History and Quaker Renaissance: the Vision of John Wilhelm Rowntree

Between 1909 and 1921 William Charles Braithwaite and Rufus M. Jones produced the seven volumes of the Rowntree Series which are still recognized as the standard historical studies of the Society of Friends.[1] One might assume that the series derived its name from the fact that its publication was sponsored and financed through a Charitable Trust established by cocoa manufacturer Joseph Rowntree. In fact, both the name of the series and the books that comprise it have deeper roots in the life and works of Joseph Rowntree's eldest son, John Wilhelm. The volumes of the Rowntree Series are not only still recognized as solid, authoritative historical works,[2] but they have also had a profound influence on the development, some would even say the meaningful survival, of London Yearly Meeting as a viable religious community during the twentieth century.[3]

Because the Religious Society of Friends is a body of believers whose reputation and influence far exceed its miniscule size, outsiders are likely to categorize Quakers in rather narrow or singular ways which do not do justice to the diversity and complexity of the Quaker experience. Because of Friends' unique mode of worship, their odd method of conducting business, their deserved reputation for social conscience, honesty, gentleness and pacifism, many tend to think of Quakers as a truly Peculiar People. Furthermore, they assume that even contemporary Friends are part of a solid continuum from the days of George Fox and Robert Barclay to the "Holy Experiment" of William Penn, and from the philanthrophic zeal of Elizabeth Fry and the righteous rhetoric of John Bright right through to the inspiring, if seemingly futile, social activism and war resistance of so many twentieth-century Quakers.

Because most non-Friends know Quakerism only indirectly through what they have seen or read rather than through close personal acquaintance with Friends, the supposition of historical continuity is not surprising. Indeed, at the close of the nineteenth century many British and American Quakers saw themselves in a similar light, though, of course, for very different reasons. The

eminent Quaker philosopher and historian Rufus M. Jones, speaking of Friends in the late nineteenth century, noted that while his co-religionists generally paid deep and sincere homage to Quaker founder George Fox as their spiritual ancestor, many of them held views that Fox had explicitly denounced. It was Calvin, not Fox, who dominated Quaker religious thinking, Jones said. One reason for this paradoxical situation, he believed, was that Friends "were not historical-minded and no historian had yet traced the slow transformations through which the Society of Friends had passed in two centuries".[4]

Ignorance of history caused most British Friends to be equally ignorant of the spiritual evolution of their Society. To be sure, they might recognize some distance between the immediacy and dynamism of George Fox's message to seventeenth-century England and the retrogressive quietism of eighteenth-century Quakers. But most were convinced that their Society had been awakened from its spiritual slumber in the early nineteenth century through the sort of "fire and vision" evangelism exemplified by Joseph John Gurney, the most influential Quaker of his generation. In this, they were largely correct. Still, the Evangelical Movement had had other momentous effects on Friends. It had brought Quakerism into the mainstream of Protestantism for the first time. Not only did Quakers gradually shed their peculiar garb and speech, they also came to rely more and more on a strict and literal interpretation of the Bible as the inspired and infallible word of God as well as on the substitutionary doctrine of the Atonement. The ideas and practices that had earlier characterized Quakerism, especially the concept of the Inward Light, or Divine Seed in every man, were widely neglected.[5] The result, said Rufus Jones, was that "Quakerism was shot through with Calvinistic doctrine".[6] Furthermore, some observers believed that the fire of Gurney-type revivalism had largely burned out after the mid-nineteenth century, leaving in its ashes a "harsh and rigid scoria of credal thought which none must be allowed to challenge".[7]

Given the strict Biblical literalism to which most, though not all,[8] Victorian Quakers adhered, the late nineteenth-century Society of Friends was as vulnerable as any other Protestant denomination to the challenges of Darwinian science and the so-called higher criticism that questioned the literal accuracy and even the authenticity of much of the Bible. The problem for Friends, however, was doubly difficult because their Society was

not only tiny but also overwhelmingly middle class. Well-to-do and comfortable Friends tended to be the leaders of the Society because only they were apt to have the leisure to perform duties essential to the maintenance of a religious body without a paid ministry.[9] During the same period, the children, and likely successors, of these "weighty" Friends were in increasing numbers enrolling for the sort of advanced education that would expose them, at a most impressionable age, to theories and ideas that threatened to undermine their fundamental religious principles. Thus, ironically, the very means of preparing a new generation of Quakers for wordly success and spiritual leadership seemed all too likely to take these potential leaders right out of the Society they were expected to lead.

Many younger British Friends of prominent families, influenced by modern science and Biblical criticism, underwent the agony of religious doubt, made more painful and protracted by the feeling that there seemed to be no elder persons in the Society who were willing or able to minister to their needs.[10] In a religious organization as small as the Society of Friends, these circumstances portended disaster, even, eventually, extinction. As the editor of *The Friend* (London) told Rufus Jones in 1895:

> We have found for some years past... our Church losing grasp of the highly educated and intelligent young men and women belonging to our best old Quaker families who were receiving first class curriculum at College and then drifting theologically. If our Society was thus to lose its best, a few years might settle our fate. Every Christian Church *must* face modern criticism and modern scientific thought.[11]

During the 1860s and 1870s some younger Quakers had attempted to address these problems, but most influential Friends had viewed questioners as rebels or heretics; they were either silenced or expelled or, in some cases, they voluntarily resigned membership.[12] Not until the anonymous publication of *A Reasonable Faith* in 1884 by three mature Friends, followed two years later by Edward Worsdell's *The Gospel of Divine Faith* was an alternative liberal theology, incorporating both Biblical criticism and Darwinism science into the Christian context, available to more progressive, better-educated Quakers.[13]

Naturally, most Evangelical Friends did not take the challenge of liberal theology lying down. Their influence in the Society was of long standing and great depth. For example, in 1887, at an important transatlantic conference in Richmond, Indiana, Joseph

Bevan Briathwaite, probably the most influential English Evangelical Friend, drafted a Declaration which set out the essential principles of the Evangelical Creed. This "Richmond Declaration" was enthusiastically and almost unanimously approved by the Conference. When, however, Braithwaite attempted in 1888 to gain endorsement for his Declaration at London Yearly Meeting, the ruling Body for British Friends, his effort was frustrated by the resolute opposition of a number of well-educated, younger Friends, some of whom vowed to leave the Society if the Richmond Declaration was accepted.[14]

The rejection of the Richmond Declaration was a decisive moment in the history of British Quakerism, for it opened the way to a much enlarged influence by liberal, progressive thinkers. But it was not a complete victory for the advocates of "modern thought". The evangelical wing was still strong (indeed dominant in America west of Philadelphia). And if many of the young liberals had resolved their own lingering doubts, they could perceive no clear means for ensuring that succeeding generations of Friends would be adequately prepared to meet the challenges of modern thought and action in the twentieth century. Although they were filled with faith and fervour, they lacked guidance, direction and a real plan for taking advantage of the opportunities open to them. They were, as one Friend has put it, like the "Seekers After Truth" of the mid-seventeenth century who gathered around George Fox and became founding members of what was to become the Society of Friends.[15]

Eventually, these late-Victorian "Seekers" also found a prophet and champion. Unlike Fox, he did not lead his disciples up some Pendle Hill or on tramps of itinerant preaching. Rather John Wilhelm Rowntree steered his followers back into the mist-shrouded past of their religious fellowship, back to the tracts and letters and diaries of the "first publishers of the truth". As Rowntree believed that George Fox and early Friends had initiated a renewal of primitive Christianity by rediscovering the Inward Light, the direct link from man to God, so he sought more than two centuries later to renew a faltering Society of Friends through the recovery and proper exposition of its roots. John Wilhelm Rowntree's vision was to use the history of the Society of Friends to demonstrate the relevance and modernity of its message, not just to his Quaker contemporaries but to the great mass of seekers outside their Society who were longing for a place

of spiritual rest in an increasingly complex and bewildering modern world.[16]

When John Wilhelm Rowntree (born in 1868) began to take an active part in the affairs of the Society of Friends in the early 1890s, few could have imagined that he would become "a prophetic figure" or "one of the most potent influences in the life of Friends".[17] For although his family had impeccable Quaker credentials (made perhaps even more weighty by the recent success of Joseph Rowntree's cocoa works), John Wilhelm had not been a promising youth. Sensitive and temperamental, he had from childhood grown increasingly deaf, a disability which undoubtedly contributed to his generally indifferent performance as a scholar. Furthermore, as a young man he was found to have contracted *retinitis pigmentosa,* an incurable eye disease causing gradual deterioration of his sight.

After leaving school at seventeen, John went immediately to work in his father's factory where, for the first time, he began to show some aptitude as a man of business and as a leader of men. By the time he reached his early twenties, the eldest Rowntree son had achieved modest success becoming with his brother Seebohm, a partner in the family business, as well as a husband and father and an active member of the Friends Meeting at York. He also began to bloom intellectually, reading widely in theology and philosophy as well as pursuing a serious interest in art, particularly the paintings of the German Reformation artist Albrecht Dürer. The Rowntree home was the centre of a growing circle of friends attracted by John Wilhelm's charm and love of fun.[18] Despite the apparent happiness and stability of his life, John Wilhelm was a profoundly troubled young man who, though he earnestly wished to embrace the faith of his fathers, seemed in danger of collapsing into agnosticism under the accumulated weight of modern scientific and historical evidence. As he told a friend in 1893: "For two or three years I have been on the verge of resignation, and had it not been that I was favourably circumstanced, should no doubt have left Friends".[19] At this critical juncture, however, under the influence of a visiting American Friend, Dr. Richard Thomas of Baltimore, Rowntree experienced a spiritual catharsis which purged him of personal doubt and caused him to dedicate himself "to making the Society of Friends... a real and living force in the world".[20]

If John Wilhelm Rowntree had resolved his own spiritual disquiet, he had not made peace with the existing conditions of

British Quakerism. Reflecting on the deliberations of the London Yearly Meeting 1893, the first in which he had played a leading role, Rowntree noted: "We spent twenty-five minutes debating whether the women should be admitted to the men's meeting. It was Quaker caution and love of detail running to seed--the spectacle was not inspiring..." Yearly Meeting, along with the entire edifice of Quaker theology and organization, he said, "wants getting out of its ruts...".[21]

What were the "ruts" from which young Rowntree wished to drag from a reluctant Society of Friends? That question may best be considered in the context of the Manchester Conference of 1895 on the "Life and Work of the Society". Called by the Friends Home Mission Committee and attended by over a thousand persons, this meeting, in the words of one perceptive modern Friend, marked "the first time that the Society had made an effort to assess its position in the light of modern thought" and to deal with "the intellectual as well as the spiritual needs of its members...".[22]

At Manchester, progressive Friends began a systematic critique of the deficiencies of Quakerism which would continue unabated until John Wilhelm Rowntree's death a decade later and would, in the end, shape the image of twentieth-century Quakerism. This criticism, in general, can be subsumed under three major areas of concern – doctrine, education and the ministry and social questions. The last of these, which emphasized the need for the Society of Friends to go beyond traditional philanthropy in dealing with social evils, is outside the scope of this paper. The others, however, are intertwined and must be carefully considered in order to appreciate the thrust of liberal criticism and the role of John Wilhelm Rowntree and his circle in integrating that criticism into the theology and practice of modern British Quakerism.[23]

First of all, Rowntree and other younger Friends believed that Quakers had to rethink their fundamental theological position. During the nineteenth century, they said, the Society of Friends had acquired the ponderous spiritual baggage of protestant Evangelicalism which, together with the revelations of modern science and biblical criticism, had become a millstone threatening to drag Quakerism down into a welter of undistinguished, indistinguishable nonconformist sects. But they were convinced that the strangling bonds of Biblical literalism could be loosened through the recovery and repossession of the early and unique

sources of Quaker inspiration, especially the doctrine of the Inward Light which emphasized the indwelling spirit of God in each human soul. One knew God, they believed, by experiencing His presence, not through infallible books, harsh creeds or powerful priests. Religious authority was within the individual and salvation was obtained by allowing the Inward Light to lead on to Christ and by following the glorious example of His life.[24] As Rowntree remarked to a former teacher in 1897:

> We are free from any weight of tradition or ritual, and with our clearer perception of the indwelling nature of the Spirit, ought to strike more easily below class distinction and form to the recognition of the true brotherhood of man--the want of which it seems to me is the cause of much of the materialism of the present day.[25]

The second major concern of the proponents of modern theology was their Society's woeful neglect of education in general and of religious education in particular. Older, evangelical Friends, they said, not only attempted to shield, futilely to be sure, young people from the rigours of modern thought but also denied them the sort of religious instruction that would permit them to intelligently evaluate their faith and its compatibility with the modern world. As Rowntree, recalling his own despairing time of doubt, noted: "How can we demand of the young who are only on the threshold of experience an acceptance of dogmas the meaning of which they cannot fully grasp, and which experience alone can teach them to understand or value".[26]

This situation was made even more acute by the fact that British Quakers had rejected a "hireling ministry" and waited in silent meeting until God made his presence felt through one or more of the gathered faithful. While Victorian Friends followed the practice of "recording" particularly prominent or inspired speakers, male and female, as ministers, these non-professional ministers seldom had any special training and generally had neither the means nor the desire to deal with the troublesome questions and worrisome doubts of younger members. Rowntree believed that the reasons for spurning a professional clergy were as sound as when George Fox had denounced mercenary priests.[27] The real problem, he said, was that the Society had failed to live up to the serious responsibility of sustaining a free ministry. Some Friends regarded "intellect as an enemy to be fought rather than an ally to be welcomed"; while others seemed to believe that the

absence of special training and even of careful preparation was a badge of honour reflecting the belief in the immediate moving of the spirit by the inward relation with God. But in John Wilhelm's view it was "among the... chief causes of disaster in the recent history of our church".

> So feeble is the witness borne to the freedom of our spiritual heritage, so negative and barren is the interpretation of our testimony, so threadbare and so poor is our simplicity... that the glory of the Quaker ideal has drawn well nigh to extinguishment... To this generation has been given to decide whether the Free Ministry, nay even the Quaker testimony itself, shall survive in a living fellowship.[28]

As early as 1894 John Wilhelm Rowntree had begun planning a new enterprise with "the definite aim of waking up the Society to thought". The means to his end was to be a series of occasional papers on the major issues facing Friends, collected, edited and published by Rowntree and an editorial committee that included William Charles Braithwaite, Edward Grubb, and Henry Bryan Binns.[29] This project, however, was impeded by various distractions, the most significant of which was the pronouncement of Rowntree's doctors that his retinitis would inevitably lead to total blindness.[30] This blow was eventually softened when he discovered a Chicago oculist who concluded that if John Wilhelm retired from the cocoa works, moved to the country and underwent a rigorous regime of treatment, the progress of his ailment could be checked. With the enforced leisure of his retreat from the world of business, Rowntree began to issue the materials he had gathered in a monthly journal called *Present-Day Papers*. This periodical, which Rowntree said "must... remain independent and free from the restraints of tradition and the necessity for compromise", was the bane of many conservative Friends, addressing, as it did a wide range of controversial theological and social issues.[31]

In the meantime, Rowntree and his allies were working on other ways to ensure that the Society of Friends would not continue to be "an unintelligent spectator of the greatest revolution in religious thought since... the Reformation".[32] He believed that the problems of dealing with educational deficiencies and ministerial ineptitude among Friends were as much practical as spiritual. To this end he planned and organized a series of Summer Schools for Biblical and other studies which would incorporate the latest scientific and historical knowledge.

Rowntree and his growing circles of disciples mobilized their resources to attract leading Quaker and non-Quaker experts to a series of Summer Schools at Scarborough (1897), Birmingham (1899), Haverford (1900), Scarborough (1901) and Windermere (1902).[33] These gatherings proved to be so successful, especially with younger Friends, that they inspired the Birmingham chocolate magnate George Cadbury to donate his estate at Woodbrooke as "a permanent settlement for Bible study" and for the short-term training of Friends who would form the basis of a new, informed, vital yet truly "free" ministry.[34]

George Cadbury believed that the establishment of Woodbrooke might "save the Society" and heaped praise on John Wilhelm not only for inspiring the idea of a Quaker centre for religious education but also for his leadership in bringing about "a remarkable change in the general feeling" among British Friends.[35] But Rowntree himself was far from satisfied with the results of his efforts. Too many Quakers, he said, still regarded their church "as a collector regards his specimens"; they still would not or could not "comprehend the philosophical content, the tremendous spiritual impact of Fox's 'gospel' ". His dream was to see Quakerism move the religious life of England in the reign of Edward VII as "the primitive giants" of the Society had moved it in the days of Cromwell and the Stuarts.[36]

> [I]f the fire that lived in George Fox, Edward Burroughs, and... Isaac Penington... only could be rekindled; if Quakerism would only arise from the dust and speak to men in language of the twentieth century, there should be such a shaking of dry bones as had not been felt before. It was not to be a revival, but a revelation of the power of the Spirit.[37]

It was a powerful vision. But at the very time when Rowntree's influence among Friends seemed about to become paramount he was deprived of his most important means of communicating his message. In October 1902, on doctor's orders, he resigned as editor of *Present-Day Papers* and this organ of progressive Quakerism simply vanished from sight.[38] Still, if John Wilhelm Rowntree was forced to relinquish one forum, his fervent, fertile mind had already settled on other means for propagating his views to Friends, and to the world.

For a long time, certainly since 1897,[39] Rowntree had believed that a real key to realization of his work for the revitalization of the Society of Friends might be in the rescuing of Quaker history

from the obscuratism and neglect in which it had languished for nearly two centuries. The indolent complacency and resolute anti-intellectualism of many Quakers, Rowntree said, was

> closely associated with the strange haziness which characterises the mind of the average Friend, when questioned as to the historical and spiritual significance of his church. Our ignorance, both as to the facts of our church history with their meaning for the present and the future, and the want of any adequate conception of our spiritual heritage, is not likely to develop the gifts latent amongst us... A small body like the Society of Friends, which has with almost dramatic suddenness broken down its social barriers and mingled with the world after a century of aloofness, must have very clear convictions if it is not to lose its identity.[40]

Rowntree was convinced that the prevailing lack of solid historical knowledge, especially among young Friends, represented one of the gravest dangers to survival of the Society. He perceived that the rising generation of Quakers had, under the influence of modern thought, broken more completely with the ideas and attitudes of their fathers and grandfathers than any previous body of Friends. But if they rejected the evangelical tradition, the only one they had been taught, what was there left in Quakerism, seemingly sunk into "a torpor of undeveloped intellectual power", to hold their allegiance?[41] There was, Rowntree said, the glorious past – history – which he once described as "the voice of God, many tongued".[42] He was confident that a "fresh and sound historical interpretation of the entire Quaker movement", incorporating the most up-to-date canons of historical research, could lead to a rediscovery of the long submerged spiritual heritage of Quakerism.[43] Not only Friends but religious seekers everywhere awaited the inspiration of "Quaker History... worked out, not simply with the view of presenting biographical sketches, and interesting historical data, but in order to bring out... 'the practical, spiritual, and non-sacerdotal aspects of Divine truth', in relation to individual and national life".[44].

It may have been entirely coincidental that the British Friends Historical Society (FHS) was established in 1903, "for promoting research in a field hitherto but imperfectly worked",[45] just at the time that John Wilhelm Rowntree was becoming seriously involved in his projected History of Quakerism. It was certainly not an accident that in early 1904 the Society's *Journal* published a notice of Rowntree's intention "to trace the development of

Quaker thought and organization... with a view to the practical bearing upon current Quaker problems..."[46]

In any event, the founding of the Friends Historical Society most assuredly represents an aspect of the new spirit sweeping through the entire Society of Friends. For at the same time that the elderly Victorian evangelical J. Bevan Braithwaite, author of the Richmond Declaration, contemplated the formation of the FHS with grave anxiety for the mischief it might do,[47] John Wilhelm Rowntree was writing to Norman Penney, newly appointed librarian at Devonshire House in London, asking for permission to borrow a series of early reports which would provide "records in the very beginning of Friends all up and down the country".[48]

This incident reflects not just differing views about the value of historical investigations but a radically different way of looking at the world and the Divine Plan for it. J. Bevan Braithwaite viewed mankind as lost and helpless, indeed hopeless of salvation without strict adherence to the infallible Authority of Holy Writ; Rowntree, on the other hand, saw each individual as the agent of God, guided, if he or she would only recognize it, by the inward Authority of the Inner Light. One of the remarkable attributes of John Wilhelm Rowntree and of the other Quaker historians with whom he worked, especially Rufus Jones and William Charles Braithwaite, was their absolute lack of concern about where their research might lead them. Because they were convinced that a balanced and meticulous history of Quakerism could only enlarge the role their Society had played in bringing the true message of Christianity to all men, they were consumed with the desire to pursue every manuscript, to find every document, to read every diary in order to discover the real "inner life" of Quakerism. As Rowntree once noted in urging his co-religionists to follow his lead into the "pages of sprawling and faded writing..."

> "Do not be angry if they are dry... There is a fascination, hard to describe in these musty books, written by men who knew persecution, not by hearsay, but by experience; who perhaps saw and heard Fox, Dewsbury and Whitehead in the flesh, and who... were our spiritual ancestors..."[49]

John Wilhelm Rowntree's work on his History began in earnest during the summer of 1903 after a trip to the United States to see his oculist, visit American Friends and collect historical sources.

He told Norman Penney in July 1903 that he had acquired 200 essential volumes with the aid of the Haverford College librarian and that despite the "crude raw state" of his thinking, he was about to embark upon his project.[50] Within a month, however, Rowntree's work was interrupted by still another physical setback, "unpleasant heart symptoms, threatening angina pectoris". The illness seems to have, in turn, induced a fit of depression settling on him "with the blackness of night". By the end of the year, however, after a rest cure in Switzerland, he was back at his desk "making headway" and finding "queer things".[51]

Throughout the first nine months of 1904, Rowntree laboured away at his home at Scalby on the Yorkshire coast, warming to his work, corresponding with Quaker scholars for advice and old schoolmasters for approval. "My desire", he informed one of the latter, "is to strip my mind as far as possible of all prejudice and to examine the past in a scientific spirit... with the fairness of a disinterested historian". "My object", he told another, "is to provide a really scientific and impartial study, not an *ex parte* statement representing one school or another".[52] In late July he confessed to Rufus Jones that he had "got so closely absorbed in my Quaker History that I am finding it increasingly difficult to give time or thought to the mere outer world."[53]

John Wilhelm Rowntree expected to spend ten years at research and writing before his study would be ready for publication[54] – a legitimate prospect for most men of thirty-five. But, in fact, these few months were the only period of sustained historical work he was to be allowed. Fortunately, his labours did reach some fruition because he promised his Monthly Meeting to deliver a series of three lectures on "The Rise of Quakerism in Yorkshire" at a "Summer School" in Kirbymoorside in late September 1904. These lectures were printed and preserved[55] and thus provide the sole material for a critical assessment of Rowntree's skill and insight as a historian.

Not surprisingly, the Yorkshire lectures at times reflect the enthusiasm and naivety of the newly initiated. They also reveal the Quaker penchant for slipping, in spite of themselves, into a private sectarian language. Thus Rowntree here speaks of a "quicking in Leicestershire" or there of Friends following "the spirit of the hat".[56] But while these touches add quaintness to his work, they do not hide either a genuine literary ability or a powerful historical imagination.

Rowntree's absorption in the words and deeds of early Friends convinced him more than ever of the depths of their spiritual power, the courage of their relentless practice, and most significantly, the soundness of their saving message – not simply to the seventeenth century but to seeking, striving humanity of every place and time. First and foremost, his research gave him a fresh appreciation of the religious insight of George Fox. Fox's genius, Rowntree told Rufus Jones, was made manifest, not in the originality of his conception of Divine guidance (the Inward Light was not a new idea), but in the logical way that he worked out his beliefs as regards social attitudes and church organization. Just as important, Rowntree felt, was the escape offered by Fox from the "terrible shadow of predestination". The "sunlight and fragrance of the best Quaker character", he said, "would have been impossible but for this emanicipation".[57]

Still, Rowntree's enthusiasm for "Fox's day", when "the molten metal had not congealed", did not blunt his criticism of subsequent developments within the Society of Friends.

> Those were great days of high courage, noble sacrifice and rich fruit. It is hard to come back to the present without discouragement, for the promise of the past has failed. But there is still the future... We can afford to study the history of the great decline and to take its lessons to heart, because we have hope in the future and faith in the great renewal.[58]

Some of Rowntree's best, most picturesque writing describes those days of the "great decline" when, following the Toleration Act of 1689, "Quakers, like a rowing crew after a fierce race, rested on their oars". It was impossible, he said, "to white-wash eighteenth-century Quakerism" passing as it did "from the apostolic vision of the Kingdom of God into the prose of Quietism and Commerce".[59]

In one of his most effective critical passages, Rowntree compared the first two phases of Quaker history. In the early years, he said, the life of Friends was in the open. They would not remove their hats for any man; they would not swear oaths; they would not fight. "It was impossible to ignore the Quaker because he would not be ignored." But after the onset of the eighteenth century,

> the life that was in the open is in secret. Timidly the Quaker peeps over his hedge of prickly cactus, willing that his plain coat of sleek broadcloth should testify for simplicity, but loath indeed to take it off, like the

Methodist, and preach to a storming crowd at the street corner. He is... ponderous in the sobriety of his language and the dullness of his intellect. His culture is narrow, his outlook small; his dinners are good, and his worship somnolent.[60]

He was less hard on the Evangelicals of the nineteenth century because they, at least, had roused Quakerism from its slumber. Still, he blamed them for their rejection of "humane learning" which had "worked incalculable mischief throughout the Society". The Evangelicals had accomplished the necessary repudiation of Quietism and reawakened the vigour of Quaker spirit. But in their zeal to ensure their fitness in the narrow light of scriptural infallibility, Rowntree noted, they had unfortunately diminished those unique aspects of Quakerism which had caught and held the first Friends, most especially the Inward Light. The result, he said, could best be summarized in the words of Thomas Hancock, a Victorian critic of Friends, who had written: "In 1658 there was not a Quaker living who did not belive Quakerism to be the one only true church of God. In 1858 there is not a Quaker living who does believe it."[61]

Despite Rowntree's discovery of much that was "sad and gloomy" in the past two centuries of his church, he scorned the idea that Quakerism was "unsuited to the masses" or that its message had been absorbed by larger, more popular churches. His final Yorkshire lecture concluded with a ringing declaration of the purpose of his History and indeed, the purpose of his entire life:

> Quakerism absorbed?... No!... There is room yet for the teaching of the Inward Light, for the witness of a living God, for the reinterpretation of the Christ in lives that shall convict the careless, [and] language that shall convince the doubting...
>
> There is room yet for a fellowship, all-inclusive in its tender sympathy, drawn close in the loving bondage of sincerity and truth, for the noble simplicity of life and manners... for a freedom that scorns the flummeries of rank... because it know the worth of manhood and loves the privilege of friendship...
>
> Climb Pendle Hill with Fox and see once more his vision--'a great people to be gathered'...[62]

When John Wilhelm Rowntree, fresh from the success of his Yorkshire lectures, sailed for America in late February 1905, the future seemed as hopeful as the recent past had been fruitful. His closest friend Rufus Jones recalled: "Every dream was coming true. His impact on the youth of the Society of Friends was

everywhere in evidence. It seemed as though a new Epoch was dawning." Then, suddenly, in mid-Atlantic he was stricken with pneumonia. After several days of insensibility, he died on 9 March 1905 in a New York hospital. Jones, who had met the ship and was with Rowntree when he died, remembered how pitiful it was "to hear him dwell, in the delirium of fever, upon the great literary plan of his life." He was buried and still remains in the courtyard of Haverford Friends Meeting House.[63]

Rowntree's death profoundly shook the British Society of Friends. A relative remarked that no single event had "moved the Society, as John's death has done, for 200 years..."[64] One prominent Friend called it "the bitterest sorrow I have ever had to bear"; another published a long elegiac poem depicting John Wilhelm as "the pure boy knight... our Gallahad".[65] Still others, to greater purpose, called on surviving Friends, especially those "possessing the historical spirit", to set themselves to completing the sort of history that John Wilhelm Rowntree had hoped would "weld and unify... the Quaker faith... and... generate throughout the Society new life and vigour".[66]

Some of the first Friends to respond positively to John Wilhelm Rowntree's death were his father Joseph, his brother Seebohm and his wife Constance. Within a few days, they set about erecting an appropriate memorial to his life and work. First, they arranged for the collection and publication of his *Essays and Addresses*; then, more significantly, they began to sound out Quaker scholars who might make a contribution to the completion of his history.[67]

At Scalby in early September 1905, members of the Rowntree family met with Rufus M. Jones, William C. Braithwaite, A. Neave Brayshaw and others to discuss the Quaker History project. What emerged from this conference was a plan to combine Rufus Jones's proposed studies of European mysticism with John Wilhelm's projected history of Quakerism in order to produce a multi-volume series named in his memory.[68] Several scholars at the Scalby meeting indicated their willingness to help, but in the end the bulk of the work fell to Jones as overall editor and to William Charles Braithwaite, newly elected president of the Friends Historical Society. For the next sixteen years Jones and Braithwaite, generously supported by the Rowntree Charitable Trust, spent what ever time they could spare in preparing the fulfilment of John Wilhelm Rowntree's dream.[69]

The relationship between the two major authors, as reconstructed through their correspondence, was both refreshing in their

approach to the subject and fascinating for the ghost that hovered over it. From their first tentative feeling out of problems to their later, more confident, consideration of the evidence, their approach seems a model of industry, honesty and growing historical insight. Braithwaite set the tone with a letter indicating that he could "see nothing... but careful, detailed, historical work if the rise of Quakerism is to be correctly delineated on a correct background". As he perused the manuscripts and letters assembled at the Friends Library in London, Braithwaite reflected that the significance of these sources was "only apparent to a person who is already in possession of other material into which the new piece of information fits. It is like rebuilding structure out of dilapidated ruins."[70]

When questions arose as to how a particular topic should be handled, the authors agreed to refer to the outline and notes that John Wilhelm had developed before he died.[71] But they did not feel obliged to follow slavishly Rowntree's largely undigested plan. When, for instance, Braithwaite received a list of chapter titles Rowntree had compiled, he altered many of them and ignored others because he believed that they were better suited to interpretative discussions of certain narrow aspects of early Quaker experience than to a fully developed history of Quakerism. As he told Rufus Jones:

> Possibly J[oh]n Wilhelm had historical discussion a good deal in mind, but I am sure he would have made sure of his groundwork of facts first and would have given us a vivid history illuminated by historical discussion and not subordinated to it.

A really adequate history of the early movement, he said, could only be worked out from the mass of material at the Friends Library which provided "contemporary sources of the best kind... involving a great deal of detailed co-ordination of dates & facts but resulting in a vivid & in many respects fresh presentation..."[72]

John Wilhelm would no doubt have approved, just as he would have applauded Braithwaite's refusal, with the support of Rufus Jones, to tone down what the cautious Joseph Rowntree called "the extravagances of the movement" (for example, the fact that some early Friends, male and female, demonstrated their rejection of "creaturely" things by parading stark naked through northern English towns). Joseph Rowntree was concerned lest the

"ordinary reader... fasten upon these and let them bulk too large in his mind..." But the author and editor would not be deterred; they published the story of early Friends "extravagances" and all.[73]

Despite these concerns, which he never pressed beyond query, Joseph Rowntree's contribution to the series was surely admirable. He continually urged the authors to "spare no expense" in order to ensure that the History might be "a standard work broadly based upon full knowledge".[74] The elder Rowntree was also involved in an incident which is an amusing reminder of the smallness and intimacy of the British Edwardian elite. Once, when Rufus Jones expressed a desire to have one of his chapters on Wycliff and the Lollards read by the newly acclaimed G.M. Trevelyan, Joseph Rowntree responded that if Jones did not know Trevelyan, "Seebohn knows Charles Trevelyan the M.P. (I forget the historian's first name)... and Seebohm tells me... that he would have no difficulty in asking him to pass on this request to his brother, the historian."[75]

Of course, Rufus Jones's contribution to the series was the largest of all. This was only fitting, given the depth of his personal, intellectual and spiritual friendship with John Wilhelm Rowntree. After his dearest friend died in his arms, Jones said, "his life in some sense went into mine", and he vowed "in every way I could... toward the fulfilment of his interrupted plans".[76] Jones discharged his pledge by writing five volumes of the series as well as providing a long introduction to Braithwaite's books. This essay was intended to link all the volumes together and "to bring home to Friends and others the vital lessons of the history."[77]

William C. Braithwaite thought Jones's introduction "quite admirable" and "of great service in giving coherence to the study" as well as illuminating "the main lesson that our Quakerism of today needs to learn".[78] During recent years, however, many of Jones's historical interpretations, especially his fixing the origins of Quakerism in Continental Mysticism, have been challenged by historians who see early Friends as children of English Puritanism.[79] Indeed, both Braithwaite volumes have been re-issued without Jones's introduction on the ground that his views have been largely refuted.[80] Still, in the words of a latter day Quaker scholar, contemporary Friends "cannot understand who we are unless... we realize how much the way we put things today is colored by our reaction to Rufus Jones and to his generation."[81]

Of that generation, John Wilhelm Rowntree has been acknowledged as the greatest representative. Not only did he give life to the implementation of many of the practical reforms that allowed British Quakerism to escape from two centuries in a religious "backwater", but his vision of the revitalizing effects of a "fresh and sound" approach to Quaker history also inspired one of the most intellectual achievements among Friends since the seventeenth century. Questions about what "the History" might have been if he had lived or what his leadership might have contributed to Quaker war resistance during their second great testing time in the First World War[82] are, however intriguing, beyond the realm of historical investigation. Suffice to say that the influence of John Wilhelm Rowntree did not cease with his death and that his presence was distinctly felt among Friends of the succeeding generations. On the fiftieth anniversary of J.W. Rowntree's death, Maurice Creasey, Director of Studies at Woodbrooke, the permanent settlement for Quaker studies that Rowntree had first proposed, noted.

> it can be truthfully said that such stability and sense of direction and points of growth as the Society has possessed in recent years, are due in large measure to the influence and teaching and guidance of the Friends whom John Wilhelm Rowntree inspired.[83]

THOMAS C. KENNEDY

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1] Rufus M. Jones (1861–1948) was overall editor of the series which was originally published by Macmillan. Jones's contributions are *Studies in Mystical Religion* (London, 1909); *Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1914); *The Quakers in the American Colonies* (London, 1911), with Isaac Sharpless and Amelia M. Gummere; and *The Later Periods of Quakerism* (London, 1921), 2 vols. William Charles Braithwaite (1862–1922) wrote *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (London, 1912) and *The Second Period of Quakerism* (London, 1919).

[2] New editions have been published with only minor changes. For comments on the series, see Hugh Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England* (New Haven, 1964), ix, 260–261 and Elizabeth Gray Vining, *Friend of life: The Biography of Rufus M. Jones* (Philadelphia, [1958]), 194.

[3] Interview with Mary Hoxie Jones, 13 September 1983, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

[4] Rufus M. Jones, *The Trail of Life in Middle Years* (New York, 1934), 56.

[5] During the London Yearly Meeting of 1861, one member suggested that the use of "Inward Light" be abandoned by Friends because it was generally misunderstood outside of their Society and, more to the point, because it was not based on Scripture. See *The Friend* (London), 7 June 1861, 139–140. Also see Edward Grubb, *The Evangelical Movement and Its Impact on the Society of Friends* (Leominster, 1924), *passim* and Elizabeth Isichei, *Victorian Quakers,* (London, 1970), 3–16.

[6] Jones, *Middle Years,* 56–57. Jones was referring to the Society in general, although Calvinism was undoubtedly more influential among American Friends than their British counterparts.

[7] Richenda C. Scott, "Authority or Experience: John Wilhelm Rowntree and the Dilemma of Nineteenth Century British Quakerism", *Journal of the Friends Historical Society* 49/2 (Spring, 1960), 75.

[8] There was always a small minority of conservative or quietist Friends who resisted the evangelical reliance on Biblical authority and continued to interpret Quakerism in the light of writings of early Friends, particularly Robert Barclay, see Isichei, *Victorian Quakers*, 16–25.

[9] *Ibid.,* 77–78.

[10] For examples of religious crises among young Friends in the 1870s and 1880s, see Edward Grubb, "Some Personal Experiences", *Friends Quarterly Examiner* (hereafter *FQE*) 72 (October, 1938), 300–302; *The Friend* (London), 27 January 1939, 69; Rufus M. Jones, *John Wilhelm Rowntree* (Philadelphia, 1942), [3–4]; and *The Trail of Life in College* (New York, 1929), 193.

[11] Henry Stanley Newman to Rufus M. Jones (RMJ), 25 Nov. 1895, Box 1, Rufus M. Jones Papers (RMJP), Haverford College Quaker Collections (HCQC), emphasis in the original.

[12] The most significant liberal challenge to Evangelical Quakerism was made by a group of Manchester Friends led by David Duncan; Duncan was disowned (expelled) in 1871. See Scott, "Authority or Experience", 76–81 and Isichei *Victorian Quakers*, 32, 61–67.

[13] The authors of *A Reasonable Faith* were all older Friends dissatisfied with the intellectual limitations of the evangelical creed: Francis Frith (1822–1898), William Pollard (1828–1893) and William Edward Turner (1836–1911); for commentary, see Jones, *Later Period,* II, 963–967. Edward Worsdell (1852–1908), an employee of the Rowntree cocoa firm and a former teacher at Bootham school, anticipated much of what John Wilhelm Rowntree and other proponents of liberal theology would say, although he is ignored by most Quaker accounts; but see Edwin B. Bronner, *"The Other Branch": London Yearly Meeting and the Hicksites, 1827–1912* (London, 1975), 33–34 and *The Annual Monitor,* 1904 (a Quaker obituary), 186–196. For Francis Frith's achievements as a pioneer in photography, see Bill Jay, *Victorian Cameraman: Francis Frith's Views of Rural England, 1850–1898* (Newton Abbot, 1973). Caroline Stephen's *Quaker Strongholds* (London, 1891) was another very influential non-Evangelical book, but Stephen, a convinced Friend, presented a moving personal witness to the spiritual possibilities of Quakerism rather than a critical analysis of its Victorian practice.

[14] For discussion of the Richmond Declaration see *Extracts from the Minutes and Proceedings of the Yearly Meeting of Friends* (hereafter *MPYMF*, with year), 1888, 27–48. Jones, *Later Period*, II, 931 called the Richmond Declaration "a relic of the past" which "reflected no sign of the prevailing intellectual difficulties over questions of science and history". Edward Grubb (1854–1939) vowed to leave the Society if the document was accepted; interview with Richenda C. Scott, 30 May 1976, Friends House, London and *The Friend* (London), 27 Jan. 1939, 68.

[15] Interview with Mary Hoxie Jones, 13 Sept. 1983, Haverford College.

[16] See Silvanus P. Thompson, "John Wilhelm Rowntree", *FQE*, 39 (April 1905), 260 and Howard Brinton, *Friends for 300 Years* (London, 1953), viii–ix.

[17] Maurice A. Creasey, *The Next Fifty Years* (London, 1956), 9; Elfrida Vipont, *The Story of Quakerism* (Richmond, Ind., 1977), 233–234; and Jones, *John Wilhelm Rowntree*, [1].

[18] Anne Vernon, *A Quaker Business Man: The Life of Joseph Rowntree, 1836–1925* (London, 1958), 76–92 contains information about John Wilhelm Rowntree's (hereafter JWR) early career.

[19] JWR to a Friend, 18 Sept. 1893, quoted in Rowntree's *Essays and Addresses*, edited by Joshua Rowntree (London, 1905), xiii.

[20] *Ibid.*, xxiv; R.M. Jones, *JWR*, [5–6]; Vipont, *Story of Quakerism, 234; and Bronner, "The Other Branch"*, 39.

[21] JWR, *Essays and Addresses*, xxiii–xxiv.

[22] Scott, "Authority or Experience", 86–87 and A. Neave Brayshaw, *The Quakers: Their Story and Message* (London, 1938), 214–315. Also see Henry Stanley Newman to RMJ, 25 Nov. 1895 and John W. Graham to RMJ, 19 Dec. 1895, Box 1, RMJP. *The Proceedings of the Manchester Conference...* were published (London, 1896).

[23] For analysis of JWR's "new movement", see Scott, "Authority or Experience", 89–91; Brayshaw, *The Quakers*, 315–321; Creasey, *Next Fifty Years*, 12–19; and Jones, *Life in College*, 195–96. Some Friends raised questions as to whether JWR was really the leader of the movement, see John W. Graham to *The Friend*, 8 July 1927, 643. It seems clear, however, that if Rowntree did not institute the reform movement, he was its most articulate and influential advocate.

[24] See JWR's "The Rise of Quakerism in Yorkshire", 28 and "The Present Position of Religious Thought in the Society of Friends", 195, in *Essays and Addresses*. Also see Isichei, *Victorian Quakers*, 35–36 and Creasey, *Next Fifty Years*, 11.

[25] JWR to Fielden Thorp, 1897, *Essays and Addresses*, xvi.

[26] JWR to a Friend, 18 Sept. 1893, *ibid.*, xiii.

[27] During his trips to the United States, JWR closely investigated the practice, widespread among western Friends, of appointing pastors to supervise and program Quaker meetings. He did not publicly attack it, but close friends recalled his deep concern that "the wide adoption of the pastoral system... was eating the heart out of Quakerism in the States." Thompson, "John Wilhelm Rowntree", 264 and Bronner, *"The Other Branch"*, 42n, 43n, 50. Also see JWR to RMJ, 19 May 1900, Box 2, RMJP.

[28] JWR, "The Problems of a Free Ministry", *Essays and Addresses*, 120–123 and "Pentecost", *Present-Day Papers* (*PDP*), 5/53 (1902), 383.

[29] JWR to Lawrence Richardson, 17 Oct. 1894, quoted in *Essays and Addresses*, xxi.

[30] See Jones, *JWR*, [6–7] and *Essays and Addresses*, xx.

[31] JWR, "Editorial Note", *PDP*, 3 [1900], 367–368. Also see *The Friend* (London), 17 March 1905, 162.

[32] JWR, "Present Position of Thought", *Essays and Addresses*, 241. This essay was originally published in *FQE* 39/153 (Jan. 1905), 109–122 and reprinted in *The American Friend*, 25 March 1905, 192–196.

[33] JWR to RMJ, 11 January 1899, Box 2, RMJP: JWR "The Need for the Summer School Movement", *Essays and Addresses*, 151–160. Also see JWR, "Our Educational Policy", *ibid.*, 181–190 *passim*; A. Neave Brayshaw, "Thirty Years", Pamphlet Group IV, *HCQO*; and Jones. *JWR*, [10–11].

[34] JWR to RMJ, 21 Jan. 1902, Box 3 and RMJ and JWR, 7 Feb. 1902, Box 38A, RMJP. JWR attempted, in vain, to persuade Rufus Jones to be the first Principal at Woodbrooke. For the history of the school, see Arnold S. Rowntree, *Woodbrooke: Its History and Aims* (London, 1923) and Robert Davis (ed.) *Woodbrooke, 1903–1953* (London, 1953).

[35] George Cadbury to RMJ, 26 Nov. and 5 June, 1902, Box 3, RMJP.

[36] JWR, "The Wages of Going On", *PDP*, 5/50 (15 Sept. 1902), 255: "A Study in Ecclesiastical Polity", *ibid.*, 5/51 (15 Oct. 1902), 302–303; and "Present Position of Thought", *Essays and Addresses*, 238.

[37] Thompson, "John Wilhelm Rowntree", 264. The quote is Thompson's paraphrase of JWR's words, emphasis in the original.

[38] See JWR, "A Personal Note to the Subscribers to *Present-Day Papers*", *PDP*, 5/53 (15 Dec. 1902), iii–iv. Rufus Jones, with the financial support of Joseph Rowntree, revived *PDP* in 1914 in America, but it ran only through 1915 when war conditions made it impossible to continue publishing the journal. See Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 22 Oct. 1913, Box 7, RMJP.

[39] Jones, *JWR*, [9] notes that JWR was already "forming... the lines of his proposed monumental History of Quakerism" when they met in 1897 on a holiday tour in Mürren, Switzerland; JWR's project neatly dovetailed with RMJ's plan for writing a history of mysticism which would set the scene for the message of George Fox. Also see David Hinshaw, *Rufus Jones, Master Quaker* (New York, 1951), 123–124.

[40] JWR, "Problems of a Free Ministry", *Essays and Addresses*, 123–124. Cf. Amelia Mott Gummere, "The Early Quakers and Parental Education", *PDP*, 5/50 (Sept. 1902), 284: "One of the first things we need to do is to learn to read Quaker history properly, and face our facts, then in the light of past experience, read more closely the lessons of the future".

[41] JWR, "The Present Position of Thought", *Essays and Addresses*, 237, 240.

[42] JWR, "God in Christ", *ibid.*, 279.

[43] Jones, *Trail of Life in College*, 195. Also see JWR "Problem of a Free Ministry", *Essays and Addresses*, 126.

[44] *Ibid.*, 130–131.

[45] "Forward", *The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, 1/1 (1903), 1.

[46] *Ibid.*, 1/2 (May 1904): 50.

[47] J.B. Braithwaite, *Journal*, 10 Sept. 1903, cited by Isichei, *Victorian Quakers*, 14.

[48] JWR to Norman Penney, 21 Oct. 1903, Box. 4, RMJP. Penney (1858–1933) was the first full-time librarian appointed to organize the Friends Library at the Society's offices, then at Devonshire House, London, with a view to aiding scholars interested in Quaker history and thought.

[49] JWR, "The Rise of Quakerism in Yorkshire", *Essays and Addresses*, 43–44. For a similar view, indicating that Fox and Barclay would have welcomed Biblical and other critical research, see Edward Worsdell, "The Restoration of the Bible", *PDP*, 1 (1898), 68–77.

[50] JWR to Norman Penney (copy), 3 July 1903, Box 4, RMJP. Rowntree collected nearly 2,000 volumes and pamphlets specifically for his history project, see *Essays and Addresss*, xxxvii and A. Neave Brayshaw, "J.W. Rowntree Biographical Notes", *The Friend* (London), 17 March 1905, 165.

[51] JWR to RMJ, 11 Aug., 28 Sept. and 4 Dec. 1903, Box 4, RMJP.

[52] JWR to Fielden Thorp (copy), 20 Jan. 1904, and JWR to William Tallack, 28 Oct. 1903, Box 4, *ibid.*

[53] JWR to RMJ, 27 July 1904, *ibid.*

[54] Jones, JWR, [14].

[55] JWR, "The Rise of Quakerism in Yorkshire", *Essays and Addresses*, 3–76.

[56] *Ibid.*, 5, 7.

[57] JWR to RMJ, 28 Sept. 1903, Box 4, RMJP; Thompson, "John Wilhelm Rowntree", 262–66; and JWR, "Rise of Quakerism", 69.

[58] *Ibid.*, 43, 40, 61.

[59] *Ibid.*, 65, 59 and "The Outlook", *PDP*, (1899), 9.

[60] JWR, "Rise of Quakerism", 62–63. Cf. with the comments of William Edmundson (1627–1712) in a letter of 1701: "Eagerness after the lawful things of this world... hinders many Friends Growth in the precious Truth, and their Service to it in their Day... two [sic] many of our Society... who have in measure escaped the Unclean, Unjust and Unlawful Things... now sit down in the Dust, in the Lawful Things of this World..." *A Journal of... William Edmundson* (London, 1715), 209.

[61] JWR, "Rise of Quakerism", 66, 73. Also see JWR and Henry Bryan Binns, "A History of the Adult School Movement", *PDP*, 5/50 (15 Sept. 1902), 262.

[62] JWR, "Rise of Quakerism", 59, 73, 75–76. Also see Thompson, "John Wilhelm Rowntree", 267–268.

[63] Jones, *JWR*, [15] and "John Wilhelm Rowntree" *The Friend* (London), 31 March 1905, 198.

[64] Arnold Rowntree to RMJ, 4 April 1905, Box 5, RMJP. Rowntree was quoting his uncle Joshua Rowntree. Also see Henry Bryan Binns to RMJ, 16 April 1905, *ibid.*

[65] Edward Grubb to RMJ, 21 March 1905, *ibid.*, and I.A.R., "In Memoriam, John Wilhelm Rowntree", *FQE*. 39/154 (April 1905), 269–272. Also see John Ellwood Paige, "John Wilhelm Rowntree – a Poem", *Friends Intelligencer*, 62/13 (1 April 1905), 193.

[66] "John Wilhelm Rowntree". *FQE*, 39/154 (April 1905), 128–131. Also see the obituary for JWR in *The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, 2/2 (April 1905), 46; George Newman (*FQE* editor) to RMJ, 15 July 1907; and Edward Grubb to RMJ, 12 Jan. 1906, Box 5, RMJP.

[67] Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 29 March and 28 April 1905; B. Seebohm Rowntree to RMJ, 1 June 1905; and Constance Rowntree to RMJ, 31 March 1905, Box 5, *ibid.*

[68] Jones, *Middle-Years*, 85–87 and Vining, *Friends of Life*, 115–117.

[69] For the origins and functioning of the Rowntree Charitable Trust, see Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 29 March and 14 Sept. 1905, Box 5, RMJP.

[70] W.C. Braithwaite to RMJ, 6 Feb. 1906, Box 5 and 5 Dec. 1909, Box 6, *ibid.*

[71] Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 14 Sept. 1905, Box 5, *ibid.* There is a typewritten copy of JWR's five-page outline entitled "A Study of the Development of Quaker Thought and Practice", Box 4, *ibid.*

[72] W.C. Braithwaite to RMJ, 6 Feb. 1906, Box 5 and 10 Jan. 1908, Box 6, *ibid.*

[73] Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 29 Aug. 1907, Box 5, *ibid.* For the early Quaker practice of "going naked as a sign", see Braithwaite, *Beginnings of Quakerism*, 148–151, 158; Braithwaite (148) emphasized that this practice "was not disowned by Quaker leaders". See Kenneth L. Carroll, "Early Quakers and 'Going Naked as a Sign' ", *Quaker History* 67/2 (Autumn 1978), 69–87.

[74] Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 30 July 1907, Box 5 and 28 April 1910, Box 6, RMJP. Joseph Rowntree also noted that while he was "responsible for all expenses... if there is any profit it will, of course, go to you"; Rowntree to RMJ, 3 Sept. 1908, *ibid.*

[75] Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 18 May 1908, *ibid.*

[76] RMJ, *A Way of Life and Service* (Oberlin, Ohio, 1939), 1–2; *Studies in Mystical Religion* (London, 1909), v–vi; and *Middle Years*, 188–191.

[77] Joseph Rowntree to RMJ, 15 June 1908, Box 6, RMJP.

[78] Braithwaite to RMJ, 26 March 1911, Box 7, *ibid.*

[79] See especially, Geoffrey Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith* (Oxford, 1946); Alan Simpson, *Puritanism in Old and New England* (Chicago, 1955); and Barbour, *Quakers in Puritan England.*

[80] See L. Hugh Doncaster's "Forward" to the second edition of *The beginnings of Quakerism*, vii. In an extremely critical article, Daniel E. Bassuk, "Rufus Jones and Mysticism". *Quaker Religious thought* 17/4 (Summer, 1978), 23, believes Jones's view is "a compound of nineteenth century liberal religion and a theology whose origins lie in the Greek, Platonic tradition". On the other hand, Melvin B. Endy, Jr., "The Interpretation of Quakerism: Rufus Jones and His Critics", *Quaker History* 70/1 (Spring, 1981), 21 has suggested that "it may be time to stop beating the Rufus Jones horse... because it has many years of productive work left in it for those... interested in historical truth..." For another article supportive of Jones's views, see Donald F. Durnbaugh, "Baptists and Quakers – Left Wing Puritans?" *ibid.*, 62/2 (Autumn, 1973), 67–82.

[81] Chris Downing, "Quakerism and the Historical Interpretation of Religion", *Quaker Religious Thought* 3/2 (Autumn, 1961), 4.

[82] One of the tragic ironies of Quaker resistance to World War I was the fact that John Wilhelm Rowntree's only son, Laurie Rowntree, was killed in action in 1918. Originally a member of the Friends Ambulance Unit, Laurie Rowntree eventually enlisted because he could not bear to see men wounded and killed while he was largely removed from danger. Interview with Mary Hoxie Jones, 13 Sept. 1983 and Vining, *Friend of Life*, 197.

[83] Creasey, *Next Fifty Years*, 22