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Abstract

The story of the French Prophets has gone down as one of the greatest examples of religious enthusiasm in English religious history. It began in 1706 with the arrival in London of three inspired Camisards from Southern France and ended with the foundation of the Shakers in 1747. These Prophets claimed to be possessed by the Holy Spirit and announced the end of the world and Christ’s Second Coming to the local Huguenot community, but rapidly attracted a majority of English speaking followers. Their ecstatic trances and alleged supernatural powers caused a great controversy over the nature of enthusiasm in the ‘Age of Reason’.

This thesis examines the significance of enthusiasm in the context of the Toleration Act of 1689 through the particular case of the French Prophets. It argues that enthusiasm meant much more than religious fanaticism in the eighteenth century and that it should be viewed in opposition to the Enlightenment. It takes an thematic approach to enthusiasm in order to reflect the multiple impacts the Prophets had on eighteenth-century England, with each chapter addressing the issue from a different perspective. Chapter one retraces their origins from Languedoc and covers the persecution and exodus of the Huguenots after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 and their arrival in England. The second chapter looks at the Camisards’ belief system and how they fitted in the English religious landscape. Chapter three analyses the social composition and organisation of the group, while the fourth chapter concentrates on their communication and the battle of pamphlets they created. The prosecution of radical dissenters in the post-Toleration era is then discussed in chapter five. Lastly, chapter six examines the medical debate on insanity and the growing perception of enthusiasm as an illness.
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Introduction

This thesis is a case study of a millenarian movement known as the ‘French Prophets’, which epitomised religious enthusiasm in eighteenth-century England. Its purpose is to demonstrate the persistence of a vibrant millenarian culture between the Restoration in 1660 and the evangelical revival of the 1730s and thus to make a case for a mystical Enlightenment. While Hillel Schwartz’s chronological study of the French Prophets does not address the significance of enthusiasm in the Age of Reason as such, this thesis discusses the impact of the Toleration Act of 1689 on radical dissent and illustrates changing perceptions of enthusiasm in the early 1700s. Its principal contention is that enthusiasm constituted an epistemological issue which cannot be discussed in purely theological terms. Instead, it will be argued that Enthusiasm raised questions of a much more complex nature and that it had a social, cultural, political and even medical impact alongside its theological implications.

In order to understand what is at stake in studying Enthusiasm in the early modern period, this introduction will first explore the theoretical context in which this phenomenon appeared. It will define enthusiasm in direct opposition to the Enlightenment and review the long tradition of dissenting sects before the French Prophets’ arrival in England. A brief outline of the historiography on the subject will then suggest the need for a fresh approach to the place of religion in the eighteenth century. The final part of this introduction will discuss the sources used and the methodology adopted to conduct this project, and how it contributes to the field of European intellectual history and the knowledge of Christianity in general.
Context and Definitions

The long eighteenth century has often been associated with the Enlightenment, an intellectual golden age that established rationalism as the basis of modern thinking. Proponents of this European movement of natural philosophers and thinkers engaged in the development of sciences and attempted to rationalise faith, tradition and superstitions.\(^1\) For Louis Dupré, ‘thinking became simpler, more rational, and more methodic. Religion and morality continued to be primary concerns, but they became subjected to a critical examination.’\(^2\) While religion thus remained central to eighteenth-century life, it would be too reductive to summarize the Enlightenment as a rationalistic battle against faith, as once suggested by Peter Gay.\(^3\)

Although the Enlightenment has long been regarded as a predominantly French phenomenon culminating in the Revolution of 1789, a few historians have reclaimed it as originally English.\(^4\) The English Enlightenment differed in good part from its French counterpart in that it was not driven by the same deep-rooted anticlericalism. Instead, eighteenth-century England remained in a heterogeneous religious matrix delineated by the Toleration Act of 1689 and saw the rise of nonconformism and deism, whose advocates challenged the grounds and legitimacy

---


of the established Church.\textsuperscript{5} If they imposed Trinitarian Protestantism as the new acceptable face of Christianity in England, many dissenters also played a significant role in the development of sciences and rationalism.\textsuperscript{6} Religion arguably influenced early modern science to a greater extent than vice versa, and both should be regarded as complementary rather than opposites.\textsuperscript{7} In other words, the English Enlightenment did not undermine religion, but rather reshaped it by forcing Churches into reform.\textsuperscript{8}

Several historians have recently argued that the Enlightenment emerged in response to the proliferation of radical sectarianism and enthusiasm in the mid-seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{9} Enthusiasm, as we understand it here, was the eighteenth-century smear word \textit{par excellence}, a far cry from its modern meaning. From the Greek \textit{entheos} meaning ‘inhabited by God’s Spirit’, the word ‘enthusiasm’ appeared in the English language in the late sixteenth century to denigrate the spawn of the Reformation.\textsuperscript{10} Luther’s protest against the Roman Catholic Church in 1517 and his defence of an individual reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular had indirectly


produced an effervescence of radical sects such as the Anabaptists and the Familists, who developed new doctrines based on divine revelation. These enthusiasts claimed to be possessed by the Holy Spirit and defended an intimate relationship with God. The Spirit allegedly infused them with the power to foretell the future –prophecy–, perform miraculous cures –thaumaturgy– and speak in tongues –glossolalia–. Yet the true essence of enthusiasm resided in the body, for these moments of inspiration were generally accompanied by convulsions and a large range of physical manifestations, which Ronald Knox described in terms of ‘ultrasupernaturalism’. Thus, the inspired served as a vehicle for the divine, making enthusiasm both natural and supernatural, corporeal and ethereal, material and spiritual. 

Enthusiasm often developed in a critical political and religious context. The Reformation and subsequent wars of religion confirmed enthusiasts in their millenarianism, that is the belief that the world was in its latter days and that Christ’s Second Coming for his thousand-year reign –the Millennium– was imminent. Likewise, the English Civil War and Interregnum in the mid-seventeenth century offered a haven for enthusiasm, with countless numbers of self-proclaimed visionaries and pseudo-messiahs announcing the end of the world, as well as the emergence of larger movements like the Quakers, the Ranters, the Diggers, the Fifth Monarchists and the Muggletonians.

---


faith to human reason in strong defiance of both secular and clerical authority, a spiritual tradition later perpetuated by the Methodists, the Moravians and the Shakers throughout the eighteenth century. Conversely, both dissenting clergymen and the restored Anglican Church promptly embraced rational theology as a weapon against enthusiasm, then perceived as a threat to political and religious stability and social peace. Although a common derogatory synonym for religious fanaticism in the mouth of most Anglicans, the term ‘enthusiasm’ was also employed more broadly against Paracelsian chemists, experimental philosophers, dissenters, religious divines, astrologers or anyone claiming superior knowledge. The fact that it cannot be decontextualised from its frontal opposition to the Enlightenment also means that the term ‘enthusiasm’ can only apply in its original sense to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Therefore, the historiographical emphasis on the eighteenth century as an Age of Reason has for a long time eclipsed the spiritual reality of that period, which in many ways may equally be described as a mystical Enlightenment. Whether in its stricter or larger sense, enthusiasm remained a highly controversial issue throughout the early modern period, its irrationality representing in Pocock’s own words ‘the Antiself of Enlightenment’.


17 James Sutherland, Background for Queen Anne (London: Methuen, 1939), p. 36.

It is in this context that the arrival of three prophets in London from the Southern French province of Languedoc was to mark a new episode in the history of enthusiasm in the summer of 1706. Durand Fage, Jean Cavalier and the charismatic Elie Marion were Camisards, a group of Calvinist peasant warriors fleeing the persecution instigated by Louis XIV against his Protestant subjects, after two years of a bloody insurrection. The three men immediately delivered apocalyptic predictions in ecstatic trances to the local Huguenot community, but rapidly saw an influx of English followers, most particularly John Lacy, a well-to-do justice of the peace, the Irish baronet and F.R.S. Sir Richard Bulkeley and Nicolas Fatio, a Swiss mathematician, F.R.S. and a close friend of Isaac Newton. Attracting over 400 followers in two years, the group quickly became known as the ‘French Prophets’ in reference to its originators rather than its actual composition.

The support they received from their wealthy followers enabled the Prophets to broadcast their message to Londoners more easily and thus help the group’s expansion. Moreover, the French Prophets differed radically from their predecessors in their unparalleled physicality and absence of doctrine. Their extravagance caused much turmoil in London, which resulted in Marion’s condemnation to the pillory for blasphemy with two of his scribes in November 1707. Yet the group’s defiance showed no limits; Lacy was subsequently predicted to raise his coreligionist Dr. Thomas Emes from the dead on 25th May, 1708, but the miracle failed to occur. The group then proceeded to expel impostors from its ranks and divided into twelve missionary tribes according to the twelve tribes of Israel.

Prophetic expeditions followed across the British Isles and on the continent during the following years, with the most successful missions in Quietist Scotland.
and Pietist Germany. Although dispersed and largely discredited, the French Prophets maintained some activity in England until the 1730s, but their numbers had already decreased sharply. Their movement was absorbed under Quaker and Methodist influences into the foundation of Shakerism by James and Jane Wardley in Manchester in 1747. In 1774, one of their disciples, Ann Lee, emigrated to America with her followers and founded the first Shaker colony in upstate New York. Only a handful of followers remain today at Sabbathday Lake, Maine.¹⁹

As the epitome of enthusiasm in the early eighteenth century, the French Prophets prove particularly important to the religious historian insofar as they bridged a spiritual gap between the Quakers and the Philadelphians on the one hand, and the Methodists and Moravians on the other, and thus reflect the denominational diversity of their time. The group is also significant for the sheer diversity and extravagance of their physical manifestations that reportedly ‘out-quaked the Quakers’.²⁰ These included visions, convulsions, foaming at the mouth, swelling bellies, howling and grunting, to name just a few. Most importantly, the French Prophets had a substantial impact on the society of their time, causing a series of riots, a battle of pamphlets mostly to their disadvantage, and even a debate on the nature of their inspirations. The survival of many of their records, as detailed below, therefore provides a unique insight into the significance of religious enthusiasm in the eighteenth century.

²⁰ Knox, Enthusiasm, p. 356.
Historiography

Despite its undeniable contribution to the advent of rationalism, enthusiasm remains a largely under-explored field, generally addressed in passing, in articles or in book chapters, but rarely the subject for a dedicated study. Even such classic as Keith Thomas’ Religion and the Decline of Magic only dedicated a few pages to the subject. The historiography of Enthusiasm truly began in 1950 with Ronald Knox’s Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion, an indispensable survey spanning from the second to the nineteenth century. Although a superb achievement, his study included medieval sects and early modern movements that proved unrepresentative of the essence of the religious enthusiasm as defined in his introduction. It may further be objected that, as a Roman Catholic priest, Knox inevitably offered a biased view of the Reformation and tended to equate enthusiasm with schism.

Few historians have shown an interest in this field in the past thirty years. David Lovejoy focussed on the implantation of radical movements in the New World and the evangelical revival of the mid-eighteenth century. Michael Heyd’s ‘Be Sober and Reasonable’ delivered an important analysis of the opposition to religious enthusiasm in the wake of the Enlightenment. The impressive collection of essays edited by Klein and La Vopa offers a broader view of enthusiasm throughout Enlightenment Europe, emphasising its dual meaning as a creative force or a disruptive delusion, as well as its semantic variations between England, France and

21 Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic, pp. 132-150.
Germany.\textsuperscript{24} Gary Dickson’s study of medieval saints and crusades falls outside our period but, given the post-Reformation semantic specificities the term ‘enthusiasm’ conveyed, one may wonder whether it is adequately entitled.\textsuperscript{25} Lastly, Jane Shaw has recently addressed the question of miracles and rationalism in an acclaimed monograph and Susan Juster’s \textit{Doomsayers} engagingly explored the prophetic culture of the late eighteenth century in Britain and America.\textsuperscript{26}

In addition to these general surveys, a number of case studies of several dissenting sects of the period are worth mentioning. In 1948, Nils Thune wrote a valuable book on the English followers of Jacob Boehme and the foundation of the Philadelphian Society.\textsuperscript{27} The 1970s marked a period of renewed interest in millenarian movements. Although it does not discuss enthusiasm as such, Christopher Hill’s \textit{The World Turned Upside Down} is a classic study of the radical movements of the English Civil War and Interregnum; and Bernard Capp’s monograph on the Fifth Monarchists remains the first and best account of this movement to this day.\textsuperscript{28} Only a handful of significant accounts of enthusiasm have appeared in the past twenty years. Henry Rack published a comprehensive study of the origins of Methodism in 1989, in which he oxymoronically portrayed John

\textsuperscript{24} Lawrence E. Klein and Anthony J. La Vopa (eds), \textit{Enthusiasm and Enlightenment in Europe, 1650-1850} (San Marino: Huntington Library Press, 1998).

\textsuperscript{25} Gary Dickson, \textit{Religious Enthusiasm in the Medieval West: Revivals, Crusades, Saints} (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).


\textsuperscript{27} Nils Thune, \textit{The Behmenists and the Philadelphians, A Contribution to the Study of English Mysticism in the 17th and 18th Centuries} (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri AB, 1948).

Wesley as a ‘reasonable enthusiast’.\(^{29}\) Phillis Mack’s groundbreaking *Visionary Women* offered a powerful insight into the early Quakers and their female mystics.\(^{30}\) Finally, the Muggletonians have been the subject of two recent studies, one by Juleen Eichinger focussing on their belief system, and another by William Lamont that covers a wider scope of the movement from its beginnings to its last descendants in the twentieth century.\(^{31}\)

The long-forgotten story of the French Prophets has likewise attracted greater interest in the past forty years. For a long time, Paul Vesson and George Ascoli’s articles, respectively published in 1893 and 1916, remained the main sources despite the condescending tone and absence of references of the latter.\(^{32}\) In 1931, Charles Bost annotated the first edition of the memoirs of Abraham Mazel and Elie Marion, a much needed first person account of the war in the Cévennes and the Prophets in London.\(^{33}\) Although Ronald Knox dedicated a chapter to them in 1950, there were no dedicated studies on the Camisards or the French Prophets until the 1970s.\(^{34}\) Then Charles Andrew Domson explored the relationship between millenarianism and

---


natural philosophy through Nicolas Fatio and the French Prophets. Similarly, Philippe Joutard’s *La Légende des Camisards* analysed the mythification of the last Protestant warriors, and Daniel Vidal studied the Cévenol prophetic speech in Languedoc and its extrapolation across Europe. However, Hillel Schwartz offered the best and most comprehensive accounts of the French Prophets in the late 1970s. His first study analysed the virulent opposition to the Prophets in their early years and delivered a particularly interesting reflection on the medical debate surrounding religious enthusiasm. Schwartz’s second book, *The French Prophets: The History of a Millenarian Group in Eighteenth-Century England*, appeared in 1980 and adopted a sociocultural perspective to provide the first full story of their movement. A few years later, Clarke Garrett built upon Schwartz’s work with an anthropological approach to transatlantic enthusiasm, tracing prophetism from the Cévennes to the Shakers in America.

The last ten years have seen a second wave of renewed interest in the French Prophets. In 1999, Jean-Paul Chabrol published a biography of Elie Marion, which unfortunately borrows too much from Schwartz. Daniel Thorburn then attempted

---


an analysis of the battle of pamphlets against the Prophets and their followers, but regrettably his account was historically inaccurate and methodologically questionable;\textsuperscript{41} Georgia Cosmos’s \textit{Huguenot Prophecy and Clandestine Worship} delivers an interesting approach to the broadcasting of the supernatural manifestations of the Cévennes by French writer Maximilien Misson.\textsuperscript{42} Finally, in December 2009 Catherine Randall opened a new perspective by exploring the Huguenot exodus to New England and the influence of the Camisard prophetism on Cotton Mather during the Salem witch trials.\textsuperscript{43} With the recent re-editions of Misson’s \textit{Théâtre sacré des Cévennes}, Lacy’s \textit{General Delusions of Christians}, Marion’s \textit{Mémoires} and \textit{Avertissements prophétiques}, as well as some pamphlets against the French Prophets, historians have thus successfully revived a long forgotten (or ignored) episode in the history of religious enthusiasm.\textsuperscript{44} It seems that the myth of the Camisards prophets is still alive and well.


\textsuperscript{43} Catherine Randall, \textit{From a Far Country: Camisards and Huguenots in the Atlantic World} (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2009).

Sources and Methodology

Each of these studies approaches the French Prophets from a particular angle, often delivering a partial view of their real impact on eighteenth-century England. Likewise, those analysing enthusiasm in purely religious terms often prove unsatisfactory as they do not take into consideration the larger connotations the term conveyed at the time. The Prophets’ defiance of the law and sciences, for example, raises further questions about the nature of enthusiasm, which arguably became not so much a religious issue, but rather an epistemological one. While Schwartz’s chronological approach to the French Prophets leaves little room for such a discussion, this thesis offers instead a thematic approach emphasising the more fundamental issues of millenarianism, censorship, toleration and madness. Looking at the Prophets from these perspectives offers a better understanding of enthusiasm that more accurately reveals its theological, social, cultural, political, legal and medical repercussions in the eighteenth century. It will be argued that enthusiasm constituted a reactionary force against the secularism and rationalism of its time and that it was increasingly perceived as a multifaceted threat by the Prophets’ contemporaries. This fresh and more comprehensive approach spans from the Toleration Act of 1689 to John Lacy’s death in 1730 in order to consider their impact in a wider historical context.

Chapter one traces the footsteps of the French Prophets from their origins in the Cévennes mountains to their arrival in London. It will be seen that the Camisards

45 Beiser, Sovereignty of Reason, p. 193.
belonged to a subculture of the Huguenots in France and were acknowledged as such by their persecutors. Such specificity will prove essential to understand the attitude of the Huguenot community in London towards the three Camisard refugees. Also of interest is the role of Protestant nations such as England and the Netherlands in the uprising in Languedoc after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and their traditional policies towards French refugees on their own land. Lastly, the exile of French Protestants will reveal the existence of a well-connected Huguenot network across Europe, on which the Prophets later relied during their continental missions.

The second chapter explores the French Prophets’ system of beliefs in an attempt to understand the nature of their spiritual appeal. As the first Camisards were rapidly superseded by more enthusiastic English followers, it will be seen, however, that the group possessed no doctrine of its own and that its theological contribution to the English religious landscape was in fact rather limited. This lack of spiritual convergence proved both an advantage and a weakness. It explains how the Prophets were able to appeal to various confessions seeking the establishment of a universal Church, but the group was also plagued by diverging aspirations and internecine rivalries which eventually precipitated it into disbandment. Beyond such doctrinal incoherences, it concludes that the nature of enthusiasm resides in the visible presence of the Holy Spirit in the body and that, contrary to common perceptions, the French Prophets were not a sect, but a religious movement.

Chapter three will then examine the social composition of the French Prophets and their organisation as a group. A reconstruction of the lists of their followers will reveal a great confessional, social and national heterogeneity among their ranks. Like the Philadelphians before them, the Prophets stood out essentially as
a socially respectable group, yet they never appeared to gather around a single, charismatic leader. No explicit rules or hierarchy prevailed during the group’s first few years of existence, thereby allowing anyone to prophesy regardless of their class or gender. Despite the presence of many children and women, it will be argued that the Prophets formed no egalitarian movement and that their lack of structure exposed them to schismatic tendencies that were consistent with the diverging spiritual aspirations of their members.

Chapter four will consider the Prophets’ communication and strong sense of publicity, for the passage from the Cévennes mountains to the streets of London required some adaptation in order to reach new audiences. The presence of wealthy benefactors sympathetic to the Huguenots’ cause enabled the Camisards to access the printed medium, which they could not otherwise have afforded. Such support ensured the successful diffusion of the Prophets’ inspirations to an English speaking audience and almost immediately triggered a battle of pamphlets. Despite a phenomenal production, the publication of books of warnings by the Prophets should not be regarded as a transition from orality to print, but rather as a complementary medium of expression. Although a significant evolution, printed prophecies never replaced the immediacy of the spoken word; the voice remained the principal channel of communication and the remaining part of this chapter will therefore concentrate on the Prophets’ dramatic assemblies, as well as the exportation of the Spirit on their missionary expeditions abroad.

The sensational publicity the French Prophets received shortly after their arrival only came second to the popular protests they caused. By delivering prophetic warnings in public, Marion and his followers spread fear among
Londoners, whose anger soon degenerated into open violence. It is worth considering in this context the role of the law and the secular authorities in ridding society of these foreign enthusiasts. The significance of the Toleration Act of 1689 has often been neglected by historians when surveying dissenting movements of the period; yet the fact that dissenters claimed the protection of the law made the prosecution of fanatics all the more complex. For this reason chapter five proposes to look at the limits of religious toleration in England and the role of the Huguenot community in the prosecution of the Prophets.

Lastly, the presence of the Holy Spirit in an inspired body could be observed through a variety of physical symptoms, making enthusiasm a visible phenomenon. Like the early Quakers, the French Prophets experienced violent convulsions that inevitably gave rise to a medical debate on the nature of these physical manifestations. While clerics and natural philosophers resorted increasingly to a medical terminology to explain enthusiasm rationally during the Restoration, it is only towards the end of the seventeenth century that physicians began to show an interest in the somatisation of prophetism. Chapter six will thus consider to what extent, by the standards of the early eighteenth century, enthusiasm might be medicalised from a perceived social epidemic into an actual bodily disease. The analysis draws upon both English and French medical sources and will explore the complexity of the debate on the body and soul dichotomy to see how Enlightenment physicians endeavoured to reconcile their diagnosis with their faith.

While most recent publications on the French Prophets rely to some extent on Schwartz’s research, this thesis entirely reexamines the archival resources to deliver a fresh interpretation of their impact on eighteenth-century England. Their exile from
France via Switzerland and later missions across the Britain and Europe mean that the primary sources needed to undertake this project are scattered across several countries. The English Short Title Catalogue, the Catalogue Collectif de France and the Swiss catalogue RERO have proven immensely helpful in locating these sources.

The library of the Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français in Paris hosts the largest collection of manuscript and printed sources on the persecution of the Huguenots and the Camisard insurrection in France. My first chapter is largely based on these sources and the French medical treatises located there appear in chapter six. The Fatio manuscripts held at the university library in Geneva provide an indispensable insight into the Prophets’ activities by their most dedicated scribe. This collection includes Fatio’s calendar for the period 1706 to 1710 as well as several lists of the group’s followers, documents that are necessary to recreate the chronology of events during the Prophets’ heyday in London and establish their sociological profile and prosopography in my third chapter.

The majority of the resources used in this thesis are located in London. The library of the Huguenot Society of Great Britain has the largest collection on the history of French Protestantism in England and is therefore the best starting point for our research. Lambeth Palace library possesses printed versions of the Royal Bounty records between 1705 and 1709, which feature in chapter three, some of the Prophets’ earliest publications and a number of manuscripts. However, most of the primary sources printed as part of a battle of pamphlets over the French Prophets are kept at the British Library. These have been extensively used throughout this thesis, but especially in chapters two and four. The English medical pamphlets and treatises used in chapter six are mostly from the same location for the sake of convenience.
The British Library also holds an unexplored military correspondence between the English government and French agents about the Camisards’ rebellion in Languedoc, on which part of my first chapter is based.

Equally important is the court record of Elie Marion’s trial, recently discovered at the National Archives in Kew and which constitutes the central part of my fifth chapter. The Archives also own the wills and testaments of several French Prophets, used in chapter three and in Appendix to assess their wealth and connections. Furthermore, I have had the rare privilege, thanks to Dr. Schwartz, to access the Stack private collection in Somerset, which includes the manuscripts and belongings of their ancestor Charles Portalès, one of the French Prophets’ most active supporter and scribe. Lastly, a few rare manuscripts and printed sources have been located in Scotland, Ireland and the United States, for which digital reproductions have been used.

Overall, this thesis proposes an entirely new approach to enthusiasm through a thematic case study of the archetypal movement that the French Prophets constituted. It aims to demonstrate the wide-ranging significance of enthusiasm beyond its obvious religious dimension. Each chapter therefore addresses the issue from a different perspective, based on an extensive use of primary sources located mostly across Europe. This original approach not only delivers a more comprehensive view of the Prophets as a group, but also offers a powerful insight into eighteenth-century England to reveal the existence of a strong millenarian culture at all levels of society before the evangelical revival of the 1730s.
Chapter 1: From the Camisards to the French Prophets

The story of the French Prophets did not start in London in 1706, but some twenty years earlier in the southern French province of Languedoc. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 was a major turning point in French history, causing the exile of tens of thousands of Huguenots abroad. Far from a local issue, the insurrection that was to take place in Languedoc against this renewed persecution rapidly gained an international dimension thanks to the support of a highly organised Huguenot network across Protestant Europe. The French Prophets’ migration therefore involved many subsidiary political, social, economic and religious questions, questions that are essential to understand the controversy the Prophets later raised in England. This chapter will consequently explore the origins of the French Prophets from their Cévenoles roots to their settlement in England.

***

The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes

In 1661, the twenty-three year-old Louis XIV (1638-1715) took full command of his country which he was to reign for over half a century.¹ The new king was no

diplomat and devoted most of his reign to fighting neighbouring nations. A staunch Catholic, no doubt influenced by cardinal Mazarin, Louis decided to unify his country around a single religion, his own. While his grandfather Henry IV had granted toleration to Calvinists in 1598, Louis presumptuously believed he could achieve a stronger unity by eradicating them: ‘Mon grand-père aimait les Huguenots et ne les craignait pas; mon père ne les aimait point, et les craignait; moi je ne les aime, ni ne les crains.’ Of his twenty million subjects, less than a million were Protestants, mostly concentrated in Normandy and the South, with one quarter of them in Languedoc. Their dispersal and the benefits obtained with the Edict of Nantes had somewhat tamed the Huguenots, who no longer represented a cohesive force by the mid seventeenth century. Despite their loyalty and relative docility, Louis decided to exploit Languedoc fiscally to build an absolutist state and put an end to the province’s autonomy. Such brutal bias intensified tensions between obedient Calvinists and ruling papists, who respectively understood Catholicism as a synonym for tyranny and Protestantism as another word for sedition.

2 ‘My grandfather liked the Huguenots and did not fear them; my father disliked them, and feared them. I do not like them, nor do I fear them.’ (My translation). Voltaire, Le Siècle de Louis XIV (Berlin, 1751, reprinted Livre de poche, 2005), p. 654.

3 Contemporary accounts estimate their number in Languedoc at 200,000, mostly concentrated in North of the province. Nicolas Lamoignon de Basville, Mémoires secrets de Lamoignon de Basville, intendant du Languedoc, pour faire connaître à Louis de Bernage, son successeur, l'esprit de la province et l'art de la gouverner (Montpellier: Bureaux d'abonnement des chroniques de Languedoc, 1877), p. 3a; Voltaire, Le Siècle de Louis XIV, p. 779; Briggs, Early Modern France, pp. 16, 116.


Louis’s persecution of the Huguenots occurred in three stages. From 1661 to 1679, everything that was not explicitly guaranteed by the Edict of Nantes was progressively forbidden, leading to the destruction of 35 temples in Languedoc, where the authorities focused their efforts. From 1679 onwards, decrees were issued further revoking the guarantees that Protestants had obtained in 1598. For example, they could no longer work in the civil service, occupy a position of power, or practice medicine. Mixed courts, composed of an equal number of Catholic and Protestant jurors, were also banned. Children had to convert from the age of seven, which in practice meant that any child found playing in the street or in an open garden could be taken by force to be raised in a Catholic institution at his parents’ expenses, a practice that was far from exceptional.

The Clergy shut up in Convents and Seminaries all their Children of both Sexes, in order to instruct them in their Religion; hoping by that Means, that when the Old People were dead, the Protestant Religion in France would be at an End.

Finally in 1681, the repression became overtly martial with the dragonnades, military expeditions set to crush civil opposition throughout southern France. Dragoons were billeted in Protestant homes, their costs to be covered by the occupied families. Facing death threats, the Huguenots’ conversion followed the dragoons from west to east, from the Béarn area to the safe Protestant town of

---

6 Over 100 edicts and declarations were published in the last 30 years of Louis XIV’s reign. Herbert Lüthy, La Banque protestante en France, de la Révocation de l’Edit de Nantes à la Révolution (Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N, 1959), I (1685-1730), p. 21.


9 Jean Cavalier, Memoirs of the Wars of the Cevennes (Dublin, 1726), p. 9 [BL 488.c.11].

Restrictions multiplied to such an extent that Louis no longer saw any point in protecting a minority now numerically insignificant. On 18th October, 1685, he signed the Edict of Fontainebleau to repeal that of Nantes, ostensibly because so many of his subjects had abjured their ‘so-called reformed religion’ to embrace Catholicism.

The focus of the dragonnades on Languedoc was anything but incidental, for this province occupied a peculiar place in France, both geographically and historically. Under Louis XIV, this area was the largest in the kingdom, considerably larger than it is today: from west to east, it spanned from its Catholic capital Toulouse to the Rhône River and north to south from the Massif Central down to Narbonne, on the Mediterranean coast (see map 1). It consisted of the County of Toulouse and the provinces of Quercy, Rouergue, Gévaudan, Vivarais and Velay. This large territory had for a long time enjoyed a political autonomy and was strategically important, as it offered access to the sea and the Pyrenees to secure French borders from Spain.

---

10 In July 1685, 21,000 Protestants out of the 22,000 who lived in Béarn abjured their religion within a few days. Voltaire, Le Siècle de Louis XIV, p. 779; Garrett, Origins of the Shakers, p. 17; Robin D. Gwynn, Huguenot Heritage: The History and Contribution of Huguenots in Britain (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985), pp. 6, 21-23; Briggs, Early Modern France, p. 16.

11 It was estimated that 90% of the population of the Cévennes belonged to the Reformed Church.

Map 1. An account of the theater of war in France. Being a geographical and historical description of Languedoc in general; and of the Lower Languedoc, the Cevennes, and the Principality of Orange in Particular (London, 1703) [BL 114.k. 31].
Languedoc was also a province of particular historical interest. It was once the homeland of Catharism and had suffered one of the most ruthless crusades in medieval history. This time, a similar but more localised situation was to arise in the Cévennes mountains, north of Montpellier. Although Calvinists, Cévenols were no ordinary Huguenots. For while the latter consisted mostly of artisans, tradesmen and bankers, who often travelled for business and enjoyed an unusually high literacy rate, the former were a much poorer, rural population and lived in a particularly austere environment. This rugged area abounded with forests, caves and remote villages, regularly cut off from the outside world by cold winters and snows between October and March. Consequently, villagers often had two occupations to cope with the seasons; shepherds and peasants in springtime and summertime; and carders and weavers for the rest of the year. They sold their wool down in the valley, in Mende, to be exported to Germany and Italy, although bed-linen and silk were the most important manufactures of the area. Communication with the outside world depended heavily on trade, but both were limited by seasonal conditions. The lack of roads connecting the villages of the Cévennes to the surrounding towns of Montpellier, Nîmes or Mende meant that people simply relied on goat paths and a thorough knowledge of the terrain.

This partly secluded rural population was comparable in many ways to the Cathars; yet the Cévenols were also confronted with a language barrier. Seventeenth-

---


century France remained linguistically divided: French had become the official
language in 1539 under Francis I (1494-1547), but it was only spoken north of the
Loire valley and in the southern towns, whereas rural areas kept their dialects.16
Beside hindering the spread of popular literacy, since books and official records were
published in French, this also meant in practice that the authorities in Montpellier
still experienced difficulties communicating with the Cévenols into the late
seventeenth century, with the mutual mistrust that went along with it.17 Some
craftsmen, travelling merchants or local ruling classes could of course speak French,
but the existence of a double language in the same region also concealed a double
culture.

The success of Catharism in the thirteenth century and the indigenous
peoples’ inclination to experience a more individualistic faith may explain why
Protestantism found an echo in Languedoc after the Reformation. Spreading across
southern France and following the main trading routes from the Swiss border to
Béarn, birthplace of Henry IV, Calvinism was indeed particularly popular among
shepherds and peasants in the Cévennes.18

Like most historians, Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie proves very sceptical of the
connection between medieval Catharism and Calvinism, while Hillel Schwartz and
Clarke Garrett do not establish any at all.19 Yet with Robin Briggs, Ladurie does

16 The name ‘Languedoc’ is the contraction of ‘langue d’oc’ – language of Oc – ‘oc’ being a common
word for ‘yes’ to southern dialects.
History of a Millenarian Group in Eighteenth-Century England* (UCP, 1980), pp. 11-36; Garrett,
*Origins of the Shakers*, p. 23.
acknowledge a surprising number of heresies in Languedoc over those five centuries.\(^{20}\) Moreover, contemporary evidence suggests that seventeenth-century Cévenols claimed direct affiliation with the Cathars and were even regarded as such by their enemies.\(^{21}\) They ought in this respect to be distinguished from mainstream Huguenots, as indeed historians have often failed to acknowledge the existence of a pre-Calvinist subculture within Languedoc. Catholics even coined the nickname ‘Barbets’, after an ugly breed of bristly long-haired dog, the French water-dog, specifically to describe this population of poor, illiterate mountaineers.\(^{22}\) With the Revocation and the growing defiance they displayed, the Barbets then became known as ‘Osards’, ‘the daring’, or more euphemistically ‘Mécontents’, ‘the malcontent’.\(^{23}\) The Catharist obsession with purity, protected for centuries by the altitude, almost certainly affected the Cévenols’ conception of the Calvinist Inner Light. For that reason, they were predestined to become the diehards of the Protestant cause in France – the Camisards – without whom, Frank Puaux estimates, Protestantism could not have survived.\(^{24}\)


\(^{22}\) Cavalier, *Memoirs*, p. 47.


The Birth of the Resistance

Louis XIV’s dragonnades may have succeeded, but his zeal certainly contributed to the embitterment of the Cévenols. Catholic reconverts or ‘nouveaux convertis’ remained deeply angered and humiliated by their forced abjurations. Still, rebellion was not an option, not only because of disproportionate means, but also because Calvinism compelled them to remain loyal to their sovereign.\(^{25}\) The Cévénols opted instead for a daily pacific resistance, taking religious education of their children into their own hands. Women thus reviewed and debunked with their children every evening what priests had taught them at school during the day.\(^{26}\)

My Mother us’d to instruct us in her Religion, and to explain to us the Errors of Popery, which she was very capable of doing, as understanding perfectly well the Holy Scriptures: She would dispute on Matters of Religion with the Missionaries, who came to Preach at our House, and would often confounded them, which occasion’d great Persecutions against her, and cost my Father (who was very timorous, and who went to Mass, to shun the cruel Persecutions) a vast deal of Money. We continued to go to School however, and consequently to Mass: But my Mother’s Instructions ran in my Head, and altho’ very young, I began to have some Distaste for the apish Tricks at Mass.\(^{27}\)

Men also took part in their children’s education and the most able among them began to preach in secret to replace ministers who had converted to Catholicism or fled into exile.\(^{28}\) Nocturnal assemblies mushroomed in the woods and up in the mountains,

\(^{25}\) John Calvin taught that kings and tyrants were chosen by God and therefore that they should not be overthrown. Myriam Yardeni, ‘Le Protestantisme français et le Refuge’, pp. 28-30; Garrett, Origins of the Shakers, p. 16; Jean Cavalier, Memoirs, p. 303.

\(^{26}\) Jean-Paul Chabrol, Elie Marion, le vagabond de Dieu (1678-1715): Prophétisme et millénarisme protestants en Europe à l’aube des Lumières (Aix: Edisud, 1999), p. 35.


\(^{28}\) The number of preachers had risen to forty by January 1686, just three months after the Revocation.
places henceforth referred to as ‘le Désert’. Hundreds of people attended these, calling upon God to protect them and sharing their determination to resist oppression.

From the beginning of 1688, extraordinary events were being reported across Languedoc. Children had become agitated in the neighbouring area of Dauphiné, where fifteen year-old Isabeau Vincent prophesied in her sleep. Vincent urged her visitors to repent and prepare for the deliverance from their persecution due in September of the same year. She also prophesied in French, claiming the Spirit was speaking through her. People were amazed at her physical symptoms and visions, and regarded her youth and ignorance as a sign of purity. Many would travel at their perils from as far as Switzerland and Holland to witness the Spirit speak through her lethargic body. 29 Vincent was soon arrested, but her prophetism had already crossed the Rhone and contaminated Vivarais, north of the Cévennes. Hundreds more young prophets appeared with similar symptoms, most famously with Gabriel Astier, but the phenomenon did not spread beyond Vivarais. 30

---


This mysterious multiplication of inspired children led to many speculations about its cause. While Patrick Cabanel has recently suggested that prophets resorted to prostitutes in order to multiply more quickly, Catholics originally fomented the idea of a ‘prophet factory’ in Dauphiné through the legendary figure of Guillaume du Serre. Although his existence has been discredited by Philippe Joutard, Jean-Baptiste L’Ouvreleul’s account of the old glassmaker is nonetheless of particular interest as it is consistent with the French Prophets’ symptoms later in England. L’Ouvreleul claims that du Serre first fell into a state of ecstasy in 1686 after reading Pierre Jurieu’s *Accomplishment of Prophecies* and received the order to preach. He then recruited local children as apprentices to his furnaces, officially to teach them the catechism. Yet L’Ouvreleul contends that the glassmaker initiated them to prophethood through the physical ordeal of privation and thus had them fast for three to four days a week for a month. Prone to hallucinations and manipulation, he then brainwashed them into memorising selected passages from the Apocalypse, announcing the near liberation of the real Church from the Antichrist and his empire – the Pope and the Catholic Church. L’Ouvreleul also regarded the prophets’ physical symptoms as pure pretence, arguing that du Serre encouraged them to perform spectacular gestures that would elevate them beyond their limited human abilities. Inspired children would then experience violent convulsions and foam at the mouth which, according to the author, they were keen to do since this gave them attention.

---


and authority over their adult audience. \(^{33}\) Although the account was most likely fictitious, Yves Krumenacker’s recent research noted a du Serre family in Lyon and may nevertheless lead historians of French propheticism in new directions. \(^{34}\)

As the nocturnal assemblies grew more frequent and virulent, the authorities deported hundreds of Protestants to Canada and remote islands in 1686. Military and justice *intendant* Nicolas Lamoignon de Basville, the king’s local administrator, was indeed convinced that only the fear of being uprooted could discourage the Malcontent. \(^{35}\) Yet their most established preacher François Vivens, a twenty-six-year-old wool-carder, was already exhorting his followers to take up arms to defend their assemblies. A charismatic figure, Vivens was caught in 1687, but was able to negotiate his departure with Basville, as exile was otherwise punishable by death. \(^{36}\) Upon his return from Holland in July 1689, Vivens and his fellow preachers unsuccessfully attempted to launch another armed uprising and he was eventually killed in 1692.

The topographical specificities of the *Désert* conferred the Cévenols, as has been seen, with a cultural barrier that helped protect their identity. With the number of preachers reaching the thousands, Basville understood that taking control of the terrain meant taming its population. He then gathered an army of forty thousand men

---


36 Vivens left Languedoc with fifty people to take refuge in Holland; twenty-two other followers sailed to Italy, and later reached Switzerland; while a third group was left behind. They were told that Vivens had betrayed them and were eventually deported to the New World. Peyrat, *Histoire des pasteurs du désert*, I, pp. 160-161. Royal decree (Nov. 13th, 1687) [BPF Ms 757/fol. 21].
and spent the following two years building military bases and some twenty-eight connecting roads to reinforce the centralising presence of the absolutist state in the remotest areas.  

Ces montagnes étoient impraticables et rien ne contribuoit tant à rendre ces gens-là mutins et séditieux; en effet, il falloit un fort petit nombre d'hommes pour arrêter une armée entière. Ces travaux ont bien réussi et ont beaucoup facilité tout ce qu'il a fallu faire pour remettre ces peuples dans l'obéissance.

Basville’s campaign helped to pacify the region: his troops were able to stop more clandestine assemblies, and they enforced further restrictions and sanctions. Hundreds of people were caught over the following years, with many women hanged and men sent to the galleys. Yet, despite such cruel repression, the Cévenols remained united and confident, these qualities ensuring one of the longest examples of civil resistance in French history.

---

37 Basville warned his successor that more than half of the population of Nîmes were ‘new Catholics’, or _nouveaux convertis_, and that it represented a serious danger for the stability of the region. _Mémoires secrets_, p. 12a.

38 ‘These mountains were impassable and nothing contributed more to make those people mutinous and seditious. As a matter of fact, a small number of men sufficed to stop a whole army. These roadworks have succeeded and much facilitated everything that needed to be done to submit those peoples back in obedience.’ (My translation) Basville, _Mémoires secrets_, p. 8a. See also Robert Poujol, _Basville: roi solitaire du Languedoc: intendant à Montpellier de 1685 à 1718_ (Montpellier: Presses du Languedoc, 1992), pp. 85-86.

39 They trebled the cost for hosting a dragoon and published the penalties for anyone caught in an assembly: Ministers coming back from exile were to be sentenced to death; men were to be sent to the galleys and women were to have their heads shaved and spend their lives in prison. Cavalier, _Memoirs_, p. 11.

40 Marquis de Guiscard reported that thousands of women prophesied and hundreds were hanged. _TSC_, p. 18 [BPF 8* 3 102/1 Rés].
Languedoc in the Wider European Context

For all its remoteness and apparent isolation, the Cévenole resistance can also be regarded from an international perspective. Indeed, if their determination remained unaltered throughout the last years of the seventeenth century, it was to some extent because the Cévenols hoped for outside relief. Vivens had established contact with foreign forces during his exile before attempting a second armed insurrection upon his return.\(^{41}\) His companion Claude Brousson, ‘an admirable servitor of God’, was very affected by his death in 1692 and began advocating passive resistance instead.\(^{42}\) A lawyer at the parliament of Toulouse, Brousson was a highly educated man and therefore an exceptional figure among the Malcontent. Acting as an itinerant preacher in the Désert, he travelled under the most severe and dangerous conditions to deliver ministerial services to the population. Brousson was also the one who instilled the belief in martyrdom in the Cévennes and likened their plight to the persecution of the Jews in the Bible.\(^{43}\) He believed that God had designated the Cévenols as his elected people through the persecution they endured, but he also had been in touch with foreign agents during his journeys abroad. During the 1690s, he went to Switzerland, Holland and England, where he would preach for hours every day before a different audience and report on the plight of his coreligionists in


\(^{42}\) Cavalier, *Memoirs*, p. 11.

\(^{43}\) Accordingly, the names of many important Camisards (Abraham, Elias, Salomon, Daniel, David, Moses, Isaac…) also bore biblical connotations. Yves Krumenacker likewise calculated that 17.7 per cent of the names of the Huguenots in Lyon came from the Old Testament. *Des Protestants au siècle des Lumières*, p. 125; Chabrol, *Elie Marion*, p. 57.
France. His charisma and international fame made Brousson Languedoc’s main public enemy. He was eventually caught upon his return in 1698 and suffered an exemplary martyr’s death in front of twenty thousand people. According to his executioner, ‘he died a saint, and sealed the truth which he had preached with his heart’s blood.’

The Malcontent had good reasons to hope for their relief, for their rebellion coincided with a favourable political context. Since 1687, Louis had been at war again to impose the Bourbon dynasty over that of the Habsburgs. France was defeating a coalition of several enemy states – the Grand Alliance or League of Augsburg – formed in 1686 by Holy Roman emperor Leopold I (1640-1705) with the German provinces of Bavaria, Saxony and the Palatinate, and later joined by Savoy, Sweden and Spain; but this situation changed in 1688 when Catholic James II of England was overthrown by William of Orange. French domination was now seriously challenged, with the Grand Alliance extended to include Holland, Brandenburg and England.

News of a Protestant coalition and the outbreak of war soon reached the Désert, where political events were read through a millenarian lens. The Cévenols regarded the accession of a Protestant king to the English throne as the accomplishment of Calvinist theologian Pierre Jurieu’s prediction of ‘the irrevocable

---


ruin of the anti-Christian empire of papism'. Therefore, while some historians have mostly regarded the Glorious Revolution as an English domestic event, it certainly also deeply affected some of the remotest parts on the continent. William III, whose family originated from the French principality of Orange bordering Languedoc, was now viewed as the champion of Protestantism and representative government and a potential Saviour to the Huguenots.

For, during the War, we flatter’d ourselves, that some Protestant Powers would interest themselves in our Misfortunes, especially king WILLIAM of a glorious Memory; but this was to expect our Deliverance from Man, instead of expecting it from God, being a Work worthy of Him, and above the Capacity of Man; tho’ he was ever so willing.

The international context of the late seventeenth century resonated well with Brousson’s millenarian teachings: the Pope was the Antichrist, William of Orange the Saviour and England the Promised Land. With such signs and continuing persecution, the contemplation of a massive exodus and the crossing of the Channel took on additional significance. Many Huguenots fled Languedoc at their peril to Switzerland, Holland, Prussia and England, mostly to the benefit of those countries.

---

47 Pierre Jurieu (1637-1712) was a Calvinist theologian who had found refuge in Holland in 1681, where he created a French church. His writings sold well all over Europe, but were smuggled into France. Jurieu claimed that the Catholic Church had evolved away from its original doctrine and strongly encouraged any form of protestant rebellion. He had himself four spies (Saint Martin, Desgranges or 'la Cousture', Henri Francillon and Samuel Pouilloux) serving against France. *Jurieu et l'organisation de son espionage en France (1693-6)* [BPF Ms 871/1]. Jean Cavalier refers to him as 'the excellent Doctor Jurieu'. *Memoirs*, p. 20; Yardeni, ‘Le Protestantisme français et le Refuge’, pp. 33-4; Chabrol, *Elie Marion*, p. 46; Daniel Thorburn’s claim that Jurieu expressed doubts about the Camisards’ divine inspirations is inaccurate and certainly incoherent with his plea and militancy for a foreign expedition to the Cévennes and his explicit support of the French Prophets. ‘Prophetic Peasants and Bourgeois Pamphleteers: The Camisards Represented in Print, 1685-1710’ in David Thorburn, Henry Jenkins, Brad Seawell (eds), *Rethinking Media Change: The Aesthetics of Transition* (MIT Press, 2003), p. 170. Jurieu to the Duke of Marlborough [BL Add. Ms. 61258/fols 171-174]. Schwartz, *French Prophets*, pp. 19-20, 170-172, 258.

48 *Jurieu et l’organisation de son espionage en France (1693-6).*

49 Cavalier, *Memoirs*, pp. 21-2; *Jurieu et l’organisation de son espionage en France (1693-6).*

50 Gwynn, *Huguenot Heritage*, pp. 3-5.
The French commissary general of fortifications, Vauban (1633-1707), reported to the king on the massive exile of some 100,000 Protestants and the ruin of the national industry, as many of those fugitives were craftsmen and merchants.\textsuperscript{51} Despite this massive exodus, most Cévenols stayed in the Désert, being too attached to their land and too poor to travel.

For all their efforts and determination, the Cévenole resistance was gradually tamed at the end of the seventeenth century. The ratification of the treaty of Ryswick in 1697 put an end to the war and completely axed their hopes for freedom. France kept its territorial acquisitions in India and Europe and Louis XIV recognised William III as the king of England who, in return, did not mention Languedoc.\textsuperscript{52} William also regained the principality of Orange as a Protestant territory, but a royal decree expressly forbade French Protestants to go there.\textsuperscript{53} The following year, Brousson was executed in Montpellier and became a martyr to his coreligionists but, after this episode, despair invaded Languedoc and the prophetic culture seems to have almost disappeared.


\textsuperscript{52} With the exception of the Palatinate, which was given to the Holy Roman empire.

\textsuperscript{53} Joutard, La Légende des Camisards, p. 28. Royal decrees (Nov. 23, 1697 and Jan. 13, 1698), repealed in May 1704 [BPF 4* 3 072/fols 82-83, 98].
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European nations resumed fighting in 1702 in the War of the Spanish Succession. Louis XIV sought to impose his grandson Philip of Anjou as the Bourbon heir to the throne of Spain in order to expand his dynasty. He therefore levied his army of dragoons from Languedoc and sent them over the Pyrenees. Meanwhile, Basville, ‘le plus cruel et le plus barbare de tous les tyrans’, was trying to please his king by executing more Protestants in hope of an important ministry. The Cévenols’ resistance was embittered by his inventive cruelty and encouraged by Louis’s military reshuffle, since Catholics, and above all priests, were now far less protected.

Only in 1701 did prophetism actually reach the Cévennes, with an estimated 8,000 prophets in the entire Languedoc. The most successful included Daniel Raoul and Etienne Gout, who kindled their respective dioceses of Uzès and Gévaudan before their executions shortly afterwards. The inspired of the Désert announced the destruction of the Devil’s empire, of the Beast and the False Prophet, evidence that millenarianism predated the beginning of the hostilities. Twenty-four-year-old Abraham Mazel, who was to become the first and last hero of the insurrection, became inspired in October 1701 and experienced violent convulsions when seized by the Spirit. A few months before taking up arms, he had a vision in which he was ordered to chase fat black bulls away from eating cabbages in a garden, which God later revealed to him symbolised priests devouring the true Church. On 22nd July,

54 Petitfils, Louis XIV, pp. 231-248.

55 ‘The most cruel and barbarous of all tyrants’ (My translation). Cavalier, Mémoires, p. 37. See also Voltaire, Le Siècle de Louis XIV, p. 799, note 2.

56 Kingston, Enthusiastic Impostors, I, p. 2; Joutard, La Légende des Camisards, p. 27; Cosmos, Huguenot Prophecy, pp. 43-44; Peyrat, Histoire des pasteurs du désert, I, p. 270.
1702, the Spirit ordered him and his brethren to take up arms and assemble on Mount Bougès. The prophecy was confirmed by four other inspired (Salomon Couderc, Pierre Séguier, Jean Rampon and Jacques Couderc) and all five men held their assembly in front of sixty people on 24th July, to whom the Spirit announced that they would liberate their brethren imprisoned in Pont-de-Montvert.57

The return of archpriest François de Langlade du Chaila to Languedoc in 1702 marked a turning point in the conflict, for his brutality was legendary.58 He was now acting as an inspector to the Cévennes and handed his prisoners to Basville, a collaboration which intensified the climate of terror in the protestant community. Du Chaila had even turned his own cellar into a prison, where he tortured and starved detainees, including children, before condemning them to the galleys or the gallows. On the night of 24th July, Mazel, Couderc, Séguier, Rampon and their men marched to du Chaila’s residence in Pont-de-Montvert in ranks of four. They found him with other clergymen and capuchins of the neighbourhood, and demanded the liberation of their relatives and friends. The altercation degenerated upon his refusal; the rebels locked the house and set it on fire. Du Chaila and some others escaped by the windows, but he was injured in the fall; he was found hiding in the garden by Mazel, Séguier and Nicolas Joani and was killed, his body being stabbed 52 times.59

57 MMM, pp. 3-6.

58 Robert Louis Stevenson later said of him: ‘A missionary in his youth in China, he there suffered martyrdom, was left for dead, and only succoured and brought back to life by the charity of a pariah. We must suppose the pariah devoid of second-sight, and not purposely malicious in this act. Such an experience, it might be thought, would have cured a man of the desire to persecute; but the human spirit is a thing strangely put together; and, having been a Christian martyr, Du Chaila became a Christian persecutor.’ Travels with a Donkey in the Cévennes (1879, reprinted London: Eveleigh Nash & Grayson, 1900), p. 131. For a complete biography, see Robert Poujol, L'abbé du Chaila (1648-1702), bourreau ou martyr?: Du Siam aux Cévennes (Montpellier: Presses du Languedoc, 1986, reprinted 2002).

Du Chaila’s murder was a severe blow to Catholics. It marked both the end of the passive resistance and the beginning of the last war of religion in France. Basville’s authority was now seriously at stake. He relied more than ever on denunciations for financial reward to catch those prophet-warriors, thanks to which he had Séguier burnt alive on 12th August. Basville’s success depended mostly on denunciations, for which he had been offering rewards since 1686. [BPF Ms 757/fol. 13]; MMM, pp. 13-14.

With the harvesting season over, about 1,000 men joined the initial group of sixty young men in the Désert. Two charismatic leaders then emerged: Pierre Laporte or ‘Roland’ (1680-1704), a wool-comber, and ‘Colonel’ Jean Cavalier of Ribaute (1680-1740), a baker’s apprentice. The group split into five smaller units, each corresponding to a county, and each with an elected leader. Under Cavalier’s orders were Elie Marion, Durand Fage and Jean Cavalier of Sauve, who would later become the future French Prophets.

In the course of what became a prophetic war, not all belligerents proved equal. Leaders were in fact elected upon their level of inspiration and thus received divine orders on the conduct of the insurrection. There were four degrees of inspiration in total: l’Avertissement acknowledged the presence of the Spirit, a stage above the ordinary state of prayer; le Souffle marked the general inspiration, when the Spirit would answer prayers; la Prophétie enabled the recipient to make judgements and specific predictions, as with the Camisards’ leaders; the final stage,

---

60 Basville’s success depended mostly on denunciations, for which he had been offering rewards since 1686. [BPF Ms 757/fol. 13]; MMM, pp. 13-14.


62 The five groups were led by Nicolas Joani in la Faux-des-Armes (modern Lozère), Salomon Couderc and Abraham Mazel in the Hautes-Cévennes (between Anduze and the Tarn river), André Castanet in l’Aigoal (western Cévennes), Roland in the Basses-Cévennes (south of the mountains) and Jean Cavalier in Bas-Languedoc (between Alais, Uzès and Nîmes).

63 Jean Cavalier de Sauve should not be confused with the leader. He claimed to be the latter’s cousin, who always denied it.
le Don, was the ability to work miracles and withdraw from earthly matters, to which all aspired.64 This spiritual hierarchy has led Napoléon Peyrat to describe their organisation as a ‘military theocracy’, in which the Spirit, not the soldiers, dictated the strategy to adopt.65

But in the Troop where I served, the Officers, and in particular Mr. Cavalier, were all graced with extraordinary Gifts, and they were constituted such for no other Reason, having otherwise no Knowledge of Military Affairs, or other Thing to recommend them, but all was given them in that way.66

Behind these prominent war heroes were soldiers and less able prophets, who hosted assemblies in the Désert to enlist new volunteers. Women also preached and supported their menfolk: it was claimed that thousands of women received inspirations, for which several hundred were hanged.67 Colonel Cavalier later acknowledged this female contribution to the Camisards in his account of the war: ‘Providence gave such Courage to some of the Women, that as soon as they were engaged, they encouraged the Men, and pursuing the enemy, with Stones in their Hands, were a great Help to me.’68

Yet most of the prophets were in fact children.69 Young prophets held a double function among the Cévenols: they perpetuated the Calvinist oral tradition of


66 Durand Fage’s declaration in Misson, A Cry from the Desart (London, 1707), p. 68 [BL 114.a.59].

67 TSC, p. 18.

68 Cavalier, Memoirs, p. 185.

69 Durand Fage’s declaration in TSC, p. 122; Chabrol, Elie Marion, p. 44; Stevenson, Travels, p. 121.
the Désert to the new generation and also embodied innocence and purity to the older one. Like du Serre’s apprentices, they would often speak in tongues—in French—which conferred them with a degree of authority on their audience:

We obeyed constantly the Inspirations of little Children, and People never so simple, especially when there appear’d a more than usual Earnestness in the Words or Agitations of the Extacy, and when several concurr’d in the same Thing.70

Witnesses were struck by the sheer number of these infant prophets, by their charisma and ability to prophesy in French. In his declaration on the mystical events of the Cévennes, Jean Dubois testified seeing sixty of them while in the Desert, the youngest just fifteen months old.71 While glossolalia was certainly part of the millenarian ethos of the Cévennes, the miraculousness of their speaking in French should however be moderated. The language barrier between the authorities and the mountaineers was not in reality as clear-cut as Robin Briggs suggested.72 Unlike Catholic priests, who preached in the local patois to make themselves understood, Calvinist ministers would preach in French, the language of the Geneva Bible. After the Revocation, Bibles were smuggled back into Languedoc to be read in clandestine assemblies. They played a key part in the education of children who, not being able to read, memorised biblical passages from an early age. The Cévenols were therefore not entirely unfamiliar with the ‘holy tongue’, as evidenced by their chanting of the

70 Misson, *A Cry from the Desart*, p. 68.
71 TSC, p. 32.
72 See page 33.
epic 68th Psalm before attacking their enemies, and by the refugees’ almost seamless communication with other Huguenots abroad.73

By the beginning of 1703, the rebels became known as ‘Camisards’, after the characteristic white smock they wore to identify each other by night, and seemed ubiquitous.74 With the five counties agreeing to provide troops to replace the dead, the rebels adopted a strategy of diffusion, relying upon an excellent communication network to coordinate simultaneous night attacks against the more numerous and well-equipped dragoons. The Camisards adopted a strategy of guerilla warfare, ambushing royal troops in forests and the mountains thanks to their unmatched knowledge of the terrain. They would also hide in caves, which they turned into cellars to store food and ammunition and used the cleanest ones as hospitals, where their two surgeons Chabrier and Tavan treated the wounded.75 Such organisation and efficiency impressed Catholics and it was reported that even dragoons would run away at their encounter. Having downplayed the crisis to Versailles, Basville now had to beg for more troops. In January 1703, Marshall de Montrevel arrived in Languedoc with unprecedentedly large numbers of troops and equipment.76 The Camisards were nevertheless able to secure major successes in the mountains, destroying 30 churches, 140 houses and castles and killing over 100 people.


74 This white smock was called ‘camise’ in the local dialect. L’Ouvreleul, Histoire du fanatisme, p. 313; Cavalier, Memoirs, pp. 157-158.


76 According to Peyrat, Montrevel had been appointed Marshal of France more because of his name than his intelligence. His father had indeed won Franche-Comté for Louis XIV and his name had remained prestigious in Versailles. Histoire des pasteurs du désert, I, pp. 405-6. Cavalier reported that Montrevel arrived in Languedoc with 10,000 men. Memoirs, p. 89.
Overwhelmed, Montrevel evidently thought they numbered at least 20,000, while they were never more than 3,000 in total.  

Mysterious, sporadic ambushes greatly puzzled the authorities, who failed to understand who the real instigators of this guerilla warfare really were. W. Gregory Monahan has recently shown that Basville and many Catholics believed Roland and Cavalier to be noblemen. Roland himself liked to be referred to as ‘Comte Roland’ (Earl Roland), as even Queen Anne knew him, while in fact he was an illiterate wool-comber, barely able to sign his own name. Despite the extensive use of torture and the lack of evidence, the authorities failed to acknowledge that they were facing a wholly popular uprising. The local Protestant nobility remained carefully neutral during the war, caught between an embarrassing peasant prophetism and the fear of being stripped of their estates by the authorities. Camisard survivors would later blame them, as well as converted ministers, for their cowardice. Their pillaging of castles led Catholics and historians to think that the Camisard revolt was fiscally motivated; yet both Frank Puaux and Philippe Joutard insist that this was no ordinary jacquerie, as it was fought for political reasons only. It was in fact Catholics of the neighbouring Rouergue area who rebelled against heavy taxation

77 David Flotard, ‘Memoire a son Altesse Milord Duc de Malborough’ (Dec. 1705) [BL Add. Ms. 61258/fols 100-104]; Tobie Rocayrol, Relation exacte et circonstanciée de la conduite du Colonel Rocayrol, et de ce qu’il a souffert de la part de la France... dans le Languedoc et dans les Sevennes (c.1750), p. 18 [Stack 18b]; Joutard, Les Camisards, p. 177; Schwartz, French Prophets, p. 30.


79 The real man behind the Camisards’ correspondence was Roland’s secretary César Malplach. Rocayrol, Relation exacte, p. 14; Petition of French deserters from Cevennes to Qu. Anne [BL Add. Ms. 61258/fol. 205]; Peyrat, Histoire des pasteurs du désert, I, p. 328-329.

80 Monahan, ‘Between Two Thieves’, pp. 544-545.

and threatened the authorities with joining the Camisards. Significantly, the Camisards did not enrich themselves, for most of the goods they stole were weapons and pewter dishes, which they could melt into bullets.

Violence continued to escalate in the course of 1703. Montrevel was at least as ruthless as Basville: on Palm Sunday, he had a mill set on fire, in which 300 Protestants –mostly women, children and the elderly– were worshipping, killing all. Although he destroyed country mills and ovens to force the Cévenols into the surrounding towns, Montrevel failed to break their support of the Camisards, who indeed responded with similar measures against Catholics. Finally, he announced his depopulation project on 14th September, effective from the 29th, and entrusted Monsieur de Julien with this mission.

C’est ne rien faire que de tuer seulement ceux qui portent les armes; les communautés fournissent aussitôt d’autres combattants; les masses sont toutes gangrenées: il faut donc passer au fil de l’épée tous les protestants des campagnes, et brûler tous leurs villages; ainsi l’insurrection ne pouvant plus se recruter, se nourrir, s’abriter, périra

---

82 Cavalier, Memoirs, pp. 240-241. MMM, p. 73.
84 From 1703, the Camisards were fighting to provide the local population with food as a revenge on Montrevel’s plan to starve them. They often ambushed battalions carrying confiscated food to steal it and give it back to the people. They vowed to kill Montrevel and nicknamed him ‘Marshal Courtevie’ – Marshal Shortlife. They decided to turn his policy against him and therefore paralysed the town of Alais, where Montrevel lived, by burning all of its mills and ovens, and intercepting food supplies along the roads. Consequently, there was no salt delivered in Alais for six months. Cavalier, Memoirs, pp. 215-216.
85 Julien was born in the protestant town of Orange across the Rhone. He fought in Piedmont, but felt badly rewarded by the Duke of Savoy and for that reason decided to serve France and convert to Catholicism. He then became known as a heartless fanatic, which is why Chamillart sent him to Languedoc to exterminate the rebels, while keeping an eye on Basville. Julien showed no remorse in settling scores with the Camisards, his former brothers. Cavalier, Mémoires (ed. By F. Puaux, 1987), p. 85, note 2.
d’elle-même, et sa destruction ne coûtera pas la vie à un seul catholique.\textsuperscript{86}

By 14\textsuperscript{th} December, over 400 villages and hamlets in 32 parishes had been completely burnt down by 8,000 troops and their inhabitants forced to emigrate.\textsuperscript{87} Cavalier vowed in retaliation to exterminate Catholics from the Cévennes and in March 1704, achieved two major victories over the king’s troops in Martignargues and Anduze that provoked consternation in Versailles.\textsuperscript{88} Louis XIV was able to defeat a coalition of powerful nations, but rather embarrassingly, could not crush a rebellion in the heart of his kingdom. After almost three decades of brute force, diplomacy came as the last resort and Montrevel was replaced by Marshall de Villars in May 1704.\textsuperscript{89}

Villars’ memoirs reveal some fascination for Cavalier’s military genius and reportedly compared him to Caesar.\textsuperscript{90} Fearing the imminent arrival of some foreign military support, Villars offered an amnesty to any Camisard willing to surrender. Cavalier responded in a risky decision which seemingly compromised the

\textsuperscript{86} ‘Killing only those under arms is like doing nothing: the communities immediately provide with other fighters. The masses are all contaminated. It is therefore necessary to slay all the Protestants in the countryside and burn all their villages. That way, the insurrection will no longer recruit, feed or shelter. It will die out by itself and its destruction will not cost the life of a single Catholic.’ (My translation) Julien, quoted in Peyrat, \textit{Histoire des pasteurs du désert}, I, p. 377.

\textsuperscript{87} MMM, p. 53; Louvreleul, \textit{The History of the Rise and Downfal of the Camisars: Giving an Account of their False Pretences to Prophecy and Inspiration} (London, 1709), p. 85 [BL 1568/1576]; Abel Boyer, \textit{The History of the Reign of Queen Anne, Digested into Annals. Year the first.} (London, 1703), II, pp. 9-11 [BL 9512.aaa.27].

\textsuperscript{88} Montrevel’s intransigence also meant to send symbolic messages. Whenever possible, he would target the rebels’ families in order to blackmail his opponents. Half of Cavalier’s family was detained in Alais and when his mother died, Montrevel threw her body to the dogs as a public warning. Cavalier, \textit{Memoirs}, pp. 221-225; Peyrat, \textit{Histoire des pasteurs du désert}, I, p. 501.

\textsuperscript{89} Before sending Villars to Languedoc, Louis XIV told him: ‘\textit{Vous me rendrez un service bien important si vous pouvez arrêter une révolte qui peut devenir très dangereuse, surtout dans une conjoncture où, faisant la guerre à toute l’Europe, il est assez embarrassant d’en avoir une dans le coeur du royaume}’ (‘you will do me a very important favour if you can stop a revolt that can become very dangerous, especially in a situation when, waging war against the whole of Europe, it is rather embarrassing to have one in the heart of the kingdom’ (my translation). Villars, \textit{Mémoires du Maréchal de Villars}, in \textit{Collection des mémoires relatifs à l’histoire de France} (Paris: Foucault, 1828), II, p. 139.

\textsuperscript{90} Villars, \textit{Mémoires}, II, p. 149.
Camisards’ unity, but was also lucid and pragmatic: the majority were indeed prepared to die as martyrs for their cause, but Cavalier’s men were also exhausted and were losing hope. Many had been killed, the group was running out of food and ammunition, its hiding nests had been discovered by denunciation and the long-promised foreign support had yet to come. That the Camisards would be defeated sooner or later seemed inevitable to Cavalier, and negotiating a peace settlement appeared as the only way to spare lives.\(^{91}\) He surrendered triumphantly to Villars in May 1704 and signed a treaty in Nîmes that was to grant freedom of worship to the Protestants, at least on paper.\(^{92}\) Yet Louis XIV stubbornly refused to honour Villars’ promises and, despite Cavalier’s conciliatory efforts, many Camisards rejected the treaty and resumed fighting under Roland’s command. The treaty of Nîmes thus ended Roland and Cavalier’s friendship and divided their forces unevenly, with only 100 men following the latter.\(^{93}\) Assured by Tobie Rocayrol, England’s messenger to the Cévennes, that English reinforcements were on their way to Languedoc, Roland continued the war, but was betrayed and executed three months later, on 14\(^{th}\) August, 1704.\(^{94}\)

Cavalier later went to Versailles and met both Chamillart, France’s war minister, and Louis XIV, to whom he justified his resistance by Basville’s cruelty and


\(^{92}\) Cavalier was granted a regiment of 2,000 Protestant soldiers to serve the king under his command in Portugal. He also obtained some relief for his co-religionists and the liberation of galley slaves, but was denied the establishment of Montpellier, Perpignan and Cète as Protestant “safety towns” and the restoration of the original Parliament of Languedoc. A copy of the treaty of Nîmes is available at the British library. ‘Copie de la Capitulation du 11 may 1704’ [BL Add. Ms. 61258/fol. 117]. Cavalier’s copy of the treaty differs in parts. *Memoirs*, pp. 266-274; *MMM*, p. 61, note 1.


refused to convert to Catholicism despite receiving a pension for his surrender.\textsuperscript{95} He left France forever at the age of twenty-four and arrived in Lausanne on 1\textsuperscript{st} September, 1704. With the loss of their leaders, the remaining Camisards were forced to surrender over the following months. Salomon Couderc, Abraham Mazel, Elie Marion and others found temporary refuge in Switzerland in November 1704, but vainly attempted a second insurrection in the Cévennes the following year. Marion surrendered again and fled to Geneva; Couderc was eventually burnt alive in January 1706, while Mazel continued to fight until his capture and execution in 1710.\textsuperscript{96}

Villars’s anticipation of a foreign invasion of Languedoc to support the Camisards was actually well founded. The rebels had been in contact with several Protestant nations, especially England and Holland, thanks to their exiled relatives and friends. The Marquis de Miremont (1656-1732) occupied a central position in the network of connections. As the last Protestant Bourbon, he had migrated to England in 1685 and was appointed lieutenant general of His Majesty’s armies.\textsuperscript{97} His military position and knowledge of French affairs elevated Miremont from 1688 onwards, when he was put in charge of plans for the invasion of Louis XIV’s kingdom. During the war in the Cévennes, Miremont repeatedly urged Queen Anne and the Dutch Grand Pensionary Heinsius to send troops and ammunition to Languedoc and himself raised regiments of refugee Huguenot volunteers in

\textsuperscript{95} Cavalier, \textit{Memoirs}, pp. 300-313. Historians have often denied that this encounter ever happened. According to Voltaire, who had met both Cavalier and Villars, it did, but the king spurned him, \textit{Le Siècle de Louis XIV}, p. 806. However, Chamillart’s correspondance reveals that Cavalier did have a secret interview with the king. Frank Puaux, \textit{Histoire du Protestantisme français} (SHPF, 1910), LIX, pp. 7-19.

\textsuperscript{96} MMM, pp.88-149; Chabrol, \textit{Elie Marion}, pp. 73-82; Joutard, \textit{La Légende des Camisards}, pp. 32-33.

London. Yet his actual powers were limited and the Queen’s halfheartedness to send troops could be sensed as far as Languedoc. Miremont had a good knowledge of the Camisards’ situation and corresponded with Cavalier, thanks to his Swiss-based agent and envoy to the Cévennes David Flotard. Yet despite their efforts and promises, there was no foreign military intervention in Languedoc during the war, but only two unsuccessful naval expeditions in June and September 1703, respectively led by Admirals Almunde and Shovell. On board with the latter was Flotard’s cousin, secretary to Miremont and chief commander of the army, Charles Portalès, who was to become the French Prophets’ first contact and supporter in London.

The dynamism of the Huguenot network was nevertheless plagued by poor communication and personal rivalry. Correspondence was of course slow and sending messengers to the Cévennes was extremely risky. Such miscommunication was responsible for the failure of Admiral Almunde’s naval expedition in 1703, for example, as the Camisards did not meet his men on the coast because they were unaware of the signal. Similarly, as he was waiting for Queen Anne’s orders, Miremont discovered that Cavalier had signed the treaty of Nîmes with the authorities and thus abandoned his plan, while Rocayrol was himself in the Cévennes.

---


99 Cavalier, Memoirs, pp. 171-173. Peyrat argues that Queen Anne secretly supported Louis XIV because he had supported her ancestors the Stuarts when her father was overthrown from the throne of England. Peyrat, Histoire des pasteurs du désert, II, p. 201.

persuading Roland to keep fighting.\textsuperscript{101} The Camisards often received contradictory information from abroad, in part due to the parallel action of the Marquis de Guiscard, former abbot la Bourlie, who was responsible for a disastrous attempt to invade Nice. Guiscard was seeking credit in England after the war and was competing with Miremont to achieve fame as the saviour of French Protestants.\textsuperscript{102} In his correspondence with the Duke of Marlborough, Flotard repeatedly denounced Guiscard’s incompetence, asking the English government to appoint him as the head of the Catholic Malcontent, whilst regarding Miremont as the legitimate defender of the French Protestant cause.\textsuperscript{103}

Miremont’s persistence was not always successful, but the repeated focus he and others put on the Cévennes made the fate of the Camisards a recurrent topic in European Courts.\textsuperscript{104} Efforts to mobilise troops in Protestant nations continued after the end of the Camisard insurrection. In January 1705, Miremont asked the Duke of Marlborough for up to 6,000 men to prepare a new expedition and was granted four regiments by the Queen a year later.\textsuperscript{105} Flotard’s correspondence also points in the meantime to connections with Prince Ragoczy, leader of the Malcontent in Hungary.\textsuperscript{106}

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{102} Antoine Guiscard, \textit{Memoirs of the Marquis de Guiscard. Or, an Account of his Secret Transactions in the Southern Provinces of France} (London, 1705) [BL 1201.f.4]. Marquis de Guiscard, Correspondence with the Duke of Marlborough [Add. Ms. 61257/fols 7-8, 13-14]. Guiscard died at Newgate prison in 1711, after stabbing Robert Harley, Duke of Oxford and Chancellor of the Exchequer. Manley, Delariviere, \textit{A True Narrative of What Pass’d at the Examination of the Marquis de Guiscard, at the Cock-Pit, the 8th of March, 1710/11} (London, 1711) [BL 1416.h.32].

\textsuperscript{103} Letters from Capt. David Flotard [BL Add. Ms. 61258/fols 89-90, 93-94, 100-104, 106-108].

\textsuperscript{104} Memorial to Privy Council (1705) [BL Add. Ms.61122, fol. 109].

\textsuperscript{105} Letters from Lt.-Gen. Armand de Bourbon-Malauze, Marquis de Miremont [BL Add. Ms. 61258, fols 56-59]; Luttrell, \textit{A Brief Historical Relation}, VI, p. 9.

\textsuperscript{106} Most likely Francis Leopold Ragoczy. Letters from Capt. David Flotard [BL Add. Ms. 61258/fols 95-98].
After fighting for England in Piedmont, Cavalier arrived in Holland in 1706 to form a new regiment at Heinsuis’s request to fight in Spain against France. A group of 150 French refugees left Magdeburg in Prussia in March to join his regiment. Miremont and Cavalier were now hoping to cross the Pyrenees and support Mazel in the Cévennes and the former was also counting on the Waldenses to invade France from the east, as French troops had been moved to the Spanish border, thus leaving the Alps unprotected. Yet persistent miscommunication and the initial reluctance of both England and Holland to invade France slowed down their efforts over the following years. Miremont’s devotion to the Cévenole cause never faded and Flotard was still working on an insurrection in Languedoc as late as 1711. Cavalier had similar plans but Miremont’s involvement in these remains unclear. Despite the allies’ invasion plans of an allegedly crumbling state, France remained an air-tight fortress until the end of Louis’ reign that slowly asphyxiated the last Camisards.


108 ‘Raby to Harley’ [TNA SP 90/4/fols 81-92].


110 Cavalier expressed his frustration about communication with the allies, which he felt was also hindered by private interests. Cavalier, Memoirs, pp. 173-174 [BL 488.c.11]; Letters from Cavalier to Queen Anne, Duke of Marlborough and A. Cardonnel [BL Add. Ms. 61258/fols 128-129, 136-137].

111 Letters from Cavalier to Queen Anne, Duke of Marlborough and A. Cardonnel [BL Add. Ms. 61258/fols 106-116].

112 Letters from Cavalier to Queen Anne, Duke of Marlborough and A. Cardonnel [BL Add. Ms. 61258, fols 149-150]; Charvet, Jean Cavalier, p. 20.
Camisards in the Refuge

By the end of the civil war, there were two different types of Camisards. The best prophets were elected at the head of soldier units and praised as heroes, whereas less prominent ones acted as soldiers and troop recruiters in the neighbouring villages. Little is known about Cavalier or Roland’s prophetic abilities, for while Mazel and Marion proudly recalled their inspirations in the Désert, Cavalier carefully avoided the prophetic tradition of the Camisards when writing his Memoirs. Once abroad, he was never visited by the Spirit again. Yet the Camisards' prophetic tradition did not die with their insurrection, although it was the less well-known survivors who were to revive it abroad.

Durand Fage, Jean Cavalier of Sauve and Elie Marion did not arrive together in England, but Marion and Fage had been acquainted since 1705. All three men had in fact little to do with Col. Cavalier and his military achievements and he was later to repudiate them after their arrival in London. Fage was a young silk-weaver with a low profile and little is known of his activities during the rebellion, except that he first carried weapons for the dragoons before deserting to join the Camisards. He also

---

113 Several testimonies confirm that Cavalier received inspirations while in the Cévennes. TSC, pp. 110-115, 117. MMM, pp. 3, 5, 16, 46.

114 'N.B. After I had finish'd this Collection, I learnt that a Person of Note had writ from Holland, that Colonel Cavalier told him, that the Three Camisars, who act the Prophets, were Three great Rogues; likewise, That the said Colonel had certified in Writing, that C[avalie]r, who calls himself his Cousin, is of no Kin to him; That F[age] is a Vagabond; and that M[ario]n gave Occasion to some Complaints against his Conduct in the Cevennes; upon which he was forbid to meddle with any thing, under Pain of Punishment.' An Account of the Lives and Behaviour of the Three French Prophets, lately Come out of the Cevennes and Languedoc (London, 1708), p. II [BPF 8*3087 Rés].
attended a Last Supper celebration in the Désert and gave a precious account of Col. Cavalier’s performance.115

Jean Cavalier of Sauve, who always claimed to be the Colonel’s cousin, attracted suspicion concerning his commitment to the Camisards, as he had been educated by the Jesuits for seven years. He had allegedly been inspired since 1701 and claimed to have been imprisoned in Perpignan until 1704, although other accounts accused him of spying on the Camisards for Basville and of having a dubious relationship with a judge. His actual role during the war is therefore obscure and Marion even claimed not to have heard of him before arriving in London.116

Elie Marion was not the most active fighter and had been a background figure during the insurrection, but he was an accomplished prophet and became the real successor of the Languedocian cause. He was a unique character among the Camisards, as he came from a well-to-do family and had trained in Toulouse as a lawyer’s clerk. His education enabled him to act as an intermediary between the Cévenols and the authorities, and even put him on the front row to negotiate a peace agreement with Villars in September 1704.117

As part of the Huguenot exodus, Marion, Fage and Cavalier initially took refuge in Switzerland. A group of Camisards was receiving some temporary financial relief from England and Holland while in the canton of Vaud, but Geneva soon

115 TSC, pp. 104-125 [BPF 8* 3 102/1 Rés]; An Account of the Lives and Behaviour of the Three French Prophets, p. 8; MMM, p. 120. For more clarity, we shall henceforth refer to him as ‘Colonel Cavalier.’


117 MMM, pp. 43-46, 56, 88-92, 95-100, 125, 133; Chabrol, Elie Marion, pp. 25-82.
turned out to be far from welcoming. The Camisards were preceded by their glorious legends of Roland and Cavalier and people expected accordingly to see imposing war heroes. The reality proved disappointing, as most were instead skinny, uneducated young men, lacking any charisma. A strong sense of incomprehension settled between the Genevan authorities and the Camisard refugees. Marion spoke openly against exiled ministers, whom he accused of cowardice and opportunism, and went to work in Lausanne for a few months. Arrested with a group of 50 Camisards seeking to join Col. Cavalier in Piedmont in November 1705, Fage was evicted from the canton of Bern and left Switzerland after seven months. He intended to join the new regiment that Col. Cavalier was forming in Holland with fellow refugees from Germany, in the hope of return to Languedoc. Cavalier reached Geneva in January 1706 and left after two months via Lausanne for the same purpose. However, Fage claimed that he arrived too late to be enlisted; Cavalier merely pretended to be seasick and Marion remained in Switzerland until July 1706. All three men had obtained certificates of good behaviour in Switzerland to facilitate their prospective journeys, though no mention was made of their prophetic gifts.

---

118 MMM, pp. 143-153; Declarations of Durand Fage and Elie Marion in TSC, pp. 84, 125.

119 Declarations of Fage and Jean Cavalier, TSC, pp. 58-60, 125; MMM, p. 152.

120 Cavalier was denied a certificate in Geneva because of his notorious reputation, but was allegedly delivered one in Lausanne, while Marion and Fage obtained one from both cities and possibly another in Nimegen. Chabrol claims that Marion was issued a third certificate in Nimegen, though Marion does not mention staying there. An anonymous pamphlet also claims that Marion lived in Nimegen for 11 months, but this is inconsistent with the rest of the narrative. An Account of the Lives and Behaviours of the Three French Prophets, pp. 25, 35-36; Chabrol, Elie Marion, p. 229, note 283; TSC, p. 125. Marion’s original certificate in Lausanne is kept in the Stack collection [Stack 12g/No. 37] and was reproduced in MMM, pp. 200-201.
Durand Fage arrived in London in June 1706, and joined the flourishing textile industry of Spitalfields as a weaver. At only twenty-five years old, he became the first Camisard to prophesy in England, even though he had not been inspired for several months.121 It is not clear why he began to prophesy on his own, considering that he had never been prominent, although he may have anticipated the arrival of Cavalier and Marion. Fage probably had connections in London, through which he met two compatriots, Jean Daudé, a lawyer from Nîmes, and Charles Portalès, Miremont’s secretary, as well as the Swiss mathematician Nicolas Fatio de Duilliers, who later embraced the group as their third scribe.122 Their Languedocian and Huguenot roots prevailed over social differences with Fage, and they began minuting his inspirations and thus put their education at the service of the Cèvenole oral prophetic tradition. Fage’s assemblies attracted only a few fellow refugees or acquaintances nostalgic of the Désert initially and remained largely unnoticed.123

121 An Account of the Lives and Behaviour of the Three French Prophets, pp. 38-9 [BPF 8* 3 087 Rés].

122 French refugees knew exactly where they were going and how to find hospitality in their exile. Hans Bots, ‘Le Refuge dans les Provinces-Unies’, in Bristiel and Bernat (eds), La Diaspora des Huguenots, p. 64. It is possible that Fage came in touch with Portalès through David Flotard. He had also visited the Hubers in Lyon, a family of powerful bankers (also established in Geneva) related to Fatio, who connected several refugees. They were also at that time in contact with Cavalier’s cousin Jean Allut, probably already in London, and his brother in Lyon. Krumenacker, Des Protestants au siècle des Lumières, p. 117. Although he recorded Fage’s arrival in June, Fatio most likely came in contact with the Camisards in July, as this is the only entry in his calendar without a specific day given and there are also indications that that some events were added retrospectively. He was also teaching mathematics in Spitalfields around that time. Fatio’s calendar, June 1706 [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 1r]. Domson, Charles Andrew, ‘Nicolas Fatio de Duillier and the Prophets of London: An Essay in the Historical Interaction of Natural Philosophy and Millennial Belief in the Age of Newton’, Ph.D. thesis, Yale University, 1972, p. 83. The Portalès were a family of merchants based in Neufchatel. Charles Portalès stayed in Languedoc after abjuring in 1685, but sent his two sons, Charles and Jacques, to Switzerland and became a banker for fugitive Protestants. Lüthy, La Banque protestante, p. 29; Schwartz, The French Prophets, pp. 24-6, note 33.

123 François-Maximilien Misson reported in late April 1707 that the French Prophets had been the subject of a controversy for seven to eight months. This coincides with Marion’s arrival in September 1706 and suggests that earlier events were relatively unnoticed. TSC, p. i.
Two months later, Jean Cavalier of Sauve arrived from Holland and settled in Soho at the house of his cousin, the cabinet-maker Jean Allut.\textsuperscript{124} His arrival seems to have created some tensions, as shortly beforehand Fage had allegedly warned Portalès that Cavalier had led a scandalous life and betrayed the Camisards. Conversely, Cavalier declared Fage ‘a rogue’ and their mutual dislike triggered a prophetic competition over who was the legitimate heir of the Camisards.\textsuperscript{125} In this, ‘C[avalier] voulut faire voir que son Esprit étoit plus habile que celui de F[age]’, with more acrobatic inspirations and violent convulsions that rapidly eclipsed his rival and attracted an increasing number of people.\textsuperscript{126} Fage nevertheless continued to prophesy, as they shared benefactors and connections. The Presbyterian minister Thomas Cotton began hosting assemblies on 15\textsuperscript{th} August and with Allut simultaneously opening his house to the public near the French church of the Greeks, the Prophets began to attract more interesting guests.\textsuperscript{127}

In Switzerland, Marion had received an inspiration on 22\textsuperscript{nd} July, ordering him to go to England, just a few days before the Geneva consistory evicted Camisards refugees. When he reached Holland, guided by David Flotard, they received a letter

\textsuperscript{124} Chabrol’s assertion that there were four original prophets emigrating to England, including Jean Allut, is inaccurate. Many sources only point at three original prophets, as Allut did not become inspired until April 1707 and become prominent until 1708. There is also evidence that Allut arrived in England before Cavalier. \textit{Elie Marion}, pp. 97-99; \textit{An Account of the Lives and Behaviour of the Three French Prophets}; MMM, p. 157; Schwartz, \textit{French Prophets}, p. 72; Another account mistakenly states that Allut was a pseudonym for Marion. John McClintock and James Strong, \textit{Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature} (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1867), 1, p. 168.

\textsuperscript{125} \textit{An Account of the Lives and Behaviour of the Three French Prophets}, pp. 4-6, 21, 25-27; \textit{Troisième lettre d’un particulier à Monsieur Misson}, pp. 3-4; \textit{Nouveaux mémoires pour servir à l’histoire des trois Camisars}, p. 22.

\textsuperscript{126} ‘C[avalier] wanted to show that his Spirit was defter than that of F[age]’, ‘Déclaration de Mademoiselle N.N.’ in \textit{Nouveaux Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire des Trois Camisars}, p. 29. ‘Preciz du Discours de Mr. Durand Fage d’Aubaye, prononcé sous l’Opération de l’Esprit, à Londres le 30 Aoust 1706, A 8 ou 9 Heures du matin’ [LPL MS 932/10]; ‘Preciz du Discours de Mr. Durand Fage d’Aubaye, prononcé sous l’Opération de l’Esprit, A Londres, le 3e 7bre 1706; à 8 ou 9 heures du matin’, pp. 9-10 [LPL MS 934/52].

\textsuperscript{127} Fatio’s calendar, June to Aug. 30, 1706 [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol.1’]. MMM, p. 157.
from Portalès announcing that two other prophets were already in London. Marion joined his coreligionists on 16th September, 1706, and immediately settled the Fage/Cavalier rivalry by taking over as the main prophet. His greater age and education secured his authority within the group, which he was able to unify. Thus, by the end of the summer, the three prophets, their three scribes and Allut had formed the original nucleus of what would soon be known as ‘the French Prophets’.128

***

The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 was undoubtedly Louis XIV’s biggest political mistake, causing the exodus of some 200,000 of his loyal and relatively prosperous Huguenots subjects over twenty years. Of these, 25,000 settled in Switzerland, 30,000 in Germany (4/5 of these in Brandenburg), 60,000 in the Dutch republic, 50,000 in England, 10,000 in Ireland, 2,000 in Denmark and northeast Europe and 10,000 in the New World.129 This extraordinary confluence towards the Refuge reflected a network of solidary connections: travelling was both very costly and dangerous and therefore had to be planned well in advance. Those who could afford it would send their children or young adults abroad for business purposes, as well as to learn languages and receive education in the Protestant religion. Unsurprisingly, the efforts split families made to maintain connections over several countries later produced further migrations, as people sought to reunite.130

130 Krumenacker, Des Protestants au siècle des Lumières, p. 92; Gwynn, Huguenot Heritage, p. 27; Lüthy, La Banque protestante, p. 27.
The departure of the Camisard survivors thus occurred surreptitiously within the last wave of a larger exodus of a relatively cosmopolitan Huguenot community towards Protestant refuges across Europe. The Cévenols belonged, however, to a distinct Calvinist subculture shaped over centuries by its geographical isolation and partial cultural insulation. Notwithstanding modern historians’ views on the origins of Protestantism in this area, the Cévenols regarded themselves and were acknowledged as the proud heirs of the Cathars. More than a temple, the Désert was a haven for divine manifestations, a place where young, innocent children fell in agitations, spoke in tongues and delivered millenarian predictions, very much to the embarrassment of the Huguenot nobility and community at large.

The Camisards were therefore the armed defendants of the oral prophetic tradition of the Cévennes and resisted, as Alan C. Clifford points out, on Vivens’s principles rather than Brousson’s. Yet, as their most prominent leaders were killed during the war, only rebels of lesser fame and prophetic abilities reached the Refuge to start a new life. Fage, Cavalier and Marion experienced the presence of the Spirit separately and only met after the end of the war, but claimed that the Spirit guided them from the mountains of the Désert to the streets of London to revive the support of their fellow refugees and free their land from persecution. Despite cultural barriers, social cleavages and much hostility, these three French Prophets would follow their divine mission and sought to ensure the survival of the Spirit behind the last French war of religion.

Chapter 2: Biblical Prophecy Resurrected

Upon their arrival in London, Fage, Cavalier and Marion began prophesying in front of a small audience of Huguenot refugees and sympathisers of the French Protestant cause. The Prophets were essentially calling for immediate repentance before the final Judgement and announcing the imminence of the Lord’s Second Coming, or Parousia, and the subsequent fall of the Antichrist. London, however, was not the Désert and the transposition of their Cévenol prophetism into an English cosmopolitan refuge would naturally yield different reactions. England already had a long tradition of religious dissent by the turn of the eighteenth century and the Toleration Act of 1689 secured religious freedoms that were unimaginable in France. The young Voltaire accordingly described England as ‘the country of sects’ during his exile in London in the late 1720s.1 Historians should not, however, consider England as a culturally isolated island when studying enthusiasm, for these religious groups stemmed for the most part from the radical Reformation on the continent.2

With new sects appearing virtually every year during the English Civil War and Interregnum (1642-1660), competition for spiritual legitimacy was fierce. Each of these sects sought to impose its own set of beliefs and practices by systematically condemning its rivals and predecessors as rogues and impostors, even though new sects were invariably compared to the previous ones.3 Half a century later and despite a decrease of new dissenting movements during the Restoration, the French

---


Prophets were no exception to this rule. On 7th January, 1707, Marion prophesied: 'The abominable Sects shall be destroy’d. I will purge out Iniquity: I will abolish their superstitious Ceremonies: I will rend the Vail [sic] that covers them – that wraps them up in their own Ignorance.'\(^4\) Thus, the French Prophets’ attempt to reunite the numerous denominations of their time in anticipation of the Millennium raises questions over the nature and resurgence of religious enthusiasm in post-Toleration England.

This chapter proposes to examine the French Prophets’ enthusiasm in three steps. It will first review previous millenarian movements in order to understand the Camisards’ theological contribution to the religious landscape of their refuge. It will then consider the Prophets’ beliefs and discuss key doctrinal issues that divided them and their contemporaries. Lastly, it will examine the Prophets’ relationship with the supernatural, through their mystical experiences and pretended miracles, as the quintessence of religious enthusiasm. It will be argued that the French Prophets distinguished themselves from their predecessors by their deliberate absence of doctrine, as well as by the form and content of their divine inspirations and ecstatic trances. Given the group’s extraordinary heterogeneity and subsequent ramifications in Scotland and on the continent, this chapter will concentrate predominantly on their London debut until 1715. Overall, the chapter seeks to define the significance of the French Prophets’ enthusiasm and its controversial appeal to eighteenth-century millenarians.

\[\text{***}\]

\(^4\) Elie Marion, *Prophetical warnings of Elias Marion* (London, 1707), pp. 110-111 [BL 852.f.18].
The Country of Sects

Religious enthusiasm in its strictest sense appeared in the sixteenth century as an indirect consequence of the Reformation. The translation of the Bible into the vernacular helped to disseminate the Scriptures to a wider audience and gave rise to new millenarian doctrines from the increased visibility of the books of Daniel and Revelation. Hillel Schwartz distinguishes here between pre-millenarians, who believed the Second Coming would precede Christ’s thousand-year reign, and post-millenarians, who expected his return at the end of his reign. Having unmasked the Pope as the Antichrist, Protestants henceforth believed that the world was in its latter days. Vain attempts were made to calculate the year of the millennium according to political events and international circumstances, but by the seventeenth century some saw indication in the numerological symbolism of 1666 (666 being the number of the Beast) that it was yet to begin.

Among the earliest sects to appear after the Reformation were the Anabaptists, literally the ‘re-baptisers’, who rejected infant baptism in favour of that for believing adults and sought to recreate the congregations of the early New Testament. Their movement began in Germany in the 1520s, but rapidly spread across northern Europe and reached England by the mid sixteenth century, where

---


they first found sympathy among the former Lollard communities. \(^8\) The Established Church’s hesitant progression toward Protestantism gave much dissatisfaction to the Puritans until the first half of the seventeenth century. The outburst of the Civil War created even more religious instability and new radical sects appeared throughout that period. Most notorious of these were the Levellers, Diggers and Fifth-Monarchists, who also applied their interpretations of the Scriptures to the secular world in an effort to bring more social justice in preparation for the rule of the Saints. \(^9\) Yet it was the Ranters and early Quakers who best epitomised religious enthusiasm in seventeenth-century England. Although bitter rivals, the two originally shared a similar belief in a personal relationship with God, which eventually led them in opposite directions. The Ranters’ ‘indwelling Spirit’ allegedly freed them from sin, for which they were accused of antinomianism and portrayed as religious libertines; by contrast, the Quakers refused to take oath and pay tithes on the basis of their ‘Inner Light’ and progressively grew into an austere faction contemptuous of the material world. \(^10\)

Millenarianism nevertheless formed an integral part of Christian eschatology and was by no means specific to dissenters. Even Anglicans expected the fall of the Antichrist to follow the Civil War. This vision was not necessarily confined to England, however, for Puritans expected biblical prophecies to be fulfilled all over Europe, relating, like the Camisards later on, the international balance of powers to

---


Scriptural allegories. A widely shared belief, millenarianism only became equated with enthusiasm and radical dissent in the 1650s. The Church of England continued to believe that the Parousia and fall of Rome were approaching throughout the seventeenth century, but progressively shifted its theological focus away from prophecy and eschatology to offer a more rational Christianity.

Most of these radical factions disappeared with the Restoration, but some had nevertheless successfully established a sufficiently large base to survive the Interregnum. The Restoration of the Church of England in 1660 resulted in the persecution of those known as ‘nonconformists’ to re-establish its authority mainly over Quakers, Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians and Independents. But in such a deeply divided religious landscape, Latitudinarians called for a broader, more united Church in response to the rise of atheism and above all fears of Catholicism. The Toleration Act of 1689, discussed in greater length in chapter five, thus granted Trinitarian Protestants the right to worship in public and appeased as a result tensions between Anglicans and non-conformists, while further marginalising religious radicalism.

---


Although a lesser concern for a while, a number of visionaries, mystics and pseudo-messiahs continued to announce the Parousia and predict the beginning of the millennium. The life of the Jewish prophet Sabbatai Zevi attracted much interest in England from 1669 to the early 1700s;\textsuperscript{15} Jesus had allegedly appeared to Barbara Cadell in London in 1694;\textsuperscript{16} Rev. John Mason believed the millennium was to begin the same year;\textsuperscript{17} and the Origenist Thomas Moore, who pretended to be the prophet Elijah, was tried for blasphemy in 1699.\textsuperscript{18} By the turn of the century, the Philadelphian Society for the Advancement of Divine Philosophy and its international network sought to deliver a message of ‘Universal Love’ and to reunite Christian denominations into peace before the Second Coming. The Philadelphians did not regard themselves as a separate church, but as a religious society within the Church of England. They developed directly from the theosophy of the German mystic Jacob Boehme, promoted in England by Dr. John Pordage since the early 1650s. After the death of their leader Jane Leade in 1704, the Philadelphians fell apart, but some of their most prominent figures remained firm in their belief in an imminent millennium and thus became some of the French Prophets’ earliest and most ardent supporters.\textsuperscript{19}


\textsuperscript{18} Samuel Keimer, \textit{A Search After Religion, among the many Modern Pretenders to it} (London, 1718), p. 19 [BL 4152.aa.56(1)].

Lastly, it should be underlined that eschatology remained a subject of fascination in the highest spheres of the Church of England. Latitudinarian theologians such as Henry Hammond and Edward Stillingfleet regarded the Scriptures as accurate history.\textsuperscript{20} Margaret Jacob pointed out that Anglican divines such as William Lloyd and Thomas Tenison, respectively bishop of Worcester and archbishop of Canterbury, regarded the war against France as the accomplishment of scriptural prophecies, as did William Whiston and Edward Fowler, two outspoken critics of the Prophets.\textsuperscript{21} Whiston, who succeeded Newton in Cambridge, even calculated the millennium to begin in 1716 and then within twenty years from 1746.\textsuperscript{22} Behind the appearances of a rationalised theology, millenarianism remained central to eighteenth-century Christianity and thus provided a fertile ground for the revival of enthusiasm.


\textsuperscript{22} Although he had initially shown an interest in the Prophets, he publicly rejected them in 1713 after hosting a conference with them at his house and deemed them to be animated by evil spirits. Whiston, \textit{The Literal Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies: Being a Full Answer to a Late Discourse, of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion} (London, 1724) [UEA B2921 WHI]; \textit{A Warning Concerning the French Prophets: Being Advice for Those that Go after Them, to Take Heed Lest They Fall into Fits, as They Do and Others Have Done, by Often Seeing and Continuing among Them} (London, 1707), p. 2 [LPL H7593 1.02]; Lucia Dacome, ‘Resurrecting by Numbers in Eighteenth-Century England’, \textit{Past and Present}, 193 (2006), p. 84. Stephen D. Snobelen, ‘Whiston, William (1667–1752)’, \textit{DNB}, article 29217.
Belief System

In the context of such a long millenarian tradition, the appeal of the French Prophets did not so much reside in their ability to introduce a new eschatology, but in their combination of all the doctrinal ingredients of their predecessors. Hillel Schwartz has argued that Christianity can be divided into four millenarian ethos, each offering a different answer to the problems of personal autonomy and social cohesion that every religious group must face within a coherent, yet not too restricted symbolic system. Accordingly, the ethos of Judgement stresses the importance of a virtuous social cohesion before God’s final judgement; inversely, the Pentecostal ethos emphasises an individual relation with God through inward spiritual gifts. The ethos of cataclysm is concerned with the precariousness of the material world and the search for personal redemption on the model of the apostolic church. By contrast, the communal ethos of the New Jerusalem seeks to establish a universal church in preparation for the millennium, in which one’s redemption depends upon that of the entire community.23 No millenarian group fits neatly into a single category of this complex Christian universe, although Schwartz contends that ‘most millenarians conflate the restorative and retributive’.24 Likewise, the French Prophets cannot be classified into a single ethos, for the Camisards’ appeal to Londoners turned them into a bilingual and denominationally diverse group, whose millenarian aspirations would ultimately clash. It is consequently impossible to refer to the French Prophets as a doctrinally homogenous movement.

23 Schwartz, French Prophets, pp. 3-6.

Perceptions of the millennium varied considerably according to the politico-religious environment to which one belonged. Herbert Lüthy has argued that the Huguenot diaspora instilled the ethos of the New Israel among Protestant exiles, whose collective works subsequently contributed to their prosperity and the establishment of a Protestant banking network across Europe. While this may be true of Huguenot refugees in a tolerant land, it certainly does not apply to the original Prophets. The Camisards were essentially religious warriors animated by an ethos of cataclysm and were accordingly prepared to die as martyrs for their faith. They had preached in the Désert the tenets of the Apocalypse, interpreted the political balance of powers in the light of Jurieu’s *Accomplishment of Prophecies* and compared their own fate to that of the Jews long before the war in the Cévennes and their subsequent exile. Once in England, Fage and Cavalier delivered sporadic millenarian inspirations announcing the fall of the Beast, but Marion was visited daily by the Spirit with increasingly warlike announcements, thereby supporting Yves Krumenacker’s claim that he originally intended to raise an army of local refugees to return to the Cévennes. On 18<sup>th</sup> September 1706, Marion thus prophesied: ‘Prepare thy self to depart within a short time out of this Country, and go to thy Brethren, to fight there more than ever.’ Judging from the small number of followers at the end of 1706, Marion’s bellicose exhortations did not resonate well with exiled Huguenots. Daniel Vidal summarised the Cévenol prophetic spirit as a cry of protest

---


against an oppressive force, yet this anger became largely irrelevant to new audiences when transposed into a land of tolerance and it presented those who vocalised it as being out of place and out of date.\textsuperscript{29} The survival of the Spirit thus depended upon its renewability and self-transcendence into a more receivable millenarianism.

It is only then that the Camisards embraced the utopian ethos of a New Israel. As they began to appeal to a wider audience, the Camisards announced the imminent foundation of the true and universal Church based on the reconciliation of Christians and Jews. On 29\textsuperscript{th} December, 1706, Marion prophesied:

\begin{quote}
I will, in a little time, open the Eyes of the Jewish Nation: They shall be the first I will call to the Knowledge of me: Their Captivity shall not be long: I come to break their Chains. I remember, I tell thee, the Covenant, which I have made with their Fathers; I come to renew it, my Child: I come to take away the Vail, that is before their Eyes, and to bring them into my Church. They have separated themselves from it; but I come out of Pity to gather them again, and join them (to it.)\textsuperscript{30}
\end{quote}

The participation and growing support of Richard Bulkeley and John Lacy over the winter of 1706/1707 brought an influx of English supporters from the summer of 1707, as the Spirit addressed them in their native tongue.\textsuperscript{31} Although French and English Prophets, and the various denominations among the latter, never merged into a homogeneous cult, they were each also largely driven by their rejection of the Established Church. Enthusiasts characteristically targeted institutional religion on the basis that it relied on man-made doctrines and ceremonies rather than personal


\textsuperscript{30} Marion, \textit{Prophetical Warnings}, p. 96.

\textsuperscript{31} See list E in Appendix.
Churches were artificial and therefore corrupt. Marion and his compatriots concentrated their attacks on the Roman Catholic Church for persecuting their coreligionists in Languedoc, but Maximilien Misson also accused the French Protestant Church of the Savoy in London of being manipulated by the Church of England. Several pamphleteers noted the group's particular contempt for the Anglican Church since Lacy's spiritual ascension in June, with one Prophet asking about ministers: ‘You say the Devil is Black, (or you paint him so) but why will you wear his Colour?’

Beyond the anticlericalism that characterised many dissenters, ministers and pious laymen alike were particularly shocked at the Prophets’ disregard for the Christian sacraments. Accordingly, Lacy’s celebration of the Eucharist with empty dishes on 6th August, 1707 during a retreat at Bushy outraged their critics, who denounced them as impostors. This unique episode occurred at a critical time for the Prophets. Marion was being prosecuted with Fatio and Daudé and the group was waiting for their sentence. Lacy had withdrawn from London with key followers (Fatio, Bulkeley, Elizabeth Gray, Jean Allut and his wife Henriette), but none of the Camisards actually went and Marion expressed his incomprehension of their retreat in a letter to Fatio. Lacy’s celebration should not be regarded as an attempt to mock


33 Maximillien Misson, *Meslange de littérature historique & critique, sur tout ce qui regarde l'état extraordinaire des Cévennois, appelez Camisards* (London, 1707), p. 35 [BL 700.e.21(6)].

34 Nicholson, *The Falshood of the New Prophets manifested* (London, 1708), pp. 22-23 [BL 695.c.6 (2)].


36 Lacy, *Prophetical Warnings II*, pp. 102-110; Papiers Fatio [Ms. fr. 601/241].
the Eucharist and its transubstantiation. By offering spiritual food to his privileged audience, he sought to wean his brethren from the earthly eucharistic elements that were ‘flattering the Palate, and spoiling the Stomach’ and thus to strengthen their faith when the time will come ‘against the Evils of the World, or the Temptations of the Devil’. There is no evidence that the Prophets renewed this experience. On the contrary, the group regularly held exclusive assemblies or ‘love feasts’ to celebrate the Holy Communion, during which real bread and wine were given to ‘select companies’. The Prophets manifestly believed in transubstantiation of the elements and the Camisards continued to attend Mass until they were banned from communion by the ministers of the Savoy.

Among many doctrinal matters, baptism proved a particularly divisive issue for the Prophets. Evidence suggests that at least some French followers continued to attach a great importance to the first sacrament within their original church. Daniel and Marie Le Tellier presented their newborn child to be baptised by the French Protestant Church of the Artillery, but were eventually forced to deliver the sacrament themselves upon staunch refusals from their local ministers. English Prophets, however, tended to diverge on the issue. Benjamin Steele had his son baptised by the Anglican Church, for example, while Samuel Keimer believed infant baptism was a human invention unknown to the primitive Christians of the first and


38 A historical relation of the workings and operations of the Holy Spirit concerning the everlasting Covenant which Jesus Christ comes to establish upon the Earth with his people. To be left as a memorial for ever unto his universall Church upon the Earth 1710, pp. 38-39, 55-56 [Stack 1]; Keimer, Brand, pp. 29-30.


40 Historical Relation, pp. 35-36; Fatio’s calendar, 14th Sept., 1707 [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 2v].
second centuries; and when Thomas Dutton sent for a minister to baptise his child, ‘the Spirit, by his Maid, who was inspired, prohibited him, crying out, *Let no Black-Coats come here*’ and Dutton later came to reject water baptism. Most followers saw no need for a spiritual passport to enter God's kingdom, for passport-like sacraments delivered by uninspired ministers were artifice and therefore not valid before God. The Prophets emphasised the importance of revelation over baptism as a spiritual prerequisite to inspiration. They therefore tended to overlook the holy sacrament and delivered instead a spiritual blessing to their newcomers, either by making the sign of the cross on their foreheads or by simply putting their hands on their heads. One anonymous pamphleteer suggested a more pragmatic explanation for the Prophets’ ambiguous position over the first sacrament, which he regarded as an ecumenical strategy to attract the great number of followers irrespective of their denomination. The author indeed argued that they would lose their appeal to the Quakers if they adopted baptism; to the Baptists if they chose infant sprinkling, and to the Pedobaptists if adhering to adult immersion. As they sought to establish Christ’s Universal Church and anticipated the conversion of the Jews, the Prophets in fact refused to condition the initiation of newcomers to the necessity of baptism and thus welcomed even the unbaptised, much to their opponents’ outrage.

---


43 Keimer, *Brand*, p. 29.


Perhaps the most shocking aspect of the Prophets’ theology was the extent to which they operated in the name of the Spirit. While their dramatic assemblies and scandalous behaviours will be explored in chapter four, the Prophets were often accused of antinomianism, the belief that grace released men from observing the moral law. They allegedly pardoned sins without asking for repentance and consequently were accused of welcoming men of vice.\textsuperscript{46} John Potter under inspiration once interrupted an assembly ‘crying out with a thundering Voice, \textit{GRACE, GRACE, GRACE}’ and distributing to the audience pieces of papers that read: ‘Here’s your Pardon purchas’d by the Blood of the \textit{Lamb}, for all your Sins past to this Day. Sign’d and seal’d by the Great Jehovah’.\textsuperscript{47} Although reminiscent of the Catholic Church’s selling of indulgences, the Prophets’ practice of absolving sins was allegedly not delivered by uninspired men, but directly by God himself. As the Spirit continued to visit more and more followers, repentance became irrelevant to the inspired because their grace justified their words and actions. Critics denounced for this reason the Prophets’ loose morals, arguing that they had no requirement for the admission of newcomers and therefore attracted predominantly ‘Atheits, Papists, Quakers, Anti-Scripturalists, Socinians, Ranters, Muggletonians and Debauchees’.\textsuperscript{48} This perceived antinomianism eclipsed in reality an implicit moral sense among the Prophets. For if some followers did go to extremes under inspiration, most were either repressed or evicted as false prophets.\textsuperscript{49} Immoral as they may have appeared,

\textsuperscript{46} Calamy, \textit{Caveat}, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{47} Keimer, \textit{Brand}, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{48} Richard Kingston, \textit{Enthusiastick Impostors no divinely inspir’d Prophets, part 2} (London, 1709), p. 132 [4632.b.32]; \textit{An Appeal from the prophets to their prophecies. Evidencing the new dispensation they pretend, to be of the same stamp and authority with their predictions} (London, 1708), p. 12 [BL 695.c.5(12)]; \textit{Nouveaux Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des Trois Camisars, où l'on voit les déclarations de Monsieur le Colonel Cavallier} (London, 1708), p. 6 [BL 700.c.21.7]
\textsuperscript{49} See pp. 132-133, 180.
there were implicit limits to what a Prophet could do in the name of the Spirit. Like Latitudinarians, the group thus refuted the Calvinist doctrine of predestination as contrary to the universality of God’s love and grace, and suggested instead that redemption was to be earned by choice through hard work rather than personal election.50

The immanent universality of the True Church as announced by the French Prophets rapidly found an echo within a confessionally partitioned, yet volatile English society, as evidenced by the denominations of their newcomers after Lacy’s ascendancy in July 1707. Since the Spirit now addressed his audience in both French and English, the group began to attract Huguenots, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Quakers, Baptists, Philadelphians, Quietists, Roman Catholics and Jews alike.51 Their appeal to such a denominationally diverse and spiritually insatiable audience provided some answers beyond the bounds and strictures of their respective churches. Historians have shown that there was a great degree of interaction and conversion between early factions like the Ranters and the Quakers, for example.52 The French Prophets likewise reflected the confessional volatility of their time. Nicolas Fatio had been successively known as a Spinozist and a Socinian before he joined the Prophets;53 the printer Samuel Keimer was raised a Presbyterian, but

50 *Reasons of ye Hope there is in us, or Matters of Fact: Consisting of Miraculous Experiences both External & Internal, or Miracles & Experiences Altogether New & Unparrell'd, since the Times of the Apostles & Primitive Christians in ye First Centuries* (n.d.), p. 22; Alan Gabbey, ‘Cudworth, More and the Mechanical Analogy’, in Kroll Kroll, Ashcraft and Zagorin (eds), *Philosophy, Science, and Religion in England, 1640-1700*, p. 120.

51 See list E in Appendix; *An Appeal from the prophets to their prophecies*, p. 12; Keimer, *Brand*, p. 2; Schwartz, *French Prophets*, p. 321.


became Quaker, a Baptist and a follower of the French Prophets before eventually returning to Quakerism. Other followers like Mary Rigby and Robert Eaton left the group and converted to Roman Catholicism. The eighteenth-century religious landscape thus proved deeply unsettled and its floating theological boundaries reveal the existence of dissent within dissent, which largely accounts for both the Prophets’ success and demise.

Despite much religious instability, it should be noted that the French Prophets displayed no separatist ambition, but assembled instead as an open congregation devoid of any explicit rules. Many followers evolved between two religious environments, attending the Prophets’ assemblies alongside their regular services. Marion, Cavalier and Fage were thus excommunicated on 30th March, 1707 for refusing to comply with the French churches of London. Daniel le Tellier and his wife Marie, Pierre Dubuc, Jeanne and Madeleine Raoux were likewise banned from communion in September 1707. The Norman weaver Isaac Havy was pressed by the non-conformist ministers of Threadneedle Street to renounce the Camisards until he acknowledged the latter as the true prophets; and James Jackson was expelled from the Quakers for his support of the Prophets on 25th February, 1708. The presence of ministers of various confessions among their ranks also seems to confirm that the Prophets sought to transcend sectarianism to establish a Universal Church on earth. Like the Philadelphians before them, they regarded themselves as a

54 Keimer, Brand, pp. 8, 38, 42, 70, 100, 105.
57 Schwartz, French Prophets, p. 103, n. 85.
latitudinarian religious society appealing to the entire Judeo-Christian community. The great proportion of Philadelphians and Anglican followers among their ranks seems to confirm their non-sectarianism. Yet with the exception of Jean Lions and a few other ministers reluctant to repudiate them, the French Prophets remained largely ostracised and ironically stigmatised as a sect they never intended to form.

During the upheavals of the Civil War, millenarian sects had attempted to transpose their reading of the Scriptures into the secular world with the hope to reform it before the Second Coming. The Levellers and the Diggers thus shook the very basis of society by attacking such traditions as primogeniture in the name of equality of rights. While ‘collective manuring of the common lands was a religious act for the Diggers’, the Levellers and the Fifth-Monarchists even justified the use of physical violence to restore power to the people. By refusing to swear oaths or pay tithes on the basis of their faith, the Quakers also made, to some extent, a political stance. The French Prophets’ eschatology contrasted with that of their predecessors’ by its very absence of political application, for they did not believe in a perfectible world and thus rejected earthly matters. Historians such as Robert T. Sidwell have interpreted Abraham Whitrow’s redistribution of Richard Bulkeley’s


60 Jean Lions, Relation de ce qui s’est passé entre Jean Lions, ministre, et ses consistoires (London, 1707) [LPL KC125]. Apologie de Jean Lions Ministre, avec des reflexions sur les écrits des sieurs Pegorier, Lamote & Rival (London, 1708) [LPL KC125]. Examen de la pretendue refutation de l’apologie de Jean Lions ministre (London, 1708) [LPL KC125].

61 Hill, The World Turned Upside Down, p. 117.

62 Ibid., pp. 53, 105.

wealth to their poorer brethren from 1708 as evidence of levelling beliefs in the French Prophets’ doctrine.\textsuperscript{64} Such hasty linkage overlooks the fact that the Prophets immediately rejected Whitrow’s reforms and expelled him shortly afterwards in 1708.\textsuperscript{65} Evidently, the Spirit also warned Bulkeley against false prophecies, but the baronet remained loyal to his friend Whitrow and had expended his fortune for their followers by the time of his death in 1710.\textsuperscript{66} Notwithstanding their notorious efforts, this was the sole reform of an unsuccessful faction within the French Prophets, rather than a core doctrine of the group: Whitrow’s levelling experience failed, tarnished with rumours of corruption, and we lose track of him shortly after Bulkeley’s death in 1710, with no further attempts made to redistribute wealth after this episode.\textsuperscript{67}

If the Prophets never advocated worldly reforms like their politically-minded millenarian predecessors, they should then be more aptly compared to the radical enthusiasts of the Interregnum. The Ranters, Muggletonians and early Quakers, for example, were primarily concerned with spiritual matters, though the latter also called for a complete separation of the Church from the State, and most were regarded as antinomians. This was particularly true of the Ranters, who denied the reality of sin, and the Familists’ sexual communism.\textsuperscript{68} Half a century later, the


\textsuperscript{65} Benjamin Furly, ‘Lettre écrite de Hollande le 30 octobre 1710’, [BGE Ms. fr.605/4/fol. 26]; Vidal, L’Ablatif absolu, p. 28.

\textsuperscript{66} Fatio’s calendar, 7\textsuperscript{th}, 24\textsuperscript{th}, 25\textsuperscript{th} Sept., 1708, 6\textsuperscript{th}, 18\textsuperscript{th} July and 7\textsuperscript{th} Sept., 1709 [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fols 4-5]; Calamy, An Historical Account of my own Life, II, p. 75.

\textsuperscript{67} Whitrow had allegedly used some of Bulkeley’s money to purchase ‘a large Brick House with Brew House, Barn, Stable, and other Out-houses, several Gardens, with very good Fruit-Trees, 2 little Wood, in all 32 acres of Land Freehold, (…) near Chasham in the County of Bucks, on a pleasant Hill’, which he put up for sale in 1714. The Post Boy, 2958 (April 22-24, 1714); James Sutherland, Background for Queen Anne (London: Methuen, 1939), p. 68.

Prophets’ quest for the recovery of Man’s original state naturally attracted similar criticisms. From 1707 the Adamite practice of going naked as a sign of regained purity appeared among the English Prophets, again following a long tradition of English mysticism. Eighty-six-year-old John Humfrey, writing against the Prophets, thus recalled that the early Quakers went to church naked in Sherborne according to the Bible.69 Similarly, John Lacy was due to walk naked to the cemetery of Bunhill fields to raise Dr. Emes from the dead and Elizabeth Gray, a highly controversial fifteen-year-old prophetess, exposed her naked body to the public under inspiration to perform as the Whore of Babylon.70 Yet unlike the Ranters and the Familists, for instance, the French Prophets proved very conservative in their attitudes toward sexuality.71 Some of their most prominent members (Lacy, Bulkeley, Thomas Cotton, John Hooke) indeed belonged to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners or the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (S.P.G.), who were respectively committed to the suppression of vice by taking prostitutes, homosexuals and alcoholics to court, and the evangelisation of pagans abroad.72 Despite their opponents’ accusations, none of the Prophets’ publications indicate Adamite beliefs, and the group’s response to

---


70 John Lacy, Predictions Concerning, the Raising of the Dead Body of Mr Thomas Emes (London, 1708), p. 8 [BL 1415.g.6.]; The French prophetess turn’d adamite being a true and comical account of a pretended French prophetess, who on Sunday the 16th of November, did in a very immodest and indecent manner (being inspired with a pretended spirit) undress her self stark naked at the popish chapel in Lincoln’s-Inn Fields (London, 1707) [LPL H9455 5.28]; Sutherland, Background for Queen Anne, p. 70. Vidal, L’Ablatif absolu, p. 25.

71 Chabrol, Elie Marion, p. 154.

Lacy when the latter was ordered by the Spirit to leave his wife for Gray in 1711 tends to confirm their tough stance on sexual and moral misconduct. The formal and austere Prophet Guy Nutt admitted that some prophetesses were carnal women and that the Spirit ordered ‘one of their Society, then Agitated, to take her by the Hair of the Head, and pull her out of the Room, as a Punishment for her Offence’. Such forms of self-censorship, combined with the presence of particularly austere single men like Marion, Fatio and James Cuninghame, may concur with Jean-Paul Chabrol’s claim that the Prophets, or at least some of them, were possibly at the origin of the doctrine of celibacy among their descendants, the American Shakers.

The French Prophets may have been a natural outlet of the Philadelphian society, judging from the early support of its members, but most critics noted in fact theological resemblances with the early Quakers. Their claim that they were inhabited by God’s Spirit echoed indeed the ‘Inner Light’ of George Fox’s Friends and thereby placing Lacy and his coreligionists in the continuity rather than a renewal of the English prophetic tradition. The Scottish Prophet James Cuninghame declared that ‘there was some good in the beginning of that sect’ in a letter to his sceptical friend Dr. George Garden, as it may be no coincidence that the Prophets attracted many Friends. Accordingly, Frederick Beiser’s definition of the prophet as

---

73 John Lacy, A letter from J. Lacy to T. Dutton, being reasons why the former left his wife, and took E. Gray a prophetess to his bed (London, 1711) [BL 1419.b.46.(2.)]; Keimer, Brand, pp. 57-70; Richard Kingston, Enthusiastick Impostors no divinely inspir’d Prophets (London, 1707), p. 73 [BL 695.e.6 (3)].

74 O.E, The Shaking-prophets alarm’d, p. 5.


an exegete can only highlight a conspicuous absence of a proper doctrine when 
applied to the Camisards’ English followers.77 Their shaping of the True Church 
revamped for the most part that of the Quakers, but their unquestionable appeal to 
early eighteenth-century English society would rapidly turn into a weakness, as many 
regarded them as mere impostors gathering on no theologically defensible ground. 
Thus, the influential Presbyterian minister Edmund Calamy once asked in a sermon: 
‘And what have we more in their Warnings, but I’ll tell thee, my Child, I’ll tell thee, 
I’ll tell thee, My Child, my Child, a thousand times over, where all that is told, is no 
more than every Man knows already.’78 John Humfrey even accused them of stealing 
the Quakers’ doctrine in announcing the Parousia.79 Most importantly, John Lacy 
himself declared in the preface to his first volume of warnings: ‘This mission brings 
no new doctrine with it, nor advances any thing dissonant from the Scriptures’.80 The 
Prophets suffered, it seems, from a lack of credibility and authenticity that probably 
affected their numbers when compared to some 40,000 Quakers around the same 
time.81 The absence of distinct beliefs and unclear sense of identity would inevitably 
result in the group’s schism as early as 1708, hence it is no wonder that conversion 
did not pertain to the Prophets’ vocabulary.

If little seemed to differentiate the French Prophets from previous millenarian 
factions, one doctrinal divergence on which they extensively based their legitimacy 
was, however, their claims to have revived the Spirit of biblical times. In his preface 


78 Calamy, Caveat, p. 28.

79 Humfrey, A Farther Account of our Late Prophets, pp. 20-1.


81 Watts, The Dissenters, p. 270.
to Lacy’s unpublished annotations to the *Spirit of Prophecy Defended*, Ramsey Michaels noted that the group’s most prominent figure embraced the cessationist belief that prophetic times had ended with the early Christians in the second century.\textsuperscript{82} Cessationism, as opposed to continuationism, was a widely shared view which by definition reduced later claims to spirit possessions to a mere imposture. Yet the Prophets argued that this period of divine silence had now come to an end since the Spirit visited the *Désert* and then England. The emergence of infant Prophets in Silesia and the story of a Swedish maid surviving for six years without any food further supported the view that God had resumed his activity on earth, hence the imminence of the millennium.\textsuperscript{83} By claiming the lineage of the Montanists, Lacy and the Prophets sought to restore the primitive Church and thus deliver a sequel to the Bible based on the accomplishment of scriptural prophecies.\textsuperscript{84} In Bulkeley’s own words, the French Prophets represented what the Church ‘never dream’d of, and what they are unwilling to believe’.\textsuperscript{85}

\begin{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{83} John Lacy, *A Relation of the Dealings of God to his Unworthy Servant John Lacy* (London, 1708), p. 31 [LPL H7593 1.08]; *Reasons of ye Hope*, pp. 28, 43; Maximilien Misson, *A new voyage to Italy. With curious observations on several other countries; as, Germany; Switzerland; Savoy; Geneva; Flanders; and Holland* (4\textsuperscript{th} ed., London, 1714), IV, pp. 490-491 [BL 981.a.18-21].

\textsuperscript{84} John Lacy, *The General Delusion of Christians, touching the ways of God's revealing Himself, to, and by the prophets, evinc'd from scripture and primitive antiquity. And many principles of scoffers, atheists, Sadducees, and wild enthusiasts, refuted The Whole adapted, as much as possible, to the meanest Capacity. In four parts* (London, 1713), pp. 229-360 [BL 764.e.8].

\textsuperscript{85} Richard Bulkeley, *An Impartial Account of the Prophets* (London, 1708), p. 4 [BL 4136.a.24].
\end{flushleft}
Spiritual Instruments

If the Camisards found in England a particularly fertile millenarian ground to deliver their warnings, they stood out from previous doomsayers by their emphasis on prophecy over eschatology. They never claimed to interpret the Scriptures to calculate the Parousia, but allegedly vocalised God’s word directly to their contemporaries. This theological difference was essentially founded on the question of grace. Christian theology distinguished between sanctifying grace, the gift by which one became fit for salvation through the virtues of faith, hope, justice and charity, and edifying grace, which enabled its holder to teach others through prophecy, glossolalia or thaumaturgy. The first form was commonly shared by the contemporary Christian community, while the second one belonged to biblical times, but was also claimed by early modern enthusiasts.86

The essence of religious enthusiasm lay primarily in its somatisation of the Holy Spirit, whose manifestations ranged from silent convulsions to speaking in tongues, dreams and visions, for example, but which also varied considerably within the group:

Every individual Person is different in his Agitations, according to the Circumstances and Nature of those things, he is to pronounce; but all those who speak by Inspiration have this in common, which is (as I have already observ’d) that the Words are formed in their Mouth, without any Purpose or Direction on their Part; in like manner, is their Body moved by an over-ruling Influence, unto the Power of which their several members are yielded up.87

86 Beiser, The Sovereignty of Reason, pp. 189-190.

87 Fage’s declaration, Misson, A Cry from the Desart (London, 1707), pp. 71-2 [BL 114.a.59].
Since divine manifestations appeared in the Cévennes, the French Prophets had claimed to be inhabited by the same Spirit that had visited Isaiah, Elijah, Daniel and even Balaam’s donkey.\footnote{Calamy, A Caveat, p. 10; NRL, 43 (Feb. 1708), p. 134 [BPF 8* 442]; Lacy, A Letter from J. Lacy to T. Dutton, p. 9; Chabrol, Elie Marion, p. 89.} During those moments of inspiration, the Spirit allegedly took full control of their bodies and used them as a communicative medium to demonstrate its power over the physical world. The Prophets not only convulsed, but also foamed at the mouth, ‘together with Gulpings, Sighings, Sobbings, Groanings, Hiccuppings, Heavings, Shakings of the whole Body, and inarticulate Voices, and mimical Gestures and Postures, and Repetitions of the same things a great many times over.’\footnote{Calamy, Caveat, p. 28.} These symptoms may be regarded as the successful transposition of a prophetic tradition from the mountains of the Désert to the streets of London, but also constituted ‘a distinctively Protestant form of spirit possession’ from sixteenth-century Germany to nineteenth-century New England.\footnote{Garrett, Spirit Possession and Popular Religion, p. 21.}

The overpowering force with which the Spirit seized the Prophets’ bodies effectively reduced them to the condition of mere puppets. The inspired denied any personal implication in such manifestations and accordingly claimed to surrender their bodies to the Spirit as its passive ‘Instruments’. Incidentally, Marion also described his mystical experience as follows:

> When the Spirit of God is about to seize me, I feel a great Heat in my Heart and the Parts adjacent; which sometimes has a shivering of my whole Body going before it; At other times I am seized all at once, without having any such preceding Notice. As soon as I find my self seized, my Eyes are instantly shut up, and the Spirit causes in me great Agitation of Body, making me to put forth of great Sighs and Throbbings, which are cut short, as if I were labouring for Breath.
have also frequently very hard Shocks; but yet all this is without Pain, and without hindering me of the Freedom of thinking. I continue thus about a Quarter of an Hour, more or less, before I utter one Word. At last I feel that the Spirit forms in my Mouth the Words which he will have me to pronounce, which are almost always accompanied with some Agitations, or extraordinary Motions, or at least with a great Constraint. Sometimes it is so, that the first Word that I am to speak next, is already formed in my own Idea; but I am very often ignorant how that very Word will end which the Spirit has already begun. And it has happened sometimes, that when I thought I was going to pronounce a Word, or a Sentence, it proved to be only a mere inarticulate Sound that was formed by my Voice. During all the time of these Visits I always feel my Spirit extremly enlarged toward my God.⁹¹

The French Prophets’ possessions surpassed their predecessors’ by the intensity of their corporeal nature and the diversity of bizarre symptoms displayed. The Holy Spirit evidently took over every part of his Instrument’s body and played it to a millennial tune. Communication was essentially oral and visual, although John Lacy and Jean Allut were also known to have performed automatic writing under inspiration.⁹² For this reason, it would be inaccurate to define such religious enthusiasm as an intimate relationship with God for the Spirit did not communicate to them, as with the Quakers for instance, but through them, thereby annihilating personal identity in order to channel the divine.

Although this complete abnegation may be regarded as an act of unconditional devotion, Daniel Vidal argues that it also excluded their personal responsibility from any controversial word or deed. When the Spirit controls the

---

⁹¹ Elie Marion, The French prophet’s declaration, p. 2 [BL 695.c.4.(3)] and Prophetical Warnings, p. vii.

⁹² Reasons of ye Hope, p. 65; Eclair de Lumière descendant des cieux, pour découvrir, sur la Nuit des Peuples de la Terre, la Corruption qui se trouve dans leurs Tenebres; afin de les inciter à la Repentance, avant que la Tonnerre gronde de la Justice de l’Agneau (Rotterdam, 1711), p. 14 [BL 850.f.10].
Instrument, the prophet loses consciousness and with it his memory. Both Cavalier and Lacy claimed not to remember what had happened under inspiration, while Marion only suffered partial memory loss and was able to correct his scribes’ minutes. Freed from personal responsibility by the Holy Spirit, the French Prophets’ agitations and extravagance rapidly spread to new recruits of all ages, sex and social rank, such as John Potter, John Glover, Anna Maria King, Mary Beer and thirteen year-old Ned. One Prophet was thus seen ‘shaking his fingers as if he had no Joints’ and Lacy was ‘shaking his head as if he was mad’ (see picture 1). Disjointed bodies seemingly transcended the laws of nature and aroused both fear and fascination: even Richard Bulkeley acknowledged the bizarre nature of these manifestations, although the presence of agitated children confirmed him in his faith. Children and ignorant women embodied an innocence that could not but support the group's extravagances. With children shaking, convulsions remained extraordinary, yet more believable.

---


94 ‘Preciz du Discours de Mr. Durand Fage d'Aubaye, prononcé sous l'Operation de l'Esprit, A Londres, le 3e 7bre 1706’, p. 10 [LPL MS 934/52]; ‘Déclaration de F.G.’ in Nouveaux Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des Trois Camisars, p. 26; Examen du Théâtre Sacré des Cevennes (London, 1708), p. 30 [BL 700.e.21.8]; An Appeal from the prophets to their prophecies, p. 17; Marion, The French Prophet's Declaration, p. 3.

95 The French Prophets’ Mad Sermon (London, 1708), p. 2 [BL 1076.l.22.(26.).]

The English and French Prophets mad or bewitch'd [sic], at their assemblies in Baldwins Gardens, on Wednesday the 12th, of November...

(London, 1707) [BL 9512.aaa.27].

The Explanation of the Cut.

A. The French Prophet stamping with his Foot.  B. Benjamin Jackson, Writing what they all say.  C. The other Writer.  D. Sir Richard Buckley, to be made straight by the Power of the Prophets in 6 Months.  E. Mister Dutton the Lawyer.  F. Mr. Lacy shaking his Head.  G.G. Converts not yet come to the full Spirit of Prophecy.  H.H.H. Spectators.  I. A little Boy being about 10 Years of Age being disturb'd, fell a Cursing the People, and threw himself on the Ground upon his Belly.  K. A young female Prophet of Seven Years of Age.  L. Mrs Betty Gray, sitting at a Table with a Dove, which flew upon her Shoulder; she is termed among the Prophets an Angel of Light.
Whilst the Prophets generally claimed passively to vocalise divine speech, not all of them prophesied in the same manner. The first assemblies in the late summer of 1706 reveal different processes of inspiration for Fage and Cavalier shortly before Marion’s arrival in London. Both Camisards were indeed depicted urging the Spirit to take control of their bodies in their first assemblies, when their later followers insisted they were visited against their will. Fage appeared particularly explicit in his invocation, asking ‘Endors l'Esprit de la Chair, afin que je ne puisse prononcer aucune Parole que par ton Esprit &c. Que ma Langue s'attache à mon palais, plutôt que je ne prononce aucune Parole, qui ne vienne de ta Volonté’, whereupon he was effectively seized by the Spirit and began speaking in a supernatural voice.\(^{97}\) Fage and Cavalier first performed two roles, alternating between human and divine voices, natural and supernatural speech; an approach that, given its early date, may have replicated the original assemblies in the *Désert*. Later inspirations seemed predominantly unsolicited as the Prophets began to attract new followers, but John Potter and Elizabeth Charras continued similar dual performances, the former once ending violently thrown to the floor by the Spirit as a sign of man’s impotence against his Creator.\(^{98}\)

Further differences in the delivery of God’s word can be noted during the Prophets’ continental missions in the 1710s. As they travelled to Holland and Germany, the Prophets adopted a different tone in their inspirations. Allut and, to a lesser extent, Marion’s prophecies saw a discursive evolution from the deictic ‘I tell

\(^{97}\) ‘May thou deaden the Spirit of the Flesh, and not allow me to to utter one Word but from your Spirit &c. May my tongue be stuck to my palate and I be unable to utter one Word other than from your Will.’ (my translation). ‘Preciz du Discours de Mr. Durand Fage d’Aubaye, prononcé sous l’Operation de l’Esprit, A Londres, le 3e 7bre 1706’, p. 1 [LPL MS 934/52].

\(^{98}\) Keimer, *Brand*, pp. 16-17; *Discernement des Ténèbres d'avec la Lumière; Afin d'inciter les Hommes à chercher la Lumière, l'Esprit de l'Eternel, pour les instruire & les enseigner dans les droites Voies* (Rotterdam, 1710), pp. 11-13 [BL 3901.b.17].
thee, my Child’ to the anaphoric use of the third person in reference to the Lord. Their repeated use of direct speech is particularly striking during the Prophets’ stay in Halle in May and June 1713. Allut’s adjunction of reporting verbs as in ‘God says’ may have helped to assert the authority of their message to the local Huguenots refugees and German Pietists, but also meant that he had effectively become a tranced preacher rather than a prophet. Indeed, he decreasingly channelled divine speech as an Instrument, but was now speaking in God’s name, reading and interpreting the Bible to his audience. Such a shift denotes the different directions, both spiritual and geographical, that their movement took over the following years. If he retained an interest in the prophetism of his English brethren until his death, Allut’s mystical experiences remained limited to dreams after 1719 and doubts were even subsequently expressed about the authenticity of his past performances. While the number of inspired Prophets declined considerably afterwards, Allut’s ecstatic preaching in his encounter with foreign mystics may nevertheless have anticipated the evangelical preachers of the 1740s.

Opponents of the French Prophets often claimed, after St Paul, that the ability to speak in tongues was essential to distinguish true prophets from false ones. If glossolalia was indeed the common denominator between ancient and modern prophets, then few of the Prophets could be legitimised. Lacy reckoned that only four

99 Discernement des Ténèbres d’avec la Lumière, pp. 2-11, 16-40 [BL 3901.b.17]; Quand vous aurez saccagé, vous serez saccagés: car la lumière est apparue dans les ténèbres, pour les détruire (n.p., 1714), pp. 1-2, 8-11, 16-17, 23, 43, 56-61 [BL 850.f.11(2)].

100 Hannah Wharton, Divine Inspiration: or, a Collection of Manifestations to make known the Visitation of the Lord, and the Coming of his Kingdom (London, 1732), pp. 73, 81, 93 [BL 852.f.23]; ‘Correspondance et méditations de Jean Allut’ [BGE Ms. fr.605/1/fols 1-33].

101 1 Cor. 14:1-25; John Humfrey, A Farther Account of our Late Prophets, p. 17 [BL 701.c.48]. Historical Relation, p. 3.
or five people could speak in tongues by 1708, figures that barely changed afterwards.\textsuperscript{102} Once a distinct power of inspired children prophesying in French in the \textit{Désert}, where it claimed a unificatory function between the peasant’s dialect and the master’s language, Pentecostalism sought to transcend linguistic, generational, religious and ultimately political divisions as part of the establishment of Christ’s Universal Church.\textsuperscript{103} It is noteworthy, however, that the original Prophets did not export the gift of tongues to England and that it was predominantly their English followers who received it. Lacy and the young Mary Beer were both able to prophesy in French, although the former also delivered warnings in Latin and Greek.\textsuperscript{104} Yet his supernatural gifts failed to impress observers, for he had already translated Misson’s \textit{Théâtre sacré} from the French and had received some basic instruction in Latin and Greek. His mastery of these languages proved very poor and Henry Nicholson judged his Latin ‘such as a School-Boy ought to be whipt for’.\textsuperscript{105}

Stranger still were the prophecies delivered in unknown languages. Although Saint Paul insisted on the intelligibility of the glossoitalic gift, the Prophets regarded its mystery as an edifying sign of their divine mission, for men cannot utter words beyond their understanding unless infused to them by the Spirit.\textsuperscript{106} Thus, one Prophet

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{103} TSC, pp. 14-5, 22, 32 [BPF 8* 3 102/1 Rés]. Vidal, \textit{Le Malheur et son prophète}, p. 146.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{104} Fatio’s calendar, July 2-6 and September 28, 1707, [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol. 2].
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{105} Misson described him in his preface as ‘a gentleman who understood French very well’. Nicholson, \textit{The Falshood}, p. 30; Ramsey Michaels (ed.), \textit{The Spirit of Prophecy Defended}, p. xxxv.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{106} ‘If you in a tongue utter speech that is not intelligible, how will any one know what is said? For you will be speaking into the air.\textendash;There are doubtless many languages in the world, and none is without meaning;\textendash;but if I do not know the meaning of the language, I shall be a foreigner to the speaker and the speaker a foreigner to me.’ (1 Cor. 14:9-11); Scott Hahn and Curtis Mitch (eds), \textit{The First and Second Letters of Saint Paul to the Corinthians: Revised Standard Version} (Nashville: Ignatius Press, 2004), p. 37. Lacy even pointed out that Paul’s speech was not always intelligible and that the gift of tongues should be distinguished from that of interpretation. Lacy, \textit{The General Delusion of Christians}, pp. 130-131, 221, 295, 400-401.
\end{flushright}
once ‘cried out Hoc, Hoc, Hoc’ while stamping his feet to crush the wicked.107 Katherine Orme also spoke in a strange language in Scotland, but it was Durand Fage who made the biggest impression when he prophesied: ‘Tring Trang, Suing Suang, Hing Hang’! Even such a knowledgeable man as Nicolas Fatio, who was believed to have mastered fifty-two languages, failed to identify this one and concluded to a Hebraic dialect, in accordance of the imminent conversion of the Jews.108 Interestingly, neither Marion, Cavalier or Allut, who later led continental missions, possessed the gift of tongues, whereas those who allegedly did, like Lacy and Beer, stayed in the British Isles. The Camisards’ prophecies were systematically delivered in French and then translated into English. Monolingualism soon became a major obstacle in delivering God's message abroad, forcing them to depart regularly as they were often met with incomprehension.109

The French Prophets’ Pentecostal experiences went beyond the gift of tongues and also affected its very medium, the voice. Ecstatic trances were often characterised by a variety discursive transgressions that conferred supernatural qualities to the voice. The Prophets’ speech was noticeably syncopated and sometimes even unintelligible. When visiting his former parishioner John Lacy, Edmund Calamy received a warning from the latter:

The speech was syllabical, and there was a distinct heave and breathe between each syllable; but it required attention to distinguish the words. I shall here add it as far as my memory serves: –

107 The French Prophets’ Mad Sermon, p. 2.


109 Chabrol, Elie Marion, p. 193.

According to Daniel Vidal, inspirations typically consist of unnatural discursive paces, endless logorrhea or, conversely, prophetic silences. The enthusiast cried to break the flow of speech and impose instead the voice as a self-sufficient medium. Individual Prophets oftentimes hummed before vocalising Spirit, but the group also used this technique to synchronise their voices before an inspiration like a rehearsal before a performance. Harmonising consequently denatured speech in favour of a mystically encoded message that only a divine revelation could decipher. By contrast, the volume of the enthusiast's voice was intended to reach everyone, from followers to mere observers. In 1711, James Cuninghame interrupted a sermon in St Paul’s cathedral, his voice being louder than the organ. Rebecca Cuff was likewise reported to Roar out in so hideous a Manner, The D-A-V-I-L, The D-A-V-I-L, The D-A-V-I-L, that it has terrify’d the Believers themselves, and had not the Windows of the Rooms we were in, been close stopd up with Shutters, Ruggs and Blankets to drown the Noise, the Outcries must needs have put the Parish in an Uproar.

---


111 Vidal, *Le Malheur et son prophète*, pp. 123-127, 137-138. Steven Connor also underlines that miming pertained to the Camisards’ inspirations, which may explain why some of their English descendants (Sarah Critchlow, John Harling and Robert Eaton) were later agitated, but never delivered divine speech. Connor, *Dumbstruck: A Cultural History of Ventriloquism* (OUP, 2000), p. 189.


113 Keimer, *Brand*, p. 68.

114 Ibid., p. 53.
The Prophets’ voice served as an instrument in itself and consequently proved just as important as the content of its message. It was verbal in order to be understood, yet also unnaturally vocal, as an echo of God’s power over an incredulous audience.\(^{115}\) When possessed by the Spirit, the enthusiast’s voice was no longer natural, but supernatural; and his body virtually disappeared behind the volume produced, thereby elevating the voice to an ultimate object of fascination.\(^{116}\)

So loud were the French Prophets’ voices under inspiration that they dehumanised them. For Jean Cavalier, who always appeared as the most extravagant of the three original refugees, ‘when he speaks, the poor, harmless People think that God thunders, and would swear, that it is not the voice of a man.’\(^{117}\) Cavalier's voice transcended his physical limits; he intimidated, not as a superman, for he never had powers, but as a timeless vector of God's Spirit. This dehumanisation is further evidenced by the Prophets uttering of animal sounds.\(^{118}\) Samuel Keimer recalled that several of his coreligionsists barked and snarled at one another like dogs and Josiah Woodward reported that the group assembled at Copenhagen, howling like dogs and destroying everything.\(^{119}\) Even years later, when Charles Wesley lodged at Isaac Hollis’s, his host ‘fell into violent agitations, and gobbled like a turkey-cock.’\(^{120}\) Such animalism certainly disrupted the natural order and consequently raised more

---

\(^{115}\) Vidal, *Le Malheur et son prophète*, p. 123.

\(^{116}\) Lacy's voice was accordingly 'so strong, clear, and harmonious, that his natural one could never furnish'. Lacy, *The Mighty Miracle* (London, 1708, reprinted in *Harleian Miscellany*, 1810), 11, p. 63.

\(^{117}\) *An Account of the Lives and Behaviour of the Three French Prophets* (London, 1708), p. 23 [BPF 8*3 087 Rés]

\(^{118}\) Vidal, *Le Malheur*, p. 126.


disturbing questions: was the prophet reduced to a beast or was the animal speaking through him? Either way, the enthusiast was losing his humanity as he lost his natural speech.

Protestants in the Cévennes already had a tradition of inspired singing and dancing that Enrique Pardo claims was exported across Europe and survives to this day in America.\textsuperscript{121} Languedocians were indeed reputed ‘powerful psalm singers’ and the city of Nîmes, a Protestant stronghold, was famous for its dances.\textsuperscript{122} The Camisards’ convulsions may or may not have been part of these, but historians and musicologists agree that they helped to prepare the voice for inspired singing. Agitations oppressed the body to allegedly extract a powerful, supernatural voice, so pure that it could only originate from God. The process took several steps before reaching inspired singing and ‘like most trance phenomena, these began with inarticulate pre-verbal sounds, screams, convulsions, quivering, shakings – in their case, interpreted as the catharsis of sin and guilt.’\textsuperscript{123} The voice thus acted by itself to exorcise the body when possessed by the Spirit. It possessed an identity of its own and was not mediated by the body, which Steven Connor describes as the opposite of ‘the disembodied speech of the ventriloquist’.\textsuperscript{124} This powerful singing and dancing tradition accompanied the interiorised faith of many Protestant circles, and proved


\textsuperscript{123} Pardo, ‘The French Prophets’, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{124} Connor, Dumbstruck, p. 189; Garrett, Spirit Possession, p. 4.
equally strong among the Convulsionaries of Saint Médard and early Methodists in the 1730s, as well as the Dutartres and the Shakers in America.

**Dreams, Visions and Stigmata**

Divine inspirations were generally multi-sensory experiences during which the Spirit manifested itself to and through its Instruments in many forms. Dreams and visions, for example, proved just as common among early modern mystics as in biblical narratives. These were not exclusive to the prophet, however, for scribes such as Nicolas Fatio and Charles Portalès also experienced visions without ever receiving prophetic gifts. Yet they often preceded a first inspiration, as Jeanne Cavalier, Henriette Allut, Susanne des Brousses, Annes Voyer, Daniel Le Tellier and Isaac Havy all dreamt of the Spirit before it visited them. While prophecies were allegedly delivered by the Spirit through the mouths of its inspired Instruments, these manifestations also differed from divine warnings in that they remained subject to personal interpretation in order to be understood. Lucia Dacome argued in this respect that ‘dreams, as much as ecstatic visions, were unrelated to the external world. And yet dreamers could stage scenarios of social and political overturning, and interpret them in the light of their own inner conviction, just as the enthusiasts did.’ Accordingly, John Lacy’s apocalyptic vision in 1715 can only be understood

---

125 Fatio’s calendar, 30th Dec., 1706 and 8th Nov., 1707 [BGE Ms. Fr. 605/7a/fols 1, 2]; ‘Lettre de Marion à Nicolas Fatio’ [BGE Ms. fr. 601/241].

126 Fatio’s calendar, 11th-13th April, 1707, [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/1].

in the light of the recent Jacobite attempt to invade England.\textsuperscript{128} This episode proved particularly divisive for the Prophets, as several significant Scottish followers and apostates actively supported the rebellion.\textsuperscript{129}

Mystics typically regarded oneiromancy, or the interpretation of dreams in order to foretell the future, as a science in itself. Looking at the positions of the planets and the activity of comets, they combined astrology and eschatology to calculate the date of the approaching Judgement, in the belief that dreams and visions were premonitory.\textsuperscript{130} Nicolas Fatio was certainly the most committed follower to this task among the French Prophets. He collected cabalistic writings and retained a great interest in astrology all his life, which his brother deplored as a sign of great credulity.\textsuperscript{131} His calendar abounds with astrological symbols, as if to confer a metaphysical dimension to the events he recorded during the Prophets’ activity in London. In 1716, he further theorised that \textit{aurorae borealis} were a sign of God’s intervention in the world, which the biblical prophet Ezekiel had witnessed in his visions.\textsuperscript{132} Three years later, Fatio’s niece, the Pietist mystic Marie Huber, solicited

\textsuperscript{128} John Lacy, \textit{The Vision of John Lacy, Esq; and Prophet, on Thursday the 9th of June 1715} (London, 1715) [BL 8630.bbb.19].


\textsuperscript{131} ‘Notes sur la Cabale’ [BGE Ms. fr. 603/fols 33-61]; ‘Notes sur l'astronomie’ [BGE Ms. fr. 609/fols 17-30]; ‘Extraits de divers auteurs’ [BGE Ms. fr. 609/fols 31-56], especially ‘Extrait du Songe de Poliphile’ (1600) [f. 34]; ‘Lettres de Jean-Christophe Fatio à son Frère Nicolas Fatio’ [BGE Ms. fr. 601/146].

\textsuperscript{132} ‘Vuës philosophiques de Monsieur Nicolas Fatio de Duillier sur d'autres objets que la Pesanteur’ [BGE Ms. fr. 2043a/34].
his oneiromantic expertise from Lyon to elucidate the recent apparition of a beast in the sky near Yverdon for twelve days and nights (see picture 2). Although many gaps remain in his correspondence and despite the Prophets’ demise, Fatio never lost hope to see the relief of French Protestants and the fall of Babylon. His last recorded dream on 15th October, 1732, recounts how he hugged and kissed the late Charles XII of Sweden, for three or four seconds at least, and saw a light blush on the latter’s cheek.

Lastly, spirit possession also resulted upon rare occasions in the sight of blood. Blood was an important symbol for the French Prophets and mystics alike because it recalled the stigmata of Christ’s martyrdom as well as those of medieval saints. It was the medium of life and spiritual regeneration, hence its significance when its sight had no natural cause such as a wound. Fatio noted in his calendar that John Moore shed tears of blood on 5th October, 1708 and that three drops of the vital fluid had fallen from Marion's nose in a remarkable manner, on 4th September, 1709. Marion had already wept tears of blood in the Désert and suffered abundant nosebleeds on his last mission to the continent in 1712/1713.


135 Chabrol, Élie Marion, p. 122.


137 Fatio’s calendar, 5th Oct., 1708 and 4th Sept., 1709 [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fols 4-5].

138 Historical Relation, p. 18; Chabrol, Elie Marion, p. 122.
Lettre de Marie Huber à Nicolas Fatio (3rd Feb., 1719) [BGE Ms. fr. 60/217]
He may well have died of consumption, which, according to Susan Juster, was the archetypal disease of eighteenth-century evangelicals and itinerant preachers. Mystical bleeding nevertheless materialised the supernatural presence of the Spirit among the Prophets and evidenced the martyrdom of their persecution and humiliation by an incredulous audience. This proved a supreme honour, for the belief in their own sacrifice can be traced back to the Camisards in the Désert and Fage had announced more to come shortly after his arrival in London. Ultimately, the French Prophets’ mysticism was presented as a denial of the self effectively reducing the inspired to a mere instrument, yet whose power resided in the unique ability to unite the physical world with the spiritual one.

**Miracles**

If the ability to speak in tongues and deliver accurate prophecies allegedly demonstrated the presence of the Holy Spirit among them, sceptics believed that only the ability to perform miracles, or thaumaturgy, could legitimise the French Prophets. As with most millenarian and continuationist circles, miracles occupied an essential part of the Camisards’ and the French Prophets’ creed. Their role was threefold: they provided evidence of God communicating through the prophet; they paved the way to the Millennium; and finally they converted the unbeliever to God’s True Church.

---


140 ‘Preciz du Discours de Mr. Durand Fage… le 3e 7bre 1706’, p. 1. ‘Récit abrégé des persécutions & oppositions faites par les prétendus ministres de Christ de la Nation Françoise contre le message de l'Éternel, et contre ses serviteurs, qu'il a envoyez au Roïaume d'Angleterre, mais prémierement à la ville de Londres, capitale du Roïaume’ (1707) [Stack 1g/fols 47-48].
Of course, the definition of a miracle differed greatly between the French Prophets and their opponents, and the latter never accepted the supernatural achievements claimed by the group. Despite many proclaimed miracles, very few descriptions of these survive, which leaves the modern historian to deal with the Prophets’ exaggerations and their opponents’ sarcasm.

At least four Prophets (Fatio, Thomas Emes, Nathaniel Sheppard and Mr. Boulter) were promised the gift of miracles by the Spirit between 1707 and 1711, but none effectively received it, the latter three all dying shortly afterwards.¹⁴¹ There is evidence, however, that other significant members amazed their brethren by their thaumaturgical powers. Jean Cavalier, for example, allegedly quenched the violence of a great fire with his bare hands for four minutes without being burnt.¹⁴² Abraham Whitrow was likewise credited with the miraculous cure of a man by his coreligionists and a thirteen year-old girl was also successfully exorcised among the group.¹⁴³ Yet neither of these Prophets matched the notoriety of John Lacy, whose charisma and numerous prophetical gifts undoubtedly contributed to the expansion of the group. Between August 1707 and April 1708, he attempted to cure over a dozen people, from blindness, carbuncles, ulcers, fevers and consumption, allegedly with some success, though almost always in the privacy of the chamber.¹⁴⁴ At a time when the French Prophets were facing a growing hostility, thaumaturgy was intended to


¹⁴² Reasons for hope, p. 53; Keimer, Brand, p. 53.

¹⁴³ See ‘batelier gueri par Whitrow’ in list C in Appendix; Reasons for Hope, p. 15.

¹⁴⁴ Lacy, A Relation of the Dealings of God, pp. 24-7; Lacy, The Mighty Miracle, pp. 62-4; Kingston, Enthusiastick Impostors I, p. 57 [BL 695.c.6(3)].
assert or confirm the group’s spiritual authority over their contemporaries by presenting evidence of a supernatural presence among them in anticipation of the accomplishment of their predictions. It was an attempt, as shall be discussed in chapter six, to defy both the laws of nature and the limits of human understanding, hence its appeal to the most desperate.

It is in this challenging context that the French Prophets proceeded to announce their most public and spectacular miracle yet. While Marion, Daudé and Fatio were being tried for blasphemy, the apothecary and recent follower Thomas Emes fell ill. John Lacy visited him on 5th December and spoke under the influence of the Spirit: ‘Fear not. Whatever I do for thy Trial, thou art in safe Hands. For, if I command thy Life away, yet I will restore it again.’ Emes died 22nd December and was buried at six o’clock in the evening on Christmas day in the cemetery of Bunhill Fields. The death of a member was a first for the group, and marked the beginning of a highly trying period for the prophets. Hillel Schwartz argues that it ‘challenged the hope that the present believers would be participants in the coming Kingdom.’ The group had indeed been announcing the imminent return of the Lord for the past year and the unexpected death of a prophet would certainly have compromised their credibility.

145 Predictions Concerning the Raising the Dead Body of Mr Thomas Emes, p. 1.

146 Bunhill Fields was London’s burial ground for dissenters between 1665 and 1854 and includes the graves of George Fox (Quaker), John Bunyan (Baptist), John Owen (Independent), Jane Lead (Philadelphian) and later on Daniel Defoe (Presbyterian). Alfred W. Light, Bunhill Fields (London: Farncombe, 1913), pp. 14-28, 84-92, 156-163; Sylvia Bowerbank, ‘Lead, Jane (1624–1704)’, DNB, article 16231. Other followers of the French Prophets (Nathaniel Sheppard, Mary Moult) were also buried near Emes. Keimer, Brand, p. 48; Portalès’ green notebook [Stack 11/fol. v].

147 Schwartz, French Prophets, p. 113.
As they gathered to mourn Emes for an entire week, twelve-year old Anna Maria King prophesied on 23rd December that his body would be raised from the dead and that ‘more marvellous Things’ should ‘come to pass in a little Time.’ John Potter, a thriving meatpacker, announced a few days later the date of the awaited miracle to be performed by John Lacy’s hand:

Know ye the Day in which my Servant was interred? Five Months from that Day, the Twenty Fifth Day of May, you shall behold him rise again. One Month above the Number of Days that Lazarus was in his Grave.148

The Prophets had now grown sufficiently confident and defiant to challenge the impossible. Followers of Richard Farnham and John Bull, as well as the Quakers, had made similar predictions long before them, but the Prophets were also actively preparing for its accomplishment.149 The five months preceding the announced miracle were not only marked by a promotion campaign in print, but also repeated purificatory fasts and a series of miraculous cures.150 It was indeed in that interval that Lacy was healing the blind and sick, and that the Spirit ordered its servants to wear a green ribbon in order to recognise them when coming to destroy the wicked.151 On 25th May, 1708, an estimated 20,000 people went to Bunhill Fields to watch Emes rise from the dead, but the Prophets feared the negative atmosphere would prevent the miracle and stayed instead at home or retreated to the countryside,

148 Predictions Concerning the Raising the Dead Body of Mr Thomas Emes; The Post Boy, 1975 (10th-13th January, 1708).


150 Keimer, *Brand*, p. 13. On the group’s publications in that period, see chapter four.

where the Spirit had announced they would be safe.\textsuperscript{152} The prophecy naturally failed, the crowd hurled insults and the French Prophets became the laughing stock of the press.

\textbf{***}

In the light of the millenarian context in which they emerged, the French Prophets stood out as both a heterodox and heterogeneous movement. This does not mean that they did not share common beliefs, but rather, because these could already be found elsewhere, that their doctrinal contribution to the English religious landscape was very limited. Indeed, the Prophets were essentially seeking to transcend denominations into the establishment of a universal Christian Church before the Second Coming, and the fact that they held no single, coherent doctrine proved to be both an advantage and a drawback. It allowed for more confessional diversity within the group, hence their initial appeal, but it also undermined the group’s fragile unity in the longer term because of the conflicting beliefs and personal rivalries of its followers. For this reason the French Prophets should not be regarded as yet another sect, but rather as a latitudinarian religious society concentrating on prophecy over eschatology.

As the Holy Spirit’s ‘Instruments’, the French Prophets did not preach the Scriptures, but allegedly channelled the divine to announce wonders and miracles

\textsuperscript{152} The Flying Post, 2040 (25\textsuperscript{th} May, 1708); Reasons of ye Hope, pp. 50-51; Esquire Lacy’s Reasons Why Doctor Emms was not Raised from the Dead, on the Twenty-Fifth Day of May, According to the French Prophets Prediction (London, 1708, reprinted in Harleian Miscellany, 1810), 11, pp. 64-5. Lacy had expressed personal doubts over the miracle shortly beforehand and wrote a letter to the city marshal on the same day. Abraham Whitrow may have been the only one attending according to some sources. Lacy, Relation of the Dealings of God, p. 31.
ahead of the Parousia. Their bodies served as a communicative medium between the supernatural and the natural worlds and thus delivered both a visual and oral experience to their observers. Accordingly, the enthusiast’s ecstatic trances and pretended ability to perform miracles confirmed his elevation above the natural, while the prophetic gift of tongues supported this body language by breaking linguistic barriers and addressing men of all nations. After the failed resurrection of Thomas Emes, the Prophets split into twelve missionary tribes according to those of Israel and travelled across Europe to deliver the Spirit’s warnings to new audiences.\textsuperscript{153} Yet the nature of their enthusiasm remained essentially the same throughout that period, a multi-sensory mystical experience of prophecy, glossolalia and thaumaturgy transcending the limits of the physical world to reassert God’s authority over incredulous audiences.

The French Prophets did not hold a monopoly on bodily manifestations of the Spirit. Their convulsions came instead in line with a long mystical tradition in England, epitomised by the Quakers before them and rapidly relayed by Wesley’s Methodism soon afterwards.\textsuperscript{154} While the former repudiated spirit possessions through a series of reforms, the French Prophets never let their convulsionary tradition die out and we find them in ecstatic trances as late as the 1740s.\textsuperscript{155} The encounter of their last believers with Quaker renegades and expellees nostalgic for their movement’s original inspirations would ensure yet another transposition of their prophetic tradition through the foundation of Shakerism. With recent research on the

\textsuperscript{153} This episode will be discussed in greater length in chapters three and four.

\textsuperscript{154} ‘While I was preaching, one before me dropped down as dead, and presently a second or a third. Five others sank down in half an hour, most of whom were in violent agonies. We called upon the Lord and he gave us an answer of peace.’ John Wesley, quoted by Cragg in The Church and the Age of Reason, p. 144.

\textsuperscript{155} Knox, Enthusiasm, p. 361.
Sweet Singers of Israel, Dorothy Gott or the Illuminati alongside better known movements such as Quietism, Pietism, the Convulsionaries of Saint-Médard, Methodism, Moravianism and Southcottianism, it becomes increasingly apparent that religious enthusiasm survived the so-called ‘Age of Reason’.\textsuperscript{156} The success of these groups and individual mystics brings into question the very idea of a ‘Great Awakening’ for they debunk that of a spiritual decline in the first place, and the denominational diversity of the French Prophets’ followers precisely illustrates the liveliness of a vibrant mystical culture in the early 1700s. Instead, the light of faith continued to shine alongside that of reason throughout the eighteenth century in what may be regarded as a mystical Enlightenment.

Chapter 3: The Composition and Organisation of the French Prophets

If the French Prophets’ claims to be possessed by the Holy Spirit caused much controversy, they also managed to attract a substantial number of followers in England, raising questions as to their identity. With so many diverging spiritual aspirations within a bilingual group, the story of the French Prophets was essentially one of transition and adaptation, from the mountains of the Désert to the streets of London, from an oral tradition to a flourishing print industry, from the French peasantry to the English gentry, from French to English.¹ While Marion remained prominent until his death in 1713, Fage and Cavalier were rapidly eclipsed by the intriguing presence of well established supporters such as Portalès, Daudé, Fatio, Bulkeley, Lacy and Misson, to name but a few. The Camisards’ appeal to all levels of the social ladder led Schwartz to liken them to a perceived social disease, and one may accordingly wonder how far their enthusiasm penetrated all levels of eighteenth-century English society.²

This third chapter seeks to determine who those new followers were and why they were prepared to be ostracised by their peers and brave popular anger in the name of the Spirit. The fact that the French Prophets maintained lists of their followers gives us a unique insight into English society under Queen Anne, thus

revealing preexisting connections and networks before the Camisards set foot in London. The first part of this chapter will look at the Prophets’ occupations and social status. It will be seen that the core of the group consisted of middling and upper-class men of good repute and that members belonged to a proportionally higher social rank than contemporary dissenters. Secondly, it will consider the place of women within the group arguing that many were in fact socially vulnerable and that, whilst women could prophesy alongside their male brethren, the French Prophets were not necessarily an egalitarian movement. Lastly, the remaining part of this chapter will examine more closely four extant lists of followers in order to discuss the group’s organisation and hierarchy.

***

**A Socially Respectable Group**

The three original prophets most certainly experienced a major culture shock when they arrived in London from the Désert via Geneva. That they settled in west London suggests that their first contacts (Portalès, Daudé, Miremont, Misson and Fatio, soon to be followed by English supporters such as Cotton and Bulkeley) were among the privileged classes. This prestigious entourage contrasted sharply with the modest

---

origins of Fage and Cavalier, although Marion had received some formal education and training, but this was not exceptional among the French Prophets. The group included highly educated men, twenty-one of these with a formal university education, as well as those with considerable fortunes such as John Lacy, Francis Moult, Peter Cuff, Nicolas Fatio, Sir Richard Bulkeley, Robert Douglas and Mr. Pario. Such company, especially early in the formation of the group, brought more credit to its assemblies and contributed significantly to its success.

Observers of the French Prophets often emphasised the presence of magnificently dressed gentlemen at their assemblies. Those such as Lacy, Bulkeley or Fatio were well known, but there were more intriguing guests and this evidently wealthy entourage made a memorable impression on newcomers, making them feel socially secure. Samuel Keimer remembered Thomas Dutton, ‘a Lawyer, seiz’d, being a Man well dress’d, in a long Tie-Wig, and I think having a Sword by his Side.’ Thomas Terrier once reported that, after four French refugees were arrested and condemned to pay a fine for supporting the New Prophets, a man (possibly Charles Portalès) dressed all in white and wearing a black wig and a sword came to

---

4 Jean-Paul Chabrol, Elie Marion, le vagabond de Dieu (1678-1713), Prophétisme et millénarisme protestants en Europe à l’aube des Lumières (Aix: Edisud, 1999), p. 37.

5 On the Prophets’ education, see Schwartz, The French Prophets, p. 328. Lacy’s income in 1708 was estimated at £2,500 p.a. Timothy C. F. Stunt, ‘Lacy, John (bap. 1664, d. 1730)’, DNB, article 15857. ‘Lacy’s Estate Act (8 Dec 1708)’ [HLRO HL/PO/JO/10/6/154/No.2519]. On Moult and Douglas, see Samuel Keimer, Brand, pp. 61, 76; On Douglas, see also James Samuel Barbour, A History of William Paterson and the Darien Company (Edinburgh: W. Blackwood and Sons, 1907), pp. 21, 30, 99; Pario allegedly spent his £1,500 p.a. income on the group and was already ruined by 1707, yet he does not appear in the Prophets’ accounts or lists. On Fatio and Pario, see Richard Kingston, Enthusiastick Impostors, I, pp. 73 [BL 695.c.6(3)].

6 Keimer, Brand, p. 9. Wearing swords was enforceable by law, and permitted to gentlemen only. Portalès, Daudé, Fatio and several other French refugees were also reported to carry swords. ‘Récit abrégé des persécutions & oppositions faites par les prétendus ministres de Christ de la Nation Françoise contre le message de l'Eternel, et contre ses serviteurs, qu'il a envoyez au Royaume d'Angleterre, mais premiérement à la ville de Londres, capitale du Royaume’ (1707) [Stack 1g/fols 47-48]. The Post Boy, 2111 (Nov. 23, 1708); Jennine Hurl-Eamon, ‘The Westminster Impostors: Impersonating Law Enforcement in Early Eighteenth-Century London’, Eighteenth-Century Studies, 38/3 (2005), p. 470.
rescue them with five guineas each. Women too were sometimes noticed for their impressive appearance, as with the ‘well drest’ one kneeling before Lacy to receive his blessing. First impressions of this kind created a feeling of reassurance that emanated from the French Prophets. Onlookers were comforted in their attendance by the presence of socially important members, who enhanced the credit of the group and impressed the masses.

Similarly, the involvement of well-established observers, who would never join the group, should also be underlined here. These included M. De Gornay, M. La Perrine, M. de l’Hermitage, Jean Graverol, Jean Dubourdieu and other French ministers, Georges-Louis le Sage, the third Lord Shaftesbury, the Earl of Chesterfield, Sir John Philipps and Mr. Smalbroke. Their presence during assemblies and their interest showed the audience and potential converts that the Prophets did not just appeal to the credulous masses. Indeed, Shaftesbury, who had himself attended one of these meetings in 1707, later advocated that the Prophets should be ignored because they fed on attention and may have felt that his presence had involuntarily boosted the group’s credibility. Even opponents, by attending one or more prophetic assemblies, contributed indirectly to raising the group’s profile and, similarly, the pamphlets, letters or sermons some of them subsequently produced may have inadvertently served to publicise the very cause they were combating.

---

7 ‘Lettre écrite par Ordre & au Nom de l’Eglise Françoise de Threadneedle-Street à My Lord Evêque de Londres’, in Nouveaux Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire des Trois Camisars, pp. 14-6 [BL 700.e. 21.7].
8 Keimer, Brand, p. 6.
Unlike most early modern enthusiasts, the French Prophets stood out as a socially respectable faction from the beginning, which even their fiercest opponents acknowledged and deplored. Thus Lacy was regarded as ‘a very sober, honest gentleman’ ‘of exemplary morals’, ‘much respected and of good reputation’, ‘known by many to be a man of sobriety and substance’. Similarly, Fatio was ‘a gentleman (...) of considerable learning, and well known in the world’; Bulkeley ‘a gentleman of learning’; Thomas Dutton ‘a sober ingenious man’; and James Cuninghame ‘a man well read, a good scholar (...) a traveller of sober life.’ Observers and opponents alike were frequently reported to have been introduced to the group by ‘a respectable gentleman’; ‘a very worthy gentleman’; ‘an honest and respectable man, reputed for his knowledge’ or ‘by the invitation of several sober well-meaning People.’ Moreover, biographical research reveals that most of these gentlemen were already acquainted, if not connected, prior to 1706 and therefore that the three Camisards did not appeal to isolated individuals, but rather to pre-existing networks. Among their main affiliations were the Royal Society (Fatio and Bulkeley); the Societies for the Reformation of Manners (Lacy and Cotton); the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel or S.P.G. (Bulkeley and John Hooke) and the Philadelphian Society (Richard Roach, Rebecca Critchlow, Peter Cuff, Caleb


11 Henry Nicholson, *The Falshood of the New Prophets Manifested with their Corrupt Doctrines and Conversations, Wherein all the Decays of the Nerves, and Lownesses of the Spirits are Mechanically Accounted for* (London, 1708), p. 7 [BL 695.c.6.(2.)]; *A Warning concerning the French prophets: being advice for those that go after them, to take heed lest they fall into fits, as they do and others have done, by often seeing and continuing among them* (London, 1707), p. 1 [LPL H7593 1.02]; ‘Déclaration de Mademoiselle N.N.’, in *Nouveaux Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des Trois Camisars, où l'on voit les déclarations de Monsieur le Colonel Cavallier* (London, 1708), p. 27 [BL 700.e.21.7]; Keimer, *Brand*, p. 5.
Furthermore, an examination of the bulk of the group’s membership reveals numerous friendships and business partnerships alongside family relations. The data compiled in list E shows that at least two thirds of the Prophets’ overall members and affiliates were connected to someone else in the group.\textsuperscript{13}

Regardless of their social rank, a sound reputation proved essential when venturing into a millenarian assembly. In an age when an individual’s identity or criminal record could not be readily verified, reputation within one’s community was the only basis for trust. One-time observers or disillusioned apostates initially attended the Prophets’ assemblies principally because their friends, neighbours or relatives already did so; hence it may be said that joining the French Prophets might depend on the emotionality of a trustworthy relationship, while leaving them was often caused by a moment of epiphanic rationality.

What is known about the French Prophets’ followers comes for the most part from a number of lists they compiled and from which Hillel Schwartz based his own account. These will be analysed in greater depth later in this chapter. Very little is known, however, about the majority of their attendants, whose numbers may have been exaggerated. Although Richard Bulkeley boasted some 200 members in 1708, records show that their assemblies never exceeded 107 people at any one time, leaving some doubt as to the actual number of active members.\textsuperscript{14} The vast majority


\textsuperscript{13} See Appendix.

\textsuperscript{14} Bulkeley, \textit{An Impartial Account of the Prophets}, p. 8 [BL 4136.a.24]; Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fols 3, 4].
of followers, however, were almost never referred to by the Prophets themselves. This raises concerns as to how far the French Prophets could be trusted on the identity of their own members: was attendance at a single assembly or citation by one of the Prophets regarded as a proof of membership, for example? While the Prophets’ own listings tell us who attended, they provide few other details as to the extent or duration of any involvement.

For all this vagueness, it is possible to obtain a fairly accurate idea of the Prophets’ overall numbers thanks to their extant lists. Schwartz’s total of 525 affiliates between 1706 and 1746, including some classified as ‘possibly not a believer but a sympathiser or casual observer’ and others who were possibly double counted under different names. The results compiled in the Appendix inflate this number above 650, although little or nothing is known about half of these. Aside from the wealthy supporters mentioned above, the social composition of the group remains open to speculation. Most may well have been unknown Huguenot refugees or poor Londoners, but names such as Louis-Henri de Mazières, Lady Jean Forbes, Lady Clara Gordon and Lord Deskford suggest aristocratic connections.

This undocumented bulk of the group dictates that a cautious approach is adopted in any social classification. Some 143 male believers have been identified with their confirmed occupations or status for the purpose of this study, with another 28 whose position has not yet been verified. Table 1 below reveals a wide range of occupations among the group, with some 17 gentlemen, 12 clergymen, 11 weavers and woolcombers, 9 printers and booksellers, 7 merchants, 7 chemists and apothecaries, and 5 lawyers among the most prominent categories.

---

Table 1: Occupations of male believers.\textsuperscript{16}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS OR OCCUPATION</th>
<th>HUGUENOTS</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>OTHER-UNKNOWN</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentlemen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7-13</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15-28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentlemen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7-13</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15-28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informer/spy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military &amp; navy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>1? 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries, clerks and agents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors &amp; teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2? 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale traders and large producers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1? 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meatpackers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail traders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booksellers &amp; printers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2? 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane-makers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{16} Table 1 is based on Appendix IV in Schwartz’s French Prophets (pp. 318-9), which is itself based on Richard T. Vann, The Development of English Quakerism, 1655-1755 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969), pp. 59-60. The percentage columns express a range, with the minimum number representing the percentage of all male of the given nationality and the maximum one that of all the males whose occupations are known. Unconfirmed occupations are indicated by ‘?’ and, unlike Schwartz’s calculations, have not been taken into account. Unconfirmed nationalities appear in the ‘other/unknown’ column, due to a lack of evidence. For those with several occupations, only the primary one was taken into account. Some occupations are grouped for more clarity. ‘Military and navy’ thus includes captains, colonels and lieutenants, and ‘textile’ weavers and woolcombers. Other unconfirmed occupations or categories (1 English antiquarian, 1 English oilman, 1 French ‘tradesman’ and 1 English upholsterer) have also been left out, again due to a lack of evidence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS OR OCCUPATION</th>
<th>HUGUENOTS</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>OTHER-UNKNOWN</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemists &amp; apothecaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furriers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers &amp; victuallers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruke-maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors &amp; stay-makers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallowchandlers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artisans and laborers</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18-33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brasiers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinetmakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutlers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engravers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmiths</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammermen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiners</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leatherworkers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patten-makers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchmakers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailors/seaman</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commoners</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL KNOWN</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUT OF</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A distinction should be made, however, between French and British supporters before assessing their wealth. Huguenot refugees benefited from an annual Royal Bounty of up to £15,000, according to their social and marital status, number of dependants and specific needs (medical, burial expenses, clothes etc.), to help them settle and open their own businesses. This helped an average of 10,000 people a year after 1696, including future followers of the French Prophets such as Jacques and Elizabeth Charrier (£8 in 1705), Olivier de Brossard des Préaux and his wife (£16 in 1705), Jaquette and Marguerite Perrot (£10 15s in 1705 and £9 in 1706), Jean Guilleminot (£1 15s in 1705 and 18s in 1708), Marie Bouhaut (£6 in 1705, 1706 and 1708), Susanne Devaux and her daughter (£8 19s 2d in 1705 and £9 in 1706), Jacques Bernard and his family (£6 in 1705, 1706 and possibly 18s in 1708) and Pierre and Jeanne Raoux (£4 8s in 1705). All appear in the Royal Bounty records as either commoners or bourgeoisie, corroborating protests from poorer refugees against what they regarded as an unfair distribution of the money.


18 Bernard Cottret, Terre d'exil : l'Angleterre et ses réfugiés français et wallons, de la Réforme à la Révocation de l'Edit de Nantes, 1550-1700 (Paris: Aubier, 1985), pp. 251-2. For the individual distribution of the Royal Bounty see Comité François, Estat de la distribution de la somme de douze mille livres sterling, accordée par la reine aux pauvres Protestants français refugiez en 1705 (Londres, 1707), pp. 1, 6, 13, 16, 17, 31, 65, 67 [LPL H9455 5.14]; Estats de la distribution de la somme de douze mille livres sterling, accordée par la reine aux pauvres Protestants frances refugiez en 1706 (Londres, 1708), pp. 5, 7, 11, 14 [LPL H9455 5.16]; Estats de la distribution du reliqua de la beneficence de 1707, et de la beneficence de 1708, accordée par la reine aux pauvres Protestants (Londres, 1709), pp. 3, 5, 19 [LPL H9455 5.18].

19 NRL, 37 (April 1706), pp. 464-469 [BPF 8* 442]. Typically, over half of the Royal Bounty was distributed to the gentry, bourgeoisie and extraordinary payments (people not usually requiring financial assistance) and about one third to commoners. For the year 1705, the distribution of £12,000 went as follows: gentry (£2,295 9s), bourgeois (£3,170 15s 1d), extraordinary payments (£1,830 1s 1d), ecclesiastics (£161 10s), orphans (£144 4s 1d), pesthouse (£445 3s 2d), provincial churches (£417 6s), commoners of the districts of Westminster (£1550 16s 6d), London and Spitalfields (£1629 17s 9d), medical expenses (£270 17s 4d), handling fees (£84). Comité François, Estat de la distribution de la somme ... en 1705, p. 84 [LPL H9455 5.14].
Although most Huguenot craftsmen generally lived in East London, and weavers particularly in Spitalfields, they did not necessarily live in dire poverty. London offered higher wages than Holland, in itself a major incentive to extend their exile in England. Whereas the majority of poor Huguenot exiles went to Holland for its numerous charities and eventually became a burden to the Dutch economy, it appears that many who settled in England subsequently contributed significantly to its prosperity.20 Thus the nineteenth-century study by Rev. Agnew claimed that “masters and journeymen, in their various useful and beautiful manufactures, hastened to secure remunerative employment” because they were reputed for their skills and inventiveness.21 With an annual average income ranging between £40 and £80, supplemented by their wives and children’s wages, the Spitalfields weavers thus belonged to the middling sort.22

British followers, by contrast, received little financial aid and some were in a precarious situation. It is noteworthy, for instance, that all of the servants and the lone teenagers listed were all British. Opponents of the Prophets saw the group, for this reason, as consisting of an elite core manipulating vulnerable masses.23 Thus John Humfrey described the Prophets’ new recruits as consisting of ‘Boys, Maids,
Women, and Children, who upon Sight of their Agitations and Example do fall into
the like (by Imitation or Infection it is like rather than by any Spirit) and after a Time
they come to speak likewise, and become Prophetesses, and small Prophets, whom
Multitudes admire.’

Even the Prophets confirmed and boasted of this influx of poorer converts, whose ignorance allegedly evidenced the genuineness of the Spirit
that inhabited them.

Rumours that the Prophets actually subsidised their members emerged around
the same time to explain the adherence of poor workers to an elitist congregation.
Josiah Woodward indeed insisted that they targeted ‘poor ignorant people to be of
their sect and number by allowing some fifteen shillings a week, some ten, and some
five, thereby keeping them in subjection, that they dare not declare the truth; for then
they would be deprived of all means of subsistence.’

Betty Gray, a fourteen year-old candle-snuffer's niece, allegedly received ‘six shillings a week in Money, besides
other things.’
The Prophets themselves admitted to providing some material
assistance, mainly food and clothes, but not cash subsidies, to their most necessitous
followers.

This did not prevent another gentleman observer from hinting at a price
scheme according to which the Prophets allocated their money. ‘I have heard also,
that when any of the Inspired list their Friends or Trade by adhering to their Party,
they have had five or ten pounds sent them from unknown hands. (…) And that all

24 John Humfrey, A Farther Account of our Late Prophets, in two Letters to Sir Richard Bulkeley
(London, 1708), p. 29 [BL 701.c.48].

25 Bulkeley, An Impartial Account of the Prophets, pp. 6-9 [BL 4136.a.24].

26 Josiah Woodward, The Copy of a Letter to Mr. F---. M---. A Gentleman, who is a Follower of the
Pretended Prophets (London, 1708), p. 2 [BL 695.c.5.(6)].

27 Kingston, Enthusiastick Impostors, I, pp. 4 [BL 695.c.6(3)].

28 Humfrey, A Farther Account, p. 6 [BL 701.c.48]; Keimer, Brand, p. 35.
the rest that want it have handsome Allowances, for they all live toppingly.’ It is almost impossible to evaluate accurately the proportion of necessitous members among the French Prophets due to the difficulty of identifying them. Yet, visible as they may have been, these poor converts did not by any means constitute the bulk of the group, which in reality consisted of the ‘middling sort’, workers, artisans or even bourgeois.

The French Prophets’ lists allow some analysis of their social composition and comparison with other dissenters. Michael R. Watts’s work on the occupations of male Presbyterians, Independents and Quakers in various parts of England, roughly between 1680 and 1720, is not necessarily precise, but provides a general idea of the dissenters’ social ranks in various parts of the country. Broadly speaking, there was a large proportion, if not a majority, of tradesmen and artisans among Dissenters. Artisans in London constituted almost three quarters of the recorded Presbyterians and nearly half of the Quakers, well above the average for the city’s population as a whole. More recently, Bill Stevenson’s study of 216 Huntingdonshire male Quakers living between 1655 and 1724 reveals that over one half were traders or craftsmen, while only 40 per cent held an agrarian occupation. This phenomenon can be explained for the most part by the restriction imposed upon non-conformists by the 1661 Corporation Act and the 1673 and 1678 Test Acts, which banned them from

---

29 Kingston, Enthusiastick Impostors, I, pp. 73-4 [BL 695.c.6(3)].
31 Ibid., p. 348; Porter, English Society in the 18th Century, p. 179.
32 Watts, Dissenters, pp. 350-1.
holding office or taking part in public affairs, leading many instead to specialise in commerce.\textsuperscript{34} Modern historians agree that, as a general rule, religious dissent was predominantly a provincial or rural phenomenon and the Quakers, Independents, Baptists, Presbyterians and Methodists originated largely in the countryside.\textsuperscript{35}

Yet this is precisely where the French Prophets differ. Although the Camisards originated from the \textit{Désert} in a foreign and, what is more, an enemy country, they soon stood out as a cosmopolitan, urban movement. They seem closer, in this respect, to the Fifth-Monarchists half a century earlier, concerning whom Bernard Capp’s study indicates a higher proportion of gentlemen and professionals among their ranks than any rural dissenters.\textsuperscript{36} Some years later, the Philadelphians offered a similar profile, since their society gravitated around a financially secure, university-educated gentry or bourgeoisie, including figures such as John Portage (1607-1681), Jane Lead (1624-1704), Francis Lee (1661-1719) and Richard Roach (1662-1730).\textsuperscript{37}

The French Prophets proved very much in line with the Philadelphians, and it is no wonder if Richard Roach and some of his coreligionists joined them when the Philadelphians disintegrated after Leade’s death in 1704. Table 2 compares the social


\textsuperscript{36} Bernard Capp, \textit{The Fifth Monarchy Men, A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism} (London: Faber, 1972), pp. 82-4.

Table 2: Known occupations of male believers by confession (per cent)†

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gentlemen</th>
<th>Merchants</th>
<th>Professions</th>
<th>Yeomen Freeholders</th>
<th>Farmers Husbandmen</th>
<th>Food consumption goods</th>
<th>Textile trade</th>
<th>Textile manufactures</th>
<th>Tailors, Shoemakers &amp;c</th>
<th>Mechanic trades</th>
<th>Seamen, soldiers</th>
<th>Labourers &amp; servants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General population</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterians</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quakers</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth-Monarchists</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Prophets</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Table 2 is designed to match Michael R. Watts’s comparative table in *The Dissenters, From the Reformation to the French Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), pp. 350-351. Figures are per cent and do not claim to give an accurate representation of the occupations of male dissenters, but rather a general estimate, as none of the records used can be held as entirely reliable (Watts, *Dissenters*, pp. 346-9). Watts’s results for the general population (1688-1706), Presbyterians (1701-1735), Independents (1670-1725) and Quakers (1652-1725), are each based on several records and have been averaged for more clarity. Data for the Fifth-Monarchists come from Bernard Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: a Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism* (London: Faber, 1972), pp. 83-85. Because of the different methodologies involved in this table, figures for the French Prophets and the Fifth-Monarchists have been recalculated in order to match Watts’ categories as closely as possible. Likewise, only the figures for male French Prophets whose occupations are known have been taken into account.
composition of the Prophets with that of four contemporary non-conformist groups. Among the former, the gentry comprised no less than twelve per cent, professionals 31 per cent and merchants, including some very wealthy ones (Robert Douglas, Benjamin Furly and Francis Wynantz), six per cent. Another major difference with contemporary dissenters was the presence of eleven members of the French and British nobility, amounting to at least two per cent of the overall group. This is particularly striking as aristocrats generally sought not to be associated with nonconformists in order to maintain social and political ambitions.\textsuperscript{38} Their presence among the French Prophets, therefore, may be ascribed to their perception of the Prophets as a religious society rather than a dissenting sect.

The French Prophets also differed from the Ranters beside the aforementioned sects in that they did not consist of outcasts but mostly well-integrated and well-reputed people.\textsuperscript{39} Artisans and craftsmen earned an average of 15s per week or £40 per annum between 1700 and 1720, and up to £800 of the better paid ones such as goldsmiths, watchmakers, pewterers, hat-makers, and tobacconists. A London labourer received about 10s per week or £25-30 per annum, bearing in mind that these wages may be underestimated as they do not take into account payments in kind or any additional income brought to the household by other family members.\textsuperscript{40} Judging exclusively from the confirmed occupations of their male

\textsuperscript{38} Watts, \textit{The Dissenters}, p. 360.

\textsuperscript{39} According to Jerome Friedman, the Ranters attracted a large number of London's urban poor, landless rural population, as well as criminals and prostitutes. \textit{Blasphemy, Immorality, and Anarchy: The Ranters and the English Revolution} (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1987), p. xi.

followers, it can reasonably be estimated that about 50 per cent of the sampled French Prophets were commoners and that another 40 per cent were anywhere from comfortable to wealthy, allowing only 10 per cent to the lower sort. These figures nevertheless appear consistent with Hillel Schwartz’s results, although he used a different, more speculative methodology that also includes women’s estimated wealth, and may consequently explain why the French Prophets were perceived as a socially respectable group.\textsuperscript{41} The contrast between their actual numbers and the publicity they received might therefore reflect their peculiar social stratum rather than the content of their message.

**French Prophets or English Prophetesses?**

In attempting to give a more accurate portrait of the French Prophets, one cannot avoid the gender question. Women accounted for 60 per cent of their overall number and yet they also proved considerably harder to track down for several reasons. Robert Shoemaker has outlined major difficulties that gender historians need to take into consideration when examining women’s place in early modern society. First, the vast majority of them were illiterate and consequently left hardly any records of their lives and thoughts. Those who were able to write did so privately, as cultural constraints restricted the topics it was proper for women to address in order to be published. Most women’s activities were generally recorded by men and women were typically identified by their marital status, rather than their personal

occupations, their own activities usually integrated within those of the household or in their husband’s names. Indeed, what we today understand as an occupation refers mostly to a single, specialised activity that largely suited men and is recorded as such, whereas wives and daughters earned income from a variety of tasks. All this distorts the picture of what women actually did and any combination of these factors therefore presents early modern women as social adjuncts. Women were typically referred to as the ‘daughter of’ or ‘wife of’, regardless of their own activity, as exemplified among the Prophets by Sara Dalgone, a surgeon’s wife, Jeanne Raoux, a notary’s wife, Mme La Jonquière, a weaver’s wife, or Jaquette and Marguerite Perrot, ‘filles de Marchand’. There are, however, occasional glimpses of the occupations of some female members. Joan Comb, Jenny Courtney, Mary Parks, ‘Betty’ and ‘Ramsay’ worked as servants; the widow Elizabeth Hughes owned a cook shop, Mrs Moreton a print-house and Mrs. Manwayring was a housekeeper. Ann Watts was a shop maid also known as ‘Pudding-Pie Moll’; and another, unnamed woman was a pastry cook in Place Yard near Golden Lane. Although many were probably illiterate, the Prophets also included educated women such as

---


La Jonquière might have been married to Henry Jonquière, who appears as a foreign weaver in London in 1710. Extracts from the Court Book of the Weavers' Company of London, 1610-1730 (HSL, Quarto series), 33, p. 63; Examen du Théâtre Sacré des Cévennes (London, 1708), p. 27 [BL 700.e. 21.8]; Estat de la Distribution de la Somme de Douze Mille Livres Sterling... pour l'An 1705, pp. 13, 67 [LPL H9455 5.14].

43 Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol. 8]; Keimer, Brand, p. 39; Mary Grey Lundie Duncan, History of Revivals of Religion in the British Isles, Especially in Scotland (Edinburgh: William Oliphant, 1836), p. 399. See also Appendix.

44 Keimer, A Search after Religion, among the many Modern Pretenders to it (London, 1718), p. 9 [BL 4152.aa.56(1.)] and Brand, p. 63; Schwartz, The French Prophets, p. 313; See also Appendix.

45 Keimer, Brand, p. 60; Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. Fr. 605/7a/fol. 8].
Mrs. Moreton and Hélène Jurieu. Similarly, Mrs. Keimer herself supervised the education of her children, Samuel and Mary; and the Spirit’s promise to make her a ‘mother in Israel’, a nurturing matriarchal figure for the Quakers as opposed to an itinerant preacheress, also indicate that she was socially secure. Another follower, Mrs. Bullmore, was known to have servants. Women of a higher social rank also appear in the Prophets’ lists: Jaquette Perrot and Marie Bouhaut belonged to the middle class or bourgeoisie; Mary Moult’s marriage to Charles Portalès in 1714 brought him a fortune and he subsequently became a prosperous merchant, while Mme Daudé, Mme Boussac, Mrs Keith and Mrs Shovel were respectively married to Jean Daudé (lawyer), Moïse Boussac (lieutenant), James Keith (physician) and Sir Cloudesley Shovell (admiral) and each consequently shared her husband’s social rank. Moreover, Clara Gordon, Mrs. Abden, Jean Forbes and Mrs. Clava each bore the title ‘Lady’, indicating a female aristocratic presence among the group. Like the male followers, women among the Prophets thus came from various social backgrounds, but did not necessarily play the same role within the group.

47 Hélène Jurieu was regarded as a scholar by her contemporaries, who accused her of engaging her husband Pierre in the French Prophets in the belief that the millennium was imminent. ‘Rev. de Superville to Rev. de la Mothe (Rotterdam, 18 Apr. 1711)’, Aufrère Papers (1/80) (HSL, 1940), 40, pp. 66-7. Although very little is known about Mrs. Moreton, she was most likely a scholar as women constituted a small minority of printers and printing required some level of education.


49 Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. Fr. 605/7a/fol. 8].

50 Comité François, Estat de la Distribution... en 1705, pp. 6, 13 [LPL H9455 5.14]. See also Appendix.

51 Keimer, Brand, p. 61; Portalès’s Marriage certificate [Stack 12g/fols 11-12].

52 See Appendix.

53 Duncan, History of Revivals of Religion in the British Isles, p. 397. See also Appendix.
Historians have often endeavoured to rediscover and reinterpret history from women’s perspective, though gender history is concerned with redefining the role of both sexes in society, not just rediscovering about women or depicting them in the guise of victims.\textsuperscript{54} Women among the Prophets outnumbered men, both as followers and as inspired members, and although the occupation or status is known for some, it is nevertheless striking that none of the main prophetesses (Henriette Allut, Elizabeth Gray, Ann Watts, Mary Keimer, Mary Beer, Ann Good, Elizabeth Charras, Anna Maria King, Jeanne Raoux, Mary Turner, Anne Steed or Ann Topham) could be identified distinctly from their husbands or fathers. This was true for their social position, but not so much for their role in the group. Some Prophetesses, such as Allut, Cavalier and Gray, generally preached alongside their husbands or lovers; others, on the contrary, were never associated with them. Elizabeth Charras was married to Jean Cachar (or Cachard) and received five shillings in aid from the Royal Bounty as Elizabeth Cachard in 1705, but she always went by her maiden name among the Prophets, as did Sarah Dalgone, married to Etienne Moleron, or Margaret Middleton, possibly married to the great Scottish physician George Cheyne.\textsuperscript{55}

The main reasons for this documentative discrepancy between genders are twofold. Women tended, first of all, to be considerably younger than their male

\textsuperscript{54} Robert Shoemaker, \textit{Gender in English Society, 1650-1850}, pp. 1-5.

\textsuperscript{55} Charras might have used her maiden name to preserve her reputation. She had been in a very precarious situation while in Geneva and Cachard accused her of making him drunk and forcing him into marrying her in order to stop begging, \textit{Examen du Théâtre Sacré des Cevennes}, pp. 27-28 [BL 700.e.21.8]; Comité François, \textit{Estat de la distribution... en 1705}, p. 51 [LPL H9455 5.14]; Anita Guerrini claims that Middleton (c.1680-1752) was the daughter of Patrick Middleton (1662-1736), non-juring Episcopalian clergyman of Aberdeen, but the chronology does not seem to correspond to his life and I was unable to find any issue from his marriage with Margaret Orme. Archibald Lundie, who reported Margaret Middleton’s agitations in 1709, refers to her as the daughter of the Principal, therefore pointing toward George Middleton (1645-1726), Principal of King’s college, Aberdeen. Middleton married in 1671 and his daughter Margaret was born in 1675. Anita Guerrini, ‘Cheyne, George (1671/2–1743)’, \textit{DNB}, article 5258 and \textit{Obesity and Depression in the Enlightenment: The Life and Times of George Cheyne} (University of Oklahoma Press, 2000), p. 79; David M. Bertie, \textit{Scottish Episcopal Clergy, 1689-2000} (Continuum International Publishing Group, 2000), p. 97; Duncan, \textit{History of Revivals of Religion in the British Isles}, p. 395.
counterparts. With the exception of Allut, Charras, Raoux and Steed, these prophetesses were aged twenty and under by the time they became inspired; whereas male Prophets were at least in their late thirties or older. A difference in marital status is also striking: all the prophetesses, save again for Allut, Raoux and Charras, were unmarried. It was not uncommon for women to join the French Prophets on their own or along with other female relatives. Possibly the condition of mothers and daughters, as well as sisters, may suggest broken households, devoid of a supporting patriarch, as further evidenced by the participation of at least eleven confirmed widows. Sara Dalgone’s husband was serving as a surgeon in Spain when she testified in the the Théâtre sacré; Elizabeth Charras lived on her own and joined the Prophets early; Mrs Shovel had two teenage daughters and first appears in the group’s records shortly after her husband’s death in 1707; as did Susanne Devaux, widow, and her disabled fourteen year-old daughter Marie. Women among the French Prophets were also less likely to be educated – in any case almost all the group’s scribes were men – and most were socially vulnerable. Possibly then the prospect of a weekly allowance of a few shillings, if verified, proved attractive to orphan teenage girls, single women and widows, and might well complement or

56 See list E.


58 Rebecca Critchlow, Mary Emes, Marie Sterrill, Elizabeth Hughes, Mrs. Roberts, Suzanne Devaux, Judith Misson, Mrs. Moreton, Mrs Shovel, Lady Abden and Mrs Keith of Caddom.

59 Examen du Théâtre Sacré des Cevennes, pp. 27-28 [BL 700.e.21.8]; Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 8]; John B. Hattendorf, ‘Shovell, Sir Cloudesley (bap. 1650, d. 1707)’, DNB, article 25470; Comité François (London, England), Estats de la distribution... en 1706, p. 7 [LPL H9455 5.16].

60 Archibald Lundie, for instance, said of Ann Topham: ‘She is, as I am informed, a very dull, ignorant creature, scarce able to speak any tolerable sense when free of those agitations.’ Duncan, History of Revivals of Religion in the British Isles, p. 394. The widow Hughes was also known to be illiterate. Keimer, Brand, p. 62.
largely account for their enthusiastic zeal. Josiah Woodward, for example, once met a
desperate woman who deplored the loss of her prophetic allowance after being
expelled for denying the efficiency of an exorcism against a devil she did not know
was inside her.61

Women’s vulnerability may have pushed them to seek further attention and
influence within the group than they actually had in their normal lives, as perhaps
with Elizabeth Gray’s impersonation of the Whore of Babylon, though they never
became as prominent as male prophets. From 1707 onwards, the majority of the
group’s followers and inspired were now female so that the French Prophets might
actually have been better named the ‘English Prophetesses’. Such prominence may
also explain what Schwartz calls ‘the rise of the female embassy’ after 1715, but the
group nevertheless remained under male dominance until then.62 Although their
ascension coincided with that of prominent female mystics such as Antoinette
Bourignon (1616-1680), Jane Lead (1623-1704) and Jeanne Guyon (1648-1717),
whose influence could be felt both in Britain and on the continent, neither the French
Prophets nor their dissenting contemporaries adopted this matriarchal model and
each offered specific gender roles.63 The Society of Friends believed the ‘Inner
Light’ was equally present in both men and women, and Margaret Fell Fox even
pleaded for an equal right for women to preach in 1667.64 Quaker women abandoned

61 Woodward, The Copy of a Letter to Mr. F---. M---, pp. 6, 8-9 [BL 695.c.5.(6)].
63 Paula Mcdowell, ‘Enlightenment Enthusiasms and the Spectacular Failure of the Philadelphian
280, 282.
64 Shoemaker, Gender in English Society, 1650-1850, pp. 47; Mack, Visionary Women, p. 176.
around the same time the prophetism of their predecessors to become instead ‘mothers in Israel’, socially secure matriarchal figures who henceforth acted as ‘hostesses, patrons, and general stabilizers of the movement.’ Yet while the Quakers encouraged such social function as well as female preaching, which John Wesley originally criticised them for, they also maintained separate female meetings throughout most of the eighteenth century. Similarly, Peter Vogt has shown that Moravianism also tended towards equality against what Zinzendorf regarded as a misogynistic Church, although it also restricted women to preaching to their sisters.

By allowing women to speak alongside men, the French Prophets undoubtedly showed more latitude than the Quakers or the Moravians. They never adopted sexually segregated assemblies nor did the Spirit appear to discriminate against women when choosing its Instruments. However, overzealous prophetesses were not tolerated by the group, and there are indications that women were kept under control despite appearances. For example, at least ten significant female followers were excluded by the group between 1708 and 1712, including the self-proclaimed ‘Saviour of womankind’ Dinah Stoddart, the sadistic prophetess Dorothy Harling, as well as Sarah Wiltshire, who was severely pummelled by Louis Joyneau for prophesying that her brethren’s predictions would fail. Domestic issues also


became public ones when entire families joined the Prophets. Thus, Abraham
Whitrow repeatedly beat his wife with a horsewhip for committing adultery, despite
the Spirit’s endorsement of the poor woman through the mouths of several Prophets.
Although wife beating was commonly accepted if abiding by the ‘rule of thumb’, the
degree of violence used by Whitrow shocked his contemporaries and denotes a
growing difficulty in controlling some women.69 Similarly, when Arthur Lacy
refused to be blessed by his father, John Lacy ‘knocked his Sons Head against the
Wainscot, and struck him so severely upon his Mouth with his Fist, that he beat out
one of his Teeth, and made his Head and Face swell in an extraordinary Manner.’70
The great schism of 1708 not only marked the exclusion of false prophets, including
Whitrow himself, but also revealed palpable tensions involving unruly women.
Whereas Phyllis Mack has argued that early Quaker women spoke with the voice of
male biblical prophets, female Prophets spoke with that of Miriam, Deborah, Huldah,
Noadiah and Anna, although their group remained less egalitarian than the Quakers.
As passive Instruments of the Spirit, the French Prophets observed a clear distinction
between preaching and prophesying and only allowed their women to speak in the
latter case. Those attempting to interpret the Scriptures and preach like the Quakers
were immediately reproved. In other words, they were not to think for themselves
and discuss doctrinal issues for example, but only to vocalise the Spirit or, as Lacy

69 Keimer, Brand, p. 35; Nicholson, The Falsehood of the New Prophets Manifested, pp. 19-20 [BL
695.c.6.(2.)]; Elizabeth Pleck, ‘Criminal Approaches to Family Violence, 1640-1980’, Crime and
Justice, 11 (1989), p. 32; Margaret Hunt, ‘Wife Beating, Domesticity and Women’s Independence in

70 The French Prophets’ mad sermon, as preacht since their sufferings at their several assemblies held
in Baldwin’s Gardens, at Barbican, Pancras-Well, and several other Places in and about London
(London, 1708), p. 3 [BL 1076.1.22.(26.)].
Put it: ‘Womens Preaching as ordinary Ministers is one thing, and God speaking in his own name through their Organs is another.’ 71

**Organising the Millennium**

The repartition of roles within the Prophets remains unclear, as their structure and composition changed almost continuously from 1706 to the 1730s. However, the group’s profile, as established in this chapter, was based principally upon four lists, each detailed in the Appendix, inventoried by its scribes, documents which are crucial in evaluating the group’s size and its evolution.

List A was compiled in French by Fatio on 19th January, 1708, and contains the names of 107 people, who attended the assembly mentioned in Fatio’s calendar for the same date. 72 The list appears in fact to follow the notes taken during this very assembly and may therefore suggest that inventorying attendants was common practice after each meeting. Although the names seem to have been written randomly, with Fatio entered as no. 4, Bulkeley no. 47 and Marion no. 104, some details indicate upon closer inspection that a precise order was followed. Thus Mary Maddocks (or Maddox), Mr. Barker, Melle des Brousses and Thomas Dutton were respectively inserted in 60th, 61st, 64th and 65th positions; causing all the rest of the list to be corrected, when their names could more easily have been added at the end. Susanne Sanger (or Sanguer) was first listed as no. 74 and later moved to no. 77 for no obvious reason; this mistake cannot be ascribed to a misspelling – in which case the name would have been rewritten on the side – as it had been handwritten clearly,

---


72 Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol.10v] and [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol.3v].
but replaced by another name. If the meaning of this order remains unclear, list A nevertheless denotes a scrupulous sense of organisation. It is by no means complete, however, given the striking absences of major Prophets such as Lacy, Glover, Fage, Cavalier and Anna Maria King, all of whom were then actively announcing the resurrection of Dr. Emes, as well as Jean and Henriette Allut.

List B is more problematic. Compiled in English, in alphabetical order and presented in four columns, it does not bear any date or author. Nor could it be exhaustive, as all the names it contains appear to be French, save perhaps for Anne Southouse and her son Filmore. A note at the bottom of the page stipulates that ‘children that have not been inspired are omitted.’ Far from perspicuous, this note is in reality very ambiguous to the modern reader. In its most literal sense, it may simply leave out uninspired youngsters and thereby indicate that Joseph Bernard (b. 1702), Filmore Southouse (b. after 1695) and Marthe Vergnon (b. 1702) had received some prophetic gifts from an early age. This may be further evidenced by the presence of Bernard and Southouse in the group’s tribes. On the other hand, the Prophets always referred to themselves as ‘God’s children’ and the Spirit would address them as ‘my Child’. Uninspired children might consequently also have meant uninspired adults in the group’s jargon, adding confusion to a seemingly clear and organised list.

73 The absence of Jean and Henriette Allut can be explained by the birth of their son four days earlier. Fatio’s calendar, 15th Jan., 1708 [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol.3r]; John Lacy, Predictions Concerning, the Raising of the Dead Body of Mr Thomas Emes (London, 1708) [BL 1415.g.6].

74 Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol.7].

75 See tribe 7 (‘Judah’) [BPF Ms. 302/fols4v].

76 Other French followers, such as Sara Dalgone, Robert Roger and Matthieu Boissier, do not appear on this list. Boissier returned to Lausanne after testifying in the Théâtre sacré. Examen du Théâtre Sacré des Cévennes, pp. 13-14 [BL 700.e.21.8].
Three adults are nevertheless reported as ‘absent’ (Col. Cavalier, Col. Béliard and David Flotard) and these were possibly serving in Spain against France in the war for the Spanish succession.\footnote{Francis Espinasse, ‘Cavalier, Jean (1681–1740)’, DNB, article 4917.} Mary Aspinhall’s name was also crossed out, perhaps due to a mistake regarding her nationality, and five names (Arnassan, Artaud, Jaques Levi, Jean Pellet and his wife Judith) are preceded by two asterisks and were not totalled at the bottom of each column. This may denote tensions within the group and subsequent exclusions, as we know that Arnassan became a confirmed apostate circa March 1708.\footnote{Examen du Théâtre Sacré des Cevennes, pp. 20 [BL 700.e.21.8].} The overall number of members appearing on list B thus amounts to 77; yet its representative quality remains questionable: it may either signify that the Prophets had held an exclusively French assembly, a known practice since 1\textsuperscript{st} January, 1708, or that they compiled separate lists by nationalities, leaving out English followers in both cases.\footnote{Keimer, Brand, p. 22.} Based upon this information, and considering Jeanne Verduron’s entry as Cavalier’s wife, it can be confidently estimated that list B was compiled some time between April 1707 and March 1708.\footnote{The list may even date from before 1708, as Jacob Allut’s was not entered, either because he had not been born yet or because of his very young age. Cavalier and Verduron married some time in March or early April 1707. Fatio’s calendar, 11\textsuperscript{th} April, 1707 [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol. 1\textsuperscript{v}].}

List C is certainly the richest source, based on an impressive ‘444 Pages compard.’\footnote{Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol. 8].} Like list B, it is undated, sorted alphabetically and presented in four columns; but it is written in French and includes entries, sometimes with alternative spellings, their relations, tribal affiliations and, most importantly for the purpose of this chapter, interconnections and occasionally their confessions and respective
occupations. Tribespeople’s names easily stand out as they are underlined and annotated with the initial of their tribe. Seven tribes (Levi, Benjamin, Issachar, Naphtali, Zebulon, Simeon and Judah) are thus represented and seven names twice underlined, quite possibly to highlight the leaders of these tribes, despite a few errors.

The list also reveals a degree of uncertainty and confusion and so cannot be entirely relied upon. A note at the bottom of the page indicates that six people, whose names are preceded by the abbreviation ‘NB’, may in fact belong to the tribe of Benjamin. It is also apparent that modifications were made to the first seven tribes after list C was compiled, as Durand Fage was not yet affiliated with any; Ann Watts was moved from the tribe of Benjamin to that of Levi; and leaders were changed for Levi and Benjamin, or were not yet defined for Issachar and Zebulon. These errors and uncertainties may have been the result of a collaborative work. The document is indeed anonymous, though the initials ‘I N’ may point out to an unidentified scribe. Lastly, the non-enlistment of prominent members among the earliest tribes, such as Jean Cavalier, Richard Bulkeley and Abraham Whitrow seems to reflect the tensions growing between the group and the latter over the summer of 1708. With only seven tribes formed and considering the uncertainties around some of them, this document was most likely completed in November 1708, thanks to the events recorded by Fatio in his calendar.  

Lastly, list D proves to be the most informative and clearest about the state of the group after the internecine tensions and rivalries of the summer of 1708. It was

---

82 Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol. 8] and calendar, Nov. 23, 1708 [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol. 4].
compiled by Charles Portalès on 22nd April, 1709, in a letter to his cousin David Flotard. Names are organised in twelve tribes, with twenty eight members for that of Levi and only twelve for the remaining ones, thus totaling 160 people. Based on list C, possible tribe leaders appeared first, regardless of their actual prophetic abilities. It is noteworthy, for example, that Marion, Fage and Lacy were all entered at the bottom of tribe one, while Fatio, Daude and Portalès, three uninspired scribes, appear at the top. All members were also renamed according to biblical characters, a possible indication of the role conferred to each of them in the survival of the group.

Despite the fact that the French Prophets were avid bookkeepers, no indication to sums of money or any pension was found in these documents. Rather, they appear to suggest a real desire, indeed an obsession, on the part of the Prophets to document their progression and perhaps to monitor their image. As these four lists were almost certainly compiled less than two years apart, they prove essential in understanding who the Prophets really were and can therefore provide us with an insight of the group at its pinnacle.

When compiling his own list of the French Prophets, Schwartz totaled 525 members between 1706 and 1746. Yet his figures appear not to include all the names and associated people appearing in list C. Servants and children may not have participated actively in the Prophets’ assemblies, but they certainly helped to increase their size and should consequently be taken into account. Indeed, entire households joined the Prophets together, raising their overall number to over 650. Of course,

83 Papiers Coquerel [BPF Ms.302/fols 4r-5r].
85 See list E in Appendix.
this total does not reflect the true size of the group in its heyday, as servants would have little choice but to follow their converted masters, or may indeed have been included without their knowledge. Many of those entered in these lists never featured again in the Prophets’ publications or correspondence. Possibly some never did become inspired or they simply left the group after its restructuring in 1708. In his *Impartial Account of the Prophets*, published late in January that year, Richard Bulkeley boasted that the French Prophets were already 200 strong and kept growing each day. His figures were quite in line with list A, compiled a few days earlier, and were consistent with an upsurge of recruits throughout the spring of 1708. Judging from the later list C, it can reasonably be estimated that their number had risen to 450 by the following autumn, probably as a result of the well-publicised announcement of Thomas Emes’s resurrection.

Bulkeley was admittedly the only manager of the group with greater responsibilities than Fatio, and consequently had a precise knowledge of their adherents. Moreover, the Prophets’ correspondence and Fatio’s calendar consistently reported large assemblies – two accounts estimating an average of 100 attendants – with dozens of people blessed each time, further supporting Bulkeley’s late January figure of 200. While plausible, this also indicates that the Prophets inflated their numbers by including the names of mere onlookers. For example, the *Honest Quaker* reported how Richard Bulkeley had demanded that all spectators give

---

86 Bulkeley, *An Impartial Account of the Prophets*, pp. 6, 8 [BL 4136.a.24]. The precise publication date (January 31, 1708) can be found in *The Post Man and the Historical Account*, 1871 (Feb. 3, 1708).

87 Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol. 8].

88 Kingston, *Enthusiastick Impostors*, I, p. 36 [BL 695.c.6(3)].

their names before John Lacy performed a miracle on Betty Gray in August 1707 and
how she, under inspiration, had threatened those who refused that they might be
made blind by God’s wrath.\(^{90}\)

List C seems to confirm this numerical exaggeration. Edward Fowler, Bishop
of Gloucester and an outspoken opponent of the Prophets, was nevertheless placed
on the list with his large family, undifferentiated from the Prophets’ genuine
followers.\(^{91}\) Sir John Philipps was likewise recorded on the same list and Schwartz
described him as ‘another man early involved with the French Prophets’, but his
sources do not suggest any interaction between Philipps and the Prophets.\(^{92}\) True,
Jean Cavalier delivered a single warning in the presence of Philipps and Mr.
Smalbrooke (or Smalbroke) on 14\(^{th}\) January, 1707, and although Philipps was
certainly active in the relief of French Protestant refugees, this makes them one-time
witnesses rather than constituting a demonstrable link with the rest of the group.\(^{93}\) In
fact, Philipps’ affiliation with the Society for the Propagation of the Christian
Knowledge (S.P.C.K.) might indicate the opposite. Whereas Lacy, Bulkeley and
Cotton all belonged to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, the S.P.C.K.
produced some of the French Prophets’ fiercest critics. Beside Fowler, these included
Josiah Woodward, Anglican clergyman, and Claude Groteste de la Mothe, reformed

\(^{90}\) The Honest Quaker: or the Forgeries and Impostures of the Pretended French Prophets and their
Abettors expos’d (London, 1707), pp. 2-3 [BL 695.c.7.(5.)].

\(^{91}\) List C [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol.8]; Schwartz, Knaves, pp. 42, 66.

\(^{92}\) Schwartz, The French Prophets, p. 70, n. 84; Thomas Shankland, ‘Sir John Philipps of Picton, the
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and the Charity-School Movement in Wales,
1699-1737’, The Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodokion, Session 1904-5 (London:
Cymmrodokion, 1906), pp. 74-216; John Mcleish, Evangelical Religion and Popular Education, a

\(^{93}\) D. W. Hayton, ‘Philippis, Sir John, fourth baronet (c.1666–1737)’, DNB, article 37850. On Richard
Smalbroke, see Clarke, The Georgian Era: Memoirs of the Most Eminent Persons, Who Have
Flourished in Great Britain, from the Accession of George the First to the Demise of George the
Fourth (London: Vizetelly, Branston and co., 1832), I, p. 493.
minister, whom the S.P.C.K. formally thanked for his 1708 collection of sermons against the Prophets entitled *Caractères des nouvelles prophéties*. If Philipps had ever been linked with the Prophets, his reputation as a pillar of the S.P.C.K. suggested otherwise, as confirmed by his biography and records of the S.P.C.K.

Even more intriguing is the entry of Colonel Cavalier’s name, along with one Col. Béliard, in lists B and C. Schwartz does not report this puzzling detail, but its implications are multiple and consequential if Col. Cavalier secretly embraced the French Prophets, despite his public repudiations of Marion, Cavalier and Fage as rogues and vagrants. When writing his memoirs with Abraham Mazel in 1708, when the Prophets’ decline was already underway, Marion insisted that Col. Cavalier supported them, revealing sympathetic letters from the latter, in which he claimed his declarations had been misreported and misinterpreted. César Gallois also declared in January 1708 that Jean Cavalier de Sauve kept letters from his alleged cousin the Colonel, in which the latter begged him not to say a word of what had occurred in the Désert for no one would believe it. If true, such testimonies might suggest that the

---


96 Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fols 7-8].


98 *MMM*, pp. 167-177.

99 ‘Lettre écrite par Ordre & au Nom de l’Eglise Françoise de Threadneedle-Street à My Lord Evêque de Londres’, in *Nouveaux Mémoires*, pp. 22-3 [BL 700.e.21.7].
once great military hero of the Cévennes was a dubious opportunist, but on the other hand, the Prophets may also have exaggerated their proportion of respectable figures, with Col. Cavalier subsequently added in order to legitimise and accredit the group, especially among fellow Huguenot refugees. Given that Marion himself never forgave the Colonel for his surrender and signing of the treaty of Nîmes to end the war in 1704, the existence of a sympathetic correspondence between the Camisard leader and the Prophets remains questionable and most likely indicates that the group claimed war heroes and respected figures as one of them better to promote their cause.\textsuperscript{100} Based on the number of 160 tribespeople selected in the last quarter of 1708, a distinction should be made between the 450 or so attendants recorded and a probable 200 to 250 genuine believers or active participants in the group.\textsuperscript{101}

The Prophets’ meticulousness in keeping records of their activity paradoxically reveals a shaky hierarchy and foundations in that they had no explicit rules or leader.\textsuperscript{102} When compared with John Lilburne and the Levellers, Gerard Winstanley and the Diggers, George Fox and the Quakers, Thomas Venner and the Fifth Monarchists, Lodowick Muggleton and the Muggletonians, Jane Lead and the Philadelphians or John Wesley and the Methodists, it may be argued that the French Prophets’ principal weakness lay in their lack of unity behind a clear and strong or charismatic leader. Of the original prophets, Fage and Cavalier were rapidly eclipsed by Marion, who certainly imposed himself at the head of the group from September 1706; although his prominence was supplanted by John Lacy in the summer of 1707,

\textsuperscript{100} Chabrol, \textit{Elie Marion}, p. 56.

\textsuperscript{101} Papiers Coquerel [BPF Ms.302/fols 4v-5r].

\textsuperscript{102} Bulkeley, \textit{An Impartial Account of the Prophets}, p. 6 [BL 4136.a.24].
when Marion was being prosecuted for blasphemy. His influence remained considerable until late in 1708 when he nominated the tribes, though he interacted mostly with his fellow French supporters by then. Nor did John Lacy, albeit the most notorious Prophet, outlast his predecessor by much. He had already expressed personal doubts shortly before Thomas Emes was due to rise from the dead and seemed less active in the Prophets’ missionary expeditions before he eventually withdrew to Lancashire in 1711. From around 1709, he was succeeded by James Cuninghame, a Scot who rapidly emerged as a prominent figure during the missionary expeditions to Edinburgh.

The French Prophets were democratic in the sense that virtually anyone might deliver the Spirit’s word before an audience. Accordingly, even John Lacy admitted that there was no hierarchy within the group, for its Instruments allegedly spoke in total self-abnegation rather than from a personal viewpoint. However, great discrepancies in prophetic abilities can be noticed in spite of Lacy’s claim and these may very well be at the origin of the Prophets’ schism in 1708. Elie Marion, the most prominent figure of the French nucleus, never spoke in tongues or performed miraculous cures. Nor did Cavalier, whose prophesies were always delivered in French even alongside English Prophets. The same was true of his cousin Jean


104 *Deuxième Lettre d’un Particulier, à Monsieur Misson* (London, 17070, p. 14 [BL 700.e.21.2].

105 Richard Kingston claims that Marion had the gift of healing, but no other evidence confirms this. *Enthusiastic Impostors*, I, p. 33 [BL 695.c.6(3)].

106 Lacy, *Predictions Concerning, the Raising of the Dead Body of Mr Thomas Emes*, pp. 4-6 [BL 1415.g.6.]
Allut, though he led continental missions between 1710 and 1713.\textsuperscript{107} Among the original prophets, Durand Fage was the only one to deliver a glossolalic performance, albeit in Marion’s shadow.\textsuperscript{108} English converts fared comparatively better than their French counterparts in terms of their prophetic powers. Thomas Emes and Nathaniel Sheppard had evidently been promised the gift of healing and Elizabeth Gray and Samuel Keimer that of tongues.\textsuperscript{109} Abraham Whitrow received the former and John Lacy both, allegedly curing dozens of people.\textsuperscript{110} Only a small minority of the inspired thus accessed to the supreme gift, Lacy reporting that four or five people were able to speak in tongues by the summer of 1708.\textsuperscript{111}

The Spirit’s evident support of English followers over French ones, and prophets over prophetesses marked a definite breach from the Cèvenole tradition of the Desert in favour of a tacitly regimented, non-egalitarian model. The group maintained distinct gender roles until around 1715, after the last missionary expeditions, whereas women proved more numerous and were more likely to be inspired than men.\textsuperscript{112} It is noteworthy, for instance, that the gift of tongues and that of healing appeared to be a male preserve, and that the French Prophets’ scribes and printers were almost all exclusively male. List D also seems to support this view.

\textsuperscript{107} ‘Sur les Inspirés auxquels Nicolas Fatio de Duillier etoit attaché’, Papiers Le Sage [BGE Ms. fr. 2043a/28/4-5]; Chabrol, Elie Marion, pp. 177-8, 189-90, 198-200, 202.

\textsuperscript{108} Troisième Lettre d’un Particulier, à Monsieur Misson (London, 1707), p. 4 [700.e.21.3]; Kingston, Enthusiastick Impostors, I, pp. 22-3 [BL 695.c.6(3)].

\textsuperscript{109} Keimer, Brand, pp. 11-2, 33-4.

\textsuperscript{110} Whitrow is only known to have cured a waterman (Richard Cheney?). See ‘batelier gueri par Whitrow’ in list C, John Lacy, A Relation of the Dealings of God to his Unworthy Servant John Lacy (London, 1708), pp. 21, 24-27 [LPL H7593 1.08]; Lacy, The Mighty Miracle; Or, The Wonder Of Wonders At Windmill-Hill (London, 1708, reprinted Harleian Miscellany, 1810), 11, pp. 62-64; Kingston, Enthusiastick Impostors, p. 57 [BL 695.c.6(3)]

\textsuperscript{111} John Lacy, Mr Lacy’s Letter to the Reverend Dr. Josiah Woodward (London, 1708), p.21 [BL 4139.aa.13.].

\textsuperscript{112} Chabrol, Elie Marion, p. 108.
Women were indeed almost absent in the dominant tribes of Levi and Benjamin, but much more numerous in the later ones, which were formed hastily over a much shorter period of time, and in which they were generally entered last, indicating their auxiliary role.113

In his history of the French Prophets, Hillel Schwartz argued that ‘women also made themselves noticeable by their mobility and independence’ and proved ‘more adventurous.’114 Admittedly, the Prophets offered more gender latitude than any other contemporary denomination, provided of course that their women remained committed to vocalising the Spirit. Jeanne Raoux was thus able to name the tribes with Marion and some women even led missionary expeditions across Britain and Holland, sometimes conjointly with men. Such enterprise, however, did not reflect the general role played by their sex. When examining the list D, for example, women only comprised 51 of the 160 tribespeople, or less than one third of the elect, and at least 32 of these were directly related to one other tribesperson.115 It seems that women were not designated individually, but rather according to their family situation.

Schwartz added that men had ‘more business entanglement’ and ‘more family connections than their female counterparts’, but this was also true of women to some extent.116 When the Spirit ordered them to abandon their businesses, John Potter, Thomas Dutton, Nathaniel Sheppard, Francis Moult and others all gave up or reduced their activities dramatically and some young followers even renounced their

113 Papiers Coquerel [BPF Ms.302/fols 4r-5r]; Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fols 3-4].
115 This figure does not include Elizabeth Gray, who was already Lacy’s lover by then, and other women whose family relationship could not be established. Papiers Coquerel [BPF Ms.302/fols4r-5r].
prospective careers.\textsuperscript{117} Similarly, there were women who sacrificed their businesses to the Prophets, as exemplified by Samuel Keimer’s mother, her daughter Mary, Ann Watts and the widow Elizabeth Hughes.\textsuperscript{118} Other independent women may also have been in the same situation, though evidence is missing here. Henriette Allut further counterposes Schwartz’s claims through her significant role in the Dutch missions, despite having two very young children.\textsuperscript{119} Phyllis Mack indeed showed that prophetesses and female preachers typically continued to undertake their daily chores, preaching during the day while serving dinner to their families at night. Those who embarked on missions entrusted the care of their children to their relatives or kin temporarily and never left for more than a few weeks or months.\textsuperscript{120} Essentially it appears that mobility and adventurousness reflected not so much the Prophets’ gender, but the fortune of people like Francis Moult, who spent ‘many Hundreds, if not Thousands of Pounds, for the carrying on and spreading that Delusion.’\textsuperscript{121}

The French Prophets’ organisation can also be examined by nationality, in addition to gender and age discrepancies. Marion and Raoux’s naming of the tribes can be regarded as an attempt to unite the group by mingling young prophetesses with older prophets, as well as French and English believers. While the group never held single-sex assemblies, it did have nationally segregated ones as early as January

\textsuperscript{117} Keimer, Brand, pp. 28, 42, 76.

\textsuperscript{118} Keimer, Brand, pp. 43

\textsuperscript{119} Jacob was born on Jan. 15, 1708 and Jerome in September 1709. Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fols 3'-5].

\textsuperscript{120} Mack, Visionary Women, pp. 178-9.

\textsuperscript{121} Keimer, Brand, p. 72.
This trend was further accentuated by internecine tensions, as the French nucleus (Marion, Allut, Fatio, Portalès and Fage) subsequently no longer met with the English one (Lacy, Potter, Cuninghame and Gray). And although later publications do show mixed assemblies held in both languages, there was noticeably only a small minority of French followers, most of whom were recent recruits. This gradual distancing between French and British followers no doubt reflected difficulties in communication, particularly if one could not speak in tongues, but probably also personal rivalries between their most charismatic figures. It is no coincidence, for instance, that Lacy and Marion were almost never reported prophesying together in an assembly. Only after the latter’s death and the former’s withdrawal did some rapprochement occur between some French and English followers. The occasional appearances by Fatio and Allut in Hannah Wharton’s meetings in the 1730s may exemplify this, but by then the Prophets already presented a very different image and had an entirely new British base.

The energy spent on forming the twelve tribes failed to bring cohesion to the group. None of these tribes undertook a prophetic expedition in reality: the British and continental missions between 1709 and 1713 consisted instead of smaller groups, oftentimes irrespective of their original tribal affiliation. The Prophets’ centre of

---

122 List B might also suggest a separate meeting of Huguenot refugees in 1707 or 1708. Keimer, *Brand*, p. 22.

123 *A Collection of advertisements respecting the regulation of assemblies, and containing the rules of discipline: wherein are comprehended several orders and commands; exhortations and admonitions; and instructions: and some examples of the Lord’s jealousie* (London, 1715) [BLO Pamph.328(30)].

124 Marion also expressed divergences with Lacy in a letter addressed to Fatio on Aug. 5, 1707. Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr. 601/241].

125 Hannah Wharton, *Divine Inspiration: or, a collection of manifestations to make known the visitation of the Lord, and the coming of his kingdom... By the mouth of Hannah Wharton at Birmingham and Worcester* (London, 1732), pp. 73, 81, 93 [BL 852.f.23].
gravity also moved over the following years from London to Edinburgh, Birmingham, Worcester and eventually to Bolton and Manchester with John and Jane Wardley in 1747.¹²⁶ These relocations reflected internal rivalries and a lack of coordination within a shrinking group. It was not until 1715 that the Prophets introduced some elementary rules conducive to their survival but, despite calls for unity, loyalty, obedience and discipline, no leader emerged from among their remnants.¹²⁷ Relatively little is known of their splintered activities beyond this date and Fatio’s calendar does not go beyond January 1710, with significant gaps in the preceding two years.¹²⁸

Hillel Schwartz and Clarke Garrett suggested a traceable chronology of the Prophets until the conversion of Ann Lee in Manchester in 1758 and her subsequent foundation of the Shakers in America.¹²⁹ However, the French Prophets’ image and constitution had changed dramatically by then, not least because of the death or departure of their most prominent members. Over 30 followers were indeed excluded or became apostates before 1715, including some prominent ones like the Philadelphians Richard Roach and Sarah Wiltshire. Jean Cavalier and his wife also left the group in 1709, but they had been ostracised by their brethren for a few months before. Bulkeley died in 1710, Marion and Jurieu in 1713, and Cuninghame in 1715; whereas Lacy withdrew to Lancashire in 1711 only to reappear sporadically until his death in 1730. Fage’s last known participations in prophetic assemblies were

¹²⁶ Wharton, Divine Inspiration [BL 852.f.23]; Notes and Queries (November 1957), p. 474; Terrie Dopp Aamodt, ‘Wardley, Jane (fl. 1747–1770), DNB, article 40904; Chabrol, Elie Marion, p. 158.

¹²⁷ A collection of advertisements [BLO Pamph.328(30)].

¹²⁸ Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fols 1r-6r].

in 1715 and he may have returned to France afterwards. Francis Moult condemned the prophetess Hannah Wharton as a bigot who allegedly had made him hate what he had previously loved after the failure of a mission to Wales in 1715. Fatio moved with Jean and Henriette Allut to Worcester in 1717, and the names of Charles Portalès and his brother Jacques were later crossed out on the manuscript of Marion and Mazel’s memoirs as if to dissociate them from the group. Thus, while meetings were still reported in Clerkenwell as late as 1740, it may be suggested that the French Prophets no longer constituted a coherent or cohesive group beyond 1715.

***

The research undertaken for this thesis has enabled the identification of new followers and revealed the occupations or status of others. The Prophets appealed to a very diverse audience and encompassed all social and religious backgrounds of late Stuart Britain, including many gentlemen and noblemen. This was uncommon among early modern enthusiasts, at least in those proportions, but it was corroborated by the presence of equally prestigious observers and opponents. Starting with only three inspired refugees, the group attracted over 650 followers, spectators and

130 Keimer, Brand, p. 57; A collection of advertisements respecting the regulation of assemblies, pp. 115, 121, 144 [BLO Pamph.328(30)]; ‘Lettre de Marthe Huber à Nicolas Fatio’ (30th Apr., 1718) [BGE Ms. fr.601/fol. 216]; ‘Lettre de Marie Huber à Nicolas Fatio’ (3rd Feb., 1719) [BGE Ms. fr. 601/218]; ‘Correspondance et méditations de Jean Allut’ (19th Sept., 1719) [BGE Ms. fr. 605/1/fol.18]; ‘Sur les Inspirés auxquels Nicolas Fatio de Duillier etoit attaché’ [BGE Ms. fr. 2043a/28/4]; Scott Mandelbrote, ‘Fatio, Nicolas, of Duillier (1664–1753)’, DNB, article 9056; ‘Lettre de Charles Portales à Nicolas Fatio’ (22nd Oct., 1719 and 12th Sept., 1732) [BGE Ms. fr.601/fols 260-261]; Portalès’ green notebook and common place book, p. 2 [Stack 1]; Mémoires de la guerre des Cévennes, p. 9 [Stack 1]; MMM, p. xiv.

131 A Complete guide to all persons who have any trade or concern with the city of London, 2nd ed. (London, 1740), p. 91 [GL ocm22742233].
possibly unconscious affiliates in total over four decades, although the vast majority of them joined in the group’s early years. A comparison with the Quakers would make the Prophets numerically insignificant, although perhaps six times stronger than the Philadelphians, according to Paula McDowell’s estimate. Yet their impact was such that they had made a name for themselves in many parts of the kingdom by 1708. This success was the result of a sharp sense of publicity and organisation, without which the Prophets would simply never have existed. However, the group was nevertheless weakened by apparent age, nationality and gender discrepancies from an early stage, which an ill-defined and unstable leadership further accelerated. With ramifications across Britain, Germany and possibly Holland, as a result of their schism in 1708, the French Prophets remained essentially a heterogeneous movement with decreasing coherence and coordination after 1715. They truly held together as a group for only a decade and, because of their small size, may have become the first victims of the decline of religious dissent in England in the first half of the eighteenth century.

132 The estimated population of the Quakers in early eighteenth-century England was 38,000 to 40,000, though Phyllis Mack claims there were 60,000 by 1660. To this must be added some 115,000 Catholics, 179,000 Presbyterians, 59,000 Independants or Congregationalists and 58,000 Baptists by 1720. Watts, *The Dissenters*, p. 270; Mack, *Visionary Women*, p. 1; Porter, *English Society*, p. 179; McDowell, ‘Enlightenment Enthusiasms and the Spectacular Failure of the Philadelphian Society’, p. 524.


Chapter 4: The French Prophets, an Eighteenth-Century Media Phenomenon

With the repeal of the Licensing Act in 1695 ending press censorship, political journalism flourished in early eighteenth-century England, the growth of newspapers outpacing the 25 per cent expansion of the electorate.¹ By 1704, nine newspapers had a combined weekly circulation exceeding 44,000 copies and in 1709, London boasted eighteen periodicals, distributed by an estimated 4,000 street sellers.² Upon their arrival in England, Fage, Cavalier and then Marion therefore discovered an accessible print market, as well as an avid, continuously growing readership.³ Broadcasting the Spirit certainly necessitated some adaptation to take full advantage of this new medium and such initiatives probably did not originate with Fage, but his educated supporters, who almost immediately constituted themselves as his scribes. Fatio, Daudé and Portalès were already recording Fage’s inspirations in July and Cavalier’s in August and early September before Marion’s arrival.⁴ However, it is only with the latter—a clerk—that the desire to print their inspirations became systematic, as the Prophets aroused the curiosity of a growing audience thanks to the support and publicity of wealthy benefactors. These ensured the transition from the

² Mark Knights, Representation and Misrepresentation (OUP, 2005), pp. 226-7. Adam Fox and Daniel R. Woolf claim that another 130 newspaper titles were established in England between 1700 and 1760. The Spoken Word: Oral Culture in Britain, 1500-1850 (Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 22.
³ It is estimated that at least 50 per cent of adults in England could read print by 1700. Adam Fox, Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500-1700 (OUP, 2000), p. 19.
⁴ Fatio’s calendar [Ms. Fr. 605/7a/fol. 1r]: ‘Preciz du Discours de Mr. Durand Fage d’Aubaye, prononcé sous l’Opération de l’Esprit, à Londres le 30 Aoust 1706, A 8 ou 9 Heures du matin’ [LPL MS 932/10]; ‘Preciz du Discours de Mr. Durand Fage d’Aubaye, prononcé sous l’Operation de l’Esprit, A Londres, le 3e 7bre 1706; à 8 ou 9 heures du matin’ [LPL MS 934/52].
Camisards’ oral prophetic tradition of the *Désert* to the English print market and thus placed the French Prophets at the centre of a fierce pamphlet war.

As the opposition to the French Prophets has already been studied in great length by Hillel Schwartz and Daniel Vidal, and addressed more recently by Jean-Paul Chabrol, John Mullan and Christopher Reid, Laurent Jaffro, Daniel Thorburn and Georgia Cosmos, this chapter proposes instead to concentrate on the Prophets’ methods of communication in their effort to deliver God’s message. It will first consider their use of the printed medium before looking at the tenor of their assemblies and finally the organisation of their prophetic missions in order to assess their impact on early eighteenth-century England. Overall, it will be argued that, although print permeated their oral tradition, the voice remained the central medium of expression by which they gained most of their publicity. Whether oral or written, the French Prophets constituted, in its most literal sense, an eighteenth-century media phenomenon.

***

From Orality to Print

Marion’s arrival in London in September 1706 marked the beginning of a mutation of divine speech. The Spirit that had spoken profusely to the Camisards in the Désert was evidently reducing his discursive pace to dictate the word of God to His servants. The Prophets began to speak conveniently slowly and use recurrent phrases such as ‘I tell thee, my Child’ to allow their scribes more time to take full notes. Holy utterance began systematically to materialise into sacred text as, between 18th September, 1706 and 30th March, 1707, the scribes compiled minutes of Marion’s prophesies on a daily basis under the prophet’s supervision. Attendants could even order free copies of their transcripts with a one to two day delivery. The Spirit made explicit the move toward the printed medium on 9th December, 1706 and repeatedly ordered his Children to publish his word thereafter. The group’s efforts resulted in the publication of Marion’s Avertissements prophétiques on 5th April, 1707.

The transition towards the written format may also have been motivated by François-Maximilien Misson, a Norman travelling writer internationally famous for his New Voyage to Italy (1695). Misson had joined the Prophets in November and began to interview Cévenols refugees about the supernatural phenomena of the

---

6 Marion, The Prophetical Warnings of Elias Marion, pp. xiii-xiv [BL 852.f.18]; Jean Gailhard, Discourses on Several Useful Subjects (London, 1708), p. 181 [SRL B4293]; James Sutherland, Background for Queen Anne (London: Methuen, 1939), p. 53; Vidal, L’ablatif absolu, p. 35.

7 Keimer, Brand, p. 9.

8 Marion, Avertissements prophétiques, pp. 50-52 [BL 8630.aaa.26]; ‘A Historical Relation of the Workings and Operations of the Holy Spirit’ (1710), pp. 23, 27 [Stack 1j].

9 Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol. 1v].

10 Marion, Avertissements prophétiques, p. 88 [BL 8630.aaa.26]. The original version was written in French and published in 1691 as Nouveau voyage d’Italie, and was regarded as the first travel guide of its time. It is thought that Misson also influenced Defoe for both his Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain and Robinson Crusoe. Craig Spence, ‘Misson, Francis Maximilian (c.1650–1722)’, DNB, article 18821.
Désert, with the clear intention of publishing their testimonies.\textsuperscript{11} This move was an effort to counterpoise the growing criticisms of the consistory of the French Churches of London upon the three Camisards.\textsuperscript{12} Acknowledging that Marion, Fage and Cavalier had aroused a controversy since September, Misson did not present them as war heroes, but instead as the last survivors of a persecuted movement and the living proof that divine manifestations had occurred in the Cévennes. ‘Ces trois braves Soldats Chrétiens, Etrangers, Pauvres, Foibles, presque autant dignes de compassion que d'estime, & cruellement molestez, trouvent leur apologie parmi les autres, dans ces Témoignages.’\textsuperscript{13} Misson spent the winter of 1706/07 collecting testimonies from Cévenols refugees with John Lacy, which he finally published on 24\textsuperscript{th} April, 1707 under his own name as Le Théâtre sacré des Cévennes, to this day one of the most emblematic accounts of the French Protestants’ plight under the Ancien Régime.\textsuperscript{14}

Twenty-six people testified on behalf of the Prophets in London, twelve of them taking an oath before John Edisbury, Esq. and Richard Holford, ‘Masters in Chancery’. This included the Prophets (Marion, Fage and Cavalier), their scribes (Portalès, Fatio and Daudé) and fellow refugees from Languedoc: Jean Vernet, Claude Arnassan, Jacques Mazel, Jeanne Castanet, Jacques Dubois and Isabeau Charras. It is not clear how and why they were chosen, but Misson’s effort to credit

\textsuperscript{11} François-Maximilien Misson, Le Théâtre Sacré des Cévennes; ou, Récit de diverses merveilles nouvellement opérées dans cette partie de la Province de Languedoc (London, 1707), p. i [BPF 8* 3 102/1 Rés]. See also Georgia Cosmos, Huguenot Prophecy and Clandestine Worship, pp. 23-36.

\textsuperscript{12} Cosmos, Huguenot Prophecy, p. 23.

\textsuperscript{13} ‘These three brave Christian soldiers, poor, weak strangers, almost as worthy of compassion as of esteem, and cruelly molested, find their apologia among others, in these testimonies.’ (My translation) TSC, p. i [BPF 8* 3 102/1]. This sentence does not appear in either of the English versions published simultaneously.

\textsuperscript{14} Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 1v]; MMM, p. 159.
the original Prophets required witnesses with trustworthy reputations. Col. Cavalier nevertheless questioned their credibility and the veracity of their testimonies: ‘Ce sont là des témoins à dire toutes choses, mêmes avec serment; pourvu que leur Déposition serve à entretenir la credulité qui les fait vivre.’ Some, he also argued, were not even in England when Misson conducted his alleged interviews. Others refuted their oaths in another declaration in 1708, which suggests that Col. Cavalier followed the progression of the French Prophets very closely. His allegation also indicates that some refugees such as Arnassan or Jean Cabanel may have briefly joined the Prophets, but then retracted for fear of retribution. Of all these witnesses, only Charras became an active follower.

Most of these testimonies acknowledged the Prophets’ participation in the hostilities and all attested supernatural manifestations, based on the Spirit’s seizure of innocent children. An extraordinary number of infant prophets had allegedly spoken in tongues, some as young as fifteen months, evidence, it was claimed, that their inspirations could not have been simulated. Women too were inspired in their thousands and preached to support their menfolk, for which hundreds were martyred. Yet the most intriguing declaration concerned Col. Cavalier’s implication with the Cévenol prophetism. Although he carefully avoided this sensitive issue later

---

15 Misson, *A Cry from the Desart: or Testimonials of the miraculous Things lately come to pass in the Cévennes* (London, 1707), pp. i-ii [BL 114.a.59]. Castanet might have been related to the Camisards leader of the same name. See p. 46, n. 62. Abraham Mazel was in Lausanne at that time. His testimony is included in Marion’s declaration. *MMM*, pp. 201-206.

16 ‘These witnesses are willing to say anything, even under oath, provided that their deposition maintains the credulity that they make of living of’ (my translation). Col. Cavalier’s declaration in *Examen du Théâtre Sacré des Cevennes* (London, 1708), p. 12 [BL 700.e.21.8].


19 *TSC*, p. 32 [BPF 8* 3 102/1 Rés].

20 Ibid., p. 18.
in his own memoirs, Claude Arnassan and Durand Fage declared that he had experienced similar agitations to the Prophets in London.\textsuperscript{21} Arnassan was a former galley slave and therefore embodied the Huguenot persecution; his testimony certainly credited Fage who, as a prophet and not a prisoner or hero, was at the heart of the controversy.\textsuperscript{22} Although these declarations corroborated the phenomena described in chapter one, it must be borne in mind, as Georgia Cosmos argued, that they were not necessarily transparent insofar as they were probably shaped by the questions and bias of those who collected them.\textsuperscript{23} The final product should be regarded in this respect as a compromise between the enthusiastic statements of the refugees and the normative bounds imposed upon them by the Masters in Chancery.

Further publications rapidly followed Marion’s \textit{Avertissements} and Misson’s \textit{Théâtre sacré} as the Prophets sought to reach a still wider audience. As the local Huguenot readership was limited and the potential English-speaking market growing fast, it rapidly made sense to address Londoners in their own language. John Lacy had worked feverishly since January 1707 on an English version of Misson’s \textit{Théatre Sacré}, which he completed on 1\textsuperscript{st} March and was published as \textit{A Cry from the Desart} around the same time as its original.\textsuperscript{24} Marion’s \textit{Avertissements prophétiques} were also translated almost simultaneously as \textit{Prophetical Warnings}, barely three weeks after its original, on 30\textsuperscript{th} April, albeit Lacy’s contribution here remains unclear.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., pp. 29, 110-115, 117. Col. Cavalier’s prophethood is somewhat ambiguous. Marion’s memoirs contain letters allegedly from his hand in which the Colonel shows his support to the Prophets and claim that his declaration were misinterpreted by their enemies. MMM, pp. 167-177.

\textsuperscript{22} On two occasions, the Prophets added his name on their member lists. See B and C in Appendix.

\textsuperscript{23} Cosmos, \textit{Huguenot Prophecy}, p. 25.

\textsuperscript{24} Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 1']. \textit{A Cry from the Desart} was published in late April/early May 1707, just a few days after Misson’s original. MMM, p. 159.

\textsuperscript{25} Charles Bost attributes this translation to Lacy, but does not support his argument. No evidence confirms this so far. MMM, p. 159.
Thus in the space of four weeks, the group had released four books and targeted both Londoners and Huguenots.

Any successful broadcast of the Spirit’s warnings required wealth and credit that the three Camisards did not have. Even though the persecution of French Protestants and the Camisard insurrection had been well reported issues, very few people had heard of Elie Marion and certainly no one of Cavalier and Fage.26 Their anonymity could only be palliated by the support of a reputable man such as Misson: ‘Pour donner plus de poids à la vérité, Mr. M[isson] se déclara l’auteur de la compilation des témoignages, suivant l’avis des Personnes judicieuses.’27 The names of Lacy and Bulkeley certainly also accredited the Cévenole cause towards Londoners, as both were particularly respectable and well-connected gentlemen. The success of the French Prophets, short-lived as it was, owed at least as much to these men’s respectability as to Marion’s aura. Indeed, Lacy, Bulkeley and possibly Misson invested in the group to promote its message to an unfamiliar audience and expand its numbers. The Prophets’ prolific enthusiasm and the wealth of their early supporters may indicate that they flooded the print market with their prophecies, having allegedly printed ‘above forty pounds worth of books’ by the end of April 1707.28 Hillel Schwartz has even suggested that the mark ‘1425’ on the front page of...

26 I have been unable to find any account of the war of the Camisards and their leaders that mentioned Marion before his arrival in London. On reports of the dragonnades and the Cévennes, see Daniel Thorburn, ‘Prophetic Peasants and Bourgeois Pamphleteers’, pp. 163-181.

27 ‘In order to give more weight to the truth, Mr. M[isson] declared himself the author of the compilation of testimonies, following the advice of judicious persons’, in NRL, 43 (Feb. 1708), p. 129; Dialogue entre deux freres, touchant les prophetes Cevenois (London, 1707), p. 2 [BLO Pamph. 272(12)].

28 A full and true account of the apprehending and taking six French prophets, near Hog-lane in Soho, who pretended to prophecy that the world should be at an end within this three weeks (London, 1707) [BLO Pamph.274(15)].
the British Library copy of Marion’s *Avertissements* was proof of a large edition, well above the 1,000 copies average for a book at that time, but this in fact refers to an accession number in Sir Hans Sloane’s personal library prior to its transfer to the British Museum in 1753.29

If the extent of the Prophets’ publications remains subject to speculation, their output certainly did not diminish. While Misson’s *Cry from the Desart* was already going through a second edition on 9th June, 1707; Lacy published three volumes of his own warnings by the end of November and Bulkeley had in the meantime ordered his broadsheet and Lacy’s first volume to be advertised by London street sellers.30 The temporary follower Henry Nicholson also reported on their broadcasting methods in 1708:

> Mr. Lacy, in my hearing, was ordered by his Spirit, speaking to him in the Person of God, to buy up all his Books of Warnings, leaving as many as might probably be vended in this City [London], and to send them Gratis all over this Kingdom; some to the Northern Parts of it, some to Wales, and some also to Ireland. This Command, to my certain Knowledge, they have begun to put in Execution.31

---

29 The full mark reads in fact ‘N.1425’ and was almost certainly written by Sloane himself, as he meticulously compiled catalogues of his own collections. Sloane, who probably knew Bulkeley and Fatio from the Royal Society, possessed other books by or about the Prophets, including *A Warning concerning the French Prophets*, 1707 (copy marked ‘H.498’) [BL 816.m.22.(121.)] and *A Collection of Prophetical Warnings, pronounced under the operation of the Holy Eternal Spirit, to the inhabitants in and about the City of Bristol* (1709) (marked ‘a 1386’) [BL 695.c.7.(1.)]. Information confirmed by the curator of early modern books at the British Library. See also Arthur MacGregor, ‘Sloane, Sir Hans, baronet (1660–1753)’, *DNB*, article 25730. [http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/sloane/about.aspx](http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/sloane/about.aspx).

25 July, 1707 [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 2]. A third, previously unknown edition, published by H. Hills in 1707, is kept at the Newberry Library in Chicago. I have not been able to examine this copy. [NLC D539.58].

30 Fatio’s calendar, 25th July, 1707 [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 2]. A third, previously unknown edition, published by H. Hills in 1707, is kept at the Newberry Library in Chicago. I have not been able to examine this copy. [NLC D539.58].

31 Nicholson, *The Falshood of the New Prophets Manifested with their corrupt Doctrines and Conversations by One who hath had intimate Conversation with them* (London, 1708), p. 2 [BL 695.c. 6(2)].
Indeed, another account published the same year confirms the successful diffusion of the Spirit’s message:

Le soin qu'a eu Monsieur Lacy de faire repandre sa Traduction dans le Royaume, avec une liberalité digne d'un meilleur Livre, à prévenu beaucoup de Personnes dans les Provinces les plus reculées. Il m'est revenu de plusieurs endroits, que le sort de la plupart de ceux que l'on a abusez, étoit le Théâtre sacré.  

More collections of prophecies followed at an uninterrupted rate until 1714. Many of these were compiled as a result of the group’s missionary expeditions across the British Isles and on the continent, where they needed to broadcast their message to new audiences. An estimated 31 different collections of prophecies alone were published in French, English and Latin during this period, not including pamphlets and letters published in response to their opponents’ criticisms. The overall figure of the French Prophets’ publications thus amounted to at least 57 over an interval of eight years.

Although the French Prophets could never have moved toward the printed medium without their wealthy supporters, the group also relied largely on its members’ personal devotion and conveniently included nine confirmed printers and booksellers. Their commitment and degree of inspiration remain unclear for none were apparently prophets, although most served the group as hosts or messengers. Thus Samuel Keimer, then a printer’s apprentice, reported paying his master £10 he

32 ‘The care with which Mr. Lacy diffused his translation in the kingdom, with a generosity that is worthy of the best books, alerted many people in the most remote provinces. I have heard from several places that the fate of most of those who have been abused was indeed the Cry from the Desert’ (My translation). Examen du Théâtre Sacré des Cevennes, pp. 1-2 [BL 700.e.21.8].

33 Robert Roger, Samuel Keimer, William Rogers, Ebenezer Draycott, Mrs. Moreton, William Wilkins, Samuel Noble, Jaques Levi and Johann Christoph Sauer. See list E in Appendix.
had received from his mother for the publication of some warnings at his press.\textsuperscript{34} In his vindictive account of his experience among the French Prophets, Keimer continued to denounce the group’s exploitation of his credulity and the subsequent debts he contracted over the years.\textsuperscript{35} Fatio’s calendar also accounts for William Rogers printing some warnings between August and October 1708; and another agreement was later made on 3\textsuperscript{rd} January, 1710, with Robert Roger, printer of Marion’s \textit{Avertissements prophétiques} and Misson’s \textit{Théâtre sacré} to print a further account of the Prophets’ agitations.\textsuperscript{36} Samuel Noble also printed and sold prophetic collections on several occasions and Johann Christoph Sauer acted as the Prophets’ printer in Germany.\textsuperscript{37} The Prophets thus relied partly on their printers and booksellers whose blind devotion probably lowered the cost of printing and hastened its publication.

The Prophets’ abundant output of millenarian predictions is a classic example of the appeal of the printing press to dissenters and thereby echoes the activity of their predecessors during the Interregnum. As Mark Knights has observed:

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{34} Keimer’s chronology is not always clear, but this most likely occurred around 1707/08. Brand, p. 52.

\textsuperscript{35} The extent of some of the devotion of some followers had no limits. Keimer reported lending his brethren great sums of money at a 500\% interest rate, but never saw his money back. Brand, pp. 76, 78, 80-81.

\textsuperscript{36} Although he appears in the Prophets’ records, Roger’s involvement with the group remains uncertain as he later printed pamphlets against them. See p. 167. Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fols 3\textsuperscript{v}, 6\textsuperscript{r}].

\end{flushleft}
Print could create textual communities on a wider scale than was possible in a scribal culture. Some groups, such as the Levellers and Quakers, were so good at exploiting the potential of the medium that one might almost say they were in part created through print. Print could also enhance identities, including those relating to gender and nationality, and widen participation by marginal groups.\textsuperscript{38}

The development of print in England was prodigious from the mid-seventeenth century and provided dissenters with a new voice.\textsuperscript{39} The printing press contributed to the diffusion of their ideas by reaching new audiences beyond the boundaries of their local communities. Fixing words on paper also had the advantage of controlling the content of a message from the author to the reader to avoid the distortions and prejudices of oral intermediaries. If the Restoration marked an era of renewed persecution, the Toleration Act and the repeal of the Licensing Act re-opened a favorable ground for dissenters by the turn of the eighteenth century. Still, interest in eschatology remained unshaken over that interval and Elizabeth Eisenstein reminds us that numerous pseudo-scientific manuals and guidebooks based on astrological and mathematical predictions appeared around Newton’s time to calculate the year of the Second Coming or to answer questions on the soul’s journey after death.\textsuperscript{40} The publicity around the French Prophets therefore should not come as a surprise, for they arrived at an opportune moment to announce the Parousia in England and consequently appeared to supply a pre-existing demand for millenarian literature.

\textsuperscript{38} Knights, Representation and Misrepresentation, p. 236.


\textsuperscript{40} Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe (CUP, 1993), p. 50.
Although dissenters have often been associated with the printing press, it would be too simplistic to see in the spread of the printed word an ineluctable decline of orality. Keith Thomas has in fact shown that oral communication remained central throughout the eighteenth century, whether in the form of Parliamentary speeches, lawcourts pleadings, sermons, teaching or apprenticeship. Even the wholly illiterate were not excluded from the printed word as newspapers were often read in public and ballads sung in taverns or fairs. Adam Fox has likewise demonstrated that, while print permeated oral culture from an early age, it did not weaken it, but simply reinvented it. Far from a destructive effect of print over orality, Adrian Johns has instead metaphorically summarised communication in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as gravitating around two powerful black liquids: coffee and ink. Likewise, the French Prophets did not turn their backs on the oral prophetic tradition of the Désert and continued to communicate first and foremost orally and visually. Certainly they shocked their contemporaries more by their bizarre vocalisations and outrageous performances than by publishing their accounts. This spectacular dimension also had been envisaged and interpreted as part of a grand design: ‘I will have thee to be an Offence to the World. I will that the World be offended in thee. The World follows the World: the Devil goes along with it. But I am with my Children.’

---


42 Fox, Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500-1700, pp. 5, 50.


44 NRL, 42 (Sept. 1707), p. 334.

45 Marion, Prophetical Warnings, pp. 9-10 [BL 852.f.18].
The Battle of Pamphlets

The printed opposition to the Camisards began in May 1707 with a series of pamphlets directed against Misson.\textsuperscript{46} By that time, their publications and the subsequent riots caused in April began to attract the attention of distinguished intellectuals, theologians, politicians and even physicians. The controversy gave birth to a formidable battle of pamphlets, whose figures established the Prophets as a true media phenomenon. The 57 publications they delivered caused another 89 reactions, including pamphlets, sermons, public letters and a play, for a total of 146 publications.\textsuperscript{47} To these figures must also be added dozens of newspaper articles between 1707 and 1710. Not only did the Prophets make full use of the print industry, but they also manifestly received greater publicity from their opponents. The relationship between the Prophets and the early modern press proved complex and inextricable. It may be further argued that their dispersal ended anti-enthusiastic publications or, conversely, that press silence accelerated the Prophets’ decline. The latter hypothesis had already been formulated by Shaftesbury in his \textit{Letter concerning enthusiasm}, in which he described enthusiasts as attention seekers and consequently advocated ignoring them.\textsuperscript{48} With the last anti-French Prophets pamphlet published in 1711, it was not long until Shaftesbury was proved correct.

\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Dialogue entre deux freres, touchant les prophetes Cevenois} [BLO Pamph.272(12)].


The French Prophets created such stir that their notoriety soon expanded beyond the British isles. A letter from Jean-Christophe Fatio to his brother Nicolas, dated 14th June, 1707, attests that he had heard from various sources in Geneva that the latter was supporting the pretended Prophets.49 Another letter, dated 5th March, 1708, confirms the flow of information in Switzerland, when Jean-Christophe wrote that the whole Fatio family was covered with shame, following Nicolas’ condemnation to the pillory the previous November.50 The foreign press also reported on the Prophets’ controversy. Marion, Cavalier and Fage appeared in Le Journal des Scavans and La Gazette de Paris in 1708; the monthly Nouvelles de la République des Lettres in Amsterdam reported on the Prophets six times between June 1707 and April 1708, for a total of 52 pages; and further accounts of the Prophets were also published in Dutch and German.51 Such a wide coverage was motivated, the author points out, by the numerous books published on the Prophets in England, thereby indicating that they had successfully acquired international attention through the European media.

In his study of the Camisards’ representation in print, Daniel Thorburn has argued that, once in England, ‘the Camisards were opposed because of the social group from which they came and because their message was spread orally.’52 Yet

49 Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr. 601/fols 145-146].
50 Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr. 601/fol. 149].
51 Le Journal des Scavans (Paris, 1708), pp. 11-15 [BNF 34348802]; Cosmos, Huguenot Prophecy, p. 133; NRL, 41 (June 1707), pp. 688-690 (July 1707), p. 110; 42 (Sept. 1707), pp. 331-339; and 43 (Jan. 1708), pp. 105-106 (February 1708), pp. 122-147 (April 1708), pp. 404-414; De propheten in Engeland, na de raad onses heeren, geoordeeld aan hare vrugten : in een brief, geschreven aan een vriend (Rotterdam, 1708); Nicolaus Hunnius, Mataeologia Fanatica, oder Ausführlicher Bericht von der Neuen Propheten (Dresden, 1708). I have not been able to consult the last two sources.
orality certainly did not distinguish them from other denominations, for the spoken word remained an essential component of the Protestant faith. Robert Scribner has indeed shown that since the Reformation, ‘it was not held to be sufficient to read printed tracts or even the Bible: the desire was to hear the word.’ The power of the pulpit described by Scribner as a medium of mass communication remained very much the same throughout the early modern period. The popularity of charismatic preachers such as Richard Baxter, Robert South, Edward Stillingfleet and John Tillotson marked what James Downey called ‘the golden age of English pulpit oratory’ and continued into the eighteenth century with Gilbert Burnet, Edward Fowler, Edmund Calamy, Joseph Butler, George Berkeley and the evangelical awakening spearheaded by John Wesley and George Whitefield. Whether it was recited or simply read aloud, the sermon was quintessentially oral and its publication, generally edited by the author rather than reproduced verbatim, its natural outlet.

For this reason, the flourishing and highly lucrative sermon literature of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, and with it the emergence of sermon plagiarism, reflected not only the growth of the print and literacy, but also first and foremost the importance of orality among both Anglicans and non-conformists.

Moreover, it may be argued that orality even served the Prophets since it was precisely from word of mouth that they attracted the attention of neighbours, friends and onlookers, as demonstrated in chapter three, and thus established a solid core of supporters. Conversely, the first pamphlets against the Prophets appeared as early as

---


May 1707 in a series of seven Dialogues targeting Misson for printing testimonies of the supernatural events of the Cévennes.\textsuperscript{56} Many following attacks on the group also commented on and debunked the propositions and claims made by the Prophets in their publications.\textsuperscript{57} Lastly, as will be seen in chapter five, Marion, Daudé and Fatio were exposed on the pillory in November 1707 for publishing blasphemous predictions. Opposition to the French Prophets therefore did not arise because of their oral tradition as such, but rather from the outlet it found in the printing press, as much as the extravagance of their physical symptoms and assemblies.

As with all controversy, participants were exploiting the issue to secure significant profits and the battle of pamphlets also involved a battle of printers. The Tory John Morphew, one of Swift’s publishers, thus engaged in the publication of numerous anti-enthusiastic pamphlets, though with the exception of Bulkeley’s \textit{Impartial Account of the Prophets}.\textsuperscript{58} Morphew’s involvement was both lucrative and conformed with the ‘Tories’ continuous attempt to repeal the Toleration Act in the early 1700s. The French Prophets, as we shall see in chapter five, gave the the latter a good reason to support their political battle. Benjamin Bragg(e), another major publisher of the time, proved less scrupulous with political consistency and published

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{56} \textit{Dialogue entre deux freres, touchant les prophetes Cevenois}, p. 2 [BLO Pamph.272(12)].

\textsuperscript{57} For example, \textit{An appeal from the prophets to their prophecies} (London, 1708) [BL 695.c.5(12)]; \textit{A dissuasive against enthusiasm} (1708) [BL 4139.aa.12]; \textit{Reflections on Sir Richard Bulkeley's answer to several treatises} (1708) [BL 695.c.6(7).]; Edmund Calamy, \textit{Sir Richard Bulkeley's Remarks on the Caveat against new prophets consider'd} (1708) [BL 4105.bb.32.].

\textsuperscript{58} See for example, Richard Kingston’s \textit{Enthusiastick Impostors} (1707); \textit{An Account of the Lives and Behaviour of the Three French Prophets} (1708); \textit{A Preservative Against the False Prophets of the Times} (1708); G.P., \textit{The Shortest Way with the French Prophets} (1708). On Morphew, see Henry R. Plomer, \textit{A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725} (London : Bibliographical Society, 1968), pp. 210-211.
for both sides.\textsuperscript{59} His output included all three volumes of Lacy’s \textit{Prophetical Warnings} and Misson’s \textit{Cry from the Desart}, as well as virulent anti-enthusiastic pamphlets such as \textit{Observations upon Elias Marion and his Book of Warnings} (1707), George Philadelphus’ \textit{The Right Way of Trying Prophets} (1708) and the second volume of Kingston’ \textit{Enthusiastick Impostors} (1709). Robert Roger, who specialised in the plight of French Protestants, likewise printed Marion’s \textit{Avertissements prophétiques} and Misson’s \textit{Théâtre sacré des Cévennes} and \textit{Plainte et censure}, but also Jean Graverol’s \textit{Sentimens désintéressez de divers théologiens protestans} (1710).\textsuperscript{60}

Such practices were common in eighteenth-century England, especially since the repeal of the Licensing Act in 1695 had ended press censorship. There were over 60 printing houses and 150 bookshops in London by 1705.\textsuperscript{61} Competition was therefore harsh and printers happily fomented controversies to encourage better sales. Samuel Keimer, the French Prophets’ unfortunate printer, was imprisoned several times for publishing libelous pamphlets.\textsuperscript{62} He later confessed to exploiting the attempted Jacobite invasion of Scotland to publish a false article in his newspapers that earned him £15! This success encouraged him to publish more provocative articles against the government until he was imprisoned again.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{59} Plomer, \textit{A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers}, p. 47.

\textsuperscript{60} Roger’s previous publications include \textit{Histoire abrégée de la ville de Nîmes} (1703); \textit{Liste des Protestans françois réfugiez en Angleterre} (1703/04); \textit{Histoire abrégée des dernières révolutions arrivées dans la principauté d’Orange} (1704).


\textsuperscript{63} Keimer, \textit{Brand}, p. 84.
Whether printing for or against the French Prophets, the battle of pamphlets proved a lucrative politico-religious controversy and the participation of major printers such as Morphew and Bragge confirms the Prophets’ impact on Queen Anne’s England.

The episode of Dr. Emes’s resurrection due on 25th May, 1708 was undoubtedly the source of great publicity. By that time the Prophets had been delivering warnings and claiming miracles for almost two years and already attracted more English than French followers, marking a successful transition from the Désert to an urban audience of Londoners. This prophecy in itself reflected both the fascination they created and their perception as deep social disrupters by the authorities, the attendance of some twenty thousand people for the announced miracle speaking for itself. By contemporary standards, this meant that about four per cent of London’s population were physically present in Bunhill Fields cemetery on that day, with at least three or four times as many more who would have probably heard of it.64 Unsurprisingly, the failure of this expected miracle confirmed their opponents in their position. Satires and songs appeared shortly afterwards to portray Thomas Emes’s disappointment by his brethren’s delusion and ridiculed the French Prophets beyond England.65

64 London’s population was estimated at around 500,000 inhabitants at the beginning of the century. Maureen Waller, 1700 Scenes from London Life (New York: Four Walls Eight Windows, 2000), p. 1; Julia Keay, Alexander the Corrector, the Tormented Genius who Unwrote the Bible (London: Harper Collins, 2004), p. 27.

65 The French Prophet’s Resurrection: with his Speech to the Multitude that Behold the Miracle (London, 1708) [DCL 7E Newenham pamphlets iii[68]]; The French Prophets Confounded: or, the Dead Man’s Speech to the Presumptious Miracle-Workers. Deliver’d under the Similitude of a Dream (London, 1708) [DCL 7E Newenham pamphlets iii[69]]; Edward Ward, ‘An Epitaph on the French Prophet, who was to make his Resurrection on the 25th of May’, in The Wars of the Elements: or, a Description of a Sea Storm (London, 1708) [PCL 10-19-30].
Critics of the French Prophets chose a plethora of formats, ranging from pamphlets, public letters or sermons to more original options like poems and songs. Such diversity of responses also reflect the Prophets’ appeal to both polite and plebeian culture, each choosing its favourite format to debunk or simply deride their victims. In May 1709, Thomas d’Urfey, a prolific playwright of Huguenot descent, had his satirical comedy *The Modern Prophets* performed at the Théâtre Royal in the gentrified neighborhood of Drury Lane. A play was certainly the most relevant medium used against the Prophets, as it could reproduce their own visual and aural performances and overall dramatic impression, and be printed too. Featuring Betty Plotwell for main character, after the young prophetess Elizabeth Gray, the play emphasized the Prophets’ ability to simulate convulsions and therefore compared them to actors. In many respects, *The Modern Prophets* resembled a play within a play, in which Plotwell revealed her tricks to make her belly swell to the audience and confessed her imposture. D’Urfey presented young female debauchees under faked inspiration seeking to attract wealthy deluded old men. This licentious portrayal may not have been far from the reality of things, not just by the debauchery the French Prophets were accused of, but also by the group’s composition. For by

---

66 The Prophets: an Heroic Poem. In Three Cantos. Humbly inscrib’d to the illumin’d assembly at Barbican (London, 1708) [11631.aaa.32.]. See also previous note.


1709, its members had become predominantly English and had a majority of women, indicating a decline of its authentic Camisard roots.\textsuperscript{70}

D’Urfey’s play turned out to be a failure and was only performed for three nights. The play was criticised several times for its mediocrity or distasteful piety, but the play also came untimely, almost one year after Thomes Emes’s failed resurrection.\textsuperscript{71} D’Urfey himself deplored that it took so long for his comedy production to be staged due to a series of unfortunate events and the two-month closure of theatres to mourn the death of Queen Anne’s husband, Prince George, at the end of 1708. The number of publications against the Prophets also decreased from 1709, coinciding with the group’s first schism and missionary expeditions. D’Urfey’s play was thus performed at a time when public interest in the Prophets had already begun to fade and was vividly criticised, ironically enough, for lacking inspiration.\textsuperscript{72}

Perhaps the most dramatic and humiliating response to the French Prophets was the popular route the government chose by ordering a puppet-show in Covent Garden. Martin Powell, the greatest puppeteer of his time, had become so popular in the early 1700s that people allegedly stopped attending mass on Sunday mornings to watch his shows. Despite their condemnation to the pillory in 1707, Emes’s failed resurrection and many fruitless predictions, the Prophets continued to assemble and convulse in public in 1710. The Earl of Chesterfiled reported that the government

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{70} See chapter 3.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{71} Harrington Smith, “Thomas Baker and “The Female Tatler””, pp. 184-185. The Tatler, 43 (July 16-19, 1709).
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
carefully avoided their persecution to prevent further unrest from other non-conformists and ordered instead a puppet show from Powell to ridicule them.\textsuperscript{73} The strategy was a clever one; it echoed what spectators had witnessed in public assemblies at the Barbican, while humiliating the Prophets before a much wider and popular audience than D’Urfey’s play. Powell even used animals in his shows, including a tamed pig he would dance with on stage, and one can easily imagine the impact his marionettes had. And indeed, Richard Steele reported in \textit{The Spectator} that Powell’s success was such that it finally wiped out the French Prophets from the public sphere.\textsuperscript{74}

\textbf{Dramatic Assemblies}

If the French Prophets excelled at promoting their cause through print, the voice remained their privileged medium of communication, as with all evangelicals, and resulted in uniquely powerful meetings. Prophetic assemblies in the English refuge began almost as soon as Durand Fage reached London.\textsuperscript{75} Although he was allegedly chosen to revive the Spirit of the \textit{Désert} across the Channel, the Prophets’ sense of promotion did not originate from inspired Camisards, but rather from fellow Huguenot refugees. The contrast between the former and the latter was quite striking, for Fage and Cavalier were neither war heroes nor accomplished prophets when they

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{73} M. Maty, \textit{Miscellaneous works of the late Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield: ... To which are prefixed, memoirs of his life}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition (London, 1779), IV, pp. 309-310.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{The Spectator}, 14 (16\textsuperscript{th} March, 1711).
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{75} Fatio’s calendar, June 1706 [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fols 1\textsuperscript{r}]; ‘Historical Relation’, pp. 23-24 [Stack 1\textsuperscript{j}]; \textit{MMM}, p. 154.
\end{flushright}
arrived in London. Still, wealthy gentlemen were prepared to promote them and act
as their amanuenses, seeing in these Camisards evidence of an approaching
millennium.

The status of the attendants to the first prophetic assemblies is clearly
reflected in Fatio’s calendar and even proved key to hosting them. Earliest hosts
included Thomas Cotton, a Presbyterian minister well-acquainted with the Huguenot
community, and Marquis de Miremont, agent to the Queen. The prestige of such
venues attracted more influential guests; Fatio recorded the presence of Messieurs de
Gornay and la Perrine, most likely of aristocratic descent, and also of English
aristocrats including Sir John Philipps and a mysterious earl.76 While these attendants
never joined the Prophets, there is evidence that more dedicated supporters belonged
to pre-existing networks before Fage set foot in England.77 Hence the promotion of
the French Prophets was at first ensured by well-connected followers hosting
assemblies with influential guests, who in turn might publicise them to their
entourage.

The venue location was also significant in the promotion of the assemblies
and often proved indistinguishable from their host’s social rank. It is noteworthy, for
example, that despite the Camisards’ modest origins, the movement of the French
Prophets was in fact born in West London. Marion and Fage were lodging near
Misson’s on Tower Street; Cavalier was staying at the house of his cousin Jean Allut,
in Soho; Cotton was preaching on Dyott Street in Bloomsbury; Miremont lived in
Somerset House on the Strand and the first assemblies took place in Seven Dials and

76 Almost certainly Anthony Ashley Cooper, third earl of Shaftesbury, who had witnessed John Lacy
prophesy in Latin. Fatio’s calendar, 15th, 20th, 23rd Aug., 7th, 30th Sept., 1706, 14th Jan. and 4th July,
1707 [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fols l'-2']; Shaftesbury, Letter concerning enthusiasm, p. 24.

77 See chapter 3.
Baldwins Gardens. It was not until later that the assemblies moved to the poorer
neighbourhoods of East London and to the South Bank. Records attest to assemblies
in Clerkenwell, Honey Lane (between St Paul’s and Bank), Southwark, Spitalfields
and Hackney Marsh. Such geographical spread of their meetings had an undeniable
strategic impact. It enabled the Prophets to promote themselves virtually everywhere
in the capital and appeal to all levels of society, to both English and French, male and
female audiences. In diversifying their venues, they thus gained the attention they
craved.

Like most early modern dissenters, the French Prophets also met in public
places such as taverns and inns, where they could assemble and attract newcomers.
When Marion, Daudé and Fatio were indicted for blasphemy following the
publication of Marion’s Warnings, the group now had to comply with the law to push
its promotion further. Rebecca Critchlow registered her house as a meeting place for
Philadelphians and French Prophets in May 1707 and from 14th June, Lacy rented the
Barbican theatre to host bigger, public assemblies, as the number of followers kept
increasing. The group needed to unify and grow solid, for Fage had already

78 Misson, Meslange de littérature historique & critique, sur tout ce qui regarde l’état extraordinaire
des Cévenois, appelez Camisards (London, 1707), p. 3 [BL 700.e.21(6)]; Schwartz, The French
Prophets, pp. 72-3; Keimer, Brand, p. 2; The English and French Prophets mad or bewitch’d (1707)
[BL 9512.aaa.27].

79 A Complete guide to all persons who have any trade or concern with the city of London, 2nd edition
(London, 1740), p. 91 [GL ocm22742233]; Keimer, Brand, pp. 6, 9, 12; Fatio’s calendar, Oct. 1 and
Sept. 11, 1708 [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 4]; Chabrol, Elie Marion, p. 129.

80 A Reply to the Main Argument, in a Paper, Entituled An Impartial Account of the Prophets in a
Letter to a Friend (1708), p. 11 [BL 695.c.5.8]; Josiah Woodward, The Copy of a Letter to Mr. F---.
M--- (1708), p. 7 [BL 695.c.5.(6)]. Taverns had become crucial meeting places in the early eighteenth
century. Roy Porter estimates that London had 207 inns, 447 taverns, over 2000 coffee houses, 5,875
217, 226.

81 Fatio’s calendar, 14th, 15th June, 1707 [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 2]. See also Edwin Welch, ‘The
predicted they would suffer persecution and martyrdom.\textsuperscript{82} By renting a theatre as their main meeting point, Lacy also added a spectacular dimension, in its most literal sense, to their prophecies; a wave of English prophets was now taking over the group that summer, performing on stage before a larger English-speaking audience.\textsuperscript{83} The strategy certainly worked as the targeted audience responded massively with a continuous influx of new adherents until 1709. The Prophets proved extremely focussed on their growth when it came to their self-promotion and kept careful track of their numbers. 107 people thus attended a private meeting on 19\textsuperscript{th} January, 1708; 78 were blessed on 22\textsuperscript{nd} July, 1708; 58 were present on 30\textsuperscript{th} September, 1708 and another 31 on 2\textsuperscript{nd} January, 1709.\textsuperscript{84} Such emphasis on the numbers and names of their followers, of which they also kept lists, therefore reveals a unique image consciousness that would rapidly translate into their stage performances.\textsuperscript{85}

There was also something bizarrely entertaining in the Prophets’ assemblies, which no doubt blurred the line between what were presented as prophecies on stage and what increasingly looked like staged inspirations. With Lacy and his brethren convulsing and vocalising the Spirit on stage, it is no surprise that many observers compared their assemblies to a play and the Prophets to actors.\textsuperscript{86} The parallel made sense, for the Prophets regarded themselves as ‘Instruments’ of the Spirit and thereby

\textsuperscript{82} ‘Preciz du Discours de Mr. Durand Fage d’Aubaye, prononcé sous l’Operation de l’Esprit, A Londres, le 3e 7bre 1706’, p. 1 [LPL MS 934/52].

\textsuperscript{83} See list E in Appendix.

\textsuperscript{84} Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 10\textsuperscript{v}]. Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fols 3, 4].

\textsuperscript{85} \textit{The Honest Quaker: or the Forgeries and Impostures of the Pretended French Prophets and their Abettors expos’d} (1707), pp. 2-3 [BL 695.c.7.(5.)].

\textsuperscript{86} \textit{An Account of the Lives and Behaviour of the Three French Prophets, lately Come out of the Cevennes and Languedoc} (1708), p. ii [BPF 8* 3 087 Rés]. NRL, 42 (Sept. 1707), p. 336 [BPF 8* 442].
denied any personal intervention. They claimed not to reform but merely to perform Biblical prophecies and deliver God’s word in a similar fashion to ancient prophets and maintained accordingly that they were animated by the same Spirit as Joel, Daniel, Elijah and even Balaam’s donkey. Such fragile and self-proclaimed legitimacy would allow the Prophets to deliver great scenes of violence and bestiality, as when Elizabeth Gray burned John Glover’s face with a fiery handkerchief or when some inspired howled like dogs at the London tavern of Copenhagen, but nevertheless failed to convince most observers, who promptly derided their assemblies as a ridiculous imposture.

By performing biblical allegories in public, the Prophets were first and foremost reviving the past into the present, adding more immediacy to the Bible by helping their audience visualise the millennium and the punishment of the wicked. Samuel Keimer indeed felt that God was speaking to him ‘face to face’. Vivid accounts of these assemblies survive, their theatricality being best exemplified in the Southwark meetings:

At one of their Meetings, one of the Prophets personated GOD, a second the Angel Gabriel, a Third the Devil, and the Fourth (who was Mary Beer a Prophetess) acted the Church. […] John Glover, who acted the Devil, making such a grim and distorted Face, as if indeed he had been a Fiend of Hell in human Shape, pretending a Right to the Church, and John Potter, (whom I think) personated God, threaten’d the Devil at a great Rate, the Devil commanding him that personated God, to bless the Church. After a great deal spoke by Way of Dialogue

---

87 Marion, *The French Prophet’ Declaration; or, an Account of the Preachings, Prophecies and Warnings of Elias Marion* (London, 1707), pp. 2-3 [BL 695.c.4.(3)]; *A Collection of Advertisements respecting the Regulation of Assemblies* (1715), pp. 18, 24, 37-8 [BLO Pamph.328(30)].


between ’em, each striving which should have the Church, who was
toss’d and tumbled to and fro, much like a Football, the Believers
were pluck’d down (by the Inspired under Agitation) into the middle
of the Room, tumbled one on the Top of the other, Heels over Head,
wallowing on the Ground in a great heap, in a filthy manner,
sometimes the Spirit tumbling an Inspir’d down Stairs headlong,
enough to have kill’d him.91

This performance, according to Keimer lasted several hours, during which the
audience locked themselves up in another room out of fear. This was not unusual
during the Prophet’s dramatic assemblies, which typically degenerated into terror and
chaos upon performing the Fall of the Antichrist. On 22nd July, 1707, the eyewitness
W.C. reported that:

At a Meeting at Sir Richard Bulkeley’s Chamber […] Betty Grey,
under violent Agitations, personated the great Whore of Antichrist.
Took all the Chairs in the Room, and barricadoed the Door, that no
body might come in or go out. This done, she laid aside her Manteau
and Night-clothes, tyed up her Hair […] then taking a Peruke and Hat
that she found in the Room, put them on her Head, and sat down in an
Elbow Chair very majestically, with her Arms a Kembo: After this she
rose out of the Chair, and for about an Hour together, thump’d and
beat with her Fist every one in the Room in their Turns, except Mr.
Lacy. […]

Then Mr. Allut falling into Agitations, and being commanded by the
Spirit to combat this Female Fury, cries out es tu la Grande Bête, la
Putain de Babylon? Art thou the Great Beast the Whore of Babylon?
Then rose up, pull’d her down upon the Floor, stamp’d upon her,
kick’d her about as if she had been a dead Cat, and walking in
Triumph on her Body, stood upon her Breast till she appear’d Lifeless.
Then to try whether she was living or dead, Mr. Allut alternately lifted
up her Legs and Arms, which fell down again upon the Floor, like the
Limbs of a dead Body.
Immediately after she rose up, spoke, and gave Thanks that Antichrist
and the Whore of Babylon were overcome; upon which, both their
Inspirations ceas’d, and both the Actors declar’d that they had no
Sense or Remembrance of what had pass’d in this Rencounter; though

91 Keimer, Brand, p. 53.
they made such a horrid Noise in the House, that Sir Richard’s
landlady gave him Warning to be gone.92

Such assemblies not only dramatised but also materialised the very prophecies and
allegories that both Anglicans and non-conformists would preach.93 Yet while the
Church was distancing itself from predicting the millennium, the French Prophets
purportedly offered their audience a confrontation with their destiny. Like earlier
enthusiasts, they called for repentance before the millennium, only their followers
chose to proselytise because they had previewed their awaiting sentence.

Their agitations and ability to endure physical pain thus transcended the
limits of the human body to offer a divine spectacle to their audience partly thanks to
the natural interactivity of the theatre or meeting house. On 30th July, 1707, a few
days after he received the gift of tongues, John Lacy now reportedly defied the laws
of physics and once again stunned his spectators:

Mr. Lacy being under Extasy, and standing strait up right in a Corner
of the Chamber, with his Heels, Calves of his Legs, close touching
each other, his Hands also thrust athwart into his Bosom, was carry’d,,
in this Posture, strait forward, to the other side of the Room, being the
space of ten or eleven Foot. He was mov’d as Sliding. His Motion
lasted four Seconds of Time, and made the Chamber shake.94

The Prophets fondly embraced those supernatural manifestations as evidence of the
Spirit’s presence among them. The greater the miracle, the more imminent the
millennium. Lacy’s divine transportation seems to have made a great impression on

93 Margaret C. Jacob, ‘Millenarianism and Science in the Late Seventeenth Century’, Journal of the
his observers, particularly on Fatio, who incidentally had worked on gravity with Newton a few years earlier.\textsuperscript{95} There were henceforth no limits to what the Prophets could achieve with the Spirit’s blessing.

Over the summer of 1707, this mystical ability was supplemented by the power to control the material world when John Lacy began to perform miraculous cures. Although thaumaturgy contains in itself dramatic qualities, these alleged miracles always occurred in the secrecy of smaller, private assemblies, which their critics contested and often attacked them for. As they gained confidence, the Prophets now pretended to perform miraculous cures in public. The group met on 17\textsuperscript{th} August for a public assembly during which John Lacy was to remove a tumour from Betty Gray’s throat with his own hands. Before proceeding, John Lacy invited the audience to feel her neck and pulse to acknowledge the gravity of her health, which failed to convince the narrator of this account. After eight hours of curiosity and impatience, the miracle unsurprisingly failed; Richard Bulkeley accused the audience of disrupting the divine atmosphere by their incredulity.\textsuperscript{96} Lacy nevertheless continued to heal people, though always in private, until 16\textsuperscript{th} April, 1708, just one month before the greatest miracle was due to take place, the resurrection of Dr. Emes.\textsuperscript{97}

As the Prophets appeared to elevate themselves above the reality of physical pain and relieve others from it, such theatricality also offered newcomers a pleasurable spiritual as well as a social experience. Assemblies became a meeting point for family members and friends seeking to abandon themselves to the Holy

\textsuperscript{95} Fatio’s calendar, 30\textsuperscript{th} July, 1707 [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 2]\textsuperscript{r}. ‘Autre Conjecture. Pour expliquer le Silence de Newton sur l’Hypothèse de Fatio. Savoir: La Crainte du Ridicule’, Papiers Le Sage [BGE Ms. fr. 2043a/30/4\textsuperscript{♠}].

\textsuperscript{96} \textit{The Honest Quaker}, p. 8 [BL 695.c.7.(5.)].

\textsuperscript{97} Lacy, \textit{A Relation of the Dealings of God to his Unworthy Servant John Lacy} (London, 1708), pp. 24-27 [LPL H7593 1.08].
Spirit. Significantly, Lacy even renamed Gray ‘Sarai’, meaning ‘No more Bondage’ in anticipation of their coming liberation.\footnote{Schwartz, \textit{French Prophets}, p. 97.} It was indeed around the same time that he notoriously became infatuated with her and would later abandon his wife and children to move to Lancashire, where the Prophetess was due to give birth to a second messiah. Other couples were likewise formed within a few years.\footnote{Jean Cavalier married Jeanne Verduron in 1707; one believer fell reportedly in love with Mary Beer; Samuel Keimer married a well-established woman among the group in 1713; Joseph Steel married Mary Aspinal; Jacques Portalès Marie Devaux; Charles Portalès Mary Moul; and John Potter Margaret Moul. Historical Relation, pp. 48-49 [Stack 1j]; ‘Jean Cavalier de Sauer to his wife’ (The Hague, 16 May 1710), \textit{The Aufrère Papers, Calendar and Selection} (HSL, 1940), 40/III, pp. 64-65; Keimer, \textit{Brand}, pp. 60, 61, 65, 74; ‘The Huguenot Family of Portalès’ [Stack 12g/fol. 2]. Charles Portalès’ marriage certificate [Stack 12g/fols 11-12].}

Behind the necessity of confessional endogamy typical of dissenting minorities prevailed rumours of indecent activities that were reminiscent of the Ranters or the Familists. One of the most common and recurrent attacks made on the group by both one time observers and apostate followers was the impression of debauchery that emanated from their meetings. The liberated Prophets held ‘love feasts’ regularly, ‘perform’d by select Companies meeting at proper Places’, during which they celebrated the sacraments with bread and wine.\footnote{Keimer, \textit{Brand}, p. 29.} During some these love meetings, the Prophets would ‘kiss, and tickle one another, chucking one another under the Chin, laughing and crying out, He, He, He, He, He, He, and using many lascivious Postures’. Further evidence suggests that the Prophets’ assemblies turned into a theatre of love. The butcher Samuel Thomlinson was thus commanded by the Spirit to ‘lie carnally with one Anne Steed’, who at first reluctant, consented upon the seventh attempt, ‘being unwilling (as she said) to resist any longer, for Fear of the Judgements of the Lord.’\footnote{Ibid., p. 71.} Guy Nutt once danced a jig with Ann Topham holding a
broomstick in her hand, kissing her under agitations. Similarly, Rebecca Cuff being inspired kissed all the men in the room during a meeting and when men and women fell down one on top of each other, the candles were magically blown out by the Spirit.102

Although many followers were apparently involved in such practices, opponents of the French Prophets often regarded those scenes as gender-related. Some women, it is true, certainly exhibited extravagant performances, both inside and outside assemblies. Elizabeth Gray impersonated, for example, the Whore of Babylon in the Catholic chapel of Duke Street in November 1707, stripping naked and adopting indecent poses on the altar.103 Mary Keimer, acting the same allegory, jumped on another woman’s body under inspiration, treading violently over her breasts, belly and legs as a sign of imminent punishment of the impious; and was described by her own brother as ‘a lusty young woman’, a rather unveiled reference to the female Prophet’s idiosyncratic mores.104 The most shocking episode came with Dorothy Harling, an old lady known as ‘Permanent Spring’, who would whip her male spectators, lift her skirt screaming ‘Christ come in, Christ come in’, then proceed to a purificatory urination on their wounds. She was rapidly expelled from the group for her indecency, but some members followed her nonetheless.105 Although women’s precariousness may have pushed a few to seek a more prominent place in the group, their growing number among the Prophets in fact put an end to

102 Ibid., p. 109.

103 The French prophetess turn’d adamite being a true and comical account of a pretended French prophetess, who on Sunday the 16th of November, did in a very immodest and indecent manner (being inspired with a pretended spirit) undress her self stark naked at the popish chapel in Lincoln's-Inn Fields[LPL H9455 5.28]; Sutherland, Background for Queen Anne, p. 70.

104 Keimer, Brand, p. 54.

105 Keimer, A Search after Religion, p. 15 and Brand, pp. 38-9, 80, 111; Papiers Fatio, 27th July, 1709 [Ms. Fr. 605/7a/fol. 5].
accusations of debauchery made against them. By the turn of the eighteenth century, attitudes towards the female sex were beginning to change. Women were less likely to be perceived as carnal predators, but increasingly as virtuous, innocent and sexually passive. Conversely, Prophetesses tended for the most part to be regarded as weak, deluded creatures, more passionate and therefore prone to hysteria.

Accusations of immorality, debauchery and licentiousness, were in reality levelled predominantly at male prophets, seen by many as manipulating and taking advantage of their female coreligionists. The anonymous author of a recently discovered pamphlet derided the Prophets for inspiring young women for their own uses, while Richard Kingston accused Marion of entertaining widows and preying on their bodies. Fage was notorious for his loose relationships with girls while in the Cévennes; and worse still, Fatio was depicted as secretly homosexual and Cavalier as a preying paedophile, who had also attempted to rape a servant on his way between Lausanne and Frankfurt. Similar behaviours were also seen during during the Prophets’ assemblies:

---


At another Meeting, John Glover under Agitations, imitated Conjugal Affection with a Prophetess on a Bed, before a Number of Believers present. This was likewise look’d upon as a Sign; but of what I can’t tell, except it was, that the Prophet would willingly perform That in Reality, which he did there shew but in Effigies.\(^{110}\)

Perhaps the greatest controversy, and one that divided the Prophets themselves, occurred when John Lacy abandoned his wife and four children for Elizabeth Gray in 1711.\(^{111}\) Lacy’s claim that this reflected a divine order from the Spirit failed to convince the rest of the group, particularly Thomas Dutton, Mary Keimer and other prophetesses, who felt their chief member was breaking the seventh commandment.\(^{112}\) Lacy justified his divorce on the grounds that Gray would give birth to a second messiah, but the adulterous couple were in fact to have two daughters.\(^{113}\) Nor was his later marriage with Gray entirely unpredictable, since observers had reported his interest in the young girl as early as 1707. Evidently he had indeed been preying on her for a while, taking lusty postures with her in bed whilst claiming to be under inspiration.\(^{114}\)

\(^{110}\) Keimer, *Brand*, p. 54.


\(^{113}\) John Lacy, *A letter from J. Lacy to T. Dutton, being reasons why the former left his wife, and took E. Gray a prophetess to his bed* (London, 1711) [BL 1419.b.46.2]; Keimer, *A Search After Religion*, p. 16; *Brand*, p. 115; John Humfrey, *A Farther Account of our Late Prophets, in two Letters to Sir Richard Bulkeley… by Mr. Humfrey, his neighbour* (London, 1708), p. 8 [BL 701.c.48]

\(^{114}\) Kingston, *Enthusiastick impostors*, I, pp. 46, 70, 73 [BL 695.c.6(3)]; *Deuxième Lettre d’un Particulier à Monsieur Misson* (London, 1707), p. 5 [BL 700.e.21.2].
In the aftermath of Dr. Emes’s failed resurrection, the Prophets engaged their credibility a step further by restructuring themselves. They evicted ‘false prophets’, including Abraham Whitrow for attempting to resurrect Thomas Emes and for his levelling activities, and divided themselves into twelve missionary tribes according to those of Israel, to deliver God’s word across Britain and on the continent. The first and most important tribe to be formed was that of Levi, which included twenty-eight people. Similarly, the group began renaming some of its most prominent members as in a role-play. Fatio became ‘Daniel’, Lacy ‘Jeremiah’, Charles Portalès ‘Samuel’, while Marion remained ‘Elias’ to preserve his name’s prophetic symbolism. Samuel Keimer, now renamed ‘Jonathan’, even received a certificate reading ‘JONATHAN of the Tribe of Aser. Keep this as a precious Pearl’, which he was to carry with him during those expeditions. While it is not known whether those parchments were issued to every tribesman, they served as both proof of membership to the French Prophets and of spiritual authenticity to future converts. The future missionaries would thus appear genuinely inspired by the same Spirit that had animated Biblical prophets. Some continued to use their new prophetic name after the formation of the tribes; Fage signed ‘D.G. Fage’ (Durand ‘Gedeon’ Fage) in Marion and Mazel’s memoirs and Guy Nutt introduced himself as Guy Nutt

115 Keimer, Brand, p. 46; Chabrol, Elie Marion, p. 170.
116 Jaques Misson, Nicolas Fatio, Jean Daudé, Charles Portalès, Pierre Audemard, Jean Le Page, Louis Henri de Voutron, John Giles, Jacques Portalès, Pierre Valette, Antoine Prades, Francis Moulit, Edmond Everard, Benjamin Jackson, Joseph Tovey, Pierre Valoué, Anne Watts, John Glover, Jean Grenier, Elie Marion, Durand Fage, Elizabeth Charras, David Nolibert, Abraham Mahieu, Jacques Soulier, Daniel Le Tellier, John Lacy and Jeanne Raoux. Papiers Coquerel [BPF Ms. 302/fol. 4r].
117 Papiers Coquerel [BPF Ms. 302/fol. 4r].
118 Keimer, Brand, p. 47.
'Matthew’ during his mission to Dublin in 1711. Yet such an identificatory dimension had probably also its limits, as it was rarely mentioned in contemporary sources and even in the Prophets’ later publications. It seems rather that renaming members pertained to the ritual of forming tribes at a critical time for the survival of the French Prophets, more than conferring upon them a specific role to play in the long term.

Despite theatrical, literary and penal humiliation, the French Prophets continued to attract new members after May 1708, when Thomas Emes failed to rise from the dead. This uninterrupted influx of new blood at a time when some important Prophets – Jean Cavalier and his wife Jeanne, Abraham Whitrow and his family, Dorothy Harling, Stephen Halford – were being expelled suggests in itself an unshaken ability to evangelise and therefore to proselytise. There is no doubt that broadcasting remained central to the French Prophets’ creed. A series of *Warnings of the Eternal Spirit* to the cities of Enfield, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Bristol and Dublin were indeed published between 1709 and 1713 to account for their expeditions.

These missions may be regarded at first as an epilogue to the London events, but they also expressed a perpetuated desire to communicate the imminence of the millennium to new audiences. Traveling across the British Isles and Europe certainly constituted more than new adventures in the history of the French Prophets. From September 1708, when they split into missionary tribes, the Prophets undertook to broadcast their message beyond London, which required a more complex

---

119 Mémoires de la guerre des Cévennes, p. 9 [Stack 1i]; MMM, p. xiv; *The shaking-prophets alarm’d, in beholding a lighted candle, taken from God's sanctuary: or, a bacon [sic] fir’d on the top of an hill, to give men light in the night of time. Being a sober warning, to the publishers of warnings, to take care of deceiving, and speaking lies in the name of the Lord* (Dublin, 1711), p. 11.

120 See list E in Appendix.
organisation than previously adopted. Dividing the group into tribes involved selecting members, allocating each one of them a geographical preaching area and maintaining long-distance communication between them in order to be successful. More pragmatically, it also required more money to pay for travel, food and lodging expenses, which neither Lacy nor Bulkeley funded. It was instead generous benefactors like Francis Moult, the wealthy apothecary, who subsidised expeditions across England including Bristol, Coventry, Chichester, Worcester, Oxford and Cambridge, as well as Scotland, Wales and Ireland.

Despite their unshakable determination and well-maintained communication between simultaneous missions, the Prophets did not generally receive much support or attention from their new audiences. They even became to some extent the victims of their own broadcasting power where their reputations had already preceded them. When the Presbyterian minister Edmund Calamy visited Aberdeen in 1709, he received a most unfriendly welcome upon entering an inn. Calamy later discovered that people had heard the French Prophets were on their way to Scotland and thought that the minister was one of them, no doubt because of his former friendship with Lacy. With the first Scottish mission occurring in 1709, this anecdote reveals that,

---

121 The first prophetic mission went to Enfield in February 1708 and therefore preceded the Prophets’ schism later that year. A second mission followed in March to Colchester, where Lacy, Gray and Dutton were invited to speak at Quaker, Baptist and Independent meetings, while Havy, Daudé and Fatio failed to meet with the local French Church. Their venue caused much turmoil in the city, forcing the group to return to London, while others were sent to Ipswich and encountered the same fate. ‘Historical Relation’, pp. 40-42 [Stack 1j]. Fatio’s calendar, March 8 and 16, 1708 [BGE Ms. Fr. 605/7a/fol. 3].

122 Lacy retired with Elizabeth Gray to Lancashire, ‘a cheap country to live in’, around the same time, and Bulkeley had been recently expelled for supporting Abraham Whitrow in his levelling enterprise to redistribute money to the poorest members. Edmund Calamy, An Historical Account of my own Life, 2nd edition (London: Colburn and Bentley, 1830), 2, p. 113; Keimer, Brand, pp. 34-35.

123 Keimer, Brand, pp. 39, 71; ‘Historical Relation’, pp. 40-51 [Stack 1j].

from an early stage, the Prophets were often preceded by their reputation. With the number of new recruits continuously declining from 1709, the Prophets were reaping diminishing returns for the money and energy invested in their missions: having reached a level of media saturation, they paid the price of their omnipresence and exhausted themselves with their last resources.

While English members were prophesying across Britain, the French nucleus embarked on a series of four continental missions between 1709 and 1714. The most significant of these started in May 1712 and was to last for two years.\textsuperscript{125} Such a project required again a great deal of resources, organisation and of course enthusiasm, which Allut, Marion, Portalès and Fatio did not lack. The missionary Prophets travelled to the continent with substantial amounts of gold and silver with them, but also relied on donations from local Huguenot or Pietists supporters in Halle, Germany.\textsuperscript{126} The sheer list of towns and countries they visited speaks for itself: Holland, Germany, Vienna, Malmö, Stockholm, Königsberg, Prague, Bratislava, Buda, Belgrade and Constantinople to convert the Sultan Ahmed III. From Turkey, they headed to Rome via Smyrna to convert the Pope.\textsuperscript{127} Traveling across Europe was certainly riskier than England. Self-proclaimed prophets (Marion and Allut) from France, roaming with their scribes (Portalès and Fatio) through enemy countries had ineluctably to confront a language barrier and different religions (i.e. Catholicism and Islam). Although they spoke in tongues, the miracle did not

\textsuperscript{125} MMM, p. 217.

\textsuperscript{126} Quand vous aurez saccagé, vous serez saccagés: car la lumière est apparue dans les ténèbres, pour les détruire (1714), pp. 19, 97-103 [BL 850.f.11(2)].

happen in Lutheran Sweden and the Prophets resolved to leave, faced with an
unintelligible and suspicious audience.\textsuperscript{128} The story repeated itself: the missionaries
never spent more than a few days in each of the aforementioned towns, except in
Halle, where they stayed for one month with a Pietist circle. They were most
unwelcome virtually everywhere and suffered many hardships.

Yet frequent migrations could only be made possible thanks to an organised
network of connections and sustained communication between them. Pierre and
Hélène Jurieu and the prosperous Quaker merchant Benjamin Furly, for instance,
hosted some Prophets in Amsterdam and Rotterdam in 1709/10.\textsuperscript{129} In Halle,
Germany, the missionaries were put up by a French teacher named Marchand, who
was none other than Jean Allut’s uncle.\textsuperscript{130} They probably also received the support of
Sir Robert Sutton, English ambassador to Turkey, when they reached
Constantinople.\textsuperscript{131} Many gaps still surround the Prophets’ last continental mission,
but it appears that the group relied on the well-connected Huguenot network across
Europe. More than a promotion, the French Prophets led themselves into a real
exportation of the Spirit that sought to transcend languages, religions and nations.
The French and English missionaries encountered much hostility in their journeys,

\textsuperscript{128} Papiers Le Sage [Ms. fr. 2043a/28/5\textbullet]; Chabrol, \textit{Elie Marion}, p. 193.

\textsuperscript{129} Hanover State Papers, II (1707-1710) [BL Stowe 223/fol. 345]; Sarah Hutton (ed.), \textit{Benjamin Furly 1646-1714: A Quaker Merchant and his Milieu} (Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2007). Although
very informative about Furly’s active support of political and religious dissenters, this study entirely
misses the strong connection with the French Prophets. \textit{Discernement des Ténèbres d’avec la Lumière}
(Rotterdam, 1710), pp. i-iv [BL 3901.b.17]; \textit{Eclair de Lumière descendant des cieux} (Rotterdam,
1711), pp. i-ix [BL 850.f.10]; Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr.602/fol. 26] and [BGE Ms. Fr. 605/4].

\textsuperscript{130} Garrett, \textit{Spirit Possession and Popular Religion}, p. 64; Chabrol, \textit{Elie Marion}, p. 197.

\textsuperscript{131} ‘Letters to Sir Hans Sloane’ [BL Sloane Ms. 4043/fol. 307].
but nevertheless made a few converts among Bourignonist and Quietist circles in Scotland and in the Pietist capital of Halle.\textsuperscript{132}

The extent of this prophetic export may be better gauged not in Europe, but in the new promised land of America. Perhaps this most mysterious expedition, not depicted by Chabrol, and merely alluded to by Schwartz and Vidal, reflects the French Prophets’ notoriety and sense of promotion by its very distance and isolation from Europe.\textsuperscript{133} Five years after Marion’s death, in 1718, Mary Keimer, one of the group’s most zealous prophetess, went on a mission to Pennsylvania.\textsuperscript{134} The circumstances and success of her departure remain unclear, but there is evidence that four people were prophesying in front of large crowds in Philadelphia by 1721.\textsuperscript{135} Her departure nevertheless reveals a persisting driving force among the group. By 1718, the Prophets had disseminated into sparse factions and their promotion efforts reduced to a hard core of believers. Samuel Keimer made it clear that, unlike his future exile for debts and problems with the authorities, his sister did not leave for personal reasons, but with the clear intention of promoting the Spirit in the New World.\textsuperscript{136} There was therefore a sixth prophetic mission abroad by the Prophets, which indicates that they, although weakened, had not lost their original sense of promotion.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[132] Chabrol, \textit{Elie Marion}, pp. 184-5.
\item[134] Keimer, \textit{Brand}, p. 124.
\item[135] ‘John Gyles’s letter to Mr. Swift in Worcester’ (17\textsuperscript{th} Aug., 1721). Schwartz hinted at a possible encounter of her later converts there with newly arrived German Pietists in the 1730s. \textit{The French Prophets}, p. 204.
\item[136] Keimer, \textit{Brand}, p. 124.
\end{footnotes}
One explanation for this ultimate expedition might lie in the Keimers’ ties with the Quakers. Mary Keimer’s brother Samuel, who had abjured and converted a few times before joining the French Prophets, became a Quaker in the mid-1710s. When he settled in Pennsylvania in 1723 to open his print-house, Keimer still greatly admired the Quakers. It is not clear whether he chose Philadelphia to follow his sister or not, though he unequivocally condemned her zeal. Even the Prophets had indirectly suggested their similarities with the Quakers when they met with William Penn in February 1708. Mary Keimer had by then become a prominent prophetess. Nothing survives of their encounter with the founder of Pennsylvania, but the Keimers’ admiration for the Quakers cannot be entirely excluded as a motivation for the Prophets’ ultimate mission. Pennsylvania in particular, was more likely to offer a more sympathetic audience, as the Quakers remained the closest religious group to the French Prophets in the early 1700s.

Assuming that Mary Keimer’s mission brought new converts in America, it is most likely that Pennsylvanians would have heard of the French Prophets by the early 1720s. Evidence suggests, however, that the Prophets had gained notoriety in America among mystical circles a few years earlier. Reverend Cotton Mather’s
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137 Ibid., pp. 100, 105, 123.

138 He took for apprentice the young Benjamin Franklin. In his autobiography, Franklin reported that Keimer had been a French Prophet and could act their agitations. He had also heard from his wife and friends ‘a bad character of him in London’ and remained cautious of his master. Still, the two men got on relatively well, experimented vegetarianism together and, acknowledging his apprentice’s bright intelligence, Keimer offered Franklin to found a new sect together, which the latter of course declined. Sidwell, “‘An Odd Fish’”, p. 21; Benjamin Franklin, The Life of Dr. Benjamin Franklin. Written by himself (Philadelphia, 1794), pp. 45-117.

139 Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. Fr. 605/7a/fol. 3].

140 Some French Prophets (Anne Steed, Anne Finkley) were indeed former Quakers; others (Guy Nutt) were even mistaken for Quakers because of their austere appearance. Keimer, Brand, pp. 60, 62. See also list E in Appendix.
correspondence reveals that ‘in 1717, John Lacy issued a collection of his prophecies and some works written while in a trance.’\(^1\)\(^{41}\) As no publication by Lacy is known for that year, this may indicate a possible American edition of his *Warnings* and confirm the Prophets’ determination to promote their cause. The media phenomenon had thus not quite expired yet. In a letter he addressed to Lacy in January 1719, Mather shows familiarity with the Prophets’ message and actions, but confesses he does not know what to think of it.\(^1\)\(^{42}\) Although this letter provides few details on the French Prophets, there is reasonable ground to believe that they had been a source of interest even before Mary Keimer’s American expedition.

This publicity might in fact go back even before then, when a similar religious faction arrived in South Carolina in 1700. The Dutartres originally fled the principality of Orange, Languedoc, after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to seek refuge in America.\(^1\)\(^{43}\) They had displayed striking similarities with the French Prophets. Peter Rombert, for instance, received the order from the Spirit to leave his wife to marry her younger, virgin sister, just like Lacy had abandoned his family and taken Elizabeth Gray for his mistress. The Dutartres also believed in martyrdom though, like Thomas Emes, their martyrs also failed to rise from the dead.\(^1\)\(^{44}\) The fact that they referred to the French Prophets as ‘the true Prophets in London’ in 1715 also raises questions concerning the possibility of a transatlantic prophetic


\(^{142}\) Ibid., pp. 270-1.

\(^{143}\) Pacifists at first, they fell under Moravian influence in 1761 and murdered three men in order to save the world from the old serpent. Alexander Hewat, *An historical account of the rise and progress of the colonies of South Carolina and Georgia* (1779), I, p. 302 [BL 1061.f.11].

communication. It is likely that the Dutartres, besides coming from an adjacent province to the Cévennes, knew what was happening in England. Historians have recently drawn a connection between the two enthusiastic movements and, although none have established a common origin, the Dutartres may have been a ramification of the Camisard oral prophetic tradition, and thereby contributed to its publicity in America.

***

The disparity between the French Prophets’ actual numbers and the publicity they received reflects an exceptional sense of communication and promotion. Like their dissenting predecessors during the Interregnum and the Restoration, their publicity depended very much on the printing press but, unlike them, this bilingual ‘battle of pamphlets’ was the result of a cultural evolution from an oral prophetic tradition in the history of the Camisards. Dictating guerilla warfare in the Désert, the Spirit evidently now commanded his Children to broadcast the coming millennium to new audiences, both orally through prophetic assemblies and missionary expeditions and in print. This would not have been possible without the support of wealthy supporters such as Fatio, Misson, Bulkeley and Lacy, none of whom had witnessed the ‘théâtre sacré’ of the war in the Cévennes.

Historians have summarised the opposition to the French Prophets predominantly on theological, moral and medical grounds, although it is striking to see how much their supernatural physical manifestations prevailed over the theological content of their message. Ministers and pious critics focussed essentially on doctrinal questions and biblical exegesis to determine whether or not the Camisards and their followers were true prophets sent by God. Yet pamphleteers endeavoured for the most part to denounce the Prophets’ agitations as an imposture and deliver eye-witness accounts of their inspirations and assemblies, while lastly a medical discourse, considered in chapter six, was also emerging to determine the physical origin of their convulsions.

Despite their relatively small numbers in comparison with the Quakers or later the Methodists, the story of the French Prophets proves far from anecdotal. It was on the contrary symptomatic of the religious diversity of eighteenth-century England, but also of the pragmatics of its print industry in a period without censorship. Still, the Prophets attracted the attention of many of their contemporaries, but their notoriety may be best measured from later accounts. Half a century after Dr. Emes’s failed resurrection, Theophilus Evans estimated that thousands of people in London still remembered this event very well. And when composing his history of London in 1773, John Noorthouck recorded only two significant events for the year 1707: the Union Act and Elie Marion’s trial. The Prophets continued to appear in
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146 See for instance, Offspring Blackall, *The Way of Trying Prophets* (1707); Jean Graverol, *Réflexions désintéressées sur certains prétendus Inspirez* (1707); Edmund Calamy, *A Caveat against New Prophets* (1708); and Edmund Chishull, *The great danger and mistakes of all new uninspir’d prophecies* (1708).


later accounts, not only in Europe, but also in America, where they seem to have required no introduction among intellectual circles.\textsuperscript{149} By the wide diversity of their audiences and despite being largely forgotten today, the French Prophets certainly imposed themselves as a true eighteenth-century media phenomenon.

Chapter 5: Enthusiasm, Toleration and the Law

When writing about enthusiasm in the early modern period, historians such as Ronald A. Knox or David Lovejoy have for the most part amalgamated all factions and sects of that era.\(^1\) In proceeding in this manner, they also neglected the changes introduced by the Toleration Act of 1689, which changed the way England dealt with religious non-conformists. Discrimination and persecution of dissenters were henceforth brought to an end with the recognition of all Trinitarian Protestants, at least in theory. The French Prophets also fell into this category. They assembled at the Barbican claiming the benefit of the Toleration Act and therefore could not be persecuted on religious grounds.\(^2\) Because they first attracted respectable gentlemen among their ranks, the Prophets were rapidly perceived as mind corrupters, religious perverters and social disrupters to the point of making the tolerated ‘intolerable’. The prospect of a legal intervention, in which the Huguenot community were to play a fundamental part, thus became inevitable.

What is known about the Prophets’ trial relies largely on a handful of broadsides and pamphlets, which unfortunately are often incomplete and even occasionally contradictory. Daniel Vidal and Clarke Garrett briefly alluded to it, while Hillel Schwartz, Jean-Paul Chabrol and Georgia Cosmos also based their


accounts on Georges Ascoli’s hostile and unreferenced 1916 article. Ascoli’s report of the legal procedure was itself rather brief and historians have followed the narrative of events occurring simultaneously rather than reflect further on the prosecution of enthusiasts in post-Toleration England. The discovery of the actual court record, however, sheds new light on the significance of this trial. It suggests that England’s welcoming policy towards the Huguenots made the prospect of a trial particularly edgy. Whilst the authorities felt compelled to rid Londoners of the Prophets in order to contain possible social unrest, they also needed to abide by the Toleration Act without stigmatising dissenters or non-conformist Huguenots. This chapter will explore for this reason the limits of toleration in Queen Anne’s England.

***

**Toleration and its Limits**

Although the Prophets were often compared to the Quakers, they emerged later and faced less adversity. George Fox’s Friends epitomised radical enthusiasm during the Restoration and became the prime victims of the Clarendon code, a series of acts...
passed between 1661 and 1665, which imposed restrictions on non-conformists.\textsuperscript{5} Persecution of dissenters reached a peak during Charles II’s reign and was further exacerbated by the Popish and Rye House plots in the early 1680s. It is estimated that some 15,000 Quakers were fined or imprisoned between 1660 and 1685 and that 500 of them died in prison.\textsuperscript{6}

Toleration had no doubt been one of the most sensitive political issues of the preceding two decades, with attempts to introduce some sort of relief to non-conformists on thirteen occasions between 1662 and 1688.\textsuperscript{7} As a general rule, the Whigs tended to support religious toleration and individual freedom, while the Tories remained loyal to the Established Church and the Crown.\textsuperscript{8} The Toleration Act was finally passed in 1689 thanks to a large Whig majority, but its real motivation has been much debated. Historians have for a long time argued that it was enacted out of necessity rather than general acceptance, in order to preserve religious cohesion and promote national unity because of the growing influence of dissenters in society.\textsuperscript{9}

However, their exclusion from political, judicial and administrative positions encouraged the development of trade and crafts, which constituted a growing

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{6} S.J Barnett, \textit{The Enlightenment and Religion, the myths of modernity} (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), p. 82; Coward, \textit{The Stuart Age}, p. 424.
\end{itemize}
economic force that gradually tilted the political balance towards the Whigs. More recently, Martin Sutherland has revised this ‘prosperity’ interpretation in favour of a more complex, political one. It is now recognised, Sutherland contends, that nonconformism existed at all levels of society and that the London merchant elite supported uniformity. Instead, the debate over toleration resulted primarily from tensions over constitutional power between the Crown and Parliament, more than economic or religious factors.

International circumstances also played a part in the adoption of the Toleration Act. Across the Channel, Louis XIV had been conducting a policy of persecution against France’s minority, the Huguenots. As we have seen, the French example led to insurrections, wars and internal tensions, though its original aim was to strengthen national unity. England too was in need of unity, but it would have been self-destructive to impose further restrictions upon religious minorities, as non-conformists accounted for no less that ten per cent of the whole population, whereas the Huguenots barely constituted five per cent of France’s total citizens. Despite such a growing confessional diversity, the Toleration Act was not preceded by any doctrine of tolerance as such, but was instead a pragmatic and political measure passed to unite Protestants against the perceived threat of Catholicism.


In post-Toleration England, however, the stakes were different. Trinitarian Protestant Churches were recognised and granted protection by the Crown, which assisted Presbyterians, Baptists and Quakers, but excluded Unitarians, Socinians, Jews and, above all, Catholics.¹⁴ Fears of a new Popish plot were rife and it seemed that Popery was at least one issue on which everybody agreed. Since 1689, non-conformists could therefore gather and worship publicly provided that their congregations were duly registered with a licence and their ministers approved. Michael Heyd estimates that around 2,500 meeting houses were thus approved over the following twenty years.¹⁵ Over the 1690s, dissent was on the increase and contributions to the Church of England conversely fell.¹⁶

The direct impact of the Toleration Act should not be overrated however. Robert Shoemaker has claimed that ‘the Toleration Act and changing attitudes towards religious nonconformity […] led to the virtual disappearance of indictments for religious offences after 1689’, but this view should be moderated.¹⁷ While the Act certainly helped to appease tensions between Anglicans and non-conformists, the latter were still deprived of many rights. Heterodoxy remained punishable under 5 Eliz. C.1 and 13. Car. II st. II. C.1, as the Toleration Act did not in effect revoke the Conventicle and Test acts of 1664, 1670 and 1673.¹⁸ Disillusion rapidly followed the original hopes and many dissenters bitterly resented the Toleration act for its

---


limitations. They could not hold office, bequeath their estates or attend university, and dissenting schoolmasters, for example, could still be prosecuted. The Quakers suffered the most from such restrictions because of their refusal to take oath or pay tithes, for which many were still imprisoned or fined long after 1689. Barry Coward has argued that for this reason the Toleration act was one the most misnamed legislation ever passed in English history.

By the turn of the century, party rivalries were inflamed, and religious dissent remained a hot political topic. The Tories had passed a Blasphemy Act in 1698 and an act against Popery in 1700 in order to limit further the extent of the Toleration Act, which they attempted to repeal upon several occasions in the following decade. Unsurprisingly, the arrival of three Camisard refugees in London between June and September 1706 did not go unnoticed, especially as they attracted some of the most highly lauded minds of the time. For the Tories, this was a unique opportunity to blame the Toleration Act and its supporters for allowing, and perforce encouraging, such things to happen. Growing popular discontent pressed the authorities to react for many regarded the Prophets as ungrateful dissenters, abusing the law by holding controversial assemblies, and they feared a conspiracy against the Crown, partly because of the Prophets’ French origins. An anonymous pamphleteer best expressed the feelings of his contemporaries: ‘I only ask, if any Nation can tolerate Persons, who, by a Principle of Religion, believe they may kill, rob, break

---


20 Coward, *Stuart Age*, p. 312.


22 Kingston, *Enthusiastick Impostors no divinely inspir’d Prophets* (London, 1707), p. 49. [695.c.6 (3).]
their Promise, cheat, betray, and commit all other Crimes; the Devil cannot invent a Religion more to his liking than this.' 23 It is in this xenophobic context that the French Prophets appeared as a particularly problematic movement that flirted with the limits of Toleration.

**Popular protests**

Whilst the number of their followers continued to grow, the French Prophets also began to face anger and hostility. An explosive religious controversy, they appeared half-way between fanatical preachers and bestial madmen to many observers, causing fear and distress among the population. As seen in the previous chapter, the Prophets had successfully promoted their cause well beyond London, using every possible means to attract attention and reach a wider audience. Whether they distributed books for free, hired street advertisers, held public assemblies in meeting houses and theatres, preached on the street or had young girls strip naked in public, the French Prophets certainly did not leave their audiences indifferent.

Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of watching the Prophets convulse was the fact that they delivered specific and even dated millenarian predictions, thereby making such threats more tangible and imminent. Indeed, everywhere they went, the Prophets warned inhabitants, if unrepentant, against the fate of their city. London was not explicitly mentioned, but Marion’s prophecy of the burning of the great city due three weeks from 4th November, 1706, was certainly understood as the English
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capital, a prophecy Ann Steed renewed on 30th March, 1717. In the summer of 1707, John Lacy also announced that the guns of the Tower of London would roar ‘in a few days’, while more warnings were also delivered to the cities of Enfield, Chichester, Bristol, Edinburgh, Dublin and Glasgow.

London had seen visionaries in the past, but the protests and assaults on the Prophets not only reflected people’s exasperation, but probably also a genuine feeling of fear. The likelihood that the Prophets were taken seriously by some could explain both the success of the group in recruiting new followers and also the degree of anger expressed against them. Beside the anxieties caused by the end of a century, the 1700s were years of incertitude and the French Prophets’ emergence coincided with unexplained events and crises. For example, extreme weather conditions produced unusual consequences that might have been interpreted as a divine warning. On 16th November, 1703,

the nation was visited by one of the most destructive calamities in nature; a hurricane whose fury was astonishing and the effects terrible. The number of buildings in London and Westminster exposed the inhabitants particularly to the distresses attending the shattering of houses all around them; (…) Our island first received the impressions
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24 The prediction was originally announced as ‘in three weeks’, but was replaced in the book by the more mysterious ‘in a few days’. Marion, Avertissements prophétiques (Londres, 1707), p. 11 [BL 8630.aaa.26] and Prophetical Warnings (London, 1707), pp. 11-12 [BL 852.f.18]; Richard Kingston, Enthusiastick impostors, I, pp. 23, 55 [BL 695.c.6(3)]; Edmund Calamy, A Caveat against New Prophets (London, 1708), p. 34 [BL 695.c.6(4)]; Samuel Keimer, A Brand Snatch’d from the Burning (London, 1718), p. 74 [BL 1419.b.46(1)].

25 Calamy, Caveat, p. 34; Kingston, Enthusiastic Impostors, I, p. 72; Abraham Whitrow, A prophetical warning pronounced by Abraham Whitrow, woolcomber, under the operation of the Spirit, to the people of Enfield (1708) [BLO Pamph.277(8)]; Mary Turner, Warnings of the eternal spirit, to the priest and people of Chichester (1709) [BL 4375.aa.45]; Mary Beer, A collection of prophetical warnings, pronounced under the operation of the Holy Eternal Spirit, to the inhabitants in and about the City of Bristol (Bristol, 1709) [BL 695.c.7(1)]; Thomas Dutton, Warnings of the Eternal Spirit, to the city of Edinburgh, in Scotland (London, 1710) [BL 695.c.7(2)]; Margaret Mackenzie, Warnings of the eternal spirit, to the city of Edinburgh (London, 1710) [BL 695.c.4(3)]; John Moul, Warnings of the eternal spirit, to the city of Dublin (Dublin, 1710) [BL 4403.aaa.34]; James Cuninghame, Warnings of the eternal spirit, to the city of Glasgow (London, 1711) [BL 695.c.7(3)].

of this singular storm, which in its course over Europe, traversed England, France, Germany, (...) The wind had blown exceeding hard for fourteen days preceding the fatal night of its extream violence.\textsuperscript{27}

At least 2000 roofs were destroyed, 21 people died under collapsed buildings, over 200 were maimed and more were drowned in the Thames or simply never found.\textsuperscript{28} 1704 was an exceptionally dry year; there was a solar eclipse in May 1706 and London was suddenly plunged in the dark for about an hour on 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} November.\textsuperscript{29} A heat wave hit London the following year:

In the latter end of this summer [1707], such prodigious quantities of flies pestered the city, that the impressions of people's feet in the streets where they lay, are said to have been as perceptible as upon snow: but though some hundreds of bushels were swept into the kennels, yet happily the inhabitants escaped without having their health injured by them.\textsuperscript{30}

In contrast, 1708 was the second coldest year in half a century and the winter of 1709 one the harshest in early modern Europe, with temperatures falling to 0\textdegree{}F in London and frost lasting for three months.\textsuperscript{31}

Prophetism may have found a favourable ground in such severe conditions, which many may have feared as a presage of the millennium, especially when combined with shaky politico-economic circumstances. England had also been at

\begin{itemize}
\item Brazell, \textit{London Weather}, p. 7. The eclipse was total in Geneva, but was nevertheless observed from Greenwich. John Flamstěd, 'Observations of the Solar Eclipse, May 1/12 1706 At the Royal Observatory at Greenwich, etc.', \textit{Philosophical Transactions}, 25 (1706), pp. 2237-2241; \textit{The Correspondence of John Flamsteed, the First Astronomer Royal: 1703-1719}, ed. By Eric G. Forbes, Lesley Murdin, Frances Willmoth (CRC Press, 2001), pp. 334-336; Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol.1'].
\item Noorthouck, \textit{A New History of London}, pp. 293-294.
\item Brazell, \textit{London Weather}, pp. 9, 12, 152; Chabrol, \textit{Elie Marion}, p. 176.
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war against France since 1702, which ineluctably created uneasiness concerning the
community of Huguenot refugees. The country needed growing resources to support
the cost of the war, but one George Whalley recalled that trade collapsed around the
time of the Prophets, adding anxiety to an already unsettled time. Moreover in
March 1708, James Edward the Pretender attempted to invade England from
Scotland with the support of France. The Prophets brandished the spectre of a
Catholic invasion and Spirit asked his followers to buy in large supplies of food
ahead of a period of famine.

Opposition to the Prophets rapidly degenerated into a wave of violence. On
22nd April, 1707, a crowd gathered in front of Jean Allut and Cavalier’s house in
Soho to insult them, forcing the two cousins to flee with their wives, while Marion,
Portalès, Daudé and Fatio headed towards Northfleet for the day, some 18 miles east
of London. On 25th April, rioters abused the first English supporters of the
Prophets. John Lacy, Sir Richard Bulkeley and Dr. James Keith had stones thrown at
their windows, causing serious damage to their houses. This time, however, these
more influential victims fought back and had the rioters arrested on 28th April.
Significantly, a petition signed by the leading rioters, probably in May or June 1707,
reveals that the three gentlemen had aroused their anger by supporting impostors
who sought ‘daily to revenge themselves by making the French odious to the

32 The Ordinary Of Newgate, His Account Of The Behaviour, Confession, And Dying Words, Of The
Malefactors Who Were Executed At Tyburn (London, 1738), pp. 7-8 [BL D-6495.aaa.39.]. See also
Schwartz, French Prophets, p. 85.
33 Keimer, Brand, p. 28.
34 MMM, p. 158; Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 1v].
35 Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 1v].
Nation’, following an article Lacy had published in the *Flying Post*. The signatories’ names –Portal, Tournard, Baudry, Gautir, Fordan, Janson, Arnaud, Bouillard– also confirm that, although ‘great multitudes of People both English and French’ gathered around their houses, the most virulent of them were Huguenot refugees.\(^36\)

Attorney general Simon Harcourt’s report, dated 21\(^{st}\) June, provides further details on the circumstances of those riots. Unsurprisingly, those indicted appeared to bear French family names. Despite their assembling ‘in so great a number and such a manner as is not strictly justifiable by law’, the rioters were acquitted of charges of violence against the Prophets.\(^37\) Misson’s house on Tower Street was next assaulted, forcing Fage, Cavalier, Marion and the Portalès brothers to seek protection from a judge near King’s Mews. As the Prophets toiled through the crowd, insults and stones, rubbish and even putrescent carcasses of cats and dogs were hurled at them. The judge eventually let them out by the back door, but protesters stayed until night, occupying the entirety of what is today Trafalgar Square.\(^38\) The turmoil continued a few more days, each time targeting a different house, including Fatio’s, with a dozen Prophets returning to Northfleet until the atmosphere calmed down.

Although historians attributed those riots to the publication of Marion’s *Avertissements*, the two events occurred seventeen days apart. The crowd’s anger therefore cannot be ascribed to an impulsive reaction to printed prophecies, especially because the Consistory of the Savoy had released their ‘acte noir’ against the Prophets three months earlier and excommunicated Marion, Fage and Cavalier in

\(^36\) James Janson, ‘Petition to Qu. Anne, etc.’ (1707) [BL Add. Ms. 61618/fol. 138].


\(^38\) **MMM**, pp. 163-5.
March. Jean-Paul Chabrol has also argued that such upheavals could not have been spontaneous, given that they involved both English and French protesters, and therefore required some consultation beforehand. He further suggests that agitators might have been bribed by the Tories to stir trouble, as had been the case against Protestant dissenters towards the end of Charles II’s reign. While plausible, Marion’s memoirs indicate instead that William Portal, formerly of the conformist Church of the Savoy, and several ministers had been encouraging those riots, but that the latter were not arrested. Marion’s testimony is precious here, as it confirms not only the role and initiative of French refugees in those protests, but also that the French ministry moved from preaching and publishing against the Prophets to agitating the crowds on the street.

On a different note, the Prophets were also feared as a potentially violent and therefore dangerous group, whose assemblies rapidly became notorious for their unpredictable nature. Some Prophets once ‘threw one another on the Fire-back, and made Motions to cut one another with knives’ at the Swan Tavern, while others destroyed everything around them at a meeting at Copenhagen. Several accounts also noted that both Fage and Lacy were prepared to kill even their own fathers if
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commanded by the Spirit;\textsuperscript{43} and Samuel Keimer, writing retrospectively about his indoctrination recalled:

For my Part, I had such a thorough Belief of the Divinity of the Spirit presiding, that had John Potter under Operation, commanded me to kill my Father, Mother, or even the late Queen on the Throne, I sincerely believe I should immediately have attempted it. To such a Heighth of Diabolical Madness was I with others, arriv’d to!\textsuperscript{44}

Many Prophets were furthermore reported to carry swords, thus feeding fears of a seditious conspiracy or a popish plot. A gathering of 100 armed followers in Hackney Marsh had indeed degenerated into a riot when challenged by angry Huguenots, who subsequently denounced the Prophets as a threat to their peaceful coexistence with Londoners.\textsuperscript{45} It was the fear of such gatherings that had led the government to anticipate violence in Bunhill Fields a few months earlier. Narcissus Luttrell reported about Dr. Emes’ well publicised resurrection that ‘two regiments of our train’d bands are ordered upon the guard during the holydayes, to prevent any disorder which may happen by the mobb on that occasion’.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{43} An Account of the Lives and Behaviour of the Three French Prophets, lately Come out of the Cevennes and Languedoc (London, 1708), p. 21 [BPF 8* 3 087 Rés]; Kingston, Enthusiastick Impostors, I, pp. 28-9 [BL 695.c.6(3)]; A True Copy of Letters Past betwixt Mr. Robert Calder minister of the gospel, and Mr. James Cuninghame of Barns (Edinburgh, 1710), p. 15 [BL 1369.a.3].

\textsuperscript{44} Keimer, Brand, p. 30; Theophilus Evans, The History of Modern Enthusiasm, from the Reformation to the Present Times (London, 1757), p. 98.

\textsuperscript{45} ‘Récit abrégé des persécutions & oppositions faites par les prétendus ministres de Christ de la Nation Française contre le message de l'Éternel’ (1707) [Stack 1g/fols 47-48]. The Post Boy, 2111 (Nov. 23, 1708).

Most of the abhorrence the group inspired lay, first and foremost, in the
nationality of its original members, at a time when England and France were at war.
Although the Crown had almost always led a welcoming policy in favour of French
refuges, francophobic attitudes had been growing since the Treaty of Dover in 1670,
which its opponents at the time saw as a rapprochement with France. Moreover,
Charles’ mother, Henrietta Maria, was French and, together with her daughter and
other son, the future James II, was a Catholic. When Charles issued a declaration of
indulgence in 1672 to relieve Catholics from the sanctions of the Clarendon Code, it
had also become apparent that he had secretly converted and so it was feared that he
might restore Catholicism as England’s official religion. His brother and successor,
the openly Catholic James II, was very unpopular for the same reason and was
overthrown by William of Orange in the Glorious Revolution in 1688. He found
refuge in France, but his son James Edward ‘the Pretender’ remained the legitimate
heir to the throne and fears of a Jacobite invasion persisted well into the eighteenth
century, with attempts indeed made in 1692, 1696, 1701-2, 1708 and 1714-5.

England under William III and Anne strongly needed the support of French
refugees in the war against France. Ever since Edward VI’s Charter of 1550, all
English monarchs, with the exception of Mary Tudor (reigned 1553-58), had
followed a favourable policy towards Huguenot immigrants. In return for their
contribution to the economy, England granted them the freedom of worship. William
had even created a Royal Bounty of £15,000 per year to help them to settle, which
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Anne perpetuated, and both gained their unconditional devotion. The argument had attracted some 200,000 Huguenots since the sixteenth century and they had grown into a solidary network, whose own institutions distributed money to their paupers, widows and children.\textsuperscript{49}

The law did not, however, favour the French Prophets and concerns about their own legal status led the Huguenots of London to reject their Camisard relatives. Many were still waiting to be naturalised after the 1681 Edict of Hampton Court, but too many restrictions and probably a lack of political motivation turned it into a huge disappointment. It was not until 1709 that they would finally be naturalised under an act itself soon to be be repealed in 1712.\textsuperscript{50} By 1706, therefore, the Huguenots were still not recognised as \emph{de facto} English citizens and instead the 50,000 or so refugees who had settled in England since 1660 remained denizens, holding intermediate status between a subject and an alien. Technically speaking, denization was granted upon a letter of authorisation from the Crown and offered permanent

\begin{flushright}

residency with royal protection, subject to customs and higher taxation.\textsuperscript{51} Maureen Waller rightfully argues in this respect that ‘Parliament was reluctant to grant the Huguenots full naturalisation, which would allow them to bequeath land to their heirs’, hence their need to show continuing devotion to the monarch.\textsuperscript{52}

If the Huguenot exodus inflicted moderate damage to the French economy, it made a considerable contribution to the growth of their host country. In England, denizenship was very lucrative for the government and the advantages of heavy taxation on such a dynamic workforce prevailed over their systematic naturalisation. The Huguenots in France had been confined to a limited range of occupations such as craftsmanship, commerce, banking and legal practice and the refugees in London, including the French Prophets, reflected these backgrounds. For instance, Jean Allut was a cabinetmaker, Jean Cavalier a weaver and Elie Marion a clerk.\textsuperscript{53} Jean-Pierre Poussou’s study also reveals that the Huguenots specialised in glass, bed linen and oil works in Brandenburg; they were active in banking in Switzerland and excelled in paper and silk manufacturing as well as in jewellery and clock making in England.\textsuperscript{54}

Xenophobic feelings against French refugees prevailed mostly among the English lower classes, who were confronted by harsh foreign competition. French fashion was already in vogue by 1700, but London merchants and workers often resented the presence of a cheaper Huguenot labour force with superior production

\textsuperscript{51} Gwynn, Huguenot Heritage, p. 57; Cottret, Terre d’exil, p. 320.
\textsuperscript{52} Waller, 1700 Scenes, p. 268.
\textsuperscript{53} See table 1 in chapter 3 and list E in Appendix.
techniques as an unfair competition.\textsuperscript{55} Such depictions did not reflect an actual social cleavage among the refugees that more obviously divided them between Spitalfields and Soho. A conservative estimate suggests that by 1700, 15,000 Huguenots had settled among English textile workers in the poorer, east London neighbourhoods, while another 8,000 lived in the western part of the capital, where many luxury craftsmen and professionals found a wealthy clientele.\textsuperscript{56} David Lovejoy’s claim that ‘Englishmen were sympathetic to the Huguenots and admired their patience and constancy they exhibited despite intense suffering’ may be true of some Francophile gentry concerning well-off Huguenots, but it is inaccurate in regard to the East London refugees and local workers.\textsuperscript{57}

The discrepancy between a Francophile government and a mainly Francophobe people deeply hindered the integration of the Huguenots into English society. Fabienne Chamayou has based her assessment of the integration of French immigrants on the practice of exogamy, though this suggests assimilation rather than integration. Her study nevertheless reveals that transnational weddings only began to occur well into the eighteenth century and involved second and mostly third generation Huguenots; a blood mix that coincided with the progressive desertion of French Churches and temples.\textsuperscript{58} Maureen Waller likewise reckons that it took at least three or four generations for those who arrived in the 1680s to be fully assimilated,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{56} Gwynn, \textit{Huguenot Heritage}, pp. 36-38.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Lovejoy, \textit{Religious Enthusiasm in the New World}, p. 69; Gwynn, \textit{Huguenot Heritage}, p. 4.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Fabienne Chamayou, ‘Le Refuge dans les îles britanniques’, p. 60.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
though there is also evidence, including among the French Prophets, that Huguenots started marrying outside their community earlier.59

Beyond economic competition and legal discrimination, ‘anti-popyery was the strongest emotional force in England at the end of the seventeenth century’, and it certainly remained so when the French Prophets arrived.60 Even John Lacy, the future leader of the French Prophets, had warned the Queen in 1704 that her ‘Kingdoms, and the True Protestant Religion establisht among us, are in this present Juncture threatned’.61 Anglicans and dissenters thus all agreed on the necessity to stand united against Popery. Ironically, the Huguenots, and even for some time the French Prophets, were regarded as disguised Catholics and part of some popish plot, a logic based upon the propositions that all papists were foreigners and all foreigners were potential papists.62

So widespread and strong was this popish paranoia that it even pervaded the Huguenots themselves, particularly the conformists. Beside their integration problems, the Huguenots were also religiously divided, which may explain why many attended Marion’s assemblies yet so few actually joined the French Prophets, for anyone associated with them ran a serious risk. In 1700, London already counted 28 French Protestant churches, seven of which were in Spitalfields.63 The Huguenot community as a whole tended to polarise into the French Reformed Church of


60 Waller, 1700 Scenes, p. 267.

61 Lacy, A Moral Test, the manifest intent in Law, of the Sacramental (London, 1704), p. 6 [BL 4106.f. 1.].


63 Waller, 1700 Scenes, p. 265.
Threadneedle Street, founded in 1550 near Spitalfields, and the conformist Church of the Savoy on the Strand. Broadly speaking, this partition divided the Huguenots more or less evenly between either end of London.64

With French refugees needing to demonstrate their loyalty to the English Crown and make themselves accepted by the population, the arrival of the three Camisards in 1706 provided a test for the Huguenots community. It is therefore not surprising that it was the French ministry who first mobilised against the inspired and brought their case to the English secular authorities. Marion was the third prophet to come to London and more prophets might have been on their way too. As their assemblies kept growing in size and frequency, the ministers of Threadneedle Street arranged a meeting with the Prophets on 18th September, but the latter failed to appear as expected. Two days later, Aaron Testas (d. 1721), one of their ministers, met with Fage, Cavalier, Marion and Fatio; their confrontation was fruitless and Cavalier accused French ministers of cowardice for leaving France. Threadneedle Street submitted a report to Henry Compton, bishop of London and ardent supporter of the Huguenots, to inform him of the situation.65 The Prophets then met five times in October with the consistory of the Savoy, presided over by Jean-Armand Dubourdieu. The ministers offered them some financial relief and after failing to


reason with them, released a ‘black act’ on 5th January, declaring Marion, Fage and Cavalier to be impostors in full control of their agitations and a serious danger for all Protestant Churches. The act was finally published in *The Post Boy* on 8th May; and the choice of this Tory newspaper by the conformist ministers of the Savoy was no coincidence.66

By making this report public, the Savoy had thus kindled a fierce political debate. Indeed, its public repudiation of the Prophets went beyond a mere spiritual and confessional condemnation; it was an act of self-censorship for the Huguenot community. As a conformist Church, the Savoy was consequently accountable to the Crown. Its ministers (Jean Graverol, Aaron Testas, Claude Grotesthe de la Mothe) also sat in the French committee in charge of the distribution of the Royal Bounty and worked in collaboration with the English committee, some of whom (Thomas Stampe, John Houblon, Charles Duncombe, Robert Beachcroft and John Ward) were former or future Lord Mayors of the City of London.67 The same ministers who promptly and vehemently attacked the French Prophets were therefore answerable to both the bishop of London and the secular authorities and the rapidity with which they reacted against the inspired Camisards reflects the degree of pressure they were placed under.68


68 Maximilien Misson, *Meslange de litterature historique & critique* (London, 1707), p. 35 [BL 700.e. 21(6)].
Although Marion, Cavalier and Fage had been excommunicated in March 1707, this was not to be the trial of the French Prophets as a group, or even of these three men. Instead Marion, Fatio and Daudé were cited on 5th May to appear at the Savoy’s request before Chief Justice John Holt (1642-1710) the following day. They presented themselves on the 6th and were bailed out by John Lacy three days later. The trial occurred in two parts and was to last until November. On 12th May, the accused appeared for the first time before the Court of Queen’s Bench in Guildhall. The attorney general Sir Simon Harcourt read charges against them. Marion was to be indicted for promoting opinions with his *Prophetic Warnings* and Daudé and Fatio for publishing them, as well as holding unlawful assemblies. Six warnings were deemed blasphemous and five of them tending towards sedition, including Marion’s declaration, which was published separately soon afterwards. The three men were defended by John Hooke, an Irish sergeant at law, founding member and treasurer of the S.P.C.K., whom the Prophets also counted among their followers; but only Richard Harcourt, ‘clerk for the Crown in the Court of Queen’s Bench’ appeared as their defending attorney. The Bench was presided over by John Holt and judges included Peter King, John Powell, Robert Eyre and probably John Turton, Littleton

69 Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol. 2].

70 R. v. Marion & ors. (Trin. 6 Anne) [TNA KB 28/22/29]; Marion, *Avertissements prophétiques*, pp. vi-viii [BL 8630.aaa.26]; *The French prophet’s declaration; or, an account of the preachings, prophecies and warnings of Elias Marion* (London, 1707) [BL 695.c.4.(3)].

Powys and Henry Gould. The case was not tried at statutory law, as previously thought, but constituted instead a non capital offence at common law involving ‘Impostures in Religion, as falsly pretending to extraordinary Commissions from God, and terrifying or abusing the People with false Denunciations of Judgments, &c.’

What appears as the trial of three reckless Huguenots was in reality a highly symbolic affair. For the King’s bench, or Queen’s bench under female monarchs, was a superior court of common law and dealt mostly with issues affecting the Crown, political cases, lawsuits involving important subjects and the maintenance of public peace. The indictment of Marion and two of his scribes was thus designed to be as public and talked about as the Prophets’ assemblies and predictions had been.

---


73 William Hawkins, A Treatise of the Pleas of the Crown (London, 1716), I, pp. 6-7 [BL 1471.k.21]. English statutory law sanctioned blasphemy and profaneness more severely. Under I Eliz. C.2, laymen were to be fined 100 marks upon their first offence, 400 upon the second and to face life imprisonment and forfeiture of their goods upon the third. 5 Eliz. C. 15 also punished false and pretended prophecies by a fine of £100 and one year imprisonment upon the first offence and forfeiture of all goods and chattels, and life imprisonment upon the second. Under the Blasphemy act of 1698, anyone denying the Trinity, the authority of the Bible or holding polytheist beliefs, violated the Toleration Act and incurred interdiction to hold any ecclesiastical, civil and military office upon the first offence, was to be deprived of their civil and legal rights and imprisoned for three years upon the second. Giles Jacob, The Common Law Common-Placed: Containing the Substance and Effect of all the Common Law Cases (London, 1726), p. 73 [BL 6145.b.25]; Readings upon the Statute Law: Alphabetically Digested (London, 1723-25), I, pp. 244-247 [BL 508.b.10-14]; William Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws of England, A Facsimile of the First Edition of 1765-1769 (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 4, pp. 59, 149. Mullett, ‘The Legal Position of English Protestant Dissenters’, p. 394.

Incidentally, all four broadsides reporting this case refer to the Prophets in their titles, rather than the actual individuals convicted.75

More audiences followed on 26th May and 13th June, with key witnesses appearing in court. François-Maximillien Misson, the acclaimed novelist, made a long plea in favour of his coreligionists, in which he argued that the Spirit that animated them was the same one that had spoken through Balaam’s donkey. His efforts did not impress the jury and one judge constantly interrupted him.76 The printer Robert Roger came next and claimed that Marion was never involved in the publication of his Avertissements prophétiques since it was Fatio and Daudé who gave him the manuscript, which the latter admitted. Lastly, Charles Portalès testified to support Marion’s sincerity and asked to be accused himself, having introduced the latter to Fatio and Daudé and transcribed more warnings than them. The interrogatory led to heated altercations: as Marion and Daudé understood little or no English, Fatio spoke in their names and warned the judges against rejecting a message sent by God. Several jurors were also challenged on two occasions, possibly in an attempt to buy time, and new ones were subsequently appointed. The accused eventually pleaded not guilty, but were found ‘guilty of printing and publishing the book’ on 4th July, and forbidden to hold assemblies. Given the length of the trial, the legal term had already been exceeded and the sentence was therefore delayed until the next term.77

75 An Account of the Tryal, Examination and Conviction, of Elias Marion, and other the French Prophets (London, 1707) [BL 1851.c.10.(33*.)]; An Account of the Tryal, Examination & Conviction of the Pretended French Prophets (London, 1707) [BLO Pamph.274(16)]; The Tryal, Examination and Condemnation of the French Prophets (1707) [BLO Pamph.274(17)]; Pillory Disappointed, or, the False Prophets Advancement (London, 1707) [BLO Pamph.274(10)].


77 R. v. Marion & ors.; ‘Récit abrégé’ [Stack 1g/fols 25v-26]; An Account of the Tryal, Examination and Conviction, of Elias Marion, and other the French Prophets [BL 1851.c.10.(33*)].
Meanwhile, the verdict served the French Prophets and helped to promote their growth, their numbers doubling between the two terms. Marion was able to turn the sentence to his own advantage, arguing that neither the prophecies, the rituals nor any doctrine had been targeted through this condemnation. Yet efforts were made to comply with the law and thus claim the benefit of the Toleration act. For example, Rebecca Critchlow and John Lacy began registering meeting places for the group and respectively hosted their first assemblies on 28th May and 14th June. English supporters were now taking the future of the group into their own hands and needed to avoid further prosecution. Luck was not on their side and the charges made against the Huguenot rioters were dropped by Simon Harcourt on 15th June. The Prophets were also most certainly aware of Holt’s tough stance on sedition and Lacy promptly asked him for a nolle prosequi in the name of the Lord on 17th and 18th June.

As their numbers grew and their composition changed, the identity of the Prophets altered. Lacy in particular gave a new impulse to the group, now claiming to speak in tongues and to have miraculously healed several people, and he prepared three volumes of warnings published between 18th July and 3rd November. These alleged miracles and the influx of new converts over the summer gave the Prophets more confidence in the significance of their coming martyr. They now claimed to have the power to strike their opponents dead on the spot and Jean Cavalier prophesied that a boat would soon sail in the blood on the streets of London. John Potter openly defied the authorities, addressing a warning to the judge in October:

---

78 ‘Récit abrégé’ [Stack 1g/fol. 26].
79 MMM, p. 165.
80 Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol. 2]; ‘Attorney General Report about French Protestants, June 21, 1707’ [BL Add. Ms. 61618/fols 135-136].
And poor Lord chief Justice Holt (since dead) was thundringly threaten’d by the Spirit in John Potter, that while he was sitting to give Judgement, the Blood should burst out of his Veins from Head to Foot, and that he should in an Agony, cry out, to this Effect, Behold the Judgments of the Great God upon me, by the Hands of his Servants.81

Marion, Daudé and Fatio returned before the judges on 6th November to hear their final sentence, but a clerk’s mistake was discovered in the first verdict and Holt ordered the case to be retried, to the defendants’ satisfaction.82 On 22nd November, the three men were eventually found guilty and were condemned six days later to stand on the scaffold for one hour on two consecutive days and pay a fine of 20 nobles each (roughly £6 12s).83 The three men served their sentences on 1st December at Charing Cross and at the Royal Exchange the following day. They were forced to wear paper inscriptions on their hats: ‘Elias Marion, Convicted for falsely and profanely pretending himself to be a true prophet, and printing and uttering many things as dictated and Revealed to him by the Spirit of God to terrifie the Queen’s people’ and ‘John D’Audé, and Nicolas Facio, convicted for abetting and favouring Elias Marion, in his wicked and counterfeit prophecies, and causing them to printed and publish’d, to terrifie the Queen’s people.’ The duke of Ormond sent constables and beadles to contain the crowd, for Fatio had been a tutor to his brother the Earl of Arran, but the angry crowd nevertheless spat and threw rubbish at them; Marion was wounded in the face and Fatio’s left eye severely injured by a stone.84

81 Keimer, Brand, p. 31.
82 Quatrième Lettre d’un Particulier, à Monsieur Misson (London,1708), pp. 18-19 [BL 700.c.21.4].
84 ‘Récit abrégé’ [Stack 1g/fols 62, 67]; Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol. 2v]; Luttrell, A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs, 6, p. 240.
PILLORY DISAPPOINTED.

OR, THE

False PROPHETS

Advancement.

To the Tune of Rotten Eggs, Tunop-Tops, Pieces of Dirt, & Brick-Batts.

Elias Marion, the head French Prophet, his Speech on the Scaffold, at the Royal Exchange in Cornhill, on Tuesday the 2d of December.

O H! Wicked Generation of Vipers, worse than the Unbelieving Philistines, that kill'd the great, strong, & good Prophet Sampson; had I the Jaw-bone of an Ass in mine Hand, I would tell you heeps up on heeps, & instead of a Thousand I would lay Ten Thousand of you sprawling like Toads in a Common-heap, or Grab-Lice on a Gours Back. Oh! you Britsh Infidels, why won't you believe the Moon's made of a Green Cheeke? Why won't you believe the Foolishness of Preaching according to the Scripture? Why will you not believe my Prophecies & Lies, which call you nothing, rather than Buy a Cobler's Almanack Tear after Tear. Stuff'd with nothing else? Oh Foolish Generation, who has Bewitch'd you? Who has has hardned your Hearts against us, that comes to tell you more in an Hour then you'll find true in an Age? If you are Angry at our Advancement, come & take our Places & Welcome; Pray, Brethren, do ye your Eggs, to make your Candles, & be not to free of your Tunop-Tops & Brick-Bats; I vow as I am a Prophet, & the Son of a Prophet, I don't require these Patients at your Hands: For as sure as a Maid of Thirty (if such a Miracle be found in your Dwellings) is defirons of something to keep her from the Dreadful Sentence of leading Ape's in Hell; so sure shall I fall into a Dimamble Fit & betray my Bracher, if the Prophets of the L----, or rather the D----, be not suddenly taken down a Hole Lower, & displaced from this Honorable Foot-stool of Repentance. Oh!

To conclude, let us still Endeavour to Cheat Fools, Oblige Knaves, Impose on the VVife, & Plague our better, to which the rest of the False Prophets Cryed, V.M.E.N., Oh! Oh!

And thus when Prophets for the Devil French,

They get poor ugly Fool, with which is Reach;

Make them believe Good's Windows the Tricks,

When We then know it all to be our Old-Nick.

Mad Men bewitch'd, turn delightful their Fire,

And Blend in Falsh'd, the Heart of their Wives.

LONDON: Printed for Robert De Chaine, next Tuesday, 1707.

[Picture 3. Pillory Disappointed, or, the False Prophets Advancement (London, 1707) [BLO Pamph.274(10)].]
Harsh and humiliating as it may appear, their sentence was in fact perceived as regretfully mild by their contemporaries, and although the fine exceeded Marion’s assets, it was easily paid by his coreligionists on 2nd December.\textsuperscript{85} Claims of prophecy, miracles, occult knowledge and witchcraft were no longer taken seriously toward the end of the seventeenth century and their prosecutions became marginal, though the belief itself persisted long afterwards. Holt and Powell epitomised such judicial scepticism and only condemned Marion, Fatio and Daudé for printing prophecies and holding illegal assemblies, thus ignoring claims of sedition, conspiracy or diabolical imposture.\textsuperscript{86} Unless prescribed by a statute, judges would also typically take into consideration the gravity of the offence as well as the gender and status of the offender when determining the amount of the fine, hence their decision to halve that of Marion and his scribes.\textsuperscript{87} The judges’ clemency thus disappointed the expectations of the Prophets’ adversaries. A Huguenot pamphleteer deplored that English laws were too favourable to the accused and argued that Marion would have been burnt alive in Paris, citing the similar case of Simon Morin half a century earlier.\textsuperscript{88}

G.D. Nokes’s study of the crime of blasphemy compiled similar common law cases between 1617 and 1922 thereby providing us with a more objective picture of the sentences delivered.\textsuperscript{89} His results confirm a particularly lenient sentence for Marion and his acolytes. As can be seen in table 3 below, all of the reported convicts

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{85} Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr.605/7a/fol. 2\textsuperscript{v}]; ‘Récit abrégé’ [Stack 1g/fol. 68].
\item \textsuperscript{86} Malcolm Gaskill, \textit{Crime and Mentalities in Early Modern England} (CUP, 2002), pp. 79-119; \textit{R. v. Marion & ors}.\textsuperscript{87} Shoemaker, \textit{Prosecution and Punishment}, pp. 156-160; ‘Récit abrégé’ [Stack 1g/fol. 68].
\item \textsuperscript{88} Troisième Lettre d'un Particulier, à Monsieur Misson (London, 1707), p. 9 [BL 700.e.21.3]; \textit{Quatrième Lettre d'un Particulier, à Monsieur Misson} (London, 1708), p. 8 [BL 700.e.21.4].
\item \textsuperscript{89} G.D. Nokes, \textit{A History of the Crime of Blasphemy} (London : Sweet and Maxwell, 1928), pp. 147-160.
\end{itemize}
Table 3. Sentences at common law for offences in relation to religious opinion.90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>OFFENCE</th>
<th>COURT †</th>
<th>SENTENCE ¶</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>Libel</td>
<td>O.B</td>
<td>20 m. F.I.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675</td>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>Libel</td>
<td>Q.S.</td>
<td>£26/13/4 F.I.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Words</td>
<td>K.B.</td>
<td>1000 m. F.I.P.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td>Muggleton</td>
<td>Libel</td>
<td>O.B.J.</td>
<td>£500 F.I.P.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1682</td>
<td>Ludlam</td>
<td>Words</td>
<td>Q.S.</td>
<td>£100 F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Delaune</td>
<td>Libel</td>
<td>O.B.J.</td>
<td>100 m. F.I.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Baxter</td>
<td>Libel</td>
<td>K.B.</td>
<td>£500 F.I.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Lowthorp*</td>
<td>Libel</td>
<td>O.B</td>
<td>500 m. F.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>Hambleton*</td>
<td>Libel</td>
<td>O.B</td>
<td>£200 F.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Fowles*</td>
<td>Words</td>
<td>O.B</td>
<td>100 m. F.I.P.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Burridge*</td>
<td>Libel</td>
<td>O.B</td>
<td>£40 F.I.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Defoe*</td>
<td>Libel</td>
<td>O.B</td>
<td>200 m. F.I.P.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Libel</td>
<td>Q.B.</td>
<td>40 m. F.I.R.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>Marion,</td>
<td>Libel</td>
<td>Q.B.</td>
<td>20 n. F.I.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daudé, Facio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Howel*</td>
<td>Libel</td>
<td>O.B</td>
<td>£500 F. 3 years I.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>Payne</td>
<td>Libel</td>
<td>K.B.</td>
<td>£100 F.I.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90 Table 3 combines Appendices B and C in Nokes’ *History of the Crime of Blasphemy*, pp. 145-167. For more legibility, I have only included the cases that were found guilty and selected a few from each decade. Cases marked * come from Appendix C (probably at common law, but not inspected by Nokes).

† O.B = Old Bailey; Q.S = Quarter Sessions; K.B. = King’s Bench; O.B.J. = O.B. presided over by a judge of K.B.; Q.B. = Queen’s Bench.

¶ F. = fine; I. = imprisonment (F. implies I. until the payment or release of the F.); m.= marks; n.= nobles; P. = pillory; R. = Defendant’s own recognisances; S. = surety’s recognisances.
between 1675 and 1714 were imprisoned or exposed on the pillory, oftentimes both, their fines ranging between 20 marks (about £13 6s 7d) and £500. The Presbyterian minister Thomas Emlyn, whose moving case Nokes briefly mentions, was actually condemned to one year imprisonment and a £1,000 fine in 1703.91

While Marion’s sentence was comparatively lighter, his trial also differed given his claims to deliver judgements from God. Few cases brought to the King’s or Queen’s bench effectively resulted in a trial and the prosecution of the three men therefore indicates a serious offence. Yet the condemnation of enthusiasts and religious impostors seems to have moved away from corporal punishments in favour of imprisonment and systematic fines. Up until 1612, death by fire was the standard punishment for the most serious cases of blasphemy.92 In 1656, the Quaker James Nayler had his tongue bored, was whipped, branded with the letter ‘B’ on his forehead and exposed on the pillory for impersonating the Lord. Eight years later, Benjamin Keach was fined £20 and imprisoned for libel against the Common Prayer and Liturgy.93 In 1699, the barber enthusiast and Origenist Thomas Moore was fined 20 nobles by the Old Bailey for seditious libel and pretending to be the biblical prophet Elijah.94 As renowned sceptics, Holt and Powell thus settled for a smaller fine, preferring for Marion, Daudé and Fatio the humiliating semiotics of the scaffold, a sentence they normally deemed inappropriate for men of letters.95


93 Readings upon the Statute Law, I, p. 247 [BL 508.b.10-14]; Nokes, Blasphemy, p. 38.


95 Gaskill, Crime and Mentalities, pp. 82, 91. Their condemnation was to serve as a precedent in 1795, for the prosecution before Parliament of the MP Nathaniel Halhed, ardent disciple of the prophet Richard Brothers. The London Packet or New Lloyd's Evening Post, 4024 (May 29, 1795).
While the trial was officially that of three individuals for publishing a book of warnings, the sentence was in effect delivered to the whole group and was advertised and perceived as such. Exposing key members of the group to public shame on the scaffold was intended to discredit what had at first appeared as a reputable congregation. Significantly, several men condemned for sodomy were originally to be displayed on the scaffold on 2nd December, but their shameful sentence was postponed to the following day in order not to assimilate the Prophets with sodomites and thus gave them their full share of humiliation. The Prophets’ condemnation thereby marked an early triumph of the Huguenot community over their zealous Camisards relations and helped to demonstrate their loyalty to the English government. Indeed, the Savoy and neighbouring French churches released a public advertisement on 6th December to notify Londoners that they initiated and covered the cost of their prosecution, in response to accusations against Huguenots of fomenting sedition.

Exposing Marion, Fatio and Daudé on the pillory served the double purpose of abashing the French Prophets and appeasing popular anger in parts of London. This was only short-lived, for the Prophets welcomed their martyrdom as part of the prerequisites of the Second Coming. On 4th July, 1707, the Spirit had already spoken through the mouth of John Lacy in French to comfort Marion, Fatio and Daudé on the day of their first verdict:

---
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Pauvre Enfant, (que) tu es, & timide, Je te donnerai courage: Je t’affirmerai contre toutes les Tempetes, les Reproches (& les) Insultes qui t’arriveront. (…) Je ferai éclater ma Gloire, au milieu de cette Ville. Tant plus qu’il vous persecutent, tant plus de Joie intérieure je te donnerai.100

Proud in appearance, the three convicts nevertheless proved more inconspicuous over the following months, as their English coreligionists raised the prospects of the group’s most extravagant prophecy. John Lacy and his new converts remained unshakeably defiant and continued to hold public assemblies. On 5th December, only three days after his brethren’s martyr on the scaffold, Lacy went to Dr. Emes’ house and ensured his dying friend of his resurrection.101 But the damage had already been done; the Prophets’ image had been tarnished for good and the news of their condemnation was promptly reported across Europe.102

Marion, Daudé and Fatio suffered to some extent for their brethren, many whom could equally have been indicted. Strictly speaking, therefore, this trial was not that of the Camisards, for Misson insisted that Fage and Cavalier were never cited, although they were the true originators of the Camisards’ prophetic revival in London, having held assemblies some two months before Marion.103 Their warnings had also been recorded in September 1706 for possible publication, but were eclipsed

100 ‘My poor and timid Child, I shall give thee Courage: I shall make thee strong against all the Tempests, Blames and Insults thou will face. (…) My Glory shall prevail, in the midst of this City. The more they persecute thee, the more Joy I will give to thy Hearts.’ (my translation). John Lacy, The prophetical warnings of John Lacy, Esq (London, 1707), pp. 62-3 [BL 852.f.19(1)].

101 Predictions concerning the raising the dead body of Mr. Thomas Emes, p. 1 [LPL H5133 243.06]. The dates of Lacy’s first prophecy to Emes given in Calder and Schwartz are inaccurate. Calder, A true copy of letters past betwixt Mr. Robert Calder minister of the gospel, and Mr. James Cuninghame of Barns, p. 26 [BL 1369.a.3]; Schwartz, French Prophets, p. 113.

102 Papiers Fatio [BGE Ms. fr. 601/149].

103 Misson, Meslange, p. 30 [BL 700.e.21(6)].
by Marion upon his arrival and had remained secondary Instruments since then. Cavalier’s cousin Jean Allut, another Cévenol, became inspired on 6th February, 1707 and was already well in the process of becoming the most important French inspired after Marion. Indeed, his house was even attacked by the angry crowd on 22nd April, thus indicating some degree of notoriety before the prosecution began.104

Along with Daudé and Fatio, Charles Portalès was the French Prophets’ third official scribe and had also taken part in the publication of Marion’s *Warnings*. While he appeared as a witness in the latter’s trial and had sworn Marion was genuinely inspired by the divine Spirit, Portalès was never indicted. Even if this came as a surprise to some, his good relations certainly spared him a trial. His employer, Armand de Bourbon, Marquis de Miremont, had supported the French Prophets since August 1706 and was close to the Queen, while his cousin David Flotard was the English emissary during the Camisard insurrection. Portalès was never as outspoken and defiant as his fellow Huguenot scribes and instead accredited the accused on the basis of his reputation; but he was also probably too close to the government and his indictment might have created a stir in Parliament.105 Marion, Daudé and Fatio were the only active members who could be easily prosecuted and scapegoated by the authorities in their discreet attempt to stop the French Prophets.

Lastly, it was common practice in early eighteenth-century England to indict anyone associated with the publication of a book or pamphlet, including the printer himself. Printers were required by law to give their names and address on the cover of any publication they printed, so that they could be easily identified and found by the authorities. This prerequisite led many to be imprisoned and saved the authorities

---

104 Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fols 1v-2v].

105 NRL, 43, p. 134 [BPF 8* 442].
the embarrassment of a public trial that would have made them encroach upon the liberty of expression guaranteed by the Licensing Act of 1695. 106 Samuel Keimer, one of the Prophets’ as well as Daniel Defoe’s printer, later spent time in prison on numerous occasions for printing libellous pamphlets and false news. 107 Accordingly, Robert Roger, the printer responsible for the publication of Marion’s Avertissements was cited as a witness, but somehow was not indicted and even agreed later to print further prophecies. 108

Many took it for granted that the real masterminds behind the French Prophets were Lacy and Bulkeley, yet neither suffered the same fate as their three Huguenot brethren, despite substantial grounds for this. Both were known around London as ardent supporters of the group, who subsidised the diffusion of their prophecies in print and organised assemblies, hence their assault by angry rioters in April 1707. Between June and November 1707, John Lacy had become the leading and most extravagant adept by far, prophesying in tongues, predicting catastrophes and divine punishments, and even apparently performing miracles. He had also published a compilation of three large volumes of his own prophecies between the first trial and Marion’s exposition on the scaffold. 109

As the Prophets continued to defy the authorities after their condemnation, Queen Anne personally ordered her attorney general to prosecute Lacy, Bulkeley ‘and other ringleaders’ on 11th December, 1707 in an attempt to thwart the group’s


108 See p. 216. Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 6].

109 Ibid. [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 2rv].
expansion, the pillory having failed in this respect.\footnote{So far as I can tell, only George Ascoli and Daniel Vidal briefly alluded to this episode, based on Luttrell’s entry in his diary, but regrettably do not go any further. Luttrell, \textit{A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs}, 6, pp. 243-244; Ascoli, ‘L’Affaire des prophètes français à Londres’, II, p. 93; Vidal, \textit{L’Ablatif absolu}, p. 27, note 27.}

This would certainly have constituted the official trial of the French Prophets by the English government, as there was a genuine intention from above to prosecute them as a dissenting sect. While the Prophets had already announced the resurrection of Thomas Emes, Earl Godolphin, the Queen’s closest advisor, and Mr. Harley, future Earl of Oxford, sent the diplomat Alexander Cunningham (1654-1737) in January 1708 to consult informally with the Presbyterian minister Edmund Calamy, who was acquainted with Lacy, about the Prophets. Indeed, Calamy recalled in his memoirs:

> Though I had been with him in company, yet I never had seen him at my house before. I presently concluded there was an end to be served, and therefore determined to be the more cautious. I did not go about to conceal my surprise, but told him it was such an unexpected honour he did me, in quitting the company of so many great persons as he daily conversed with, to come and take notice of so obscure a person as myself, that I could not but apprehend there was something considerable at the bottom.

> He was not free to own his visit had any special design; he always had a respect for men of worth, of all characters and denominations, and it was to show me that he had so, that he came to pay his respects to me, and that was all; upon which we entered into a general conversation about news and affairs of the world, &c. Sometimes he would ask me some questions about the new prophets, and then would go off again to some other subject.\footnote{Calamy, \textit{An Historical Account of my Own Life}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition (London: Colburn and Bentley, 1830), II, pp. 105-106.}

Although the Queen’s decision to prosecute the Prophets had been publicly announced, Calamy’s testimony reveals a great degree of uncertainty and embarrassment from the government concerning the most appropriate response to their continuing defiance. Trying the Prophets would assuredly confirm a tough
stance on radical dissenters at a time when the Tories attacked them on toleration, yet it might also send the wrong signal to all non-conformists. As a respected moral authority among dissenters, Calamy therefore advised his interlocutor not to intervene in the matter and allow the Prophets to discredit themselves with further failed predictions.\footnote{Calamy, \textit{Historical Account}, pp. 106-110.}

After witnessing John Lacy speaking in Latin, Lord Shaftesbury published his famous \textit{Letter concerning enthusiasm}, in which he also argued that the Prophets should be ignored as they fed on public attention.\footnote{Shaftesbury, ‘A Letter Concerning Enthusiasm to my Lord *****’, \textit{Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times}, ed. by Lawrence E. Klein (CUP, 2001), pp. 4-28.} Yet Calamy’s views also reflected his concern for social peace. He feared that repression might fail to convince, or also create martyrs, and that it might be interpreted by all dissenters as a revision of the Toleration Act, creating irreparable tensions between the government and a considerable proportion of the population so ‘heartily engaged in the public interest’. Calamy successfully convinced the government via Cunningham, with all charges against Lacy and Bulkeley abandoned shortly afterwards.\footnote{Calamy, \textit{Historical Account}, pp. 106-110.} Defending toleration remained the top priority for the government in seeking to secure social peace and political stability. As Queen Anne herself had once declared: ‘I shall be very careful to preserve and maintain the Act of Toleration, and to set the minds of all my people at quiet.’\footnote{Gregg, \textit{Queen Anne}, p. 159.} It was in this context that the Prophets were left free to hold their assemblies and obtained permission to exhume Thomas Emes’ body on 25\textsuperscript{th} May, 1708.
The French Prophets may have caught the government’s attention and even rekindled the passionate debate over toleration, but they were not a politically-minded group. Unlike most of their dissenting predecessors, the Levellers, Diggers, Quakers and Fifth Monarchists, they were in fact little concerned with political reforms, very much as they did not call for social or religious reforms. Abraham Whitrow’s proto-communist project may seem to contradict this view, yet he only attempted it after Dr. Emes failed to rise from the dead and the group actually expelled him shortly afterwards. Strictly speaking, Whitrow’s movement constituted a marginal reformist experience that the Prophets firmly condemned and therefore cannot be held as representative of the whole group, especially as there is no evidence that it survived beyond Richard Bulkeley’s death in 1710.

The Prophets did, however, deliver politically oriented prophecies from an early stage, albeit in different forms. The original nucleus, Fage, Cavalier and Marion, only spoke in general terms of divine punishments such as the fall of Babylon, whereas their English converts proved bolder and more explicit in their predictions. On 26th July, 1707, John Lacy warned Louis XIV of France against his imminent fall and urged him to convert to Protestantism, while Versailles and Toulouse were to be reduced to ashes and Toulon would soon be taken. George Johnson once had a revelation that he was inhabited by the spirit of Prince George and went to court to marry the Queen. On another occasion, John Potter and others prophesied that:

116 Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fols 3r-5]. See also pp. 81-82.
117 Lacy, Warnings, II, pp. 40-42 [BL 852.f.19(2)]; John Humfrey, A Farther Account of our Late Prophets, in two Letters to Sir Richard Bulkeley (London, 1708), p. 11 [BL 701.e.48]; Fatio’s calendar [BGE Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 2v].
Queen Anne should become a Prophetess, and be agitated in the like Manner as they were, the Spirit calling her by the name of, My Servant Anne, that she should go to Barbican, which Place was prophecy’d should become more noted over the whole World, than ever Jerusalem had been, and there preach the everlasting Gospel, and that the Queen should give Mary Beer (...) the right Hand of Fellowship, as her elder Sister, as being the elder Prophetess.\textsuperscript{118}

That they addressed or mentioned monarchs in their inspirations does not mean that the Prophets were making political claims. Instead, they understood the European political chessboard in millenarian terms, trying to make sense of the wars between Protestant and Catholic nations as signs of an imminent Doomsday, in a more explicit but nonetheless similar fashion to eminent mystico-scientists such as Isaac Newton and his successor William Whiston.\textsuperscript{119}

Nevertheless, some followers or affiliates may have held political designs independently of the Prophets, possibly to use the group as a smokescreen for a scheming network. The presence of Edmund Everard and Sir Joseph Tiley on the Prophets’ lists is particularly intriguing: these two British spies had respectively been involved in the Popish and Rye House plots in 1681 and 1683 and remained in contact while adhering to the Prophets. Although both appear on the later list of tribes, Everard’s religious interest remains questionable as his biography presents him as an opportunist, converting back and forth between Catholicism and Protestantism according to the various, often conflicting interests that he

\textsuperscript{118} Keimer, \textit{Brand}, pp. 31, 114.

successively served. In March 1708, while London was awaiting Thomas Emes’ resurrection, Jean Cavalier reportedly went to Nottingham to meet the Earl of Tallard, a French colonel held prisoner there between 1707 and 1711. The purpose or authenticity of his visit is unknown, but might have been motivated by Cavalier’s own political designs in seeking to negotiate the relief of Protestants in France with this important military figure.

On 20th August, 1708, as they prepared to disperse into missionary tribes, ‘the Spirit commanded the Believers to wear a Green Ribbon, of about a Yard long, as a Mark for the destroying Angel to know us by, when he should come to execute the Judgements of the Lord.’ The adoption of such a symbol may have marked a first step towards introducing some organisation in the group to ensure its survival after the scathing failure of Thomas Emes’ resurrection and the expulsion of ‘false’ prophets. The group’s purchasing of the ribbon may also have been facilitated by its close ties with the Spitalfields weaving industry. Of course, wearing this green ribbon also made their identification easier for their enemies: On 7th October, 1708, an assembly in Hackney Marsh was interrupted by angry Huguenots who attacked the Prophet Isaac Havy and pulled his ribbon from his hair. A week later, nine of these Huguenots rioters returned to the same place, but this time were attacked by
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about 100 Prophets; and later reported to a Justice of the Peace that their aggressors all wore a green ribbon on their hats and swords under their upper garments.\textsuperscript{123}

The fact that their enemies aimed specifically for this ribbon when fighting against the inspired indicates that it evidently carried a deeper symbolism than a mere fashion accessory. Although Schwartz does not explore this in detail, Margaret Jacob has argued that the Prophets could not have naively adopted this symbol as it already had significant connotations in England.\textsuperscript{124} The green ribbon had indeed been notoriously associated with radical dissenters in the seventeenth century and in particular the Levellers. It then became associated with those political dissidents in the 1670s and probably drew from informal coffee-house and tavern meetings. A Green Ribbon Club even appeared around the same time as the most notorious of the thirty or so Whig clubs in existence during the Restoration, whose activities included Pope-burning processions and anti-Duke of York propaganda. The Club consisted of radicals of every part of the social ladder and marked the emergence of a revolutionary political movement in the 1680s, some members bearing particularly active in the Rye House Plot and Monmouth’s rebellion.\textsuperscript{125} Titus Oates, the fabricator of the Popish Plot, also reportedly wore a black hat with a green ribbon.\textsuperscript{126} Such fresh and infamous memories of political dissidence make the perception of the French Prophets as conspirators very plausible and may therefore explain the

\textsuperscript{123} \textit{The Post Boy}, 2111 (Nov. 23-25, 1708).


\textsuperscript{126} Thomas Salmon, \textit{Tryals for High-Treazon, and other Crimes. With Proceedings on Bills of Attainder, and Impeachments. For three hundred years past} (London, 1720-31), IV, p. 320.
Huguenots’ anxiousness to destroy their ribbons a few months away from their naturalisation.

Schwartz also suggested that Marion may have sought to echo the Camisards’ practice of wearing green-and-red ribbons in England, just six days before Abraham Mazel returned to the Cévennes to launch a new insurrection.\(^{127}\) His claim is not supported, however, and accounts differ greatly on the Camisards’ semiotics, pointing at monochromatic red, blue, black, white and silver ribbons.\(^{128}\) Even if true, the Prophets’ English followers could not have ignored the significance of such a symbol and the dangers it would expose them to; yet Jacob’s implication that it evidenced a political claim is undoubtedly exaggerated, for politics was not part of the Prophets’ inspirations. Green was the colour traditionally associated with Christ the Redeemer and the ribbon was ‘look’d upon as a Bride Favour for the Marriage of the Lamb’.\(^{129}\) For this reason the Prophets were prepared to embrace martyrdom as part of divine plans foreboding the Lord’s Second Coming. As a result of a divine command, only the millenarian symbolism of the green ribbon mattered and its association with radical dissent may simply have been the result of an unfortunate cultural coincidence.

###

\(^{127}\) Schwartz, *French Prophets*, p. 128.


The trial of Marion and his two scribes is significant in the religious history of England for several reasons. On a local level, it illustrates the solid collaboration that existed between the French refugee ministers and English authorities. Like the battle of pamphlets that accompanied it, their trial was originally a Franco-French issue. The legal procedure was not initiated by the government, but from the local level of the French ministry, who sought to purge the Huguenot community from its inspired Camisards and to contain disruption within their own ranks, while reasserting their loyalty to the Crown. Only then did the Huguenots attract the attention and receive the support of the government, with the Queen first granting a *nolle prosequi* to the rioters who had assaulted the Camisards and their English followers in June 1707 and personally ordering the prosecution of more prominent Prophets in December.

On a national level, their trial was also symptomatic of the tensions between Tories and Whigs over the Toleration act, some twenty years after it was passed. The discovery of the court record reveals the thorniness of trying radical dissenters at a time when latitudinarianism prevailed over outright repression. Indeed, the Prophets’ enthusiasm proves to have greatly embarrassed the judges, who eventually settled for a relatively lenient sentence based exclusively on two undeniable charges of printing books and holding unlawful assemblies, thus leaving aside the more serious allegations of sedition and conspiracy to avoid further disruption. Their decision would soon prove in line with another major controversy in Queen Anne’s reign. Only two years later, in 1709, Henry Sacheverell, a respected high-churchman renowned for his fiery preaching, infuriated the Whig government when he denounced dissenters in a sermon as ‘Factious, and Schismatical Impostors’ dividing the Anglican Church. A new battle of pamphlets immediately followed as
Sacheverell faced impeachment, but again the Queen’s influence resulted in a compromise for a mild sentence that involved burning his best-selling sermon.\textsuperscript{130}

Although central to the story of the French Prophets, their trial and humiliation on the scaffold did not put an end to their defiance of the physical world. It is known, for example that Samuel Keimer, James Cuninghame and John Philips appeared before the Quarter Sessions around 1711 for interrupting a sermon in St Paul’s cathedral and subsequently causing a riot.\textsuperscript{131} Lacy also appeared in court in 1717 for living in adultery with Elizabeth Gray in Chester.\textsuperscript{132} As they travelled on their missions, the Prophets confronted the law further still. John Glover and Samuel Noble were imprisoned in the House of Correction in Edinburgh for eight to ten days at the beginning of August 1709, and were deported to Newcastle a few days later. More Prophets appeared ‘at the Cross and in the market place of Edinburgh’ in 1710; the Spirit ordered them to go to Ireland as the magistrates came for them, though Mr. Gibs remained in prison.\textsuperscript{133} Similar scenes occurred in the equally tolerant refuge of Holland, where the magistrates imprisoned and expelled the missionaries from Rotterdam and The Hague in 1710; and again in Poland, where Allut, Marion, Fatio and Portalès spent eight months in prison in 1712.\textsuperscript{134} These examples may seem
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sporadic and anecdotal, but claims by eighteenth-century mystics of religious freedom in the name of a Spirit nevertheless raise further questions over the policing of religious toleration in the broader context of Enlightenment Europe, which have yet to be explored.
Chapter 6: Towards a Medicalisation of Enthusiasm

As established throughout this thesis, religious enthusiasm entailed a large range of physical manifestations allegedly somatising divine inspirations. The case of the French Prophets is also particularly interesting because of the intellectual context in which it occurred. The seventeenth century had seen a ‘scientific revolution’ during which natural philosophers such as the rationalists Descartes, Spinoza, Hobbes and Leibniz on the one hand, and the empiricists Bacon, Galileo, Boyle and Newton on the other, engaged in the study of the physical world that would lay the foundations of the Enlightenment across Europe. This new science remained closely linked to heterodox theology and religious enthusiasm became an issue of natural philosophy.¹

The Cartesian system is of particular interest to the understanding of religious enthusiasm because its dissociation of the body from the soul had a significant impact on contemporary medicine. Descartes argued that ethereal and corporeal substances existed and could be understood independently of one another. Both matter and spirit coexisted in men, which established the mind as an autonomous entity filled with innate ideas and effectively reduced the body to a mere machine.²

This dualistic approach entrusted human reason to seek out natural causes of mental


distempers, but the interactions between the soul and the body remained largely controversial and even more so in the case of enthusiasts. In 1701, a few months before the war in the Cévennes, Bâville ordered a medical examination of convulsive children in Uzès:

The learned and famous College of Physicians at Montpellier (...) were much more used to the Study of Nature, than to look into Things supernatural, they would neither affix the Name of Prophet, nor of Demoniack, to the inspired Children; nor could they find sufficient ground to ascribe to them any bodily Distemper, as the Cause of their Agitations and Discourses; (...) a Brand therefore must be fixed upon the Inspired, and no better one could be found than that of FANATICK, for in all Ages as well as ours, the Prophet was accounted a Fool, and the Inspired a Madman.3

The spectacular ecstasies of the three Camisards and their English followers raised similar questions across the Channel, where this ‘social disease’ contaminating the body politic found a natural echo in a new medical debate.

The English medical revolution had been marked in particular by the discoveries of the circulation of the blood and the nervous systems, and the emergence of great physicians such as William Harvey, Thomas Willis and Thomas Sydenham. Clinical observations and experiments confirmed the Cartesian view of the human body as a machine that was progressively revealing its secrets to human understanding. By the eighteenth century, physicians henceforth shared the ambition to cure anything, including old age.4


French medicine, this chapter considers how convincingly by the early eighteenth century, religious enthusiasm might in fact be ‘medicalised’ into a new form of insanity, or whether it continued to be seen largely as one more recalcitrant example of religious fanaticism.

***

Possession to Medicalisation

Before looking at the eighteenth-century medical debate on religious enthusiasm, it is important to understand the early modern perception of the mind. Throughout the Middle Ages and until Locke, the Christian soul ensured the incorruptibility of the mind, and madness and deviant behaviour were generally ascribed to supernatural causes. Interpersonal conflicts occasionally resulted in barren accusations of witchcraft or demonic possession.\(^{5}\) The difficulty to prove such allegations and the lack of tangible evidence often led to high acquittal rates and a growing judicial scepticism. The last execution for witchcraft occurred in 1682 in England and by the 1690s ‘the symbolic appeal which the witch had, as amphibian denizen of the secular and sacred jurisdictions, was necessarily dissipated by the Lockean conception of society and toleration.’\(^{6}\) Although witchcraft prosecution fell dramatically afterwards, the belief itself underwent many transformations and survived among

---


both polite and plebeian societies, with accusations sporadically reappearing throughout the eighteenth century.7

Disbelief in the reality of witchcraft was as old as the belief itself and, although sceptics privileged a natural explanation of demonic possession, we should not assume that they rejected the supernatural altogether.8 The Dutch physician Johann Weyer, often hailed as a pioneer psychiatrist and a witchcraft sceptic, regarded witches as innocent victims prone to melancholy, but described enthusiasts as agents of Satan.9 Weyer’s theory of an imbalance of humours was no revolution and he maintained the role of the Devil in manipulating the imagination. In fact, his ‘diagnosis’ proved consistent with earlier theological views such as those of Hildegard von Bingen, who had argued in the late 1100s that melancholy was the predominant humour after the Fall and was responsible for sins and diseases.10 Natural and supernatural explanations continued to coexist throughout the seventeenth century, although the scientific revolution increasingly brought forward melancholy as a convenient label to designate all sorts of distempers.11

The prospect of enthusiasm as a disease was not new to early modern England and goes back, in reality, to Plato. So long as disturbances of the mind in their broadest sense were attributed to an imbalance of humours in the Middle Ages,

enthusiasm did not enter the religious vocabulary and was mostly thought to be the work of the devil until the mid-seventeenth century. The turning point in the ‘medicalisation’ of enthusiasm occurred in 1621, when Robert Burton coined the phrase ‘religious melancholy’ as a physiological transposition of pretended inspiration in the third volume of his *Anatomy of Melancholy*, which he nevertheless ascribed to the devil. As Galenic medicine became increasingly challenged in the mid-seventeenth century, it was in fact Restoration clergymen and divines who first adopted a new medical terminology against enthusiasm, Paracelsianism and the theosophy of Jacob Boehme. Religious melancholy thus appeared in Meric Casaubon’s *Treatise Concerning Enthusiasm* (1655), Henry More’s *Enthusiasmus Triumphatus* (1656), George Hickes’s *The Spirit Exorcis’d of Enthusiasm* (1680) and John Moore’s sermon *Of Religious Melancholy* (1692).

In his study of the opposition to the French Prophets, Hillel Schwartz noted that all critics regarded their bodily agitations and beliefs as ‘something abnormal in the soul-body alliance’, although with different opinions as to their cause. Indeed, it is particularly striking to see a decline of supernatural explanations in post-Toleration

---


England, to the increasing benefit of a case for madness.\textsuperscript{17} Witchcraft and the devil were rarely mentioned in the battle of pamphlets around the Prophets, despite a strong proportion of inspired women among their ranks. Schwartz pointed out that only older generations made such accusations at a time when ‘the learned approached witchcraft and possession with skepticism’.\textsuperscript{18} ‘I cannot chuse but suspect there is some Witchery among them, and they know it not’, wrote 86 year-old John Humfrey, a non-conformist pastor, whose generation had lived through the millenarianism and witchcraft trials of the Interregnum.\textsuperscript{19} Similarly, the Bishop Edward Fowler was in his late seventies when he attributed the Prophets’ agitations to some possession, being unable to find natural causes.\textsuperscript{20} Yet the theory of a younger generation rationalising their elders’ supernatural beliefs is only true to some extent. Still in 1718, for example, 30-year-old Samuel Keimer claimed to have ‘acted very madly and bewitchedly, (as being no less than infatuated by the Devil)’ during the eight years or so he spent among the group.\textsuperscript{21}

Historians such as Roy Porter have claimed that ‘polite society finally ceased to believe in the reality of witchcraft’ by the early eighteenth century and implied, like Susan Juster, that ‘only the “vulgar” –the ignorant and credulous– continued to believe in, or at least to be entertained by, tales of the marvelous and the fantastic’


\textsuperscript{18} Schwartz, \textit{Knaves}, p. 41.


\textsuperscript{20} Schwartz, \textit{Knaves}, p. 42.

\textsuperscript{21} Keimer, \textit{A Brand Snatch’d from the Burning} (London, 1718), pp. 26, 37, 78 [BL 1419.b.46(1)].
during the Enlightenment. Cultural historians have more recently invalidated this theory, suggesting that belief in the supernatural remained an integral part of eighteenth-century mentalities. Joseph Addison reasserted his belief in witchcraft in 1711, although he could not account for any credible instance, and Daniel Defoe’s *Political History of the Devil* (1726) nuanced the ideology of witchcraft and relocated Satan’s influence in party rivalries plaguing the state. Supernatural beliefs and powers even persisted in the highest spheres, for example with Queen Anne touching for scrofula until her death in 1714. Radical dissenters and in particular the Methodists continued to affirm the reality of witchcraft later in the century, and John Wesley claimed that ‘the giving up of witchcraft is in effect giving up the Bible.’ Opponents of the French Prophets, on the other hand, generally saw their enthusiasm as a delusion, no longer caused by the devil, but by some ‘evil spirit’. Demonic allegations were apparently giving way to a more nuanced terminology that might better cohere with emerging scientific theories. Consequently, the early eighteenth-century response to enthusiasm revealed perhaps more a lexical temperance than a profound change in mentalities.


Although it would be exaggerated or simplistic to say that the adoption of this naturalistic approach was politically motivated or party specific, there were nevertheless ideological divergences in the interpretation and response to enthusiasm.28 Accordingly, ‘the difference between possession and delusion was the difference between exorcism and pity, and as one expressed pity, one adopted natural explanations.’29 As they came under fire from the Tories for allowing dissenters to worship in public, the Whigs tended to defend the Toleration Act by ascribing the excesses of enthusiasm to natural, rather than supernatural causes.30 John Locke located its origin in a ‘warmed or overweening brain’ and both Addison and Defoe expressed compassion for the French Prophets.31 Defoe, himself a non-conformist, regarded the Prophets as victims of a delusion and called for leniency in their favour, rather than their condemnation to the pillory for terrorising the Queen’s subjects.32 The third Earl of Shaftesbury made a more significant plea in his Letter concerning Enthusiasm, in which he distinguished a virtuous enthusiasm from its religious form.33 Although he argued that enthusiasm could have creative, artistic qualities when arising from a healthy inspiration, he nevertheless unequivocally condemned Lacy’s enthusiasm as an expression of tormented passions and imagination.

29 Schwartz, Knaves, p. 44.
32 Incidentally, his empathy can be explained not only by his personal experience of pillory five years earlier, but by adherence to the French Prophets of his printer, Samuel Keimer (1689-1742).
Shaftesbury alluded to a contagious humoral disease spreading in London: thus, while melancholy was generally an individual affliction, enthusiasm represented its epidemic form.\textsuperscript{34} With approximately 400 followers by the summer of 1708, he dismissed the idea of a cure as fruitless, calling instead for reason and common sense as the only viable weapons against enthusiasm.\textsuperscript{35} Denying the French Prophets the attention they craved became the ultimate rational solution, which would eventually lead them to disappear by themselves.\textsuperscript{36}

The place of the French Prophets in English society remained nonetheless an unresolved issue for many contemporaries believed they should neither hold assemblies, nor be confined within Newgate prison.\textsuperscript{37} A growing number compared their convulsions to symptoms of mental distempers: ‘Another prophet fell a shaking lamentably, as if he had been one of the Lunaticks of Bethlehem’\textsuperscript{38} Fears of what Schwartz describes as a ‘social disease’ convinced many of the necessity to confine enthusiasts for the perceived threat they posed to society.\textsuperscript{39} John Tutchin, the Whig editor of the controversial Observator, who incidentally had been condemned for seditious libel in 1704, went further in calling for the creation of a specific Bedlam for such enthusiasts:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34} Ibid., p. 9.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Ibid., pp. 11-12.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Hostile publications to the French Prophets started to diminish from 1709, following the failure of Emes’ resurrection. The group then reappeared only sporadically in contemporary sources.
\item \textsuperscript{37} The Honest Quaker: or the Forgeries and Impostures of the Pretended French Prophets (London, 1707), p. ii [BL 695.c.7.(5.)].
\item \textsuperscript{38} The French Prophets’ Mad Sermon (London, 1708), p. 4 [BL 1076.l.22.(26.)].
\item \textsuperscript{39} Schwartz, Knaves, p. 52.
\end{itemize}
We have a bedlam for Mad-men, and why these should not be admitted into their Society, I know not. Religious Mad-men ought especially to be taken Care of, because their Madness is more dangerous: And I really believe, were these Men under close Confinement, their Heads shav’d, Phlebotomy and the necessary Operations of Physick and Chyurgery us’d, Mankind would be convinc’d, that this Practice would tend more to the effecting a Cure, than all the Recipe’s prescribed by the Physicians of Doctors-Commons or the Crown-Office.\textsuperscript{40}

Although Bedlam did accommodate some enthusiasts, Tutchin’s proposition went unheeded. The Prophets were not confined for a collective religious madness and were progressively dissipated through their chronic infighting, but the medical debate on enthusiasm was nevertheless to take place.

**The Diagnosis**

The French Prophets’ agitations would certainly not have occupied Londoners’ attention had these involved a single individual. Rather, Marion, Fage and Cavalier’s ability to attract English followers reinforced the threat of a convulsive contagion that could spread throughout a religiously unsettled and vulnerable country. Samuel Keimer reported that

the Infection began to spread and operate most unaccountably upon the Bodies and Minds of Men, Women and Children, who were generally Persons that had made a serious Profession of Religion, under the various Denominations of in this our Land, \textit{viz.} those of the National, Presbyterian, Independent and Baptist Perswasion.\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{40} *The Observator*, VI/42 (July 23-26, 1707).

\textsuperscript{41} Keimer, *Brand*, p. 2.
Eighteenth-century England lived in the permanent fear of a return of fanaticism and, worst of all, Catholicism and suspicions that the French Prophets might be disguised Papists were fuelled by their steadfast growth.\textsuperscript{42} From three original prophets in September 1706, the group had gained over 400 members by the end of 1708.\textsuperscript{43} The \textit{Nouvelles de la République des Lettres} had reported in Holland the birth of a new sect in London as early as June 1707.\textsuperscript{44} It therefore seems as though the fear of an epidemic of fanaticism was well-grounded.

The main question remained who, between the clergyman and the physician, was better suited to stop this threat. This was to prove a continuous controversy, which embarrassed and divided both parties. The Scottish physician George Cheyne (1671-1743), possibly the most reputed practitioner in London at the time, bridged the gap by his consensual view on the medico-religious issue of the passions:

\begin{quote}
The Diseases brought on by the Passions, may be cured by Medicine, as well as those proceeding from other Causes, when once the Passions themselves cease, or are quieted. But the preventing or calming the Passions themselves, is the Business, not of Physick, but of Virtue and Religion.\textsuperscript{45}
\end{quote}

Cheyne’s call for temperance resonated well with both Galenic medicine and the doctrine of sin. Ministers like John Moore, Bishop of Norwich in 1692, insisted on the importance of repressing the passions in order to prevent minds from

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{43} See list E in Appendix.
\textsuperscript{44} \textit{NRL}, 41 (June 1707), p. 689 [BPF 8* 442].
\textsuperscript{45} Anita Guerrini, ‘Cheyne, George (1671/2–1743)’, \textit{DNB}, article 5258. From the same author ‘Newtonianism, Medicine and Religion’, in Grell and Cunningham (eds), \textit{Religio Medici}, pp. 295, 301.
\end{flushright}
degenerating into madness.\textsuperscript{46} As a particularly pious man, whose father once destined him for the ministry, Cheyne endeavoured to conciliate his medical knowledge with his faith at a time when medical practice was becoming increasingly secular.\textsuperscript{47} Many among his contemporaries were convinced that enthusiasm was not a disease of the soul and therefore was ultimately a matter for the physician. Sir Richard Blackmore explained in 1725 that enthusiasm falls out in almost all Instances of great Melancholy (the unhappy sufferers are more to be pitied than derided and exposed) and the Patients themselves and their Relations should be convinced, that such religious Melancholy is as much a bodily Disease, as any of another Class and a different Nature; and they must more depend upon the Art of the Physician, and the Force of Medicine, than the Skill and Reasonings of the Casuist, for their recovery.\textsuperscript{48}

Four years later, Nicholas Robinson (c.1697-1775), a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians and an administrator of Bedlam, reiterated the physician’s legitimacy to cure enthusiasm in the specific case of the French Prophets and denounced the inefficiency of their condemnation to the pillory:\textsuperscript{49} ‘And certainly a great many of our religious Visionaries, and French Prophets, that swarm’d here in such Numbers, would have done much better under the Hand of the Physician, than the secular arm.’\textsuperscript{50} His French contemporary Philippe Hecquet, a Rheims-trained physician and a doctor of the Paris faculty of medicine, was demonstrating the

\textsuperscript{47} See Roy Porter’s introduction to Cheyne’s \textit{English Malady}, especially p. xxxvi.
\textsuperscript{48} Richard Blackmore, \textit{A Treatise of the Spleen and Vapours: or Hypocondriacal and Hysterical Affections}, London, 1725, pp. 159-160 [BL 1191.k.3.(1.)].
\textsuperscript{49} Norman Moore, ‘Robinson, Nicholas (c.1697–1775)’, \textit{DNB}, article 23861.
\textsuperscript{50} Nicholas Robinson, \textit{A New System of the Spleen, Vapours, and Hyponchondriack Melancholy} (London, 1729), pp. 406-7 [BL 1191.k.4.]
natural origin of enthusiasts’ convulsions and made their cure a medical duty. Like Cheyne, Hecquet was a very religious man, only he categorically excluded any divine interpretation of the causes of enthusiasm and consequently the intervention of a priest, based on what he regarded as purely physical manifestations.\textsuperscript{51} Physicians were increasingly encroaching on clergymen in healing the mind and John Wesley wondered:

Why ... do not all physicians consider how far bodily diseases are caused or influenced by the mind, and in those cases which are utterly out of their sphere call in the assistance of a minister; as ministers, when they find the mind disordered by the body, call in the assistance of a physician?\textsuperscript{52}

Notwithstanding a secularising diagnosis of mental distempers, the distribution of roles in the battle against enthusiasm remained unresolved throughout most of the eighteenth century in both England or France. Physicians and clerics continued to combat enthusiasm, though on increasingly distinct paths, long after the deaths of Marion and Lacy.

Despite diverging views on its nature, physicians agreed that, if a disease, enthusiasm could not be a purely mental illness, but a bodily one. Eighteenth-century English medicine remained heavily influenced by the Lockean tradition of the \textit{tabula rasa}: the mind was completely blank at birth and developed from ideas transmitted by the senses to the brain. Misconceived ideas and dreams thus resulted from erroneous sensations which, in turn, arose from dysfunctional organs and nerves. The

\textsuperscript{51} Philippe Hecquet, \textit{Le Naturalisme des convulsions} (Soleure, 1733), I, pp. 3, 6, 21-2, 57, 130-1.

insane, unlike idiots, had not lost their reason, but were simply making deductions
from wrongly associated ideas. Empiricists thus rejected the Cartesian theory of
innate ideas and argued that the thinking soul communicated with the body through
an ‘imponderable, invisible, “rarified” fluid matter’ known as ‘animal spirits’. Although widely accepted in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, physicians disagreed on the location of this ethereal substance, some contending that it resided in the blood, others in the nerve canals. This has led Koen Vermeir to describe the animal spirits as a floating concept, about which nobody could demonstrate anything more definite than a mysterious connection between soul and body. Given that the Lockean mind was continuously shaped by its corporeal envelope, the main difficulty for physicians, argues Lucia Dacome, then became to differentiate between their patients’ perception and illusion.

Two factors were generally incriminated for delusion, namely the passions and the imagination. The mystic George Cheyne, who had close ties with the Scottish branch of French Prophets through his patient James Cuninghame and his friends Dr. James Keith and Chevalier Andrew Ramsay, dedicated his life to repressing the passions, knowing from personal experience the dreadful consequences they could

---


54 Schwartz, *Knaves*, pp. 31-41.


have on a patient’s health. In his best-selling *Essay on Health and Long Life*, he defined the passions as follows:

- All violent and sudden Passions, dispose to, or actually throw People into acute Diseases; and sometimes the most violent of them bring on sudden Death.

- The slow and lasting Passions, bring on chronical Diseases; as we see in Grief, and languishing hopeless Love.

- Therefore the sudden and acute Passions are more dangerous than the slow or chronical.

Cheyne’s ideas on the passions were widely admitted as a threat to the animal œconomy in England and on the continent. The threat was not the same for everyone, though; women, children and cowardly men were regarded as more impressionable and sensitive to the passions. Their intensity, Hecquet argued, increased the elasticity of the animal spirits or of the nervous juices, ultimately triggering strong convulsions that took several people to restrain. Worst of all, Hecquet also suspected such ‘shameful love passions’ to be the natural cause of the convulsive epidemics and debauchery then occurring in the St-Médard neighbourhood of Paris.

The second factor held culpable for enthusiasm was the imagination, or Fancy. Although Pilet de la Mesnardière (1610-1663) had denied that the imagination


59 *A Plain and Succinct Discourse on Convulsions in General; but more particularly in Children* (London, 1721), pp. 12-3 [BL 1178.e.2(1)].


had any control over the body and could cause agitations as early as 1635, the contrary view prevailed in the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{62} ‘The imagination – or more precisely, the pathological imagination – became an almost bottomless reservoir for the explanation of bodily anomalies among the impressionable.’\textsuperscript{63} It was indeed commonly held that the passions, if unrestrained, could overheat the imagination and fill the patient’s mind with wrongly perceived ideas. Women being regarded as weaker, their imagination was commonly blamed for abnormal births, and mystical pregnancies. The Mary Toft scandal was just one example of the acceptance by reputable eighteenth-century physicians of the power of the imagination to affect the body.\textsuperscript{64} Similarly, the imagination was often cited as the main cause of the French Prophets’ convulsions and enthusiasm.\textsuperscript{65} But Nicholas Robinson distinguished himself from his contemporaries by fully dismissing the imagination as a causative factor of medical distemper. For if all diseases find their origin in the body, as it was commonly accepted then, ‘I hope these gentlemen [i.e. incompetent physicians] will be so candid as to inform us, from whence that wrong Turn of the Fancy it self arises, that is suppos’d to give Being to all those Symptoms’ for ‘it’s impossible that the Mind can suffer, and the Body be unaffected at the same Time, & vice versa.’\textsuperscript{66} Robinson was convinced that the soul suffered from the affections of the body and,

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{62}{Hippolyte Jules Pilet de La Mesnardière, \textit{Traité de la mélancholie, sçavoir si elle est la cause des effets que l'on remarque dans les possédées de Loudun} (1635), p. 45 [BNF 30728760].}
\footnote{64}{Mary Toft, wife of a poor journeyman clothier, caught sight of rabbits while pregnant and allegedly gave birth to seventeen dead rabbits over several days in 1726. The delivery was first verified by several physicians and later invalidated as a hoax, which ridiculed the medical profession. S. A. Seligman, ‘Mary Toft-The Rabbit Breeder’, \textit{Medical History}, 5/4 (1961), pp. 349-360; Jane Shaw, ‘Mary Toft, Religion and National Memory in Eighteenth-Century England’, \textit{Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies}, 32/3 (Sept. 2009), pp. 321-338; Porter, \textit{Bodies Politic}, p. 54.}
\footnote{65}{Schwartz, \textit{Knaves}, p. 48.}
\footnote{66}{Robinson, \textit{New System}, p. 176.}
\end{footnotes}
just as he had attempted to find its location in the brain, he went further than anyone in advocating a fully physiological approach to religious enthusiasm.

Broadly speaking, the nature of the disease depended on that of the passions. As a mechanistic approach to the body came increasingly to replace Galenic humoralism, bourgeois melancholy became ‘a disease of civilisation’, to use Roy Porter’s expression, and gained the attention of elite physicians over the maniacs, raving lunatics and idiots of Bedlam.67 Physicians now held that lax fibres and nerves, body temperature, heavy and thick blood caused melancholy, rather than the humour of the same name and, if the patient proved particularly pious, religious melancholy.68 Such affliction would only plague the over-thinking wealthy and forged England’s reputation for ‘the English malady’ across Europe as the price for economic prosperity and individual freedom.69 Melancholy was thus typically characterised by a feverless delirium and dotage –idée fixe– during which the patient’s mind would fill with dark, imaginary thoughts such as being abandoned by God, that could lead in some cases to suicide.70 While some French Prophets did attempt or committed self-murder, this was not because of the English malady, but by sheer defiance of the laws of Nature. In Enlightenment France, suicide was understood as a bodily disease rather than a theological issue. As Montesquieu noted:


70 John Woodward, Select cases, and consultations, in physick (London, 1757), pp. 239-245 [BL 1169.g.18].
We do not find in history that the Romans ever killed themselves without a cause; but the English destroy themselves most unaccountably; they destroy themselves often in the very bosom of happiness. This action among the Romans was the effect of education; it was connected with their principles and customs; among the English it is the effect of a distemper; it is connected with the physical state of the machine, independent of every other cause.\textsuperscript{71}

Comparing the body to a machine of triggers and hydraulics was typical of the scientific revolution and Enlightenment medicine and, in this respect, Montesquieu was only echoing the Cartesian tradition of mechanist physicians like Matthieu Chastelain and Philippe Hecquet.\textsuperscript{72} John Woodward argued in 1707 that heredity aggravated melancholy considerably as the distempers of both parents became concentrated into a single individual.\textsuperscript{73} Many ascribed this melancholic scourge and proneness to suicide to the peculiar instability of the climate in the British Isles, an idea that can be traced as far back as Hippocrates;\textsuperscript{74} but this, combined with its religious diversity, also made England susceptible to enthusiasm. Indeed, the Moravians and Methodists appeared just as the French Prophets dispersed.

The precise modes of contagion continued to divide the medical world in the eighteenth century. There was little new or practical on offer by then and the miasmatic theory —contagion by ‘bad air’— of the environmentalists seemingly remained the most logical cause for enthusiasm.\textsuperscript{75} Physicians therefore followed the tradition of emphasising prevention or avoided the subject, as neither Galen nor the


\textsuperscript{73} Woodward, \textit{Select cases}, p. 245 [BL 1169.g.18].


Hippocratics had mentioned contagion in the past.\textsuperscript{76} Among those who confronted the issue, Henry Nicholson (1683-?), M.D. and a lecturer in botany at Trinity College, Dublin, produced a retrospective diagnosis of the six weeks he spent among the French Prophets. While admitting that he had experienced convulsions himself, Nicholson also insisted that his own differed from those displayed by the rest of the group and therefore suspected some fraud on their part. After carefully observing them, he concluded that their contagion derived from mimicry, rather as the act of yawning produces a similar reaction in those watching. Nicholson further argued that a sound technique called ‘harmonising’, synchronised humming typical of the Quakers, contaminated the spectator by overheating his imagination. The nerves then inflamed and triggered heavy convulsions in the subject.\textsuperscript{77} Another interpretation, published in a \textit{British Journal} article on 13\textsuperscript{th} April, 1723, related this phenomenon to ‘an unusual Kind of Epileptick Fits, which often actuate the Organs of Speech without the Patient's knowing it, and have often been mistaken for divine Trances, and their incoherent Rapsodies been esteem'd Revelations.’\textsuperscript{78} Such trances, as the author emphasised, were common among the Quakers and the French Prophets, but his diagnosis converged with the emerging theory that defined enthusiasm as an airborne illness –\textit{miasma}– that carried the emanations of the bodies of the sick –\textit{effluvium}– to those of the healthy.\textsuperscript{79}

\textsuperscript{76} Lawrence I. Conrad (et al.), \textit{The Western Medical Tradition, 800 BC to AD 1800} (CUP, 1996), p. 54. On preventive medicine, see Riley, \textit{The Eighteenth-Century Campaign to Avoid Disease}, pp. ix-xi, 52-3.

\textsuperscript{77} Henry Nicholson, \textit{The Falshood of the New Prophets Manifested} (London, 1708), pp. 11-14 [BL 695.c.6.(2)].

\textsuperscript{78} \textit{British Journal}, XXX (April 13, 1723), p. 2.

\textsuperscript{79} An estimated 7,000 children died from convulsions every year in London only. \textit{A plain and succint discourse on convulsions in general; but more particularly in children} (London, 1721), p. v [BL 1178.e.2(1)]; Riley, \textit{The Eighteenth-Century Campaign to Avoid Disease}, pp. 139-140; Schwartz, \textit{Knaves}, p. 53.
There seems to be no Difficulty, in conceiving that the Effluviums, which steam from the Body of an Enthusiast, should infect others suitably qualify'd with the same Distempers, as Experience shews us, that the minute Particles, which are convey'd by the Bite of a mad Dog, cause Madness, and will make the Person infected bark like the Dog who bit him; and such Particles, and in other Instances may be convey'd through the Pores, and in a common Instance undoubtedly are so.80

By ‘minute particles’ one should understand ‘seeds of disease’, a remotely Galenic idea that anticipated bacteriology and held that the wind transported invisible animalcules from infected bodies.81 This theory provided a ready-made explanation for smallpox and syphilis in the early modern period, but also for convulsions in the eighteenth century. It was indeed an epidemic of bodily agitations that drove Hecquet to write his *Naturalisme des convulsions* in response to what he regarded as an emergency in the case of the Jansenist Convulsionaries of Saint Médard.82 Yet while he addressed enthusiasm by focussing on its convulsive manifestations, his English counterparts showed a different approach to the issue and opened a diagnostic debate on enthusiasm as a whole.

Despite the widely accepted Burtonian transposition of enthusiasm as a form of religious melancholy, the term lacked precision. The French Prophets’ enthusiasm had indeed little to do with the despair that typically characterised melancholy. In his survey of religious enthusiasm in the early modern period, Ronald A. Knox coined


82 Hecquet estimated that the number of ‘Convulsionaries’ in St-Médard rose from 8 to 800 people in less than two years. *Naturalisme des convulsions*, I, p. 113.
the term ‘ultrasupernaturalism’ to illustrate the incandescence of such a phenomenon; but perhaps the phrase “ataxic illuminism” more accurately conveys the French Prophets’ total loss of body control.\(^8^3\) In the eighteenth century, however, this condition remained largely ill-defined. While Hecquet continued to ascribe convulsions to the domination of the melancholic humour;\(^8^4\) John Woodward, M.D. and F.R.S., diagnosed an enthusiast as a delirious maniac suffering from excessive melancholy and Thomas Fallowes, a notorious London quack, claimed that melancholy, mania and lunacy were merely words that could interchangeably designate the same disease.\(^8^5\) In his response to Mark Duncan, M.D. (d. 1640), who argued that melancholy caused convulsions when it touched the nerves, Pilet de la Mesnardière had clarified this confusion in 1635, arguing that melancholy was used in a broad sense as a synonym for disease and rather than one of the four humours, for it equally designated the yellow and black bile.\(^8^6\) Although Lodovico Ricchieri had classified enthusiasm as a mania of divine origin as early as 1517, it was not until 1729 that a clearer classification appeared in England, when Nicholas Robinson counterpoised religious melancholy and enthusiasm, linking enthusiasm with religious mania.\(^8^7\) Thus:

> Sometimes this raging Lunacy is improv'd upon the Habit of warm, biliose Constitutions, from a set of religious Objects, and then it arises to Enthusiasm; a Species of Madness quite different form religious Melancholy, and which produces different Effects:  For whereas the


\(^{86}\) Pilet De La Mesnardière, *Traité de la mélancholie*, p. 87.

Patient under the Symptoms of religious Melancholy, was greatly oppress'd with Fear, Sadness, and Despair; these, on the contrary, from an over-weening Opinion of their own Sanctity or Holiness, are elevated to the highest Degree of Familiarity with their Maker: They are his Viceroys, chosen Saints and Servants, sent on especial Errands, to reclaim the unbelieving World.\textsuperscript{88}

Like his Newtonian colleagues, Robinson rejected the idea of an autonomous mind separated from the body and filled with innate ideas. Instead, religious melancholy thus originated from a combination of laxed fibres, want of spirits and a heavy, thick blood that set a fixed idea –dotage– on the patient’s doomed fate. Religious mania or enthusiastic madness, as displayed earlier by George Fox, James Nayler and Ludovic Muggleton and now by the French Prophets, hence arose from contracted nerves and a fevered brain.

From this Way of reasoning we may gather, that all these fantastick Agitations of our modern French Prophets, and other late Visionaries, were nothing else but strong convulsive Fits, which those Wretches had habituated their Bodies to, from the Strength of their Passions, and a strong Persuasion, that they were illuminated from Above.\textsuperscript{89}


\textsuperscript{89} Robinson, New System, pp. 247-8.
The Treatments

Although the medicalisation of enthusiasm was underway by the time of the French Prophets, physicians were not yet able to offer a specific treatment. Religious melancholy did not differ, in their view, from conventional melancholy as far as the body was concerned; the patient’s mind simply focussed on his or her salvation instead of a passion such as love. Proprietary medicines were flooding the medical market with both brand remedies and numerous counterfeits, some henceforth targeting the insane as part of a ‘trade in lunacy’.90 Quacks like Thomas Fallowes, simply offered secret recipes of their own make against all manner of mental distempers, such as ‘the incomparable Oleum Cephalicum’.91

The works of Roy Porter and Andrew Wear suggest that chemistry had a very limited impact on eighteenth-century bedside medicine and university-trained physicians continued to offer their treatments in the lineage of Galenic medicine.92 Sir Richard Blackmore privileged evacuative treatments to relieve his patients from madness, precisely because its cause lay in the body. He advocated purgatives, vomitives and stimulants (usually liquors) against melancholy, although he debunked bloodletting for further weakening the body. They were, however, most useful (10-12 ounces a month) against hypochondria, together with long-term effect purgatives

91 Fallowes, The Best Method for the Cure of Lunaticks [BL 1191.g.1(1)].
(aloes), immediate emetics and alkali (coral, pearl and crabs’ eyes) to counterbalance the acids in the stomach.\textsuperscript{93}

George Cheyne’s watchwords, typically, were moderation and temperance: Based on his own experience, he advocated a well-balanced vegetarian diet—milk, vegetables and seeds—to regain health and cure melancholy. His treatment, in effect, reasserted the values of virtue against vice. At the time he was writing, coffee-houses were indeed springing up across London, obesity was rife among the upper classes and the gin craze was beginning to ravage the poorest. A cure based upon natural foods satisfied Cheyne’s religious beliefs and the cautious medicine he practised complemented religious views without encroaching upon the minister’s field.\textsuperscript{94}

Nor was Nicholas Robinson’s approach more innovative. Like many contemporaries, he emphasised the importance of rigour and discipline against the chaos of insanity and believed the patient was to be confined, to ensure his own safety and that of his entourage.\textsuperscript{95} As Thomas Willis’ heir, Robinson focussed his treatment on the nerves, which he deemed responsible for the maniac’s convulsions. As the remedy ought to be as strong as the illness, Robinson opted for an abundant evacuation of bodily fluids: ‘In this Case, therefore, the most violent Vomits, the strongest purging Medicines, and large Bleedings, are often to be repeated’.\textsuperscript{96} His treatment relied on both conventional and iatrochemical measures, including the use of Black Hellebore, a toxic plant renowned since the Greeks for its purgative virtues, and \textit{Ens Veneris}, a compound of copper and ammonium chlorides created by George

\textsuperscript{93} Blackmore, \textit{A Treatise of the Spleen and Vapours}, pp. 61-9, 167-173.


\textsuperscript{95} Robinson, \textit{New System}, p. 243.

\textsuperscript{96} Ibid., p. 402.
Starkey and Robert Boyle around 1650.\textsuperscript{97} Both medicines were believed to relax the fibres of the brain and restore the patient to a normal condition, although the violence of the treatment was to equal that of the original shock that plunged the patient into his maniacal condition. Despite pushing for a medicalisation of enthusiasm, and more specifically of the French Prophets, Robinson, by holding to the traditional therapeutic armamentarium, remained an heir of the English medical tradition rather than a pioneer in the medicine of the mind.\textsuperscript{98}

French medicine, by contrast, seems to have concentrated on the specific cure of convulsions, rather than the actual illness that caused them and treatments evolved considerably by the turn of the eighteenth century. Nicolas Lémery (1645-1715), a physician, pharmacist and lecturer in Paris, emphasised the importance of astrology in the practice of medicine and recommended dried peacock droppings in white wine against children’s convulsions in 1685, the year of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.\textsuperscript{99} By the time of the French Prophets’ controversy, he produced his \textit{Dictionnaire des drogues simples}, in which he advocated black hellebore as a universal purgative against melancholy, mania and hypochondria.\textsuperscript{100}

\begin{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{98} The medical armamentarium began to change in the mid-eighteenth century with the progressive elimination of such ingredients as human fat, spider webs, moss grown on human skull and unicorns’ horns, though woodlice, coral, pearls and vipers remained in use. Most animal ingredients disappeared with the 1788 edition of the \textit{Pharmacopeia}. Porter, \textit{The Greatest Benefit to Mankind}, p. 269.

\textsuperscript{99} Nicolas Lémery, \textit{Le Nouveau recueil de curiositez rares & nouvelles} (1685), pp. 100, 127 [BNF 37242979].

\textsuperscript{100} Nicolas Lémery, \textit{Dictionnaire ou traité universel des drogues simples} (Amsterdam, 1716), pp. 254-5 [BIUM 20212].
\end{flushleft}
Philippe Hecquet, on the other hand, recommended distractions, emetics and occasionally venesection to cure both melancholy and mania but, as a champion of vegetarianism and a philanthropist, he also advocated herbal remedies in his *Médecine des pauvres* (‘Medicine for the Poor’). For example, scarlet pimpernel roots macerated in Buglossé wine purified the blood and fortified the spirits in case of melancholy. A decoction of the same plant, however, or a balm of ivy juice and olive oil, worked best against mania. But when writing against enthusiasm, Hecquet’s main focus was clearly on the convulsions and not so much on the melancholy/mania continuum that preoccupied his English colleagues. The cure for essential convulsions, i.e. those independent of a disease, required antispasmodics such as opium and camphor, which ironically Nicholas Robinson prescribed with determination as stimulants against melancholy. Understanding and use of remedies often differed considerably from one practitioner to another in the secular medical market; yet Hecquet’s piety ultimately led him to converge with Robinson, Cheyne or Patrick Blair concerning the unparalleled virtues of disciplinary shock treatments (cold baths and flagellation) in the cure of maniacal or melancholic convulsions. It is precisely this consensual dimension of confinement and restriction that led pessimistic historians to summarise Enlightenment medicine as ‘a disaster for the insane’.

---


An Unfair Competition?

What was the real motivation of those doctors who showed growing interest in religious enthusiasm? Beside the general sense of optimism and the medical confidence brought by the scientific revolution and the Enlightenment, profit-making and claims of specialism contributed considerably to the medicalisation of religious enthusiasm and insanity in general. Tutchin’s plea for a public asylum dedicated to enthusiasts was not answered, but private madhouses were mushrooming in and around London. This ‘trade in lunacy’ was thus privately supplying the seclusion of what the public viewed as social disease.105 Madness had indeed become a highly competitive and lucrative market, which unlicensed practitioners ruled more or less benevolently, owing to a lack of regulations and, unlike on the continent, public alternatives.106 Results and the level of care varied considerably from one institution to another and university-trained physicians had no alternative to offer in the treatment of insanity when compared with empirics and quacks. Clinical observations pioneered by Sydenham had not yet impacted the English medicine of the mind by the time of the French Prophets: most establishment physicians either practised medicine for the wealthy or from a distance.107


106 England had indeed few hospitals compared to France. By the early eighteenth century, only two of them, Bedlam in London and Bethel in Norwich, were dedicated to the insane. Porter, *The Greatest Benefit to Mankind*, pp. 198, 239 and *Health for Sale: Quackery in England, 1660-1850* (Manchester University Press, 1989); Harold Cook, ‘From the Scientific Revolution to the Germ Theory’ in Irvine Loudun (ed.), *Western Medicine, An Illustrated History* (OUP, 1997), pp. 80-101, p. 82, 88.

To the pecuniary motivation must be added a definite ideological rivalry. Mark Jenner has shown that enthusiasts typically challenged academic knowledge and the French Prophets were no exception to that rule.\(^{108}\) They daringly defied science and medicine by performing allegedly miraculous cures, thereby illustrating Beiser’s argument that enthusiasm stood as an alternative to the Enlightenment.\(^{109}\) John Lacy did not attend university, unlike his siblings, and prophesied several times against intellectuals and academic education:\(^{110}\) ‘I am come down to reason with you. O ye learned Doctors, Sucklings shall confound you, you, you. I will make Babes teach you.’\(^{111}\) Lacy was also an acclaimed thaumaturge among his coreligionists and intended to straighten Richard Bulkeley, a hunchback and one of the group’s main financiers. Bulkeley had suffered from many ailments all his life and had lost his trust in physicians when he joined the group in hope of a miracle, though he died before one was achieved.\(^{112}\)

On another occasion, it was announced that Lacy would remove a tumour from Elizabeth Gray’s swollen neck with his own hands. Before proceeding, Lacy sent for a doctor to examine Gray. Upon arrival, Timothy Byfield, M.D., duly declared to the audience that medicine could not cure her and that only Lacy could accomplish such a miracle, although evidently the Spirit did not seize Lacy because of the audience’s overpowering incredulity.\(^{113}\) The relationship between radical

---


\(^{111}\) Lacy, *The Prophetical Warnings of John Lacy* (London, 1707), p. 34 [BL 852.f.19(1)].


\(^{113}\) *A True and Faithful Narrative of the Sayings and Actions of Elizabeth Gray, at Esquire Lacy’s Congregation, held on Sunday the 17th of August, 1707* (London, 1707), pp. 1-8 [BL 695.c.7.(5.)].
dissenters and medicine was complex and often difficult to disentangle. Some, like the Ranters and the Seekers, embraced the new medicine of the mid seventeenth century, while others like Lodowick Muggleton openly despised physicians.\footnote{114} His contemporary George Fox had allegedly received the gift of healing and several Quakers had also attempted to resurrect their coreligionist James Parnell in Colchester in 1656.\footnote{115} By their alleged miraculous cures and their attempt to raise Thomas Emes from the dead, the French Prophets denounced likewise the laws of physics and medicine as unchristian and therefore sought to restore the centrality of the Scriptures in the wake of the Enlightenment.

### All But a Great Hoax?

And yet the French Prophets nevertheless maintained an odd relationship with scientists and physicians. Among their earliest supporters were Bulkeley, an inventor, and Fatio, perhaps the most celebrated mathematician of his generation, both fellows of the Royal Society. When examining the social composition of the group, one cannot but notice the presence of at least twelve physicians, surgeons or apothecaries among their followers.\footnote{116} Some were even well established in their practices. Henry

\footnote{114} Peter Elmer, ‘Medicine, Religion and the Puritan Revolution’, in French and Wear (eds), \textit{The Medical Revolution of the Seventeenth Century}, pp. 22-23. 
\footnote{116} James Keith, James Craven, Timothy Byfield, Thomas Emes, Daniel Critchlow, John and Francis Moul, Nathaniel Sheppard, Henry Nicholson, Thomas Lardner, Mr. Coughen and Mr. Wall. See Appendix. Robert Eaton did not become a physician until 1715 and was accounted for as a minister in table 1.
Nicholson was an M.D. graduate from Trinity College, Dublin, where he also taught botany from 1711 to 1715.\textsuperscript{117} The Scot James Keith was a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians and one of the first advocates of inoculation against smallpox after losing two sons to this disease in 1717.\textsuperscript{118} Robert Eaton was a ‘priest-physician’ who graduated in Avignon in 1715 and obtained the letters patent from the King for his Balsamick Styptick against bleedings in 1724. He was still in business with his former coreligionists Daniel Critchlow and Francis Moult, although he had supposedly converted to Catholicism in Rome.\textsuperscript{119}

While Jenner highlighted the intricate relationship between seventeenth-century quacks and enthusiasts, the same trend can be verified among the French Prophets.\textsuperscript{120} Thomas Emes was a Socinian and an apothecary, though not of great reputation according to his biographer, who had been excluded from the Baptist church in Cripplegate in 1694 for denying the divinity of Christ and the Holy Trinity.\textsuperscript{121} John and Francis Moult, probably brothers and both apothecaries, were eminent members of the group. Francis, ‘chymist’ and fellow of the Apothecaries’ society, was involved with his other brother George, F.R.S., in a great controversy over a patent that granted Nehemiah Grew (1641-1712), M.D. and F.R.S., the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{119} Eaton’s diploma [BL Add. Ch. 53510]; Charles Portalès’s notebook [Stack 1/fol. 5]; Keimer, \textit{Brand}, p. 38; \textit{The Daily Post}, 1629 (15\textsuperscript{th} Dec., 1724); Venner, ‘Quackery and Enthusiasm’, in Grell and Cunningham (eds), \textit{Religio Medici}, 313-339, especially pp. 323-8.
\item \textsuperscript{120} Jenner, ‘Quackery and Enthusiasm’, pp. 313-340.
\item \textsuperscript{121} Michael Bevan, ‘Emes, Thomas (d. 1707)’, \textit{DNB}, article 8798.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
exclusive right to extract the Epsom Salts –‘bitter purging salts’– in 1698. Francis quickly translated Grew’s treatise Tractatus de salis cathartici amari in aquis Ebeshamensibus into English without permission and the brothers discovered another spring, whence they began extracting their own salts regardless of Grew’s patent. Because their spring proved richer in minerals, they were able to considerably cut the price of their Salts from one shilling an ounce to three pence a pound and gained a great impact on the medical market prices. Moult was later accused of selling poisonous salts that allegedly killed an unfortunate Irish bishop. By the time of the French Prophets, Francis Moult had become one of the richest men in London and one of their most active supporters.

Moult’s former business associates, Daniel Critchlow and Timothy Byfield also joined the French Prophets from an early stage. Byfield obtained a patent for his Sal Oleosum Volatile in 1711, an alleged panacea intended to save a thousand children annually against fatal convulsions and cure all mental distempers, according to Schwartz and Chabrol, which nevertheless enjoyed some credit at the time, since even reputable physicians like Richard Blackmore recommended it against

---


124 Keimer, *Brand*, p. 76.

125 Little is known about Critchlow, except that he and Francis Moult won a lawsuit against Byfield before 1715 that ruined their former associate. Although many sources labeled Byfield as a quack, Schwartz claims that he had graduated at Trinity College, Dublin. *The French Prophets*, p. 328; Byfield’s will [TNA PROB11/594]; *The Craftsman*, 422 (3rd Aug. 1734), reproduced in Thomas Lockwood, ‘Did Fielding Write For *The Craftsman*?’, *The Review of English Studies*, 59/238 (March, 2007), p. 103.
hypochondria.\textsuperscript{126} Satires published shortly after Emes’s failed resurrection also portrayed him asking for his brethren these very medicines.\textsuperscript{127} While some medical practitioners among the Prophets may have regarded the art of healing in purely millenarian terms, others seemed more animated by the lucrative appeal of emerging proprietary medicines.\textsuperscript{128} Such evidence seems indeed to suggest a certain compatibility between enthusiasm and charlatanism, for which the French Prophets may have offered an effective conduit and an associated market.

The most common accusation against the French Prophets was that of an imposture. Most of their opponents did not believe in an epidemic or a new disease, but suspected perfectly simulated convulsions in order perhaps to cover a political plot.\textsuperscript{129} The Prophets’ convulsions can be explained in several ways. A common ritual among the group was the recurring practice of purificatory fasts. Indeed, no sooner did he arrive in London in September 1706 than Marion ordered his followers to fast repeatedly for three or four days in preparation for great events to come.\textsuperscript{130} Similar practices were observed among English followers, with Dr. Craven’s widow allegedly fasting for 40 days and John Potter’s friends for months.\textsuperscript{131} Frequent periods of abstinence certainly weakened the body and favoured hallucinations if not

\textsuperscript{126} Petition of Timothy Byfield, doctor of physic, to queen, desiring letters patent for his new medecine, known as ‘sal volatile’ [TNA SP34/16/fol. 92]; Blackmore, Treatise of the Spleen, p. 70; Schwartz, French Prophets, pp. 247-248; Chabrol, Elie Marion, pp. 103, 164; Haycock, ‘Medicine within the Market’, p. 6.

\textsuperscript{127} Kingston, Enthusiastic Impostors, No Divinely Insp'rd Prophets (London, 1709), pp. 141-142 [BL 4632.32]; The French Prophet’s Resurrection: with his Speech to the Multitude that Behold the Miracle (London, 1708) [DCL 7E Newenham pamphlets iii[68]].


\textsuperscript{129} John Humfrey, A Farther Account of our Late Prophets (London, 1708), p. 16 [BL 701.c.48]. Nouvelles de la République des Lettres, 37, p. 465.

\textsuperscript{130} Elie Marion, Prophetical Warnings (London, 1707), pp. 7, 29, 55 [BL 852.f.18]; François-Maximilien Misson, Le Théâtre Sacré des Cévennes (London, 1707), pp. 67-68 (erroneous pagination should read pp. 75-76) [BPF 8* 3 102/1 Rés].

\textsuperscript{131} Keimer, Brand, pp. 13, 115.
visions among the group. Such practices proved a common denominator in trances and visions among enthusiasts and pseudo-prophets of all times.\textsuperscript{132}

The French Prophets were not dissimilar from convulsive predecessors like the Quakers, in this respect. Yet many agreed that their agitations surpassed those of the early Friends and that their fasting alone could not account for imposture, since it also featured in the Bible and remained an essential component of Christianity. The young physician Henry Nicholson, himself an apostate Prophet, suggested in 1708 that ‘they may be assisted by the immediate power of a separate Agent, from any thing in them; because some of their Actions seem to be, sometimes, beyond the Power of meer Nature’.\textsuperscript{133} Resort to an hallucinogenic substance was later echoed by Samuel Keimer, who recalled that Marion once handed him a piece of Communion bread and that his ‘Mind was rais’d higher than any Rocket.’\textsuperscript{134} This testimony was probably more than just a metaphor, as it supports accusations that Marion drugged his coreligionists, which the presence of apothecaries among the group certainly facilitated.\textsuperscript{135} Similarly, Thomas Artisien, a forty-year-old Huguenot refugee, reported seeing in December 1706 ‘on a table, a small phial inside which there was a liqueur similar to oil; and all those around the table passed around the said phial, giving it to one another, and pushing it towards the said Elias Marion.’\textsuperscript{136} François


\textsuperscript{133} Nicholson, \textit{Falshood}, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{134} Keimer, \textit{A Search After Religion}, p. 17 [BL 4152.aa.56(1)].

\textsuperscript{135} Vidal, \textit{L’Ablatif absolu}, p. 201.

\textsuperscript{136} \textit{Nouveaux Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire des trois Camisars} (1708), p. 19 [BL 700.e.21.7].
Pommier was likewise given some powder and began beating his wife, who refused to join the group;\textsuperscript{137} and during a continental mission in Halle, the Spirit announced through Jean Allut’s mouth that It would let aromatic oils flow on Its Children’s heads in order to sensitise them to Its presence.\textsuperscript{138}

Among potential substances, posset appears as the most probable option. This drink, made of hot curdled milk with ale or wine with garlic or spices was particularly popular against fevers. On 5\textsuperscript{th} August, 1707, Lacy under inspiration ‘lay about three Hours, in the Condition of a Bedrid Person, not able to rise, nor to turn himself, nor to stir upon the Bed.’ Being manifestly afflicted with several diseases, Lacy fainted and had ‘to be refresh’d by smelling to a Bottle of Sal Armoniac’, at which point he ‘call’d for, and drank some Posset-drink, which accidentally was at hand, and so was instantly cur’d.’\textsuperscript{139} This posset might easily have been prepared by Francis Moult, whom Lacy sometimes asked to serve drinks to the audience.\textsuperscript{140} The Prophets also used to drink very good wine during the Communion, as Samuel Keimer recalled.\textsuperscript{141} Although it remains impossible to identify the type of substances they used due to a lack of further evidence, earlier enthusiasts also consumed alcohol and tobacco, especially the Quakers and the Ranters, and so the French Prophets were not unexceptional in this respect.\textsuperscript{142}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{137} ‘Declaration de Magdeleine Pommier’, in Nouveaux Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire des Trois Camisars, pp. 16-17 [BL 700.e.21.7].
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{138} Quand vous aurez saccagé, vous serez saccagés (1714), p. 11 [BL 850.f.11(2)].
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{139} Lettre d’un particulier à Monsieur Misson (London, 1707), pp. 11-12 [BL 700.e.21.1]; Lacy, Warnings, II, pp. 96-98; Kingston, Enthusiastick Impostors, I, p. 58.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{140} Fatio’s calendar, April 7, 1708 [Ms. fr. 605/7a/fol. 3].
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{141} Keimer, Brand, p. 29.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{142} Coward, The Stuart Age, p. 209.
\end{flushleft}
Notwithstanding their probable use of drugs, many deemed the Prophets insane and the question remains whether they were genuinely mad or not. Without risking the anachronism of a retrospective diagnosis, evidence suggests that some members suffered from mental distempers or experienced deep emotional distress shortly before joining the group. Samuel Keimer’ obsession with his salvation resembled greatly a case of religious melancholy:

I had very awakening Thoughts of my Soul, and would many Times in great Distress of Mind weep by my self, wishing I had never been born; and being willing to be inform’d rightly in those Things which concern’d my eternal Welfare, I read all the Books I could get that treated on Religious Subjects, and amongst the rest, I had in my Search, got some destructive Books of those False Teachers, who hold, That God has elect’d such a particular Number, and reprobated all the rest, who must unavoidably perish. This Doctrine fill’d my poor distracted Soul with fresh Fears.  

Others, however, presented symptoms of religious mania. The baker Richard Gardiner became raving mad and had to be tied to his bed; other followers attempted suicide and both Thomas Harling and John Dutton succeeded. Mary Keimer also tried to immolate herself; and ‘Spragg’s Lad, about 15 Years of Age […] ran mad with ‘em, barking like a Dog, and was put into Bedlam, or some other Madhouse.’

It must be noted, however, that such acts were not committed out of any despair, symptomatic of religious melancholy, but in clear defiance of the laws of nature, since the Spirit had promised them many great things. These destructive drives illustrate the danger attending religious enthusiasm, as underlined by Tutchin, and Robinson’s diagnosis of religious mania seems consequently sound.

143 Keimer, Brand, pp. 7-8.

144 Ibid., pp. 79, 114-115.
Mental distempers can be more easily identified higher in the group’s hierarchy. Richard Bulkeley, often mocked as a deluded old man, was declared *non compos mentis* by the Chancery Court and his house at Ewell was sold in order to pay for the debts he had accumulated to support the Prophets.\(^{145}\)

Domson’s biography of Nicolas Fatio reveals that the Swiss mathematician did not turn toward prophecy with the Prophets, but rather in the early 1690s under Newton’s influence.\(^{146}\) Indeed, Fatio had shown little interest in religion prior to his arrival in England and became a suspected Spinozist, being too rationalist and not Newtonian enough for the Royal Society.\(^{147}\) Domson described him as

> calm, sober, uncommitted to the ardent defense or support of any religious establishment, predisposed against wild readings of the scriptures, and suspicious of prophetic ravings: these, in brief, were the chief components of Fatio’s intellectual and spiritual temper – that is, in 1687.

Fatio went into a severe depression upon his mother’s death in 1692, shortly before Newton’s spiritual crisis, but never fully recovered. He subsequently developed an interest in alchemy and the kabbalah around that time and even considered becoming a physician to cure the world with his own remedies. The two men ended their relationship over the French Prophets in 1707, although David Ramsay, one of


Fatio’s students, claimed that Newton hankered for the group, but was stopped by his friends who feared he would fall into similar disgrace.148

Lastly, John Lacy was undoubtedly the one who best epitomised eighteenth-century enthusiasm among the French Prophets. As a respected Justice of the Peace, Lacy had been deeply affected by the loss of an important lawsuit in 1704, a cause he deemed just, but which had infuriated Chief Justice Holt at Westminster Hall. The Presbyterian minister Edmund Calamy visited his parishioner at Mrs Lacy’s request:

I left Mr. Lacy much dejected upon the loss of his lawsuit, though I was not able at that time to form any positive judgment what his concern might issue in. He soon proved delirious, Was forced to be confined, and kept in the dark, &c. For awhile, his language was raving, and very sad ; such as he never used before, though not uncommon with delirious persons.149

Lacy never really recovered from his mental breakdown. He attempted to sell his land and manor in Littlebury, Essex, in 1708, hoping to raise £10,000 to pay off his debts and provide for his wife and five children, whom he abandoned shortly after for Elizabeth Gray, a teenage prophetess due to give birth to the second Messiah.150

***


149 Calamy, Historical Account, II, pp. 76-77, 94-95, 111-113.

150 John Lacy's Estate Act, 8th Dec., 1708 [HLRO HL/PO/JO/10/6/154/No.2519].
The case of the French Prophets proves of particular interest as an illustration of the changing perceptions of religious enthusiasm in early eighteenth-century England. This chapter has demonstrated how enthusiasm evolved from a theological issue into a medical one over the seventeenth century, as a naturalistic consequence of the scientific revolution first put forward by Restoration theologians. This was by no means a sudden or definite shift, as clergymen and physicians continued to encroach on each other’s sphere throughout most of the Enlightenment. By the early eighteenth century, theologians tended to focus on doctrinal matters and the legitimacy of millenarian predictions, while an increasing number of medical practitioners began to consider enthusiasts’ bodily symptoms as a potential disease.

The Camisards’ migration abroad also offer a valuable comparison of medical approaches to enthusiasm in both France and England and it is noteworthy that French physicians appeared to focus on the mechanics of the convulsions, whereas their English counterparts opened a diagnostic debate on enthusiasm as a whole. Despite the rivalries between Montpellier-trained iatrochemists and the more orthodox faculty of Paris, French medicine showed a common Cartesian approach to the body as a machine that completely excluded the mind.151 Accordingly, Chastelain criticised Willis’ emphasis on the brain and argued instead that convulsions were caused by a mixture of inflamed animal spirits and ‘convulsive matter’ that flowed through the blood rather than the nerves.152


Lastly, there is evidence that some of the French Prophets’ followers were or had been mentally vulnerable at the time they joined the group and that drugs or alcohol may have helped some to enter collective trancelike conditions. The presence of physicians and apothecaries among the group perpetuated the parallel between religious and medical heterodoxy that had begun with their dissenting predecessors’ interest in Paracelsianism. The French Prophets certainly resembled the early Quakers by their convulsions, but their impact is all the more interesting as it further assimilated enthusiasm as either a disease or an imposture in the wake of the ‘trade in lunacy’ and the ‘golden age of the quack’, and most importantly the advent of English establishmentarian medicine.

It was nevertheless too early to talk about a medicine of the mind, as both French and English physicians agreed that madness originated from the body. Being confronted to a new sort of disease, they strove to understand it and concentrated, generally speaking, on its diagnosis rather than its cure. For beside opiates, Paracelsian and Helmontian chemistry still had but a limited influence on everyday medicine, which left physicians almost helpless against insanity. It is precisely because insanity was accepted as a somatic disease in the first half of the eighteenth century, that Porter’s reference to Cheyne, Blackmore and Robinson as ‘fashionable psychiatric doctors’ is both anachronistic and self-contradictory. Instead, the works of Blackmore and, to a greater extent Robinson, reclassified enthusiasm as a

---


religious mania, in which the mind could only be cured through the body. It was not until the second half of the eighteenth century, with the introduction of moral treatment in William Battie’s *Treatise on Madness* (1758) and the foundation of the York Retreat in 1777, that the medical focus moved onto the mind and therefore that madness became a mental disease as such.\(^{157}\)

Conclusion

The French Prophets’ Legacy

It is generally estimated that the French Prophets remained active until the mid-1740s, when their movement was absorbed by the foundation of Shakerism by the Quakers James and Jane Wardley in 1747. Yet by 1709, hardly three years after the arrival of Fage, Cavalier and Marion in London, a consensus had emerged that the French Prophets had not been sent by God. The episode of Thomas Emes’s failed resurrection in 1708 precipitated the group’s demise over the months that followed, leading the Prophets to reorganise into twelve missionary tribes and disperse over Britain and on the continent to announce the millennium to the world. The group continued to hold assemblies over the following decade and evolved into a sect after Marion’s death in 1713, thanks to the introduction of rules and structural organisation to palliate divergences and rivalries.\(^1\)

Once seemingly more structured, the group paradoxically faded away from public attention after 1715. In Schwartz’s own words, ‘the years 1715-30 were penumbral years, years of death and leave-taking, relationship by correspondence, sparse prophecy’.\(^2\) The Prophets lost a great number of their most prominent figures and hardly recruited any newcomers. The Spirit allegedly revisited the group around 1720 with the arrival of two newly inspired converts, which rejoiced Fatio, Allut and

---

\(^1\) A collection of advertisements respecting the regulation of assemblies, and containing the rules of discipline: wherein are comprehended several orders and commands; exhortations and admonitions; and instructions: and some examples of the Lord’s jealousie (London, 1715) [BLO Pamph.328(30)].

Lacy, but the Prophets never regained their original fame.\(^3\) Even though we continue to trace their existence through private correspondences and sporadic assemblies after this second prophetic wave, the condition, activity and numbers of the French Prophets remain debatable. Their influence nevertheless persisted beyond the mid-eighteenth century and the Shakers continue to refer to them today as their direct ancestors.\(^4\)

Although relatively short-lived in comparison with the Quakers or the Methodists, the story of the Camisard prophets has been repeatedly mythicised since the nineteenth century, especially by German romantic writers. Isaac von Sinclair’s dramatic trilogy *Cevennenkrieg* appeared in 1806 in the context of the Napoleonic wars and later influenced Ludwick Tieck’s novel *Der Aufruhr in den Cevennen* (1826). The Camisards also inspired French artists a few years later. In 1840, the novelist Eugène Sue wrote the epic *Jean Cavalier ou les fanatiques des Cévennes*, a four-volume account of the Camisard insurrection. Aimé Maillart composed *Les Dragons de Villars* in 1856, a three-act opera that became immensely popular throughout Europe and was also subsequently staged in New Orleans and New York City. Another opera appeared on the same theme in 1887 with *Die Camisarden*, written by Ernst Kuhl and composed by August Langert. More recently, French French director René Allio released in 1972 his award-winning film *Les Camisards*, featuring Roland and Abraham Mazel as its main characters, while the Swiss writer

---

\(^3\) John Gyles’s letter to Mr. Swift in Worcester, 17\(^{th}\) Aug., 1721.

\(^4\) *The Testimony of Christ's second appearing: containing a general statement of all things pertaining to the faith and practice of the church of God in this latter-day*, 2\(^{nd}\) edition (Albany, 1810), pp. xxiii, 406-408. *A Summary View of the Millennial church: or United society of believers (commonly called Shakers.) comprising the rise, progress and practical order of the society; together with the general principles of their faith and testimony* (Albany, 1823), pp. 2-5.
Pil Crauer imagined an encounter between a Camisard leader and Louis XIV’s finance minister in *Rolland Laporte begegnet Minister Colbert oder die Vorzeit endet 1704*, published in 1980. The French Prophets have also penetrated Anglo-American popular literature since then. John Fowles explored the early Shakers in his novel *A Maggot* and even mentioned Misson, Marion, Emes, Lacy, Bulkeley and James Wardley; while Nicolas Fatio features as a supporting character in both Gregory Keyes’ *The Age of Unreason* (1998-2001) and Neal Stephenson’s *The Baroque Cycle* (2003-04). Since their rebellion in the *Désert* and subsequent exile in England, the Camisards and French Prophets have therefore aroused both fear and fascination as legendary figures of heroic resistance or deluded mystics announcing the millennium. In either case, they certainly deserve our full attention for making a significant impact on the society of their time.

**Thesis Contribution**

While Hillel Schwartz and Clarke Garrett retraced their story from the Camisards to the Shakers from a social and anthropological perspective, this case study of the French Prophets abstracted from chronological constraints to concentrate instead on significance of their enthusiasm in eighteenth-century England. Accordingly, this thesis sought to reflect the complexity of enthusiasm with a more comprehensive view of its meaning and nature, at a time when the term was itself loosely used against dissenters, religious divines, Paracelsians, almanac-makers and astrologers alike. It has argued that enthusiasm had largely lost its purely theological meaning by

---

1700 and represented in reality an epistemological position reflected in the choice of a thematic structure. Thanks to this original approach, it is now apparent that the term ‘enthusiasm’ designated a very complex, somewhat ungraspable, yet ostensibly dangerous phenomenon that raised concerns far beyond religion.

Chapter one tracked the origins of the French Prophets in the Cévennes mountains and established the Camisards as a distinct population from mainstream Huguenots. Although it would be risky for the historian to make a direct connection between the Camisards and the Cathars, there is no denying that these Calvinist rebels regarded themselves as the proud descendants of this medieval sect and were acknowledged as such by the authorities. The austere and rugged environment they lived in contributed significantly to preserve their identity and consequently became worshipped as the Désert. Their geographical isolation ensured the perpetuation of an oral tradition at a time when Huguenots proved more mobile through trade and saw a rise in literacy. Although Protestant at heart, both communities held significant social and cultural differences, leading many Huguenots to distance themselves from the Camisards’ prophetic tradition.

Despite the local scale of the war in the Cévennes, chapter one has also highlighted the international dimension of this conflict thanks to the unexplored military correspondence between the English government and French agents. Furthermore, the Camisard insurrection proves doubly interesting not only as the last French war of religion, but also as a prophetic war, in which the Spirit allegedly dictated its military strategy to the rebels. The Camisards leaders were thus divinely inspired warriors fighting against the oppression of the Catholic Church and the
England, as we have seen, had a long millenarian tradition before Fage, Cavalier and Marion set foot on its soil. Belief in the Second Coming had been widely shared among the Christian community until the Interregnum, but it became more closely associated with dissenters after the Restoration, as the Church of England rationalised its theology to distance itself from millenarian calculations. By concentrating on the spiritual appeal of the three Camisards, chapter two revealed that their apocalyptic predictions found an echo among both radical dissenters and Anglicans. In the context of a confessionally partitioned, yet volatile English society, the French Prophets were able to appeal to all denominations seeking the establishment of a Universal Church. However, this original strength rapidly turned into their main weakness, for the Prophets diverged considerably on such issues as
the sacraments and their relation to the Church of England. It ultimately became apparent that they held no clearly defined doctrine of their own and that the diversity of their system of beliefs reflected that of their followers. The Prophets should therefore not be regarded as a new sect, but instead as a religious society seeking to transcend the spiritual boundaries of England’s diverse religious landscape.

If the French Prophets’ theological contribution was rather limited, they mostly stood out from their millenarian predecessors and contemporaries by the physicality of their religious experiences. The Pentecostal silence claimed by cessationists had allegedly come to an end and the Spirit was now speaking through the Prophets as its ‘Instruments’ in the same manner as it did with the biblical prophets. Accordingly, the imminence of the millennium was evidenced by their prophetic, glossolalic and thaumaturgical gifts, as well as the intensity of their physical manifestations. Their enthusiasm resided essentially in the body and was first and foremost visible. Unlike ministers and dissenting preachers, they did not interpret the Scriptures, but allegedly served as unconscious vectors between the spiritual and the material world, and thus offered their followers a direct experience of God’s power to their audience. All in all, the French Prophets imposed themselves as spiritual performers rather than reformers.

Chapter three examined the social composition and organisation of the French Prophets as a group. It added over one hundred followers, sympathisers or mere observers to Schwartz’s results, bringing their overall numbers to around 650. Many may well have been socially vulnerable women and children, but these did not constitute the bulk of the group. Thanks to the lists presented in the Appendix and the
diversity of the sources examined, this chapter considerably refined the prosopography of the group and thus revealed preexisting networks of lawyers, clergymen, physicians, printers and traders. In addition, the religious affiliations of these followers confirmed the argument made in chapter two that the Prophets transcended the deep denominational divisions of their time despite their relatively small numbers, effectively attracting both Anglicans and dissenters alike. The Quakers occupied a prominent place among the latter and the Philadelphians found in the Camisards a spiritual outlet for their dying movement. Overall, it appears that the Prophets appealed to people of all social ranks, although they gravitated essentially around a well-off, educated urban middle class.

If the French Prophets seemed more permissive than their contemporaries with regards to the place of women and children, they never were an egalitarian movement. They drew in reality a clear line between preaching and prophesying and women were accordingly allowed to speak alongside men only under inspiration. They differed in this respect from contemporary movements centered around a motherly figure and those Prophetesses or inspired children who showed too much zeal were in fact severely reprimanded or expelled. Their attitude towards women was coherent with their emphasis on divine inspiration over scriptural interpretation insofar as only prophecy legitimised the individual to address an audience in the name of God. The near exponential growth of inspired Prophets therefore placed them on the more or less equal footing within the group. With the exception of those who claimed the gift of tongues and healing, no explicit hierarchy or rules prevailed until around 1714. It was probably too late by then; the French Prophets had suffered
from a lack of structure and coordination from the beginning and gradually turned into a sect after much of the controversy they created had ended.

The spectacular growth of the Prophets’ movement from three Camisards to several hundreds of followers and sympathisers raises questions about the group’s communication. Chapter four examined for this reason the Prophets’ extraordinary sense of publicity in successfully delivering the Spirit’ message to an English speaking urban middle class audience. While the Camisards originally intended to return to Languedoc, it has been argued that it was their supporters, especially Misson, Lacy and Bulkeley, who promoted their cause to Londoners by translating and financing the publications of the Prophets’ warnings. Like the radical dissenters of the English Civil War, they shared a great interest in the printing press and the presence of several printers and booksellers among their ranks ensured a large diffusion of their prophetical warnings that would have otherwise been inaccessible to poorer Camisard refugees.

If the French Prophets initiated a battle of pamphlets, chapter four also argued that their extensive use of print should not be regarded as a transition from the oral prophetic tradition of the Désert to the booming English print culture. Indeed, speech remained the Prophets’ preferred medium of communication and most of their publications consisted of transcriptions of their divine inspirations. Warnings were delivered first and foremost orally and print only provided a convenient medium to reach new audiences further afield. They followed in this respect the lines of the great sermon preachers since the Restoration and were, to some extent, competing for spiritual authority by offering Londoners divine inspirations against rational
theology. Despite rising levels of literacy, print only came second to the immediacy of the spoken word in the eighteenth century. The Prophets continued to vocalise the Spirit and hold dramatic assemblies long after the aforementioned pamphlet war and looked to missionary expeditions to attract new crowds. Whether in print or in speech, the French Prophets constituted a truly eighteenth-century media phenomenon.

After successfully making the Spirit’s voice heard and causing protests and riots as a result, the French Prophets’s enthusiasm also had judiciary repercussions. Many sectarians had of course been prosecuted for disrupting the social order before them, but the Prophets also stood out by the nationality of their original members, in the context of a war against France and fears of a Catholic conspiracy against the Crown. As some contemporaries argued, this was a new sort of enthusiasm, precisely because it was not only foreign, but French. Nationality indeed played a fundamental part in the prosecution of Marion and his two scribes, especially at a time when Britishness was also being defined. For reasons explained in chapter one, the Camisards found more opponents than supporters among the Huguenots refugees in London. The latter were well aware of the suspicions held against them and sought to be naturalised for this reason. Taking the Prophets to court proved to be an act of loyalty towards their host country; the trial was consequently not initiated from above, but rather from below, as part of what was originally a franco-French discord.

The second specificity of this case was that the Prophets claimed the benefit of the Toleration Act of 1689. The discovery of the court record of Marion’s trial sheds new light on their case and revealed that the judges of the Queen’s Bench were
greatly embarrassed by the prospect of prosecuting the Prophets on religious grounds. For this reason there was no trial of the French Prophets as such, but only of three singled out members when others could equally have been indicted. The charges brought against them were therefore minimal in comparison with the social disruption caused and it has demonstrated that they received a very mild sentence. Although a case of blasphemy by the publication of a book, the condemnation of Marion, Daudé and Fatio was in reality a warning to the French Prophets. Yet this chapter has also revealed the government’s intention to prosecute the most active members of their movement and therefore that religious Toleration remained a great political concern long after it was enacted.

Lastly, that the French Prophets’ enthusiasm was primarily characterised by its exceptional physicality is further evidenced by the nascent medical debate on ecstatic trances around the same time. Although Restoration ministers had resorted to natural causes to explain religious enthusiasm, and despite the fact that madness was one of the most common accusations made against the Prophets, chapter six showed that it was not until the early eighteenth century that English physicians began to consider religious enthusiasm as a possible form of illness. Yet if physicians discussed the nature of enthusiasm, few dared to venture inside the mind or the soul and concentrated instead on the body. Although French medicine privileged a mechanistic diagnosis of convulsions and ignored the mind, English physicians placed enthusiasm on a mental continuum between religious melancholy and religious mania. Either way, the interest of physicians in religious enthusiasm is undeniable. Despite diagnostic and curative divergences, there nevertheless remained
a fine line between medicine of the soul and that of the body. If enthusiasm constituted a disease at all in the first half of the eighteenth century, it was certainly a bodily disease rather than a mental one.

Although the medical argument provided an increasingly viable explanation for religious enthusiasm, there is no evidence that any of the French Prophets were ever diagnosed and treated for religious madness. Admittedly, some were mentally and emotionally vulnerable when the Camisards arrived in England, but we lose track of them during their confinement. Most importantly, the French Prophets had a particularly interesting relationship with medicine, not only as potential patients, but also as healers. Indeed, chapter six revealed the existence of a network of iatrochemists among the group, further supporting the perpetuated interest of dissenters in paracelsian ideas as a challenge to traditional medicine. These may have facilitated ecstatic trances and visions with hallucinogenic substances, like the Ranters and early Quakers’ experimental uses of alcohol and tobacco before them. Yet by placing thaumaturgy at the centre of their claims, the Prophets essentially challenged university-trained physicians in an attempt to reassert the superiority of spiritual cures over medical treatments. This ideological rivalry and encroachment over science is generally regarded as one of the driving forces for the emergence of the Enlightenment.

The research methodology adopted for this thesis provides more than just a case study of the French Prophets. It offers a powerful insight into Queen Anne’s society by exploring its social strata, its booming print industry and its religious diversity. Their appeal to conformist and non-conformist denominations reveals the
existence of a vivid millenarian culture in what used to be regarded as an Age of Reason. Indeed, the French Prophets appear to have bridged what religious historians have long perceived as a spiritual gap between earlier sects such as the Anabaptists, the Ranters, the early Quakers and the Muggletonians on the one hand, and the Moravians and the Methodists on the other. However, it has been argued that they generally stood out from their contemporaries as a socially respectable, non-sectarian religious society, very much along the lines of the Philadephians or the Scottish Quietists. If it may be argued that there was a decline of new radical factions by the turn of the eighteenth century, the belief in an imminent Second Coming certainly persisted within both intellectual and popular spheres well after 1700. The French Prophets did not instill, but capitalised on these millenarian expectations until personal rivalries and spiritual divergences precipitated their dispersion. Still, they should not be regarded as a barren movement, for they merged with other mystical movements in Britain and on the continent after their schism, and thus paved the way for the evangelical revivals of the 1730s.6

This study does not claim, however, to provide an exhaustive account of the French Prophets from their origins to their disappearance. The narrative has of course been restricted to a shorter time range in order to serve the methodological purpose assigned at the beginning of this project. Thus, it does not explore the influence of the Prophets’ descendants on the rise of Methodism in the 1730s; nor does it address the group’s relationship with the Scottish Quietists and the German Pietists, or follow

its schismatic factions led by Abraham Whitrow, Dorothy Harling, Lady Abden and Christina Pickering, for example. There are still many aspects to be explored to improve our understanding of the French Prophets. An examination of the correspondence between the English government, the Dutch pensioner Heinsius and their allies in the German provinces and perhaps even central Europe may shed considerable light upon the military plans of Protestant nations to support the Camisard insurrection in Languedoc during the war against France. Relatively little is known about the French Prophets’ missions in Britain and on the continent. The discovery of the letters of Lord Pitsligo in Aberdeen and Archibald Lundie’s correspondence with his brother in Leyden may reveal missing information on the Prophets’ aftermath in Scotland and Holland. Lastly, there is reasonable ground to believe that the missionaries relied on the Huguenot network on their way to Scandinavia and Germany, and much of these refuges have yet to be studied.

**Enthusiasm in the ‘Age of Reason’**

As they openly defied the Church, the state and even science, the French Prophets imposed themselves as the archetype of enthusiasm in the eighteenth century, hence a force of opposition and resistance to the Enlightenment. The choice of this thematic approach sought to reflect the polysemic understanding of enthusiasm in the so-called Age of Reason. The term designated a very complex and overall ill-defined issue. Although a spiritual phenomenon in its etymology, enthusiasm meant in reality much more than a spirit possession by the eighteenth century. It was increasingly
perceived as a social as well as a physical disease, a threat to the social order and a legal limbo, and the French Prophets came to epitomise this complexity. Yet if this thesis echoed the multiple repercussions of their movement on English society by its structure, it also provides an original perspective on eighteenth-century European history by combining the micro-history of a millenarian movement with the wider context of the Huguenot diaspora and the War of the Spanish Succession.

Historians in the English-speaking world have increasingly questioned the idea of a single, secular Enlightenment in the past thirty years, or even denied its existence altogether. If it was not specifically the Age of Reason, the long eighteenth century nevertheless remained enlightening in many respects. The persistence of a strong millenarian culture at all levels of English society disproves the long-held theory of a decline of superstitions among the elite after 1700. In fact, the most prominent figures of the Enlightenment, including Descartes, Pascal, Whiston, Newton, Fatio, Swedenborg and Rousseau all experienced mystical revelations at some point in their lives and retained a strong interest in the supernatural until their deaths. The compatibility of millenarian beliefs with Enlightenment rationalism is undeniable and has encouraged historians to reassess this fascinating period to integrate the semantic variations and specificities of ‘les Lumières’ and the ‘Aufklärung’. As John Pocock has recently argued, we are increasingly moving

---

towards a plurality of Enlightenments, which may now be described as either radical, moderate, providential or even mystical.\(^8\)

Enthusiasts of all times shared a common contempt for institutional religion, but also claimed an exclusive relationship with God. The impossibility of knowing God meant that faith was not to be reflected upon, but experienced. Exegesis was therefore irrelevant and churches illegitimate insofar as they preached human doctrines over personal revelation. The sporadic resurgence of millenarian factions throughout the long eighteenth century evidenced a need to reassert the supremacy of the spiritual light of faith over that of reason and enthusiasm may accordingly be regarded as a reactionary force against the Enlightenment. The case of Sabbatai Zevi, the Sweet Singers of Israel, the Dutartres, the Convulsionaries of Saint Médard, the Illuminati, the Swedenborgians, Ann Lee and the Shakers, Dorothy Gott, Richard Brothers and Johanna Southcott all illustrate the central place occupied by religion in the Age of Reason at both popular and intellectual levels.\(^9\) Thus, the long eighteenth century was also the scene of a mystical Enlightenment that had been eclipsed by the advent of rationalism for too long. These enthusiasts have nevertheless failed to adapt and survive in the long term and their descendants have become largely

---


marginalised in the Christian world. Beyond the semantic restrictions we have ascribed to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, enthusiasm and its millenarian calculations are simply a pattern that repeats itself under different names throughout history and even continues until today. At the time I am writing, the end of the world is announced for 21st December, 2012.
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Abbreviations and Symbols

ENTRY: date of first known appearance among the French Prophets

NAME: * indicates apostasy or exclusion from the group

DOB: Date of birth (a = ante, c = circa, p = post)

POB: Place of birth (EN = England, FR = France, GE = Germany, IR = Ireland, NE = New England, SC = Scotland, SW = Switzerland)

DOD: Date of death (a = ante, c = circa, p = post)

REL: Religion (A = Anglican, B = Baptist, C = nonsectarian Protestant, H = Huguenot, including children born in England from Huguenot parents, J = Jew, M = Methodist/Moravian, P = Presbyterian, Sw Pr = Swiss Protestant, Ph = Philadelphian, Pi = Pietist, Q = Quaker, (Q) = Quaker claimant, Qt = Quietist, RC = Roman Catholic, SPCK = Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge)

OCC/STAT: Occupation or Status

ROLE: Function within the group (A = has agitations but does not speak, C = receives cure, H = Host, M = Missionary, P = Prophet, S = Scribe, ? = unconfirmed believer, possible sympathiser or observer

T: Tribe (1 = Levi, 2 = Benjamin, 3 = Issachar, 4 = Naphtali, 5 = Zebulon, 6 = Simeon, 7 = Judah, 8 = Gad, 9 = Ruben, 10 = Osser, 11 = Menasseh, 12 = Joseph; @ appointed apostle to that tribe)

CONN: Connections within the group, as follows:
= married to
+ nuclear relationship (father, mother, brother, sister, son, daughter)
& other kinship relations
[ ] friend, religious or business associate or employer
### List E: Chronological Profile of the French Prophets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>POB</th>
<th>DOD</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>OCC/STAT</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>CONN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>FAGE, Durand</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>c1750?</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Soldier</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[10, 4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>DAUDE, Jean</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>p1736</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>M S H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JUN</td>
<td>PORTALÈS, Charles</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Secretary, merchant, chief commissary in the army (1703)</td>
<td>M S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>231, +198, &amp;22, [8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AUG 10</td>
<td>*CAVALIER, Jean</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31, &amp;5, [1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AUG 15</td>
<td>ALLUT, Jean</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>a1740</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Cabinetmaker</td>
<td>P M H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29, &amp;4, [9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AUG 15</td>
<td>BULKELEY, Richard</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SpCK</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>C S H</td>
<td>[15, 63, 220]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AUG 15</td>
<td>*COTTON, Thomas</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>311, [9? 15?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AUG 20</td>
<td>BOURRON, Armand de, Marquis de Miremont</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Marquis, agent to Queen Anne</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3, 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>AUG 30</td>
<td>FATIO DE DUILLIERS, Nicolas</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>Sw Pr</td>
<td>Mathematician, tutor</td>
<td>M S H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[77, 26, 85, 146, 201, 299]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SEPT 16</td>
<td>MARION, Elie</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[1, 22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SEPT</td>
<td>ROUVIERE, Jean</td>
<td>a1683</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>+58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>OCT 1</td>
<td>BOISSIER, Matthieu</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Woolcarder</td>
<td>+201, +164, +371...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NOV</td>
<td>MISSON, François-Maximilien</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|14|NOV 23|DALGONE, Sara|a1680|FR|H|Surgeon's wife |?
|15|DEC/NOV|LACY, John|1664|EN|1730|Pr|JP, gentleman |P M|1| [6, 7?], =25 |
|16|DEC|CRITCHLOW, Rebecca|a1675|EN|Ph|Widow, preacher |H|&46, &89, &115, 117? |
|1707|JAN 4|M AJOU, Jérémie|1645|FR|H|Minister |? |
|18|JAN 14|*ARNASSAN, Claude|a1645|c1678|FR|H|Carter |
|19|JAN 14|PHILIPPS, John|c1666|EN|1737|A|SpCK |Baronet / Arts master? |? +385 |
|20|FEB|*D’HUISSEAU, Anne|a1688|FR|H|? |
|21|FEB|*VERDURON, Abraham|a1668|FR|H|Silk-weaver |5 =84, +31 |
|22|MAR 1|FLOTARD, David|1670|FR|H|Agent for #8 |7 | [3, 8, 10] |
|23|MAR 5|CHARRAS, Elizabeth|a1670|FR|H|Wife of a gunsmith |P M|1 |
|24|MAR 7|*ROACH, Richard|1662|EN|1730|A/Ph|Minister |H|9 | [many] |
|25|APR 1|GRAY, Elizabeth|1692|EN|p1718|A?|Niece of a candlemaker |P M|6 | =15 |
|26|APR 1|KEITH, James|1684a|SC|p1721|Qt|Physician |=355, [9] |
|27|APR 1|*LIONS, Jean|a1675|FR|H|Minister |&364? |
|28|APR 1|ROGER, Robert|a1660|FR|H|Printer |? |
|29|APR 7|ALLUT, Henriette|a1685|FR|p1745|H|P M|8 | =5 |
|30|APR 11|DES BROUSSES, Susanne|FR|H|P|11 |
|31|APR 11|*CAVALIER, Jeanne|a1685|FR|H|P M | =4, +84 |
|32|APR 11|VOYER, Anne|1637?|FR|H|P |3 |
|33|APR 13|*HAVY, Isaac|a1680|FR|H|Weaver |P M| (2) |
|34|APR 13|*LE TELLIER, Daniel|a1670|FR|H|Weaver |P | (1) =73, +257, +258 |
|35|APR 28|PRADE, Antoine|a1680|FR|H|Innkeeper |H|1 |390, +263, +264 |
|36|APR 29|DAUDE, Mme.|c1650|FR|H|S H |2 |
|37|MAY 28|KNIGHT, Mr.|EN|Ph|? | [24] |
|38|JUNE 3|KEMP, Mr.|EN|Ph|&381 [24], &nieces, &cousins |
|39|JUNE 3|KING, William|a1680|EN|Ph|Tallow chandler |S |5 | +223, +229 |
|40|JUNE 3|WELLS, Mrs.|EN|Ph|? | [24], *children |
|41|JUNE 6|POTTER, John|1673|EN|1740|B|Meatpacker? |P M|4 | =376 [65] |
|42|JULY 1|HOOKE, John|1655|IR|1712|A|SpCK |Sergeant-at-law | [67] |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>POB</th>
<th>DOD</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>OCC/STAT</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>CONN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>July 5</td>
<td>EYTON, Marie</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Widow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>July-5</td>
<td>EV CONN, Mme.</td>
<td>a1660</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>+43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>July 5</td>
<td>TUCKER, Mary</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'?'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>July 7</td>
<td>CRITCHLOW, Sarah</td>
<td>a1687</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+115, &amp;16, &amp;89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>DRAYCOTT, William</td>
<td>a1685</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Brasier</td>
<td>S H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+253, +120, +121, [Carter?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>KEIMER, Mary</td>
<td>c1686</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1718</td>
<td>Pr/B</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+49, +50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>*KEIMER, Samuel</td>
<td>c1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1742</td>
<td>Pr/B</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+48, +50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>KEIMER, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1666</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1718</td>
<td>Pr/B</td>
<td>+48, +49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Aug 6</td>
<td>CHANIER, Mme.</td>
<td>a1687</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Wife of a tailor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Aug 9</td>
<td>Edouard</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from St Albans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Aug 10</td>
<td>*WHITROW, Abraham</td>
<td>a1670</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>A?</td>
<td>Woolcomber</td>
<td>P M H</td>
<td>=53, +172, +173, [Joan]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Aug 12</td>
<td>LAUGHTON, Mary</td>
<td>a1670</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>=52, +172, +173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Aug 16</td>
<td>CRAVEN, James</td>
<td>a1668</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>=315 [146]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Aug 17</td>
<td>BYFIELD, Timothy</td>
<td>c1650</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1723</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>+296 [146]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Aug 17</td>
<td>WATTS, Anne</td>
<td>1690?</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1718</td>
<td>Shop maid</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Aug 24</td>
<td>ROUVIERE, Anne</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+11 [99]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Aug 29</td>
<td>BEER, Mary</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>a1737</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shopmaid</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>= 511, + many, &amp;49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Sept 2</td>
<td>GOOD, Anne</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>+336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Sept 2</td>
<td>*WILTSHIRE, Sarah</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Q/Ph</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widow?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>[24, 165]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Sept 5</td>
<td>EMES, Thomas</td>
<td>a1670</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>=122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Sept 5</td>
<td>JACKSON, Benjamin</td>
<td>a1670</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1722</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inventor</td>
<td>S M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=461?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Sept 5</td>
<td>TOVEY, Beata</td>
<td>a1667</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>=65 [500]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Sept 5</td>
<td>TOVEY, Joseph</td>
<td>a1667</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1722</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Tallow chandler</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=64, +193, &amp;5 nieces, [314]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Sept 10</td>
<td>LE TELLIER, Samuel</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1709p</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td></td>
<td>+34, +73, +257, +258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Sept 10</td>
<td>DUTTON, Thomas</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1741</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>=437, +228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Sept 15</td>
<td>BULLMORE, Mary</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>=294, +mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Sept 15</td>
<td>EVERARD, Edmund</td>
<td>c1660</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>p1711</td>
<td>RC/C</td>
<td>Informer, spy</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[81, 97]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Sept 15</td>
<td>HAMMOND, Mr.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Politician? MP?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Sept 21</td>
<td>DUBUC, Pierre</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Sept 21</td>
<td>RAOUX, Jeanne</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wife of a notary Widow by 1709</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Sept 21</td>
<td>RAOUX, Madeleine</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Sept 27</td>
<td>LE TELLIER, Marie</td>
<td>a1675</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+34, +257, +258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Oct 1</td>
<td>GILES, John</td>
<td>a1670</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1721</td>
<td>Ph?</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>M S H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Oct 5</td>
<td>EAST, Rachel ?</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td>Daughter of a grocer</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Oct 5</td>
<td>STEFFKINS, Christian</td>
<td>a1675</td>
<td>GE</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td></td>
<td>Viol player (at court)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[143, 247]+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>*STODDART, Dinah</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Oct 31</td>
<td>NOUL, Jean</td>
<td>c1693</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>[116]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Nov 1</td>
<td>MOSELY, Mrs.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Nov 25</td>
<td>PRESTON, Hugh</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Q?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Servant?</td>
<td>C H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>=391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Nov 10</td>
<td>TYLEY, Joseph</td>
<td>a1660</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lawyer / MP for Exeter</td>
<td>C H</td>
<td></td>
<td>[68]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Dec 14</td>
<td>JACKSON, James</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1721</td>
<td>I/Q</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>C H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[165]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Dec 18</td>
<td>*VERDURON, Marie</td>
<td>a1668</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>p1710</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+39?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Dec 19</td>
<td>DE BEAULIEU, M.</td>
<td>SW?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SwFr?</td>
<td></td>
<td>[9]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Dec 25</td>
<td>*HALFORD, Stephen</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Q?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>[87, 88]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Dec 25</td>
<td>TAYLOR, Jonathan</td>
<td>a1689</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinetmaker</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td></td>
<td>[86, 88]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Dec 25</td>
<td>WHARTON, Richard</td>
<td>a1689</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patten-maker</td>
<td>=413, +many</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>ENTRY</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DOB</td>
<td>POB</td>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>OCC/STAT</td>
<td>ROLE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>CONN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Dec 31</td>
<td>CRITCHLOW, Daniel</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1724</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Chemist, surgeon</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>115, 46, [56], [1 servant]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>CLARK, Mary</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>217?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>HOLLOWAY, John</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gentleman?</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>MOORE, Mary</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>MOULT, John</td>
<td>a1670</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>A?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apothecary</td>
<td>C P</td>
<td>231, 376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Jan 5</td>
<td>GLOVER, John</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>a1736</td>
<td>A? B</td>
<td>Anab.</td>
<td>Vicuiller, Preacher</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Jan 10</td>
<td>ASPINAL, Mary</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stay-maker's wife</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Jan 15</td>
<td>ALLUT, Jacob</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+5, +29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>*ANGIBERT, Anna</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>AUDEMAR, Jeanne</td>
<td>c1662</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Silk weaver</td>
<td>M C H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98 [57]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>AUDEMAR, Pierre</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>BARKER, Mrs</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>BENNET, Elizabeth</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoe-maker</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+102?, +233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>BENNET, John</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arts-master</td>
<td></td>
<td>+101?, +233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>BERNARD, Esther</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>104, +234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>BERNARD, Jacques</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Engraver</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103, +234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>BOUSSAC, Mme.</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>BARKER, Mrs.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>CARTER, James</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>IR?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>CHARRIER, Elizabeth</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Bounty recipient</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>CLARK, John</td>
<td>p1690</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+217, +303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>CLERE (CLARE), John?</td>
<td>p1700</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+111, +112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>CLERE, William</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>A?</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>=112, +110, +1 other son, +1 daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>CLERE, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111, +110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>COCOQ, William</td>
<td>a1670</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upholsterer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>COOPER, Elizabeth</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+107, &amp;521?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>CRITCHLOW, Mary</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>=89?, &amp;16, &amp;46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>CUFF, John (Peter)</td>
<td>a1685</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Watchmaker</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>=117, [78], [25], +son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>CUFF, Rebecca</td>
<td>a1685</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>DES PREAUX, Olivier</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>DES PREAUX, Renée</td>
<td>c1662</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>=118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>DRAYCOTT, Anna</td>
<td>a1675</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+121, +47, &amp;253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>DRAYCOTT, Sarah</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+120, +47, &amp;253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>EMES, Mary</td>
<td>a1675</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widow by Dec. 1707</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>=son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>GILMAN, C., Mr.</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Son of a physician? Founding member of the Philadelphian Society</td>
<td>=124, *daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>GILMAN, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>ENTRY</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DOB</td>
<td>POB</td>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>OCC/STAT</td>
<td>ROLE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>CONN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>GLADMAN, Joseph</td>
<td>a1675</td>
<td></td>
<td>p1712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>GRAISSMITH, Mr.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>GUILLOMOT, Isaac</td>
<td>a1689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+128, +215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>GUILLOMOT, Susanna</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+215, +127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>HODGES, Joseph</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>HUMPHREYS, William,</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>[24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>HUNT, Sarah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>JACKSON, George</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>JANSSEN, Jean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>KELL, Abraham</td>
<td>a1675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>KEMP, Joyce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp;38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>LA JONQUIÈRE, Mme.</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Wife of a weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+daughters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>LE PAGÉ, Jean</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>MADDOX, Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Station's wife?</td>
<td>+ 2 daughters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>MAHIEU, Abraham</td>
<td>a1670</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>p1732</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=140, +144, [1 apprentice]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>MAHIEU, Susanne</td>
<td>a1670</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=139, +144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>MARSHALL, Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>MIDDLETON, Thomas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Qt</td>
<td>Principal?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[267]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>MONIN, Mr.</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[76]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>MOREL, Jeanne</td>
<td>a1689</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>+139, +140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>MORETON, Elias</td>
<td>p1696</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+375 (mother)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>MOULT, Francis</td>
<td>a1675</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Apothecary</td>
<td>M S H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+93, &amp;147, &amp;3…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>MOULT, John</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P M?</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp;146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>NAIT, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR?</td>
<td>H?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>NOLIBERT (NOLIBET?),</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>OWEN, Isaac</td>
<td>p1679</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>a1718</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Son of a minister, Student</td>
<td>M S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>[friends]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>PERROT, Jaquette</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Daughter of a merchant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>+262, &amp;13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>PERROT, Marie</td>
<td>c1650</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&amp;262, &amp;13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>PLEURET, Elizabeth</td>
<td>a1685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>RAMSAY, Ann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SC?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>RIGBY, Mary</td>
<td>a1695</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1718p</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+157, +158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>RIGBY, Thomas</td>
<td>a1675</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1718p</td>
<td>Cane-maker</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>+157, +156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>RIGBY, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1675</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+157, +156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>ROSE, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>SANGER, Susanna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1730c</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>=500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>SEWARD (SOUART?),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>SOULET, Susanne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>SOUTHHOUSE, Anne</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Widow?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>+13, +238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>STEED, Anne</td>
<td>a1685</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1718</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>[61, 82, 493]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>*STERRILL, Marie</td>
<td>a1650</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H/Ph/ Q</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>TOPHAM, Ann</td>
<td>a1672</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1693/4</td>
<td>Q?</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>TURNER, Mary</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q?</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>URQHART, Patrick</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>RC?</td>
<td>Professor of Medicine?</td>
<td>A H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>=407?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>VALETTE, Pierre</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>VALOUÉ (VALOULÉ?),</td>
<td>a1689</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Son of a goldsmith?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+son (below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>WHITROW, Ann</td>
<td>p1696</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+52, +53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>WHITROW, Deborah</td>
<td>p1696</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+52, +53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>WILLSON, Sarah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>ENTRY</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DOB</td>
<td>POB</td>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>OCC/STAT</td>
<td>ROLE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>CONN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Jan 19</td>
<td>YONGE, Mme.</td>
<td>EN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Jan 24</td>
<td>HUGHES, Elizabeth</td>
<td>a1668</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>Cook shop, Widow</td>
<td>M +192 (daughter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>MAZEL, Abraham</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Woolcomber</td>
<td>P [10]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Feb 4</td>
<td>ROBERTS, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1678</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Feb 4</td>
<td>BURBURY, Thomas</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Feb 4</td>
<td>*CASH, Samuel</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Feb 7</td>
<td>DOWNING, Mr.</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Ph?</td>
<td>Printer and bookseller? [24], &amp;6?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Feb 23</td>
<td>PLYMORE, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>A/J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Mar 11</td>
<td>POMMIER, François</td>
<td>a1675</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Mar 22</td>
<td>RAYNER, Mr.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>B?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sailor?</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Mar 29</td>
<td>SPONG, William</td>
<td>a1646</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td></td>
<td>C 3 =398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Mar 30</td>
<td>MOORE (MORE?), John</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cloggmaker</td>
<td>P (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Apr 1</td>
<td>MOORE, John</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>A/B Pr</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>*PLASS, Timothy</td>
<td>p1690</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>A?</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>[6]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Apr 14</td>
<td>RUSTBACK, Mrs.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Apr 17</td>
<td>PELLET, Jean</td>
<td>c1672</td>
<td>1669?</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1752?</td>
<td>H Teacher</td>
<td>H =383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Apr 29</td>
<td>BYWORTH, James</td>
<td>c1678</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Victualler</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>May 5</td>
<td>WILLIS, Mary</td>
<td>a1651</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>May 23</td>
<td>HUGHES, Elizabeth</td>
<td>a1689</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1718</td>
<td>B?</td>
<td>P M 11 +176 (mother)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>May 25</td>
<td>BLANDFORD, Elizabeth</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td></td>
<td>H 12 [65], +sisters, &amp;more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>LARDNER, Thomas</td>
<td>a1679</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Apothecary</td>
<td>M S 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>*NICHOLSON, Henry</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Student, physician? Professor of Botany, Trinity College, Dublin</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 23</td>
<td>CHENEY, Richard</td>
<td>a1678</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Waterman</td>
<td>C [6]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>July 25</td>
<td>RAWSON, Benjamin</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Aug 25</td>
<td>PORTALÈS, Jaques</td>
<td>p1676</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>H Gentleman</td>
<td>M S 1 +3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Aug 28</td>
<td>ROGERS, William</td>
<td>a1678</td>
<td>a1660</td>
<td>EN?</td>
<td>p1712</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Sept 7</td>
<td>MISSION, Jaques</td>
<td>a1660</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>1 +13, +371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Sept 7</td>
<td>DE MAZIÈRES, Louis</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Sieur de Voutron</td>
<td>1 =460 [9]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Sept 14</td>
<td>GRENIER, Jean</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Sept 21</td>
<td>SOULIER, Jaques</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Merchant hatter? Priest?</td>
<td>P 1 [139]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Oct 5</td>
<td>*WISE, Robert</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sawyer</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>BOUÉT, Marie</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>CHARRIER, Jaques</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Commoner</td>
<td>2 =108, + 3 children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>GERALD, François</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Commoner</td>
<td>2 =241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>MONY, Jean</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 =374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>THIBAULT, Thomas</td>
<td>a1679</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td>2 =245 [13]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>MAYN, Mr.</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>FR?</td>
<td>H?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>OLIVER, Mr.</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>FR?</td>
<td>H?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>GEIPIN, Mr.</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>FR?</td>
<td>H?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>DUCROS, Daniel</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>EASTMAN, Susan</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Ph?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 [24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>GUILLEMOT, Jean</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Commoner</td>
<td>S H 3 =128, +127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Oct 18</td>
<td>PICKWORTH, Henry</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>Q Tanner</td>
<td>[65, 426], [1 friend]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Oct 31</td>
<td>CLARK, John Adam</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 =303, +251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Oct 31</td>
<td>DOUGLAS, Robert</td>
<td>a1678</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rich Merchant of the East India Company</td>
<td>4 [428?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>ENTRY</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DOB</td>
<td>POB</td>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>OCC/STAT</td>
<td>ROLE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>CONN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Nov 7</td>
<td>DEVAUX, Marie</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>p1723?</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Commoner?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Nov 7</td>
<td>KING, Emma</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-39?, +83?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Nov 7</td>
<td>LE PAGE, Mlle.</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+127, +230, +360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Nov 7</td>
<td>NOBLE, Samuel</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1730</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bookseller</td>
<td>M S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Nov 7</td>
<td>PAYN, Jean</td>
<td>FR?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Butcher?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Nov 7</td>
<td>REASON, Hal</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>A?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Nov 14</td>
<td>DUTTON, John</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>1713?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+66, [49]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Nov 14</td>
<td>KING jr., William</td>
<td>p1700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+39, +223?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Nov 14</td>
<td>LANGTUIT, Pierre</td>
<td>a1664</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&amp; +224, &amp;360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Nov 14</td>
<td>MOULT, Mary</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>=3, +93, +376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Nov 23</td>
<td>ARPWOOD, Thomas</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Nov 23</td>
<td>BENNET, Stephen</td>
<td>p1700</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>A?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+101, +102?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Nov 23</td>
<td>BERNARD, Joseph</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+103, +104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Nov 23</td>
<td>Mar 11, 1707/08</td>
<td>COCK, John</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>A?</td>
<td>Clockmaker</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+ 1 son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Nov 23</td>
<td>FOSTER, Mary</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>=45?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Nov 23</td>
<td>SMALL, Thomas</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>=219, female relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Nov 23</td>
<td>SOUTHOUSE, Filmore</td>
<td>p1695</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+164, &amp;13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Nov 23</td>
<td>VERGNON, Louise</td>
<td>a1682</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>=409, +240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Nov 23</td>
<td>VERGNON jr., Samuel</td>
<td>p1700</td>
<td>a1694?</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>a1710?</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+239, +409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Nov 28</td>
<td>GERALD, Anne</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Wife of a commoner</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>=207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Nov 28</td>
<td>HUBBARD, Elizabeth</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Nov 28</td>
<td>Dec 25, 1707</td>
<td>NUTT, Guy</td>
<td>a1685</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>(Q)</td>
<td>P M H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>=379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Nov 28</td>
<td>PARIS, Jaques</td>
<td>a1665</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Tradesman?</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[13]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Nov 28</td>
<td>Jan 19?</td>
<td>THIBAULT, Marie</td>
<td>a1679</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>=209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Nov 28</td>
<td>WHARTON, Edward</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Receiver general?</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+88, +413?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Nov 28</td>
<td>WHARTON, Isaac</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+88, +413?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>ALDERIDGE, Thomas</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>BAGNAL, George</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>BEER, Hamond</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>&amp;266, &amp;267</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>=217, +303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>CLARK jr., John</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>Aug 1707</td>
<td>FINKLEY, Anne</td>
<td>a1668</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>=254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>DRAYCOTT, Ebenezer</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&amp;47, &amp;120, &amp;121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>FINKLEY, Nathan</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Furrier</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>HARLING, Sarah</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>=343?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>*HARTLAND, John</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>LE TELLIER jr., Daniel</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+34, +73, +258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>LE TELLIER, Jaques</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+34, +73, +257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
<td>BEER, Handrior</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+260?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
<td>BARR, John</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+259?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
<td>DEVAUX, Suzanne</td>
<td>1653?</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Silk merchant's widow</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
<td>PERROT, Marguerite</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Daughter of a merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+151, +152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
<td>PRADE, Jean</td>
<td>c1705</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+35, +390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
<td>PRADE, Josué</td>
<td>c1705</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+35, +390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
<td>ROCFORT, Peter</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1737?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mime, inventor</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Dec 12</td>
<td>BEER, Beata</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+267...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>ENTRY</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DOB</td>
<td>POB</td>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>OCC/STAT</td>
<td>ROLE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>CONN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Dec 12</td>
<td>BEER, Sarah</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>EN?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+266…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Dec 12</td>
<td>LLEWELLYN, William</td>
<td>EN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Dec 12</td>
<td>LOW, Robert</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Dec 12</td>
<td>RICHARDSON, Robert</td>
<td>a1691</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1732?</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Societies of writers to the signet?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>[24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Dec 12</td>
<td>SPRAGG, John</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Dec 15</td>
<td>*ARTAUD, Pierre</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**c.1798**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>POB</th>
<th>DOD</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>OCC/STAT</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>CONN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALLIX, Pierre</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>+family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALLIX, Mme.</td>
<td>c1650</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALLIX, Jean Pierre</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>+273,+274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALLIX, William</td>
<td>1688/9</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>+273,+274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALLIX, Marie</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>+273,+274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALLIX, Gilbert</td>
<td>1693/4</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1767?</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>+273,+274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALLIX, Margaret</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>+273,+274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td>*ARTAUD, Catherine</td>
<td>1688a</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASH, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASH, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASHEY, Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bagnal, Mary</td>
<td>c1688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=221?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td>BALBING, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td>BARBER, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
<td>BARBER, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
<td>BARKER, Joshua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
<td>BASIN, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BASIN, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td>BENNET, George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Betty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>[67]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td></td>
<td>BILLARD, David/Daniel</td>
<td>a1685</td>
<td>1664-69</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Soldier Lieutenant</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>[37, 227] [Mazel]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
<td>BISHOP, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
<td>BOISSIER, Abraham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp;12?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
<td>BOUHAULT, Marie</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Bourgeois</td>
<td>[13]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td>BOUSSAC, Moïse</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>=105, [goldsmith (Hoare?) and his servant].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
<td>BRIDGES, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
<td>BROUSSE, Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td></td>
<td>BULL, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td>BULLMORE, Mr. ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td>BURROUGHS, Rebecca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td></td>
<td>BYFIELD, Dorothy</td>
<td>a1675</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
<td>CALVERLY, Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Betty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>[67]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
<td>CASE, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
<td>CASWELL, John</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Astronomer</td>
<td>[9], +friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHILD, Martha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chichester Friends?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHOLMONDLEY, Mr.</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHOLMONDLEY, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHOLMONDLEY, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>301,+302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLARK, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td>217, 109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
<td>COLLISON, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td>COMB, Joan</td>
<td>a1700</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>[166]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#73-417 are listed alphabetically from list C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ENTRY #</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>POB</th>
<th>DOD</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>OCC/STAT</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>CONN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>CONWAY, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>COOK, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1673</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>COOK, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1673</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>COOT, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[365]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>CORBYN, Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>COTTON, Joan</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1700</td>
<td>EN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>COUGHEN, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[24], +1 daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>COULON, Mlle. (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>COURTNEY, Jenny</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1700</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[64], [65]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>CRAVEN, Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1678</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=55, +children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>CREAM, Joan</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>CREED, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>CROISSAC, Mlle.</td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>DARBY, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>DAVIES, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>DAWSON, Hannah</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>DU PONT, Antoine</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1685</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=475 (bigamy)? =324, &amp; sister-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>DURAND, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>DURAND, Mme.</td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>EASTON, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>EYRES, Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1692</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+327, [24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>EYRES, Robert?</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+326, +son, &amp; 1 relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>FORESTER, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Oilman?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>FOWLER, Edward</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1632</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[457], +5-8 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>FOX, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>FOULSTER, Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>FREAK, William (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Gentleman, Writer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>GENTIL, Mlle.</td>
<td></td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>GLOVER, Constance</td>
<td></td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=94, +children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>GODFRY, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>GOOD, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1677</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>GREEN, Anna</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1675?</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[165]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>GROVES, Joan</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hackney friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>HALL, Martha</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writer? S?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>HALLOWAY, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>HAMMOND, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>HARLING, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a1668</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+255, +425?, +2 daughters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>HARRYS, Timothy</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gentleman?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>HARTLET?, John</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>HARTMAN, John</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>HEADLEY, Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>HICKES, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>HIDE, John</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>HOWE, Susannah</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

308
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ENTRY</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>POB</th>
<th>DOD</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>OCC/STAT</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>CONN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHNSON, Elizabeth</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td></td>
<td>JOHNSON, George</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coachman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[15, Lacy's servants]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
<td>KEIMER, Samuel</td>
<td>a1666</td>
<td></td>
<td>p1718</td>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td></td>
<td>50, +48, +49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
<td>KINNADY, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td></td>
<td>LADORE, Pierre (?)</td>
<td>FR?</td>
<td>H?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joiner?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAMB, Bulfinch</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>p1731</td>
<td>Captain? Agent of the English African Company?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td></td>
<td>LA TOUCHE, Jaques</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[13]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE PAGE, Catherine</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=137, +child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE ROI, Mr.</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
<td>LEVI, Jaques</td>
<td>a1670</td>
<td></td>
<td>p1736</td>
<td>Bookseller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td></td>
<td>LEVIT, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
<td>LION, Susannah</td>
<td>FR?</td>
<td>H?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp;27?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOCKART, Mrs.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[309]?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAGPETH, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td></td>
<td>MARTIN, Susannah</td>
<td>SC?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=368, +sister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
<td>MARTIN, Mr.</td>
<td>SC?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAZARGUILLE, Mr.</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAZARGUILLE, Mme.</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td></td>
<td>MESSENGER, Mr.</td>
<td>EN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td></td>
<td>MESSENGER, Mrs.</td>
<td>EN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=371</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISSON, Judith</td>
<td>a1640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minister's wife widow</td>
<td>+13, +200, +2 daughters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISNON, Marguerite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td>MONY, Mme.</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
<td>MORETON, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Printer, Widow</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>+145 (son), +sister?, [apprentice (Humfrey)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEVILLE, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOBLE, Mrs.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=225, +son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
<td>NUTT, Mrs.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=243, +servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td>ORPEWOOD, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td></td>
<td>PARKER, Mrs.</td>
<td>IR?</td>
<td>A?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=96, +son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td>PATERSON, Ann</td>
<td>EN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp;38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td>PEARSON, Mrs.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
<td>PELLET, Judith</td>
<td>a1663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=189, +4 children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td>PENNY, Mrs.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[24]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHILIPPS, Elizabeth</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td></td>
<td>PIGGOTT, Mary</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td></td>
<td>PIKES, Mary</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLASS, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=153, +son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
<td>PONTIN, Mlle.</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRESTON, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRICE, Humphrey</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRICE, Mrs.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
<td>RAMSAY, Andrew</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Qt</td>
<td>Tutor, secretary</td>
<td>[420, 428]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAUNIER, Mme.</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
<td>SHEPHERD, Richard</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>ENTRY</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DOB</td>
<td>POB</td>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>OCC/STAT</td>
<td>ROLE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>CONN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Jan 19?</td>
<td>SHOVEL, Mrs.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Admiral's wife; Widow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[3?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPAVEN, Mary</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPONG, Rebecca</td>
<td>a1646</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Ph?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>STAMPLE, Sarah</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td></td>
<td>STEELE, Benjamin</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1744</td>
<td>Watchmaker</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>[9], [146], +402?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
<td>STEEL, Joseph</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staymaker</td>
<td></td>
<td>=95, +401?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
<td>STEVENSON, Mr.</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Ph?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
<td>STEVENSON, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Ph?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUTTLE, Mary</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td></td>
<td>TILBY, Joshua</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
<td>URQUHART, Mrs.?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=169?, [husband's apprentice, one servant]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td></td>
<td>VERGNON, Marthe</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>+239, +409, +240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td></td>
<td>VERGNON, Samuel</td>
<td>a1682</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>=239, +240, +408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td></td>
<td>WALL, Mr.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td></td>
<td>WARD, Catherine</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td>WEBSTER, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp;306, *daughters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td></td>
<td>WHARTON, Hannah</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=88, +many</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td></td>
<td>WHARTON, Joseph</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+88, +413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
<td>WHITEHEAD, Thomas</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Merchant H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WILLSHIN?, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td></td>
<td>WILLSON, Betty</td>
<td>c1695</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td></td>
<td>WILLSON, Mary</td>
<td>c1688</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Sailor/seaman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms/Mrs</td>
<td>Pastry cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+son and friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>from Bristol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>LE TELLIER, Elisabeth</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td></td>
<td>=34, +73, +257, +258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>JURIEU, Hélène</td>
<td>a1650</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Scholar H</td>
<td></td>
<td>=419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>early</td>
<td>JURIEU, Pierre</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Minister H</td>
<td>=418, [220]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>CUNINGHAME, James</td>
<td>c1665</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Qt &quot;laird&quot;</td>
<td>P M H</td>
<td>[394, 26, 429]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>GORDON, Kennet</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Qt</td>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>S H</td>
<td>+422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>July 14</td>
<td>GORDON, Clara</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Qt</td>
<td>&quot;Lady&quot;, Widow?</td>
<td>P M P +421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>July 25</td>
<td>*ABDEN, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Qt</td>
<td>&quot;Lady&quot;, Widow?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>July 25</td>
<td>ORME, Katharine</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Qt</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>July 27</td>
<td>*HARLING, Dorothy</td>
<td>a1679</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>+431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>Aug 1</td>
<td>SHAW, Samuel</td>
<td>a1689</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>[216]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRELAND, Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal's daughter</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>MIDDLETON, Margaret</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal's daughter</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAMERON, Isabel</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+430?</td>
<td></td>
<td>[420]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>ORUM, Catherine</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A P</td>
<td>[420]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 29</td>
<td></td>
<td>GREEN, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>&amp;333?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 29</td>
<td></td>
<td>HOPE, Thomas</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Qt</td>
<td>Baronet?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>[394, 420, 218]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPENCE, David</td>
<td>a1669</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Lawyer? Bank of Scotland? Secretary to the Darien Company?</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>[420]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>Dec 6</td>
<td>CAMERON, Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Qt</td>
<td></td>
<td>P M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>HARLING, John</td>
<td>a1699</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>c1711</td>
<td>Barber?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+425?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>NEWSON, Mr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>ENTRY</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DOB</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>OCC/STAT</td>
<td>ROLE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>CONN</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Jan 3</td>
<td>HOGG, James</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minister?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[394]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 5</td>
<td>INGLIS, James</td>
<td>a1673</td>
<td>Pr/Ph</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 5</td>
<td>CLAVA, Mrs.</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lady</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 9</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>a1690</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chaplain</td>
<td>Woolmote's family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 9</td>
<td>RAMSAY</td>
<td>a1695</td>
<td></td>
<td>Servant maid</td>
<td>Woolmote's family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>STUART, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>CARNEY, Mr.</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>FERGUSON, Mr.</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>a boy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td>[421]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>July 3</td>
<td>MACKENZIE, Margaret</td>
<td>a1688</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>Sept 10</td>
<td>DUTTON, Mary</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>A?</td>
<td>=66, +228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 19, 1708?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>Dec 24</td>
<td>DU LAURIER, Jonathan</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>+439, +440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Dec 24</td>
<td>DU LAURIER, Marie</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>+438, +440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Dec 24</td>
<td>DU LAURIER, Mme.</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>+439, +439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>Dec 25</td>
<td>GERVEAISE, Louis</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>Dec 27</td>
<td>JOYNEAUX, Louis</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1721?</td>
<td>Leatherworker</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>Dec 27</td>
<td>WALLER, Mary</td>
<td>1689?</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1722 A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>FALCONAR, Alexander</td>
<td>a1689</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1745 Qt</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>[420]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Jan 2</td>
<td>PERROT, Jeanne</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>+152, +262, +151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Jan 2</td>
<td>EVERSDEN, Hannah</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>p1718</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Daughter of a baker</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>&amp;450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>Jan 8</td>
<td>CARRIAGE, Liddy</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>HICKS, Nathaniel</td>
<td>a1684</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[449]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>TODD, Samuel</td>
<td>a1684</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>[448]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Mar 1</td>
<td>GARDNER, Thomas</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Antiquarian?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>&amp;446</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Mar 12</td>
<td>MILL, John</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td>P M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>Mar 16</td>
<td>FORBES OF PITTIFICHE, John</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1715 Qt</td>
<td>Son of a baronet</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>&amp;454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>Apr 26</td>
<td>PETITMAITRE, Mme.</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Sw Pr</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>FORBES OF PITSLIGO, John Alexander?</td>
<td>a1689</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1762 Qt</td>
<td>Laird?</td>
<td>&amp;452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>*PICKERING, Christina</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Widow?</td>
<td>P A &amp;455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PICKERING, Mr.</td>
<td>p1721</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>=455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>RIGG, Mr.</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>A?</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>May 23</td>
<td>FOSTER (FORSTER), John</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Minister, Priest</td>
<td>A S H &amp;236?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>BURGIS, Timothy</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>P?</td>
<td>[216]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>PARKS, Mary</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>[216]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>DE VOUTRON, Mme.</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>=201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>June 17</td>
<td>JACKSON, Miss</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>&amp;63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>June 21</td>
<td>BROUCKTOF, Mme.</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Sw Pr</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>June 21</td>
<td>MARSH, Mr. (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>June 29</td>
<td>VALENTIN, Judith</td>
<td>FR?</td>
<td>H?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>Aug 8</td>
<td>FORBES, Jean</td>
<td>a1664</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Qt</td>
<td>&quot;Lady&quot;</td>
<td>P M A &amp;420, &amp;452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>Aug 8</td>
<td>IRVINE (ERWYN?), Henrietta</td>
<td>p1643?</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>C?</td>
<td>P M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>Sept 18</td>
<td>SWAN, George</td>
<td>a1681</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Hammerman</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>Sept 26</td>
<td>OGILVIE, James</td>
<td>a1687</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1730 Qt</td>
<td>Lord Deskford, Politician</td>
<td>? &amp;420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>KEITH, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1684</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Qt</td>
<td>&quot;of Caddom&quot;, Widow</td>
<td>H &amp;472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>SHARP, Daniel</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471</td>
<td>Nov 5</td>
<td>SALTER, Mark</td>
<td>a1689</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P M [448, 449]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>Dec 12</td>
<td>KEITH, Mr.</td>
<td>a1689</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Qt</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>BOULTER, Mr.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>c1711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[162]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>ENTRY</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DOB</td>
<td>POB</td>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>OCC/STAT</td>
<td>ROLE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>CONN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>Mar 19</td>
<td>ANDREW, Mr.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>Mar 21</td>
<td>BRUNELLE, Anne</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>May 4</td>
<td>BOUCHÉ, Mr. (?) M.C.</td>
<td>FR?</td>
<td></td>
<td>H?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>PHILLIPS, William</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>A?</td>
<td>Weaver, Art's master?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>June 27</td>
<td>HARRIS, Mrs.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp;497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>July 3</td>
<td>BUNDY, Joseph</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>BROWNE, Mr. (?) N.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MANWAYRING, Mrs.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housekeeper, Widow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[146]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>Mar 20</td>
<td>*HANET, Paul</td>
<td>a1680</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>P1730</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Goldsmith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>June 3</td>
<td>WALL, Mary</td>
<td>EN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>June 13</td>
<td>DE RIDDEN, Marie Hélène</td>
<td>HO</td>
<td></td>
<td>B?</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+410?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>June 15</td>
<td>JAMETS, Etienne</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>June 15</td>
<td>WEBSTER, Sarah</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>July 6</td>
<td>GARDNER, Richard</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>P A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Nov 13</td>
<td>DOLADILLE, J.-J.</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Aug 3</td>
<td>BOUCHER, Mr.</td>
<td>FR?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Sept 5</td>
<td>PETERSON, Ann</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>Sept 30</td>
<td>PAGEZ, François</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>Oct 20</td>
<td>ROUSSIÈRE, Daniel</td>
<td>a1694</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>TOMLINSON, Samuel</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Q)</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[165]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td></td>
<td>PIGRIN, Mme</td>
<td>FR?</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Widow?</td>
<td>[48]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>Feb 5</td>
<td>EATON, Robert</td>
<td>a1696</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Feb.23, 1728 RC</td>
<td>Physician, Minister &amp; son of a minister</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[146]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>Mar 1</td>
<td>HATTON, Mrs.</td>
<td>a1699</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>July 23</td>
<td>HARRIS, Robert</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>Nov 10</td>
<td>BABER, Ann</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[499]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
<td>Nov 10</td>
<td>EVANS, Mary</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[498]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>WILKINS, William</td>
<td>a1690</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=161, &amp;65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Mar 25</td>
<td>WHARTON, George</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physican?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp;88, &amp;413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Apr 26</td>
<td>CLAY, Mr. Charles</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watchmaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>WEINTRAUB, William</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pi?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[146]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Sept 27</td>
<td>IRELAND, Timothy</td>
<td>p1732</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ZEIDIG, Johanna C.</td>
<td>a1700</td>
<td>GE</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Pi</td>
<td>Minister's wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steele, Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+/-401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>WHARTON, Mary</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+88, +413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>WHARTON, Sarah</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+88, +413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>WYNANTZ, Francis</td>
<td>a1700</td>
<td>GE</td>
<td>c1712</td>
<td>Pi</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>Sept 12</td>
<td>HAINES, Susannah</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Oct 3</td>
<td>HOLLIS, Isaac</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>B/Ph Gentleman</td>
<td>A [24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>ENTRY</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>DOB</td>
<td>POB</td>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>OCC/STAT</td>
<td>ROLE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>Early 1726?</td>
<td>STUBBES, George</td>
<td>a1706 c1683</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>Fellow of Exeter College, Reverend, Chaplain</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>[500]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>DELBOSE, Mme.</td>
<td>FR?</td>
<td>H?</td>
<td>Wife of a merchant?</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>SAUDIGNAN, Simon</td>
<td>FR?</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>WHITEHEAD, Joseph</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>&amp;415?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Jan 28</td>
<td>PLEWIT, Mary</td>
<td>EN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>Jan 28</td>
<td>SELLERS, Lydia</td>
<td>a1720</td>
<td>p1744</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>[518]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>Apr 17</td>
<td>SHAW, Mr.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[518]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>Apr 20</td>
<td>*BRAY, John</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[516, 517]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>Apr 28</td>
<td>*BOWERS, Mr.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[518]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>FISH, William</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[518]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>June 7</td>
<td>COOPER, Mrs.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>June 7</td>
<td>LAVINGTON, (Ms.)</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>[523]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>June 7</td>
<td>WISE, Mr.</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[522]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>June 13</td>
<td>WOLF, Shepherd</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>Feb 18</td>
<td>DU PLAN, Benjamin</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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