

1-1-2009

## Recovering the Lost Radiance: The Kingdom of God, the Early Friends, and the Future of Quakerism

Gerard Guiton

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



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Guiton, Gerard (2009) "Recovering the Lost Radiance: The Kingdom of God, the Early Friends, and the Future of Quakerism," *Quaker Religious Thought*. Vol. 113 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/qrt/vol113/iss1/4>

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 [arolfe@georgefox.edu](mailto:arolfe@georgefox.edu).

# RECOVERING THE LOST RADIANCE: THE KINGDOM OF GOD, THE EARLY FRIENDS, AND THE FUTURE OF QUAKERISM<sup>1</sup>

GERARD GUITON

Quaker “history” is much more than an engaging story that can be set aside at leisure. Rather, it is best understood as a *continuing theology* opening up opportunities for the Religious Society of Friends to be a truly gathered people with a coherent theology. The early Quakers of the 1650s enjoyed such a theology because they placed the *halakah* of Jesus, his proclamation of the Kingdom of God, at its core and lived it.<sup>2</sup> Friends of all traditions in the modern era need to do likewise. If they do not, the Society may continue its painful demise.

The term “Kingdom of God” occurs many times in early Quaker tracts. For instance, between 1652, the year of the first known Quaker publication, and 1663, they published nearly 1,000 works. Of the 800 in my possession, 735 are by authors with more than 20 works to their name. Of *these*, 88% refer, often more than once, to “Kingdom” or its equivalent expressions such as “Dominion of God,” “Sovereignty of God,” “New Israel” or “Law of God.”<sup>3</sup>

The centrality of the Kingdom to Jesus and the first Friends raises a number of questions. Why is it not taught as a discrete entity in our educational institutions, Meetings, Churches and homes? Why is it not consciously the basis of our concerns for peace, justice, and mercy when it is the foundation of our testimonies? Why is it not, again consciously, the central motivation of our service organizations and interactions with authorities? Why are we not bringing this living dynamic directly into the public domain just as the early Quakers spoke at the market place? In so doing they exercised an incarnational ecclesiology, a messianic spirituality, and an apostolic leadership.<sup>4</sup> Why are we not doing the same in our own way for our own times?

The Kingdom, or the Presence of Love, remains Quakers’ solid spiritual foundation, but it is one that disavows uniformity of thought and conformity to specific ideologies, dogmas, or creeds. Nonetheless,

a coherent theology the Kingdom provides the common language which we crave as a Society, leading Friends into *qualitative* unity and purpose. If seekers observe such they will join us. Understanding and living the Kingdom, then, is the key to our flourishing, both spiritually *and* numerically. If we embrace it authentically and openly, we will stand at the threshold of a new age for Quakerism.

These are bold claims. They sound utopian, but Jesus and the first Friends were not utopians. Their first-hand experience of evil, the ocean of darkness, and the Cross went hand in hand with envisioned “places” in which a great people would be gathered. This people would realize God’s Kingdom in the here and now; they would live that Kingdom as if it already existed.

So, what *is* the Kingdom in its biblical and early Quaker forms? In an attempt to shed light on that question, this paper is divided into three sections. It begins with a brief exegesis of the Kingdom in which compassion is encountered as the source of Jesus’ revolutionary politics. Section B focuses on the Kingdom’s neglect and evasion by the Church, something the early Quakers roundly condemned, and Section C discusses the early Quakers’ interpretation of the Kingdom. Necessity dictates an introduction to the internal apocalypse of “convincement” and its outward manifestation, the Lamb’s War, among whose principal outcomes were three crucial peace declarations. These were issued during a Pentecostal “moment” between October 1659 and April 1660,<sup>5</sup> a moment of existential realization on a corporate level which crystallized their 1650s soteriological experience of Kingdom and Testimony. It was a moment that brought them into ever closer unity with a Gospel message that is unconditional to time and space. As the “Day of the Lord” or “Day of Visitation,” the Kingdom, being “over all” both spiritually and physically, forged a new understanding of politics and history.

## A. A BRIEF THEOLOGY OF THE KINGDOM

Jesus never succinctly defined the Kingdom. Instead, he proclaimed it through stories, miracles, and in the way he conducted his life for God and humanity. During his day, people generally understood the Kingdom in political, apocalyptic, or separatist ways.<sup>6</sup> These prevented them from fully comprehending the Kingdom as espoused by Jesus and what it might expect of them—personal transformation

and even physical danger. That the Kingdom was already known in Jewish traditions has led subsequent generations to perceive it as a “mystery”—as something that was incomprehensible and divorced from its theological meaning. This may help explain why, rather than being a single and identifiable entity, the Kingdom came to evoke a host of associations within the early Church. Fox’s accusation that the Church at large was “in apostasy since the apostles’ days” meant it had not only neglected the Kingdom, but that it was still living contrary to it.<sup>7</sup>

Within the larger Christian movement it is only since the late nineteenth century that theologians have given the Kingdom serious, albeit periodic, attention.<sup>8</sup> The overall effect is the conception of a Kingdom “spread upon the earth” to be sure, but as an esoteric concept only (cf. Logion 113, Gospel of Thomas). Thus, it still remains “unnoticed by most.” Worse yet, both the Kingdom and its *magna carta*, the Sermon on the Mount, have often been neglected by the leaders of Christendom.<sup>9</sup> All this is strange, considering the Kingdom was the very *raison d’être* for Jesus’ mission, his life and death, and his testimony to restored unity with God—strange also, because his death and resurrection were affirmations of the loving Kingdom as eternal life (Jn.3:15). His death signified the very majesty of Love itself for us all.

The Kingdom to which the Synoptic Gospels in particular refer also includes the experience of God’s righteousness, justice, peace, mercy, spiritual joy, and the enactment of these in the world (cf. Gal. 5:22-23). The Hebrew notion of “kingship” was given a new vitality by Jesus, but usually in opposition to human reasoning in its propensity to comply with the world’s principalities and powers. As such, the Kingdom proclaimed by Jesus was counter-cultural, as were most prophetic pronouncements in the Hebrew Scriptures. The Presence of Love, therefore, differed radically from what passed as religion and politics, including their conventional structures. Today it continues to be revealed by such familiar figures as Martin Luther King Jr., Desmond Tutu, and the Burmese Buddhist leader, Aung San Sui Kyi. Such people, and the many more like them who remain unknown, are exemplars of the “great commission” (Mt. 28:19; Lk. 10:1-2). They enhance the prophetic tradition embodied by Jesus.

Both it and the Sermon, itself the most substantial discourse in Matthew 5-7, make significant, though not impossible, demands of each one of us. Jesus expected the literal implementation of the

Sermon's ethics. He did so because he well knew the practicality of their transformative initiatives for reconciliation and healing, including with enemies. The Sermon's ethics underline the on-going, nonviolent revolution he inaugurated.

For its part, the Sermon is neither a farewell discourse nor a "death of a sage" paraenesis. Still less is it an interim ethic as suggested during the late nineteenth century by Johannes Weiss and in the early twentieth by Albert Schweitzer.<sup>10</sup> Weiss sought an eschatological and future Kingdom, while Schweitzer, developing Weiss' arguments, regarded Jesus as an apocalypticist who believed in the imminent end of the world after which the Kingdom would indeed "come".

Jewish Apocalyptic saw history as moving forward under God's guidance towards a definite end. Apocalyptic, therefore, is to be identified with the promise of God's Kingdom. However, while the Kingdom involves God's saving initiative,<sup>11</sup> we are also called into partnership in its establishment. Jesus' table fellowship illustrates this point by signifying God's welcoming of all, Gentile and Israelite alike, to the banquet of the Kingdom (Mt. 8:11; Isa. 42:6). In other words, God calls us to the work of spiritual restoration, to working the Kingdom's presence into our daily experiences, and to encouraging its understanding and enactment in other people's lives. The early Quakers dubbed this process "addressing that of God [and thus, the Kingdom] in everyone." If, like Jesus, we celebrate the Presence of Love in this way, we will find strength in the struggle towards the transformation of life on earth so that it reflects "heaven" or, put another way, God's desire for us. The Kingdom is redemptive and thus leads to salvation—that is to say, wholeness and unity with Love/God (Isa. 52:7; Mk. 1:14-15). As such, the Kingdom is incarnational and resurrectional—both heavenly and profoundly this-worldly—in its origin and its consequence.

The Kingdom crops up where one least expects it: wherever God's Presence is felt or God's Love is actualized. This is the same loving God who brings justice, peace, and mercy. It constitutes the good news that is ever near, about the Love that is ever incarnate among us, a Love that is beyond calculation and payment (Zeph. 3:15; Mt. 10:7-8). When Jesus healed, expelled demons, taught a new ethic for living, or offered new hope in God in the wake of evil's apparent invincibility, he demonstrated the Kingdom in action.

Jesus knew from his own religious tradition that the Kingdom was already incarnate in the world where, with human help, it constantly awaits unveiling. The ancient Greek for “coming” or “unveiling” (*apokálupsis*) is frequently associated with “the end of the world” being nigh (*eschaton*). While often confused with each other, apocalypse and eschatology do go hand in hand in the sense that the invasion of God’s Presence and Love into human history decisively brings an end to our old destructive ways of thinking, and behaviour—that which create barriers between ourselves and God. Such barriers hinder God’s grace from fully invading our lives and the world. The Gospels and Paul’s epistles affirm that only with God’s grace can these barriers be overcome. Implied here is the goal of consummation, a world-changing coming together of humanity to a “present” encounter with the Kingdom to God.

While always experienced in the here and now, the Kingdom also engages the past and the future. It calls to us from the past through remembered witness, but it also calls us to the future, when all that is of God will be consummated in Love “in the fullness of time” (Jn. 7:8; Gal. 4:4; Eph. 1:10). The Ocean of Light and Love, therefore, rises above the confines of time and space; it is ultimate and universal.

### Compassion as Revolutionary Politics

Those embracing the Way of Jesus aspire to a worldview in which social, economic, spiritual and political interaction is based squarely on God’s justice, peace and compassion—on relationships that are equitable, harmonious, and summed up in the Hebrew words *mishpat* and *sadiqah*. *Mishpat* carries a strong sense of working towards resolving conflict with equal rights for all in mind. *Sadiqah* involves fulfilling the responsibilities of one’s relationship with God and with other people. Both speak of the power of solidarity and community based on Divine Love.

Jesus’ political and religious outlook was naturally influenced by his Hebrew tradition. From Maccabees, for instance, he learned that God’s Kingdom or sovereign authority was in constant revolt against the power of mammon, but that it was an earthly yet spiritual reality. He understood the “messiah” as the one anointed to bring God’s love and justice to all people, especially the sick, the marginalized, and the poor. In this respect, he was acquainted with the prophets

as God's messengers, ready to remind everyone of their covenantal obligations to God. These obligations could easily be neglected, usually at the expense of justice, peace, and mercy (Isa. 1: 16-17; Jer. 22:17; Mic. 2:1-5), but law codes, the psalms, and the prophets extensively challenged their neglect. In keeping with these traditions Jesus formulated a view of the Kingdom that sought to get at the heart of the Torah.<sup>12</sup>

In Jesus' teachings, the Torah is very much internalized, as the Mosaic Law becomes the Law of the heart. It was a radical departure from legalism—a re-discovery of Jeremiah 31:34, which was also a favorite of early Friends.<sup>13</sup> Jesus downplayed the letter of the Law and elevated its emphases upon the love of God and compassionate concern for humanity. His intimacy with God embodied the nearness and presence of the Kingdom; it signaled the possibility that anyone could be similarly intimate with the God of Love—thus fulfilling the heart of the Law.<sup>14</sup>

For the Kingdom to be present and “at hand,” Jesus added another important factor—personal transformation (*metanoia*)—a reality that is possible only with God's help. It involves repentance in the sense of giving up one's own agenda (and fears and ego) and trusting completely in God (Mk. 1:16-17). Transformation results from *kenosis*, an “emptying” of one's self-originated understanding and one's “convincement” of the truth. Consequently, one's values and actions need to conform to the Kingdom which he demonstrated by his healings and exorcisms, eschatological meals (giving hope to sinners), inclusivity (to women, strangers, Gentiles), opposition to domination and thus to class and economic inequality. These could have no place in the Presence of Love (Jn. 4:1-42). The revolutionary politics of Jesus were, therefore, fundamentally of compassion and may be understood, it seems to me, as:

1. Being constantly in the service of humanity and giving voice to the voiceless; exposing the structures and works of oppression. Caring for the well-being of others with steadfast love (Heb. *hesed*).
2. Advocating and demonstrating social and economic justice—for instance, a redistribution of land and wealth (Lev. 25: 1-34).
3. Never elevating Caesar and other icons above God.

4. Speaking Truth to power (including political, military, ecclesial authority).
5. Promoting inclusivity and equity in opposing discrimination caused by hierarchies, as well as gender, age or class bias.
6. Advocating and demonstrating non-violence. Keeping one's heart and mind free of the seeds of war.
7. Creating alternatives to violence: being a means of transformation, reconciliation and healing.
8. Being constantly in prayer.
9. Being willing to live the Kingdom of God/Covenant of Love as a priority and as already present.
10. Letting one's life speak, therefore, and being willing to die like Jesus for Love if necessary.

Transformation in the way we have described meant the end of exile, a “returning home to within” as the first Friends called it,<sup>15</sup> living harmoniously as brothers and sisters, as sons and daughters of God (Isa. 2:2-5; Eph.1:3). For this to occur, prayer, discernment and knowledge, and experience of the living Christ are essential. In the Quaker context, Scott says that “the Meeting for Worship, waiting for the presence of Christ and his direct teaching through words spoken or in the silence of the heart, is both a sign of the Kingdom of God and a means to it.”<sup>16</sup> With God we help the seed (the Presence of Love) to grow from its small beginnings.

The immanence of the Kingdom through *metanoia* will always demand an immediate and radical response, one that is covenantal (Jn.3:16). The Parable of the Talents shows how God gives us tasks according to our measure (Mt. 25:14). Liberation theologian Jon Sobrino calls this relationship the “most fundamental structure of historical reality.”<sup>17</sup> It is a reality that often appears weak and yet it stands constantly and resolutely against the anti-Kingdom, the principalities and powers when they lie, cheat, oppress, and kill (Eph. 6:12).

The early Christians and the early Quakers saw Jesus and his message as fulfilling the promise of Hebrew kingship. His mission was seen to have fulfilled the Law. Being within and among us as the true Law, the Presence of Love exists for all (Lk. 17:20-21).<sup>18</sup> Through it, all people can emerge from death and join the Way in Truth so they may enter into the Life that is abundant and eternal (Jn. 14:6).<sup>19</sup>

Having a constant awareness of the Kingdom as our foundation and vision leads to the fulfillment of God's peace and purpose in our lives and in the world (1 Th. 5:16-18).

## B. EVASIONS OF THE KINGDOM

Despite its prominence in the Gospels, the Kingdom received little attention by mainline Christian theologians until the sixteenth century, when it was re-discovered by tiny groups of European Anabaptists. It remained, therefore, the preserve of a select few. It was during the late 1640s and particularly the 1650s that groups such as the Quakers and other marginal thinkers, like the Digger Gerrard Winstanley and the Baptist William Dell, considered it of paramount importance.

By the 1650s, a long tradition had developed, stretching back to the early Church, in which the Sermon on the Mount was seen as a list of negatives. These include Jesus' "commands" that we should have no anger, no lust, no divorce, no oaths, no resistance to evil, no asserting of any rights. Knowing they could never avoid anger, some Christians came to accept the Sermon's demands as too difficult. Though praised for its idealism, it was soon considered impractical for the "real world," and ethical principles from other sources were adopted and systematized. Over the years, the Sermon on the Mount became a resource for illustrations of "love" without requiring adherence. Being "perfect" was reserved for a future dispensation without sin.

Quakers, however, saw this evasion of Jesus' clear teachings as "apostasy" and declared institutional Christianity to be an affront to the Kingdom. Aided by a reading of Eusebius' *The Ancient Ecclesiastical Histories*, we might assume they recognized a paucity of Patristic reference to the Kingdom and the Sermon, and exegeses on Luke 17:20-21 and Mt. 5:1-7 (the Beatitudes).<sup>20</sup> Their view is supported by Viviano, who maintains that the Kingdom underwent a brief renaissance in the later writings of Irenaeus of Lyons, only to flicker fitfully in the works of Justin Martyr, Origen, John Chrysostom, Augustine and Eusebius himself.<sup>21</sup>

These authorities followed Paul. Though he never ignored the Kingdom and even offered a "definition" of it (see Ro. 14:17; 2 Cor. 8:9), Paul concentrated much more on Jesus as messiah and saviour.<sup>22</sup> In addition, despite the clear social aspect of Romans 14:17, Paul

generally envisioned the Kingdom as a future event. Georgia Harkness powerfully suggests that the Synoptic Gospels being “compiled considerably later than any of Paul’s letters, is evidence that the Kingdom teachings of Jesus had persisted in spite of, and perhaps because of, the centrality given to Jesus as the Christ.”<sup>23</sup>

Come medieval times and the situation had changed little. Mendicant preachers, particularly Francis of Assisi, did indeed center their lives and message on the Beatitudes. However, their appeal was localized.<sup>24</sup> Thomas Aquinas, following Augustine, believed the Beatitudes and the Sermon summed up “the whole process of forming the life of the Christian.” And yet he, too, failed “to devote any significant portion of his principal theological enterprise, the *Summa Theologiae*, to the Kingdom of God despite the vast moral construction he built around justice.”<sup>25</sup>

One would expect a greater focus on the Kingdom as a result of the Reformation with its preference for scriptural exegesis. But despite isolated efforts it was not to be. Paul’s emphasis of Jesus over Kingdom remained intact as indeed it does today among mainline Church thinking. In fact, for Viviano himself, it became “obvious” early in his Dominican formation and subsequent theology lecturing that the central theme of the preaching of the historical Jesus of Nazareth was the near approach of the Kingdom. Yet, to my astonishment, this theme played hardly any role in the systematic theology I had been taught in the seminary. Upon further investigation I realized that this theme had in many ways been *largely ignored in the past two thousand years, and when not ignored, often distorted beyond recognition*. How could this be?<sup>26</sup>

Broadly speaking, the Reformation concerned itself chiefly with a radicalization of the Pauline-Augustinian message of salvation by grace through faith alone. Like Aquinas, John Calvin never fully addressed the Way of the Kingdom in his *Institutes*.<sup>27</sup> As with Luther and the Anabaptists, he developed a two-Kingdom ethic, which separated the secular and sacred. The result was that the Sermon would be followed in the spiritual realm only. Fox and the Friends, then, made a bold discovery for their times and, though they deeply respected Paul, proceeded towards a full inversion of his position.

Today, a new problem confronts modern Friends directly. Mindful of Fox’s criticism of the Church at large, twentieth century Marxist, Quaker, and other historians and theologians have also missed or vastly

understated the Kingdom focus of the 1650s Quaker experience.<sup>28</sup> It is a significant oversight considering the first Friends' intense engagement with the Kingdom. There are seven basic explanations for the oversight:

1. We have seen how Jesus never succinctly defined the Kingdom linguistically and the effect this has had on succeeding generations. Nowadays, as a tensive symbol—that is, as a multifaceted phenomenon with present and future aspects—the Kingdom possesses different meanings in a variety of places and settings. Often its interpretation remains largely the prerogative of the individual.<sup>29</sup>
2. During the previous 110 years an unfortunate link was made between the Kingdom of God and Jesus' apparent belief in an imminent and physical End-time. It is a concept now associated more with modern Fundamentalism. While challenged more recently, the theory that Jesus was an eschatological prophet originated, as we have seen, with Weiss and Schweitzer. It found subsequent expression in the scholarship of Ritschl and Bultmann, and then in the 1970s with Pannenberg, Moltmann, Perrin and Sanders.<sup>30</sup> It had proved a highly influential theory.
3. While greater interest in the Kingdom arose among theologians in the later years of the nineteenth century and continued throughout the twentieth, particularly among social gossellers led by Walter Rauschebusch, it was limited to academic circles.<sup>31</sup> However, the work of Jesus Seminar theologians, some of whom are allied to the “Emergent (or Emerging) Church” movement, reflects recent signs of interest as indeed does the Convergent Friends movement among Quakers.<sup>32</sup>
4. “Kingdom” is regarded in various quarters as masculine and hierarchical, especially in its understanding of God. It has been linked to war, murder, and various forms of injustice such as intolerance, alienation, sexism, and homophobia. For some, it is a reminder of a difficult religious upbringing. Its dramatic language can easily be misunderstood and is insufficiently explained.<sup>33</sup> And while the Greek for “Kingdom,” *basileia*, is actually gender neutral, “Kingdom” is often associated with traditional Christianity which many,

including Quakers, have left behind and sometimes with bad memories. Guthrie sums up such beliefs well: “‘Kingdom’ can provide theological justification for the misuse of human power in familial, social, and political relationships to oppress other people and to rape our natural environment.”<sup>34</sup>

5. The Sermon on the Mount has been and remains domesticated by various denominations as an individualistic and non-radical means of accessing the Kingdom. Further, it has been represented solely in ethical rather than political terms, since politics is so often associated with statecraft.
6. Seventeenth century understandings of the Kingdom were normally invested in Calvinist-Puritan notions of commonwealth and Church, both of which were often divorced from the spiritual imperatives in Matthew 5, and particularly in the Sermon on the Mount.
7. Without familiarity with early Quaker language and their use of the Gospels, it is easy to miss the many embedded references in their works to “Kingdom” and its equally numerous alternative expressions, and also their meanings in context.

### C. THE EARLY QUAKER KINGDOM/COVENANT OF LOVE

Like Jesus and the disciples, the principal goal of the early Friends was to preach the Kingdom and to live it. They claimed to have known it passionately, “in their bowels,” and for them it had always been present even “before Jesus was.”<sup>35</sup> Like the Christ (the Light, Divine Love), the Kingdom was changeless, “from everlasting to everlasting” (Dan. 2:44; 7:27).

They equated the Kingdom with the Second Coming, which they believed had already taken place and was ever-revealing: “Christ is come and coming.” Their experience taught them that as they became more authentic in the life of prayer, both the Covenant of Love and the inner Second Coming were inextricably linked to their understanding and pursuit of inward and outer peace (Jer. 31:33). Their attempts at reaching the Light in “all people” (Jn. 1:9) meant addressing the Kingdom within them and through them its manifestation in the “carnal” world as the Lamb’s War.

The Lamb's War was spiritual, a witness that was most specifically represented by the three peace declarations mentioned earlier under the names of Edward Burrough, Margaret Fell, George Fox, and Richard Hubberthorne.<sup>36</sup> Put another way, the declarations were a theological tapestry of the Quakers' 1650s experience of Kingdom and Testimony, *the actual peace testimony*. Testimony possessed cosmological meaning and purpose. It was given potency by the Pentecost-type "moment" also mentioned earlier. Testimony was both absolute and Christian in the early Quaker mould rather than that of the wider Church. They were sure it was true to the Way of Jesus.

The early Quakers' spiritual revolution repeatedly eschewed violence and was diametrically opposed, therefore, to that perpetrated by Church and State. In James Nayler's *The Lamb's War* (1657) we read that Jesus the Lamb came "to take the Government to himself." The phrase represented the inward authority of the prophet who, having chosen the path of peace and salvation through the Christ, could adopt an outward authority to proclaim (or "publish") the Truth and its Kingdom. In this way the prophet was spiritually ordained. As a call *par excellence* to spiritual arms for Gospel transformation, Nayler's phrase and others like it cut deeply into traditional church faith and practice. It also profoundly challenged the earthly powers when these turned to unrighteousness.<sup>37</sup> Today, it resonates with critical authority because the faith that underlines it assumes discipleship, the doing of Truth and Justice, which are so dear to Quakers. This orthopraxis, in turn, reaches beyond time and space reminding us that we need to *live* the Presence of Love in the now, in faithfulness to the past and for the sake of the future.<sup>38</sup>

### The Peace Testimony and Convincement

Present-day Friends erroneously associate their peace testimony with the Fox-Hubberthorne declaration of 1660/1. According to Tucker, the effect is to divorce the testimony from our other beliefs, thus making it a detailed system complete in itself with its own burden of doctrinal assumptions.<sup>39</sup> This is to misunderstand the early Quaker theology of Kingdom and Testimony which first led them to confront sin through "convincement." During the seventeenth century "convincement" meant "convicting" the "Beast" (sin) within. In this way an individual witnessed to the Inward Light before the "throne of God," the inner court or conscience. The Light informed the

conscience. For those truly convinced, the Kingdom or Inward Light revealed an inner darkness out of which they could be resurrected or re-born. All sin, separation from Love, was a result of the self's denial of God and the Kingdom.<sup>40</sup> Separation from God—not an irrevocable break from God—always expressed itself in varying degrees of violence. As such, it blocked the Light which led to salvation, in other words to wholeness, maturity and unity in God.

The Light was the same in everybody in any time or place, but was given to people proportionally according to their spiritual capabilities (“measure”). The more intense the Light within them, the greater would become their righteousness, perfection, and peace in being one with God.<sup>41</sup> Perfection here should be understood as spiritual maturity. The aim was to restore Eden to the heart and mind, and to grow it.<sup>42</sup> This was how one “entered” the Kingdom, the inner garden. Being “born again” described an inward transformation (1 Pet.1:23), therefore, and it went far beyond modern individualism. In the words of Burrough, it involved “regenerating and making like unto God, being his image of justice, truth and righteousness . . . in which (we) may be saved everlastingly.”<sup>43</sup> Being re-born into God's love, justice, and compassion demanded their implementation as a holistic, collective act. Burrough and Friends were aware that Scripture held no sense of an exclusively held individual piety (Lk. 18:10-13).

The conviction process flowed naturally into the company of Friends for the forging of unity among each other and with God. Listening, reconciliation and healing skills were then applied to the violence that came their way from outside their communities and to violence *per se*. The presence of conflict on these three levels led hopefully to an ever-discovery of the Kingdom and a complete self-abandonment to God. Through the enactment of Testimony on the internal and external levels, the separated one was graced by Divine mercy and forgiveness. The path was cleared to love and serve God. In this way,<sup>44</sup> they applied justice not only to one another but to themselves.

If conviction was an encounter with “true religion” it would always be liberating. Hence, each person would be free of sensuality, hatred, and hardness of heart against neighbors.<sup>45</sup> They would be perfected to enjoy and promote God's Law of justice and compassion. Thus inscribed in the heart, *this* Law would be reflected through human action. Like the Sermon on the Mount, it did not signify

interim ethics because, while the Kingdom was directed towards people *now*, it would be carried into the future. For this, they were to be in the world, not other-worldly, bringing the Kingdom to “all people” including enemies.

The theology of the peace testimony, therefore, is that of the Kingdom. The Jesus at its center is the down-to-earth Nazarene as in Matthew, the cosmological Jesus as in John, Revelation and Paul (see Col. 1:20), and the victorious Lamb over its war with the principalities and powers as in Paul and Revelation (Rev. 2:26). How can a defenseless Lamb wage war? The answer is found in Jesus’ teaching and example (Mt. 5: 38-42). It is, of course, given voice by acting with love, justice, compassion, patience, purity, trust, and humility as “babes” of Light; by discipleship.<sup>46</sup>

### **The Early Quaker Kingdom/Covenant of Love: Specific**

One early Friend who “defined” the Kingdom was Francis Howgill. In *Some of the Mysteries of God’s Kingdom* (1658) he described an everlasting, spiritual Kingdom replete with “purity,” which

comes to be felt working in the heart, and as it is loved and obeyed, it leads and converts the heart, to the Lord, and draws towards itself, out of unholiness, and from under the dark power.<sup>47</sup>

The Kingdom, he said, was home to those formerly exiled, those spiritual refugees who now knew the balm of God’s righteousness/justice which included, *inter alia*, peace, joy, and hope.<sup>48</sup> It was, he continued,

eternal brightness shed abroad through all things which pierces through and searches the secret place, even that which is invisible, and makes manifest all things. And the nature of everything by the day of the Lord comes to be seen, and it appears in the heart. [People are] to wait for the day to dawn . . . [for] that which makes evil manifest and brings it to light.<sup>49</sup>

The “Day of the Lord,” which we will meet later, *was* the Kingdom. It was “pure Light” already present with its justice and the possibility of regeneration. The Day’s grace was free. It was “God’s appearance” and satiated the hunger and thirst for righteousness within. It placed people in the world but on a different path to it and thus nearer to

God. Describing his own experience in finding the true Covenant at long last, Howgill was amazed at the depth of unity with others with whom he was “caught up as in a net.” Expressing the same idealism they may have found in Isaiah 58:6-8, he exclaimed:

And from that day forward our hearts were knit unto the Lord, and one unto another in true and fervent love, not by any external covenant or external form but we entered into the covenant of Life with God. And that was as a strong obligation or bond upon all our spirits which united us one unto another... in the unity of the Spirit and of the bond of peace.<sup>50</sup>

### **The Kingdom/Covenant of Love and Community**

Their corporate unity was of supreme importance. Through it the covenant of death was “disannulled” by the “power and arm” of God. The begotten of the Kingdom were “heirs to the promise” as they unveiled the new covenant within.<sup>51</sup> God’s Light or grace was gifted naturally to all but “not in the same measure” for some were more prone to evil than others.<sup>52</sup>

Acknowledging that words could never fully describe the ineffable, Howgill affirmed them as mere sounds, veils that covered the true beauty and meaning of this spiritual “habitation” or the “treasure house of wisdom.” All who partook of “the Divine nature” received this “Wisdom of Life.”<sup>53</sup> To be of the Kingdom was to live in the Spirit like Jesus as a prophet. The Kingdom’s “fullness fills all things,” Howgill continued, and in its many mansions there would be an eternal welcoming for the children of the resurrection, the poor in spirit who would experience “birth immortal.” Their self-description as “Children of Light” was, as Nuttall observed, a natural expression of their belief that in *them* primitive Christianity, the Kingdom, was being revived.<sup>54</sup> Thus, as the “children,” they would be saved from death and quickened into the Life to be whole. The Life (the Covenant, Kingdom) was hidden, however, from those in the reprobate state.<sup>55</sup>

The Kingdom, being within, as the Friends understood Jesus to have said, meant that one must “dig deep, sweep clean and search narrowly” to discover the pearl, the mustard seed.<sup>56</sup> For the Friends these represented the advent of the Covenant from its small beginnings, the anticipation of the inner and outer worlds being turned upside down. And it represented a reversal of fortune anticipated in the

Beatitudes. This demanded faithfulness which involved an awareness of God's presence, a patient waiting in the peace and righteousness of the Spirit. The Kingdom had to be earned. In this respect, Howgill quoted the Sermon on the Mount to assure his readers that anyone who cared to seek would indeed find: "so first every one must come to feel in (them) the Kingdom (and they) that believe (are) entered into the rest;" and so "blessed are the poor in Spirit" therefore. As the Kingdom was revealed through God's power, glory and grace to those who waited, it could be fully experienced on earth when a loving unity existed among people and thus between humanity and God.

### The "Day of the Lord" In History and Time

In this way, the Presence of Love was the "Crown immortal." As the end of the inner old world was experienced, it was possible to see a new beginning in all its majesty. It placed the present and future in relation to the saving activity of the Spirit together with the birth, ministry, death, resurrection, ascension and glorification of Jesus. All these were understood spiritually. The Kingdom was independent of time and space and so, by definition, it could not end. In the *now* of this compassionate Spirit, in its immediacy, time disappeared. There *was* no beginning and end. Here Howgill answered the dualism, the crude "imaginings," of the Puritans. The Friends believed the Puritan Kingdom of Glory (experienced after death by an Elect chosen prior to Creation) and their Kingdom of Grace (the Kingdom of the present represented by the Church) were now replaced by what *Jesus* taught and demonstrated as the living Word.<sup>57</sup> In the way that Yahweh for Jesus was not only the One who Is but *Immanú'el*, the One who is *with* us, the Friends' own intimate relationship with God and Jesus was for them *the* determining reality. It bound them together as a redeemed community which, in turn, linked all to God. The Day's coming was imminent, immanent, and salvific. And its epiphany was often expressed as theophany.<sup>58</sup>

Though the Kingdom was endless, the Friends believed it could be lost. And yet, it would return as the "Day of the Lord" or "Day of Visitation," as the manifestation of Love that would be "over all." "Over all" signified the power of the Light within and among people. The "Day" was also a corrective and a mediator. It was revelatory. Its realization within, they said, would be by God's "sword" or "wrath," not in the punitive sense but as God restored after their painful

expiation of sin. The desire for purity came with a great price since the Way was “narrow,” difficult to follow and many would fall on stony ground (Mt.13:19-23). But if the heart were true, sin would be washed away in the Fountain of Life. Nuhn tells us there is “nothing easy or automatic about the fulfilment of the Judeo-Christian hope. The vision shines against a backdrop of disaster and crisis, panic and confusion, unready lives, failed measures and falling regimes.” All these constitute a “day of judgment” brought on by our separating from Love.<sup>59</sup>

Once convinced, the Friends were “open” to the Day. In other words, it could be freely experienced without inner restriction as pure Light, a pure shining forth of God, of Eternity, of the Life “putting itself forward”. Only those born of the Light could see it with the spiritual eye since the truly spiritual person was the image of God. Put another way, only those blind to the carnal could see the Day and receive its warning and peace. The Day/Kingdom was the birth from above which discerned all things contrary to it. And, as with the element of crisis during human birth, the Friends saw the “Day” as an ever-coming crisis that would usher in the new era of Edenic purity, the Covenant of God’s Love. In *this* way the Day was apocalyptic and prophetic.

Fox understood Jesus as the Advent, the Fulfilment, and the embodiment of the new messianic age. He was the fulfilling of a Kingdom that was, and would always be, present in the *now*. This eternal now was the spiritual “place” where Jesus continually passed on his mantle to a new people, a holy “nation.” It was a dimension with no new outer religious practice or personality cult. The Quakers internalized the Hebraic idea that a kingdom was impossible until a “nation” was formed. What concerned Fox and the movement was their readiness as a chosen “nation” of the Light to be at the command of God in ever walking the Way of peace until the fullness of time. The Kingdom, then, could never be a short-term event or experience because God alone was its eternal and ever-immanent inspiration. That is to say, God could be incarnated at any point in time, or, more precisely, at a point always in the present with the future at its center. By cutting across time, Fox believed Jesus had liberated God’s love from “history,” symbolically bound within the strictures of the Mosaic Law.

Only by their obedience to the Light would God’s sovereignty cover the earth. “Obedience” is best understood as listening to

and waiting upon God, what Tucker has called “revolutionary faithfulness.”<sup>60</sup> Walking the Way of peace, equality and truth was to be their sole vocation, just as it was Jesus’ (Ac. 2:17-18; 2 Cor. 5:17). They were to bring the Kingdom to “all people on the earth.” We have seen how Matthew 5-7 provided the ethical basis of their Lamb’s War. So, too, the Epistle of James into which the Sermon on the Mount was partially incorporated. The Lamb’s War led to that same unity and wholeness in God, to unity with each other as well as with all humanity thus fulfilling God’s intention. The Kingdom bespoke a worshipping community discerning the will or loving desire of God. It was the way of perfection because perfection, only possible through the Light, was attainable in this life.

While the Light of Christ, the Kingdom, was their universal saving necessity, they did not believe that all people would enjoy salvation, that none would be eternally lost. God’s saving activity intended that everybody could respond to Divine grace by virtue of the universal nature of the spiritual atonement. People could choose between the Light and darkness (Jn.1:5). While the Light was universally available to all people, each person had to accept it and live by the guidance it provided. Or they would be lost to the “dark world.”<sup>61</sup> This applied to everybody whether or not they experienced the Christ or knew Jesus. The Light was a means of bringing humans into an encounter with the Divine, something that would overcome ecclesial practice with its lifeless creeds and dogma. The Friends could not agree, for instance, with the Protestant-Catholic position that the atonement was fixed at a particular time, 33 C.E. It was a continual phenomenon which they internalized. They did so initially through their conviction by crucifying the old self and resurrecting something that was always potentially present—“that of God within.” As such, they gave freedom to the Light.

By claiming to abolish the old history and creating a new one, Fox and the Friends were zealous in restoring the spiritual revolution of Jesus by bringing the future to the present. Hope could now be manifest in the Kingdom’s Love and liberation. The image and fear of the outer, physical End which was a commonplace for the times could now be replaced by the nearness and security of the inner End-time. Their vision would free individuals from the old dispensation which still lingered in the “world’s corruption” and which “struck at (their) heart.” In this way they could redeem time and inspire future

generations in the ways of the Kingdom. Here was the most potent of brews for turning the world upside down.

## CONCLUSION

This paper invites all Friends of whatever persuasion to prayerfully examine and discuss together the roots of their Society and its theology in relation to the Kingdom of God/Presence of Love. It began by suggesting the vitality of the Kingdom as a discrete entity worthy of our spiritual and theological concentration. It advocated resurrecting the Kingdom for our own times as the early Friends did for theirs. Should we not teach the Kingdom, even bring knowledge of the Presence of Love into the public square?

Though Jesus did not formally define the Kingdom, the early Friends presented us with credible explanations of a Kingdom neglected by the Church “since the Apostles’ days.” They were spiritually mature and often sophisticated theologians. Indeed, only now are some modern theologians coming to terms, often unwittingly, with key aspects of early Quaker faith and practice.<sup>62</sup> As in their day, I argued that the Kingdom is also the key to the unity and survival of our Religious Society and its message for the world. The Presence of Love remains its spiritual ground and can provide the common language Quakers desire.

The Kingdom is our vocation, the controlling purpose of our lives individually and corporately. It *is* the Light, God-in-action and is always revelatory and revolutionary. The Kingdom can be best appreciated, then, as a radical encounter with hope. Being so, it bespeaks an eschatological continuum entailing a witness to an awareness that God is always pregnant with self-disclosure. The Kingdom thus gives birth to prophets, to the true “apostolic” or “royal” priesthood.<sup>63</sup> God needs the children of Light, this priesthood, in every generation to enact the Kingdom. Like Jesus, the early Friends were indeed prophets of hope. We can be the same. By moving towards the Kingdom, by dwelling in the Kingdom when enriching the experience of the Kingdom, and by spreading it, each generation of Friends will carry the Presence of Love into the future.

In sum, what the first Friends gave us, what many died for, remains a Kingdom-enhancing yet unfinished pathway into authenticity, wholeness and peace on the inner level and externally for the whole world. Only such a lived and living experience can command attention

and loyalty. Only such a lived and living experience can convince. Should this gift from the early Friends be neglected, Quakerism, potentially a refreshing, healing and liberating revolutionary orthopraxis of the Kingdom of God, will run like sand through our fingers. Its special radiance will thus be lost. Do we dare to live adventurously in giving holy witness to the Presence of Love in the Quaker image? Can we afford not to?

## ENDNOTES

- 1 I wish to acknowledge the support of the Central Committee of FWCC, the AWPS Section of FWCC and Australia YM (Testimonies Committee and Peace and Social Justice Fund) for my attendance at the QTDG colloquium at which this paper was delivered. Appreciation is also due to QTDG Friends and particularly Paul Anderson for their helpful insights.
- 2 *Halakah* in Hebrew refers to “the right way of walking.” Since “Kingdom of God” has negative associations for some people today, I interchange it with “Presence of Love” and, occasionally, “Rule of Love,” “Covenant of Love,” and George Fox’s term, “Ocean of Light and Love.” Undeniably, “Kingdom” contains all the historical resonances and works in all contexts. It is the term many recognize and/or understand even if they object to it. Its many alternatives (see below 35*n*) do not theologically fit all the contexts in which they are used. While “Peaceable Kingdom” is another useful alternative, emphasizing peace and modifying the effect of “Kingdom,” it also is not entirely satisfactory. Jesus spoke of the Kingdom of *God*, setting it against the earthly kingdoms and empires of his day; the Roman Empire, for instance, was known as a “kingdom.” He was saying how much better life would be for ordinary people if God were “king” and they lived under the rule of God’s love instead; for “king” one might substitute “over all,” another well-used Fox expression.
- 3 Also, for instance, “Covenant of Life,” “Dominion of immortal life,” “Garden of God,” “Eternal Life,” “Word of Faith,” “Pearl,” “Government of Christ,” “New Creation,” “New Jerusalem.” Of 152 works Fox composed in the same period, “Kingdom of God/Heaven/Christ/of the Messiah” occurs 519 times in 72 works (46% of 152), a figure that rises to 144 works (or 93% of 152) when equivalent expressions are included. Fox also used the terms 95 times in 49 of the 225 epistles under his name again during the same period. In total, he used “Kingdom” and equivalents 614 times in 377 writings, a pattern replicated in the works of the other leading (or “public”) Friends.
- 4 D. Cronshaw, “The Shaping of Public Theology in Emerging Churches” (Canberra: Oct., 2008), 2-4 at: <<http://www.csu.edu.au/special/accc/worddocs/Papers%20&%20Publications/AAMS%20missions%20conference/Cronshaw.pdf>>.
- 5 Between the end of Fox’s illness at Reading (Berks) and the “Yearly Meeting” at Skipton (Yorkshire). For a fuller explanation of the “Pentecost” see my *The Growth and Development of Quaker Testimony* (New York: Mellen, 2005), 102-11.
- 6 For a helpful insight into the political, apocalyptic and quietist understandings of the Kingdom during first century Palestine see Grant, “The Gospel of the Kingdom,” *passim*.
- 7 Fox’s accusation is found, *inter alia*, in *A Reply to the Pretended Vindication* (1657), 18; *An Answer to the Papists . . . Lately Out of Holland* (1658), *passim*; see p. 1; *The Lamb’s Officer* (1659), 4, 8, 12, 14, 16; see also *Journal*, 109 (for Fox on Firkbank Fell.), 196,

- 294, 418-19 and B. Viviano, *The Kingdom of God in History* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1988), 61.
- 8 J. C. O'Neil, "The Kingdom of God," *Novum Testamentum* 35, Fasc. 2 (1993), 138; J. Gray, *The Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979), 323.
- 9 Cf. also Lk. 6:17-49, the Sermon on the Plain. Noteworthy is the impact of the Sermon on the Mount upon the Mennonite and Brethren traditions, and other peace churches alongside Friends.
- 10 Jonathan Draper, "The Genesis and Narrative Thrust of the Paraenesis in the Sermon on the Mount," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 22, #75 (2000), 25-47, esp. 46. See A. Schweitzer, *The Quest for the Historical Jesus* (New York: Macmillan, 1910 in English; org. pub. 1906) and J. Weiss, *Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God* (eds./trans., R. Hiers and D. Holland; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971; orig. pub. 1892).
- 11 Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (trans. K. Grobel; London: SCM, 1952-5), 4-5.
- 12 The Law Codes are found in Ex. 20:22 and 23:33 (Book of the Covenant); Deut. 12-26 (Deuteronomic Code) and in the Holiness Code of Lev. 17-26.
- 13 See M. Buber, *Two Types of Faith* (trans. N. Goldhawk; New York: Harper & Row, 1961), 55; C. Stettler, "Purity of Heart in Jesus' Teaching," *Journal of Theological Studies* 55:2 (2004), 492-95. For early Quaker references to Jer. 31:33-34 see, for instance, W. Dewsbury, *A True Prophecy* (London: Calvert, 1653: D1279), 4; and Fox and J. Nayler, *Several Papers* (N.p.: n.p., 1654: F1904), 6.
- 14 See W. Smith, *A Manifestation of Prayer* (N.p.: n.p., 1663: S4314), Bds. and R. Farnworth, *The Spiritual Man* (London: Calvert, 1655: F505), 18. According to J. Jeremias, from the earliest times Orientals applied *Abba* ("father") to God to encompass something of what "mother" signifies to us today; see *The Prayers of Jesus* (Naperville: Allenson, 1967), 63. For Goergen, *Abba* also implies "mother" (*Imma*); see *The Mission and Ministry of Jesus* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1986), 279. The Aramaic *Abba* signifies an intimate "daddy" and "mummy."
- 15 F. Howgill, *A Lamentation for the Scattered Tribes* (London: Calvert, 1656: H3170), 6.
- 16 J. Scott, "The Meaning of Hope," *Friends Quarterly* 32, 8 (2001), 356.
- 17 J. Sobrino, *Jesus the Liberator* (Tunbridge Wells: Burns & Oats, 1994), 93-5, 161-2; see Eph. 6:12 for "principalities and powers."
- 18 Cf. Gospel of Thomas, logions 2-3 at: <<http://users.misericordia.edu//davies/thomas/Trans.htm>>.
- 19 See Jn. 1:12; 10:10; 14:6.
- 20 See Howgill's *The Glory of the True Church* (London: Calvert, 1661:H3162), *passim* and esp. 1-19.
- 21 Viviano, 9.
- 22 J. Fuellenbach, "Kingdom of God as Principle of Action in the Church" at: <[www.sedos.org/English/fuellenbach.htm](http://www.sedos.org/English/fuellenbach.htm)>, p.6 of 16.
- 23 G. Harkness, *Understanding the Kingdom of God* (New York: Abingdon, 1974), chapter 4 at: <[www.religion-online.org/showchapter.asp?title=577&C=740](http://www.religion-online.org/showchapter.asp?title=577&C=740)>.
- 24 Viviano, 84-99 and esp. 84-5; C. Muessig, "Preaching the Beatitudes in the late Middle Ages," *Studies in Christian Ethics* 22:2 (2009), 136-150, esp. 137, 150.
- 25 Viviano, 9.
- 26 *Ibid.*, my emphasis.

- 27 *Ibid.*, 84-5.
- 28 For evasions see Viviano, *passim* and G. Stassen, "Recovering the Way of Jesus," at: <[www.epcra.ch/papers/belgien/strassen.htm](http://www.epcra.ch/papers/belgien/strassen.htm)>, unnumbered pgs. 1-3, 12.
- 29 For "tensive symbol" see N. Perrin, "Eschatology and Hermeneutics," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93:1 (1974), 13.
- 30 See Schweitzer, Weiss, also Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*; A. Ritschl, *Three Essays* (trans. P. Heffner. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972); W. Pannenberg, *Theology and the Kingdom of God* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969); J. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope* (London: SCM, 1967); N. Perrin, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1963) and E. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Allen Lane, 1993). For an excellent literature and historical survey of Kingdom concerns see V. Figueroa-Villarreal, *Gustavo Gutiérrez's Understanding of the Kingdom of God* (Ph.D. dissertation, Berrien Springs, MI.: Andrews University, 1999), 17-71.
- 31 See Rauschenbusch's *Christianising the Social Order* (New York: Macmillan, 1912), *passim*. Rauschenbusch and the social gospel movement were influenced by Ritschl's *The Christian Teaching of Justification and Reconciliation* (ed./trans. H. Mackintosh and A. Macaulay. Edinburgh: Clark, 1900). See also J. McCandless, "The Life of the Cross and the Coming of the Kingdom," *Quaker Religious Thought* 15:4 (1974), 3-25; esp. 7-14.
- 32 This young and growing phenomenon, too recent for historical analysis, has many different expressions around the world. According to Cronshaw, it claims "to express new forms of mission and innovation appropriate for a post-Christian context." It understands that mission needs to holistically include mercy and advocates for justice, not merely evangelism. See Cronshaw, "The Shaping of Public Theology" and Moritz, "Beyond Strategy," *passim*. See also C. W. Daniels, "Convergent Friends," *passim* and R. Mohr at: <<http://robinmsf.blogspot.com/2006/01/robinopedia-convergent-friends.html>>.
- 33 Such as in Lk. 16:16: "From this time onwards the Kingdom of God is proclaimed and everyone is getting in by violence." "Getting in by violence" meant being "urgently pressed into" the Kingdom. And it was "urgent" in order to break the domination of forces which held people in thrall. See also Mt. 11:12 and Gray, *The Biblical Doctrine*, 319.
- 34 S. Guthrie, "Human Suffering, Human Liberation," *Theology Today* 53:1 (1996), 22.
- 35 See Penington, *The Consideration of a Position* (1660), title pg. and *passim*; see also *Letters of Isaac Penington* (1859), 7-8, Letters 19, 29.
- 36 Burrough et al, *A Declaration . . . to the Present Distracted and Broken Nation of England* (London: Simmonds, Dec. 1659: B5989); M. Fell et al, *A Declaration and an Information* (London: Wilson & Simmonds, June 1660: F628); Fox & R. Hubberthorne et al, *A Declaration of the Harmless and Innocent People* (London: Wilson, Jan. 1660/1: F1786).
- 37 J. Nayler, *The Lamb's War against the Man of Sin* (London: Simmonds, 1657: N291 2nd. ed.), 3.
- 38 *Journal*, 357; Epistle 183 (1659) in *The Works of George Fox* (hereafter *Works*. Philadelphia: Gould, 1831), vol. 7, 173.
- 39 R. Tucker, "Revolutionary Faithfulness", *Quaker Religious Thought* 9, 2 (Rev. ed., 1971: orig. 1967-8), 18.
- 40 For a fine understanding of separation see F. Howgill, *A Lamentation*, 5-6.
- 41 See 2 Cor. 6:15; Eph. 4:6; 2 Pet. 1:4 and Fox's *Journal*, 27, 230-1.

- 42 Fox, *The Pearl Found in England* (Hereafter *Pearl*. London: Simmonds, 1658: F1878), 5; *Journal*, 135.
- 43 Burrough, *The Everlasting Gospel of Repentance* (London: Wilson, 1660: B6001), 18.
- 44 They did so automatically, though not consciously, in the spirit of *dikaosun* (justice/righteousness)—unsurprisingly mentioned five times in the Matthean Sermon on the Mount.
- 45 “Liberated from mammon” (see Mt. 6: 24); “sensuality” (Lk. 7: 50); “hatred and hardness of heart” (Mt. 6:1); “perfect” (Mt. 5:48); “promote justice” (see Mt. 5:20); “inscribed in people’s hearts” (Jr. 31:33); “not other-worldly” (see Mk. 10: 42-44).
- 46 See also Mt. 11: 25; 19:14, 23-25; 20:21-25; Mk. 9:47.
- 47 Howgill, *Some of the Mysteries of God’s Kingdom Declared* (London: Simmonds, 1658: H3179), 38-40. He was probably evoking Jer. 32:40.
- 48 Howgill, *ibid.* See Ro. 14:17-18 and Howgill, *The Invisible Things of God* (London: Simmonds, 1659: H3169), 144. He also mentioned pleasantness, virtue, eternal life, assurance of God’s love, felicity, comfort and consolation, eternal dignity, quietness, and grace.
- 49 Howgill, *ibid.*, 147-8.
- 50 Howgill, *A Testimony Concerning . . . Edward Burroughs* (London: Warwick, 1662: T809), 6.
- 51 See J. Anderdon, *God’s Proclamation* (London: Calvert, 1659: A3081), 5.
- 52 Howgill, *Some of the Mysteries*, 34. Probably echoing Ro. 8:9, Howgill wrote, “It is a lamentation to see how people are gone out of the pure simplicity which is in Christ.”
- 53 And “Power and Virtue.” One would be filled with “Divine love,” the “word of the Kingdom,” “the word of Power,” the “word of Life.” See Howgill, *The Glory of the True Church*, 3.
- 54 G. Nuttall, *To the Refreshing of the Children of Light* (Wallingford: Pendle Hill, 1959) and at: <[http://www.pendlehill.org/pendle\\_hill\\_pamphlets.htm](http://www.pendlehill.org/pendle_hill_pamphlets.htm)>, 4-5. See Lk. 16:8; Jn. 12: 36; Eph. 5:8; 1 Thess. 5:5; and also Mt. 5:9; Lk. 20:30.
- 55 Penington, *The Jew Outward* (London: Lloyd, 1659: P1174), 13.
- 56 See Fox, Epistle 19 (1652) in *Works*, vol. 7, 26-7; see esp. para. 2, in which he quotes Lk. 17:20-21.
- 57 Howgill, *Some of the Mysteries*, 2-5, 38-43.
- 58 For apocalyptic and theophanic language see *Pearl*, 12; and Nayler, *The Power and Glory of the Lord* (London: Calvert, 1653: N302), 11, 14-15; both quote Dan. 2:34-35 (cf. Mk.5:5).
- 59 F. Nuhn, “The Peaceable Kingdom,” in D. Freiday, ed., *The Day of the Lord* (Newberg: Barclay Press, 1981), 30.
- 60 Tucker, 12.
- 61 For “dark world” see, for instance, Nayler, *The Power and Glory of the Lord*, Sig. D2, 11, 14-15.
- 62 Cf., for instance, Marcus Borg’s Christology in *Jesus: A New Vision* (New York: HarperCollins, 1987) with that in W. Bayly, *A Short Discovery* (London: Westwood, 1659: B1536), 4; J. Crook, *Truth’s Principles* (London: n.p., 1662: C7217), 8-9; and I. Penington *et al*, *The Way of Life and Death* (London: Lloyd, 1658: P1219), 461.
- 63 Nayler, *A Discovery of the First Wisdom from Beneath* (London: Calvert, 1653: N272 & N273), 13. Early Quaker reference in this respect was usually to the Order of Melchizedek (Ps.110:4).