

2009

# 'Chipping at the Landmarks of our Fathers': The Decline of the Testimony against Hireling Ministry in the Nineteenth Century

Thomas D. Hamm  
*Earlham College, Richmond, USA*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/quakerstudies>

 Part of the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), and the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

## Recommended Citation

Hamm, Thomas D. (2009) "'Chipping at the Landmarks of our Fathers': The Decline of the Testimony against Hireling Ministry in the Nineteenth Century," *Quaker Studies*: Vol. 13: Iss. 2, Article 2.

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/quakerstudies/vol13/iss2/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Quaker Studies by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact [arolfe@georgefox.edu](mailto:arolfe@georgefox.edu).

‘CHIPPING AT THE LANDMARKS OF OUR FATHERS’:  
THE DECLINE OF THE TESTIMONY AGAINST HIRELING  
MINISTRY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY\*

Thomas D. Hamm

Earlham College, Richmond, USA

ABSTRACT

One of the distinctive features of Quakerism from the 1650s until the 1870s was its stance against any kind of pay for ministers, what Friends referred to as ‘hireling ministry’. Friends viewed a paid, authoritative pastoral ministry as contrary to Scripture, as tending toward preaching that pleased humans rather than God, as limiting the leadings of the Holy Spirit, and as generally corrupting. One of the criticisms of Orthodox by Hicksite Friends in the 1820s was that the Orthodox were compromising this testimony by associating with clergy of other denominations in reform and humanitarian causes, and both Orthodox and Hicksite Friends in the United States invoked this tradition to discourage Friends from joining abolition societies after 1830. Between 1860 and 1900, however, most Friends softened their stance. Hicksites, while eschewing paid ministry, came to view labeling other minister as ‘hirelings’ as being uncharitable and judgmental. American Gurneyites, swept up in a wave of revivalism in the 1870s, came to embrace pastoral ministry as the best way of caring for converts. In the British Isles, however, equally evangelical Friends of Gurneyite sympathies, for complex reasons, while also ceasing to label other clergy as ‘hirelings’, after some controversy and for complex reasons, rejected the pastoral system.

KEYWORDS

Quakerism; Religious Society of Friends; Evangelicalism; ministry; Holiness; Home Missions

In 1878, the Hicksite Baltimore Yearly Meeting was in the midst of revising its book of discipline. One of the proposals was to drop the ancient query whether Friends upheld a consistent testimony against a ‘hireling ministry’. Some Friends argued that it was a relic of the seventeenth century. But not all agreed. One spoke up to tell the Yearly Meeting that he ‘did not like this chipping at the landmarks of our Fathers’. His protest was unavailing. The Yearly Meeting replaced the negative query against ‘hireling ministry’ with a positive one on upholding a ‘free Gospel ministry’.<sup>1</sup>

The action of Hicksite Friends in Baltimore was not unique. Between 1800 and 1900, Quakerism was transformed by schism, missionary and evangelistic outreach, and social change. What had been a united Society of Friends splintered into at

least three, arguably four, bodies. Most had discarded the traditional practices of separation and peculiarity that had distinguished them, outwardly in dress and orally in speech, from their neighbors. An overwhelmingly Anglocentric group, most of whom were descended from seventeenth-century Quaker ancestors in the British Isles, had become more diverse, and was on the cusp of becoming far more international, as Friends sought converts in the Caribbean, Asia, and Africa. And a majority had given up the unique Quaker worship practice of waiting in silence and had become what we now usually refer to as pastoral Friends.

Even Friends who firmly rejected the pastoral system, however, had softened their opposition to a paid ministry in other denominations. Only among the most traditionalist members did one hear reference to 'hirelings'. Whether or not they embraced a pastoral form of worship for themselves, the overwhelming majority of Quakers had decided that active opposition to paid ministry was no longer a duty. This was, without question, one of the greatest changes to take place among Friends since the days of George Fox.

This evening I want to consider this change in four stages. First, after a brief examination of the foundations of the ancient testimony of Friends against a hireling ministry, I want to show how central it had become to Friends' understanding of themselves in the first decades of the nineteenth century. Second, I want to show its central role in the bitter Quaker divisions from the 1820s to the 1850s. Third, I want to show how, beginning in the 1820s, Friends came to soften their critique of a paid ministry in other denominations, and why even Friends who articulately affirmed what they called a 'free ministry' among Friends were willing to accept, and even praise, a paid ministry for others. Finally, I want to look at one of the great divergences of the Quaker world: how Gurneyite Friends in North America and the British Isles, equally evangelical in their understandings of Quaker faith in 1860, took such different paths on the subject of a pastoral ministry for Friends between 1880 and 1900. Both in the United States and the United Kingdom, decisions came with far more controversy than most Friends realize. The die had been cast for a divergence that has become greater with the passage of time and with whose consequences we still live.

One of the chief controversies between the first generation of Friends and their contemporaries was over the nature of ministry. Rosemary Moore has given us a succinct summary of the Quaker critique of the parish ministry they found in the 1640s and 1650s: 'The church building was not the house of God, formal worship of any kind was wrong, and ministers should give their services freely, like Jesus's disciples... Ministry should be given freely in accordance with the New Testament'. George Fox asked opponents: 'And is not this your own custom or tradition, that such must preach that be covetous, and strikers, and hirelings, when Christ tells you, "that a hireling will flee, and leave the flock"... By these doings the flocks are almost plucked to pieces by the hireling shepherds'. Thus, Quaker ministry came to be defined by what it was not. Like all Protestants, at least in theory, Friends accepted the necessity of a call; and like many of the radical sectarians of the seventeenth century, they believed that ministers should work at a secular occupation, or, if called to travel, be supported by voluntary donations.

What set Friends apart was their belief that ministry could not be on schedule—no Friend could ever be sure when or where God might call him or her to minister.<sup>2</sup>

Even as many Quaker edges softened in the eighteenth century, this one did not. The two foremost systematic American expositors of Quakerism before the Hicksite Separation of 1827–28, Jesse Kersey and Elisha Bates, although they would take opposite sides in it, were largely in agreement on this. In his 1815 treatise, Kersey was succinct but seemingly absolute. ‘But though we are satisfied that male and female are called to the ministry; we do not believe they are to be paid for their labours, or to preach by contract; but agreeably to the charge of Christ to his disciples:—“Freely ye have received, freely give”. We cannot therefore own any in the ministry who disobey this command of Christ’. Kersey went on to argue that it was the duty of Christians to relieve the necessities of the poor, which could include ministers. But, he concluded, ‘as we do not unite with those who are hirelings, so neither do we own such to be the ministers of Christ, who profess to be always ready, and who make it their rule to preach at all times when an assembly is gathered’. Kersey effectively challenged the bona fides of virtually every minister who was not a Friend.<sup>3</sup>

A decade later, Elisha Bates, the clerk of Ohio Yearly Meeting, elaborated on these points. ‘The Society of Friends, allow no salaries, for the support of their ministers, believing it right that they should minister to their own necessities’, he wrote. ‘The ministry never was designed for a *trade*; for the true ministers do not take the oversight of the Church for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind’. But Bates added a significant qualification that apparently never occurred to Kersey: ‘And yet we do not suppose, that all those ministers are actuated by these motives, who, according to the roles of the Society to which they belong, are provided with a maintenance’. Still, Bates’s emphasis was on the danger of preaching for pay: ‘The gospel never can be made an article of bargain and sale, like merchandise in the market, or like a man’s professional skill’.<sup>4</sup>

Friends agreed on the reasons for this testimony. First, they understood it as the command of Christ that Christians should support each other without the compulsion of contracts. They cited biblical texts such as Matt. 1:10 or 1 Pet. 5:2.<sup>5</sup> But they saw hireling ministry as irreconcilable with other aspects of Quaker ministry as well. Thomas Willis, a Long Island Friend who found himself in a pamphlet war with Billy Hibbard, a Methodist minister, put one cogent argument forth in 1812. Hibbard called Quaker ministers ‘eye servants’, who were like a hired hand in a harvest field who sat down ‘lolling till he sees the master coming, then jumps up and goes to work till the master retires’. Willis’s answer was devastating: before Friends could go to work, they had to wait for the Master’s directions. In contrast, the Methodist, ‘whose time is always ready, feels not this necessity, and can preach on all occasions, may, by the power of his own natural abilities, operate upon the animal passions, and many times produce a warmth by the sparks of his own kindling, which being void of the Heavenly power, cannot profit the people at all’.<sup>6</sup>

Just as Friends believed that hirelings ‘preached in their own will’, they believed that hirelings had no choice. They were contracted to preach, and their

congregations expected them to do so at stated places and times. If they refused, they would have broken their agreement and so would lose their living. Joseph John Gurney was pointed on this issue. Such agreements made ministry a matter of human arrangement rather than divine calling, and any right-minded believer would see that 'the compact which binds the minister to preach, on the condition that his hearers shall pay him for his preaching, assumes the character of absolute inconsistency with the spirituality of the Christian religion'.<sup>7</sup>

Some Friends went further and argued that *all* who accepted pay for preaching were necessarily corrupt. Typical was Emmor Kimber, a Friend from Chester County, Pennsylvania. 'A hireling preacher is a worldly-minded man who makes a trade of preaching; bargains with the people to preach for a specific sum, and sets down where he can get the most money', Kimber wrote. Such ministry was, in his view, 'a curse instead of a blessing'. Thomas Wetherald, a minister from Alexandria, Virginia, agreed. Hirelings were incapable of being true shepherds of the faithful. 'And is it not obvious, that when men with interested minds undertake to preach the gospel of Christ, they will preach conformably to their own views?' he asked. 'Is it possible that men, receiving one, two, three, or four thousand dollars a year, can faithfully testify their sense of the slips and wickedness of those employ them? No; this fault must be covered, and that weakness overlooked, because they preach for hire, and divine for money'.<sup>8</sup>

A final implication of this testimony informed rules on marriage. Friends, of course, were required to marry only within the group. But usually in England, and often in the United States, marriage out of Meeting meant marriage by a 'hireling'. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting recorded its judgment that this countenanced 'the exercise of a function which is designed merely to advance the interests and profits of a certain class of men; and which is no part of the office of a Gospel Minister'. London Yearly Meeting urged the 'great inconsistency and pernicious effects, of marriages by the priest'.<sup>9</sup>

Those familiar with early nineteenth-century Quaker history will have noticed that this Quaker consensus crossed the boundaries of the separation that would come in 1827-28. Kersey, Kimber, and Wetherald were Hicksites; Bates, Gurney, and Willis Orthodox. But one can make a case that the testimony against hireling ministry was an issue in the separation.

Certainly Hicksite Friends perceived that Orthodox Friends had formed common cause with 'hirelings' in the 1820s. Emmor Kimber worried that Orthodox Friends had fallen victim to what he called 'a kind of fashionable cant...that has turned the Christian Testimony against hireling priests backwards; they call it *Charity!*... It exists in those that court popularity and the applause of men'. When Hicksites looked at Orthodox Friends who were active in Bible and missionary societies with non-Friends, they saw compromises of Quaker peculiarity and distinctiveness. 'If we, as a society, so far depart from the teachings of the spirit of truth, as to mingle with other professors in what is called religious concerns, though professedly to promote the cause of Christ', Philadelphia Yearly Meeting told its members in 1830, 'our individuality, as a people, will be lost, and our excellent testimonies, as it respects us, will fall to the ground'.<sup>10</sup>

Hicksites were unrestrained in denouncing what they saw as the corruptions of evangelical clergy in the 1820s and 1830s. Elias Hicks was unsparing. 'You might search the kennels of any great city, and take soldiers, sailors, and the very worst of mankind', he preached, 'and they would be more likely to enter into the kingdom of heaven than the hireling priest'. Many attacks focused on money, what one called 'the profligate avarice of the professed teachers of Christianity'. A Wilmington Friend, Benjamin Ferris, elaborated: 'The proofs of the *mercenary* character of *educated* ministers, generally of every age and sect, are so abundant as to produce embarrassment *only* on the *choice* of evidence'. Such Hicksites saw nothing less than an evangelical, primarily Presbyterian, plot to unite church and state. 'People already begin to see that a numerous *priesthood* will prove only a burden and a curse, and overthrow the liberties of a country', Ferris concluded. Other Hicksites agreed. 'That lust of power which has ever distinguished the ecclesiastics of all times and countries, is not without its influence in inflaming the zeal of modern professors', one wrote. 'We conceive that the accumulation of immense wealth, drawn from the people under specious pretences, and placed almost exclusively under the control of the clergy, to be ominous of sinister designs...incompatible with the freedom of the people'. Such fears continued to be common well into the 1860s among Hicksites.<sup>11</sup>

This fear of reform and humanitarian movements as plots by evangelical ministers was central to the bitter divisions among Friends in the 1840s and 1850s over the anti-slavery movement in the United States. All Hicksite Friends opposed slavery, of course, but they differed about whether it was right for Friends to join 'mixed' anti-slavery societies that embraced non-Quakers. Many Hicksites saw such groups as being just as dangerous as older evangelical enterprises. Some Friends in New York summarized this fear in 1840: such groups 'may draw Friends to associate with the people of the world, and even with the clergy; and may lead to the violation of some of our important testimonies, particularly that against a hireling ministry'. One Friend in 1839, for example, characterized the abolitionist movement as 'a mercenary priesthood endeavouring to extend its influence'. Others equated salaried abolitionist lecturers with 'hireling ministers'. Especially outspoken was the New York City minister George F. White, who in 1841 told his daughters 'he had rather they would go to the theater than to go hear Angelina Grimke', the well-known abolitionist, speak. When another Friend asked the reason, he responded that Grimke was 'laying waste the most precious testimonies of the Society...the testimony against the hireling ministry'. Many Friends agreed with the Hicksite Indiana Yearly Meeting in 1843, when it urged its members not to attend lectures by paid agents.<sup>12</sup>

Abolitionist Friends could not deny that they worked with paid ministers and agents, so they responded variously to such attacks. Phebe Post Willis, a New York Friend, opined hopefully in 1838, that anti-slavery, by bringing 'Preasts [*sic*] and people' together, 'would have a tendency to dethrown [*sic*] Priestly influence'. Charles Marriott, another prominent New York Hicksite who was also a director of the American Anti-Slavery Society, concluded that 'in regard to our associating with others in Anti Slavery societies, I am apprehensive that many of

us might insensibly lose ground by so doing, unless more watchfully attentive to our best guide, than I fear we should be'. But for Marriott, the solution was obvious: 'But if we were *so attentive*, & felt it to be our place to mingle, our lights would in my opinion be far more extensively useful than they are now'.<sup>13</sup>

Other abolitionist Friends were willing to go farther. A good example is Isaac Post of Rochester, New York. 'For some cause I hate the Priest's position', he wrote in 1859. 'I early formed the idea from reading Friends' writings that they were the enemies of man, enemies of God, and I still feel as tho they stand in the way of progress'. Yet his contacts with fearless abolitionist clerics like Theodore Parker and Samuel J. May had softened his conviction: 'I almost forget the minister', he conceded. 'Or when they are on the free platform pleading for humanity, for justice, I feel that I could almost take them to my heart'. Lucretia Mott went farther; she admired the Unitarian icon William Ellery Channing and in the British Isles in 1840 sampled Unitarian and even Roman Catholic services. Jonathan Thomas, an Ohio Hicksite, concluded that 'there is to[o] much done by a great many of our Society to keep up the partition walls between us and others... I should like to know these [*sic*] walls enough broken down to receive good let it come from where it would'.<sup>14</sup>

The most radical position would be that of the Congregational or Progressive Friends, who separated from the Hicksite Yearly Meetings in the 1840s and 1850s to escape what they saw as intolerable limitations on their liberty of conscience in acting against slavery and other evils. They were free in comparing the clerks and elders of the older organization to 'bishops and reverends'. Lucretia Mott noted approvingly that the new Congregational Yearly Meetings were established 'on radical principles—doing away with select mgs, ordaining ministers'. But on the other hand, they were so committed to freedom of thought and speech that they embraced even paid ministers. One supporter wrote in 1852 that he would 'allow any one to speak in meeting if he was a good man. I would allow a Methodist preacher... I go for the greatest liberty'. The Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting of Progressive Friends welcomed Theodore Parker and a variety of other clergy.<sup>15</sup>

The Progressive Friends largely disintegrated after 1860, but they were better precursors of the future than the larger body of more traditionalist Hicksites. Increasingly, Hicksite Friends discarded the language of 'hireling ministry' when highlighting differences with other denominations. Striking was a minute of Genesee Yearly Meeting in 1866. In the previous decade, it yielded to no one in its ferocious scoring of 'priestcraft'. But now it condemned 'harsh denunciations or bitter anathemas' aimed at 'hirelings', calling instead for a 'spirit of charity'. Four years later, the *Friends' Intelligencer* in Philadelphia noted that a growing number of Friends objected to the label 'hireling' as an unkind epithet. John J. Cornell, perhaps the most influential Hicksite minister at the end of the century, refused to denounce ministers of other denominations. He thought that the older vituperation aimed at 'hirelings' tended 'to repel instead of to gather, to engender prejudice instead of making an open way for others'. In 1873, Lucretia Mott told Philadelphia Yearly Meeting that when Friends referred to ministers of other denominations, it should be as 'paid', not 'hireling'. The latter, she said, was 'an

opprobrious term and unworthy of our elevated standard as a Society'. Louisa J. Roberts, another weighty Philadelphia Hicksite, agreed. She supported Mott, asserting that 'we had outgrown this', and that contacts with non-Quaker ministers had persuaded her that 'there were many earnest and excellent men among them'. Joshua Ross, a Friend from Chappaqua, New York, put the case a little differently a decade later. 'I believe there are many good men that take pay for their service and [are] not hirelings... Let us bear our testimony [*sic*] in favor of our principles and not condemn others that think different'. In 1885, in an article that would have been unthinkable thirty years earlier, a writer in the *Intelligencer* answered the question, 'Is a Paid Minister Necessarily a Hireling?' with a resounding 'no'.<sup>16</sup>

Between 1880 and 1900, Hicksites found unity on the question of a paid ministry. On the one hand, they firmly rejected it in their Meetings, although not without some surprising discussion, concluding that a 'free ministry' based on silent worship was an essential of Quakerism. This took place against a background of deep concern about the quality of ministry in Hicksite Meetings. As early as 1875, an Indiana Hicksite had worried that 'there is in both branches of Friends a growing sentiment in favor of a mercenary compensation for those who feel it their duty to minister', and at least one Meeting in upstate New York did explore the possibility of hiring a preacher. More stir came in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting in 1882, when Samuel J. Levick, a minister, told Friends that their objection was not to ministers receiving pay, but to being taxed for it. This led to considerable debate. Hicksites generally agreed that while they probably needed to be more generous in defraying the expenses of ministers who felt called to travel, anything resembling a pastorate was 'diametrically and shockingly opposed to the views of early Friends'. On the other hand, Yearly Meetings took the final step in dropping discussions of 'hireling ministry' from their books of discipline. Philadelphia did so in 1894.<sup>17</sup>

Why did Hicksites adjust thus? My sense is that it reflects their growing ties with reformers of other denominations and with Protestant liberals, especially but not limited to Unitarians. An increasing sense of commonality hindered denunciation. There was also a sense that currents in the larger religious world were moving their way, that ministers of other denominations were increasingly embracing Quaker ideas about peace, equality, the ministry of women, and what Friends called 'the divine immanence'. Friends no longer felt called to score seekers whose spiritual quests seemed to lead them toward truths that Friends had long held.<sup>18</sup>

Very different was the experience of Orthodox Friends after the Separation. By 1900, they would be sundered into pastoral and unprogrammed groups, and most American Friends would have started down a road very different from that taken by Quakers in the British Isles. At the beginning of the twentieth century, a clear majority of American Friends worshiped under pastoral leadership. In the British Isles, after debate, anything resembling a pastoral system had been rejected. This is a complicated story to tell, one that requires us to move back and forth across the Atlantic.



As we have seen, one of the fears of Hicksite Friends in the 1820s was that their opponents were forming ties with non-Quakers that compromised the testimony against hirelings. For the most part, Orthodox Friends ignored this particular Hicksite attack. When pressed, they did name their testimony against 'a hireling ministry' as one of the things that distinguished Friends from other Protestants.<sup>19</sup>

Such ties emerged as an issue in the 1830s and 1840s, in England in what became known as the Beaconite controversy and in the United States as Wilburite separations. I will begin with Beaconism. The basic facts are clear. A group of weighty, strongly evangelical Friends became convinced that traditional Quakerism did not place enough emphasis on salvation through the Atonement and came to question the Scriptural basis for the doctrine of the Inward Light. One of them, Isaac Crewdson, summarized their views in a book entitled *A Beacon to the Society of Friends*. The ensuing controversy brought intervention by London Yearly Meeting and the resignations of Crewdson and a number of sympathizers. But the response also included a stronger emphasis on evangelical doctrine, especially the necessity of a definite conversion experience and the authority of Scripture.<sup>20</sup>

The question of paid preaching was originally tangential; Crewdson said little about it. But one of the pointed critics was Henry Martin, a birthright Friend from Manchester who had resigned his membership but produced a steady stream of pamphlets that attacked 'Beaconism'. For Joseph John Gurney, who sympathized with Crewdson but ultimately broke with him, Martin's defense of Quakerism savored of 'Hicksism'. One of Gurney's criticisms was that Martin was too severe in his censures of ministers of other denominations. Martin responded with a long compilation of seventeenth-century Friends at their most vehement in attacking 'hirelings' as 'robbers of the poor, the fatherless, the widow, and the orphan, oppressors, deceivers, greedy dumb dogs, men-eaters, scripture sellers, hirelings, hypocrites', and concluded that Christian charity did not require Friends to acknowledge 'hirelings and deceivers' as 'ministers of the Gospel'.<sup>21</sup>

Gurney, of course, was Exhibit A for any Friend who feared the influence of association with outsiders on the Society of Friends. He had studied in Oxford, and was an intimate of some of the leading Evangelicals in the Church of England, working actively in causes such as Bible distribution, prison reform, and anti-slavery. One critic described Gurney and like-minded Friends as being simply 'the Quaker branch of the sect of Clapham'. Gurney, to be sure, could be critical of 'hirelings'; among his publications was a fierce attack on the Tractarian movement. But the dominant note in Gurney's life and ministry was to emphasize the essential unity of Friends with non-Quaker Evangelicals on what he saw as the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. For example, he ended a long defense of the Quaker conception of ministry and refusal to pay tithes with an acknowledgment that he knew 'of few persons who are more generally free from useless prejudices, more zealous in the cause of religion, and more ready for every good word and work, than many serious and devoted ministers of the Anglican church'.<sup>22</sup>

Such attitudes gave some English Friends cause for deep concern. Most eloquent was the minister Thomas Shillitoe, who shortly before his death in 1836

declared that Gurney's writings embraced 'not sound Quaker principles but Episcopalian ones, and they have done great mischief in our Society... I declare the author is an Episcopalian, not a Quaker'. Gurney's critics were a minority in London Yearly Meeting; they could not force a condemnation of his writings. But they were articulate and persistent, and they continued to voice fears about the erosion of Friends' testimony against a paid ministry. They found an organ in the *British Friend*, which began publication in 1843 and saw itself as the voice of an embattled traditional Quakerism resisting innovations. One such fear was too much charity toward hirelings. 'The more fair-seeming and goodly the preachers trained up in this false system are, the greater is the danger to our own members, and especially to our ministers of an intimate friendship and cooperation with them in private life, and in works of public utility and Christian benevolence', wrote one concerned Friend in 1848. 'For witnessing their amiable and virtuous conduct—having a common feeling in the benevolent plans in which they are engaged—we may allow these feelings an undue influence in judging of such as a minister'.<sup>23</sup>

These critics proved a minority in the British Isles. Friends there between 1830 and 1860 moved steadily in the direction of accepting ties with clerics of other denominations, even as they showed little interest in developing any kind of pastoral or paid Quaker ministry. Quaker journals with evangelical sympathies, such as the *Yorkshireman*, or the *London Friend*, which also began publication in 1843, published sympathetic reviews of books by or about paid ministers and their families, especially missionaries. In 1860 the latter fittingly noted that 'A pious and zealous clergyman of the "Established Church", Edward Edwards of Lynn, was instrumental in imbuing the minds of the late J.J. Gurney and several others of the family, "with a clearer comprehension of the fundamental principles of New Testament doctrine than they possessed before", and there can be no doubt that his labours were largely blessed'. But doubters remained.<sup>24</sup>

In North America, developments among Orthodox Friends were culturally similar, but structurally took different forms. A revealing story involves Christopher Healy, a minister of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting visiting England in the 1830s. Calling at a Friend's home, he was told that she was out, attending a Bible society meeting. Healy saw danger: 'Bible society, missionary society, temperance society, and—out of Society!' For him, such collaboration with non-Friends led away from real Quakerism. Certainly, such Friends saw considerable reason for worry between 1830 and 1860.<sup>25</sup>

Elsewhere I have written about how most Orthodox Friends in the United States moved closer to the dominant evangelical culture in these years. One sees it in Quaker periodicals, as they saluted the work of such organizations as the American Bible Society and the American Tract Society and endorsed the works of such American and British evangelical authors, most of them ordained ministers, as Joseph Butler, Philip Schaff, Albert Barnes, Thomas Erskine, and Adam Clarke. A prime example is found in the diary of Ann T. Updegraff, a young Friend of Mount Pleasant, Ohio, whose brother David will loom large later. Her reading included the *Oberlin Evangelist*, a biography of the English missionary Henry

Martyn, and works by a variety of non-Quaker evangelical ministers. Charles G. Finney, perhaps the most influential evangelical minister in the United States between 1820 and 1850, was a family friend. Hearing a Friend in Meeting warn against attending services of other churches, she responded in her diary: 'Christians will be united in Heaven, why should they so separate on Earth?' Ann Updegraff spoke for many Orthodox Friends in finding the lives and works of those conservatives regarded as 'hirelings' as in fact inspired and inspiring, part of a common Christian cause in which sectarianism was sinful.<sup>26</sup>

This movement was part of a larger intellectual ferment that saw a growing interest in higher education. Orthodox Friends concluded that ignorance had been one source of 'Hicksism', so after 1830 they put new energy into opening boarding schools in places where they had not existed before: North Carolina, Ohio, Indiana. Even more significant was openness to higher education. Previously Friends had associated colleges with the production of 'hireling priests'. Now, Friends began to venture to Yale, Amherst, Bowdoin, Oberlin, and Antioch, leading some Orthodox Friends to fear that if Friends did not open their own institutions that a generation would be lost. So in 1856 Haverford became the first Quaker college in the United States, with Earlham following in 1859.<sup>27</sup>

Some Orthodox Friends looked askance at this intellectual ferment, seeing in it 'creaturely activity' and the pursuit of 'head learning' at the expense of spiritual growth. They were critical specifically of the ministry and writings of Joseph John Gurney, particularly his views on salvation and holiness, but more generally they feared contact with the 'world's people', even in good causes, as detrimental to the peculiarity that God commanded for Friends. Typical was Ohio minister Joseph Edgerton. Traveling in upstate New York in 1843, he noted that 'many Friends' had 'become excited on the subject of abolition, temperance, etc., and thus running in the activity of the creature, into the mixture with other people, so that genuine Quakerism seems likely to be eaten up'. Central to this conservative Orthodox critique of reform activism was the same view that many Hicksites were advancing—such activity was, as one critic put it, 'the great struggle of priestcraft to sustain itself'. So they warned against worshiping with non-Friends or reading books written by their ministers. Ultimately, the tensions proved too great. Separations came in several Orthodox Yearly Meetings, particularly New England and Ohio, and Philadelphia preserved its unity only by cutting off correspondence with other Yearly Meetings. Those with a more expansive view became known as Gurneyites, their opponents as Wilburites, from the New England minister John Wilbur, one of Gurney's most articulate critics.<sup>28</sup>

In the United States, a new generation of young American Gurneyites was raising questions about the Quaker future by 1860. I label them a 'Renewal movement'. They were convinced that the fundamentals of Quakerism were sound, but that archaic accretions needed to be pared away. Thus, they upheld unprogrammed worship, but called for more careful Bible study and education by ministers and an end to the singsong tone that had characterized Quaker ministry for a century. They urged a relaxation of the rules against marriage out of Meeting. By 1860, they were coming into positions of leadership.<sup>29</sup>

We will never know what might have come of this movement, since the Civil War deflected and absorbed its energies. Friends found themselves responding to crisis—winning exemptions from military service, working among the freed people, and trying to counter a broad movement of young Quaker men into the Union army. The war left many leading Friends with a sense that far too many Friends did not understand what it meant to be a Quaker.<sup>30</sup>

The response in Indiana Yearly Meeting, which was by this time the largest in the world, was to launch a series of General Meetings. Such Meetings brought together Yearly Meeting leaders, especially ministers, for both worship and education, to explain Quaker faith both to members and outsiders. The response there was encouraging, so that by 1870 other Gurneyite Yearly Meetings were following the Indiana model. For some Friends, however, this was inadequate. As the most uncompromising of them, David B. Updegraff of Mount Pleasant, Ohio, wrote:

Many could not see that the blessing of God rested upon an attempt to convey to perishing sinners 'accurate *information*' about our 'distinctive *tenets*'. I was one of that number and joined with others in imploring that the 'the dead' might be left to 'bury the dead', and that we might unite in preaching the gospel and getting converts to *Jesus*. In the providence of God such counsel prevailed, and then it was that our General Meetings became 'Revival Meetings'.

And by 1875 it had become a revival by any standard, as music, the mourner's bench, and claims of instantaneous salvation and sanctification swept Friends' Meetings from upstate New York to the west coast.<sup>31</sup>

Why did it happen? Here we have to go back a generation. By the 1840s, most Orthodox Friends, led by Gurney, were beginning to see salvation in a revolutionary way. For at least a century before, Friends had understood that humans achieved salvation, or justification in the eyes of God, gradually. Through baptisms of suffering and mortification, through obedience to the Light Within, and through separation from the world as evinced by plainness, Friends would gradually be purged of their sinful natures. Thus, they would achieve holiness, or sanctification, and through this sanctification they would be saved. Thus, in their view, justification and sanctification were inseparable. But Gurney, following the lead of non-Quaker Evangelicals, had challenged this view. He argued that salvation came instantaneously through faith in the efficacy of the Atoning Blood of Christ. Sanctification was a second, gradual experience. And the Inward Light was almost irrelevant. By the 1860s this had become the dominant outlook of American and British Gurneyite Friends.<sup>32</sup>

The revivalists were almost without exception advocates of a different conception. Inspired by the largely Wesleyan Holiness movement that was extremely influential in the second half of the nineteenth century, they argued that sanctification was a second, instantaneous experience, achieved, like salvation, through faith in the efficacy of the Blood of Christ. In their system, all one had to do was *claim* this experience, not wait for it. And since most saw holiness as the baptism with the Holy Spirit, they dismissed nearly all of the traditional system of Quaker peculiarity and distinctiveness. Instead, they redefined Quaker community to be

not 'Our Society', but as the brotherhood and sisterhood of sanctified Christians. Indeed, in their eyes, most traditional Quaker practices were at best hindrances to effective soul saving, at worst 'dead works' that endangered those who embraced them. By 1880, they were triumphant in nearly all of the Gurneyite Yearly Meetings in North America—only Baltimore, the smallest, remained entirely aloof.<sup>33</sup>

This is not the place to outline how profoundly the revival changed most of American Quakerism. But one of its most important effects was to demolish the two hundred year-old testimony against a paid ministry. The ministers who led the revival were, by the late 1870s, devoting nearly all of their time to religious work. Some had personal resources, while others depended on donations from supporters. Both they, and sympathetic Friends, began to ask whether it was God's will that men and women with such evident gifts not devote themselves entirely to ministry. This was not in itself a radical break from past practice. When Friends had traveled in the ministry under divine call, it was the responsibility of other Friends to see to it that their needs were met.<sup>34</sup>

What did move Friends toward a regular pastoral ministry was a second concern. The early years of the revival, before 1875, had been inward looking, as revivalists undertook to be sure that Friends were soundly converted and sanctified, or to reclaim former members who had been disowned for minor offenses. After 1875, the movement became evangelistic, as the revivalists tried to reach out to the unchurched generally. The result was a steady growth of membership and expansion into new areas, especially in the Midwest. Indiana Yearly Meeting, for example, had by 1890 established two quarterly Meetings with over one thousand members in areas where less than a dozen Friends had lived in 1875. An English Friend traveling in Iowa in 1888 found many Meetings without a single birthright member.<sup>35</sup>

What many Friends concluded, however, was that many, perhaps most, of these new Friends would be lost without settled, consistent pastoral care. One Indiana Friend noted how converts found regular Meetings for Worship, sometimes entirely silent, 'dull and uninteresting' in comparison with revivals, which 'were so full of life and enjoyment'. Regular preaching was a necessity. And converts had other needs. 'Every analogy of nature teaches us that when life is produced it must be nourished, and if life of the higher order it is a crime not to do it', wrote a Michigan minister. 'Better that life should not be produced than that it should be neglected'. To many supporters of the revival, the conclusion was clear—those who had a talent for preaching and care of souls should devote themselves entirely to it. Some went to great lengths to insist that such ministry was very different from that of the 'hirelings' early Friends had denounced. Still others asserted that times had changed, and Friends needed to keep up with them. As John Henry Douglas, a leading supporter, put it: 'The pastoral work is the turning point and pivotal point, and upon its right use depends the perpetuity of our church'.<sup>36</sup>

By the late 1870s, several Meetings in Iowa, Indiana, New York, and Ohio had made informal agreements with ministers for support while the minister lived among them. In 1886, Iowa Yearly Meeting became the first Yearly Meeting to

formalize the pastoral system. By 1900, all of the Gurneyite Yearly Meetings except Baltimore, embracing a majority of American Friends, had accepted it. Wilmington Yearly Meeting stated the majority view that year: 'There is not one meeting within our borders but needs the rightly directed care and labor of an earnest consecrated pastor'.<sup>37</sup>

This change came in the face of considerable opposition. By the early 1880s, separations had taken place in Indiana, Western, Kansas, and Iowa Yearly Meetings, as conservative Friends who could not stomach the revivals and the changes they brought left to worship in the older ways. But there remained behind in the Gurneyite Yearly Meetings an articulate and influential group of moderate Friends who welcomed new life, but wanted reform, not revolution. Influential especially in New York, New England, Baltimore, Indiana, and Western Yearly Meetings, they offered a pointed critique of the rise of the pastoral system, disputing nearly every premise for its support. They agreed that new converts needed pastoral care, but argued that it was more effective, and in keeping with Quaker practice, for elders and overseers and committees to take responsibility. Even if one conceded this need, the disadvantages they saw far outweighed any benefits. A pastoral system, they argued, would end the traditional traveling ministry, would lead to bargaining and competition, would marginalize women ministers, would effectively silence other recorded ministers in the congregation, and would lead the pastor to preach regardless of whether he or she felt led by the Holy Spirit. Concentrating leadership in one person would, as a Baltimore Friend concluded, 'entrust the main interests of the church to a rather inferior class of men...and eliminate the influence of the Sober Earnest spiritual minded Friends of an older period'. The end result would be 'a distinctly marked *clerical class*, with authority, privileges and support like those awarded to the clergy of other denominations'. And this, argued the *Friends' Review*, was 'radically unsuited to the Society of Friends, and will tend either to its rapid dissolution or its entire transformation'.<sup>38</sup>

Not surprisingly, Wilburites and Conservative Friends generally saw the pastoral system as the final affirmation of everything that was wrong in Gurneyism. 'A man who accepts a salary on the condition he is to deliver a sermon on each meeting day, is not the less a "hireling minister" because he bears the name of Friend', editorialized the *Philadelphia Friend*. 'If other sects maintain the pastoral system, as the best that is practicable in the present state of mankind, we need not oppose them', wrote another critic in 1896. 'But to admit that "it has fastened its teeth into our body and cannot well be removed", is to admit that the days of our high standard of Divine communion and of ministry are numbered'.<sup>39</sup>

This revolution did not go unnoticed in the British Isles. Friends in Dublin and London Yearly Meetings watched intently. Ultimately, they concluded to take a different course, but not without considerable discussion and debate, and not without embarking on experiments similar to those American Friends undertook.

We now need to shift back across the Atlantic to London Yearly Meeting in the 1850s. As Thomas Kennedy has persuasively argued, it perceived a crisis. Ministry was deeply evangelical, but it was an Evangelicalism still joined with what some saw as draconian restrictions on marriage and amusements and preaching

that was often dry if not non-existent. And at a time when the population was growing and vast numbers were unchurched, attendance at Meetings was stagnant. The most famous fruit was the 1859 competition to diagnose 'The Causes of the Decline in the Society of Friends'. The winner, John Stephenson Rowntree of York, urged improving ministry, relaxation of the Discipline, and, as Kennedy summarizes it: 'more knowledge of the wider world, deeper comprehension of the Bible as a guide to living in that world, and stronger appreciation of the necessity for liberty of thought and action'. In the early 1860s, such suggestions began to yield fruit, as the Discipline was relaxed on matters of marriage, plainness, and amusements.<sup>40</sup>

At first glance, one sees considerable similarity between British and American Friends in the 1860s and 1870s. Like American Friends, many members of London Yearly Meeting were concerned about what they saw as stagnant membership and attendance, with a ministry that often failed to inspire, and about lack of pastoral care for members and evangelistic outreach to others. One Friend noted in 1882 that in the past century, London Yearly Meeting had closed 196 Meeting Houses, while opening only 73 new ones, and that a third of local Meetings had less than 20 members. Moved by such concerns, Friends looked in new directions.<sup>41</sup>

One such manifestation was organization of the Friends Foreign Missionary Association in 1868. This was the outgrowth of an older impulse. As early as 1829 and 1830 some Friends had argued that Anglican missionaries were not hirelings. In 1860, the Meeting for Sufferings asked the Yearly Meeting 'whether means might not be found by which the members of our religious Society might take a more decided part in efforts towards the spreading of the knowledge of the Gospel in heathen countries, and amongst the unenlightened in our own land, without compromising our religious principles'. By 1867, Henry Stanley Newman, who would become perhaps the most articulate advocate of foreign missions in the Yearly Meeting, was arguing for Friends to follow the model of other denominations. 'God has certainly guided our sister churches in the establishment of their Missionary Societies', he wrote. It would be a break with long-standing practice, but, he concluded, 'it was not yielding to precedent that created Quakerism. We should never have been a people if we had not laid aside the traditions of men, and risen at the call of our Lord to follow his footsteps'. With such inspiration, Friends began work in Africa and India.<sup>42</sup>

A second, and more important manifestation of this impulse was the Adult School and Home Mission movement in London Yearly Meeting. As Kennedy describes them, 'the concept of Adult Schools was simple and the aims modest: a Sunday morning Meeting to teach reading and Christianity to the unlettered working classes using the bible as primer'. By 1870, as Kennedy notes, over one thousand adult school teachers were teaching over 15,000 pupils, outnumbering the Yearly Meeting's membership. One Friend happily concluded in 1871 that, 'in the Home Mission field much has quietly been accomplished by us during the last twenty years. First-Day Schools, Bible Classes, Reading Meetings, Sewing Schools, Mothers' Meetings, and various other agencies for relieving the spiritual and temporal wants of those around us, have been carried on successfully by many

of our more zealous members'. One Friend told the Yearly Meeting in 1877 that, 'when a Mission Meeting comes to be connected with each of our meetings, we shall feel then ever the blessedness which rests on spreading the Gospel to all around us'. In 1883, the Yearly Meeting formed a Home Mission Committee. Significantly, such schools and Meetings usually included singing and Bible reading, very different from regular Meetings for Worship.<sup>43</sup>

In 1875, the Yearly Meeting appointed a Committee on General Meetings, modeled on the American practice. Dublin Yearly Meeting had begun to experiment with them a year earlier. Advocates praised them as an opportunity to 'show brotherhood with Christians of other denominations' by minimizing 'sectarian' views. American revivalists visiting England, such as Dougan Clark, Rufus P. King, and Caroline E. Talbot, took part. One of the most vivid accounts we have is of a General Meeting at Leiston in 1876: 'The Lord wonderfully owned and blessed the efforts put forth... Strong men bowed before [God], and shook as aspens; depraved sinners listened eagerly to and drank in the glad tidings'. People of all ages left 'feeling that they had been washed in the precious blood of the Lamb'.<sup>44</sup>

The American revival impulse found considerable support in London, although, as we will see, this was often in response to ferocious criticism. In 1871, the London *Friend* praised the 'quickenning effect which so constantly attends on earnest care and self-denying efforts on behalf of others' as seen in the General Meetings in America. Another writer endorsed singing, mourner's benches, and any other practice that led to conversion. When critics pointed to excesses, supporters such as Richard Littleboy and William Scarnell Lean pleaded for charity. Newman concluded that while 'the desire for quick results has often led to unwise teaching, and to much that has endangered the depth and stability of work undertaken in the name of the Lord', nevertheless there was 'a true and most earnest desire to advance the kingdom of God and to save souls from being lost far more in accordance with the spirit which actuated George Fox and his companions than is that dread of ever out-stepping the lines of Quakerly procedure'.<sup>45</sup>

The final parallel is the lamentation that so few of those who attended the Adult Schools and Mission Meetings ever joined Friends. In 1878 a Carlisle Friend who was an admirer of the American evangelist Dwight L. Moody struck this note. 'If we do not shepherd and feed the sheep that have been gathered by our ministerial labour, but leave them to the care of other shepherds to invite them into other folds, we seem to be abrogating the duties of a distinctive church', the Friend complained. A few years later a Sheffield Friend agreed, telling the Home Mission Conference: 'Well, if they held mission services as members of the Society, and draw people from the world through the influence of the Gospel, and then send them off to other places of worship to become members there, he did not see how they were likely to increase'. As American Friends were concluding, converts needed pastoral care.<sup>46</sup>

By the early 1870s, such concerns were leading at least some members of London Yearly Meeting to conclude that Friends needed a new understanding of



the ministry and its support. Isaac Brown, a strongly evangelical Friend, said in Yearly Meeting in 1872: 'We could not prevent the world from going forward, and arrangements that were once made in the wisdom of God, and by the direction of the Holy Spirit, might, in our altered circumstances, be out of place'. Foreign missionaries in particular seemed to justify an exception to the rule against financial support for ministers, since the nature of their ministry ruled out secular work. In 1872, a Friend identified only as D.T. made an extended argument in the *Friend* for change. 'Is the practice of the Society in reference to the support of ministers and their families, in accordance with the teachings of the New Testament?' the Friend asked. 'I have long felt that it is not'. He began with an argument that Quaker policy led 'to the Roman Catholic and unscriptural doctrine of priestly celibacy', since young men who felt a call to ministry would choose not to marry out of concern that they could not support their families. It was, moreover, inconsistent: 'When a Friend feels himself called to labour in distant foreign lands for months or years, the Society, at a very great expense, cheerfully provides for his wants all the while he is from home', but if that Friend wanted to give the same time to local ministry, there would be no support. The Friend concluded that when anyone 'feels it right to settle himself in a particular meeting, and to labour all his time for the edification of its members and for its increase', then he should receive support. By 1883, Newman sensed a movement in that direction, 'The tendency in our own Society has been of late to regards its practice as to the non-support of ministers, except when *travelling* in the service of their Master, as arising from too narrow an interpretation of the teaching of our Lord and Master', he wrote. 'It has been openly advocated that those well-qualified for evangelistic labour should devote themselves wholly to the work, the Church meanwhile maintaining them and their families, that they may be free from undue care'. And by the late 1880s the Home Mission Committee was paying the salaries of a number of full-time religious workers in the Adult Schools and Mission Meetings. Such devoted workers could not be considered 'hirelings', supporters insisted. And some observers saw them as harbingers of dramatic change. A non-Quaker reporter observing a conference in Reading in 1880 wrote of 'a very great and deep revolution which is passing over the methods of the Society of Friends.'<sup>47</sup>

This movement received powerful intellectual support in 1876, with the publication of Robert Barclay's magisterial *The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth*. Barclay, an intensely evangelical minister from Reigate, had as early as 1873 urged the need for 'a well-trained ministry and pastors' among Friends. His book was a reinterpretation of the origins of Quakerism that laid the foundations for modern Quaker historical study. Its relevance here is that Barclay concluded that George Fox had created 'a system of circuit, or itinerant preaching...nearly as complete as that of the Wesleyans', and that ministers were supported by a common fund. Ministers, moreover, exercised pastoral authority. The closest contemporaries to Fox and the early Friends in the 1870s were, Barclay argued, the American evangelists Dwight L. Moody and Ira Sankey.<sup>48</sup>

In short, the stage seemed to be set for a transformation in the British Isles similar to that among American Gurneyites. But, as we all know, that did not happen. Why not?

The simple answer is that the pastoral system did not come to London Yearly Meeting because London Yearly Meeting never experienced a revival. The General Meetings were kept carefully separate from regular Meetings for Worship, just as the regular Meetings for Worship were kept separate from the Adult Schools and Mission Meetings. This separation damped pressures that might have made for more radical change.

Why was this the case? I see five reasons: a reluctance, perhaps class-based, to take in large numbers of new members; the relative weakness of the holiness movement among British Friends; articulate and principled resistance to revivalism from both traditionalist and modernist Friends; an engrained opposition to anything suggesting a paid ministry even among Friends who were sympathetic to evangelism otherwise; and a widespread reluctance to push for radical changes that might endanger the unity of the Yearly Meeting.

We know relatively little about the comparative social status of British and American Friends in the late nineteenth century, but Stanley Pumphrey, an English Friend who traveled widely in the United States, saw a profound difference. Ninety percent of English Friends, he said, were involved in commerce, while ninety percent of American Friends were farmers. Few American Friends outside the eastern cities had much wealth. West of the Appalachian Mountains, Pumphrey noted, he stayed with only one Quaker family who regularly employed servants. This was very different from England, where Friends in general were relatively well to do. American Friends were reaching out to people not much different economically or in class from themselves. Indeed, Americans did not understand why English Friends did not try to bring the students from Adult Schools into their Meetings *en masse*.<sup>49</sup>

English Friends, while they did admit some attenders of the Adult Schools to full membership, certainly did not embrace them *en masse*. Some Friends bemoaned what they saw as 'pride of class and of birth' and 'aloofness' among Friends that alienated potential working-class members. One Friend told the story of a Birmingham man who had long attended the Adult School. 'Why don't you apply for membership?' the teacher asked. The student answered: 'It's all right; I'm saving up: I've nearly L40'. His impression was that this was the price of admission. And some Friends apparently worried that an influx of impoverished members would make financial demands on Meeting resources. The fears of some Evangelicals that Friends wanted to remain a 'little circle' had some justification. Consider, for example, an anonymous Friend writing to the *British Friend* in 1878. 'Hitherto, owing to the homogeneous character impressed upon the members of the Society, by their education together in the Society's Schools, and by their general intelligence and social communion, a large measure of harmony and unanimity has been preserved', he concluded. 'But a very different and unpleasant result may be anticipated if the ranks of membership are to be hastily swelled by persons entirely lacking in the early training of Friends'. William Tallack, a

weighty London Friend and prison reformer, agreed: 'If we introduced these foreign and heterogeneous elements, we should...drive the ship of our Society on the rocks'. Another Friend said that the lower classes should be left to groups like the Wesleys and the Salvation Army, who were better suited to evangelizing them: 'It was not our mission to cut out the rough masses of stone, but rather to raise the polished shafts'.<sup>50</sup>

Second-experience holiness was the driving force of the American Quaker revival. But it was a movement that never achieved the same power among British Friends. There was some interest in it in the 1870s, largely because of the work of the American Friends Robert Pearsall and Hannah Whitall Smith. Yet the doctrine apparently held little appeal for Friends in London and Dublin Yearly Meetings. More conservative Friends saw the results of the American Quaker revivals as anything but holy or sanctified, and even more sympathetic Friends held to the older Gurneyite formulation of sanctification as a second but gradual experience. The great engine of the American revival found little fuel among British Friends.<sup>51</sup>

As we noted earlier, British Friends were interested observers of the American revival, and many were supporters of it. The weighty Friends who dominated London and Dublin Yearly Meetings insisted on recognizing the revived bodies as legitimate Yearly Meetings when separations took place, and hailed what they saw as an advance of the Kingdom. But a determined group of more traditionalist Friends were unrelenting in their criticism: Daniel Pickard, William Irwin, Charles Thompson, Joseph Armfield, and William Graham, the editors of the *British Friend*, as well as some unexpected allies like Tallack. As early as 1873, Graham commented, with atypical restraint, that: 'He should be glad if American Friends could sober down'. As the revivalists advocated the pastoral system, the attacks became more heated. Consider, for example, Thompson: 'It seems to me high time this "conspiracy of silence" on the part of English Friends was abandoned, and that we should cease to hold official intercourse with those American Yearly Meetings in which such practices are encouraged and testify against them', he wrote in 1890. 'This may be the only method now left to us of protesting against a return to those pre-arranged, formal, man-ordained systems of public worship OUT OF WHICH our forefathers were led'. But by the 1880s conservatives were finding support from the rising generation of modernist Friends. William Pollard and Francis Frith, co-authors of the modernist manifesto, *A Reasonable Faith*, were equally pointed in criticizing the movement of American Friends toward a professional ministry. And in the 1890s they were joined by young liberal Friends such as John Wilhelm Rowntree and John William Graham.<sup>52</sup>

But such doubts did not come just from the two extremes, but from the evangelical center of London Yearly Meeting. Listen, for example, to Henry Hipsley, a fervently evangelical minister who led the offensive against David Duncan and the Manchester Liberals in the 1870s and who in the 1880s worried that young Friends were losing their salutary fear of hell fire. Yet when the Iowa Yearly Meeting epistle, rejoicing in the progress of its pastoral system, was read in the Yearly Meeting in 1888, he was mournful. If Methodists had done the work

described, he said, 'he should have rejoiced'. But Friends were not Methodists, and so 'he could not but feel grief at a departure in America, not from merely conventional usage in our Society, but from that founded upon an intelligent conception of principle'. Equally pointed was Isaac Sharp, another leading evangelical: 'The one-man element, so far as Friends are concerned, appears to me to be alien to the headship of Christ, and to the genius of New Testament Quakerism'. Even that most evangelical of Friends, Joseph Bevan Braithwaite, was by 1892 deeply worried about the direction of American Friends, and singled out pastors as his central concern.<sup>53</sup>

Such tensions had led to separation in the United States. Yet these, and other tensions over theology, did not have the same effect in London or Dublin Yearly Meetings. Why not? One has a sense at times that Friends on this side of the Atlantic regarded their American brothers and sisters as negative exemplars. Daniel Pickard, for example, was a 'conservative stalwart' who sympathized with revival opponents. Nevertheless, he told London Yearly Meeting in 1878: 'Our brethren in America...had an instinctive capacity for organization'—by organization he clearly intended *reorganization* through separation. He thought that American Friends too 'apt to run to that vain remedy'. Joseph Bevan Braithwaite agreed. 'How could we, in England, part with Friends who, though they may not agree with everything they see or hear, yet are nevertheless a great help to our body?' he asked at the same session. 'We are constantly helped by the forbearance, deep exercise, and conscientiousness which some of these dear Friends exert in our midst'. He concluded: 'Not a little of the strength, unity, and stability of the Society in this country, was because we are not in the habit of constantly flying off at a tangent'. This was also the judgment of Fielden Thorp, the Bootham School headmaster. 'The spirit of love and forbearance so largely prevalent in our Yearly Meeting will, I trust, obviate any further divisions among us... There is room in the Society of Friends for minds of very different orders'. David Duncan might have seen it differently, but it is clear that Friends here saw more latitude than one found in North America.<sup>54</sup>

In the 1890s, of course, British Friends took a decisive turn in a different direction. Evangelical Quakerism began to give way before a new generation of young liberal Friends, and the methods of the Adult Schools and Mission Meetings did not become those of regular Meetings for Worship. In one of the ironies of Quaker history, the Manchester Conference of 1895, one of the defining events in the growth of liberal, unprogrammed Quakerism, was first projected by the Yearly Meeting's Home Mission Committee.<sup>55</sup>

I have told a long, complicated story this evening. It has been a story of division, divisions that grew greater over time. By 1900 Friends were permanently divided into Hicksite, Wilburite, and Gurneyite strains, divisions that remain with us down to the present day. Most striking, a majority of American Friends (and Americans were most of the world's Quakers in 1900), had embraced a pastoral system of ministry, despite its seeming discontinuity with historic Quakerism. And that, in turn, would determine the course of most Quaker growth in Africa,

Asia, and Latin America down to the present day. But even Friends who held to what they called a 'free ministry' had given up the use of the term 'hiringling ministry', with all of its implications. The ancient landmarks had not been merely chipped away, but largely thrown down.

## NOTES

\* This essay was originally presented as the George Richardson Lecture at Woodbrooke on June 27, 2008, as part of the joint meeting of the Conference of Quaker Historians and Archivists and the Quaker Studies Research Association. The author is indebted to Thomas C. Kennedy of the University of Arkansas for comments on an earlier draft.

1. 'Baltimore Yearly Meeting', *Journal*, 11th Mo. 20, 1878, p. 346.
2. Moore, R., *The Light in Their Consciences: Early Quakers in Britain, 1646-1666*, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000, pp. 129-30; *Gospel Truth Demonstrated, in a Collection of Doctrinal Books, Given Forth by That Faithful Minister of Jesus Christ, George Fox*, 3 vols., Philadelphia: Marcus T.C. Gould, 1831, I, pp. 322-23.
3. Kersey, J., *A Treatise on Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Religion: In Which Are Illustrated the Profession, Ministry, Worship, and Faith of the Society of Friends*, Philadelphia: Emmor Kimber, 1815, pp. 27-28.
4. Bates, E., *The Doctrines of Friends: or, Principles of the Christian Religion, as Held by the Society of Friends, Commonly Called Quakers*, Mt Pleasant, OH: The Author, 1825, pp. 210-11.
5. Kersey, *Treatise*, pp. 27-28; Bates, *Doctrines*, p. 210.
6. Willis, T., *The Doctrines and Principles of the People Called Quakers, Explained and Vindicated; in a Reply to Hibbard's 'Address to the Quakers, Including the Pamphlet Entitled Errors of the Quakers, Etc'. in which, His Gross Misrepresentations and Calumnies are Exposed and Refuted*, New York: Samuel Wood, 1812, pp. 80-82.
7. Gurney, J.J., *Observations on the Distinguishing Views and Practices of the Society of Friends*, New York: Mahlon Day, 1840, p. 168.
8. Kimber, E., *The Church of Christ, and Way of Salvation Universal*, Philadelphia: E. Littell, 1822, p. 23; *Sermons by Thomas Wetherald and Elias Hicks, Delivered During the Yearly Meeting of Friends, in the City of New York*, Philadelphia: Marcus T.C. Gould, 1826, p. 255.
9. *Christian Advices, Published by the Yearly Meeting of Friends, Held in Philadelphia*, Philadelphia: Kimber & Conrad, 1808, pp. 44-45; *Extracts from the Minutes and Advices of the Yearly Meeting of Friends Held in London*, London: W. Phillips, 1802, p. 72.
10. *Bishop Doane's Sermon, 'Rev. Mr. Keith' and the Society of Friends, in North America. A Series of Essays Showing the Great Similarity Between George Keith and His Followers, Who Dissented from, and Left the Society of Friends in the Year A.D. 1692, and That Portion Who Separated in 1827 and 1828, and Are Styled 'Orthodox'*, Princeton: R.E. Hornor, 1835, pp. 14-15; 'A Disinterested Observer', *Advocate of Truth* 3 (3rd Mo. 27, 1830), p. 102; *Journal of the Life and Religious Labors of Elias Hicks*, New York: Isaac T. Hopper, 1832, pp. 357-58; *Memoirs of the Life and Religious Labors of Edward Hicks, Late of Newtown, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Written by Himself*, Philadelphia: Merrihew & Thompson, 1851, p. 164; Kimber, *Church of Christ*, p. 9; *Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Minutes (H)*, 1830, pp. 7-8.
11. Editorial, *Advocate of Truth*, 3 (4th Mo. 17, 1830), pp. 127-28; 'The Herald of Truth', *Advocate of Truth* 3 (12th Mo. 25, 1830), p. 422; *The Cabinet; or Works of Darkness Brought to Light. Being a Retrospect of the Anti-Christian Conduct of Some of the Leading Characters in the Society of Friends Towards Elias Hicks. To Which Is Added, the Proposed Quaker Creed!! And an Appendix, Containing Some Remarks of Thomas Eddy's Letter and His 'Facts and Observations', with a Glance at Passing Events*, Philadelphia: John Motimer, 1825, p. 17; [Gibbons, W.], *Truth Advocated in Letters Addressed to the Presbyterians*, Philadelphia: Joseph Rakestraw, 1822, p. 113; [Ferris, B.], *Observations on a Sermon, Delivered at Newark, by John E. Latta, before a Meeting of the Bible Society of Delaware, October 16, 1822. With an Addenda, Being a Reply to 'Truth in Plain English'*, Wilmington:

Mendenhall & Walters, 1823, pp. 50-52. For later expressions of the same views, see, for example, *Genesee Yearly Meeting Minutes, 1861*, p. 5; *Ohio Yearly Meeting Minutes (H), 1856*, p. 9; and John J. White, *An Exposition of the Church of Christ and Its Doctrine: Forming a Supplement to 'The End of Controversy, Controverted'* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co., 1855, p. 136.

12. Charles Stokes to Benjamin Ferris, 12th Mo. 13, 1836, box 2, Ferris Family Papers, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA; *Address of the New-York Association of Friends for the Relief of Those Held in Slavery, Etc. to the Members of the Association, and Friends Generally*, New York: Mercein & Post's Press, 1840, p. 4; 'An Appeal to the Society of Friends, on the Subject of Slavery', *Friends' Intelligencer*, 4th Mo. 1, 1839, p. 341, ; 'Remarks on Popular Associations', *Friends' Intelligencer*, 1st Mo. 1, 1839, p. 276; Mary R. Post to Isaac and Amy Post, 4th Mo. 1, [184-], box 1, Isaac and Amy Kirby Post Papers, Rush Rhees Library, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY; Palmer, B.W. (ed.), *Selected Letters of Lucretia Coffin Mott*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002, p. 38; Abby Kimber to Elizabeth Pease, 3rd Mo. 3, 1841, Ms.A.1.2, v. 11, p. 98, Antislavery Collection, Rare Books Department, Boston Public Library, Boston, MA; Westfield Monthly Meeting Men's Minutes, 1st Mo. 31, 1844, Ohio Valley Yearly Meeting Archives, Watson Library, Wilmington College, Wilmington, OH.

13. Phebe Post Willis to Edmond P. Willis, 2nd Mo. 12, 1838, box 2, Post Papers; Charles Marriott to Rowland T. Robinson, 3rd Mo. 2, 1837, box 1, Robinson Family Papers, Sheldon Museum, Middlebury, VT.

14. Isaac Post to Joseph and Mary Post, Aug. 30, 1859 (in possession of Margery Post Abbott, Portland, OR); Cromwell, O., *Lucretia Mott*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958, pp. 39, 117; Tolles, F.B. (ed.), *Slavery and 'The Woman Question': Lucretia Mott's Diary of Her Visit to Great Britain to Attend the World's Anti-Slavery Convention of 1840*, Haverford, PA: Friends Historical Association, 1952, pp. 41, 59; Jonathan Thomas to Nathan Macy Thomas, 1st Mo. 22, 1844, box 1, Nathan Macy Thomas Papers, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

15. *Plain Dealing with the Discipline of the Society of Friends*, New York: G. Vale, 1846, p. 17; Lucretia Mott to Richard D. Webb, 9th Mo. 10, 1848, Ms. A.1.2, vol. 18, p. 34, Antislavery Collection; *Basis of Religious Association, Adopted by the Conference Held at Farmington, in the State of New York, on the 6th and 7th of Tenth Month, 1848*, Waterloo, NY: Sentell & Pew, 1848, p. 7; Wahl, A.J., 'The Congregational or Progressive Friends in the Pre-Civil-War Reform Movement', EdD diss., Temple University, 1951, pp. 89, 123-27, 170; Fisher, W.L., *Progressive Friends: An Account of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Progressive Friends, with Some Observations on Their Principles and Prospects*, Wakefield, PA, 1856, pp. 5-6.

16. 'Genesee Yearly Meeting', *Friends' Intelligencer*, 7th Mo. 14, 1866, p. 297; Editorial, *Friends' Intelligencer*, 11th Mo. 12, 1870, p. 584; I.W.G., 'Is a Paid Minister Necessarily a Hireling?', *Friends' Intelligencer*, 1st Mo. 24, 1885, pp. 788-89; *Autobiography of John J. Cornell, Containing an Account of His Religious Experiences and Travels in the Ministry*, Baltimore: Lord Baltimore Press, 1906, p. 134; 'Philadelphia Yearly Meeting', *Journal*, 6th Mo. 4, 1873, p. 142; Joshua B. Ross to Abel Mills, 6th Mo. 9, 1884, box, 1, Abel Mills Papers, Illinois Historical Survey, University of Illinois, Urbana.

17. 'Friends at Richmond, Indiana', *Journal*, 4th Mo. 7, 1875, p. 73; 'Baltimore Yearly Meeting', *Journal*, 11th Mo. 23, 1881, p. 358; Levick, S.J. (ed.), *A Paid Ministry: Have Friends Any Testimony on the Subject? If So, What Is It? Views of a Number of Prominent Friends on the Subject*, Philadelphia: Journal Office, 1882, *passim*; 'Further Notes on the New Discipline', *Friends' Intelligencer*, 6th Mo. 2, 1894, p. 344. For concerns about the ministry, see Hamm, T.D., 'The Hicksite Quaker World, 1875-1900', *Quaker History* 89 (Fall 2000), pp. 19-20.

18. Hamm, 'Hicksite Quaker World', pp. 28-32.

19. See, for example, Foster, J.J. (comp.), *An Authentic Report of the Testimony in a Cause at Issue in the Court of Chancery of the State of New Jersey, between Thomas Shotwell, Complainant, and Joseph Hendrickson and Stacy Decow, Defendants*, 2 vols., Philadelphia: J. Harding, 1831, I, p. 299.

20. See Isichei, E., *Victorian Quakers*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970, pp. 45-53; and Mingsins, R., *The Beacon Controversy and Challenges to British Quaker Tradition in the Early Nineteenth Century: Some Responses to the Evangelical Revival by Friends in Manchester and Kendal*, Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004.

21. The exchange is summarized in [Martin, H.], *Early Friends and Modern Professors, in Reply to 'Strictures' by Joseph John Gurney*, London: Edmund Fry & Son, 1836, pp. 19-36. For information on Martin, see Mingsins, *Beacon Controversy*, p. 87.

22. Swift, D.E., *Joseph John Gurney: Banker, Reformer, and Quaker*, Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1962, pp. 114-44; Gurney, J.J., *Puseyism Traced to its Root, in a View of the Papal and Hierarchical System, as Compared with the Religion of the New Testament*, Norwich: Josiah Fletcher, 1848; 'Elizabeth Fry's Memoirs', *British Friend*, 7, Supplement (2nd Mo. 28, 1849), p. 24; Gurney, *Observations*, p. 179.

23. Swift, *Joseph John Gurney*, pp. 162-84, 213; 'Are Friends, as a Society, Increasing or Decreasing?', *British Friend* 6 (11th Mo. 30, 1848), p. 282.

24. 'A Yorkshire Minister; with the Form of His Ordination by the Presbytery', *Yorkshireman*, 10th Mo. 15, 1832, pp. 107-109; 'Missions and Ministers', *London Friend* 18 (2nd Mo. 1, 1860), p. 34; 'Reviews', *London Friend* 18 (10th Mo. 1, 1860), pp. 194-95; Editorial, *London Friend* 18 (12th Mo. 1, 1860), pp. 223-24.

25. I.J.R., 'The Tendency of Bible or First Day Schools among Friends', *Philadelphia Friend*, 7th Mo. 25, 1896, p. 3.

26. 'The American Bible Society', *Western Friend*, 5th Mo. 25, 1848, p. 228; Editorial, *Friends' Review*, 1st Mo. 2, 1864, p. 281; 'Friends Books', *Friends' Review*, 9th Mo. 10, 1864, p. 26; 'The Gospel: Justification by Faith', *Friends' Review*, 3rd Mo. 4, 1865, pp. 422-24; 'Ancient Christology', *American Friend* 1 (5th Mo. 1867), pp. 27-28; Nereus Mendenhall Diary, April 25, 1851, box 4, Mendenhall-Hobbs Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC; Elijah Coffin to Ezra Cattell, 6th Mo. 10, 1855, Letterbook 1851-1862, box 1, Coffin Papers, Friends Historical Library; Ann T. Updegraff Diary, 10th Mo. 24, 1842, 5th Mo. 30, 1843, 2nd Mo. 8, 10th Mo. 7, 12th Mo. 17, 1844, 3rd Mo. 9, 1845, Updegraff Family Papers, Quaker Collection, Haverford College, Haverford, PA; Good, D.G., 'Elisha Bates: American Quaker Evangelical in the Early Nineteenth Century', unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967, pp. 137-38; Hamm, T.D., *The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends, 1800-1907*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988, pp. 23-28.

27. See Hamm, T.D., 'The Search for the Quaker College', in John W. Oliver, Jr, Charles L. Cherry, and Caroline L. Cherry (eds.), *Founded by Friends: The Quaker Heritage of Fifteen American Colleges and Universities*, Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2007, pp. xii-xviii.

28. *Journal of the Life of John Wilbur, a Minister of the Gospel in the Society of Friends; With His Correspondence*, Providence: George H. Whitney, 1859, pp. 113-15; Eunice Thomasson (comp.), *Some Account of the Life and Religious Services of Joseph Edgerton, a Minister of the Gospel in the Society of Friends, with Extracts from His Correspondence*, Philadelphia: William H. Pile, 1885, pp. 131-32; *Memoirs of Joseph Tallcot*, Auburn, NY: Miller, Orton & Mulligan, 1855, pp. 160-61; 'Philadelphia Yearly Meeting', *Western Friend*, 5th Mo. 11, 1848, p. 210; 'Epistle', *Philadelphia Friend*, 3rd Mo. 27, 1841, p. 203.

29. Hamm, *Transformation*, pp. 36-66; W.N., Letter, *Friends' Review*, 3rd M. 2, 1867, pp. 428-29.

30. Hamm, *Transformation*, pp. 66-71.

31. Hamm, *Transformation*, pp. 71-92.

32. Hamm, *Transformation*, pp. 3-7, 21-22.

33. Hamm, *Transformation*, pp. 77-92.

34. Hamm, *Transformation*, p. 126.

35. Hamm, *Transformation*, p. 125.

36. Editorial, *Friends' Review*, 12th Mo. 23, 1886, p. 328; Pritchard, C.W., 'Essay', *Christian Worker*, 4th Mo. 27, 1882, p. 213; 'Pastoral Care', *Christian Worker*, 9th Mo. 7, 1882, p. 442; 'Church Work', *Christian Worker*, 9th Mo. 14, 1882, p. 443; Wasson, A.B., 'Evangelists and Pastors', *Christian Worker*, 1st Mo. 1, 1885, p. 14; Woodard, L., 'Church Extension in Connection with the Society of Friends', *Christian Worker*, 9th Mo. 9, 1886, pp. 421-22; 'Church Work', *Gospel Expositor*, May 11, 1883, p. 2; 'The Richmond Conference', *British Friend* 45 (12th Mo. 1, 1887), p. 291; 'American Yearly Meetings', *British Friend* 46 (11th Mo. 1, 1888), 283; *Kansas Yearly Meeting Minutes*, 1897, p. 29.

37. Hamm, *Transformation*, pp. 126-27; *Wilmington Yearly Meeting Minutes*, 1900, p. 39.

38. C[offin], C.F., 'Pastors', *Friends' Review*, 3rd Mo. 25, 1882, pp. 515-16; 'More about the Ministry', *Friends' Review*, 8th Mo. 19, 1886, pp. 40-41; 'Free Gospel Ministry', *Friends' Review*, 6th Mo. 20, 1889, pp. 744-45; Mitchell, W.F., 'Another View', *Christian Worker*, 10th Mo. 26, 1882, p. 521; James Carey Thomas to Charles F. Coffin, 7th Mo. 8, 1890, box 1, Charles F. and Rhoda M. Coffin Collection (Friends Collection, Earlham College, Richmond, IN).

39. Editorial, *Philadelphia Friend*, 2nd Mo. 2, 1889, p. 216; Letter, *Philadelphia Friend*, 8th Mo. 22, 1896, p. 37.

40. Kennedy, T.C., *British Quakerism 1860-1920: The Transformation of a Religious Community*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001, pp. 40-44.

41. Rowntree, J.S., 'Membership in the Society of Friends', *Friends Quarterly Examiner* 6 (4th Mo. 1872), p. 272; Pollard, W., 'The Yearly Meeting's "Report on Ministry and Eldership"', *Friends Quarterly Examiner* 2 (10th Mo. 1868), pp. 570-87; Barclay, R., 'On the Statistics of Friends in America', *London Friend* 12 NS (4th Mo. 1, 1872), p. 82; 'Report of the Conference on the State of Society Held in London', *London Friend* 13 NS (11th Mo. 21, 1873), pp. 306-307; 'The Responsibilities of Dissent', *London Friend* 19 NS (4th Mo. 1, 1879), p. 91; 'Closed Meeting-Houses and Small Meetings', *London Friend* 22 NS (4th Mo. 1, 1882), p. 70; 'Contributions of a City Correspondent', *British Friend* 25 (5th Mo. 1, 1867), p. 107.

42. Davis, W., 'Letter on Missions', *Friends Monthly Magazine* 1 (12th Mo. 1829), pp. 77-79; R.K., 'Remarks on Missions', *Friends Monthly Magazine* 1 (2nd Mo. 1830), pp. 157-60; Greenwood, J.O., *Quaker Encounters*. Vol. II. *Vines on the Mountains*, York: Sessions, 1977, pp. 214-28; Newman, H.S., 'Go Ye, and Teach All Nations', *Friends Quarterly Examiner* 1 (4th Mo. 1867), p. 217.

43. Kennedy, *British Quakerism*, pp. 120-22; J.T.K., 'Actualities and Possibilities of the Society of Friends', *London Friend* 11 NS (5th Mo. 1, 1871), pp. 105-106; 'Yearly Meeting', *British Friend* 35 (6th Mo. 1, 1877), p. 139. See also Rowntree, J.W., and Binns, H.B., *A History of the Adult School Movement*, London: Headley Brothers, 1903.

44. 'Notes of General Meetings Held at Grange (County Tyrone), Sixth Month, 1874', *London Friend* 14 NS (8th Mo. 1, 1874), p. 198; 'General Meetings', *London Friend* 15 NS (12th Mo. 1, 1875), pp. 323-26; 'Movements of Ministering Friends', *London Friend* 16 NS (1st Mo. 1, 1876), p. 23; 'General Meetings', *London Friend* (12th Mo. 1, 1876), p. 320; H.S., 'The Cause of Our Decline', *London Friend* 19 NS (2nd Mo. 1, 1879), pp. 36-37; 'Stockton General Meeting', *British Friend* 35 (4th Mo. 2, 1877), pp. 84-85; Land, W., 'Address to the Members of Brighthouse Monthly Meeting', *Philadelphia Friend*, 12th Mo. 31, 1881, p. 165.

45. 'London Yearly Meeting', *British Friend* 27 (6th Mo. 3, 1869), p. 132; Editorial, *London Friend* 11 NS (6th Mo. 8, 1871), p. 144; 'Harvesting', *London Friend* 18 NS (1st Mo. 1, 1878), p. 9; 'London Yearly Meeting', *London Friend* 19 NS (6th Mo. 7, 1879), p. 160; 'Our American Correspondence', *London Friend* 26 NS (2nd Mo. 1, 1886), p. 28.

46. H.S., 'Harvesting', *London Friend* 18 NS (1st Mo. 1, 1878), pp. 8-9; 'Report of Home Mission Conference', *London Friend* 21 NS (12th Mo. 3, 1881), p. 336.

47. Newman, 'Go Ye', p. 219; 'London Yearly Meeting', *London Friend* 12 NS (6th Mo. 5, 1872), 124; D.T., 'The Support of Ministers', *London Friend* 12 NS (9th Mo. 2, 1872), pp. 212-13; 'A Day among the Society of Friends in Reading', *London Friend* 20 NS (4th Mo. 1, 1880), p. 94; 'Free Service', *London Friend* 21 NS (10th Mo. 1, 1881), p. 265; 'Lay Preachers', *London Friend* 23 NS (3rd Mo. 1, 1883), p. 51; Rowntree, J.S., 'The Home Mission Committee',



London *Friend* 27 NS (9th Mo. 1, 1887), p. 236; Dymond, J.J., *The Maintenance of Ministers: A Bible Lesson*, Leominster: Orphans' Printing Press, 1890, pp. 13-15; Isichei, *Victorian Quakers*, pp. 99-100.

48. 'Report of the Conference on the State of Society', p. 313; Hamm, T.D., 'George Fox and the Politics of Early Nineteenth-Century Quaker Historiography', in Michael Mullett (ed.), *George Fox 1624-1891: A Collection of Essays*, York: William Sessions, 1993), pp. 11-21.

49. 'Address on American Friends by Stanley Pumphrey', London *Friend* 20 NS (7th Mo. 3, 1880), p. 185; Editorial, *British Friend* 2 NS (12th Mo. 1893), p. 326; 'California—Startling Statements', *British Friend* 4 NS (8th Mo. 1895), pp. 218-19.

50. A.E., 'The Poor Relief System of the Society', London *Friend* 13 NS (12th Mo. 1, 1873), pp. 327-28; 'First Day School Conference at Reading', London *Friend* 20 NS (4th Mo. 1, 1880), p. 92; 'report of Home Mission Conference', London *Friend* 21 NS (12th Mo. 3, 1881), p. 338; 'London Yearly Meeting', London *Friend* 22 NS (6th Mo. 8, 1882), p. 143; 'An Impending Danger', *British Friend* 36 (5th Mo. 1, 1878), p. 109; 'London Yearly Meeting, 1878', *British Friend* (6th Mo. 1, 1878), p. 134; 'London Yearly Meeting', *British Friend* 4 NS (6th Mo. 8, 1895), p. 158; 'Dublin Yearly Meeting', *British Friend* 8 NS (6th Mo. 1899), p. 137.

51. For early opposition to holiness doctrine, see 'London Yearly Meeting', London *Friend* 11 NS (6th Mo. 8, 1871), p. 121. For positive reports, see 'The Conference at Scarborough for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness', London *Friend* 16 NS (12th Mo. 1, 1876), pp. 315-16; and 'Somerton', London *Friend* 16 NS (12th Mo. 1, 1876), p. 321. For criticism, see 'The Offices of the Holy Spirit', London *Friend* 18 NS (8th Mo. 1, 1878), p. 202; 'The Issue', London *Friend* 21 NS (4th Mo. 1, 1881), pp. 83-84; and Beck, M.E., 'Thoughts on "The Higher Life"', *Friends Quarterly Examiner* 9 (4th Mo. 1875), pp. 252-54.

52. 'London Yearly Meeting', London *Friend* 13 NS (6th Mo. 6, 1873), p. 121; Pollard, W., 'The Home Mission Committee and Paid Preachers', London *Friend* 23 NS (3rd Mo. 1, 1883), p. 57; 'Yearly Meeting', *British Friend* 35 (6th Mo. 1, 1877), pp. 146-47; Tallack, W., 'London Yearly Meeting's American Correspondence', *British Friend* 42 (5th Mo. 1, 1884), pp. 111-12; 'London Yearly Meeting', *British Friend* 46 (6th Mo. 8, 1888), p. 137; Thompson, C., 'Paid Preachers', *British Friend* 48 (10th Mo. 1, 1890), p. 249; 'The Maintenance of Ministers', *British Friend* 2 NS (4th Mo. 1893), p. 94; Frith, F., 'The Home Mission Question', *British Friend* 2 NS (5th Mo. 1893), p. 117; Rowntree, J.W., 'Has Our Society Failed?', *British Friend* 8 NS (4th Mo. 1899), pp. 92-93.

53. 'London Yearly Meeting', *British Friend* 46 (6th Mo. 8, 1888), p. 138; 'Isaac Sharp in America', *British Friend* 41 (12th Mo. 1, 1883), 288; J. Bevan Braithwaite to Coffin, 12th Mo. 22, 1892, box 1, Charles and Rhoda Coffin Collection; Kennedy, *British Quakerism*, pp. 66, 99.

54. 'London Yearly Meeting', London *Friend* 18 NS (6th Mo. 7, 1878), pp. 127-28; Thorp, F., 'The Society of Friends and Its Implied Terms of Membership', London *Friend* 18 NS (4th Mo. 1, 1878), p. 83. See also 'Dublin Yearly Meeting', *British Friend* 4 NS (5th Mo. 25, 1895), p. 136.

55. Kennedy, *British Quakerism*, pp. 119-56.

#### AUTHOR DETAILS

Thomas D. Hamm Thomas D. Hamm is a native of New Castle, Indiana. He received his PhD in history from Indiana University in 1985. Since 1987, he has been archivist and professor of history at Earlham College. His most recent book is *The Quakers in America*, published by Columbia University Press in 2003. He is currently at work on a book on Hicksite Friends from 1827 to 1900.

Mailing address: Department of History, Earlham College, Richmond, IN 47374, USA. Email: tomh@earlham.edu.