

'Men of our own Nation': Gender, Race and the Other in Early Modern Quaker Writing

Naomi Baker University of Manchester

In the non-Quaker account *Eben-Ezer: Or, a small Monument of Great Mercy* (1684), William Okeley recounts his capture by Turkish pirates, subsequent slavery in 'Algiers' and final escape, promising his readers that they will 'meet with nothing *in Fact* but what is *precisely true*.'¹ His narrative contrasts the religion of the 'imperious *Turk*' with English Christianity: within the terms of the latter, 'Inferiours ... give the most full *Obedience*' to their 'Superiours', but are nevertheless protected from the 'tyranny' which characterises the former. 'Whoever has known *Turkish Slavery*', Okeley concludes, 'is obliged to become a more *Loyal Subject*, a more *Dutiful Child*, a more *Faithful Servant*.'² Okeley's attempt to construct a clear binary of English and Turk betrays the instability of such categories, as the ostensible contrast between English Christian freedom and Turkish oppression becomes blurred by the hierarchical structures of English society.

Despite such evident tensions, Okeley's narrative exemplifies the anxious assertion of the East as an inferior other which characterised dominant English representations of the Orient in the early modern period.³ The Turks are characterised by cruelty, covetousness and a deluded religion, as the narrative of James Deane which is appended to Okeley's account confirms:

It was vain to Intreat or expect any other usage from those whose tenderest *Mercies* were the Extremities of *Cruelty*, ... [they indulged] unnatural Lusts, to which they were not wanting in their Cursed Importunities; so that our very *Souls* were not free from their Tortures; They being so filthy as to mix with *Brute Beast* ... as fill'd our Hearts with horror, and [is] not fit to be named amongst Christians.⁴

Okeley employs biblical imagery to assert the fixed and superior nature of an English identity in opposition to Turkishness:

there is a secret Magnetisme in a Native Soile, with which our Hearts being once strongly toucht, could never admit of the least variation, but still pointed directly Homewards; and such a Land too, as was like Goshen, all Light, while the Land of our Captivity was like Egypt, both for Slavery and Darkness ...⁵

The stability of Englishness is nevertheless far from evident in the text, which negotiates with representations of the Turkish other in an attempt to secure an English identity which is clearly under threat. While the land of light described above appears secure in its possession of truth, Okeley elsewhere asks 'what should be the grounds of their confidence, who speak as if the Gospel were entailed upon England, by vertue of some Ancient Charter; as if God would make us Exceptions from his General Rule ...?'⁶ The anxious self-referentiality which informs Western representations of the Orient is apparent in Okeley's narrative as he constructs a threatening foreign presence in order to intimidate the English into conformity:

If we enjoy the Light, and yet walk in darkness, it's righteous with God, to overspread our *Habitations with Egyptian, or Babylonish, Turkish, or Popish* darkness. God can carry us to *Rome, or Algiers*; or else send *Rome, and Algiers* home to us ...⁷

The division between 'West' and 'East', as between light and dark, is thus revealed to be less than absolute: paradoxically, the potency of 'Turkishness' (along with its similarly dangerous concomitants) as the ultimate other depends upon its capacity to overtake the English self, transgressing seemingly absolute boundaries with a terrifying ease. The fact that Catholics are included alongside Egyptian, Babylonian and Turkish heathens also betrays the fact that English representations of the 'East' in the early modern period were often inextricable from more pressing domestic struggles between Protestants and Catholics. Stable binaries of Christian and heathen, and West and East, as well as the unified 'English' or 'Christian' identity which such categories attempt to police, are thus resisted by the text.

Even the fundamental division between English liberty and Turkish slavery and the insistence upon a natural, fixed national identity which at one level operate in the text become unstable as Okeley considers his opportunity to escape:

I might possibly find *worse* Quarter in *England*, where the Civil Wars were now broke out, ... If the Name of *Native Countrey* bewicht me, If That dazled my Eyes; surely *wherever we are well is our Countrey*, and *all the World is Home to him that thrives all over the World*: ... *Liberty* is a good

*word, but a Man cannot buy a Meals meat with a word: And slavery is a hard word, but it breaks no mans back.*⁸

Eben-Ezer nevertheless ultimately resists such transgressive tendencies, as Okeley reasserts the binary structures upon which his sense of identity depends: ‘any thought of *England*, and of its Liberty and Gospel *confuted a thousand such Objections*’.⁹ The narrative consciously occludes evidence which would further undermine stable boundaries of self and other, for instance when Okeley alludes to an episode of ‘more bitterness ... than in all our slavery; and yet they were *Christians*, not *Algerians*; *Protestants*, not *Papists*; *English-men*, not *Strangers*, that were the cause of it: But I have put a force upon my self, and am resolved not to publish it.’¹⁰ Likewise ‘what cold Entertainment we met with ... from some of our Own Country, I shall draw a veil over’.¹¹

The occlusions and paradoxes of *Eben-Ezer* thus betray the tensions surrounding early modern constructions of the Oriental other. The binary of ‘English’ and ‘Turk’ was clearly complicated by the categories of Protestant and Catholic which it was instrumental in negotiating, demonstrating the anxious instability of English identity in this era. It is as a result of such anxieties that Okeley, and many others like him, ultimately insist upon the superiority of an English Protestant identity in opposition to a foreign other in an attempt to secure their own identity.

The formulation of an English identity in opposition to foreign others also defines the self-representations of some seventeenth-century English sectarians. The ‘Leveller’ John Lilburne’s campaign to realise the ‘native, naturall, just, legall and hereditary freedoms and liberties’ of the English people is figured in his writings through setting the rightfully free English subject against an oppressive foreign enemy: ‘We remain under the *Norman* yoke of an *unlawfull Power*, from which wee ought to free our selves.’¹² Discourses of gender intersect with those of nationality in the inflammatory rhetoric of Lilburne and his circle. English subjects are ‘[men] of mettle’, rational and self-assertive: ‘all true English men ... love justice and reall actions’.¹³ They are nevertheless threatened with emasculation by effeminate foreign ‘intruders’ into their affairs. Lilburne’s adversaries exemplify the terrifying effects of a surrender to the ‘delusive Arts’ of the ‘softened and debased’ Normans: they ‘durst do nothing manlike for themselves, but sate in silence like a company of sneaks without souls or hearts.’¹⁴

In Quaker accounts, however, such national and gendered binaries are problematised. While remaining influenced by dominant ideologies of the opposition of the Protestant Christian self to the Turkish (and Catholic) other, Quaker identities were primarily defined in opposition to dominant English Christian subject positions. As Susan Wiseman has argued in relation to early modern Quaker women’s travel narratives,

[Quaker] systems of belief are thrown into relief not by encounters with the 'other' of heathens, pagans or believing slaves, but in encounters with members of their own culture who have different belief systems ...¹⁵

The journals of the Quakers Thomas Lurting, Daniel Baker, James Dickinson and John Taylor, among other missionary and travel narratives, describe encounters with Turks and native Americans which deconstruct the hierarchical binary of English and 'foreign', exploiting the instabilities of dominant representations of the 'Oriental' other in order to differentiate the Quaker self from orthodox English Christian locations. The self-marginalising impulse of Quaker subjectivities often entails the narrative selves within Quaker accounts being paradoxically cast as 'other', thus complicating the ostensibly fixed polarities of Orientalist discourse. The non-hegemonic frameworks within which the autobiographical personae of early modern Quaker travel narratives are formulated also renegotiate gendered dynamics. The potentially feminised location of the early modern Quaker, for instance, overdetermines male Quakers' representations of themselves in relation to the Oriental other, calling into question the universality of models of hyper-masculine male British Orientalist and feminised Oriental which operate in recent post-colonial theory.¹⁶

The problematised position of Quaker subjectivities within the colonial context to some degree correlates with recent analysis of the position of women within colonialism. Said's *Orientalism* conspicuously ignored the complex positioning of women within the colonial project, an absence which theorists such as Sara Mills, Reina Lewis and Billie Melman have sought to rectify.¹⁷ The renewed visibility of women within Occidental frameworks, participating in the colonial project, and yet occupying nuanced positions as a result of their own cultural marginality, has led Melman to assert that 'Europe's attitude towards the Orient was neither unified nor monolithic.'¹⁸ Lewis similarly argues that Said's construction of Orientalism, 'in which the Orient is characterised as irrational, exotic, despotic, and heathen, thereby securing the West in contrast as rational, familiar, moral, just and Christian', posits 'a homogeneous discourse enunciated by a colonial subject that is unified, intentional and irredeemably male'. The colonial articulations of Western women challenge such structures, as 'women's problematic access to the superiority of a colonial position makes their work difficult to classify'. Lewis avoids an ahistorical valorisation of all women as counter-hegemonic, conceding that many women collaborated in colonialism. Yet 'the contradictions of their position mean that their representations are likely simultaneously to confirm and transgress social and textual codes.'¹⁹

Rather than necessarily entailing resistance to the oppression and appropriation of the colonised subject, however, the 'transgression' of dominant forms of colonial discourse can itself constitute an alternative form of colonialism. Moira Ferguson stresses that even anti-slavery writings by British

women in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries remained implicated in the construction of the colonised subject wholly with reference to the colonising self. Instead of granting colonised subjects a voice, or the power to represent themselves, these women often ‘mediated their own needs and desires, their unconscious sense of social invalidation, through representations of the colonial other, who in the process became more severely objectified and marginalised’.²⁰ Ferguson’s work therefore warns against any straightforward celebration of the ostensibly anti-colonial discourse generated within marginalised groups, instead highlighting the need for all representations of the colonised subject from the early modern era to be critically examined in order to expose the power relations which they inscribe.

An awareness of the remaining political imbalance in non-hegemonic colonial positions is particularly pertinent to an analysis of Quaker texts which depict the New World, where, as Wiseman has established, unorthodox representations of the colonial subject are often manipulated as currency in the power-struggle between Quakers and Puritans. Slaves and native Americans, Wiseman argues, figure in Quaker texts merely as ‘marginal counters’, useful only in the central authorial impulse to ‘Quaker self-mythologization’.²¹ Even Quaker travel narratives which display radical departures from hegemonic colonial representations thus potentially remain implicated in the manipulation of racial others in the self-serving interests of Western powers.

While European categories have been problematised by feminist insistence on the differing positions of women within colonialism, a general presumption of the remaining self-identity of the colonising Western *male* identity nevertheless remains intact. Women’s cultural marginality, it is argued, engenders a complex negotiation with colonialism; men, it is assumed, remain universally hegemonic and centralised, defining the unambiguous coloniser and orthodox Orientalist perspective. Post-colonial theory frequently constructs gender models within the colonial context in terms of a hyper-masculine colonialist, whose male gaze constructs the inferior feminine other of the colonised subject. The renewed visibility of women’s ambiguous status within the colonial context has often served to emphasise the homogeneous nature of the male Occidental subject further. In a recent article, Sara Mills argues that

The ideological form of masculinity developed within the colonial context can be considered to be extreme and excessive This particular type of masculinity developed within the colonial context because of the need to appear as a colonial subject, as a member of a ruling race. It was constructed on the basis of opposition to other seemingly weaker forms of ‘native’ masculinity, such as the ‘feminine’ Punjabi, and also in relation to the forms of femininity available to British women within the colonial context.²²

Mills further emphasises that colonial discourse in the nineteenth century (and yet implicitly as a universal rule) constructed coloniser and colonised

in specifically sexual terms: 'even the colonial landscape was represented as a compliant female body – a virgin territory opening itself up to imperial penetration.'²³

Early modern Quakerism nevertheless produced non-hegemonic males as well as marginalised females, who occupied an ambiguous position in relation to dominant discourses of identity. The rational, masculine European self which Lewis finds it difficult to apply to women in her study is clearly equally problematic as a depiction of Quaker male travellers to the East or the New World in the early modern period. An analysis of their complex and contradictory constructions of the other, which frequently undermine dominant colonial representations while often nevertheless invoking alternative forms of 'cultural imperialism', thus constitutes a further challenge to critical constructions of an homogeneous Occidental perspective, pointing instead to the need for historically and culturally specific readings of 'colonial' or 'Orientalist' texts from this period.²⁴

*'They are Turks and we are English Men'*²⁵

As Okeley's narrative reveals, the idea of the Turk was surrounded with dense cultural signification in the early modern period. El-Beshti argues that the figure of the Turk operated in the era as the 'embodiment for a Protestant nation of all it loathed and feared'.²⁶ The above discussion nevertheless highlights the extent to which any construction of a unified English identity in the period is reductive: Protestants, for instance, were centrally concerned with policing the boundaries between themselves and Catholics, while even within the category of 'Protestant', separate groups focused their energies on distinguishing themselves from each other, rather than primarily opposing themselves to more 'exotic', distant subjects. While the Oriental subject, and particularly the Turk, figured in the English imagination as an ultimate other, the deployment of such a figure in Quaker writings is consequently often implicated in the ongoing struggle to construct clear boundaries between groups of Western Christians, rather than in relation to the formulation of a more generic 'English' identity.

When Thomas Lurting adds 'A *true Account of George Pattison's being Taken by the Turks; and how Redeemed by God's Direction and Assistance, without Bloodshed, putting the Turks on Shoar in their own Country, the 8th Month, 1663*' to his autobiography, *The Fighting Sailor Turn'd Peaceable Christian* (1710), he is therefore engaging with a complicated array of cultural configurations. The account describes his experiences in 1663 as George Pattison's Mate, when his ship, sailing from Venice, is overtaken by a Turkish Man-of-War. As the title suggests, the tale celebrates Lurting's peaceful response, which ultimately leads to the liberation of the English crew and the return of the Turks to Algiers. The English Christian is set against the Turkish other in his narrative, which depicts a fundamental

collision of national and religious identities. While echoing many of the widespread mythological constructions of the Turk, Lurting's account nevertheless undermines some of these assumptions, as he establishes the difference of his own perspective from that of his fellow English sailors.

From the outset of the narrative, Turkishness signifies a feared cultural other, precipitating anxiety and defensiveness in the English:

We heard that many *Turks* Men of War were at Sea, and that they had taken many *English* Ships; and it was much in my Mind, that we should be taken; and I was very much concerned, as well for the Men, as for my self.²⁷

The ease with which the English later overcome the Turks betrays the extent to which such anxiety is an exaggerated response, based on what people have 'heard', in terms of the cultural mythologising of the Turkish threat.

The construction of the Turks as the repository of religious otherness continues in the work as Lurting presents himself as the Messianic saviour of the English from the heathens: after the ship is occupied by the Turks, the word of the Lord assures him that his English, Christian identity will be preserved (*'thou shalt not go to Algier'*). Lurting is anxious to police the boundaries between the Turks and the English. His primary desire is to re-group the English in one place: *'Were but the Master on Board, and the rest of our Men, if there were twice as many Turks, I should not fear them.'* Fear therefore stems from the threat of assimilation with the irreducible other, which confuses established boundaries of identity. Once this situation is rectified, Lurting regains his idealised, rational and dominant identity: *'Now we being all together ... I began to reason with them'* (34–35).

A correlation between Englishness and dominant constructions of masculinity surfaces in the text when Lurting operates within the terms of conventional Orientalist discourse. Rationality and the concomitant control of one's emotions were central to configurations of the ideal masculine self in this era. Lurting emphasises such qualities, instructing his fellow countrymen to embody their prescribed difference from the Turks: *'they are Turks, and we are English Men, let it not be said, We are afraid of them'* (40). The superiority of the English thus lies in their courageous masculinity, while the Turks conspicuously fail to be described as 'men'. Such gendered colonial discourse emerges again as Lurting takes the Turks to the shore. The anxiety of his fellow countrymen begins to unsettle Lurting's own sense of superiority, and he consequently reasserts received concepts of masculinity: *'your many Fears have brought some on me also; therefore now behave your selves like Men, and be not afraid'* (44).

While rationality, courage and self-control define 'manly' Englishness, the Turks are depicted as weak-minded, cowardly and hysterically emotional:

And as soon as he told them, we were going towards *May-York*; they, instead of rising, fell all to Crying; for their Courage was taken from them,

and they desired that they might not be Sold; which I promised they should not; and so soon as I had pacified them, I went into the Cabin to our Master, he not knowing what was done; and so he told their Captain, *That we had overcome his Men, and were going for May-York*: At which unexpected News he wept; and desired the Master not to sell him; which he promised he would not. (37)

The English overcome the supposedly terrifying military might of the Turks with almost no effort, and the sense of 'natural' inevitability in this reassertion of English mastery is echoed by the speed and ease of the Turks' unquestioning acceptance of the reorganisation. The language of slavery is overlaid with that of childhood as the Turks are portrayed as feeble and afraid, needing to be 'pacified' by the paternalist English.

Perhaps most significantly of all, the emasculated Turks are denied any direct voice in the text. The representation of their speech is minimal, and, where it does occur, is wholly mediated through the voice of the English narrator. Such silence is associated with their passivity in the text: despite their initial military aggression, the Turkish 'conquest' of the ship is not described in any detail, so that it is difficult to envisage. Almost from the outset, it is Lurting, not the Turks, who manipulates the course of events. Turkish agency is thus almost entirely erased from the narrative, as English mastery, bravery, and superior intelligence is constructed in opposition to a conspicuous Turkish lack of these qualities.

The English male selfhood upon which such binaries depend is not, however, a construct with which a Quaker can easily identify. Contemporary principles of masculinity invoked ideals of rational control and demonstrations of physical valour through violence from which the early modern Quaker dissented. The intersecting discourses of colonialism and masculinity are thus undermined in the narrative by Quaker frameworks, ultimately placing Lurting in an ambivalent relationship with the Turks.

The main body of *The Fighting Sailor* has already delineated the degree to which Lurting's Quaker conversion reformulated his identity, undermining many of the premises of masculinity in relation to which he had previously constructed himself. Central to his new persona is a conviction of pacifism, which sets him apart as a seemingly unpatriotic, emasculated coward. The appendix continues to represent this non-hegemonic model for the male self, as Lurting insists on a peaceful relationship with the Turks. The contrast with Leveller self-portrayals is stark: John Lilburne's writings repeatedly refer to his military prowess, emphasise his military titles, and assert a willingness to use force, as he emphasises his heroic Englishness.²⁸ Lurting's attitude towards the Turks thus distinguishes him from the self-representation of dissenters within other sects. The clear-cut binaries of self and other which otherwise appear to govern the narrative begin to be dismantled as Lurting defends the Turks: *'If I know any of you that offers to touch a Turk, I will*

tell the Turks my self' (35). While the text posits the Turks as 'strange' ('*They [are] Strangers, I must treat them well*'), Lurting himself is also alienated from his fellow Englishmen: 'some said to me, *I was a strange Man ...*' (39, 35).

The Orientalist binary of godly and God-forsaken is also questioned through Lurting's assertion that he and his crew only have divine blessing because they have sworn not to harm any Turks: 'I believed that the Lord would prosper it, by reason I could rather go to *Algier*, than to kill one *Turk*' (36). The implication that God would frown upon the murder of Turks opposes the dominant philosophy that constructed them as the embodiment of God's enemies.

Ambiguity concerning the divisions between Lurting's and the Turks' identities again emerges as he refuses to sell them as slaves to the Spanish. Any perception of European Christians as an homogenous Occidental mass, unanimously opposed to 'Orientals' is undermined: the Turks 'resolvedly helped us, and we made all haste to run from the *Spaniards*; which pleased the *Turks* very well. So we put our selves to the hazard of the *Turks*, to save them' (38–39). The Turks are abruptly redefined as allies in the context of the superior Quaker need to establish their difference from the closer enemy of the Catholics. Conventional understandings of ideal Englishness are undermined through such a manoeuvre, as is made clear from the reaction of the '*English* master', who 'look'd upon us as Fools, because we would not sell them; which I would not have done for the whole Island' (38). Quaker processes of self-differentiation thus subvert received understandings of English behaviour, altering the terms by which the self is opposed to, and thus defined by, a culturally demonised other.

The narrative reaches a tense climax as Lurting and his fellow sailors row the Turks to the shore, near '*Algier*'. Lurting again demonstrates a transgressive identification with the Turks, empathising with their predicament:

God willing I will put them on Shoar; for they'll come quietly near the Shoar, but if we carry them on Board, there will be nothing but Rising: For if it were my own Case, I would rise ten times, and so will they; on the Shoar we must put them. (44–45)

El-Beshti identifies any construction of the sameness of Occidental and Oriental identities as inextricable from the Occidental desire to convert, and thus to assimilate the 'other'.²⁹ Yet Lurting's insistence on common motivation and behaviour between English and Turk generates an opposite movement. Instead of appropriating the Turks, his recognition of their humanity in relation to his own identity generates a desire to return them to their own land and culture. Lurting's empathy with the Turks in fact almost begins to undermine his pacifist convictions, as he entertains the possibility that he, too, would 'rise', if placed in such circumstances. Ironically, the radical identifications which are working to construct Lurting's Quaker subjectivity in the text

therefore have the potential to destabilise this same identity, illustrating the extent to which such dissident representations ultimately resist coherence.³⁰

The trip to the shore is punctuated by anxious outbursts from Lurting's fellow Englishmen, as they inscribe their fears onto the landscape:

Lord have Mercy on us, There are Turks in the Bushes on Shoar. ... Positively there's Men in the Bushes. And he speaking so positively of it, it seized me, so that I was possessed with Fear: And so soon as the Turks in the Boat saw I was afraid, they all rose at once in the Boat. And this was one of the greatest straights that ever I was put to: Not for fear of the Turks in the Boat, but for Fear of our Mens killing them; for I would not have killed a *Turk*, or caused one to be killed, for the whole World. (43)

The Turks in the bushes turn out to be the products of over-active imaginations, as Lurting exposes the mythological nature of the projected cultural fears of the English. The real threat to peace and stability, instead of coming from Turkish barbarians, stems from English constructions of such an entity. The hostile heathens are in fact hospitable hosts: 'with Signs of great Kindness, they took leave, ... and they would gladly have had us gone to the Town, telling of us, *There was Wine*, and many other things; and as for my Part, I could have ventured with them' (45). Lurting's ability to see beyond the dominant cultural identification of the Turks as an irreducible and terrifying other is clearly not matched by his countrymen. His central difference, in terms of his 'strange' Quaker identity, engenders a blurring of the binaries of national and religious self and other which transgresses the remaining polarities of orthodox English discourse.

The ship's return to England emphasises the unorthodox nature of Lurting's approach to the Oriental other. The King states that Lurting '*should have brought the Turks to him*'. Lurting nevertheless resists the cultural appropriation which is revealed as the dominant English attitude to the Oriental subject, as he defiantly answers '*I thought it better for them to be in their own Country*' (46). The complexities of Lurting's cultural and national position are betrayed through this phrase, which could on the one hand be interpreted as asserting the need for strictly policed boundaries between the self and other, or, on the other, a defence of the cultural and national autonomy of the Turks. Both meanings are perhaps present simultaneously, in an apt microcosm of the collision of discourses which occurs throughout Lurting's narrative.

Lurting's complex representation of the Turks therefore exemplifies the degree of identification between marginalised groups which Ferguson applies to Quaker women's perceptions of Negro slaves in the seventeenth century.³¹ Yet the renegotiation of the Orientalist assignation of self and other which occurs within Lurting's text remains inscribed with uneven power relations. Ferguson's accusation that even anti-slavery writers represent Africans as a 'totalized, undifferentiated mass' is particularly pertinent

to Lurting's account, in which the Turks are similarly denied any 'authentic heterogeneity'.³² The Turkish subjects continue to be denied the power to articulate their own subjectivities, remaining instead mere pawns in the Western subject's projection and formulation of his own identity.

The Quaker Daniel Baker's account of his missionary journeys to Asia in the seventeenth century further illustrates the ambiguous negotiations with dominant Orientalist discourse entailed in early modern Quaker travel writing. Baker's life writing is appended to the autobiography of Katherine Evans and Sarah Cheevers, *This is a Short Relation* (1662), which he edited and circulated after visiting the women in the Maltese Inquisition.³³ The 'othering' of Oriental subjects in Baker's text is again renegotiated through the narrator's overt identification with such figures, and yet Baker remains implicated in an undifferentiated and self-referential representation of Oriental subjects which works to objectify them further.³⁴

Baker's autobiographical persona is initially constructed as emphatically English, as he articulates a strong bond to his 'Native Countrey, Kindred and Father's House'.³⁵ This sense of location within a patriarchal national tradition is accentuated as he emphasises the fact that his endeavours imitate those of his father: 'travelling from one Nation to another people, as my Father did in the ancient days'. Baker presents himself as the privileged bearer of truth, who intends 'to give a sound to the Nations afar off, of the mighty day of our God'. Biblical imagery establishes a binary between his misleadingly represented English vulnerability and dark, threatening foreign forces. God will protect him, as he 'doth his Lambs, whom he so sends forth as among Wolves, in his Dovelike innocency, harmlessness and wisdom'. The more sinister implications of British power and imposition are nevertheless betrayed by a later image: his message will be 'coming upon the Nations as a weight either to condemnation or justification, as the same is received or rejected among them' (92).

Baker's narrative nevertheless immediately establishes that 'Englishness' is not a unified construct and that Baker and his colleagues do not therefore represent such an identity in any straightforward manner. They assert that they are going to preach to the unenlightened, but this category includes 'men of our own Nation, the Jews and others' (92–93). The narrative in fact proceeds to dismantle clear-cut national distinctions. Daniel Baker and Richard Scostrop 'pass *Eastward*, to *Smyrna* and *Constantinople*, in *Asia*', thus entering an 'Oriental' realm, yet conventional boundaries between self and other are immediately re-defined:

But behold it came to pass ... with threatnings breathed forth from the Apostate Christians, especially men of no small degree (of our own Nation) against us, when *Turks, Jews, Greeks, Heathens*, and others, were not altogether so evil affected But oh! How the Christians (by Name) in *Asia* (who should first have received the Word of saving-health) how did they defie and reproach [us]. (93)

Biblical rhetoric lends authority to a realignment of their fellow Countrymen as the opposing, demonised enemy, while the racial and religious otherness of '*Turks, Jews, Greeks and Heathens*' is subsumed within a newly imposed pro-Quaker identity. Categories of race, religion and class are thus transcended by the alternative category of inclusion or exclusion in terms of Quaker sympathies.

The colonial ideology which continues to inform this negotiation with traditionally defined boundaries of self and other remains evident in the assumption that the English should, by rights, have been more receptive to Christian truth. Baker 'besought the men of our own Nation, ... that they may become a sweet savour of the pure life of Christ and Christianity, indeed and in truth, which tends to answer the Witness of the Eternal God manifest in *Turks, Greeks, Jews, Heathens* and Apostate Christians among the dark Nations ...' (94). The ostensibly 'natural' English possession of Christian truth is nevertheless subtly challenged by the Quaker doctrine of the witness of God within all humanity. The location of the revelation of God and Truth within '*Turks, Greeks, Jews, Heathens* and Apostate Christians' undermines central colonial premises of the relative proximity of God to different nations, dismantling English claims to superior knowledge of the divine. Yet this radical revaluation of the spiritual worth of the Oriental subject is only achieved through the imposition of English Quaker frameworks. Baker's 'recognition' of the colonial subjects' spiritual status is therefore a projection of his own ideals, rather than a recognition of their own, different, culture and religion.

Baker's critique of Orientalist stereotypes thus remains located within an explicitly Quaker framework which participates in an alternative form of cultural imperialism, as is apparent in his representation of the Turk who is sent by the English authorities to implement the exile of the Friends. In opposition to contemporary configurations of Turkish barbarity, the anonymous Turk is presented as 'courteous and moderate'. Perhaps most significantly of all, he possesses a spiritual perception which surpasses that of the English authorities:

[He] saw over and beyond that foolish Ceremony of the Hat, neither did he burthen himself with the same, as many unwisely do, to the clouding or veiling of a good understanding, which hath a more noble respect to Equity, Justice and Judgement, without respect of persons in them, ... than to such foolish ceremonies which are below men of Wisdom; yet he desired that we might not take it ill as from him ... in doing as he was obliged in the prosecution of the Warrant. (96)

Turkish culture thus rejects the empty foolishness of much English custom in an unconventional assignation of 'wisdom' and 'good understanding' to the supposed embodiment of foreign, depraved otherness. The Turk's moderation, insight and courtesy expose the English lack of such qualities, in a sharp critique of contemporary English self-perceptions. Yet rather than articulating

his own culture, the Turk is used in the text to reinforce the truth of Quaker sentiments, for instance their rejection of 'hat' customs. This denial of cultural difference enables a radically positive representation, and constitutes a critique of dominant Orientalist discourses, and yet clearly involves an alternative appropriation of the Oriental subject. The Orientalist assumptions and techniques which continue to generate Baker's text are further apparent in the manner in which racial and religious others are typically referred to as an homogeneous mass. Their identities are reduced to a list of conventional, italicised others, '*Turks, Jews, Heathens, Greeks or Barbarians*', whose otherness remains a useful tool for exposing the folly of Quaker enemies. The Turk thus remains the construction of the Western perspective which generates him according to its own needs and desires, while his own identity remains suppressed and obliterated.

The extent to which Baker's articulations nevertheless challenge dominant English colonial sentiments and practices is evident in the English authorities' attempts to exile the Quakers from Asia. The warrant issued for their expulsion tellingly highlights the centrality of specific forms of identity to the maintenance of colonial authority:

*We are informed, that there is lately arrived ... one Daniel Baker, with his Companion, commonly called Quakers, ... and because we sufficiently have had experience, that the carriage of that sort of people is ridiculous, and is capable to bring dishonor to our Nation, besides other ill-conveniences that may rebound to them in particular, and to the English in general: ... We therefore will and require you to give a stop to the said Quakers ...*³⁶

Colonial English power thus in part depended upon the performance of a rational, respectable English identity, from which the 'ridiculous' 'carriage' of the Quakers must be divorced. The 'ill-convenience' of the Quaker identity highlights the disparity from orthodox English norms which is a central facet of their self-construction. Their texts consequently remain in an ambiguous location in relation to both colonial configurations and national self-representations.

The realignment of conventional categories of self and other which has taken place in the course of the autobiography is finally emphasised through Baker's significantly altered reiteration of the imagery of lambs and wolves towards the end of his work. It is now the English who are identified with the 'Den of Lyons, or ... barren caves of ravening Wolves', and who threaten and oppose the Quaker 'lambs': the warrant 'came not from either them called *Turks, Jews, Heathens, Greeks or Barbarians*, but even from the men of our own Nation' (97).

The alternative subjectivity constructed in Baker's text is not therefore ultimately associated with victorious worldly triumph. Instead, Quaker identity, in common with that of the colonised and subordinated Turks, is largely

identified by means of oppression, exile and cultural marginalisation. Baker's account, like the narrative of Evans and Cheevers with which it is bound, reinterprets a location of cultural 'otherness' as the terms of an ideal selfhood, identifying persecution as the ultimate evidence of an elevated identity. Thus while the image of 'lambs' with which Baker initially represented himself seemed inappropriate to the English colonial project on which he appeared to be embarking, the self-sacrificial connotations of the image are ultimately revealed as a key representation of the Quaker identity which he constructs in the narrative. It is within such re-defined frameworks that the alternative representation of the Turks becomes possible. The otherness which they represent within the contemporary English imagination permits their valorisation within the terms of the Quaker narrative, leading them, rather than the dominant English authorities, to be identified with the truly ideal self.

The 'feminine' nature of this ideal and marginalised Quaker self is repeatedly emphasised in Baker's account, as he demonstrates the manner in which categories of gender overlap with those of race in the representation of a marginalised subjectivity. As he relates his journey home from Malta, for instance, he lapses into ecstatic, and highly feminised, self-description:

The Words of Wisdoms Life did I wear as a Chain of precious Stones and Diamonds about my neck, and as Bracelets and Ornaments of a comely and delicate chaste Bride, about my hands and loins (49)

He continues to relate visions of 'the Bride, the Lambs Wife', identifying with a wife's prescribed role as he states that he 'know[s] how to be silent'. The female self-identification of the passage reaches a climax in his appropriation of the words and experiences of the Virgin Mary: 'the same was given me to treasure up within my very heart, till an appointed time and season'.³⁷ Baker's identity is therefore constructed in opposition to the more normative hyper-masculinity constructed within colonial discourse and tales of foreign travel and adventure in this, as in later periods.³⁸

Baker's autobiography thus traces the author's development from a patriarchal national identity into a negotiation of self and other which reworks national, racial and gendered categories through the alternative imposition of religious binaries. As with Lurting's autobiography, the extent to which his narrative has constructed his own alienation from English spheres renders his return to England problematic. While Lurting figures his remaining alienation through his ambiguous encounter with the King, Baker omits any description of his return altogether. The masculine home from which he was initially so reluctant to depart has now become the 'other' against which he structures his identity, finally representing the degree to which his Quaker identity has radically reformulated the fundamental terms of his self-recognition and construction.

'These Bloody Indians'³⁹

El-Beshti cites Marlowe's reference to 'Indian moors' in *The Tragical History of Dr. Faustus* as evidence of the inclusion of native Americans within the discourses of sexual excess, devilment and barbarity with which Negroes and Muslims were denigrated in the Renaissance period.⁴⁰ In a similar manner to the accounts of the Quakers meeting Turks, Quaker narratives of missionary journeys to the New World in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries negotiate with and partially challenge contemporary colonial representations in their depiction of Quaker encounters with North American Indians.

The first Quaker missionaries to America were two women, Mary Fisher and Ann Austin. Their arrival in Boston in 1656 provoked a swift and furious response from the Puritan authorities, who immediately imprisoned them, burned their books and examined their bodies for signs of witchcraft, before expelling them from the colony. Quaker missionaries were nevertheless undeterred in their efforts to bring news of the inner light to the New World, an endeavour which ultimately led four Friends (including Mary Dyer) to the gallows between the years of 1659 and 1661.⁴¹

It was in the 1680s, however, when William Penn claimed a portion of the colonies in lieu of the sixteen thousand pounds owed his father's estate by the English Crown, that the Quaker expansion to the New World began in earnest. Penn arrived in what became Pennsylvania in 1682, and thousands of English Friends swiftly followed him.⁴² The motives behind the Quaker emigration included a desire to escape persecution in England, a wish to set up a 'holy experiment' of godly government, and missionary zeal to convert the natives of the New World. Quakers remained in government in Pennsylvania until 1756, when the colony's declaration of war on the Delaware and Shawnee Indians contradicted the Friends' pacifist principles, forcing them to resign from the Assembly.⁴³

As Errol Elliott observes, the 'friendly relations between Quakers and Indians is a classic within American history'.⁴⁴ Since the first years of their arrival in the New World, Quakers have proudly highlighted their 'glowing' good treatment of the natives against a 'dark background of white aggrandizement, fraud, and violence'.⁴⁵ Penn's famous treaty with the Delaware Indians at Shackamaxon in 1682 soon became symbolic of the Friends' willingness to purchase land already granted them by the English Crown, and the 'leagues of friendship' established between the native tribes and the Friends is a recurrent theme in contemporary and later histories of Quaker settlement in Pennsylvania and the surrounding states.⁴⁶

Despite the inferences of many Quaker texts, however, negotiated purchases of land from the Indians were not unique to Friends. Isaac Sharpless states that by 1682 the payment of the Indians for land was 'recognised by colonists generally as wise policy'.⁴⁷ Yasuhide Kawashima questions the ostensible justice of such treaties, as the colonists were blind to the cultural

differences which divided Indians and settlers.⁴⁸ Even when the colonists intended to treat the native Americans fairly, their frameworks of 'justice' remained wholly European, working to the disadvantage of the native subjects.⁴⁹ The cultural insensitivities which characterised white attempts at justice in this period are exemplified by the Quaker law that all matters of dispute between Indians and white settlers be adjudicated by a jury comprising equal numbers of Indians and Friends.⁵⁰ Friends appeared to remain oblivious to the fact that 'juries' (and the English criminal system in general) were meaningless and irrelevant to Indian conceptions of justice.⁵¹ Despite such blind spots, however, there is something of a consensus among historians that Quakers treated the native Americans with more goodwill, courtesy and respect than did most of the other settlers. The fact that the Pennsylvanian settlers lived in peace with local Indian tribes for around sixty years (the period of Quaker influence in government) attests to the amicable relationship so widely celebrated in Quaker writings.⁵²

Alice Curwen's autobiography nevertheless reveals the fear which surrounded European imaginings of the Indian in the early modern era, as she highlights her own heroism in relation to their threatening presence: 'we travailed through the Woods and Places where the devouring *Indians* had made great Desolation in many Places, but the Lord preserved us'.⁵³ The bestial implications of 'devouring' combine with the apocalyptic associations of 'Desolation' to inscribe multi-faceted discourses of otherness onto the New World landscape and its occupants. In contrast to the depersonalised depiction of the North American Indians in Curwen's narrative, however, where the natives themselves remain conspicuously absent, other Quaker autobiographies narrate specific encounters with native Americans where the ostensibly clear-cut boundary between Christian Westerner and New World native becomes fraught with ambiguities and contradictions.

John Taylor's missionary autobiography, *An Account of Some of the Labours ... of John Taylor, of York* (1710) relates an encounter with native Americans which negotiates ambivalently with dominant colonial discourses.⁵⁴ Taylor's narration of his visit to an Indian settlement operates within the parameters of Western superiority, as he interrupts the community rituals of dancing, singing and spitting which the Indians practice in order to cure a sick man:

So they all stopt their knocking, beating, and great noise, and were all quiet; so [the interpreter] told them, The *Englishman* says, Nothing will come while he is here (for they converse sometimes with dark Infernal Spirits) he will take some Care for Cure ... So next Morning I ordered the Sick Man what he should do for the present, and when I came to *Shelter-Island* I would send one that should Cure him, which I did.⁵⁵

Native American ritual is dismissed as meaningless 'noise', which is silenced by the authoritative assertions of the Englishman who presents himself as a

talisman for good among a 'dark Infernal' people, as Western rationalism and empiricism denigrate and suppress alternative cultural and medical practices.

John Taylor's autobiography nevertheless undermines the critical premise that male colonialists represented an homogeneous 'masculine' position, or that the colonised subject was necessarily constructed in opposing 'feminine' terms.⁵⁶ His account in fact establishes a stark contrast between the highly masculine native American subjects and his own identity. Taylor's first encounter with the natives engenders an impression of them as 'lusty proper Men, *Indians* all'. His description of their ritual dancing further emphasises their physical manliness, as each of them is naked, 'and beating himself with his Arms, and Clapping his Hands, till he was all of a foam with Sweat'.⁵⁷ Taylor constructs a sense of his alienation from this visual and material masculinity, as he observes it from a fearful and uncomprehending distance.

The imposition of Quakerism nevertheless to some degree renegotiates gendered identities within the settlement. The loud masculine voice of the native American ('speaking something in his own Tongue very Loud') is replaced by the passive submission and silence of Quaker ideals, while the female Indians gain a new prominence in the community.⁵⁸ While this development appears to illustrate the process by which colonialism results in a feminisation of the colonised subjects, the difference between Taylor's account and the normative colonial representations analysed by Mills and others lies in the initial recognition of the native subjects' masculinity, as well as the remaining 'feminine' construction of the colonial protagonist. The feminisation of the native subjects is thus less a means of establishing their difference from and inferiority to the masculine Western colonialist, as is assumed by much post-colonial theory, than an inscription of them within the idealised, shared terms of a Quaker identity. While this representation of the Indians clearly entails alternative cultural imperialism, the ostensibly straightforward colonialism of Taylor's representations is thus problematised by his own marginalised location.

James Dickinson's autobiography, *A Journal of the Life, Travels and Labour of Love ... [of] James Dickinson (1745)* similarly negotiates the complexities arising from a specifically Quaker position within a colonial context.⁵⁹ While still in England, Dickinson represents his autobiographical persona in transgressive terms, as his Quaker convictions compel him to interrupt conventional church services. His radical actions are paradoxically framed as the actions of a passive self, who is directed to speak by forces beyond his control: 'the Lord ... shewed me what I had to do'. His assertion of his own lack of agency echoes the strategies of many early modern women writers and prophets, while the wider society's labelling of him as an irrational, sub-human entity similarly repeats the experience of many dissenting women:

Great was the Confusion that soon appeared, many of them speaking all at once; some asking, *what Beast was that, which was come amongst them?*⁶⁰

Dickinson's lower class origins contribute to his passive and alienated location. The preface to his autobiography emphasises his position as one of God's 'mean and illiterate instruments', who 'had not the Advantage of a liberal, or learned Education', and who therefore exemplifies the principle of God's use of the foolish of this world.⁶¹ From the outset, therefore, Dickinson is located within a marginalised cultural space. Passivity remains a characteristic of his self-depiction in the narrative, as the contemporary masculine ideals of rational self-control are displaced by Quaker principles of the 'death', or complete surrender, of the will, emotions and intellect to God. The Quaker necessity of depicting personal reluctance, overcome by God's direction, typifies the presentation of every event in the text, for instance as he is compelled to confront a Presbyterian minister:

I was unwilling to answer what the Lord required of me, insomuch that my natural strength was almost taken from me, then I was made willing to do whatsoever the Lord required of me ... (11)

The physical weakness that enables an increase of the divine within the self mimics the strategies of female mystics in the seventeenth century such as Sarah Wight and Anna Trapnel. The valorisation of a passive, potentially feminised narrative self continues to be evident throughout the narrative, for instance as Dickinson encounters Turkish pirates, yet eschews any public display of 'manliness', remaining instead 'inwardly retired to the Lord' until the crisis has passed (32).⁶²

A later incident in the autobiography illustrates further the extent to which Dickinson's persona occupies a transgressive gendered location. He arrives at the Island of Portland, generating violent opposition which is narrated within the terms of an explicitly gendered discourse:

Whilst I was speaking, the Man which belonged to the Castle came with a drawn Sword in his Hand, and made several Passes at me, yet had not Power to hurt me; a Friend spoke to him, and told him *he unman'd himself in offering to strike at one that would not strike again*, then he became somewhat sober ... (66-67)

The phallic symbolism of the 'man' contrasts with the figure of Dickinson, who occupies a feminised sphere of helplessness in the face of violence, thus demanding chivalrous restraint from his opponent. Dickinson ironically undermines the legitimacy of a conventional enactment of masculinity through appealing to stereotypically gendered behaviour, as he reinterprets an emphatically masculine challenge as an 'unmanly' display.

The ambiguously gendered position of James Dickinson's autobiographical persona corresponds with the contradictory and problematic status of his journal in relation to colonial discourses. His missionary journeys to the New

World aim to convert the natives, and he invokes conventional understandings of God's judgement on the heathens; for instance as epidemic sickness in Barbados is interpreted as 'the Hand of the Lord upon the Inhabitants' (49–50). Yet Dickinson simultaneously relates the details of specific encounters with native Americans which contain elements of a critique of the colonial project. The most striking of these encounters is his relation of a conversation with an unnamed Indian, in which the native subject, rather than being the silenced and spoken-for other of conventional colonial writing, is granted direct textual representation (even if only in the compromised form of reported speech). Even more unusually, this voice overtly questions the English colonial project. Dickinson asks the Indian '*if he believed there was a God? He told me yes, and that all the Indians believed so too*', revealing an instinctive knowledge of the role of the conscience. Quaker discourse necessitated a representation of the inner light within all humanity, which challenged contemporary representations of the Indians as innately heathen and devil-worshipping. Dickinson nevertheless presents himself as possessing superior spiritual wisdom, as the Indian admits that he does not actually know God, leaving the Quaker to '*inform him how he might know the great God that made all Things: He said he would willingly learn that*' (90).

Such contradictions continue, as Dickinson's Quaker framework repeatedly undermines the colonial project in which it simultaneously participates. He proceeds to explain Quaker truth to the Indian in terms which undermine any essential racial or religious difference between people-groups:

I told him, *the great God, that made the Indians, and all Things, was a Spirit and great Light, and appeared in the Indians Hearts in order to teach them to be good and forsake Evil ...* (90–91)

Dickinson thus paradoxically instructs the Indian that he needs no external instruction since he possesses the internal teacher, or divine principle, by which all truth is learned, exemplifying the collision of contradictory discourses of Quakerism and dominant forms of colonialism in Quaker travel narratives. The ironies which undermine the legitimacy of his missionary project become explicit as Dickinson narrates the native American's extraordinary reply to this instruction:

Then he asked me *what made the Englishman swear that knew God was so near? I told him it was the Devil which made both the English-man and Indian bad: He said he never swore before he learnt to speak English, for they had no swearing in their Language; but so soon as they could speak English they learned to swear; but if he had more of my Company, I would teach him better, and wished he was a Quaker, then he would not swear.* (91)

The echo of Caliban is unmistakable, yet the extent to which this episode is 'factual' or derived from the Shakespearean text is less interesting than the complex cultural codes which Dickinson negotiates through its inclusion within the narrative.⁶³ Quaker egalitarianism engenders a representation of the Indians and the English as possessing the same propensity to both good and evil, an assertion of cultural 'sameness' which, as El-Beshti warns, invokes the negative implications of colonial assimilation.⁶⁴ Yet the native American's case goes beyond this Quaker commonplace: far from conceding a shared religious essence, he poignantly portrays Indian innocence, corrupted and defiled by English colonial imposition. The fact that his accusation, as with Caliban's, focuses on language is particularly astute, as it undermines the heart of the British colonial project, highlighting the key role of language in the transmission and construction of cultures and identities. The imposition of the English language has suppressed native Americans' powers of self-constitution, formulating them in alternative terms.⁶⁵ To the colonial mindset, this is the process by which the Indians will become 'civilised'. The native American here presents the project in a radically different light.

The powerful critique of dominant colonial frameworks that emerges is nevertheless compromised by the Quaker self-interest through which it is generated. Highlighting the inadequacies of the orthodox English colonial project clearly justifies the displacement of these forms by the Quaker model of exported English truth, while simultaneously affirming Quaker difference from, and superiority to, the Puritan authorities. The Indian's statement explicitly dissociates 'Quaker' from 'English', as Quaker discourse acquires the status of a wholly separate and superior language: the corruptions of the English can be undone through exposure to Quakerism. Rather than entailing a rejection of Western authority and rule, the native American's pathetic status enables the Quaker missionary endeavour to acquire new, and specific, importance.

Dickinson's politically charged representation of the Indian operates within the philosophical and literary tradition of the 'noble savage', a figure employed increasingly in the eighteenth century as a means of criticising dominant English structures.⁶⁶ Peter Weston relates this discourse to the emergence of the bourgeois subject in late seventeenth-century Europe: the 'free unitary subject' conceptualised by figures such as Locke, and ultimately Rousseau, existing prior to language and society, could be located within 'primitive' peoples such as the native Americans, and then set against the supposed 'civilisation' of European society in order to expose the redundancies of that society.⁶⁷ The potential 'radicalism of primitivism' identified by Weston nevertheless clearly coexists precariously with the appropriation of the 'primitive' subject to valorise emerging Western ideals of the rational, autonomous subject.

The renegotiations of self and other which occur within early modern Quaker travel writings therefore entail alternative forms of colonial division and imposition, as other cultures and peoples are invoked in order to dissociate

the Quaker self from other Western Christian identities. Quaker literature dealing with foreign 'others' therefore exhibits the complexities entailed in a specific Quaker identity which conceives of itself as at once powerful and powerless, included and excluded, as it asserts its exclusive claim to universal truth, while simultaneously celebrating its marginality. Despite such self-referential frameworks, the reformulations which take place in these texts constitute a radical departure from both orthodox English colonial subjectivities and the models of national and racial identity constructed within other sectarian groups. The multiple, ambivalent constructions of the racial and religious 'other', as well as of the English colonial male self, which figure in early Quaker writings ultimately point to the heterogeneous complexity of English colonial discourses in the early modern period, as well as the need to locate such discourses within the specific cultural settings from which they emerged.

While undermining simple binaries in relation to colonial discourses, the texts that I have discussed in this article also establish the need to avoid generalisations regarding early modern male identity. The self-representations of Lurting, Baker, Taylor and Dickinson illustrate the nuanced, often contradictory positions of non-hegemonic men within larger patriarchal and colonial structures. Their works demonstrate fundamental connections between colonial and gendered frameworks, such that an awkward positioning within normative masculine contexts also potentially alienates the male subject from dominant colonial and national forms of identity. The negotiations with multiple models of male identity which occur within the texts show 'masculinity' to be a potentially fluid social construct, rather than a fixed or natural identity. Through illuminating the differences attendant upon, and generated by, male, often lower class, English Quaker identities, these writings further illustrate the extent to which the articulation of gender, for early modern men as well as for their female counterparts, is inextricable from the subject's negotiation with multiple historical frameworks, including, critically, those provided by a specific religious context.

While demonstrating the extent to which early Quaker frameworks enabled the radical reformulation of orthodox categories of the self, the dissident perspectives articulated in Quaker life writings therefore ultimately highlight the complexities and differences surrounding the formation of the early modern English subject. John Morris once described James Dickinson's journal as 'perfunctory ... and uninteresting': 'All is barren chronicle and automatic jargon, and there is page after page of it.'⁶⁸ This article has conversely sought to demonstrate that, far from being 'uninteresting', the life writing of early male Friends illuminates in new and different ways the workings of gender, colonialism and identity in the early modern period.

Notes

1 William Okeley, *Eben-Ezer: Or, a small Monument of Great Mercy, Appearing in the Miraculous Deliverance of William Okeley, William Adams, John Anthony, John Jeph's, John Carpenter, From the Miserable Slavery of Algiers* (Second edition, London, 1684), Preface.

2 Okeley, *Eben-Ezer*, sig. A4.

3 See Bashir Mahmud El-Beshti, 'The Displacement towards the East: The Oriental in English Renaissance Literature and Culture' (unpublished PhD Thesis, University of California, 1989), *passim*.

4 James Deane, 'A Further Narrative of James Deane', appended to Okeley's account, p. 91.

5 Okeley, *Eben-Ezer*, sig. B2.

6 Okeley, *Eben-Ezer*, sig. A4.

7 Okeley, *Eben-Ezer*, sig. A4.

8 Okeley, *Eben-Ezer*, p. 46.

9 Okeley, *Eben-Ezer*, p. 47.

10 Okeley, *Eben-Ezer*, sig. B5.

11 Okeley, *Eben-Ezer*, p. 83.

12 John Lilburne, *The Free-Mans Freedom Vindicated Or a true Relation of the Cause and Manner of Lieut. Col. John Lilburne's present imprisonment in Newgate* (London, 1646), p. 5; John Lilburne, *A Remonstrance of Many Thousand Citizens, and other Free-born People of England, To their Owne House of Commons*. (London, 1646), p. 13. See Christopher Hill, 'The Norman Yoke', in his *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1958), pp. 51–82.

13 Richard Overton, *Martins Eccho* (London, 1645), p. 6; John Lilburne, *The Prisoners mournfull cry against the Judges of the Kings Bench* (London, 1648), p. 8. Jeremy Gregory also highlights the connections between Protestantism, masculinity and Englishness, noting the manner in which certain English writers in the era establish a 'contrast between the vices of an effeminate Continental Catholicism and the virtues of a healthy masculine Protestantism.' See his 'Homo Religiosus: Masculinity and Religion in the Long Eighteenth Century', in Tim Hitchcock and Michele Cohen (eds), *English Masculinities 1660–1800* (London and New York, 1999), p. 110.

14 Lilburne, *A Remonstrance*, p. 4; Lilburne, *The Legall Fundamentall Liberties of the people of England* (London, 1649) in William Haller and Godfrey Davies (eds), *The Leveller Tracts 1647–1653* (New York, 1944), pp. 408–9.

15 Susan Wiseman, 'Read Within: Gender, Cultural Difference and Quaker Women's Travel Narratives', in Kate Chedgzoy, Melanie Hansen and Suzanne Trill (eds), *Voicing Women: Gender and Sexuality in Early Modern Writing* (Keele, 1996), p. 167.

16 See Sara Mills 'Post-colonial Feminist Theory', in Stevi Jackson and Jackie Jones (eds), *Contemporary Feminist Theories* (Edinburgh, 1998), p. 99. Anne McClintock also argues that 'gender dynamics were, from the outset, fundamental to the securing and maintenance of the imperial enterprise.' See her *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Imperial Contest* (London, 1995), pp. 6–7.

17 See Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (London and Henley, 1978); Sara Mills, *Discourses of Difference: An Analysis of Women's Travel Writing and Colonialism* (London and New York, 1991); Reina Lewis, *Gendering Orientalism: Race, Femininity and Representation* (London and New York, 1996); Billie Melman, *Women's Orients: English Women and the Middle East, 1718–1918* (London, 1992).

18 Melman, *Women's Orients*, p. 7.

19 Lewis, *Gendering Orientalism*, pp. 16–17, 18, 22.

20 Moira Ferguson, *Subject to Others: British Women Writers and Colonial Slavery, 1670–1834* (New York and London, 1992), pp. 3–4.

21 Wiseman, 'Read Within', pp. 164, 154.

22 Mills, 'Post-colonial Feminist Theory', p. 99.

23 Mills, 'Post-colonial Feminist Theory', pp. 100–01. See also John Tosh, 'What Should Historians Do With Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-Century Britain', *History Workshop Journal*, 38 (1994), 197. For an example of the gendered and sexual overtones of Renaissance colonial discourse, see John Donne, 'To his Mistress going to Bed', ll. 27–30, and 'The Sunne Rising', ll. 17–18, 21–22, C. A. Patrides (ed.), *The Complete English Poems of John Donne* (London, 1985), pp. 184, 54.

24 Ferguson refers to Howard Temperly's use of the term 'cultural imperialism' in *Subject to Others*, p. 65.

25 Thomas Lurting, *The Fighting Sailor Turn'd Peaceable Christian: Manifested in the Convincement and Conversion of Thomas Lurting. With a Short Relation of many great Dangers and wonderful Deliverances, he met withal* (1710), p. 40.

26 El-Beshti, 'Displacement towards the East', p. 112.

27 Lurting, *The Fighting Sailor*, p. 33. All further references to this text will be marked within the body of the article.

28 For an example of Lilburne's nationalistic and hyper-masculine self-representation, see John Lilburne, *The Prisoners mournfull Cry*, p. 8.

29 El-Beshti, 'Displacement towards the East', p. 15.

30 I am grateful to the anonymous reader who pointed out the ambiguities surrounding Lurting's identification with the Turks at this point in the text.

31 Ferguson, *Subject to Others*, p. 61.

32 Ferguson, *Subject to Others*, p. 4.

33 Baker also wrote an 'Epistle to the reader' for *This is a Short Relation* (London, 1662), in which he defended the significance of women's spiritual and authorial contributions, denying that women of the Spirit should be restricted along the same lines as women under the Law. His autobiographical narrative describing his travels as a Quaker missionary was written while he was imprisoned in Newgate in 1662.

34 See Ferguson, *Subject to Others*, pp. 3–4.

35 Evans and Cheevers, *This is a Short Relation*, p. 91. Further references to this text will be marked within the main body of the article.

36 'A Copy of the Warrant', Evans and Cheevers, *Short Relation*, p. 95.

37 Evans and Cheevers, *Short Relation*, p. 50. See Luke 2 v. 51. For a wider discussion of the cross-gender identifications which are a feature of early Quaker writings (and especially early male Quaker writings) more generally, see Phyllis Mack, *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-century England* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford, 1992), pp. 154–57, 162–63.

38 Richard Phillips discusses the extent to which masculine identity is forged through adventure stories, although he also notes that the same stories can become a site of resistance against such locations. See his *Mapping Men and Empire: A Geography of Adventure* (London and New York, 1997), pp. 12–13.

39 Alice Curwen, *A Relation of the Labour, Travail and Suffering of Alice Curwen* (London, 1680), p. 4.

40 *The Tragical History of Dr. Faustus*, I. i. 120, in J. B. Steane (ed.), *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays* (London, 1969), p. 269. Quoted in El-Beshti, 'Displacement towards the East', p. 203.

41 See Rufus M. Jones, *The Quakers in the American Colonies* (New York, 1962), pp. 70–87; Arthur J. Worrall, *Quakers in the Colonial Northeast* (Hanover, New Hampshire and London, 1980), pp. 9–15.

42 See Isaac Sharpless, 'Quakers in Pennsylvania', in Jones, *The Quakers*, pp. 419–22.

43 See Sharpless, 'Quakers in Pennsylvania', pp. 492–93. See also *Some Account of the Conduct of the Religious Society of Friends towards Indian Tribes ... Published by the Aborigines Committee of The Meeting for Sufferings* (London, 1844), pp. 30–1.

44 Errol T. Elliott, *Quakers on the American Frontier: A History of the Westward Migrations, Settlements, and Developments of Friends on the American Continent* (Richmond, Indiana, 1969), p. 237.

45 Elliott, *Quakers on the American Frontier*, p. 237.

46 See Sharpless, p. 495; *Some Account*, *passim*.

47 Sharpless, 'Quakers in Pennsylvania', p. 495. See also Yasuhide Kawashima, *Puritan Justice and the Indian: White Man's Law in Massachusetts, 1630–1763* (Middletown, Connecticut, 1986), pp. 51–52.

48 To the Indians, who operated with a system of collective land ownership, for example, the 'sale' of land usually signified merely the granting of rights of use and residence, rather than the final alienation of land understood by the colonists. See Kawashima, pp. 13–14.

49 Kawashima, *Puritan Justice*, pp. 42–71.

50 See *Some Account*, p. 28.

51 See Kawashima, *Puritan Justice*, pp. 5–6.

52 See Sharpless, 'Quakers in Pennsylvania', pp. 496–97; Elliott, *Quakers on the American Frontier*, pp. 237–43; *Some Account*, *passim*; Robert Daiutolo (Jr.), 'The Early Quaker Perception of the Indian', *Quaker History*, 72 (1983), 103–19.

53 Curwen, *Alice Curwen*, p. 4.

54 The life writing of John Taylor of York (c. 1638–1708/9) relates his conversion through George Fox in 1656 and his missionary travels, beginning in 1659, to New England and the Caribbean.

55 John Taylor, *An Account of Some of the Labours, Exercises, Travels and Perils, By Seas and Land, of John Taylor, of York* (London, 1710), p. 7.

56 See Mills, 'Post-colonial Feminist Theory', pp. 99–101.

57 Taylor, *An Account*, p. 6.

58 Taylor, *An Account*, pp. 6–8.

59 James Dickinson (1658–1741) originated from Cumberland. His life writing describes his early conversion and his almost immediate commencement of a public ministry, and is largely a record of his missionary journeys, covering England, Ireland, Scotland, America, Holland and Germany.

60 James Dickinson, *A Journal of the Life, Travels and Labour of Love in the Work of the Ministry of that Worthy Elder ... James Dickinson* (London, 1745), pp. 9–10.

61 Anon., 'To the Reader', Dickinson, p. v. Further references to this text will be marked within the main body of the article.

62 For a discussion of the increasingly 'public' emphasis of eighteenth-century masculinity, which explicitly opposed the inner emphasis of seventeenth-century enthusiasts', see Gregory, 'Homo Religiosus', pp. 96–7.

63 For a discussion of Caliban's similarities with contemporary constructions of North American Indians, see G. Wilson Knight, 'Caliban as Red Man', in Philip Edwards, Inga-Stina Ewbank and G.K. Hunter (eds), *Shakespeare's Styles: Essays in Honour of Kenneth Muir* (Cambridge, New York and Melbourne, 1980).

64 El-Beshti, 'Displacement towards the East', p. 15.

65 The recognition that the Indians possessed powers of language prior to the arrival of the colonists is in itself a radical admission, in light of the early colonial refusal to grant the Indians any grasp of meaningful language. See Stephen Greenblatt, 'Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century', in Fredi Chiappelli (ed.), *First Images of America: The Impact of the New World on the Old* 2 vols. (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1976), Vol. 2, pp. 562–63.

Gender, Race and the Other in Early Modern Quaker Writing

66 See Stelio Cro, *The Noble Savage: Allegory of Freedom* (Waterloo, Ontario, 1990), *passim*.

67 Peter J. Weston, 'The Noble Primitive as Bourgeois Subject', *Literature and History*, 10:1 (Spring 1984), 59–71.

68 John N. Morris, *Versions of the Self: Studies in English Autobiography from John Bunyan to John Stuart Mill* (London and New York, 1966), p. 118.

Address for Correspondence

Naomi Baker, British Academy Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of English and American Studies, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL, UK, e-mail: naomi.baker@man.ac.uk