therefore tell his opponents, "And when ye all come to know this power that works out the salvation with fear and trembling, your reproaches will be laid aside".³

The debates regarding worship reached their climax in the discussion on the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper. The Quakers' disuse of these ordinances was, of course, quickly noticed and condemned, and from the beginning of the anti-Quaker literature the Friends were charged with denying all ordinances.⁴ Hammond voices a typical Puritan opinion:

1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 58.

2. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 211. Cf. J. Owen, Works, XVI.427.

3. G.M., p. 169.

4. F. H[igginson], A Brief Relation of the Irreligion of the Northern Quakers, pp. 8-9.

"The casting off all the known Ordinances of Christ, is very destructive; but this is a Principle and Practice of the Quakers".¹ Baxter is equally critical, and more specific: "They deny many of Gods ordinances; not only the Baptism of Infants, but of any; and use not the Lords Supper".² Whether termed "sacraments" or "ordinances", baptism and the Lord's Supper were regarded by the opponents of Quakerism as essential to Christian faith. They were the "Seals of the Covenant", instituted by Christ, and to last until Christ come again.³

The Quakers consistently maintained their polemic against forms and ordinances, and applied their arguments with perhaps even greater vigor to baptism and the Lord's Supper. Fox tells an opponent that regarding the saints' use of these ordinances "Ye have all been ignorant of in this night of apostacy since the dayes of the Apostles".⁴ Again, the visible was disparaged in favor of that which is not seen, "For the things that are seen are temporal (Bread, Wine, and Water are seen) but the things that are not seen are eternall".⁵ We shall see these arguments repeated in reference to both of the particular ordinances. At this

1. S. Hammond, The Quakers House Built upon the Sand, p. 11.

2. R. Baxter, One Sheet Against the Quakers, pp. 3-4.

3. S. Eaton, op.cit., p. 44. Eaton cites Mt. 28:19, and I Cor. 11:23.

4. G.M., p. 94.

5. Ibid.

point we may note one further Quaker contention concerning the sacraments in general; this was the assertion that Christ brought outward ordinances to an end. Fox writes, referring to Christ:

And we say he hath triumphed over the Ordinances, and blotted them out, and they are not to be touched; and the Saints have Christ in them, who is the end of outward forms, and thou art deceived, who thinks to finde the living among the dead; ¹

Christ is the "Second Covenant, the Everlasting Covenant"; in the First Covenant the people were taught by the statutes of the Law, but in the Second Covenant the outward observances of the Law were "blotted out".² Those who are in Christ the Second Covenant are taught by God, led by the Spirit, and are in the life and power which brings forms to an end: "Every one that is in the spirit of Christ sees him who hath blotted out the hand writing of Ordinances, and triumphed over them".³

The debate on the specific ordinance of baptism centered on the primary question of baptism with water, and from this followed the secondary issue of infant baptism. In a reply to the statement that it is an error to forsake "Water-Baptisme", Fox touches on almost all the main points of the Quaker opposition to baptism with water:

1. Ibid., p. 16.

2. G. Fox, Gospel-Truth Demonstrated, p. 113. Fox here speaks of ordinances as statutes of the Law, cf. Col. 2:14; the wider connotation of ordinances as outward observances becomes explicit in the two quotations from the G.M., pp. 16, 305 (footnotes 1. and 3.).

3. G.M., p. 305.

Doth not the Apostle bring people off of those things that are seen? And is not outward water, and outward bread the things that are seen? And are not these things temporall? though these things in their places and service is owned. But who comes into the baptisme of the spirit, they come into the one, in which all the other ends, the greater. ¹

The Puritans strongly resented the description of water-baptism as a "carnall thing", but the Quaker meaning was quite simple: "Outward water is not spirituall, but it is a carnall thing as it is in it selfe", and true baptism was spiritual. The early Friends did not regard baptism with water as an ordinance instituted by Christ; they frequently contrasted the baptizing of John the Baptist with that of Jesus (Mt.3:11), and cited Acts 11:16 as Christ's command to baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. Hubberthorne concludes that Christ never commanded his disciples to baptize with water, and Mt.28:19 is adduced as evidence for this verdict. Hubberthorne adds a less frequent note of Quaker exegesis in noting that although some of the disciples did baptize with water, "yet who shall judge their permission in it?" But he comes back to the dominant theme when he stresses Paul's disclaiming of baptizing as his own task (I Cor.1:17).² This attempt to disprove the Scriptural basis of water-baptism was also made with regard to infant baptism, and a common Quaker query was the demand, "Shew me what Scrip-

1. Ibid., p. 112.

2. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 123.

ture you have which speaks, that the Apostles sprinkled Infants".¹ To the Quaker mind, "sprinkling Infants is an Invention, and none of Christs Institution".²

The Puritans, of course, were sharply divided on the issue of infant baptism, but with regard to adult baptism almost all of the anti-Quaker Puritan writers would agree with Samuel Hammond that "the Baptisme of Water for the remission of sins, that is a standing Ordinance".³ Perhaps the most vigorous defense of adult baptism came from the two General Baptists, Jeremiah Ives and Matthew Caffyn. Caffyn constructs three arguments for baptism in water: John was sent to baptize with water; Jesus commanded it, for Mt. 28:19 signified water-baptism--the disciples could not and did not baptize with the Spirit, as Christ did; Acts 10:5f confirms it, and in Acts 10:47f, "even the Spirit-baptized people, Peter commands to be baptized".⁴ Caffyn adds that I Cor.1:17 means only that "Pauls especiall work was not to baptize", and it does not prove that Paul was opposed to baptism generally.⁵ Several of these arguments are repeated by Ives, who also refutes the Quaker contention "that water-baptism did end, when other Ceremonies of the Law ended".

1. Quoted in R. Sherlock, op.cit., p. 2.

2. R. Farnsworth, The Scriptures Vindication, p. 20.

3. S. Hammond, op.cit., p. 20.

4. M. Caffyn, The Deceived Quakers...Discovered, p. 52.

5. Ibid., p. 53.

Ives maintains to the contrary, that Christ commanded it after His resurrection (Mt.28:19). Ives attacks another Quaker argument when he wonders where the disciples actually obeyed the command to baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire.¹ He also contends that the "one Baptism" of Eph.4:5 is "not exclusive": there are "diverse baptisms; as of water, and afflictions, and the Holy Ghost; yet there is but one properly so call'd, to wit, that of water, and the other are metaphorical baptisms".²

The issue of infant baptism was a specific development of the dispute on baptism with water, and one of the Puritan writers apparently viewed the Quaker polemic here as being rather redundant: "with what equity or reason", Stalham demanded of the Friends, "can you call for a command for water-Baptisme to Infants, who deny it to Adults".³ On this derivative question the Baptists, of course, become silent, and the defense of infant baptism is urged by the generally more conservative elements of Puritanism. The Congregationalist, Samuel Eaton, defends his practice of using "the water of Baptism in a washing way, which sutes [i.e., suits] well the mysterie in it, which is washing away of sin".⁴ He goes on to describe baptism as "an outward Seal of an outward and visible Covenant of Grace", which is "to be extended in ref-

1. J. Ives, op.cit., pp. 24-25.

2. Ibid., p. 38.

3. J. Stalham, Marginall Antidotes, p. 8.

4. S. Eaton, op.cit., p. 33. Acts 22:16 is cited; also, on baptismal water signifying Christ's blood, Heb.12:24, 9:13, and Mark 7:4 are referred to.

erence to the subject as far as the Covenant is extended". Since the Covenant extended to believers and their infant seed, baptism likewise extends to infants.¹

On the far right wing of Puritan thought, the conformist Robert Sherlock continues this argument by noting that Scripture records the baptism of "whole Families". He reasons further that as circumcision was the "Seal of the righteousness of faith" under the Law, so baptism is now; it is a necessary condition of membership in Christ's Church; "Children are of the Kingdome of God", and are to be given the "privilidges" of the Kingdom, of which baptism is one; several Scriptures show that "Infants are in some measure capable of the Spirit of God", and may, therefore, be given the outward baptism of water; Mark 10:15 shows that little children can receive the Kingdom of God, even though they do not understand it; and since the sin of Adam is imputed to children, who do not understand it, so the righteousness of the Second Adam is by God "communicated to Infants, though they know it not".²

All these arguments for the baptism of adults and infants were answered, directly or indirectly, by the Quaker Publishers. Although they condemned the use of so-called "Sacramentall water", they usually hastened to affirm, "yet the Baptisme by one Spirit we owne,..into one body".³

1. Ibid., Gen. 17:7, Ex.12:48f, and other texts are cited.

2. R. Sherlock, op.cit., pp. 9-10.

3. R. Farnsworth, op.cit., p. 20. Cf. I Cor.12:12f, Eph.4:4f.

This was the baptism which "the Saints witnessed", for they came away from the several doctrines of baptism and witnessed instead that which the outward forms signified, the "substance". Hubberthorne explains this viewpoint:

...so all those things in which the substance was signified, whether circumcision or water, is not denied in their time and place; when the obedience in them was from the command of the spirit, and not from tradition;

People are now following tradition and not the spirit, he continues, since they are "both out of the command, and out of the substance". Baptism is not administered as it was in Biblical times, for no one has first received the Holy Ghost nor "believed in Christ" before they were baptized with water.¹ As for Eaton's definition of baptism as "outward Seals of the Covenant", Burrough replies:

The Seal of the Covenant of God is the Spirit,...and not any outward thing; for the Covenant of God is inward and spiritual, and not outward and carnal; and the Seal and Testimony of it is the Spirit of Life, & no Tradition of man:

Burrough adds that baptism as currently practiced is "wholly an Invention of man", and the sprinkling of infants is so far from being a Seal of the Covenant "that it is a Mark of the Whore of Rome, and was by her first of all invented".²

The dispute is taken up by Fox as well, who meets the statement that "Baptisme of water...doth wash away sin" with

1. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 35.

2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 489.

the rebuttal, "Here thou puts water in the roome of Christs blood..., and what need of that, if water doth it, outward water can but wash the outward".¹ Fox makes a similar protest regarding the proposition that baptism with water is a sign of "our being ingrafted into the body mysticall"; to this he replies that "that signe, a tradition, doth not bring into the body mysticall, but leads from it,...; But that which baptizeth into the body is the spirit".² Here is the root of the Quaker position, and no better summation of it can be found than that of Nayler:

In the World there be many Sorts and Forms of Baptisms, but in Christ there is but One, and that is that of the Spirit; and this is the Baptism of Christ, and all that are baptized with it, are baptized into his Death, buried with him unto the World, its Ways and Worships,...; and through this Death is the Seed of God raised up out of the Grave, quickned by the same Spirit which raised Jesus from the Dead. ³

The debate on the Lord's Supper followed the same main lines of argument, and both sides repeated the principles which they had urged with regard to baptism with water. Like baptism, the Lord's Supper was claimed by the Puritans to have a sound Scriptural basis as an ordinance of God, instituted by Christ. Ives brings Mt.26:27f and I Cor.11:23ff to prove that "bread and wine was instituted by Christ, and prac-

1. G.M., p. 323.

2. Ibid., p. 161.

3. J. Nayler, A Collection, p. 317.

ticed by the Primitive Christians, in remembrance of the dyings of the Lord Jesus".¹ Eaton and others again speak of the Lord's Supper as a Seal of the Covenant, and once more the complaint is raised that the Quakers disparage the sacramental elements by calling them "carnal". One writer even points to this terminology as proof that the Quakers look "upon the institutions of Christ with a fleshly carnal eye".² It is clear to all who read their works, argues Clapham, that the Quakers own "no Lords Supper, but feeding on Christs flesh and blood by faith".³

In defense of their position, the Quaker Publishers also repeat familiar themes. Farnsworth declares:

but the Lords Supper I owne, and witnesse
that he is come in to sup with mee, Rev:3.20.
And the bread which we breake, it is the com-
munion of the body of Christ, and the Cup
which we drinke, it is the communion of the
blood of Christ; and as Paul said so say I; 4

The bread and wine are indeed carnal, since they are "a temporall thing, a thing seen"; they may turn to ashes, "but the body and blood of Christ will not do so". This is part of Fox's answer to the contention that the sacramental ele-

-
1. J. Ives, op.cit., p. 39.
 2. J. Griffith, A Voice from the Word of the Lord, pp. 1-2. This tract equals the most vigorous Quaker claims to immediate revelation. Griffith, a General Baptist, speaks to the Quakers "from the Lord; therefore thus saith the Lord to thee O Quaker,.....". Ibid., p. 1.
 3. J. Elapham, op.cit., p. 40.
 4. R. Farnsworth, op.cit., p. 20. Cf. I Cor.10:16.

ments, when consecrated, are not an "ordinary bread and wine", but are the body and blood of Christ. Fox replies further:

By all this what differ ye from the Papists?
 ...Now bread and wine is but bread and wine,
 not spiritual after consecration, it is but
 the same bread as it was before; and it is
 no nearer the body of Christ after they have
 consecrated it, than it was before. ¹

Likewise, Burrough rejects the view that the Lord's Supper is a Seal of the Covenant, and maintains instead:

The Supper of the Lord is the Bread of
 eternal Life,...: And as for Bread and
 Wine, visible and carnal, that is not
 the real Supper of the Lord; and even
 the purest institution & Practice there-
 of is but a Representation of a thing,
 and not the very thing; and the End and
 Substance being come, the outward Sign
 may be neglected. ²

In the eyes of Burrough and the early Friends, the existing churches were a false Church which had gotten the practice without the power, and whose Covenant, Seals, and ordinances were all outward and devoid of the Spirit. Nayler may again be allowed to state the essence of the Quaker position: "the true Supper of the Lord, is the spiritual Eating and Drinking of the Flesh and Blood of Christ spiritually"; the world takes "only the Outward Signs", and therefore cannot discern the Lord's Body. ³

1. G.M., p. 161.

2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 490.

3. J. Nayler, A Collection, p. 22.

It must be emphasized, however, that while Nayler saw it as a mark of spiritual emptiness and hypocrisy that the world called this outward ordinance "a Communion, but lives in Envy, Strife and Debate",¹ the fact was that much of the strife stemmed from honest disagreement among the Puritans themselves. The Puritan arguments on the ordinances which have been outlined in this chapter represent only a few elements of Puritan thought, and these are mostly the more conservative elements. The more radical Puritans, who tended to share the Quaker priority of spirit over form, apparently chose to be silent in the Puritan-Quaker controversy on ordinances for they did not elect to enter the debate as explicit allies of the Quakers.²

1. Ibid.

2. For the development of this radical Puritan disparagement of ordinances, cf. G. F. Nuttall, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience, Chapter VI.

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Office of the Ministry

Among the "Ordinances of Jesus Christ" of which the Quakers were held to be "enemies" was "the ministerial teaching and preaching of the word".¹ This charge initiates the second stage of our investigation into the ecclesiological conflict between the Puritans and Quakers. The persistent Quaker criticism of the Puritan conception of the Church and its worship and ordinances, is now directed to what Baxter describes as "the Principal members of the body of Christ".² The attack on the ministers of the Church was viewed with the utmost seriousness by the Puritan clergy, not only because it constituted a direct personal affront, but because it was held that "The office of the Ministry is an undoubted Ordinance of God, to continue in the Church to the end of the world".³ But for their part, the First Publishers did not consider themselves to be enemies to the office of the ministry in itself, for they exercised that office in their work as Publishers of Truth. The opposition of the early Friends was directed against those whom they

-
1. J. Clapham, A Discovery of the Quakers Doctrine, p. 38.
 2. R. Baxter, One Sheet for the Ministry, p. 2.
 3. Ibid., p. 1.

deemed to be false ministers, those who are called "Ministers of Christ" but who "abide not in the Doctrine of Christ".¹ It will appear as we proceed that the Quakers judged the basic Puritan conception of the ministry, and most of the Puritan ministers as well, to be contrary to the doctrine of Christ.

The Quaker criticism began at the logical starting point, the preparation of ministers by means of a university education. One of Fox's earliest openings, "'that being bred at Oxford or Cambridge was not enough to fit and qualify men to be ministers of Christ'",² became a basic principle in the Quaker view of the ministry. It was frequently re-echoed in a query such as the following:

Whether your Gospel be the same that the Apostles preached? and if it be, Why go you to Oxford and Cambridg, when the Apostle said the Gospel he preached was not after man, neither was he taught it by man, neither received he it from man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.³

This query at once recalls the doctrine of immediate revelation, and we have the whole argument on immediacy to buttress the Quaker attack against learning of God from books and human teachers. The opposition to a university education as a qualification for the ministry gained further support from the underlying disparagement of the role of reason in the realm of religion, and from the explicit derogation of linguistic studies as purely "natural", rather than spiritual.

1. J. Nayler, A Collection, p. 16.

2. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I. 7.

3. G. Fox and R. Hubberthorne, Truth's Defence, p. 3.

This last point received steady emphasis from the early Friends, and it was Fox's main argument in his discussion with Cromwell's emissary who was setting up a university at Durham. Fox explained that

yt (was not ye way) to make y^m Christs ministers by Hebrew greeke & latine & ye 7 arts which all was but ye teachings of ye naturall man; for ye many languages begann att Babell... 1

Pointing out that those who spoke these languages, the Jews, Greeks, and Romans, had nevertheless rejected Christ, Fox also notes that "Peter & John yt could not reade letters preacht ye worde Christ Jesus".² The Quaker Publishers were always ready to remind their more scholarly opponents of the "unlearned Men, Fishermen, Ploughmen and Herdsmen" who wrote the Scriptures, and whose words could only be known by the same Spirit by which they were given forth.³ As we saw in Chapter Three, the Quakers insisted that Scripture must be known and interpreted by the Holy Spirit, and without the Spirit human learning is of no avail for the understanding of God's words. The opposition to higher education as a prerequisite for the ministry follows consistently from the doctrine of immediate inspiration. "As for Learning, it is Natural, I own it in its Place; but that it makes and breeds able ministers, I deny it".⁴ In giving this verdict, Howgill

1. Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 311. For the discussion on immediate revelation, cf. above, pp. 29-44; on reason, cf. above, pp. 109-112; on languages, cf. above, pp. 150-153.

2. Ibid., I. 312.

3. J. Naylor, A Collection, p. 43.

4. F. Howgill, Works, p. 16.

is speaking from the center of Quaker thought.

The Puritan defense of a university-educated clergy was, of course, largely based on the rejection of the Quaker views on immediate revelation and the interpretation of Scripture by the Spirit, without "natural" languages. These disputes have already been referred to, and we need here only recall the Puritan conclusion that God now teaches his people mediately through the Scriptures, which are to be studied in their original languages with the aid of human learning. Such sincere and earnest study was not considered as contrary to or devoid of the Spirit, for it was a means given by God for helping men understand his Word. Richard Sherlock, after bringing these arguments against the doctrine of immediate revelation, goes on to add:

Neither go we to Oxford and Cambridge to learn the Gospel we preach, but to learn the knowledge of those tongues and languages, arts and sciences which are the external means enabling us to understand and open the meaning of the Gospel,... 1

Arguing in a similar vein, Baxter declares that "We study nothing but the Word, and works of God", and says that such study is commanded in Scripture.² Likewise, he meets the objection that he and his colleagues are not "true Ministers" because they have their learning "only from Books, and Universities" by giving a strong defense of the clergy's learning:

1. R. Sherlock, The Quakers Wilde Questions, pp. 5-6.
Cf. above, p. 39.

2. R. Baxter, A Second Sheet for the Ministry, p. 16. Ps.1:2, I Tim. 4:13,15; 4:6, and II Tim. 2:15 are cited.

We have it from God in the Use of his means even by Prayer, Reading, study and learning his works & word of our Teachers, whether at Universities or elsewhere. 1

To the more conservative Puritans there was no essential incompatibility between human learning and the guidance of the Spirit, and since Scripture was to be interpreted by diligent study of Scripture itself, a university education was upheld as a proper, highly desirable, or even absolutely necessary qualification for the ministry.

The Quaker doctrine of immediacy, which underpinned the argument against education, was applied even more directly to the discussion on the ministry in the dispute on an "immediate call". The Puritans spoke of an "ordinary" or "mediate" call, but the Quakers renounced such a call as insufficient for the true ministry. Fox gives the main outline of this view in his reply to a writer who said that "his call into the Ministry is mediate".

Answ. So is not a Minister made by the will of God which is immediate; nor a Minister made by the spirit, which is immediate. Mediate is naturall, and the naturall man knows not the things of God, for they are spiritually discerned. 2

To another opponent who contended that "It is an error to say they are immediately sent of God", Fox replies that anyone who preaches "not by the immediate spirit, and a call from God, are them that run and the Lord never sent you",

1. Ibid.

2. G.M., p. 245.

and he concludes, "I say none can preach the Gospell..., but who is in the immediate call".¹ The Quaker held that "Such as are called of God, are called by his Spirit", and if a minister were to object that "he pretends to no such Call of an Apostle", the Quaker response was sharp: "if he have not the same Call, by the same Spirit as the Apostles had, he is no Minister of Christ".²

This objection, however, was precisely the one which the Puritans urged most frequently in rejecting the demand for an immediate call. There is a "mediate call since the time of the Apostles",³ one Puritan writer says, and another points out that "ministerial gifts are not now to be found in the world, such which the Ministers of the Gospel had in Primitive times".⁴ The Puritans who contended that extraordinary inspiration had ended with the Biblical writers also argued that an immediate call ended with the Apostles. The fullest exposition of this position comes from the pen of Baxter:

Both in the Old and New Testament there is mention of two distinct sort of Ministers, of Gods appointment. First, such as received some new Revelation;...immediately from God;....But besides these, there is a second sort of true Ministers, whose Office is not to receive from God any new Doctrine, Law, or Message; but to proclaim the Laws already delivered,... 5

-
1. Ibid., p. 110. Cf. Nayler's description of his call, quoted above, p. 31.
 2. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, pp. 130-131.
 3. T. Weld, as quoted in G.M., p. 76.
 4. S. Eaton, The Quakers Confuted, p. 46.
 5. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 2.

The present ministers--and all those since the apostles-- are of the second sort, who are not to bring new doctrines, but to continue the Gospel and Church of Christ already given. A further proposition makes the argument perfectly clear:

This ordinary Ministry for Teaching, Ruling, and Publike worship, was ordained by Christ to continue till his coming, and doth yet continue, and did not cease when the extraordinary Ministry ceased. ¹

Since it was Baxter who, among all the anti-Quaker writers, dealt most thoroughly and forcefully with the subject of the ministry, two additional arguments urged by him may be noted at this point. The first is his use of the conception of apostolic succession to prove that his call was from Christ.

The Lord called his first Apostles by his own voice, and appointed them to call others, and to establish an Order for the succeeding of others in that Office of the Ministry to the end of the world, Matth.28.21 [i.e. 28:20]..

Baxter adds that those called thereafter

might not expect a voice from Heaven to their ears, but might be called in Christs appointed way? And in this way I have been called by Christ. ²

Those lines were written in reply to the query asking Baxter whether he had received a command to preach from Christ, and his initial answer was even more direct. Offering to show his "Commission from God" if the Quaker questioner would show his, Baxter was told that the Quaker's commission was "in-

1. Ibid., pp. 7-8.

2. R. Baxter, The Quakers Catechism, p. 21.

visible". This response drew the complaint from Baxter, "and why may not you take the answer that you give?"¹ Since the Puritans strongly believed in the guidance of the Spirit, however much they might insist on the Scriptures as the criterion of inspiration, it is remarkable that they hardly ever ventured the retort that their call was also spiritual and "invisible".

However, confronted with the exclusive Quaker emphasis on an immediate call by the Spirit, the Puritans were chiefly concerned in defending the visible means through which the Spirit may act. Baxter himself goes on to list, among the "Signs" of Christ's call, "The Ordination of authorized Church Officers".² Again, an external form was not considered incompatible with the presence of the Spirit, and ordination was defended as a genuinely spiritual act. Sherlock writes that

There is no Minister of God, is or can be made so by the will of man only, but by man in subordination to the minde and will of God: for, 1. God by his holy Spirit puts it into our hearts, to use the means to be qualified for so great a calling. 3

The gifts and qualifications for the ministry are attained through divine assistance, and when the Fathers of the Church have approved these qualifications, then "we are...by them through fasting, prayer, and imposition of hands set apart to this office".⁴ The ordination ceremony had to be secured

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid.

3. R. Sherlock, op.cit., p. 13.

4. Ibid. For the mode of Puritan ordination, cf. H. Davies, The Worship of the English Puritans, Chapter XIII.

against being labeled as a merely human custom, and hence the laying on of hands was traced back to apostolic practice. To Puritans such as Baxter, who followed and upheld this practice, it was "only Christ and not the Ordainers, People or Magistrates who give us our Office and Power". The ordainers "instrumentally invest us" in the office, but the power and the office comes from "God's Institution", and not from the ordainers.¹

These arguments did not satisfy the Quaker Publishers, nor stem their censure of ordination. Hubberthorne replies to Sherlock that his ministry was "made by the will of man"; he moreover finds it incongruous that Sherlock maintains that there is no call now such as the apostles had, but "yet thou talkest of laying on hands".² According to Quaker thought, the apostolic laying on of hands was inspired and directed by the Spirit, whereas those who ordain men now do not have their power from the Holy Ghost.³ It was the Holy Ghost who "made Overseers, and so Elders in the Church,...and the holy Ghost is not such men as you are".⁴ This judgment regarding the ministerial ordainers is thoroughly elaborated by Fox:

And your laying on of hands, (since the Apostacy from the Apostles) is not as the Apostles, who have not an infallible spirit, nor are infallible, (nor called immediately) as they were; none of them you lay on your hands can receive the Holy Ghost, who you your selves are not in the immediate spirit, nor infallible, nor called immediately. 5

1. R. Baxter, A Second Sheet for the Ministry, p. 15.

2. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 16.

3. G. Whitehead, A Brief Treatise, pp. 15f.

4. R. Farnsworth, The Scriptures Vindication, p. 21.

5. G.M., pp. 107-108.

Just as no man was qualified for the ministry by human learning, nor called to it by any human agency, so no man is set apart for the ministry by those who "are not in the immediate spirit". According to Fox and the early Friends, "the holy Ghost is immediate that makes the officers in the Church".¹

This rejection of ordination had as its corollary the acceptance of the lay ministry: the arguments used against ordination also supported the right of unordained persons to preach. Both the right and the practice of lay preaching, however, had been established before the rise of Quakerism, and among the Congregationalists, Baptists, and more radical Puritans it was a widely accepted practice.² Therefore the Quaker Publishers found that opposition to their unordained preachers came only from the Presbyterian and more conservative Puritans, who continued to insist on ordination as legally necessary or highly desirable as a requisite for the ministry.

One of the most forceful statements on behalf of ordination was that quoted by Howgill from an (apparently) anti-Quaker tract:

It is utterly unlawful for any Christian whatsoever, gifted or not gifted to preach the Word in the Name of the Lord before the Church publickly assembled, unless they be ordained and set apart by the Church for such a Work. ³

1. Ibid., p. 162.

2. Cf. R. Barclay, The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth, pp. 157ff. Parliament's ordinance of 1645, forbidding the preaching of unordained ministers, was strongly opposed by Independents and Baptists.

3. "R.I.", as quoted in F. Howgill, Works, p. 355. Howgill was

The more moderate position is well represented by Baxter, when he says that "Ordination is ordinarily necessary as a means of our right entrance, but not absolutely necessary to the Being of our Office or Power".¹ Baxter explains that ordination does not make a man a minister: it is simply a rite whereby his status as a minister receives solemn public confirmation.² Nevertheless, the office of the ministry must be safeguarded by some means, for Baxter elsewhere points out that however much we may wish to the contrary, the fact is that not all the "Lords people" are prophets or teachers, and while all are urged to improve their gifts, yet

we would not have men turn Ordinary Teachers, that are neither sound, nor able, nor sent; nor every self-conceited ignorant man, have leave to abuse the name and word of God, and the souls of men. 3

Baxter made this last statement in answer to the accusation "that we are against the preaching of any but our selves". The defenders of the necessity or desirability of ordination often met with such a charge, and Dewsbury utters a typically Quaker complaint against the ministers when he writes:

There is no Scripture for your particular Houses that you have to creep into, where none must come but your selves,... 4

replying to Ignis Fatuus, by R.I. It has not been possible to locate the pamphlet or to identify its author.

1. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 14.
2. Ibid., pp. 14-15. On the following page, Baxter goes on to affirm that "The Ordinances are valid to the people when the Minister is uncalled and unordained, if they know it not:", the minister in question shall answer for himself, but the people shall nevertheless have "the fruit of his ministration".
3. R. Baxter, One Sheet for the Ministry, p. 12.
4. Wm. Dewsbury, Testimony, p. 105.

The pulpit or preacher's "House" may, from Baxter's viewpoint, have to be safeguarded from the ignorant and unqualified, but even though that be granted, the Quakers refused to allow an ordination which stood in the will of man to be the criterion for the ministry of Christ. Again the Quaker contrasts the present ministers with the apostolic ministers, telling his contemporaries that "you be in another ordination than they was in", for now there "is never a one of you all that ever durst say, ye have heard Gods voice immediately from heaven".¹ Since those who were ordained could not satisfy the Quaker qualification of witnessing the immediate calling of the Spirit, the Quakers concluded that such ministers could not bar the spiritually gifted but unordained from preaching.

The argument regarding lay preaching logically included the principle of the preaching and "prophesying" by women. The Quaker reasoned that "there is neither male nor female, but all is one in Christ and in the Spirit, from which preaching and prophesying proceeds".² The same criterion for the office of the ministry applies to men and women: whoever is led by the Spirit of God is qualified to declare his Word. Howgill opposes the standard text adduced against women speaking in the church, (I Cor.14:34) asking whether the "Spirit's Authority" is "any whit less efficacious or powerful when he speaks in the female?" Howgill then asserts:

1. G.M., p. 54. Fox is replying to Baxter.

2. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 262.

now they that are come to feel the Power of God, and thereby be moved to speak, the Power gives her Authority to speak, but she that is not in the Power, neither doth feel the Motion of the Spirit, such a one Usurps Authority,...., and such and they only were prohibited by Paul,... 1

The Quaker contention is therefore regarded as proved, namely,

That a woman declaring, speaking or prophesying by the Spirit of the Lord, and in the Authority of God, is a lawful, and a commendable, and a justifiable Act in the Sight of God, and all the Children of Light; 2

As was the case with the issue of unordained men preaching, opposition to the prophesying of women came only from the conservative wing of Puritanism. The practice of women speaking in churches had already arisen among some of the Congregationalists and Baptists, although among the Quakers the ministry of women was exercised on an unprecedented scale.³ But from whatever quarter the opposition might come, whether with regard to men or women, the Quakers were ready to reply with Fox that

such as limit or quench the spirit in the Males or Females, are them that are apostatized and ravened inwardly from the spirit of God, and despise prophecy,...., and knows not the spirit,... 4

The insistence on the immediate inspiration of the Spirit was used not only to reject the Puritan refusal to

1. F. Howgill, Works, p. 358.

2. Ibid. This principle, however, was not accepted by all early Friends. Cf. R. Barclay, op.cit., pp. 344ff.

3. Cf. G. F. Nuttall, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience, pp. 87ff.

4. G.M., p. 153.

allow lay preaching: it was also used to criticize the preaching of the ordained ministers. As we saw in Chapter Three, the Quakers maintained that only those who had such inspiration of the Spirit could interpret Scripture. Those who attempted to expound Scripture by means of human learning and natural reason were said to be adding to Scripture. Since the Letter and the Spirit are not inseparable, the Quaker concluded that anyone who denied immediate revelation had only the Letter, and therefore could only "steal" words from the prophets and apostles.¹ This criticism of the current method of preaching is well stated by Dewsbury:

There is no Scripture for your stealing the Saints Words, in taking a part of Scripture, and adding to it your wisdom, tearing it in sunder, in Doctrines, Reasons, Uses, Helps, Motives, according unto the fancies of your Brains. ²

The Quaker Publishers often demanded of their ministerial opponents whether they had the same life manifested to them that was given to the apostles, and they would then add, "And if it be, why do you take a Text from the Letter, and Preach from it, and shew the People the Letter?" A second query reinforced the same point:

And shew me where the Prophets did take a Text, and preach from it, but only Christ read a place, and said, it was fulfilled, who said he was anointed to preach; and which of you can witness you are anointed to preach by the living God, yea or no? ³

-
1. T. Lawson, An Untaught Teacher Witnessed against, pp. 1-2.
 2. Wm. Dewsbury, Testimony, p. 105.
 3. "The Quakers Queries", in S. Eaton, op.cit., pages unnumbered.

The reference to Luke 4:16ff as proof that Christ preached on a text was not accepted, for, says Fox, "Christ who came to fulfill, took the book, and read, and said it was fulfilled".¹

The Puritan defense of preaching from a text was, of course, based on their arguments against immediate revelation, and on those upholding the interpretation of Scripture by studious and prayerful exegesis, together with the contention that the Bible is the Word of God, the only source of God's revelation in the present days. Eaton, therefore, answers the above queries by affirming that Christ is manifested to us now not in a bodily but in a spiritual sense, "with the eyes of Faith". But, nevertheless,

we take a Text from the letter, because
the whole will of God, and minde of Christ
is left us in letters; ²

Eaton further argues that although they did not take a particular text, yet the apostles "preached from many Texts, for they cited many to confirm their preachings".³ Again, Luke 4 is taken as evidence that it was Jesus' custom to preach on a text, and since Christ was anointed by the same Spirit by which "all whom he calls to the Ministry" are anointed-- "onely he hath the preheminance, and hath an anoy[n]ment above his fellows"--the Quakers' objection is answered.⁴

1. G.M., p. 164.

2. S. Eaton, op.cit., p. 21.

3. Ibid., p. 22.

4. Ibid., p. 24.

The Puritans could not be expected to agree with the Quaker judgment that their preaching was devoid of the Spirit. Baxter answers the charge that he was "empty of the Spirit, because I studied" with the reply, "I pray God forgive me that I Study no more", adding, "We do not so despise God, his Word, or our hearers, as to speak, before we consider what to say".¹ Elsewhere, he answers a similar objection that "You read your Sermons out of a Paper; therefore you have not the Spirit", with a reference to the "good of the hearers", and he notes that it is relatively easier to preach without preparation.² Another variation on the same theme is the Quaker query, "Whether had any Ministers of Christ an hour-glasse to preach by". To this Baxter replies that an hour glass does not limit the Spirit, since he can limit his speaking without limiting the Spirit--adding typically, "as if the Spirit excluded Reason and Prudence, and set a mans tongue a going, so that he cannot stop it".³ Neither human learning nor human traditions were regarded as prima-facie evidence of the absence of the Spirit, and the majority of the Puritans would subscribe to the following statement of the spiritual validity of their preaching:

the Servants of Christ ministring from, or
out of the Scriptures, through his Spirit,
are not shut out from the holy men of old,

-
1. R. Baxter, The Quakers Catechism, p. 20.
 2. R. Baxter, One Sheet for the Ministry, pp. 13-14.
 3. R. Baxter, The Quakers Catechism, pp. 21-22.

for they also ministred out of the Scriptures,...., yet were they not ministers of the Letter; ¹

Nevertheless, the Quaker insistence on immediate inspiration continued unabated, and having challenged the method underlying Puritan preaching, they also attacked the acknowledged purpose or result of the ministry. Another query which Eaton and many of his colleagues had to answer was the following:

Whether a man shall ever grow up that he need no man teach him under your Ministry, yea or no? Seeing the Apostle saith, you need no man teach you, and you which have been long Teachers, how many have you brought up into this Condition? ²

The basis on which the Puritans answered such a query has been discussed in Chapter One,³ and it was also noted that in addition to defending their rejection of immediate teaching, the Puritans made a counter-charge against the Quaker position. The Quakers were held to be involved in a contradiction, for while they cry "cease from man" and human teachers, they "run many miles to hear George Fox; and you use writings, and printings, which are outward means of teaching".⁴ Baxter asserts that the Quakers' doctrines are "self-contradictory", for "They say that all men have a sufficient light within them. And yet they go up and down preaching with great zeal and violence".⁵

1. M. Caffyn, The Deceived...Quakers Discovered, p. 25.

2. S. Eaton, op.cit., pages unnumbered.

3. Cf. above, pp. 39-44.

4. G. Camelford, as quoted in G. Fox and R. Hubberthorne, op.cit., p. 31.

5. R. Baxter, One Sheet against the Quakers, pp. 8-9.

The question of immediate teaching thus turned back upon its first proponents, and the Quakers had to defend their own preaching and teaching. Part of the Quaker defense hinged upon their interpretation of the sufficiency of the light within: "although there was a Light which was sufficient, . . . , yet they must be turned to it, and obey it, or else they were not saved by it".¹ Men have to be turned to the light within, and therefore Christ came and preached, and sent his disciples into the world to preach. But another line of argument was more negative: people had to be turned away from the false teachers who denied the light within. Fox records one of his sermons, which lasted "severall houres", in which he declared

yt ye Lord & Christ Jesus was come to teach
his people himselfe & to bringe y^m of [i.e.
off from] all ye worlds ways & teachers to
Christ there way to God: 2

Burrough makes a sharp distinction between Quaker teachers and the other "Teachers without", for he, as a Quaker teacher, is not one "as preaches for Hire, and divines for Money"; on the contrary, Burrough describes himself as one who turns people

to the Anointing, that it may dwell in them,
that they may need no man to teach them; and
such were the Apostles, and them that are
sent of Christ: But such Teachers I would
have them cease from, where people are alwayes
learning, and never able to come to the Knowl-
edge of the Truth, 2 Tim.3. 3

-
1. R. Hubberthorne, The Light of Christ within, p. 18.
Cf. above, pp. 88f.
 2. Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 42.
 3. E. Burrough, Works, p. 451.

The argument has circled around to its original question, for the Quakers assert that their teaching is necessary in order to combat and correct the false teachers who will not allow that a man may grow up under their ministry to a condition where he needs no man to teach him.

While, from the Quaker viewpoint, this reasoning merely showed the sincerity and high purpose of their teaching, from the Puritan viewpoint it clearly established that the Quakers were undoubted enemies to the ministry of Christ. In view of the relentless and thoroughgoing criticism directed by the early Friends against the Puritan ministers it is not surprising that the "Quakers light" was held to be one which teaches people "to revile, and throw filth upon the true Ministers, and true Churches of Christ".¹ Baxter complains that

Their very preaching and zealous talk is much, if not most of it, malicious prating against Gods servants, (3 Joh.10) and railing accusations and reviling words; yea lyes and slanders; ²

Over and over again the anti-Quaker writers deplore the "bitter rayling" or "horrid rayling" which they find in their opponents' pamphlets, although, of course, a similar complaint emerges from the Quaker side.

The basis of this charge of excessive enmity against the ministers is indicated in Hammond's grievance against the Quakers for "their taking up a company of Phrases against the

1. G. Firmin, Stablishing against Shaking, p. 41.

2. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 4.

Priests of old, and applying them to the Ministers of the Gospel now".¹ There was good cause for this accusation, for in reply to Baxter the following rhetorical question is put by Nayler:

Whether may not the Spirit of God (in whom it is) use the same words against false teachers now, as it former hath done against them that was found in the same practise?... and is it now any more railing & blasphemy than it was then,...? 2

Howgill defends the practice of speaking in church services on the same grounds:

and though we have gone into the Steeple-houses...., and declared against Idolatry and Deceit, Formality, Feignedness and Hypocrisy,...., this was the manner of the Apostles of Christ...; but that which was Order in the Churches of Christ, is counted Disturbance by you Mass-house-worshippers,... 3

In apostolic times, and in any place "where the Ministers are Godly", those who are moved by the Spirit are allowed to speak, and true ministers do not count this as an "affront" to them in their worship.⁴ It is not the true ministers whom the Quakers reproach. Burrough explains that the term "priest" is used in a derogative sense only with regard to

-
1. S. Hammond, The Quakers House Built upon the Sand, p. 6. R. Barclay (op.cit., pp. 202ff) points out that the same expressions used by the early Quakers against ministers had been used by Puritan writers "many years prior"; Ezekiel 34 was "constantly quoted" by opponents of both the Episcopal and Presbyterian clergy.
 2. J. Nayler, An Answer to a Book called The Quakers Catechism, p. 61.
 3. F. Howgill, Works, p. 291.
 4. J. Nayler, A Collection, p. 156.

such...as disputed against Christ, and spake against him, the Priests that were subverted from God's Law, and that are Persecutors of the Innocent,... 1

These are the false ministers, who do not abide in the doctrine of Christ, and who practice things such as "the Scribes and Pharisees did, which Christ cryed Wo against".² The First Publishers held that they were opposing those who were walking contrary to Christ, and that therefore they were justified in using the terms with which Christ and the apostles and prophets had denounced the false priests of their time.

As we have seen throughout this chapter, indeed, throughout the entire study, the early Friends judged the Puritan ministers to be contrary to Christ's doctrine in almost every area of thought and practice. But it can safely be said that no specific practice elicited a greater protest from the Quakers than the maintenance of the ministry by tithes. Baxter had correctly assessed the main direction of the Quaker attack against the ministers when he exclaims, "The principal sin which we must be hated, reproached, and cast out for, is, that we take either Tithes or other set maintenance".³ Like the problem of lay preaching, the question of tithes had been vigorously debated among the Puritan factions before the emergence

1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 451.

2. Wm. Dewsbury, Testimony, p. 101. Dewsbury adduces the favorite Quaker text, Mt.23:5ff, to show how the ministers "walk contrary to the Doctrine of Christ, in having the chiefest places in the Assemblies, standing praying in the Synagogues, and having uppermost rooms at Feasts, Greetings in the Markets, and of men called Masters". For the dispute on the title "Master", cf. below, 349ff.

3. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 7.

of Quakerism, and there were many Congregationalists and Baptists who anticipated the Quaker attack on this issue. We are, therefore, again dealing with a Quaker-Puritan dispute in which only a section of Puritanism is represented.¹

The intensity of the Friends' opposition to tithes or a maintenance established by law is vividly seen in the customary phrases with which they upbraided the offending clergy. The term "hireling" (cf. John 10:12f) was one of the most frequently used, and a large part of the polemical vocabulary is represented in Fox's description of several clerical adversaries as "hirelinge teachers", "such as beare rule by your meanes", such as those "y^t seekt for there gaine from there quarter", "such as you y^t taught for ye fleece & ye woull; & made a prey off ye people", and especially, "such as you y^t devined for money & preacht for hire".² Hubberthorne declares that no minister should take "oversight of the Flock" for "filthy lucre sake", and he denies any maintenance to "such who are greedy dumb doggs, and can never have enough, as Isa.5,6".³ Burrough utilizes almost all of these phrases, giv-

-
1. The majority of the state-supported clergy whom the early Friends encountered were Presbyterians, (along with Anglican priests who accommodated), but there were some Congregationalists and a few were Baptists. Cf. R. Barclay, *op.cit.*, pp. 204ff. G. F. Nuttall, in "Congregational Commonwealth Incumbents" (Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society, Vol.XIV, pp. 155ff.) states that of the ejected ministers listed in Calamy Revised, "only 189 (171 genuine) were certainly Congregationalists".
 2. Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 155. Cf. Jer.5:31, Isa.56:11, Ezk.34:3 Mic.3:11.
 3. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, pp. 128-129. The passage in Isaiah is 56:10f. Since he is writing against Independents,

ing additional Scriptural texts, and compares his opponent with "the false prophets, who through covetousness made merchandise of souls".¹

Underlying all this denunciation of a set maintenance was a moral criticism: "the earthly spirit of the priests wounded my life", writes Fox, and he compares the church bell with the "market-bell", for it was

to gather people together, that the priest might set forth his ware to sale. O! the vast sums of money that are gotten by the trade they make of selling the Scriptures, and by their preaching,... 2

To the Quakers, a moral issue lay at the root of the problem: the acceptance of a fixed, annual stipend was to them a sign of worldliness and covetousness. Of all the personal charges directed by the Quakers against the clergymen of their day, the accusation of covetousness or worldliness was the most frequent. Part of this polemic consisted in contrasting "the wages of God" with the wages "of the world", and it was asked whether any could be "called the Ministers of Christ, which dare not trust him for their wages?"³ Fox asserts that "the great work of the Apostles was not to wrangle about their maintenance, as it is the great work of the Ministers now",⁴ and more than one minister was charged that "he will

Hubberthorne is not using the term "dumb doggs" in its usual seventeenth-century usage, viz., as an epithet applied to non-preaching ministers.

1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 156.
2. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I. 41.
3. T. Aldam, et.al., A Brief Discovery, p. 18.
4. G.M., p. 114. (Misnumbered 154).

not preach, if he have not so much Money, Tythes, or such things".¹

The opposition against tithes was supported by reference to several New Testament passages. One of these was I Cor.9:14, "...they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel"; in citing this text the Quaker writers implied that those who receive state maintenance derive their living from the law and not from the gospel, but we shall return to the legal aspect of the question in the following chapter.²

Another customary text was Mt.10:8b, to which Fox was referring when he told a priest that

if hee had anythinge from Christ or God
(hee ought) to speake it freely & dont
take tyths from ye people for preachinge
seeinge Christ commanded his ministers to
give freely as they had received freely: 3

But the basic Scriptural support for the Quaker argument came from Hebrews 7, to which Hubberthorne gives the characteristic Quaker interpretation:

There was a time that they received Tythes,
& they might not neglect them, as denying
their Tythes to the first Priesthood. There
was a time after Christ,...that he was preached
the unchangeable Priesthood, Heb.7. then the
Priesthood which received tythes, was denied;
therefore the wo is come upon thee and all thy
generation, who receive tythes according to
the changeable Priesthood. 4

1. E. Burrough, Works, p. 640.

2. Cf. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, pp. 129f., G.M., p. 216.

3. Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 153. The "priest" was Nathaniel Stephens.

4. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, pp. 10-11.

According to Fox and the early Friends, Christ is "the everlasting Priest-hood, not after the order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchisedeck":

Tythes to the first Priest-hood was allotted by God; but Christ the second Priest-hood ended that Priest-hood and Tythes both; and the Priests that took them made by Gods law, and the commandments that gave them [are now] disannul'd. ¹

It has already been noted that the Puritans did not accept the view that Christ brought an end to all outward forms of worship and church organization. The Puritan defenders of the maintenance of the ministry by tithes therefore referred to both the Old and New Testament in support of their argument. Hammond writes that the priests under the Law had house, lands, and tithes "by Gods appointment",² and insists that "We had the warrant and example of the Apostles for receiving Wages".³ Baxter also declares, regarding the taking of tithes, that "God ordaineth it", and he lists several texts to prove this contention.⁴ Sherlock also adduces I Cor.9:13f, from which he concludes, "Even so must the Ministers of the Gospel be maintained, as were the Priests under the Law; and that was by Tithes and offerings".⁵ Elsewhere, Sherlock gives several other customary Puritan arguments:

1. G.M., p. 84.

2. S. Hammond, op.cit., p. 21.

3. Ibid.

4. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 7. Cf. Mal.3:8-10, Mat.23:23, and I Cor.9:6ff.

5. R. Sherlock, op.cit., p. 8. Cf. Luke 11:42.

Christ himself when he preached the Gospel, was maintained by the gifts and benevolence of his Auditors;...; And the Apostles for preaching the Gospel had more I believe than 100£ or 200£ a year; for many of their Converts sold all their estates,..., and laid it down at the Apostles feet; For, saith the Apostle, If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter, if we reap your carnal things? ¹

Sherlock ends with perhaps the most frequently quoted text for the Puritan position: "For our pains in labouring in the Word and Doctrine, the Apostle gives this general rule, The Labourer is worthy of his wages".²

These arguments received several direct replies from the Quakers, in addition to the main contentions against tithes discussed above. To the proposition that "The Lord hath given tythes for the maintenance of the Ministry of this Nation" Fox gives a sharp retort: "It was the Pope and the apostates from the Apostles...that hath given Tythes".³ Burrough tells the Presbyterian Giles Firmin that "the Pope settled Tythes upon his Priests, whose Generation you are of",⁴ and Howgill declares that that which the Pope gave "unto his Emissaries and Ministers, you have gotten into your Hands".⁵ The principle of receiving "carnal" or temporal things in return for sowing spiritual things receives a sharp

1. Ibid., p. 19.

2. Ibid., p. 21. Cf. I Tim.5:17f.

3. G.M., p. 87.

4. E. Burrough, Works, p. 157.

5. F. Howgill, Works, p. 275.

rebuttal from an early opponent of Baxter, who tells him that "thou did never yet sow spiritualls, and therefore can have no right to temporalls".¹ This severe accusation recalls the overall Quaker criticism of the ministers as false priests, devoid of spiritual power, and apostatized from the doctrine of Christ. Thus, the receiving of tithes or a set maintenance is only one mark of apostacy, for, writes Burrough,

it is confessed, that free Teaching would not prove you to be true Ministers, for you are false,...., and Ministers of Antichrist, under many considerations more than one; as in your Call, and Worship, and many other things: 2

The Quaker attack against those whom they considered to be false ministers was indeed many-sided, but the opposition to tithes was perhaps the most personal, and obviously the most dangerous for the material welfare of the established ministers. If the controversy has become unduly acrimonious, therefore, we may expect it to become even more so when the argument for tithes was supported not only by the force of words, but by the legal arm of the State as well. The battles in the courtroom translated the theological intensity of the Quaker-Puritan controversy into terms of physical urgency, and to these struggles we now turn.

1. B. Nicholson, Truths Defence Against Lies, p. 4.

2. E. Burrough, Works, p. 156.

CHAPTER EIGHT

The Church and the State

The issue of upholding tithes by law was another question regarding which there was strong disagreement among the Puritans themselves. We have seen that not only Presbyterians, but also some Independent and Baptist ministers enjoyed livings in the Church of England under the Commonwealth. Nevertheless, many Independents and the majority of the Baptist preachers remained outside the establishment, and often explicitly defended their position by opposing state maintenance and by advocating in its place the so-called "voluntary principle".¹ The enforcement of tithes was, of course, an unpopular measure in the eyes of the general populace, and the sentiment in the army may be indicated by the reformation of the tithe system urged in the "Agreement of the People".² The Nominated Parliament mustered a significant minority in a vain attempt to abolish tithes,³ and "The Instrument of Govern-

-
1. J. Stoughton, History of Religion in England, II. 232. Stoughton does not find any of "the chief Independents of the Commonwealth" writing in defense of the voluntary principle; but the Fifth Monarchy Anabaptists "distinctly... opposed tithes". (II. 231f). It is notable that the chief General Baptist controvertists, Caffyn and Ives, both of whom were supported voluntarily, make no mention of ministerial maintenance in their anti-Quaker pamphlets. For a radical Puritan attack against tithes, very similar to the Quaker argument, cf. W. Erbery [Erbury], Ministers for Tythes, ...are No Ministers of the Gospel.
 2. S. R. Gardiner, History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, II. 102.
 3. Ibid., II. 290.

ment" upheld the present system of the maintenance of ministers only as a temporary measure, to be replaced by "'a provision less subject to scruple and contention'".¹ Even near the end of the Commonwealth, the more radical Puritans in the short-lived Rump Parliament manifested their desire to suppress tithes,² but as before, the established system of maintenance remained in force.

In the debate on the legal enforcement of tithes, as with many of the issues in the preceding chapters, we shall therefore find only a section of the Puritan writers upholding the affirmative against the Quakers. In this limited group of controversialists the most thorough defense of state maintenance comes from Baxter's answer to a Quaker tract attacking The Worcester-shire Petition.³ Baxter argues that "God gives us our wages (as you call it) two ways": God gives both the "Right" to it, and then "he gives the Thing it self".

First, He hath made a Law, commanding all the world to whom we preach his Gospel, to allow us a sufficient maintenance,

although this right is not fulfilled

till men obey Gods command by conferring it upon us. God hath made it every mans duty to do this freely of his own accord, so that he doth but Justice in doing it,.... 4

1. Quoted in Ibid., II. 336.

2. B.Q., p. 458.

3. This was "at Baxter's instance", presented to the Rump "in favour of continuing the maintenance of the Clergy by Tithes". F.J. Powicke, A Life of the Reverend Richard Baxter, p. 248.

4. R. Baxter, The Worcester-shire Petition...Defended, pp. 3-4.

Secondly, there is a sense in which God, in his providence, gives the "actual possession" of maintenance, for he sees "that his Servants want nothing that is good for them"; in this the minister's trust is in God, and in God's providence "we are content (I can speak for my self) with the portion allotted". However, while content with God's law and providence, ministers are not content "with mens disobedience";

And where any man will not do justice, and pay the Labourer the wages that he owes him, the Magistrate must see Justice done, or else I know not what he hath to do. ¹

Not only divine law, but human law as well entitles the ministry to maintenance by tithes. Baxter asks "Whether the Ministry of England have not as full a Right to their Tithes and Glebes, as any other man to his Lands?", and he answers his query by pointing first to the "Donors" who gave "these portions to the Church"; he then refers to

The Law of the Land, which establisheth their right as firmly, as it establisheth any other mans in his Estate. ²

In this contention he is joined by the Presbyterian Giles Firmin, who maintains that tithes are no man's own property, but are a separate part of a man's estate, and are "as duly our own, as any mans estate is his".³ Both Baxter and Firmin turn the accusation of covetousness back upon their opponents,

1. Ibid., pp. 4-5.

2. Ibid., p. 25.

3. G. Firmin, Stablising against Shaking, p. 9.

for since both the Law of the Land and the Law of God and Christ command maintenance as a right, "Is it not Covetousness and Theft, or violent detaining another mans goods, for any man to refuse to pay Tithes?"¹ Baxter sums up the legal case for tithes in another pamphlet:

Whose are the Tithes? are they ours or theirs? The same Law of the Land that makes the nine parts theirs, doth make the tenth ours. If we have no title to the tenth, they have none to the rest. 2

We have already seen the Quaker argument denying that tithes or a "sufficient maintenance" had a divine or dominical institution, and we shall shortly investigate the grounds for the Quaker refusal to comply with the national law. At this point we need note only the Quaker elaboration of the voluntary principle of ministerial maintenance. This is finely stated in a paper Hubberthorne sent to the Council of State in 1659:

Let every one that will minister the Gospel, do it freely, according to the example of the Apostles, and the Ministers of Christ.

And do not you go about to provide any maintenance for any Ministers...; for in that you will but lay...an imposition upon tender Consciences, which cannot do any thing but what they do freely as unto the Lord;...; for the cry of the honest and godly people of this Nation, is, to have a free Ministry, and free maintenance, and are willing freely to maintain those that minister unto them..., and are not willing that the Civil Magistrate should meddle with that which relates to spiritual things in this case; 3

-
1. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 25. Cf. G. Firmin, op.cit., pp. 10ff.
 2. R. Baxter, One Sheet for the Ministry, p. 11. Reference is made to I Cor.9:6ff.
 3. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 234.

As for the question of having the magistrates see that justice is done, Fox's reply to Baxter gives ample expression to the Quaker reaction:

The Apostles, Ambassadors and messengers of the Lord Jesus Christ..., they had not a Law at the Magistrates hands to give them wages, hale their hearers before them to give them wages, or put up Petitions before every Supreme [Authority] of the Nation before whom they came, this was not the work of the Apostles,....Oh! this stinks and shewes it is out of the power which the Apostles, disciples and messengers of the Lord Jesus Christ were in. ¹

Moreover, the accusation of covetousness still remains in force, for since Christ ended the priesthood that had a right to tithes, "Therefore they that be covetous, will take them by violence from the people".² Nayler, in his reply to Baxter, allows that anyone who so desired could give a tenth of his land to the "hireling", but he denies that "the hireling [must] therefore take mens goods against their wills, to maintain in such a Ministry and Worship as God never set up"; to take a part of a man's labor against his will is "robbery".³ This last epithet should suffice to show how far the Quaker was from viewing the legal enforcement of tithes as an act of "justice".

But the argument on upholding tithes by law was not merely a theoretical debate, for Fox was stating a simple fact

-
1. G.M., p. 234. The polemic about petitioning notwithstanding, the Friends sent a petition to the Rump in 1659, in opposition to tithes, (cf. B.Q., p. 458) and for this Fox was partly responsible, (Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 385, n.l.). Cf. below, pp. 338ff. for the Quaker view of civil power.
 2. Ibid., p. 86.
 3. J. Nayler, An Answer to a Book called the Quakers Catechism, p. 20.

when he wrote in a paper to Cromwell that "manye lyeth in goales because they cannott paye ye priests tythes, & manye hath their goods spoiled".¹ The Quakers questioned not only the Scriptural basis for tithes; they also demanded of their clerical opponents where there was a divine command "that you should sue men at the Law, and cast them in prison till death", for it is not the "glad tidings" of the Gospel to "hale up and down to Courts and Sessions for outward maintenance".² To the Quaker mind those ministers "who sue for Tythes" are clearly those in the first priesthood, who were denounced by Christ for laying heavy burdens upon the people.³

The enforcement of the payment of tithes was looked upon by the early Friends as one of the greatest evils promulgated by the priests, and this attitude is vividly evidenced in a passage from Howgill, directed against the tithe-supported clergy:

What Havock you have made of mens Estates with your Bayliffs, and the Bil-men, driving away Cows, Horses, Sheep, Swine, Pots taken, and Pans, the poor Peoples Bedding and Apparel, which amount to very great Sums, sometimes for three Pounds claiming,...so that the very Earth Groans to be delivered of you,..... 4

Howgill was not merely giving vent to the popular antagonism against the tithe system. His graphic denunciation is grounded in the fact that many Quakers suffered imprisonment, fines, and

1. Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 193.

2. G.M., p. 216.

3. F. Howgill, Works, p. 9. Cf. Mt. 23:4.

4. Ibid., p. 275.

deprivation of goods as a result of their refusal to pay tithes.¹ Since Fox and the First Publishers considered that this suffering because of tithes was caused primarily not by the magistrates but by the clergy--"by ye Independant & Presbyterian preists & some baptist preists y^t had gotten Into Steeplehouses"²-- it is not surprising that the Quaker polemic against the ministers was often conducted with the severity and intensity which we have observed in the preceding chapters.

In addition to cases relating to non-payment of tithes, there were several other occasions when the Quaker-Puritan conflict was resolved, at least temporarily, by the intervention of the law in behalf of the Puritans. One such situation was the disturbance of ministers. Friends usually remained within the law regarding speaking in church by waiting until the preacher had ended his sermon, but they sometimes could not hold back a rebuke or refutation, and were therefore arrested for disturbing the minister.³ Furthermore, after 1656, it was a legal offense to willfully disturb a minister not only in church, but in his going and returning from church; indeed,

-
1. Cf. W. C. Braithwaite, "The Penal Laws affecting Early Friends in England", in The First Publishers of Truth, ed. N. Penney, pp. 362f. (This book is hereafter abbreviated, F.P.T.).
 2. Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 194.
 3. Fox's first imprisonment was for interrupting a preacher. Cf. above, p. 23. For Fox's exposition and application of the law in question, cf. The Short Journal, ed. N. Penney, pp. 27f. On the Puritan side, T. Weld et. al., The Perfect Pharisees, p. 47, complain that of late (1653) the Quakers purposely wait until the preacher has finished, in order to escape punishment.

any evidence of contempt for ministers might be deemed sufficient grounds for punishment.¹ Whatever the specific provocation, the general heading of the 'disturbance of ministers' covers numerous cases of imprisonment and fines suffered by Friends during the Commonwealth period. It may be added that where the offended preacher was not supported by the magistrate or justices, he was often rescued by the more violent members of his congregation. Fox's Journal and other Quaker records are full of references to the priest's "rude company", who were allowed and sometimes encouraged to forcibly eject the Quaker critic from the church, market-place, or even from the town itself. Again, the early Friends held the ministers to be largely responsible for both the legal persecution and much of the mob violence--although the "rude people" of that day rarely needed such incentive.

Another case of legal action against the Quakers, in which the Puritan ministers were involved to some extent, was the law relating to blasphemy. Fox was imprisoned twice on a charge of blasphemy, and several other Friends were prosecuted under the same law.² The opponents of the Quakers were not adverse to laying "their errors and blasphemies before the Magistrates, that they may stop their mouths", but to this Fox retorted by demanding, "And where did ever the Apostles go to the Magistrates for help, and complain against Errors and Blasphemy". Fox followed this objection with a second

1. Cf. W. C. Braithwaite, in F.P.T., pp. 348-350.

2. Ibid., pp. 345f.

rebuttal against his opponents

who would stop the Presse that Truth should not be published to the Nation; Shewing yee have not the spirit that is able to gainsay, nor able to contradict the spirit that is in the Quakers. Therefore do you beg with your Petitions...for the powers of the Earth them to stop: ¹

The charge of blasphemy obviously could not be confined to the spoken word alone, and more than one earnest Puritan might ask with Baxter: "shall men have leave to print their most impudent railings against Christs Ministers and Churches, if they will but plead conscience for it?"² Whether it be blasphemy against God or abuse of his ministers, the main body of Puritan thought was not prepared to see such "railings" tolerated.

The attempt to suppress blasphemy raises at once the question of religious liberty, but for a full discussion of this subject we would have to forsake the Quaker-Puritan polemical literature. The terms "freedom" or "liberty" are very rarely found in these controversial tracts, and the principle of religious freedom in itself did not form a main theme in the controversy between Quaker and Puritans. The Puritans themselves were, of course, sharply divided on the

1. G.M., p. 34. Fox was replying to A Second Beacon Fired, by Luke Fawne and five other London booksellers. It was a petition to the Government that "they would do what may be expected from Christian Magistrates, in suppressing Blasphemous Books". (Title page).

2. R. Baxter, The Worcester-shire Petition...Defended, p. 35. Baxter levels this question against printers as well as writers, and makes special reference to Giles Calvert, one of the chief printers of Quaker books.

question, and the Quakers would again be at one with the more radical Puritans who championed complete (or nearly complete) religious toleration. Furthermore, the Quakers as a religious body were not legally denied freedom of worship, for in spite of the persecution of Quakers during the Commonwealth, no specific legislation against Friends was enacted by the government--with the one exception of James Nayler's case.¹ "So far as the central authorities were concerned, it was as persons causing disturbance that the Quakers suffered and not because of their religion".² Cromwell himself, while strongly opposed to the Quaker disturbing of ministers,³ was otherwise kindly disposed to Fox and the Friends, and was responsible for the release of many individual Quakers from prison. Braithwaite concludes that Besse's Sufferings show "that the actual persecution which occurred was local and capricious";⁴ "the rude persecution of the local justices continued to be more or less mitigated from Whitehall".⁵ Likewise, although there were occasional difficulties connected with the distribution of Quaker literature,⁶ the Friends were usually able to express themselves freely in print during the Commonwealth period.⁷ The Quakers

1. W. C. Braithwaite, in F.P.T., p. 345.

2. Ibid., p. 350.

3. Cf. Cromwell's proclamation on religious liberty, quoted in S. R. Gardiner, op.cit., III. 260f.

4. B.Q., p. 464.

5. Ibid., p. 452.

6. L. M. Wright, The Literary Life of the Early Friends, pp. 93ff.

7. B.Q., pp. 303f.

could inveigh against individual persecuting magistrates, or the particular ministers who were "crying to the Magistrates", but they could not charge the Puritans in general with a theoretical or an actual denial of religious liberty to them as Quakers.

But while the principle of religious freedom per se was seldom debated in Quaker-Puritan disputes, it remained in the immediate background throughout the discussion on the relationship of Church and State. We may pick up the thread of the argument by referring to the charge that the ministers were "crying to Magistrates, Help; stop the mouths of Blasphemers", for to this Fox replies:

Now thou hast made thy self manifest, that thou hast not the spiritual weapons:....If ye be Ministers that have the Spirit of God, stop the mouthes of the gain-sayers, for never did the Apostles, nor the true Church wrestle against flesh and blood; But they struck at the power that captivated the Creatures, to the intent that the Creatures might come into the Libertie of the Sons of God. ¹

Fox tells his opponent that because he is "inwardly ravened" from the Spirit, he has lost the spiritual weapons, and has to use the carnal weapons of the magistrates. This contention that the Church is not to use physical force to convince people of spiritual truths is one of the main principles by which the Quakers rejected the plea that "The Magistrates are to protect the Church from the ravenous Wolves": such a plea shows that its author does not have the spirit to resist his critics, and

1. G.M., p. 176. Punctuation slightly altered. Fox's adversary here is the Presbyterian, Ralph Farmer.

must therefore call in the magistrate.¹ Whitehead gives the typical Quaker verdict on such a policy of defending the Church by force:

And such Churches as these that cannot stand without carnal force and Compulsions, we have no cause to Conform to; for it appears plainly that their Weapons, and Arms and Defence are not of God but of man, not Spiritual as the Saints and true Churches were, but Carnal. 2

This particular Quaker argument received its most direct and extended reply from Baxter. Addressing himself to the "Rulers of this Commonwealth", Baxter argues that if they make laws to defend their own "(subordinate Analogical) Sovereignty", it would be a great error to "permit men unpunished to deny the Authority of God or the Lord Jesus".³ Since it is "God-Redeemer now that is your Sovereign", the "permission of denying your Sovereign, is the permission of High Treason, and endeavors to dissolve your Commonwealth".⁴ God's name and glory will be vindicated, whether by God himself or by the earthly rulers who receive their power from him.

But because God useth not Miracles, till ordinary means faile, (when there is no Christian Magistrate, the Apostle will kill Ananias and Saphira for Sacrilege and Lying, by a Miracle). O do not you that have the Sword in your hand, put the jealous God to it, to take

-
1. *Ibid.*, p. 96. Fox is quoting from the "Epistle to the Protector", in J. Clapham, A Discovery of the Quakers Doctrine.
 2. G. Whitehead, Truth Tryumphing, p. 14.
 3. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 36.
 4. Ibid., p. 34.

it into his own, lest you have the first blow your selves, and you and we should perish together. ¹

As for the contention "that Truth is stronger than Error", and therefore all may freely speak without endangering God's truth, Baxter thinks such an objection is easily overthrown, and lists four brief arguments against it:

God is sufficient to deliver the Nation from enemies without you, and needs not the help of you or your Armies; but should you therefore neglect our defence?

Secondly, the common people are easily deceived, and whoever can "make a lye seem true, may cause it to be believed". Thirdly, do the advocates of this contention "perswade you to do by God and mens souls as you would be done by?" For you would not allow men to persuade your army to revolt, nor your wives to unchastity, nor your children to steal, simply because they say, "Truth is stronger than Error; and all should be heard". Fourthly, what is this truth for which liberty is pleaded? "Is Railing at Christs Ministers as Dogs and Devils this necessary Truth?" Baxter concludes by applying what he has said "against this liberty of the Press" to "the like liberty of the Pulpit":

I abhor as much as most do, too rigorous restrictions, & not bearing with each other in tolerable differences; But that a Pulpit should be Satans Oracle, or a place to make Christianity contemned, is very sad. ²

These arguments by Baxter have been related in detail because they typify the general viewpoint of the more conserva-

1. Ibid., p. 37.

2. Ibid., pp. 37-39.

tive Puritans who upheld the right or duty of the civil powers to protect the Church. To this section of Puritan thought, the Quaker opposition of "spiritual" and "carnal" would be highly suspect,¹ and we recall the numerous occasions when Puritan controversialists refused to allow that human forms or means were incompatible with the Spirit or with spiritual power. It is a similar line of reasoning which permits many Puritans to view the "Christian Magistrate" as no contradiction in terms, but as "Ministers of God" whose "Office and Power" is primarily "to see his Lawes executed, as far as you can".² The Puritan could say that "the Magistrate is the Officer of Christ", although he might qualify this assertion by adding:

...the Magistrate in this externall politick Kingdome is a Mediator, though he is no Officer nor Magistrate in the Spirituall Kingdome of his Church. And if this be received by Magistrates, that they have nothing to do with the worship of God, Christ is little beholding to them: 3

This was by no means a universal sentiment among the Puritans, but it was the main bulwark of those who opposed the Quakers on the issue of the relationship of Church and State. It was

-
1. A. S. P. Woodhouse, (Introduction, pp. 57ff, in Puritanism and Liberty) points out that the tendency "to segregate the spiritual from the secular" is absent in "the Party of the Right, the Presbyterians", but it emerges in the "Centre Party", the Independents. This "principle of segregation" bears a positive relation to the principle of liberty, for it is most marked in "those groups of the Left who are most deeply devoted to liberty of conscience" and are the chief Puritan advocates of political liberty.
 2. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 36.
 3. "Epistle to the Protector", in J. Clapham, op.cit., quoted in G.M., p. 95.

on these grounds that Baxter gave the following answer to the Quaker query "Whether it be not below the Saints priviledg, to petition or make Addresses unto Counsellors of men, ...?", for, asks Baxter:

Why hath God set up Magistrates, if men may make not addresses to them without the guilt of Infidelity or Atheism? Is not all power of God? Are they not by him appointed to execute wrath, as Gods Ministers, on them that do evil? and are they not the Ministers of God for good to them that do well? ¹

The Quakers frequently declaimed against petitioning the civil authorities, but they could still answer the above questions in the affirmative. Fox begins a letter to the Protector by affirming that "The majestrate is not to bear ye sword in vaine: which is aterror [sic] to ye evill doers", but he goes on to complain that because the Quakers who denounce evil are imprisoned, and the evil doers are set at liberty, the magistrate's sword is, in fact, borne in vain, and he "hath turned his sword backward against ye lord".²

Hubberthorne denies that the Quakers

would have any Magistrates to bind themselves from striking at offenders,...: we own that such should be punished according to the offence; ³

Fox and his colleagues stoutly maintained that "the magistrate is set for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well",⁴ and they constantly reprimanded

1. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 22. Rom.13:1-5 is cited.

2. Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 192.

3. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 149.

4. Jnl., bi-cent.edn., I. 53.

magistrates and justices whom they considered were using the sword in vain by persecuting the Publishers of Truth instead of the evil-doers and enemies of the Light of Christ.

The arm of the law nevertheless had fixed bounds, beyond which Quaker thought refused to let it pass. Immediately following Hubberthorne's statement on offenders, he adds:

but the Magistrates Law reaches but to the outward man to keep that in peace and good order, and not to the inward man to binde or limit that. ¹

Howgill puts the case even more clearly:

Civil and Military Officers are not for making Religion, or setting up Religion, but are to keep the Peace, and to stop the Violent-doer, and to be a Terror to Evil works and workers, and a Praise to them that do well; and that is their place to govern in Righteousness, but not to exercise Lordship over the Conscience, which Power belongs only to Christ; ²

This position has particular bearing on the question of the law against blasphemy and doctrinal errors in general, for, says Naylor:

...Christ did never leave it to the Magistrates to judge of Errors and Blasphemies, but hath reserved it to himself, and them in whom he is, even the judgment of all Spiritual Things, that concern his Kingdom; ³

Furthermore, there is the problem of who is able to correctly judge of men's spiritual condition. Whitehead raises a familiar Quaker viewpoint when he demands, "And how is it in the

1. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 149.

2. F. Howgill, Works, p. 287.

3. J. Naylor, A Collection, p. 156.

Magistrates Coercive power to suppress Errors and Heresies, and to secure the Churches cause, when they do not pretend to Infallibility of judgment in spiritual matters".¹ Howgill protests that he is well aware "that there is Heresie and Blasphemy", but he adds that "none can judge who they are, but who have an infallible Spirit".² Indeed, it is a frequent complaint of the Quaker Publishers that the saints in all ages suffered, "not as for Truth, but as for blasphemy"-- and they suffered by them that had only the form, and utterly lacked the Spirit.³

The allegation that magistrates are often devoid of the Spirit, by which alone they can correctly distinguish between "the precious and the vile", raises the question of the grounds of civil obedience. We have seen that the Quakers could quote Romans 13 as fervently as Baxter and other Puritans, and Nayler solemnly speaks of "Magistracy" as "an Ordinance of God, ordained for the Punishment of Evil-Doers, and an Encouragement of those that do well". He adds that where Justice and Righteousness and impartiality are exercised, there is a land in peace, "and those who judge for the Lord, I honour as my own Life".⁴ But to the query, "Must not Men own wicked Magistrates?", Nayler gives the distinctively Quaker interpretation of being subject to the higher powers;

1. G. Whitehead, op.cit., p. 14.

2. F. Howgill, Works, p. 15.

3. G.M., p. 96.

4. J. Nayler, A Collection, pp. 22-23. Cf. Rom.13:3.

concerning wicked magistrates,

I say, they are to be owned and obeyed in all things, as they are appointed by God; for God limits them, and hath set bounds to them, though they know it not; and so far as they command the Will of God, they are to be obeyed for Conscience sake; but when they are contrary to God, and command that which God forbids, and forbid what he commands, then God is to be obeyed, and Man denyed for Conscience sake; 1

Fox returns a similar answer to the proposition that "If a hypocrite reign, his power is of God: and Saints are to yield to the power and it must be honoured, and have obedience from the Saints":

Answ. Such as are turned into corruption, and are hypocrites they are gone from the higher power, which the soul should be subject to, and its gone over [i.e. from] them; and so for the Lords sake the Saints cannot be subject to that power, but that power that brings down the hypocrisie, and the corruptions in Magistrates, and as they come to be clothed with the power of God, they are able to put a difference betwixt the precious and the vile, and that they [the saints] own; 2

It was not the civil power in itself that was to command obedience; the "higher power" is God, and magistrates and civil governments are to be honored by Christians only when they are in accordance with God's will and sovereign power.

Such an interpretation of Christian citizenship was theoretically far too radical for many of the Quakers' opponents, and when it was put into practice by the refusal to

1. Ibid., pp. 298-299.

2. G.M., p. 90.

pay tithes, to take oaths, or to bow the knee or take off the hat to magistrates as a token of respect, the Quaker viewpoint readily became suspect in the eyes of Puritan officials. Furthermore, the practical objections heavily outweighed the theoretical criticisms: there was little or no reference to the doctrine of the light within as a politically subversive principle. The nearest approximation to such a charge is Stalham's statement that "The Magistrate is not to level his Law with every mans conscience and light". But to this Hubberthorne replies that the Quakers say the same, for some mens' consciences are "defiled"; the laws are not to be made

according to mens several Opinions, and defiled Consciences, but according to the light of Christ Jesus in every mans Conscience, which is but one in all, and is according to the Law of God, and every just Law will be according to it; 1

Had the underlying charge of subjectivism been more fully elaborated, it would have been answered by the Quaker arguments distinguishing the light or Spirit within from the individual conscience or from any natural capacity of man.

Aside from any question about the light in the conscience, the Puritans had no dearth of reasons for suspecting the Quakers to be enemies to civil authority. One such line of reasoning proceeded from the premise that the Quakers were adversaries of Christ and His ministers to the conclusion that they were therefore opposers of the civil officers of

1. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 148. He has taken the opposing statement from J. Stalham, The Reviler Rebuked.

Christ. Baxter declares that it is a true prophecy that "No Ministry, no Christian Magistracy; no Christian Magistracy, no Christian Commonwealth", and implies that those who rebel against Christ, the true Sovereign, will also rebel against the earthly sovereigns who received their power from Him.¹ Later, Baxter enforces his argument that the "Rulers of this Commonwealth" should protect the ministry by warning the rulers, "See you not that while you are too silent at the vilifying of Christs Ministers, the next turn is your own?"² William Prynne strikes a similar theme when he says of the Quakers that "it is evident by some late instances, that they are Anti-magistratical as well as Anti-ministeriall".³ To Prynne and many other Presbyterian Puritans, the Quakers' ways and doctrines are "directly contrary and destructive to the two Great ordinances of God in the world, Magistracy and Ministry".⁴

Another ground of suspecting the Quakers as a danger to the nation emerges in the full title of Prynne's tract:

The Quaker unmasked, And clearly detected to be but the Spawn of Romish Frogs, Jesuites, and Franciscan Fryers; sent from Rome to seduce the intoxicated Giddy-headed English Nation.

Prynne followed this with a second pamphlet entitled, A New Discovery of some Romish Emissaries, Quakers, and a similar

1. R. Baxter, op.cit., p. 23.

2. Ibid., p. 34.

3. Wm. Prynne, The Quakers unmasked, 1664 edn., p. 8.

4. Ibid., p. 13.

contention was urged by a William Brownsword, in his tract, The Quaker-Jesuite, or, Popery in Quakerisme.¹ Jonathan Clapham sets out to show "twenty particulars" in which the Quakers "exactly egree" with the Papists;² Thomas Underhill produces a similar list proving the "Popery of the Quakers",³ and Baxter states that on the doctrine of perfection "and many other Doctrines, they do so openly comply with the Papists, that we may plainly see that the Jesuites and Fryers are their Leaders".⁴ Baxter adds that "This hath been proved by many Confessions",⁵ and there was, in fact, a widely-circulated sworn testimony that two of the "chief Speakers among the Quakers" in London were Franciscans.⁶

The Quaker writers, of course, roundly denounced all such allegations. John Audland and George Whitehead both refuted the evidence of this informant,⁷ and the First Publishers frequently counter-charged that

if the Priests of England could as well shew an evident example for their cleerness from popery, as we can for ours who are called Quakers, there should not be that vast difference betwixt us that there is; 8

-
1. Brownsword describes himself as "Minister of the Gospel at Kendal". He is not listed in Calamy Revised.
 2. J. Clapham, op.cit., p. 64.
 3. T. Underhill, Hell broke loose, p. 30.
 4. R. Baxter, One Sheet against the Quakers, p. 8.
 5. Ibid.
 6. From "The Information of George Coolishey of the City of Bristol", quoted in R. Baxter, The Quakers Catechism, preface, pages unnumbered. The "Information" was originally printed in Prynne's The Quaker Unmasked (1655), pp. 3-4.
 7. Cf. J. Audland, The School-Master Disciplined, pp. 7-13, and G. Whitehead, op.cit.; both were written against Prynne.
 8. G. Whitehead, A Brief Treatise, p. 2.

It appears rather strange to see Richard Baxter and the early Friends charging each other with popery, but such charges were a measure of the extent of error which each believed they discovered in their opponents' views.¹

The anti-Quaker writers had a special argument for their case, however, and Whitehead with many other Friends shared the accusation that he was a papist because he would not take the oath of abjuration.² He was cleared of this charge by the Baptist, Henry Denne, who correctly assessed the Quaker position: "For Whitehead refuses that Oath, not because it abjures Popery, but because it is an Oath, and because he thinks it unlawful to swear at all".³ Fox gives a similar explanation to the Protector, and points out the suffering borne by Friends because of their doctrine on this point:

And many hath suffered greate fynes of money because they could not swear, but in Christs doctrine doth abide, whoe saith sweare not ait all,....And now many are cast in prison, because they cannott take ye oath of abjuraçon, though they denye all y^t is conteined in itt, 4

-
1. If Baxter found many points of agreement between Quaker and Papist doctrine, Burrough adduced several similarities between the papists and Baxter "and all the Presbyterians in England". E. Burrough, Works, p. 315.
 2. Anon., The Quaker Disarmed, pages unnumbered.
 3. H. Denne, The Quaker no Papist, p. 6. Denne argues against the contents of the oath of abjuration, but he later recommended the taking of the oath of allegiance. For this he was reproved by S. Fisher, Testimony, pp. 789-832.
 4. Jnl., Camb.edn., I. 193. The oath of abjuration came into special use after the Royalist uprising in April, 1655. Cf. B.Q., p. 446, F.P.T., p. 346.

Fox and the First Publishers held that those who swear "are out of Christs Doctrine and the Apostles, who said sware not at all".¹ This was a case where the magistrate was commanding what Christ forbade, and the Christian's obedience was to Christ.

For the chief debates on the principle of swearing we must go to the Restoration year, when the imposition of the oaths of allegiance and supremacy put the issue on a broader and even more urgent basis. Although many Baptists shared the Quaker scruples against oaths, John Tombes argued strongly for the Scriptural basis of swearing, and in this he was answered by Hubberthorne and Fisher. The main arguments given by Tombes were that "swearing is not de toto genere, or in its whole kind evil. Therefore some swearing may be lawful".² Christ did not forbid all oaths, for the key texts, Mt.5:34ff and Jam.5:12, only exclude "frequent, vain, light, prophanee, unnecessary, customary, passionate swearing, or in secular matters of no importance";³ "some swearing is approved by God", as is shown by Ps.63:11, the examples of Abraham, Isaac, David, and other Old Testament figures, and by New Testament passages such as I Thes.5:27, II Tim.4:1, where the Greek words are equivalent to an oath;⁴ "some swearing hath a necessary use for the benefit of humane

1. G.M., p. 276.

2. J. Tombes, A Serious Consideration of the Oath of the Kings Supremacy, p. 6.

3. Ibid., p. 12.

4. Ibid., p. 6.

society".¹

These arguments of Tombes were repeated by other controversialists, but wherever they occurred they met with a strong Quaker rebuttal. The breaking of any of Christ's commands, one of which was "swear not at all", is "in its whole kind evil",² and "all Swearing, which is contrary to the command of Christ, is unnecessary and vain".³ Christ put an end to all swearing, for Christ is "the end of Oaths and Types, ... the end of the Prophets, of Abraham, of David"; He Himself is the "Oath of God".⁴ Therefore, because swearing was "used de facto, before Christ... cannot clearly prove, that it now is in use, de jure".⁵ Finally, "Christ who hath ended oaths" also "ends controversies amongst men" the resolving of which is the occasion for using oaths.⁶ Fisher puts this argument clearly and forcefully:

An Oath when used to its right end, i.e. to end Strife, is so used among Men only in the Fall, who live in Hatred, Variance, Strife, and such deeds of Darkness and the Flesh, but not among the Saints, that are saved from it, and live in Love and Peace,.... 7

-
1. Ibid., p. 7. The remainder of Tombes' arguments deal with the lawfulness of giving an oath of allegiance to a King, as "Supreme Governour". Cf. the full title of this tract, in the Bibliography.
 2. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 243.
 3. E. Burrough, Works, p. 489, in reply to S. Eaton.
 4. G.M., p. 239.
 5. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 794. Tombes replies that Christ ended only ceremonial, not moral rites: "In moral things the commands and examples of the old Testament, are rules to us still". (A Supplement to the Serious Consideration..., pp. 6-7).
 6. G.M., p. 179
 7. S. Fisher, Testimony, p. 802. Tombes regards this as a "silly shift", for saints are imperfect men, they may be

The Quaker refusal to swear allegiance often merely confirmed the antagonism against them, for usually the magistrates or justices had already been offended by the Quaker refusal to give the customary signs of respect. Because they did not put off their hats, nor bow the knee, nor use common salutations, but addressed high and low alike by "thee" and "thou", the Quakers were frequently charged with being "enemies to Civility and good manners".¹ Clapham concludes his section substantiating this allegation by making another: the Quaker casting off of all good manners

doth...directly tend to overthrow all government and authority amongst men; for, take away outward honour and respect from superiours, and what government can subsist long amongst men? 2

The Puritan magistrate and minister alike found that one of the Quaker principles seemed to be "Not giving any outward token of reverence to Magistrate, Parent, Master, or any other",³ and Baxter expresses the general verdict against the application of such a principle by the Quakers:

They break the fifth Commandment by open dishonouring of Magistrates and Ministers, and impenitently justifie themselves in all. They will not only deny civil honour to the Magistrate, but revile him if he displease them. 4

The Quaker Publishers did indeed justify their principle, but they denied that it meant a refusal to honor any man;

in strife, and may therefore take an oath. (op.cit., pp.13ff.)

1. J. Clapham, op.cit., p. 66.

2. Ibid., p. 71.

3. T. Weld, et.al., The Perfect Pharisee, p. 33.

4. R. Baxter, One Sheet against the Quakers, pp. 4-5.

on the contrary, the Quakers' spirit "teacheth them to have all men in esteem, and to honour all men in the Lord: Yet they are convinced by the Law to be transgressors, if they respect mens persons".¹ Richard Farnsworth gives a full explanation of the Quaker position:

Civillity and honour wee owne, and knows to whom honour is due, & to whom it is not; for if I honour a proud man for his pride, I dishonour God in so doing, for pride is one of the abominations...; But all men that are joynd to the Lord, and walke in union with him, and his seed, I honour & love,...; and yet besides all this, I can love my enemies: But to follow foolish idle fancies, to worship men with cap and knee, and flatteries, as the Serpents seed doe,...we doe that deny,...²

As for the fifth commandment, Fox points out that it "doth not speak of bowing the knee", and he also refers to the "honour of men" as being in the "first Adam". Fox asserts that the Quakers held all men in esteem by honoring the seed of God or the light of Christ in them, but customary tokens of respect they viewed as "honour of the earth", which only the earthly Adam looks for.³

The particular token of respect which caused the greatest antipathy between Friends and the ministers was the title "Master". The First Publishers severely criticized the clergy for accepting such an earthly title, and of the many Puritan replies to this criticism we may note only two.

1. G.M., p. 32.

2. R. Farnsworth, The Scriptures Vindication, p. 23. (Punctuation slightly altered).

3. G.M., p. 165.

Samuel Eaton sees no cause to reject this designation:

It doth import nothing but civil honour and respect which others shew us: It is put upon all persons who have either birth, breeding, riches of this world, office and employment of an honourable nature; It was not only put upon Christ, but upon the Apostles of Christ also, in Joh.12.21. and not rejected by them. ¹

Eaton adds that the title is forbidden only when it is accepted in pride, and Baxter takes up this point by explaining that in Mt.23:8, Jesus was censuring those rabbis who set themselves up as "Sect-masters", and thus exercised absolute lordship over their disciples' religion. It was this usage of the term "Master" that Jesus forbade, for His disciples have but "one such Absolute Master, which is Christ".²

But when the Quakers put forth their frequent query, "Whether they be not Antichrists and do disobey Christ,... [in being] called of men Master"³ they were taking Mt.13:8 literally and without qualification. Whatever exegetical arguments might be advanced, the Quaker continued to assert that "Christ saith to his Ministers, Be ye not called Masters; and the Spirit of Christ being our rule, that leads us in the fulfilling of Christs words".⁴ And when he agreed with the Puritan contention that the chief evil in accepting the title was a sense of pride and flattery, the Quaker controversialists could shrewdly conclude with Nayler that after

1. S. Eaton, The Quakers Confuted, p. 52.

2. R. Baxter, The Quakers Catechism, p. 17.

3. G. Fox and R. Hubberthorne, Truth's Defence, p. 34.

4. R. Hubberthorne, Collection, p. 138.

all his opponents' arguments written to uphold the title "Master" it is hard to believe that they do not love it.¹

In these disputes on "Civility and good manners" we see the conflict between Quakers and Puritans spreading out to include mundane and commonplace matters seemingly far removed from the concerns of religious disputants. The controversy has shifted from the church or church yard to the town hall, and from the town hall to the market place, the street, or any occasion of social intercourse. Not only Puritan ministers, but Puritan magistrates, "professors", and the populace in general, were involved in disputes with the Quaker Publishers, who brought all areas of life under their scrutiny. A large part of the antagonisms engendered by the Quaker criticism of manners and morals was, of course, not confined only to the Puritans, but was shared by the general populace. Moreover, many of these more mundane quarrels never found their way into print, and when they did, were often mentioned only in passing. The disputed issues relating to the State and to society as a whole which have been discussed in this chapter were the issues most frequently pronounced upon by the controversialists. But behind the polemical writings there are many personal, social, and political sources of animosity, and these are too individual and emotional to be classified or fully evaluated as to their role in the controversy.

1. J. Nayler, An Answer to a Book called The Quakers Catechism, p. 32.

CRITICAL CONCLUSION

The first point to be considered in drawing up any conclusions regarding the Quaker-Puritan controversy is to designate clearly to whom our conclusions apply. This is a task which is obviously necessary in any study, but which is imperative in the investigation at hand. The terms "Puritans" and "Quakers" have been dealt with in a highly selective manner throughout this work, and the entire discussion becomes meaningful only when the principles of selection are constantly kept in mind. The most important limiting factor is the historical one, and this has been indicated in the title itself. The year 1660 suffices to point out that we are not dealing with Restoration Puritanism nor with the second period of Quakerism. We have taken the phrase "the early Quakers" in a literal and definite sense, and the Quaker arguments described throughout are those given by the First Publishers in the earliest years of their preaching. This study is, therefore, in part an investigation into the doctrines and tenets of primitive Quakerism.

The Puritan side of the work is most accurately defined as an inquiry into the doctrinal positions of those Puritans who entered into dispute with the early Quakers. This narrows the focus both historically and polemically.

The end date has been set at the Restoration, and the beginning of George Fox's preaching in 1647. Since the major part of the controversy did not develop until 1653, we are, therefore, referring only to the latter half of Commonwealth Puritanism, and within these historical bounds only to those Puritans who wrote against the Quakers. The last three chapters have made special mention of the groups or elements of Puritan thought which drop out of the dispute on various issues. But throughout the entire study many leading Puritans are conspicuous by their absence, and we look in vain for writings by representatives of the radical wing of Puritan thought, and this fact rules out any broad generalization, based on the given data, regarding Puritanism as a whole.

The limited nature of the Puritan controvertists furthermore qualifies our approach to the problem of the continuity and discontinuity between Quakers and Puritans. If Puritan thought is seen as embodying a wide variety of theological outlook, containing parties ranging from right to left, and if Quakerism is seen as having close affinities with the far left wing of Puritanism, it is obvious that our picture will be incomplete. We have no continuum, for the radical Puritans who might be the connecting link are missing. Moreover, since we are dealing exclusively with polemical writings, we may expect that even the more moderate and conservative Puritans would be loathe to emphasize what agreement they might have with the Quaker position. We have been outlining a virulent and hard-fought controversy, one

conducted with the utmost seriousness; when the opposing party is described as Antichrist, led by the Devil, and seducing men's souls, there is little chance that the areas of agreement between opponents will receive much attention.

Having clearly determined the identity of the opposing protagonists, and recognizing the incomplete representation on the one side, we may now proceed to formulate our critical observations on what these disputants have said. We have heard all their basic arguments, and have noticed where the disputes were louder and longer than others. We interposed only to set the arguments in a logical order, and to point out the logical relationships between various contentions. Since the main lines of reasoning and the principle al x areas of disagreement have been indicated as the discussion progressed, we need not retrace our steps by attempting to condense the entire discussion into a few summary sentences. What remains to be noted is not so much what was said by the controvertists themselves, but what we refrained from saying while they were speaking. Had we been allowed to express ourselves, as critical, outside observers, with no pressing obligation to support either contestant, what would we have said? Had we been the judge in the dispute, rather than merely the moderator attempting to keep the discussion in order, what critical observations would we have made?

Perhaps the first aspect of the debate to which we would draw attention would be the continual entanglement of

abstract doctrinal issues with concrete religious, moral, and political issues. Basic theological differences usually create their own difficulties for orderly discussion, but when accusations of spiritual emptiness, moral laxity, and suspected political subversion are thrown into the dispute, the difficulty of discussing the theological issues on their own merits is immense. Moreover, while we, in our era, make an attempt to analyze the causes of divisions between religious groups in terms of non-theological as well as theological factors, the seventeenth-century disputants rarely recognized such a distinction. The contentions urged in the last chapter, regarding civil obedience, taking of oaths, manners and morals, all had a theological and Scriptural basis. There were no limits to the subjects which might come into the debate, and in such a situation it is not surprising that the discussion often gains in emotional fervor what it loses in logical development.

As critical observers we may go on to analyze the logical and semantic difficulties involved in the disputed issues, for the controversy was not only complicated by factors which are on the periphery of theology proper. We have noted several specific misunderstandings due primarily to terminology; for example, the question of the conjunction of Word and Spirit, when by "Word" the Quaker meant Christ while the Puritan meant the Scriptures, or again, the Quaker rejection of the word "humane" being taken for a rejection of the doctrine of the humanity of Christ. But the most serious

problems arising out of misleading terminology were those connected with the Quaker use of the word "within". Whenever it was used, whether concerning the light within, the Spirit within, Christ within, heaven within, or justification within, this term invited and received the accusation of subjectivity. In emphasizing the dimension of 'withinness', the Quaker was constantly charged with minimizing, ignoring, or even denying the objective, historical realities of the Christian faith: the transcendent character of God and the Holy Spirit; the historicity of Christ's crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, and second coming; the objective existence of heaven and hell; the atonement and justification of Christ as something done "without", by His death on the Cross. In all these cases, the discussion tended to reach an impasse because the Quaker, while acknowledging his belief in the external objective realities, continued to insist that these realities had no religious value unless received "within", by the acceptance of faith. As we saw most clearly in connection with the light within, the Quakers did not hold that revelation originated within the individual believer; it was simply to be received within, accepted and obeyed. The Puritans never denied this receiving, experiential side--although some of them came close to doing so with regard to the Atonement--but to them the Quaker emphasis on within seemed too extreme and one-sided, and they reacted by placing renewed emphasis on that which was "without".

In addition to the semantic problems, we may also

point to the several logical difficulties in which the arguments of both sides were involved. One of these was the tendency of the controvertists to separate into mutually exclusive components that which both sides really held as an inseparable unity. We noted in Chapter Four that the issues of "Christ within" and "Christ without", and of "flesh" and "spirit", were treated largely in terms of an 'either/or', when Quakers and Puritans alike would otherwise readily allow that a full Christology includes both the inner and the external perspective, both the spirit and the flesh. A similar bifurcation was made with regard to the doctrine of justification, for while both sides maintained a belief in the atoning death of Christ and in the acceptance by faith of this justification, the Quakers were charged with denying the former, and rejecting the "imputed" righteousness of Christ, and the Puritans were charged with overlooking the latter, and minimizing the sanctifying work of Christ in the believer's life. Had we been permitted to inject a critical observation into these disputes, we would surely have said that the two groups of disputants were much closer to each other than they would admit.

A second logical problem which served to cloud the discussion was that raised by the personal nature of much of the polemic. We have noticed that the Quaker attack and the Puritan counter-attack was frequently directed to the individual character of their opponents, rather than to their ideational principles. Such a method of attack ob-

viously added much confusion to the disputed issues, but on the other hand it must be allowed that there were certain ad hominem arguments which had a fundamental validity. When, with the Puritans, the ultimate judge of religious doctrine and practices was the Scriptures, such personal attacks would indeed be basically irrelevant. But when, with the Quakers, the ultimate judge and touchstone was the Spirit, it was necessary to ask, "What canst thou say?", or more precisely, "What canst thou say that thou hast heard from the Spirit of God?" Since, from the Quaker viewpoint, the ultimate authority was that which the individual had received immediately from God, the primary issue in any debate was not so much what the man said, but whether he was one who witnessed the immediate Spirit of God. Thus the Quaker accusation that an opponent was "inwardly ravened" from the Spirit was not merely personal invective: it was the basic critical judgment of Quaker theology.

The mention of the word "theology" brings us close to the center of the logical difficulties inherent in the controversy. A large portion of the Quaker arguments about which the disputes arose were more in the nature of religious affirmations than theological formulations: they dealt more with the experiential than with the reflective. This is, of course, a dangerous distinction to make, for it implies a separation between perception and ideation, or between 'heart' and 'mind', which does not, in fact exist. But while recognizing the essential unity of human behavior, we may

distinguish between statements which refer primarily and directly to a deeply felt experience, and statements which refer primarily to a reflection upon experience, and to the conceptual implications of this reflection. It would appear that many of the key arguments proposed by the Quakers are of the first category, they are basically experiential or religious testimonies; they are not to be taken as fully developed conceptual formulations of the theological implications involved in the given religious experience.

Thus the many statements relating to 'withinness', and the vigorous denunciation of the Puritans for allegedly denying the light within, Christ within, justification within, etc., stem not from the abstract idea of withinness, but from the keenly-felt experience "within" of revelation, God, Christ and His justification, and the Holy Spirit. Again, spiritual infallibility, the victory over sin, the immediate call to the ministry, immediate "openings" of divine truth, and immediate divine guidance on specific courses of action, were not primarily theological doctrines deduced from the words or thoughts of other people: they were facets of experience testified to by all the early Quaker writers. Similarly, in the life of the Church, liturgical and sacramental forms could be disparaged because the early Friends knew from their own experience that they could maintain a high degree of spiritual vitality without the aid of such forms. The question whether or not the Church can exist without outward forms of worship, ordinances, organization, and ordination of

ministers received an affirmative answer from the Quakers, not in theory but in experienced fact.

In so far as the Quaker argument on these points consisted mainly in a statement of experienced fact, a description of a religious experience, the issues remained outside the realm of theological discussion. An experience per se can only be stated or described, it cannot be debated. Discussion on this level can be made up only of a comparison of experiences, and much of the Quaker criticism may be classified as a challenge to the Puritans to testify to the same kind of spiritual experience as the Quakers held that they enjoyed. Had the Puritan writers answered the Quaker insistence on witnessing Christ within, for example, with an equally forthright declaration that they did indeed feel the inner presence of Christ, much of the Christological debate would have ended almost at once. But even Puritans like Bunyan, who were not adverse to speaking of what they felt and experienced, apparently found the Quaker emphasis on "within" too extreme, and therefore replied instead by placing a counter-emphasis on that which was prior to experience, the objectively given, rather than the subjectively received aspect of Christian faith. We may add that the Quakers often reacted to this reply by placing even greater stress on the reception of divine life and power within the believer, and the Quaker assertions that the Spirit dwells in the believer in a "personal and essential union", and that Christ was within the saints in a bodily sense, are to be seen in the context

of this counter-reaction.

When all these complicating factors in the discussion are considered, we are left with two principle questions: what remains as the basic theological divergence between Quakers and Puritans, and who seemed to get the better of the theological argument? Both questions are hazardous, for the first involves the risk of over-simplification and the second contains the obvious danger of imposing our own interests and presuppositions upon the given data. However, since these risks are unavoidable, it is sufficient to guard against them as much as possible, and then proceed. The basic cleavage between the Quakers and their Puritan opponents may, it seems to us, be analyzed in terms of two dichotomies frequently referred to by the controversialists themselves, viz., the opposition between "immediate" and "mediate", and between "within" and "without". It is suggested that one or the other, and sometimes both of these pairs of opposites lie at the root of the Quaker-Puritan divergence on every major issue. The latter pair has already been discussed in this conclusion, and we have considered the Quaker insistence on 'withinness' as basically an experiential declaration. So long as the Quakers did not deny the objective element, the aspect of 'withoutness', most of the Puritans could have shared the experiential affirmations. But in reaction to the extreme Quaker emphasis on "within" which seemed to overlook or exclude the "without", the Puritans placed a counter emphasis on the latter, which in turn seemed to the Quakers to derogate the inner dimension

of religion.

The dichotomy of "within" and "without" undergirded the arguments on Christology, justification and sanctification, and forms of worship. The opposition of "immediate" and "mediate" dominates the discussion on revelation, the inspiration of the Spirit, the Scriptures, and the call and ordination of ministers. The two dichotomies mutually reinforce each other throughout the entire controversy, for the claim of immediacy is based upon the experiential affirmation that the divine will is manifested within the believer, directly and immediately. The assertion that the divine will is not immediate presupposes external, objective forms such as the Biblical writings, or historical events such as the Crucifixion, by means of which God manifests himself without, indirectly and mediately. Since it was the opposition of immediate and mediate that formed the conflicting Quaker and Puritan answers to the problem of authority, we may take this as the more important of the two pairs of opposites. The disputes on within versus without were often a matter of emphasis, but the divergence on immediate versus mediate was a matter of principle. Here we cannot tell out controversialists that they were in greater agreement than they would admit, for between the assertion that revelation is immediate, as opposed to mediate, there could be no rapport. When, on the basis of immediate revelation as a possibility and actuality in the present day, the Quakers held up the Spirit as the judge and touchstone, and when on the basis of mediate revelation as the only possibility

in the present day, the Puritans held up the Scriptures as the judge and touchstone, two mutually antagonistic courses of thought and action had been firmly set. The cleavage regarding immediate and mediate was the watershed of the Quaker-Puritan controversy.

The relative success of the arguments of the two opponents must largely rest on our judgment of their defense of immediacy and withinness, or of mediacy and withoutness. In so far as both Puritans and Quakers stoutly maintained that they were being true to the doctrine of Christ and His apostles, and as they both denounced each other as forsaking the apostolic gospel, it seems that on the argument for immediacy the Quakers had the advantage. Since the Puritans, as well as the Quakers, affirmed that the prophets and apostles witnessed immediate revelation and were taught directly by God's Spirit, the Quakers had an incisive question when they asked why, if the Puritan writers claimed to be in the apostles' doctrine, were they not in the apostles' spirit. If it be answered that immediate revelation and extraordinary inspiration ceased after the apostolic period, the Quakers would take this as proof of their contention that everyone has been in the apostacy since the apostles' days, having only their forms and words, without the Spirit that gave them forth.

The question of why the Spirit is thought to work in one way in Biblical times, and another way ever since, is indeed a continually perplexing problem for Protestant

theology, and the Puritan controversialists never gave it a direct answer. The Puritans pointed instead to the dangers of the principle of immediacy, and to the need for a criterion by which contemporary inspiration was to be judged. In holding up the Scriptures as this criterion, they had the benefit of pointing to an external authority, one which was theoretically independent of any man's private judgments. The outward, objective, transcendent aspects of divine revelation; and the historical nature of the events of Christ as Saviour, are as indispensable to Christian faith as is the indwelling Spirit of Christ, and the Puritans clearly had the edge on the argument when they applied the corrective emphasis of God's transcendence. Yet the Quaker writers could legitimately be accused only of underemphasizing the element of the "without", and not with denying it altogether, for we have seen that where they seemed to be most subjective, viz., on the light within, they were explicitly and thoroughly supernaturalists.

Furthermore, the Quakers also used the Scriptures as a court of appeal, and in this they undercut both their own and their opponents' position. They directly weakened their own position on the Spirit as primary authority, for in appealing to Scripture they referred to the Spirit only as it spoke mediately through the Biblical writings. They likewise weakened the pragmatic value of the view that the Scriptures were the judge of controversy, for when Scripture was cited by both sides it lost effectiveness as a judge between them. When quoted by sincere and fervent religious opponents,

the Scriptures spoke with as many conflicting voices as did the men's spirits of which it was to be the judge.

Coming to the final question, "Who won?", several considerations must be taken into account. First, it is always easier to attack than to defend, and as critics of the established Puritan doctrines and practices, the Quakers clearly had a strategic advantage. Secondly, the plea for inner spiritual vitality is always an attractive one, and in protesting against dead forms, and insisting on witnessing the living spirit, the Quakers elicit a natural degree of sympathy. Thirdly, the balance between the dimensions of the within and the without, is always in danger of being disrupted, and both Puritans and Quakers were justified in exercising a mutual corrective against the tendency to emphasize one side to the exclusion of the other.

But the key question upon which our evaluation of the controversy rests is the dual problem of the Quaker claim to immediate inspiration and the verification of this claim. If it is agreed that primitive Christianity is the model for all true Christians, as, for example, in forms of worship or ethical and communal matters, it would seem that the apostolic witnessing of immediate inspiration must be allowed as a possibility in any century. But the more difficult question is that of the verification of this immediacy. In advocating the Scriptures as the criterion, the Puritans were unable to make this criterion an effective judge, since the Quakers, however inconsistently, claimed that the Scriptures verified

their position. The Quaker criterion of the Spirit, was never fully put to the test by the Puritan controversialists and we can imagine that it would have been a different but equally unresolved debate had the Puritans looked to the Spirit as their primary authority. The controversy leaves us with these two answers to the problem of authority, both involving unsettled difficulties, and neither can be judged completely successful.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Sources:

(Full titles have been given wherever they contain material relevant to the controversy. The words italicized correspond to the abbreviated titles used throughout this work.)

- Aldam, Thomas, et.al., A Brief Discovery Of a threefold estate of Antichrist Now extant in the world: viz. A description of 1. The true and false Temple, 2. The false Ministry, and 3. The false Churches. Whereunto is added The Trial of one George Fox in Lancashire, with his Answer to eight Articles exhibited against him;...Also, Certain Queries upon a Petition lately presented to the Parliament from divers Gentlemen and others in Worcester-shire; necessary to be answered by the Petitioners who are said to be 6000 in number. London, Printed for Giles Calvert,...., 1653.
- Anonymous, An Answer to a Book Which Samuel Eaton put up to the Parliament: Which he saith he is a Teacher of the Church of Christ, heretofore meeting at Duckenfield, now at Stockport in Cheshire; And he calls the Title of his Book Quakers Confuted...London: Printed for Giles Calvert,....,1654.
- _____, An Answer to a Scandalous Paper, wherein were some Queries given to be answered. And likewise, Therein is found many Lies and Slanders, and false accusations against those people whom he (and the World) calls Quakers. Dated from Dorchester in New-England, August 17, 1655, subscribed Edward Breck,...London, Printed for Giles Calvert,...., 1656.
- _____, The Quaker Disarm'd, or A True Relation of a Late Publick Dispute held at Cambridge. By Three Eminent Quakers, against one Scholar of Cambridge. With a Letter in Defence of the Ministry, and against Lay-Preachers. Also Several Quaeries proposed to the Quakers to be answered if they can. London, Printed by J.C.,...., 1659. (Note: The "Scholar of Cambridge" is Thomas Smith, and Smith's Anti-Quakeriana lists this tract under his name. But it is anonymous, and the author describes himself as a "moderate sympathizer" of "T.S.". But cf. also entry on H. Denne.)

- _____ The Querers and Quakers Cause at The Second Hearing, Or, The Quakers Antiquering Advocate examined: his Pleadings found light and weak, his language lewd and railing, his Principles loose and large. The Quaking and entranced faction discovered to be a new branch of an old root, revived by Satan; some of their strange un-gospel-like tenents, unchristian practises, and opinions fathered upon the Spirit, to be abhorred, and avoided by all holy Soules, are also discovered, and truly laid open. London: Printed by I.G. for Nath. Brooke,...., 1653.
- _____ [G. Fox and J. Nayler] To all that would Know the Way to the Kingdome, whether they be in Forms, without Forms, or got above all Forms. A Direction to turn your minds within, where the voice of God is to be heard, whom you ignorantly worship as afar off; and to wait upon him for the true wisdom. That you may know Truth from Errour, the Word from the Letter, the Power from the Form, and the true Prophets from the false. Given forth by those whom the World in scorn calls Quakers,...Printed at London, 1655.
- _____ Twenty Quaking Queries, Having been Clowded, and now Brought forth to Light, By Mad-Tom. London, Printed for Robert Page,...., 1659.
- Audland, John. The School-Master Disciplin'd: or, a Reply to a Lying Paper, entitul'd, "The Gadding Tribe reprov'd:" put forth under the name of George Willington, School-master in the City of Bristol;...Also, An Answer to a scandalous Paper, put forth by William Prynne, entituled, "The Quakers unmasked and clearly detected,"...Whereunto is added a Reply to an additional Paper, put forth by William Prynne, in his lying, enlarged Edition of his scandalous paper aforementioned; in which he is more unmasked, and proved to be spawned from the Father of Lies, whose refuge is sweeping away...London, Printed for Giles Calvert,...., 1655.
- _____ The Innocent delivered out of the Snare, and the Blind Guide Fallen into the Pit; or, An Answer to a Booke entituled, "The Great Mysteries of Godliness and Ungodliness, full of Lies, Slanders, and false accusations; Put forth by Ralph Farmer, a pretended Minister in the City of Bristol,....Also an Answer to William Prynne and Samuel Morris of Bristol. London, Printed for Giles Calvert,...., 1655.
- Baxter, Richard. A Second Sheet for the Ministry Justifying our Calling Against Quakers, Seekers, and Papists, and all that deny us to be the Ministers of Christ. London, Printed by R. White for N. Simmons,...., 1657.

- Baxter, Richard. (cont'd) One Sheet against the Quakers,
London: Printed by Robert White, for Nevil Simmons,
..., 1657.
- _____, One Sheet for the Ministry, Against the Malignants
of all sorts. London, Printed by Robert White, for
Nevil Simmons, ..., 1657.
- _____, Reliquiae Baxterianae: or, Mr. Richard Baxter's
Narrative of The most Memorable Passages of his
Life and Times. Faithfully Publish'd from his own
Original Manuscript, By Matthew Sylvester. London:
Printed for T. Parkhurst, ..., 1696.
- _____, The Quakers Catechism, or, The Quakers questioned,
Their Questions Answered, and both Published, For
the Sake of those of them that have not yet sinned
unto Death; And of those ungrounded Novices that
are most in danger of their Seduction. London, Printed
by A.M. for Thomas Underhill, ..., 1656.
- _____, The Worcester-shire Petition to the Parliament for
the Ministry of England Defended, By a Minister of
Christ in that County; In Answer to XVI Queries,
Printed in a Book, called, A Brief Discovery of the
threefold Estate of Antichrist; Whereunto is added,
XVII. Counter-Queries, and an Humble Monition To
Parliament, People, and Ministers. London, Printed
for Tho. Underhill.... 1653.
- Bewick, John. An Answer to a Quakers Seventeen Heads of Queries,
containing in them seventy seven Questions. Wherein
Sundry Scriptures out of the Prophets and Apostles
are cleared: The maintenance of Ministers by Tithes
is by Scripture fully vindicated: Several Cases of
Conscience are resolved: Several points of Christian
Religion are confirmed: Parochial Churches, and the
Practises of some things in these our English Churches
are thoroughly justified: The Grand Antichrist with
the Heretical Anti-christs are decyphered and paral-
leled....London: Printed by T. R., for Andrew Crook
..., 1660.
- Bourne, Immanuel. A defence of the Scriptures, and the Holy
Spirit speaking in them, as the chiefe Judge of Con-
troversies of Faith, and of the light in them, as
needfull to be looked unto for direction to attaine
Salvation: With a Vindication of that Honour due to
Magistrates, Ministers, and others, according to
their Places and Dignities. In a Relation of a Dis-
putation at Chesterfield in the County of Darby, be-
tween some Ministers of the Gospell, and James Nayler
an erring Quaker. The Questions disputed were these
foure: 1. Whether the Spirit of God speaking in the

Scripture, be the Chiefe Judge of Controversies of Faith? Affirmed by us Ministers of Christ. 2. Whether the private Spirit in the Pope, or in any Quaker, be the Chiefe Judge of Controversies? Denied. 3. Whether every man be bound to looke to the light within him (as sufficient) for his direction to attaine Salvation? Denied. 4. Whether it be lawfull to call any man Master or Father, upon earth, or to give any honour to man? Affirmed.... London, Printed for John Wright.... 1656.

Brownsword, William. The Quaker-Jesuite, or, Popery in Quakerisme; Being a clear Discovery. 1. That their Doctrines, with their Proofs and Arguments, are fetcht out of the Council of Trent, Bellarmine, and others. 2. That their Practises are fetcht out of the Rules and Practises of Popish Monks. With a serious admonition to the Quakers, to consider their ways, and return from whence they are fallen.... London, Printed by J.M.,.... 1660.

Burrough, Edward. The Memorable Works Of a Son of Thunder and Consolation:.... Printed and Published..., in the Year, 1672.

Bunyan, John. The Entire Works of John Bunyan,... Edited... by Henry Stebbing,.... London: Virtue & Co., Ltd. [1859].

Caffyn, Matthew. The Deceived and deceiving Quakers Discov-ered. Their damnable Heresies, horrid blasphemies, mockings, railings, unparallel'd Deceit, and Dishonesty laid opn. In the discovery of which, is made known the pure use of the holy Scriptures (which by them is denyed) the true Christ, and how he justifies, his second coming proved not to be already (as the Quaker affirms) Also the Resurrection from the dead, and the Eternal Judgment, and several other particulars that Saints are required to be stedfast in.... London, Printed by R.I. for Francis Smith..., 1656.

_____, "The great Errour and mistake of the Quakers, concerning the true Christ; and how he is said to be in his People: And concerning the Rule of Mankind.", in Faith in Gods Promises, the Saints best Weapon:pp. 37-52. London, Printed by S. Dover, for F. Smith,.... no date .

Clapham, Jonathan. A short and full Vindication of that sweet and Comfortable Ordinance, of singing of Psalmes. Together with some profitable Rules, to direct weak Christians how to sing to edification. And a briefe Confutation of some of the most usual Cavils made against the same.... London, Printed, ... 1656.

- Clapham, Jonathan. (cont'd) A Discovery of the Quakers Doctrine to the Protector. (Note: This is the title wrongly given by Fox in the G.M., p. 95, to Clapham's A Full Discovery and Confutation of the wicked and damnable Doctrines of the Quakers.... London; Printed by T. R. & E. M. for Adoniram Byfield....., 1656. Our copy of Clapham's pamphlet lacked the title page, the Epistle to the Protector, and several other pages, and we used Fox's reply in the G.M. to locate its identity. Smith's Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana apparently follows the G.M. and gives two separate titles. But Hubberthorne's reply is to the same book as Fox answers, and Hubberthorne gives the title correctly as, A Full Discovery and Confutation....)
- _____, Obedience to Magistrates recommended. A sermon preached upon September 9, 1683.
- Clarke, Samuel. A Mirrour or Looking-Glasse both for Saints, and Sinners held forth in some thousands of Examples. Wherein is set forth, as Gods exceeding great mercies to the one, so his severe judgements upon the other...Collected out of the ancient Fathers, ecclesiastical writers, moderne divines, the chronicles of severall countries, and other authors of good credit....The third edition very much enlarged. T. R. & E. M. for T. Newberry; London, 1657.
- Deacon, John. An Exact History of the life of James Naylor with his Parents, Birth, Education, Profession, Actions, and Blasphemies. Also How he came first to be a Quaker, and received his commission from Heaven (as he saith) when he was in the Field at Plow. Taken from his own mouth. With the Doctrines, Tenets and practises of some other of the same Sect.London, Printed for Edward Thomas,...., 1657.
- Denne, Henry. The Quaker no Papist, in Answer to The Quaker Disarmed, or A brief Reply and Censure of Mr. Thomas Smith's fiivolous Relation of a Dispute held betwixt himself and Certain Quakers at Cambrige.London, Printed and are to be sold by Francis Smith, ...1659.
- Dewsbery, William. The Faithful Testimony of that Antient Servant of the Lord, and Minister of the everlasting Gospel William Dewsbery:....London, Printed and Sold by Andrew Sowle,.... [1689].
- Duke, Francis. An Answer To some of the Principle Quakers, Which deceive the People, but more Particularly to a Book of John Chandler's, Called or known by this Title, A Narrative plainly shewing, That the

Priests of England are as truly Anti-Christ (who got up since the days of the Apostles) as the Pope and his Clergy;.... London: Printed by T. N. for Miles Michel the younger,..... 1660.

Eaton, Samuel. The Quakers Confuted, being An Answer unto Nineteen Querries; Propounded by them, and sent to the Elders of the Church of Duckenfield in Cheshire; Wherein Is held forth much of the Doctrine and practise Concerning Revelations, and immediate Voices, and against the holy Scriptures, Christs Ministry, Churches and Ordinances etc. Together With an Answer to a Letter which was written and sent by one of them to a Family of Note and Quality in the said County, which pleaded for perfection in this life, and for quaking...London, Printed by R. White for Thomas Brewster,....., 1654.

Erbery, William. Ministers for Tythes; being a manifest proof, that these men are no Ministers of the Gospel, who follow the Magistrate for a worldly Maintenance, and fee the Lawyers to plead for Tythes. London, 1653.

Faldo, John. Quakerism no Christianity; or, a Thorow-Quaker no Christian. Proved by the Quakers Principles, detected out of their chief Writers, and confuted by Scripture and right Reason: with a Key to their Terms and Phrases, a Discourse of Apostolical Inspirations, and an Account of their Foundation laid in Popery....London: Printed by B. G. for Jonathan Robinson,....., 1675.

Farnsworth, Richard. The Holy Scriptures From Scandals are cleared. Or An Answer to a Book set forth by the Baptizers; to wit, Henry Hagger and Thomas Pollard, Entituled, The Holy Scriptures clearing it self of Scandals:....And something here is, in Answer to a false Prophet, called John Griffith, set out by him and several others, in a false Prophetie or Book, bearing the Title of True Gospel Faith,....London, Printed for Giles Calvert, 1655.

The Scriptures Vindication, against the Scottish Contradictors. By one John Stalham, and as he saith, Preacher of the Gospel at Edenborough in Scotland. And the other stiled, A Serious review of some Principles of the Quakers; wherein error is discovered, and truth defended; By P. E. and written with a pen at Edenborough, Printed in the year 1655, and a written name, as if it were the Printer called Peter English, but no Printed name;....London, Printed for Giles Calvert, 1655.

- Fawne, Luke, et.al., A Second Beacon Fired. Humbly Presented to the Lord Protector and the Parliament By the Publishers of the First. With their humble Petition, that they would do what may be expected from Christian Magistrates, in suppressing Blasphemous Books. London, Printed for the Subscribers hereof, 1654.
- Feake, Christopher, et.al., A Faithful Discovery of a treacherous Design of Mystical Antichrist Displaying Christs Banners, But attempting to lay waste Scriptures, Churches, Christ, Faith, Hope &c. and establish Paganism in England. Seasonably given in a Letter to the Faithful in and near to Beverley. Containing an Examination of many Doctrines of the People called Quakers in Yorkshire, Together with a Censure of their Way,.... London, Printed by H. Hills for Thomas Brewster,...., 1653.
- Firmin, Giles. Stabliishing against Shaking: or, A Discovery of the Prince of Darknesse (scarcely) transformed into an Angel of Light, powerfully now working in the deluded people called Quakers: with A Sober Answer to their railings against Ministers for receiving maintenance from their people....London, Printed by J. G. for Nathaniel Webb...., 1656.
- Fisher, Samuel. The Testimony of Truth Exalted, by the collected Labours of that Worthy Man, Good Scribe, and Faithful Minister of Jesus Christ, Samuel Fisher. Who died a Prisoner for the Testimony of Jesus, and Word of God, Anno 1665....Printed in the Year, 1662.
- Fox, George. Gospel-Truth Demonstrated, in a Collection of Doctrinal Books, Given forth by that Faithful Minister of Jesus Christ, George Fox: Containing Principles, Essential to Christianity and Salvation, held among the People called Quakers.... London, Printed and Sold by T. Sowle,...., 1706.
- _____. Journal, Bi-Centenary Edition [ed. T. Ellwood] 1901, reprinted 1902. London: Headley Brothers.
- _____. Journal, Cambridge Edition. [ed. N. Penney] Cambridge: at the University Press, 1911.
- _____. The Short Journal and Itinerary Journals of George Fox, edited by Norman Penney, Cambridge at the University Press, 1925.
- _____. The Great Mistery of the Great Whore Unfolded: And Antichrists Kingdom Revealed unto Destruction. In Answer to many False Doctrines and Principles which Babylons Merchants have traded with, being held

forth by the professed Ministers, and Teachers, and Professors in England, Ireland, and Scotland, taken under their owne Hands, and from their owne Mouths sent forth by Them from time to time, against the despised People of the Lord called Quakers, who are of the Seed of that Woman, who hath been long fled into the Wildernes.

Also An Invasion upon the great City Babylon, with the spoiling of Her golden Cup, and delicate Merchandize whereby She hath deceived the World and Nations: And herein is declared the spoiling of her prey, in this Answer to the multitude of Doctrines held forth by the many false Sects, which have lost the key of Knowledge, and been on foot since the Apostles dayes called Anabaptists, Independents, Presbyters, Ranters and many others; who out of their own Mouths have manifested themselves not to be of a true descent from the true Christian Churches; But it's discovered that they have been all made drunk with the Wine of Fornication received from the whore which hath sitten upon the Beast, after whom the World hath wondred. [wandered] London, Printed for Tho. Simons, ..., 1659.

and Hubberthorne, Richard. Truth's Defence against the Refined subtilty of the Serpent, held forth in divers Answers to several Queries made by men (called Ministers) in the North. Given forth by the Light and Power of God appearing in George Fox and Richard Hubberthorn. Printed for Tho. Wayt..., 1653.

Griffith, John. A Voice from the Word of the Lord, to those grand Impostors called Quakers. Wherein is discovered their fleshly and filthy mindedness, together with the judgments of the Lord attending them. Also a word of caution to all that are called to be saints in this Nation, which may be of concernment to all people.... London, Printed for Francis Smith..., 1654.

Hammond, Samuel. The Quakers House Built upon the Sand; or, A Discovery of the Damnableness of their pernicious Doctrines. With a Warning to the People of God, and all others that tender the salvation of their immortall soules, to build upon the Rocke Christ Jesus, and his Righteousnesse, to confirm the Faith once delivered to the Saints. In Answer to a Rayling Pamphlet, lately put forth by George Whitthead. This is Published for the securing the Saints, keeping others out of the snare, and (if possible) the reducing some of those that have been reduced by their Destructive Principles.Gateshead, Printed by Stephen Bulkley, 1658.

H[igginson], F[rancis]. A Brief Relation of The Irreligion of the Northern Quakers. Wherein their horrid Principles and Practises, Doctrines and manners, as far as their Mystery of Iniquitie hath yet discovered itself, are plainly exposed to the view of every Intelligent Reader. Together with a (Brief Reply) to some part of a very scurrilous and lying Pamphlet called Sauls errand to Damascus. London, Printed by T. R. for H. R., ..., 1653.

Howet, Henoch. Quaking Principles dashed in pieces by the standing and unshaken Truth. Being an Examination of the Tenents held forth by certain Northern People, viz. 1. Slighting of the written Word. 2. A speaking to that within Man. 3. Denying the use of Reason in the matters of God. 4. A denying of the Ascension and Being of the Body of Christ. 5. A denying of all the Ordinances of Christ. 6. A denying Honor to Men. 7. Affording absolute perfection at one instant. London, Printed by Henry Hills, ..., 1655.

—————. The Beast That was, & is not, & yet is, looked upon; or, The Bo-peeping Beast pointed at: or, He that hideth himself hunted, because of whom Truth complaineth, and is spoken to by Pope and Prelate, by Presbyter, by Independent, by Quaker, by Baptist: Together with her several Answers to them all.... London: Printed for Daniel White, ..., 1659.

Howgill, Francis. Works (The Dawnings of the Gospel Day, and its Light and Glory Discovered: by a Faithful and Valiant Follower of the Lamb, and Labourer in the Work and Service of God, and a Sufferer for the Testimony of Jesus, Francis Howgil,...). Printed in the Year, 1676.

Hubberthorne, Richard. A Collection of the several Books and Writings of that Faithful Servant of God, Richard Hubberthorn, London, Printed, and are to be sold by William Warwick, 1663.

—————. The Light of Christ Within, proved to be sufficient to lead unto God, in answer to a Book put forth by John Tombes and Richard Baxter, In which they go about to prove the Light within insufficient to lead to God; by many fallible arguments, by perverting of scripture, and their own reasonings. ... London, Printed for Thomas Simmons, ..., 1660.

—————. The Quaker's House Built upon the Rock [of] Christ, wherein neither their Doctrines, Principles, nor Practices can be confounded, nor disproved; being

neither damnable, nor pernicious. As Samuel Hammond hath falsely affirmed in his Book called, The Quaker's House Built upon the Sand,....(No Printer or place given.)

- Ives, Jeremiah. Innocency above Impudency: or, The strength of Righteousness exalted, Above the Quakers Weakness and Wickedness; In A Reply To a Lying Pamphlet, call'd Weakness above Wickedness; Published by J. Nayler, in Answer to a Book, Entituled, The Quakers quaking. By which his notorious Lyes are made manifest, and the Truth of the said Book justified:....London, Printed by J. Cottrel for R. Moon,...., 1656.
- . The Quakers Quaking: or, The Foundation of their Deceit shaken, both in their Quakings, Doctrines, Ministerie, and Lives. (Note: The title page was missing, and this title has been taken from page one.)
- Lawson, Thomas. An Untaught Teacher Witnessed against. Or, The old Bottles mouth opened, It's Wine poured forth, drunk of Drunkards, denyed of them who have tasted of the new. That is to say, the unsound, unseasoned, unsavory Doctrines, and opinions of Matthew Caffyn, Baptist-Teacher laid open, who in the County of Sussex, is cryed up to be as their Battle Axe, and Weapon of Warre,....London, printed for Giles Calvert,...., 1655.
- Nayler, James. A Collection of Sundry Books, Epistles and Papers written by James Nayler,....London: Printed and Sold by the Assigns of J. Sowle,...., 1716.
- . An Answer To A Book Called The Quakers Catechism, Put out by Richard Baxter. Wherein the Slanderer is searched, his Questions Answered, and his Deceit discovered, whereby the simple have been deceived; And the Popery proved in his own bosom, which he would cast upon the Quakers....Also some Queries for the discovering the false Grounds of the literal Priest-hood of these dayes, in the last time of Anti-christ....., London, Printed in the Year 1656.
- . An Answer to Twenty-Eight Queries Sent out by Francis Harris to those People he calls Quakers: Wherein his Spirit is tryed, to be contrary to that Spirit that was in all the Children of Light, by his own words and infallible proof: his slanders being removed, his Queries are groundless: and so the truth cleared, in the sight of the least of the Lord's People....London, Printed for Giles Calvert,...., 1655.

- Nayler, James. (cont'd) A Publike Discovery, of the Open Blindness of Babel's Builders, and their confused Language, who have been building without, till they deny Faith, Knowledge, and the Gospel-Light within, the Law of the New Covenant and matter of the New Creature. Plainly laid open in an Answer to a Book Intituled, A Publike Discovery of a secret Deceit, subscribed John Deacon, in behalf of some who pretend to call to the Ministry....London, Printed for Giles Calvert,...., 1656.
- _____ . A True Discoverie of Faith, and a Brief Manifestation of the Ground upon which we stand, to those who desire to know it. With a Declaration why we cannot repair the Idolls Temples, Nor pay wages to a Clerk. Also an Answer to severall Queries put forth by one John Reyner, London, Printed for Giles Calvert,...., 1655.
- _____ . Deceit brought to Day-Light, in an 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, ..., 1656.
- _____ . The Light of Christ, And the Word of Life. Cleared from the Deceits of the Deceiver, and his litterall Weapons turned upon his owne head....Occasioned by laying open some Deceits in a Booke titled, The deceived and deceiving Quakers Discovered; Subscribed Mathew Caffin and William Jeffery, brethren in iniquitie, who are joyned to deny God, Christ, the light, and Spirit, in his Saints, and calls it teaching Christs Spirit apart from his body, and an evill Spirit, to witness the Spirit of Christ in the Saints....London: Printed for Giles Calvert..., 1656.
- _____ . Weaknes above Wickednes, And Truth above Subtilty. Which is the Quakers Defence against the Boaster and his deceitfull slanders. Clearly seen in an Answer to a Book called Quakers Quaking; Devised by Jeremiah Ive's against the dispised contemptible people trampled on by the world, and scorned by the scorers. In which the deceits are turned into the deceivers bosome, and the truth cleared from the accuser....Also some Queries to Jeremy Ive's touching his false Doctrine and Deceits....London: Printed for Giles Calvert....1656.
- Nicholson, Benjamin. Truths Defence Against Lies. In a brief Answer to a Book, intituled the Worcestershire Petition defended; set forth by one (of Englands blind

guides) who calles himself a Minister of Christ, yet pleads altogether, that the Friars, Abbots, Bishops, Deans and Chapters Lands, which the Papists set forth to maintain their Idolatrous Worship, are of Divine right and institution, and were given to the maintaining of the Church of England, which he calles the Church of Christ, and complains of the sin of Sacriledge, against those who have, or shall take any of the aforesaid Lands or Tithes, from the Clergy, which he calles the Church, &c. (No printer, place, or date. Probably 1654).

Owen, John. Works, edited by W. H. Goold. London, Johnstone and Hunter, 1853.

Pendarves, John. Arrowes against Babylon, or Certain Quaeries serving to a cleere Discovery of the Mystery of Iniquity. Whereunto are added Endeavours for Reformation in Saints apparrell. With some Quaeries for the people called Quakers....London; Printed by M. S. for Livewell Chapman,...., 1656.

Prynne, William. A New Discovery of some Romish Emissaries, Quakers; as likewise of some Popish Errors, unadvisedly embraced, pursued by our Anticomunion Ministers. Discovering the dangerous effects of their discontinuing the Frequent publick Administration of the Lords Supper; the Popish Errors where-on it is bottomed; perswading the frequent Celebration of it, to all Visible Church-members, with their Free-Admission thereunto; and prescribing some legal Regal Remedies to redress the New Sacrilegious detaining of it from the people, where their Ministers are obstinate....London, Printed for the Author,...., 1656.

The Quakers unmasked, And clearly detected to be but the Spawn of Romish Frogs, Jesuites, and Franciscan Fryers; sent from Rome to seduce the intoxicated Giddy-headed English Nation. By an Information formerly taken upon Oath in the City of Bristol, January 22, and some evident Demonstrations....The Second Edition Enlarged....London, Printed for Edward Thomas,...., 1664. (Note: first published in 1655).

Rosewell, Thomas. An Answer unto Thirty Quaeries Propounded by those who by the World (as they say) are scornfully called Quakers...London, Printed in the Year, 1656.

- Sherlock, Richard. The Quakers Wilde Questions objected against the Ministers of the Gospel, and many Sacred Acts and Offices of Religion. With brief Answers thereunto. Together with A Discourse 1. Of the Holy Spirit of God, His Impressions and Workings on the Souls of Men. 2. Of Divine Revelation, Mediate and Immediate. 3. Of Error, Heresie, and Schism: the Nature, Kindes, Causes, Reasons, and Dangers thereof: with Directions for avoiding the same. All very seasonable for these times....London, Printed by E. Cotes for R. Royston,...., 1656.
- Stalham, John. Marginall Antidotes, to be affixed over against the lines of R. H. and E. B. their pamphlet, entituled, The Rebukes of a Reviler.... London, Printed for Edward Bruster,...., 1657.
- . The Reviler Rebuked: or, a Re-Inforcement of the Charge against the Quakers (So Called) For their Contradictions to the Scriptures of God, and to their own Scriblings, which Richard Farnworth attempted to answer in his pretended Vindication of the Scriptures; but is farther discovered, with his Fellow Contradictors and Revilers, and their Doctrines, to be Anti-Scriptural, Anti-Christian, and Anti-Spiritual....London, Printed by Henry Hills and John Field,...., 1657.
- Stubbe, Henry. A Light Shining out of Darknes: or, Occasional Queries submitted To the Judgment of such as would enquire into the true state of things in our Times. ...with a brief apologie for the Quakers, that they are not inconsistent with a Magistracy.... London,...., 1659.
- Taverner, Philip. The Quakers Rounds, or A Faithful Account of a large Discourse,....; at which time and place the Quakers maintained, I. That the Scriptures were not the Word of God, because the Devil spake something, and Pharaoh spake something that is there written. II. That no Man is Justified further than he is Sanctified. III. That evil Motions not consented to, are not sin. IV. That Perfection is Attainable in this Life. V. That the Scriptures were given to the World, not to the Saints.... London, Printed by G. Dawson, for Lodowick Lloyd,, 1658.
- Toldefvy, John. The Foot out of the Snare; or, a Restoration of the Inhabitants of Zion into their Place, after their bewildered and lost Estate by the operation of a violent Power, and authority, wrought in the

Author by the Prince of Darkness, under an Appearance of the brightest Light....London, Printed by J. C. for Tho. Brewster,...., 1656. (Note: This tract is prefaced by a declaration signed by Wm. Adderley, T. Brooks, G. Cokayn, J. Goodwin, T. Jacomb, Wm. Jenkin, M. Poole, and J. Tombes; it has no direct bearing on Toldervy's confession.)

- Tombes, John. A Serious Consideration of the Oath of the Kings Supremacy; Wherein these six Propositions are asserted. 1. That some Swearing is Lawful. 2. That some promissory Oaths are Lawful. 3. That a promissory Oath of Allegiance and due obedience to a King is Lawful. 4. That the King in His Realm, is the onely Supreme Governour over all persons. 5. That the King is the Governour of the Realm, as well in all Spiritual or Ecclesiastical things, or causes as temporal. 6. That the Jurisdications, Priviledges, Preeminences, and Authorities in that Oath, may be assisted and defended. London, Printed by Henry Hills....[1660].
-
- . A Supplement to the Serious consideration of the Oath of the Kings Supremacy; Published October 1660. In, First, Some consideration of the Oath of Allegiance. Secondly, Vindicating of the consideration of the Oaths of the Kings Supremacy and Allegiance, from the exceptions of Richard Hubberthorn, Samuel Fisher, Samuel Hodgkin, and some others against them, in the points of Swearing in some case, and the matters of those Oaths....London, Printed by Henry Hills....[1660].
-
- , and Baxter, Richard. True Old Light exalted above Pretended New Light; or A Treatise of Jesus Christ, As He is the Light which enlightens every one that comes into the World. Against the sense both of the Quaker, Arminian, and other Assertors of Universal Grace; whose Light is proved to be Darkness. Delivered in Nine Sermons, By John Tombes, B.D. And Commended to Publick view By Mr. Richard Baxter. London, Printed by A. M. for Thomas Underhill....1660.
- Underhill, Thomas. Hell broke loose: Or an History of the Quakers Both Old and New. Setting forth many of Their Opinions and Practices. Published to antidote Christians against Formality in Religion and Apostasie. London, Printed for Simon Miller..., 1660.
- Weare, George, and John Hart, William Grey, William Lowry, William Mitchell, Richard Ismaell. The Doctrins & Principles of the Priests of Scotland, Contrary to

the Doctrine of Christ and the Apostles. Here all may see, The Priests of Scotland, and their Church, and their Persecution, against the Saints, and Lambs, Servants, and Children of God, which the Lord moved to go among them, to visit the Seed of God, in that dark wilderness Country, who has been as Sheep among Wolves....London, Printed for Giles Calvert,...., 1657.

Weld, Thomas, and Wm. Cole, Wm. Durant, Samuel Hammond, and Richard Prideaux. The Perfect Pharisee, under Monkish Holinesse, opposing the Fundamental Principles of the Doctrine of the Gospel, and Scripture Practises of Gospel-Worship manifesting himself in the generation of Men called Quakers. Gateside, Printed by S. B. and are to be sould by Will. London,, 1653.

Whitehead, George. A Brief Treatise, On the Truths behalf in discovery of Falshoods which are dispersed abroad in two papers of Richard Baxters who is greatly esteemed of as an able Minister at Kedarminster in Worcestershire, but his ignorance and deceit is here made appear in his two papers, the one intituled, One Sheet for the Ministry, the other A Second Sheet for the Ministry. And he hath pretended the one against Malignants, among whom he hath numbred them called Quakers, and uttered forth his envy in several lies and revilings against that people called Quakers, whose known integrity shall stand a witness against all such deceivers and revilers as he is proved to be perpetually. 1. Here are several of this said R. Baxters lies made manifest and void. 2. Here is something concerning Ministers maintenance, and tithes, which this Priest Baxter goes about to prove that tithes are both of Civil and Divine Institution. 3. Concerning the Priests call to their Ministry, and how it differs from the true call, with several other things of concernment that here both Magistrates and people may come to see the blindness of the deceivers in this Nation....London, Printed for Thomas Simmons, 1658.

_____ . A Serious Search into Jeremy Ives's Questions to the Quakers: who are herein cleared from his scornful Abuses, and Jer. Ives himself manifest to be No Christian from his own Observations, Reviling, Ostentation, &c....Printed in the Year, 1674.

_____ . Cain's Generation Discovered, in Answer to an Epistle directed to the Reader, in a Book Titled, A Short and Full vindication of that sweet and comfortable Ordinance, of Singing Psalms. Put forth by one Jonathan Clapham, who calls himself M.A. and Minister of Christ in Wramplingham in Norfolk; Wherein he is found in envy, in Cain's way, in his false accusations and

fierce despising and envious railing against the innocent, which is answered by me whose name in the flesh is George Whitehead,...: also several Quaeries to them that profess the scriptures to be their rule to walk by, and some to them that profess the scripture to be their Rule, and the Saints Rule to try the Spirits by. London, Printed for Giles Calvert,...., 1655.

- _____ . and Atkinson, Christopher. David's Enemies discovered, who of him make Sons, but without the Spirit and without understanding, as the Drunkard did which he declares of in Psal. 69.12. or, a True Discovery of that Custome and Forme which the Priests of this Generation would make an ordinance of, to blind the eyes of the simple, as this priest Clapham: in his 6 arguments, which is here answered,....London: Printed for Giles Calvert,...., 1655.
- _____ . The Pernicious Way of the Rigid Presbyter and Antichristian Ministers, Detected. And several weighty Matters (in Controversie, betwixt Sion and her Adversaries, or between the true Church and the false) discussed. To inform both Magistrates, Ministers, and People, against the Spirit of Antichrist and Persecution. Partly upon occasion of a Book, entitled, The Quakers Libel Answered, by Creswel Whately; who calls himself Minister of the Gospel. To which is annexed, Something concerning the true Christ, and his being in his People; In answer to Matthew Caffin his great Error and Mistake of the Quakers, in his Book, entitled, Faith'in God's Promises, the Saints best Weapon. London, Printed for Robert Wilson, 1662.
- _____ . Truth Tryumphing in a Suffering Time over Deceit and Falsehood; or, William Prynns Book of Quakers Unmasked, clearly detected, and the Innocency of the People Vindicated from the Grosse Abuses and Injuries done by him. This is occasioned upon W.P. his said Book (with his Additions to it in Reply to John Audland) being lately divulged. This for the Information of the Nation: [London, 1664].

II. Secondary Sources:

- Ashley, Maurice. England in the Seventeenth Century (1603-1714). London: Penguin Books, 1952.
- Barclay, Robert. The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1876.
- Besse, Joseph. A Collection of the Sufferings Of the People called Quakers. London, Printed and Sold by Luke Hinde,...., 1753.
- Braithwaite, William C. The Beginnings of Quakerism. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1912.
- _____. The Second Period of Quakerism. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1921.
- Brayshaw, A. Neave. The Personality of George Fox. London: Allenson & Co., Ltd., 1933.
- _____. The Quakers: Their Story and Message. London: The Swarthmore Press, Ltd., Second Edition, 1927.
- Calamy, Edmund. The Nonconformist's Memorial; Abridged, Corrected, and Methodized...by Samuel Palmer. London: 1802.
- Calamy Revised, ed. Arnold Gwynne Matthews. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934.
- Davies, Horton. The Worship of the English Puritans. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1948.
- Dictionary of National Biography, ed. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1885-1912 edn.
- Gardiner, Samuel R. History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate 1649-1656. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903.
- Nuttall, Geoffrey F. The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience. Oxford: Blackwell, 1947.
- _____. "The Quakers and the Puritans", the Congregational Quarterly, XVI, No. 3, pp. 315ff, London: Independent Press.
- _____. "Congregational Commonwealth Incumbents", Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society, Vol. XIV, No. 3, pp. 155ff.

- Plum, Harry Grant. Restoration Puritanism: A Study of the Growth of English Liberty. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1943.
- Powicke, Frederick J. A Life of the Reverend Richard Baxter, 1615-1691. London: Jonathan Cape, 1924.
- Russell, Elbert. The History of Quakerism. New York: Macmillan Co., 1942.
- Schenk, W. The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1948.
- Sewel, William. The History of the Rise, Increase and Progress, of the Christian People called Quakers: Second Edition Corrected. London: Printed and Sold by the Assigns of J. Sowle,...., 1725.
- Smith, Joseph. A Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books,.... London: Joseph Smith, 1867.
- _____. Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana; or, A Catalogue of Books Adverse to the Society of Friends,.... London: Joseph Smith, 1873.
- Stoughton, John. History of Religion in England. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1881.
- Talon, Henri. John Bunyan: The Man and His Works. English translation by Barbara Wall. London: R. Clay & Co., 1951.
- The First Publishers of Truth, ed. N. Penney. London: Headley Brothers, 1907.
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay. England Under the Stuarts. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., Eighteenth Edn., 1941.
- _____. History of England. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., Ltd. Reissue, 1952.
- Whiting, C. E. Studies in English Puritanism from the Restoration to the Revolution: 1660-1688. London: S.P.C.K., 1931.
- Woodhouse, A. S. P. Introduction to Puritanism and Liberty, ed. A. S. P. Woodhouse. London: J. M. Dent, 1938.
- Wright, Luella M. The Literary Life of the Early Friends, 1650-1725. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.