

Quaker Mobilization and the Tithe Controversy in Interregnum
England: a Social-Psychological Study

Quaker Mobilization and the Tithe Controversy in Interregnum
England: A Social-Psychological Study

by

STEPHEN ALAN KENT, B.A., M.A., M.A.

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

December, 1983

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1984)
(Religious Studies)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Quaker Mobilization and the Tithe-Controversy in
Interregnum England: A Social-Psychological Study

AUTHOR: Stephen Alan Kent, B.A. University of Maryland,
College Park

M.A. The American University

M.A. McMaster University

SUPERVISOR: Professor I. Greenspan

NUMBER OF PAGES: x, 229

Abstract

Quaker Mobilization and the Tithe Controversy in Interregnum
England: A Social-Psychological Study

This dissertation interprets the origins and growth of pre-Restoration Quakerism through concepts developed in social-psychology and the sociology of religion. It argues that previous attempts to interpret Quakerism through psychological or mystical perspectives fail to locate the group in its socio-historical setting, and therefore these interpretations provide inadequate explanations of the group and its most prominent personality, George Fox. By utilizing, however, the social-psychological theory of "relative deprivation," the dissertation both explains the origins of Quakerism's religious ideology, and shows how its members' sense of felt deprivation determined the group's decisions about allocating economic and personal resources in an anti-tithe campaign.

Briefly stated, the central argument of the study is that the Quakers felt frustration and resentment toward the victorious Puritans (post 1648) whom they believed had failed to implement a series of promised social and political reforms, including tithe-abolition. In fact, the group emerged among religious and political radicals who

felt particularly resentful over the continuation of the state-supported tithe system, and Quakerism launched a vehement campaign to have governmental officials abolish tithes at the same time that it encouraged people to withhold payment of them.

Quakerism's anti-tithe campaign generated a number of staunch opponents, however, and the dissertation uses the concept of "relative deprivation" to explain their reaction to the group. These fearful opponents felt deprived relative to the social conditions that would be imposed if the Quakers were to succeed in achieving their goal of tithe-abolition, since many of them were tithe-receivers themselves.

In loving memory of my grandmother, Irma Elizabeth Gibney
(May 20, 1894 to November 6, 1983), whose funeral I could
not attend because of the pressing deadline for the
dissertation's completion.

Acknowledgements

The completion of this dissertation would have been impossible had I not received financial, moral, and academic support from a number of organizations, groups, and individuals. Three institutions provided financial assistance during my stay at McMaster, and by doing so kept me relatively free from the monetary woes that afflict many graduate students. During the 1981-82 school year, I received an Ontario Graduate Scholarship; during 1982-83 I received a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Fellowship; and from 1977 to 1983 I received the generous support of fellowships, tutorials, and travel allowances from McMaster University itself. Inevitably, however, I ran short of money now and again, and during those times my parents, Stanley and Doris Kent, were very generous, as they always have been.

Academically, I have been aided by the helpful and efficient work of my present advisory committee. My chairman, Dr. Louis Greenspan, undertook the supervision of my work under difficult circumstances, and proved to be a helpful and encouraging administrator and critical editor. Dr. John Robertson and Dr. Paul Younger kindly agreed to serve on my committee despite the fact that my topic was in a different area from their own. Dr. Richard A. Rempel read two drafts of my dissertation despite severe pain from a

back problem and his already staggering workload, and his suggestion that I increase the amount of historical information in certain sections improved the quality of my argument. Although the late Dr. James Daly had to resign from my committee due to health reasons, I have not forgotten the personal attention that he gave me for several years. I feel privileged to have studied with him, and I mourn his loss. Finally, I spent several thoroughly enjoyable weeks working with Edward Milligan and Malcolm Thomas at Friends' House Library, London, England. All of these gentlemen receive my thanks.

I offer special appreciation to Dr. Robert Blumstock. No other person at the University has contributed to the development of my career as much as him. His professional standards and his consistent and clear academic guidance motivated me to strive for a scholarly rigour that would please and satisfy him. Equally valuable, however, is his friendship. Long ago I realized that Dr. Blumstock maintained respect for me even as he commented critically on my work, and that he was genuinely concerned about my welfare without ever prying into my personal life. He has developed that rare ability to command respect by giving it. To him, and to his wife Ruth, go my deepest gratitude.

Finally, I wish to thank Sociological Inquiry, British Journal of Sociology, and The Journal of Religious History for allowing me to use revised versions of material that I published with them (see bibliography).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Half Title Page.....0

Title Page.....i

Descriptive Note.....ii

Dedication.....iii

Acknowledgements.....iv-v

Abstract.....vi-vii

Table of Contents.....viii-x

Introduction.....1

Chapter One: Psychological and Mystical Interpretations

of Early Quakerism.....16-55

 Introduction.....16

 William James.....18

 Evelyn Underhill.....23

 John Wilhelm Rowntree and Rufus Jones.....24

 Josiah Royce.....35

 Rachel Knight.....37

 Anton T. Boisen.....38

 Recent Interpretations of Quakerism and Mental
 Health: Michael MacDonald and George Rosen...41

 Psychological and Mystical Interpretations:
 Summary and Assessment.....42

 Religion and Male Sexual Urges.....45

 Boehme and Fox: A Reevaluation.....46

 The Lichfield Incident as Social Protest.....48

 Hat-Honour Refusal and Plain Speech [Thee-ing
 and Thou-ing] as Social Protest.....49

 Fox's Sensitivity to the Mentally Ill.....52

 Religion and its Social Context.....53

Chapter Two: Weberian Interpretations of Early
Quakerism.....56-81

Introduction.....	56
Weber on Early Quakerism: An Overview.....	58
Weber on Asceticism and Quaker Business Procedures.....	62
The Fixed Price Policy in Its Historical Context.....	64
The Tradition of Radical Reform During the Civil War.....	67
Quakerism and the Radical Tradition.....	71
Bernstein on Quaker Frustration: An Argument Ignored.....	76
Chapter Three: Resentment, Relative Deprivation, and Resource Mobilization: A Study of Early Quakerism.....	82-114
Introduction.....	82
Resentful Frustration and Relative Deprivation.....	82
Relative Deprivation and Resource Mobilization.....	85
The Interregnum Anti-Tithe Movement.....	90
The Anti-Tithe Movement and the Beginnings of Quakerism.....	93
The Social Origins of Religious Doctrines.....	96
Quakerism and Radical Frustration.....	100
Interregnum Governments and Tithe Support.....	104
Quakerism's Anti-Tithe Constituents.....	108
Conclusion.....	111
Chapter Four: Quakerism and the Fear of Subversion.....	114-143
Introduction.....	114
Fear of Catholicism and Its Social Setting.....	117
William Prynne and Richard Baxter.....	121
Sworn Testimonies.....	123
Oath Refusal.....	125
Disruptive Behaviour as Proof of Popery.....	126
Popery and Quaker Doctrines.....	127
The Social Factors Behind the Subversive Catholic Charges.....	131
The Social Functions Served by the "Papist" Charges.....	134
Mobs.....	135
Arrests and Interrogations.....	138
The Meaning of the Term, "Popery".....	139
The Charges Ignored or Refuted by Opponents Themselves.....	140
Chapter Five: Conclusion.....	144-152

Appendix: Civil and Religious Strife in the

1640s.....	153-163
Causes of the Civil War.....	153
Parliamentarians, Presbyterians, and Professional Soldiers.....	155
Leveller and Agitator Radicalism.....	157
Grandeess and the Struggle for Power.....	159
Radicalism Broken.....	161
Endnotes.....	163-187
Introduction.....	164-169
Chapter One: Psychological and Mystical Interpretations.....	170-173
Chapter Two: Weberian Interpretations.....	174-178
Chapter Three: Resentment, Relative Deprivation, and Resource Mobilization.....	179-183
Chapter Four.....	184-187
Bibliography.....	188-229

INTRODUCTION

Within the sociology of religion, the study of religious sectarianism is expanding more rapidly than any other area. No doubt this is true because the profusion of sects, cults, and new religions within the past two decades in Europe and North America provides sociologists of religion with an abundance of data with which to develop and refine theory. The value of theory, however, and indeed its true test, lies in its applicability to situations and groups beyond those which provided the data for its original constructions.

One era that is reminiscent of the late 1960s and early 1970s, and therefore one to which sectarian theories should apply, is the English Puritan period of the 1650s. That decade, over three hundred years ago, was characterized by an explosion of religious sectarianism that is well documented in both primary and secondary sources. Many students of Puritanism have recognized similarities between the two periods, and occasionally have considered the ways in which their understanding of the past might be increased from sociological analyses of the present. An historian noted for his studies of the Muggletonians¹ and the Quakers, Barry Reay, summed up this new awareness by saying that "Sociological concern with sectarian activity provides the historian of seventeenth-century English

Nonconformity with a potentially fresh awareness denied to most nineteenth-century historians and, unfortunately, still not utilized by many" (Reay, 1976: 32).

While many of his colleagues have yet to apply sociological theories and concepts from modern sectarian studies to further their own work, some at least are suggesting parallels between groups in the two periods. Others are being stimulated to study problems in seventeenth century religious history as the result of witnessing contemporary events. Perhaps the most frequently compared groups are the Ranters² of the 1650s and the hippies of the 1970s. Christopher Hill, for example, in his monumental study on John Milton, drew a comparison between them regarding drug-use. He pointed out that "In the [English] revolutionary decades [of the 1640s and 1650s] smoking was still rather a naughty habit: for Ranters and others it was a means of heightening consciousness akin to drug-taking in our own society" (C. Hill, 1977:98, 1972b: 160; Yinger, 1982: 116).³ Similarly, Norman Cohn discusses the ecstasy and the terror that Ranters experienced in their mystical visions, and then suggested that, "In our own time similar experiences have been induced in some subjects by psychedelic drugs" (Cohn, 1970b: 21, see 1970a: 286). Still another author goes so far as to say, with good reason, that "Escapism, subjectivism, introversion--these are the marks of the Hippies as of the Ranters. Both groups seek an escape from harsher concepts of reality" (Ellens,

4
1971:107).

Equally thought-provoking are the similarities between the mid-seventeenth century and contemporary radicals. Given Christopher Hill's Marxist orientation, it is not surprising that he has realized these similarities. After suggesting that the 1650s radicals may have helped "to bridge that gap between the waning of magical beliefs and the rise of modern technology" through their attempts to offer economic solutions to society's problems (C. Hill, 1972b: 309), Hill further asserts that:

Even more important, perhaps, for our generation, were the glimpses of a possible society which would transcend the property system, of a counter-culture which would reject the protestant ethic altogether (Hill, 1972b: 309-310).

His statement about "transcending the property system"⁵ alludes to the Diggers, and the rejection of the protestant ethic suggests the Ranters (see Yinger, 1982: 211). Hill continues in the same vein, apparently with the Diggers again in mind:

The technological possibilities may now exist even for a community in which the creation of unemployment need not be regarded as a principal task of government, and in which 'the beauty of the commonwealth' could take precedence over private profit, national power or even the G.N.P. My object is not to patronize the radicals by patting them on the head as 'in advance of their time'-- that tired cliché of the lazy historian. In some ways they are in advance of ours. But their insights, their poetic insights, are what seem to me to make them worth studying to-day (C. Hill, 1972b: 309-310, see 13).

Likewise, another historian of the mid-seventeenth century equates the Diggers' seizure of commons land in 1649 with "'sit-ins and People's Parks'" (Kim, 1974:460; see 475;

also Yinger, 1982: 211), and a San Francisco commune in the 1960s that dedicated itself to providing food and shelter for other hippies adopted the name, "Diggers" (Foss and Larkin, 1976: 52; Westhues, 1975: 397).

The social unrest of the past two decades serves as a basis for identifying similar reactions between seventeenth century and contemporary radicals. One researcher, for example, who characterized the early 1970s as an "'age of anxiety,'...of political crisis and radical restructuring of social values," mentioned an early Quaker form of prophecy, which involved either walking or running naked through the streets. He claimed that this behaviour was indicative of "the antinomian personality" which appears in "recurrent times of crisis and change" such as the present era (Adler, 1974: 297, 283; Yinger, 1982: 116). This behaviour by the early Quakers, along with their prophesying in sackcloth and ashes in the spirit of the Old Testament/ Hebrew Bible prophets, has received extensive analysis by the Quaker historian Kenneth L. Carroll, whose interest in the phenomenon was spurred by protests about which he read in 1970. One of these protests was by a Christian commune whose sackcloth-garbed members picketed a political appearance by Richard Nixon, who, ironically, is a "birthright" Quaker (Carroll, 1977: 84n.65).

Just as the social tumult of the early 1970s brought to mind the uncertain political climate in which the early

Quakers first appeared, so too has the religious tumult of the later 1970s and early 1980s brought to mind the persecution that the early Quakers suffered at the hands of their opponents. In both periods, new religions and their opposition groups engaged in acrimonious and occasionally violent struggles, and in the process produced an enormous amount of books, tracts, and other polemical literature. When contemporary scholars and polemicists wish to place the current "climate of fear" about "the new religious groups" in an historical perspective, they use mid-seventeenth century Quakerism as a comparative reference. Examples of persecution against early Quakerism for its reputed "subversion," antinomianism, and social disruption contrast dramatically with modern Quakerism's social respectability, and the new religions attempt to acquire legitimacy themselves by drawing analogies between current "anti-cult" campaigns and the mid-seventeenth century anti-Quaker attacks. For example, in an article distributed to the public by the Unification Church (i.e., the Moonies) in Toronto, Frank K. Flinn summarizes the talks that were presented about deprogramming at a February 4, 1977 meeting held in New York City under the auspices of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). The article says that the chairman of the ACLU, Aryeh Neier, told the assembly that "'This is not the first time that different religions have competed for the loyalty of the young.' Mr. Neier went on to note that Quakers, Levellers and Puritans were considered

'insane' in their own time" (Flinn, n.d.: 1).⁷

Harvey Cox, in his introduction to the book, Strange Gods, uses Quaker examples to further his argument about the injustice of the current "persecution" of the new religions, sects and cults. He asserts that "America has not set an exemplary record in the area of religious freedom," and as an early example of intolerance he cites the hangings of four Quakers on Boston Common between 1659 and 1661 (Cox, 1981: xi, xii, xiii). He even refers to the early Quaker martyr, Mary Dyer, as being "among our first 'cultists'" (Cox, 1981: xiii).⁸ David Bromley and Anson Shupe, in the text of the book in which Cox's introduction appears, expand Cox's argument by insisting that various persecuted religious groups, including the Quakers, suffered only because of "other's fears that they would have some detrimental effect on American society" (Bromley and Shupe, 1981: 7). An article on the new religions in the Toronto newspaper, The Globe and Mail, mentions another Boston Quaker, Edward Wharton, whom a Puritan magistrate sent off to jail in March, 1661 because:

his hair [was] too long and he act[ed] strangely. Mr. Wharton [was] one of the lucky ones to reach the safety of a prison cell. His crime [was] that he [was] a member of the upstart Quaker church at a time when Quakers [were] being hanged, flogged, sold into bondage, [and] having holes burned through their tongues with hot irons (Lancashire, 1978: 10).

Following this story is an account of a young man who was "snatched" off of a New York street by "right-thinking

Christians" who abducted him to Kentville, Nova Scotia and spent twenty-eight days trying to forcibly "rehabilitate" him (Lancashire, 1978: 10). The Globe and Mail article even has a four column illustration of two Quaker men who are tied to a horse-cart and being led through the streets as Puritans whip them.⁹

Similar examples of early Quaker persecution are again mentioned in the 1980 report that was commissioned by the Ontario government on sects, cults, and mind development groups. "In 17th-century New England," the report states, "Quakers were hanged, flogged, deported, maimed, and sold into bondage by Puritans" (D. Hill, 1980: 50, see 529).¹⁰

Along the same lines, Barry Reay points out that "Friends could be extremely disruptive, splitting families (modern sects are hated for similar reasons) and upsetting the local community. Indeed, sectarian loyalties superseded familial ties" (Reay, 1980a: 396).¹¹ Finally, a very recent article on new religions in Britain insists that Quakers (along with several other religious groups) "are now regarded as proper, respectable and respected religious bodies, but in their early history they were greeted with a horror and widespread opposition similar to that which greets the present wave of new religious movements" (Barker, 1983: 34).

Disparate as these quotations are, they nonetheless give substance to Christopher Hill's insight that "History has to be rewritten in every generation, because...each generation asks new questions of the past, and finds new

areas of sympathy as it re-lives different aspects of the experiences of its predecessors" (C. Hill, 1972b: 13). Indeed, the use of Interregnum English history (1649-1660) to bolster the position of the new religions, sects, and cults in the 1980s emerge from concerns over "religious persecution," whereas the scholarly interpretations that were made in the early 1970s stressed the period's antinomian elements. With the possible exception of Christopher Hill, however, none of the writers that have made comparisons between contemporary events and mid-seventeenth century English history identify the key concept upon which these similarities depend: the sense of profound political frustration and resentment that people in both periods felt toward political leaders whom they believed had betrayed them. Individuals and groups in both periods had political expectations that they felt were legitimate and realistic but which were not being implemented by their political leaders whom they had trusted to do so. In sociological terms, persons and groups in both periods felt "deprived" relative to their political and social aspirations. Certainly the causes of resentment and felt deprivation were substantially different in the two periods, with, for example, the hippies wanting to see a war concluded and the Interregnum radicals wanting to see the social and political fruits of a war extended. Nevertheless, the practical results of the felt deprivation and resentment

in both eras took religious forms, and the religious ideologies of both periods often contained poignant social and political criticism that elicited harsh social and political reaction. I propose, therefore, that not only can contemporary theories on sects, cults and new religions help us conceptualize the movements of the 1650s, but also analyses of the Interregnum sects can help produce sociological theories about religious movements that have broad applicability.

The central question that I ask of the historical material from the 1650s is straightforward: how did a feeling of deprivation relative to political expectations influence the development of radicalism, particularly Quakerism, during the English Interregnum? This question is, in my opinion, the crucial one with regard to the emergence and development of sectarianism in the 1650s. A second question is closely related to the first: how was the sense of relative deprivation translated into the organizational dimensions of early Quakerism? Finally, having learned about the hostile reaction to early Quakers by some of their contemporaries, I pose the question: can the anti-Quaker movement be interpreted in part as a reaction against the Quakers' attempts to alleviate and redress their sense of relative deprivation?

By utilizing the concept of relative deprivation in my interpretation of Interregnum Quakerism, I draw upon a large and established body of research in the areas of

sociology, social psychology, and social movement theory. Into this research I will integrate a number of studies on the form and content of religious sectarianism. I realize, however, that Quakerism has been viewed through other established bodies of literature, particularly psychological theories and mystical interpretations that discuss the dynamic between religious experience and mental health. Before I can establish the primacy of the deprivationist perspective, therefore, I must present and analyse these competing interpretations. I will do so in Chapter One, which will conclude that the psychological and mystical interpretations of early Quakerism provide neither a sufficiently broad theoretical base for the location of Quakerism into the social climate in which it emerged and developed, nor theories rigorous enough to be widely applied to a number of other sectarian groups.

I also realize that another major interpretation of early Quakerism exists in the influential work of Max Weber, who examined early Quakerism in his famous essays, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism and "The Protestant Sects and the Spirit of Capitalism." My interpretation of the Quakers offers a direct challenge to his, since I emphasize the primacy of political and social frustration in the emergence of religious ideology while he emphasized the primacy of religious ideology in the formation of economic attitudes and activities. For him, the

Quakers were politically apathetic; for me, they were politically resentful and acutely interested in political and social developments. In Chapter Two, therefore, I will present Weber's interpretation of early Quakerism along with those of other social scientists who have followed his lead. I will argue that Weber's interpretation is deficient (as is, therefore, the interpretation of most sociologists in the Weberian tradition) because he failed to appreciate the role that social and political frustration played in the formulation of their economic policies.

In Chapter Three, I will locate my discussions of political and social frustration within a theory of "relative deprivation," and I will demonstrate how this theory can illuminate the dominant elements of early Quaker history. I will argue that early Quakerism originated as a collective expression of people who felt deprived relative to their political leaders' failure to abolish tithes and the ministerial and class systems that depended upon them. Quakerism attempted, therefore, to achieve goals that involved fundamental changes in England's values regarding the relationship between religion and politics.

Since I will be linking the Quakers' sense of deprivation with their anti-tithe activities, I will be able to extend relative deprivation theory by connecting it with an emerging sociological perspective that specifically analyzes the development of social organizations. This emerging perspective, which sociologists developed by

examining the social movements of the 1960s and early 1970s, is called resource mobilization theory, and it provides a comprehensive framework in which to analyze the development of social movements or groups. It is, however, characteristically weak in explaining the initial conditions which foster the emergence of a group or movement, yet this is the very issue on which relative deprivation theory is strongest. By combining, therefore, the two theories I can offer an interpretation of Quakerism as part of a social movement whose anti-tithe position provided the ideological basis around which the group recruited new members and developed its policies.

In Chapter Four, I will examine Quakerism's sense of relative deprivation and consequent social and political endeavors from the viewpoint of its detractors. I will argue that because Quakerism's rabid anti-clericalism challenged the very basis of England's social, religious, and political structures, it therefore elicited a reaction of fear and anger among segments of the population who had a considerable stake in preserving the status quo. While significant work already has been published on the anti-Quaker movement (see Reay, 1980a, Bitterman 1973, Pestana, 1983), I will examine one neglected aspect of this topic: the charge that Quakerism was the handmaiden of Roman Catholic, or "Papist," subversives. By doing so I will locate Quakerism within the social and political debates of

the period, and will demonstrate the utility of relative deprivation and resource mobilization theories for the study of an opposition movement to a particular sect.

I will conclude the dissertation with a brief discussion of the contribution that my work makes to the disciplines of sociology and history. With regard to sociological methodology, for example, I will put to rest a persistent assertion by sociologists that relative deprivation theory and resource mobilization theory are incompatible. Not only will I have demonstrated the utility of these approaches with regard to analyzing the origins and development of a particular religious group, but also I will have shown how a combination of these theories fosters the analysis of a group's detractors and opponents. With regard to social history, the dissertation's analysis of both the social conditions out of which Quakerism emerged and the political implications of Quakerism's religious doctrines will demonstrate the influence that socially and politically generated resentment and deprivation can have on the formulation and implementation of religious ideology. At the same time it will provide a critical assessment of Weber's interpretation of the predominantly religious sources of Quaker ideology and sectarian behaviour. The dissertation, therefore, should be of interest to both social scientists and historians of the English Interregnum period.

As is apparent in this outline of the dissertation's contents, I assume unquestionably the utility of

sociological theory for interpreting historical material. In doing so I do not wish to entangle myself in the ongoing discussion about the relationship between the two disciplines (see, for example, Past and Present eds., 1964; Abrams, 1971, 1972; Rothman, 1971; B. Wilson, 1971; Stone, 1981; Burke, 1983), especially since I find much of the scholarly discussions on it to be unenlightening (exceptions being Abrams, 1972; Swatos, 1977). When pressed, I find it difficult to maintain an absolute disciplinary distinction between the two fields. Perhaps my unquestioned assumption about the utility of combining sociology and history reveals my indebtedness to Max Weber, however critical I remain of his application of sociology to mid-seventeenth century history. All that I can say in my defense is that other sociologists of religion as well as historians of the period make the same assumption and offer no apologies for doing so. Gordon Marshall, for example, in his new study of Weber's "Protestant ethic" thesis, calls for closer cooperation between the two disciplines, but avoids discussing the potential methodological and conceptual problems that might arise. His own scholarly work on the "Protestant ethic" debate provided him with "the clear message...that sociology and history must move forward together--or not at all" (Marshall, 1983:170), and my own publications lead me to the same conclusion (Kent, 1982a, 1982b, 1983 [forthcoming]). Similarly, William Swatos

points out that "virtually every major sociological thinker...has relied at one point or another in his analyses upon historical data" (1977: 107-108). Likewise, from an historian's perspective, Michael R. Watts points out that, "in the last half-century the historian's monopoly of explanation of the behaviour of past generations has been disputed by psychologists and sociologists..." (Watts, 1978: viii). I will leave for others, therefore, the problem of providing the philosophical justification for joint endeavors of this kind.

CHAPTER ONE: PSYCHOLOGICAL AND MYSTICAL INTERPRETATIONS OF
EARLY QUAKERISM

Introduction

Historians of religious movements frequently apply psychological interpretations to aspects of their material. Norman Cohn, for example, utilized psychoanalytic terminology to interpret medieval Christian eschatological themes (Cohn, 1970: 84-88), and E. P. Thompson analyzed elements in early Methodism, particularly Methodist hymns, by discussing their "maternal, Oedipal, sexual, and sado-masochistic" qualities (Thompson, 1963: 370-374). Historians also have made occasional use of broad psychological categories to interpret selected elements of early Quakerism, such as Hugh Barbour's discussion of the "insane" acts of a few of the group's earliest members (Barbour, 1964: 117-119). Common to these interpretations is the assumption that "religious" experiences, or at least elements of them, have natural, not supernatural, causes which originate in the processes of the mind.

Mystical interpretations contrast with psychological ones by assuming that religion has supernatural, not natural origins, and is based upon contact between "God" and the "soul." While mystical interpretations of religion and religious groups are less popular today than they were in

earlier periods, they nevertheless underwent a resurgence during the late 1960s and early 1970s in response to the increase in meditational activities and mind-altering drug-use (see Deikman, 1963, 1966; Pahnke and Richards, 1966), and occasionally Quakers were mentioned in this scholarly literature (Clark, 1968: 233). Earlier in this century, however, mystical interpretations of Quakerism were quite common, and it is easy to understand why. The Quaker belief in the Inner Light that was to be experienced through silent worship provided interpreters with a religious framework in which to explain Quakerism as another example of an outbreak of mysticism, the antecedents of which stretch back not only into nascent Christianity but also into non-Christian religious traditions.

Despite inherent tensions between the natural versus the supernatural assumptions that underlie them, the psychological and mystical interpretations of early Quakerism share a common intellectual catalyst in the work of William James. The fact that his Varieties of Religious Experience influenced both interpretations of Quakerism suggests the extent to which the book's psychological pragmatism was buried beneath the sheer number of rambling but interesting quotations from Western mystics. No single non-historical work can rival James's Varieties for its influence on interpretations of early Quakerism, which even extended into the Society of Friends itself.

James's work does not provide, however, a

comprehensive framework in which to analyze early Quakerism, nor do any of the psychological or mystical interpretations that use him. These perspectives cannot locate the group in its social and cultural setting, nor can they be easily translated into analyses of collective activities. However insightful might be some of the psychological and mystical interpretations of the early Quakers, they can provide at best partial and fragmented pictures of the group in its first years. Indeed, most dimensions of early Quakerism that initially were interpreted through psychological or mystical perspectives have been reconceived after subsequent research took account of crucial social influences. In fact, many of the insights from the psychological and mystical interpretations can be subsumed within the social-psychological and sociological theories of sectarianism that I will apply to early Quakerism in Chapters Two and Three. In this particular chapter, I will first present the psychological and mystical interpretations of Quakerism, and then examine their claims in light of modern historical and socio-cultural perspectives. I will show that most of these interpretations suffer from inattention to the social climate in which Quakerism emerged and grew.

William James

Initially written for presentation as the 1901-1902 Gifford Lectures at the University of Edinburgh, James's

psychological interpretation of religion, The Varieties of Religious Experience, has become a classic. While he insisted in it that religious experience had to be studied by its practical consequences, and could not be comprehended or appreciated as either a physio-neurological malfunction or the product of "perverted sexuality" (James, 1902: 27-31), he nonetheless showed that an intimate relationship existed between mental distress or illness and religious insight (James, 1902: 36). He asserted, for example, that an intelligent individual who also suffered psychological problems was more likely to "make his mark and affect his age, than if his temperament were less neurotic" (James, 1902: 36). As evidence for this claim, he discussed the personality of George Fox, who is the person commonly thought to have "founded" Quakerism. James introduced Fox by insisting that:

Even more perhaps than other kinds of genius, religious leaders have been subject to abnormal psychical visitations. Invariably they have been creatures of exalted emotional sensibility. Often they have led a discordant inner life, and had melancholy during a part of their career. They have known no measure, been liable to obsessions and fixed ideas; and frequently they have fallen into trances, heard voices, seen visions, and presented all sorts of peculiarities which are ordinarily classed as pathological. Often, moreover, these pathological features in their career[s] have helped to give them their religious authority and influence" (James, 1902: 24-25).

Fox was, James claimed, the quintessential example of this type of unstable but religiously sensitive personality, yet even his contemporaries, including Oliver Cromwell (1599-

1658), widely acknowledged his personal power (James, 1902: 25). To support his assessment that mental instability was the handmaiden of religious insight, James quoted a long passage from Fox's Journal in which the religious leader, while standing outside of Lichfield (a town that is presently within Staffordshire) in 1651, heard a voice from the Lord command him to remove his shoes and walk barefoot through its streets crying "Wo to the bloody city of Lichfield." As he did this, Fox saw "a channel of blood running down the streets, and the marketplace appeared like a pool of blood." Only later did Fox learn, so he told us in his Journal, that a thousand Christians had been martyred there during the time of the Roman Emperor, Diocletian¹ (James, 1902: 25-26; see Fox, 1694a: 71-72; 1694b: 15-16).

The neurotic and psychological material that James presented in his analysis of the predispositions toward religious insight stood in striking contrast to his discussion of mysticism and its inherent qualities. In a statement that has endeared him to generations of religious practitioners, James asserted that, "The kinds of truth communicable in mystical ways...are various,...but the most important revelations are theological or metaphysical" (James, 1902: 314). Once again, Fox served as an illustration of this point. James quoted Fox's description in which he claimed to have experienced the condition of Paradise before the fall of Adam, and in doing so had the Lord reveal to him "the nature and virtue" of all created

things. As a result of his revelation, Fox even considered undertaking "the practice of physic [that is, medicine] for the good of mankind" (Fox quoted in James, 1902: 315n.30; see Fox, 1694a: 27; [not in 1694b]).² In the same footnote James also pointed out that Jakob Boehme (or Jacob Behmen [1575-1624]), the famous late-sixteenth and early seventeenth century German mystic, had received a similar revelation about the properties of herbs and grasses, and later wrote about it that "In one quarter of an hour I saw and knew more than if I had been many years together at an university. For I saw and knew the being of all things, the Byss and the Abyss, and the eternal generation of the Holy Trinity, the descent and original of the world and of all creatures through divine wisdom" (quoted from Behmen [Boehme], 1691: 425, 427). This association that James made between Fox and Boehme, we shall see, was to influence for years other interpretations of Quakerism.

On another topic, "Saintliness," James discussed the Quakers with regard to "the impulse for veracity and purity of life" (James, 1902: 230). He argued that:

The battle that cost them most wounds was probably fought in defense of their own right to social veracity and sincerity in their thee-ing and thou-ing, in not doffing the hat or giving titles of respect. It was laid on George Fox that these conventional customs were a lie and a sham, and the whole body of his followers thereupon renounced them, as a sacrifice to truth, and so that their acts and the spirit they professed might be in more accord (James, 1902: 230-231).

He supported this interpretation with long quotes from both

Fox and another early Quaker, Thomas Ellwood (1639-1713), as well as from an eighteenth century colonial Friend, John Woolman (1720-1772 [James, 1902: 231-233; see Fox, 1694a: 36-37; not in 1694b; Ellwood, 1714: 32-34]). Along these same lines, James even used Fox's description in his Journal of his lonely and painfully self-reflective youth (James, 1902: 262-263; see Fox, 1694a: 9-12 [not in 1694b]) to support his (disputable) claim that religion was best studied as individual experiences rather than as ecclesiastical institutions (James, 1902: 42, 262). If his approving use of material about early Quakerism left any doubts about his opinion of the group, James removed them when he gave his personal interpretation of it. "The Quaker religion which [Fox] founded is something which it is impossible to overpraise. In a day of shams, it was a religion of veracity rooted in spiritual inwardness, and a return to something more like the original gospel truth than men had ever known in England" (James, 1902: 25).

James's influence on interpretations of Quakerism was enormous, despite the fact that his psychological reductionism would not have been appreciated by most of the people who praised his work. While many of the writers, for example, who gave mystical interpretations to early Quakers' (particularly Fox's) experiences, cited James's The Varieties of Religious Experience, none presented an important statement from his conclusion:

Let me then propose, as an hypothesis, that whatever it may be on its farther side, the 'more' with which in religious experience we feel ourselves connected is on its hither side the subconscious continuation of our conscious life. Starting thus with a recognized psychological fact as our basis, we seem to preserve a contact with 'science' which the ordinary theologian lacks. At the same time the theologian's contention that the religious man is moved by an external power is vindicated, for it is one of the peculiarities of invasions from the subconscious region to take on objective appearances, and to suggest to the Subject an external control. In the religious life the control is felt as 'higher'; but since on our hypothesis it is primarily the higher faculties of our own hidden mind which are controlling the sense of union with the power beyond us is a sense of something, not merely apparently, but literally true (James, 1902: 386-387).

"God is real," James concluded, "since he produces real effects" (James, 1902: 389). The measure of legitimate mysticism, therefore, was simply the extent of its practicality.

Evelyn Underhill

Despite his evaluation of religious experience that, in its final analysis, took a psychologically pragmatic direction, James was cited time and again by persons giving mystical interpretations of early Quakerism. Evelyn Underhill, for example, incorporated James's categories, "sick soul" and "healthy-minded" soul, into her classic analysis of mysticism (Underhill, 1911: 98-99, see 7, 8, 192), although her emphasis on Fox's presumed mysticism differed from his. While James had used Fox as an example of a distraught (if not "sick") but powerful personality, Underhill used him as "a typical example" of a mystic whose

mystical insight did not come suddenly but rather as a "gradual and increasing lucidity" (Underhill, 1911: 177-178; see Pratt, 1920: 155n.9). In support of this claim, she, like James, quoted from Fox's account of the emotional traumas that he suffered in his late teens and early twenties, and the section that she used begins with a passage that James had elided in his quotation from the same part of his Journal (Underhill, 1911: 177-178; see Fox, 1694a: 10, 12, 14; not in 1694b). Worth noting, too, is that she connected Fox and Boehme with regard to their mystical experiences (1911: 238, see 469), and James also had connected the two figures, albeit with regard to a particular type of mystical experience in which they both claimed to acquire knowledge of the curative properties of plants (1902: 315n.30). Even if Underhill's association of the two figures might have been influenced by Rufus Jones's work (as will be discussed below), a more recent psychological study on religious ecstasy also associated Fox and Boehme, and cited James as its source (Laski, 1961: 119-120 and n.1).

John Wilhelm Rowntree and Rufus Jones

James's discussion of the mystical elements of early Quakerism had a major impact on the Quakers' interpretations of both their religious founder and the group as a whole. Liberal British Quakers apparently were quickened by his

positive interpretation of early Quakerism's vitality, and their major publication, Present Day Papers, referred to his Varieties as "a treasure-house for Friends" (Present Day Papers v (1902): 292, quoted in Isichei, 1970: 39). Likewise, the most prominent British Quaker of this period and founder of the Present Day Papers, John Wilhelm Rowntree (1868-1905 [see Scott, 1960; Kennedy, 1983]), referred to James's "eloquent testimony" about Fox and his work (1905: 102, 224-225 [but written in 1902-1903]).

Of greatest significance, however, was James's influence on the famous and prolific American Quaker scholar and deep personal friend of Rowntree, Rufus Jones (1863-1948). As one contemporary Quaker historian said, "...we cannot understand who we are unless...we realize how much the way we put things today is colored by our reaction to Rufus Jones and to his generation" (Christine Downing, quoted in Endy, 1981: 4). At their very first meeting in mid-June, 1897, Jones and Rowntree agreed to write histories of Quakerism, since they both believed that the Society of Friends had to understand the power of its original message if it were to free itself from the stifling influence of evangelicalism and become a salient force in the modern world (Vining, 1958: 72; see Kennedy, 1983: 5, 7-8). Jones's specific task was to relate Quakerism to other Christian mystical movements (Vining, 1958: 72), which was an undertaking that he already had been considering for a number of years. Rowntree's tragic death in 1905, however,

became the catalyst for Jones and several other Quaker historians to begin serious work on the early periods of the Society, and the series of books that emerged on Quaker history was financed by a trust fund that the Rowntree family established for this purpose. Jones wrote two books on European mystics and mystical groups in The Rowntree Series of Quaker Histories, and he attempted to show in them that European mysticism was "at least one of the great historical sources for the Quaker movement" (Jones, 1914: v). In these studies, James's Varieties played a significant role.

Jones had spent the 1900-1901 school year at Harvard, where James taught, but at that time James was in Europe preparing his Gifford Lectures (which were, of course, later published as The Varieties of Religious Experience). Jones already had had, however, some personal contact and correspondence with James, and by 1894 had read thoroughly his Principles of Psychology in preparation for the psychology course that Jones taught at Haverford College (a Quaker College near Philadelphia and his alma mater [Vining, 1958: 66-67, 85-86]). Nevertheless, Jones's first academic love remained the field of mysticism. In 1886, he wrote his Haverford graduation thesis on mysticism (Vining, 1958: 39), and he continued to investigate the subject for the rest of his life. He even claimed to have had three different mystical experiences himself (Vining, 1958: 51, 99, 291).

Because he had taught psychology, however, Jones was conversant with basic psychological material, so it is not surprising that, as he began writing about mysticism, he responded to many of the contemporary psychological interpretations of religious experience. Unfortunately, his relative neglect of the social forces that helped shape Quaker doctrine and practice severely limited the value that his work might have had for posterity.

His first major study of mysticism, which Underhill cited (1911: 185), was entitled Studies in Mystical Religion. In this 1909 work, Jones acknowledged that many types of mystical experience "may, and often do, pass over the border-line of normality and occasionally, at least, exhibit pathological phenomena" (Jones, 1909: xxv).³ He nonetheless insisted that "the real mystic" was one "who, by conformity to the goal of life revealed in Christ, has realized his life upward in full union with God--a way of living which is as normal as healthy breathing" (Jones, 1909: xvii, see xviii). He argued further that mystical experiences "offer a very weighty ground for believing that there is a More of Consciousness continuous with our own--a co-consciousness with which our own is bound up, and that constructive influences do come into us from beyond ourselves" (Jones, 1909: xxix). As evidence for this assertion, Jones cited James's Varieties of Religious Experience (1902: 384).

While this is the only direct reference that Jones made to James in Studies in Mystical Religion, James's influence may have been a factor on one other issue: the reputed association between Fox and Boehme. Jones was unequivocal about the association, stating that "Both Fox and [Gerrard] Winstanley bear the marks of direct influence from Boehme" (1909: 495). This assertion takes on greater meaning when we realize that, in the introduction to his book, Jones had quoted the same phrase from Boehme that James had used to show that both men had had mystical experiences in which they claimed to have gained knowledge of creation, including all of the properties of plants. He even used the same book that James did, and it seems quite possible that, given this source's early date (1691), he simply borrowed James's quote but did not indicate that he took it from the psychologist's study (Jones, 1909: xxvi n.2; see James, 1902: 315n.30).

In 1912, Jones published the "Introduction" to a comprehensive history of early Quakerism by William Charles Braithwaite, a book that was the cornerstone of the Rowntree Series of Quaker Histories. Jones's introduction contained a complicated blend of current psychological notions fused with mystical interpretations. While Jones did not mention William James by name, at least two parts of his introduction resonated with James's language. For example, Jones spoke about religious experiences as the "invasive alterations of consciousness as results of the tension of

subliminal memories reaching the bursting point" (Jones, 1912: xxvi-xxvii; see James, 1902: 190n.4). Psychologically speaking, Fox had "'peculiar psychological traits'" (1912: xxviii) and was "plainly of a very unstable sort" (1912: xxxi), yet his "fixity of will and moral purpose" were (paradoxically), "the very core of normality" (Jones, 1912: xxiii; see James, 1902: 164; and Starbuck, 1899: 224, 262).⁴

Despite these psychological traits, if not because of them, Jones still insisted that Fox, along with several other early Quakers, were mystics (1912: xxxv-xxxviii). Jones also claimed, however, that Fox was a prophet who felt himself to be "under commission to utter the will and purpose of God to his age" (1912: xxxviii). Counterbalancing the mystical strains and prophetic tendencies of Quakerism, Jones realized, was the movement's "moral earnestness" (1912: xlii), and in this vein he believed that Fox's "awakening in his nineteenth year [was] not over his own sins, but over the moral conditions and the social customs about him" (1912: xlii). While he misrepresented the era by stating that "it was in this focussing upon moral effort that the Quakers differed most from other sects of the Commonwealth period," he knew that "their 'views' were not novel or original [as] every one of their peculiar ideas had already been proclaimed by some individual or by some religious party" (1912: xliiii). This aspect of Quakerism, Jones argued, must be studied along with its mysticism

(1912: xliii-xliv). In subsequent publications, however, Jones did not follow his own advice, and he continued to concentrate on what he felt were the group's mystical dimensions.

Jones's 1914 publication, Spiritual Reformers in the 16th and 17th Centuries, demonstrated his continued interest in the study of mysticism. Not surprisingly, therefore, he intended this book as a companion volume to his 1909 publication, Studies in Mystical Religion, as both works were part of the Rowntree Series. In this new publication he distinguished more precisely the difference between his "mystical" perspective on religious experience and the psychological interpretations of religion, although when doing so he did not cite any of the psychological studies that he wished to challenge. He insisted that a psychologist's science:

can deal only with an order of facts which will conform to the scientific method, for wherever science invades a field, it ignores or eliminates every aspect of novelty or mystery or wonder, every aspect which cannot be brought under scientific categories, i.e., every aspect which cannot be treated quantitatively and causally and arranged in a congeries of interrelated facts occurring according to natural laws (Jones, 1914:xvii-xviii).

Important to note, however, is his interpretation of Boehme's influence on Fox. In this discussion Jones's use of a source by Boehme provides further evidence that he drew the association between the two religious figures from William James's work. He devoted an entire chapter to "Jacob Boehme's Influence in England," and in it spent several

pages discussing the question of "whether Boehme exercised any direct influence upon the early Quaker movement" (Jones, 1914: 220, see 220-234). He admitted that "[t]here is at present no way of proving that George Fox, the chief exponent of the [Quaker] movement, had actually read the writings of the Teutonic philosopher or had consciously or unconsciously absorbed the views of [Boehme]." He nonetheless insisted that "there are so many marks of influence apparent in the Journal that no careful student of both writers can doubt that there was some sort of influence, direct or indirect, conscious or unconscious" (Jones, 1914: 220). Once again he compared Fox's account from his Journal of gaining knowledge of all of creation's properties and thereby considering the occupation of "physic" (i.e., medicine), and Boehme's experience of acquiring knowledge of all creation's properties of plants (1914: 222-223). He quoted from three translations or commentaries about Boehme from the late 1640s to substantiate his association of the two figures, and he also cited this same association made in an 1876 work by the renowned Quaker historian, Robert Barclay of Reigate (1876: 214-215).

Because Jones footnoted Barclay's discussion of Fox and Boehme in which Barclay printed parallel texts of the two figures, Geoffrey Nuttall was to claim some years later that Jones was following Barclay's assertion that Fox was

influenced by the German mystic (Nuttall, 1946: 16n.13). Indeed, Barclay quoted Boehme from an unnamed 1648 source, and in Spiritual Reformers Jones quoted a passage from John Sparrow's 1648 translation of Boehme entitled The Three Principles, which was the only book by Boehme printed that year. On the basis of Jones's citation of Barclay (Jones, 1914: 22n.1), Nuttall deduced that Jones was following the late nineteenth century author's association of the two men. He failed to point out, however, that when Jones made this association five years earlier, he had quoted the same text on Boehme that James had used in The Varieties of Religious Experience. If Jones had been influenced exclusively by Barclay's discussion, then he would have used Sparrow's 1648 source in his 1909 discussion. Since he did not do so, we may conclude that the earliest influence on him regarding the association between Fox and Boehme was William James's Varieties, and that Barclay influenced him only after he⁵ started to research the question in depth.

In response to a psychological study that James Leuba published in 1925, Jones's hostility increased toward exclusively psychological interpretations of early Quakerism. Two years after Leuba's work appeared, Jones published New Studies in Mystical Religion, and in it he expressed his hostility in no uncertain terms. Leuba connected, in his The Psychology of Religious Mysticism, Jones's mystical interpretations of religion with James's, and then criticized both of them. They had attempted to

distinguish between "mystical experiences which are divine and those which are not" (Leuba, 1925:260, citing Jones, 1909: xxix-xxx and James, 1902), but Leuba insisted that "a line of demarcation between influxes of moral energy which are from God, and those which have an ordinary, natural origin, have never been satisfactorily drawn" (Leuba, 1925: 260). While he realized that Jones had interpreted early Quakerism as a movement whose members "were no less profoundly conscious of a Divine Presence than they were of a world in space" (Leuba, 1925: 281, 303, quoting Jones, 1902: 161), he nonetheless concluded that "there need be no differences between religious and non-religious ecstasies other than those due to a different interpretation--the interpretation being itself the cause of important affective and volitional phenomena" (Leuba, 1925: 315). "The mystical experience," Leuba said bluntly, "is not of a nature other than that of the rest of conscious experience" (1925: 316).

In Jones's 1927 publication, which he saw as another extension of his 1909 examination of mysticism, he wasted no time in presenting to the reader his opposition to Leuba's work. In the very first sentence of the book Jones stated that "[t]he main attack in recent years on the validity of mysticism as a religious experience is the characteristic attack of the psychologist" (Jones, 1927: 9). As an example of what he meant Jones footnoted Leuba's The Psychology of Religious Mysticism. While he acknowledged that the

discipline of psychology has "taught us to discriminate facts in that obscure region within us" (Jones, 1927: 11), he nonetheless promised to:

raise my word of protest only when the empirical scientist goes out beyond the obvious limits of his field and pronounces, authoritatively, on matters which do not belong within it, and about which he has no expert knowledge that qualifies him to speak. Psychological training alone gives no one authoritative ground to construct with finality theories of knowledge or to settle dogmatically the problems that arise out of our experience of spiritual values" (1927: 13-14).

In his subsequent discussion of mysticism, William James once again played a prominent role (1927: 20, 62, 80-81, 85, 146, 197), as did Evelyn Underhill (1927: 66, 203). At one point he even spoke of the two writers as both telling us "that to be a genuine mystic one must form 'new pathways of neural discharge'" (Jones, 1927: 78). As in his earlier works, Jones associated Boehme and Fox (1927: 198).

On one important point, however, Jones attempted to extend James's discussion of mysticism, and that was with regard to its solitary nature (Jones, 1927: 146). "I am convinced," Jones asserted, "that mysticism flourishes best in a group, and that it can, if left to itself, produce out of its experience a type of organization that favors its growth and increase in depth and power" (1927: 148). Not surprisingly, the clearest example of such a religious organization was early Quakerism. "The Society of Friends offers, perhaps, the best historical example, especially in its formative period, of a mystical body with an

organization adapted to promote mystical experience in its membership" (Jones, 1927: 165)⁵. Jones had made this same point some years earlier in his 1919 introduction to Braithwaite's second contribution to the Rowntree Series, The Second Period of Quakerism. "With all its limitations, this Society...has proved to be the most impressive experiment in Christian history of a group mysticism" (Jones, 1919: xxx)⁶. For Jones, therefore, early Quakerism's organizational development reflected the mystical content of its members' message rather than, as I will argue, the protest element of their social doctrines.

Josiah Royce

In a relatively small book entitled, George Fox: Seeker and Friend (1930), Jones not only mentioned James's discussion of both Quakerism and Fox (1930: 11, 12, 23), but also referred to "a careful psychological study" done by a colleague and friend of James, Josiah Royce (1855-1916 [Jones, 1930: 32, see 33])⁷. During the year that he had attended Harvard (1901-1902), Jones seems to have audited a course under Royce, and reflecting back upon this time in 1924, wrote that "Professor Josiah Royce had a larger influence on my intellectual development, I think, than any other one person" (cited in Vining, 1958: 86-87). Jones's biographer, Elizabeth Gray Vining, even claimed that "he considered Royce's study of the psychology of George Fox the best ever written" (Vining, 1958: 87). He did, however,

believe that Royce had not appreciated the quiet, preparative period that Fox had spent before he began his very active religious life (1930: 33).

Royce's study, which Jones discussed but did not cite, appeared in 1913 and was a contribution to the work that James had begun in Varieties. Royce proposed to "sketch some personal peculiarities of the founder of Quakerism, George Fox, and in the end to show what place was filled in his life by what may be called experiences as a mystic." He attempted to do this through showing "the place that the experiences of silent worship occupied in the mental life of Fox himself, and why he found this form of what is technically called mysticism a valuable feature of his religious consciousness" (Royce, 1913: 31). He concluded that what distinguished Fox as a mystic was his possession of "a consciousness of the presence of the divine which was a central figure in what he calls the 'Light'; namely, in that Light which he believed to be the most precious possession of all believers" (Royce, 1913: 53). Unique in Royce's discussion, however, was his identification of the dynamic between Fox's mental health and the social and political forces of seventeenth century English society. He identified, for example, the causes of Fox's mental illness in 1659 as "the political troubles of the time and the sympathetic distresses caused by persecution of Quakers" (1913: 45; see Jones, 1912: xxxi), and this insight has been

verified by subsequent research (Maclear, 1950: 261-262; see Barbour, 1964: 202). Likewise, his "prophetic visions...usually related[d] to important political, social, or religious crises" (1913: 49), and "He always vehemently condemned the practice of the State clergy in preaching for hire" (1913: 42). Royce even admitted that "What made [Fox] historically important was his practical work as a leader of men, as an organizer of religious communities, as a social reformer, and as a consistent expounder and exemplar of...the ideal of a spiritual unity of all men" (1913: 38). Despite his insights, however, into the social and political influences on Fox's life, Royce failed to see any element of social or political protest in Fox's barefoot walk through "bloody Lichfield," and instead gave it a strictly psychological interpretation (1913: 50n.1).

Rachel Knight

Royce's psychological insights into George Fox's "mystical character" and mental health were utilized in another mystical interpretation of early Quakerism that was published in 1922: Rachel Knight's The Founder of Quakerism: A Psychological Study of the Mysticism of George Fox. As with Jones's studies of Fox and the early Quakers, however, she too failed to pick up and expand upon Royce's insights into the effects of society and politics on the psychological health of Quakerism's "founder." Dedicated to her Quaker teacher and friend, Edwin Starbuck, Knight's

study betrayed a prejudice that tainted almost all of the psychological and mystical studies of Fox and Quakerism during the first part of this century. With regard to the relationship between Fox's "mysticism" and the social environment in which Fox lived, Knight portrayed his religious experiences as a force that impelled him to act against the evils of the world, rather than as a religious response itself to the society's evils. For her, mysticism compelled Fox to address certain conditions in society rather than the conditions of society driving Fox to an inward or mystical religion. To support this claim about the primacy of mysticism for Fox (and by extension, for the other early Quakers) she utilized Royce's article on the group's "founder" (Knight, 1922: 110, 121-122, 205, 253, see 36), and also used James's Varieties (Knight, 1922: 58, 81, 223, 264, 266, see 139), Jones's Studies of Mystical Religion (Knight, 1922: 35, 153-154), and Underhill's Mysticism (Knight, 1922: 54-55). When she discussed the similarities between Fox and Boehme, she cited, of course, Rufus Jones (Knight, 1922: 33, 35; footnoting Jones, 1909: 495).

Anton T. Boisen

At least one other psychological interpretation of Fox and the early Quakers must be placed within the sphere of influence of James's Varieties: Anton T. Boisen's

personally revealing study published in 1936, The Exploration of the Inner World. His own mental breakdowns had been alleviated through religious insights, and as a result he became convinced that "many forms of insanity are religious rather than medical problems and that they cannot be successfully treated until they are so recognized" (Boisen, 1936: 7). A sufferer of mental illness "is facing what for him are the great and abiding issues of life and death and of his own relationship to the universe. He thus shows invariably marked religious concern" (Boisen, 1936: 60). In order to find examples of the healing powers of religion, Boisen turned to history, and among the accounts he discovered, "there is none more illuminating, from the standpoint of inquiry, than the autobiography of George Fox, the great founder of the Society of Friends" (Boisen, 1936: 61). Boisen was particularly concerned with Fox's "disturbed period which began in his nineteenth year and continued until his twenty-third" (1936: 64), a period which, Boisen claimed, "seems to have been singularly free from the grosser sex maladjustments, which figure so prominently in most of our hospital cases" (1936: 64). His religious experiences, which began with the "'opening' that training at Oxford or Cambridge was not enough to 'fit and qualify men to be ministers of Christ'...enabled him to rebuild his life and to work out his Weltanschauung [that is, his life-view]" (1936: 65). Some of his insights were "of great social value" (1936: 66). Throughout his career,

Fox continued to listen to commands that he felt were from the Lord, as demonstrated in his barefooted walk through Lichfield (1936: 67).

As part of his criticisms of the insensitivity, he claimed, of aspects of the mental health establishment of his time to the religious roots of many mental problems, Boisen next constructed an exercise in which he brought Fox before a variety of experts (including Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung!) who addressed themselves to psychiatric problems, and then evaluated the extent to which Fox would have received a sympathetic and helpful hearing from them. If he were brought, for example, before William James, a representative of "the Doctors of Philosophy," then Fox would receive a sympathetic ear, since James had "really grappled with the problem which George Fox represents, and that with the keenest insight" (1936: 90). Boisen based this interpretation on, of course, James's Varieties (1936: 90-91). James Leuba, however, would not be as understanding of Fox as would James, since, as indicated by his Psychology of Religious Mysticism, he seemed to have "little first-hand acquaintance with the mentally ill. He is moreover apparently content to look upon psychoses, and even some of the psycho-neuroses, as organic in origin and makes no constructive attack upon the problem from the standpoint of psychopathology" (1936: 97; see Clark, 1968: 232-233; Bertocci, 1971: 32-38).

Recent Interpretations of Quakerism and Mental Health:
Michael MacDonald and George Rosen

Boisen's narrative may appear to be a fanciful use of history, but the positive opinion he maintained of the way in which George Fox achieved mental healing through religion received indirect support in a recent study of "popular beliefs about insanity and healing" in seventeenth century England (MacDonald, 1981: xii). MacDonald speaks of George Fox in a very complementary manner:

Finally, some of the leaders of the Dissenting sects possessed special powers of persuasion and healing. George Fox in particular enjoyed an extraordinary gift for calming raging lunatics and people who were thought to be possessed or bewitched. He believed that his miraculous cures were an extension of his mission to teach troubled souls God's truth, and he repudiated the use of force to restrain or treat violent madmen. The key to healing the insane, in Fox's view, lay in his ability to communicate his conviction that the inner light resided in everyone. The remarkable narratives of his dealings with mad people show that he could, through gentle persuasion, somehow establish a bond between himself and men and women whose capacity to understand was apparently ruined. Although Fox rejected violent medical treatments of insanity, neither he nor the other Nonconformist healers condemned medicine altogether (MacDonald, 1981: 228).

MacDonald also points out that Fox's techniques with the mentally deranged "closely resembled" the humane healing practices that were pioneered by the Quaker asylum for the insane, the York Retreat (MacDonald, 1981: 230; see Glover, 1972).

If Fox (and possibly other Quakers) apparently could

cure cases of mental illness, then also he and his cohorts could cause it, or so claimed still another interpreter. George Rosen, who was both an M.D. and a Ph.D. in sociology, presented a number of examples of religiously extremist enthusiasm from Quakerism's first decade, including instances in which Quakers were accused of trembling, shaking, foaming at the mouth, "roaring," "swelling in the belly," and walking or running naked through the streets (Rosen, 1968: 208-209). He gave, however, almost no interpretation of these activities beyond acknowledging that some Quakers went naked because "they were acting like prophets of the Old Testament." He added that this form of prophecy "appears somewhat less extravagant when we remember that the Quakers belonged to a period which was still close to the Middle Ages" (Rosen, 1968: 209).

Psychological and Mystical Interpretations: A Summary and Assessment

Three somewhat distinctive positions emerge regarding psychological and mystical interpretations of Fox, and by extension, of early Quakerism. Royce, Underhill, Jones, Knight, and Boisen suggest that psychological distresses sensitized Fox to religious, indeed mystical, experiences, and that, for the most part, these experiences helped him channel his talents and energy into creative activities. This pattern was, presumably, common among other Quakers.

Contrasting with this mystical interpretation is a

psychological one, as presented in James, Leuba, and Rosen (despite the fact that Leuba himself thought that his position differed from James's). While James and Rosen can be placed on opposite ends of a continuum in this perspective, all three believed that "mystical" insight must be studied as forms of psychological phenomena. Rosen, however, even went so far as to suggest that the Quakers' religious activities resembled acts of mental illness. This "mysticism" versus "psychology" debate about early Quakerism mirrors a larger debate within the field of the "psychology of religion" itself (see Clark, 1968: 233-234).

Finally, MacDonald offered still a third interpretation of Fox, and by extension, early Quakerism, which linked Fox's sensitivity to the mentally ill with the principles that he developed as the result of both his own psychological struggles and the religious tenets that he held. Since a number of early Quakers were involved in attempts to heal the mentally ill, MacDonald probably thought that Fox's sensitivity was more or less representative of them as well.

All of the psychological and mystical interpretations of early Quakerism attempt to identify the relation between mental activities and religious, often mystical, insight. As this chapter has shown, however, they disagree on fundamental points, and these disagreements are indicative of the problems that arise when trying to apply either the

perspectives to limited historical data. They attempt, in short, to do too much interpretation with too few facts. Not surprisingly, therefore, these interpretations often utilize what few facts are available in an ahistorical and acultural fashion, and by doing so remove them from the only context in which they can be properly understood. Moreover, these interpretations tend to concentrate on the psychological and "mystical" activities of George Fox, and by doing so assume that his experiences, as he related them to us in his Journal and other writings, were normative for all Quakers during the 1650s. Needless to say, this is quite an unsound assumption to make, if for no other reason than the sheer size of the group (between 30,000 to 40,000 followers) after its first decade of existence (Braithwaite, 1955: 512).

Just as Erik Erikson's psychological study of Luther was criticized for "the sparsity of the evidence" about the young man (Bainton, 1958: 409), so too must the same criticism be made about both the psychological and mystical studies of George Fox. All that we know about Fox's youth and adolescence, for example, was written by the mature Fox, and although we can make some intriguing speculations with regard to the the psychological forces at play during his early period, we simply cannot stretch the interpretations very far. To see early Quakerism as the projection into society of the psychological dynamics of one man is to hopelessly simplify a very complex interplay

between social, political, and religious forces in which Quakerism emerged and evolved.

Religion and Male Sexual Urges

One of the more intriguing psychological speculations, however, about the youthful Fox does suggest that he was driven in his religious quest by forces whose influence on him would have surprised many of his later interpreters. Contrary to James (1902: 27-31) and Boisen (1936: 64), who stated that sexual traumas played no part in Fox's religious quest (see Jones, 1912: xlii),⁷ Michael R. Watts suggests that Fox may have been haunted by "sexual desires" (Watts, 1978: 187). Fox admitted, for example, that when he was nineteen, "temptations grew more and more and I was tempted almost to despair" (Fox, 1694a: 4, see 6, 11, 14). Given what we know about the nature of these "temptations" within several men from the mid-seventeenth century (including the Quaker, William Ames) and within a few male Methodist leaders a century later, they probably had to do with masturbation (Watts, 1978: 418; Delany, 1969: 59, 61).⁸ By itself, of course, a desire among late adolescent Puritan males to escape the "demon" of sexual urges cannot explain why so many people, including women, converted to Quakerism, but it can serve as one factor, among many, that predisposed young men to investigate religious questions during that period of their lives (see

Lofland and Stark, 1965: 864-867; Lofland, 1981: 33-41).

Boehme and Fox: A Reevaluation

The identification of Fox's probable struggle with questions of sexuality is one example of the way in which modern historical scholarship has reinterpreted the material that either the psychological or the mystical interpreters used to support their positions. Another dramatic example of this reinterpretation involves the question of Boehme's possible influence on Fox. Both psychological and mystical interpreters of early Quakerism argued that Fox had been influenced by the German mystic, Jacob Boehme (James, 1902: 315n.30; Jones, 1909: 495, 1914: 220, 1927: 146; Knight, 1922: 33-35; see Underhill, 1911: 226, 238, 255, 469). This interpretation, however, has been discredited by more recent scholarship, and even Jones himself expressed doubts about the connection in his later work. In his 1932 study, Mysticism and Democracy in the English Commonwealth, Jones conceded that "it is quite likely that Fox had pretty much found his trail before he was consciously aware of the light of Boehme's torch," even though he still insisted that "Boehme's influence is certainly apparent in Fox's Journal" (Jones, 1932: 140).

Even that influence, however, has been challenged by Geoffrey Nuttall. Nuttall pointed out that Jones, as well as Barclay of Reigate, insisted that Fox's use of the phrase, "the flaming sword," in his statement, "Now was I

come up in spirit through the flaming sword into the paradise of God" (Fox, 1694a: 27), indicated Boehme's influence on Fox, at least by the time that he wrote his Journal (Jones, 1914: 221-222; Barclay of Reigate, 1876: 214). Nuttall pointed out, however, that Fox's use of the phrase simply indicated that he, like Boehme, had read Gen. 3: 24 (Nuttall, 1946: 16n.13). (Likewise, it seems probable that both Fox's and Boehme's claims to have gained knowledge of the properties of plants was based upon Gen. 1: 28-30 and 2: 19-20.) Nuttall's interpretation of the "flaming sword" passage was accepted by the prominent Quaker historian, Henry J. Cadbury, who cited it in (gentle) refutation of Jones in his "Additional Notes" to the second edition of Braithwaite's The Beginnings of Quakerism (Braithwaite, 1955: 548 n.3 to p.40). Jones's "mystical" interpretation of early Quakerism, in which he connected the first Quakers to various Continental "mystical" groups, fell into such disrepute that Quaker scholars decided to omit Jones's introductions to both of Braithwaite's histories in their second editions (L. Hugh Doncaster's "Preface" to Braithwaite, 1955: vii; Frederick B. Tolles "Introduction" to Braithwaite, 1961: xxix, xxxii n.1; see Vining, 1958: 194). Given the fact that Jones had been the editor of the Rowntree Series of which Braithwaite's books were a part, the elimination of his introductions from both of Braithwaite's second editions is remarkable. Jones's

mystical interpretation of early Quakerism simply has not withstood the tests of time, since it paid too little attention to the social and political situations in which early Quakerism emerged and grew.

The Lichfield Incident as Social Protest

As the limitations of Rufus Jones's work indicate, a recurrent problem with the mystical and psychological interpreters' use of facts is that they paid too little attention to the social and political conditions in which Quakerism emerged and developed. Take, for example, the psychological and mystical interpretations given to Fox's barefooted walk through "bloody Lichfield," an event that James, Royce, and Knight cite as evidence of Fox's psychopathology (James, 1902: 25-26; Royce, 1913: 50; Knight, 1922: 82-83; Boisen, 1936: 67). As early as 1912, when the first edition appeared of William Charles Braithwaite's still-standard study, The Beginnings of Quakerism, Quaker historians gave Fox's Lichfield incident an interpretation that located it within a social and historical context. Braithwaite suggested that "the sight of the spires threw him into a fever of spiritual exaltation, and the nearer view of the cathedral, scarred and ruined from the Civil War, suggested to his deeply sympathetic nature the blood-guiltiness of the city" (Braithwaite, 1955: 56). He added that, just twelve years before Fox's birth, Edward Wightman had been burnt there for religious heresy

(apparently Unitarianism), as had Mrs. Joyce Lewis (for her Protestant views) in 1557 (Braithwaite, 1955: 56 and n.; Barbour, 1964: 117). Fox would have been particularly concerned about religious persecution at this time, since (as even Royce was aware) he had just suffered nearly a year's imprisonment in Derby as the result of his own religious beliefs (Braithwaite, 1955: 53-54; see Royce, 1913: 50n.1). Seen in its social setting, therefore, Fox's behaviour was, albeit highly emotional, probably not pathological. It nevertheless represented an act of "social protest" against a town whose history symbolized the forced conformity of the established churches against which Quakers protested throughout the 1650s.

Hat-Honour Refusal and Plain Speech [Thee-ing and Thou-ing]
as Social Protest

Failing to see Quakerism in its social setting, psychological and mystical interpreters of the group presented "facts" in support of their positions that actually mitigate their claims. James, for example, asserted that the Quakers used the pronouns, "thee" and "thou," when addressing others, and refused to either give hat-honour or use titles of respect, because they considered these social conventions to be "a lie and a sham," and were against their "impulse for veracity and purity of life" (James, 1902: 230-231). Boisen felt that Fox's revelation

concerning the inadequacy of mere academic training at Oxford or Cambridge for a true minister of Christ was the beginning of Fox's construction of a new self conception and new goals for his life (Boisen, 1936: 65). Royce even identified Fox's hostility toward the tithe-collecting, state-supported ministers (Royce, 1913: 42), but he mentioned this only in a discussion of Fox's honesty and his apparent skill at managing his money. Historians have placed, however, all of these activities within a context of widespread radical agitation for social and political reforms, particularly against the clerical system and the class system that supported it. In 1646, for example, the Leveller leader, John Lilburne (1614-1657), refused to remove his hat when he was brought, against his will, before the House of Lords for having printed insulting and slanderous material about Lord Manchester, the Speaker of the House of Lords (Wolfe, 1963: 145; Brailsford, 1961: 92-93; Gregg, 1961: 140-143). Richard Overton, another Leveller leader, also refused to uncover his head when he was brought before a committee of the House of Lords (Wolfe, 1963: 150). Two Diggers, Gerrard Winstanley and William Everard, refused to remove their hats when General Thomas Fairfax visited their community (Wolfe, 1963: 316). Nor did the radical Fifth Monarchist and plotter, Thomas Venner, remove his hat for Oliver Cromwell, the Lord Protector, when Cromwell was questioning him about his subversive plans in 1657 (Brailsford, 1961: 46; Capp, 1972: 143). Christopher

Hill points out that, even a century before the Quakers appeared, the Marian martyrs refused to remove their hats when they were in front of their accusers (C. Hill, 1972b: 198). Refusal to give hat honour was, in sum, "a long-standing gesture of popular social protest" in a social environment that was riddled with class and status distinctions (C. Hill, 1972b: 198), and claims about its religious origins must be seen in this light.

Use of the pronouns, "thee" and "thou," also was a recognized form of social protest (see C. Hill, 1972b: 198-199; Brailsford, 1961: 46), and the Quaker historian Hugh Barbour points out that "The stigma of social inferiority was the real issue behind the Quaker testimony" concerning them (Barbour, 1964: 164, see 163-166). The Quakers' insistence on lay ministry, and their rejection of the formal training system that many of the state-supported ministers had undergone at Oxford or Cambridge, also was part of a long-standing and deeply felt anti-clericalism that was shared by numerous radical and antinomian groups (James, 1941; Maclear, 1956; C. Hill, 1972b). To assert, therefore, that Quakers developed and maintained these customs simply as a consequence of their religious convictions is to remove their activities from the social environment in which they were performed and in which they acquired meaning.

Fox's Sensitivity to the Mentally Ill

Even Fox's powers to heal the emotionally distressed, which MacDonald mentions, depended in large measure upon the social and cultural conditions of mid-seventeenth century England. As MacDonald points out, his compassion for the disturbed seems to have been related to his religious beliefs, but MacDonald does not indicate that Fox, as well as other Quakers, often failed in their efforts to heal mental and physical illness. Their failures reveal as much, if not more, about the types of illnesses and "healings" that were accepted at this time as do their successes. Quakers believed that they had reconstructed the Apostolic Church, so they felt that they could perform healing and curing miracles in the manner of the Apostles. Mental distress was, Keith Thomas informs us, among the easiest types of illness to cure, since the healer's "greatest asset was his client's imagination" (Thomas, 1971: 209, see 208-211). He illustrates this fact with a story about Fox.

When we learn that one of George Fox's patients, John Banks, had visions that Fox alone would be able to cure him, we are not surprised to discover that he turned out to be one of the Quaker leader's successful cases; on the other hand, when Fox met a cripple at Kendal and told him to throw away his crutches, it is no wonder that, although the man did so, he remained a cripple (Thomas, 1971: 148).

MacDonald's interpretation of Fox's healing abilities, therefore, is not incorrect, it simply is incomplete. Fox's religious principles were aids in his healings, as

MacDonald claims, but their efficacy lay in a complicated relationship between the nature of the illness and his patients' willingness to be influenced by his powerful personality. All of these factors interacted within a cultural milieu in which people both lacked effective treatment for mental illness and held strong beliefs about the possibility of "miraculous" cures.

Religion and its Social Context

After placing the evidence used by psychological and mystical interpreters of early Quakerism within the social and historical context of mid-seventeenth century England, the limitations of these two perspectives become obvious. Quakerism must be seen as the consequence of historically and culturally distinctive forces, and it cannot be understood through psychological or mystical approaches that ignore its social setting. When given a cultural context, however, psychology can make a contribution to interpretations of Quakerism, and herein lies the value of social psychology. Social psychology assumes that a dynamic relationship exists between the processes of the mind and the socio-cultural environment, and therefore insists that behaviour and beliefs, including religious ones, are the result of this interplay. As the Canadian psychologist of religion, Bruce Hunsberger realizes, "The theoretical basis of the psychological study of religion has typically been weak or non-existent..., and social psychology's theories

and experience in the development of theories of social phenomena would be valuable if applied to the study of religion" (Hunsberger, 1980: 72). The most fruitful analysis, therefore, of why people develop and acquire religious beliefs takes place on the level of social psychology rather than on the level of psychology per se. Likewise, mysticism, when examined within clear historical and cultural boundaries, can provide valuable insight into the development of religious conceptions and experiences. Geoffrey Nuttall did this so admirably well in his unsurpassed work, The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience (Nuttall, 1946), in which he approached his doctrinal examination "from a particular historical angle" (Nuttall, 1946: viii).

Put concisely, religion is a cultural system, (see Geertz, 1973), and therefore must be studied as a socio-cultural phenomenon. Within this perspective, "religious symbols formulate a basic congruence between a particular style of life and a specific (if, most often, implicit) metaphysic, and in so doing sustain each with the borrowed authority of the other" (Geertz, 1973: 90).

As will be particularly clear in the chapters that follow, this study identifies the congruence between the Quakers' "style of life" (that is, their customs and activities) and their "metaphysic" (that is, their religious ideology) by relating their social customs and activities to

their sense of having been denied the opportunity to implement, through important social changes, deeply held, culturally specific values regarding tithe abolition. By analyzing Quakerism in this manner, I locate my study within the assumptions of the social scientific study of religion, and most particularly social psychology and historical sociology. I prefer to use social-psychological rather than strictly psychological interpretations of religious involvement, just as I prefer to view mysticism as an historically and culturally specific, rather than as an ahistorical, phenomenon. I will show in the next chapter, however, that even some of the most influential sociological studies of early Quakerism, which are found in the Weberian tradition, fail to place the group in an adequate socio-cultural perspective. It is to this analysis of Weber and his followers that we now turn.

CHAPTER TWO: WEBERIAN INTERPRETATIONS OF EARLY QUAKERISM

Introduction

Through the work of Max Weber, early Quaker history has played a significant role in at least two important topics within the sociology of religion. First, Quakerism figured prominently in Weber's "Protestant ethic thesis" about the influence of religion on the rise of early capitalist mentality. Quakerism was, for Weber, the best example of a non-predestinarian Puritan group whose members practiced a form of inner-worldly asceticism that was conducive to the development of a "spirit" of honesty, frugality, and reinvestment. Second, Quakerism's reputed "unpolitical" or "anti-political principles," its emphasis on lay preaching, egalitarian attitudes toward women, refusal to take oaths of any kind, and refusal to take up arms in the service of the state provided examples, Weber believed, of a sect's typical hostility or ambivalence to the world. Upon these and related characteristics Weber developed an "ideal type" construction of religious sectarianism, and the influence of that construction is still apparent in the debates over sect typologies.

Regardless of its impact, however, on the sociology of religion, the early Quaker material that Weber cited was, from an historical viewpoint, woefully inadequate to

sustain the arguments it was intended to support. Historians are justified in pointing out that he was "astonishingly casual about the detailed historical validation of his argument" (Abrams, 1972: 24), and this was true about both his portrait of early Quakerism and the evidence that he garnered from it. When discussing the determinative impact that Puritanism had on the rise of early modern capitalism, Weber based his case primarily on theological pronouncements rather than on historical or social evidence, and by doing so he presented an inaccurate picture of Puritan life. As Gordon Marshall indicates, "For someone who [was] so explicitly interested in the practical consequences of theology, rather than theology itself, [Weber was] strangely unconcerned about documenting these consequences empirically as opposed simply to arguing them by assertion" (Marshall, 1982: 95, my emphasis). To put the issue simply, Weber failed to provide adequate socio-historical evidence about the religious groups upon which he built his case about the impact of religion upon the economic activities and attitudes of mid-seventeenth century Puritans. Seen in this way, the problem with the Weberian interpretation of early Quakerism resembles the problem with the psychological and mystical interpretations of the group: it is inattentive to the social and political forces amidst which Quakerism emerged and developed.

In this chapter I will critically analyze the Quaker evidence that Weber presented in his argument about the

relationship between Puritanism and early modern capitalism. I will do so by focusing on one important aspect of early Quakerism's economic doctrines, the "fixed price" policy in business exchanges, since Weber himself often discussed it. By drawing from a number of early Quaker historical and literary sources, I will argue that Weber misunderstood the motives behind the group's economic activities. He failed to appreciate the extent to which Quakers felt frustrated anger toward persons in power with regard to desired economic and political reforms. Likewise, Weber did not appreciate the way in which Quakers translated their resentment into economic behaviours and social demands. I will argue, in short, that Quakers felt frustrated and deprived with regard to the refusal of governmental and military officials to implement various political and social reforms, and they translated their sense of frustration and deprivation into economic activities and religious doctrines. This chapter, therefore, has direct bearing upon the "Protestant ethic" debate, and indirect bearing upon the "sect typologies" discussion. It also paves the way for my application of relative deprivation and resource mobilization theories to early Quakerism in the next chapter.

Weber on Early Quakerism: An Overview

During the later years of his life, Weber felt a personal respect for Quakerism, a respect he revealed in

some of his letters and conversations. For him, the "Quaker ethic" of "a consciously responsible feeling of love" offered a "truly humane interpretation" of both the "inner and religious value" of marriage and the socially responsible value of worldly activity. He even interpreted his own marriage in similar terms (Mitzman, 1970: 219, 221; Weber, 1946: 350; 1920a: 563)¹ That Weber held such respect for Quakerism is noteworthy, given his own assertion that he was "absolutely unmusical religiously and [had] no need or ability to erect any psychic edifices of a religious character" within himself (Marianne Weber, 1926b: 324).

This personal respect for Quakerism emerged from his research, since he did not maintain any active contact with the Quaker community of his day. He attended only one Quaker meeting for worship, and while he was moved by its silence, he was unmoved, even somewhat bored, by a long ministry that a member presented. If, however, this respect sensitized Weber to Quakerism's religious dimension, then it also blinded him to its social and political dimension. Weber consistently failed not only to see the social and political implications of the group's activities, but also to appreciate the feelings of frustration and resentment that the first Quakers felt toward the Puritans in power. I shall reveal these shortcomings by discussing his analysis of the origins and development of Quakerism's fixed price policy.

Weber undertook research on Quakerism as part of his

attempt to understand the role of the Puritan sects in the development of early modern capitalism. He recognized that Quakerism, like the other Puritan groups, maintained an inner-worldly asceticism, but he may not have fully understood that its merchandise-pricing policy was unique among the Puritan groups (see Weber, 1946: 312; 1920a: 219n.1; cf. Weber, 1910a: 118). In contrast to the accepted market practice of customers and merchants haggling over prices, Quaker merchants asked of all customers one fixed price for each item and refused to dicker over it. Weber believed that this policy reflected their religious concern for honesty, and therefore he saw it as a practical demonstration of their religiously motivated ethics.

While Weber recognized that "the religiously determined way of life is itself profoundly influenced by economic and political factors operating within given geographical, political, social, and national boundaries" (1946: 268; 1920a: 268-269), he nonetheless insisted that the theodicies of both suffering and good fortune were more important for the development of religious ethics than were either class interest or social resentment (1946: 271; 1920a: 241-242). Consequently, the fixed price policy exemplified for Weber a general sociological truth: a religious ethic "receives its stamp primarily from religious circles, and first of all, from the content of its annunciation and its promise" (1946: 270; 1920a: 240).

Thus, Weber was compelled to pay greater attention to Quakerism's religious doctrines and accompanying theodicy of business success than to the political, social, and economic conditions in which the group arose and developed. He did so because he believed that the group's religious doctrines decisively influenced its economic activities, including the fixed price policy. Yet his observation that the non-predestinarian Quakers upheld an inner-worldly asceticism that "was equivalent in practice" to the inner-worldly asceticism of the Calvinistic Puritans (Weber, 1920b: 148; 1920a: 157) obscured the fact that the fixed price policy was an exclusively Quaker innovation. Weber neither saw this clearly nor was inclined to search for the unique social and historical factors that gave rise to its formulation.

Close examination of the first decade of Quakerism, however, reveals that the Quakers' religious beliefs provide only a partial explanation for the appearance and development of the fixed price policy. My basic proposition is that the fixed price policy arose partly as a reaction to the prevailing business practices of the day, and was but one aspect of the Quakers' response to the Puritans' failure to institute the Levellers' proposed social, political, and economic reforms. While Weber believed that the fixed price policy originated primarily from religious motives, I will show that it was significantly influenced by social and political circumstances. In the following chapter I will

show that these circumstances also had a determinative impact upon other aspects of the Quakers' ideology and practices.

Weber on Asceticism and Quaker Business Procedures

Weber noted that the Quakers' inner worldly ascetic ethos had practical implications for their business procedures. An immediate consequence of their inner worldly asceticism was their strict adoption of the fixed price policy,³ and this policy proved to be a necessary step in the development of business honesty and nonpreferential treatment of buyers (Weber, 1922d: 638; 1922b: 383-384). Economic exchanges that were conducted according to these principles were both "a condition as well as a product of a particular stage of capitalist economy known as Early Capitalism [and t]hey are absent where this stage no longer exists" (Weber, 1922d: 638; 1922b: 383-384).

Important is Weber's claim that the fixed price policy was a consequence of the Quakers' inner-worldly ascetic ethos, since in this claim he failed to see that the policy also was a consequence of their critical judgement upon the business community of the day. Weber believed, for example, that Quakerism's "very strong contemplative elements" prevented Quakers from being concerned about "mundane interests," including social issues, despite the fact that their religious beliefs "again and again directed

them to the course of action" in the world (1946: 291-2; 1920a: 264). He believed that for "religious reformers" such as the Quaker, George Fox, "programmes of reform never were the center of interest....Their ethical ideals and practical results of their doctrines were all based on [the salvation of the soul] alone, and were the consequences of purely religious motives" (Weber, 1920b: 89-90; 1920a: 82). Further, Weber argued, Quaker asceticism involved "methodologies of apathetic ecstasy" (1920e: 163), which in turn fostered "unpolitical or even anti-political principles" (unpolitischen oder geradezu antipolitischen Grundsätze) [1920b: 150, 254 n.4, 173, 149; 1920a: 160; see 1946: 337; 1922d: 518n.6]).

For Weber, these "methodologies of apathetic ecstasy" involved "rational" actions, since they were directed to an "absolute value" (wertrational) (1947: 116; 1946: 287; 1920a: 259). In the Quakers' case, the absolute value was a "religious call" to live according to the model "of the first generations of Christians" (1920b: 146; 1920a: 154), "regardless of possible costs to themselves" (1947b: 116). One of the rational actions that the Quakers undertook, according to Weber, was the adoption of their fixed price policy, even though their trades and businesses suffered from the fact that the Quakers' customers thought it peculiar that they both refused to haggle over prices and charged rich and poor the same fee (1946: 312-313; 1920a: 219n.1; see 1920b: 69; 1920a: 53). Eventually, however, the

value-rational policy of the early Quakers--that of "honesty is the best policy" (Weber, 1920b: 282n.112; 1946: 313; 1920a: 219)--was fortuitous, having the unintended result of bringing them increased business, since potential customers began to "have confidence in the religiously determined righteousness of the pious" (1946: 312; 1920a: 218).

The Fixed Price in Its Historical Context

The fixed price policy was indeed the expression of the absolute religious value that Weber described. The Quakers' insistence on selling a particular item at the same price to all customers, regardless of their social class, was based on their religious assertion that the seed of God existed in all people (Fox, 1661: 3), including the nonbelieving "heathen" (Fox, 1656: 101). Moreover, Fox's Journal mentions that early Quaker tradesmen suffered initial losses because of their refusal to haggle (1694b: 138-9), and an extant Quaker letter from 1656 makes the same point. Finally, a 1655 publication by a temporarily lapsed Quaker describes how his business suffered from his refusal either to haggle with customers or to show them "civil respect" by removing his hat and bowing to them when they entered his shop (Toldervy, 1655: 19).

The policy, however, was more than the reflection of Quakers' deeply felt religious convictions; it also was a

bitter indictment of contemporary mercantile practices. Quakers who engaged in fixed price exchanges did so in part as "judge[s] out of the power of God" against "all the defrauders, cozeners, cheaters, overreachers, liars, and wrong-dealers" in the marketplace (Fox, 1658: 1; see 1657: 3-4). The judgemental impact of the protest was made clear in two demands that Fox put forward in a 1658 tract entitled A Warning to all the Merchants of London. First, Fox called upon merchants to desist in their "cozening and cheating, and defrauding" price-setting and haggling practices, and replace them with the honest fixed price policy (1658: 1). The numerous husbandmen and other rural residents who practiced Quakerism (Reay, 1980b: 62, 67) especially would benefit from the policy's implementation, since the London merchants "hath a name and a bad report...[for] deceiv[ing] the country people that deals with you (Fox, 1658: 3). Second, Fox insisted that "the merchants, great men, and rich men" with their "gold and silver, and gold chains about [their] necks, and [their] costly attire" relinquish some of their wealth for the "poor blind women and children and cripples crying and making a noise up and down [the] streets" (1658: 2). In both demands, which in Fox's mind were inseparable, he was indicting the ethics of the business community of his day, and voicing his social concern for the poor. For instance, Fox admonished the merchants to "take in the blind and the cripples that cries up and down your streets, and feast them when you make your

feasts; for the rich feast the rich, and not the poor that cannot feast them again" (1658: 4 [see Luke 14: 12-14]). This hostility against the wealthy on behalf of the poor is even more apparent in other Quaker tracts (Maclear, 1950: 243-5; 254; Nuttall, 1973: 149; Petegorsky, 1940: 235-238).

Contrary to Weber's claim that George Fox and similar charismatic figures were not "the proponents of humanistic projects for social reform or cultural ideals" (Weber, 1920b: 89; 1920a: 82), Fox and his fellow Quakers had a keen eye for social, economic, and even political reform. In addition to Fox's tract that demanded reforms among the merchants, Quakers wrote many others to judges, lawyers, and members of parliament in which they called for reforms in their respective occupations (Schenk, 1948: 114-131; Nuttall, 1973: 151-154; O'Malley, 1979: 174-175). These tracts, like Fox's to the merchants, typically contained warnings about human "pride,...loftiness,...wantonness, and haughtiness" (Fox, 1658: 6), vices which Quakers held to be the real causes of social iniquity. Consequently, their reformist demands, including the fixed price and poor relief, were practical measures aimed at eradicating what Quakers believed was widespread human suffering that resulted from human pride and greed.

By arguing that the Quakers' formulation and implementation of the fixed price reflected not only their belief in an absolute religious ethic of honesty but also

their hope for practical social reforms, I am asserting that two apparently different types of rational activity were associated with the policy. The Quakers' insistence on fixed prices was an example not only of value rational (wertrational) activity based on religious honesty, but also of an instrumental rational (zweckrational) activity that attempted to prepare men's hearts for specific social and political reforms. Weber himself realized that interactions between these two types of rationalities took place (1922d: 26; 1922b: 13), even though he failed to see that the business ethos of the early Quakers provided an excellent example of it.

The Tradition of Radical Reform During the Civil War

Quakers' general attacks on particular human vices, moreover, were the result of bitter lessons that they had been taught by recent political disappointments. After the Puritans gained power in government at the end of the 1640s, they refused to implement popular but radical demands for economic, political and religious reforms. Although the Quakers' fixed price policy was usually directed toward the merchants, Quakers believed that the human pride and greed that plagued the merchants was the same evil that plagued the political figures. The demands for personal reform that are contained in the fixed price policy must be viewed, therefore, in a social context in which Quakers came to believe that personal reforms were urgently needed. Crucial

to this social context were the reformist efforts of the radical movement whose participants were known as the Levellers, and the Quakers' demands must be located within the same radical tradition that flourished during the English Civil War (see Cole, 1956; J. Martin, 1965: 86-122; Reay, 1980a: 106; D. Martin, 1965: 62-64, 66, 67-68; C. Hill, 1972: 193; Nuttall, 1973: 154-159, 161-162).

Prior to the appearance of the Quakers, the Levellers waged a fervent campaign for wide-ranging economic, political, and religious reforms. Beginning in 1645, the campaign included demands for the abolition of government-sponsored monopolies, mandatory tithe-payments, and oath-taking on religious, political, and legal issues. Likewise, they called for an extension of the franchise and a significant increase in the government's poor relief activities (see Haller and Davies, 1944). While Weber was somewhat familiar with many of the Levellers' social, political, and economic demands, he made only passing reference to them in The Protestant Ethic and they played no part in his basic argument (1920b: 282 n.110; 1920a: 201n.1: 1920b: 216 n.29; 1920a: 81n.1). In the "Protestant Sects" essay, he correctly described the Levellers and the Quakers as opposing tithes and a state-supported ministry (Weber, 1946: 318, 458n.27, see n.30; 1920a: 230.n.4, 230.n.2, see 231n.2),⁹ but he failed to connect the two groups chronologically with regard to their basic reformist

concerns about tithes and other issues.

In their day, the Levellers in London were capable of inspiring thousands of people to participate in emotion filled demonstrations (Brailsford, 1961: 360, 602). Nonetheless, the group failed to persuade either the Long Parliament or the Rump¹⁰ to institute any of its reformist demands, nor was it able to win support from the Army officers (called the Grandees) who reshaped the government in 1648 (see Appendix One). The Grandees' refusal to accept the reformist doctrines embittered the Levellers, since they felt betrayed by the very commanders under whom they had risked their lives fighting to rid the country of political and religious "oppression." In the famous Putney debates of late October, 1647, for example, in which Grandees and Levellers wrestled with the question of extending the franchise, the Leveller, Edward Sexby (d. 1658; [see D.N.B.]), complained to Cromwell that:

All here, both great and small, do think that we fought for something. I confess, many of us fought for those ends which, we since saw, were not those which caused us to go through difficulties and straits [and] to venture all in the ship with you. It had been good in you to have advertised us of it, and I believe you would [have] had fewer under your command to have commanded (reproduced in Woodhouse, 1938: 74).

Sexby made these comments on October 29th. The day before, the radical preacher, John Saltmarsh (d.1647; see D.N.B.), made a similar point in a letter that he wanted read at the debate:

ye have not discharged yourselves to the people in

such things as they justly expected from ye, and for which ye had that spirit of righteousness first put upon ye by an Almighty Power, and which carried you upon a conquering wing. The wisdom of the flesh hath deceived and enticed, and that glorious principle of Christian liberty which we advanced in at first (I speak as to Christians) hath been managed too much in the flesh (reproduced in Woodhouse, 1938: 438, see 81).

Fourteen months later, when the Levellers believed that the Grandees had agreed to utilize a radical document, [A Second] Agreement of the People, as the model for a new government, they were shocked to hear the officers retreat from this position in a series of debates held at Whitehall (Woodhouse, 1938: 125-178). The Levellers and other radicals were appalled, for example, the the Grandees would desire to give civil magistrates "compulsive and restrictive powers in matters of religion," (Woodhouse, 1938: 125). As far as Lilburne was concerned, the court system in 1648 was as tyrannical as the courts had been under Charles--nothing had substantially changed (see Lilburne's comments in Woodhouse, 1938: 349-350).

The feeling expressed by the Levellers and their supporters--of frustration at the turn of events by those who wanted more--commonly occurs after wars. As W. G. Runciman discovered in his research about early twentieth century England, raised expectations for social change often occur among "the underprivileged strata who are seen to have shared the exertions and sufferings of war in equal measure with their social superiors [and had been] encouraged to feel a common aspiration with their superiors for a joint

share in a better world" (Runciman, 1966: 24). As is often the case, however, with victorious soldiers, the radical Parliamentary troops of the English Civil War were left unsatisfied.

After Thomas Fairfax (1612-1671) and Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) suppressed the Leveller-inspired army mutinies at Burford in May, 1649, the movement never recovered. The reasons for its failure have, of course, been much-debated by historians (see Aylmer, 1975: 45-55, Frank, 1955: 187-221). Yet, from the perspective of many Levellers, the movement failed because of the basic spiritual depravity of those in authority. Reflecting on the recent "betrayal" by the army officers a few months earlier, three prominent Leveller leaders wrote in March, 1649, that the Grandees had succumbed to their own "Delusions and perfidious Strategems...to betray and enslave [the country] to their own Pride, Ambition, Lusts, Covetousnesse, and Domination" (Lilburne, Overton, and Prince, 1649: 16; in Haller and Davies, 1944: 187). The common people had fought to cast off an oppressor, but now found themselves oppressed by the very men whom they had supported. It was a theme that made sense out of a confusing and disappointing time, and it would recur often in the radical literature of the next decade.

Quakerism and the Radical Tradition

If pride and similar vices were the cause of the authorities' opposition to reforms, then the real enemy was

not so much an outward, political opponent as it was an inner, spiritual one. The true enemy, human pride, lay within, and it was against this vice that the Quakers launched their inward "spiritual war" during the very years that the Leveller movement was dying. Fox, for example, wrote that in 1647, "I went back into Nottinghamshire and there the Lord shewed me that the natures of those things which were hurtful without were within, in the hearts and minds of wiced men.... The natures of these I saw within, though people had been looking without" (Fox, 1694a: 19, see 31). Like the Levellers, the Quakers believed that the Puritan authorities had succumbed to their own vices, and in the Quakers' eyes, this explained why the Puritans had refused to implement the reforms that the radicals demanded. The Puritans, charged the Quakers:

had power and opportunity to have removed all oppression out of the Land. But alas, covetousness and self-seeking lusts sprang up in most of them, and leavened them; and when they had rest and fulness, they forgot the oppression of their brethren also, and regarded not to pay vows to God and man (Fox the Younger, 1660: 7).

Quaker criticism of the reigning Puritans was strikingly similar to that voiced by the frustrated Levellers: Puritans had fallen victim to their own pride and covetousness, and consequently had failed to implement the political and social reforms that many people expected. When prominent Quakers put forth reformist demands, they were almost identical to those of the Levellers: abolition

of tithes and oaths, granting religious toleration (for Protestants), election of annual parliaments by an extended franchise vote, abolition of monopolies, and extension of poor relief (Burrough, 1657: 6; see B[illing], 1659; Schenk, 1948: 114-118; Brailsford, 1961: 639-640). In fact, Weber even realized that the most prominent Leveller of the 1640s, John Lilburne, converted to Quakerism (1922c: 175; 1922d: 550; 1922b: 333).¹¹ With at least one doctrine, however, Quakerism went beyond the Levellers' reformist demands, and that was with respect to the fixed price.

The economic innovation of the fixed price policy must be understood in light of the Quakers' inward war and the the Levellers' outward, but unsuccessful struggle. The policy was part of Quakerism's war against greed and dishonesty, and did not depend upon a government for enforcement or success as had the Levellers' proposals. The innovative policy had, as Weber recognized, religious ideas at its base, but it also had been preceded by a history of unfulfilled social demands. The Levellers' demands had been directed to the parliament of the nation; the Quakers' fixed price policy was directed to the merchants of the nation, although the principle of honesty that lay behind it was to be adopted by all men, regardless of their occupations. The fixed price policy was a personalized attempt to institute an economic change in a manner different from the failed political attempts of the preceding years. Since the Quakers felt that the Puritan

revolution had failed because of the authorities' capitulation to pride and vice, their new attempt at reforms depended largely on the elimination of pride and covetousness for its success. "All tradesmen, lawyers, merchants, seaman, magistrates and ye idle people of the land repent," Fox demanded, "for the day of the Lord's wrath is at hand.... [Therefore,] keep to yea and nay in all your communication [i.e., be honest, and do not haggle or dicker]; whatsoever is more is evil" (Fox, 1656:3-4).

By placing their reformist doctrines, including the fixed price policy, within the social context of the era, we see that Quakerism was in large measure a reactive movement (see Kent, 1983b). Many of its members had shared the "legitimate" reformist expectations of the Levellers, especially those regarding the abolition of tithes, and had felt frustrated at the movement's political and economic failure (see Kent, 1983b). As Alan Cole observed:

it is impossible to doubt the bitterness of the Quakers' disillusion [over the radicals' failure]. But their political standpoint is comprehensible only if we recognize that they were disillusioned not with the cause for which they fought, nor even with the means by which they had sought to advance it, but with the men who were now betraying it. Hence they were confronted with a profound contradiction between their own passionate enthusiasm for civil and religious liberty and the immediate possibilities of the historical situation (Cole, 1955: 24-25).

The Quakers responded to the Levellers' failure by spiritualizing their predecessors' reformist demands, making them part of an inevitable millenarian social order that

would emerge with Christ at its head. "For the mighty day of the Lord is coming," Fox warned the London merchants, "wherein every one of you must give account of his deeds done in the body, and every man's work must be tried by fire" (Fox, 1658:6; see Rev. 18: 11-18)¹²

One important modification of the earlier Leveller demands was that the Quakers stressed the necessity of righteous activity by "saints" who were to conduct their lives in a manner that signified their awareness of Christ's imminent return. Millenarianism was, of course, widespread in mid-seventeenth century England, with the Civil War victory symbolizing Christ's establishment of the country as the New Jerusalem to which he would soon return and lead the saints in the final battle against the "Romish antichrist" (see Rev. 17:12-20:15 [Ball, 1975; Hill, 1971]). By legitimizing their conduct through saintly and divine claims, however, the Quakers gave new life to many of the radical hopes of the period, especially with regard to the abolition of the state-supported church system (see Kent, 1983b). Just as Jesus instructed his Aposles to preach freely and live off the voluntary contributions of those who accepted their message (Lk. 9:3, 10:3-8), so too did the Quakers demand that mandatory tithes be abolished in the very age in which Christ was expected to return. In a similar vein, the Quakers' belief in the imminent return of Christ, who would strike down the lofty and proud as he rewarded the saints, provided them with an impetus to

develop a merchandizing policy that was scrupulously honest (see Underwood, 1970: 95) even by Puritan standards (Bebb, 1935: 102-103, 105, 110-112). They did not relinquish the radicals' hopes for reform, and on some issues (such as tithe abolition) they persistently pressed public figures regarding their implementation. They held out little hope, however, of achieving their goals until either the officials themselves underwent a spiritual regeneration within their own hearts, or Christ himself returned to rule on earth. Weber did not identify the "psychic, economic, ethical, religious, or political" distress out of which the "charismatic revolution" of Quakerism appeared (Weber, 1922d: 1111-1112; 1946: 245; 1922b: 662), but we can identify it as the widespread indignation caused by the Puritan failure to institute the political, economic, and religious reforms that had been the objects of struggle and hope for so many people.

Bernstein on Quaker Frustration: An Argument Ignored

Weber himself was aware of an interpretation of Quakerism that on the one hand revealed the bitter frustration that Quakers felt over recent political events, and on the other hand identified this frustration as the source of the group's personalistic demands for reform. This interpretation had been written by Weber's friend, Eduard Bernstein, nearly a decade before the publication of

The Protestant Ethic, and it included a discussion of the social conditions that gave rise to the earliest formulations of Quaker doctrine. "The [English] civil war," Bernstein realized:

had claimed unto sacrifices, without any satisfactory result; political struggles had succeeded each other without bringing a solution of social difficulties any nearer; men who had been hailed as deliverers, when once raised to power, assumed the mien of oppressors, and thus the conclusion seemed inescapable that the chief evil lay in man himself, in the weakness of human nature, which the existing churches had proved powerless to overcome (1895b: 227-228; 1895a: 294).

From the vantage point of the 1650s,

No reliance...could be placed upon men, nor could any hope be set upon an alteration in government, but improvement could only follow the cultivation of the right spirit. This attitude may be observed after all great political reactions (1895b: 238; 1895a: 309n.).

George Fox, Bernstein believed, aptly represented this personalistic response to recent social and political disappointments (1895b: 228; 1895a: 294).

Bernstein had, therefore, grasped the complex interplay between the Quakers' religious views and their political frustrations. He even asserted that "religion, and above all, this religion, provided an outlet for the tension caused by the proceedings on the political stage" (1895b:242; 1895a: 314). Despite the fact that he mistakenly accepted the assertion of a Quaker historian who claimed that Fox "practiced an absolute separation from all political aims and objectives of men of his time" (Bernstein, 1895b: 229n.1; 1895a: 296n.; 1895a: 297;

quoting Barclay of Reigate, 1876: 193; cf. Reay, 1978: 194-195),¹³ Bernstein nonetheless realized the reformist aspirations of many of the early Friends. He observed that "it was not until after the restoration [of the Monarchy in 1660] that Fox's doctrine of abstention from politics was adopted by the Quakers. During the Commonwealth [of the 1650s] this was...little the case" (1895b: 229; 1895a: 297). Later in the work he added that, "originally, in this as in similar movements, the negative side, the protest--in this case against the establishment of new [social and political] hierarchies--was uppermost" (1895b: 236; 1895a: 306-307). Bernstein's basic argument has recently been confirmed by historians, one of whom shows that Quakerism "was prepared to play a political role in 1659: any reservations were due not to qualms of conscience but suspicions of the integrity of those in power" (Reay, 1978: 196).

Despite the fact that Bernstein's interpretation of Interregnum Quakerism stressed that political frustration provided the impetus for many of the group's activities and beliefs, Weber complimented him on this study by referring to it in The Protestant Ethic as an "excellent essay" (1920b: 219n.5; 1920a:88n.1; 1905: 5n.4). Furthermore, in both The Protestant Ethic and its accompanying "Protestant Sects" article, Weber printed his thanks to Bernstein for providing him with both Quaker books and salient passages from them (1920b: 256n.181, 283; 1920a: 156, 202n2; 1946: 312-313; 1920a: 219n.1). Indeed, five of Weber's major

sources were ones that Bernstein had footnoted in his 1895 work (Barclay of Reigate, 1876; Barclay of Aberdeen, 1701; J. S. Rowntree, 1859; Weingarten, 1868; Clarkson, 1869).¹⁴

In sum, while Weber cited Bernstein's work in which the essay on Quakerism appeared and books on the Quakers possibly borrowed from Bernstein's private collection, he nonetheless ignored Bernstein's insightful analysis of the social and political forces that generated and propelled the group during the period in which it formulated its fixed price policy. Weber's omission of Bernstein's critical insights is troubling, even if perhaps Weber felt that his friend's interpretations were tainted with a Marxist flavor that would have mitigated his own argument for religion as the dominant force behind the Quakers' economic activities (see Kent, 1983b [forthcoming]).

Perhaps Weber's neglect of Bernstein's argument explains why the commentators on the "Protestant ethic" theory also have failed to address it. Another author on early Quakerism, Ernst Troeltsch, cited Bernstein's study, (1911: 782, 979), yet he too ignored Bernstein's basic argument by portraying the sect as "a religious body which sprung into existence out of an entirely unworldly spiritual movement" (1911: 781). Troeltsch, no doubt, had theological reasons for differing with Bernstein (see Troeltsch, 1911: 987), but he saw fit to note those aspects of Bernstein's analysis of early Quakerism that dealt primarily

with economic matters (1911: 979). H. Richard Niebuhr, whose examination of "the salvation of the socially disinherited" (1929: 30) could have benefited from Bernstein's perspective, neglected to use him. Niebuhr might have understood, for example, why it was true that "two characteristics marked the religious social revolt from Diggers and Levellers to Quakers--the doctrine of inner experience as the source of authority and the common hope of Christ's kingdom on earth" (Niebuhr, 1929: 48). Similarly, David Martin, whose examination of early Quakerism led him to the conclusion that "the aetiology of pacifism is substantially identical with the aetiology of apocalypticism" (D. Martin, 1966: 68, see ch.4), would have found a kindred argument in Bernstein's study, but he, too, did not cite him. Bernstein's discussion of the Quakers' frustrated internalization of social and political protest might have helped Martin interpret why "the passivity of [oppressed, excluded, or alienated groups] is more formal than real, since the underlying psychological attitude is often one of acute aggression. It is merely that God is seen as the Sole Executor of their will to triumph" (Martin, 1966: 47).

Once the political and social context of the fixed price policy is considered, then Weber's claim that Quakers' economic activities stemmed "purely [from] religious motives" must be modified. As a millenarian protest group whose members were disappointed and disgruntled with the course of recent political events, Quakerism transformed its

members' resentful frustration into internalized efforts at reform which would lead, they hoped, to fundamental political and social changes. The fixed price policy emerged as one example of its members internalized and personalistic efforts in the face of Christ's imminent return as judge and king. Seen in its historical setting, the policy not only reflected Quakerism's religious concern for honesty, which Weber identified, but also revealed a concern for the poor and a hostility for the lifestyle of the wealthy, which Weber neglected. His neglect of these mundane aspects of Quakerism is apparent in his portrayal of the group as mystically contemplative, unpolitical or apolitical, with no central concern for ethical or social reforms that were independent of purely religious endeavors.

CHAPTER THREE: RESENTMENT, RELATIVE DEPRIVATION, AND
RESOURCE MOBILIZATION: A STUDY OF EARLY QUAKERISM

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I argued that the Quakers felt frustration and resentment toward the Puritans in power regarding their refusal to institute the radicals' social, political, and religious reforms. These feelings, I maintained, determined the form and style of the Quakers' economic behaviour. In this chapter, I broaden my argument by demonstrating that the Quakers' frustration and resentment determined both the content of their religious message and the social behaviours that they used to express their beliefs. I build my argument within the framework of two established sociological theories--relative deprivation theory and resource mobilization theory. Contrary, however, to a body of literature in the sociology of religion which asserts that these theories offer competing interpretations of data, I demonstrate, through the use of Interregnum Quaker history, that they are complementary.

Resentful Frustration and Relative Deprivation

The role played by feelings of resentment and frustration in the formation of social movements, including religious ones, is well established in the sociological and

social-psychological literature on relative deprivation. Put simply, these feelings result when people believe that they are being denied what legitimately belongs to them. In his study of Melanesian Cargo cults, for example, Peter Worsley argues that when "[t]he incompatibility between [a person's] wants and the means of satisfying them is...aggravated by the notion of a right to these goods...,[i]t becomes a particularly powerful source of resentment and frustration, charged with emotion" (Worsley, 1968: 247, see 243). Ted Gurr discusses the complex relationship between frustration, discontent, and deprivation (Gurr, 1970: 199), and W. G. Runciman continuously associates resentment with people's perceptions of relative deprivation (1961: 70, 73-75; 1966: 10, 14, 59, 67). In a similar manner, the Yale psychologist, Faye Crosby, indicates that, "[t]he emotion of relative deprivation can be called 'a sense of grievance' or of resentment" (1976: 88, 90, see 94, forthcoming: 12). These studies indicate that the theoretical concept, "relative deprivation," presupposes underlying feelings of resentment and frustration. The reason why this is so lies in the social dynamic of comparing oneself or one's group to another.

Within social-psychology, relative deprivation is defined as "a felt grievance resulting from an unfavourable comparison to another person or group regarding the possession of 'X.'" Relative deprivation exists as a group phenomenon if that group believes it lacks "X" but 1)perceives that another group possesses it; 2)wants to

possess it; 3) feels entitled to possess it; 4) thinks that it is feasible to possess it; and 5) does not blame the group itself for its failure to possess it (see Crosby, 1976: 90). If all five of these conditions exist, then this group is likely to take social action in an attempt to alleviate its grievance. The existence of felt deprivation by a group does not imply automatically that collective action will result, but if a number of structural and situational contingencies coincide, then collective action is likely (see Smelser, 1962:15-22). Moreover, if the sense of deprivation involves fundamental societal values (as did the anti-tithe debate during the English Interregnum), then the resulting movement is likely to be religious in nature (Smelser, 1962:25-26,30). While the existence of group resentment is not a sufficient factor to cause the emergence of a social movement, it is a necessary, and a very important, one (Smelser, 1962: ch.3).

The social-psychological insights upon which relative deprivation theory is based are quite old, dating back at least to Alexis de Tocqueville. In his 1856 analysis of the French Revolution, de Tocqueville perceptively argued that, "[p]atiently endured so long as it seemed beyond redress, a grievance comes to appear intolerable once the possibility of removing it crosses men's minds" (de Tocqueville, 1856: 177 [Part Three, Chapter Four]). Modern sociologists, however, took notice of "relative deprivation"

as a theoretical concept only after the 1949 work by Samuel A. Stouffer and his colleagues on the job-satisfaction attitudes of American soldiers. In 1957, Alice Rossi and Robert Merton systematized Stouffer's use of the concept (reprinted in Merton, 1968: 279-334), and in 1959 James A. Davis developed a number of formal propositions regarding relative deprivation that were based upon Stouffer's study. For a number of years afterward relative deprivation enjoyed a prominent place in the sociological literature. Among the most important subsequent refinements and applications of the theory was Neil Smelser's work on collective behaviour, in which he specified the social conditions in which a feeling of relative deprivation would manifest in various forms of social action (Smelser, 1962). In 1966, W. G. Runciman cleverly used the concept to explain how the relatively equal amount of unemployment among England's working class during the Depression inhibited the development of political radicalism (Runciman, 1966: 63-67). More recently, Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge have discussed the relationship between feelings of relative deprivation and interpersonal relationships among sect members (Stark and Bainbridge, 1980).

Relative Deprivation and Resource Mobilization

Recent trends in sectarian studies, however, indicate that researchers are utilizing resource mobilization perspectives at the expense of once-popular relative

deprivation theories (see Gurney and Neff, 1982). This development suggests a growing interest in explaining the means by which groups survive and evolve over a period of time, and indicates in part a diminished interest in questions about why sects first appear (Neal, 1970: 11; McCarthy and Zald, 1977: 1212). Certainly this shift also reflects the fact that some sects which arose in the 1960s and early 1970s have existed for a decade or more, and the limited motivational questions usually associated with relative deprivation theories have become outdated (Robbins, Anthony, and Richardson, 1978: 95-99).

In addition to the presumed limitations of their motivational questions, relative deprivation perspectives are falling into disfavour as the result of problems regarding their implementation and confirmation. Critics argue, for example, that relative deprivation cannot be determined unless evidence exists about pre-conversion attitudes of the members which reveal their sense of frustration, resentment, or "unfair" denial. It is just as likely, critics assert, that groups socialize their members to feel relatively deprived than it is that people either form groups or join them as attempts to alleviate their deprivation (Wallis, 1975: 360-361, 362). Moreover, critics point out that relative deprivation theories virtually ignore the dynamics of group organization, and thereby fail to explain how feelings of relative deprivation are

translated into collective action (Bromley and Shupe, 1979b: 19). Finally, when researchers tested relative deprivation theories by investigating the reasons why people joined established sects, relative deprivation could not explain most of the conversions (Wilson, 1978: 495-502; Beckford, 1975:152-153, 154-158; 1978: 110-113, 118).

These and other criticisms (see McCarthy and Zald, 1977: 1214-1216; Bromley and Shupe, 1979: 17-19; Hine, 1974: 651-656) are brought against relative deprivation theories as proof of their inadequacies, and are used to encourage the adoption of other perspectives. The most promising perspective to emerge as a replacement is concerned with groups' efforts to mobilize and utilize resources (McCarthy and Zald, 1977; Bromley and Shupe, 1979b; Zald and Ash, 1966; Zald and Berger, 1978). Briefly stated, this perspective emphasizes organizational analyses both as internal processes and as external processes in relation to society. Special attention is paid to methods by which a group procures and utilizes money and labour. Likewise, care is taken to identify both the assistance and the obstructions provided by non-members and their organizations (see Shupe and Bromley, 1979a). The level of discontent among members toward a given issue is no longer presumed to be the primary motivation for either the membership or the sympathetic non-members.

The utility of the resource mobilization perspective in the analysis of sectarian movements is great, especially

since it has heuristic value for as long as groups have resources at their disposal. Its frequent portrayal, however, as being incompatible with relative deprivation theories is overstated. Although most relative deprivation theories do share certain basic assumptions, they are quite diverse in content (Zygmunt, 1972: 450-451; Crosby, 1976: 88-89, forthcoming: 5-15), and these differences must be distinguished before judgement is passed on their analytic utility. Certain resource mobilization advocates have, for instance, focused too narrowly on the psychopathological elements of relative deprivation perspectives (Bromley and Shupe, 1979: 18-19, see also Bainbridge and Stark, 1979: 284-287), and ignored other attempts to identify the structural forces in society that generate widespread feelings of resentment and deprivation.

Moreover, resource mobilization advocates have frequently underutilized Denton Morrison's relative deprivation theory (Morrison, 1971)² which discusses the non-deprivational recruitment incentives used by a group after it has a core membership of initial adherents whose sense of relative deprivation is high. Morrison's theory assumes, along with resource mobilization theories, that a sense of deprivation varies among members of "power-oriented movements," (Morrison, 1971: 676) and that the analysis of "the costs and rewards of participation" (Bromley and Shupe, 1979b: 19) must be undertaken in order to understand the

conversion process. In addition, Morrison's discussion of the costs and benefits of movement membership not only invites the analysis of society's counterefforts against a group, but also calls attention to the process of social mobility and reward attainment within a group. Both of these perspectives also are crucial to resource mobilization theories.

This chapter will demonstrate the complementarity of Morrison's relative deprivation theory with the resource mobilization perspective presented by McCarthy, Zald, and others by undertaking a sociological analysis of the emergence and development of early Quakerism from 1652 to 1660. It will analyse the appearance of Quakerism as a relative deprivation group or social movement organization that opposed the state-supported tithe system in Interregnum England. It will show that many prominent Quakers felt, prior to their conversion, that the Puritans in power had denied their "legitimate" expectation regarding tithe-abolition. It also will reveal that this sense of deprivation was not only a major issue around which the group converted members, but also served as the group's resocialization goal for people who converted in response to recruitment incentives. In addition, it will suggest that many constituents supported Quakerism because of the group's stand against the state-supported tithing ministers and the tithe-receiving landed gentry. Finally, it will set the stage for the next chapter, which will demonstrate that the

way in which the group attempted to seek a structural solution to its relative deprivation largely determined the membership and activities of its countermovement.

The Interregnum Anti-Tithe Movement

If we follow McCarthy and Zald's definition of a social movement as "a set of opinions and beliefs in a population which represents preferences for changing some elements of the social structure and/or preferences for changing some elements of a society," (McCarthy and Zald, 1977: 1217-1218), then we see that a social movement against tithe payments flourished in Interregnum England (Watts, 1978: 146-150). Indeed, this social movement had a long history (James, 1941; C. Hill, 1956: ch. 5-6; Maclear, 1953, 1956), and the victory of the parliamentary army in the Civil War (August, 1648) set the stage for a fervent effort by several groups of political radicals and religious separatists³ to have tithes abolished (Manning, 1976: 291-292). Early in the Interregnum, two Parliaments, the Rump (December 6, 1648 to April 20, 1653) and the Nominated (July 4 to December 11, 1653)⁴, struggled over the question of tithe-support for the ministry, and while the former could not devise an acceptable financial alternative (Underdown, 1971: 271-272), the latter (or at least its radical members) worked so strenuously for tithe-abolition that parliamentary moderates dissolved their own assembly in order to prevent

such an extreme demand from becoming law (Fraser, 1973: 440-442; Watts, 1978: 148-151). Even the Instrument of Government (December 16, 1653 to May 25, 1657), which established Cromwell as the Protector (Roots, 1966: Ch. 19; Gardiner, 1906: 405-417), acknowledged the unpopularity of tithes but still refused to abolish them. It insisted that "as soon as may be, a provision less subject to scruple and contention [than tithes], be made for the encouragement and maintenance of able and painful teachers, for the instructing [of] the people." It added, however, that, "until such provision be made, the present maintenance shall not be taken away or impeached" (Section XXXV, in Gardiner, 1906: 416). The trouble with the clause was that no one could devise a politically and religiously acceptable alternative to them, so the system remained intact and the radicals' frustration grew.

Much was at stake in the debate over tithes, since the issue was explosive. The abolition of the tithe-system not only would have undermined the state's control over religion and reduced the income of wealthy impropiators (that is, laymen to whom tithes were owed), but it also would have eliminated the only means of support for many of the nation's ministers (unless of course some other means of support were to be found). To abolish tithes was to destroy a practice that was at the heart of England's system of religious, political, and social values. Despite these consequences, if not because of them, many parliamentary

soldiers during the Civil War believed that they were fighting to secure the right to freedom of conscience in Christian religious worship, and believed further that this freedom could occur only when preachers were financially supported by voluntary contributions from their approving parishes (Solt, 1959: 97-98).⁵

Viewing this social movement in sociological terms, we can say that a large segment of the population⁶ around the close of the Civil War, especially political and religious radicals, parliamentary soldiers, and farmers (Reay, 1980c: 55-72) experienced a rapid increase in their hopes for tithe-abolition, yet they were frustrated when, time and again, Oliver Cromwell (and later his son, Richard), members of parliament, and powerful generals in the army did not fulfill their expectations on the issue. Using Morrison's terminology, these people felt aspirational deprivation, since "the magnitude of aspiration [about tithe abolition] increase[d] to a much greater extent than opportunities for realizing the increased aspiration"⁷ (Morrison, 1971: 680; see Beckford, 1975: 153. Furthermore, this frustrated segment of the population felt that its expectations were "legitimate" ones (Morrison, 1971: 677-678), since tithe-abolition not only had been an important issue for the parliamentary army during the Civil War, but also had been central to the sectarians' demands for the right to liberty of conscience in matters of

religion.

A large number of Englishmen, therefore, felt the deprivation (Morrison, 1971: 684); and this deprivation only intensified hostility between the predominantly rural tithe-payers and sympathetic sectarians on the one side and ecclesiastical and civil authorities, impropiators and other wealthy land-owners on the other (James, 1941: 4-7). Broadly speaking, a fairly "high role and status commonality" (Morrison, 1971: 685) existed among tithe-payers who were "from the middling and the poorer sort, [since] the rich suffered comparatively little, and even [had been] recipients of tithes." (C. Hill, 1962: 164). Consequently, tithe-payers tended to have far less political power and social prestige than did the wealthy (see Morrison, 1971: 685); and these disparities heightened emotions in the tithe-controversy.

The Anti-Tithe Movement and the Beginnings of Quakerism

Quakerism first arose in the north of England among people who shared the aspirational deprivation over tithes and the state-supported church. Evidence for this claim need not be deduced from post-conversion statements by members, since abundant pre-conversion evidence exists in legal records about tithe resisters in the period immediately prior to Quakerism's emergence. This pre-conversion evidence has been summarized in two historical studies, one analysing pre-Quaker tithe resistance in

Lancashire (Blackwood, 1965) the other analysing pre-Quaker evidence from Somerset, Kent, Essex, Suffolk, and Cumberland (Reay, 1980b). The author of the more extensive of the two studies concludes that, "for many [people], Quakerism became not only (as Trevor-Roper has observed) 'the ghost of decreased Independency' but also a possible haven for those involved in anti-tithe activity in pre-Quaker days.... Many Quakers had had a background of anti-tithe activity" (Reay, 1980b: 100).⁸

The frequent transition from tithe-resister to Quaker occurred for several reasons. For one thing, Quakerism originated as a spontaneous outburst among radical Independent or Seeker groups that met in religious worship outside the pale of established churches and tithed ministers. Many of their members "had reached the Quaker experience [even] before [George] Fox came among them,"⁹ (Braithwaite, 1955: 60, 82), and the birth of Quakerism usually is dated from Fox's preaching successes in 1652 among Seeker groups in Westmorland and western Yorkshire. In Westmorland's Preston Patrick district, for example, the Seeker group had rejected the tithe system and worshiped under the direction of two lay ministers who received only voluntary contributions. Not only did these two lay ministers, John Audland and Francis Howgill, become important Quaker evangelists, but also members of their group and other Seeker groups in Northern England "formed

the central nucleus of the new [Quaker] movement" (Jones, 1932: 100; Nuttall, 1973: 160-161; Braithwaite, 1955: 82-86).

Applying Morrison's perspective, we can identify these groups as the "voluntary association activity" which provided Quakerism with "a residue of leadership and organizational skills that [were] crucial for getting [the social] movement off the ground" (Morrison, 1971: 685). It is possible to sharpen Morrison's terminology, however, by viewing Quakerism as a "social movement organization," a label that resource mobilization theorists have given to any "complex, or formal organization which identifies its goals with the preferences of a social movement or a countermovement and attempts to implement its goals" (McCarthy and Zald, 1977: 1218). Quakerism was a social movement organization within the popular anti-tithe social movement; and it emerged from, and continued to recruit among, an existing but loosely formed social movement organization, the Seekers. Quakerism inherited the Seekers' style of worship, borrowed their pattern of monthly regional meetings, imitated their efforts at poor relief and gained some of its influential evangelists and organizers from among their ranks.

In addition to the fact that Quakerism gained numerous tithe-resisters by recruiting among radical Independent and Seeker groups, Quakerism also attracted them because of its ideological assertions. Its religious

ideology provided tithe-resisters with a series of sanctified justifications for their refusal to contribute to the local ministers' (or local impropiators') upkeep. In general, Quakerism's ideological assertions support one of Morrison's theoretical claims, which he intended primarily for norm-oriented movements in comparatively open and democratic societies (Morrison, 1971: 677). He asserts that "the beliefs in structural blockage and structural solution [constitute] the major features of ideology of the movement" (Morrison, 1971: 684). Since Quakerism was, however, part of a value-oriented movement in a relatively closed and aristocratic society, (Stone, 1976), its ideological assertions often were expressed in religious language, as is common when a society's institutions and norms are "thoroughly integrated with a religious system."¹¹

The Social Origins of Religious Doctrines

Quakerism's central religious doctrine, for example, that there exists "the good and just principle of God in everyone," (Fox, 1661: 8, abridged in Barbour and Roberts, 1973: 43), provided the theoretical basis for the Quakers' attack on the Calvinistic predestinarian teaching of many of the tithed ministers (Barbour, 1964: 133-135). Quakers denied the ministers' power to marry them by establishing a

procedure whereby they solemnized their members' marriages in the presence of at least ten or twelve others, and then reported the event to local officials (Braithwaite, 1955: 144-146, 312-313, 315, 316-317). Similarly, the Quakers' refusal to do either hat-honour or verbal honour to persons of high social status (and justifying this by claiming to give honour to God alone [Fox, 1694a: 36]), was often scornfully directed against the judges and justices of the peace who, along with lawyers, persecuted them for their tithe resistance and sermon disruptions (Barbour, 1966: 165-166). Quakerism's claim of having reconstructed the Apostolic Church provided further support for tithe-resisters, since, according to the Quaker Anthony Pearson, the early Christians had rejected the Jewish tithe system. "[F]reely [the Apostles] preached the Gospel which they received," Pearson asserted, "and did not require any settled maintenance, but lived of[f] the free offerings and contributions of the Saints, who by their Ministry were turned to Christ Jesus" (P[earson], 1657: 3, see Pearson, 1654: 7; Fox, 1654: 6; Pain, 1655: 11-12). Likewise, Quakerism's personalistic eschatology and imminent millenarianism--its sense that Christ dwelt within the hearts of its members as a prelude to his physical return as worldly king (Dewbury, 1655: 1, 5, abridged in Barbour and Roberts, 1973: 95, 97; Watts, 1978: 207-208; Ball, 1975: 209)--initially provided Quakers with the spiritual strength to suffer the punishments that inevitably befell them for

their tithe resistance and related activities (Watkins, 1972: 169-170). Finally, the Quakers' insistence on dressing plainly and simply, without lace or other frills, revealed their scorn for the "pride" of the wealthy (Gummere, 1901: 18), who as a group usually favoured the continuation of the tithe system and its ministers (C. Hill, 1962: 164). While it is true that each of the Quakers' religious tenets had long religious precedents within English society, each of them contributed to the Quakers' protest against tithe-payment and mandatory ministerial support in the 1650s.

Not all persons who converted to Quakerism did so because of its anti-tithe posture; yet all converts were expected to demonstrate their opposition to the tithe-supported ministry. Many people, for example, converted to Quakerism because of its numerous healing "miracles" (Thomas, 1971: 127; see Cadbury, 1948). Others converted because Quakerism's doctrine of spiritual certainty offered a haven from long and anguished religious struggles against sin (Vann, 1969b: 22-24; Watkins, 1972: 161-169) and sexual urges (Watts, 1978: 187; Delany, 1969: 59, 61). General Baptists, who were predisposed to Quakerism's anti-tithe position (Lumpkin, 1959: 184; Watts, 1978: 146-149), converted either as a reaction against a growing Baptist literalism, legalism, and ceremonialism or as a rejection of the salvific claims for the baptism ritual itself (Watts,

1978: 205-207, 203).

Healings, claims of spiritual certainty, anti-ceremonialism, and anti-sacramentalism were, therefore, important "purposive" recruitment incentives¹³ for joining the group, and these incentives had no direct connection to the group's stand against tithe-payment. As Morrison predicts (1971: 686), these incentives helped attract people to Quakerism by offsetting the high personal costs of joining (which included financial expenses, time commitments, persecution alienation from family and friends, etc.). They also became part of Quakerism's compensations for worldly sufferings and present distress.

After they had converted, however, new members felt compelled to harass ministers of tithe-paying churches (see Bernstein, 1895b: 230-231). Their verbal attacks on ministers, which often led to violent encounters with congregations, became "an essential ritual that had to be performed to prove to themselves, their colleagues, and God the genuineness of their dedication and faith..." (Spurrier, 1976: 7). Even if members had not joined Quakerism because of its anti-tithe stand, still they were rapidly socialized into placing both symbolic value and intra-group status on ministerial harangues and related activities. It is possible to view the Quakers' resocialization of members who had joined for reasons other than aspirational deprivation over tithe abolition as an attempt to instill in them feelings of deprivation over the issue. Members' public

demonstrations against tithe-supported ministers became not only an important group ritual, but also a means by which individual members both "proved" their faith to themselves and others, and gained status within the group.

Quakerism and Radical Frustration

It seems unlikely, however, that many people joined Quakerism without knowing that membership involved active opposition to tithes. Their tithe hostility and anti-ministerial attacks were too persistent and too notorious to be overlooked. Furthermore, they published a barrage of anti-tithe pamphlets that were directed to Interregnum parliaments and government figures which attracted considerable attention. These pamphlets reveal the expectations that many Quakers, especially former Parliamentary army members,¹⁴ had held in previous years regarding social and religious reforms, and the subsequent frustration and resentment that they now felt toward the Puritans who refused to implement them.¹⁵

James Nayler's [1618?-1660) proclamation of late November, 1653,¹⁶ is typical of these pamphlets, especially since he was an eight- or nine-year Parliamentary army veteran. Like most seventeenth century booklets, it carried a long but descriptive title: A Lamentacion...over the Ruines of this oppressed Nacion, to be deeply layd to heart by Parliament and Army.... Nayler had intended that all

members of the Nominated Parliament would receive a copy of it, but Cromwell dissolved the body (December, 11, 1653) before it was printed. His disgruntlement and resentful frustration with the Puritan parliamentarians is clear from the very first line. "Oh England," he exclaimed, "how is thy expectation failed now after all thy travails? [T]he People to whom Oppression and Unrighteousness hath been a Burden, have long waited for Deliverance, from one year to another, but none comes, from one sort of men to another" (Nayler, 1653: 3). One of the continuing oppressions that "Godly" people like the Quakers suffered, Nayler charged, was tithe-payment, and their opposition to it was, they believed, a simple Christian act. "Some of [the Quakers] are moved to go into the Idols Temples," Nayler argued in colourful Biblical language, "to dispute and reason with them who upheld the Idol Worship, and to call the People out of it, unto the worship in Spirit; and though this seem[s] a heinous thing to you, yet it was the practice of the Apostles and Saints as is plain in Scripture" (Nayler, 1654: 5).

In 1656, a former parliamentary soldier who converted to Quakerism, George Fox the Younger (d.1661, and called "the Younger" so as not to confuse him with his famous namesake), wrote an articulate and concise tract to "the Officers and Soldiers of the Armies in England, Scotland and Ireland." In it he described himself as one "who for several yeers [sic] was amongst you, and had a great zeal (as some

of you once had) against Tyrants and unjust Laws" (Fox the Younger, 1656: 16). This work epitomizes the Interregnum Quakers' interpretation of the initial motives of the Civil War's parliamentary supporters, and the subsequent resentment that they now felt over the Puritans' failure to institute a number of reforms, especially tithe-abolition. Fox the Younger began with a reiteration of the godliness of the parliamentary soldiers and their cause:

Remember, how at the beginning of the late Wars in these Nations, that many of you were of the lowest of the people according to the accompt [i.e., account] of men, and were poor and contemptible in the eyes of your Enemies....But I bear you Record that then many of you had a zeal for God and against his enemies... (Fox the Younger, 1656: 10).

One of the most oppressive enemies of the godly was the tithe-receiving ministers:

and...some of you were come so far as to see the Priests [i.e., the tithing ministers] to be enemies to the truth, and such as deceived the people, and your zeal waxed hot against them and their Idolatry....[A]nd you saw that the Priests laid heavy burthens [i.e., burdens] upon the people, and oppressed them greatly in forceing [sic] them by an unjust Law to give them the tenth of their labours...(Fox the Younger, 1656: 10).

The godly soldiers promised both God and the people that if they were victorious they would then abolish tithes and other oppressions. For this reason, many people supported them:

And then you promised and vowed unto God if he would deliver your Enemies...into your hands, that then you would take off that great Oppression which by unjust Laws were laid and continued upon the people....These things you promised and engaged to do, and you caused many people to engage to be true unto you, and to

stand firm with you, that so you might recover their Liberties & outward Rights, and bring them out of bondage in which they were (then) held captives by their Enemies; and upon this Accompt the people furnished you with money & weapons to war against their oppressors...(Fox the Younger, 1656: 10-11).

Now that they had won, however, the parliamentary soldiers had failed to keep their promises:

But now the love of the Lord unto you & the day of your distresse by you is forgotten; and your vows and promises which you made unto God and man are neglected by you, for as great or greater oppression and burthens yet remain upon the people as was then...(Fox the Younger, 1656: 11).

The reason that they had reneged upon their promises was because they had succumbed to their own lusts and personal desires:

that simplicity and tenderness that was once in some of you, is destroyed and murdered by the lusts of the flesh which is highly exalted in you, and that zeal (that was once in some of you for God, and against his enemies, and those unjust Laws which by them were made and upheld) is now lost...(Fox the Younger, 1656: 12).

The soldiers were called upon to repent in their hearts for their unrighteousness, and their repentance would lead them to immediately institute the social reforms, such as tithe-abolition, that they had promised:

So come down to the Light of Christ in all your consciences...and with it search your hearts and trie your waies, and it will shew you your backslidings and the evil of your doings; and repent speedilie and do your first wor[d]s, and return to your integretie, and do violence to no man...(Fox the Younger, 1656: 14).

If however, the soldiers refused to repent, then (in a typical statement of the Quakers' resentment) God would smite them down:

But if you refuse to return unto the Lord...and pay your vows to him: Verily the living God will arise and set free the oppressed, and destroy their oppressors...., and he will cast you off, and by his own power will he bring you down and destroy you and root you out (Fox the Younger, 1656: 14-15).

A similar tone of disappointed hopes appears in an anonymous Quaker tract from 1658 entitled To the Generals and Captains, Officers, and Souldiers of this preent Army.... The authors referred to themselves as "The Faithful Friends of this Common-wealth, and well-wishers for the Peace and good Government thereof, who have undergone many great Battels (with you) for the purchasing [of] Peace and Freedom in the Temporal and Spiritual liberties in body and Spirit..." (Anonymous, 1658: 1). They went on to lament:

what oppression by Tithes, and what oppression in the Laws doth abound, what oppressions are there abounding through the Lawyers, and through unjust Judges? Even the whole land mourns under it, and was was it not in your hearts once to have Corrected and Regulated these things (Anonymous, 1658: 5).

Interregnum Governments and Tithe Support

As these three typical tracts demonstrate, Quakers continuously demanded that prominent political and military leaders abolish tithes in accordance with (the Quakers felt) promises that the Puritans had made during the Civil War. Up until the politically tumultuous year of 1659, however, their demands fell on deaf, if not hostile, ears. The First Interregnum Parliament to meet under the Instrument

(September 3, 1654 to January 22, 1655), was openly hostile to the new political arrangement, including the broad religious toleration that the Instrument guaranteed to all Christians who were not "Papists", Anglicans, peacebreakers, practitioners of licentiousness [Section XXXVII, reprinted in Gardiner, 1906: 416]). Its hostility to toleration coupled with its persistent attack on the power that was granted to the Protector caused Cromwell to dissolve it on the very first day that he could within the law--five lunar months after it convened (Roots, 1966: 184-189). In August, 1655 Cromwell divided England and Wales into ten (soon eleven) administrative districts, each one under the control of a major-general from the army, and since part of their responsibilities involved helping to maintain general order, they constantly had to deal with the social problems caused by Quakers who interrupted sermons and harranged ministers (See Braithwaite, 1955: 447-450; Roots, 1966: 193-194). The Second Protectorate Parliament (September 17, 1656 to February 4, 1658) was openly aggressive toward the Instrument's religious toleration, and it vented its anger on the Quaker, James Nayler, who was brought before it on charges of blasphemy. On October, 24, 1656 Nayler had ridden into Bristol, Christ-like, on a donkey with several women signing "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth" (Braithwaite, 1955: ch. 11; Nuttall, 1954). Escaping Parliament's death penalty by a mere eight votes (Braithwaite, 1955: 262), he nonetheless was sentenced to be

whipped twice, branded on the forehead ("b" for blasphemer), bored through the tongue with a hot iron, and then imprisoned indefinitely. Needless to say, this Parliament was not one to consider the question of abolishing tithes. Hostility toward the Quakers continued to mount, and a section in the new government "constitution" of May 25, 1657 (entitled The Humble Petition and Advice) contained a clause that almost certainly was directed against their practice of interrupting tithe-receiving ministers who were giving sermons (Section 10, reprinted in Gardiner, 1906: 454). Sixteen months after the Humble Petition and Advice took effect, however, the entire political situation in the country changed: on September 3, 1658, Oliver Cromwell died.

After his death, the political situation deteriorated. Richard Cromwell (1626-1712) assumed the position of Protector, but, lacking the army-support that his father enjoyed, he was forced to resign less than a year later (April 22, 1659). The army, in an attempt to establish some political stability, reconstituted the Rump of the Long Parliament on May 7. The religious radicals, including the Quakers, were jubilant, since they now believed that their goals of tithe-abolition, religious toleration, and law reform finally would be implemented. When it appeared, therefore, to the Quakers that the Restored Rump might eliminate mandatory tithe payment, they acted with impunity. Making use of the group's extensive national network, two

Quakers, Thomas Moore and Gerrard Roberts, organized and submitted to Parliament a list of justices of the peace who persecuted Friends (often of course for tithe resistance), plus lists of Quakers and non-Quaker moderates who were willing to replace them (Braithwaite, 1955: 400; Reay, 1978: 197-198). Moreover, by 27 June Quakers from at least six counties had collected an anti-tithe petition with 15,000 signatures and were presenting it to Parliament. Less than a month later, Quakers presented Parliament with a second anti-tithe petition, this one containing 7,000 signatures that had been collected by Quaker women (Braithwaite, 1955: 456-458).

All of these efforts, however, came to naught, as the Rump chose to court the more numerous and more influential Presbyterians (which, by the way, it did unsuccessfully) rather than the Quakers and other radical sectarians (Reay, 1978: 197-198). On the very day that the largest of the two Quaker petitions was received in the House, the Rump voted, albeit with many dissenters, in favour of maintaining tithes (Reay, 1978: 198). By mid-October, the restored Rump, too, found itself abolished by the army, and the political situation continued to deteriorate. Stability was restored only with Charles II's (1630-1685) return to England as King on May 25, 1660, but the throne's restoration marked the elimination of any realistic chance that the Quakers' reformist aspirations might be realized.

Quakerism's political activities demonstrate a clear

connection between the aspirations concerning tithe abolition of its first members in the beginning of the 1650s and the group's ideological stand on the same issue at the end of the 1650s. Quaker ideology, therefore, in part reflected its members' sense of deprivation over frustrated aspirations (see Aberle, 1970: 212). Furthermore, many people converted to Quakerism because of its ideological stand against tithes. While aspirational deprivation of this kind is never sufficient by itself to explain the appearance of a sectarian group, it could easily be placed within a "value-added scheme," as Smelser sketches, and thereby become the "structural strain" component which not only contributes to a sect's emergence, but also, as Morrison and others suggest, provides the group with an ideology and recruitment incentive (Morrison, 1971: 684; Aberle, 1970: 213; Worsley, 1968: 225-226; Smelser, 1962: 23-46, 313-387). If a society is both "conducive" to collective activity and unable or unwilling to suppress it, then aspirational deprivation can be the necessary condition of "structural strain" around which people "mobilize" in an effort to seek redress, compensation, or revenge (see Smelser, 1962: 12-22).

Quakerism's Anti-Tithe Constituents

Having established the role of aspirational deprivation in the formation and ideological development of

Quakerism, we also can see its effects in attracting constituents (and in the next chapter, breeding opponents). Constituents "are those [persons] providing resources for [a social movement organization]" (McCarthy and Zald, 1977: 1221), and at least some of Quakerism's constituents supported the social movement because they sympathized with its anti-tithe activities. Colonel William West, for example, had been one of the radicals in the Barebones Parliament who voted for the abolition of tithes (Braithwaite, 1955: 119 and nn.), and as a Lancashire justice of the peace during the Interregnum he intervened several times on George Fox's behalf in 1652 to prevent his imprisonment (Fox, 1694a: 136, 139-40). Also in that year he entertained prominent Quakers in his home (Fox, 1694a: 141, 148).¹⁶ Captain John Herring, another former radical in the Barebones Parliament, allowed Quakers in 1654 to hold meetings in his Hereford house (Braithwaite, 1955: 168n.2). Robert Minter, a former tithe resister in Kent, also held Quaker meetings in his home, and wrote an anti-tithe tract in 1657 (Reay, 1980b: 102-103). In the same vein, Henry Lovor of Yeovil, Somersetshire, combined a scathing attack against tithes and the ministers that they supported with a defence of the Quakers and their anti-tithe activities, which he published in 1657 (Lovor, 1657). Henry Marten, the radical "gentleman" who helped the Levellers write their famous December, 1648 pamphlet, [The Second] Agreement of the People, that included a demand for tithe-abolition

(Lilburne in Woodhouse, 1938: 348, 365, see Williams, 1978a: 121), penned (but never published) a defense of the Quakers in 1655. In it he alluded favourably to their opposition to tithe-receiving ministers (reproduced in Williams, 1978b: 132 and n.17, 133 and n.21).¹⁷ Henry Stubbe [Stubbs, or Stubbes], a radical Independent who had served in the Parliamentary army, attacked the Presbyterians and their tithe-receiving ministers in 1659, and at the same time praised the Quakers' demand for voluntary contributions. He even singled out the Quakers as "Patriots" of the Commonwealth and its principles (Jacob, 1983: 36-40). Quakers were the most prominent anti-tithe opponents of the Interregnum, and their vocal and visible position won them sympathy and support from persons who shared their hopes.

In addition to the examples of tithe-opponents who became constituents of the Quakers, numerous cases exist of community members who provided resources in the form of money, labour, or community pressure against ministers for Quakers who suffered punishment as a result of tithe resistance. In 1657, for example, a Bedfordshire minister was forced by community pressure to return goods that he had seized from a Quaker for tithe payment refusal. Occasionally impropiators had trouble laying their tithe claims against Quakers because none of the Quakers' neighbors would testify about the amount of agricultural yield that Quaker farms produced. Wiltshire and Somerset

records reveal that neighbors often warned tithe-resisting Quakers of approaching constables, and accounts from the Restoration period (post-1660) show that neighbors occasionally "borrowed" particular items or animals in order to protect them from being confiscated (Reay, 1980b: 113, Anderson, 1977: 258-259). Community and social bonds tied these neighbors together, and these bonds help to explain why some people assisted persecuted Quakers. It nonetheless is true that quite a few of these supporting community members were "potential beneficiaries" (McCarthy and Zald, 1977: 1221) of Quakerism's desired goal accomplishment, and that support for persecuted Quakers indicated support of their goal.

Conclusion

The history of Interregnum Quakerism is rich with implications for sociological theory that addresses itself to the origins and development of social movement organizations, particularly religious sectarian ones. Using Quakerism, I have demonstrated that "resentment," spoken of in the form of relative deprivation theory, can be compatible with resource mobilization theory. It can explain for resource mobilization theory not only the motive which, in combination with other factors, initiates the formation of a sect, but also the logic underlying a sect's ideological assertions and public activities. In addition, the chapter has suggested that the espoused deprivationist

goals of a social movement organization may significantly determine who its constituents will be. (In the next chapter, I will extend this argument by showing how a social movement organization's goals may significantly determine who its opponents will be.)

It no longer seems wise, therefore, to insist, as some resource mobilization theorists have, that resource mobilization theory is incompatible with relative deprivation theory. Despite their disclaimer that "recent empirical work...has led us to doubt the assumption of a close link between pre-existing discontent and generalized beliefs in the rise of social movement phenomena," (McCarthy and Zald, 1977: 1214; Bromley and Shupe, 1979b: 17-19), McCarthy and Zald's formulation of resource mobilization assumptions allows for the possibility that relative deprivation can be the basis for social movements and social movement organizations. Their statement that "social movements may or may not be based upon the grievances of the presumed beneficiaries" (McCarthy and Zald, 1977: 1216) is cautiously wise, since it entertains, even invites, the use of non-deprivationist approaches to explain the appearance of various movements and groups. This formulation also should suggest, however, that relative deprivation theory can be embraced by resource mobilization theory when it can be demonstrated that a social movement or a social movement organization is based upon the grievances of presumed

beneficiaries.

All social movement organizations must attempt to mobilize their resources toward goals regardless of the reasons that cause the groups to form. Resource mobilization theory provides the most promising conceptual framework in which to analyse this mobilization process. It does not, however, provide an adequate discussion of the motives for the initial formation of particular groups, nor for their subsequent ideological positions. In some instances, as with the early Quakers, a relative deprivation theory such as Morrison's provides the necessary theoretical complement.

CHAPTER FOUR: QUAKERISM AND THE FEAR OF SUBVERSION

Introduction

Just as the Quakers mobilized their resources to achieve their intensely held goal of tithe-abolition, so too did the receivers of tithes mobilize their talents, time, and money to block the Quakers in their efforts. Coinciding, therefore, with the persistent anti-tithe campaign waged by the Quakers was a reentless anti-Quaker effort to suppress them and prevent them from achieving success. The Quakers' success would come only at the expense of tithe-receiving ministers and landed gentry, but these groups were determined to see that this would not happen.

Using concepts from relative deprivation theory to view this conflict, we can say that Puritan ministers and landed gentry felt "decremental deprivation" with regard to the possible abolition of tithes. Morrison defines "decremental deprivation" as the feeling that results when opportunities suddenly decline faster than do the aspirations regarding a particular goal (Morrison, 1971: 680), and he indicates that this feeling is likely to result when, for example, "social, institutional, or legal changes take opportunities away" (1971: 680).¹ Since we also know that people can feel relatively deprived when they compare their present situations to their appraisals of their future

states (Aberle, 1970: 209), then Morrison's description of decremental deprivation captures the feelings of Interregnum tithe-receivers about what they feared would happen to them if the Quakers and other radicals achieved their goal of destroying the tithe-system. In the previous chapter I argued that Quakerism must be seen as part of an anti-tithe social movement within Interregnum England. In this chapter I take the complementary perspective that many tithe-receipients were part of an anti-Quaker/ pro-tithe social movement.

As is common in social disputes, each side in the tithe-controversy published tracts to explain its positions and discredit its opponents. The tone of this propaganda was bitter, with each party outdoing the other in name-calling and invective (see Braithwaite, 1955: 284). One of the most surprising charges, however, that the Quakers' opponents threw at them was that they were Catholics in disguise who harboured the intention of politically and socially subverting the country. The accusation was, of course, false, and not only did the Quakers consistently deny it, but also they hurled it back themselves by referring to all tithe-receiving ministers as "priests." Nevertheless, the anti-Quaker charge of "Popery" continued to appear in Interregnum books and pamphlets that were hostile to the group, and it had damaging consequences.

While the "Papist" attacks against the Quakers provide a vivid illustration of the social tensions within

seventeenth century England, analogous charges of subversion against religious groups have appeared in other historical and cultural periods. It is instructive to look at these charges and the social conditions which generated them, since by doing so the Interregnum fear of Popery becomes an example of a recurrent pattern of social fear. In the first part of the nineteenth century, for example, a virulent campaign flourished in the United States against the Mormons, the Catholics, and the Freemasons on the unfounded grounds that "Freemasons had infiltrated the government and had seized control of the courts,...Mormons were undermining political and economic freedom in the West, and...Roman Catholic priests, receiving instructions from Rome, had made frightening progress in a plot to subject the nation to popish despotism" (Davis, 1960: 205). With hindsight we now understand that these groups:

were seen to embody those traits that were precise antitheses of American ideals. The subversive [groups] were] essentially an inverted image of Jacksonian democracy and the cult of the common man; as such [they] not only challenged the dominant values but stimulated those suppressed needs and yearnings that are fulfilled in a mobile, rootless, and individualistic society (Davis, 1960: 208).

More recently Harvey Cox has identified what he calls "the subversion myth" regarding the new religious groups. "Sometimes these [groups] are seen as mainly religious fronts for politically subversive movements, or as movements that will endanger civil authority" (Cox, 1978: 126). In a related interpretation, Robbins and Anthony (1980: 90) argue

that "a crisis in American civil religion...forms the context for both the proliferation of cults as well as the growth of anticult demonology." Finally, in a related argument, Shupe, Spielmann and Stigall (1977: 942) "compare the phenomena of commitment to marginal religions and the deprogramming of persons so committed to demonic possession and exorcism." Shared by all of these interpretations is the belief that stereotyping and persecution occurs of many unorthodox or new religious groups occurs because they accentuate crises in existing societal values.

The anti-Quaker accusations of Catholic subversion have, therefore, historical parallels, and I will point to them as I identify the particular "Papist" charges that opponents brought against the Quakers. To supplement this approach, I will also examine the manner in which these attacks against the Quakers contributed to the mobilization of Quakerism's opponents. The discussion will make a contribution to the development of sociological theory on the use of subversive propaganda in counter-movement mobilization efforts against new and deviant religious groups, as well as shed light on a rarely explored aspect of Interregnum history.

Fear of Catholicism and its Social Setting

Begetting the Civil War and witnessing the execution

of the King in late January, 1648/9, the 1640s was a period of heightened political emotionalism in England. The country was embroiled in events whose causes were beyond the comprehension of most of its citizens, and, under these circumstances, political scapegoating provided simple answers to not-so-simple questions. A frequent scapegoat was Roman Catholicism, since for decades Protestants had been reared in a religious climate of anti-Catholic hostility and fear. Whatever the particular crisis, whether the outbreak of the Civil War (1640) or the beheading of Charles, its root was found by various Protestant writers to be "Popery" (see Clifton, 1971, 1973; Manning 1976: ch. 2; Lindley, 1973).

Events of the 1650s further provided Protestants, especially Puritans, with reasons to make Roman Catholicism a scapegoat. In an atmosphere of political confusion and Cromwellian "toleration," numerous sectarian movements burst onto the scene with such impact that the very foundation of the country's religious and social life seemed threatened. The Interregnum Protestants saw the sectarians as subversives who advanced the Catholic intention of destroying Protestant England.² Of the emerging sectarian groups, none was more visible nor more hostile to other Puritans than Quakerism, and the "Papist" charges against it appeared soon after the group began vigorously to recruit new members to its anti-tithe cause. Many prominent anti-Quaker pamphleteers saw the new sect within the context of

the Catholic fear of the age, and they were able to interpret the group's beliefs, practices and social consequences within this pervasive paranoia.

One way to view the Interregnum charges of "Popery" against the Quakers is to see the attacks as part of a sequence of fear that dates back at least to the Civil War. This sequence is illustrated by the virulent anti-Catholic barrages of the famous lawyer, M.P., Puritan controversialist, and Presbyterian sympathizer, William Prynne (see Lamont, 1963; D. N.B.). When Prynne, in 1643, wrote about the cause of the Civil War, he blamed the conflagration on the King's attempt to maintain Roman Catholicism (Lamont, 1963: 108). By the latter part of the Civil War, however, Prynne had come to see the subversive Catholic threat within the very heart of the restless Parliamentary army itself (Miller, 1973: 85). By the middle of the Interregnum, the seditious Catholic threat now existed for Prynne in the activities of the Quakers. In his words, Quakers were "but the Spawn of Romish Frogs, Jesuites, and Franciscan Fryers, sent from Rome to seduce the intoxicated Ciddy-headed English Nation" (1655: title page). The Jesuits and Franciscans, he claimed, were using the Quakers and the other Sectarians to destroy the nation by dividing and fragmenting it. "The Romish Emissaries and Vermin," who were the Quakers' "chief Speakers and Rulers," had set out "to reduce and divide the people by setting up

New Sects and Separate Congregations in all places, and broaching new Notions and opinions of all Sorts, or old Heresies or Blasphemies..." (1655: 9).

Prynne, in later tracts, pressed forward with his Papist charges against the Quakers, and these charges received support by other prominent Puritans who both cited him and provided additional "evidence." Many Puritans would also have agreed with Prynne's further charges in 1655. "There are multitudes of Romish emissaries and Vermin now residing and wandering up and down freely among us," he warned the nation. These emissaries entered the country under a number of disguises--"Souldiers, Merchants, Mechanicks, Physicians, Chyrurgions, Travelers, Exiles for Religion, and pretended Converts to the Protestant Religion"--but their single purpose was "to spread their doctrines, that will divide the country so that it will destroy itself out of mutual discord" (Prynne, 1655: 4). Toward this destructive end, "Papists" adopted the most devious means, and even posed as "the most zealous Protestants" by passing harsh laws against Catholics. They took such hard stands against their own members in order that they could manoeuvre themselves into high places, from which they might "propigate the Popish Religion upon all occasions..." (Prynne, 1655: 25-26).³ These arguments, by the way, parallel ones that appeared almost two hundred years later in the American nativistic movement, in which nativists believed that "subversives would cunningly profess

to believe in freedom and toleration of dissent as long as they remained a powerless minority" (Davis, 1960: 211).

In Prynne's claims we see a Catholic conspiracy theory on a grand scale, yet it was a theory whose components had some basis in still-recent history. In Elizabethan England, Jesuits and other Catholic groups undertook ambitious missionary campaigns, and initially experienced some success in their conversion efforts. All of these early missionaries had the same goal in mind: to keep the Catholic religion alive until the government returned to Catholic hands. Even after the 1620s, when the missionaries accepted their plight as a permanent minority sect, Protestants still feared them as potential and potent subversives (Basset, 1967: 28, 36-40). Indeed, as Prynne claimed, Jesuits and priests were in the country during the Interregnum, but because no Protestants knew how many there really were, imaginations ran wild. We now know, however, that nearly four hundred missionary priests were in the country in 1660, among them Jesuits, Benedictines, and Franciscans (Bossy, 1976: 422, see 19--224; Thaddeus, 1898: 56-7, 62-73, 75-78; see Foley, 1875-1883).

William Prynne and Richard Baxter

Many Interregnum Protestants staunchly believed that Catholics had as a major goal the destruction of the English state. Protestants worried that Catholics would attempt to

achieve this goal by any means at their disposal, including regicide, a Spanish invasion, infiltration of the court, or disruption and division of the society (Clifton, 1973: 149-157). Nothing during the Interregnum was as disruptive, Prynne and others believed, as the activities of the Sectarians, and no group was as disruptive as Quakerism with its vehement attack on tithes, the state-supported ministry, and the gentry. Therefore, Prynne and others reasoned, the Quakers were Papists, or at the very least were infiltrated by Catholic missionaries. Richard Baxter, the well known Kidderminster preacher, agreed, and his major sources for Catholic evidence against the Quakers were (aside from his own paranoid imagination) Prynne's writings (Lamont, 1979: 184-185; 1980: 290). The country, he observed, was filled with "young raw Professors"--young men publically professing their faith--who were coming "to despise their Teachers" (that is, their pastors). The "Papists seeing the temper of our foresaid unsettled Professors do creep in among them, and use their utmost skill to unsettle them more." They had infiltrated the leadership of the Separatists, the Anabaptists, and the Quakers, and had done so with the greatest cunning. They would, for instance, "cry out against the Pope, and call all that differ from them Antichristian, purposefully to divert suspicions and blinde men's eyes." They were so successful in their wiles "that the silly people never know that it is Papists that are their Leaders." Their goal was clear: "the Destruction

of our Churches" (Baxter, 1656: C^v -C^r2), and he himself had been harranged in front of his congregation by zealous Quakers (Braithwaite, 1955: 194-195).⁴

To support their claim that Quakers were Papists, Prynne, Baxter, and others cited evidence of many different kinds. Several authors, including the Bristol Presbyterian vicar, Ralph Farmer, imputed Popish guilt to Quakers because the group's leaders and travelling ministers originated from "those Northern Counties"--particularly Lancashire and Westmorland--that were "famouse for Papists and Witches" (Farmer, 1655: 77; see Prynne, 1656: 5, see 9; Prynne, 1655: 36-37). From their Northern starting points, the Quaker missionaries travelled "into other quarters of the Kingdom, two by two, at first; no doubt by the direction of their Popish Provincial, just as the Franciscan Friars are sent out by their Provincial"⁵ (Prynne, 1656: 5).

Sworn Testimonies

While their northern origins and travelling partnerships implied their Popish roots, several sworn testimonies by informed persons "proved" it. In 1655 Prynne published the 22 January 1654/5 testimony (reprinted in Penney, 1911: 150-151) of a Bristol ironmonger, George Cowlshaw [or Cowlithay], who in September 1654, had learned from a Franciscan Irishman that members of his order were now "chief speakers amongst the Quakers in London...." The

Franciscan, whose name was Coppinger, had spoken in London Quaker meetings about thirty times, and had been well received. Furthermore, he even was able to predict that some Quakers would come to Bristol in three weeks or a month, an event that happened as predicted, Cowlshaw claimed. The fact that a Franciscan was able to predict when Quakers first would arrive in the city was proof that "generals and superiors" of the "Romish Emmissaries" were in London and were directing their missionary work (Prynne, 1655: 3-5). Prynne defended the veracity of the sworn testimony he had cited even after the travelling Quaker minister, John Audland, had attempted to show that the information in it was false (Audland, 1655: 7-13; quoted in Prynne, 1655, see 34-36).⁶ In responding to Audland, the clever Prynne was able to turn each of the Quaker's denials against him, and as a result Prynne maintained the upper hand in the dispute. The Cowlshaw story was so convincing that the Cambridge librarian and vicar of Caldecote, Thomas Smith, referred to it (and Prynne's book by name) in a 1659 anti-Quaker tract (Smith, 1659: sec.1, no.50). Baxter also referred to Prynne's citation of it, but then thought it important enough to quote the testimony in full (Baxter, 1656: C.3ff.). Joshua Miller, the Rector of St. Andrew's in Glamorganshire, Wales, reproduced it as well (Miller, 1655: 31).

In a second work, published in 1656, Prynne related another account that linked the Quakers with the

Franciscans. A gentleman named Charles Chester recently had arrived in Bristol from "Marcelles" (that is, Marseille), France, and related a story to some "persons of credit" in the city about his encounter with two Franciscan Capuchin Friars. (These "persons of credit" in turn had told Prynne.) The friars had informed Chester that recently they had been in England. They said that they had gone "under the name of North Country men (as the Ringleaders of the Quakers all do) but in truth they were Irish-men born," and "intended to return shortly to England again." While in Bristol the friars had been "very well acquainted" with some of "the principal Male and Female Quakers" of the city. Chester, apparently after his return to England, had actually heard the monks speak to the assembled Quakers at one of the latter's Bristol meetings (Prynne, 1656: 9).

Oath Refusal

Prynne "showed" that Quakers were Papists by referring to stories and sworn oaths; Thomas Smith, taking a complementary approach, "proved" that Quakers were Papists on the basis of their refusal to swear oaths to the contrary. Arguing syllogistically in a public bebate with two prominent Quakers, George Whitehead and George Fox, Smith reasoned: "He who refuseth the oath of abjuration is a Papist. He who wrote this book [Fox's Ismael and his Mother cast out] refuseth to take the oath of abjuration.

Therefore, he who writ this book is a papist" (Smith, 1659b: n. pag. [2nd and 3rd unnumbered pp. of the dispute]; see 1659c: 16; Fowler and Ford, 1656: 16).⁸

Disruptive Behaviour as Proof of Popery

On the basis of geographical evidence, sworn testimony, and oath-refusal, Prynne, Baxter, and Smith were convinced that Quakers were Papists. They perceived additional proof in the Quakers' hostile and disruptive behaviour, especially to tithing ministers.⁹ Many of the arguments followed similar lines: Papists opposed Protestant ministers; Quakers opposed Protestant ministers; therefore, Quakers were Papists. William Brownsword, vicar of Kendal from 1659 to 1672, who had been abused by Quakers, complained: "They use the vilest language they can invent against us, deny our Calling, say we come from Rome, Had no Church before Henry the eighth, that others may do the work of the Ministry as well as we, even women. Papists say the same..." (Brownsword, 1660: 6). Later in the same work he continued the argument:

They are not only opposers of some Ministers...but of all the Protestant Churches, and the very Protestant cause; so that what hath been vainly attempted by Antichrist, is their very designe; which, if accomplished, do but think how Papists would rejoyce in it, and what advantage that Church would have by it (Brownsword, 1660: 11).

The Quakers, he claimed, even would agree with the Papists' assessment that the Protestant rite of communion was a "profane" sacrament, "void of...all Grace..." (Brownsword,

1660: 5; see Baxter, 1656: C.3^v; Prynne, 1655: 27, 34; Emmot, 1655: 13). To Christopher Feake and his two other Fifth Monarchist co-authors, the Quakers' hostility to Presbyterians, Independents, and Anabaptists was the result of an association with "the Romish Antichrist" (that is, the Pope [Feake, Simpson, and Cokayn, 1653: 27]). Joshua Miller wrote against the Quakers in the same spirit as did Prynne and Feake. "Seeing [that the Quakers] are against all ministers as Antichristian," Miller asserted, "the Pope laughs in his sleeve...., for he hath told them so.... [T]he Church of Rome denies any Gospel Ministry in England; therefore, the Pope and the Quakers in this agree" (Miller, 1655: 30).¹⁰

Popery and Quaker Doctrines

Quakers "demonstrated" their Papist ties, not only by their attacks on the Protestant ministry, but also by the doctrines they espoused and the principles they followed.

Their rejection of predestination was a clear sign of their Popery. "Quakers affirm," William Brownsword wrote, "That there is no absolute Degree of Election and Reprobation from eternity....Papists affirm, the same [doctrine]" Brownsword, 1660: 5). Earlier he said that "Papists affirm...That the righteousness whereby we are justified, is a real inherent righteousness within us....The Grace we have is...a Divine Quality inherent in the soul...." (Brownsword, 1660: 6). A

Catholic writer, Baily, he said, "scoffs at Calvin's and the Protestant's (as the Quakers do) Philosophy, That sin doth dwell in our souls" (Brownsword, 1660: 3-4).¹¹

In a related set of arguments, Brownsword and Prynne pointed out that Quakers and Papists alike asserted that they could gain perfection in this life. Quakers believed, said Prynne, "That the Saints are perfectly holy in this life, and do not sin..." (Prynne, 1655: 6). Similarly, Brownsword asserted, "Quakers affirm That there is a perfection attainable in this life, whereby they are freed from all sin, and from the body of death." They insisted "that all men have a light within them sufficient to convince of [that is, conquer] sin, and to lead men to repentance and salvation, if it be obeyed." Indeed, some of them claimed to "have the same Spirit of infallibility that the Apostles had." All of these claims of perfection by the Quakers resembled a tenet spelled out in the Council of Trent, which stated, "if any man say that the commandments of God are impossible to be observed by a justified man, who is in the state of Grace, let him be Anathema" (Brownsword, 1660: 3).¹²

Not only had Quakers and Catholics denied predestination and the inherent sinfulness of man, but they denied also the absolute authority of the Scriptures. This denial took several forms. Quakers affirmed "that the Scriptures are not the Rule," and similarly, the Jesuit scholar, Bellarmine, said that they were only "to help us on

our pilgrimage" and not meant "to be a rule of Faith" (Brownsword, 1660: 5).¹³ Farmer attacked the Quakers' practice of "magnifying [their] papers equal to the holy Scriptures." With this attitude to the Bible, he said, they "add their Authority to it, as [do] the Papists," rather than believing the Scriptures to be the sole authority for their faith (Farmer, 1655: 74-75). The Anabaptist, Henoeh Howet, charged that the "same spirit" was behind the Quakers' insistence on "the uselessness of the Scriptures" (presumably since they were superseded by the Inner Light) and the Papists's attempts to "denie us the Scriptures in our mother Tongue" (Howet, 1655: 2: see also Baxter, 1656: C.3^v; Smith, 1659a: sec.1 no.58; Underhill, 1660: 30; Baxter, 1657a: 8).

The severity and harshness of the attacks against the "Papist" Quakers on geographical, social, and doctrinal grounds often were coupled with equally condemnatory diatribes against their monkish" behaviours. In several important ways, their enemies charged, Quakers revealed their Jesuit and Franciscan heritage. For instance, Brownsword, in his pastoral duties, heard families' complaints about children who had "cast off respect due to their Parents and Relations" after becoming Quakers. He interpreted the children's action by pointing out that monks similarly were known for "disclaiming" their parents (Brownsword, 1660: 8). In another vein, Smith, Brownsword,

Prynne, and three Newcastle ministers pointed out similarities between Quakers' and monks' attire. Smith said that both George Whitehead (1636-1723) and the Papists "place much of their holiness in their beggarly apparel" (Smith, 1659a: sec. 1 no.58). Prynne went so far as to allege that "Some of them wear...rough Hair cloth and cords about their bodies like the Franciscan Cordlilers; [and this] is very probable Evidence that they were spawned from them" (Prynne, 1655: 37). The Quakers' "neglect of Apparel, the[ir] pretended frequent fastings, [and] their dissembling separation from the world," argued Thomas Weld, Rich[ard] Prideaux, and Sam[uel] Hammond, "is clearly the superstition of Monks and Fryers..." (Weld, et. al., 1653: 51; see also Miller, 1655: 4; Brownsword, 1660: 7).

Other habits and activities also "revealed" the Quakers' Papist connections. Brownsword said that both their emphasis on silence (presumably in worship) and their practice of fasting, especially as a "means of spiritual knowledge," originated with the monks. Furthermore, their practice of "run[ning] up and down naked" arose from the Jesuit order, and possibly from the Flagellantes¹⁴ (Brownsword, 1660: 7-8). Both Brownsword and Prynne traced the Quakers' claims to "Visions and Revelations" (Brownsword, 1660: 9)--their "Quaking Fits and Trances" (Prynne, 1655: 10)--to the monks and nuns, and especially to Ignatius Loyola (Brownsword, 1660: 8; Prynne, 1655: 7-8, 18, 20-23). Prynne also connected the "enthusiasm" of female

Quakers to St. Briget, and charged that the women acted "in imitation of the New Order of Jesuitesses" (1655: 7, 18) He even went so far as to ascribe the convulsions and fits of Quaker "enthusiasm" to the Devil (1655: 11). Like Prynne, Baxter charged "that Popery and the Quakers Faith is hatched by the Prince of darknesse (Baxter, 1656: C.3). From all the Papist evidence ammassed against the Quakers, Brownsword's conclusion must have represented the attitude of many of his colleagues. "I have now (I hope) made it evident, that the hand of a Jesuite is in the Quakers' Religion. How could they else be so well versed in their most absurd Doctrines?" (Brownsword, 1660: 10).

The Social Factors Behind the Subversive Catholic Charges

Brownsword's question is worth considering in depth. Why did Quakerism's opponents see the group's doctrines and activities as examples of Catholic subversion? Why was it that, as Thomas O'Malley points out, "This association of Quakerism with social subversion was the theme which, besides certain theological ones, occurred most often in anti-Quaker pamphlets" (O'Malley, 1979: 179). In truth, the Quakers had no theological connection with Catholicism, and they readily admitted that they shared in the general Protestant antipathy toward Rome. In 1655, for example, two Quaker proselytizers, Thomas Salthouse and Miles Halhead, stated in court proceedings against them that "In the presence of the Eternal God, and before all this people, we

do deny, with as much detestation as any of you do, the Pope and his supemacy'" (quoted in Sewel I, 1725: 155; cited in Selleck, 1960: 146). Fox, Edward Burrough, and eight other prominent Quakers published, during or before 1655, A Declaration Ag ainst all Poperie and Popish Points... (Smith I, 1867: 649), and in 1658 Fox specifically refuted Catholic doctrines from the Council of Trent (Smith I, 1867: 656).¹⁶

In 1658 Quakers even travelled to Rome and testified against Catholicism to Jesuits at their college, and for this brashness one Quaker paid with his life (Braithwaite, 1955: 424-428). Quakerism's religious origins, moreover, were strictly from English Puritanism, and even attempts to link it to the Protestant mystical tradition on the Continent (especially with the Boehmists) have established only the slightest possible influence (Endy, 1981: 19-21; Nuttall, 1946: 16-19). Why, then, did some authors consistently see the Quakers as Papists? Furthermore, what effect did these charges have on mobilizing resources against the Quakers?

Much of the reason for the persistence of the "Papist" subversive charge lies in the disruptive effect the Quakers had on the social fabric of local communities, especially on local churches. Quakers were known for their vehement challenges to Puritan ministers during and after church sermons (Barbour, 1964: 127-129), and their insolent and resentful behaviour was extremely disruptive to the life of the parish. Often the relationship between Puritan

ministers and substantial numbers of their parishoners was weak (Thomas, 1971: ch. 6 sec. iii and iv), and the vituperative attacks and challenges of the Quakers jeopardized it even further. Certainly, too, the charges were defences of the ministers' own characters and occupations, both of which were slandered by the Quakers. Local churches were the social and political hub of much of the community's life, and many persons saw the attacks against the ministers and the tithing system that supported them as assaults against the very basis of orderly society (Reay, 1980a, 1980b). Quakerism threatened, for instance, to draw people out of the Puritan congregations and into yet another Separatist sect (and one that seemed particularly seditious). It is no accident that Brownsword, Smith, Baxter, Farmer, Miller, Feake and his two co-authors and Weld and his three co-authors all were ministers who had been abused by the Quakers, and therefore had particularly good reason to fear the social and religious disruption they caused. Nuttall points out that a 1660 Quaker publication, The Cruelty of some Fighting Priests Published..., named seventy-five ministers who "persecuted" the Quakers, and Nuttall himself mentions at least fifty Puritan Interregnum ministers whom Quakers claimed "persecuted" them (Nuttall 1983: 9-14). Given the English fear and paranoia toward Catholics at the time, many Puritan ministers were unable to view the bitter attacks by their Quaker adversaries as part of a struggle within the Protestant faith.

Opponents of Quakerism further feared the seditious potential of the group's religious doctrines. Puritan ministers believed that the Quakers' doctrine of the "Inner Light" subverted Biblical authority, and that, given the sinful nature of humankind and the devious wiles of Satan, this subversion would lead to the destruction of the nation. Amidst the shambles, Catholicism would be able, many people believed, to make its return. In this paranoid atmosphere, it is no wonder that so many Puritans were convinced by such weak "Papist" evidence against the Quakers as second-hand stories, unverifiable oaths, and analogous arguments.

The Social Functions Served by the "Papist" Charges

Believing as they did in the possibility of imminent social breakdown, the ministers accomplished several goals through their "Papist charges, and we can best understand these accomplishments by placing them within the framework of "resource mobilization" concepts. Generally speaking, the goals of an organization or movement involve increasing the support and influence of sympathizers while decreasing the support and influence of opponents. At the very least, uninvolved "bystanders" can be turned into "adherents" for the cause; adherents can be turned into active "constituents," and opponents can be either transformed from constituents into sympathizers or bystanders, or else controlled or suppressed (McCarthy and Zald, 1977: 1221;

Marx, 1979: 96). Most desirable is the support given by "elites," that is, by persons "who control large resource pools" (McCarthy and Zald, 1977: 1221) such as wealth, power, and influence, but often support comes only from persons whose resource pools are small (that is, from "mass" supporters [McCarthy and Zald, 1977: 1221]).

Applied within the dimensions of Interregnum history, the "Papist" charges against the Quakers probably helped ministers and other opponents rally mass support against them, and also aided in their efforts to attract elite support to their cause. The charges proved to be a device by which opponents "creat[ed an] effective public image and ideology" against the Quakers, "inhibit[ed] freedom of movement..., appl[ied] legal sanctions" against them, and "destroy[ed] or displaced leaders," at least temporarily, through imprisonment (Marx, 1979: 96).

Mobs

Among the most effective uses of mass support against the Quakers was the mobilization of mobs against them. Not only were the ministers' "Papist" charges, therefore, warnings to their congregations about the evils of the troublesome sect, but also they served either as calls to riot against the intruding Quakers or, as with Ralph Farmer, post hoc justifications of violence that the ministers had incited against the group. On this point E. P. Thompson's comments about a later period in English history equally

apply to Cromwellian England. "A mob was a very useful supplement to the magistrates in a nation that was scarcely policed" (Thompson, 1963: 68), and often the targets for mobs were people whom the rioters thought to be "Papists." He adds that "The cry 'No Popery' has reverberated in the popular consciousness since the Commonwealth and 1688; and no doubt swept into many whose sub-political responses were described by Defoe many years before--'stout fellows that would spend the last drop of their blood against Popery that did not know whether it be a man or a horse'" (Thompson, 1963: 71-72). This also was the situation in the 1650s, as Quakers continually were victimized by mobs toward which magistrates turned blind eyes and which ministers often urged forward (Reay, 1980: 401, 403-404; Burnet, 1952: 31; Hoy, 1967: 202-203).

The Papist/ Quaker incidents in Farmer's city of Bristol in late 1654 and early 1655 illustrate dramatically the way in which mob action became one component in the overall anti-Quaker movement (recorded in Bishop et. al. 1656; summarized in Braithwaite, 1955: 170-173). In December, 1654, Farmer, who was a Presbyterian, tithe-receiving minister, encouraged the apprentices of his parish to attack two visiting Quakers, John Camm and John Audland. The next day, after three of the apprentices had been arrested, a mob of fifteen hundred people (or so the account claims) forced the magistrates to release them. Fearing that the mob would start a Royalist insurrection, officers of the

local garrison finally intervened, and thereby brought the mob under control.

Farmer lost no time in writing-up the incidents, a fact that we know because the London bookseller and collector, George Thomason, recorded that he received a copy of Farmer's Quaker/Papist attack, The Mysteries _ of Godlinesses and Ungodlinesses, on January 23, 1654/5. In an attempt to receive "elite support" for his anti-Quaker campaign, Farmer dedicated his work to the powerful Secretary of State who was in charge of repressing political subversion, John Thurloe (see D.N.B.). Suspiciously, on January 22, Bristol's local officials recorded the deposition of the iron-monger, Cowlshaw, about his conversation with the Franciscan, Coppinger, who had accused the Quaker leaders of being disguised Catholics, and the officials forwarded this to Thurloe (Penney, 1911: 150-151). Both the timing of the deposition and its retrospective accusations strongly suggest that it was a fabrication. As Anson Shupe has observed with regard to more recent counter-movements to religious organizations, they will "manufacture" persons who have reputedly "inside" information against their opponents, solely as a reason for justifying repression against them (Shupe, 1981: 218), and this seems to have occurred with the Cowlshaw story. Nonetheless, Bristol officials used the charges of their reputed "Popery" as a basis upon which to issue a warrant

against prominent Quakers leaders (Bishop et. al.: 1656: 78-80; reproduced in Besse, 1733: 14), and as a result a number of Quaker homes were forcibly entered and seached, and a few Quakers were imprisoned for being disguised Franciscans (Besse, 1733: 14-15). Cowlshaw's fabricated deposition received national distribution through Prynne's The Quakers Unmasked, and it subsequently was quoted by Smith in Cambridge, Baxter in Kidderminster and Miller in Glamorganshire, Wales. Farmer's "Papist" charges were, therefore, effective in mobilizing Bristol's "elites" (i.e., local magistrates, aldermen, and the mayor) against the Quakers, and quite possibly played a part in the incitement of mobs against them.

Arrests and Interrogations

The Bristol officials' concerted effort to paint the Quakers as Catholic subversives almost certainly contributed to suspicions about them throughout the Commonwealth. In January, 1656, for example, Edward Burrough was interrogated in Watford, Ireland, for being a Jesuit (Braithwaite, 1955: 214)¹⁷, and in December 1657, six Suffolk Quakers were called before the Quarter Sessions court because they were "suspected or reputed to be Papists or popishly affected" (Besse, 1733: 463-464, 249-250). Also in 1657, a soldier named John Hall was court-martialed in Aberdeen, Scotland, "for disturbing the minister and being a vagabond, a Jesuit and a spy" (Braithwaite, 1955: 229). While visiting St.

Ives, Cornwall, in 1655, Fox, Edward Pyott and William Salt apparently were questioned for Popery (Fox I, 1694b: 207; see Gardiner III, 1901: 211:), and numerous Friends were detained when they refused to take the Oath of Abjuration which required that persons renounced Popery (Braithwaite in Penney, 1907: 346; Braithwaite, 1955: 446). Just as the modern charge against "cult" members being "brainwashed" serves the function of excluding converts from legal protection involving freedom of religious worship (Shupe, Spielmann, and Stigall, 1977: 942, 945-946), so too did the "Papist" charges serve the function of exempting Quakers from the right to worship under the toleration laws of The Instrument of Government (section XXXVIII, reprinted in Gardiner, 1906: 416), which was the 1653 document that outlined the structure of government for the Commonwealth (Gardiner, 1901 III: 224; 1889: 416).

The Meaning of the Term, "Popery"

While many persons accused the Quakers of being Catholics, no uniformity existed in the meaning of the charges. Sometimes the charges meant that Quakers, as a group, were thought to be "Papists" in disguise. Other times the charges specified that the Quaker leaders were Catholics, and the members simply were "poor and ignorant people" who were deluded by them. In this sense, the "Popish" charges against the Quakers resembled the

subversive charges against the early nineteenth century American Masons, Catholics, and Mormons, in which "nativists discerned a group of unscrupulous leaders plotting to subvert the American social order. Though the rank and file members were not individually evil, they were blinded and corrupted by a persuasive ideology that justified treason and gross immorality in the interest of the subversive group" (Davis 1960: 208).¹⁸ In still other contexts, the accusations meant that the Quakers, who professed a belief in God, seemingly did not believe in the Protestant God. Frequently the latter charge also connoted that the Quakers were destructive of the social fabric of the community, just as the "Papists" were suspected to be. As Barry Reay says, "It was the idea of the Quaker that was hated and feared rather than the individual" (Reay, 1980: 393). Finally, a few of the accusations meant that the Quakers were charged with practicing demonic magic. That the term "Papist" had so many gradations of meaning is not surprising, especially since other religiously perjorative terms of the day were equally imprecise.¹⁹

The Charges Ignored or Refuted by Opponents Themselves

Despite the fact that the imprecise nature of the charge and the unsystematic use of evidence gave the Puritan accusers a considerable range of tactics to use against the Quakers, not all Puritans were convinced by the accusations. For example, the modern historian, William Lamont, indicates

that Baxter's Quaker/ Papist attack, A Key for Catholicicks, received a "hostile reception" (presumably among the general public [Lamont, 1979: 184; 1980: 290]), and one wonders whether some of that reception had to do with respect for the Quakers' anti-tithe attacks. We do not know.

An unusual argument against the Papist/ Quaker equation was put forth by a group of hostile Newcastle-on-Tyne ministers--Thomas Weld, Richard Prideaux, Samuel Hammond, and William Durant. They wrote that the equation between the two groups was false because the perfection that the Quakers achieved was far below that of the monks. "Nay, we could produce instances of Visions, Revelations, Fastings, etc. in that shaven Generation [that is, the monks] which might let those [Quakers] know their perfection they boast of leaves them many Leagues short of this kind of perfection which hath been more fully attained by the Popish Rabble" (Weld, et. al., 1653: 51). Needless to say, this is a remarkable argument coming from a group of Puritan ministers, but it reveals how far they were willing to go in order to counter the Quakers' claims.

Another Puritan minister (and former Burford mutineer), the Baptist Henry Denne, offered a systematic refutation of his colleagues' efforts to prove the Quakers' "Papist" guilt by using either proof-by-analogy or proof-by-oaths. ²⁰ Attacking the practice of "proof-by-analogy," he said:

We all know 'tis a fallacious way of arguing to proceed...to prove that a thing really is, because it is possible that it might be: and yet no better is the argument of the Papist Adversaries in this case. They know the Popish Priests and Jesuites are men, that have a zeal for their Religion...[and] are using endeavors to bring about their designs of gaining Proselytes about.... But certainly till the thing be more evident, Christian Charity...should teach us another lesson: and that seeing such manner of dissembling Religion is a most heynous crime and sin against God, we ought not to charge [the Quakers] with it upon light grounds, but rather be inclined to think contrary... (Denne, 1659: 20).

Elsewhere in the work he challenged the claim that Quakers were disguised Papists. "For I ask, was there ever such thing duly proved? Was there ever any Jesuit or Papist taken under such masque, or disguise?". He attacked Prynne's use of the oath by the Bristol iron-monger, Cowlshaw, because the Irishman whom Cowlshaw had accused of Popery was not available for questioning (Denne, 1659: 19). Finally, on another issue--Smith's charge of Popery against George Whitehead--Denne understood why the Quaker refused to take the Oath of Abjuration. "Whitehead refuses the Oath, not because it abjures Popery, but because it is an Oath, and because he thinks it unlawful to swear at all" (Denne, 1659: 6).

On each of these points, Thomas Smith responded with vengeance. His responses lacked the logic that Denne demonstrated, but what they lacked in logic they made up for in fervour. One major claim, however underlay all of Smith's defences of the Papist/ Quaker evidence that his "frivolous and learned friend," Henry Denne, attacked: Denne was a

"reverend Apologist for the Society of Jesus" (Smith, 1659a:
21
sec. 1 no.2). After all, what else could a learned person
be who defended the Quakers against a charge that was so
obviously correct?

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

A crisis of religious and political values in mid-seventeenth century England created the social conditions out of which Quakerism emerged. The group's theological doctrines reflected that crisis, and indeed the behaviour of its members heightened it. As a religion, therefore, Quakerism cannot be understood unless the social factors are analyzed that both produced it and fostered its growth. Neither can the anti-Quaker movement be interpreted properly unless we appreciate the practical and social implications that would have resulted had the Quakers been successful at achieving their goals.

In dispute was the government's continuation of the tithe-system. This system was inseparably linked with the country's religious institutions and class structures, since both ministers and gentry impropiators collected tithes. The Quakers responded to the government's persistent refusal to abolish the system by waging a fervent anti-tithe campaign among local parishioners, tract and pamphleteer readers, and even Parliamentarians and the Lord Protector. They pursued their anti-tithe activities with such vigour (and such invective) that tithe-receiving ministers and governmental officials, many of whom had vested interests in maintaining the status quo, feared the Quakers as subversive

"Papists" and attempted to suppress them on these grounds.

The anti-Quaker charges of subversion, as outlined in Chapter Four, suggest the fundamental nature of the values that the group's opponents believed to be at stake. To put the matter in sociological terms, when the issues being contested are ones upon which the institutions and norms of society are based (Smelser, 1962:31-32), then the "established" party is likely to perceive the new religious challenger as subverting the very principles upon which that society is constructed. It will portray, therefore, its new religious opponents as subversives, and in doing so will paint them as evil figures who are driven by either demonic forces or sinister agents. We see similar patterns of indiscriminate charges against various religious groups in other historical periods, including our own. In England itself, fear of Popery both precedes and postdates the Interregnum, and the topic itself warrants specialized study. In any case, subversive imagery is extraordinarily effective in mobilizing opposition, since they represent the issues at stake as ones involving societal preservation versus societal destruction. Especially when these contests occur in societies, such as Interregnum England, in which religious interests are not differentiated from normative institutions (e.g., courts, families, legislatures, etc. [Smelser, 1962: 320-321]), then the subversive charges are likely to elicit a hostile response by governmental and law enforcement elites against the "threatening" group.

Of overriding importance for interpreting early Quakerism is an appreciation of the rise of expectations that a portion of the population experienced as the result of the Parliamentary victory in the English Civil War. In the latter part of Chapter Two I show that, on both religious and political issues, many supporters of the parliamentary cause wanted to see the "Puritan revolution" extend beyond the limits imposed upon it by persons in power. As these supporters came to realize that their new leaders, for whom many had risked their lives in battle, were not going to enact the desired changes, they felt deeply betrayed. Having little faith in those whom they once trusted, many former supporters came to have considerable faith in themselves and the causes in which they believed. The self-reflective nature of the Quakers' doctrine of the "Inner Light" aptly represented this process of political disillusionment and personal sanctification, as did their "fixed price" policy in business exchanges.

The Quakers' fixed price policy demonstrates the extent to which their frustration toward contemporary political leaders manifested even in their business activities. Convinced that Puritan leaders during the Civil War had promised to abolish tithes if they were to obtain power, Quakers believed that their political success had corrupted them. Having achieved the political power that they had wanted, they had become both hungry for more and

greedy for the wealth that accompanied it. If they could be made to see the ungodly state into which they had fallen, however, they still might repent from their greed and fulfill their promise. In business exchanges, one practice that fostered greediness was that of haggling over prices in an attempt to maximize one's economic advantage. As part of the Quakers' struggle against greed, therefore, haggling and dickering were to be replaced by a merchandizing system in which customers from all walks of life and the shopkeepers with whom they dealt asked honest, fixed prices of one another. The policy was an attempt, therefore, to bring about a change of heart within individuals that would pave the way for greater changes to be brought about by repentant Puritan leaders. Had Max Weber realized that the Quakers' fixed price policy originated partly in their political frustrations, then his discussion of the group might have provided a more adequate analysis of the effect that social forces played on their reputedly religious doctrines.

This is not to argue, however, that Quakerism was a retreat from the radical aspirations of the Civil War sectarians. To the contrary, it actually helped to preserve them. Sanctifying the radicals' hopes by bestowing upon them divine legitimacy, Quakerism ensured that political and religious radicalism would not die, even when it met concerted, and at times vicious, opposition from both former foes and former allies. Either through a change of heart among the rulers or through the imminent return of

Christ, the full fruits of the Puritan revolution still would be realized, or so the early Quakers claimed to their contemporaries. The Quaker doctrine of the "Inner Light," therefore, always contained an activist and reformist element throughout the Interregnum. Belief in the Inner Light helped the Quakers transform their feelings of frustration and resentment toward persons in power back into hope.

By insisting that the religious "experience" of Quakerism was based upon social resentment and felt deprivation rather than mysticism, this study offers a socio-cultural perspective on religion that challenges basic assumptions frequently held by scholars in the discipline of religious studies. The historical evidence, however, leads to no other conclusion. Unlike some religious groups, for which the historical record is thin, many aspects of Quakerism are well documented by both its supporters and its detractors. Under these circumstances, it is unsound to discuss the group's religious doctrines in a manner that removes them from the social context in which they appeared. Inattentiveness to the social climate of mid-seventeenth century England is the major criticism that I level against a number of early twentieth century interpreters of Quaker "mysticism," including Rufus Jones and Evelyn Underhill. To assume, from a phenomenological, theological, or history of religions perspective, that Quakerism is yet another

outbreak of mysticism--of establishing contact between God and Man--is to exclude the possibility of providing secular explanations for the faith. It is an assumption that cannot be sustained, as my analysis in Chapter One indicates.

Equally unsound are attempts to interpret early Quakerism through analyses of the psychological dynamics of the group's prominent personalities, especially George Fox. While psychology can shed light on particular aspects of Quakerism and its leaders, it cannot generate broad interpretations of group phenomena. Its usefulness, therefore, in sectarian analyses is very limited. Even if the development of psychological theories of religion were more advanced, the historical evidence about the group and its members does not provide sufficient details of Quakers' private lives to warrant extensive psychological explanations. Prominent psychological interpretations of Fox by William James, Rachel Knight, and Josiah Royce have been discredited by subsequent research, which has shown the extent to which his mental health was connected to social and political events.

Social-psychological interpretations, however, of early Quaker material are promising, since they assume that people's psychological attitudes and beliefs result from their interaction with the society in which they live. For example, the social-psychological theory that I apply to early Quakerism, relative deprivation theory, assumes that the Quakers' psychological feelings of frustration and

resentment were the result of unfulfilled social expectations about tithe-abolition. Social-psychological theories, have, therefore, the advantage over strictly psychological ones of locating people's attitudes and beliefs within their socio-cultural environment.

My own application of relative deprivation theory in the dissertation runs counter to a prevailing methodological trend in sectarian studies. Recent theoretical discussions have downplayed the role that relative deprivation can play in the genesis of religious groups, and instead have concentrated on utilizing resource mobilization theory to analyze groups' organizational dynamics and resource allocation techniques. This trend entails a reassessment of the widespread use of relative deprivation that occurred a decade or more ago, so it seems that the the two theories are engaged in a struggle for interpretive hegemony regarding religious sectarianism. I have demonstrated, however, in Chapter Three that the two theories are complementary, since feelings of deprivation regarding desired social changes can translate into organizational goals to which groups direct their resources. Furthermore, I have shown in Chapter Four that a group's opponents are likely to be constituted by those persons or groups who themselves would feel deprived if a particular set of goals were to be achieved. Viewed from this new perspective, relative deprivation theory can provide the causal component

in interpretations of the resource allocations among groups' constituents and opponents.

Worth pursuing in a future study will be the extent to which the Quakers' success in business was in part the result of constituents' support for their anti-tithe activities. Given the widespread hostility to tithes, it is plausible that other tithe opponents engaged in business with the Quakers as one way of offering financial support to their efforts. If verified, then a study of this kind would be an further corrective to Weber's exclusively religious interpretation of early Quakerism, about which I was critical in Chapter Two. by locating their business activities within the social dynamics and community conflicts of the period.

While engaged in this study I was aware of the extent to which our conception of the past reflects our understanding of the present. This is true because our reconstruction of history occurs within both the shadow of contemporary events and the influence of current intellectual trends. What we choose to highlight and what we choose to omit may bespeak our cultural and temporal bias. By attempting to comprehend the past, therefore, we often gain insight into the social forces at work in our own lives.

My decisions to emphasize certain elements of Quakerism were influenced by my own experiences of American sectarian groups in the early 1970s. I was part of a

generation that felt political frustration and resentment towards its political leaders, so I was not surprised to find an analogous feeling among Interregnum Quakers. I still remember the exhilarating hope we felt at the thought that the millennium, the dawning of the New Age, ensured the ultimate success for our political and social visions. Also from my experiences with various groups in the early 1970s I appreciate the way in which political frustration can drive people into a religion of meditational reflection or into countenance of violence.

It seems, however, that the revolution of the 1970s failed. As the world moves dangerously closer to nuclear annihilation, our chants of peace now seem to have been hopelessly naive. I receive some comfort, however, in realizing that, in the short run, the Puritan revolution failed, but with time almost all of the radicals' reformist demands have been realized if not surpassed. Tithes have been abolished; the franchise has been extended (even farther than the radicals ever demanded); Parliament's powers have supplanted those of the King and Queen, and religious toleration (again more than most radicals dared dream) is an accepted fact of life. Perhaps, too, the hopes of my generation will come to pass in the decades that, presumably, lie before us.

APPENDIX: CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS STRIFE IN THE 1640S

The 1640s in England was a decade of war, politics, and religious fervor, and its events provided the radicals of the 1650s with the hopes and expectations that they held so dear. Of overriding importance for the country was the Civil War, because its effects permeated all aspects of people's lives in the decade that followed it. Some understanding of this war helps locate the rise of Quakerism (usually dated after 1652) in a necessary historical and ideological perspective. I present here a sketch of the 1640s, and highlight the influence that political and religious radicalism played during this time.

Causes of the Civil War

Although the causes of the Civil War are complex, two interrelated political and religious issues predominated. Politically, the Long Parliament and King Charles I (1600-1649; reigned 1625-1649) had reached an impasse regarding both taxation and the control of the militia. Between 1629 and 1640, Charles refused to call a parliament, despite the fact that it was the only legally sanctioned body allowed to levy taxes, and instead devised a number of clever but dubiously legal schemes to procure revenue. Only when war threatened with the Scots (1640) did Charles call a

parliament to raise money for an army, but when the Parliament balked at granting his request until it obtained redress regarding a number of grievances, he dissolved it after only three weeks (hence, its name, The Short Parliament). Before the year was out, however, the Scots invaded, routed Charles's rag-tag army, and occupied Northern England, so Charles was left with no choice but to call another Parliament. [Because this Parliament, or at least part of it, was to sit for almost thirteen years, it became known as The Long Parliament). Like its immediate predecessor, the new parliament immediately began to seek redress on a number of legal and legislative points. As Parliament persisted in its efforts to curb the King's power while at the same time secure its own, it continued to balk at Charles's financial request for money with which to outfit an army. Parliament wisely feared that the King would use an army against it as well as against the Scots. After the struggle over the army intensified, Charles withdrew from London to Nottingham and declared war against Parliament (August 22, 1642).

The second issue that caused the Civil War involved religion. Puritans deeply resented the high Anglicanism that Archbishop William Laud (1573-1645) had forcibly imposed on the country and which the King, with his Catholic leanings and Catholic wife, supported. Puritans saw the Established (Anglican) Church as idolatrous "Popery," and therefore were intent upon abolishing it. Laud, whom

Parliament arrested and kept imprisoned in the Tower until his death, had utilized a brutal church court known as the Star Chamber to enforce conformity, and its abolition had been long-awaited by Puritans across the country (Gardiner, 1906: 179-186).

If two sets of issues, one political, the other religious, provided the powder for the initial explosion between King and Parliament, then it was religion that provided much of the fuel for the sustained war. The legal questions that underlay the political disputes were, as even Richard Baxter admitted, too complex for the ordinary citizen to comprehend (Manning, 1973: 86-87), but people knew what kind of religion they wanted, and the Puritans realized that their religion would be sustained only by a Parliamentary victory. Indeed, contemporary events suggested that they were correct. Royalist soldiers were convinced that all Puritans were their enemies, so they took every opportunity to beat them and plunder their property (Manning, 1973: 93-95). Of course by doing so the Royalists fulfilled their own suspicions, and by 1643 prominent Puritans were declaring the Civil War to be a war over religion, and Puritan recruits were answering the call (Manning, 1973: 88).

Parliamentarians, Presbyterians, and Professional Soldiers

The war, however, was almost a short one. The King's

forces scored a number of quick victories, and for a while it seemed as if the Parliamentary forces would be quickly defeated. While trying desperately to avoid total defeat, parliamentarians took two actions that would prove crucial not only for their eventual victory but also for the outbreak of radical dissent that would occur amongst their supporters. First, Parliamentarians secured Scotland's help in 1643 by promising to establish the Presbyterian religion in England. The contents of this Agreement, called the Solemn League and Covenant, were to be sworn by all Englishmen (Gardiner, 1906: 267-271). Second, Colonel Oliver Cromwell began training his own troops in the spring of that same year. Cromwell wanted soldiers who supported the Parliamentary side because of conscience' sake, and at the same time who were godly men, convinced of the righteousness of their cause. These two traits, combined with careful and disciplined training, made Cromwell's soldiers (appropriately called the Ironsides) a formidable and determined foe on the battlefield (Fraser, 1973: 98-101). Cromwell's soldiers were so successful that in 1645 Parliament itself placed new emphasis on professional training and competent leadership, and it renamed its forces the "New Model Army". A condition for joining the New Model Army was taking the Solemn League and Covenant Oath, and for that reason one noteworthy, battle-proven soldier resigned from military life--John Lilburne (1614-1657 [Shaw, 1968: 30; Gregg, 1961: 111; Gibb, 1947: 102]). Lilburne quickly

became an ally of William Walwyn (b.1600) and Richard Overton, both of whom had begun publishing against Presbyterian religious intolerance (Shaw, 1968: 30, 40), and who soon broadened their attacks to include tithes (e.g., Overton's The Ordinance for Tithes Dismounted, [1645]). These three men were to become the principal authors and spokespersons for the radical group that (after 1647) was known as the Levellers.

Leveller and Agitator Radicalism

In June, 1646 the King surrendered to the Scots, and the Civil War appeared to be over. The Presbyterian conservatives began negotiations with the King to secure from him acknowledgement of Parliament's new power in politics and Presbyterianism's ascendancy as the national religion. The King, while pretending seriousness about these negotiations, was only biding time. He hoped that the deep political and religious divisions between the Parliamentary Presbyterians and the army's Independents and sectarians would rupture into fissions that he could exploit. His patience almost paid off. Parliament was rightfully wary of the army at the same time that it was burdened by its expenses, so with the cessation of hostilities it sought to achieve the army's disbandment. A vote to this effect occurred in early 1647, but the rank-and-file soldiers were furious. Parliament still owed them

months' worth of back-pay; it had not offered them indemnity for actions (such as horse-theft) committed as acts of war, and it had not made provisions to care for the maimed, widowed, and orphaned. Taking a series of unprecedented steps, the soldiers started to establish their own channels for expressing their grievances. By April some cavalry regiments had elected representatives, known as "Agitators," who were designated with responsibility to establish a representative army council. Within a month, Agitators had been chosen from throughout the ranks (Shaw, 1938: 50).

At an early stage the Levellers may have been involved with fanning these fires; they were definitely involved, however, with the events that followed. When the Parliamentary order came on May 25, 1647 for the mobilization to begin, the army broke into open mutiny. The King, who was under the control of Parliament, was seized by the army and put under its control. The Agitators, meanwhile, told their commanding officers, known as Grandees, that a general meeting of the army was to occur with or without their support. The Grandees, probably having some sympathy with their men but also having no way to control the army at this stage, agreed to cooperate (Goodhouse, 1938: 401-409). Working as a team, the Agitators and Levellers continued to press for radical governmental reforms, especially at the expense of the Presbyterian-controlled Parliament. In August, 1647, when the army

occupied London in order to prevent Presbyterian Parliamentarians from gaining control of the London militia, the Levellers may have facilitated the army's easy entrance into the city (Shaw, 1968: 56-57; see Aylmer, 1975: 26). In any case, the Agitators and Levellers continued to refine their political views, and in late October and early November, 1647, a proposal that the two groups wrote, which called for a reconstituted Parliament based upon a wider-than-present franchise, was hotly debated by various officers (including Cromwell), radical Agitators, and common troops at Putney (see Thomas, 1972). Fearing the growing radicalism that he saw among the troops and their proposals at Putney, Cromwell finally began to work decisively against the Agitators and their Leveller supporters. When, for example, two regiments mutinied at Ware (north-east of Hereford) on November 15, he had one of the mutineers shot (Aylmer, 1975: 33-34; Shaw, 1968: 64-65).

Grandeers and the Struggle for Power

A few days earlier, on November 11, 1648, the King and his court escaped to the Isle of Wight, and by the spring he had made an alliance with the Scots and resumed the Civil War. He was, however, soundly defeated by the fall, and army officers began to discuss whether Charles should be brought to trial. It was, the army realized, an unpopular position, since Presbyterian- and even some

Independent-Parliamentarians were reopening negotiations with the King, and the King himself still had considerable popular support. The only way the Grandees could gain the upper hand was to secure the backing of their troops, and this meant that they had to win the confidence of the Levellers.

In mid-November, 1648, therefore, the Grandees, working through Colonel Thomas Harrison (1616-1660), struck a deal with the Levellers whereby a joint committee of four parliamentary Independents, four religious Independents, four Army leaders and four Levellers would draw up a document (entitled [The Second] Agreement of the People) that would serve as the basis for a new government (Shaw, 1988: 73-75; Aylmer, 1975: 40-41). With the support of their troops assured, the Grandees now acted decisively. On December 1 they seized the King; on December 6 Colonel Pride expelled the Presbyterians from the House of Commons; and on January 20, 1648/9 the Commons (known as The Rump of the Long Parliament) brought the King to trial. Ten days later he was beheaded. Continuing to consolidate power, the Commons voted to abolish both the House of Lords (on February 6) and the Monarchy (on March 17). In their places the Rump established a "Commonwealth" consisting of a parliamentary chamber and a Council of State that together would rule the country. Cromwell became the Council's "temporary" executive. The Grandees and their supporters were in firm control of the government (Roots, 1966: 132-

11).

Radicalism Broken

For the Levellers, progress on the Agreement of the People went badly, and by late December, 1648 they felt that they had been cheated by the Grandees. The four Levellers on the Committee had proposed a draft resolution that, after amendments, was passed by a majority of the committee members who were present. The document called for an extended franchise for parliamentary elections, legal reforms (including ridding the kingdom of "those vermin and caterpillars, the lawyers"), tithe-abolition, and a broad religious toleration for Protestants about which parliament was prohibited from restricting. The Levellers thought that the Agreement would, in its approved form, serve as the basis for the next government. They were mistaken. Intermittently between mid-December to mid-January the Council of Officers debated the Agreement at Whitehall, especially its provision on religious toleration and official intervention in religion. After Lilburne saw the conservative drift of the debates, he withdrew in disgust and anger (Shaw, 1968: 75; Woodhouse, 1938: 125-178, 472-481; Aylmer, 1975: 40-41), and recorded his sense of having been "cozened and deceived" (in Legal Fundamental Liberties, 1639 [reprinted in Woodhouse, 1938: 343-355, see 350]). He now believed that the Grandees had temporarily appeased the

Levellers and Agitators simply in order to gain power. On December 15, 1648 he published what he claimed was the document that the joint committee had passed (reprinted in *The House*, 1938: 342-367). When the Rump finally received the much-attended Agreement on January 20, 1649, it was completely overshadowed by the trial of the King that was taking place on the same day. As Lilburne feared, it was ignored. Just when the Levellers thought that their proposals were to provide the model for the government that the Grandees would form, the Grandees had out-maneuvered them.

Reeling from these events in the winter, the Levellers nonetheless began stirring-up troops late in the spring, and in May about 1200 men revolted at Burford. Colonel John Fairfax rushed up from London and attacked the mutineers in the dead of night. Three hundred and forty prisoners were captured, and under military law all were condemned to death. To make a point, however, only three of the mutineers were shot (as their fellow rebels watched).

In spite of several more pamphlets that appeared and Lilburne's dramatic trial on charges of treason in 1653 (in which he defended himself and was acquitted), the Leveller movement was effectively crushed.

The forty-three year old Lilburne died in jail in 1657, having converted to Quakerism at the end of 1655. In spite of his acquittal in 1653, he was never released from prison because the government feared his radicalism.

Overton apparently became a spy for Cromwell's government,
and then a plotter against it (see D.N.B.). Walwim became a
physician (Hill, 1977: 199).

ENDNOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1

The Muggletonians began in 1652 after two London sailors, John Reeve and Lodowick Muggleton, "received revelations from God," along with a "commission" that they were His last witnesses (Rev. 11: 3) before Christ returned to establish his heavenly kingdom (and not, as many other sectarians believed, a kingdom on earth). After Reeve died in 1658, Muggleton remained the group's leader until his own death in 1698. Theologically, it was predestinarian, anti-trinitarian, anti-clerical (although members were allowed to pay tithes rather than suffer confiscation of their goods), and mortalistic (that is, its members believed that the soul lies with the body and is resurrected only when Christ raises the elect at the Last Judgement). In order to be a member, Muggleton required only that people believe his doctrines, including his own special mission from God with the concomitant power to identify the "elect." The group, therefore, was loosely organized, and never achieved more than several hundred members. Remarkably, however, the group continued in England, despite an ever-dwindling membership, until 1979! During both the Interregnum and Restoration periods (1649-1688), it engaged in bitter and crimonious debates with the Quakers. On the Muggletonians, see Reay, 1976 [revised in Hill, Reay and Lamont, 1983]; and Lamont, 1983. On their relationship to the Quakers, see Hill Reay and Lamont, 1983: 47, 52, 61-62, 70, 74-78, 84, 96, 99. On their doctrinal similarities to Milton, see C. Hill, 1977: 111-114.

2

Pantherism was as much an attitude as a group, since it was never formally organized. Theologically, it was pantheistic, believing that a new age had arrived in which no thing was sinful. God existed in all things, so it was unaimed, and this belief led to either a mystical pantheism or a radical materialism that often culminated in self-justification. Ranters were notorious for their immorality, tobacco smoking, whistling and rude singing. They came to prominence soon after the Leveller defeat at Burford in 1649, but we hear very little of them after 1651. Their doctrines bear striking resemblances to those of the adherents of the Free Spirit, although no clear connection between them has been established. Discussions of the ranters include Morton, 1970; Cohn, 1970a: 287-330 (which

produces excerpts from tracts either written by, or written about, Ranters); Cohn, 1970b; C. Hill, 1972b: chs.9 and 10. C. Hill's discussion of the relationship between Ranters and Quakers is corrected by McGregor, 1977 (see 11); and Watts, 1978: 203n.6. The University of Exeter has produced at least two documents that have direct bearing on the Ranters: Abiezer Coppe's (alias Auxilium Patris's) Ranter book, A Fiery Flying Roll (Coppe, 1649), and a work by the Ranter-turned-Muggletonian, Laurence Clarkson (or Claxton), The Lost Sheep Found... (Claxton, 1660). Claxton's book ends, not surprisingly, with an attack on Quakerism.

3

Naughty as it might have been, Hill does mention that Milton enjoyed an evening pipe (C. Hill, 1977: 98), and George Fox, in his later years, smoked as well (whether for medicinal reasons or pleasure we do not know). On Fox and smoking see Nuttall, 1967: 194-203, especially 203; Penney, 1920: 583; cf. Fox, 1694a: 6, 110; Fox 1831 [7]: 330.

4

Cohn draws other comparisons between Charles Manson's anarchistic and hippie-like "Family" and the Ranters (1970b: 25); student radicals and the Ranters (1970b: 17); and "free love" and an analogous activity practiced by the Ranters' "spiritual forerunners", the brethren of the Free Spirit (Cohn, 1970a: 151). Ellens (1971: 106) makes a tentative comparison between Ranterism and one aspect of Upanishadic religious philosophy. Yinger (1982: 116) draws analogies between: Abbie Hoffman's philosophy of "ripping-off" the wealthy and powerful and the Ranters' attitudes toward theft (see Cohn, 1970a: 301); the Free Speech Movement and the Ranters' practice of swearing (1982: 116); and the 1960s counterculture's development of "counterculture language" and the Ranters' use of "secret language" (1982: 162; see Cohn, 1970a: 296). C. Hill mentions the fact that the "hippy-like existence" of some Ranters who entered Gerrard Winstanley's Digger community (see next endnote) caused much disruption by their sexual promiscuity, "idleness," and other indulgent habits (1972b: 184).

5

The Diggers or True Levellers, whose leader was the prolific and literate writer, Gerrard Winstanley (1609-1676?) were land squatters pushed onto commons or waste lands as the result of land shortage, increased population, and poor casual labour opportunities during the 1648-1649 depression. Their political platform, as set out by Winstanley, called for an end to private property, and for the establishment of a government that held as a primary objective the elimination of starvation. On April 1, 1649, a small group of men collected on St. George's Hill near

alton-on-Thames (just southwest of London) and began digging up the commons land in order to plant crops and start a communistic colony. They were harassed continuously by local landlords and the local parson, and suffered beatings, imprisonment, theft and destruction of property and crops. Later, they moved a few miles away to Cobham Heath, and a few other communities sprang up around the country. They were forcibly disbanded in April, 1650, as a consequence of the persistent raids that were led by John Platt, rector of West Horsley. A number of their pamphlets survive, which can be read in Winstanley, 1652, 1941; 1973; and short excerpts in Hughes, 1981: 188-201. Numerous books and articles exist on them, including Bernstein, 1895b: 105-122; Gooch, 1927: 182-191; Berens, 1906, which is criticized in Hudson, 1946: 3n.15; Petegorsky: 1940; Wolfe, 1941: ch. II; Elmen, 1954; Aylmer, 1968; Thomas, 1969; C. Hill, 1972: ch. 7; C. Hill, 1976, which is criticized by Mulligan, Botte, and Richards, 1980: 144-146 and in turn responded to by C. Hill, 1980: 147-151; Juretic, 1975; Davis, 1976; and Bortz, 1977. On the similarities and dissimilarities between the Diggers and the Quakers, including the debate over the probable conversion of Winstanley to Quakerism before his death, see Sabine's introduction in Winstanley, 1941: 33-34; Hudson, 1943; Vann, 1962; Alsop, 1979.

6

Yinger's reference to "Many Quakers and Ranters who] went naked through the streets and into the churches--to segregated beach for them" (Yinger, 1982: 116), seems excessive on two counts. First, the Ranters did not prophesy naked in the streets, even though their ministers occasionally might have "preach[ed] stark naked" (Cohn, 1970a: 315-317). Second, his allusion to a "nudist beach" removes the religious and "prophetic" aspect of the Quakers' protest.

7

A general discussion of insanity charges against zealous Puritans, Anabaptists, millenarians, prophesiers, and other radical sects and individuals who opposed the existing Church order [including] the Fifth Monarchy Men and the Quakers," can be found in Heyd, 1981: 276-280; see also Thomas, 1971: 145. More often than not, however, Quakers are charged with either being bewitchers or bewitched (May, 1980: 396-400; Gummere, 1908; see Kent, 1982a: 188; Middle, 1978: 118-119, 127). While I am not aware of any instances of the Levellers being considered insane, I know of at least two instances in which John Lilburne was considered to be mad during incidents that occurred before his Leveller days (Shaw, 1968: 27, 29). No doubt Mr. Neier could have found interesting and disturbing an attempt made by Puritan ministers to "deprogram" two youthful Quaker converts, one of whom performed an act that indicated, if

of insanity, then at least a temporary mental imbalance. Quite possibly the young man's imbalance was the result of his father's hostility toward his new religious choice. In a letter that the famous Quaker traveling minister, James Nayler, wrote to Margaret Fell around April 25, 1654, he described what happened after he converted the son and two daughters of a local minister. The father, along with twelve of his colleagues, attempted to change the converts' minds through reasoned argument, and when that failed, the ministers became enraged--particularly, it seems, at the son. "One priest stroke of [f] his hatt, another bad send him to [the] house of Corection, another bad slitt his skin from his backe to his feete, others bad bind him and whipp him, & all went away in a great rage." (Keep in mind that Quakers called the Puritan, tithed ministers "priests," and that they refused to give hat honour to anyone, including parents.) That night, the son heard a voice that commanded him to "'Up get ye hence,'" but once the son left the house he did not know where he was supposed to go, so he returned. Nayler then claimed that Satan "tempted [the son] strongly to destroy himselfe bidding him cast himself into the fire persuadinge him he should not burn, but at length he grew up high, yt he prevailed with him to put his hand into a little full of boyleing lickyour yt was on the fire, & they report yt he held it in a quarter of an houre...." (Presumably one of the children must have reported the incident to Nayler, because he was not there to witness this.) The minister held Nayler responsible for his son's action, and denounced the Quaker leader as a devil. The following morning Nayler had to face an angry crowd that was greatly agitated over the incident, but he claimed in the letter to have "convinced" (that is, converted) some of the listeners. This incident is recorded in Swarth. MSS, 3:192, no. 2.869 (Nuttall 61), and is quoted in Cadbury, 1948: 15-19. In the manuscript itself this story is crossed out, but on the basis of a marginal comment that was written in Nayler's hand I concluded, in consultation with Edward Milligan, the Head Librarian at Friends House Library, that the expunction had not been done by Nayler as part of the original letter. The story related, after all, the kind of incident that Friends might have wished never happened and which, for purposes of public image, they wished would be forgotten. Yinger (1982: 168-169) draws a parallel between the Quakers' refusal to give hat honour and some American blacks who also were unwilling "to accept an inferior social status." He also points out that Quaker youth failed to give deference to their elders in much the same way as do some members of the contemporary counterculture (1982: 168-169).

8

The Quaker account of these incidents can be found in Bishop, 1661, 1667, and Whiting, 1702, all reprinted (in slightly abbreviated form) in Bishop et.al., 1703.

Historical summaries of these events can be found in Chu, 1978; Jones, 1923: ch. 4 & 5; and Pestana, 1983. In addition to Mary Iyer, the Quakers who were hung were William Binson, Marmaduke Stephenson, and William Leddra.

9

This particular court appearance by Edward Wharton (there were others) is described in Bishop et. al., 1703: 188-199. When Wharton enquired of the magistrates why he had been called in front of them, they replied, "'Your hair is too long and you are disobedient to that commandment which saith Honour thy father and mother.' To which Edward said, 'Wherein?' 'In that you will not put off your hat before the magistrates,'" they answered. He was not, however, imprisoned for this, as Lancashire claims, but rather he was banished from the colony (an order that he disobeyed). He was hardly lucky, either, since he already had been whipped for his Quaker beliefs, and he was to be whipped several times more. For some of his whippings he was tied to the back of a horse-cart in the manner that is depicted in the newspaper illustration (Bishop, 1703: 112, 276, 280, 285, 297, 304). Although a law was passed that required a Quaker man to have his tongue bored with a hot iron if he were to return to the Massachusetts colony a third time after having been banished, that part of the sentence seems not to have been carried out on anyone. A Quaker, however, in England, James Nayler, did have his tongue bored in 1656 (Smithwaite, 1955: 262).

10

Again see Bishop et. al., 1703 and Jones, 1923 for documentation of the brutal and sadistic whippings that both Quaker men and women suffered, along with the deportations and maimings that were inflicted upon them. (For example, three Quakers, Christopher Holder, John Copeland, and John Lewis, had their ears cropped). The children of Lawrence and Cassandra Southwick, Daniel and Provided, were ordered sold into slavery because they had no money or estate with which to pay a fine for not attending a church service. The family had been ruined by fines that had been inflicted on the parents. The slavery order, however, was never carried out because the ship-captain whom an official approached about taking them to Barbados refused to do so, calling the sentence "A thing so horrible" (Bishop, 1661: 88-92; Jones, 1923: 69).

11

For numerous examples of this occurring see Reay, 1990a: 396n.50; Brownsword, 1660: 8. Worth keeping in mind, however, is that often parents rejected or abused their children because of their conversions. See, for example, Thomas Ellwood's accounts of the beatings that his father inflicted upon him for his refusal to give him hat honour

(Milwood, 1714: 53, 59-60, 64-65), as well as the story summarized in note 7 (above). Besse (1733: 40-41) relates a story from Austell, Cornwall in October, 1658, about the way in which a family persecuted a Quaker named Anne Upcott. Anne's father, who was a minister, and his three sons were angered at her conversion to Quakerism. One of the sons, who was a constable, got a local justice of the peace to charge Anne with the offence of working on the Sabbath because she had sewed a tear in her waistcoat on Sunday morning. The justice let the brother choose between fining her or putting her in the stocks, and he chose the latter. For five rainy hours she remained in the stocks as her father and brothers stood inside their house shouting and jeering at her, and even encouraging the town's boys and other "rabble" to harass her.

ENDNOTES TO CHAPTER ONE: PSYCHOLOGICAL AND MYSTICAL
INTERPRETATIONS OF EARLY QUAKERISM

1

As Braithwaite (1955: 56) and Cadbury in Braithwaite (1955: 548) point out, a number of books in Fox's time attest to the fact that in Lichfield a thousand Christians had died under Diocletian. These historians do not, however, cite a reliable source as verification for the claim, and Cadbury even suggests that the story about the town might have been a myth. I have not been able to document the story myself. For an alternative explanation of why Fox called Lichfield "Cody," see Saxon (1949: 86-87), who relates a story from 1770 in which a pool near Lichfield mysteriously turned blood-red (possibly from algae-growth?).

2

The different content of Fox's journals (1694a, 1694b) is the result of the manuscripts used. Penney's edition The Journal of George Fox (1694b) was based upon the original Spence MSS. on file in Friends House Library, London, and is referred to as the Cambridge Journal. Fox probably began composing it during his imprisonment in Worcester jail in 1673-74, during which time he began dictating sections to a fellow prisoner, Thomas Lower (1633-1700), who also was his son-in-law. It was completed at Northmore Hall, Ulverston (presently in Cumbria), which was Fox's home after his marriage in 1669 to the widowed Margaret Fell (1614-1702). Before publication of the account, however, Friends assigned to the Quaker, Thomas Ellwood (formerly John Milton's amanuensis), the task of editing Fox's work. The Journal, with Ellwood's editions, finally was printed in 1694. As Ellwood's edition contained Fox's reminiscences on his childhood and religious activities during the 1640s, they also appear in Nickalls's edition of the Journal. The original manuscripts upon which these are based, however, have been lost, so that Penney's edition, which reproduces the Spence MSS, begins with events in late 1649. For discussions of this editing, see Nickalls's preface in Fox, 1694a: vii-xvi; Penney's introduction in Fox, 1694b: xxxi-xli; and Cadbury, 1974. For a discussion of the way in which Fox's Journal might have given posterity an embellished interpretation of both Quaker history and Fox's importance for the group during its early years, see Hudson: 1944a, Cadbury's response (Cadbury, 1944), and Hudson's rejoinder (Hudson, 1944b).

3

In 1938, Jones wrote that, "I see now, as I did not in the early period, what a large pathological factor there has been in the lives of many mystics in the long historical line" (quoted in Vine, 1958: 126).

4

Edwin Starbuck's (1866-1947) Psychology and Religion argued that religious conversion usually occurred between the ages of fourteen and seventeen, and therefore it tended to be an adolescent phenomenon which aided in the maturation process. He mentioned Fox in his study (1899: 22), and he had read Fox's Journal. Fox certainly received religious insights throughout his adolescence (or so his Journal indicates), although many came at a later age than Starbuck's study might suggest. His study of conversion is mentioned, however, in one of the better studies of Quakerism (Vann, 1969: 83n.45), because Vann attempted to identify the ages of the Quakers' conversions. Although he was hampered by limited data, he found that the median age at conversion of the prominent early Quaker ministers, the so-called "Valiant Sixty," was 23, while the median age at conversion for people from Norwich, Buckinghamshire, and Norfolk was about 33 (1969:83-84). Vann, who was critical of Starbuck's use of language when discussing religion, admitted admiration for James's Varieties (1969: 83n.45). Worth mentioning is that William James wrote the preface to Starbuck's book.

5

I do not know whether the claim made in the Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church that the Behmenists "later amalgamated with the Quakers" is somehow based upon a misinterpretation of Jones (Cross and Livingstone, 1977: 100), but Jones, as well as James and the Quakers, has a separate article in it.

6

At least one recent study has argued that both the early Quaker meeting for worship and the modern one, can transport the meditator "into the farthest stage of meditation, namely, contemplation, wherein he is capable of truly mystical experiences" (Adams, 1975: 189). This article cites, by the way, both Rufus Jones (Adams, 1975: 189, citing Jones, 1914[: 222]) and William James (Adams, 1975: 186, referring to James, 1902: 24), and the uncredited reference to James comes from the section of Varieties that is immediately prior to James's discussion of George Fox.

7

Jones revealed how well he was versed in the psychological literature by mentioning the terms, "Introvert/ extravert" (Jones, 1930: 32) which came from Carl Jung's 1921 publication, Psychologische Typen, that had

been translated into English in 1923.

8

Fox's Journal relates, for example, the following incident from 1649: "Now after I was set at liberty from Nottingham gaol..., I travelled as before in the work of the Lord. And coming to Mansfield-Woodhouse, there was a distracted woman under a doctor's hand, with her hair loose all about her ears. He was about to let her blood, she being first bound, and many people being about her holding her by violence; but he could get no blood from her. And I desired them to unbind her and let her alone, for they could not touch the spirit in her, by which she was tormented. So they did unbind her; and I was moved to speak to her in the name of the Lord to bid her to be quiet and be still, and she was so. The Lord's power settled her mind, and she ended and afterwards received the Truth, and continued in it to her death" (Fox, 1694a: 43-44; also cited in Cadbury's introduction to Fox, 1948: 121, see 121-122. On Fox and medicine, see Cadbury's discussion in Fox, 1948: 45ff.

9

Quaker historians themselves have acknowledged instances of insanity or "near-insanity" among the early Quakers, including a suicide by a man who might have expected to undergo a miraculous resurrection (Cadbury's introduction to Fox, 1948: 13-16; Barbour, 1964: 117-119).

10

Worth mentioning here is that Boisen's own bouts with mental illness had a great deal to do with sexuality, despite his insistence that his "problem" (as he called it) was religious in nature. He spoke, for example, of his "recocious sexual sensitivity, dating from my fourth year. With the onset of adolescence the struggle became quite severe" (Boisen, 1936: 2). Almost certainly this "struggle" had to do with masturbation. Later in his life, when he was in love with his preoccupation with a YMCA worker, Alice Batchelder, he regarded as his primary motivation to enter the ministry. He believed, incorrectly, that by doing so she would agree to marry him. For a summary of Boisen's sexual traumas, see Bergman, 1979: 213-216.

11

I am unable to find a corresponding sexual trauma among women that might have predisposed them to religious doubts, unless perhaps it was childbirth and child-death. Up to and well after the seventeenth century, childbirth was an exceedingly dangerous and very painful experience, and Keith Thomas suggests that it made women "far more conscious [than men] of the imminence of death" (Thomas, 1962: 321). According to the Book of Genesis, pain in childbirth was a curse put on women as the result of the Fall (Gen. 3: 16),

and Quakers (and other groups during the same period and throughout history) believed that they had recovered the purity of Adam (and presumably, Eve) before the Fall (Fox, 1944a: 27; C. Hill, 1972b: 259). Several Quaker women had unusual, and sometimes unfortunate, experiences with childbirth, but in two (and possibly three) cases these experiences happened after they already were Quakers. Their conversions, therefore, cannot be attributed to these childbirth experiences. Dorothy Benson of Sedbergh (wife of the prominent and active Quaker, Gervase Benson), expected that her impending childbirth would be miraculously painless, and the wife of the Olveston, Gloucestershire Quaker, Walter Clement[s], claimed, in 1657, to have undergone a painless delivery of her daughter. George and Margaret Fox apparently expected the miraculous birth of a child (she was fifty-five years old at the time of her marriage to Fox). On these stories see Cadbury's Introduction to Fox, 1948: 22n.2, 98. The wife of the Quaker, John Robins, expected that she would give birth to a new Christ, and that the birth would, we can presume, be painless, as was (according to legend), Mary's (Morton, 1970: 92; see Thomas, 1971: 28). The Quaker martyr, Mary Dyer, went through a painful childbirth in 1637 (the child was breached hip-wise). When it was finally freed (and Mary had passed out from pain), it was dead, and, alas, horribly deformed. As Thomas points out, Puritans believed that disastrous births were signs of God's judgement on the fathers or the families (Thomas, 1971: 94, 106, 107). The Quaker wife at Dyer's delivery was Anne Hutchinson, the famous New England Antinomian, herself a mother of fifteen children, although three of them died at various ages (one male before he was nine, her oldest daughter at age fourteen, and another daughter at age eight [Battis, 1962: 177-179, 13, 49]). In later periods in English history, we know that Ann Lee Stanley (1736-1784), founder of the Shakers, gave birth to four children, all of whom died in infancy, and the birth of her last child almost killed her. Not surprisingly, the religious vision that she experienced in 1770 "showed her that the foundation of human depravity was the sexual relations of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden" (Munsey, 1973: 17). The English prophetess, Joanna Southcott (1750-1814) claimed, when she was sixty-three years old, that she was going to give birth to a child (soon referred to as Shiloh) who would usher in the Millennium (see D.N.E.: s.v.; Blunt, 1874: s.v.). As indicated by the story of Ann Lee Stanley (and suggested by others), the loss of children also could predispose women (and I suppose, men) to seek religious answers about death, and this pattern occurred in the case of Mrs. Miles Halhead's conversion to Quakerism after the death of her only child, a five year old son (Sewell I, 1722: 103).

ENDNOTES TO CHAPTER TWO: WEBERIAN INTERPRETATIONS OF EARLY
QUAKERISM

1

Weber based his interpretation of the Quaker ideals for marriage on "William Penn's letters to his wife" (Weber, 1946: 350, 1920a: 563; quoted in Mitzman, 1970: 219). Weber probably had in mind a 1682 letter entitled "My dear wife and children," which he probably read in Evans and Evans (1941: 166-169; see Weber, 1920b: 266 n.35). For interpretations of Weber's possible identification with Puritanism, see both Tiryakian's (1981: 27-29) and Victor Gollwitzer's speculations (Tiryakian, 1981: 32), and my criticism of Tiryakian's argument (Kent, 1983b).

2

Weber's impressions of the meeting are found in Arianna Weber (1926b: 288-289, 1926a: 327) and Max Weber (1920b: 258 n.193; 1920a: 162 n.4, 1946: 317-318, 1920a: 230 n.2). His wife's biography contains an excerpt from a letter that he wrote to his mother in the fall of 1904, during his trip to the United States. He had attended a Quaker meeting for worship at Haverford College, a Quaker school outside of Philadelphia. In the letter he referred to the Quakers' religious services as "something special. What silence!" "Until a person spoke in it, "one heard only the crackling of the fireplace and muffled coughing (it was cold)." Another person spoke before the meeting was over, but most of it was spent in silence, "waiting for the spirit." (The first person who spoke in the meeting was a librarian-philologist, and this could have been Allen Thomas, who was the librarian of Haverford College from 1878 to 1915. I am indebted to Dr. W. Meyer of the Quaker Collection at Haverford for forwarding this piece of information to me.)

3

Since Weber suggested that the Baptists also claimed to have originated the fixed price policy, he may not have realized that the Quakers actually were the ones to have done so. He did not document his assertion for the Baptists, and I have been unable to determine what his source might have been. He realized, however, that in the eighteenth century the Methodists also adopted the fixed price policy (1946: 313; 1920a: 219 n.2). On the discussion of both the fixed price policy and the related just (or fair) price policy by other Puritan groups, see Tawney, (1926: 160-161), Bailyn (1955: 20-21), Robertson (1933: 17-18), and Bebb (1935: 102-103, 105, 110-112). On the

Methodists and the fixed price policy, see Wesley (1961: 416). Keep in mind that a fixed price on a given item did not vary according to customers, while a just price could be slightly higher for wealthy customers than for poor ones.

4

Nonetheless, it remains true that the fixed price policy has become an accepted procedure in contemporary business exchanges, at least on the level of consumer purchases.

5

Worth noting is that the Quakers' fixed price policy seems not to have stimulated widespread public discussion. For example, John Toldervy's reference to the fixed price policy in his anti-Quaker tract is the only indication that I can find in the polemical material that might indicate that a discussion of the policy was going on within the public sphere. The Quakers who attempted to refute Toldervy's book, however, did not even address the charge that the fixed price policy and related Quaker doctrines had damaged his business (Nayler, 1656; Fox, 1659: 85-87), nor did Toldervy reiterate or clarify this charge in his subsequent efforts to defend his argument (1656b, 1656c). (Unfortunately, Toldervy did not say what his business was, and neither I nor Malcolm Thomas of Friends House Library, London, are able to determine it.) Other Quaker doctrines clearly were more contentious than the fixed price policy, and therefore they attracted the most attention, especially among Puritan ministers who led the public debate against the Quakers.

7

Not all Quakers themselves, however, followed Fox's admonition. As Reay (1980a: 402-403) indicates, court records and statements from the 1650s show that at least five Quakers were accused of dishonest or unsavory business practices. These accusations involved selling underweight bread, inaccurately measuring grain, engrossing corn, regrating butter, and selling corn outside the local community during a time of shortage.

8

On the debate over the instrumentally rational (weckrational) aspects of value-rational Calvinistic behaviour, see Cohen, Hazelrigg, and Pope (1975a: 233-235, 1975b: 671), and Parsons (1975: 667). Since the early Quakers had a certainty about their salvation, however, their inner-worldly asceticism cannot be interpreted as being "self-interested" (see Cohen, Hazelrigg and Pope, 1975a: 235) as perhaps could that of the predestinarian Puritans. Schluchter's recent attempt (1981: 39-69) to develop a schema of ethics based upon the work of Weber, Jürgen Habermas, Martin L. Hoffman and Lawrence Kohlberg

might provide a useful way of conceptualizing the Quaker ethic of the fixed price policy. Using Schluchter's terminology, I am arguing that the fixed price policy, as portrayed by George Fox, exemplified an ethic of responsibility, while Weber saw it primarily as an example of an ethic of conviction.

9

As a small corrective to one of the facts that Weber cited (1946: 458 n.27, 1920: 230 n.2): [John] Goodwin (1594?-1665) did not debate in [the Long] Parliament with [William] Prynne (1600-1669) over the issue of tithe support for ministers. This debate was in printed form, since Goodwin never was a parliamentary member (see Haller, 1955: 249-253).

10

The Long Parliament met from November 3, 1640 to April 20, 1653, although on December 6, 1648, the army, through Colonel Thomas Pride, prevented forty-one members from taking their seats in Westminster because of their suspected support of efforts to reach a settlement with King Charles I. The remaining assembly that met after "Pride's purge" and until Oliver Cromwell's dissolution in 1653 is called the Rump (of the Long Parliament). The Rump was restored in the politically tumultuous year of 1659, only to be expelled by the army, then reinstated again. On February 26, 1659/60, General Monck (1608-1670) coerced the Rump to reinstate those members of the Long Parliament who were expelled by Col. Pride, and on March 16th, the restored Long Parliament voted for new elections and dissolved itself. For a general discussion of these events see Roots (1966) under "Long Parliament" and "Rump;" Underdown, 1997; and Worden, 1974.

11

Weber (1922c: 175, 1968: 550, 1922b: 333) portrayed Lilburne as having undergone the transformation of a mystic whose "revolutionary preaching to the world was chiliastically irrational," to a mystic who was "remote from the world." While I would take exception to Weber's pre-conversion portrayal, his post-conversion description is partially correct. An early biographer of Lilburne (Gibb, 1947: 340) argues that, "in one important respect Lilburne had undergone a change by no means characteristic of all Quakers....[H]e was now ready to renounce any further part in worldly struggles." She still cautions, however, that "his [conversion] experience [in 1655] is...to be seen neither as a violent change nor as an apathy of reaction" (1947: 355), given the complementarity of the Leveller ideas and Quaker beliefs (1947: 334). Nuttall (1973: 159) evaluates Lilburne's conversion by insisting that "It is clear, in the first place, that what was transformed was not

his social and political programme but himself.... Outwardly, what Lilburne's conviction did was to change not his ends but his methods of gaining them. It required that he turn from plots and threats of violence, and accept that overriding concern for the recovery of the oppressor, as well as of the oppressed, which is the mark of [Q]uaker manifestoes throughout the decade." On the relationship between the Quakers and the Levellers, it is worth noting that James Nayler, who almost certainly would have had contact with the Levellers while he served in the army, continued to communicate with the Levellers once he was released. While imprisoned in the Appleby jail in January 1652/3, Nayler wrote to Fox that "there is some good things propoundinge by ye army, ariseinge from a true sence. I should have sent you some of ye heads, but it may be you will have them at large, some other way" (Swarth. MSS.3:66, tr.2.847 [Nuttall 395]). Unfortunately the letter is undated, so we cannot be certain that Nayler was alluding to the January 28, 1653 tract, A Letter from the General Meeting of the Officers of the Army [Thomason number 669 f. 1r [83]], before it was published. In any case, Nayler and the Levellers used the same London publisher, Giles Calvert, to print their works (Terry, 1937). Nuttall (1952: 89), however, dates Nayler's letter to Fox simply as "February, 1653 (Appleby," and states that Nayler was referring to the army petition of 7 April 1653. (His reference, by the way, to this petition in Gardiner, 1903 iii: 252 should be to 1903 ii: 252.) On this issue of Nayler's apparent contact with the Levellers while he was imprisoned in Appleby, see Riddle, 1978: 81ff. Finally, Anthony Pearson, who converted to Quakerism in mid-1653, attended meetings in 1654 called by the seditious Leveller, Sir John Wildman, as Wildman was plotting to overthrow the Protectorate (Gardiner, 1903 iii: 70 n.1). Also in attendance at some of the meetings was a "Captain Bishop," but this might have been Henry Bishop, not the Quaker, George Bishop (d.1668; [see Nuttall, 1973: 155 n.39]). The same uncertainty over "Bishop's" identity also must apply to the "Bishop" who participated in the Putney Debates (see Woodhouse, 1938: under "Bishop, Capt."). For a good summary of George Bishop's radical political views, see Oliver, 1977: 123ff. Cadbury (1936: 70) quotes from a diary from the Interregnum that included the claim that "severall Levellers settled into Quakers."

12

Weber stressed the irrational aspects of millenarianism (1946: 340, 1920a: 553-554) and chiliasm (1920b: 149, 1920a: 158, 1922c: 175, 1968: 550, 1922b: 333), but apparently did not realize that millenarianism could stimulate value-rational behavior, especially in the economic sphere.

13

Between 1652 and 1660, Fox directed at least twelve tracts to parliaments or prominent political figures, and at least seven to soldiers, army officers, magistrates, or lawyers (see Smith, 1867, under "Fox, George.")

14

Two of Weber's references to Quaker material require clarification. First, Weber incorrectly cited J. A. Rowntree as the author of Quakerism Past and Present (1920b: 283 n.112, 1920a: 202 n.2), but the author's name should be J[ohn] S[tevenson] Rowntree. Second, Weber was uncertain about the first year of publication for Thomas Clarkson's Portraiture of the Christian Profession and Practice of the Society of Friends; he believed it to be "around 1830." He cited a third edition from 1867, printed in London. Actually, the book was first published by that title in 1847, and I can find references to the third edition only being published in Glasgow by R. Smeal, 1869. An 1847 copy of the work (edition unknown) was published in Glasgow by W. and R. Smeal, but in 1806 a book was published by Clarkson, entitled A portraiture of Quakerism as taken from a view of the moral education, discipline, peculiar customs, religious principles, political and civil economy and character, of the Society of Friends (London, Printed by R. Taylor for Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme). I thank Kenneth Ives for pointing out the 1806 publication to me.

ENDNOTES TO CHAPTER THREE: RESENTMENT, RELATIVE DEPRIVATION,
AND RESOURCE MOBILIZATION: A STUDY OF EARLY QUAKERISM

1

Note, however, that these studies examine conversion to established sects, not to newly forming ones.

2

McCarthy and Zald (1977: 1214 n.4) refer to Harrison's article as "an early attempt to move beyond a simple grievance model. [It] attempts to explain recruitment in social movement organizations rather than the attitudes of movement support of isolated individuals." They do not, however, develop any of his ideas.

3

These various groups, including Quakerism, the Fifth Monarchy Men, General Baptists, Seekers, Ranters, radical Independents, and remnants of the Levellers, constituted what McCarthy and Zald (1977: 1219) would call the anti-tithe "social movement industry," i.e., "all social movement organizations that have as their goal the attainment of the broadest preferences of a social movement."

4

The Nominated or Barebones Parliament (the latter name deriving from one of its members, Praise-God Barebones), met from July 4 to December 12, 1653. Its 140 members were chosen by Cromwell and the Council of Officers from names submitted by various Baptist, Independent, and other "gathered" churches, and by others who were in favour with the government (such as Major-General Thomas Harrison). In the six months of its existence, it passed a number of progressive (or some might say, radical) bills involving civil marriage, debtor and poor-prisoner relief, protection of infants and the insane, and several legal reforms. The assembly divided, however, over the issue of tithe-continuance, as the radicals pressed their demands that the entire system be abolished with no more state support offered for religion. As the radicals persisted in their abolition efforts and began achieving some parliamentary victories, the moderates feared their success and took action to prevent it. Early in the morning on December 12, the moderates convened without the radicals and declared the assembly dissolved, thereby returning their powers to Cromwell (see Watts, 1978: 142-151; Roots, 1966: 166-169).

5

A former parliamentary soldier-turned-Quaker, Richard Hubberthorne, published an account of Cromwell promising to abolish tithes "if the Lord would but deliver him" from harm in the Battle of Dunbar in September, 1650 (Hubberthorne, 1659: n.p., cited in Brockbank, 1929: 45). Cromwell, of course, never abolished them, but the story is likely to be heretical. Hubberthorne did not publish this until 1659, the year after Cromwell had died. A scholar on the famous Quaker, James Nayler, said that she never found the story verified in other literature (Fogelklou, 1931: 1). Fox mentioned it in his Journal (1694a: 394; 1694b: 115), however, which suggests that Quakers accepted Hubberthorne's story. If they did, then it undoubtedly contributed to their feelings of disgruntlement and resentment over the persistence of tithes. C. Hill (1970: 115-126; 1977: 104) cites this story, however, as if it were accurate.

6

In relative deprivationist terms, the "frequency" or "the proportion of a group who feel" the deprivation was high (Runciman, 1966: 10; see Beckford, 1975: 155).

7

Runciman (1966: 10) defines "magnitude" as "the extent of difference between the desired situation and that of the person desiring it." See also Beckford, 1975: 153. On aspirational deprivation, see also Gurr (1970: 50-56).

8

H. R. Trevor Roper's quotation is from Trevor-Roper, 1967: 443. Between Blackwood's and Reay's studies, sixty tithes resisters-turned-Quakers are mentioned, and many other tithes-resisters had surnames that appear in later Quaker records.

9

By "the Quaker experience," I believe that Smithwaite meant the belief in the immanent existence of God that was experienced through both silent worship and inspired preaching.

10

The General Baptists also contributed to the membership, activities, and organizational structure of early Quakerism in much the same way as did the Seekers. See Mann, 1969b: 25-27, 100; Barclay of Reigate, 1876: ch. X; Tallack, 1868: chs. III and X. Later in this chapter I discuss the conditions under which General Baptists came to accept to Quakerism. On the movement of people from one group to a similar one, Greil (1977: 116) points out that

"recruitment of any individual to a social or religious movement does not necessarily entail conversion to the perspective of that movement....[A] person may enlist in a movement whose perspective he has shared for a long period of time.... These individuals have been recruited, but they have not been converted, for they have shared the party's perspective all along." He continues by adding that "There are many cases where recruitment involves some alteration of the perspective of the individual, but where the alteration is not so great that we would be justified in speaking about a conversion." The processes that Greil describes probably were at work in the evolution from Seeker or General Baptist to Quaker.

11

Robert Bellah, "Religious Aspects of Modernization in Turkey and Japan," American Journal of Sociology 164 (1958): 1, quoted in Smelser, 1962: 320. Bellah's point, however, should not lead to the simplistic view that all of the Quakers' arguments against tithes were religiously motivated. Reay (1980b: 105) states that, "As common as scriptural arguments was a wide range of economic and social objections to tithes and other exactions by ministers, grievances which reflected a deep hostility towards the social order and rabid anti-clericalism."

12

Quakers were extremely critical of magistrates and lawyers (see Schenk, 1948: 125-127; Maclear, 1956: 448).

13

Purposive incentives are ones that offer value fulfillment. See Zald and Ash, 1966: 329. Membership in Quakerism offered "solidary incentives" of "prestige, respect, [and] friendship," but, with the exceptions of poor relief to members, financial support to its evangelists and possibly business from other Friends, it did not offer "material incentives (money or goods)." To the contrary, membership in Quakerism usually brought on financial loss, both through contributions to the group and confiscations over tithe payment refusal. Anderson (1977: 250) states, for example, that "Most Quakers seem to have fallen foul of the legal system sooner or later," and Watkins (1972: 183) indicates that "Practically everyone who maintained the Quaker witness against tithes and the Conventicle Acts suffered fines, imprisonment and distraint of goods, often much in excess of the law...."

14

The connection between former parliamentary army involvement and involvement with Quakerism is well known. Hirst (1923: 527-529) lists ninety-two Quakers who had been either soldiers or seamen during the Civil War, all but five

of whom had been parliamentarians. Friends' House Library, London, has more complete lists of seamen and soldiers who converted to Quakerism in its "Index of Occupations." It lists at least twenty seamen who converted, but it is not clear how many of them fought in the Civil War. All but a few of the one hundred and seventy-eight soldiers in its records fought with the parliamentary army. Many more converts, however, were former soldiers, but they are not named (see, for example, the numerous citations under "Soldiers convinced" in the index to Fox, 1694b; Firth and Davies, 1940: 134, 234-235, 247-248, 258, 272, 394-395, 440, 441, 503, 656-657, 659). General George Monck, commander of the English army in Scotland during the 1650s, considered Quakers among his troops to be potential mutineers, and considered as many of them as he could. Quakers, no doubt like the Levellers and Agitators during the late 1640s, were thought to be a threat to army discipline. As Charles Firth and Godfrey Davies indicate, "Monck entirely agreed with [Colonel William] Daniel that Quakers were 'neither fitt to command nor obey, but ready to make a distraction in the army, and a mutiny upon every slight occasion'" (quoted in Firth and Davies, 1940: 493-494).

16] When the political structure of a society is crushed by war or other means, or fails to answer the needs of a people who wish to carry on the struggle, then a prophetic, often millenarian, leadership is likely to emerge" (Worsley, 1968: 230). Worsley's primary data came from Melanesia, but no less an historian than Keith Thomas has mentioned the parallels between certain behaviours that Worsley observed and occurrences in seventeenth century England. "The Cargo cults of Melanesia are obviously analogous with such millenarian movements as that of the Fifth Monarchy Men in England; in this connection, Mr. Worsley's interpretation of the ritual defiance of traditional taboos in Melanesia makes more intelligible the breaking of social and sexual conventions by the Anabaptists of the Quakers" (Thomas, 1963: 10-11).

16

I differ with Thomason's dating of this publication. He has it listed as 27 January, 1653, but I think that it should be placed one year later, on January 27, 1654. In the tract itself Nayler dated it, "Westmerland, the 9th month, 1653" (Nayler, 1654: 11), which would, under the Julian calendar that most Englishmen used, make this "November." Fox, who published his Warning to the Rulers of England not to usurp Dominion over the Conscience along with Nayler's Lamentacion, dated his "From Westmerland, the 1st end of the month called November, 1653." The Parliament to which Nayler and Fox had wanted to distribute their tracts had to be the Nominated or Barebones

Parliament, which dissolved itself on December 11, 1653.

17

West's relationship with the Quakers may have been complicated when West apparently tried to marry the daughter of Judge Fell and the active Quaker, Margaret Fell. The daughter, whose name also was Margaret, rejected the proposal on grounds that West had not "come into the Unity of the Spirit" (that is, had not converted to Quakerism. "If we should sell the Truth of God...for a fading inheritance," the daughter claimed, "we should lose that price which the whole world cannot purchase for us" (quoted in Ross, 1949: 25-26).

18

If Williams (1978b: 126) is correct in his citation of sources that identify the author anonymous tract, The Working of Mountebanck... (1655) as Donald Lupton, then we have an example of a person who was opposed to the tithe-system but also opposed to the Quakers. Williams points out, however, the stark contrast with which this pamphlet stands in relation to his earlier opinions, and on this basis alone I am skeptical of Lupton's reputed authorship of the piece.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR: QUAKERISM AND THE FEAR OF
SUBVERSION

1

Morrison further indicates that movements which feel incremental deprivation "are typically involved in [efforts] to block changes or to bring about changes that will restore former condition--i.e., rightist or reactionary movements" (Morrison, 1971: 680). This description aptly applies to the anti-tithe/ anti-Quaker social movement. Conversely, he indicates that movements which feel aspirational deprivation "are typically involved in [efforts] for change--i.e., liberal or leftist movements" (Morrison, 1971: 680). This description aptly applies to the anti-tithe/ pro-Quaker social movement.

2

On both the conditions of Catholics and the fear of "Popery" during the Interregnum, see J. Miller, 1973: 1-86.

3

Several years later, Richard Baxter reiterated the same sentiments in a work that he dedicated to Richard Cromwell (1626-1712), the Lord Protector, after his father's death. Baxter warned him about "the subtilty of Masked Papists or Infidels that would creep into places of Council, Command, or Justice, or any public office...." One group of "Masked Papists" were "[t]he secret guides of the Quakers" (Baxter, 1659: "Epistle" [n. pag.]). Sociologically, this appeal to Richard Cromwell is an example of Baxter's attempt to acquire "elite" support for his anti-Quaker cause; and this technique will be discussed below with regard to Ralph Barker's dedication of a book to John Thurloe (1616-1668). For similar warnings about Quaker "Papists" attempting to "sneak into high places, see Tombes, 1660: "Epistle dicatory" [n. pag.]); Jarridge, 1658: 38.

4

Several years later, Baxter made similar arguments in his contribution, "To the Reader," in Tombes, 1660. See also Jarridge, 1658: 25. On Baxter, see D.N.B.; on Baxter and the Quakers, see Barbour, 1964: 135-136; Barclay of Reigate, 1976: 332-333; Nuttall, 1965: 70-71; Lamont, 1979: 48-49, 50, 127, 175-176, 180, 184, 192. In his autobiography, Baxter said that "The pamphlets [that is, The Quakers of techism] being but one or two days' work, were no great interruption to my better labours, and as they were of small worth, so also of small cost" (Baxter, 1974: 97). See also

the slanderous charges, especially against George Fox, in
London (?), 1655: 6-7.

5

On the origins of Quakerism in the midlands and the
North of England, see Barbour, 1964: 35-52, especially 41-
44. On the practice of early Quaker missionaries traveling
in pairs, see Barbour and Roberts, 1973: 35; Penney, 1907.

6

Actually, the first Quakers in Bristol were John
Mulland and Thomas Airey, who had briefly visited the city
on July 12, 1654. They spoke to some Independent and
Baptist churches, and then departed for Plymouth on July 14
(see Mortimer, 1967: 2).

7

See also Jarridge, 1658: 35-37, where the author
repeated a story about an unnamed English merchant who
identified a Quaker leader in Dorchester as a Jesuit, and
further asserted that other Jesuits were spread throughout
the West and the North of the country. Prynne (1656: 25)
related a similar story of the reputed arrest and confession
of an Irish Franciscan in Bristol whose doctrines reminded
him of Quakerism's tenets. Baxter put great stock in these
stories: see 1657: 8; 1659: 334. In a similar manner of
argument, Baxter (1659: 185-187) associated the Quakers with
the "Papists" by telling an unusual story about a person
who, as a boy, had confessed to working in collusion with
Catholic priests, and now was either a Quaker or a
sympathizer with their attacks on ministers. See also the
story in which Joshua Miller linked Quakers and "Papists"
(1655: 30).

8

For a discussion of the Oath of Abjuration, which
also was known as the Proclamation of April 1655, see
Braithwaite, 1955: 446; Fox, 1694b: 225. Braithwaite's
source is Gardiner, 1901: 225. See also "An Act for
convicting, discovering, and repressing Popish Recusants,"
20 June 1647, in Firth and Rait II, 1911: 1171-1180, and "An
Ordinance for Explanation of a Former Ordinance for
sequestration of Delinquents' Estates with some
Purgements," 18 August 1643 in Firth and Rait I: 1911:
225-256. For a brief discussion of the laws against
Catholics during the Interregnum, see Madden, 1847: 188-193.
For a more extensive discussion of these laws, including
similar laws from later periods, see Anstry, 1842.

9

Quakers were as critical of magistrates and lawyers
as they were of tithed ministers: see Schenk, 1948: 123-125;
and Maclear, 1956: 448. A tract written by a person who

identified himself only as "Mad Tom," asked his readers "whether the Jesuite did not infuse that Principal into [the Quakers], of keeping their Hats on their Heads, to teach them the better to contemn our Christian Magistrates?" (1659: 3). It might well be significant that Prynne was a lawyer. He paralleled the Quakers' disrespect toward the magistracy with the same attitude among the Franciscans, and then cited nearly a hundred Biblical verses against such behaviour (1655: 6).

10

See also Grigge, 1658: "An Advertisement to the Reader." On Feake and Cockayn[e], see D.N.B.; on the two of them and Simpson, see Capp, 1972: Appendix I.

11

To support his claim he paraphrased from Session 6 Can. 11 of the Council of Trent (See Schroeder, 1941: s.v.). The Jesuit named "Baily" to whom he referred probably was Thomas Baily (d. 1591), a native of Yorkshire who became vice-president of the Jesuit's English College at Douai. I am unable to identify, however, Brownsword's reference to Baily's text. On the basis of the Quakers' rejection of predestination, the gentryman and parliamentary peer, William Fiennes, 1st Viscount Saye and Sele (1582-1662), also concluded that "Priests and Jesuits" were actively involved in Quakerism (Schwarz, 1973: 22-23).

12

The Council of Trent doctrine to which Brownsword referred must be Session 6 Can. 18. See Schroeder, 1941: s.v.. For similar attacks on the Quakers' claim to perfection, see Clapman, 1656: 25-26; Baxter, 1657: 12.

13

Brownsword referred to "the Ministers of Newcastle" in this passage, who were Thomas Weld, Richard Prideaux, and Samuel Hammond, authors of The Perfect Pharise under Monkish Religion (1653).

14

Similarities of fasting between the Quakers and monks were mentioned in one of the first anti-Quaker tracts to appear, Francis Higginson's The Irreligion of the Northern Quakers (1653). See also Cadbury: 1948: 5, 22, 32-33, 94, 171. On the Quakers' practice of naked prophecy, see Carroll, 1975; 1977; 1978; Penney, 1907: 364-369.

15

For more about the associations between Quakers and Satan, see Gummere, 1908; Reay, 1980a: 396-400; and Thomas, 1971: 487.

16

In light of these and similar Quaker attacks against Catholicism, I find rather amusing Bossy's attempt (1976: 392-394) to establish "a special historical link" between Quakers and Catholics, especially for the Interregnum period.

17

Worth mentioning about Burrough's arrest is that the Bristol community sent a certificate to Waterford that denied that Burrough was a "Papist" (Braithwaite, 1955: 214-215).

18

On the charges of lewdness against the early Quakers, see Reay, 1980a: 391, 395). I did not, however, find any association make between their reputed "Popery" and these charges of immorality.

19

For a discussion of the term "atheism" in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Thomas, 1971: ch.6 sec. iv [Skepticism]). For a discussion of the various meanings of the term, "Ranter," as used by Quakers, see McGregor, 1977: 351, 354, 358; and for the late seventeenth century term, "enthusiasm," see Heyd, 1981: 268, 277, 279-280.

20

On Denne, see D.N.B.; Barclay of Reigate, 1876: 160-161. Neither of these sources mention that he was a repentant mutineer at Burford (C. Hill, 1972: 56). As a Baptist minister during the uncertainties of 1659, Denne wrote the tract in an attempt to offset the efforts that he saw the Presbyterians and Prelatists taking to divide the "Saints" (Horne, 1975-6: 357). Denne (1659: 6) also had read some of Baxter's charges.

21

Smith (1659a: sec. 1, no. 58) referred to Clapman's work (Clapman, 1656), and elsewhere he mentioned Prynne's story about the Cowlshaw confession (1659a: sec. 1 no.50). Smith, in a letter to a friend, evaluated the effects of his book as follows: "I have lately printed a book against ye Quakers entitled a Gag....The circumstances ([which] were then seen by all here & will now appear to y[o]u by my letter to Den) make it appear a better piece of service to this town yn otherwise it could have been; for ye Disputants ran out of town next day & never came hither since. And their meeting [which] has before encreased hath since much faln: & is almost empty..." (cited in Penney, 1913: 117).

References

- Aberle, David. 1970. "A Note on Relative Deprivation Theory as Applied to Millenarian and Other Cult Movements," in Sylvia L. Thrupp, Millennial Dreams in Action: Studies in Revolutionary Religious Movements. New York: Schocken: 209-214.
- Abrams, Philip. 1971. "Sociology and History," Past and Present 52 (August): 118-125.
- _____. 1972. "The Sense of the Past and the Origins of Sociology," Past and Present 55 (May): 11-32.
- Adams, Paul L. 1975. "Metapsychiatry and Quaker Meditation," in Stanley R. Dean, ed. Psychiatry and Hysteria. Chicago: Nelson Hall: 185-193.
- Adler, Nathan. 1974. "Ritual, Release, and Orientation: Maintenance of the Self in Antinomian Personality," in Irving I. Zaretsky and Mark P. Leone, ed. Religious Movements in Contemporary America. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 283-297.
- Alsop, James. 1979. "Gerrard Winstanley's Later Life", Past and Present 82 (February): 73-81.
- Anderson, Alan B. 1977. "A Study in the Sociology of Religious Persecution: The First Quakers," Journal of Religious History 9 no. 3 (June): 247-262.
- Anonymous. [Donald Lupton?] 1655. The Quacking Roundtable, or The Jesuite turn'd Quaker. London: E.B.

- _____. 1658. To the Generals, and Captains, Officers, and Souldiers of this present Army.... London: [n.pub.].
- Anstey, Thomas Chisholme. 1842. A Guide to the Laws of England Affecting Roman Catholics. London.
- Aspley, Maurice. 1947. John Wildman: Plotter and Postmaster. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Audland, John. 1655. The School-Master Disciplined. London: Giles Calvert.
- Aviner, G.E. 1968. "England's Spirit Unfouled, or an Incouragement to Take the Engagement. A Newly Discovered Pamphlet by Gerrard Winstanley," Past and Present 40 (July): 3-15.
- _____. ed. 1975. The Levellers in the English Revolution. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Bainbridge, Bernard. 1955. The New England Merchants in the Seventeenth Century. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Bainbridge, William Sims and Rodney Stark. 1979. "Cult Formation: Three Compatible Models," Sociological Analysis 40 no.4: 283-295.
- Bairston, Roland H. (1958-1959). "Luther: A Study in Psychiatry," review of Erik H. Erikson, Young Man Luther. The Yale Review 48: 405-410.
- Ball, Bryan W. 1975. A Great Expectation. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Bellzell, E. Digby. 1979. Puritan Boston and Quaker Philadelphia. New York: The Free Press.
- Balour, Hugh. 1964. The Quakers in Puritan England. New

Haven: Yale University Press.

- _____. 1975. "Ranters, Diggers and Quakers Reborn," Quaker History 64 no. 1 (Spring): 60-65.
- _____ and Arthur O. Roberts. 1973. Early Quaker Writings: 1650-1700. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Barclay of Aberdeen, Robert. 1676 (1701). An Apology for the true Christian Divinity, as the Same is Held Forth, and Preached, by the People, called in scorn, Quakers. translated. 1678, 4th ed. London: T. Sowle.
- Barclay of Peigate, Robert. 1876 (1878). The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth. 2nd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Baker, Eileen. 1983. "New Religious Movements in Britain: The Context and the Membership", Social Compass 30 no. 1: 33-48.
- Barnett, Bernard, S.J. 1967. The English Jesuits from Campion to Martindale. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Battis, Emery. 1962. Saints and Sectaries. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.
- Baumgarten, Eduard. 1964. Max Weber: Werk und Person. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Becker, Richard. 1656. The Quakers Catechisme. London: A. M.
- _____. 1657a. One Sheet Against the Quakers. London: Robert White.

- _____. 1657b. A Winding Sheet for Popery. London: Robert White.
- _____. 1659. A Key for Catholicks. London: R. W.
- _____. 1660. "To the Reader", in John Tombes, True Light Exalted Above Pretended New Light. London: A. M.
- _____. 1974. Autobiography of Richard Baxter. Abridged J. M. Lloyd Thomas, ed. N. H. Keeble. London: Dent.
- Webb, E. D. 1935. Nonconformity and Social and Economic Life 1660--1800. London: The Epworth Press.
- Wickford, James A. 1975. The Triumph of Prophecy. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- _____. 1978. "Sociological Stereotypes of the Religious Sect," Sociological Review 26: 109-123.
- Bellah, Robert N. 1958. "Religious Aspects of Modernization in Turkey and Japan," American Journal of Sociology 64 no.1 (July): 1-5.
- Wendix, Reinhard. 1962. Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.
- Wrens, Lewis H. 1906. The Digger Movement in the Days of the Commonwealth. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent, and Company, Ltd.
- Wernstein, Eduard. 1895a (1922, 1974). Sozialismus und Demokratie in der grossen englischen Revolution. Berlin: Verlag J. H. W. Dietz Nachf. GmbH.
- _____. 1895b (1963). Cromwell and Communism: Socialism and Democracy in the Puritan Revolution.

- translated by H. J. Stenning. New York: Schocken.
- Bertocci, Peter A. 1971. "Psychological Interpretations of Religious Experience," in Merton P. Strommen, ed., Research on Religious Development. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1971: 3-41.
- Besse, Joseph. 1733. An Abstract of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers.... Volume I (From the Year 1650 to the Year 1660). London: J. Sowle.
- Biddle, William G. 1978. The Quakers' "Jesus"--James Nayler. Ph.D. Dissertation, Wayne State University.
- B[illing], E[dward]. 1657. A Declaration to All the World of Our Faith. London: Thomas Simmons.
- Bishop, George. 1661. New England Judged by the Spirit of the Lord, Part First. in George Bishop, et. al., New England Judged...., London: T. Sowle, 1703: 7-78.
- Bishop, George. 1667. New England Judged by the Spirit of the Lord, Second Part. in George Bishop et. al., 1703. London: T. Sowle: 181-335.
- Bishop, George, et. al. 1703. New England Judged by the Spirit of the Lord, in Two Parts, with an Appendix, and John Whiting, 1702. An Answer to Cotton Mather's Abuses of Said People London: T. Sowle.
- _____, Thomas Goldney, Henry Roe, Edw[ard] P[ott], and Dennis Hollister, 1656. The Cry of Blood. London: Giles Calvert.

- Blumenthal, M. G. F. 1973. "The Early Quaker Literature of Defense", Church History (June): 203-228.
- Blackwood, Bruce Gordon. 1965. "Agrarian Unrest and the Early Lancashire Quakers," Journal of the Friends Historical Society 51 no. 1: 72-76.
- Blunt, John Henry, ed. 1874. Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, Ecclesiastical Parties, and Schools of Religious Thought. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.
- Bolton, Jacob. 1648. A Description of the three principles of the divine essence. [Translated by John Sparrow]. M. S. for H. Blunden.
- Boisen, Anton T. 1936 (1962). The Exploration of the Inner World. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bosnyk, John. 1976. The English Catholic Community 1570-1850. New York: Oxford.
- Brailsford, H.N. 1961. The Levellers and the English Revolution. ed. Christopher Hill. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Braithwaite, William C. 1912. The Beginnings of Quakerism. intro. by Rufus Jones. London: Macmillan and Co.
- _____ 1955. The Beginnings of Quakerism. 1912, 2nd ed. Ed. and revised by Henry J. Cadbury, forward by L. Hugh Doncaster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Lucy. 1979. "Anton Boisen Revisited." Journal of Religion and Health. 18 no. 3: 213-229.
- Brockbank, Elizabeth. 1929. Richard Hubberthorne of Yealand.

London: Friends Book Store.

Brenley, David and Anson D. Shupe, Jr. 1979. "Moonies" in America: Cult, Church and Crusade. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

_____. 1981. Strange Gods
Boston: Beacon Press.

Brownsword, William. 1660. The Quaker-Jesuite, or Popery in Quakerisme. London: J. M.

Brown, H.H. 1972. Science, Values, and Politics in Max Weber's Methodology. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

Burke, Peter. 1980. Sociology and History. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Burnet, G. B. 1952. The Story of Quakerism in Scotland 1650-1850. London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd.

Burrough, Edward. 1657. A Declaration to All the World of Our Faith. London: Thomas Simmons.

Cadbury, Henry J. 1936. "Some Anti-Quaker Sallies From Notebooks of a 17th Century Clergyman," Journal of the Friends' Historical Society 33 (1936): 70-71.

_____. 1944. "An Obscure Chapter of Quaker History," The Journal of Religion 24 (1944): 201-213.

_____. 1948. "Introduction" to George Fox's Book of Miracles. ed. Henry J. Cadbury. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 1974. "The Editio Princeps of Fox's Journal," Journal of the Friends' Historical Society

53 no. 3: 197-218.

- Carp, B. S. 1972. The Fifth Monarchy Men. London: Faber and Faber.
- Carroll, Kenneth L. 1975. "Sackcloth and Ashes and Other Signs and Wonders", Journal of the Friends' Historical Society 53 no. 4: 314-325.
- _____. 1977. "Quaker Attitudes towards Signs and Wonders", Journal of the Friends' Historical Society 54 2: 70-84.
- _____. 1978. "Early Quakers and 'Going Naked as a Sign'", Quaker History 67 no. 2 (Autumn): 69-87.
- Ch., Jonathan Moseley. 1978. Madmen and Friends: Quakers and the Puritan Adjustment to Religious Heterodoxy in Massachusetts Bay During the Seventeenth Century. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington.
- Clapman, Jonathan. 1656. A Full Discovery and Confrontation of the wicked and damnable Doctrines of the Quakers London: T. R. and E. M.
- Clerk, Walter Houston. 1968. "The Psychology of Religious Experience," Psychology Today. rpt. in H. Newton Malony, ed., Current Perspectives in the Psychology of Religion. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1977: 227-237.
- Clerkson, Thomas. 1806 (1869). A Portraiture of the Christian Profession and Practice of the Society of Friends. 3rd ed. Glasgow: R. Smeal.
- Clouston [Clarkson], Laur[ence], 1660. The Lost Sheep Found....

London: Laurence Claxton. rpt. by the University of Exeter: The Rota, 1974.

Cliston, Robin. 1971. "The Popular Fear of Catholics During the English Revolution", Past and Present 52: 23-55.

_____. 1973. "Fear of Popery", in The Origins of the English Civil War. ed. Conrad Russell. New York: Harper and Row: 144-167, 271-274.

Cohen, Jere, Lawrence E. Hazelrigg, and Whitney Pope. 1975a. "De-Parsonizing Weber: Critique of Parsons' Interpretation of Weber's Sociology," American Sociological Review 40: 45-64.

_____ 1975b.

"Reply to Parsons," American Sociological Review 40: 670-674.

Cole, Norman. 1970a. "The Ranters," Encounter. (April): 15-25.

_____. 1970b. The Pursuit of the Millennium. 1957, rev. and enlarged. New York: Oxford.

Cole, (W.) Alan. 1955. The Quakers and Politics, 1652-60. Ph.D. Thesis, Cambridge University.

_____. 1956. "The Quakers and the English Revolution," Past and Present 10: 39-54.

Cole, Abieter. 1649 (1973). A Fiery Flying Roll.... London: n.pub. rpt. by the University of Exeter: The Rota.

Cox, Harvey. 1978. "Deep Structures in the Study of New Religions," in Jacob Needleman and George Baker, eds.

Understanding the New Religions. New York: The Seabury Press: 122-130.

_____. 1981. "Introduction" to David Bromley and Anson D. Shupe, Jr. Strange Gods. Boston: Beacon Press: xi-xv.

Craig, Gerald R. 1966. "The Collapse of Militant Puritanism," in Essays in Modern Church History in Honor of Norman Sykes. ed. G. V. Bennett and J. D. Walsh. New York: Oxford: 76-103.

Croby, Faye. 1976. "A Model of Egotistical Relative Deprivation," Psychological Review 83 no. 2: 85-113.

_____. Forthcoming. "Relative Deprivation in Organizational Settings," in B. M. Straw and L. L. Cummings, ed. Research in Organizational Behavior. An annual series of analytic essays and critical reviews. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Cross, F. L. and E. A. Livingstone, eds. 1977 (1958, 1974). The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. 2nd, ed. corrected. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davis, David Brion. 1960. "Some Themes of Counter-Subversion: An Analysis of Anti-Masonic, Anti-Catholic, and Anti-Mormon Literature," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 47 no. 2 (September): 205-224; Bobbs Merrill Reprint Series in History--H-48.

Davis, James A. 1959. "A Formal Interpretation of the Theory of Relative Deprivation," Sociometry 22: 280-296.

- Davis, J.C. 1968. "The Levellers and Democracy," Past and Present 40 (July): 174-180.
- _____. 1980. "Gerrard Winstanley and the Restoration of True Magistracy," Past and Present 70 (February): 76-93.
- Deelman, Arthur J. 1963. "Experimental Meditation," Journal of Nervous and Mental Disorders 136: 329-373; rpt. in Charles T. Tart, ed. Altered States of Consciousness. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1972: 203-223.
- _____. 1966. "Deautomatization and The Mystic Experience," Psychiatry 29: 324-338; in Charles T. Tart, ed. Altered States of Consciousness. Garden City, New York, 1972: 25-46.
- Delaney, Paul. 1969. British Autobiography in the 17th Century. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Deane], Henry. 1659. Quaker No Papist, in Answer to the Quaker Disarmed. London: Francis Smith.
- _____. 1660. An Epistle Recommended to all the Prisons in this City & Nation. London: Francis Smith.
- Deerbury, William. 1655. A True Prophecy of the Mighty Day of the Lord... London: Giles Calvert. abridged in Hugh Parbour and Arthur O. Roberts, 1973.
- Eller, G. F. S. "The Ranters Ranting: Reflections on a Ranting Counter Culture", Church History 40 no. 1 (March, 1971): 91-107.
- Ellwood, Thomas. 1714 (1885). The History of Thomas Ellwood. London: George Routledge and Sons.

- Ellen, Paul. 1954. "The Theological Basis of Digger Communism," Church History 23: 207-218.
- Emmet, G[eorge]. 1655. A Northern Blast, or the Spiritual Quaker Converted. London: R. Lambert.
- Emm, Melvin B. 1981. "The Interpretation of Quakerism: Rufus Jones and His Critics," Quaker History 70 no. 1 (Spring): 3-21.
- Evans, William and Thomas Evans (eds.) 1841. Friends Library V. Philadelphia: Joseph Rakestraw.
- Farmer, Ralph. 1655. The Great Mysteries of Godliness and Ungodliness. London: S. G.
- Faulstich, Christopher, John Simpson, and George Cokayn. 1655. A Faithful Discovery of Treacherous Design of Mystical Antichrist. London: H. Hills.
- Firth, C. H. and R. S. Rait, eds. 1911. Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum. 3 Volumes. London: H. M. Stationary Office.
- Firth, Sir Charles and Godfrey Davies. 1940. The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Flecken, Frank K. n.d. "Deprogramming: The Legal, Religious, and Psychiatric Issues", Supplement to New Religions Newsletter 1 no. 1.
- Fousterlou, Emilia. 1931. James Nayler The Rebel Saint. Translated by Lajla Yapp. London: Ernest Benn Limited.
- Foley, Henry. ed. 1875-1883. Records of the English Province

of the Society of Jesus. 7 vols. London: Burns and Oates.

Portescue, G. K. ed. 1908. Catalogue of Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts...Collected by George Thomason, 1640-1661. 2 vols. London: Longmans & Company.

Forster, Daniel A. and Ralph W. Larkin. 1976. "From 'The Gates of Eden' to 'Day of the Locust':An Analysis of the Dissident Youth Movement of the 1960s and its Heirs of the early 1970s--the Post-movement Groups," Theory and Society 3: 45-64.

Forster, Christopher and Simon Ford. 1656. A Sober Answer to an angry Epistle Directed to all publick Teachers in this Nation. London: Samuel Gellibrand.

Fox, George. 1656. A Cry for Repentance, unto the Inhabitants of London.... London: Thomas Simmons.

_____. 1657. Concerning Good-Morrow, and Good Even.... London: Thomas Simmons.

_____. 1658. A Warning to all the Merchants in London and Such as Buy and Sell with an Advisement to them to lay aside their superfluity and with it nourish the poor. London: Thomas Simmons.

_____. 1659. The Great Mystery of the Great Whore unfolded.... London: Tho[mas] Simmons; reprinted in George Fox, 1831, vol.3: 1-519.

_____. 1661. The Line of Righteousness and Justice stretched Forth Over All Merchants, etc.. London:

Robert Wilson.

- _____. 1694a. [1975]. The Journal of George Fox.
ed. John L. Nickalls, epilogue Henry J. Cadbury and
intro. Geoffrey F. Nuttall. London: Religious Society
of Friends.
- _____. 1694b. [1911]. The Journal of George Fox. 2
vols. ed. Norman Penney. 1975 rpt. New York: Octagon
Press.
- _____. 1831. The Works of George Fox. 8 vols.
Philadelphia: Marcus T.C. Gould.
- _____. 1948. George Fox's Book of Miracles. in Henry
J. Cadbury, 1948.
- Fox the Younger, George. 1656. Compassion to the
Captives..., containing Unto you the Officers and
Soldiers of the Armies in England, Scotland and
Ireland. London: Thomas Simmons.
- _____. 1660. A Noble Salutation...Unto
Charles Stuart. London: Giles Calvert.
- Frank, Joseph. 1955. The Levellers. New York: Russell and
Russell.
- Fraser, Antonia. 1973. Cromwell: The Lord Protector. New
York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Friske, J. 1967. "Bellarmine, St. Robert", New Catholic
Encyclopedia, vol. 2. Toronto: McGraw Hill.
- Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. 1903. History of the Commonwealth
and Protectorate. 4 vols. London: Longman's Green and

Co.

- _____. ed. 1906. The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-1660. 1889, 3rd edition. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Gibb, M. A. 1947. John Lilburne the Leveller: A Christian Democrat. London: Lindsay Drummond, Ltd.
- Glover, Mary. 1972. "Mad Quakers," The Friends' Quarterly. (October): 341-355.
- Geertz, Robert Krehbiel. 1977. To Plant the Pleasant Fruit Tree of Freedom: Consciousness, Politics, and Community in Digger and Early Quaker Thought. Ph. D. Dissertation, City University of New York.
- Gooch, G. P. 1927 (1959). English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century. 1898, 2nd edition. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Grell, Arthur L. 1977. "Previous Dispositions and Conversion to Perspectives of Social and Religious Movements," Sociological Analysis 38 no.2: 115-125.
- Grigge, William. 1658. The Quaker Jesus: or, The unswadling of that Child, James Nailor. London: M. Simmons.
- Gummere, Amelia Mott. 1901. The Quaker: A Study in Costume. New York: Benjamin Blom.
- Gurney, Joan Neff and Kathleen J. Tierney. 1982. "Relative Deprivation and Social Movements: A Critical Look at Twenty Years of Theory and Research," The

Sociological Quarterly 23 (Winter): 33-47.

- Guer, Ted Robert. 1970. Why Men Rebel. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Haller, William. 1955. Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Haller, William and Godfrey Davies, ed. 1944. The Leveller Tracts. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hoyes, Thomas. 1979. Winstanley the Digger. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Head, Michael. 1981. "The Reaction to Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth Century: Towards an Integrative Approach", Journal of Modern History 53 (June): 258-280.
- Hobinson, Francis. 1653. The Irreligion of the Northern Quakers. London: T.R.
- Hill, Christopher. 1956. Economic Problems of the Church. corrected 1968. Oxford: Clarendon.
- _____. 1962 (1966). The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714. rpt. New York: W.W. Norton.
- _____. 1970. God's Englishmen: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution. New York: Harper and Row.
- _____. 1971. Antichrist in Seventeenth-Century England. London: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1972a. "The Radical Critics of Oxford and Cambridge in the 1650s," in John W. Baldwin and Richard A. Goldthwaite, ed. Universities in Politics.

- Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press: 107-132.
- _____. 1972b. The World Turned Upside Down.
London: Temple Smith.
- _____. 1977 (1979). Milton and the English Revolution. Markam, Ontario: Penguin Books.
- _____. 1980. "A Rejoinder" to Lotte Mulligan,
John K. Graham, and Judith Richards, "The Religion of
Gerrard Winstanley," Past and Present 89
(November): 147-151.
- _____, Barry Reay, and William Lamont. 1983.
The World of the Muggletonians. London: Temple Smith.
- Hill, Daniel (Special Advisor). 1980. Study of Mind
Development Groups, Sects and Cults in Ontario.
Toronto: Government of Ontario Publications
Department.
- Hill, Michael. 1973. A Sociology of Religion. New York: Basic
Books.
- Hine, Virginia H. 1974. "The Deprivation and Disorganization
Theories of Social Movements," in I. I. Zaretsky and
M. P. Leone, Religious Movements in Contemporary
America. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hurst, Margaret E. 1923. The Quakers in Peace and War. New
York: George H. Doran Co.
- Hurle, Craig W. 1975-76. "Quakers and Baptists: 1647-1660",
Baptist Quarterly 26: 344-362.
- Howet, Henoeh. 1655. Quaking Principles dashed in pieces by
the standing and unshaken Truth. London: Henry Hill.

- Levy, W. Ivan. 1967. "The Entry of the Sects into Scotland," in Duncan Shaw, ed. Reformation and Revolution. Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew's Press.
- Hubberthorne, Richard. 1659. A Word of Wisdom and Counsel to the Officers and Souldiers of the Army of England. London: Thomas Simmons.
- Hudson, Winthrop S. 1943. "Gerrard Winstanley and the Early Quakers," Church History 12: 177-194.
- _____. 1944a. "Quaker History: Dr. Hudson Replies [to Henry J. Cadbury]," The Journal of Religion 24 no. 4 (October): 279-281.
- _____. 1944b. "A Suppressed Chapter in Quaker History," Journal of Religion 24 (April): 108-118.
- _____. 1946. "Economic and Social Thought of Gerrard Winstanley: Was He a Seventeenth Century Marxist?," The Journal of Modern History 18 no. 1: 1-21.
- Hughes, Ann (ed.). 1980. Seventeenth Century England: A Changing Culture Vol. I: Primary Sources. Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Noble.
- Hinsberger, Bruce. 1980. "Problems and Promise in the Psychology of Religion: An Emerging Social Psychology of Religion?," Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science 12 no. 1: 64-77.
- Lutchei, Elizabeth. 1970. Victorian Quakers. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Ives, Jeremiah. 1656. The Quakers Quaking: or, The Foundation of their Deceit Shaken. London: J. Cottrel.
- Jacob, James R. 1983. Henry Stubbe, Radical Protestantism and the Early Enlightenment. London: Cambridge University Press.
- James, Margaret. 1941. "The Political Importance of the Tithes Controversy in the English Revolution, 1640-1660," History 26: 1-18.
- James, William. 1902 (1958). The Varieties of Religious Experience. New York: New American Library.
- Jarridge, Peter. 1658. The Jesuites Displayed, or, Their Works of Darkness brought to Light. London: W. Gilbertson.
- Jones, Rufus. 1909. Studies in Mystical Religion. London: Macmillan.
- _____. "Introduction" to William C. Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism. London: MacMillan and Co. Ltd.
- _____. 1914 (1959). Spiritual Reformers in the 16th and 17th Centuries. rpt. Boston: Beacon Press.
- _____. 1919. "Introduction" to William C. Braithwaite, The Second Period of Quakerism. London: MacMillan and Co.
- _____. 1923. The Quakers in the American Colonies. London: Macmillan and Company.
- _____. 1927. New Studies in Mystical Religion.

London: Macmillan and Co., Limited.

- _____. 1930. George Fox: Seeker and Friend. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- _____. 1932. Mysticism and Democracy in the English Revolution. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Juretic, George. 1975. "Digger No Millenarian: The Revolutionizing of Gerrard Winstanley," Journal of the History of Ideas 36: 263-280.
- Kennedy, Thomas. 1983. "History and Religious Revival: The Vision of John Wilhelm Rowntree," paper presented at the Western Conference on British Studies, Boulder, Colorado (October).
- Kent, Stephen A. 1982a. "The 'Papist' Charges Against the Interregnum Quakers", Journal of Religious History 12 2 (December): 180-190.
- _____. 1982b. "Relative Deprivation and Resource Mobilization: A Study of Early Quakerism", British Journal of Sociology 33 no. 4 (December): 529-544.
- _____. 1983a. "The Quaker Ethic and the Fixed Price Policy: Max Weber and Beyond." Sociological Inquiry 53 no. 1: 16-32.
- _____. 1983b. "Weber, Goethe, and the Nietzschean Allusion: Capturing the Source of the 'Iron Cage' Metaphor", Sociological Analysis 44 no.4 (forthcoming).

- Kim, Chrysostom, O.S.B. 1974. "The Diggers, The Ranters and the Early Quakers", The American Benedictine Review 25: 460-475.
- Kirby, Ethyn Williams. 1931 (1972). William Prynne: A Study in Puritanism. Reissue. New York: Russell and Russell.
- Knight, Rachel. 1922. The Founder of Quakerism. A Psychological Study of George Fox. London: The Swarthmore Press.
- Lanont, William M. 1963. Marginal Prynne: A Study in Puritanism. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- _____. 1979. Richard Baxter and the Millennium. London: Croom Helm.
- _____. 1980. "Christian Magistrate and Romish Wolf," in Prophecy and Millenarianism. Essays in Honour of Marjorie Reeves. ed. Ann Williams. Harlow, Essex (U.K.): Longman House: 279-303.
- _____. 1983. "The Muggletonians 1652-1979: A 'Vertical' Approach," Past and Present 99 (May): 22-40.
- Lancashire, David. 1978. "The New Religions: Mind-Benders or True Redeemers?", Globe and Mail (Toronto), Saturday, January 21: 10.
- Laski, Marghanita. 1961. Ecstasy: A Study of Some Secular & Religious Experiences. London: The Cresset Press.
- Lavor, Henry. 1657. Replies made to the Antiqueries of Thomas Lye, who writes himself Minister of the Gospel at Chard.... London: Dan[iel] White.

- Leuba, James H. 1925. The Psychology of Religious Mysticism. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Lewy, Guenther. 1974. Religion and Revolution. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lilburne, John, Richard Overton, and Thomas Prince (probable authors). 1649. The Second Part of England's New Chaines Discovered. rpt. in William Haller and Godfrey Davies, ed. The Leveller Tracts. New York: Columbia University Press. 1944: 171-189.
- Lindley, Keith. 1973. "The Part Played by Catholics," in Brian Manning, ed. The English People and the English Revolution. London: Edward Arnold.
- Lloyd, Arnold. 1950. Quaker Social History. Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Lofland, John. 1966 (1977, 1981). Doomsday Cult. Enlarged edition. New York: Irving Publishers.
- _____ and Rodney Stark. 1965. "Becoming a World-Saver: A Theory of Conversion to a Deviant Perspective," American Sociological Review 30: 862-875.
- Longkin, William L. 1959. Baptist Confessions of Faith. Philadelphia: Judson Press.
- Lupton, Donald(?). 1655. The Quaking Moutebanck or the Jesuite turned Quaker. London: E.B.
- McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory,"

American Journal of Sociology. 82 no. 6 (May): 1212-1241.

Macdonald, Michael. 1981. Mystical Bedlam: Madness, Anxiety, and Healing in Seventeenth-Century England. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Macgregor, J. F. 1977. "Ranterism and the Development of Early Quakerism," Journal of Religious History 9 no. 4: 349-363.

Muclear, James Fulton. 1950. "Quakerism and the End of the Interregnum: A Chapter in the Domestication of Radical Puritanism," Church History 19: 240-270.

_____. 1953. "The Making of the Lay Tradition," Journal of Religion. 33 no.2 (April): 113-136.

_____. 1956. "Popular Anticlericalism in the Puritan Revolution," Journal of the History of Ideas 17 no. 4 (October): 443-470.

Mal Tom. 1659. Twenty Quaking Queries, Having been Clouded, and now Brought forth to Light. London: Robert Page.

Mendon, R. R. 1847. The History of the Penal Laws Enacted Against Roman Catholics. London: Thomas Richardson and Son.

Manning, Brian. 1973. "Religion and Politics: The Godly People," in Brian Manning, ed. Politics, Religion and the English Civil War. London: Edward Arnold.

_____. 1976. The English People and the English

- Revolution 1640-1649. London: Heinemann.
- Martel, Martin U. 1979. "Parsons, Talcott." International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences: Biographical Supplement. edited by David Sills. New York: Free Press: 609-630.
- Marten, Henry. [1655]. Justice Would-bee / that made himself / a Ranter last week in opposition to / those hee calls / QUAKERS / Aunswered / by one who knowes as little of them as / hee doth. MSS. published in C. M. Williams, 1978b.: 130-134.
- Martin, David. 1965. Pacifism: An Historical and Sociological Study. New York: Schocken Books.
- Martin, Joseph Walford. 1966. The English Revolution and the Rise of Quakerism 1650-1660. Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University.
- Marx, Gary T. 1979. "External Efforts to Damage or Facilitate Social Movements: Some Patterns, Explanations, Outcomes, and Complications," in Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy, eds. The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Social Control, and Tactics. Cambridge Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.: 94-125.
- Merton, Robert K. 1968. Social Theory and Social Structure. Enlarged Edition. New York: The Free Press.
- Miller, John. 1973. Popery and Politics in England--1660-1688. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, Joshua. 1655. Antichrist in Man: The Quakers Idol.

London: J. Maccock.

- Mitman, Arthur. 1970. The Iron Cage: An Historical Interpretation of Max Weber. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Morrison, Denton E. 1971. "Some Notes Toward Theory on Relative Deprivation, Social Movements, and Social Change," American Behavioral Scientist 14 no. 5 (May-June): 675-690.
- Mortimer, Russell. 1967. Early Bristol Quakerism: The Society of Friends in the City 1654-1700. Bristol: Bristol Branch of the Historical Association.
- Mulligan, Lotte, John K. Graham and Judith Richards. 1980. "The Religion of Gerrard Winstanley," Past and Present 89 (November): 144-146.
- Munsey, Raymond Lee. 1973. Sex and Marriage in Utopian Communities. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Naylor, James. 1654. A Lamentacion...over the Ruines of this oppressed Nacion, to be deeply layd to heart by Parliament and Army..., York: Tho[mas] Wayt.
- _____. 1656. Foot Yet in the Snare... London: Giles Calvert.
- Reed, Arthur G. 1970. "Conflict and the Functional Equivalence of Social Movements," Sociological Focus 3 (Spring): 3-12.
- Riesebrodt, H. Richard. 1929 (1957). The Social Sources of

Denominationalism. New York: The World
Publishing Company.

Norman [Niman?], Henry, Edw: [Edmund] Dun [Donne], Rob:[ert]
Dun [Donne], Benj:[amin] Dunt., Tho.[mas] Taylor,
Wil[liam]. Saunders, Henry Slave [Slane, Slann?],
Tho.[mas] Beedle, younger, Rich:[ard] Moseley, and
John Currant, A Declaration of the grounds and
Reasons, why we the poor Inhabitants of the Parrish
of Iver in Buckinghamshire, have begun to digge and
mannure the common wast[e] Land...., in Keith Thomas,
1969a.

Puttall, Geoffrey. 1946. The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and
Experience. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

_____. 1952. Early Quaker Letters From the
Swarthmore MSS. to 1660. London: Library of Friends
House.

_____. 1954. James Nayler: A Fresh Approach.
London: Friends Historical Society.

_____. 1965. Richard Baxter. London: Nelson.

_____. 1967. The Puritan Spirit: Essays and
Addresses. London: Epworth Press.

_____. 1973. "Overcoming the World: The Early
Quaker Programme," in Derek Baker, ed. Studies in
Church History Vol. 10. Sanctity and Secularity: The
Church and the World. Oxford: Basil Blackwell: 145-
164.

_____. 1983. "Record and Testimony: Quaker

- Persecution Literature 1650-1700", Manuscript, Friends House Library, London.
- Oliver, Pamela. 1977. Quaker Testimony and the Lamb's War. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Melbourne.
- O'Malley, Thomas P. "The Press and Quakerism, 1653-1659," Journal of the Friends Historical Society 54 no. 4: 169-184.
- Pahnke, Walter N. and William A. Richards. 1966. "Implications of LSD and Experimental Mysticism," Journal of Religion and Health 5, rpt. in Charles T. Tart, ed. Altered States of Consciousness Garden City, New York, 1972: 409-439.
- Payne [Payne], John. 1655. A Discovery of the Priests. London: Giles Calvert.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1975. "On de-Parsonizing Weber (Comment on Cohen et. al.)," American Sociological Review. 40: 666-670.
- Past and Present editors. 1964. "History, Sociology and Social Anthropology," Past and Present (April): 102-108.
- Pearson, Anthony. 1654. A Few Words to all Judges, Justices, and Ministers of the Law in England. London: Giles Calvert.
- [Pearson,] A[nthony. 1657. The Great Case of Tythes Truly Stated, clearly opened, and fully resolved. London: Giles Calvert.

Fenney, Norman, ed. 1911. The First Publishers of Truth.

London: Headley Brothers.

_____. 1913. Extracts from State Papers Related to Friends, 1654-1672. Supplement to The Journal of the Friends Historical Society, Nos. 8, 9, 10.

London: Headley Brothers.

_____. 1920. The Household Account Book of Sarah Fell of Swarthmoor Hall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Festana, Carla Gardina. 1983. "The City upon a Hill under Siege: The Puritan Perception of the Quaker Threat to Massachusetts Bay, 1656-1661," The New England Quarterly (September): 323-353.

Petegorsky, David W. 1940. Left Wing Democracy in the English Civil War. London: Victor Gollancz.

Prall, Stuart E. 1966. The Agitation for Law Reform During the Puritan Revolution 1640-1660. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Pratt, James Bissett. 1920. The Religious Consciousness: A Psychological Study. New York: Macmillan Company.

Prvno, William. 1648. Demand of His Liberty to the General. Broadside (26 December).

_____. 1655. Quakers Unmasked, and Clearly detected to be but the Spawn of Romish Frogs, Jesuites, and Franciscan Fryers. The Second Edition Enlarged.

London: Edward Thomas.

_____. 1656. A New Discovery of Some Romish

Emissaries, Quakers. London: William Prynne.

- Reay, Barry G. 1976. "The Muggletonians: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Sectarianism", The Journal of Religious History 9 1 (June): 32-49.
- _____. 1978. "The Quakers, 1659, and the Restoration of the Monarchy," History 63: 193-213.
- _____. 1980a. "Popular Hostility towards Quakers in Mid-Seventeenth Century England," Social History. 5 no. 3: 387-407.
- _____. 1980b. "Quaker Opposition to Tithes 1652-1660," Past and Present 86 (February): 98-120.
- _____. 1980c. "The Social Origins of Early Quakerism," Journal of Interdisciplinary History 11 no. 1 (Summer): 55-72.
- Robbins, Thomas, Dick Anthony. 1979. "Cults, Brainwashing, and Counter-Subversion," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. (November): 78-90.
- _____. 1980. "Brainwashing and the Persecution of 'Cults,'" Journal of Religion and Health. 19 no. 1 (Spring): 66-69.
- _____, and James Richardson. 1978. "Theory and Research on Today's 'New Religions,'" Sociological Analysis 39 no. 2: 95-124.
- Rosen, George. 1968 (1969). Madness in Society New York: Harper Torchbooks.

- Ross, Isabel. 1949. Margaret Fell: Mother of Quakerism.
Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Rothman, David J. 1971. "Sociology and History," Past and Present (August): 126-133.
- Roots, Ivan. 1966. Commonwealth and Protectorate. The English Civil War and its Aftermath. New York: Schocken Books.
- Rowntree, John Stephenson. 1859. Quakerism, Past and Present: Being an Inquiry into the Causes of its Decline in Great Britain and Ireland. London: Smith, Elder, and Co.
- Rowntree, John Wilhelm. 1906. John Wilhelm Rowntree: Essays and Addresses. ed. Joshua Rowntree. London: Headley Brothers.
- Royce, Josiah. 1912. Sources of Religious Insight. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- _____ 1913. "George Fox as a Mystic," Harvard Theological Review 6: 31-59.
- Runciman, W.C. 1961 (1968). "Problems of Research on Relative Deprivation," in Herbert H. Hyman and Eleanor Singer, eds., Readings in Reference Group Theory and Research. New York: The Free Press: 69-76.
- _____. 1966. Relative Deprivation and Social Justice. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Saxon, Beatrice. 1949. "Notes and Queries: 'Woe to the Bloody City of Lichfield,'" Journal of the Friends' Historical Society. 41 no. 2: 86-87.

- Schenk, W. 1948. The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution. Toronto: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Schluchter, Wolfgang. 1978. "The Paradox of Rationalization: On the Relation of Ethics and World," in Max Weber's Vision of History: Ethics and Methods. trans. Guenther Roth. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1981. The Rise of Western Rationalism; Max Weber's Developmental History. trans. Guenther Roth. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Schroeder, H. J., ed. and trans. 1941. Canons and Degrees of the Council of Trent. London: B. Herder Book Company.
- Schwarz, Marc L. 1973. "Viscount Saye and Sele and the Quakers," Quaker History 62 no. 1 (Spring): 14-34.
- Scott, Richenda C. 1960. "Authority or Experience: John Wilhelm Rowntree and the Dilemma of 19th Century British Quakerism," Journal of the Friends' Historical Society 49 no. 2 (Spring): 75-95.
- Selleck, A. D. 1960. "The Trial of Thomas Salthouse and Miles Halhead," Journal of the Friends' Historical Society 49 no. 3 (Autumn): 137-147.
- Sewel, William. 1722. (1854 or 1855?) The History of the Rise, Increase, and Progress of the Christian People Called Quakers.... corrected 1725, rpt., 2 volumes in 1. Philadelphia: Friends Book Store.
- Shupe, Anson D. Jr. 1981. Six Perspectives on New Religions:

A Case Study Approach. Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press.

_____ and David G. Bromley. 1979. "The Moonies and the Anti-Cultists: Movement and Countermovement in Conflict," Sociological Analysis 40 no. 4 (Winter): 325-334.

_____, Roger Spielmann, and Sam Stigall. 1977. "Deprogramming: The New Exorcism," American Behavioral Scientist 20 no. 6 (July/August): 941-956.

Simpson, Alan. 1954. "Saints in Arms: English Puritanism as Political Utopianism," Church History 23: 119-125.

Smelser, Neil. 1962 (1971). Theory of Collective Behavior. rpt. New York: Free Press.

Smith, Elsie M. 1911. "Extracts Relating to Friends from the Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe," Journal of the Friends' Historical Society 8 no. 4: 147-169.

Smith, Joseph. 1867. A Descriptive Catalogue of Friends' Books... 2 vols. 1970 rpt. New York: Kraus Reprint Company.

_____. 1873. Bibliotheca Anti-Quakeriana. London: Joseph Smith.

Smith, Thomas. 1659a. A Gagq for the Quakers, with an Answer to Mr Denn's Quaker No Papist. London: J.C.

_____. 1659b. The Quaker Disarmed. London: J. C.

- _____. 1659c. Questions Propounded to George Whitehead and George Fox . . . in Camb. Aug. 29, 1659 by R. G. [Richard Blome]. London: J. C.
- Solt, Leo. 1959. Saints in Arms: Puritanism and Democracy in Cromwell's Army. London: Oxford.
- Spurrier, William Wayne. 1976. The Persecution of the Quakers in England: 1650-1714. Unpublished Dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Stark, Rodney and William Sims Bainbridge. 1980. "Networks of Faith: Interpersonal Bonds and Recruitment to Cults and Sects," American Journal of Sociology 85 no. 6: 1376-1395.
- Starbuck, Edwin Diller. 1899 (1911). The Psychology of Religion: An Empirical Study of the Growth of Religious Consciousness. 3rd ed. Preface by William James. New York: The Walter Scott Publishing Co.
- Stephen, L. and S. Lee, ed. 1885-1900 (1908-1909). Dictionary of National Biography. 21 vols. 1885-1900, corrected rpt. London: Oxford University Press.
- Stone, Lawrence. 1966. "Social Mobility in England, 1500-1700," Past and Present 33: 16-55; rpt. in Seventeenth Century England: Society in an Age of Revolution. ed and intro. by Paul S. Seaver. New York: New Viewpoints (A Division of Franklin Watts), 1976: 26-70.

- _____. 1981. The Past and the Present. Boston: London & Kegan Paul.
- Swatos, William H. 1977. "The Comparative Method and the Special Vocation of the Sociology of Religion," Sociological Analysis 38 no. 2: 106-114.
- Tallack, William. 1868. George Fox, the Friends, and the Early Baptists. London: S.W. Partridge & Co.
- Taylor, Edward. 1691. Jacob Behmen's Theosophick philosophy unfolded. London: For Thomas Salusbury, Tawney,
- Richard H. 1926 (1977). Religion and the Rise of Capitalism. rpt. Baltimore: Pelican Books.
- Terry, Altha E. 1937. Giles Calvert, Mid Seventeenth Century English Bookseller and Publisher: An Account of His Publishing Career, With a Checklist of Imprints. Master of Science in the School of Library Science, Columbia University.
- Thaddeus, Rev. Father, O.F.M. 1898. The Franciscans in England: 1600-1850. London: Art Book Company.
- Thomas, Keith. 1958. "Women and the Civil War Sects," Past and Present 13, rpt. in Crisis in Europe 1560-1660. ed. Trevor Aston. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1965: 317-340.
- _____. 1963. "History and Anthropology," Past and Present. 24 (April): 3-24.
- _____. 1969a. "Another Digger Broadside," Past and Present 42 (February): 57-61.

- _____. 1969b. "The Date of Gerrard Winstanley's Fire in the Bush," Past and Present 42 (February): 160-162.
- _____. 1971. Religion and the Decline of Magic. New York: Scribners.
- _____. 1972. "The Levellers and the Franchise," in G. E. Aylmer, ed. The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement 1646-1660. London: Macmillian Press: 57-78, 219-222.
- Thompson, Christopher. 1980. "Maximilian Petty and the Putney Debate on the Franchise," Past and Present 88 (August): 63-69.
- Thompson, E.P. 1963 (1966). The Making of the English Working Class. rpt. New York: Vintage Books.
- Thrupp, Sylvia L. ed. 1970. Millennial Dreams in Action: Studies in Revolutionary Religious Movements. New York: Schocken.
- Tiryakian, Edward A. 1981. "The Sociological Import of a Metaphor: Tracking the Source of Max Weber's 'Iron Cage'," Sociological Inquiry 51: 27-33.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de. 1856 (1858, 1955). The Old Régime and the French Revolution. Trans. Stuart Gilbert. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.
- Tombes, John. 1660. True Old Light Exalted Above Pretended New Light. London: A. M.
- Toldervy, John. 1655. The Foot Out of the Snare...Being a Brief Declaration of his entrance into

the...Quakers...With the manner of his separation from them. London: Tho[mas] Brewster.

_____. 1656a. The Snare Broken.... London: N. Brooks.

_____. 1656b. The Naked Truth Laid open.... London: Giles Calvert.

Trevor-Roper, H. R. 1967. Religion, the Reformation and Social Change. London: Macmillan.

Troeltsch, Ernst. 1911 (1931). The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches. 2 Vols. trans. Olive Wyon. London: Allen and Unwin.

Underdown, D. 1971. Pride's Purge. Politics in the English Revolution. Oxford: Clarendon.

Underhill, Thomas. 1660. Hell Broke Loose: Or an History of the Quakers Both Old and New. London: Simon Miller.

Underhill, Evelyn. 1911 (1957). Mysticism. rpt. London: Methuen.

Underwood, T. L. 1970. "Early Quaker Eschatology," in Peter Toon, ed. Puritans, the Millennium, and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology--1600 to 1660. London: James Clarke and Co.: 91-103.

Vann, Richard T. 1959. "From Radicalism to Quakerism: Gerrard Winstanley and Friends," Journal of the Friends' Historical Society 49 no. 1: 41-46.

_____. 1962. "Diggers and Quakers--A Further Note," Journal of the Friends' Historical Society 50

no. 2: 65-68.

_____. 1969a. "Nuture and Conversion in the Early Quaker Family," Journal of Marriage and the Family 31 no.4: 639-643.

_____. 1969b. The Social Development of English Quakerism 1655-1755. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Vining, Elizabeth Cray. 1958. Friend of Life. The Biography of Rufus M. Jones. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Wallis, Roy. 1975. "Relative Deprivation and Social Movements: A Cautionary Note," British Journal of Sociology. 26: 360-363.

Watkins, Owen C. 1972. The Puritan Experience. New York: Schocken.

Watts, Michael R. 1978. The Dissenters vol. 1. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Weber, Marianne. 1926a (1950). Max Weber; ein Lebensbild. Heidelberg: L. Schneider.

_____. 1926b (1975). Max Weber: A Biography. trans. and ed. Harry Zohn. New York: John Wiley.

Weber, Max. 1903, 1905a, 1906 (1975). Roscher and Knies: The Logical Problems of Historical Economics. Translated and introduction by Guy Oakes. New York: Collier MacMillan.

_____. 1904, 1905b. "Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus." Archiv fur Sozial-

wissenschaft und Sozialpolitik, volumes XX and XXI.

_____. 1910a (1978). "'Anticritical Last Word on The Spirit of Capitalism' by Max Weber," trans. and intro. by Wallace M. Davis. American Journal of Sociology 83 no. 5 (1978): 1105-1130.

_____. 1910b (1924). "Geschäftsbericht und Diskussionsreden auf den deutschen soziologischen Tagungen [Rede auf dem ersten Deutschen Soziologentage in Frankfurt]," in Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Soziologie und Sozialpolitik. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

_____. 1920a (1972). Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie. Band 1. rpt. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

_____. 1920b (1930, 1958, 1976). The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Translated and edited by Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

_____. 1920c (1951). The Religion of China: Confucianism and Taoism. Translated and edited by Hans H. Gerth. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

_____. 1920d (1966). Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie, Band 2, Hinduismus und Buddhismus. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

_____. 1920e (1958). The Religion of India. Translated and edited by Hans H. Gerth and Don Martindale. New York: The Free Press.

_____. 1920f. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie,
Band 3. Das Antike Judentum. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr
(Paul Siebeck).

_____. 1920g (1952). Ancient Judaism. Translated and
edited by Hans H. Gerth and Don Martindale. New York:
The Free Press.

_____. 1922a (1968). Gesammelte Aufsätze zur
Wissenschaftslehre. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul
Siebeck).

_____. 1922b (1956). Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft.
Vierte Auflage besorgt von Johannes Winckelmann.
Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

_____. 1922c. (1963). The Sociology of Religion. 4th
edition revised by Johannes Winckelmann, edited and
translated by Ephram Fischhoff. Boston: Beacon Press.

_____. 1922d. (1968). Economy and Society. 2
vols. ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. 4th rev.
ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____. 1936. Jugendbriefe. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul
Siebeck).

_____. 1946. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology.
translated and edited by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright
Mills. New York: Oxford.

_____. 1947b. The Theory of Social and Economic
Organization. trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott
Parsons. New York: The Free Press.

_____. 1947b (1968). Schriften zur Theoretischen

Soziologie zur Soziologie der Politik und Verfassung.

Reprint. New York: Burt Franklin.

_____. 1949. The Methodology of the Social Sciences.

Translated and edited by Edward A. Shils and Henry A. Finch. New York: The Free Press.

Weingarten, Hermann. 1868. Die Revolutionskirchen Englands.

Leipzig: Brekopf und Hartel.

Weld, Thomas, Richard Prideaux, Samuel Hammond, and William

Durant. 1653. (1654). The Perfect Pharise under

Monkish Holines. Reprint. London: Richard Tomlins.

Wesley, John. 1961. Wesley's Standard Sermons [The Standard

Sermons of John Wesley]. Vol. 1. ed. Edward H.

Sugden. 5h ed. London: Epworth Press.

Westues, Kenneth. 1975. "Inter-Generational Conflict in the

Sixties," in Samuel D. Clark, J. Paul Grayson, and

Linda M. Grayson, ed. Prophecy and Protest: Social

Movements in Twentieth Century Canada. Toronto: Gage

Educational Publishing Limited: 387-408.

Williams, C. M. 1978a. "The Anatomy of a Radical Gentleman--

Henry Marten," in Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas,

eds., Puritans and Revolutionaries. Essays in

Seventeenth Century History Presented to Christopher

Hill. Oxford: Clarendon Press: 118-138.

_____. 1978b. "An Unpublished Defence of the

Quakers, 1655," Journal of the Friends' Historical

Society 54 no. 3: 126-134.

- Wilson, Bryan R. 1971. "Sociological Methods in the Study of History," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 5th Series. 21: 101-118.
- _____. 1978. "Becoming a Sectarian: Motivation and Commitment," in Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian. ed. Derek Baker. Studies in Church History vol. 15. Oxford: Basil Blackwell: 481-506.
- Wing, Donald, ed. and compiler. 1945. Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America...1641-1700. 3 vols. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Winstanley, Gerrard [Gerrard]. 1650. Englands Spirit Unfouled. Or an Incouragement to Take the Engagement.... in G.E. Aylmer, 1968.
- _____. 1652 (1941, 1973). The Law of Freedom in a Platform or, True Magistry Restored. ed. Robert W. Kenny. rpt. New York: Schocken Books.
- _____. 1973. The Law of Freedom and Other Writings. ed. Christopher Hill. Baltimore: Penguin Books.
- Winthrop, John. 1790. The History of New England From 1630 to 1649. Vol. 1. ed. James Savage. New York: Arno Press, 1972.
- Wolfe, Don M. 1941 (1963). Milton in the Puritan Revolution. rpt. New York: Humanities Press.
- Woodhouse, A. S. P., ed. 1938. Puritanism and Liberty.

- London: J. M. Dent and Sons Limited.
- Worden, Blair. 1974. The Rump Parliament 1648-1653.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Worsley, Peter. 1968. The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of
'Carqo' Cults in Melanesia. 2nd augmented ed. New
York: Schocken.
- Yinger, J. Milton. 196. Religion and the Struggle for
Power. New York: Russell and Russell.
- _____. 1982. Countercultures: The Promise and
the Peril of a World Turned Upside Down. New York:
The Free Press.
- Yule, George. 1958. The Independents in the English Civil
War. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zald, Mayer N. and Roberta Ash. 1966. "Social Movement
Organizations: Growth, Decay and Change." Social
Forces 44 (March): 327-341.
- _____ and Michael A. Berger. 1978. "Social Movements
in Organizations: Coup d'Etat, Insurgency, and Mass
Movements," American Journal of Sociology 83
no. 4: 823-861.
- Zygmunt, Joseph F. 1972. "Movements and Motives: Some
Unresolved Issues in the Psychology of Social
Movements," Human Relations 25 no. 5: 449-467.