The Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) originated mainly from ‘the middling sort of people’.1 Historians have observed that it subsequently moved up the social scale, in William C. Braithwaite’s words, ‘from lower-middle-class obscurity into upper-middle-class respectability’,2 at the same time as it developed from a loose movement of persecuted Nonconformists into a highly organized and reputable Society. Recent studies of the social history of the Society have focused on individual regions; they have highlighted a degree of geographical variation in both occupation and social status during the first few decades,3 and have thus offered a more differentiated picture. Through the first two and a half centuries however, the overall pattern remains one of upward social mobility and simultaneous internal consolidation.4 When the famous confectionery manufactur-

---

4 Cf., however, Vann, who arrives at the conclusion that ‘in the beginnings of Quakerism the gentry and wholesale traders were especially drawn to it, and that the tendency was for the social standing of Friends to decline during the first century’. Richard T. Vann, *The Social Development of English Quakerism 1655–1755* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), 50. There has also been some disagreement regarding occupational patterns. While Raistrick claims that Quakers gradually ‘moved from predominantly craftsman-artisan in the seventeenth century, to middle-class traders in the late eighteenth century’ (Raistrick,
er and social reformer George Cadbury died in 1922, he left a fortune of more than a million pounds. Some nineteenth and early twentieth-century Quakers accumulated such stunning riches that the owners of chocolate factories (such as the Cadburys and Rowntrees), iron forges (such as the Darbys and Rawlinsons), and banks (such as the Barclays and Lloyds) immediately come to mind when thinking of Quaker business activity. Considering that the Society never constituted more than 1 per cent of the English population, Quaker business ventures certainly led to ‘outstanding successes from a limited number of people’. Most of the well-known Quaker companies were founded or began to expand seriously at the beginning of the industrial age, when a wide variety of commodities became available to more and more of the population and caused a boom in start-ups. However, in attempting to account for the remarkable concurrence of religious affiliation and economic success, historians often look back to the early years of the Quaker community. Its initial precarious status as a religious minority is generally thought to have encouraged the


6 A growing number of biographical studies of these Quaker entrepreneurs are being published. For the example of the chocolate factory owners, see John F. Crosfield, A History of the Cadbury Family (Cambridge, 1985), and Robert Fitzgerald, Rowntree and the Marketing Revolution: 1862–1969 (Cambridge, 1995).


8 There were, of course, also many successful Quaker businesses which did not develop brands that are still recognizable today. See e.g. Richard L. Greaves, Dublin’s Merchant-Quaker: Anthony Sharp and the Community of Friends, 1643–1707 (Stanford, Calif., 1998).
Quakers to pay special attention to their occupational situation, and certain Quaker characteristics are regarded as favourable to both community life and commercial activity.9

Seventeenth and early eighteenth-century Quakers, however, were a community of converts, and do not fit easily into a neat pattern. Many of the typical traits of Quaker business culture (for example, the proverbial system of ‘Quaker cousins’ resulting from strict endogamy, and the Quaker apprenticeship system) only developed from the middle of the eighteenth century. While the differences between early Quakers and those of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries do not challenge the assumption that the foundations for later success were laid during the seventeenth century, they highlight the need to investigate more closely the period before industrialization.

By extending our geographical knowledge of Quaker business activity in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, this essay aims to assess critically the assumptions made in explaining Quaker business success. It calls into question the seamless success story unfolding from the vantage point of later developments in Britain and the transatlantic context. Attention has focused almost exclusively on Quaker business connections within these geographical regions, while those that linked Britain with the European Continent have hardly been studied. This is not surprising, since Quaker meetings were established much more successfully in Britain and North America than in Europe, and many Quakers were engaged in the transatlantic trade (which rapidly intensified during the period under consideration) as merchants or shipowners. On the other hand, there was a time-honoured tradition of trade relations between Britain and Europe, and from the 1650s onwards, Quakers began to participate in these. And as soon as Quaker meetings began to exist on the Continent, there were also European Quaker business people.

The first decades of Continental Quaker business activity coincide with the first wave of Continental missions between 1655 and around 1720. How were they related? Most obviously, geographical mobility was crucial to both Quaker missionary and commercial activities. In Britain, the spread of Quakerism has been found to have partly depended on business relationships, since these constituted an

9 See below for a detailed discussion.
important interface between Quakers and non-Quakers (or, from a missionary point of view, potential converts). The widespread notion that religious groups such as Quakers lived separated from their social surroundings agrees so well with their own ideal of turning away from the (morally corrupt) ‘world’ that it may even have derived from this ideal. Their contemporary relevance for society as a whole, however, can be considered by looking more closely at connections between the different spheres of their lives, such as the religious and the occupational. This is overdue, especially with regard to seventeenth-century Europe where the Quakers were only one of a large number of similar groups that had emerged at more or less the same time, leading to unprecedented religious plurality. Social historians have introduced the concept of the network as a useful tool that accommodates both geographical and social mobility. In this essay, I shall use this concept to consider connections between Quaker religious and business spheres.

Explanations of Quaker Business Success

To some scholars, the stereotypical Quaker asceticism (exceptional industriousness and thrift) has seemed to confirm the Weber (or Weber–Troeltsch) thesis of the close connection between the Protestant work ethic and the rise of capitalism, although Max Weber himself made only a few scattered and often passing references to the

10 Reay especially emphasizes the connection between wholesale trade and the spreading of Quakerism. See Reay, The Quakers and the English Revolution, 24.
11 With a specific focus on the Quakers, see Prior and Kirby, ‘Society of Friends’. Walvin dedicates a whole chapter to ‘Networks’ in his The Quakers, 81–90.
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Quakers, and did not consider them specifically. Nor did Ernst Troeltsch, who adopted Weber’s concept of the Protestant ethic and modified his typology of churches and sects, adding a third category (mysticism) in which he included the Quakers.

Most historians of Quakerism have dismissed this explanation, which correlates specific theological tenets, thought to have been held by all Protestants but by Calvinists and those denominations derived from Calvinism in particular, with their motivation to achieve commercial success. Instead, they have concentrated on individual criteria of success: the narrowing down of occupational choice for Quakers by their exclusion from service in public offices; the early preparation of the younger generations for professional life (even seventeenth-century Quakers were highly literate, valued careful tuition and training, and subsequently founded a number of private schools that developed a favourable reputation beyond Quaker circles); and a high degree of social cohesion within the Quaker community. Social cohesion is thought to have been brought about by persecution during the early years in England. Before the Act of Toleration (1689), Quakers suffered serious oppression, especially imprisonment and distraint of property, because of their insistence on holding meetings (Conventicle Acts, 1664 and 1670) and their refusal to swear oaths (Quaker Act, 1662) or to pay tithes and fines. They developed a specific culture of Quaker ‘sufferings’, recording cases of persecution centrally, publicizing them, and trying to alleviate the hardship of co-religionists by providing financial relief. This was ini-

14 Ernst Troeltsch, Die Soziallehren der Christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen (Tübingen, 1912).
16 Raistrick, Quakers in Science and Industry, 36–7, 42.
17 Ibid. 48–50.
18 Walvin claims that ‘the crucial link is not that between Quaker business and a particular theology, so much as Quaker membership of a powerful organisation and the culture it created’. Walvin, The Quakers, 3.
19 See e.g. ibid. 29; Raistrick, Quakers in Science and Industry, 22.
tially the responsibility of local meetings for worship and Monthly Meetings. In 1675, the London Meeting for Sufferings was introduced as a permanent institution dealing with such matters, and solidarity and mutual support within the Quaker community were thus institutionalized.

In addition to support, however, the emerging organizational system of local, regional, and national meetings also came to include mechanisms of internal control. If, for example, a member planned to set up a business (and especially if he or she required help with start-up financing), such plans would be discussed by the Monthly Meeting concerned, and compulsory advice given if it was considered necessary. Such internal control became most powerful in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when members who invested in risky business transactions or went bankrupt were frequently excluded from the Society. But in the early years, too, Quaker committees occasionally disowned members who failed to live up to the community’s strict moral standards. Quakers who decided to embark on new business ventures became subject to the Society’s internal discipline. Trades that were not consistent with the Society’s ‘testimonies’ did not qualify as approved occupational options. The criteria for such restriction changed with time. While many prominent first-generation Quakers came from the ranks of Oliver Cromwell’s army, this did not agree with the Quaker ‘peace testimony’ formulated on the accession of Charles II (1660).

Quakers ‘did not regard the collective responsibility towards their members and the Society as being limited by locality’, and migration plans required members to obtain certificates from their respective Monthly Meetings confirming that they were clear of debt. For the Quaker community to grow and consolidate, such internal mechanisms of support and control were highly necessary, especially on the periphery, where it continued to be threatened as a minority even after the Act of Tolerance had somewhat relaxed the situation in Britain. They aimed to reduce potential points of attack against Quakers by maximizing conformity to Quaker principles, but simultaneously restricted their choice of profession even further, channelling their economic acumen into certain lines of business, especially trade.

20 For examples see Prior and Kirby, ‘Society of Friends’, 117–18.
21 Ibid. 127.
Quaker Missionary and Commercial Activities

In addition to such mutual support and control, some other Quaker habits are also thought to have benefited Quaker economic activity. ‘Regular travelling, not only through the meetings in this country [England], but over the whole world’ and an institutionalized system of correspondence drew ‘the Society together into a coherent whole’, but also helped to stabilize Quaker business connections.22 In this respect especially, continuity has been noticed between the early years and the later ‘golden age’ of Quaker business ventures: ‘such networks had been vital since the pioneering days, when, like George Fox, itinerant preachers had wandered the country, and had been dependent on Friends and sympathisers for shelter and comfort.’23 From the beginning, meetings for worship were social events and provided their members with opportunities for exchange on many aspects of life: meeting other Friends and doing business could often be conveniently combined. This phenomenon became more apparent as Quaker entrepreneurship increasingly concentrated on certain lines of business. It has even been compared to early trade associations.24 Moreover, an internal system of loans ensured that Quaker capital was most often invested in Quaker undertakings in a ‘web of credit’.25 Finally, Quakers were believed to have carried their ‘spiritual standards into the affairs of everyday life’ and ‘established a new commercial standard of truth and honesty’26 that guaranteed their creditworthiness to the extent that Quaker business people acquired a reputation for sobriety and reliability, even in the eyes of those outside the Society.

In short, all current explanations suggest that the conspicuous concurrence between Quaker religious affiliation and economic success was the result of the highly consistent impact of the religious sphere on the world of business, and that the Quakers’ religious principles directly guided their business activities. Yet there are good reasons to be sceptical about this conclusion. It is well known, for example, that business success later presented serious challenges to these principles, culminating in the dilemma of choosing between ad-

22 Raistrick, Quakers in Science and Industry, 46; Walvin, The Quakers, 82.
23 Ibid. 82.
24 Raistrick, Quakers in Science and Industry, 27.
26 Raistrick, Quakers in Science and Industry, 44.
vanced social status and the ‘testimony of simplicity’ (the Quaker vow to abstain from unnecessary luxury). Ultimately, this caused a rift between ‘plain’ and ‘gay’ Quakers. 27

This essay will now go on to provide a brief summary of Continental missions, starting by pointing out some connections between missionary and commercial activities in Europe, and analysing the occupational situation of German and Dutch Quaker converts between 1655 and 1720. It will be shown how the community sought to influence their business activities and, although many findings from Britain can be confirmed for Europe, the differences challenge the idea that the Quaker religious sphere had a consistent impact on their commercial activities.

The European Missions

Although the first wave of Quaker missionary ventures to Europe eventually turned out to be of very limited success, it lasted for approximately seventy years. 28 It originated around the middle of the 1650s, when George Fox (the founding father of Quakerism) began to announce the arrival of Quaker missionaries, as heralds of the Kingdom of Christ, to many rulers all over the world. 29 This global


28 For fuller accounts of the European missions, see Sünne Juterczenka, Über Gott und die Welt: Endzeitvisionen, Reformdebatten und die Europäische Quäkermission in der Frühen Neuzeit (Göttingen, 2008), and the Swarthmore College Monographs on Quaker History series by William I. Hull. For Germany see also Wilhelm Hubben, Die Quäker in der Deutschen Vergangenheit (Leipzig, 1929), for the Dutch Republic Jan Z. Kannegieter, Geschiedenis van de Vroegere Quakergemeenschap te Amsterdam: 1656 tot Begin Negentiende Eeuw (Amsterdam, 1971).

29 Many of these visionary ‘epistles’ were printed and are listed in Joseph
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and universal project of religious renewal proceeded from a peculiar form of realizing eschatology. The Quakers expected a spiritual revolution to come about inwardly in each individual who turned to the ‘inward light’ for guidance, and they regarded themselves as instruments in bringing this about through their missionary endeavours. Between 1654 and about 1720, more than eighty Quaker men and women, who had no formal training in theology but regarded themselves as missionaries, travelled to the Continent in what has been called ‘one of the most dramatic outbreaks of missionary enthusiasm in the history of the Christian church’.30

By the mid-1670s, however, the millenarian hopes of the Quakers were disappointed when it became clear that the Kingdom of Christ had not arrived as soon as they had expected. They abandoned the idea of a universal mission and instead adopted a more practical approach, downsizing the missionary project to more manageable proportions. Disillusioned reports from missionaries who stayed on the Continent for longer periods of time (for example, William Ames and William Caton) contributed to this shift, which was accompanied by changes in missionary method. Instead of addressing spontaneously assembled and often unsympathetic audiences by preaching in public spaces such as market places, missionaries began systematically to acquire the linguistic skills and local knowledge that enabled them to target specific groups and individuals, and they increasingly relied on a limited number of personal contacts.

Most notably, they deliberately sought out other Nonconformists who appeared to be in a similar situation. In the Dutch Republic, Quakers came into contact with the Mennonites, Collegiants, Remonstrants, the adherents of Jean de Labadie, and followers of the mystic visionary Antoinette Bourignon. In the German territories, they encountered Mennonites, Silesian Schwenckfelders, Pietists, and various spiritualists on the fringes of Pietism.31 Relations between these

31 In recent years, all these groups and individuals have attracted increasing interest, and connections between them have been highlighted. For examples of groups and individuals who came into contact with the Quakers, see Hans Schneider, ‘Der radikale Pietismus im 17. Jahrhundert’, in Martin Brecht (ed.), Der Pietismus vom siebzehnten bis zum frühen achtzehnten Jahrhundert
groups were ambivalent. On the one hand, they were competing for adherents; on the other, they interacted and sometimes even cooperated with each other. Apart from the more general aim of driving on religious reform where, in their eyes, the Reformation had fallen short, they shared a number of spiritual principles and practical concerns. The former included an emphasis on individual revelation (either through Bible studies or direct inspiration); the latter the holding of regular meetings for worship and the production and distribution of non-mainstream religious literature despite opposition from the authorities. Quaker missionaries profited not only from direct contact with other religious reformers, but also from the activities of broker figures who could put them in touch with, or mediate between, reformers and rulers or local authorities. Such brokers opened up channels of communication that were crucial to delivering the missionary message. Elisabeth, sister of the Elector Palatine, was a typical example. She maintained a prolonged correspondence with William Penn and other prominent Quakers, drew their attention to other religious groups (such as the Labadists), wrote them letters of recommendation, and tried to intercede with her brother on their behalf.

The personal contacts that missionaries came to rely on also stemmed from non-religious contexts. Often transcending confessional boundaries, they served to maintain and stabilize the new Continental Quaker groups at local level. Connections of this sort included neighbourhood, family, and business ties. First generation Quakers often engaged in relationships that predated their ‘convinement’. In fact, this kind of local inter-confessional networking is not peculiar to Quakers on the Continent. Other groups, such as the Mennonites, practised tolerance (including intermarriage) at local

level, so long as it did not undermine the cohesion of the community as a whole. Similar cases have been pointed out in England, both in the Quaker and other dissenting communities.

The missionaries succeeded in founding various small Quaker communities in northern Germany and the Dutch Republic, together making up an estimated 430 converts. When the first wave of Quaker missions to Europe subsided round 1720, Quaker membership in Britain itself had already begun to dwindle. The first generation of missionaries had died and the Society’s priorities had shifted, so that from now on, outreach was no longer the primary objective. Most Continental meetings founded during this first wave of missionary activity ceased to exist within the next decade, and only that in Amsterdam survived to the middle of the century. Given the moderate success of the first wave of European missions and the short lifespan of the Continental meetings, their historical significance lies in the established churches’ agitated and broadly communicated reactions to the new arrival, and in the missionaries’ interactions with other religious reformers active at the same time.

Business and the European Missions

Non-Quaker English tradesmen were, of course, already present on the Continent when the first missionaries arrived. Indeed, as long as the missionaries lacked the linguistic skills necessary to preach in Dutch, English-speaking exile or merchant communities (for example, in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Vlissingen, and Middelburg), were their favoured audience. William Caton, one of the first Quaker missionaries who travelled to the Continent, specifically targeted Anglicans, English Baptists, Brownists, and exiled supporters of the

---

Commonwealth.\textsuperscript{36} As the missionaries succeeded in winning some converts, a few English, Dutch, and German business people (especially in the urban centres) came to sympathize with the Quakers and hosted meetings for worship in their homes.\textsuperscript{37} In Rotterdam, Caton and his companion John Stubbs arranged the first Quaker meeting 'at an English Merchants-House [Benjamin Furly?], unto which many Merchants (especially) came, both Dutch and English',\textsuperscript{38} and in Amsterdam, too, the Quakers initially held their meetings in a street called the Engelsche Gang after its residents.\textsuperscript{39}

Quakers attending to Continental business affairs routinely took part in the religious gatherings initiated by missionaries active locally, such as the Irishman Joseph Pike, who mentions in a letter to the missionary Roger Longworth that he had met William Penn and his company on his first journey in the Rhine valley (1686): 'I went several times to England, and twice to Holland, on account of trade. On one of these occasions, I accompanied our beloved Friend W. Penn, who went to the Yearly Meeting at Amsterdam, where we met Roger Haydock, George Watts of London, and other Friends in the ministry.'\textsuperscript{40}

Some missionaries pursued their own business interests. William Penn is often thought to have used his missionary trip to the Rhine valley (1677), probably the best known and most amply documented campaign in the history of the missions,\textsuperscript{41} to promote his Holy Ex-

\textsuperscript{36} See William I. Hull, \textit{Benjamin Furly, 1636–1714, and the Rise of Quakerism in Rotterdam} (Swarthmore, 1941), 220–6.

\textsuperscript{37} For Amsterdam, see Kannegieter, \textit{Geschiedenis} and William I. Hull, \textit{The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, 1655–1665} (Swarthmore, 1938). The Rotterdam Meeting and its members are best described in Hull, \textit{Benjamin Furly}.

\textsuperscript{38} Caton, \textit{Journal}, 24. See also Hull, \textit{Benjamin Furly}, 201.

\textsuperscript{39} Hull, \textit{Amsterdam}, 286, 293–4.

\textsuperscript{40} Quoted in Swarthmore College Library (hereafter SCL), Hull MSS, box 19, folder 2E, 291.
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periment in Pennsylvania (which was, after all, a major business enterprise). Some commentators even dismissed his sermons as mere enticement to potential immigrants: ‘Some seriously look’d upon the Preacher to come to propagate the Gospel that was here planted among that odd sort of Christians [the Quakers]: Other Waggs more witty, thought his coming was only to get some more Proselytes or Planters for his large Plantations in America.’

Penn travelled with a large number of prominent Quakers (George Fox, Robert Barclay, George and Elizabeth Keith, George Watts, John Furly, William Tallcott, Isabel Yeoman, and Edward Haistwell are known to have taken part in his mission), and he was not the only member of this delegation to recognize the potential synergy between business and missionary ventures. This is revealed by a source not often consulted in connection either with Quaker missionary activity or Continental business affairs: Sarah Fell’s household account book. Sarah was George Fox’s stepdaughter and lived at Swarthmoor Hall near Kendal, the birthplace of Quakerism and a Quaker lieu de memoire. In 1652, Fox had first succeeded in attracting diverse groups of religious seekers to the area, and his wife-to-be Margaret Fell had converted to Quakerism. Fell inherited the hall on the death of her first husband, Judge Thomas Fell, in 1658. Even before she married Fox in 1669, Swarthmoor had functioned as a base for numerous ministers travelling throughout England and also farther afield, including Europe. Fell managed the Kendal Fund which provided financially for the missionaries, and many letters written by missionaries in Europe were addressed to her at Swarthmoor Hall. In her account book, which covers the years from 1673 to 1678, Sarah Fell recorded all the money spent and received by the Swarthmoor household. Business transactions included trade with coal, grain, and dairy products. Sarah had run Swarthmoor’s affairs during her moth-

44 Quoted in SCL, Hull MSS, box 19, folder 2E, 291.
er’s imprisonment in Lancaster Castle (1664–8) and continued to do so during her long absences. This included managing an iron forge in nearby Furness which Sarah and three of her sisters owned (it was subsequently sold to Thomas Rawlinson and, among other assets, formed the economic basis of the Rawlinson concern). On 16 August 1677, Sarah recorded that samples of iron ore from Furness had been sent to George Fox. While there is no indication of where and when Fox received them, or of any specific customers he may have had in mind, it is evident from Sarah’s entry in the book that she sent the samples to Fox while he was on a missionary visit to Europe with Penn. He was clearly expecting business opportunities to present themselves during that trip.

The connection between business and the European missions is especially obvious with regard to religious sanctuaries, where otherwise marginalized dissenters were deliberately encouraged to settle by rulers who regarded them as especially useful subjects, appreciating their diligence and hoping to profit from their technological expertise. In places such as Altona and Friedrichstadt, the Mennonites and Remonstrants paved the way for the Quakers. In Emden, where the authorities initially persecuted Quakers vigorously (one of them even died in prison), they soon became aware of the economic benefit that a thriving Quaker community might bring to a town already engaged in trade with England. On the accession of James II (1685), a number of well-to-do business people left England for fear of re-Catholicization and were given a friendly reception in Emden. The Meeting for Sufferings recorded that two of Emden’s magistrates had visited the Quaker Magdalena van Laer, informing her

that the Council had sent them to acquaint her & ye rest of ye Q[aker]s in the City or any other of that way that would come to live there, that they had Decreed, that they shall hence forth

live in ye City without molestation and Enjoy any encourag-
ments that other burghers Injoy, or that they may hold their
meetings publick, & if they please shall build them a Meeting
house in ye City & that ye Council would Confirm this under
ye Seal of ye City, when Desired.48

Lengthy communications between the Quakers and the authori-
ties ended with the publication of a toleration edict in Emden.49 The
Swedish king even offered to give ‘ye ground to build a Meeting
house etc. in his Territories’,50 presumably referring to the north Ger-
man territories that fell under Swedish rule after the Thirty Years
War, rather than Sweden itself. The Quakers recognized the potential
of such interests for their missionary project. Sanctuaries attracted
their attention, and they became hotspots of missionary activity. In
the early 1680s, Penn hoped to establish such a sanctuary in the ter-
ritory of the Elector Palatine. Although this plan did not gain the
Elector’s approval, the Quakers’ commercial activities were mostly
welcome. They even saved two missionaries from being expelled by
unsympathetic authorities. In 1680 Roger Longworth and Roger
Haydock were arrested on a charge of proselytizing near Kriegsheim,
but were discharged when they identified themselves as merchants
and claimed that their visit was on business.51 As late as 1748, when
the Quakers offered copies of Robert Barclay’s Apology (the most sys-
tematic contemporary explanation of Quaker theology) to foreign
delegates at the congress preparing the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle
(which ended the War of the Austrian Succession), the Prussian
ambassador, according to an account by Jan van der Werff from
Amsterdam, invited the Quakers to ‘come into Prussia where we
might Enjoy all Freedom’.52 In connection with this conversation, it
was even suggested that Quakers from Britain might already ‘have

48 See the minutes of the Meeting for Sufferings, Library of the Religious
Society of Friends (hereafter LSF), London, MS 4, 18 Oct. 1685, 224.
49 26 Feb. 1686, printed in Ernst Kochs, ‘Die Quäker in Emden’, Upstalsbooms-
blätter für ostfriesische Geschichte, Heimatschutz und Heimatkunde, 10/1 (1921–3),
60–79, at 79.
51 Juterczenka, Gott und die Welt, 109.
intentions of Removing, to settle in Eastfriezland, or elsewhere, in Germany'.

Successful local business people who associated or sympathized with the Quakers not only hosted Quaker meetings for worship, but were also sometimes willing to help the Quakers gain acceptance in the eyes of rulers. Thus the influential Rotterdam linen merchant Benjamin Furly, who acted as a land agent for Pennsylvania in the 1680s, helped to secure the legitimacy of Quaker marriages in the Dutch Republic (an issue of special importance with regard to legacy concerns) by appealing directly to the Grand Pensionary at the Hague, using connections which he had been able to establish only because of his standing as a wealthy and highly esteemed citizen. As a result, Dutch Quaker marriages were recorded by notice even if they had not been contracted before a magistrate.

At local level, individual business connections could be extremely useful with regard to one of the missionaries’ main activities, the distribution of religious literature. With few exceptions, it was not common for Quaker publications to be sold profitably by regular booksellers. In 1680, the Meeting for Sufferings decided that ‘the way of exposeing of bookes to shale, bee for the future by sending them to Market Townes to such ffreinds and Shopkeepers as will expose the same to Sale in their Shoppes and houses’. This seems merely to have confirmed an already common practice. During the 1677 tour, George Fox had instructed Quaker converts at Danzig: ‘where ye hear of any, or have any correspondence in trading with any sober people, far or near, send them books.’ This practice was still in use towards the end of the century. When the Quaker clockmaker Daniel Quare, for example, returned from a business trip to Flanders in 1689, he reported to the Second Day Morning Meeting, which supervised the publication of Quaker books, that he had distributed copies of Barclay’s Apology there. He had found that ‘they were acceptable but much more desired in French’ and so ‘proposed to this Meeting that

---

53 Ibid. 398–1.
54 Hull, *Benjamin Furly*, 60–7. See also SCL, Hull MSS, box 19, folder 2E, 264.
55 LSF, MS 10, Apr. 1680, 165.
56 Fox to the Quaker Meeting in Danzig, dated Amsterdam, 18 June 1677, quoted in LSF, Hull MSS, 321.
it might be of service to Truth to have that Book Printed in French’.\(^{57}\) The meeting agreed and in due course, Barclay’s book was translated. French copies were taken to all major trading ports along the English coast, some explicitly to be handed to shipmasters who would take them abroad.\(^{58}\) Similarly, when Willem Sewel’s sympathetic history of Quakerism was published in Dutch in 1717 and translated into English in 1722, the London Meeting for Sufferings, which oversaw the production and distribution of translations into English, instructed its members to find out ‘what Trading Cityes Near or Remote friends do know of to place a few for sale’.\(^{59}\)

Occasionally, business relationships also proved helpful to missionaries in trouble with the authorities. When Thomas Rudd was imprisoned in France ‘for giving away abou.[u] 5 books’,\(^{60}\) and ‘for going into their place of worship [a church] with his hat on’ in 1680,\(^{61}\) the Meeting for Sufferings contacted a local English merchant. John Phillips was willing to report on the state of affairs, advance Rudd some money, and pass his correspondence on to a member of the Meeting. After his release, Rudd reported to the Meeting that Phillips had ‘been kind to him’,\(^{62}\) although he was not a Quaker himself.

**Continental Quaker Business Life**

Regarding the business activities of Continental Quaker converts, Dutch and German sources contain little compared with the records left by early modern Quakers in Britain. While British registers of birth, marriage, and death and other records have yielded ample data

57 See minutes of the Morning Meeting, 14 Nov. 1698, LSF, MM 2, 126.
58 See LSF, MS 16, 9 May 1703, 235.
59 See the minutes of the Meeting for Sufferings, 19 June 1720, LSF, MS 23, 69.
60 In the eighteenth century, the Society re-wrote its history in line with the pacifist principles it had by then adopted, contradicting its public image as riotous and enthusiastic. Sewel’s *Histori* was subjected to such modifications. See Erin Bell, ‘Eighteenth-Century Quakerism and the Rehabilitation of James Nayler, Seventeenth-Century Radical’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 59 (2008), 420-46, esp. 441-6.
61 LSF, MS 4, 31 May 1685, 94.
62 Ibid. 4 June 1685, 130.
63 Ibid. 18 July 1685, 137.
on social status and occupational patterns, the only surviving Continental Quaker register is that in Friedrichstadt.63 Most available information therefore comes from correspondences, and from source material external to the Society (for example, notarial records kept in municipal archives). Economically successful Quakers are over-represented in these kinds of sources. Nevertheless, they reveal that, as in Britain, those who joined the Quakers on the Continent were also mostly ‘of the middling sort of people’.64 A number of ‘unruly’ or ‘half-baked’ troublemakers were excluded by missionaries during the early years (especially in Rotterdam),65 but too little is known about them to decide whether this also brought about an improvement in the overall social status of Dutch Quakers. Undoubtedly, however, some Dutch and North German Quakers acquired considerable fortunes.

A number of Dutch Quakers ran their own businesses. In Amsterdam, these included the sisters Geertruyd, Niesje and Annetje Dirricks’s dairy shop, the button-making companies of Pieter Hendricksz Deen and Jan Claus and of Isaack Jacobsz van Buylaert, Jacob Claus’s printing press and bookshop, and two distilleries for essential oils, one run jointly by Eelke Auckes de Vries, Cornelis Jacobsz Kuyper, Dorothea Walthuysen, Grietje Pieters, and Volkje Willems and the other by Jansz de Witt and Duyfje Jans Jongkint. Willem Roosen traded in cereals (leaving a considerable fortune on his death); Michiel Laars with silk. A few Quaker converts lived in nearby Haarlem. Among these, Pieter Leendertsz and his wife were also active in the textile trade.66 In addition to Benjamin Furly, the Rotterdam meeting was attended by the merchant families Welch, Sonnemans, and Hope.67 Other members may not have been quite so well-to-do, but were also successful in business: Jacob Eppens and his wife Catharina van den Ende, Harman Hendricksz van der Pals

63 LSF, MS vol. 123.
64 Kannegieter comes to a similar conclusion in Geschiedenis, 9. For a list of Amsterdam Quaker converts whose occupations are known (based on Kannegieter), see Appendix.
65 Hull, Benjamin Furly, 183–201.
66 For all information on the Amsterdam Quakers, see Kannegieter, Geschiedenis.
67 Hull, Benjamin Furly, 131–6; Kannegieter, Geschiedenis, 285.
and his wife Grietje Hessels Heyns, and Simon Jansz Vettekeuken with his wife Maria Weyts (who left a considerable legacy, including a building used as Quaker meeting house) cooperated in running a vinegar brewery. The smaller Quaker groups in rural areas that were collectively organized in monthly meetings, such as Harlingen Monthly Meeting in Friesland, seem to fit best into the category ‘craftsman-artisan’ within the Dutch context. Those whose occupations are mentioned in the records included the lace maker and book printer Reyner Jansz, the button maker Willem Koenes and (from 1694) his wife Annetje Joosten, who continued to run his business after his death. Another Frisian Quaker, Eelke Aukes de Vries, kept bees (although the records do not clearly state that apiculture was the occupation by which he earned his living), but later moved to Amsterdam, where he became engaged in the oil-distilling business mentioned above.

Little is known about the occupations of Quaker converts in the German lands. They seem to have been considerably less well-off than their Dutch co-religionists. Of the Krefeld Quakers, who emigrated to Pennsylvania in 1683–4, all but one were linen weavers; the occupations of the few Kriegsheim converts remain unknown, and none seem to have been particularly wealthy. The small group in Danzig suffered especially severe persecution, so that its members (all artisans except for Gergen Wunderlich, who had been trained in the medical profession) were frequently inhibited in earning a living, and membership constantly dwindled, until the last Quaker there died in 1721. Most converts in Hamburg, notably members of the Mennonite family Roosen, early migrated to Amsterdam, where they joined the local Quaker meeting. However, one Quaker businessman stayed in Hamburg: Jacob Hagen, one of whose sons (Jacob Junior) immigrated to London, and subsequently cooperated with his father in a transnational business partnership in the stave trade. Of

68 Kannegieter, Geschiedenis, 209.
69 See minutes for the London Yearly Meeting, LSF, YM 1, 9 Apr. 1682, 128–9.
70 See Hubben, Quäker, 61–73.
71 See LSF, Hull MSS, 329.
72 See LSF, MS vol. 123.
73 See Dictionary of Quaker Biography, unpublished loose-leaf collection in LSF. The Hagen family frequently appear in the epistles sent to the London Yearly Meeting. LSF, Epistles Received.
the twelve families forming the small Quaker meeting in the East Frisian town of Emden, most were artisans, except for the medical doctor Johann Wilhelm Haesbaert. Only the Friedrichstadt meeting included a number of wealthy citizens, as indicated in the tax records. They were able to build their own meeting house and owned many buildings in the town’s most favourable locations (in fact, their land-ed property exceeded the average ownership of Friedrichstadt families from other denominations). In 1698, the value of the majority of Quaker-owned houses exceeded 1,000 Marks. Among the Friedrichstadt Quakers were different kinds of weavers, a carder, rope maker, tanner, cobbler, brewer, and one building contractor, while several kept their own shops.

As mentioned above, Dutch Quaker converts frequently engaged in joint ventures, and these are well documented in Amsterdam’s notarial records. Occasionally, but not always, they coincided with family ties, as is the case with both the Quaker oil distilleries. Frequenty, unmarried female relatives worked together running shops, such as Maria and Neeltje van der Werff, Anna Maria and Magdalena Claus, and Annetje, Niesje, and Geertruyd Niesen Dircks (for a while, the latter also cooperated with Pieter Hendricksz in running her shop). Continental Quakers often engaged in business transactions with other Quakers, although by no means exclusively. They even operated internationally in partnerships which included Quaker acquaintances in London, such as the above-mentioned stave mer-

76 See ibid. 75.
77 See the records of the Monthly Meeting, LSF, MS vol. 124, passim.
78 See Appendix.
chants Jacob Hagen and his son, and the Amsterdam button makers Deen and Claus, who sold their product to the textile merchant William Crouch. Dutch Quaker business people borrowed money from each other, and occasionally from their monthly meeting, but also from non-Quakers. Jan Claus repeatedly called on his friend, the Haarlem silk merchant Simon Bevel, who sympathized with the Quakers for a while, but in the end preferred to stay with the Mennonites. Nevertheless, Bevel advanced a large sum towards the setting up of the Assurantie, Commercie en Navigatie Compagnie by one of Claus’s sons, the coffee merchant Jan Willem Claus van Laer. Jan Willem invested heavily in shares and convinced several Dutch Quakers (including Archibald Hope) to do the same, but was ruined during the 1720 stock bubble when he later took over a brewery in Middelburg, his parents once again solicited Bevel’s financial support.

Did persecution on the Continent promote the community’s coherence and stimulate it to develop mechanisms for mutual support and control which benefited Quaker business activities, as in Britain? During their visit in 1677 Fox, Penn, and other missionaries convened the first Continental Yearly Meeting and began to introduce the organizational structure that already existed in England to the Continent. Another Yearly Meeting was set up in Danzig (1683), and Monthly Meetings were established in Hamburg, Friedrichstadt, Harlingen, Rotterdam, and Krefeld. Despite the favourable religious

---

80 Ibid. 69, 73.
81 e.g. Dorothea Walthuysen lent money to several Dutch Quakers (Kannegieter, Geschiedenis, 93); Walthuysen, Hope, and other Quakers lent money to Maria and Neeltje van der Werff (ibid. 150); and Archibald Hope lent money to Herman van der Pals (ibid. 151).
82 Jacob Kuypen borrowed 1,000 guilders from the Amsterdam Monthly Meeting (see Kannegieter, Geschiedenis, 88). The Meeting also sold Dorothea Walthuysen a life annuity worth 300 guilders in 1712 (ibid. 87).
83 Kannegieter, Geschiedenis, 162–76.
84 Ibid. 178.
85 This structure has remained largely the same since it was first set up in the 1670s. Local meetings are grouped in organizational units, the Monthly Meetings, so called because they convene once every month. These refer all important matters to Quarterly Meetings. Each country also has a Yearly Meeting, which is the highest decision-making body.
climate in the Netherlands, mechanisms regulating business activities, which had developed in England under the pressure of persecution, were introduced there also. The correspondence system which connected Quakers in London with the remoter regions of the Kingdom now expanded across the Channel. The names of European correspondents (for example, that of Jan Claus in Amsterdam) entered the same lists as those of English county correspondents, and the Continental Quakers regularly appeared in the records of the London Meeting for Sufferings. British and Continental Quakers began to visit each other’s Yearly Meetings, and the Continental Yearly Meetings sent an annual ‘epistle’ to London, reporting on the well-being of the local communities and on important events in Germany and the Dutch Republic. The records in London only rarely contain instances of oppression in the Netherlands, but in Friesland and the German territories, persecution was rife. As soon as the meeting structure had been transferred to the Continent, therefore, the Monthly Meetings acted in the same way as in England, extending support and sometimes soliciting financial help from London, and the Meeting for Sufferings recorded instances of persecution on the Continent in the same way as those within Britain. Thus in 1692 Nicholas Rust, a cobbler who lived in Danzig, applied to the Meeting for Sufferings because he was no longer able ‘to get his Bread by reason of ye Customes of the Company of y.t Trade there, And an Offer being made to him by some P[er]sons of Note att Dantzick, to Joyn in a New Imploye in Buying and Selling by Commission, and stands in Need of Some Assistance in order thereto’. The meeting approved of Rust’s change in occupation and advanced twenty Pounds ‘towards Settleing him in the said Imploye’. As long as regular meetings existed on the Continent, the Meeting for Sufferings continued to support co-religionists in need of help with their professional training or unable to earn a living. As late as 1727 it recorded a request for contributions towards paying ‘800 florins for the board-

86 LSF, YM 1, 121.
87 See Joseph Besse, *Collection of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers*, 2 vols. (London, 1753), which has separate chapters on Europe and Asia, Hungary and Austria, the German territories, and the Dutch provinces.
88 LSF, MS 8, 20 Mar. 1692, 91.
89 Ibid.
ing of a young lass who is learning a trade—the youngest daughter of Philip de Veer of Friedrickstad’.

Similarly, the Dutch Quakers in several instances assisted co-religionists who had run into financial trouble or lost their jobs in order to help them save their businesses or at least make a living for themselves. Thus when Brught Takes of De Woude in Friesland became unemployed, he was commissioned to make beehives for the Harlingen Quakers, who promised to buy them even ‘at a loss’. Jan Jansen, another member of the Harlingen Monthly Meeting was sent wooden wares that he would be able to sell at a profit; he was carefully instructed to pay the money back as soon as possible. Jansen either received financial support from the Monthly Meeting or acted in a similar function to Eelke Aukes, who had undertaken to market the beehives for Takes on behalf of the Meeting.

But support was not unconditional. Just as in England, members who did not fulfil expectations of sound business practice were subject to disciplinary measures. The Rotterdam banker Henry Hope was found by the General Meeting at Amsterdam to have rashly speculated with borrowed money in 1676. The Meeting duly published a lengthy ‘testimony’, in which it distanced itself from his ‘burdening himself with debts, and encumbering himself with the means of other people without having sufficient opportunity of giving satisfaction to them; giving his word, and not living up to it’. Although Henry was publicly disowned, the Hope family continued to be associated with the Dutch Quakers. Henry’s son Archibald helped to achieve the legalizing of Quaker marriages, and family members later acted as trustees when the Rotterdam meeting house was sold. They also sometimes acted as interpreters for Quaker missionaries.

In 1677 Joannes Clasen of Deinum in Friesland was accused of hav-

90 Quoted in SCL, Hull MSS, box 19, folder 2B, 371.
91 See LSF, Temp MSS 749/2, minutes of the Monthly Meeting, 6 Aug. 1678, 5v., see minutes for 6 Dec. 1682, 15r.–v.
92 Ibid. 10 June 1679, 7r.
93 See ibid. minutes for 8 Nov. 1677, 4v. and 7 Jan. 1679, 6v. (Takes is reported to have delivered thirty-two beehives), 11 Mar. 1679, 6v. (he has made another forty-eight), 8 July 1679, 7r. (all the beehives have been sold, and if Takes is still without employment, he is asked to make more).
94 Translated in Hull, Benjamin Furly, 245–7.
95 See ibid. 251–2. Continuity with later periods is especially clear in the case
ing ‘sunk himself in many debts’, all the while pretending ‘that he did not owe much’, and also ‘through deception’ borrowing money and goods from the Quakers.\textsuperscript{96} Brught Takes, despite the support he had initially received, was disowned for irregular conduct in 1680,\textsuperscript{97} although two of his children fell to the care of Harlingen Monthly Meeting after their parents’ death.\textsuperscript{98} The brandy distiller Jacob Feyt from Danzig, whose family took refuge in Friesland in 1700 was advised by the meeting to find a new occupation, as it did not see any opportunity for employment for him in his old one. But all further assistance was withdrawn as soon as the meeting became aware of his unwillingness to accept ‘any honest Employment of which divers sorts were offered him’.\textsuperscript{99}

Another prominent case, for which, however, no official certificate of disownment exists, is that of Benjamin Furly. Furly was most likely not formally disowned because he had never formally joined the Society, but the reasons for his eventual estrangement from the Society pertain to the question of internal social control. In the 1660s and early 1670s he had taken sides with John Perrot in a controversy that had ended with Perrot’s disownment, but Furly was reconciled with the Quakers through the intervention of several influential members.\textsuperscript{100} Unlike Henry Hope, Furly was extremely successful in his business life. His estrangement was thus not the result of unsound business practices. On the contrary, it was a reaction to the Quakers’ accusation of ‘vanity’ and ‘worldly pomp’.\textsuperscript{101} Even after of the Hope family. See Marten G. Buist, \textit{At Spes Non Fracta: Hope & Co., 1770–1815. Merchant Bankers and Diplomats} (The Hague, 1974).

\textsuperscript{96} SCL, Hull MSS, box 20, TS 300–52, at 330.

\textsuperscript{97} See LSF, Temp MSS 749/2, minutes for 6 July 1680, 11r.–v.

\textsuperscript{98} In 1684 the Meeting considered sending Sjoerdtje Bruchts to Amsterdam in order to find employment for her there; see 7 Oct. 1684, 18v. To judge by her name, she might well have been one of De Woude’s two children who enjoyed Quaker support, but the records of Harlingen Monthly Meeting do not explicitly state this. The minutes later record a complaint made about one Take Brucht, possibly the second child under Quaker care. See ibid. 7 Aug. 1686, 23r.–v. and 2 Oct. 1686, 23v.

\textsuperscript{99} LSF, Epistles Received, 3 Feb. 1701, 338.

\textsuperscript{100} See Hull, \textit{Benjamin Furly}, 16–20.

\textsuperscript{101} See the letter written by Furly to his friend John Locke on 7 and 17 Nov. 1692, printed in Esmond Samuel de Beer (ed.), \textit{The Correspondence of John Locke}, 8 vols. (Oxford, 1978–89), iv. 572–3 (no. 1,562).
this estrangement, however, Furly continued in his key position as a land agent for Pennsylvania, and he was also willing to store and distribute books for the Quakers.\footnote{See Juterczenka, \emph{Gott und die Welt}, 161.} Instances of disciplinary action on the Continent are too few to permit generalizations, but many disownments or admonitions occurred in connection with business.

Regarding control over members’ choice of residence, the same restrictions as in England began to apply as soon as the meeting structure had been set up in the Low Countries and the German territories. Quakers actively seeking the advice of the community are repeatedly mentioned in the records. Thus when three converts living in Emden took refuge from persecution in Delfzijl in 1679, the Friesland Monthly Meeting decided to support them, without, however, encouraging them to stay permanently. It arranged ‘that some yarn be purchased for Harmen Bogarts, with which to knit stockings, so that in his wandering exile he may have as much opportunity as possible to eat his own bread’. At the same time, Bogarts agreed to ‘seek no fixed residence outside of Emden, but rather to betake himself to a suitable lodging in Delfzijl, and watch for some opening for him in Emden’.\footnote{SCL, Hull MSS, box 20, TS 300-52, at 339.} In December 1687 Reyner Jansz presented the Monthly Meeting at Harlingen with his wish to retire as a merchant and move to the countryside, where he hoped to spend more time with his family. He proposed Sneek as a new place of residence, but the Meeting advised him to go to Harlingen instead.\footnote{LSF, Temp MSS 749/2.} Similarly, in 1700 Nicholas Rust decided that despite the support he had received from London, he could not thrive in Danzig, and along with a group of other Quakers (the Feyt family among them) temporarily migrated to the Netherlands.\footnote{For the full story of the Danzig group’s flight and return, see my article ‘Von Amsterdam bis Danzig: Kommunikative Netze der europäischen Quäkermission im 17. und frühen 18. Jahrhundert’, in Claudia Schnurmann and Hartmut Lehmann (eds.), \emph{Atlantic Unterstandings: Essays on European and American History in Honor of Hermann Wellenreuther} (Hamburg, 2006), 139-57.} The Dutch Quakers, who had been informed of the plans beforehand and had consulted with the London Meeting for Sufferings, managed to place two of the refugee families in Harlingen and one in Amsterdam, and they made efforts to find employment for them. After consulting with the Meeting for
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Sufferings, however, the Monthly Meeting persuaded the emigrants to return to Danzig. Since their occupational situation did not significantly improve after their return, they henceforth received regular financial support from London and the Netherlands. The Continental network of meetings even worked to prevent Feyt, who had decided to ignore the advice given, from escaping disciplinary measures. After he and his family had left Harlingen for Königsberg, the Frisian Meeting sent a warning to the only remaining Quaker in Danzig to acquaint him with its decision in case Feyt made any attempt to solicit support from him or the local Mennonites. To members wishing to migrate to Pennsylvania, however, the same Monthly Meeting granted certificates of removal, for example, to the Haarlem cooperator Jan Willems Boekenoogen and Jan Reyers from Harlingen, both prominent members of their local Quaker meetings. In one case, the London Meeting for Sufferings even granted such a certificate for emigration after it had been denied by Amsterdam Monthly Meeting.

In the specific situation of Quaker converts on the Continent, the policy of controlling members’ choice of residence reflects both the wish to protect against scandal, which was likely to aggravate an already precarious situation, and ambitions to establish a stable body of members, even if this restricted their professional scope. Thus to dismiss from the community’s control a member who had previously been subject to disciplinary measures would have been undesirable. Similarly, the loss of one eminent Friend by a local meeting in which he fulfilled a key role could seriously endanger the functioning of that meeting, and since meetings on the Continent were scattered and scarce, it would also affect the Society’s opportunities for further outreach there. Only in the case of Continental Quaker converts intending to migrate to Pennsylvania were such deliberations overruled.

106 Between 1678 and 1706, London Yearly Meeting sent a total of £565 to Danzig. See the records of the Meeting for Sufferings, in LSF, vols. 1–18.
107 See LSF, Epistles Received, 3 Feb. 1701, 338.
108 SCL, Hull MSS, box 19, folder 2E, 282.
109 Kannegieter, Geschiedenis, 246.
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Conclusions

External circumstances, the setting up of internal structures, and Quaker characteristics that developed during the early years brought out the strengths in Quaker networks in the British Isles, otherwise, the Cadburys might have remained humble shopkeepers, and the Quaker movement might never have developed into the Religious Society of Friends. On the other hand, their growing acceptance and economic success heralded an age of ever more tightly knit Quaker networks, yet ironically also a dramatic decline in membership figures. The disownment of members who failed economically increased the network’s homogeneity and the number of successful Quaker business ventures in proportion to overall membership figures. But the more it was perfected by the exclusion of non-members (by way of intermarriage, internal business partnerships, and specifically Quaker institutions of education and training), relying on a small number of ‘strong ties’, the weaker the network as a whole became.

On the Continent as in Britain, commercial and religious activities were often conveniently combined, so that both Quaker business people and missionaries profited from geographic mobility. Moreover, most of the early factors usually held responsible for Quaker business success and internal consolidation (except literacy, for which no representative data is available) were also present in Quaker communities on the Continent: the narrowing down of occupational choice by exclusion from public office and ‘un-Quakerly’ occupations applied equally; the ‘spiritual standards’ of Dutch and German Quaker converts do not seem to have differed from those in Britain; they engaged in joint ventures with each other and lent each other money; and European meetings were integrated into a transnational network of internal support and control as soon as an effective system of Monthly and Yearly Meetings had been established. The latter remained in place for as long as missionaries were active on the Continent, and only collapsed when the missionaries failed to come. In a few places with large and relatively stable communities, such as Amsterdam, elements of this system continued to exist even after the first wave of Quaker missions had ceased. All this helped to nurture business activities in some respects, but also regulated them in others. However, since a decision not to join the Quakers by sympathizers such as Furly or the disownment of members such as Hope did
not end all contact with the community (non-Quakers and disowned members were not in principle barred from attending meetings for worship), these people continued to support the missions—something they were only able to do because of their social status as successful business people and respected citizens.

While Quaker meetings and businesses remained relatively unmolested in the large Dutch cities and in Friedrichstadt, in most places in Germany and in Danzig they were subjected to much greater external pressure and could not survive despite functioning networks. Rather than promoting cohesion and spurring business ambitions, this often led to emigration (from Danzig to the Netherlands and from Krefeld and Kriegsheim to Pennsylvania). Although Quakers were gradually socially more accepted in the Dutch Republic and even welcomed as immigrants to some German territories, Quakerism on the Continent was never consolidated in the early modern era to the extent that it became a lasting presence.

The Continental evidence reveals the limits of the beneficial effects which outward pressure can have on religious minorities like the Quakers. But while the internal cohesion of the British network enabled it temporarily to stabilize, exclusivity eventually also affected its ability to function. Contrary to the idea that the consistent impact of the religious on the commercial sphere was a recipe for success, the evidence presented here suggests that this alone was not enough, and that a certain degree of inclusiveness or compromise with the ‘world’ (which Quakers were still willing to accept during the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries) helps to ensure the proliferation of such networks.
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#### Appendix

Table 7.1A Amsterdam Quaker business people and joint ventures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Joint ventures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aken, Willem van (b. 1689)</td>
<td>tailor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arentsz, Jacob (fl. 1680)</td>
<td>‘coorenfactor’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boekenoogen, Jan Willemsz (†1692)</td>
<td>weaver (velvet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borsum, Jan Jansen van (†c.1681)</td>
<td>goldsmith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buylaert, Isaack Jacobsz van (11672)</td>
<td>button maker, trader (hosiery)</td>
<td>with Geertruyd Niesen Dircks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carton, Jacob (fl. 1680)</td>
<td>shoemaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claus, Anna Maria (c.1689–1746)</td>
<td>trader (printed cotton)</td>
<td>with Magdalena Claus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claus, Jacob (1642–1727)</td>
<td>printer, publisher, bookseller, merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claus, Jan (1641–1729)</td>
<td>button maker, merchant</td>
<td>with Pieter Hendricksz Deen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claus, Jan de Jonge (†1747)</td>
<td>button maker</td>
<td>with Jan Claus and Pieter Hendricksz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claus, Magdalena (c.1683–1733)</td>
<td>trader (printed cotton)</td>
<td>with Anna Maria Claus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocham, Robbert (fl. 1658)</td>
<td>bucket maker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Vos, Arnoldus (1666–1718)</td>
<td>apothecary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deen, Pieter Hendricksz (†1704)</td>
<td>button maker</td>
<td>with Jan Claus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eppens, Jacob van den Dam (†1717)</td>
<td>‘hairkooper’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haesbaert, Immetie (fl. 1726)</td>
<td>maid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricksz, Adriaen, also Adriaen Gerritsz († before 1702)</td>
<td>barber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricksz, Pieter (c.1634–1704)</td>
<td>baker, trader (dairy products), button maker</td>
<td>with Annetje Niesen Dircks, Jan Claus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jans, Geertruy (†1726)</td>
<td>engaged in textile manufacture or trade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jongkint, Duyfje Jans (†1713)</td>
<td>distiller (essential oils)</td>
<td>with Jan Jansz de Witt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Joint ventures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kuyper, Cornelis Jacobsz</strong></td>
<td>merchant, distiller (essential oils)</td>
<td>with Dorothea Walthuysen, Grietje Pieters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laars, Michiel de Jonge</strong></td>
<td>merchant (silk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loosveld, Adriaen</strong></td>
<td>merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Markon, Jan Rochusse</strong></td>
<td>‘sijdegrijnwerker’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mom, Jan</strong></td>
<td>distiller (essential oils)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Niesen, Annetje Dircks</strong></td>
<td>trader (dairy products)</td>
<td>with her sisters Niesje and Geertruyd, later with Pieter Hendricksz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Niesen, Geertruyd Dircks</strong></td>
<td>trader (dairy products, buttons)</td>
<td>with her sisters Niesje and Annetje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Niesen, Niesje Dircks</strong></td>
<td>trader (dairy products, buttons)</td>
<td>with her sisters Annetje and Geertruyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pieters, Grietje</strong></td>
<td>distiller (essential oils)</td>
<td>with Dorothea Walthuysen and Cornelis Jacobsz Kuyper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pietersz, Hendrick</strong></td>
<td>shoemaker, ‘doch hem ernerende met perspapier te maecken, voor de verwers’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roelofs, Cornelis</strong></td>
<td>wholesale trader (hosiery)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roelofs, Pieter</strong></td>
<td>merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roosen (Stockvleet),</strong></td>
<td>merchant (cereals) after death of her husband, Willem Roosen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roosen, Willem</strong></td>
<td>brushmaker, merchant (cereals)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewel, Jacob Willem</strong></td>
<td>surgeon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewel, Willem</strong></td>
<td>schoolmaster, trader (printed cotton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stockvleet, Cornelis</strong></td>
<td>trader (cotton fabric)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stockvleet, Lourens</strong></td>
<td>trader (yarn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telner/Tellenbaer, Jacob</strong></td>
<td>‘grijnwerker’, merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tongeren, Barent van</strong></td>
<td>accountant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triponet, J.F.</strong></td>
<td>jeweller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vries, Eelke Auckes de</strong></td>
<td>distiller (essential oils)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quaker Missionary and Commercial Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Joint ventures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walthuysen, Dorothea (†1714)</td>
<td>distiller (essential oils)</td>
<td>with Cornelis Jacobsz Kuyper and Grietje Pieters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werff (Laars), Maria van der</td>
<td>trader</td>
<td>with Neeltje van der Werff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(†1740)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werff, Jan Roelofs van der</td>
<td>merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1642-97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werff, Jan van der (the</td>
<td>silversmith, merchant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>younger) (1695-1780)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werff, Neeltje van der</td>
<td>trader</td>
<td>with Maria van der Werff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(†1748)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willems, Annetje (†1712)</td>
<td>trader (tea, coffee, haberdashery)</td>
<td>with Cornelis Jacobsz Kuyper, Dorothea Walthuysen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willems, Volkje (1677-1739)</td>
<td>distiller (essential oils)</td>
<td>and Grietje Pieters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witt, Jan Jansz de († before</td>
<td>distiller (essential oils)</td>
<td>with Duyfje Jans Jongkint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Based on Jan Z. Kannegieter, *Geschiedenis van de Vroegere Quakergemeenschap te Amsterdam: 1656 tot Begin Negentiende Eeuw* (Amsterdam, 1971).*
According to Friends, the Quaker movement was unique in the history of the Christian church because it had returned to the authentic gospel path trodden by Christ and his apostles. As proof of its historic mission, Friends recorded much of the sect’s progress and this evidence has proved an invaluable source for historians. Despite the evident hostility encountered by Friends and their own sense of uniqueness, they did not constitute a wholly segregated group in local society. Business meeting etiquette. Meetings come in all shapes and sizes, and are more important than ever in business today. There are everyday office meetings, board meetings, and seminars. Meetings can now be conducted in a plethora of ways: face-to-face, by teleconference, video-conference, or online via the Internet. Do not use exaggerated or indirect communication styles during business meetings with your German counterparts as this will be viewed with suspicion. German business culture has a well-defined and strictly observed hierarchy, with clear responsibilities and distinctions between roles and departments. When close friends greet each other, it is common to kiss both the left and right cheeks. However, this is considered inappropriate in a business setting. Business Meetings Business meetings are seen as a key communication for doing business in the UK. The meetings are planned in advance and the people attending are expected to be well prepared, since the agenda has been distributed beforehand. The agenda is planned carefully in order to be effective and the results are documented in the minutes. Negotiations are rather done by senior manager since the trust their qualifications is higher. Also it is to note, that British approach business manner more in a detached and emotionless way. Men wear dark colored, conservative business suits and women wear a business or a conservative dress. To intern abroad in Europe click here to book your initial interview with our admissions team. Sources: Photo 1. by Verne Ho, CC0 1.0.