

OPENING THE SHUTTERS: GURNEYITE QUAKERISM AND THE
STRUGGLE FOR WOMEN'S EQUALITY IN THE MEETING FOR
BUSINESS, 1859 TO 1930

Isaac May
Harvard University, USA

ABSTRACT

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries American Gurneyite Quakers ended the practice of having separate women's Meetings for Business. This article examines the discourse among Gurneyite Quakers that argued for and against ending these separate Meetings and the creation of co-gendered 'joint' Meetings. It argues based on this inquiry that while this process may have been linked to larger shifts in gender roles that were occurring within American religious life, it also arose out of circumstances that were particular to Quakerism. Further, this paper raises questions about what the consequences were for Gurneyite women of eliminating Women's Meetings, suggesting that it may actually have worked to marginalize them and restrict their roles in church governance.

KEYWORDS

Women, gender, Gurneyite, Rufus Jones, Meeting for Business, men, equality.

Any Gurneyite Quaker who was reading *The American Friend*, the major periodical of that branch of the denomination, knew that something important was happening in 1915. Issues after issue of the biweekly magazine announced the upcoming Men's Conference, a chance for men to gather together to talk about the issue that concerned their role in the Religious Society of Friends. *The American Friend* lamented in an article that Friends had 'exacted no service from their men as men, while they have opened their doors wide for ladies to band together as ladies' aid societies, in support of missions, both home and foreign, and in some places in social fellowship groups'. Women, the conference organizers argued, were becoming more powerful than men.¹

The conference was deemed necessary lest Quaker Meetings become too feminized. As the magazine observed, 'In many Meetings the women outnumber the men two to one at Sabbath morning services for worship, while in the

majority of our Meetings far too many of our strong, virile men never present themselves at a business session'. While the magazine made clear that it was trying to 'not call for any less activity on the part of women', it was still sounding the alarm on behalf of what it perceived as these marginalized 'virile men', who might lose control of the Quaker business Meetings.²

Was there validity to these fears? Were women threatening to dominate the Gurneyite branch of the Religious Society of Friends, marginalizing male Friends? Scholar Ann Douglas has written about how during the nineteenth century women began to exert greater influence over liberal clergy, leading to fears that religion was being feminized. The fact that Quakers had long accepted women as ministers, and shunned paid clergy until the late nineteenth century, makes these fears seem less convincing in a Quaker context.³ Despite this, many male Friends in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries worried about losing their power within the faith. The reason for this was women's growing authority; they were finally gaining access to one of the last levers of power within Quakerism that had been closed off to them, the Meeting for Business. In the nineteenth century women had been confined to separate, less powerful business Meetings, and often meeting houses used physical shutters to separate men from women. At the turn of the twentieth century, practices were changing and those shutters were permanently opening up.

This article explores how men's and women's Meetings were integrated into unified business Meetings within Gurneyite Quakerism. It uses the discourse surrounding this issue in the leading Gurneyite periodicals to understand how it was perceived within that branch of the faith. While the greater role of women in the surrounding culture, as demonstrated through suffrage and the proliferation of female ministers in other denominations, contributed to this change, particularly Quaker factors were far more significant. A demographic crisis within Gurneyite Quakerism meant that men were, as the men's conference observed, becoming outnumbered and unable to deny women's growing presence. At the same time, the introduction of paid ministry, along with theological shifts and changes in the nature of authority, meant that letting women into business Meetings mattered less. Women were allowed in when they could no longer be refused and when letting them in meant they would not gain substantial power. Some women actually resisted this new found 'power' fearing, with some justification, that the loss of separate women's Meetings would cause them to have less influence.

THE ORIGINS OF SEPARATE BUSINESS MEETINGS

From the beginnings of Quakerism during the chaos of the English Civil War, there was an attempt to give women an equal place within the faith. Even at its start Quakerism embraced the idea that women could be ministers and preach just as any man could. Margret Fell, an early convert and leader within Quakerism, who also became the wife of Quaker leader George Fox, wrote a pioneering tract that historian Thomas D. Hamm explains as early Quakers' 'definitive defense of women's ministry'.⁴ This tract, 'Women's Ministry Justified', used a number of

different points to argue for women's ability to minister, including the idea that the biblical fall put women and 'the serpent' at odds, that woman were a frequent feature of Jesus' ministry and witnessed the resurrection, their involvement in the early Church and the idea that holy spirit could direct women.⁵ There would come to be a notable difference in Women's ministry between Quakers and other denominations.

Fox, the charismatic spiritual leader of the movement who set up the first business Meetings, embraced the idea of women in ministry and in positions of power. As historian Rebecca Larson observes, 'Since the sexes existed in a state of equality before original sin, George Fox contended that after rebirth in Christ that relationship was restored'.⁶ In 1668 Fox made clear that both women and men embodied the gospel authority that was displayed in Meeting.⁷ Despite his rhetoric, however, Fox was also responsible for marginalizing women's authority within Quakerism.

In 1666 Fox issued an epistle urging the creation of separate women's business Meetings. Fox stated that woman had a role other than church governance, remarking:

Men and women being help meet, are to see that all walk and live in order with the Gospel and to see that nothing is lacking; women in their assemblies may inform one another of the poor widows and fathers and in the wisdom of God may find the best way of setting forth of their children and see that their children are preserved in truth.⁸

Fox's prescription was for women's Meetings to serve in what he perceived as female roles, dealing with specifically female concerns such as regulating marriages or caring for the poor and needy. Fox did very little to set up women's Meetings and spent most of his life creating men's Meetings. As H. Larry Ingle points out in his biography of Fox, 'he clearly expected the men to make major decisions and administer discipline'.⁹

In fairness to Fox, this was a compromise position; he faced heavy opposition from both those who wanted more equality for women as well as from Friends who would have preferred women to be silent, without any role in governance or ministry.¹⁰ Fox managed to preserve women's ministry and to ensure that they had some minor responsibilities in administering Meetings. In addition to the women's Meetings this scheme also allowed for the existence of the Select Meeting for Ministers and Elders, which was a co-gendered gathering in most meetings (at preparatory, monthly and yearly levels).

But the representation of women was limited. It would take until 1784 before London Yearly Meeting (under pressure from American Quakers) created a separate Women's Meeting.¹¹ American Meetings would do things differently, having quarterly and yearly women's Meetings from the time the first Quakers arrived in North America, but Fox's legacy would still loom large. Even within the Select Meetings for Ministers and Elders, which appeared to be the one totally egalitarian structure in Quakerism, women initially could not be named as elders, so they could only be represented if they were ministers.¹²

This history of Fox and the origins of women's Meetings is important, not just because in it lies the origins of the uneasy gender divide within Quakerism, but also because it became a frequent reference point in debates over women's roles in the Religious Society of Friends. Quakers' treatment of women was repeatedly affirmed internally as righteous, in contrast with their neighbors.¹³ Fox and early Quaker leaders had a prominent place in the religious belief of the Gurneyite Quakers in the latter half of the nineteenth century, perhaps comparable to the kind of reverence in which some Roman Catholics held the church fathers. Fox was not just a historical figure; he was the model for religious practice and the question of whether he had intended women's equality was an important one.

GURNEYITE TRADITIONS ON WOMEN

The early nineteenth century saw many Quaker fractures; first the Orthodox Hicksite separation of 1827 and then, before the coming of the Civil War, there was the separation of the conservative Wilburites from the larger Orthodox body, Meetings which were thereafter usually termed Gurneyite.¹⁴ Around fifty to sixty thousand of the approximately one hundred thousand American Quakers were Gurneyites. These Gurneyites, following the example of English Minister Joseph John Gurney, tended to emphasize scriptural authority rather than revelation.¹⁵ The Gurneyite path would be different from that of Hicksites or other Quaker groups.¹⁶

Gurneyites had the same regard for women ministers that earlier Quakers did. English Friend Elizabeth Gurney Fry, Joseph John Gurney's sister, was a prominent minister and widely praised by Gurneyites in the early years of the separation. However, Gurneyites were not radicals on issues of women's equality.¹⁷ There was no mass move towards a greater role for women in meetings in the antebellum period, although there were some local efforts. New York Yearly Meeting in particular allowed women to have a great deal of power. As early as 1804, the Meeting created a joint committee of men and women, although one with limited influence. This 'Indian Committee', which would minister to Stockbridge Indian women, was permitted after the Indian women had taken the initiative of directing their communications to Quaker women.¹⁸ Yet by 1859, records indicate that New York Yearly Meeting was holding many of its Meetings as joint sessions. In the same year, the revision of the Discipline, perhaps the most important act of a yearly Meeting, was done by men and women at a joint Meeting.¹⁹ This was not the same as integrating the business Meetings, however. Men's Meetings continued to have preeminence, as the choice to meet jointly typically occurred at the behest of men.

The Friends' Review, then edited by Samuel Rhoads, remained attentive to discussions about gender during and following the American Civil War. Although the *Review* did not devote entire articles to debates over women's equality, such matters were occasionally featured in articles on other topics. In 1865, for example, the *Friends' Review* reported that Iowa Yearly Meeting, like the New York

Yearly Meeting, allowed joint Meetings (of men and women) to revise discipline.²⁰ Earlier, in 1862 *The Friends' Review* featured an article reprinted from *The London Friend* about how London and Dublin Yearly Meetings were dealing with women's representation. This would have been of particular interest to American Friends because the London Yearly Meeting remained an important moral and organizational example of Quaker practice. American Yearly Meetings sent their epistles to London, and Gurneyite Friends particularly prized their relationship with their English co-religionists because the English Friends saw them, rather than the Hicksites or Wilburites, as being the legitimate Religious Society of Friends. The fact that the London Yearly Meeting was addressing the question of how to hold joint conferences of men and women on discipline, without creating 'agitation or controversy', would have attracted considerable interest.²¹

American Friends would have also noted the cautious tone of this slow process of reform, which sought to find out how 'that position [of women's exclusion] can be improved without interfering with the reservation to the men's Meetings of those powers which have been, as we should be prepared to maintain, properly vested in them'. London Friends thought that they achieved this end by confining joint Meetings to certain topics, essentially a reassertion of the argument that women and men had separate spheres.²² Americans would no doubt perceive this as a largely symbolic reform, but it was a reform in favor of women. Still, it would take many years before any American Meeting would be bold enough to take action and make the first moves to end the long gender segregation.

NEW TRADITIONS IN NEW YORK

New York Yearly Meeting led the way in being forward thinking on issues of gender equality. In 1874, when revising its discipline, New York Yearly Meeting eliminated the need for separate men's and women's Meetings, a change that attracted considerable attention. The Meeting wrote a minute on the topic of women's equality, stating assertively that 'the rights and privileges of membership are in no way affected because of sex'.²³ It was a controversial decision and one that would have far-reaching implications.

The editor of *The Friends' Review*, at that time William J. Allinson, struggled to explain and justify this change to its readers. An article on the subject began by suggesting it was part of a historical process, citing the importance of women's preaching as a return to the principles of primitive Christianity (something Quakers usually aspired to revive) and noting that 'at that time [there were those] who objected to rightful elevation of the privileges of women; the spirit of whose opposition George Fox strongly condemned'. This was an attack on both conservatives in the seventeenth century and those who opposed women's equality in Meeting in the nineteenth. These people were wrong, Allison argued, because 'all progress towards enlightenment since that period has tended to lessen the inequality of influence and privilege between the sexes'. Readers of *The Friends' Review* were given a mental image of New York Yearly Meeting embodying the best traditions of Quaker equality and living up to the spirit of George Fox.²⁴

At the same time, *The Friends' Review* did not want to push things too far. Its editor noted that joint Meetings were good only for 'certain occasions' and he reassured readers that New York had not banned the existence of women's Meetings at any level, whether preparative, monthly, quarterly or yearly; it was simply the case that New York Yearly Meeting had only not *required* these separate women's Meetings. *The Friends' Review* struck a middle ground by praising New York Yearly Meeting's devotion to 'the principle of promoting the elevation of women's religious equality' at the same time that they called for existence of separate women's Meetings to be maintained.²⁵

Why was the New York Yearly Meeting taking such a radical step? Why were other Quaker meetings not following suit? The general religious ferment that had percolated in antebellum New York offers some clues. The so-called 'burned-over district' gave rise to revivalism and Mormonism, while perfectionists followed John Humphrey Noyes to the Oneida community in Utica. The Hicksites in New York were more radical than they were in the rest of the country, producing the Congregational Friends, who had no allegiance to a Yearly Meeting. These Friends would give rise to spiritualism.²⁶ In that kind of intellectual climate, such innovations within the Gurneyite community made more sense.

Issue of women's equality had also surfaced with particular force in New York. The campaigns for married women's property rights and for women's suffrage in antebellum New York prompted discussion over gender roles, as did debate over dress reform and women's higher education. By the 1870s, other challenges, from feminist advocates such as Victoria Woodhull and Susan B. Anthony, from colleges and universities such as the newly established Vassar and the newly co-educational Cornell, and from women entering into medicine, the ministry and law undermined easy assumptions about women's secondary roles. As historian Paula Baker has written, however, nationally suffragists and antisuffragists alike agreed that women possessed particular moral authority. Their disagreement centered on where women might best exercise this influence.²⁷ Quaker concerns reflected a similar effort to determine an appropriate forum for women's contributions.

This was also not the first time that the New York Yearly Meeting had bucked Quaker tradition. In 1859, it had controversially ended the practice of disowning members who married non-Quakers.²⁸ Prior to this, marriage had to be endogamous, and Quakers were often expelled for marrying outside Meeting.²⁹ While it might be possible to admit one's 'misconduct' to the Meeting and plea for forgiveness to retain membership, this was not common. Yet here was the New York Meeting, insisting that the only thing one had to do after marrying a non-Quaker to retain membership was to declare the marriage to the Meeting. Because marriage was usually regulated by women's Meetings, this suggests that New York Yearly Meeting had few qualms about tampering with accepted notions of gender roles within Quakerism.

Such an unconventional approach was not necessarily well received by other Quakers. Even years later, New York Yearly Meeting would still be defending its

choice to include women in its Meeting for Business, especially in its representative Meeting. In 1888, Mary G. Underhill, a Quaker from Poughkeepsie, wrote an article in *The Friends' Review* to rebut commonly held misconceptions on the operation of New York Yearly Meeting. To the assertion that women might lack the intelligence of men, Underhill agreed but argued that women had 'intuition and tenderness', which was a necessary complement to men within Meetings. From working together, 'men have learned to conduct debates in a gentler and more courteous manner (we hear this from themselves). And women have found how to condense their remarks, to speak directly to the point.' Yet the crux of Underhill's argument was a reply to women from other Meetings who had suggested that women's voices might be marginalised in joint Meetings. She stated that through participation in their local Meetings, women gained the courage to speak in the Yearly Meeting. The advancement of women in this new 'progressive age', she said, required women in joint Meetings.³⁰ Change was inevitable, she argued, and eventually all of Quakerism would embrace it.

TOWARDS A NEW GOSPEL ORDER

Other Yearly Meetings did not respond as quickly to this call for reform. In 1884, in the sessions of New England Yearly Meeting, questions were raised about the practice of gender-segregated seating in Meeting for Worship and the choice to have separate male and female Meetings for Business at the preparative, monthly and quarterly meeting levels. Several quarterly Meetings went as far as to petition the yearly Meeting for the right to have joint sessions. While they could find little reason other than tradition to justify seating arrangements in Meeting for worship (which was not deemed reason enough), the idea of ending gender separation in business Meetings proved more controversial.³¹

The debate in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting was particularly contentious. As a Yearly Meeting it was rather an anomaly. Numerically dominated by Wilburites, it had a substantial minority of weighty Gurneyite Quakers among its members and it had refused to align clearly with either faction.³² When the Yearly Meeting was gathered, several Friends (presumably all men) raised questions about whether women would 'lose interest' in participating in Quaker affairs if joint Meetings were held. An article originally from *The Philadelphia Press* observed that 'little fear of this [loss of interest] seemed to be entertained by women themselves, and, it was denied that such would be the effect of those who have tried joint sessions'.³³ The Yearly Meeting allowed the discipline to be changed.

The Friend, a Philadelphia Wilburite periodical edited by Joseph Walton, was predictably conservative on such matters and used its bully pulpit to express concern. Lumping the changes for women in with other changes in the discipline, such as allowing Bible reading in worship, the periodical declared that such practices 'general adoption would lead the Meetings away from ancient Quakerism'. It was a reminder that even small reforms such as letting women have equality in local Meetings could prove to be enormously divisive within the Society of Friends.³⁴

The Gurneyite periodical *The Friends' Review*, thanks in part to its new editor Henry Hartshone, was more progressive in its outlook. An article that the periodical published in 1886 noted that while many Meetings were beginning to be composed of joint sessions, the New York Yearly Meeting was the only Yearly Meeting that transacted all of its business this way. Furthermore, the article asserted, in the years that it had been in effect, New York's policy had only had positive results. Hartshone claimed that it was 'a simple, natural and rightful culmination of the advance towards equal and full fellowship in Christian privileges and duties, which belongs to the nature of Gospel dispensation'.³⁵ This notion of 'gospel dispensation', or gospel order, was extremely important to Friends; to say that women's integration and equality in business Meetings was part of it was to make a bold claim.

Later that same year another issue arose that made it vitally important to any advocate of women's equality or independence to take a stand in favor of unified Meetings for Business. This issue, raised publicly at Baltimore Yearly Meeting, was the question of whether women's Meetings had legal standing. Baltimore Yearly Meeting tried to legally incorporate, and the state legislature passed an act allowing it to do so, but in that process acknowledged only the existence of the Men's Meeting. A visiting Friend pointed to a similar court case in Iowa involving that Yearly Meeting, which had raised the possibility that the only legally recognized decision-making body was the Men's Meeting. The Women's Meeting had no legal standing in court, a finding that was likely to be upheld in other jurisdictions as well. Many within the Baltimore Yearly Meeting felt that the London Yearly Meeting might echo the courts and refuse to acknowledge Women's Meeting's decision-making power if there was ever a divisive issue before the Meetings. Rather than face the possibility that the Women's Meeting might be merely a formality, Baltimore Yearly Meeting opted for full equality, integrating the business Meeting and allowing women as members of the powerful Representative Meeting.³⁶ It was a decisive stand for adhering to principles in the face of unintentional opposition from the state.

At the end of the 1880s, the debate over the continued existence of separate women's Meetings reached fever pitch in the pages of *The Friends' Review*. Mary G. Underhill's article defending New York Yearly Meeting was just the start of this argument. The debate in this instance occurred largely between women Friends over whether joint Meetings really gave women more of a voice.

Eliza C. Armstrong, an Indiana Friend and a key organizer of the Quaker Women's Foreign Mission Societies (for which she would eventually be regarded as the 'mother' of the Women's Missionary Union of Friends in America), was firmly of the view that joint Meetings were wrong.³⁷ In an article for *The Christian Register* reprinted by *Friends' Review*, she lamented that it now 'seems almost a foregone conclusion that women's separate Meetings for discipline are to be a thing of the past' because she felt that joint Meetings marginalised women's roles. She angrily observed 'that the joint session is always practically a *men's Meeting*. The same can be said of large committees. They are men's committees with

women present.' She did not blame men for this but rather nature; she argued that women simply could not deal with being in the same Meetings as men without deferring to them.³⁸

She argued that asking for joint Meetings was to fundamentally misunderstand equality, which required separate spheres. As she explained, '[women's] equality with her brother in the Church no more implies that she must surrender her particular place, or do the identical kind of work he does, than equality of the husband implies she must take hold of the plow'. Armstrong's remedy was to foster the growth of separate women's organizations within Meeting. Should that fail, she warned, Quaker women would 'look with envy upon the *inequality* of women of other churches, who are directing with marked ability their special lines of church work'.³⁹ Armstrong had vocal supporters, such as Rachel S. Howland, an assistant clerk of the New England Yearly Women's Meeting, who backed Armstrong's argument by offering historical evidence that George Fox was in agreement.⁴⁰

Even critics of these views acknowledged that men tended to dominate Meetings. Underhill admitted that joint sessions were less useful than single-gendered Meetings in some cases, noting that after attending the New England Yearly Meeting she had concluded that the women's Meeting was 'lovely' while the 'joint sessions were not so satisfactory'. Underhill nevertheless insisted that the choice of holding joint business Meetings of men and women should be left up to each Yearly Meeting.⁴¹ Other articles that appeared in *The Friends' Review*, presumably written by editor Henry Hartshorne, explained that scattered gossip (presumably from women Friends) about joint Meetings suggested that they were not necessarily conducive to women having a greater voice. Unlike Armstrong, these articles implied that the chief problem was not 'nature' but male Friends. However, they also conceded that Armstrong had made a compelling case for separate women's organizations, such as the Women's Missionary Associations, to be continued at least for the present.

The overall trend within the journal seemed to be support for more joint Meetings. S.A. Rhoads, a Friend from the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, argued that one of Fox's goals had been to promote greater equality between men and women, something only possible in joint Meetings. She decried women's absence from representative Meetings and argued that because certain traditional queries about religious practice (which were always read during yearly Meeting), such as the query on drunkenness, were not asked of women, separation was problematic. She pleaded that joint Meetings become the way of the future if only for simplicity's sake.⁴² *The Friends' Review* under Hartshorne and his successor as editor, Haverford Professor Rufus Jones, would continue making new arguments for women's inclusion by citing improved female education. Such advances made joint Meetings more viable, the editors insisted. They reasserted their support until the publication merged with *The Christian Worker* in 1894 and created a new periodical, *The American Friend*.

DEMOGRAPHICS IN CRISIS

Other forces beyond internal debate shaped Quaker responses in this period. Quaker periodicals also show the peculiar pressures within the denomination, and among the most pressing was the ongoing demographic crisis within Quakerism that had existed from the end of the Civil War. Simply put, Quakers were hemorrhaging people. At best numbers were holding steady even as the American population as a whole grew. Further, women increasingly outnumbered men in the rapidly shrinking denomination. While these demographics could empower women, helping them gain access to Meetings for Business, it was also one of the reasons why some members resisted women's growing influence.

By 1915, *The American Friend* was willing to publish an alarmist article by Quaker minister and Whittier College President Charles E. Tebbetts. Tebbetts wrote what was essentially a demographically based jeremiad, as he explained to readers that 'we hear much said (and too much cannot be said) about winning souls. We need a far greater emphasis on keeping souls'. He quoted statistics, grimly explaining that 'over 10,000 Friends have been received during the period [1909–14] by letter or certificate and over 11,000 dismissed... When the loss from other causes is taken into account many Meetings lose more than half their members in a five-year period.'⁴³ Tebbetts noted that this was more than just a numbers problem; it was one of declining member interest and spirit. Tebbetts recounted:

In some sections prominent members give their time and means to outside religious associations and are rarely found at our Yearly Meetings or supporting their work. A considerable percentage of membership in some Meetings is more sympathetic to movements leading away from the regular activities of the church than her call for service. In some sections very few copies of *The American Friend* are taken, and members are practically out of touch with church work.⁴⁴

Nowhere was this crisis of numbers and spiritual devotion more visible than the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, formerly the spiritual center of American Quakerism. Between the establishment of the Orthodox Meeting (following the Hicksite separation) in 1827 and the turn of the century, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting lost around forty percent of its members. Even these statistics were misleading because many of those listed were nominal members, who did not serve on committees, contribute funds or keep to Quaker practices. By 1900 the Meeting had only 4,460 people involved, less than one-third the number involved in the Hicksite Meeting (which itself was in a similar steep decline). It was a far cry from the days when Quakers had been the most powerful religious and political force in the state. William Penn's own city apparently was having trouble sustaining a viable, vibrant Quaker presence.⁴⁵

Women posed a particular kind of demographic concern. In the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting an extremely large number of the women members were single. Examining both the Hicksite and the Orthodox (which included Wilburites and Gurneyites) Yearly Meetings in Philadelphia, scholars Hugh Barbour and J. William Frost have concluded that forty percent of women in these Meetings

remained unmarried. As they explain, 'the requirement for endogamous marriage that the Orthodox kept until after World War I meant that some women had to choose between their faith and getting married'. They point out that these women often received jobs connected with Quakerism, through Quaker schools or charities.⁴⁶ In a religion without priesthood, the numbers of women who lived outside of the control of husbands or fathers were a challenge for male power because they could claim equal access to religious authority. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting exemplified a trend that was echoed throughout Quakerism.

The question of the gender ratios within Quakerism more broadly is perhaps a more ambiguous question. At the close of the nineteenth century women vastly outnumbered men in American denominations, but the picture is not as clear within Gurneyite Quakerism. Some anecdotal evidence suggests that Quakers reflected this trend in certain places. For instance, when the Baltimore Yearly Meeting met in 1880 an article in *The Friend* reported that only fifty to sixty men and over one hundred women were in attendance, yet they did not think this ratio of women outnumbering men by two to one remarkable enough to take any special note.⁴⁷

Others insisted that Quakers were exempt from a trend towards the feminization of religious attendance. Another article in *The Friend* from 1900 contended that Friends Meetings tended towards a more balanced gender ratio than other denominations, something it claimed to have statistics to back up (which regrettable they did not print). The author credited this balanced gender ratio to 'worship consisting of realities rather than symbolism, [which] commends itself directly to the masculine mind'.⁴⁸ Quoting from the periodical *Quaker Strongholds*, the authors argued that Quakerism, unlike other faiths, was based upon the 'Christianity of Jesus Christ Himself' which was not 'a religion for women and children only, but appeals to and fortifies the best instincts for manly independence'.⁴⁹

The Friend asserted that the very truth of Quaker faith was proven by the gender ratios of the denomination, suggesting that if for any reason these ratios themselves or the power relationship between the sexes was upset, it was a recipe for instability. By 1915, the organizers of the Men's Conference were claiming women outnumbered men two to one in most Meetings for Worship.⁵⁰ If men believed that even gender ratios testified to the strength of Quaker faith, by the early twentieth century they could not help but see that faith as endangered as women began to outnumber them.

Overall, these demographics worked both to push for women's equality in business Meetings and to feed male resistance. The large number of women, especially unmarried women, could claim with sound historical backing to be spiritual equals to men, even citing George Fox for justification. They were clamoring for access to the business Meetings and to the ability to regulate their own religious lives. At the same moment, men feared that women might displace them. If Quakerism was a religion of equality, men could not retreat to being priests; they would have to deal with being outnumbered, with a possible loss of their historic power. Men's roles were changing and they were concerned, but then, so was all of Quakerism.

WOMEN AND THE TRANSFORMATION QUAKERISM

Gurneyite Quakerism was in a tremendous upheaval throughout the latter part of the nineteenth century. Scholar Thomas D. Hamm, in his book *The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends, 1880–1907*, chronicles the largest changes, the growth of the Renewal and Revival movements within Gurneyite Quakerism. The Renewal movement of the 1860s sought to reinvigorate Quakerism to, as Hamm puts it, ‘break down sectarian barriers while preserving distinctiveness, a heightening of humanitarianism and reform concerns, and a modification of worship that emphasized individual freedom and worship’.⁵¹ The Renewalists’ legacy would be taken much further by the Revivalists who took hold in the late 1860s and 1870s, as they embraced a much more evangelical and holiness-centered theology.

Plain dress, the distinctive attire that Quakers wore, was disappearing. Estimates from 1860 suggest that two-thirds of Midwestern Friends were wearing plain dress, yet eight years later a Quaker periodical, *The Herald of Peace*, noted that the practice was a relic of the past.⁵² Plain Speech, the use of ‘thee’ and ‘thou’ in conversation, was also vanishing. In the intense drive towards revivalism, new theological doctrines and practices were being introduced, including water baptism. The Ohio Yearly Meeting even repudiated the traditional Quaker doctrine of the Inner Light.⁵³ If an individual Quaker had been in a Rip Van Winkle-style sleep from the Civil War until the 1880s, they would have found that status of women was one element which had changed relatively little within the denomination.

The most significant change, one that had great consequences for women, was the widespread adoption of paid ministry or ‘programmed ministry’ similar to other churches, and the elimination of traditional Quaker worship. Hicksites and most Gurneyites were moving towards theological modernism as the twentieth century neared, but only Gurneyites would embrace the pastoral system. Starting in 1875, paid pastors became common and in 1900 every Yearly Meeting except Baltimore had accepted them.⁵⁴ These pastors were overwhelmingly male, something that would later prove to have ominous implications for women.

Another consequence of change within Quakerism was more interaction with the outside world. Quakers were no longer the insular people they had once been. Despite professed hostility to the Hicksites, many Gurneyites in the latter half of the nineteenth century increasingly looked to heal the old wounds. This meant they would have also been aware of Hicksites’ ongoing struggles over the same issues of women’s representation in Meetings that Gurneyites faced.

The Hicksites in 1875 were discussing women’s roles in the same way that the Gurneyites were, with many suggesting that there should be a move towards joint Meetings.⁵⁵ While by the 1890s three Hicksite Yearly Meetings did have joint Meetings, most seemed to conclude that joint Meetings were unnecessary as long as the powers of women’s Meetings were equal in practice to men’s.⁵⁶ It is unlikely that the specifics of this would have spurred any Gurneyites to decisive

action. The Hicksites were actually moving more slowly than the Gurneyites to reform, and it would have been unwise for a Gurneyite to suggest following the actions of 'heretics' too closely. Even so, Gurneyites would have been reminded by Hicksite struggles that women's roles needed to be addressed.

Gurneyites were also drawing closer to other denominations. Many trends for women's participation that existed in other Protestant denominations simply were not applicable to Quakerism. In mainstream Protestant denominations, for instance, women's missionary societies often became concentrated sources of female power; scholar Dana Roberts, for example, writes about how the breakup of large women's foreign missionary groups spurred many Protestant women to push for the right to become clergy. Within these denominations, missionary societies served as a basis for action.⁵⁷ Within Orthodox Quakerism, the role of Women's Missionary Societies in opening up a path to church governance for women was more uncertain.

Mary Whitall Thomas, writing in *The Friends' Review*, raised questions about the appropriateness of Yearly Meetings creating their own Women's Foreign Mission associations when the Religious Society of Friends was supposed to have equality between the genders. She sarcastically asked women Friends if they would 'consider approving a *men's* [italics in original] Foreign Missionary Society, which would leave them out of its plans and purposes'. She urged Men's and Women's Foreign Mission's groups be made to subordinate to the existing co-gendered Foreign Missions Committees that operated out of Yearly Meetings, expressly suggesting that failing to do so might endanger the principles that had allowed men and women to work together, without subordination, in merged business Meetings.⁵⁸

The Friends' Review printed views from other Friends that echoed these sentiments, including one from a female English Friend, who argued that all committees and Quaker organizations should be joint whenever possible.⁵⁹ Mary Underhill aired her criticisms of female-only organizations succinctly, writing that 'one says, what a power women are in the Women's Christian Temperance and the Women's Foreign Missionary Association! Yes. But why do these exist? Because, largely, there has been no outlet in other denominations for women.' Underhill saw joint Meetings in business and co-gendered committees as making these kinds of organizations unnecessary.⁶⁰ Despite opposition, however, and the threat of violating Quaker principles, these women's missionary associations would form the Women's Foreign Missionary Union of Friends in America in 1890, and its descendent remained gender-segregated.⁶¹ Still, Underhill's arguments and those of others towards the missionary societies would contribute to the creation of more joint business Meetings.

A NEW KIND OF QUAKERISM

The end of the century would move the debate about joint business Meetings forward as Quakerism changed. *The American Friend*, under the stewardship of editor Rufus Jones, would become one of the most influential outlets in

Gurneyite Quakerism. Jones would use *The American Friend* as the starting point in a distinguished career, becoming one of the founders of the American Friends Service Committee and arguably the single most important figure in twentieth-century American Quakerism, commanding wide respect from most of its branches.⁶²

Because of his influence, Jones' stand on the issue of unified business Meetings was significant. In 1896 Jones dedicated most of an issue to the topic when the London Yearly Meeting moved to consider the question.⁶³ The events covered were changing Quakerism; after 1896, the London Meeting would begin to direct all important business to joint committees and to start appointing women to their Meeting for Sufferings (their version of the Representative Meeting).⁶⁴ More critical for American Friends, however, was Rufus Jones' firm stand in the pages of *The American Friend*. Jones boldly argued:

Notwithstanding...a theoretical equality in the church, women Friends have not in fact been a constituent part in the meeting for the affairs of the church. They have been until more recent years an appendix to the men's meeting... In most American Yearly Meetings joint sessions, in part, or in full, have become the settled plan and it has proved to be a satisfactory solution to the question, and has established in every detail the equality of the sexes in the church... We believe that every branch of church work has profited by this union. Some of our Yearly Meetings still hold a few separate sessions during the Yearly Meeting, and in very large meetings this custom has many advantages. A united meeting of some sort is perhaps the only way to establish *in fact* a principle which we have always held *in theory*, and it involves the sacrifice of no principle whatever.⁶⁵

Ultimately Jones rejected the possibility that Quakers might move towards equality gradually, or attempt to get closer to George Fox's vision on an unattainable ideal. Instead, Jones contended that joint Meetings and women's access were matters of Quaker principle; equality in Meeting should start immediately.

At the same time that Jones declared his position, Quakerism was also undergoing a change in governance in the United States. By the turn of the century, long-contemplated plans to create a body above the Yearly Meetings were coming to fruition. In 1900, two years before the creation of the Five Year Meeting, which unified Gurneyite Meetings under one structure, a uniform discipline was created. The section of the uniform discipline that referred to the existence of separate business Meetings was quite brief, merely reading that 'Meetings which may desire to continue the ancient practice of holding separate business meetings of men and women are at liberty to do so, appointing separate Clerks from their number'.⁶⁶ Yet, the absence of objections to joint Meetings opened the door for their wider acceptance.

Powerful forces had coalesced around the idea of men and women taking part in the business Meeting, but not all opposition ceased. Eliza C. Armstrong, for example, continued to argue for the importance of separate women's societies (particularly in the foreign missions field). She contended that in many instances women had less influence without separate representation, as she pointed to the Board of Trustees at Quaker run Earlham College, which went from being half

female to only having three women on a board of twelve. Yet by the turn of the century, even Armstrong was willing to accept that women were gaining some status within the faith, admitting 'as it is now men and women are co-ordinate members of the same denomination, whereas formerly women could hardly be accounted members in the fullest sense of the term'.⁶⁷ Apparently Armstrong concluded that it was only a matter of time before joint Meetings became accepted fact, and she was not wholly negative about the prospect.

When Meetings became joint meetings, Quaker periodicals and Meeting minutes often failed to mention the transition. The trend for joint Meetings and unified Meetings was so pervasive that in 1908 Rufus Jones wrote what can only be described as an article to declare victory on the issue of women's equality. He told readers:

The Society of Friends was the first important body of Christians to annul all distinctions of sex in matters of spiritual gifts and services and to open to woman a large area of ministry. By the blunder of setting up separate Meetings for business at a later date, the real equality was, in practice, seriously lessened, but in our generation Friends have seen the inconsistency of double Meetings, and have been gradually returning to the original principle of complete equality, with no distinction of sex at all.⁶⁸

Jones' article may have been a bit overly optimistic. While most Meetings had unified business Meetings and allowed women in the representative Meeting by the 1910s, it took a long time for some Meetings to finally allow joint Meetings. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting notably only allowed joint Meetings in 1923, and continued to appoint a separate women's clerk as late as 1930.⁶⁹ Gaining access to business Meetings would also prove to be no guarantee of gaining any real power.

TWO STEPS FORWARD...

Some men clearly feared women's growing influence. This was one of the reasons for taking steps such as calling for the Men's Conference, as men anxious to maintain control over areas of faith that had been exclusive to men reacted. As a result, in the period immediately after women were integrated into Meeting, women's power decreased in other realms.

The most obvious area was in ministry. As paid ministry began to take hold, the idea that women could be ministers in the Religious Society of Friends was increasingly called into question. Although it was never overtly repudiated, few Meetings would tolerate the idea of a woman as their minister. *The American Friend* (no longer edited by Rufus Jones) spotlighted this problem when it published an article from Emma C. Coffin, who was directed to write on the topic of women's ministry by the Pastor's Assembly Board of Iowa Yearly Meeting.

Coffin asked leading Friends from within the Five Year Meeting (especially Superintendents of Evangelism, who were supposed to help discern the call for ministry) about the declining number of women in ministry. The responses she got back indicated that women were unlikely to become ministers. One of her

respondents claimed that women were less suitable because they could not do interdenominational work with male clergy; others said that women might be in ministry if their husbands were also ministers. One participant commented that motherhood prevented ministry because it alienated women from congregants, while another claimed that men simply did not like to hear women preach. Some of the respondents wanted women in ministry but noted with concern that the number of women entering the field was declining. Another respondent remarked honestly that 'given a man and a woman of equal attainment in ministry, the man will be chosen as pastor nine to nine and a half times out of ten'. Reviewing the data, Coffin wondered, 'Is this the time for a backwards swinging of the Friends Church?'⁷⁰ As the door for women in business Meeting was opening up, young women were also facing the reality that they would never be ministers, as Quaker women of the past had been.

Even having a voice in the Yearly Meeting did not matter as much as it once did. The creation of the Five Year Meeting, which was supposed to be the central governing body of Orthodox Quakerism, meant that there was a higher level of organization. One women Friend, Mary Grove Chawner of South Dakota, wrote powerfully about women's representation at the 1912 gathering of Five Year Meeting, noting that women were significantly underrepresented. She observed that one of the delegations held eight male ministers and only one woman.⁷¹ Chawner pointedly asked, 'Much has been gained, no doubt in joint meetings; but has all been gained that should be gained and has, perhaps, something been lost?'⁷²

Much of the power within Quakerism was being exercised behind closed doors, forbidden to women. Education was becoming more important as a marker of status within Quakerism, yet the leading Gurneyite institution of higher learning, Haverford College, remained exclusively male, with its alumni networks and connections closed to women.⁷³ Quaker-organized men's clubs increasingly proliferated within Quaker Meetings and provided men a way to politic outside of formal Meeting structures.⁷⁴ The most respected positions for leaders within the denomination would no longer be clerks of Meetings, but rather professors or presidents at Quaker Colleges, editors of Quaker periodicals or staff of Quaker organizations like the American Friends Service Committee. These positions were largely closed to women. Women had fought and struggled, finally achieving what they had aimed for by having joint meetings. Quakers celebrated how they had adhered to their ancient principles. Yet they ignored the reality that women had little more than a fiction of equality.

LEGACY AND LINGERING QUESTIONS

That Quakers were the first major Protestant group to acknowledge women as ministers is worthy of praise, but it should not be an excuse for historians or contemporary Quakers themselves to ignore the difficult journey towards greater equality for women in Meetings. Just as authors Donna McDaniel and Vanessa D. Julve have recently offered qualifications of Quakers contributions to antislavery

and civil rights struggles in their book *Fit for Freedom Not For Friendship*, which exposed underlying racism within the faith, the place of women must be also approached with a critical eye.⁷⁵ It is not enough to simply celebrate a historic legacy of Quaker progress. Like any group, Orthodox Quakerism must come to terms with the rockier parts of its past.⁷⁶

Studying the Quaker past may also remind us that there is no linear march of progress towards equality. Even when moments of advancement occur, they may occasion setbacks. In 1986 the Quaker Women's Group was given the chance to give the Swarthmore Lecture, a British lecture that was the most important pulpit in all of Quakerism. The women Friends giving the lecture raised the issue that Quakerism had frequently ignored women's voices.⁷⁷ Some Quakers expressed shock; had not the issue of equality been dealt with in the Religious Society of Friends better than any other religious group? The women of the Quaker Women's Group argued from experience that they still were engaged in a struggle. History provides this point as well in the lives of Gurneyite Quaker women. It must be made clear that as the shutters that divided the meeting house were opened up, those last obstacles removed and the men's and women's Meetings unified, other, more insidious and far less visible barriers were being raised up.

NOTES

1. 'National Conference of Men Friends', *The American Friend* 32/20 (20 May 1915), pp. 314-15. *The American Friend* changed volume numbers when it changed editors. For the purpose of consistency this paper uses the old volume numbers, which were continued alongside the new numbering scheme.

2. 'National Conference of Men Friends'.

3. Douglas, A., *The Feminization of American Culture*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977. Douglas makes the argument that the decline of state churches made the clergy of liberal denominations economically beholden to the tastes of women. She argues these ministers had to provide a sentimental approach both to keep women involved in churches and secure them as paying audience for their writing. Because ministerial work was mostly unpaid for Quakers, even male ministers would not have subjected to the same pressures that Douglas describes.

4. Hamm, T.D., *Quaker Writings: An Anthology, 1650-1920*, New York: Penguin, 2011, p. 95. The name Margaret Fell is used here because she is referred to infrequently as Margaret Fell Fox in historical writing.

5. Fell, M., 'Women's Ministry Justified', in T.D. Hamm (ed.), *Quaker Writings: An Anthology*, New York: Penguin, 2010, pp. 95-105.

6. Larson, R., *Daughters of Light: Quaker Women Preaching and Prophesying in the Colonies and Abroad, 1700-1775*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2000, p. 21.

7. Ingle, H.L., *First among Friends: George Fox and the Creation of Quakerism*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1994, p. 252.

8. George Fox quoted in Lloyd, A., *Quaker Social History, 1669-1738*, New York: Longmans, Green, 1950, p. 108.

9. Ingle, *First Among Friends*, p. 252.

10. Lloyd, *Quaker Social History, 1669-1738*, pp. 110-11; Kennedy, T.C., *British Quakerism, 1860-1920: The Transformation of a Religious Community*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001, pp. 212-13.

11. Kennedy, *British Quakerism, 1860–1920*, pp. 212–15. The London Women’s Yearly Meeting was reintroduced in 1784, partly thanks to American Friends’ advocacy.

12. Russell, E., *The History of Quakerism*, New York: Macmillan, 1942, p. 217; Dunn, M.M., ‘Saints and Sisters: Congregational and Quaker Women in the Early Colonial Period’, *American Quarterly* 30/5 (1 December 1978), pp. 582–601.

13. ‘Women’s Meetings’, *Friends’ Review: A Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* 40/14 (4 November 1886), p. 296; Howland, R.S., ‘Woman’s Equality in the Society of Friends’, *Friends’ Review: A Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* 42/50 (11 July 1889), p. 787; ‘The London Friends’ Meetings and their Associations: Women’s Meetings’, *Friends’ Review: a Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* 23/10 (30 October 1869), p. 157.

14. Because the Hicksite separation took place at different times in different meetings, scholars sometimes extend it through 1828. See Russell, *The History of Quakerism*, p. 280; Hamm, T.D., *The Transformation of American Quakerism: Orthodox Friends, 1800–1907*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1992, p. 15.

15. Hamm, T.D., *The Quakers in America*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2003, pp. 47–49. The dates of the Wilburite separation are a bit more ambiguous than the Hicksite separation, occurring in different places in different times. The first separations occurred in 1845 in New England Yearly Meeting, and by the Civil War the separation was largely finished.

16. This paper examines only Gurneyite Friends (or Quakers) and Gurneyite Meetings unless otherwise indicated. All Gurneyites were Orthodox Quakers, though not all Orthodox were Gurneyites (some could be Wilburites). This paper uses the label Orthodox in instances before the Gurneyite/Wilburite split, though it is always referring to groups that became Gurneyite unless otherwise noted. Some scholars have used the term Gurneyite and Orthodox relatively interchangeably. This paper seeks to avoid that, but in some instances, such as when an institution or concept existed before the split, such usage is unavoidable.

17. Quaker attitudes regarding suffrage are beyond the scope of this paper. In general, however, it can be observed that Gurneyites were generally less progressive on this issue than Hicksites. Some Gurneyite Friends did move to a cautious support of suffrage by the early twentieth century. From perusing both Gurneyite and Hicksite periodicals in the latter half of the nineteenth century it does also appear that Hicksites mentioned women’s suffrage much more. For more information on Quakers and suffrage see: Bacon, M.H., *Mothers of Feminism: The Story of Quaker Women in America*, Philadelphia, PA: Friends General Conference, 1986, pp. 120–36, 184–201.

18. Hewitt, N.A. et al., ‘Women’s Rights and Roles’, in H. Barbour et al. (eds.), *Quaker Crosscurrents: Three Hundred Years of Friends in the New York Yearly Meetings*, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1995, pp. 165–82.

19. ‘New York Yearly Meeting’, *Friends’ Review: a Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* 12/39 (4 June 1859), p. 616.

20. ‘Iowa Yearly Meeting’, *Friends’ Review: a Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* 19/5 (30 September 1865), p. 72.

21. ‘London and Dublin Meetings’, *Friends’ Review: a Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* 15/47 (26 July 1862), p. 745.

22. ‘London and Dublin Meetings’.

23. New York Yearly Meeting Minute quoted in ‘Women’s Meetings’, *Friends’ Review* 28/4 (12 September 1874), p. 56.

24. New York Yearly Meeting Minute quoted in ‘Women’s Meetings’.

25. New York Yearly Meeting Minute quoted in ‘Women’s Meetings’.

26. Braude, A., *Radical Spirits: Spiritualism and Women’s Rights in Nineteenth-Century America*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2nd edn, 2001), pp. 13–15.

27. Baker, P., ‘The Domestication of Politics: Women and American Political Society, 1780–1920’, *American Historical Review* 89/3(1984), p. 620; Fischer, G.V., ‘“Pantalets” and “Turkish Trousers”: Designing Freedom in the Mid-Nineteenth-Century United States’,

Feminist Studies (1997), pp. 110–40; Clawson, M.A., ‘Nineteenth-Century Women’s Auxiliaries and Fraternal Orders’, *Signs* (1986), pp. 40–61; Dubois, E., *Feminism and Suffrage: The Emergence of an Independent Women’s Movement in America, 1848–1869*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978; Ginzberg, L.D., *Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics, and Class in the Nineteenth-Century United States*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992; Dorsey, B., *Reforming Men and Women: Gender in the Antebellum City*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006.

28. Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism*, p. 51. London Yearly Meeting, like New York Yearly Meeting, would end the practice of disowning members for marrying out of Meeting in 1859. However, because English law stated that only two Quakers could become legally married in a Quaker ceremony it would take until 1860 for the passage of new legislation to give such marriages legal status. See Kennedy, *British Quakerism, 1860–1920*, pp. 39–42.

29. One of the best-known examples of this was Angela Grimke, who was disowned by her meeting for marrying a non-Quaker, as was her sister, Sarah, for merely attending her wedding. John Greenleaf Whittier apparently escaped disownment by watching the wedding through a doorway, rather than entering the room. See: Mayer, H., *All on Fire: William Lloyd Garrison and the Abolition of Slavery*, New York: St Martin’s Griffin, 1998, pp. 243–44.

30. Underhill, M.G., ‘Ye Are All One in Christ’, *Friends’ Review: A Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* 42/3 (16 August 1888), p. 35.

31. ‘Article 4—No Title’, *The Friend: A Religious and Literary Journal* 57/50 (19 July 1884), p. 399.

32. Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism*, pp. 33–34.

33. The Philadelphia Press quoted in ‘Article 4—No Title’, *The Friend* 57/50.

34. The Philadelphia Press quoted in ‘Article 4—No Title’, *The Friend* 57/50.

35. ‘Women’s Meetings’, 4 November 1886.

36. ‘Baltimore Yearly Meeting’, *Friends’ Review: a Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* 40/20 (16 December 1886), p. 312. A Representative Meeting was a kind of executive standing committee that often conducted the business of a Yearly Meeting when it was not in session. Originally these bodies were called Meetings for Sufferings.

37. Obituary in Eliza Armstrong Cox, ‘Looking Back Over the Trail’, 1927, <http://www.usfwi.org/PDFfiles/EACbook.pdf>, accessed 8 December 2012.

38. Eliza C. Armstrong quoted in ‘Article 2—No Title’, *Friends’ Review: A Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* 42/43 (23 May 1889), p. 680.

39. Eliza C. Armstrong quoted in ‘Article 2—No Title’, *Friends’ Review* 42/43.

40. Howland, ‘Woman’s Equality in the Society of Friends’.

41. Underhill, M.G., ‘Joint and Separate Sessions in Friends’ Meetings’, *Friends’ Review: A Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* 42/50 (11 July 1889), p. 798.

42. Rhoads, S.A., ‘Woman’s Place in Our Religious Government’, *Friends’ Review: A Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* 42/37 (11 April 1889), p. 581.

43. Tebbetts, C.E., ‘Membership Changes for Statistical Study for Five Year Period, 1909–1914’, *The American Friend* 22/35 (2 September 1915), pp. 552–53. At the time Whittier College was a denominational college run by Gurneyite Quakers.

44. Tebbetts, ‘Membership Changes’. This is also a telling statement on the importance of denominational periodicals within Quakerism.

45. Barbour, H., and Frost, J.W., *The Quakers*, Richmond, IN: Friends United Meeting Press, 2nd edn, (1988), pp. 219–20.

46. Barbour and William Frost, *The Quakers*, p. 221. In her article on the status of single women from 1780–1860 among English Quakers, Shelia Wright has observed that a higher than average percentage of Quaker women chose to remain single, in part because of the comparatively high status accorded them while unmarried within the Quaker community. Her observations on British Quakers firmly echo the example of Gurneyite women, even into the

early twentieth century. See: Wright, S., ‘“I Have No Horror of Being an Old-Maid”: Single Women in the Religious Society of Friends 1780–1860’, *Quaker Studies* 16 (2011), pp. 85–104.

47. ‘Article 2—No Title’, *The Friend: A Religious and Literary Journal* 54/13 (6 November 1880), p. 104.

48. ‘Article 11—No Title’, *The Friend: A Religious and Literary Journal* 73/38 (27 January 1900), p. 217.

49. *Quaker Strongholds Quoted* in ‘Article 11—No Title’, *The Friend* 73/38.

50. ‘National Conference of Men Friends’.

51. Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism*, pp. 36–37.

52. Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism*, p. 52.

53. Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism*, p. 123. This is actually a point of contention between Hamm and Caroline Dale Spencer. Spencer argues that holiness theology was implicit in Quakerism from the religion’s inception. To some degree both scholars’ personal theology and notion of Quakerism is at stake in this debate. For a brief overview of the debate, see Spencer, C.D., *Holiness: The Soul of Quakerism: An Historical Analysis of the Theology of Holiness in the Quaker Tradition*, Colorado Springs, CO: Paternoster, 2007.

54. Hamm, *The Transformation of American Quakerism*, p. 127.

55. Jacob, C., ‘Women’s Meetings’, *Friends’ Intelligencer* 32/14 (29 May 1875), p. 212;

Powell, G.T., ‘Women’s Meetings’, *Friends’ Intelligencer* 32/12 (15 May 1875), p. 212; Smith, S.N., ‘Women’s Meetings’, *Friends’ Intelligencer* 32/8 (18 April 1875), p. 116.

56. ‘The Evolution of the Discipline’, *Friends’ Intelligencer* 50/19 (13 May 1893), p. 296; ‘Women’s Meeting and Discipline’, *Friends’ Intelligencer* 49/12 (19 March 1892), p. 181.

57. Robert, D.L., *American Women in Mission: A Social History of their Thought and Practice*, Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1996, pp. 303–304.

58. Thomas, M.W., ‘The Woman’s Foreign Missionary Society of Friends and its Bearing upon the Position of Woman in the Church’, *Friends’ Review: a Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* 41/10 (6 October 1887), p. 148. It should be noted that Thomas was not opposed to the idea of single gendered organizations. She worked closely enough with the Women’s Christian Temperance Union that they published a memorial booklet for her after she died. Instead, Thomas’s reservations were specifically related to the consequences for equality within the Religious Society of Friends. See: E.T.G., *Thoughts: Memorial of Mary Whitall Thomas*, Baltimore, MD: Women’s Christian Temperance Union of Maryland, 1888.

59. Richardson, M., ‘Joint Committees of Men and Women’, *Friends’ Review: a Religious, Literary and Miscellaneous Journal* 41/44 (31 May 1888), p. 693.

60. Underhill, ‘Ye Are All One in Christ’.

61. Dandelion, P., *An Introduction to Quakerism*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007, pp. 159–60.

62. Hinshaw, D., *Rufus Jones, Master Quaker*, New York: G.P. Putnam & Sons, 1951. Jones actually finished the last year of *The Friends’ Reviews* run as its editor before taking over at *The American Friend*.

63. ‘London Yearly Meeting’, *The American Friend* 3/25 (18 June 1896), pp. 597–601.

64. Dandelion, *An Introduction to Quakerism*, p. 158.

65. ‘The Position of Women in the Affairs of the Church’, *The American Friend* 3/25 (18 June 1896), pp. 591–92. This article is not directly given a byline, but as Jones had just taken over editorial control it can be safely assumed that he is the author.

66. ‘Constitution and Discipline for the American Yearly Meetings of Friends’ (American Yearly Meetings, 23 May 1900), p. 16. This document was drafted before the official creation of the Five Year Meetings, so it was credited simply to the ‘American Yearly Meetings’. This document’s creation and the Five Year Meeting’s creation are so interconnected it would be a mistake to not see this as a product of the same movement.

67. Armstrong, E.C., ‘Equality’, *The American Friend* 6/33 (17 August 1899), p. 774.

68. Jones, R., 'The Coming of Women', *The American Friend* 15/29 (16 July 1908), pp. 451-52. In a notable example of Quaker views on suffrage, Jones also used this occasion to condemn British suffragists' methods, though he sympathized with their goals.

69. Bacon, *Mothers of Feminism*, pp. 181-82. The transition to joint Meetings did not inherently imply that Meetings should not appoint both a male and female clerk, but they often seem to have moved to having only one clerk shortly after. This may have been partly a matter of convenience, as having two people trying to conduct a Meeting might have been problematic.

70. Coffin, E.F., 'Women and Preachers and Pastors', *The American Friend* 27/31 (29 July 1920), pp. 677-83. Coffin's use of the term 'Friends Church', rather than 'Religious Society of Friends', is evidence of a shift in the terminology used by many Gurneyite Quakers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

71. Bacon, *Mothers of Feminism*, p. 182.

72. Mary Grove Chawner in Bacon, *Mothers of Feminism*, p. 182.

73. Peterson, D.F., 'Haverford College', in J. Oliver, C.L. Cherry, and C.L. Cherry (eds.), *Founded by Friends: The Quaker Heritage of Fifteen American Colleges and Universities*, Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2007), pp. 1-20 (17). Haverford only allowed women admission in 1980, long after they had abandoned any formal denominational connection. This is in contrast to other Orthodox Quaker-founded colleges of less acclaim, such as Earlham College, which were co-educational from their foundation. Hicksite-founded Swarthmore College was also co-educational.

74. Joy, C.R., 'Faith of a Pacifist', *The American Friend* 24/13 (29 March 1917), pp. 244-46; 'Men's Brotherhood at Marion', *The American Friend* 30/43 (25 October 1923), p. 848.

75. McDaniel, D., and Julye, V.D., *Fit for Freedom, Not for Friendship: Quakers, African Americans, and the Myth of Racial Justice*, Philadelphia: Quaker Press, 2009.

76. More scholarly work on this subject remains to be done outside Gurneyite Quakerism. There is a great need for scholars to explore the process by which Hicksite and Wilburite women in the United States were able to gain access to business Meetings, as well as a need to examine the role of Quaker women internationally. The Kenyan Yearly Meetings, the fruit of American Orthodox Quaker missionary work and today the most numerous Quaker group, should be considered in light of struggles over women's roles within American Quakerism.

77. Shellens, H., 'You May Lead a Horse to Water... Friends and the 1986 Swarthmore Lecture', *Quaker Studies* 11/2 (March 2007), pp. 237-58.

AUTHOR DETAILS

Isaac May is a graduate of Earlham College and currently pursuing a Masters of Theological Studies at Harvard Divinity School. He studies the history of liberal religion in the United States and historic peace churches. He is especially interested in the intersection of religious pacifism and politics.

Mailing address: 41 Banks St., Cambridge, MA 02138, USA.

Email: ibm647@mail.harvard.edu.