

came to arrest them, they ceased not to call men away from the forms of religion and to give regard to the life within. The limits of the time accorded us for this paper do not permit us to go into the particulars of Fox's life. He married, he traveled about, and he suffered his share of the persecution of the Friends. He was hauled before courts, he was stoned and beaten until he bled, he was imprisoned with malefactors. Finally a better understanding of Friends arose, or perhaps it was shame for their sufferings, and Fox and the others had more peace in their gatherings, and in their ministrations. Fox continued in the work almost to the day of his death. It is recorded that on First day the 11th of the eleventh month, 1690, he attended meeting at Gracious Street, London, where he preached and prayed with great power. As he came out of meeting he felt the cold strike to his heart, and he went to a Friend's house near by. There he took to bed and died on the following Third-day evening, the 13th of eleventh month, 1690, in the 67th year of his age.

What is the moral of the life of this servant of the truth? Is it to follow in his footsteps, and teach and preach as Quaker doctrine the things which he taught and in the way he taught? I believe not. Just so far as we teach or preach truth as George Fox saw it, and in the manner in which he saw it, shall we be offering that which was suitable to the needs of the seventeenth century; and just so long as we make use of the forms and phrases of his time and try to adapt them to ours, and try to make each other believe that what the world needs is spiritualizations of doctrines of baptism, regeneration, et cetera, and expositions of forms of truth which are more philosophical than religious, like the threefold nature of man. Just so long as we continue to face these problems of centuries gone by, shall we continue to keep our backs to the future, and our hands

from the plow of the present. Let us in our turn be freed from the form of seventeenth century expressions. Let us find out if possible what was at the heart of these expressions, and if there are truths there that are adapted to us and important and necessary for our better living, let us hold them and advance them with a zeal which we may copy from George Fox and the early Friends, and if they are found of value to the world I believe we shall no longer have discussions on the decline of the Society.

To my mind there is no question that there was a truth at the bottom of his refusal to follow priests, attend churches, to put off the hat, and conform to fashions, and a great verity underneath his peculiar doctrine of the Light Within. I believe it is this: That the ministry of priests or clergymen, that attendance at church, and conforming with the customs of the world are of no importance compared with human character. That the outward form of life is of no consequence compared with the life within. That the form is the shell and may be cast off. That no service is complete when the heart is absent. That sincerity and truthfulness are more to be valued than bowings and kneelings. That to seek after the truth and to do the best one's circumstance allows will lead to more light upon the truth. That it is not the outward form but the inward thought that builds up the character, and that character is better than adherence to forms the most significant and beautiful. In short, that we should look to the Inner Life, instead of the outward form. So many theories and forms of thought have grown around our doctrine of the Inner Light, the term adapts itself to so many beautiful similes, that the substance of the thought is sometimes obscured. "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he," is the substance of the idea. Why should we not altogether cast aside the term as being to us a