

spiritual ease, resting more in the pious habit of worshipping an unknown disembodied God more than the one incarnate in man.

The God in man, whose body is His temple, the Heavenly Father of Jesus—is the God all His children must worship in order to gain the crown of everlasting life.

To abandon that worship is to shrink and shrivel spiritually, and to lose in a large measure the capacity to live for any useful purpose. The Society of Friends has been shorn largely of its vitality since it abandoned its primitive worship. The laurels of its pioneers have been worn as a shield to preserve their ancient renown before the world.

The glory of the past true worshippers still lives; the glories of the present have departed.

We are not now the true worshippers that worship in spirit and in truth. We are doing reverence to the unknown God that is worshipped at Jerusalem or on Mount Sinai, and are having our reward for our apostasy.

The seeds of weakness and decline were introduced into the polity of the Society at its incipency. The elements that composed it were so heterogeneous, and in some respects so incompatible that it was impossible to unify and entirely harmonize them. Many who identified themselves with the organization brought with them their predelections and preferences, acquired through their education and connection in earlier life with the forms of worship in other religious Societies, which they never felt fully prepared to entirely surrender.

There was by no means an entire unity in discarding all formal worship. Some insisted on retaining music and some order of formal prayer. The leaders who preferred discarding all forms of worship at their meetings, because they were lenient and indulgent towards such, were charged by the more active, decided opponents of these innovations, with favoring a kind of formal worship. While Wm. Penn

and George Fox did not wish to do anything to offend any who had come to them, they denied that they had introduced any formal worship.

Wm. Penn, in his "Rise and Progress" of the Society, writes, in regard to the manner of conducting their religious meetings, "They distinguish between good order and imposing any practice that immediately regards faith or worship (*which is never to be done, nor suffered, or submitted unto,*) as a duty of the members."

Yet, in opposition to this emphatic, early, authoritative protest, the Society soon after settled down into a uniform method of formal worship, which has long been a decided check against the introduction of any useful improvements that might have been adopted to advance the spiritual life, the interest, and to the promotion of the truth and prosperity of the Society.

Again he says, "Some weakly mistook good order in the government of church affairs for discipline in worship, and that it was so pressed and recommended by him (George Fox) and other brethren, whereas these things related wholly to conversation, and the outward civil parts of the church," and were in no sense intended to do in regard to any manner of conducting their meetings, the Friends should see from time to time, it might be an advantage for them to adopt. The quietism of Fenlon and Lady Guion, of monkish origin in the Catholic church, had found its way among some Friends in the ministry, and this had much to do in establishing a quietism in the form of worship, and an opposition to any united effort at proselyting through aggressive work.

The basic principles of the Society at the beginning were liberty of thought and conscience, freedom from obligations to any forms of faith or worship. The only unity that should hold them together as a Society that should be obligatory was a unity in spirit and purpose, with each one to enjoy the liberty of working for the truth, as this spirit moved him according to his capacities,