

How Defoe, Cooper, and Melville “Let Brotherly Love Continue”
Quaker Casuistry in Love and War

MITCHELL SANTINE GOULD

He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him.
— 1 John 2:10

ABSTRACT

This paper explores ardent Brotherly Love as a conduit for God's love, first, in Thomas Lurting's memoir of Quaker conviction aboard an English man o' war, *Fighting Sailor Turn'd Peaceable Christian*, and then, in novelist Daniel Defoe's derivative portrayal of a Quaker “pyrate” in *Captain Singleton*. These are early treatments of one species of Quaker *casuistry* — the essential conflict between Friendly pacifism and a sailor's complicity in a world of war, piracy, cruel discipline, or whaling. Subsequent tales by Joseph C Hart (*Miriam Coffin*) and Thomas Chandler Haliburton (*The Season Ticket*), however, ignored Quaker friendships and focused solely on the paradoxical violence of “Quakers Afloat.” The last novel to handle the problem of Friends at war was *Hugh Wynne*, by S Weir Mitchell.

But there was a *second* species of Quaker casuistry: flirtations with male *eros* in a society (ostensibly) dominated by Biblical prohibitions against it. This continued to inspire novelists, because it continued to inform the actual lives of Quaker men. The letters of Henry Clapp and Elihu Hubbard Smith suggested that the cultural latitude for fervid affection among Friends could raise hackles in mainstream America. James Fennimore Cooper fictionalized his father's passionate friendship with a private secretary in *The Pioneers*, while coyly hinting at the community's misgivings about their relationship. Whereas Hart and Haliburton, in their novels, chose to wrestle only with the casuistry of bloodshed, Herman Melville, given his greater investment in love between men,

cleverly subverted it in *Moby Dick* to allude to a more unspeakable casuistry: eroticized Brotherly Love. Embers of the inflamed sexual suspicions rampant in the *antiQuakeriana* of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, therefore, smoldered throughout the nineteenth century. Mitchell's 1896 novel *Hugh Wynne* marked the end of the pre-Freudian era, a time when a story of the friendship between a fair-haired Quaker "girl-boy" and "the perverted Quaker with the blue eyes" could still — somehow — be appreciated without embarrassment.

Introduction

The Quaker tradition of Brotherly Love was originally inspired by passages in *Romans*, *Thessalonians, 1* and *2 Peter*, and *Hebrews*, which featured the Greek concept of *philia*, meaning "friendship," but usually translated as "brotherly love."¹ Biblical authors, writing in Greek, drew implicitly upon Aristotle's characterization of *philia* as wanting the best for someone, and actively helping to bring about that best outcome. The great philosopher also considered *philia* to require a mutuality of affection.

To be [true] friends, then, they must be mutually recognized as bearing goodwill and wishing well to each other... Perfect friendship is the friendship of men who are good, and alike in virtue²

Friends' adoption of *philia* can be traced to their earliest times, for example, George Fox's "salutation of love" to his disciples, in 1683:

Be kindly affectioned one towards the other, in brotherly love, in honour preferring one another.³

From the beginning, and for almost two millennia, the Christian tradition championed *philia* (brotherly fellowship) over *eros* (desire). The former connoted an innocent, benevolent relationship; the latter could be suspect, unreliable, and potentially exploitative. Therefore, Quaker usages of "Brotherly Love," at least initially, did not cause other Christians to notice anything unusual — after all, they preached the same Bible-based tropes. Like the other Protestants, Friends usually directed their Brotherly Love vaguely, towards all humanity. Less often, they specifically offered it to a prized friend. But down the years, as factual and fictional accounts of Friends' lives accumulated (in texts composed inside and outside the Quaker "fence"), these stories revealed that Friends' most ardent experiences of *philia* could entail a life-altering experience. This had profound implications for career, family, wealth, self-worth, creativity, or spirituality.

Such a divine love in the context of marriage, and *eros*, was laudable; in fact, it was the ideal that every couple should aim for. But in the context of friendships outside of marriage (whether same- or opposite-sex), too much passion was cause for concern. Indeed, we can draw no clear boundary where *philia* ends and *eros* begins. Despite a modern historical theory which insists upon widespread cultural sanctioning of same-sex "romantic friendships," such grave misgivings were often hinted in the surviving literature. Couldn't passion tempt young Friends to engage in fornication? Couldn't it risk emotional or sexual adultery?

For historians, thoroughly aware of the extent to which overseers could micromanage the lives of the faithful, the answer would seem perfectly obvious: Meeting's concern readily translated into "dealing with" the offender — either until the suspect relationship was abandoned, or the Friend was eventually disowned. Thomas Clarkson, writing in 1806, described American Quaker polity. Given the sterling reputation of Quaker morality, he said, the public generally imagined that Friends discovered to be engaged in prostitution (for example) would be instantly disowned. However, he went on,

it is not so probable that the Quakers would [immediately] disown these... as it is that these persons, long before the facts could be known [by the public], had been both admonished and disowned... [N]o person of the society can be found erring even for the first time, without being liable to be privately admonished. These admonitions may be repeated for weeks, or for months, or even for years, before the subjects of them are pronounced so incorrigible as to be disowned[, but still, this happens] long before their offences [sic] had been made public.⁴

Clarkson claimed that George Fox established "The great principle... that every christian was bound to watch over another for his good." He admitted that the practice was criticized as "a system of espionage," but such vigilance lacked the mischief of a spy, because it was intended to "preserve reputation and virtue, not to persecute but to reclaim." After all, he argued, "the Quakers would contend, that all persons who live in civil society, must give up a portion of their freedom." He went on to describe the prominent role that scandal played in small town conversation. Quakers, by contrast, disowned anyone who repeated "any unfounded scandal, that operated to the injury of another's character" if the Friend would not reveal the source, or "make satisfaction" for the damaged reputation. Finally, Clarkson stressed, "But it is certainly true, that Quakers are more upon their guard, with respect to scandalizing others, than many other people."⁵ Barry Levy, in *Quakers and the American Family*, requires about two pages to describe the pornographic content of *antiQuakeriana* during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁶

Although Clarkson's simple scenario remains uncritically accepted by scholars today, "Wet-Quakers" — persons who were not members of Meeting, and therefore not under Oversight — were nevertheless quite frequently recognized by themselves, and by society, as in some important cultural sense "Quaker."⁷ In 1823, novelist James Fennimore Cooper described them in his Colonial-era novel, *The Pioneers*: "quite the Quaker in externals."⁸ In other words, although not under the watchful eye of any Meeting, these persons were distinguished from the rest of society as the products of Friends'

unique values, habits, and motivators. One example would be Emerson, who famously said, "I am more than anything else a Quaker,"⁹ or his protege Whitman, who insisted, "We were like two Quakers together."¹⁰

This "demi-quaker" phenomenon was more than an individual calling. The Free Quakers broke away from Friends to fight during the Revolutionary War. The Hicksite schism of 1827, of course, was the most historically significant split in Quaker history. The Progressive Friends schism, begun in America during the restless 1840s, represented a startling hybridization between Quaker humanitarian impulses and raucous reformer conventions.¹¹ Even more dramatic instances include the Wardley Society, or "Shaking Quakers," initiated in 1774;¹² the derivative "Publick Universal Friend" cult subsequently established in America by Jemima Wilkinson in 1776;¹³ and the "White Quaker" commune, founded in Ireland in 1842 by Joshua Jacob.¹⁴ Most of these schisms involved breathtaking violations of Friends' conventional polity on sexual behavior. Wilkinson's society, following Shakerism, was (ostensibly) celibate. The White Quakers were widely believed to be practitioners of free love.

These are developments which cannot be properly appreciated until we rank them alongside the field's canonical Quaker schisms. In many cases, they were important reactions to the period's ironclad, misery-making insistence upon life-long conventional marriage — and for precisely that reason, they were quite controversial. Indeed, they were controversial, but by the nineteenth century, the real heat of such controversies, as preserved in the early *antiQuakeriana*, was largely excluded from print, and is thus tractable to the historian only after the most persistent searching and closest readings of the archive. Even then, they are only tractable using the sensitivity of the gay historian to context, nuance, and innuendo, in a textural approach alien to the field of Quaker History.

Thomas Lurting: "A Quaker, Whom I Intirely Loved"

In 1711, Quaker Thomas Lurting published the story of his religious conviction aboard an English man o' war, entitled *The Fighting Sailor Turn'd Peaceable Christian*.¹⁵ Nine years later, Daniel Defoe, fresh from the great success of *Robinson Crusoe*, published a novel, named *The Life, Adventures, and Pyracies of the Famous Captain Singleton*.¹⁶ For one brief moment in 1965, it was recognized that the charismatic Friend Walters whom Defoe created for his novel could easily have been inspired by Lurting's story.¹⁷ But GA Starr's footnote was treated as little more than a throwaway remark, and after the moment passed, his insight was forgotten. This paper re-examines and extends Starr's conjecture about Defoe's debt to Lurting.

As boatswain's mate on an English naval vessel in the Canary Islands, *circa* 1646, Thomas Lurting commanded about 200 men. It was his responsibility to compel every sailor to attend religious services — by force, if necessary. While visiting the ship, a soldier who had attended Quaker Meeting in Scotland befriended two of Lurting's men. Six months later, these two sailors exhibited signs of turning Quaker, and pretty soon, others joined them in silent worship. The captain, a Baptist minister, was enraged by their heresy, and commanded Lurting to punish them with "many a Heavy Blow." After he began to suffer moral injury from prosecuting this violence, the Light which blinded Saul on the road to Damascus restrained him from further violence. "And the Lord by his in-shining Light," recalled Lurting, "open'd my Understanding... so that I seperated [sic] from all sorts of [Christians], except on Roger Dennis, who was called a Quaker, whom I intirely [sic] loved." Lurting admitted, "I never struck him: For he had a Check upon me... [and with him] looking upon me, I durst not touch one of them." This incident defined his introduction to nonviolence, which eventually bloomed into a comprehensive pacifist stance.

Lurting's refusal to batter the novice Quakers seriously risked his being charged with mutiny, and alienated him from the other officers. "After some time," he wrote, "I desired to be much alone [and] the Lord... gave me many a heavenly Visitation." God's bitter rebuke for his cruelty towards innocent men repeatedly tortured him, but he patiently entertained a train of regrets over his crimes "because they brought me into much Tenderness... for it was a Heart Work."

The Light returned, "by the in-shining of his glorious Light in my own Heart," and "melted" him. He was then regarded by the crew as hopelessly "distracted," if not mad. He had changed so much that he reminded some of a "Dumb Saint" (presumably, he meant a holy statue), and became a "Scoff and a Derision with all Sorts of Professors, except the People called Quakers; but I was one of them in my Heart." Indeed, he adds,

many a time I felt that Living Eternal Power, which hath made me both to Tremble and Quake, and was glad when it was so with me; yet then I was no profess'd Quaker, for the Cross was still too hard for me.

But his crisis had only begun, because his ruminations turned suicidal:

I desired of the Lord, rather to die than live... What [have I done] to such a People, that I have been so long Beating and Abusing, and that without just Cause! Death would be more welcome to me... Yet it cost me many a bitter Sigh, and many a Tear, before I could give up to go to Roger Dennis, my Friend called a Quaker...

Behind closed doors, the "Hand of the Lord" melted his heart once more.

before he opened his Mouth, the Hand of the Lord was upon me, and melted my Heart, and brought me into great Tenderness, and then he spake but a few Words, but they were in great Humility and Tenderness towards me, hitting the Mark to a Hairs's Breadth; so that I had great Satisfaction, being quiet in my Mind, and we parted in great Love.

After this incident, the narrative of Lurting's dramatic friendship with "Roger Dennis, one that I dearly loved, and desired his Company" was mysteriously truncated; although, to be fair, any account of uniting with the Quaker community was similarly omitted. The rest of his memoir is concerned with the evolution of his peace testimony, beginning with his ship's role in combat with a Spanish vessel:

setting my whole Strength and Rigor to kill and destroy Mens Lives, and in a Minute after I could not kill or destroy a Man, if it were to gain the World; for as I was coming out of the Fore-Castle Door, to see where the Shot fell, the Word of the Lord run through me, how if I had kill'd a Man; and it was with such Power, that for some time I hardly knew whether I was in the Body or out of it; but when I came to see, and felt what it was, I turned about... and some ask'd me, If I was Hurt? I answered, No, but under some scruple of Conscience on the Account of Fighting, altho' I had not [yet] heard that the Quakers refused to Fight.

After recounting a series of similar naval adventures, sorely testing his newfound commitment to pacifism, Lurting concluded, somewhat anticlimactically, "the Lord carry'd me through [too many adventures] to mention... as I was made willing to give up to him, and to be nothing of my self."

Leaving aside Thomas's war stories, which will only interest the naval historian, the perennial appeal of Lurting's testimony arises from the irresistible force of warfare contending with the immovable object of Brotherly Love. Both the warfare and the amity were initially directed towards humanity, and then, more specially, towards one man. If drama hinges entirely upon conflict, what greater conflict could there be? The threats and alienation from his fellow officers created enormous tension, ripping his heart open to repeated incursions of the Light, and peeling away the denial and psychic numbness. The price to be paid was an eruption of excruciating moral pain. The only escape seemed to be into the void. It cost him "many a bitter Sigh, and many a Tear," as he contemplated suicide, before he could give in to the instinct to reach for his friend. When at last he did so, the border between God's love and man's love dissolved — his heart melted. They parted, swore Thomas, "in

great love." And then, for unaccountable reasons, Roger Dennis disappeared from the rest of the narrative.

Hart and Haliburton: Quakers Ashore and Quakers Afloat

Turning from the problem of piratical Quakers to whaling Quakers, consider the Friendly violence committed by Joseph C Hart's "amphibious" "half Quaker, half sailor breed" in *Miriam Coffin* (1835). In this novel, an act of shipboard murder was followed by their whaleship mortally ramming a French privateer, not to mention, obviously, the slaughter of whales.¹⁸ These incidents hardly jive with the sentimental cliché of a Peaceable Kingdom. To be sure, Hart fictionalized the tales he gathered from Nantucket's common sailors, after being turned away by taciturn ship owners and captains, on account of their unexplained "shyness" when queried by *coofs* (off-islanders). Ironically, given all the spilt blood, Hart felt an obligation to defend his heroes, the Coffins, with the claim that whalers "seldom, or never" indulged the "evil propensities" of the common sailor — an assertion implicitly contradicted later by Melville in *Moby Dick*.¹⁹

Writing in 1860, Thomas Chandler Haliburton addressed similar casuistry by introducing the notion of Quakers ashore *versus* Quakers afloat.²⁰ He illustrated this phenomenon by describing how saintly old Captain Jacob Coffin threw off his broadbrim and olive drab, to don a tarpaulin hat and pea jacket, "a thick coarse pilot pair of trousers," and "stout and monstrous heavy fisherman's boots." Next he slipped brass knuckles over his "sledge-hammer fists," since they were "awful persuaders." Haliburton, in his "Sam Slick" voice, said he looked "a plaguy sight more like a pirate than a Quaker."

Coffin, enraged by his own steward's tardiness, "hit him a blow with his knuckle-dusters under the ear, that not only knocked him down, but made him turn a somerset; and as he threw up his legs in going over he fetched him a kick with the toe of his heavy boot that was enough to crush his crupper

bone." Haliburton's corn-pone persona told the wicked captain, "I think the spirit moved you that time, and no mistake, but it was the spirit of the devil."

"Friend Peabody," retorted Coffin, "did thee ever see a 'Quaker afloat' before?" adding, "A 'friend' is no more fit to command a ship than a bishop... We are among a different race from those who inhabit cities or till the land... We have no time for circumlocution, and thee-ing and thou-ing." Should anyone doubt Haliburton's satire, the historical basis for a shocking ashore/afloat dichotomy among Nantucket whaling captains was confirmed by Nathaniel Philbrick.²¹

Daniel Defoe: "I Will Never Part with Thee"

Hans Turley provided unique insights into Daniel Defoe's *Captain Singleton*, a rambling yarn from 1720 which, at first glance, is nothing more than a seafaring adventure.²² In the first half of the novel, after Bob Singleton was marooned on Madagascar, he took a swashbuckling journey across Africa. In the second half — the portion of interest to this author, and to Turley, who called it "generally overlooked" by critics²³ — Singleton pursued such marauding piracy throughout the East Indies that stories were being often told how his crew "murdered [sic] the people in cold blood, tying them back to back, and throwing them into the sea." But the plot thickened when he took a hostage aboard his craft: a Quaker surgeon named William Walters.

Somewhere in the Caribbean, Singleton's three ships captured Walters' sloop, bound from Pennsylvania. Dr Walters was not serving as the sloop's surgeon, but since he planned to set up a practice in Barbados, all of his surgeon's chests were with him. It was standard practice for pirates to

forcibly impress any sailor that might prove particularly useful, but they were willing to issue a certificate declaring that the kidnapped man had joined the pirates against their will. This certificate was handed over to the released portion of the crew, before they sailed back to England, and meant that if the rogues were ever captured by the English navy, the impressed men would not be hanged.

From the very beginning, Singleton noticed that the peaceable Quaker — for reasons that Defoe never spelled out — exhibited a bizarre, tacit eagerness to join the pirates. "I have brought you away by force, it is true," said Singleton, "but I am not of the opinion I have brought you away so much against your will as they imagine. Come, you will be a useful man to us, and you shall have very good usage among us." William replied, "I shall make myself as useful to thee as I can, but thou knowest it is not my business to meddle when thou art to fight." This came as no surprise to Singleton, and he agreed to the proposition. Contrary to form, Defoe marshaled a remarkable number of adjectives to emphasize William's attractiveness: "merry," "comic," "good-humoured," "pleasant," "bold," "stout," "brave," and "sprightly." Moreover, he lavished far greater care with dialogue than is found in most of his fiction, in his depiction of William's affectionate banter with his captor.

Captain Singleton, like *Fighting Quaker*, *Miriam Coffin*, and *The Season Ticket*, is an exercise in casuistry: the demanding art of negotiating the most ethical path through a moral quandary. The first story involved a Quaker complicit in immoral, and even potentially-murderous, piracy. The second involved a Quaker naval officer, another sort of killer. The principal difference was that one killed on behalf of the King, whereas the other killed to benefit himself. Recall that Thomas Luring began by refusing to harm his loved ones, and ended by refusing to kill any man, in a display of consistent spiritual growth. Quaker William's strategy was more gradual, and as Turley pointed out, was intrinsically tainted by complicity: "He manages to have it both ways."²⁴ Because humor is a signpost for underlying absurdity, there is something dryly comical in the way that the talented Friend

continually improved upon Singleton's rather crude tactics of seafaring plunder. It didn't take long for Singleton to admit to himself that William, a mere landlubber, was "fitter to be captain than any of us."

To make a long story short, while the pirates amassed great wealth, William attempted to gradually wean Bob off violence, finally making the issue explicit: "And wouldst thou," asked William, "rather have money without fighting, or fighting without money?" Singleton replied, "O William," says I, "the first of the two, to be sure." But redemption does not happen overnight, and Singleton's heart lagged behind his mind in accepting the simple Quaker logic. For a while, Singleton continued in his crimes, "concluded at last without [William]."

Then, for the first time, Singleton was faced with sheer horror over his vicious career. An ominous dark cloud which had been following the ship suddenly launched a bolt of lightning from a "fracture in the clouds," and its radiation "quivered so long among us," that the heat raised blisters on the crew's skin, due to the "noxious particles which mixed themselves with the matter inflamed." The sails ballooned backwards, and the ship lurched as if it had been struck by a broadside. In a moment, the thunderclap arrived, like "a blast of a hundred thousand barrels of gunpowder," permanently deafening some of the men. In the ensuing confusion, had able Friend William not immediately overseen the re-rigging of the sails, the ship would have been overwhelmed in the sea.

For a moment, Singleton feared that God had "resolved to be the executer [sic] of His own vengeance," but he was still a spiritual infant, "not at all feeling any of the moving, softening tokens of a sincere penitent; afflicted at the punishment, but not at the crime." Worse, still, recalled Singleton, "Nor can I deny but that we were all somewhat like the ship; our first astonishment being a little over, and that we found the ship swim again, we were soon the same irreligious, hardened crew that we were before, and I among the rest."

To paraphrase *Hebrews 13:1*, Quaker William let Brotherly Love continue, recovering "that of God" left hidden within the captain's stained soul. Then came a dream-plagued night in which

Singleton cried out while he and the Devil discussed his future prospects in Hell. The next day, William brought up his desire to return home, and Bob admitted that it was only natural to think of going home, now that he possessed wealth. But there was an essential difference between himself and William: "Why, man, I am at home... for I have nowhere to go." However, he was willing to consider William's ideas.

Knowing Singleton's worsening moral crisis, and that Bob was too distraught to come up with his own plan, William pointed out that they could not consider repenting while they continued in piracy. Bob immediately recognized that their roles must therefore reverse: "you shall command me from this hour, and everything you direct me I'll do." Since they had plenty of booty, William proposed to employ the international monetary system to convert it all into liquidity.

But it was nevertheless blood money. "As to the wealth I had, which was immensely great, it was all like dirt under my feet; I had no value for it, no peace in the possession of it... it was impossible I should ever make any restitution." Eventually, "nothing lay upon my mind for several days but to shoot myself into the head with my pistol." Only at the last minute — just like Thomas Lurting — did Bob reach out to his friend.

I had no minister, no Christian to converse with but poor William. He was my ghostly father or confessor, and he was all the comfort I had... However, it pleased God to make William the Quaker everything to me.

The resulting exchange sounded a bit like a Monty Python routine.

"Shoot yourself!" says William; "why, what will that do for you?"

"Why," says I, "it will put an end to a miserable life."

"Well," says William, "are you satisfied the next will be better?"

When Singleton was forced to admit that it wouldn't, he added that he nonetheless could not bear to go on. William called his bluff.

"Very well," says William; "come, give me the pistol thou talkedst of just now."

"Why," says I, "what will you do with it?"

"Do with it!" says William. "Why, thou needest not shoot thyself; I shall be obliged to do it for thee. Why, thou wilt destroy us all."

"What do you mean, William?" said I.

"Mean!" said he; "nay, what didst thou mean, to cry out aloud in thy sleep, 'I am a thief, a pirate, a murderer, and ought to be hanged'? Why, thou wilt ruin us all. 'Twas well the Dutchman did not understand English. In short, I must shoot thee, to save my own life. Come, come," says he, "give me thy pistol."

Although his affectionate teasing thwarted the suicide, William was sincerely anxious about Bob talking in his sleep. Singleton declared that "he took care to lie with me always himself, and to keep me from lodging in any house where so much as a word of English was understood."

As the first step towards their deliverance, William cautiously wrote to his poor, widowed sister for the first time in years. Not knowing his situation, she sent him a check for five pounds to help him return home. It brought tears to both men's eyes, and caused Bob to realize that he must let go of his only friend, who would presumably be exonerated by his certificate of kidnapping: "Why should I desire to keep you from your relations, purely to keep me company?"

The Quaker "looked very affectionately" upon his friend, and cited *The Book of Ruth*. "Nay," he answered, "we have embarked together so long, and come together so far, I am resolved I will never part with thee as long as I live, go where thou wilt, or stay where thou wilt."

Gradually doling out their great wealth to the English Quakeress, they persuaded William's sister to sell her shop in London and secretly purchase a large house outside town, under the pretense of setting up a boarding house. For the next two years, their plans to return to England remained on ice because of Bob's fear that he would be recognized by old acquaintances and exposed. At last, he found a solution to the inevitable suspicions.

"Why, first," says I, "you shall not disclose yourself to any of your relations in England but your sister— no, not one; secondly, we will not shave off our mustachios or beards" (for we had all along worn our beards after the Grecian manner), "nor leave off our long vests, that we may pass for Grecians and foreigners; thirdly, that we shall never speak English in public before anybody, your sister excepted; fourthly, that we will always live together and pass for brothers."

The closeted lovers, with wealth intact, lived happily ever after, with Singleton married — for further "protection" — to William's sister. Bob's concluding words were, "I am much more happy than I deserve." With this *precis* of *Captain Singleton* concluded, let's return to Starr's original comment: "The careers of such men as Thomas Lurting may have contributed to the portrait of Singleton's Quaker aide, William Walters."²⁵ But this close reading shows that Starr was right for the wrong reasons. While it's clear that Friend William Walters, just like Thomas Lurting, was forced into casuistry in order to navigate between Quakerism and piracy, in a deeper sense, the imaginary Captain Bob Singleton is a closer spiritual match. These two shared the same drama of an encounter with transcendent love through the medium of a Quaker's love.

James Fennimore Cooper: "the son hesitated to avow his connexion"

In *The Pioneers*, published in 1823, we find James Fennimore Cooper working out some nagging family dynamics, and in passing, he suggested one way in which Brotherly Love might raise suspicion.²⁶ He concocted a scenario in which the future-Judge Marmaduke Temple (drawn after his own father, Judge William Cooper) forged a secret financial partnership. As a schoolboy, Marmaduke Temple and Edward Effingham experienced "an early inclination for each other" which developed into "an intimacy." This friendship, Cooper wrote, would eventually pave the way to most of his "future elevation in life." Like Judge Cooper, Judge Temple was "quaker Enuff,"²⁷ a product of Pennsylvania Quaker culture

[and] his habits and language were somewhat marked by its peculiarities... When Marmaduke first became the partner of young Effingham, he was quite the quaker in externals; and it was too dangerous an experiment for the son to think of encountering the prejudices of the father on this subject. The connexion, therefore, remained a profound secret to all but those who were interested in it.

Cooper was re-visiting his father's *de facto* adoption of Moss Kent, a younger man warmly embraced by the family, who acted as his private secretary.²⁸ The author found it safer to address that intimate history by recasting it as non-romantic business partnership. This required, on the one hand, that the fictional Effingham must be able to bankroll the partnership, but on the other hand, that he must also possess "foibles" that required Temple as a manager. Whereas Effingham was "indolent" and "impetuous," Temple was gifted with "activity and enterprise." That led to another problem to be solved by the plot: namely, justifying how Effingham could come into possession of the necessary wealth at an early age. So Cooper proposed that Effingham's father descended from landed gentry "who thought it a degradation... to descend to the pursuits of commerce." In other words, someone so burdened with managing his wealth that he was willing to turn it over to his son.

In *The Pioneers*, the pair established some sort of "mercantile house" in the City of Brotherly Love. Effingham's wealth was considered Temple's "possession," while "in secret, the other was entitled to an equal participation in the profits." Effingham insisted on being a secret partner, firstly, because it wounded his pride to require a more sensible partner. The other reason is more interesting: his father, a retired major in the colonial army of occupation, considered pacifists "moral imbeciles."

At no time was the old soldier an admirer of the peaceful disciples of Fox. Their disciplined habits, both of mind and body, had endowed them with great physical perfection; and the eye of the veteran was apt to scan the fair proportions and athletic frames of the colonists, with a look that seemed to utter volumes of contempt for their moral imbecility... Knowing the sentiments of the father, in relation to this people, it was no wonder that the son hesitated to avow his connexion with, nay, even his dependence on the integrity of, a quaker.

The reference here to "physical perfection," "fair proportions," and "athletic frames" calls to mind the excitable train of adjectives Defoe employed when showcasing the charms of Quaker William. (We shall find the same sort of praise in our final example, *Hugh Wynne*.) And when Alan Taylor reconstructed the parallels between the Cooper-Kent alliance and the Temple-Effingham partnership, he began with the striking personal similarities between the judges. The fictional Judge Temple, a man "of a large stature," had "a fine manly face" which expressed "extraordinary intellect, covert humour, and great benevolence." The real Judge Cooper — sometimes known in Philadelphia as "Friend Billy" — was recalled by James Fennimore Cooper as "noble looking, warm-hearted [and] witty" with a "deep laugh, sweet voice and fine rich eyes."²⁹

Similar muscular Christians surface again in Herman Melville's 1851 portrayal of *Pequod* owners Peleg and Bildad, who were "brown and brawny, like most old seamen."³⁰ Although they were minor characters, and hardly noticed by devotees of *Moby Dick*, Melville took pains to offer an exacting treatment of these "insulated Quakerish Nantucketer[s]," who, for some unspecified reason,

were "rather distrustful of all aliens, unless [like sailors] they hailed from Cape Cod or the Vineyard." Melville cleverly engineered names which symbolized their position in the bitter Hicksite Schism of 1827. In *Genesis*, Peleg was named for a time in which "the earth was divided." In *Job*, Bildad was the quarrelsome "son of contention," and, as shown below, Melville recognized him as even more of a paradox than Peleg. Melville cleverly alluded to the tension between a Quaker's ideal of pacificism and a whaler's reliance on bloodshed in order to portray the *Pequod's* owners as Quakers "anomalously modified by things altogether alien and heterogeneous." He then *pretended* to explain what he meant by this: "They are fighting Quakers; they are Quakers with a vengeance."

Recall that while Joseph C Hart, in *Miriam Coffin*, was eager to convince the reader that whalers "seldom, or never" indulged the "evil propensities" of the common sailor, Melville would have nothing of it. His intended audience, steeped in the commonplaces of sexuality during the Age of Sail, recognized that his actual meaning was whispered in the next statement: namely, they "still... strangely blend with these [Quaker] peculiarities, a thousand bold dashes of character, not unworthy a Scandinavian sea-king, or a poetical Pagan Roman." Every reader educated in Greek and Roman classics was familiar with the sexual habits of ancient Rome. But in case that was not plain enough, Melville reinforced his point with a winking description of the evangelical/conservative Quaker, Bildad:

unlike [liberal Hicksite] Captain Peleg — who cared not a rush for what are called serious things, [such as serious sexual infractions] and indeed deemed those self-same serious things the veriest of all trifles [and therefore not worth a trace of guilt] — Captain Bildad had not only been originally educated according to the strictest [evangelical Orthodox] sect of Nantucket Quakerism, but all his subsequent ocean life, and the sight of many unclad, lovely island creatures, round the Horn — all that had not moved this native born Quaker one single jot, had not so much as altered one angle of his vest.

Bildad was not subject to heterosexual arousal. Was this mere Quaker asceticism? Since Melville portrays both the liberal and conservative Quaker sailors as part of a lewd "Pagan Roman" *milleau* afloat, and Melville suggests that such "serious things" gave Peleg no grief, it's clear that the casuistry which most fascinated Melville was how Bildad could remain so obsessed with his homophobic Bible while participating in that sordid world. To the naive reader, Melville's ethical dilemma manifested as the immorality of whaling:

[How] pious Bildad reconciled these things in the reminiscence, I do not know; but it did not seem to concern him much, and very probably he had long since come to the sage and sensible conclusion that a man's religion is one thing, and this practical world quite another. This world pays dividends.

In reality, Melville, with his well-established personal interest in romance between men, was telling the alert reader that Bildad set aside his worrisome Orthodox reading of *Leviticus* because it could have interfered with maritime profit — and, indeed, Nantucket at precisely that time was one of America's richest communities.

Alan Taylor: "Cooper's unrequited longings grew keener"

Let us now return to the subject of James Fennimore Cooper's father, as depicted in *The Pioneers*. The secretive partnership in *The Pioneers* is a retelling of a stormy relationship that began in

1794, when Judge Cooper practically adopted Moss Kent — at twenty-eight, twelve years his junior — into his family, in addition to relying upon his services as secretary. This incident was fictionalized at the very beginning of *The Pioneers*, when Judge Temple hires a mysterious young man as his secretary immediately upon meeting him, and brings him instantly into the household. At the end of the book, this character is revealed to be Edward Effingham — the son of Judge Temple's dead business partner. In other words, the unitary life of Moss Kent was fissioned fictionally into separate father and son characters.

The real Edward Effingham, Moss Kent, wrote in 1795: "I never lived more agreeably in my Life. Mrs. C[oooper] I think is a very fine woman and both she and the judge treat me with almost *parental* attention... They have three little boys from 5 to 9 who are as sweet and lovely little fellows as ever born of a woman & they are extremely fond of me." However, two months after this chirpy domestic report was posted, Kent began to support two politicians who challenged the Judge's political power.³¹ As Kent later confided to his brother, Judge Cooper would "undoubtedly impute the Loss of his election to my exertions against him... & it is a matter of Triumph to me to think so. He is a base Scoundrel and has used me most basely."³² Despite these acts of betrayal, writes Taylor, "the judge repeatedly tried, but failed, to reclaim his resentful protege." One of Cooper's friends warned him that Kent was capable of "wantonly and maliciously insulting and attempting to Villify the Character of a man of honor." This raised the familiar issue of scandal yet again. Nevertheless, as Taylor tells it, "Cooper's unrequited longings grew keener."³³

In the first chapter of his book *William Cooper's Town*, biographer Alan Taylor carefully delineated the ways in which James Fennimore Cooper's father, Judge William Cooper, variously embraced or abandoned Quaker ways. Of particular relevance is Taylor's mention of the Judge's reading habits, as a member of the Library Company of Burlington: "*The Adventures of Roderick Random* had a special appeal to Cooper. It was one of the two books he checked out on his first day."³⁴

Roderick Random's flamboyant Captain Whiffle "gave scandal an opportunity to be very busy with his character, and [to] accuse him of maintaining a correspondence with his surgeon, not fit to be mentioned." Later, lecherous Lord Strutwell tries to proposition the hero with a classical Greek defense of same-sex acts, concluding that they "will become in a short time a more fashionable vice than simple fornication."³⁵ Historian Alan Taylor observes, correctly, that "It was certainly a long march from the exemplary, pious biographies read by orthodox Friends." Taylor went on to observe that Cooper "may have readily identified with Random," who got ahead in life partially by dint of his self-described "good face and shape."

Judge Cooper's alarming appetite for unrequited love was not unique during this period. The potential for male panic can also be traced to other Friends' biographies. In *American Sympathy*, historian Caleb Crain investigated an intensely romantic three-sided friendship between Yale medical student Elihu Hubbard Smith and Quakers Joseph Bringhurst (another medical student) and the aspiring novelist Charles Brockden Brown.³⁶

But Elihu Hubbard Smith also had a *fourth* beloved friend, the future congressman, Theodore Dwight. Dwight was initially scandalized when it became apparent that Smith, under Quaker influence, was bound for Deism. Smith's attempt at reconciliation made matters only worse. "You must not... be surprized [sic] if... I use rather the expressions of a lover than a man; for I feel for you all that Jonathan felt for David."³⁷ Dwight recoiled at Elihu Hubbard Smith's "bald-face stile [sic]." This prompted a humiliated walk-back from Smith: "It had become habitual for me, in respect to Brown, Bringhurst, and Wilkins (who were educated in Quaker habits) and I believe some others — before I thought of it's being more proper than any other."³⁸

Likewise, when Walt Whitman's future publicist, Henry Clapp, visited Nantucket during the 1840s, he found that a visit to his "island-home" was necessary to melt the comparatively "icy hearts" of inland Americans: "relief and recreation... I have found it in the sweet society of these loving

friends" (an obvious reference to the same Quaker whalers who fascinated Melville). It was a place where men could discover "a favorite flower" and "take down (or leap over) the bars which society has put up between them, and enjoy the luxury — for say what we will it is a luxury — of a good hearty embrace." Only in such a luxuriously-isolated Quaker enclave, "Hand locked in hand, heart locked in heart," could lonely landlubbers at last truly begin "soothing ourselves with pleasant loves."³⁹

S Weir Mitchell: "girl-boy" and "perverted Quaker"

As late as 1896, the drama of Friends' casuistries could still enthrall Victorian readers, as shown by the fiction of Walt Whitman's personal physician, S Weir Mitchell. In *Hugh Wynne*, two Philadelphia Quaker boys, Hugh Wynne, a captain's son, and his friend Jack Warder haunted the ships at dock, listening to the alluring sea yarns of sailors.⁴⁰ Whereas Jack admired Hugh's "muscular power" and "massive build," as well as his "great eyes of blue, and a fair, clear skin," Hugh appreciated Jack's slender but "well-built" figure, and his complexion "rosy, and quite too pretty, with his blond locks." Hugh's spinster "masculine" Aunt Gainer considered Jack "a girl-boy," and a "manly miss," "fit only to sell goods, or, at best, to become a preacher." (The Victorian stereotype of a gay male was just such a "counter-jumper.")

Coming into manhood during the Revolutionary War, Hugh had experiences "for both good and evil," and life "was not without its pleasures." But Jack complained that "the town was full of officers of all grades, who... brought with them much licence [sic]." Indeed, Hugh was quickly "getting an education from these sailors which did me no good... Gambling, hard drinking, and all manner of worse things became common and more openly indulged in." Jack escaped these temptations because,

"As regards worse things than wine and cards... I have always been like some well-nurtured maid."

After this difference led to the breakup of their friendship, Jack tried to win Hugh back from the bars:

"I walked to and fro until the clock had struck twelve, fearful and troubled like a woman... There were many people who loved Hugh, but, save his mother, none as I did."

After Hugh became an utter degenerate, Jack Warder became the town's favorite. But he admitted that "If I think a man I esteem has no affection for me, I will fetch and carry to get it. Thank God I need not for Hugh... My Hugh is a big handsome fellow nowadays, builded to be of the bigness of his father, but cleaner fashioned, from early use of his muscles. He has the strong passions of these hot Welsh..." "I saw Hugh strip," Jack added, "and was amused to see [his fencing teacher] feel his muscles and exclaim at his depth of chest."

There was, during this historical period, a schism called "Free Quakers" who considered themselves "free" to join the militia. Jack, disowned as a mainstream Quaker, became a captain in the American army of colonial rebellion, and Hugh was overjoyed at their reunion. "He ran to me as I spoke. I think I should have kissed him but for the staring soldiers." Hugh soon realized that "Jack felt that he was under some necessity to take care of me, or from that affection he has ever shown desired to keep me near him."

During this period, after Jack and Hugh both developed a romantic interest in one Darthea Peniston [sic], she remarked on the former's feminine mannerisms. Hugh defended Jack's honor as a warrior: "he was raging in a furious mob of redcoats... but he never got a scratch." He added, "I like him best in camp with starving, half-naked men. I have seen him give his last loaf away [and] how like a tender woman he was among men who were sick and starving." Darthea was impressed: "He is fortunate in his friend, Mr. Wynne. Men do not often talk thus of one another. I have heard him say as much or more of you. Mistress Wynne says it is a love-affair."

When the army intercepted some mail, the entire troop was amused by some homophobic gossip about Jack and Hugh: "How is the pretty boy-captain? Does he still blush? And... the perverted Quaker with the blue eyes?" Reading this letter to Jack caused him "to twitch in a queer way." The novel ended with Jack agreeing to become merely Darthea's friend, while Hugh's (clearly triangulated) love for Miss Peniston triumphed.

S Weir Mitchell: "no one would insult or strike a man in drab"

This study has documented dramatic themes which recurred down the generations, whether in Friends' tracts, in their private correspondence, or in popular fiction penned by "the world's people." The conflicts arose not only from recurrent challenges to Quaker pacifism, but also from challenges to what Isaac Pennington called Friends' "gospel order:"⁴¹ *eros*, pornography, secrecy, scandal, and schism. This litany of dangers even includes sexual panic, given the early *antiQuakeriana* well-known to historians. Less well-known is the short-lived sexual panic surrounding the Hicksite Schism of 1827, triggered by the moral implications of the Inner Light as a divine authority for conscience, one which could trump both scriptural and ecclesiastical *shall-nots*.⁴²

It is difficult for today's scholar to appreciate the sheer gravity of scandal in Victorian America. In his 1838 book *The Code of Honor*, John Lyde Wilson explained that a dishonored man was

avoided in society, his friends shunning his approach, his substance wasting, his wife and children in want around him, and traces all his misfortunes and misery to the slanderous tongue of the calumniator, who, by

secret whisper or artful innuendo, has sapped and undermined his reputation, he must be more or less than man to submit in silence.⁴³

If the rudimentary justice system of the day could not shield a man from the effects of defamation, then “the first law of nature, self-preservation, points out the only remedy for his wrongs” — namely, a duel. For example, Senator from California David C Broderick died in a 1859 duel precipitated by the homophobic accusation that his supporters were his “personal chattels,” and they belonged to him, “bodies and breeches.” Broderick’s biographer reminded his 1911 readers that in those days, people would fight over mere trifles but “their ‘honor,’ was of course, a more valuable commodity.”⁴⁴ In 1897, Paul Duval published an allegation that Marcel Proust was having a same-sex affair, likewise leading to a duel.⁴⁵

Another, even more serious, peril during this period was vigilantism. Walt Whitman’s biographers have too often repeated an unsubstantiated legend that he was tarred and feathered for molesting a student during his early days as a teacher on Long Island. But there was indeed a sinister basis for the gossip. In 1872, while Whitman was living in Washington, DC, another bachelor poet, in Whitman’s hometown of Huntington, NY, made unwanted advances towards a young woman. Her friends kidnapped Charles G Kelsey, tarred and feathered him, and cleaved his body in half, before throwing it into Long Island Sound. Months later, only the tarred and feathered lower torso and legs were recovered.⁴⁶ The incident clearly illustrates the extent to which early communities could punish sexual transgression.

These aspects of Victorian life figure into enigmas: firstly, how, if praiseworthy *philia* among Friends could give way to damnable *eros*, their generally-sterling reputation for morality remained more or less enshrined in public discourse. Secondly, why is it that the criticisms of their morality

which did make it into print must be so painstakingly excavated from period documents by historians? Mitchell, — the same novelist who introduced the Quaker “girl-boy” and “the perverted Quaker with the blue eyes” — asserted in his 1880 novel, in *Hephzibah Guinness*: “no one would insult or strike a man in drab, however great the provocation he might give. It is as good as chain-armor.”⁴⁷ The logic was inescapable: for an antebellum pacifist, too, honor was irreplaceable. But he could not and would not defend it using violence.

In addition, respectable persons simply did not bring up the subject of same-sex acts in the first place, even when the stakes were terrifically high — such as the safety of their own sons, according to English headmaster Ennis Richmond in 1899.⁴⁸ Writing four years after the international Oscar Wilde scandal of 1895 — which did more than anything to shatter the silence — Richmond complained that although “In all big schools this vice exists,” certain evils went unremarked, because “the worthy must suffer for the faults of the unworthy.” In other words, people with an “unwholesome” attitude caused the virtuous to keep silent, rather than run the risk of “opening a nauseous stream” into refined discourse. Any author, such as Richmond, who alluded to same-sex acts would be criticized by a “shocked and offended” audience for being “too outspoken,” because of the belief that “it is better they should not know.” Even worse: as long as these situations were buried, an irresponsible society “need take no count of them.” Parents took refuge in the belief that “what can’t be cured must be endured.” Schoolmasters were content to exert something less than “that ceaseless untiring vigilance” necessary to “fight” the evil. But so much silence, asserted Richmond, assisted “the evil one in his work of impurity by wrapping up natural matters in a veil of secrecy.” In every school, he claimed, “boys feel... they are living in a society which holds a danger of which they could never speak.”

But it is equally vital to realize that same-sex acts were also passed over in silence, for reasons opposite to those just described. In the 1850s, the long-suffering Irish Quaker Mary Greer wrote that the straw that broke the camel’s back and finally caused her to join the Church of England concerned

her discovery that Sidcot School, where she hoped to place her son, was "infected with the most abominable sin — all were polluted." When she expressed her outrage, she was amazed to find that

The "Friends" took it all very coolly. They were very sorry indeed that the circumstance had been discovered; but they hoped, as our son was not remaining there, we "would see the propriety of not allowing it to transpire." One said, It was not worth talking about. He would send his own son there, without hesitation.⁴⁹

Decades later, by the time Ennis Richmond published his book on the moral problems of English schools, a certain part of the general public had adopted the same liberal view. A review of his book, *Through Boyhood to Manhood*, said that "much that is mourned by our Public School Masters" was "regarded as venal by many parents of their pupils."⁵⁰

In conclusion, until the "fence" of Quaker Discipline was dismantled, and Quakerism therefore ceased to constitute a distinct culture — a process that was almost complete by 1900 — Friends let Brotherly Love continue, even in cases where *philia* gave way to *eros*. Despite this review's necessary emphasis on secrecy, scandal, and sex, the reason this history matters is because the most ardent Brotherly Love acted as the most inspiring conduit for God's love. Walt Whitman seems to have expressed this best in the words of a Quaker sea captain, in his 1871 poem, "Passage to India."

O we can wait no longer,
We too take ship O soul,
Joyous we too launch out on trackless seas,
Fearless for unknown shores on waves of ecstasy to sail,
Amid the wafting winds, (thou pressing me to thee, I thee to me, O soul,)
Caroling free, singing our song of God,

Chanting our chant of pleasant exploration.

With laugh, and many a kiss,
(Let others deprecate, let others weep for sin, remorse, humiliation,)
O soul, thou pleasest me, I thee.

Ah more than any priest O soul we too believe in God,
But with the mystery of God we dare not dally.

...

Sail forth— steer for the deep waters only,
Reckless O soul, exploring, I with thee, and thou with me,
For we are bound where mariner has not yet dared to go,
And we will risk the ship, ourselves and all.

¹ For the apostle Peter, “sincere brotherly love” meant loving one another with “unity of mind, sympathy... a tender heart, and a humble mind.” Faith alone was not sufficient, but must be paired with “brotherly affection.” See: *1 Peter* and *2 Peter*. Paul believed that *philia* sprang from a soul truly in communion with God. (1 Thess. 4:9). And in Hebrews, we find that invitation so cherished by Elias Hicks: “Let brotherly love continue” (Heb. 13:1).

² Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* [circa 340 BCE], Book VIII.

³ George Fox *Journal of George Fox* (London: W and FG Cash, 1803), 259.

⁴ Thomas Clarkson *A Portraiture of Quakerism: Taken from a View of the Education and Discipline, Social Manners, Civil and Political Economy, Religious Principles, and Character of the Society of Friends* – vol 1 (New York: Samuel Stansbury, 1806).

⁵ Clarkson, cited above.

⁶ Barry Levy *Quakers and the American Family* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988) 82-4.

⁷ Usually, “Wet-Quaker” was a euphemism for a “secret drinker,” but more generally, it referred to those just outside the “fence” of Quakerism. “In America a *wet quaker* is a quaker who is limp or loose as regards observing the rules of the sect — one who is worldlyminded, not ‘dry’ in religion.” Albert Barrère, Charles Godfrey Leland *A Dictionary of Slang, Jargon & Cant*, vol 2 (London: George Bell & Co, 1897), 392. “The term Wet-Quaker, is applied to those who retain the Quaker faith, but adopt the manners and costume of other denominations. The celebrated Nathaniel Greene was a Wet-Quaker, as were many of the people of Rhode Island, where religious liberty first erected its standard in America.” John Hayward *The Religious Creeds and Statistics of Every Christian Denomination in the United States and British Provinces* (Boston: John Hayward, 1836).

⁸ James Fennimore Cooper *The Pioneers*, vol 1 (New York: Stringer and Townsend, 1823).

⁹ David Greene Haskins *Ralph Waldo Emerson: His Maternal Ancestors* (Boston: Cupples, Upham, and Company, 1887), 118.

¹⁰ Walt Whitman and Horace Traubel *With Walt Whitman in Camden* (Monday, April 23, 1888).

¹¹ Ann Braude *Radical Spirits* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989).

¹² “True, I could say to you that we are shaking Quakers — that we include all the elements and principles of the Quaker order. Those which the Quakers hold in common with Presbyterians and Swedenborgians — the marrying, and giving in marriage — we drop; but that which constitutes them Quakers — the peace principles, the no poverty principle, the plainness of dress and of language, and the inflexible adherence to principle, the spiritual religious life that they are called to live — these are all included in the Shaker order.” Frederick William Evans *Autobiography of a Shaker: And Revelation of the Apocalypse* (Glasgow: United Publishing Company, 1888), 217.

¹³ “Jemima had been repulsed in all her advances towards them, in the early part of her career, and having succeeded in forming a sect of her own, and fearing that an acquaintance and intercourse with them would, from the similarity of some of their manners and customs, tend to incorporate her people with the Society of Friends, and thus sap the foundations of her independent government, she had taught her disciples to look upon them with contempt and abhorrence.” David Hudson *Memoir of Jemima Wilkinson: A Preacheress of the Eighteenth Century* (Bath, NY: RL Underhill, 1844).

¹⁴ ‘ The White Quakers, who were led by Joshua Jacob and Abigail Beale (a couple united in a free union) were dedicated to restoring Fox's original teachings, which they interpreted in communist and eschatological terms. They preached and practised free love...’ Barbara Taylor *Eve and the New Jerusalem: Socialism and Feminism in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), 174. Moncure Conway, reporting about a few years after the 1854 end of the Shaking Quakers, called them “a sort of free-love Quaker monastery near Dublin, set up by Joshua and Abigail Jacobs, who went barefooted and in white garments. It is a metre of the excited condition of those times that a long-haired gentleman, much more a lady, walking through the country in a peculiar dress or undress, was sure to be fixed upon as a prophet.” Moncure Daniel Conway “South Coast Saunterings in England” *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine* vol 39, (August 1869), 341. See also: James Gregory “‘Some Account of the Progress of the Truth as it Is in Jesus’: The White Quakers of Ireland” *Quaker Studies* vol 9 issue 1 (2004), 68-94.

¹⁵ Thomas Lurting *The Fighting Sailor Turn’d Peaceable Christian* (London: J. Sowle, 1711).

¹⁶ Daniel Defoe *The Adventures of Captain Singleton in 2 vol.* (Edinburgh: John Ballantyne & Co, 1810).

¹⁷ “The careers of such men as Thomas Lurting may have contributed to the portrait of Singleton's Quaker aide, William Walters...” G. A. Starr “Escape from Barbary: A Seventeenth-Century Genre” *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol 29, no 1 (Nov., 1965), note 31, page 49.

¹⁸ Joseph C Hart *Miriam Coffin*, vol 1 (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1835), 33.

¹⁹ Hart, “Introduction.”

²⁰ “Sam Slick” [Thomas Chandler Haliburton] Chapter 10: “The Old and the New Year; or, Quakers Afloat and Ashore.” *The Season Ticket* (New York: Scribner, Welford and Co), 1860.

²¹ Nathaniel Philbrick, *In the Heart of the Sea* (New York: Viking Press, 2000).

²² Hans Turley *Rum, Sodomy, and the Lash: Piracy, Sexuality, and Masculine Identity* (New York: New York University Press, 1999).

²³ Turley, 112.

²⁴ Turley, 117.

²⁵ Starr, cited above.

²⁶ James Fennimore Cooper *The Pioneers* (New York: Charles Wiley, 1823).

²⁷ Alan Taylor *William Cooper’s Town* (New York: Vintage, 1999), 21.

²⁸ Taylor, 236.

²⁹ Taylor, 16-17.

³⁰ Herman Melville *Moby Dick* Chapter XVI: “The Ship” (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1851).

³¹ Taylor, 236-7.

- ³² Taylor, 253.
- ³³ Taylor, 254.
- ³⁴ Taylor, 23.
- ³⁵ Tobias George Smollett *The Adventures of Roderick Random, etc* (London: J Osborn, 1748).
- ³⁶ Caleb Crain *American Sympathy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001)
- ³⁷ Indeed, Edward Hicks, painter of the prolific *Peaceable Kingdom* series, also painted a mysterious outlier, the gender-bending *David and Jonathan at the Stone Ezel*. Mitchell Santine Gould “Walt Whitman’s Quaker Paradox” vol 96, no 1 (Spring 2007): 1-23.
- ³⁸ Crain, 80, 88.
- ³⁹ Henry Clapp “Letter from Nantucket” *The Pioneer: or, Leaves from an Editor’s Portfolio* (Lynn, MA: JB Tolman, 1846).
- ⁴⁰ S Weir Mitchell *Hugh Wynne, Free Quaker: Sometime Brevet Lieutenant-colonel on the Staff of His Excellency General Washington* (New York: Century, 1896.)
- ⁴¹ Isaac Penington *Works of the Long-mournful and Sorely-distressed Isaac Penington* vol 1, (London: James Phillips, 1784).
- ⁴² Mitchell Santine Gould “Walt Whitman’s Quaker Paradox” (cited above), “Walt Whitman of the New York Aurora,” *Quaker Theology* vol 15, no 1 (Spring-Summer, 2016). “Forgetting Friend Walt: Whitman and Hicksite Amnesia (2013)” <https://www.academia.edu/7207930/142124972-Forgetting-Friend-Walt-Whitman-and-Hicksite-Amnesia-2013>
- ⁴³ John Lyde Wilson and Thomas J Eccles *The Code of Honor* (Charleston: Thomas J Eccles), 1838.
- ⁴⁴ Jeremiah Lynch *A Senator of the Fifties: David C. Broderick, of California* (San Francisco: AM Robertson, 1911), 201-2.
- ⁴⁵ Douglas W Alden “Marcel Proust’s Duel,” *Modern Language Notes*, vol 53 (1938).
- ⁴⁶ Anonymous *The Kelsey Outrage* (Philadelphia: Barclay & Co, 1873).
- ⁴⁷ S Weir Mitchell *Hephzibah Guinness* (Philadelphia: JB Lippincott & Co, 1880).
- ⁴⁸ Ennis Richmond *Through Boyhood to Manhood: A Plea for Ideals* (London: Longmans, Green, 1899).
- ⁴⁹ Mary Greer *Quakerism, or, The Story of My Life* (Philadelphia: JW Moore, 1852), 339-40.
- ⁵⁰ “Public School Library” *Public School Magazine* vol 3 (1899), 354-5.