

orthodox in his views, but here, again, even supposing this, and not the opposite, to be the true view—what of it? Suppose, if you will, that they were each and all of them as orthodox as Channing the Unitarian prophet was, or as anti-orthodox as Channing's collaborer, Parker, was. Again, what of it?

The statistics of Charles Darwin's cousin, Francis Galton, have shown that the great and famous insistors upon opinion have ever, quite uniformly, insisted upon those opinions with which it can be shown that they were impregnated before they came to years of discretion. And conversely, by the same unanswered authority and by the same impersonal, impartial method of statistics, it has been shown that those who were not dogmatically impregnated with an opinion before they came to years of discretion, have quite as uniformly *not* been dogmatists.

Thus one is inclined to insist that if "Quakerism" be the opinion of this or that person, why, then, so much the worse for "Quakerism."

If the conclusions of Francis Galton are correct, the inference is that if a Fox, or a Penn, or a Barclay had developed in the environment of another age and another home, then the opinions of that Fox, or of that Penn, or of that Barclay, would have been different from the views and opinions of the historical Fox, or Penn, or Barclay.

And yet that which was differentiating in the methods of the hypothetical Barclay might still be one and the same with that which was peculiar to the method of the historical Barclay, and each might, with an equal and concurrent right, be entitled to bear the name "Quaker."

For the purposes of this article, therefore, *Quakerism* will be defined as something that is more universal, more demonstrable, more verifiable by observation, than the opinion of this or that person, it will be held to be and to have been, at each successive moment, more truly represented by the *Association of Friends* than by the

*sect of Quakers*. For instance, that it was more truly represented by the broad minded rather unfanatical intellects that ceased to associate themselves with the Quaker sect after it had had, under the leadership of Fox, expelled the sincere, though of course, rather more fanatical "Hatters." The recent historian of the Quakers, Turner, claims that the expulsion of the Hatters by Fox, knifed the life of the Society. This was the beginning of that "quietism" which has been the cherished characteristic of the sect of the Quakers, during the period of their decline. Use is the universal law of life, and so far as "quietism" has led to uselessness, it has led to the extinction of the Society. So, for the purposes of this article, which are not historical, Quakerism will be held to be and to have been rather a perception of one of the methods of search and the development of logic of this method, than that it is or was any one of the successive materializations of opinion in statement by any Friend, either "early" or late.

Neither is Unitarianism, for the purposes of this article, defined as a *sect*. It likewise will be defined as a "movement," another method of search for the explanation of the universe, or rather as only the second step in the search, Quakerism being the first step, rather than as the statement of any opinion or of any set of opinions. As is well known, though not commonly emphasized, Channing held to one set of opinions, and to opinions which were, in many respects, substantially orthodox, while Parker, on the other hand, held to opinions which were and are substantially *anti-orthodox*, and yet each mutually recognized the other as of the same fellowship, and to-day, notwithstanding the partial and temporary exile of Parker during the latter part of his life, these two men are quite universally and uniformly recognized and received as among the elder prophets of the Unitarian Society in America.