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Introduction

The People Called Quakers

They began amidst uncertainty, conflict, upheaval, and even personal torment. They were one of dozens of strange, sometimes bizarre sects that sprang up in England in the 1640s and 1650s, as common folk—farmers, smiths, cobblers, shopkeepers, wives, and mothers—took advantage of civil war and the breakdown of government control to assert the right to seek God, read the Bible, and find truth in their own ways. In what hostile observers called “a world turned upside down,” both the learned and the illiterate challenged accepted orthodoxies: political, social, and religious. Yet of all the sects that flourished in this generation—Diggers and Levelers, Ranters and Muggletonians, Brownists, Familists, and Fifth Monarchists, to name just a few—only one has survived to the present day. At first it had no name, then came to refer to itself as Children of the Light, then Friends of the Light, and finally the Religious Society of Friends. Detractors labeled them “Quakers,” an insulting nickname that the Friends would, for the most part, eventually embrace.

The early Quaker world was one of conflict. In 1642, Great Britain was plunged into a civil war that pitted King Charles I against Parliament. Although the power of king versus Lords and Commons was central, so was religion. Charles was a staunch supporter of a state-supported, ritualistic Protestant church ruled by bishops with him at their head. Parliament was dominated by Puritans, champions of a purer, Reformed church in which bishops would be abolished and ritual would be minimal. By 1650, the king was dead and the old Church of England no longer existed. Now the terms of the religious debate shifted. Would there be a new state church along Puritan lines, or would some form of religious toleration and liberty become the rule?

Coming of age amidst this uncertainty was a young man from a Puritan family in Leicestershire, George Fox. Born in 1624, Fox was by his own account an unusually solemn, pious youth. He was tormented by the claims of the competing groups around him, convinced that if he made the wrong choice in faith, a just and jealous God would damn him. So he embarked on a kind of spiritual pilgrimage, seeking out both clergy and laypeople with reputations for piety, yet, as he put it, “none spoke to my condition.” By 1646, his journey took him onto the moors of Yorkshire and Lancashire. There he had a series of experiences that we today would call revelations—he called them “openings”—in which Fox was certain that God spoke directly to him. As he described it later: “when all my hopes . . . were gone, so that I had nothing outwardly to help me, nor could tell what to do, then, Oh then, I heard a voice which said, ‘There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition.’”

Over the next few years, Fox’s “openings” continued, laying the foundations for the Quaker movement. Key was the idea of direct revelation, that God spoke directly to human beings through the Holy Spirit, just as he had in the days of the Hebrew
prophets and the apostles. While Fox was a devout student of the Bible—a Friend later said that if all the Bibles in the world were somehow lost, it could be reconstructed from George Fox’s memory—he insisted that the same spirit that inspired the scriptures still inspired believers. Fox gave equal weight to the centrality of the experience of the light of Christ. This light, he argued, was inward. He wrote, “every man was enlightened by the divine light of Christ, and I saw it shine through all, and they that believed in it came out of condemnation and came to the light of life, and became the children of it, but they that hated it, and did not believe in it, were condemned by it, though they made a profession of Christ.” If Friends were obedient to this light within them, then they would know salvation; but if they disobeyed it, they would be damned. Radically, Fox and other early Friends argued that this light was in all, even those who had never heard of Jesus, and that obedience to it would bring anyone salvation, even without any knowledge of Christianity.

Such beliefs led Friends in other directions. While they valued preaching, and gave deep respect to their own ministers, they repudiated any conception of an ordained clergy. All that was necessary was a call from God, and no human action could confer more legitimacy. Particularly radical was the Quaker conviction that women as well as men could be called to preach and minister. Few features of early Quakerism were as controversial as the place of women within it. Fox’s first convert was a woman, Elizabeth Hooton, who herself became a well-known Quaker preacher.

Commitments to direct revelation and the ministry of all believers also shaped Quaker worship. It had no predetermined form; ritual was entirely absent. Quaker worship included no preset prayers or recitations of formulas or creeds, no singing of hymns or psalms. Friends gathered in utterly plain, unornamented buildings, waiting in silence, confident that if God had something to be shared with the gathered meeting, then he would inspire someone present to speak. Theoretically, that might be any member of the congregation. In practice, however, most of the speaking or preaching was done by “Public Friends,” Friends who had “a gift in the ministry.” Such Friends’ status, however, came entirely from their gifts as preachers and their reputations for piety and spiritual wisdom, what Friends came to refer to as “weight.” While Public Friends exercised considerable authority and constituted the movement’s leadership, they did not assume pastoral offices.

Early Friends did not lack confidence in their inspiration. Many, particularly Fox, argued that it was possible for humans, through obedience to the light and the leadings of the Holy Spirit, to achieve perfection, the sinless state of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden before the Fall. They took other radical positions, most notably on the nature of the sacraments. Friends argued that baptism and communion should be understood as purely spiritual, that “outward” observances such as water baptism and “the supper” with bread and wine were unnecessary and could even detract from real spirituality and Christian experience.

This determination to achieve perfect obedience and avoid anything that might detract from the guidance of the inward light and the Holy Spirit manifested itself in other ways. Friends became known for their commitments to distinctive practices that set them apart from many of their neighbors. They shunned outward decoration and display. Even relatively well-to-do Friends were expected to live simply, not using dress or ostentation to cast themselves as socially superior. One manifestation was the
Quaker refusal to use courtesy titles such as “Mister” or “Your Honor” or “My Lady” or “Your Excellency” that were considered both good manners and appropriate social deference in seventeenth-century England. While not committed to a leveling of all social ranks, Friends believed that the use of such “compliments” encouraged sinful pride and vanity. Similarly, Quaker men refused to doff their hats to their “betters.” Perhaps best known was the Quaker insistence on addressing others as “thee” and “thou.” Grammatically, this was the singular of “you,” but it had become customary to use “you” to show respect to parents and social superiors. Friends, however, refused to follow such practices. Another Quaker peculiarity was refusal to swear legal oaths, which Friends believed implied that one could be trusted to speak truthfully only in certain situations.

Friends saw all of their activities as embraced in what they labeled “the lamb’s war,” the lamb being Jesus Christ. They were convinced that they were called to play a central role in advancing the kingdom of God on earth. Many shared an apocalyptic expectancy that it would happen in their lifetimes.

Friends also proved aggressive in advocating and seeking converts to their beliefs. Between 1647 and 1652, Fox appealed to small groups of religious radicals in the north of England, many of whom described themselves as “seekers.” By 1652, however, the foundations for a movement were laid. He felt inspired by a vision that he had on Pendle Hill in Lancashire, where he saw “a great people to be gathered.” Fox attracted a capable group of supporters, of whom the most important were James Nayler, a farmer from Yorkshire, and Margaret Fell, a Lancashire gentle-woman whose home, Swarthmore Hall, became the effective headquarters of the movement, and who in 1669 married Fox. Cadres of Public Friends, who later became collectively known as the “Valiant Sixty,” took the Quaker message south, making thousands of converts. By 1660, London and Bristol had come to rival Yorkshire and Lancashire as Quaker centers.

The rapid growth of such a radical movement was not unopposed. The very name “Quaker” was first used as an insult for Friends in 1650, from a widespread conviction that Friends would shake and quake under the influence of the Holy Spirit. By 1653, Puritan ministers were issuing pamphlet attacks on the movement with titles such as The Irreligion of the Northern Quakers. Dozens of such works appeared before 1660. The sources of opposition were varied. Some critics saw Quakers as blasphemers who made themselves equal to Christ. Friends often invited such attacks with their self-assertion and combativeness. An example is Mary Fell, the daughter of Quaker leader Margaret Fell, writing to a local minister: “Lampitt, the plagues of God shall fall upon thee and the seven vials shall be poured out upon thee and the millstone shall fall upon thee and crush thee as dust beneath the Lord’s feet. How can thou escape the damnation of hell?” Mary Fell was eight years old. Some Friends interrupted services of other groups to point out their shortcomings. A few Friends were led to “go naked as a sign,” either for self-abasement or to demonstrate their own spiritual innocence. Most controversial was James Nayler, who before 1656 rivaled Fox as a Quaker leader. That year, however, Nayler and a group of followers made a bizarre entry into Bristol that appeared calculated to reenact Christ’s entry into Jerusalem, leading many observers to accuse Nayler of blasphemy. Nayler was jailed, tried by Parliament, and severely punished. Hundreds of other Friends found themselves imprisoned before
1660. The restoration of the monarchy in 1660 worsened the situation of Friends. The new king, Charles II, without firm religious views himself, sometimes found Quaker effrontery amusing, but the gentry-dominated Parliament equated religious dissent with sedition. As Friends struggled to find their place in the new order, one response was to solidify a repudiation of violence that had appeared in the thought of many Friends in the 1650s, what would become known as the “Peace Testimony.” Some historians see this as a calculated response to political change, others as simply a strengthening of a basic Quaker belief. Early in 1661, after a failed radical uprising in London, Fox and other leading Friends issued a statement: “All bloody principles and practices, we . . . do utterly deny, with all outward wars and strife and fightings with outward weapons, for any end or under any pretense whatsoever.” Pacifists were unlikely supporters of armed rebellion. Nevertheless, Parliament between 1661 and 1664 passed a series of laws that effectively outlawed Quaker worship. As a result, thousands of Friends were fined and imprisoned over the next three decades, and many died in prison.

The Quaker response was complex. To aid the suffering, and to promote group solidarity, Friends became more organized, creating a series of monthly, quarterly, and yearly business meetings, with the yearly meeting as the highest authority. The monthly and quarterly meetings were remarkable for including women Friends, albeit in separate groups. Friends also became adept in using the English legal system, showing themselves quite willing to take advantage of technicalities to escape punishment. Friends with gentry connections, such as Margaret Fell, employed them to Quaker advantage.

After 1660, Quakerism changed in other ways. By 1664, several important early leaders, such as James Nayler, were dead. The survivors, led by Fox, lost some of their earlier sense of apocalyptic urgency. Friends no longer expected to convert the entire world, or initiate the kingdom of God. Friends continued to attract converts but not at the same rate as in the 1650s. Two Friends “convinced” (the Quaker term for converted) in the 1660s would be especially important. One was William Penn (1644-1718), an Oxford-educated son of an admiral who would become a leading minister, a prolific writer, and a visible Quaker politician. The other was Robert Barclay (1648-1690), a Scot trained by Jesuits who would become the new movement’s most important systematic theologian. His 1676 treatise, An Apology for the True Christian Divinity, would increasingly define the boundaries of Quaker faith.

Between 1660 and 1690, the geographic boundaries of Quakerism expanded. Public Friends had traveled widely in the 1650s—two even made it to Constantinople with the goal of converting the Ottoman emperor. More attention, however, went to British colonies in North America. Friends faced bitter persecution in Massachusetts and Connecticut—four, including one woman, Mary Dyer, were hanged in Boston between 1659 and 1661. In other places, Friends were banished, fined, and imprisoned. But by the 1670s, meetings had been established in the British West Indies, the Chesapeake, Rhode Island, Long Island, and Albemarle Sound. George Fox himself traveled widely in the Caribbean and from New England to the Carolinas in 1672 and 1673.

Most important for Quaker development would be the Delaware Valley. In 1675, a group of British Quakers had purchased about half of the future state of New Jersey—
what was then called West Jersey—from an English nobleman. Quaker migration to
the east side of the Delaware River began soon afterward, and Burlington and Salem
became important Quaker settlements. In 1681, William Penn received a large grant of
land that would become Pennsylvania. Penn’s framework for government was a mix of
Quaker idealism and feudal autocracy. He saw himself in many ways as a benevolent
dictator. But he guaranteed religious liberty, opened office-holding to all Protestants,
tolerated Roman Catholics and Jews, instituted an enlightened criminal code, and
made liberal provisions for landownership. Power quickly passed into the hands of a
Quaker-dominated assembly. Penn took pains to negotiate with the Native American
inhabitants, and for the next seventy-five years relations between Europeans and
American Indians would be better than in any other British colony.

By the time of George Fox’s death in 1691, Quakerism’s survival was no longer in
question. In 1689, Parliament instituted religious freedom. While Quaker scruples
against bearing arms, swearing oaths, and paying tithes to the established church still
caus ed problems, Quaker worship was now legal. Second- and third-generation
Friends, generally more prosperous than most of their neighbors, found themselves
respectable. On both sides of the Atlantic, Friends responded by turning inward.

Historians usually refer to the period from roughly 1690 to 1820 as the era of
“quietism.” “Quietist” has become a convenient term for a Quaker outlook that
focused on the preservation of group discipline and fear of what Friends referred to as
“creaturely activity.” Friends saw obedience to God and attention to the inward light as
virtually depriving them of any right to heed human inclination, will, or intellect. They
strived to become empty vessels, devoid of any desire to think, say, or do anything that
was not clearly revealed as the divine will. Increasingly, Friends saw salvation as
something to be achieved gradually, through a lifelong process of growth into holiness,
sanctification, or perfection, which fitted believers for heaven. Friends advanced their
growth through introspection, avoiding “diversions” and “outward activity,” and
experiencing periods of mental suffering and depression that they referred to as
“baptisms.” Silence became more common in meetings for worship, as even Friends
who felt called to preach were terrified that they might speak without a clear leading.
The creation of the office of elder, charged with overseeing the ministry—encouraging
fledgling ministers but also discouraging those who apparently had mistaken their gifts
—strengthened such tendencies. While new members continued to join, they were
relatively few compared with the early period.

What historians refer to as a “reformation” between 1750 and 1780 reinforced this
direction. In both Great Britain and America, Friends gave increasing attention to the
enforcement of the rules and regulations that were embodied in the “discipline.”
Friends had always condemned moral lapses such as drunkenness or fornication, but
they now became less tolerant of deviations from Quaker peculiarities, particularly
marrying nonmembers. Friends were disowned even for erecting tombstones for
spouses. Statistical analysis suggests the loss of thousands of members, although high
birth rates meant that the number of Friends continued to grow.

Paradoxically, the era of quietism was also one of innovation in Quaker attempts to
influence the larger world. Although war in Pennsylvania ended peace with Native
Americans, Friends shifted their attention to attempting to defend Indian rights.
English Friends became pioneers in humane treatment of the mentally ill. English and
American Friends were at the forefront of prison reform movements. And Quakers were at the heart of the eighteenth-century antislavery movement. By 1784, Friends had ruled that no member could own a slave and that Friends who did own slaves must free them unconditionally. American Friends John Woolman and Anthony Benezet are recognized as central to eighteenth-century antislavery, while British Friends were at the heart of the movements to abolish first the slave trade in 1807 and then slavery in the British Empire in 1833.

By the early nineteenth century, however, signs of strain were becoming apparent on both sides of the Atlantic, especially in the United States. Its sources have been debated by Friends then, and historians now, but by 1828 Quakerism would fracture in a division that has endured to the present.

By the 1820s, Elias Hicks, a Quaker minister from Long Island, had become the most controversial figure in the Quaker world. An old man, born in 1748, Hicks was in most respects a staunch quietist whose writings show an intense desire to subordinate any hint of his own will to the leadings of the inward light. Hicks often felt led to travel and before his death in 1830 had visited most of the Quaker communities in North America.

By the 1820s, Hicks had become convinced that Quakerism was under siege, threatened by forces in the larger world. These ranged from commercialism (Hicks opposed construction of the Erie Canal as unnatural) to slavery to general “worldliness.” Hicks’s particular concern, however, was what he saw as the growing influence of non-Quaker evangelicalism on Friends. He argued that Friends who had formed ties with Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, and others through business or reform work had imbibed many of their ideas and were endangering true Quakerism. Hicks pointed to the increasing emphasis that some Friends were placing on the authority of the Bible, which he saw as diminishing the centrality of direct revelation and the inward light. From time to time, Hicks also advanced ideas about the nature of the divinity of Christ that some Friends saw as dangerous and at odds with historic Quakerism. Some Friends accused him of denying the Virgin Birth, a charge that Hicks denied. But Hicks was clear that he viewed Jesus Christ as unique because he was the only human who had ever been perfectly obedient to the inward light. This obedience made him the Christ; he was not born as Christ. To counter the inroads of “the world,” Hicks argued, Friends needed to undergo a reformation to restore the Society of Friends to its original basis.

Many Friends perceived this as simply historic Quaker doctrine, but others, both in North America and in the British Isles, denounced Hicks’s views as un-Quakerly, unchristian, and even atheistic. While maintaining their commitment to distinctive Quaker doctrines such as the inward light, they argued that Friends had always understood Jesus to have been born as the Christ. Moreover, salvation was achieved through faith in the efficacy of his blood shed on the cross, an understanding that Hicks denounced. Such Friends became known as Orthodox. By the early 1820s, leading Friends in Philadelphia were denouncing Hicks and urging New York Friends to silence him. Traveling Friends from Great Britain, where Hicks’s ideas found little support, strengthened the Orthodox. Social divisions may also have played a role. Studies have found that in the Philadelphia area, Orthodox Friends tended to be more prosperous and more likely to live in the city, while rural communities were Hicksite
strongholds. This pattern is not clear in other yearly meetings.

In spring 1827, the Philadelphia yearly meeting split, with Hicksites withdrawing to “reorganize” what they claimed was the true historic meeting. The division obliged other yearly meetings to decide which one they would recognize and thus take sides. This produced splits in New York, Baltimore, Ohio, and Indiana yearly meetings. New England, Virginia, and North Carolina sided with the Orthodox, as did Friends in the British Isles. Estimates are that Hicksites were about 40 percent of all American Friends.

The separations of 1827-28 set a pattern for the rest of the century. In the 1830s and 1840s, both Hicksite and Orthodox Friends in America faced bitter controversies, as did, to a lesser extent, Friends in the British Isles. While Orthodox Friends agreed in viewing Elias Hicks as dangerous, they soon found themselves divided over what their relationship with the larger Protestant world should be. Some, especially in England, came to question the doctrine of the inward light; the most extreme, who became known as Beaconites, were disowned by the larger body of British Friends. But other Friends began to articulate a vision of Quakerism that found common ground with evangelical Protestantism, subordinating the inward light to the guidance they found in the Bible, and urging Friends to be open to ties with other evangelicals. The most articulate advocate of such views was a wealthy English minister and banker, Joseph John Gurney (1788-1847), whose sister, Elizabeth Fry (1780-1845), won international fame as a prison reformer. Like-minded Orthodox Friends became known as Gurneyites. A minority of deeply conservative Orthodox Friends, in England and North America, saw such views as dangerous innovation, condemning Gurney. In North America, the most articulate critic was a New England minister, John Wilbur (1774-1856), who lent his name to the opponents of Gurney. When other New England Friends disowned him for what they saw as his unfair attacks, Wilbur and his supporters separated, producing another series of splits among Orthodox Friends. In turn, these critics of innovation often argued among themselves over points of theology or their relationships with other yearly meetings. This produced a bewildering series of splits among Wilburites, Middleites, Maulites, Kollites, Otisites, and Primitive Friends.

Hicksite women were not immune to these tendencies. In the aftermath of the separation, they were a heterogeneous group of conservatives opposed to what they saw as Orthodox innovation, incipient liberals who questioned the inspiration of some parts of the Bible, and ambivalent members who had simply followed the majority in their meetings without any deep sense of commitment. In the 1830s and 1840s, some Hicksites, most notably the Philadelphia minister Lucretia Mott (1793-1880), became active in reform movements such as temperance, nonresistance, and, most of all, the radical antislavery movement. All agreed that slavery was an evil, but conservatives argued that to join non-Quakers in reform causes endangered Quaker distinctiveness and would introduce influences similar to those that Orthodox Friends had embraced. The conservatives were a majority, and some radicals separated in the 1840s and 1850s to form groups that they called Congregational or Progressive Friends. Others, like Mott, remained within the larger Hicksite bodies. Hicksite women would be in the forefront of the women's rights movement for the rest of the century. Four of the five women who organized the first women's rights convention in American history—at
Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848—were Hicksite Friends or had Hicksite ties. Of the three most influential women’s rights activists of the nineteenth century—Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, and Susan B. Anthony—the last two were Hicksite Friends. By 1860, however, the Progressive groups of Friends had dwindled, with most either returning to the larger Hicksite bodies or joining other denominations. Many became Spiritualists.

The American Civil War saw almost all Friends firmly supportive of the Union. English Friend John Bright, a Member of Parliament, was unrelenting in his opposition to Confederate attempts to gain British support. The relatively small number of Friends in the Confederacy, all in Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee, opposed secession, and many young Quaker men fled north rather than be conscripted into the Confederate army. In the North, hundreds of Friends disregarded the strictures of their meetings and joined the Union army. Many other Friends, both men and women, went south during and after the war to work with the freed people as teachers or nurses.

The late nineteenth century was a period of change for most Friends. Most visible were those among American Gurneyites. Beginning in the late 1860s, most Gurneyite Friends in the United States were swept up in a wave of revivalism that transformed their lives and worship. The roots of this movement lay in an openness to influences from the larger religious world that Gurneyites had embraced since the 1830s. In the 1860s, many were urging a relaxation of some traditional rules, especially those against marrying a non-Quaker. But the driving force of the revival would be the interdenominational Holiness movement that had a profound impact on American Protestantism between 1850 and 1900. Its advocates argued that all Christians should have two separate, instantaneous experiences, both made possible by faith in the efficacy in the atoning blood of Christ. First they would be converted, born again, or “justified.” Then would come the experience of sanctification, or holiness, in which any propensity to sin would be eradicated. In the 1860s and 1870s, this movement drew many Gurneyite Friends. The best known, Hannah Whitall Smith of Philadelphia, had an uneven relationship with Friends. Others, such as David B. Updegraff, Luke Woodard, John Henry Douglas, and Esther Frame, used the message and revivalist techniques of the Holiness movement to revolutionize Quakerism. By 1890, most Gurneyites, an overwhelming majority of American Friends, had changed dramatically. The plain life was restricted mainly to the elderly. Pastors had taken charge of worship, and music had become central to it. Gurneyites followed the lead of other evangelicals in becoming aggressive proponents of missionary work. By 1920, they had established missionary outposts in Mexico, the Caribbean, China, Japan, and East Africa.

Such changes did not come without controversy. The revivals produced a new round of separations between 1877 and 1904, as traditionalist Friends left revived bodies to preserve the old ways. Gradually, they formed common cause with the older Wilburite bodies and became known as Conservative Friends.

Change also came to British Quakerism, although not as dramatically. Although by midcentury, the prevailing ministry and theology was strongly evangelical, most British Friends perceived Quakerism as declining. Unlike their American counterparts, a revival movement did not develop among them, but British Friends did establish
evening schools and mission meetings with paid staffs that not only brought in some new members but also gave many younger Friends a sense of purpose. Similarly, English Friends began missionary work in Palestine, Madagascar, and India.

As evangelical Friends innovated and transformed themselves, a liberal Quaker renaissance was emerging in the late nineteenth century. It had two sources. One was the Hicksite wing of American Quakerism. While rejecting revivalism and pastors, American Hicksites were receptive to other changes, significantly relaxing the rules on dress, amusements, and marriage to non-Quakers. By the 1880s, most identified themselves as liberal Protestants and reached out to Unitarians and other religious liberals. A parallel movement began in the London yearly meeting in the 1880s. A turning point came at a conference in Manchester in 1895, after which it was clear that liberal Friends would have the upper hand. In turn, by the early twentieth century, a small but influential group of liberal American Gurneyite Friends, led by Haverford College professor Rufus Jones, had emerged.

While differing on some issues, these liberals shared certain fundamental views about Christianity and Quakerism. They embraced modernist, critical study of the Bible. They emphasized the love and mercy of God, envisioning the death of Christ not as an atoning sacrifice but as an ultimate act of love. They became adherents of the Social Gospel, arguing that Quakerism required social activism on behalf of the poor and disadvantaged. While embracing modern life, however, they also embraced the Quaker past. Liberal Friends produced major works of Quaker history and gave new emphasis to traditional Quaker doctrines, particularly that of the inward light, which they used to argue for the essential goodness of humanity.

By the early twentieth century, Quakerism was becoming increasingly diverse. For the first time in its history, it included significant numbers of Africans, Asians, and Latin Americans. Theologically, it ranged from pastoral Friends who saw themselves as part of the emerging fundamentalist Protestant movement to liberal Friends who embraced Darwinian evolution and critical study of the Bible, with other Friends at almost every point on the doctrinal spectrum between these two extremes. Today, this diversity remains true of Quakerism worldwide, even as all claim spiritual descent from Fox and the “First Publishers of Truth.”
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