

1-1-2003

An Author's Response to Stephen Angell and Corey Beals

Rosemary Moore

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/qrt>



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Moore, Rosemary (2003) "An Author's Response to Stephen Angell and Corey Beals," *Quaker Religious Thought*: Vol. 99, Article 8.
Available at: <http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/qrt/vol99/iss1/8>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Quaker Religious Thought by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University.

AN AUTHOR'S RESPONSE TO STEPHEN ANGELL AND COREY BEALS

ROSEMARY MOORE

I should like to start by introducing myself. I was brought up to the Church of England and discovered Quakers almost exactly 50 years ago while at university, becoming a member in 1954. I took a degree in philosophy, politics and economics, and followed this with a theology degree. Presently I married, and, like many women of that generation, I combined raising a family with schoolteaching. In 1985, the local education authority was offering teachers generous early retirement terms, which I accepted, and I had then to decide what to do with myself. I hoped that I could make myself useful as a Quaker, and since retiring, I have served in various monthly and preparative meeting offices. At this present time I am preparative meeting co-clerk, member of Meeting for Sufferings, and a member of the Meeting for Sufferings Committee, which is a body recently set up to prepare the detail of Sufferings business.

I also wanted to do something academic, and after resurrecting my long-lost theology I wanted to go further. A good friend suggested a Ph.D., and my first idea was to look at the similarities and differences between the Corinthian church and early Quakers, and maybe to compare both with another charismatic body. However, working with John Punshon at Woodbrooke, I found that this topic was not viable because of the lack of agreement among experts as to the nature of early Quakerism. So I changed my subject to “The Faith of the First Quakers” and completed my Ph.D. in 1993. Incidentally, I don't think I ever said that I intended to read all the early Quaker letters—that would be an impossibility—but I did set out to look at all the printed pamphlets that I could get hold of, resisting the suggestion of my supervisor that a sample would do as they were all much of a muchness.

My Ph.D. thesis ended with the restoration of the monarchy in 1660. During the next few years I read further, bringing my proposed book to the autumn of 1666, just before Fox started his major reor-

64 • ROSEMARY MOORE

ganization and before Penn and Barclay came on the scene. Turning my material into a readable book was a complicated process, and much is owed to Peter Potter, editor-in-chief of Penn State University Press, who was insistent that he would only accept a book that would be accessible to the general reader as well as useful to the specialist.

Now to your reviewers. It is difficult to reply to such a generous review as Stephen Angell's. I'd like to comment briefly on what he says about Henry Cadbury's edition of Fox's "Book of Miracles." Angell gave me the impression that he thinks that I disagree with Cadbury. Not so. Cadbury's introduction makes it clear that he was applying the "hermeneutics of suspicion," as we would say nowadays, and as a great biblical scholar would, and most of what I say about the lack of contemporary evidence for miracles, can be found in Cadbury's newly reprinted book. Incidentally, Richard Farnworth, at the time mentioned on page 131, was aged about twenty-seven or twenty-eight, not twenty-two, but he was, all the same, excitable!

I am grateful to Angell for finding some mistakes. Inevitably, more will turn up, and I deal with this matter later in this review.

Turning to Corey Beals, I have no quarrel with his list of themes. Just two small points. In Paragraph 12, on sexuality, he uses the word "repressed" instead of my "unexpressed." I chose the word "unexpressed" precisely because I did not want to be accused of using Freudian jargon. In part VII, especially para. 19, he picks up my word "rationalising." Maybe I should have written, "making sense of what was happening to them," and avoided the psychologist's word.

Turning to the remainder of the paper, which is mainly concerned with methodology, I think that Beals has missed the point of why I chose to work as I did. I was attempting to write a book that would be acceptable in academic circles, and it is a fact—unfortunate if you like—that God has to be left out of academic discourse, and that teleology is almost equally unacceptable. However, I don't consider this such a disaster as Beals does. I think that the naturalistic and divine explanations of events are not mutually exclusive, but merely two ways of looking at the same facts.

I must protest about what Beals says about my "suspicion of first-hand testimony." The whole book is based on first-hand testimony—contemporary testimony. First-hand testimony written some years later, and, maybe, for different readers, is another matter. It is not the teleology of Fox's *Journal* that I objected to—early Quaker writings

are full of it—but the date. Most of what I say about the doubtful reliability of the *Journal* is not my own idea, but is to be found in the writings of Norman Penney and Henry J. Cadbury. In fact, I used a good deal of material from Fox's writings, but as far as possible, only from those published at the appropriate time and not re-edited. Beals refers to what I say about the suspect nature of Fox's writings on page 236. I refer him to what I say about the text of the Epistles on page 230. In any case, there is no need to think the worse of Fox because his later writings give a different impression from the early ones. People do change their ideas as they get older. Moreover, Fox was a man of his time, and a little massaging of evidence was not, in the seventeenth century, considered a sin against the truth.

Regarding the Principle of Parsimony. Surely this is just Ockham's Razor under a new name? "*Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem.*" This principle being 700 years old, I think it has proved its value!

I noticed that Stephen Angell thought that my own Quakerism shows through from time to time, but Corey Beals seemed to think the opposite! I'd be interested in other people's opinions on this. It is a fact that I started my work with a considerable distaste for grand theories and preconceptions of any sort, and did my best to be objective, but, as Beals says, everyone has his or her own bias. It is extremely difficult to recognize one's own. I think it very likely that I missed some patterns in what was going on, and I may have overemphasised others, notably anything relating to the development of Quaker worship and organization, because they particularly interest me.

So where do we go from here? First of all, since my book has found favor, it is important to eliminate mistakes before they get copied. I have already sent Paul Anderson a list of those I know about, none of which, interestingly, were picked up by Angell or Beals. Please let me know if any of you find any more errors. If there is ever a second edition I will make corrections, and meanwhile, I should be grateful for advice as to how a list of errata can best be passed to likely users.

I should like to make a few suggestions for further work, in directions I did not have time to explore fully. On the historical side, more work is needed on the nature of the Separated congregations in the north of England that became Quaker in 1652, on the precise nature of the relationship between Fox and Nayler, and on the Quaker

66 • ROSEMARY MOORE

“fringe” as exemplified by such individuals as Robert Rich and John Pennyman.

But this is a theologians’ conference. To you, I would make a special plea for some solid work on the Fox corpus. There is no scholarly edition of the epistles nor of his occasional pamphlets, and Norman Penney’s monumental work on the text of the Journal is nearly a century old. Many important Fox manuscripts in the library of Friends House in London await examination and transcription.

Finally, we need a proper catalogue of early Quaker manuscripts, accessible by manuscript source, by writer, by chronology and by topic. I made one for my own purposes, but it is far from complete. If someone has the necessary computer facilities and would be willing to mastermind this task, I will pass over my own lists as a starting-point. Thank you so much for reviewing my book, and for the opportunity to engage in dialogue across the miles!

NOTES ON ERRATA BY ROSEMARY MOORE

Some reviewers have criticized descriptions of non-Quaker bodies, especially in chapter 1. These were very brief owing to tight constraints of length, and cannot be improved without lengthening the text. They were intended as background information for the general reader, and serious scholars should supplement them from specialist works. I am grateful to Richard Hoare, Larry Kuenning and David Neelon for pointing out certain errors and ambiguities. They are not responsible for the following corrections. Where a replacement text is offered, this should fit over the existing text if suitably formatted.

I should be glad to be notified of any further corrections needed.

1. Page 11, beginning of final paragraph, first sentence. Richard Farnworth was probably 24, not 20. The accompanying note 30 needs correction to give a probable birth year of 1627, with acknowledgment to Richard Hoare who has examined the parish registers.
2. Page 58, penultimate paragraph, penultimate sentence: “Indeed, George Whitehead...received for Truth.” Delete this sentence and replace with: “George Whitehead, writing in 1661, gave the impression that the possibility of mistranslations made little practical difference, and that normally the Scriptures were to be taken as ‘a perfect Testimony of God...whatsoever is written ought to be believed and received for Truth.’”
3. Page 109, first complete paragraph, first 2 lines to read: “Fox’s theology was, however, obscure. If the light was not unambiguously identical with Christ, was it the Holy Spirit? In one pamphlet proclaiming....”
4. Page 122, penultimate paragraph, quotation from Nayler beginning “I have served for the good of these nations...” “Covenant” in the next line should be “government.”