

place. "They disowned us, and said we were Unitarians, but I never could find out what for," said a Friend to me one day after meeting, who came to enquire whether I also was what was called orthodox. "I was brought up at the tail of the plough" said a minister in meeting; and the statement was typical. I am not sure that I have heard a single Hicksite minister who was not so brought up. "The separation was not about doctrine in these parts," said a Friend to me after a Quarterly Meeting, "we all went one way." And that also was typical. The country districts went almost all for Elias Hicks. They knew but little about doctrine; but they thought that a beloved minister, whom they had crowded the meeting-houses and climbed the trees to hear, these twenty years or more, was being used tyrannically by an oligarchy of city Friends; so that it was something of a revolt of the rank and file against Elders and Overseers. The select few remained orthodox, about 8,000; the multitude followed Elias Hicks, and numbered about 18,000, in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting. Thus a large part of the personal wealth and power went orthodox. The feeling of revolt against an autocracy (a sentiment easily aroused in America) may be understood when we recall the single fact that the Book of Discipline was a secret book, only to be read by members of the Select Meeting. Years after the separation, when a Hicksite was being dealt with concerning his son's membership by an orthodox overseer, he told the latter, after much pressing, "Well, now, I have worshipped in the brick (*i. e.* Hicksite) meeting-house all my life, and shall do so till I die."

All these types, as well as those convinced by reason on one side or the other, still persist. If any of my readers could sit, as I have done repeatedly, face to face with a "Hicksite" Quarterly Meeting, and could note the weather worn foreheads and

work-hardened hands of most of the men present—their horses neighing through the open windows at their tethers outside—and observe their wives and mothers in plain bonnets, and conforming to the type both of Martha and of Mary, but not of Hypatia,—the bogey of heresy and rationalism would be for ever impossible. These people are not theological at all, nor were their fathers before them. They are mostly plain folk, much like those who must have filled our country meeting houses in England half-a-century ago. They are descended from such. The Hicksite population of Bucks county for instance is derived from Satterthwaites of Colthouse, Watsons of Cockermonth, and Atkinsons of Lancaster and Settle. There are Friends' meeting-houses of this branch in village after village in that county, a few miles apart. Their homes, to forty of which I have been admitted as a visitor, in various parts of America, are in Quaker plainness, cleanliness and comfort. French Rationalism has been talked about in connection with the separation. So far as the bulk of the membership goes, that may be disposed of "by inspection," as the mathematician says.

And the ear confirms what the eye perceives. The ministry dwells on one theme, albeit a good one:—"Mind the light"—"Be faithful to the call of duty,"—"Trust the voice of the Lord and be at peace." A quiet pathetic hunger and thirst after righteousness, by hard working and self-respecting people, meets and gladdens one again and again. And it is clear that our Lord's promise that such "should be filled" has not lost its validity in the experience of these dear Friends. The theory of the right call and qualification for the ministry is held, even to a one-sided extent, in the way of the most characteristic Quakerism of the past. The intellect is not permitted to have much to do with preaching. As a result the ministry is