

1-1-1979

## Christ's Wife: A Vision for All Women

Lisa Bieberman Kuenning

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



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kuenning, Lisa Bieberman (1979) "Christ's Wife: A Vision for All Women," *Quaker Religious Thought*: Vol. 48 , Article 2.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/qrt/vol48/iss1/2>

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 editor of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact [arolf@georgefox.edu](mailto:arolf@georgefox.edu).

## *Christ's Wife: A Vision for All Women*

LISA BIEBERMAN KUENNING

Expanded and substantially revised from an article, "Christ's Wife," originally published in *Friends Journal*, May 15, 1975. Title, basic argument, and any similarities in wording are used here by permission.

I remember my incredulity the first time a young woman told me she had trouble with Jesus because he was male. This obstacle to faith was new to me. Surely God had no sex! I wrote to her later, "God's Word was made flesh only once in history, and he had to choose one sex or the other. Am I to quarrel with him because he chose the other? I love him too much."

Afterwards I got to thinking there might be more to it. I remembered the biblical imagery of God's marriage with Israel, of Christ as the bridegroom. When Larry and I were planning our wedding, Lewis Benson sent us a copy of George Fox's paper about his coming marriage to Margaret Fell. George said he was commanded to marry Margaret as a testimony of "the Church coming out of the Wilderness, and the Marriage of the Lamb, before the Foundation of the World was." Once we'd come to terms with his dreadful grammar and punctuation, we found what Fox said about the heavenly marriage rather exciting. So Christ was to be our husband? That was fine with me, since I was in love with him. I did have a twinge of anxiety as to whether a heterosexual male would feel left out by the arrangement. Larry assured me it was not a problem. He was in love with him too. But he had no feeling that Christ should be the bride.

Several months later I had occasion to post around Harvard University some announcements in which God was referred to as "he." Indignant feminists at the Divinity School circled the offending pronoun with the female symbol. One of them explained to me, "Seminary women are defensive. You see,

some denominations won't ordain women or hire them as ministers." Words like "ordain" and "hire" were rude reminders of the Babylon whose territory I had wandered into and of how little it knew of the glorious liberty of the sons and daughters of God.

Out of these incidents has grown in me a determination to understand and to share the unique liberating message for women that belongs to the prophetic Christianity of early Quakerism. If I must oppose the new trend of feminist theology, it is not because I would defend the institutional churches or society at large in their ways of treating women. Nor do I have a reform program for society or the churches, not even for the Society of Friends. My vision is radical; it calls for building on an entirely different foundation from that which the institutions of society and religion are built upon. Yet this vision is firmly anchored in the understanding of God, humanity, and history held by the biblical prophets and apostles and by the earliest Quakers.

Lewis Benson's *Catholic Quakerism* was subtitled *A Vision for All Men*, back in the innocent days when "men" included both sexes. My aim is to show how the prophetic Christian message, expressed in the teaching and practice of early Friends, and recovered in our time by Lewis Benson and the Publishers of Truth, is in a special way a vision for all women.

Prophetic Christianity has been so fully elaborated by Lewis Benson in this journal and elsewhere<sup>1</sup> that a brief summary will be sufficient here to introduce it. It begins with the creator of all things who created man and woman to live in a special relationship with himself. (Yes, God is a "him." More on this later.) Our creator meant us to hear his voice, to learn from him what we ought and ought not to do, and thus to live in harmony with God, with one another, and with all the creation. This harmony having been broken by human rebellion, God undertook to restore what had been lost, through a series of historical interventions intended to create an obedient people who would witness his government to the world. "If you will obey my voice," God said to the Hebrews through his prophets, "you will be my people and I will be your God." The history of God's dealings with this old-covenant nation



culminated in the sending of his son, Jesus the Messiah, to fulfill and end all that was imperfect in the old covenant and to be himself the prophet who embodies God's voice and makes God's rule available to all people. Having suffered the worst that a rebellious world could do to him, and being risen from the dead and exalted to God's right hand, Jesus Christ reveals God's will, gives power to obey, and gathers his disciples into a new-covenant Israel, a unique community led directly by himself. This kind of Christianity is called "prophetic" because it involves a God who speaks to people in order to reveal his continuing work in history and to engage them in it.

George Fox and other early Quakers claimed to be republishing the prophetic Christian message after it had been lost for sixteen centuries. Fox did not regard himself as heir to the "Judaean-Christian tradition," that favorite scapegoat of humanistic reformers. He saw the traditions available through Catholic and Protestant institutions as apostate; having neither listened to Christ's voice nor obeyed his commands, these churches had lost sight of the radical consequences of Christ's coming. Fox recovered the apostolic focus on prophetic<sup>2</sup> by emphasizing Christ's office as the prophet foretold by Moses, who speaks from heaven, who is to be heard in all things, and who bestows the gift of prophecy on all his disciples in fulfillment of Joel's prophecy: "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy" (Joel 2:28 KJV). This prophet Christ, said Fox, was alive, able to teach, govern, and empower his people more directly and to undo the Fall more immediately than the institutional churches dreamed.

This message gathered a community that was revolutionary in its form of government, its manner of worship, and many aspects of its members' life style. It was also unique for its time — indeed for most times — in the equality it accorded to women. It is remarkable that with all the feminist visions being offered today, with their inventive rearrangements of the cosmos, it does not seem to have occurred to anybody to examine the example of seventeenth-century Quakerism and ask how it got that way.

The emancipation of women in the early Quaker movement was a consequence of the prophetic Christian gospel, and it was understood to be so by the Quakers themselves. This gospel is as liberating to women now as it was then. In this paper I will be discussing three things: the early Quaker practice with regard to women, the theology which underlay this practice and by which it was defended, and the implications of this theology for a modern community.

#### WOMEN IN EARLY QUAKERISM<sup>3</sup>

In 1653 a complaint was made to the mayor of Cambridge about a scandalous occurrence near the gate of Sidney-Sussex College: "Two Women were preaching." This was outrageous not only because of the offenders' sex but because they had encroached upon the training ground of the officially recognized ministers. The mayor had the pair hauled in:

He asked *their Names*: They replied, *their Names were written in the Book of Life*. He demanded *their Husbands Names*: They told him, *they had no Husband but Jesus Christ, and he sent them*. Upon this the Mayor grew angry, called them Whores, and issued his Warrant to the Constable *to whip them at the Market-Cross till the Blood ran down their Bodies*. . . . So they were led to the Market-Cross: . . . The Executioner commanded them to put off their Clothes, which they refused. Then he stript them naked to the Waste, put their Arms into the Whipping-post, and executed the Mayor's Warrant far more cruelly than is usually done: . . . they endured the cruel Torture without the least Change of Countenance, or Appearance of Uneasiness, and in the midst of their Punishment sang and rejoiced, saying, *The Lord be blessed, the Lord be praised, who hath thus honoured us, and strengthened us thus to suffer for his Name's sake*. . . . As they were led back into the Town, they exhorted the People *to fear God, not Man*.<sup>4</sup>

The First Publishers of Truth were convinced that God had given them a message to proclaim to the whole world. Before there was any clearly articulated meeting structure and



before many of what we know as Quaker testimonies became uniformly accepted in the new community, women took up the prophetic mission with amazing courage and endurance. Though shocking to their Puritan contemporaries, their role was unquestioned within the Quaker movement. A gospel was to be preached. This shining fact threw into shadow all distinctions of age, sex, or social station. Matron or housemaid, teenager or septuagenarian — whoever could stand up and walk could preach it and suffer for it.

After George Fox, the first recruit to this work was the middle-aged mistress of a fairly substantial estate. Elizabeth Hooton took leave of her husband and children to become a traveling preacher. During the next seven years she was jailed four times. With another woman Friend she went to New England, where three Quaker men and one woman had already been martyred; and there she preached from place to place, despite jailings, floggings, and banishments. At 70 she accompanied Fox and several other prominent Friends to the West Indies to support the Quaker community in Barbados.

This Barbados community had been founded by the preaching of two women. One of these, Mary Fisher, had been a servant girl when she was convinced. She was soon in prison on the charge of "speaking to a priest." Released after sixteen months, it was she who with Elizabeth Williams incurred the wrath of the mayor of Cambridge. Her zeal to publish Truth took her to the West Indies, New England, and (on foot and alone) to the court of the Turkish Sultan at Adrianople before her death in South Carolina.

The long list of brave women who helped break the ground for Truth includes such different careers as those of Elizabeth Fletcher, who burned like a torch through England and Ireland for four short years and was dead at 19 from the abuses she underwent, and Barbara Blaugdone, an elderly governess who terrified judges and magistrates wherever she went with her unquenchable tongue, which on occasion she also used on Quaker men. She helped establish the Quaker church in Ireland and lived to the age of 95.

We know of these women because of what they did, not because of what man they were connected to. They witnessed

the spirit of prophecy poured out on sons and daughters alike and defied their culture in obedience to their heavenly husband. In an age when housekeeping and child-rearing were almost the only respectable occupations available to women, they renounced the shelter of home and family and endured the world's jeers and brutal physical abuse to spread the prophetic word. Many Quakers owed their conviction and the founding of their meetings to these women.

Later, when the work of the First Publishers had led to a large ingathering and the unique structure of Quaker church government was taking shape, this movement saw another radical departure from conventional Christendom — business meetings composed entirely of women. Women's meetings were charged with inquiring into the clearness of proposed marriages, overseeing the relief of prisoners and the poor, and dealing with disciplinary cases among their own sex. Lest these be thought peculiarly feminine functions, they were also the chief functions of men's meetings. The reason for separate meetings may have been to ensure that the women would not be overpowered by men and that they would have opportunity to discuss matters of particular concern to them as women. Fox writes, "Women cannot for civility and modesty' sake speak amongst men of women's matters, neither can modest men desire it, and none but Ranters will desire to look into women's matters."<sup>5</sup>

As this bit of polemic suggests, the women's meetings were not established without controversy. This was not a contest between the sexes; most Quaker men accepted the meetings. Opposition came chiefly from one local faction.<sup>6</sup> Fox took the lead in encouraging women's meetings and rebutting their opposers. His writings during this period shed light on the theological reasons why prophetic Christianity is a revolution for women.

#### WOMAN IN QUAKER THEOLOGY

Fox's earliest defense of the unusual liberty of Quaker women is obviously addressed to outsiders scandalized by such preachers as Mary Fisher and Elizabeth Williams. A long title serves as summary: "The Woman Learning in Silence, or the



Mystery of the Woman's Subjection to her Husband. As also the Daughter prophesying, wherein the Lord hath fulfilled and is fulfilling what he spake by the Prophet Joel: 'I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh,' &c." Several scriptural texts are cited to establish that the spirit of prophecy is given to women, and those who would quench this spirit are rebuked:

So you that despise prophesying... are out of Moses's light and life, who said, would to God all the Lord's people were prophets,... and daughters are the Lord's people... Now hear you magistrates, priests and people, which do put into prison sons and daughters for prophesying,... you shew a spirit that hath erred from Moses's spirit, who cannot endure that the spirit of the Lord should be poured upon them, that they should prophesy, but would limit it to learned men, old books, and authors. And Anna the prophetess... spake of Christ to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem... Here you may see a daughter which did give testimony of Jesus, which would be, and is a wonder in this our age, to see a woman of four-score years of age to speak of Jesus;... into prison with her would the priests say.

Fox is aware of the opposition's favorite scripture, 1 Cor. 14:34-35 (KJV): "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home." Alluding to the comment in 2 Peter, that some of Paul's writings are easily misunderstood, Fox directs attention to Paul's own gloss on his advice to husbands and wives in Ephesians, "This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church" (Eph. 5:32 KJV):

Peter, who was unlearned in the letter, yet learned of Christ, says, such as were unlearned wrest the scriptures, and the epistles, being unlearned... They are to learn in silence, and not to speak, as saith the law, but learn of Christ their husband who makes free from the law, Christ in the male, and Christ in the female.<sup>7</sup>

The modern scholar may wince at Fox's free way of hanging texts together (at least eight distinct ones are woven into the above quotation). Nevertheless we should not imagine that Fox, like some moderns, has taken a feminist stance for personal or political reasons and then scoured the Bible to support a platform plank with no organic relation to the rest of his message or to his total understanding of the Bible. On the contrary, the concepts emphasized in this essay — prophecy and the husband/wife relation between Christ and his people — are essential to Fox's thought and appear in many contexts where the "woman question" is not at issue. His acceptance of women flows from these elements of his faith; it is not tacked on.

Fox has an integrated approach to the Bible that combines Old and New Testaments into a whole centered on Christ. Dean Freiday has said it is "nothing short of miraculous" that Fox, with no scholarly tools at his disposal, was able to achieve an understanding of the whole biblical story that anticipates and outdoes the past one hundred fifty years of scholarship.<sup>8</sup> Fox would have agreed that his insight into the Bible owed to a source above the human; he says: "These things I did not see by the help of man, nor by the letter, though they are written in the letter, but I saw them in the light of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by his immediate Spirit and power, as did the holy men of God, by whom the Holy Scriptures were written."<sup>9</sup> During the later controversy about women Fox writes, "If there was no scripture for our men and women's meetings, Christ is sufficient."<sup>10</sup> Fox's insights do not come from the Bible; they do not depend on finding precisely the right exegesis of particular texts. But neither are they human theories for which biblical proof-texts are offered as a concession to the times. Fox was convinced that the Christ who spoke to him was the one of whom the whole Bible testifies, and this early essay in defense of women is concerned to exalt Christ:

Christ is come to reign, he by whom the world was made, who was before the world was made, who now reigns in his sons and daughters, and in the male and in the female, that the glory is seen that the Son had with the Father before the world



began, which glory those males and females that receive Christ do see.<sup>11</sup>

Fox had yet to spell out his chief argument for how the coming of Christ takes the stigma off from women. The springboard for this later argument may have come from his opponents in the internal controversy over women's meetings. Fox relates how, in 1673, "we had... some opposition by one Nathaniel Coleman against the women's meetings... This Coleman and others, in their opposition, asked me whether it was not the command of God that a man must rule over his wife, and he would rule over his wife."<sup>12</sup> Coleman is alluding to the sentence that God passes on Eve in Gen. 3:16; he is going back to beginnings. Where did the subordination of women come from? Modern feminists speculate on this question and offer theories. All must agree that it is a very ancient thing. It was already an ancient thing when the Pentateuch was written, and the author of Genesis 3 recounts its origin in the manner of a just-so story:

The LORD God said to the serpent,  
"Because you have done this,...  
I will put enmity between you and the woman,  
and between your seed and her seed;  
he shall bruise your head,  
and you shall bruise his heel."  
To the woman he said,  
"I will greatly multiply your pain in childbearing;  
in pain you shall bring forth children,  
yet your desire shall be for your husband,  
and he shall rule over you."  
And to Adam he said,  
"Because you have listened to the voice of your wife,  
and have eaten of the tree  
of which I commanded you,  
'You shall not eat of it,'  
cursed is the ground because of you;  
in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life;  
thorns and thistles it shall bring forth to you."

(Gen. 3:14-18 RSV)

Here we find the ugly side of sex roles — man oppressed by work and woman oppressed by man — linked directly to

the rebellion of the first couple against their maker, *i.e.*, to the primordial Fall that has caused all the evils in the world. Coleman is wrong: "He shall rule over you" is not a command addressed to the man. Adam and Eve, by their disobedience, have put themselves outside the condition of hearing and obeying the creator's commands, and what God says to them here is a prediction or curse. There is no suggestion that the order of relations between the sexes here described is the way things ought to be; in a fallen society, it is the way things are.

Fox's answer to Coleman, "Thy ruling over thy wife... is in the Fall, for thou art in the transgression and not... in the restoration where they are helpsmeet in the righteousness and image of God,"<sup>13</sup> is a capsule of thoughts related to the Fall, the restoration, and the "righteousness and image of God" that he develops more fully in other papers and epistles of this period. The Fall is an important concept for Fox. It does not consist simply in the eating of a forbidden fruit nor in guilt transmitted by heredity. The Fall is the opposite side of Fox's basic doctrine that people are to get moral instruction by hearing God's voice. This hearing and obeying relationship is the "righteousness and image of God" from which man and woman fell.

God was the first teacher in paradise; and whilst man kept under his teaching, he was happy. The serpent was the second teacher; and when man followed his teaching he fell into misery, into the fall from the image of God, righteousness, and holiness.<sup>14</sup>

The sin of Adam and Eve was not only a specific transgression but an attempt to know good from evil apart from God's teaching and thereby to dispense with obedience altogether. In taking this course they achieved neither wisdom nor liberty; instead they acquired a new teacher and master — the serpent:

And the serpent's false doctrine and teaching was, 'Ye shall not surely die if ye eat [of the tree of knowledge of good and evil], but your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods,' &c.



So here was the first false doctrine taught by the world's god, who . . . brought man and woman into the death and fall, from the image of God. . . .

So Adam and Eve came to be dead to God; and instead of being wiser, came to be fools. . . .

The serpent he became their god, and Adam and Eve his slaves.<sup>15</sup>

Fox stresses that there was no sex-role oppression in the beginning:

Now, whilst Adam and Eve . . . kept God's commandment, and obeyed his voice, they were help-mates in the image of God; . . . and their work was to dress the garden, and to keep it. . . .

So here you may see the work which God commanded man and woman to do, whilst they were in his image; they were not to be idle, neither were they to do this in the sweat of their brows; . . . neither did God set the man over the woman, . . . but were meet-helps.<sup>16</sup>

Genesis says Eve was a "help meet" for Adam, but Fox treats this as a reciprocal term and uses it in the plural: "meet-helps" or "helpsmeet." In this he is not doing violence to the Hebrew text: *'ezer kenegdo* might be translated "helper corresponding to him"; the first word carries no connotation of inferiority and is most often used of God ("The Lord is our help"), while the second suggests an equal and parallel relationship.

Christ has come to reinstate this wholesome relationship by restoring the image and righteousness of God that was lost by the Fall. He does this by being God's spokesman, making it again possible for people to know the will of God and obey him:

Christ Jesus was the third teacher; of whom God saith, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him:" and who himself saith, "Learn of me." This is the true gospel-teacher, who bruises the head of the serpent the false teacher. . . . So as man and woman come to God, and are renewed up into his image, righteousness, and holiness by Christ, thereby they come into . . . the state which man was in before he fell; and into

a higher state than that . . . in Christ who never fell.<sup>17</sup>

In "an epistle to be read in the men and women's meetings" Fox points to the consequences of this restoration for women:

And now, you women, though you have been under reproach, because Eve was first in transgression; the promise was, 'The seed of the woman should bruise the serpents head.' And this promise of God is fulfilled. . . . Now, here comes the reproach to be taken off from women . . . and also the reproach and transgression taken off men, that believe in the seed Christ Jesus, who . . . renews man and woman up into the image of God, as they were in before they fell. . . . So that Christ Jesus may be head in all men and women, and every man and woman may act from him their holy head.<sup>18</sup>

Again he sounds this theme in his Wheeler Street sermon of 1680, alluding to Gal. 3:28 (RSV, "There is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus"):

This Seed is come: . . . the Seed of the Woman, who suffered and tasted death for every man that was and is in death. So when Christ was risen, the woman that was first in the transgression, the women went first to declare the Resurrection. . . . Certain *women* they were, disciples, learners and followers of Christ. This seemed as idle tales, but when they came into the belief of it, male and female believed: so both are one in Christ Jesus. . . .

So here . . . they come to be meet helps; Not as it was in the fall: the woman was first in transgression, then Adam was set over the woman; now here is unity, here is the headship in Christ Jesus.<sup>19</sup>

Thus the work of Christ in raising woman to an equal dignity with man is expressed in at least three ways:

- 1) He pours out the spirit of prophecy without distinction of sex;
- 2) He comes as a husband to his people;
- 3) He restores the holy state that was lost by the Fall and so annuls the curse upon Eve.



## HUSBAND

I would like now to look more closely at the second of these three points, for it is hard for modern people to understand how Christ's husbandhood is good news for women. Fox's position seems paradoxical. When he writes, "The woman, (which is the church,) must be subject to her husband in all things,"<sup>20</sup> we recall his saying elsewhere that in the restoration by Christ, women are *not* ruled by their husbands.

Contemporary feminist theology certainly does not see Christ as a husband. Indeed the thrust of this movement has been to reject all masculine references to God in favor of an androgynous or even feminine deity. If Jesus is admitted at all into the feminist's pantheon, it is only to point out his respect for women during his earthly years and then to retire him to the gallery of good examples. Moreover, marriage itself is under attack in the women's movement, and no exalted conception of a husband's role is current. The idea of a masculine figure to whom we must be subject is just what the women's liberationists are trying to get away from; to call this person our husband would be to them the surest evidence that such a theology must lead to the enslavement of women by their human husbands and by men in general.

Yet for early Friends, it implied just the opposite. Fox associates the husbandhood of Christ with the emancipation of women:

And in the lamb or seed of the woman, the females do meet as well as the males, and they are all one in him, . . . in Christ, their own head and husband.<sup>21</sup>

That makes the serpent so to rage, that Christ should be in the females as well as the males . . . and that now the women should have a meeting in Christ . . . and so that they should be married to Christ.<sup>22</sup>

The linking of "head and husband" suggests that Fox has in mind the apostolic saying, "The husband is the head of the wife," and thus the husband idea may also be present in the previously quoted passages: "Every man and woman may act from him their holy head" and "here is the headship in Christ Jesus."

Margaret Fell too makes this connection:

Christ in the Male and in the Female is one, and he is the Husband, and his Wife is the Church; and God hath said, that his Daughters should prophesie.<sup>23</sup>

They that . . . are against Women's Speaking in the true Church . . . would usurp Authority over the Man Christ Jesus, and his Wife too, and would not have him to Reign.<sup>24</sup>

What is this marriage that Fox and Fell speak of? Fox says it is a "mystery," and "Who are in the flesh [the fallen state] know nothing of this in the first nature, for it is the mystery which the apostle speaks of; and so it is a mystery still, but where it is opened and made manifest, such are subject to the husband Christ Jesus."<sup>25</sup> Yet we can learn something about the conception of marriage that is involved in this mystery. To do so we must suspend the contemporary mindset for which "husband" or "wife" means little more than a legalized sexual partner. From what Fox says about the Christ-marriage, we can recover a sense of what these terms conveyed to a mind steeped in biblical imagery.

### a) *This marriage is monogamous*

"The apostle Paul tells the Corinthians, 'I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ.'"<sup>26</sup> Conversely, "Let no one have but one wife, for Christ hath but one, his church, which is his people."<sup>27</sup> Though Fox often speaks of Christians' marrying Christ individually, he would still insist on the unity of the bride:

His members are joined together. They are called a spouse by which they have all one mind soul and heart and spirit married to Christ Jesus.<sup>28</sup>

### b) *The union lasts forever*

Ye may be married to the lamb in the everlasting marriage, and remain with him in the world that is without end.<sup>29</sup>



c) *It is an intimate relationship*

Fox stresses this aspect of marriage against those who denied Christ's immediate teaching of his church, as in the following passage rebutting an anti-Quaker pamphlet:

P[inciple]. He saith, 'They are no christians that do not hold Christ absent from his church; but antichrists.'

A[nswer]. Which is contrary to the scriptures, which say, they are 'flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone,' and they are as nigh together as husband and wife. And thus he is ignorant of the great mystery, Christ and the church, which Christ is the head of.<sup>30</sup>

In another place he challenges Papists and Protestants alike:

All you that call yourselves churches... you say you never heard Christ's voice. How then were you married to Christ that never heard his voice and Christ thy husband never spoke to thee? Strange kind of marriage.<sup>31</sup>

d) *The wife must be pure for her husband. In the beauty of her purity she adorns herself for the wedding*

So in the power and in the bed of purity, in the singleness of virginity, and in the beauty of holiness live...

And all ye virgins pure, lose not the ornaments of the Lord, but wait, that ye may be married to the lamb.<sup>32</sup>

Oh! therefore mind the holy life, the chaste life! That is the bride's clothing, by which she adorns herself for her husband, Christ Jesus.<sup>33</sup>

So all the inward virgin minds, and souls, and spirits, that are hidden to the Lord, they will die before they will lose their inward virginity, but will keep it to the marriage of the Lamb.<sup>34</sup>

e) *The husband cherishes his wife and protects her purity*

Husbands love your wives, even as Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it, ... that he might present it [to himself] a glorious church, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing.<sup>35</sup>

They are preserved over the man of sin, whom Christ their husband bruises the head of, and destroys him and his works. ... And therefore all such virgins as are come to Christ, and are married to him, Christ your husband, he will deal with the foul man of sin.<sup>36</sup>

f) *The husband communicates his virtue to his wife*

His members are... married to Christ Jesus through which life and virtue holiness and goodness and godliness is brought forth being married to him who is righteousness and truth itself.<sup>37</sup>

g) *The wife shares in the husband's power and glory*

Hallelujah to the Lord in the highest, the saints shall have the victory, ... the Lamb's power is known, the marriage of the Lamb is come, the bride the Lamb's wife is witnessed, she hath trimmed herself for her husband.<sup>38</sup>

His spouse is his Empress clothed in white raiment and fine linen.<sup>39</sup>

h) *The husband has authority over his wife*

Now the woman, (which is the church,) must be subject to her husband in all things. Jesus Christ is the husband; in every thing she must be subject to him.<sup>40</sup>

Thus Fox has envisioned a marriage in which the man is master and the woman is disciple; his glory is primary, hers derivative. What can we say to this male-chauvinist image?

There are two things I would say. First, though the wife is absolutely subordinate in this vision, there is no trace of contempt for her. Nothing could be farther from the spirit of the mockers who told Fox that "women have no souls, ... no more than a goose."<sup>41</sup> The woman here is in a condition of glory and bliss. She is an empress. She does not covet the primary status of her emperor; her greatest joy is to do the will of him who has also given himself for her. Of all the hierarchies to which Christ's relationship with the believer has been likened — king/subject, priest/penitent, teacher/pupil, leader/follower — this one surely soars the farthest beyond



mere power and functionality. It exists for its own sake and for love.

Where does this image come from? Fox could find it in the New Testament, of course, and the New Testament authors could find hints of it in the Old Testament, yet its origin remains a mystery. This marriage is not like the marriage of Adam and Eve, either before the Fall or after; for at first there was no such primacy of the male over the female, and then there was male domination of a less happy sort. I suppose that only in a society with a patriarchal tradition could this vision have captured the imagination, yet it must certainly have transcended the concrete experience of that society. Perhaps this should not surprise us; the Jews had many visions that went beyond their experience, as Fox was aware. But before returning to this I want to say a second thing about this conception of marriage.

The second point is that Fox never applies this idea to earthly marriages. He never suggests that a woman must obey her earthly husband and devote her life entirely to him. Whatever the *source* of the male/female archetype expressed in the description of the heavenly marriage, it does not have as its *consequence* the subjection of women or the aggrandizement of men on earth. The male and female of the heavenly marriage are not the biological male and female: thus John Perrot can end an epistle to Friends, "I am your sister in our Spouse,"<sup>42</sup> and Fox can write, "if Christ be the husband, men must ask counsel of him at home, as well as women, before they teach."<sup>43</sup> Christ's husbandhood helps women stand up to men, as Mary Fisher and Elizabeth Williams did when they boldly declared that they had "no Husband but Jesus Christ, and he sent them."

How can a male-supremacist religious vision encourage the equality of the sexes? I believe there is an answer to this question that fits in with Fox's thinking about what Christ has accomplished. To understand the paradox of Christ's husbandhood we must turn to Fox's doctrine of "types, figures and shadows."

Fox saw the whole Bible as telling a story that centers in Christ. It is the story of how God is redeeming his fallen creation and raising it beyond its original condition into a state

"in Christ who never fell." This story has two major parts — that which preceded the coming of Christ and that which follows it.

The time before Christ was not just a time when God wasn't doing anything or when his actions had no reference to Christ. God's revelation to the Jews, the people of the old covenant, was a revelation of Christ, but it was an imperfect, incomplete, and figurative revelation. Fox says, "The law, and the first covenant, were figures of the everlasting covenant, Christ Jesus."<sup>44</sup> "And so, live in the substance, which is... Christ, who ends the prophets, first covenant, first priesthood, and all the types, and figures, and shadows given after the fall."<sup>45</sup> All that was experienced imperfectly of God's intentions for his people through the institutions of the Old Testament is now to be experienced immediately through Christ, who fulfills and ends the types, figures, and shadows.

The catalogue of Israelite institutions that Christ fulfills and ends is a long one. Lewis Benson has listed thirty-seven, and he didn't get them all.<sup>46</sup> Christ is the high priest, who ends the institution of priesthood.<sup>47</sup> He is the king of kings, who ends the Israelite monarchy and brings in the kingdom of God.<sup>48</sup> He is the offering for the sins of the world who has abolished ritual sacrifices;<sup>49</sup> his body is a spiritual temple that does away with sacred buildings.<sup>50</sup> Bearing a spiritual sword and leading his followers in battle with a spiritual enemy, he brings them off from all outward weapons.<sup>51</sup> Fox felt that the institutional churches, with their temples, priests, and sacraments and their reliance on the sword of the state, had completely missed the point of Christ's coming. They were clinging to the shadows, unaware that the substance had come to abolish these things and to lead them into a new way of walking with God in which Christ himself would fulfill all these functions. With labored patience Fox wrote dissertations to instruct his contemporaries on the difference between the old covenant and the new.

The question I have brought to this study is this: Does the heavenly marriage, the wedding of Christ and his people, fulfill and end something? Is there a figure and shadow of which it is the substance? I feel that the answer has to be



yes, and that this answer is hinted at throughout Fox's treatment of the subject, though I am not sure that he ever states it in so many words.

In the paper by which Fox announces his own marriage intentions<sup>52</sup> he writes, "In the beginning... God made them Male and Female, and whom God joins together let no Man put asunder; which Marriage was a Figure of Christ and his Church," and he adds that his marriage with Margaret "is a Figure or Testimony... of the Church coming out of the Wilderness, and the Marriage of the Lamb." Here we have a figure, but it cannot be quite the same sort of figure as Fox's "types, figures and shadows," for nothing is *ended*; outward marriage predates the Fall and is not abolished by the marriage of the Lamb.

It seems to me that the shadow, the thing that is not only fulfilled but ended by Christ as husband, is male supremacy. If Fox does not say so plainly it may be because he couldn't find a way to do so that didn't imply that marriage itself was abolished, or it may be that he did not see male supremacy as belonging to the old covenant, but merely to the Fall.

Yet the types are not strictly limited to the old covenant period, as is shown in the following passage:

Oaths which ended strife in the time of the law and before, were figures of Christ, the oath of God, who sware by himself; which oath Christ Jesus endeth, and destroys the devil the author of strife, and brings people to yea and nay.... For there were no oaths commanded before the fall; so there are none to be in the restoration and redemption by Christ.<sup>53</sup>

Here the figure exists not only "in the time of the law" but also "before," and the parallel to what Fox says about male dominance is striking: something which did not exist in Eden, and which came into being because of the devil's influence on human society, has been ended by Christ — but here it is explicitly said that Christ is the antitype which the old institution prefigured.

Again, Fox may have been deterred from putting these pieces together by his desire to find evidence for female

participation "in the time of the law" as well as in the restoration. When he got going on this subject, at the height of the Wilkinson-Story controversy, he seemed unable to resist dragging in any scriptural passage that accorded any dignity at all to women, especially if it mentioned a women's meeting — the subject of dispute. "Now old Ely was not against the assemblies of the women, who assembled by troops, as (in the margin of the bible) you may see, 1 Sam. ii. 21, 22. though some men now-a-days may be against women's meetings."<sup>54</sup> But when we turn to the text we gain no light on why the women had assembled; we learn only that Eli's delinquent sons used to sleep with them. Many of Fox's other Old Testament examples fare no better.

Fox is inconsistent on the question of women's status under the law, for his usual exegesis of 1 Cor. 14:34 (KJV, "Women... are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law") includes the comment, "Christ makes free from the law."

There is not room in this paper to explore how far the Hebrew regulation of relations between the sexes really does prefigure the asymmetrical marriage of Christ and the church, but the question would be worth examining. Such a study might contrast the precepts of the Mosaic law with earlier practices described in Genesis and with the laws of other ancient oriental societies and might find the old covenant community outstanding in the value it placed on marriage and in its jealous concern for female purity.<sup>55</sup> It may be that this community was indeed being prepared, not only for the higher and more equal morality of the New Testament, but also for a transfiguration of the patriarchal pattern into a spiritual union in which lordship and love are totally fused.

Fox could have argued more consistently if he had recognized that Israel was thoroughly patriarchal and that Christ brings a real change, so that where he is received women enjoy an unprecedented liberty in companionship with men. Fox could then have identified male dominance as a figure which Christ both fulfills and ends, as he comes close to doing in this brief passage: "So here is no man ruling over the woman, as Adam did over Eve in the fall; but Christ, the spiritual man, among and over his spiritual members."<sup>56</sup> The adjective "spir-



itual" belongs to Fox's typology language; he speaks of "spiritual Jews," "spiritual temple," "spiritual weapons," etc., and contrasts these spiritual realities to their "outward" counterparts in the Old Testament. "Christ the spiritual man" usually means, in Fox, "Second Adam," but the context here suggests some additional sense of "spiritual husband" or "spiritual male," especially in conjunction with "spiritual members," for we recall that "his members . . . are called a spouse."

#### CHRIST'S WIFE TODAY

I have given much space to the seventeenth-century Quaker precedent because its theory and practice are both matters of record, showing that prophetic Christianity brought a dignity and freedom to women that was in sharp contrast to the expectations of its surrounding culture. I have sought to show that the community that experienced this liberating power differed from conventional brands of Christianity by giving more, not less, weight to the witness of the whole Bible to the power and authority of Jesus Christ. My aim has been to challenge the assumption that a faith centered on "the male Jesus" must lead to a male-dominated church. Now I want to speak of how the prophetic Christian gospel is again good news for women.

Despite the outward improvements in her status since the seventeenth century, woman today finds herself unfulfilled and unfree. The feminist movement never tires of telling us this. It points to cultural expectations that channel women, overtly or subtly, into roles that emphasize their subordination to men. Against this channeling and the stereotypes and social manifestations of prejudice that go with it, many women are justifiably protesting.

Yet if Fox and the Bible are right, the root of woman's bondage is deeper and older than any social arrangement, and it takes a power greater than any that can be released by political organizing and consciousness-raising, to undo it.

Fox's testimony was not that *he* and his friends were liberating women, nor that the women themselves were doing so, but that *Christ* was liberating them. Christ's new order is not the sort of thing that can be voted on by Congress. It is experienced where Christ is received as prophet and teacher,

as husband and king; it is the heritage of Christ's kingdom and bride. The community that receives this revolutionary power has not come together to implement a feminist program. It has gathered for no other purpose than to hear and obey Christ and be the people of his covenant; the liberating consequences of this covenant come as gifts that are realized in the course of the life of discipleship.

For the past three and a half years a community has been gathering to the prophetic Christian gospel to be this new-covenant fellowship. At the time of this writing its members are six men and seven women, including married couples, single persons both male and female, and married persons of both sexes whose spouses have not joined the community. I do not think it would be very convincing for me to argue the practical effect of discipleship on male-female relations from such brief experience with so few people, and that will not be the main thrust of what I have to say in this final section. I do feel justified in making two points about the new Publishers of Truth. First, the things I will be asserting about the liberating power of Christ for twentieth-century women and men are borne out by our experience, as far as that experience goes. And second, this group is unusual among sexually mixed communities in containing no satellite women.

A satellite woman is one whose world revolves around a man. We have all seen how such a woman functions, or frequently doesn't function, in meetings. She is there because her husband or boy-friend is there. Though she may affirm the purposes of the organization and promote them, her primary relationship is to her man and her contribution is subordinate to his. In groups where this pattern of relationships predominates one sees women, theoretically of equal status with the men, sit in silence while men make decisions. We have also witnessed communities, conceived and organized by men, become fragmented by the conflicting hidden agendas of the satellite women whom these men have brought in. *No* woman has come into the Publishers of Truth *through* her male partner. Every member has been gathered directly to the prophetic message about Christ and finds his or her primary tie to the center.



If we remain faithful in building on the one foundation, this will always be so.

What we have experienced is a beginning. But now I want to speak in the future tense about how the prophetic Christian gospel is a vision for women. What will it mean for us to be married to Christ?

a) First, it means that no person will be the satellite of another. Each one's primary relationship will be to Christ and, through him, to the whole community of disciples.

b) This primary relationship to Christ will strengthen the solidarity between men and women. In particular it will put human marriage on the firmest possible basis. Contemporary feminists express suspicion of marriage, in fear that a life-long yoke can be sustained only by violently constricting the horizons of one of the partners — too likely the woman. But those whom God joins together in the power of Christ will know that so long as they remain faithful to him, his voice will unite them in a manner that fulfills both and oppresses neither. In the marriage of disciples, as in the whole church, we will not find individuals doing their own things, nor yet one individual doing his thing and pressuring another to go along, but every man and woman doing Christ's thing and finding their satisfaction in him.

Larry and I are often asked about the Publishers of Truth testimony against divorce: "What if the man and woman have grown apart, and the marriage is a burden to them? Why should they be chained together?" Our response is that the church does not recommend moral ideals to society apart from the gospel about Christ. Those whom Christ joins together live in that life and power that takes away the occasion for divorce. Outside that life and power we do not know any grounds for assurance that the unity of a marriage can endure.

c) No one will be hung up on his or her masculinity or femininity. These will not constitute the essence of our identity, for we will all be feminine in relation to Christ. There will be no occasion for the male pride in being tough, independent, and aggressive that leads some men to try to dominate women. We will know that our true strength is not in ourselves but in our Lord, and it is a strength we receive through

submission to him. The frailest girl may have this strength supremely; the most powerful male may lose it if he forgets its source.

d) There will be no rivalry between the man's career and the woman's. Neither men nor women will pursue careers in the world's sense. Neither men nor women will find their main vocation in occupations defined and rewarded in terms of salary or social status. Our chief occupation will be given us by Christ, and it will be a job concerned with publishing the truth about him and building up his community. We will find that the work he gives us uses our capacities to the utmost, gives purpose to our lives, and takes away all occasion for competition, for the tasks that others are given will complement ours. We will not get money for this work, nor will we find that it is accorded prestige in the larger society; indeed the world is likely to denigrate it. Our reward will be of a different kind, coming from him in whom there is no scarcity.

Meanwhile there will be maintenance tasks, the work that puts food on the table and keeps the dishes washed. Christ will guide us in these things too, but he will teach us not to place our hearts in them. Income-producing work will be chosen from different considerations from those the world applies. We will ask, Is it innocent? Is it useful? and Does it leave time for my priority work of preaching the gospel and building up the church? Very humble jobs will be found to meet these requirements. Nobody's self-worth will be wrapped up in them. It will not matter whether this income-producing portion of the maintenance work is done by the man or the woman of the family or both. Maintenance tasks will be divided in whatever way is convenient for two people whose purpose is the same and whose major work, directed to that purpose, is of a different sort. We will neither insist on conventional sex roles in this division of labor nor go out of our way to defy them.

Here we glimpse the lifting of Adam's curse as well as Eve's, for his sentence was not a light one either. Even where survival as such does not require people to exhaust themselves, still the demands of careerism are consuming bodies and spirits, and it is chiefly the male sex that has succumbed to this slavery



and reaped its crop of thorns and thistles. Christ will teach us ways to make the breadwinning side of our lives less central and less exacting.

e) Single women will be liberated, too. I never realized until I married how much prejudice I had experienced when single simply because I was single. Too many people fail to take a single woman seriously and assume that her mature life will begin only when she has achieved identity through a man. There will be no occasion for this attitude among the members of Christ's spouse. None of us will be alone. None of us will be waiting for some human being to give our lives meaning and wholeness. The center and main direction of our lives will already be established in response to Christ's call to discipleship and his proposal of marriage.

Because the church, not the family, will be our primary community, those who are outwardly unmarried will participate as fully in church life as those who are married. Married and single people will not gravitate into subgroups with separate interests.

Nobody will be looking for a mate. We will have more urgent things to do. We will know that the one who called us to these more urgent things is also the arranger of marriages. If he wants us to marry he will show us the right partner in the course of our discipleship. He will not neglect to share his intentions with the other partner. There will be no unrequited love and no jealous competition.

Goodbye to the torture chambers of artificial beauty: the uncomfortable and impractical clothing fashions, cosmetics, machinations with our hair. Simplicity will teach us to discard them, and liberation from the man-hunt will make it easy.

f) Nineteenth-century Quakers have been much criticized for disowning those who married outside the Society. But their problem was not that a wrong principle was applied but that it was applied in a community which had lost the first love without which such a principle becomes a dead legalism. Those who understand what it is to be married to Christ will readily perceive that their calling precludes choosing a lifetime partner who does not share this commitment.

But what of those who are already married when they hear Christ's call? One thinks of Margaret Fell's anxiety as her husband came home filled with the neighbors' reports that George Fox had bewitched her. That case turned out fairly happily, but in other cases, Fox pointed out, "We may see . . . what variance it maketh in a family . . . when a husband is convinced, or a wife is convinced . . . for he brings a sword and war, and not peace to that nature they lived in, and had in old Adam, before they received the Prince of peace, and the sword of the spirit from him to war against the other peace which they had."<sup>87</sup>

No simple formula can be offered to those who have this problem. What we know is that Christ calls us to a commitment that outranks all others, that he is fully aware of our circumstances — the things that can be changed and the things that can't — and he will not leave us without guidance and strength to cope with them.

So here is a vision for women and men. It shows us the root of sexism in people's refusal to take counsel of the creator. It tells us what the creator has done to restore our right relationship to him and to one another. It points us to the one whom God has sent as the master to end all human masters. It offers us, in him, a new community and a new way of living in which men and women may experience together the life and power that takes away the occasion for men's oppressing women and for anyone's oppressing anyone.

It will be seen that this is a vision to be received as a whole or not at all. It is not made of separate planks that can be detached and reassembled as parts of a political platform. Christ's marriage brings liberation to women, the only real liberation there is. But it is not a project of the women's liberation movement. It is never entered as a means to something else. Those choose it who are in love with him. They have been pierced by his spiritual sword, and to their eyes he fills heaven and earth with his brightness. Like Mary of Bethany they have seen that "one thing is needful": they will listen to their Lord.



## Notes

1. See *Quaker Religious Thought*, Vol. 1, no. 1, Vol. 2, no. 1, Vol. 3, no. 2, Vol. 5, no. 1, Vol. 7, no. 2, Vol. 11, no. 2, Vol. 12, no. 2, Vol. 16, nos. 1 & 2; see also Lewis Benson, *Catholic Quakerism: A Vision for All Men* (Philadelphia: Book & Publications Committee, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, 1968).
2. When the New Testament is approached with the question — what was the “good news” that the earliest Christian apostles proclaimed when they presented their message to people who were hearing them for the first time? — it turns out that the primitive gospel emphasizes Christ’s prophetic office and sounds much more like George Fox than it sounds like either Roman Catholic doctrine or Protestant “gospel” preaching. See Larry Kuenning, *The Foundation of Prophetic Christianity* (unpublished, 1975).
3. My information on the lives of the women mentioned in this section comes mostly from Mabel Richmond Brailsford, *Quaker Women, 1650-1690* (London: Duckworth & Co., 1915).
4. Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings Of the People called Quakers, for the Testimony of a Good Conscience, from The Time of their being first distinguished by that Name in the Year 1650, to the Time of the Act, commonly called the Act of Toleration, granted to Protestant Dissenters in the first Year of the Reign of King William the Third and Queen Mary, in the Year 1689*, 2 vols. (London: Luke Hinde, 1753), Vol. 1, pp. 84-85 (italics in original).
5. George Fox, Letter, 30th Jan. 1675 (in Kendal Early Record Book, p. 59), quoted in William C. Braithwaite, *The Second Period of Quakerism* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1919), p. 274n.
6. For a discussion of the history of this controversy see Braithwaite, *op. cit.*, chapter XI.
7. [George Fox], *The Works of George Fox*, 8 vols., reprint from edition of 1831, Philadelphia and New York (New York: AMS Press, 1975), Vol. 4, pp. 104-110 (hereafter referred to as Fox, *Works* (1975)).
8. Dean Freidav, “Not a Steeple, a Steeple,” *Friends Quarterly*, Vol. 18 (October 1974), pp. 377-378.
9. [George Fox], *The Journal of George Fox*, rev. ed. by John L. Nickalls (London: Religious Society of Friends, 1975), p. 34 (hereafter referred to as Fox, *Journal* (1975)).
10. Fox, *Works* (1975), Vol. 8, p. 115.
11. *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p. 110.
12. Fox, *Journal* (1975), pp. 666-667.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 667.
14. Fox, *Works* (1975), Vol. 2, p. 144.
15. *Ibid.*, Vol. 6, pp. 8-10.
16. *Ibid.*, Vol. 6, pp. 9-10.
17. *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 144.
18. *Ibid.*, Vol. 8, pp. 140-141.
19. Reconstruction from manuscript copies, printed in Hugh Barbour and Arthur O. Roberts, eds., *Early Quaker Writings: 1650-1700* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Company, 1973), p. 505 (italics in original).
20. Fox, *Works* (1975), Vol. 7, p. 89.
21. *Ibid.*, Vol. 6, p. 244.
22. *Ibid.*
23. [Margaret Fell], *A Brief Collection of Remarkable Passages and Occurrences Relating to the Birth, Education, Life, Conversion, Travels,*

*Services, and Deep Sufferings of that Ancient, Eminent, and Faithful Servant of the Lord, Margaret Fell; But by her Second Marriage, Margaret Fox. Together With Sundry of Her Epistles, Books, and Christian Testimonies to Friends and Others; and also to those in Supreme Authority, in the several late Revolutions of Government* (London: J. Sowle, 1710), p. 344. This quote and the following one are from the essay, “Women’s Speaking Justified, Proved, and Allowed of by the Scriptures, All such as speak by the Spirit and Power of the Lord Jesus.” Her arguments in defense of women are essentially those that Fox uses.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 350.
25. Fox, *Works* (1975), Vol. 7, p. 89.
26. *Ibid.*, Vol. 6, p. 209.
27. *Ibid.*, Vol. 7, p. 85.
28. Manuscripts bound with the Annual Catalogue of George Fox’s papers, Friends House, London, p. 70, Cat. No. 81E (hereafter referred to as Annual Cat. (London)); quoted in Lewis Benson’s file-card index to the works of Fox, C40.
29. Fox, *Works* (1975), Vol. 7, p. 85.
30. *Ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. 49.
31. Annual Cat. (London), p. 150, Cat. No. 119E; quoted in Lewis Benson’s file-card index to the works of Fox, C40-B.
32. Fox, *Works* (1975), Vol. 7, p. 85.
33. *Ibid.*, Vol. 7, p. 145.
34. *Ibid.*, Vol. 8, p. 6.
35. *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p. 105.
36. *Ibid.*, Vol. 8, p. 6.
37. Annual Cat. (London), p. 70, Cat. No. 81E; quoted in Lewis Benson’s file-card index to the works of Fox, C40.
38. Fox, *Works* (1975), Vol. 4, p. 243.
39. Annual Cat. (London), p. 153, Cat. No. 119E; quoted in Lewis Benson’s file-card index to the works of Fox, C40-B.
40. Fox, *Works* (1975), Vol. 7, p. 89.
41. Fox, *Journal* (1975), pp. 8-9.
42. John Perrot, *Two Epistles. Written to all Friends in the Truth: The one, touching the Perfection of Humility; Written in Rome — Prison of Madmen. The Other, Touching the Righteous Order of Judgement in Israel, Written at Lyons in France* (London: Robert Wilson, 1661); quoted in Kenneth L. Carroll, *John Perrot: Early Quaker Schismatic* (London: Friends’ Historical Society, 1971), p. 41.
43. Fox, *Works* (1975), Vol. 2, p. 279.
44. *Ibid.*, Vol. 7, p. 139.
45. *Ibid.*, Vol. 7, p. 155.
46. Lewis Benson’s list of “types, figures and shadows” occurs in his paper, “Biblical Foundations of Fox’s Christology” (1973), p. 20. Part of this paper was incorporated into his “George Fox’s Teaching about Christ,” *Quaker Religious Thought*, Vol. 16, nos. 1 & 2, but without the discussion of types.
47. Fox, *Works* (1975), Vol. 6, pp. 39, 41, *inter alia*.
48. *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, pp. 330-331, Vol. 6, p. 69.
49. *Ibid.*, Vol. 6, pp. 40, 70.
50. *Ibid.*, Vol. 8, p. 286.
51. *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p. 357, Vol. 6, p. 48, *inter alia*.
52. Reprinted in Francis Bugg, *A Finishing Stroke: Or, Some Gleanings, Collected out of the Quakers Books. By Way of Prologue. Never before Publish’d. (With Directions to the Book-binders, who Bind up this*



- Folio with the Seven following Parts:) Whereby The Great Mystery of the Little Whore Is farther Unfolded* (London: R. Wilkin and H. Clements. 1712), p. 268.
53. Fox, *Works* (1975), Vol. 7, p. 139.
54. *Ibid.*, Vol. 8, p. 96.
55. For a brief discussion of these differences, see Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, Vol. I, tr. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), pp. 80-82.
56. Fox, *Works* (1975). Vol. 2, p. 224.
57. *Ibid.*, Vol. 8, p. 49.

## Looking ahead . . .

*The Quietist Heritage.* Articles by William Taber and Ruth Pitman.

*The Everlasting Gospel and John 15.* 1979 Malone College conference papers by Dean Freiday, Douglas Gwyn, and others.

*A Theology of Evangelism and Outreach for Friends.* 1978 Barnesville conference papers by Alan Kolp, Ron Allen, and Larry Barker.

Also in forthcoming issues:

William F. Rushby: *The Friends Meeting as Community: High Ideals and Hard Realities.*

Daniel Smith: *Robert Barclay's Social Ethics.*