IT is the contention of Donald Worster, *Nature's Economy*, that ecological attitudes predated "ecology" in America and had their impact upon life and environment long before the study of species in their natural habitat emerged as a science in the second half of the nineteenth century. Historians are now in the process of reconstructing what Worster has called "the roots of ecology" in the early modern period. Ecological attitudes of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in America appear multifaceted, not monolithic. Religious attitudes, as much as anything, seem to have shaped these various human approaches to nature. Thus, the human assessment of self in relationship to nature emerged, for many, through the refractive lens of theology. It is the contention of this paper that "tender" and "savory" Quakers of the eighteenth century in America—that is, those most dedicated to the Christian ethos of their religion—formulated a distinctive ecology at some variance with the prevailing environmental opinion of their day.\(^1\) Friends such as John Woolman (1721–1772), Anthony Benezet (1713–1784), John Churchman (1705–1775), Joshua Evans (1731–1798), and John Hunt of West Jersey (1740–1824) lent themselves to the religiously-inspired movement for Quaker withdrawal from Pennsylvania politics after 1756. They cleansed themselves from the dross of worldly concerns so as to immerse themselves in the joys of mystical communion with God in their meeting houses for worship. From the centrality of this mystical experience, they radiated love to all of oppressed and despised humanity and even to the more vulnerable beasts in the world of nature.\(^2\)
For eighteenth-century Friends, love of God and benevolence toward all his creatures lay at the heart of man’s moral responsibility to himself and to his world. For Anthony Benezet, the ideal of Christian service was to provide for “every creature” an outpouring of love: “Love, with its fruits of patience, meekness, humility, gentleness, joy, is all we can wish to ourselves, and our fellow-creatures; for this is to live to God, united to him, both for time and eternity.” John Woolman yearned for a return to that “primitive harmony” that had existed before “sin” had introduced to man’s life a temporal “discord.” As a young lad, Woolman tells us that he had once killed a mother bird and her “young ones” for sport. As he later contemplated the “visible creation,” however, “an awfulness [a sense of awe]” covered him and his “heart was [made] tender.” With maturity, he came to believe that “our Gracious Creator cares and provides for all his Creatures. His tender mercies are over all his works; & so far as his Love influences Our minds, so far we . . . feel a desire to . . . lessen the distresses of the afflicted & increase the happiness of the Creation.” In the last year of his life, probably as he crossed the seas on a religious ministry to England, this gentle Quaker beseeched the Lord to preserve his spirit “in Tenderness both toward Mankind and the Animal Creation.” Shortly before Woolman’s death in 1772, a younger Friend and second cousin, John Hunt of West Jersey, struggling with his own religious development, sought to vanquish creaturely pride and to cultivate humility, but was finally compelled by the Lord’s irresistible power to stand before Friends and pronounce thirty three words at a meeting for worship.³ “After I sat down,” said he, “I felt such quietude, peace and composure, and a love that seemed to me to be new, that for some days I felt as if I had got into a new world. I loved not only my nearest connexions, but all mankind, and even the brutile creation, with a new love.”⁴

The “seed” of benevolence, already present in the religious experience and activities of George Fox and other seventeenth-century Quakers, found its special flowering among reformist Friends during the Quietistic period.⁵ “Tender” Friends sought to embrace all “the family of mankind” as well as “the beasts of the field” with a disinterested and unselfish love. Such was the intrusiveness of symbolic Love that it informed the dreams of John Churchman in the “person” of an “angelick apparition,” “not much different from one of the Indians, clean washed from his grease.” Churchman concluded that “the good Spirit” had communicated a profound truth to him in the slumbers of the night: “All colours were equal to [the Lord], who gave life and being to all mankind.” In 1816, John Hunt speculated that Friends had been
relieved from the burdens of ritual that the ancient Jews had suffered so that they might get on with the task of perfecting their “Morral Duties” to God, to mankind, and to the creation.6

Thus, humanitarian service to oppressed peoples was a keynote of eighteenth-century reformist Friends. In 1784, near the end of his life, Anthony Benezet published a treatise in support of the dignity and humanity of the American Indians and castigated frontiersmen for stealing their land or plying them with rum. Benezet and John Churchman had earlier attended treaty negotiations with “the natives” during the French and Indian War. They supported Indian rights and cultivated Indian friendship so as to preserve, if possible, tranquility in “the backlands” of English America. Woolman had crossed the mountains in 1763 on a famous mission to the Indians which he recorded in his journal as formative of religious insights. Joshua Evans and John Hunt, during the crisis of the American Revolution had visited and ministered to the poor remnant of “natives” who resided at Edgepelick in New Jersey. Hunt continued this service well beyond the close of the century.7

Woolman and Benezet, on the other hand, devoted much of their lives to lifting the oppression of the African slaves. Woolman wrote Some Considerations on the Keeping of Negroes as early as 1746 and the Overseers of the Press published it in 1754. Benezet was especially influential in confronting through his pamphlets the inhumanity of the slave trade. Both he and Woolman pressed the Society of Friends to purge itself of slave involvement through progressive alterations in church discipline in 1754, 1758, and 1776. Churchman, Evans, and Hunt all “laboured” with slave owners within the Society to “raise them” above “darkness.” As early as 1757, Woolman had begun quietly to refuse the hospitality of Friends who still embraced the world through the oppression of their slaves. This eighteenth-century Quaker crusade for slavery abolition was no mere philosophic abstraction. Benezet, in his old age, beset with ill health, moved beyond abolitionism to assume the “lowly” task of educating free blacks in the Africa School of Philadelphia. The position of African schoolmaster, as Benezet reported, was thought inferior to the teaching of whites, that is, “less profitable” and “less honourable” “in the eyes of most people.”8

Nonetheless, Friends of the Truth remained “tender” to Indians, blacks, the poor, and the oppressed generally. Joshua Evans extended compassion to the destitute and homeless Acadians or French “Neutrals” when he visited their former homeland in the 1790s. Evans and John Hunt continued this benevolent tradition of the Society of Friends
near the end of the eighteenth century by visiting "those under suffering" in the poor houses and jails of West Jersey. In 1817, John Hunt sat "in suffering silence" with those who had "lost their reason & were chained" in Burlington county jails. Many tears, said he, were shed.9

For reformist Friends, this benevolent service to mankind complemented opposition to warfare, for men could not be in harmony with God and nature unless they were first in harmony with themselves. The Quaker environmental and ecological vision centered on a divinely-inspired tranquility within the human family for men stood incapable of "dealing gently" with God's "pasture," "vines," or "beasts" if they had first wrecked devastation on themselves or on their environment through violence or warfare. John Churchman called upon Friends to subject themselves "to the Lambs Nature in Every Respect and not shake hands with that Nature that would tear and Destroy nor in any shape Voluntarily Contribute to the Prince of Blood."10

In writing to Israel, John, and James Pemberton—Philadelphia Friends then imprisoned at Winchester, Virginia, for pacifism and alleged disloyalty to the American cause during the Revolution—Anthony Benezet reflected on the folly of war and on the crimes that it had spawned. Men, he observed, were "overwhelmed" with their own "misery and mortality" and yet were striving further "to increase the wounds of nature, and invent new ways of destroying one another." In 1778, be branded war "a teeming womb of mischief" in which "property is . . . scattered, and destroyed, . . . laws are trampled under foot, government despised, and ties of all civil and domestic order broken into pieces, . . . fruitful countries . . . made desarts, and stately cities a heap of ruins." "Great numbers of men," as Woolman observed, were "often seperated from tilling the Earth, and useful employ, to defend what contending parties mutually claim as their interest." War was thus an ecological disaster. Who could calculate the "hurry and toyl" of oppressed laborers in the earth and exhausted tradesmen in the villages who struggled to supply "the food those armies eat, the garments they wear, their wages," not to mention the inevitable "support for the maimed"?11

In the midst of wars, reformist Friends sought quietness and tranquility but were often "led forth" to confront the martial spirit of "the world's people." John Churchman had publicly denounced indirect provincial involvement in King George's War in 1748. Friends had opposed the French and Indian War in 1756 and had remained aloof from the American Revolution in 1776. They had protested against the
War of 1812 in the person, among others, of our aged reformist Friend, John Hunt. Woolman and Benezet had entertained scruples against paying military taxes or augmenting governmental revenue for the indirect purpose of sustaining war. John Churchman had declined passage on an armed frigate bound for Barbados. Joshua Evans had also avoided anything tainted with the military. He summed up the position of conscientious Quakers when he declined to contribute his coin or paper towards the expense of “killing men, Women & Children & laying waist Countries & Towns.”

For John Woolman, the origins of war resided in the cultivation of a mean, selfish spirit through which men sometimes sported with violence, inadvertently confounding themselves, mutilating their environment, and possibly compromising their eternal welfare. The holding of “great estates,” the employment of slave labor to sustain and enrich “great estates,” and the pursuit of warfare to defend “great estates” all proceeded, said Woolman, from the taproot of human greed. Prominent Friends in the eighteenth-century reformation of the church—Woolman, Benezet, Churchman, Evans, and Hunt—all labored to promote what Woolman called “the True Harmony of Mankind” by weaning men from their excessive attachment to wealth so that they might best harmonize their natures to the innocent pleasures of landscape and life around them.

Perhaps most eighteenth-century Quakers were possessed of a moral attachment to the land and were especially committed to the advance of “husbandry” as an ideal vocation for the “children of God.” Robert Barclay (1648–1690), the great theologian of the early Quaker movement, had maintained that “to follow after gardnering” constituted, among other things, simply an “innocent divertisement.” William Penn (1644–1718) thought agriculture useful, as well as ethically upright. He advised his children to be “gardners,” “plowmen,” or “shepherds” (at least in spirit), for those vocations retained “least of Snare and most of Use.” John Woolman proclaimed the joys of cultivating earth in his First Book for Children and sustained this enthusiasm by planting pear trees and grafting “Wine Saps,” and “Yellow Pipins” near his vegetable garden.

As personal wealth, “tea tackling,” and “fancy, ornamented ceilings” proliferated among Philadelphia merchant Friends, “solid,” “savoury,” country Friends clung to the ideal of simplicity in their cultivation of the land. Indeed, one might contend that Woolman, Benezet, Churchman, Evans, and Hunt were collectively “country Friends” in their hearts and moral sensibilities even though Benezet actually resided in Philadelphia.
Woolman "pruned" his orchard, Benezet "cultivated" his garden, Churchman recommended that his children follow in their father's footsteps, "brought up at the plough tail," Hunt wielded a scythe, and George Churchman later described Evans as "a simple farmer." Woolman causes a mythical "labourer" to observe that nothing in life is "more innocent in its nature, more healthy, and more acceptable in common to the minds of honest men than husbandry. . . ." Cultivation of the land was not simply a chance vocation: it possessed all the virtues of a righteous livelihood and contrasted favorably with the "merchandizing," "hucksturing," and "trade" of the cities.\(^\text{15}\)

Reformist Friends "in the country tradition" hardly cared to conceal their disdain for seaport merchants or traders and they were equally dubious concerning the "cumbers" of a professional life. Woolman thought that the "followers of Christ" ought to be "employed about trade and traffic no further than justice and equity evidently accompanies."\(^\text{16}\) He, himself, had given up "merchandizing" in 1753 as had his friend, Anthony Benezet, in 1756, when the two Quakers had separately concluded "that being much amongst the buyer and seller" constituted a "snare" to the soul. "Country Friends" likewise distrusted lawyers, "hireling physicians," involvement in the professions generally, or in governmental service.\(^\text{17}\)

Rustic Quakers seem to have liked the city no better. One suspects that Philadelphia was made most tolerable for pious "country Friends" only during the time of Quaker yearly meeting. In 1795, Joshua Evans complained of the "Clamor, noyse & Croud" that abounded in that large city. He thought "the inhebetance [the inhabitants] was more wicked than ever." They "reside[d] in cities and populous places, for an easier life, and . . . outward substance," shunning "commendable, wholesome labour, in cultivating the soil." Woolman could only express "brotherly sympathy" for those who dwelt in the fowl air of cities and towns and he advised city dwellers to labor for "resignation" until the "holy Leader" might direct them to "a Country life or some change of employ."\(^\text{18}\)

Certainly Friends ought ordinarily to shun the "snares" of "jobbing goods" on the high seas. Reformist Friends in "the country tradition" saw trans-Atlantic trade as nearly a violation of the natural order of things, certainly an implicit affront to the bounty of nature in America. Perhaps at one time, colonies isolated in the wilderness had required trade and supplies from their mother country, but who could now justify shipping valuable American grain abroad in return for rum, spices, and luxuries? To view a heap of "superfluities" among merchants and to
witness simultaneously the "straits" of the poor for want to cheap grain was enough to convince John Hunt to "stop up," if he could, the flow of trade. For Joshua Evans, the exchange of Jersey flour for West Indies rum was not a good bargain, certainly not a moral one. As Woolman perceived it, such "sending abroad, and fetching from far" put "hazard" to men's lives and "the good fruits of the earth brought forth through much labour, are often buried in the Sea."\(^{19}\)

Woolman took compassion on all the sailors and indeed on all living creatures cramped and imprisoned aboard ships. "Lads and young Men" were being "trained up" to seafaring "amidst . . . great Corruption." Even the animals suffered. In 1772, Woolman noted the "dull appearance" and "pining sickness" of cocks and hens caged aboard his English-bound frigate, presumably in order to satisfy the potential hunger of ship captains and officers. He lamented the unnatural fate of these wretched animals cast to sea. The cocks had not once crowed between the Delaware and the sight of Cornwall. He hoped that someday men would become "gentle" and "not lessen that Sweetness of life, in the Animal Creation which the great Creator intends for them. . . ."\(^{20}\)

It was to the land—to the earth—that men and beasts should ultimately return as to their ordinary and temporal habitat. Animals, by instinct, would take comfort in their natural domain but men must learn again to adjust sensibly to their landscape. They should employ the fruits of cultivation to the usefulness of themselves and to the glory of God in whose sovereignty men held the world as in trusteeship. By the second half of the eighteenth century, ecology-minded Friends had evolved an explicit ethic of environmental responsibility in the conservation of pasture and garden. They drew in part upon the example of the American Indians whom they admired. As one Friend expressed it, Indians, on occasion, seem to have possessed a sort of mystical communion with the Great Spirit in whose Love they "apprehended . . . the Virtues, and Nature of Several Herbs, Plants & Trees and the different Relation they had one to another. . . ." These "natives" understood themselves in relation to nature in the same fashion as Christians ought to understand themselves in relation to God and a God-given environment. It had only been the greed of white men that had corrupted Indians into decimating wild life and scattering game.\(^{21}\)

Indians also impressed Anthony Benezet, for one, inasmuch as they cultivated "no more land than is necessary for their plentiful subsistence, and hospitality to strangers." Woolman thought Europeans ought to do the same. If they did, the lands to the east of America would
"accommodate the greatest number of people [they were] capable of" before white men "pressed" again on Indian territory. By the end of the eighteenth century, Joshua Evans was cautioning Friends in western North Carolina and east Tennessee not to be captivated "with the love of a rambling, lazy life," nor to "run" in a fever of "unsettlement" into "remote places" from whence "the poor Indians have been driven, or their lands obtained by measures inconsistent with the holy principle of Truth." Instead, Europeans ought to live on the land in a "compact," economical fashion, according to Benezet, cultivating the earth lovingly and efficiently to the service of its divine master.2

Men in their temporal realm must not waste or abuse the land for in truth it did not belong to them. John Woolman put the matter bluntly: "The Creator of the Earth is the owner of it." Everything man possessed constituted a gift from God and so in distributing the world's goods to others, "we act as [God's] Steward." Thus, by the late eighteenth century, reformist Friends, steeped in existential plainness and humility, had evolved a doctrine of custodianship in the right use of land and goods. Benezet thought man the simple "steward" of God's bounty, "which after a sober subsistence for ourselves & moderate provision for our Children is really the property of the rest of the Family of mankind." The doctrine of custodianship extended not only to the realm of things but had application also to the animal kingdom. As Joshua Evans expressed it, "the creatures . . . were graciously given or rather lent to us to [be] govern[ed] in [the great Creator's] fear." Evans noted that man could not create life, even the life of "the least insect": "therefore as we cannot give life let us be cautious of taking it away. . . ."23

Embedded within the doctrine of custodianship, one finds a fairly explicit ethic of social justice to all living things and to those a yet unborn. This sense of divinely-mandated justice appears most strongly in the writings of Benezet and, especially, Woolman. Benezet noted that "there is a certain degree of wealth in the World for the Common Use of Mankind" and concluded in consequence, that "the heaping up wealth" by one man at the expense of another was morally unjustified. Woolman found it simply natural for men to require nourishment from the earth and so to have a right to "a convenient subsistence that no man may justly deprive [them] of. . . ."24

On the other hand, if the rich engaged too much land or demanded too much labor from their tenants, they "disordered" "the joynts and bands of Society." They invaded the rights of all "inhabitants of that world of which a good and gracious God is proprietor, under whom we
are [all] tenants.” Depression “in the Wages of poor Labourers” produced a “streightness of their Condition” and compelled them, in the face of the indifferent rich, “to labour under Weariness, to toil through Hardships . . . and frequently to oppress those useful Animals with which we are entrusted.” Plantation owners, repaying debts or amassing wealth, sometimes lost sight of their responsibility to future generations. Desperate or greedy landholders, ”. . . by too much tiling,” says Woolman, have “so robbed the earth of its natural fatness, that the produce thereof hath grown light. . . . The produce of the earth is a gift from our gracious Creator to the inhabitants, and to impoverish the earth now to Support outward greatness appears to be an injury to the succeeding age.”

The paucity of social justice in the world not only set men against men but pitted humanity, sometimes unwittingly, against the least defenseless of living things, the “brutile creation.” “Many poor people,” said Woolman, were “so thronged in their business that it [was] difficult for them to provide shelter suitable for their animals.” Woolman observed “oxen and horses . . . often . . . at work when through Heat & too much labour, their eyes, and the emotion of their Bodies, manifest that they were oppressed. Their loads in wagons [were] frequently so heavy that when weary with hauling . . . their drivers [found] occasion in going up Hills or through mire to raise their spirits by whiping to get forward.” The poor themselves were being, in a sense, “whiped forward” to meet, if possible, the demands of the rich.

In these circumstances, domestic animals suffered most. Woolman has a mythical “labourer” inform a “rich man” that he lacked grain to feed both his family and his cow: “I knew her voice,” said he, [that is, the voice of his cow], “and the sound thereof was the Cry of Hunger.... I have seen poor creatures in distress for want of good Shelter and plentiful feeding, when it did not appear to be in the power of their owners to do much better for them, being Straitned in answering the demands of the wealthy.” The “labourer” informed the “rich man” that he may not “easily forget” what he had heard in the darkness of winter: “In wasting away under want, nature hath a voice that is very piercing.”

In a century still notable for its bear-baiting, cockfighting, and wanton abuse of animals through sport and calculated cruelty, reform Quakers displayed notable compassion to those beasts with whom they shared the earth. Humility and benevolence combined in the Quaker ethos to produce an ecological vision of man in harmony with the entire creation. Woolman, Benezet, Evans, Churchman, and Hunt all dis-
played a special sensitivity to the suffering of animals. John Churchman recounts his dismay, as a youth, when a self-professed Christian, having just spoken to him of things religious, took a dislike to his horse, abused his animal, and called it "an ugly dumb beast." Young Churchman noted that Christians had not "made" the animals either for their pleasure or for their wrath but should love all living things if they truly loved the Lord.2

John Hunt, surviving well into old age and into the early nineteenth century, took occasion in his eightieth year to extend compassion to "the beasts of the field and wilderness, and to the birds and fowls of the air" who were suffering privation in the biting cold of First Month, 1821. During the last year of his life, John Woolman had refused the use of stagecoaches in England either for personal transportation or for carrying of his mail. He had been informed by Friends that coaches often travelled "upwards of a hundred miles in 24 hours," leaving the exhausted horses, as a consequence, either dead or blind. He scrupulously refused such dearly-won service even though his disinclination to use the public mails compelled him to request of John Townsend, his English friend, that all correspondence to America be defrayed or diverted.29

Benezet, Woolman, Evans, Churchman, and probably additional reform Quakers as well, refused in adulthood to partake of "animal food." Joshua Evans seems to have suffered most the deprivation of meat. At least he wrote wistfully about it, telling us that under vegetarianism his "Appetite seem'd to crave flesh more than ever." But he had "centered down" in "a fellow feeling with the tribulated everywhere" and "bowed in Awful reverence" before his Maker, he had sensed that "life in all is sweet, the taking of which [became] a tender point with me." Churchman thought his avoidance of "animal food" and his spartan diet had rendered him "singular" in the eyes of the World but nonetheless he persisted. His friend, Anthony Benezet, undoubtedly spoke to some degree for all the ecologically-minded reformist Friends when he reported to John Smith of Burlington that he had formed "a kind of League of Amity & Peace with the animal Creation, looking upon them as ye most greatful, as well as ye most reasonable Part of God's Creatures." Woolman, in his Ledger Book, 1769 to 1772, departed sums and calculations to observe that "a good man regardeth the life of his creatures. Sport not with the misery of animals."30

Love of the animal creation thus infused the thinking of eighteenth century reformist Friends. In teaching "young scholars" to peruse their
spelling books in his Philadelphia schoolhouse, Anthony Benezet tells us that he wished to raise in the hearts of the young "principles of compassion and tenderness, as well to the brut creation, as to [our] fellow men." "If, in our sport or play, we spoil or hurt those good things which God has made," first pupils were told, "guilt and sin will be on us." "He who made us, made the bird and the fish[]. He who made them, loves to do them good. Bird and fish can feel pain, even as we do: So be sure that thou hurt them not in thy play." Such the power of Quaker "moral ecology" in the eighteenth century that it appears to have altered, in part, the dietary habits of its elders and the enforced reading habits of its young.31

Thus, from the wellspring of Quaker insight and the "leadings" of Quaker experience, eighteenth-century "Publishers of the Truth" formulated a distinctive vision of man's place in the world of nature. From their mystical tradition, reform-minded Friends—notably Woolman, Benezet, Churchman, Evans, and Hunt—each separately and all collectively drew upon the benevolence of God in relation to his creatures and stressed the incumbent humility of fallen man in the presence of his creator. Combining sentiments of humility and love, these Quakers of "tender sensibilities" formulated a distinctive and explicit "moral ecology" of holistic dimensions that enjoined man to retain land in custodianship to God, to extend benevolence to all the human family and to the animal creation, to promote social justice, and to oppose warfare as destructive of man's environment and all the species of life therein.

This diffident and humble conception of man as simple custodian of God's environment stood in sharp contrast to the Enlightenment mentality of early republican ideology with its determination to remake constitutions, societies, forest lands and waterways in an exuberant outpouring of political technology and environmental engineering. In general, Friends resisted the presumptions of human betterment implicit in their age but they were but an isolated and self-proclaimed "peculiar" remnant within eighteenth-century American society.32

Unfortunately, the "moral ecology" of which we have spoken may not have entirely survived the close of the eighteenth century, even within the Quaker movement itself. "Moral ecology" in practice was a unique product of "tender" Quaker sensibilities toward nature flourishing within the security of an insular but self-confident Quaker world. As late as 1833, "A Catechism ... for the Instruction of Youthful Members' still referred young Friends to "... gardening and other things of this nature" and admonished Quaker children to "show
kindness” and “mercy” “to all dumb animals.” But by this era, one suspects that children, or at least their parents, were otherwise pre-occupied with purely human contentions. In 1827–1828, the Society of Friends had been torn asunder by theological disputes between Orthodox and Hicksite Friends, hopelessly divided by what Edward Hicks (1780–1849) would later call “ranterism,” skepticism, Deism, and atheism on the one extreme and formalism, biblical literalism, orthodoxy, and “Romish tendencies” to church discipline otherwise.29

Hicks, the now-famous nineteenth-century Quaker artist of the “Peaceable Kingdom,” retreated again and again into a Christian utopian world of men and allegorical animals in divine harmony with one another even as he agonized over theological disputes and bitter in-fighting within his beloved Society of Friends. He slaughtered hogs on his farm and displayed no evident concern for animals in the real world even as he sketched on canvas a portrait of divine love for the whole creation. When one of the most benevolent and Christocentric of religions became pre-occupied with sectarianism, when metaphysical speculations replaced loving actions, when refinements of theology overrode ethics, one suspects that it was the animals and the ecology of land management that suffered most the burdens of human folly.34

NOTES

1. For an analysis of the impact of Quaker theology on Friends’ attitudes toward nature, see a previous companion article, “The Evolution of Quaker Theology and the Unfolding of a Distinctive Quaker Ecological Perspective in Eighteenth-Century America.”


3. “I believe it is needful, and would be profitable, when we are thus met together, diligently to watch against all such thoughts as we know ought not to have place in our minds.” John Hunt’s Journal in Friends’ Miscellany, Containing Journals of the Lives, Religious Exercises, and Labours in the Work of the Ministry of Joshua Evans and John Hunt, Late of New Jersey, X (Philadelphia, Comly, 1837), 222.


5. The intense proselytizing of the “world’s people” by early Friends had largely abated
by the opening of the eighteenth century. The Society of Friends was becoming more insular and clannish in this period but the emphasis upon purity of religious principles and the waiting upon mystical insight in meetings for worship led Quakers to emphasize God's potential Salvation to all men who would curb creaturely pride and experience the divine presence within themselves. Quietistic Friends feared excess of words, rationality, emotionalism, or human pride in the quest for God. Members of the Society, who were becoming in other respects more inward-looking and detached from the currents of the world, emphasized love, both human and divine, to all the creation irrespective of creed.
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