THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

AN

EXAMINATION

OF CERTAIN

PROCEEDINGS AND PRINCIPLES

OF

THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS,

CALLED QUAKERS.

BY ELISHA BATES.

Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things. *Phil.* iv. 8.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 1875 CITY OF WASHINGTON

ST. CLAIRSVILLE:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR, BY HORTON J. HOWARD.

1837.

BX 7731
.B37

INTRODUCTION.

In presenting the following work to the notice of the Christian public, it is necessary to remark, that the subjects have an intimate relation to the common doctrines of our holy religion. Had the proceedings of the Society of Friends in my case, related to me alone, I never should have offered a history of them to the world.

The case however is widely different from this. It is a tissue of the most arbitrary and oppressive measures, first by private influence, and then by unauthorized Church Power, to destroy the religious character, and the religious rights of an individual. But while an *individual* was made the object of an unexampled course of persecution for years, it is a fact, well known to the parties, that there is a large number of persons in the Society of Friends, who are menaced by these proceedings. Thus the case is found to affect not merely *one* but *many*. The cause, too, is not of a *private*, but of a *public* character. It is not for offences, disturbing the public peace, nor endangering the happiness of men. It is not for letting down the authority of the Word of God, or any of the doctrines contained in it. It is for recurring to the Holy Scriptures, as a divinely authorized record of the will of God; and maintaining that the Apostles of the Lord Jesus were both commissioned by Him, and qualified by the Holy Ghost, to establish a system of Faith and Practice, in perfect accordance with the will of God, and binding on men to the latest generations.

At a time when, in the Dispensations of Providence, Gospel light is spreading in a most remarkable manner in the earth—when religious enquiry is awakened, not only in Christendom, but in the Heathen parts of the world, and the Holy Scriptures are sought and read in regions,

where the grossest darkness, and the strongest prejudices had for ages prevailed—one single Society, admired for the mildness of its manners, is found to be struggling to shut out the light which is breaking in upon it from heaven—alarmed at the increasing attention to the Bible among its members—opposing the plain and *undeniable* doctrines it contains—letting down the authority of the Apostles—making *their* practice, a ground of disownment—and contending for sentiments and practices which marked the history of its Founders, from which common decency must recoil.

Does this statement surprise the reader? I intreat his patience, and it will be exemplefied, even beyond his first impressions.

The doctrines which have been brought into discussion, in the recent proceedings of the Society of Friends, are of the most deeply interesting character, and those which demand the close and practical attention of every Christian. The perusal of the work, on this ground, may therefore be attended with advantage.

But there is another point of view, in which the subject demands the attention of Christians of all denominations. Christianity is a system of universal benevolence. It prompts its possessors to seek the good of all; and to spread around, the light and the blessings of the Gospel. The consistent believer in the Lord Jesus, cannot feel indifferent to the errors, and the dangers, in which his fellow creatures are envolved. It is one and the same spring of heavenly feeling, from which he derives the admiration of the goodness of God, the joy and peace of believing, and the ardent desire that others, as well as himself, may be delivered from spiritual bondage, and made heirs of an eternal inheritance in heaven.

The *Christian* public, therefore, cannot feel indifferent to the state of a Society, like that of the Friends. There should be a lively solicitude, in the mind of every one that

loves the Lord Jesus, that the members of this Society should abandon every sentiment, and every custom, which obstructs, in any degree, the full and heart-felt adoption of the doctrines of the Apostles, who preached the Gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. This solicitude, not merely arising from a love for the doctrines of the Apostles, but with a deep sense of their divine authority, as coming from God himself, points to the present and eternal happiness of those who may have been entangled in opinions and practices, at variance with those which are written for the instruction and correction of succeeding ages.

The nature of the case demands a concise history of the events, connected with the controversy in which I have been involved with the Society of Friends. In addition to this, it will be necessary to examine the charges which have been brought against me, and show the departure from uprightness—from the rules of the Discipline, and from the doctrines of Christianity, which have been made in those proceedings.

It will be proper also, in defence of myself and of the *Truth*, for which I have been persecuted, to show that the Society of Friends, is most imperiously called upon to make a reformation in practice, and an expurgation of their accredited writings, in matters of Fundamental importance. I shall show that the Early Friends and their writings cannot be relied on, as conclusive authority in matters of Faith and Practice, but that sentiments lie scattered through their works, which have been productive of the most dangerous errors, and which, so long as they are recognized, characterize the Society as unsound in the Fundamentals of religion. I shall show that these things are utterly irreconcileable to the *sound* declarations which have been made by the Society on the same points, and that to *retain* error, is to abandon Truth.

As some attacks have been made upon me in print, I

think it proper to review such publications, so far as they are at all entitled to notice.

And finally, it will be proper, in the conclusion, to correct some of my own past errors, contained in the work called "The Doctrines of Friends," and give my present views of certain doctrines, treated on, in that work.

To understand the *proceedings* of the Friends, in the prosecutions they have carried on, it is necessary to give a brief sketch of the origin of the Society, and the system of Church government, which it has established.

The Society was founded by George Fox, about the year 1647, for at that time, the first meetings appear to have been formed.

G. Fox was born in 1624. In early life, he appears to have been of a remarkably grave and religious turn of mind. His sense of moral obligation appears to have been acute; and his state of mind was strongly marked with *trouble*, in his religious exercises.

His father was a member of the Church of England, and a weaver by trade. George was put apprentice to a shoemaker, and was considerably imployed in keeping sheep. His opportunities of education appear to have been extremely limited, though it may be fairly inferred, that in the course of his life, his *reading* was considerable. It has been said by some friends, that he had acquired some knowledge of the Hebrew language, and it is a curious fact, that in one of his pieces in the Book called Doctrinals, p. 456, he (or his friends for him) has actually introduced a quotation in *Greek*, which he undertakes to explain. I have my doubts however, whether he did understand any thing of either of those languages or not. His knowledge of the English tongue was certainly extremely defective—though from reading, and from conversation with educated persons, it must be supposed that he could generally express himself, so as to convey the idea which he intended.

At the age of nineteen he left his master, and his rela-

tives and friends, as he supposed, by a divine *command*, and travelled from place to place in great trouble of mind.—These troubles continued several years; during which, his apprehensions of having extraordinary revelations, increased. Under these impressions, he supposed that he had revelations of *doctrines* without the help of any man, book or writing. He supposed that he was in the same spirit and power that the apostles and prophets were in,—that he had come up, through the flaming sword, into the Paradise of God—and into the state that Adam was in before he fell—that the creation was opened to him—and he was at a stand in his mind, whether he would not practice medicine for the good of mankind, seeing the nature and virtues of the creatures were so opened to him by the Lord.

If he was not mistaken in respect to these *openings*, it must be regarded as an irretrievable loss to science, as well as a great neglect of an *extraordinary Revelation*, that he has left no record of the *nature and virtues of the creatures*.

From the condition of Adam, he writes, he was taken up in Spirit, "to see into another or more steadfast state than Adam's in innocency, even into a state in Christ Jesus that should never fall." Journal, Part 1, p. 53. On the same subject he says: "Moreover, the Lord God let me see (when I was brought up into his Image, in righteousness and Holiness, and into the Paradise of God) the state, how Adam was made a living soul: And also the stature of Christ, the mystery that had been hid from ages and generations, which things are hard to be uttered, and cannot be borne by many. For of all the sects in Christendom (so called) that I discoursed withal, I found none, that could bear to be told, that any should come to Adam's perfection, into that image of God, and righteousness and holiness that Adam was in before he fell; to be so clear and pure without sin, as he was. Therefore, how should they be able to bear being told, that any should grow up to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, when

they cannot bear to hear that any shall come whilst upon earth, into the same power and spirit that the Prophets and Apostles were in? Though it be a certain truth, that none can understand their writings aright, without the same spirit, by which they were written." Journal, Part 1 p. 59, 60.*

The reader will observe here, that the assumption of being in the state which Adam was in, before he fell, is unequivocal. And I leave every one to judge for himself, whether G. F. did not speak of coming to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, in the same sense, in which he spake of coming into the state that Adam was in, before he fell? It was something so far beyond the state of Adam before the fall, and also beyond being in the same power and spirit that the Prophets and Apostles were in, that as the attainment to these states could not be believed, he does not admire that many *could not bear* to be *told* the other. I ask then what was it, that was so far beyond the state of Adam before he fell, and beyond being in the same Power and Spirit that the Prophets and Apostles were in, but the character or state of Jesus Christ?

He claimed for his own communications, the title of "the word of the Lord," "the word of God," "the word of the Lord God," while he strenuously denied these terms to the Holy Scriptures.

He professed to have *visions*, to hear *voices*, to have seen an Angel, to have wrought miracles, of various kinds—healing the sick—restoring the disabled—casting out devils, &c.—Speaking of preaching through a town on a market day, he says—"And so dreadful was the power of God that was upon me, that the people flew like chaff before me into their houses," Journal, Part 1. p. 153. He relates that at one place he was taken for

---

*In the Friends' Library this passage is quoted, but with omissions, and changes of sundry words,

an Angel or Spirit; and on others that the people thought the house *shook* where they were.

In such a time of excitement the Society was formed. And the more the history of its origin is examined, the more evident it will appear, that an unusual excitement in regard to the character and supernatural qualifications of G. Fox, contributed to the rapid increase of its members. That many of the new converts were wild and extravagant in their views, is proved by the worship which was offered to James Naylor; the adoration and titles of Deity which were given to George Fox*—and by the numbers that went naked in streets and other public places, as signs,—by the great opposition which was made to the establishment of any system of Church Government, on the plea of its being superceded by the teaching of the Spirit to each individual; and by many other circumstances which might be mentioned.

From the number of females which signed Petitions to Parliament in the year 1659, it would seem that at that time, the whole number of members could not have been less than 30,000. The present number in Great Britain is estimated at 18,000. The greatest accession of numbers was certainly during a few of the first years of George Fox's ministry; and before any system of Church Government was established.

Among the peculiarities which first distinguished the new sect, were,

An extraordinary profession of revelation, and this independent of the Scriptures.

A mystical view of the Blood of Christ, which was supposed to be in all men. Being in a great meeting, where they were discoursing of the Blood of Christ, G. F. says:

---

*George Richardson, a zealous Conservative, and advocate of G. F., fully concedes that this delusion was the same in both cases, and that it prevailed to a considerable extent in the Society. But of this I shall say more hereafter.

"And I cried out among them, and said: '*Do ye not see the blood of Christ? See it in your hearts, to sprinkle your hearts and consciences from dead works, to serve the living God.*' For I saw it, the Blood of the New Covenant, how it came into the heart. This startled the Professors, who would have the Blood only without them, and not in them." Journal, Part 1, p. 49.

The disuse of the usual modes of salutation, and the use of the singular pronouns, when but one person was spoken to. This rested upon a special revelation to George Fox. The account which he gave of the matter is as follows:

"Moreover, when the Lord sent me forth into the world, he forbad me to put off my hat to any, high or low. And I was required to *Thee* and *Thou* all men and women, without respect to rich or poor, great or small. And as I travelled up and down, I was not to bid people *Good Morrow*, or *Good Evening;* neither might I *Bow* or *scrape with my Leg*. And this made the sects and professors rage." Journal, Part 1, p. 63.

To preach freely without stipend,* and severely to censure those who did not.

To refuse to take an Oath, as being contrary to the express command of Christ.

To make silence a prominent part of public worship.

It does not appear, however, that George Fox and the leading ministers, in the first formation of the Society, were very frequently in the practice of silence in public meetings. And yet it was made quite remarkable. The first notice which I find of it in the Journal of G. F. was in the year 1651, or four years after the Society was

* I use the word *stipend*, for it does not appear that G. F. was averse to receiving aid from those who freely gave it. For he was liberally supported by his friends, and died possessed of some considerable estate—one item, being upwards of 1000 acres of land, not far from Philadelphia, which was *given* to him by Wm. Penn.

formed. The account which is given of it, is remarkable.

"I passed on to another town, where there was a great meeting, and the old Priest before mentioned went along with me; and there came professors of several sorts to it. Now I sat on a Haystack, and spake nothing for *several hours;* for I was to famish them from words. And the professors would ever and anon be speaking to the old Priest, and asking him when I would begin? and when I would speak? And he bad them wait; and told them, That the people waited upon Christ a long time before he spake." Journal, Part 1. p. 123.

This was a long silence—"Several hours." And the design of it does not appear to have been to obtain a *qualification for himself* to speak—but to famish the people from words. So novel a procedure, and in an age of superstition, when they sometimes thought he was an angel or spirit; (Jour. Part 1. p. 110) when it was supposed, that the house was shaken when he prayed; (Jour. Part 1. p. 49) or preached, and some even hastened out of the church for fear it would fall upon their heads; (ib. 154) when on certain occasions, "the people flew like chaff before him into their houses," (ib. 153)—was calculated to work up expectation to the highest point—especially when the old Priest, was comparing this waiting on G. F. to the waiting of the people on *Christ* for him to speak.

The result of this meeting, in which G. F. was silent several hours, while the people were ever and anon speaking, and having their expectations worked up,—was, that nearly the whole company became converts to him.

As early as the year 1653, G. F. says, "Now Friends being grown *very numerous* in the northern parts of the nation," &c.

There was no *system* of Church Government, for many years after the formation of the Society.—The present form, or rather the ground work of it, was not settled till

the year 1678, when a Yearly Meeting of representatives, (which had been held once before), was established in London. This was then the Superior Meeting of the whole Society.

Since that time, a gradual change has taken place in the General Constitution, and in the rules of Discipline.

Before the establishment of the Y. M. of Representatives in London, there was a Yearly Meeting of Ministers held there, which exercised a general care over the whole Society. Thus the governing power was first vested in the *ministers*. And the judgment delivered by this body, was considered binding on the members, as being directed by the Spirit.

But this principle was by no means settled. For a large number of the first converts to Quakerism, carried out the doctrine of immediate guidance of the Spirit, to a decided objection to Church Government. The personal authority of George Fox, no doubt, governed the Society in its infancy, and exerted a controling influence as long as he lived. But he soon found the necessity of uniting the influence of others with himself. The first arrangements for this purpose, did not appear entirely to reach the object. And something more systematical was soon called for. When this was attempted, it produced a strong excitement. Many regarded it as a departure from the original principles of the Society: and it cannot be denied that there was much plausibility in the objection. It certainly was a very important change in the Constitution of the Society, after it had existed about 20 years, and through the period of its most rapid growth, and most severe sufferings. But George Fox, Robert Barclay, William Penn, George Whitehead, and other persons of distinction, no doubt saw, that without the adoption of some *system*, such a state of anarchy and confusion would be produced, as totally to destroy the new Society.

Whether the liberty which had been enjoyed by the early Friends, before the adoption of Discipline, led to the formation of a representative form of government or not, I do not pretend to determine; but this was the form which prevailed.

The whole Society was divided into certain districts, and subdivisions. The smallest formed meetings for worship, commonly called Particular Meetings. These, besides meeting for worship, convened once a month to transact minor matters of business, or to digest those that were more important, in order to send them up to the Superior Meetings. Hence they are called, as respects their business character, Preparative Meetings.

Several of these Preparative Meetings, when small, constitute a Monthly Meeting, which, as its name imports, meets monthly. The powers of the Monthly Meeting are *Judiciary*. They attend to the common concerns of the Society—set parties at liberty to marry—grant certificates of removal—receive converts into membership—treat with offenders and disown them—set ministers at liberty to travel as ministers, (within certain limits), &c. &c. and receive from the Preparative Meetings, the accounts which the *Overseers* make out, of the state of the respective meetings—given in answer to certain Queries.

Several Monthly Meetings, except in cities, or where those meetings are large, constitute a Quarterly Meeting, held once in three months. These receive the Answers to the Queries from the Monthly Meetings—assist the Monthly Meetings when thought necessary, and try Appeals from them.

The Yearly Meeting embraces the whole Society within certain limits. This Body possesses both Legislative and Judiciary powers. It adopts all rules of Discipline, possesses a supervisory control over the Quarterly and other Meetings, and tries Appeals, which are brought up from the judgment of the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings.

The Monthly Meeting is the only body that can Disown a member. When the party disowned is *dissatisfied*, he can appeal to the Quarterly and from that to the Yearly Meeting.

Representatives are appointed by the Monthly to the Quarterly, and by the Quarterly to the Yearly Meeting. These *Representatives* may be regarded as constituting the Meeting. But in practice, all members not under dealing, are allowed to attend and take part in the transaction of business.

No officer presides in those meetings, except the Clerk, who records the conclusions arrived at by the meeting. And all those meetings when convened for the transaction of business, have a meeting for worship, in the first place, which begins with silence.

When proceeding to Business, the men and women separate, and transact their business apart.

For the prompt attention to important business, affecting the Society at large, or the interests of the Yearly Meeting, there is a body called the Meeting for Sufferings. It is composed of 26 members appointed by the Yearly Meeting, and *four* by each Quarterly Meeting; making in all (in Ohio Yearly Meeting) forty-six.

All acknowledged ministers have a right to attend—but other members have not.

They meet twice in the year, once at the time of the Yearly Meeting, and once at the time of the Quarterly Meeting at Mountpleasant in the 2nd month. But they have the power of calling a meeting on any emergency, when four members concur in considering it necessary.

To this meeting is given the inspection of writings, relating to the doctrines of the Society. This rule of Discipline, however, has been frequently disregarded in latter times, by all the parties by which the Society has

been marked, as, the Hicksites, the Orthodox, the Conservatives, and the Evangelical Friends.

The Meeting for Sufferings is considered as the representative of the Yearly Meeting during its recess. But it has no power to adopt rules of Discipline or articles of Faith, or to try appeals, or to treat with offenders, touching their rights of membership.

From the infancy of the Society, the Ministers have held meetings apart from the ordinary members, hence they have frequently been called *select* meetings. In 1727 the order of Elders was instituted. These are intended to be experienced persons, but not ministers, and they are associated with the ministers in their select capacity, and are designed to have a care over them.

Females, equally with the men, fill the stations of Ministers and Elders.

In *Government* there is no specific rule, as to office or sex: but it results in practice, as individuals happen to acquire influence.

All persons have a right to speak in meetings for worship, either in preaching or prayer, unless their communications be disapproved by the Elders.

After a person has spoken frequently as a preacher, if his or her communications are approved by the meeting of ministers and elders, *that* body lays the case before the monthly meeting, by which the minister is recognized as such. But they pass no examination on doctrines or other qualifications for the office.

Ministers have no special charge of any meeting or congregation; and there is, as respects the office, no grades of ministry.

There is no provision for the support of ministers, except they be *poor*, and then their outfit and travelling expenses, when they travel, are paid by the meeting that sets them at liberty to travel. Their common wants are generally supplied by private acts of benevolence.

Those who have property, pursue the common avocations of life, like other people.

The Ministry of the Friends, has much of an itinerant character. But the Society takes no care that its meetings should be supplied with ministers. And where ministers reside, they neither are charged with the christian instruction of the members, nor are they at liberty to appoint a meeting, without the concurrence of the monthly meeting, or the elders.

If they wish to travel as ministers, a certificate of the monthly meeting must be obtained, stating the extent of the proposed visit, and expressing the concurrence of the meeting.

If the visit is to extend within the limits of another Yearly Meeting, the concurrence of the Quarterly Meeting is required.

A visit beyond the seas, or a general visit to the society on this continent, requires a certificate from the Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders.

The Ministers and Elders of each Monthly Meeting, meet once in three months, in a select capacity, to attend to the affairs of this part of the Society. This is called a Preparative Meeting of Ministers and Elders. These meetings, within each Quarterly Meeting, form a Quarterly Meeting of Ministers and Elders. And these again uniting, constitute a Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders. These meetings respectively are composed of both sexes, which do not transact business separately, as the meetings for the general administration of Discipline do.

The children of members, are members in full connection. It is made the duty of parents to bring up their children in a manner conformable to the views of the Society. But there is no officer charged with the religious instruction of the members.

Once in three months the Overseers make out in wri-

ting, Answers to certain Queries, relating to the observance of moral duties, and the peculiar views of the Society. These Answers are laid before the Preparative Meeting, and by that sent to the Monthly Meeting, and thence to the Quarterly Meeting—And once a year the Quarters send up the embodied answers from the Monthly Meetings to the Yearly Meeting. These answers are intended to represent the state of the Society. A similar course is taken by the Meetings of Ministers and Elders.

There is, from the sameness of the subjects inquired after, much sameness in the Answers. And from habit, or some other cause, these Answers do not generally vary with the varying state of the Society. But the Queries and Answers bringing many *subjects* into view, afford opportunities for those who know the actual state of things, to give suitable admonition and advice in those meetings which take notice of what is called "The State of Society." But the cases of individual delinquents are not noticed in the "Answers," or in any proceedings growing out of the Answers.

When a member violates the rules of Discipline, it is the business of the Overseers to visit the offender and endeavour by private labour to reclaim him. If this prove ineffectual, the Overseers report the case to the Preparative Meeting, which sends a written statement of the charges, to the Monthly Meeting.

The Monthly Meeting is to appoint a Committee to visit the delinquent, and endeavour to convince him of his error. If he inclines to make "satisfaction," he prepares an "acknowledgment"—that is, a paper confessing his offence, condemning his conduct, requesting the meeting to pass it over, and promising to do better in future. These are the general outlines of an Acknowledgment, but in practice there is great variety of forms. This is to be shown to the committee, and if approved by them, when the minute relating to the case is read, the com-

mittee report the result of their labours, and the culprit walks into the meeting, lays his paper on the table, and sits down till the clerk reads it. After a pause, he retires, and the meeting is expected to "settle down" to feel after the suitability of the "offering." If it should be satisfactory, a minute to that effect is made, and a friend or two is deputed to inform the person "under dealing;" and so the matter ends.

But if the delinquent is not wrought upon by the committee, they generally report—That they have had an opportunity with the individual, but did not find him in a disposition to condemn his deviation—or something to this effect. The meeting then proceeds to decide whether he shall be "testified against:" which is never determined by votes, except that when contrary sentiments are expressed, the clerk determines what is the sense of the meeting, having respect both to the numbers and to the *persons* who have spoken on the opposite sides.

When it is determined to "issue a testimony" against a person under dealing, or in other words to "disown" or excommunicate him, a minute is made of the conclusion, and a committee appointed to prepare the document for that purpose, giving him information of the judgment of the meeting in his case.

This "Testimony," as it is called, is to embrace the charges on which he is to be excluded from the Society. The document thus prepared is to be presented to the meeting, and if approved, signed by the clerk. Another committee is then appointed to give the disowned person a copy of it, with information of his right of Appeal.

If he incline to avail himself of this privilege he gives notice of his intention to the Monthly Meeting, which enters it on its minutes, and appoints a committee to attend the Quarterly Meeting, to answer the objections of the Appellant.

The Quarterly Meeting on receiving the Report of the

Monthly Meeting, calls in the Appellant, inquires if he wishes to prosecute his appeal—and then appoints a committee to examine the case—on which committee no member of the Monthly Meeting from which the case was brought up, is to be appointed. And the Appellant is understood to have the right of objecting to any person, named on that committee, who, he may think, would not do him justice.

The committee of the Quarterly Meeting, after hearing the objections of the Appellant, and the explanations of the committee from the Monthly Meeting, make up their *judgment* in the case, which is presented to the Quarlerly Meeting.

If the disowned person is still dissatisfied, he may, in like manner, appeal to the Yearly Meeting.

The Overseers are persons of both sexes, appointed by the Monthly Meetings, to have the care of each Meeting and the members within their limits. It is the duty of the Overseers to treat with offenders privately, and when their labours are unavailing to report the case in writing to the Preparative Meeting, which is to forward it to the Monthly Meeting.

Ministers may be taken under "dealings" in the Meetings of Ministers and Elders, for causes not actionable under the common rules of Discipline. Thus for example, if a minister is thought "to have lost his service," that is, if his ministry is not acceptable to the other ministers and elders, or the influential part of them, he may be taken "under dealing." And if the Preparative Meeting of Ministers and Elders concur in the judgment, it is to be carried to the Quarterly Meeting of Ministers and Elders. If the same sentiment prevail there, the case is returned to the Preparative Meeting of Ministers and Elders, which is to report the case to the Monthly Meeting. But whatever may be the judgment of the Monthly Meeting in the case, the Minister so reported is not to attend any meet

ings of Ministers and Elders, until he is recommended as at first. In others words, he is displaced from the Station of a Minister, by the sole action of the Ministers and Elders, and it may be without even a charge of immoral conduct, or unsound doctrine, or breach of disipline in any respect.

This power must be seen to be liable to great abuses.—If personal influence can be acquired, which is no very difficult matter, personal dislike or unsoundness of principle in ruling members, may be brought to bear upon a Minister, to his official degradation, however sound he may be in his ministry, however fair in his moral character—however lively in his piety. And when he is displaced from the ministry, should he speak as a Minister, which is the common privilege of all, he is liable to be disowned.

The Disipline giving this almost unbounded power, to the *select* body, as to the degradation of a Minister, requires that the Elders should treat with him in *private*–then bring his case before the Preparative Meeting of Ministers and Elders—then the Quarterly Meeting of the same class. These steps of dealing in his case, are all the safeguards which he has for his dearest rights, involving his most sacred duties.

The foregoing sketch of the organization of the Society and of its rules of Disipline, is necessary for an understanding of the transactions noticed in the following work.

The work is submitted to the impartial judgment of an enlightened community.

Mountpleasant, 7th mo., 1837.

EXAMINATION, &c.

CHAPTER I.

In the Pamphlets which I have recently published, and in the last ten numbers of the 5th vol. of the Repository, I have shown what were the leading points of Doctrines, embraced in the Hicksite controversy. I have shown also, both in these and in the former part of the Repository, that I supposed the Early Friends to mean what they said, *in their soundest declarations*, of the Inspiration and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, and of the doctrines contained in them.

I freely confess, that my strong prepossessions in favour of our "forefathers," induced me to make too large an allowance for their indiscretions; and to grant too wide a range for arguments and forms of expression which are to be found in their writings. Still the rallying point with me, as to those writings was, a solemn declaration made by Robert Barclay, in his Apology, which, in substance was, *That they never refused, and never should, to bring all their doctrines and practices to the Scriptures to be tried by them, as the Judge and Test, freely admitting that whatever was not according to their testimony, should therefore be rejected as false.*

This completely places *all the doctrines* and *practices* of the Society, on the ground of a *Scriptural examination* at *all times*. And not only so, but gives a pledge, that every innovation of simple Scripture doctrine, should be *rejected as false*. If this declaration had been made with sincerity by the writer, (which I am not about to call in question,) and held in good faith by his successors, it would have warranted not only a *selection* of the soundest things that were written by Early Friends, as exhibiting Quakerism; but it would have sanctioned to the full ex-

tent, the principle of *Reformation*. It would not only have allowed us to take the *best*, and *only* the *best parts* of their writings, but have subjected even these, to the most rigid scrutiny, and correction by Scripture.

It will require but little argument, with unbiased minds, to show that this is absolutely right. To hold any opinions or doctrines of men, as not subject to correction by the Scriptures, is plainly and palpably to set such doctrines or opinions *above* the Scriptures, however this result may be denied. To refue to allow the *examination*, is to carry the assumption, in favour of the authority of such opinions, in opposition to the Scriptures, still higher.

If I had not supposed that the declaration of Robert Barclay, was to be considered as identical with Quakerism, I never should have been found among its advocates. But I did suppose it was to be held in good faith; and on this ground, I selected the soundest parts of the writings of early Friends, without feeling myself bound by such passages of an opposite character, as were quoted by others in support of the doctrines of Elias Hicks. I did indeed indulge the hope that the writers did not mean what they said, or seemed to say in the passages selected by the friends of E. H. But the declaration of R. B. and others of a similar character, passed over this question, to more certain and substantial grounds. They refered all questions of Faith and Practice—not to themselves for decision, but to the Scriptures.

In refering to the views of the Early Quakers, we made one class of quotations, the *Hicksites* made another. The doctrines thus presented were irreconcileable to each other, and the Society was rent asunder, with violence.

In close connection with the Separation, we made a strong effort to introduce among our members, a more intimate acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures. Inquiries were instituted, under the derection of the Yearly Meeting, how far the members were furnished with the Bible,

and whether they were in the daily practice of reading it, in families collected—or willing to adopted that regulation. *Many* families were found not furnished. In one Quartely Meeting in Indiana, upwards of Eighty Families were found in this situation: and the Reports of the Bible Association of Friends of America show a surprising deficency in various parts of the Society. In the visits which were made by committees to the families of Ohio Yearly Meeting, a very large proportion were found not in the daily practice of reading the Scriptures collectively—and *some* were not willing to adopt it, for fear of formality.

This collective reading was strongly recommended, in connection with opportunities for other devotional exercises; and, for a time, much interest was excited in this attempt to introduce the reading of the Bible, and the daily exercise of devotion in families collected. But that interest evidently subsided, while a zeal for the writings of early Friends, and the maintenance of what was gravely called "Old fashioned Quakerism" increased. At one time, a number of associations were formed, under the character of Scripture Schools, being designed to promote the mutual study of the Scriptures. But they excited much alarm, and many prominent members exerted their influence so effectually, that in this section of the Society, and in many other places, they are entirely put down.

In the discharge of my duty as a Minister of the Gospel, I continued, (after the Separation from the followers of E. H.) to preach the same great doctrines, which I had maintained in that controversy; and to carry them out, in their practical application. It is well known, that E. H. and others held, that *Christ* was an *inward principle*, and identical with the Holy Spirit—and this was described as a *universal inward light*, that the body and blood of Christ, were but terms, designating this Inward Light, and therefore were to be found *in* the heart. It was a counterpart of the same theory, to deny "the outward per-

son that suffered"—the man "that walked about the streets of Jerusalem" to be *the Christ*, or that the *blood* shed upon the cross, was the blood by which we are cleansed from sin. Justification was made to rest upon works, through the operation of the Spirit, "Internal Light," or inward blood of Christ, which was explained as the "Life." The doctrine of a future state was brought into notice but not very extensively discussed; as the Character of *Christ*, his *blood*, and the nature of his *death* at Jerusalem, obtained the largest share of attention. E. H. however, very much discarded the idea of Heaven as a *place*—and regarded it merely as a state—considered the final Judgment to be in this life—and the end of the world, to be the end of each one's life. And he very much let down the authority of the Holy Scriptures.

I held the conclusive authority of the Bible, and in conformity with it, I maintained that Jesus of Nazareth, was the Christ, the son of God—that to him give all the Prophets witness, that through his Name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins: that in his death upon the cross at Jerusalem, and the actual shedding of his Blood, was offered that sacrifice for our sins, without which none could be saved, and which was represented by the Atoning sacrifices which had been offered by the Fathers, and under the Law. This doctrine of Christ, of his death, and of the Shedding of his blood, when carried out, necessarily, led to that of Justification by Faith. We were reconciled to God by the death of his Son—*Justified* by his Blood—and thus made partakers of that redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through Faith in his blood.

This naturally involves repentance toward God, and Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. Here a change of heart is produced, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, for no man can *repent* of that which he once delighted in, without a change of the feelings and desires of the heart.

Repentance has a necessary connection with the doctrine of accountability. "God commandeth all men every where to repent, *because* he hath appointed a day in which he will Judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

This accountability involves the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead, and of the Day of Judgment. And all that we can fear, and all that we can hope for, combine to admonish us to the discharge of the duty of prayer—and of walking by the Spirit—and of laying hold of that salvation which comes by Jesus Christ.

These doctrines, in connection with the others which pertain to the Gospel of Christ, I went on to preach, after the Separation. But it was not long before I discovered indications of the disapprobation of certain prominent members of the Society. These indications appeared to be confined to a few, and were irregular as to duration. I still pressed on, in the discharge of my duty, as a Minister, and travelled in most parts of the Society on this continent.

In 1832 I obtained the usual credentials from the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings of Short Creek, and the Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders of Ohio, to pay a religious visit to Friends and others, in some parts of Great Britain and Ireland. The following is a copy of the latter Document.

"*To Friends in Great Britain and Ireland.*—Our beloved Friend Elisha Bates, in a feeling manner, spread before this meeting a prospect which has, for a number of years, impressed his mind, to pay a visit in Gospel love, to Friends and others, in some parts of Great Britain and Ireland; and that he apprehended the time had come for disclosing the concern to his friends. He produced a certificate of the unity of Short Creek Monthly Meeting, endorsed by the Quarterly Meeting of Short Creek.

The subject thus opened, engaged our weighty con-

sideration; and with feelings of near sympathy with this our dear and much devoted friend, and full unity with him in the important engagement, we have believed it right to set him at liberty to pursue the prospect, as best wisdom may direct; certifying that his conduct and conversation are exemplary: in his ministry he is sound in doctrine; and careful to wait for divine ability.

We commend him to the care of the Shepherd of Israel, disiring that through an humble dependence upon Him, and the unfoldings of his counsel, he may not only experience support and preservation through every Baptism and conflict, but that he may be enabled to perform the service required of him, to the comfort and edification of the Churches where his lot may be cast, and to the peace of his own mind.

Signed by the direction of Ohio Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders, held at Mountpleasant, by adjournments on the 1st, 5th and 7th of the 9th month, 1837.

BENJAMIN W. LADD *Clerk*."

Immediately after the Yearly Meeting, I obtained a certificate from the Monthly Meeting of Short Creek to attend the Yearly Meeting of Indiana. It was shortly after this visit, that a sudden and violent excitement was produced throughout the Yearly Meeting of Ohio—and spread to other places, in consequence of my preaching the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Day of Judgment, *in Scripture language*. I saw more and more of the necessity to *state doctrines in Scripture language*. And this produced a difficulty on the part of the dissatisfied—in making objections to my doctrines. For as I carefully kept to Scripture language in setting forth the doctrines—these could not be called in question, without coming directly into collision with the Scriptures. But the excitement was not the less violent on this account. Nor were the efforts to destroy my religious reputation, the less active and persevering, because they could not

successfully make war on the Scriptures with which I was fortified. Private defamation and detraction, both by word and writing, were resorted to, in order to produce an effect, where it was impossible for me to counteract it.

It was during this excitement that I wrote the Address to the members of Ohio and Indiana Yearly Meetings, and presented it, for approval, to the Meeting for Sufferings, specially convened for that purpose. By the Discipline, the *ministers* have the right to attend the settings of the Meeting for Sufferings. And those members of the meeting who, according to the provisions of the Discipline, took upon them the calling of a special meeting, to examine the Address, determined to invite the ministers, both men and women, within the Yearly Meeting, which was accordingly done.

I have stated in the Refutation, that I had read the Essay of the Address to a company of Friends, previous to the call of this meeting—that the character of it was well known—that Benjamin W. Ladd, who was one of that company, requested a friend to use her influence to induce me to take out the passages of Scripture in the Address, relating to the Resurrection, and insert, instead of them, quotations from the writings of Early Friends. I stated also that the Address was decidedly, (I might have said, *violently*), opposed in the meeting, by sundry prominent and influential members—such as William Flanner, William Wood, Jacob Ong, Jacob Branson, Benjamin Hoyle, &c.—that B. W. Ladd proposed the appointment of a committee, to see if such a modification of the Address could not be made, as would relieve my mind, and satisfy the objecting Friends—that he was put on that committee, and with two others of it, Jesse Kenworthy and Jordan Harrison, called on me the same evening.—After much discourse on the subject, in which he insisted that the end of the world, was the end of each man's life, he made the proposition, which no doubt he had in his

mind in proposing the appointment of the committee to modify the Address, viz. to take out the passages of Scripture and supply their places with quotations from the writings of Friends. This, in mere condescension, I agreed to do, but on reflection I declined it, and withdrew the Address.

In withdrawing the Address, I said that it contained my sentiments on the subjects of the Resurrection and final Judgment, and entreated those who had most severely reflected on me, on account of those doctrines, to show the grounds of their objections. This they steadily declined to do; and thus the meeting closed.

But though these ministers and elders, entirely declined to enter into discussion with *me* on the doctrines in question, they did not decline to calumniate me behind my back; but made it their business to impugn the doctrines I held, when I was not present to defend myself.

The spring of 1833 was now advancing, and the time appeared every day, more and more pressingly to demand that I should prosecute my visit on the other side of the Atlantic. In the mean time, the state of the Society, and the treatment I had received from those I had regarded as my friends, so operated upon my mind, as to destroy my health, and a severe attack of illness ensued. The appearance of hostility gradually subsided: and while I was confined with this illness, W. Flanner called to see me, in an apparently friendly disposition, and encouraged me to look towards the prosecution of my transatlantic visit, as soon as I could prepare for it. He never had had one word of *conversation* with me, on the doctrines to which he had shown so much aversion; nor did he enter at all on the subject now. Others treated me with apparent friendship, and no one made objection to my going. I left home the 26th of the 6th month 1833. About a week before, my certificate had been *re-signed* in the

monthly meeting, and liberty was granted me, to have two meetings in Mountpleasant.

I went directly to Baltimore to attend the General Committee; appointed by the several Yearly Meetings, except Philadelphia, which was very decidedly opposed to the measure.

I was then on my way to embark for a foreign land, with all the credentials that the order of the Society demanded. And the separation from my American friends was very sensibly felt. During the session of the General Committee, a meeting for business occurred in Baltimore. I am not certain whether it was a Monthly or Preparative Meeting. Wishing a parting opportunity with my friends, I requested it—but it was opposed by one of the most prominent members, on the ground, as he said, that I had not a certificate addressed to *them;* and they did not therefore know me officially as a minister—though all of them knew me as a minister—and as a delegate to the General Committee from Ohio Yearly Meeting, and as liberated to visit Great Britain and Ireland as a minister of the gospel. The objection, however, was overruled, and the opportunity was granted me.

I mention this fact, to show the manner in which a wide-spread dissatisfaction with me operated, while professed unity with me was maintained, and while I was liberated and encouraged to travel as a minister into foreign countries.

Facts have abundantly proved, that those by whom this underworking was carried on, were rather pleased than otherwise, with my absence from this country, that they might make their arrangements, and prepossess the minds of friends against me, while I was gone. The hope, too, might be entertained, that the Conservatives in England, would find some hold to take on me, by which I might be led into difficulty there. But the Lord was on

my side, and those who watched for my halting were disappointed.

I have already given some sketches of sentiments, that I met with on that side of the Atlantic; and I refer to the recent numbers of the Repository, for information in regard to transactions in that country. The Letters also that I shall give in a subsequent part of this work, will further elucidate the subject.

On my return home in the 11th month 1834, my health was such as to confine me to my room a considerable time. In the 2nd month 1835, I attended the Quarterly Meeting. It was in the Meeting of Ministers and Elders at that time, that I made some remarks, on the importance of soundness in the fundamental doctrines of religion, on the part of Ministers and Elders. I exhorted them to seek for the help of the Holy Spirit in the exercise of their gifts, and expressed my full persuasion that if this were the case, a new spring of ministry would be opened among them. I gave it as my belief, that the ministry had not been thoroughly purged by the late separation, but that the essential doctrines of Hicksism were still in the Society. And by way of elucidation, I referred to the command which was given to Saul, utterly to destroy Ameleck. But he destroyed only that which was vile and refuse, and saved the best of the spoil, and spared Agag the King alive. And I expressed my strong apprehensions, that the Society had only thrown off the grosser matters which were found in it, while the very essence of the unsoundness was still retained. And I entreated my friends to take the subject deeply into consideration.

At the close of this meeting, both Benjamin Hoyle, a minister, and B. W. Ladd, an elder, called upon me for explanations of this discourse. At the close of the latter interview, B. W. Ladd remarked, in substance, as follows: "Well, Elisha, if thee goes beyond our early Friends, thee will be a reformer, and carry off a party." On my answer-

ing, that I intended to keep very close to the Scriptures, he replied, "No—the writings of our Early Friends are something that has risen up between us and the Scriptures, and we must not go beyond them." This was in the presence of Dr. Parker and Benjamin Wright. The Doctor does not *seem* to remember this part of the interview, though he does not deny that it took place. But B. Wright *does* remember the conversation just recited.

In the 5th month I obtained a certificate to attend the Yearly Meeting on Rhode Island. And there I found a number of my former friends, quite changed in their feelings towards me—but some were not. In New York, I learned from an estimable minister who attended the Yearly Meeting in Philadelphia, that it was confidently stated there, at that time, that I would receive no certificate from the Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders, to be held in London the last of the 5th month—that is, more than a month after it was announced in Philadelphia.

That a private decision should thus be made up by individuals, so long beforehand, for a body professing to act under the immediate guidance of the Holy Spirit, is certainly not to the credit of the parties concerned in such transactions.

Agreeably to this previous conclusion, when the Meeting of Ministers and Elders convened in London, the attempt was made to decline giving me a certificate of satisfaction with my visit, as is usual in such cases. And so determined were the objectors, that they overruled the other part of the meeting, and it was concluded to give no certificate.

But information of this decision got out, and the question was asked in the Yearly Meeting, whether such was the fact or not. The Yearly Meeting being the Superior Meeting, the call for information was imperative, and the state of the case was disclosed. The decision of the Ministers and Elders was overruled, and they were directed to

reconsider the subject. This was mortifying beyond measure; but there was no alternative; and the subject was again taken up. Another violent effort was made to withhold the certificate, but it failed, and the document was prepared, recognizing my Gospel labours and certifying that they were acceptable to many.

Previous to the passing of this paper, every objection that could be thought of was advanced, investigated, and removed.

It is a fact, however, that the certificate, as to *me*, is full—the *abatement* falls on those to whom my *gospel labours* were not acceptable.

These facts exhibit a tissue of disgraceful intrigue and management, that never could exist in a sound state of Society. The private making up of decisions beforehand, for an important meeting, professing immediate divine guidance, must be regarded as placing the claims of such meetings in a very unfavorable point of view. It turns out, also, that those who earnestly endeavoured to carry out this previously-formed judgment, were ministers of the very first standing in the Conservative party. Among these, according to Thomas Evans's letter, was William Allen, the clerk of the meeting. George and Ann Jones, Sarah Grubb and Elizabeth Robson, were also among the number. But this was not all. The anticipated decision was sent over to America, long before the meeting that was to form it under divine guidance was held—and was actually used in this country, more than a *month* beforehand, to have an unfavourable effect upon my religious character. And after all, it was set aside by the highest meeting in the Society. And the Ministers and Elders themselves, finally issued a document, directly contrary to their conclusion, but a few days before.

On my way home from New England, I stopped a few days in Philadelphia. But I did not see Thomas Evans, he having gone to the sea side, on a summer excursion. I

mention this, because it is one of the features of his letter.

The approaching storm was now gathering around me. I think the summer and autumn of 1835 was, as relates to the Society, the most painful period of my life. I saw that the friends could not bear sound doctrine: and the grief arising from this painful conviction, impressed upon me by observations, through the whole length of the Society, from London to Indiana—the long and sore persecution I had received from my former friends, bore with such weight upon me, that I could most literally say with the Apostle, I was pressed above measure, so that I despaired even of life. It did indeed seem, at times, that my constitution, shattered as it was, must sink under the burdens which I had to bear.

Thomas Evans's Letter to me, under date of 7th month 25th, (see Appendix), shows that the dissatisfaction with me was for *doctrines—new views*, as he is pleased to call them. But he is careful not to specify what they were. It shows also, an extensive correspondence and understanding among the Conservatives, in my case. It discloses the fact, that no reformation or correction, in the views of early Friends, would be allowed; and that my disownment was determined on, without an entire submission on my part.

That a few individuals, such as Ann Jones, Thomas Evans, and B. W. Ladd, should exercise such despotic powers in the Society, at this day, as to proscribe whoever they please—and that, too, for holding the simple and plain doctrines of the New Testament, is certainly astonishing.

In the mean time the manuscript Letter, (reviewed in the 25th and 26th numbers of the Repository), had been widely circulated in the western country. It was written by Thomas Evans of Philadelphia, to Benjamin W. Ladd of Smithfield, under date of 4th month 25th, 1835.

The intention was to produce an excitement, by pri-

vate and underhand means, against certain individuals, on account of the doctrines which they held. Of these individuals, Isaac Crewdson was one, and E. Bates was another. Of the offensive doctrines, that of the conclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures, stood prominent—and "the observance of the first day of the week as a moral obligation" was another. In tracing out that Letter, we find the doctrine of the Resurrection mentioned in an ambiguous way. But from the close connection which has been maintained between the writer of that letter and those who violently opposed that doctrine—from the fact that it was written *to* one of those opposers of the doctrine, and by him put into circulation, for the promotion of his own views, all uncertainty as to the meaning of the passage is removed. He objects, in strong terms, to the idea that "many of the views of our worthy predescessors [are] unscriptural and unsound." By this, he plainly declares his opinion, that all the writings of the Early Friends, are sound and scriptural.

The doctrine held by those called Evangelical Friends, relating to *Justification by Faith*, is mentioned with disapprobation. And he proceeds to say: "Accompanying the promulgation of these erroneous views I have mentioned, is an active promotion of what is styled family duty; reading and expounding the Scriptures; praying vocally by heads of families with their assembled household; and also what they style teaching the Gospel, which they say is a distinct thing from the ministry, and may properly be exercised by every concerned parent. Hence their performances have become very common; and in the families of some friends are accompanied with the vocal singing of hymns, or the repetition."

From these facts, it is evident, that the holding of the conclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures—Justification by Faith, the Ressurrection of the dead, the practical duty of prayer, with other domestic devotions, and the

teaching of the Gospel by "concerned parents," had all given offence, as "going from the original ground of our profession," and measures were taken to put them down.

The pious christian of any other denomination, can scarcely read these developements of sentiment without astonishment, that now, in the 19th century, such a warfare should have been commenced against Christianity, in Faith and Practice, and carried on to the disownment of individuals.

It is important to take notice of this letter, as all the points of doctrine are distinctly embraced in it, which I have charged the Society for opposing.

The whole letter is given in the Appendix, together with another letter from the same writer, addressed to me.

This last-mentioned letter shows that *doctrines* was the ground of dissatisfaction with me, both in England and in Philadelphia. And by the allusion to the "new notions of Crewdson and his friends," we are warranted in concluding, that they are the same which were mentioned in the Letter to Benjamin W. Ladd. In this letter I was given to understand, that an extensive interchange of sentiment had taken place among the the Conservatives in England and America, in relation to me; that they were dissatisfied with those *new* doctrines, which were plainly the absolute authority of the Holy Scriptures in matters of Faith and Practice, Justification by Faith, the Resurrection of the dead—the practical duty of Prayer, and the obligation on heads of families to lead their families into devotional exercises, and to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. I was given to understand, also, that no reformation in the views of early Friends would be tolerated,—was invited to leave the Society, and virtually informed, that if I did not, or settle down into *quiet*, and an entire abandonment of the new notions of Crewdson and his friends—

disownment would be the inevitable consequence. This, it should be remembered, was more than nine months before the 23rd number of the Repository was written—thirteen months and a half before I was baptized, and about fifteen months before the Appeal was published. Here my intended disownment was distinctly announced, long before one single thing mentioned in the charges on which I have been disowned, had occurred.

I do not intend to say that the Society would not have disowned me, for calling the papers of George Fox in question, or for being Baptized, if the original causes of dissatisfaction had not previously existed. I believe they would. But the papers already referred to, and those which I shall hereafter bring into notice, show beyond all contradiction, that my disownment was long intended and threatened, on account of my holding and preaching the great doctrines and duties of religion.

The letters of Sarah Grubb, Ann Jones, and Thomas Evans, are expressed in terms that indicate an imperious and overbearing temper. That such a temper is permitted to rule in the Society, is one of its present calamities: and as is evident from the facts of the present case, is intimately connected with unsoundness in principle.

The Document of the Meeting for Sufferings of Ohio, issued in the 9th month 1835, is a further evidence of the combination which had been formed, and of the doctrinal character of the excitement which had run throughout the Society, from London to Indiana.

Isaac Crewdson had written an exposure of the doctrines of Elias Hicks, which he called a Beacon to the Society of Friends. As a refutation of those doctrines, by which the Society had so deeply suffered, and from which it was far from being clear, the Beacon is not inferior, to say the least of it, to any of the Philadelphia publications, from the *anonymous* pamphlets, to the Declaration of the Yearly Meeting. The Friends of that city, how-

ever, determined to put it down, and they made a formal parade against it, at the Yearly Meeting in the 4th month.

An attempt was made in the meeting for Sufferings for New England in the 6th month, to issue a document against it. I was there, as were Thomas Kite of Philadelphia, Joshua Lynch of Salem Q. M. Ohio, Robert Comfort and Mead Atwater of N. Y. Yearly Meeting, &c. When the subject was introduced, I made some objections to the course proposed, and there was good sense enough in the meeting, to decline to follow in the path which had been struck out in Philadelphia. A feeling of indignation however was manifested against me, by some present, of which I had not met with many examples before.

Joshua Lynch abruptly broke off his visit in New England, immediately after the Yearly Meeting, left his carriage and horses, and hastily returned home, by public conveyance.

About a week before the Yearly Meeting here, he came into the neighbourhood, to make some private visits, to promote certain objects he had in view; one of which was, to prepare the minds of some of the members of the meeting for Sufferings, for the issuing of a document against the Beacon.

Thomas Evans also came to the Yearly Meeting, with a certificate, though not in the station either of a minister or elder. At the opening of the first sitting of the meeting for sufferings, a request was made for his admission, he being waiting in the yard. He was not a member of the meeting for Sufferings in Philadelphia—and by the Discipline was not elegible to attend. But contrary to the uniform practice of the Society, he was admitted.

I mention this circumstance for two reasons, one, to show how little the order of the Society is regarded by the conservatives themselves—the other, to mark the connection of his visit with the issuing of the Document of the Meeting for Sufferings.

Although I have reviewed this document in the 26th no. of the Repository, I shall insert it here with a few remarks upon some of its prominent parts.

"This meeting has been brought under exercise and concern on account of the dissemination of sentiments, calculated to weaken the faith of our members, in the fundamental doctrines of the universality of Divine grace, and the influence of the Holy Spirit on the mind of man, as the primary rule of faith and practice; and to undervalue some of those Christian testimonies which, under its guidance, our worthy predecessors in the truth were led to promulgate to the world, and which are clearly set forth by our blessed Lord and his Apostles in the Holy Scriptures.

"Among the means of spreading these unsound views we may particularly notice a late work entitled "A Beacon to the society of friends," containing sentiments repugnant to the Christian principles which our religious society has always held and maintained, since it pleased the Lord first to gather us, as a distinct people. We feel an earnest and tender solicitude that all our dear friends may be preserved from being entangled in any views which would lead them lightly to esteem these precious doctrines and testimonies; that they may avoid all doubtful disputations and speculative opinions, which gender strife and contention, and seek to know an establishment on the alone sure foundation, Christ Jesus the Rock of ages, abundantly testified of in the Scriptures of truth, and inwardly revealed by the Holy Spirit to the humble believing soul.—As they come in living faith to him who died for our sins, that we might be justified through his blood, and yield themselves in reverent obedience to his spiritual government, they will experience a growth in grace and in that divine knowledge which accompanies salvation; and thus be qualified to fill up their respective stations and duties in the world and in the Church, to their own peace and the edification of the body.

"Our religious society has always firmly and sincerely believed in that holy scripture doctrine that 'the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to *all* men; teaching us, that denying ungodliness, and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.' This grace of God we believe is 'the spirit of truth,' which our blessed Lord promised to send to guide his disciples into all truth, 'it is the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world;' and 'he that followeth him shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.' To this divine light, inwardly revealed, our worthy forefathers were engaged to call the attention of the different classes of professors in their day, as the foundation of all living experimental religion; that by obedience to its teachings they might be led from a dependence an a mere outside profession, however sound in its doctrines, to an inward, practical acquaintance with the cleansing and sanctifying operations of the Holy Ghost. Nor was it by precept only that they enforced the great truths of the Christian religion, by submission to the dictates of this blessed spirit, they were enabled to shew forth its power and efficacy in holiness of life and circumspection of demeanor, bringing forth the fruits of meekness, long suffering, gentleness and purity, adorning the doctrine of God our Saviour in conduct and conversation.

"They believed, as the society has done down to the present day, that whatsoever Christ did in his outward manifestation, both living and dying, was of great benefit to the salvation of all that have believed, and now do, and that hereafter shall believe in him, unto justification and acceptance with God. But the way to come to that

faith, is to receive and obey the manifestation of his divine light and grace in the conscience, which leads men to believe and value and not to disown or undervalue Christ, as the common Sacrifice and Mediator. For we do affirm that to follow this holy light in the conscience, and to turn our minds and bring all our deeds and thoughts to it, is the readiest, nay, the only right way, to have true, living, and sanctifying faith in Christ, as he appeared in the flesh; and to discern the Lord's body, coming and suffering aright; and to receive any benefit by him, as our only Sacrifice and Mediator; according to the beloved disciple's emphatical testimony, 'If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.'

"May it then, dear friends be our individual concern to be established on this safe and sure foundation, being rooted and built up in Christ; that 'we may all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. That henceforth we be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the slight of men and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive, but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head even Christ.'

"We feel an affectionate solicitude for our members of every class, but especially for the beloved youth, that they may seek after retirement and quietude of mind, and cultivate an acquaintance with their Lord and Saviour as he is pleased to reveal himself by his Spirit in their hearts. This state of silent introversion, and waiting on the Lord, will be a suitable qualification for the profitable perusal of the precious pages of Holy Scripture, a practice which we recommend to the daily observance of all; believing that they are 'profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correc-

tion, for instruction in righteousness,' and 'able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.'' As we come to know and follow him in humility and holy fear, we shall be enabled to distinguish his voice from that of the stranger, however specious the resemblance, be preserved from every stratagem of the unwearied adversary and in the progress of our religious growth, be prepared under the fresh anointing from on high to labour availingly for the advancement of the glorious cause of truth and righteousness in the earth."

The first thing I shall notice in this paper, is the profession of *concern*, into which the meeting was introduced —a thing however made up beforehand, as was well understood by a number of the members of that meeting.

In the Review of this document, which I published in the Repository, I stated that I believed in the original draft, as it passed the meeting, the exhortation to the members of the Society that "all our dear friends may avoid all doubtful disputations and speculative opinions, which gender strife and contention, and seek to know an establishment on the alone sure foundation, Christ Jesus the Rock of ages, abundantly testified of in the Scriptures of truth, and inwardly revealed by the Holy Spirit to the humble believing soul;" the clause relating to inward revelation, stood before that which relates to the testimony of Scripture. I am able to say now, without the fear of contradiction, that such was the *fact*. The passage originally read as follows: "We feel an earnest and tender solicitude that all our dear friends may be preserved from being entangled in any views which would lead them lightly to esteem these precious doctrines and testimonies; that they may avoid all doubtful disputations and speculative opinions, which gender strife and contention, and seek to know an establishment on the alone sure foundation, Christ Jesus the Rock of ages, inwardly revealed

by the Holy Spirit to the humble believing soul, and abundantly testified of in the Scriptures of truth."

The question will very naturally occur, why was the transposition of the two latter clauses of this sentence, after it had deliberately passed the meeting, and with objection made to it, and over-ruled, thought to be a matter of so much importance, as to demand a call of the meeting, for the simple purpose of making the change? The reason was this, the passage as it stood, had alarmed some friends, as well it might, with the idea that it was direct Hicksite doctrine. And the transposition was made, to quiet that alarm—but without changing the doctrine intended to be conveyed by the Document, as it originally stood. That doctrine was, to maintain the views of early Friends, as arising from inward revelation to them, and not from the Scriptures, but merely corroborated by the Scriptures.

The alteration may justly be charged with a lack of candour; for the document, as it stood at first, evidently conveyed the sentiments of its framers: and it contains the very same sentiments still—though *arranged* for the special purpose of not giving alarm. Let the reader recur to the very first sentence in the document, and there he will find the "exercise and concern" of the meeting to be, on account of the dissemination of sentiments, calculated to weaken the faith of our members in the fundamental doctrines of the universality of Divine Grace, and the Influence of the Holy Spirit on the mind of man, as the primary rule of faith and practice." I take this part of the sentence to avoid breaking the connection; and to make two passing observations as we go along: One is, that injustice is done to Isaac Crewdson, in representing him as denying the universality of divine grace: the other is, that the whole weight of their "exercise and concern" fell upon the maintenance of the doctrine of the divine and conclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures, in matters of

Faith and Practice. But the part of the sentence which immediately follows the foregoing quotation, is that to which I wish to call particular attention, as containing the sentiment which the transposition was made, in some degree to conceal,—"and to undervalue some of those Christian testimonies which, under its guidance, our worthy predecessors in the truth were led to promulgate to the world, and which are clearly set forth by our blessed Lord and his Apostles in the Holy Scriptures."

This agrees precisely with the passage which was transposed, and the transposition of which was thought of sufficient importance, to demand a special meeting of the meeting for Sufferings. It is a prominent object of the whole document, to inculcate the idea, that the Early Friends derived their doctrines from inward revelation, and not from the Scriptures. And then, by a strange inconsistency, to contend for the influence of the Holy Spirit, as the Primary Rule of Faith and Practice, and make that Rule identical with the views of Early Friends.

To discredit the Scriptures, by not allowing *them* to be *the means*, of bringing us, in the first place, to a knowledge of the doctrines of Christianity, is plainly to discredit the Record which God has given of his Son. To claim for the views of the Early Friends this high character of revelation, is to set them above the Scriptures, in several respects. It places those friends not only upon apostolic ground, but as having peculiar claims on us, as "*our* worthy predecessors," "*our* dear forefathers," &c. It sets those writings *above* the Scriptures, or in other words, it not only places them beyond *correction* by the Scriptures, in ascribing to them the character of a more recent revelation than the New Testament, but it claims a controul over the Scriptures, as containing the true doctrine of Scripture, given to Early Friends by revelation. And every effort is used, to fix this notion in the minds of the members of this Society—that they may avoid all investigation—keep out

of the way of all arguments, conducted on purely Scriptural grounds—and shut up all controversies, with the opinions of Early Friends—as these are to be given out, in the course of a few years, in the Friends' Library.

But take the doctrine of the Influence of the Holy Spirit as the Primary Rule as ostensibly stated in the Document, and it cannot be sustained.

The Early Friends insisted that the *Holy Spirit* was the Primary Rule. But if the declaration of the meeting for Sufferings means neither more nor less than this, why should the sentence be incumbered with the additional terms. But every man acquainted with the meaning of words, must see at once, that the terms are not identical. Why then did the meeting enter upon this new version of the old doctrine of the Friends? Do they think it is proper for *them* to modify or change doctrines, which they denominate *Fundamental*, and that, not to render them conformable to the Scriptures, at the very moment when they were passing censure upon a Friend in a Foreign country, (and over whom they had no jurisdiction, whatever—) for bringing the Scriptures to bear upon the same point of doctrine?

But take either the *old* or *new* version of the doctrine of the Primary Rule, and it cannot bear the test of Holy Scripture. The question is not whether the dictation of the Holy Spirit is infallibly true or not: for no one in his sober senses will deny this. But whether, to us, who have the Scriptures, *they* are not of absolute and conclusive authority, in all points of doctrine, whether of principles or practice?

I think it necessary to narrow up the question, so as to include only those who *have* the Scriptures—because, by arguing from the condition of the Heathen, Friends have argued themselves upon Heathen ground. For taking the Light which men, in a state of nature have, (entirely independent of the Bible,) as the Primary Rule, and every

one acquainted with this part of the human family must know, that *this Rule* gives no knowledge of those doctrines of Christianity, which every true believer acknowledges to be of Fundamental importance. And if that Rule does not give, to those who have no other, the *essential* doctrines of Christianity, then Christianity itself is not included in this Primary Rule: which would be to banish Christianity from the system of religion to be inculcated and maintained by it.

To say that Christianity would be taught by this universal Light which the Heathen possess, if they were obedient to its dictates, is assertion without proof. The doctrines committed to the Apostles, and the Scriptures of the Prophets, are, by the commandment of the everlasting God, to be "made known unto all nations for the obedience of Faith." The Scriptures show clearly that the doctrines of religion are to be communicated to mankind through *them*, and all history establishes the fact, that where they have not been directly or indirectly known, the religion of Jesus Christ, which is the only true religion, has not been enjoyed.

Leaving then the condition of the Heathen, to be disposed of by the Judge of all the earth, who will do right—and whose tender mercies are over all his works, we come to the question, immediately relating to *ourselves*—what is *the Rule* of Faith and Practice, by which we are to be governed? God has spoken by the Prophets, Apostles, and by his own dear Son. Shall we take his Word thus given to us in the Scriptures, as *the Rule*, or shall we consider the *impressions* on our *own minds* as the Rule? I say the *impressions* on our own minds, because the divine origin of those impressions is not to be taken as a thing of course. We all know that whatever God may immediately communicate to man will necessarily be true. But we have to prove that the impression is such a communcation from him, before the advantage of this concession can be rightly claimed.

Take for example, the impressions of Jacob Behmen, and of George Fox, that they knew by revelation the nature and virtues of all things—and can any sober minded man believe that they were not mistaken? Take George Fox's discernment of the witches by revelation, as mentioned in the two first editions of his Journal, but excluded from those afterwards printed, and do we believe that he really had such a revelation? Very few will answer in the affirmative. Take his letter to Oliver Cromwell, in which he calls himself "the Son of God," and says "my kingdom is not of this world;" and again and again he says he was moved of the Lord to write it—but can we believe that he really was so moved to write—what was either gross ignorance or gross blasphemy? I might multiply examples, but these will suffice to show, what every man ought to admit, with all readiness, that men are very apt to be mistaken in their own impressions. If the very Founder of the Society was so greatly mistaken in what he took to be immediate revelations, how can the ordinary members of the Society, insist upon the impressions of their own minds, as the Primary Rule of Faith and Practice? But it may be said, that we do not profess our impressions to be the Rule—but the Influence of the Holy Spirit, and this only.

But there is an utter fallacy in this. For if we have impressions, on a matter in hand, the question, on this theory will immediately arise, is this impression from the Holy Spirit? Or is it the working of my own imagination? And how, I ask is this point to be decided? If by the impression itself, then the impression is taken, as divine, whether right or wrong, and then, after this, it is to be tried—*by itself.* But the absurdity of this must be obvious. If on the other hand, the *impression* is to be tried by some Rule to which it must be subjected, as of acknowledged divine authority—then that rule must be of higher authority than the impression. And it would be preposterous to suppose,

that the impression was first to be made subordinate to that acknowledged Rule, and then the Rule made subordinate to the impression.

But if the Primary Rule is in every man, then every man must consult it for himself, and thus subordination in Society would be at an end. And there is a manifest contradiction in insisting that the Primary Rule is in every man, to be known by every man, in himself and for himself, and at the same time to hold over him, as of absolute authority, either the opinions of his predecessors or of his cotemporaries. And as an illustration of my meaning, take the case of an individual, who sincerely believes that both the testimony of Scripture and the direct witness of the Holy Spirit, clearly determine a point of Christian doctrine, if that decision is not according to the views of George Fox, or the opinions of the ruling Conservatives, as to what were the opinions of George Fox, all that such a man may say of the concurrent testimony of the word, and of the Spirit, will avail nothing. He must succumb, or be disowned. How rediculous then is the pretension to such a fundamental principle, as to what is the Primary Rule, when it resolves itself, not into the immediate teaching of the Spirit, as really recognized by the Society, but the opinions of George Fox and his cotemporaries, as handed out by present conservatives—who serve them up at discretion, "*with their intrinsic value enhanced.*"*

But while the Society thus practically gives a contradiction to its own Fundamental principles, in its dealing with its members—individuals in their *private* musings, must necessarily have some Rule to which questions of doctrine are to be brought. And here a mistake may be of incalculable mischief. If we claim to ourselves, revelations of doctrine, independent of the Scriptures, and make the Scriptures "Secondary, and Subordinate" to their sup-

*See Prospectus for the Friends' Library.

posed revelations—if emboldened by the cases so solemnly brought forward by Robert Barclay, of persons who could not read their own native language, who, when pressed with texts of Scripture, boldly declared that the text was certainly wrong and that the Spirit of God never said so: we undertake to *adopt*, *reject*, or *construe* the *Scriptures* to suit our own supposed revelations—what barriers can be set against the wildest imaginations? Of such mistakes the Society of Friends affords a variety of examples.—Those who went naked in the streets and other public places—and those who approved such proceedings (and they were approved by George Fox, Samuel Fisher, &c. &c.)—the worship paid to James Naylor, and to George Fox—with many other things in early times, and the wild extravagances in New England about twenty years ago, &c. may be pointed to as examples.

But it is not in such flagrant cases alone, that we may see the mischief developed. Whenever the conclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures is made to yield to the impressions on the minds of individuals, either as to the doctrines to be believed, or as to the practical obligation of those doctrines, there the pernicious influence of an erroneous principle may be discovered—though the mischief may be held in check by other causes.

As already noticed, it is a fact, established by the experience of all nations, and of the last 1800 years, that the doctrines of Christianity are not known in those portions of the globe, where the Scriptures have not directly or indirectly been communicated. This settles the question whether the doctrines of *Christianity* are communicated to mankind by the Scriptures—or by immediate revelation independent of the Scriptures. The proof is positive, as respects the Heathen part of the world. And the *inference*, is not less strong as respects Christian countries. For in addition to the facts of the case, the reasoning is irresistable—that if God does not furnish, by immediate

revelation, a knowledge even of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity where those doctrines have not been carried by the Scriptures—we cannot suppose he would grant such an extraordinary mode of conveying that knowledge, where the Scriptures *are possessed.* The reason is obvious, "They have Moses and the Prophets, let them hear them. If they will not hear Moses and the Prophets, neither would they be persuaded though one arose from the dead." This is the language of the Lord Jesus, in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. What shall we say now, where in addition to those records of the will of God, we have the Evangelists and Apostles?

But we have cases among us, as fully to the point as the Heathen nations. They are the deaf and dumb persons, who occasionally attain to the years of understanding, before they receive the benefits of education. These persons, when made capable of receiving and communicating ideas, have fully established the fact, that previous to instruction, they were totally ignorant of the doctrines of the Christian Religion.

These facts prove conclusively that the doctrines of Christianity are conveyed to mankind *by the Scriptures.* And if we derive a knowledge of these doctrines from the Scriptures, then the Scriptures must be *the Rule* by which doctrines are to be examined. I think this conclusion is as clear as a mathematical demonstration.

The Document proceeds to pronounce, that the *grace* spoken of, Titus 2. 11, is the Holy Spirit.

But the simple meaning of the word *Grace*, is *Favour*, and applies to that unmerited goodness of God, in which the means of redemption were provided through Jesus Christ our Lord. But in addition to the literal meaning of the original Greek word, [*charis*,] it is clear that the meaning which the Friends have imposed upon the passage cannot be correct; because if all men have the *grace* in the sense contended for, then all men have the teaching

described by the Apostle. And this embraces the peculiar doctrines of Christianity—"looking for that blessed hope, [the hope of the Gospel], and the glorious appearing of the great God, *and our Saviour Jesus Christ who gave himself for us*, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." But these peculiar doctrines of the Christian religion, are not taught where the Scriptures have never been carried.

The writers of the document fell directly into the error of Hicksism, in confounding the distinction between *Christ* and the *Holy Spirit;* and again in making these divine characters identical with a "universal Inward Light."—This was strictly the theory of Elias Hicks, and this is the doctrine plainly stated in the document before us. After giving the definition to *grace*, already noticed, they go on to apply to it, the very language used in Scripture with direct application to Jesus Christ—"he that followeth him, shall not walk in darkness, but have the Light of Life." I believe it is the first time that I ever saw the masculine pronoun *him* applied to *grace*.

But the grammatical error is of little importance, compared with the doctrinal heresy contained in it. It changes the view of the character of Christ, and must, when carried out, result in all the objectionable notions for which, but a few years before, Elias Hicks and his friends were broadly charged with *Infidelity*.

It is one of the peculiar features of that unsoundness, which has been the besetting sin of Quakerism, to lead the mind from that simple Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, which is so clearly set forth in the Scriptures, to a system of mysticism, under the delusive idea of superior spirituality. And that feature is most distinctly brought out in the document.

The occasional acknowledgment of Jesus Christ, is not a sufficient safeguard against the effects of the mysticism

of which I have been speaking. We know that such acknowledgments were frequently made by Elias Hicks. But what *did* they, or what *can* they amount to, when the character of *Christ* is merged into that of a mere "*inward principle*," and the belief in the efficacy of his blood, shed upon the Cross, is lost in the notion of the presence of "a pure, spiritual, invisible principle" in man?

The Apostles preached, and the Primitive Believers received the doctrine, that JESUS was *the Christ* the *Son of God*, that believing they might have life through his name. It was upon this point that the important question turned, on which depended the acceptance or rejection of the promised Messiah. It was not the recognition of an "inward principle," in all men, that was agitated before Pilate, when the cry of the Chief Priests and Rulers of the Jews resounded through the Hall, "crucify him, crucify him." No—it was the "man of sorrows"—who was despised, rejected, buffeted and spit upon—crowned with thorns, and crucified between two thieves—who bore our sins in his own body upon the Tree—and under the weight of that load, which none other could have borne, exclaimed, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" He died for our sins, and his precious blood was shed upon the Cross, in that one offering which he made when he offered up himself. On that ever-memorable occasion, which will swell the anthems of the redeemed in heaven,—when the Son of God, was wounded for our transgressions, was bruised for our iniquities—when it pleased the Lord to bruise him,—to make his soul an offering for sin—and to lay upon him the iniquity of us all—the sun was darkened—the earth quaked, the rocks were rent, and the vail of the temple was rent from the top to the bottom.

The impressive language of an inspired Apostle pointed, in unequivocal terms, to this same suffering *Jesus*, "whom," saith he, "God hath raised up, having loosed the

pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that *same Jesus* whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ."

Such was the simple, plain, and powerful preaching of the Apostles—so they preached, and so the saints believed. They preached Jesus Christ as a *person*, and not as an inward principle. The term *principle* is not applied to him in the whole New Testament. But what have we gained, by our "refined spirituality." Only a few years ago, one third at least of the whole Society in the United States, was separated from those called the Orthodox, on the very ground of this mystical representation of the character of Christ, of his body and blood. And now the remainder of that Society, is following with rapid strides, in the footsteps of those they so recently disowned; and by official documents, *Tracts*, preaching, and the revival and earnest recommendation of unsound parts of the writings of Early Friends, is spreading the very same doctrines, like an overwhelming torrent—bearing down every thing that opposes it.

The reader should bear in remembrance that the Beacon, against which such an excitement was raised through the length and breadth of the Society, was a refutation of the *doctrines of Elias Hicks;* among which the perversion of the character of *Christ*, and of his body and blood, stood pre-eminent. The alarm was spread in every direction, that *Quakerism was endangered*—and with this book before their eyes—and for the purpose of rendering it altogether odious, the document was issued: plunging the Society into the very vortex of that heresy, from which it was just rising.

The Document goes on to declare what the Society believes of our Lord Jesus Christ. And as they were condemning an able refutation of the doctrines of Elias Hicks, if they did not themselves hold those doctrines, they

should, in the clearest manner, have shown the difference between those they intended to maintain, and those held by Elias Hicks and his friends. And this was the more necessary, as the first principles of the doctrine of Christ were immediately involved.

The character of Jesus Christ, the efficacy of his death, the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, and the duty of Prayer, being prominent parts of the Beacon, in opposition to Elias Hicks, if the Society was sound on these doctrines, the Meeting for Sufferings should have placed that soundness beyond all question. But we have seen, that in the definition given to *grace*, they have directly fallen into the primary error of Elias Hicks. We come now to what they say of Christ. Speaking of Early Friends, they say: "They believed, as the Society has done down to the present day, that whatsoever Christ did, in his outward manifestation, both living and dying, was of great benefit to the salvation of all that have believed; and that now do and hereafter shall believe in him unto justification and acceptance with God."

And is this all? Did not the Meeting for Sufferings think the company of their Philadelphia friends at that time, *a great benefit?* And yet these *common place* terms, are to cover the whole ground, of *all* that Christ did, *both living and dying*. I ask if this is not the very ground of the sinner's hope? Did not Christ bear the load which otherwise would have crushed us down to everlasting ruin? Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. But he was wounded for *our* transgressions, he was bruised for *our* iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord has laid upon him the iniquity of us all. He bore our sins in his own body on the tree, and died for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God—we were reconciled to God by

the death of his Son. And being justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. And there is none other name under heaven, given amongst men, whereby we must be saved. Does all this, and more than men or angels can describe besides, call for no more than this familiar, common place form of expression, *a great benefit?* Saints on earth, and the redeemed in Heaven, will make, in very different language, their acknowledgments of whatsoever the Lord Jesus Christ did, both living and dying. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." "Having therefore boldness to enter into the Holiest by the Blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us through the vail, that is to say, his flesh, and having an high priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith." "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood!" But it may be said that the passage under review was a quotation from William Penn. Those who are acquainted with the writings of that great man, know very well, that with all his abilities, and all his excellent qualities, he was a most unstable writer. Passages, the most incongruous, and contradictory to each other, may be selected from his writings. At one time he declares that "nothing we can do, though by the help of the Holy Spirit being able to cancel old debts and wipe out old scores: It is the power and efficacy of that propitiatory offering [the sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ] that Justifies us from the sins that are past"—and at another, as in the Sandy Foundation Shaken, he treats the whole doctrine of "satisfaction" and *atonement*, with the most revolting levity and ridicule. I will not transcribe in this place the arguments which he uses, to explode the doctrine of the suffering of Christ as a satisfaction—or means of procuring the remission of our sins. He takes precisely the same grounds which are taken by professed Infidels, and ridicules the

notion of the innocent suffering for the guilty, &c. &c. At one time he declares that we *distinguish*, but we do not *divide* between Jesus of Nazareth and Christ; and at another, without the least retraction or acknowledgment of error, asserts that we *do not* distinguish *or* divide, between Jesus of Nazareth and Christ.

Of the apparent acknowledgment of the character of Jesus Christ, in this passage, and the efficacy of his Blood, I shall say something more, when I come to speak of the manner in which William Penn and others explained their views of Christ, and of his Blood. For the present I shall briefly remark, that there is a most palpable defect in this passage, in regard to the way of coming to true faith in Christ. They do not so much as *name* the Scriptures, as being concerned in bringing us to true faith. It is the light of Christ in the conscience, and to turn our minds, and bring all our *deeds* and thoughts to it, that is the *readiest*, nay, the *only right* way to have true, living and sanctifying faith in Christ.

But as the light in the conscience does not reveal to any (independent of the Scriptures) that there ever was such a person as Jesus of Nazareth, not to say, that he was the Son of God, and that he died upon the cross, a sacrifice for our sins—and rose again from the dead, and is passed into heaven—there to appear in the presence of God for us—if we do not accept the Record which God has given of his Son, the Son himself cannot be an object of our faith; as said the apostle: "How shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" To make Faith entirely dependent on the light of conscience, altogether independent of the Scriptures, or without them, is plainly to have only such a Faith, if Faith it can be called, as is held by heathen nations that never heard of the doctrines of revelation. And to inculcate such a notion here, is directly to let down the importance of the

Fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and build up a system, destitute of *Christ;* a cold, a heartless system of morality, depending only on that light which men in a state of nature have.

We now come to what the Meeting thought proper to be said specially of the Holy Scriptures. The Beacon had claimed them as the Rule of Faith and Practice. This the Meeting had zealously denied. The first public attack on the Beacon in England, was in a printed Letter, written by Thomas Thompson of Liverpool. In that Letter he confined himself to two points; one was, to deny the conclusive authority of Scripture, the other was, to object to the Beacon, as bringing into view the doctrines of Elias Hicks. On the former point he distinctly denied the correctness of the authorized version of 1 Tim. 3. 16. "All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God." Thomas Evans, in his letter to B. W. Ladd, of 4th month 25th, 1835, which was extensively circulated in MS. in this country, notices this Letter with evident approbation, calling the writer "a worthy Elder of Liverpool."

Thomas Evans and B. W. Ladd were both actively concerned in getting up the document, and with a knowledge, and apparent approval of Thomas Thompson's denial, that all scripture *is* given by inspiration of God—they quote into the document, a *part* of the very text in question, with the portion of it to which T. T. objected, *entirely omitted.* They say: "This state of silent introversion and waiting on the Lord, will be a suitable qualification for the profitable perusal of the precious passages of Holy Scripture, a practice which we recommend to the daily observance of all; believing that they are—"profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."

Why did they leave out the part declaring that "*All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God,*" and begin at

"*profitable?*" The sentence which they had framed, as well as the nature of the subject, demanded that the text should not be mutilated, and the very part which declared the divine authority of the Scriptures, struck off. The omission, with the circumstances of the case, carries on the face of it, a virtual denial of the doctrine contained in the omitted part of the text.

As the Document stands, it recognizes neither the whole of the Scriptures, nor even a *part* of them, as given by inspiration of God, nor as *binding* in the doctrines they contain. They had previously passed them entirely over, as having any place in the means of bringing us to the doctrines they contain. And while another Rule is claimed, and the Scriptures professedly held *secondary and subordinate* to *that*, a scriptural reformation in the Society will be defeated. Individuals, and especially the junior members, may break the fetters in which they are bound, and lay hold of the Faith once delivered to the Saints, but the Society, in its official character, must cease to be what it is, before it can be established in the doctrines and practices of the Apostles.

I was present in the Meeting for Sufferings, when the subject of the Document was introduced, and objected to it. But this was regarded as a high offence, and they went on. I did not attend that meeting afterwards, nor did I interfere with their proceedings when they were introduced into the Yearly Meeting. They made the Document just what they would have it to be, and the foregoing are some of its capital errors.

Soon after the Yearly Meeting, I obtained from Short Creek Monthly Meeting a certificate to attend the Yearly Meeting of Indiana. B. W. Ladd hearing of my intentions, wrote the following Letter, and sent it by a young man who, with some others, intended to go in company with me.

"Smithfield, O., 9 month 25th, 1835.

"Dear Friends—

"We have had a large and favoured Yearly Meeting, attended by several valuable friends from other yearly meetings. Many subjects of importance were resulted, I trust, to the honour of Truth, and in accordance with the ancient principles and doctrines of friends. Two of these I will name, the first in magnitude relates to an attack made upon some of our fundamental doctrines, in the late publication of a Book, written by a minister of our society in England, Isaac Crewdson—The work is entitled, "A Beacon to the Society of Friends." If you have seen the Book, you no doubt have been struck and pained too, to observe that the author says, in opposition to Barclay, and all our worthy forefathers in the truth, page 8. "Now the Holy Spirit cannot, in any proper sense, be denominated a Rule." Page 9. "therefore there can be no higher rule than the Holy Scriptures." In pursuing the work, other parts are quite as objectionable, such as limiting the grace of God to the circulation of the Holy Scriptures; disparaging silent worship, &c.

"Hence the late Yearly Meeting of London issued a most excellent Epistle, addressed to their Quarterly and Monthly Meetings, particularly pressing upon the notice of their members, a close attention to those peculiar doctrines which have ever distinguished our religious society. This valuable Epistle our Yearly Meeting thought it right to print in connection with the General Epistle.—Our Meeting for Sufferings, from deep concern, apprehended it right to take notice of the Beacon, and the dissemination of the dangerous principles advocated in it; and issued a minute expressive of our concern, &c. This minute was brought before the Yearly Meeting, and being fully united with, was directed to be printed in our minutes, as you will see, should they reach you in time. I am sorry to say that our dear friend Elisha Bates did

strongly oppose the meeting for sufferings, taking up this subject. And I am equally pained at heart to know that the Beacon party in England claim him to be of their number. One thing is certain, that since his return from England he has advocated sentiments somewhat in character with those of the Beacon—one I would mention, that he does not feel himself bound to respect the writings of our early standard Authors, any further than they accord with his understanding of the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles. (This sentiment, if adhered to, will lead to a separation. All Christian sects claim to be founded upon the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles, and yet we know they are divided). This confession he will readily make to you, if candid. I write thus freely, and without reserve, and you are perfectly at liberty to show him my letter. My object in being thus plain is, to give you an understanding of the state of things, painful as they are. If you take up the subject of the Beacon in your Meeting for Sufferings, which I heartily wish you may have strength to do, that these new notions, or Episcopalian doctrines, may find no more entertainment in our Religious Society now, than they did in its rise, and during the time of our faithful worthies, who by deep suffering purchased for us our high profession. I say, if you approach this subject, I have little doubt but he will use his influence to draw you off from the subject. It is one, from the accounts received from England, which has involved the sincere hearted there in deep suffering, and if persisted in here, will inevitably lead to another separation, and to the disownment of some of our brightest and most gifted instruments."

The next paragraph relates to Indian affairs, which is the other subject, to which the writer refers in the beginning of the letter. He then proceeds:

"James Smith can inform you of the state of things in

our Yearly Meeting, &c. I think he took a copy of the Beacon to dear Charles Osborn.

"In the love of the Truth, I remain your friend

BENJ. W. LADD."

The reader will observe the strain in which the writer sets out, to give an imposing character to the transactions of the Meeting for Sufferings, and of the Yearly Meeting. For a meeting to be "Favoured," in the estimation of a friend, is equivalent to proof, that its decisions, at least in the general, were divinely *directed and sanctioned.* Establish this point, and all reasoning on the propriety or impropriety of those things which were done, under divine Favour, must be at an end. But what are the evidences of this *favour?* Why, plainly for matters to be carried as the party wished.

In speaking of the Yearly Meeting, the writer's mind was particularly impressed with the company of his Philadelphia Friends, as materially conducive to the results, which he regarded so much to the honour of Truth, &c. I say, *Philadelphia Friends*, because I *know* that three ministers who were here from other places, were regarded with very great *coldness*: and that on account of their preaching mainly, the same doctrines which I did, in regard to the authority of the Holy Scriptures—the obligation which rests upon us, to study them,—Justification by Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ,—and the practical duty of prayer. I *know* that a prominent minister of this Yearly Meeting, manifested an open, and unrelenting disunity towards one of those ministers, and indignantly refused to grant an interview which was requested for the purpose of reconciliation—that another of them was treated with *rudeness*, and the third received both here and in Indiana, a coldness and incivility, to say the least of it, that was extremely disgraceful.

The ancient principles and doctrines of Friends, form the

standard which the writer of this letter had in his mind.

The subject first in magnitude, which had been resulted at this *large and favoured* Yearly Meeting, was the document of which I have just been speaking.

In adverting to the Beacon, the object which he had chiefly in view was, to counteract the arguments which I. Crewdson had used, to bring the Society to a practical acknowledgment of the authority of the Scriptures, as *the Rule* of Faith and Practice. For this purpose he garbled two passages, and dragged into his service, "Barclay and all our worthy forefathers in the truth."—The first passage in the Beacon referred to, is as follows:

"Now the Holy Spirit *cannot*, in any *proper sense*, be denominated A RULE. [Thus to have designated Him, has evidently arisen from misapprehension of terms, and has led to confusion of ideas; for whilst we reverently and thankfully acknowledge the Holy Spirit to be the great agent *in* the believer, through whom his sanctification is effected, it is plain that the RULE must be *that* which *proceeds from* the Spirit, and not the Holy Spirit himself.—To speak of the Holy Spirit as a rule, involves the same incongruity as to speak of God as a rule.]" Beacon, 2nd ed. Address, p. 7. 8.

All that part of the paragraph enclosed in brackets, was omitted by B. W. L., and for very obvious reasons. The argument contained in it, is so clear and convincing, as to set refutation at defiance. Neither B. W. L., nor any of his valuable friends, have ventured, in manly investigation, to set aside the position here laid down. Instead of this, he took a fragment of the paragraph, shrunk behind "Barclay and all our worthy forefathers in the Truth," and thought himself secure by such a fortification.

It is true that Barclay and others advanced the notion, and tried to defend it, that the Holy Spirit is the Primary Rule of Faith and Practice. But when the pen of Brown

was applied to him, he started from the ground he had taken, and made the following remarkable declaration: "'For I was never so absurd as to call God, simply considered, or the Spirit of God in *abstracto* (not as imprinting truths to be believed and obeyed in men's hearts, not contrary, but *according* to Scripture, for he cannot contradict himself), the rule of Christians." Works, fol. 752.

Here, though he endeavours still to hold to the opinion, that the immediate dictation of the Spirit is *the Rule*, he totally abandons, as *absurd*, the notion that *God*, simply considered, or the *Spirt of God*, *abstractly*, could be "called the Rule of Christians." Every man of sense, and of impartiality, must see at once, that if Barclay did not acknowledge the Scriptures to be the Rule, nor give up the notion of an inward Rule, he certainly did fully concede that the *Holy Spirit* could not in any proper sense be denominated *a Rule*—and that it would be *absurd* so to denominate either God, or the Spirit of God, strictly speaking.

On the evening after the Meeting for Sufferings, in which the Beacon was taken up, I cited to B. W. Ladd the foregoing passage from Robert Barclay. To make such a reference to Barclay as he did in his Letter, with a knowledge of the declaration which Barclay made on the very point in question, was not *candid*, to say the least of it. And to garble the quotation from the Beacon, shows an obliquity of *intention*, altogether incompatible with the love of *Truth*.

His next quotation from the Beacon is equally garbled and unfair. As given by Isaac Crewdson, it is the last member of a syllogism.

The whole passage stands thus:

"There can be no higher rule, than that which is given by inspiration of God.

All scripture is given by inspiration of God. 2 Tim. 3, 16.

Therefore there can be no higher rule than the Holy Scriptures."

Now I ask if B. W. L. can be defended as having acted fairly, and with even the appearance of a desire for the Truth to be elicited and held, in making the garbled quotation which he did? Why not present the argument from which the conclusion was drawn? Plainly because it was calculated to carry conviction, and he was not able to refute it.

To show the retrograde movement which has taken place in the Society, in reference to the authority of Scripture, I will quote a few passages, from a Pamphlet, which was published by Orthodox Friends of Philadelphia, in 1824. The title page is as follows: "Letters and Observations relating to the Controversy respecting the Doctrines of Elias Hicks; Containing a Review of his Letter to Dr. N. Shoemaker. Third Edition Revised. Philadelphia: Printed for the Reader. 1824." It contains several Letters, with the names of the writers; but both the author and printer of the Pamphlet, have thought proper to conceal their names. Why was this caution in defending the cause of Christ? Plainly because it was published some years before the division of the Society, and our Philadelphia Friends, in coming forward *boldly* against errors, which they believed were calculated to sap the very Foundation of Christianity—could not obtain the sanction of the Meeting for Sufferings; and were afraid to be known as the authors of the pieces they published, lest the Hicksites should put in force against *them*, the same rule of Discipline which their intimate friends in this country have turned against *me*,—viz. for publishing without the revision of the Meeting for Sufferings.

Thus sheltered in concealment, with nothing to fear; and with minds stirred up to the importance of those doctrines which were then called in question, let us hear

what they said on the conclusive authority of Scripture. Whether the writer of the Pamphlet above mentioned was Thomas Evans or not, I shall leave for himself to determine. In the Review of E. Hicks' Letter to Dr. Nathan Shoemaker, the author says: "As Elias Hicks appeals to the Holy Scriptures as the authority for his opinions, and professes to predicate his arguments upon them we shall assume it as *granted* that their authority is *finally conclusive*." "We view them as the only legitimate test of our respective sentiments, and to be consistent with *his own practice*, he must concur with us in such judgment.—In the following pages, therefore, Scripture language must be the umpire between us." p. 43.

Here the authority of Scripture is declared to be *finally conclusive*—the only legetimate test of conflicting opinions—and Scripture language was to be the *umpire* between them. There was no idea held out that E. H. was at liberty to appeal to the *rule* in his own mind, nor to those writings of early Friends, which have since been held up as the depositories of the true meaning of Scripture. No, it was the *authority* of Scripture, and the *Language* of Scripture, that was to be finally conclusive.

But the writer of the Pamphlet says: "Our blessed Redeemer tells us himself, and there can be no *higher authority*," p. 44. Where does he tell us so? Plainly in the *Scriptures*. Wherein then does this passage fall short of the line, quoted with so much disapprobation from the Beacon? The sentiment was sound and satisfactory to the Orthodox in 1824. In the short space of eleven years it is regarded with *indignation*—an excitement is spread from London to Indiana, and private Letters and public documents are put in requisition, lest *the ancient principles* and doctrines of the Society, should sink into insignificance, by the full and free admission of the Holy Scriptures.

B. W. Ladd goes on to say: "Other parts of the work

are quite as objectionable, such as limiting the grace of God to the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, disparaging silent worship, &c." But he makes no quotations from the Beacon, in support of the statement. Those who would examine the subject for themselves, are referred to the "Beacon," the "Defence of the Beacon," &c.

"Hence" says he, "the late Yearly Meeting of London issued a most excellent Epistle," &c.

In that Epistle it is said: "Whilst thus alluding to our predecessors in religious profession, we would earnestly but affectionally recommend to our dear friends generally but especially to those in early life, the frequent and serious perusal of their writings; replete as they are with instructive evidence of the sufficiency of that foundation upon which it was their concern to build, and eminently calculated, as we believe they are, to impress the mind with a deep sense of the importance of the experimental work of religion on the heart."

Here we have an *earnest* recommendation of the writings of early Friends, without any limitation or exception. In a subsequent part of this work, I shall show some sentiments that were thus recommended to friends generally, but especially to those in early life. At present I need only to say that this Epistle, though addressed exclusively to the members of London Yearly Meeting, was taken up by Ohio Yearly Meeting, out of the usual order of proceeding, and not only thus adopted, but sent down to its individual members. But the General Epistle of 1836 which contains the best declaration of the authority of the Holy Scriptures, that the Society ever made—though according to the long established usage of the Society, addressed to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings of Friends in Great Britain, Ireland and Elsewhere, was not permitted by Ohio Yearly Meeting, to go to its subordinate Meetings, to which it was directed. But the former contained a strong and general recommendation

of the writings of early Friends, the latter, a declaration of the authority of Holy Scripture.

The allusion in the letter, to the *concern* of the Meeting for Sufferings, must appear in rather a ridiculous point of view, to impartial persons, who are acquainted with the facts of the case. A paper got up as this was—containing an exposition of terms so incompatible with every principle of sound criticism—setting forth sentiments so subversive of the doctrines of the Gospel, to be represented, in the peculiar phraseology of the Society, as arising from *deep concern*, cannot be a very prepossessing exhibition, to any but *Conservative Friends*.

But the Meeting for Sufferings thought it right to take notice of the Beacon, "and the dissemination of the *dangerous principles* advocated in it." Joseph John Gurney acknowledged the Beacon to be an able defence of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity; and the Yearly Meeting's committee, after months of investigation, abandoned the doctrinal objections to the work. Here then we have B. W. L. and the Meeting for Sufferings, aided by T. Evans, &c., considering the principles advocated in the Beacon as *dangerous*, but J. J. G. regarding the work as an able defence of fundamental doctrines, and the whole committee giving up doctrinal objections.

And now a very grave question must arise. Did J. J. G. and the others of the committee of London Yearly Meeting, make these consessions to a work that advocated dangerous principles? Or did the Meeting for Sufferings, and the friends of Ohio and Philadelphia, characterize an able defence of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, as advocating *dangerous principles?* These two great divisions of Conservatives, are here directly at issue.

But this not all. In the Monthly Meeting in Manchester, 9th mo. 15, 1836, Joseph John Gurney, on behalf of the Yearly Meeting's Committee, said: "It might be remembered that at the special Monthly Meeting held in

12th Month last, the Yearly Meeting's Committee had then stated that they did not feel called upon to recommend to the Monthly Meeting to take any proceedings in I. Crewdson's case with reference to the doctrinal question; he said *they were one with Isaac Crewdson in doctrine*," &c.

That there is much inconsistency in the proceedings of the Yearly Meeting's Committee, in justifying the *Doctrines* contained in the Beacon, and condemning the author, by a course of proceedings unknown to the Discipline, will readily be granted. But if the work contained *dangerous principles*, as B. W. Ladd says it did, then the whole committee of London Yearly Meeting must fall under the censure of holding those principles, for J. J. G. their organ, publicly stated that they were "one with Isaac Crewdson in doctrines." If, on the other hand, the doctrines contained in the Beacon are sound, then those who have charged it with containing "*dangerous principles*," and have made war upon both the work and its author, must be themselves unsound in doctrine, and unchristian in their practice.

But these two classes of Concervative Friends, are understood to be united, in the present course of measures going on in the Society. But what, it may be asked, can be the common bond of union between them? How can B. W. Ladd, T. Evans, &c. regarding the Beacon as an attack upon the fundamental doctrines of the Society—and as disseminating, and advocating dangerous principles, unite with Joseph John Gurney, Willian Forster and others, who are one with Isaac Crewdson in doctrine? Or how can the latter unite with the former, in carrying on a system of proscription and disownment, which they know is levelled at the doctrines which they hold themselves? However difficult it may be to answer these questions, one thing must be obvious—that there is an *understanding* among the parties, that *they* on either side,

shall not be made the subjects of proscription or disownment. Another fact cannot escape attention—that both sides have determined to sustain the writings of the early Friends, without correction or expurgation. And on this ground, there is no doctrine held by those called the Hicksites, none maintained by the Orthodox, (so called,) and conservative Friends, but may receive a ready defence. This is, in reality, the *sheet anchor* of the Society, in maintaining its *peculiar views*; the shelter for the individual members, who cannot "*endure* sound doctrine." Grant that the Early Friends were in error on *some* points, and that a Scriptural examination should be made—rejecting whatever will not abide that test; and all the Conservative Friends know full well, that the Society cannot stand on its present basis. And hence the efforts now making to unite all parties, to contend—not for the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles—but for the views of George Fox and Early Friends. Even that best of the documents of the Society—the declaration contained in the Epistle of London Yearly Meeting of 1836, relating to the authority of the Holy Scriptures, discovers a most intense solicitude on the part of the meeting, not to suffer the views of Early Friends to be called in question. Hence also the sentiment expressed in the letter before us, finds so ready an admission, so wide a range, and so many open advocates in the Society.

"One thing is certain, [says B. W. Ladd] that since his return from England, he has advocated sentiments somewhat in character with those of the Beacon—one I will mention, that he does not feel himself bound to respect the writings of our early Standard authors any further than they accord with his understanding of the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles, (this sentiment if adhered to will lead to a separation. All Christian sects claim to be founded upon the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles, and yet we know they are divided.) This confession he will readily make to you if candid."

The agreement between this sentiment, which he charges on me, and those of the Beacon, is plainly in practically maintaining the authority of the Holy Scriptures. It is one thing to admit their authority occasionally, in words; and another to carry it out in practice. It was not the question in the case before us, whether, The Rule of Faith, or Standard of doctrines should be an *outward* or an *inward* one. It was plainly whether our Early Standard Authors, or Christ and his Apostles, are to be regarded by us, as of the highest authority.

I do not know from what particular conversation of mine he drew the conclusion here stated. It might possibly have been from that which occurred in the interview, which he had with me in the 2nd month proceeding, in which he said: "That if I went beyond Early Friends I would be a Reformer and carry off a party." And on my replying that I should endeavour to keep very close to the Scriptures, he replied "No, the writings of our Early Friends are something that has risen up between us and the Scriptures, and we must not go beyond them." To this I objected: and he might very naturally have drawn the inference, that I did not hold myself bound, to respect the writings of our early Standard authors any further than they accorded with my understanding of the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles. In addition to this, he was present during a part of a conversation, which I had with Thomas Evans, at my own house, at the commencement of the Yearly Meeting, that year; in which I objected to *some parts* of the writings of the Early Friends; such as Penn's Sandy Foundation Shaken; and the same writer's *distinguishing* between Jesus of Nazareth and Christ —and saying—"*But that the outward person that suffered, was properly the Son of God, we utterly deny.*"

I recollect no conversation touching the subject of the authority of Friends' Writings, either with B. W. Ladd, or in his presence, after this with T. Evans. And I am

strongly inclined to think it was *this*, that was in his mind; for it was one that was attended with unusual excitement. The conversation was begun at my table, by a friend present, (D. U.) asking T. Evans; If we were bound by *all* that the early friends had said? He replied that we were bound by the *principles* which they held. And added with considerable warmth, "If you do not like these principles, *leave the Society*." I wished to know, what we were to understand by the *principles* they held? And I mentioned the Sandy Foundation, and other matters above mentioned, to know if these things were included among the *principles* by which we were bound? The offence taken at this was very strongly marked.

In the charge made in the letter, which is virtually for my not prefering the authority of Early Friends to that of Christ and his Apostles—the doctrine of the Inward Light, as the Primary Rule, is totally lost sight of, because it would have been impossible to have maintained the conclusive authority of an *inward Rule*, in a case in which the *understanding* was decided on the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles, and at the same time to have enforced the superior claims of the writings of Early Friends, against the *Letter of the Scriptures*, and the secret, and entire conviction of the mind.

B. W. Ladd's objection in the Letter under notice, is so stated, as to set the writings of "our Early Standard Authors," above the plain and undeniable doctrines of Christ and his Apostles, and also, not the *supposed*, but the *real* testimony of the Spirit. That there are passages in the writings of "the Standard Authors" alluded to, which are *contrary* to the Scriptures, must be admitted by every candid person, who is acquainted with the subject. Every sentiment for which E. Hicks was broadly charged with Infidelity, could be backed by quotation from Early Friends. And some passages could be found in their writings, which go far beyond the language, if not the secret

thoughts of E. H. What will the Friends think of George Fox's declaration in his Great Mystery, of *Equality with God?* Or of the soul being a part of God? Or his declaration in the Preface to his Battledore. "All language are to me no more than dust, who was before languages were?" What will they say of W. Penn's *utter denial* that the outward person that suffered was properly the Son of God? How will they reconcile J. Humphrey's shocking reflections on a "Human bodied Christ" —and his trying to make out that there is little difference between the *Scriptures* and the *Devil*, and finally that they *are* the Devil—and his grossly impious assertion, that "all things visible and invisible are *God in a Lump?*" Or will they stand by Barclay's notion of the *Vehiculum Dei*, or a pure, Spiritual invisible principle in man, in which God as Father Son and Spirit dwells? Will they contend for Samuel Fisher's pretended Revelation, "from out of a hole in the Gate house in Westminster, through an earthen Vessel there imprisoned," in which he makes out that *each good man* is one third annihilated and two thirds saved —and *each wicked individual*, to be one third annihilated, one third saved, and one third sent to perdition? Of these wild notions, I shall say something hereafter, to which I shall now refer the reader. Now I ask, can we doubt that the work of the Spirit, will deeply impress the minds of pious Christians, with the utter variance of these things, from the doctrines of Christ and his Apostles? If the direct witness of the Spirit is to be expected in *any* case whatever—if the understanding of man is ever opened by a divine illumination, to distinguish between Truth and Error, we have reason to expect it in such a case as this.—Yet the authority of Early Friends is set up, in opposition to common sense, to Christ and his Apostles, and to the Holy Spirit!

This Letter, it should be remembered, was written by the Clerk of the Yearly Meeting, and the Clerk of the

Yearly Meeting of Ministers and Elders—He has since retained those appointments, and been put on committees not only of those two meetings, but also on committees of the Quarterly Meeting, and the Quarterly Meeting of Ministers and Elders—He is the most influential member of the Meeting for Sufferings: and of the committee by which the Boarding School is governed. I make these remarks, not as reproachful to B. W. Ladd, for they show the *high* estimation in which he is held. But I do it as proof, that the Society is accountable for his known opinions. I do it also to show, the sentiments, out of which has arisen the strange excitement which has been raised in the Society.

In such a state of things, I ask if we are not imperiously called upon to show the errors in the writings of the Friends? However mortifying the exhibition may be, the members of the Society, and the Christian public should know, that there are things contained in the writings which are thus set up, as paramount to *all* authority, which conscience, common sense, and God himself forbid to be received as Truth. It should be known also, that by recent official proceedings, the maintenance of these things is made essential to the very existence of Quakerism. And further—that persons heretofore claiming to hold Evangelical Doctrines, and who were supposed to hold them, have lent themselves, or given their names, their influence and their active exertions, to carry out the sentiments of which I have been speaking; and to establish Quakerism on this false foundation.

I ask if the very spirit and influence of the Letters of Margaret Fell and others, are not brought out into full operation, in the sentiment advanced in this Letter? Is it, in fact, any thing short of the character of Diety ascribed to our Early Standard Authors, (of whom G. F. was chief) to set them above Christ and his Apostles, and all the Light which can be shed upon the understanding, to

fix in the heart the obligation of their doctrines? If this is not *Idolatry*, what is?

Let me appeal to the Society of Friends, to look to the position in which they are placed by their Leaders. What can you expect as the result of the principles now held and broadly advocated in the Society?

The allusion to the divisions which exist in Christendom, is altogether fallacious: and if carried out, must result in a total abandonment of the Scriptures and of the Truth itself. It will virtually proceed upon the assumption, that there is no truth in Christianity—that all is but a parcel of jarring and discordant systems, dependent on no principles of truth, and subject to no correction by any one common Standard. With what gratification will the *Infidel*, lay hold of the sentiments advanced by B. W. L. as congenial with his feelings, and exactly in accordance with his most common strain of declamation against the truth of revealed religion!

Different, far different from the views of B. W. L. are the sentiments of the pious, of *all denominations* with whom I have conversed. It is the almost universal sentiment with these, that there are, in all the various system of the different sects, some imperfections—some errors, which affect the unity, and mar the beauty of the Church of Christ. And it is a subject of frequent conversation, and of fervent prayer, that these discrepancies may be removed—that the Church may be sanctified and cleansed by the washing of water by the *Word*, and presented to Christ, a glorious Church, not having Spot or Wrinkle or any such thing. Even those *few*, (*and very few* of this discription I have found,) who do not appear to have discovered any defects in their own systems—take this ground: "We believe that our views are according to the testimony of the Scriptures—but we freely admit that we should search the Scriptures whether these thing are so. And if it

should be found, that in any thing we have deviated from the Word of God, it should by all means be corrected."

I do not recollect to have met with one single individual, out of the Society of Friends, for the last five years, that took more rigid sectarian grounds than this. So far as has fallen under my observation, it is in the Society of Friends, and in that Society alone, that the *peculiar views*, of a sect, are set up as *infallible*, and not subject to correction by the Word of God.

The reasons B. W. L. gives for writing, plainly show that his object was to prepossess the minds of my friends against me, when I was travelling as a minister with the usual credentials from my friends at home, and that without once speaking to me on the subject. In this proceedure he not only acted an unmanly part, which the rules of common decorum should have forbidden, but he placed himself in direct opposition to the official acts of the Society, and trampled its order under foot. This transaction has long been known to the active members of the Society here, and so likewise have been the sentiments already noticed; yet so far has he been, from being called to account, either for the breach of discipline, or for the unsoundness of his sentiments, that he has been put on almost every committee on which he could be appointed, and actually directs the course of the proceedings of the Society.

He goes on to express his *hearty wish* that the Meeting for Sufferings of Indiana, might take up the subject of the Beacon, which with all readiness they did; though Charles Osborn, William Hobbs, James White, and John Poole, acknowledged to me, that they "knew of but *the one* copy" of the work, which, from B. W. L.'s letter, had been sent to "dear Charles Osborn," for this very purpose.

The writer seems, in his zeal on the present occasion, to have lost a little of his usual keenness of perception. He uses the terms "*new notions*, or *Episcopalian doctrines*," in order to cast an odium upon the sentiments, which he

had been so earnest to condemn. What was the most prominent of these? The maintaining of the paramount authority of the Holy Scriptures. But is this a *new notion?* O yes, for it is an Episcopalian doctrine. But is not Episcopalianism older than Quakerism? If he would even apply the epithet Episcopalian* exclusively to the Church of England—did not that Church exist before George Fox was born? If the doctrines are Episcopalian, or identical with those of the Church of England, (for I presume that was the idea he intended to convey), how can they be new notions? Will he acknowledge that he intends any thing in accordance with George Fox's Preface to his Battledore, where he says: "All languages are to me no more than dust, *who was before languages were*" ? Here is an antiquity claimed, that renders the Scriptures themselves, in comparison *new*. And we are brought to this very point, for it is the divine authority of the Scriptures, which stands out in every page of the Bible, that is the *new notion*, against which this determined warfare is waged.

But he heartily wishes, "that these new notions, or Episcopalian doctrines, may find no more entertainment in our religious society now, than they did in its rise, or during the time of our faithful worthies, who by deep sufferings, purchased for us an high profession."

But what sort of *entertainment* had they at the time, and by the persons to whom this very solemn reference was made? Perhaps a single quotation from one of those "faithful worthies," may throw some light upon the subject.

"*When synods and councils, doting Doctors, infatuated Ghostly Fathers*, and such as admired their persons, as they did the persons of the apostles and primitive disciples, *began to bundle together what they could get of the writings*

*Episcopalian, strictly means a form of Church Government, recognizing Bishops.

of such as were cœlaneous with Christ and the Apostles, and, without any such order from either Christ or the Apostles, *to canonize what in their conceits* might be useful to others, as they had found them, tis like to themselves, into a Rule or Canon, and stated them into a common standard for all to have their sole recourse to, in soul-cases, and matters of christian faith and holy life, and to run a whoring after some remnants of writings that dropt from them in the whole world now called Christendom, instead of an apostolical spouse of Christ, as Christians were at first, presented a chaste Virgin to himself by them, there stands up an apostolical strumpet that had the Letter and good words written there," &c. Samuel Fisher, p. 494.

For further examples, I refer the reader to a subsequent part of this work, where I intend to give some quotations from the writings of early Friends, on several points of doctrine. But it is evident, if we recur to such examples now, for the entertainment to be given to the doctrine of the authority of the Holy Scriptures, the Society must be recognized as occupying a position, in which none who have any regard for the Word of God, and the Testimony of Jesus Christ, will be willing to be identified.

But these faithful worthies, by deep sufferings, purchased for us our high profession! No profession that has not Christ for its author, is worth holding, by whomsoever, or at whatever expense of sufferings it may have been purchased.

The thousands of self-devoted victims to the superstitions of the heathen world, so far from giving any value whatever to the error, increase the magnitude of the evil, and afford a powerful additional inducement to eradicate it altogether. And so, in regard to every shade of error, on subjects of religion. The *truth* or error of a doctrine, is that which demands our attention in the first place; and in deciding this question, the Scriptures must be admitted to be *finally conclusive*—the *only legitimate* test—

the *language* of Scripture must be the umpire. It is of importance, in such an examination, to be divested of prepossession. To call up the sympathies of our nature, by appeals to the deep sufferings of our "dear forefathers," is to throw dust into our own eyes, at the very moment when the clearest vision is demanded. No man who really wishes to find the truth, and to be delivered from every mistake into which our predecessors may, in human weakness, have fallen, will pursue such a course. But if he wishes to be bolstered up in the opinions of his fathers, "right or wrong"—if he wishes to stifle conviction, and keep his own understanding bound in chains—this is the most effectual course he could possibly pursue.

The subject, he says, "is one, from the accounts received from England, which has involved the sincere hearted there, in deep suffering, and if persisted in here, will inevitably lead to another separation, and to the *disownment* of some of our brightest, and most gifted instruments."

We have seen that the prominent objects in view of this writer, were, to deny the absolute and conclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures, in matters of Faith and practice—to establish the writings of early Friends as conclusive, even in cases in which they were believed not to be in accordance with the doctrines of Christ and his apostles; and in intimate connection with these premises, (as will be more fully shown), to establish as the doctrines of Quakerism, the very opinions for which Elias Hicks and his friends were condemned as Infidels. The letter now before us shows, that there was an understanding and concert, between the Conservatives in England, and in this country; and that if I and some others adhered to the offensive doctrines, *disownment*, and even *separation*, would be the consequence. He bestows on the advocates of the Bible, and of the doctrines contained in it, the high character of being "the brightest and most gifted

instruments" in the Society. At the same time, he discloses the determination which had already been formed, to sacrifice them on the *altar* of Quakerism. This is but an echo of the sentence pronounced in Thomas Evans's Letter to me, of 7 mo. 25th, preceding. It has now been a little less than two years since these letters were written, and the writers, and the Society, in conformity with those decisions, first secretly formed, have steadily pursued the course which had been marked out, as to the final results, till now, *I* am made the *first victim* selected for execution. And while I deplore the state of the Society which I have so long and so ardently loved, and feel with full sensibility, the wounds inflicted in the houses of my friends, I thank God that he has counted me worthy to suffer for the cause of our Holy Redeemer; and has enabled me to endure the utmost stretch of their power, without compromise of principle, and without flinching. And now I call upon my persecutors to come forward, and publicly defend the principles they have avowed, and the measures they have pursued, or make a formal recantation. Their silence in such a case will show, that while they are conscious of the badness of their cause, they have not sufficient candour to acknowledge the Truth, nor sufficient uprightness to do an act of simple justice, when they know they have committed injuries on personal character and personal feelings.

The reference to James Smith, shows how extensively private influence was exerted, to prepare the Society for action, on subjects, and on individuals, to carry out the designs of ruling members. James Smith is a member of Indiana Yearly Meeting, who had come to Mountpleasant, in company with a travelling minister. He had been made acquainted with "the state of things," and was relied on to carry out representations which could not easily be made in writing.

If James Smith had consented to be used as a tool for

such a purpose, which is strongly implied in the letter, it was very different from the estimate which I had made of his character.

The sending of the Beacon to "dear Charles Osborn," and the flattery that went along with it, to enlist *his* services, in carrying out the preconcerted plan of Philadelphia or English Conservatives, is only a small part of that ingeniously contrived machinery, which has so effectually moved a whole Society, by the hands of a *few* individuals.

CHAPTER II.

I HAVE been induced to give the narrative of my own case, with some minute details, not only because it is necessary as a history of events, but because, from the frequent changes which have been made in the mode of attack, and the charges brought against me, and the pains which have been taken to mislead the public mind, there is danger of losing sight of the true grounds of dissatisfaction. And I wish the reader to bear this remark in remembrance, as he passes along.

Benjamin W. Ladd's Letter, was shown to me by James Hunnicutt, immediately after he received it. He also kindly gave me a copy it.

On reaching Richmond, in Indiana, I was informed that other letters had been spread through the Society, in that quarter, in order to make an unfavourable impression on the minds of Friends against me; of which, both as to the cause, and the effect, I very soon had additional evidence.

This method of assassination of character, is disgraceful in the *world*,—but when practiced and countenanced by the ruling members of a religious body, is proof positive of deep *corruption*. Wrong practices, and false principles, often have an intimate connection; and in *all* cases, I believe it will be found, that where evil practices *prevail*, *sound* principles are not duly regarded, if believed at all. It is also a striking proof of the divine origin of *christianity*, that where its principles are sincerely held, there is a high standard raised for moral conduct. There is no toleration granted to any departure from *uprightness*, no countenance given to falsehood and deceit. But where unsound prin-

ciples are entertained, there may indeed be a *show* of morality, but its pretensions are false, and its standing altogether uncertain; and often, very often, the working out of evil practices, shows the badness of the foundation on which the building rests. Men do not gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles.

At the commencement of the Yearly Meeting in Indiana, Charles Osborn, William Hobbs, James White and John Pool, requested an interview with me. In that interview, Charles Osborn confessed that he had received letters from persons both in England and America, unfavourable to my religious reputation, and which he acknowledged had had an effect on *his* mind. But I could not induce him to state what were the things laid to my charge, nor who were the writers.

He had concieved a very strong dislike to Joseph John Gurney, and some other friends in England, on account of their views of certain doctrines, among which he mentioned *Justification* and the *Sabbath.* The first of these engaged his most particular attention. It so happened, that I had neither conversed with J. J. G. on this subject, nor recently read the chapter on it, in his Essays on Christianity. I was not therefore prepared to discuss J. J. G's. opinion on Justification, while C. O. expressed decided disapprobation of it. But though I declined, for obvious reasons, to take up the opinions of persons with which I was not well acquainted, I declared my own sentiments with all frankness and freedom. Justification was the absorbing subject, and while C. O. was totally unable, or entirely declined, to controvert the explanations which I gave of my own views, it was perfectly evident, that he was no better pleased with mine, than he was with J. J. Gurney's. The interview lasted, I think as much as four hours: and ended without satisfaction to either party.—They evidently did not unite with my views of Justifica-

tion: and I was grieved with their deficiency in sound doctrine, in Christian kindness, and fair dealing.

Through the whole course of the Yearly Meeting, the treatment I received was entirely different from any thing I had ever met with there before. On the evening before the last sitting of the Yearly Meeting, another conversation took place between myself, on the one part, and Charles Osborn and several other friends on the other. I again requested copies of the letters that he had received relating to me, for the purpose of calling the writers to an explanation. But he persisted in declining, either to furnish me with copies, or with information of the names of the writers, or the subjects on which they wrote.

The doctrine of Justification was again brought into view, and his dissatisfaction with me was more distinctly marked than before. After several other questions, he asked me, if I believed that *Justification* was the *consequence* of *Sanctification?* I told him I did not. Then said he, "We are at points." I replied "Be it so." He then asked again how I held Justification? I told him "By Faith." "Therefore being Justified by Faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." "To him give all the Prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."

He declined to support his own opinion by arguments, but manifested a deep and settled dissatisfaction with mine.

At the close of the Yearly Meeting, when the usual certificates were brought in, for those who were in attendance from other Yearly Meetings, expressive of satisfaction with their company, &c., my name was passed over in silence: which was the highest censure they could pass upon me, short of some measure that would have claimed the official notice of my friends at home. But this would have required investigation, which they did not intend.

Some pains were taken by individuals, to convey the idea that this negative censure was not passed upon me

in consequence of any thing I had said or done *there*, but on account of the Letters which had been written relating to me. But while it showed the extent of this vile system of defamation and detraction, and openly admitted that the Yearly Meeting in its official conduct, was weak enough to be influenced by such proceedings—the facts which I have stated are sufficient to prove, that the dissatisfaction *was* on account of the doctrines which I held, on points of fundamental importance.

Some time after my return home, I paid B. W. L. a visit, to expostulate with him on the unkind treatment I had received from him. But he gave no satisfaction. On returning home, I met with a letter from a friend in Cincinnati, mentioning the circulation of letters, to the injury of my reputation. I then wrote a short note to B. W. L. which I sent by B. Wright, an Elder of our Monthly Meeting, mentioning what I had heard, and calling upon him to retract what he had said to the injury of my reputation; or if he had any thing against me, to bring it forward, for investigation before the Elders or Overseers of the meeting to which I belonged. But he treated this reasonable request with contempt—spoke of it to B. Wright, as a *challenge*, and called *him* my *Second*.

In a day or two after, he called at my door, to propose to leave the subject to the Meeting for Sufferings, which he well knew was completely under his influence and direction. I told him that I admired, that, with his knowledge of the discipline, he should make such a proposition. He knew perfectly well, that the Meeting for Sufferings had nothing to do with treating with offenders: that he had violated the order of the discipline, and was liable to be treated with accordingly. "O yes" was his answer, "come and have us all taken under dealing." I told him I did not wish to prosecute any one. But I wished, if they had any thing against me, they would bring it forward in the regular order of the Discipline, and give me

an opportunity of meeting it, in a tangible form. He replied with great indignity, "Does thee think I will come over here, to be tried by old John Loyd and James Kinsey?"* I told him that I made no such proposition, I knew very well, that a complaint against *him* must be tried before the Overseers of his own meeting. But charges against *me*, should be brought forward before the officers of the Society *here*. And I again pressed him to retract his charges, or sustain them by an open and orderly proceeding. "What I have done" said he "I have done from *concern*, and I shall retract nothing."

This was near the end of the 11th month 1835. And I have noticed it here, that I might not break the connection of the parts of the story, relating to the Letters.

Soon after my return from Indiana, John Hall, an Elder of Short Creek Monthly Meeting, called on me, to express the wish he felt, that if I could be *easy* to keep silence, as to the ministry, I would do so. He professed to come on his own *concern*, though it was evident then, and has been more so since, that he had been put up by others to do it.

The Preparative, (or as it would be called in England, Monthly) Meeting of Ministers and Elders, occurred soon after. W. Flanner, whose residence was at Still Water, but who had been on a long visit to his children in this neighbourhood, attended. And after sitting in the meeting a while, he proposed that we should proceed to business, remarking that he expected to attend the Quarterly Meeting of ministers and Elders next day; as if to give us to understand, that he had nothing to say to us *then*, but that we might hear from him the next day. The clerk, of course, opened the meeting, and proceeded to read and answer the Queries as usual. When he came to the Query relating to the ministry, he formed an answer, low-

*These are two Elders of Short Creek Monthly Meeting.

er than usual. One of the Elders objected to this, John Hall supported the clerk, but after a free expressions of sentiment among the Elders, the answer was corrected, so as to convey no complaint in regard to the ministry.—When this was done, W. Flanner rose, and discharged upon the ministry of Short Creek Monthly Meeting, such a volley, as I had seldom witnessed before.

The evidence, I think is conclusive, that he expected the answer to be let down in that meeting, and that he intended to "hold up his fire" till next day, when the subject would be opened in a superior meeting. The plan however was defeated, and he had to take us there, or not at all.

When he had done, I rose, and adverted to the precepts of our blessed Lord, and the order prescribed in the discipline, for treating with those against whom offence may have been taken; and expressed an earnest wish, that the friend would pursue this christian course, with those with whom he was dissatisfied.

The next day he was silent—no measures were taken in the meeting, and all the leading conservatives appeared to be disconcerted.

I waited for W. F. to take the opportunity of a personal interview, which I had invited, but in vain. And after the Quarterly Meeting the next day, when I was just thinking of calling on him, I looked out of my window, and saw him preparing immediately to set out home. From that day to this, we have had no conversation on any religious subject.

A little previous to the next Quarterly Meeting, John Hall went over to Concord, another branch of the Monthly Meeting, and stopped the Elders at the close of a meeting, to inquire if they were not prepared to unite in the judgment, that I had lost my gift, and was only a Minister of the *Letter?* They answered in the negative, and advised him to go home and be quiet.

In the Preparative meeting of Minister and Elders, in the 2nd month he made another effort to let down the answer relating to the ministry; but the meeting overruled the proposition, and the answer went up clear.—The next day, when the answers from the subordinate meeting were received in the Quarterly Meeting of Ministers and Elders, John Hall rose, and objected to the answer from Short Creek, relating to the ministry. William Wood had great *sympathy* with the friend; and B. W. Ladd thought it was a *suffering case*, and that something must be done. A committee was accordingly appointed, and B. W. Ladd was one of that committee.

When a Minister becomes an offender, in ministry or general conduct, or otherwise, the discipline directs that he should first be treated with in private by the Elders. If not reclaimed, the case is to be reported to the Preparative Meeting of Ministers and Elders, which is to extend further labour. If the cause of uneasiness should not be removed, the case is to be sent to the Quarterly Meeting of the same class, and then, if necessary, laid before the Monthly Meeting for Discipline.

Instead of pursuing this course, in which the individual has an opportunity of meeting, at every stage of the business, a distinct charge, the unfair expedient was adopted, to get the Quarterly Meeting to act directly upon an individual, who had never had the advantage of private investigation, or even of meeting the charge in any tangible form. And not only so, but while the case is thrown into a superior meeting, without any thing to limit its action, the very persons who may be the secret prosecutors, and workers of the whole machinery, to crush an individual, may be made his judges, and carry on their own schemes of enmity, under the authority of superior meetings.

It is now well known, that these measures were intended to bear directly upon me. And the unfairness of the proceeding, must be obvious to every unbiased mind.

Joshua Lynch said, on his visit to this neighbourhood, a little before the Yearly Meeting in 1835, that neither I, nor several other ministers of Short Creek Monthly Meeting, could be allowed to travel. And alluding to the prevailing opinion, that we were in unity with the Monthly Meeting, he said that he should not be surprized if the Monthly Meeting, though the largest in the Yearly Meeting, should be *laid down*. Benjamin W. Ladd passed severe cersure on the Monthly Meeting, for setting me at liberty to travel, and said, that it had let down its *dignity* in doing so. To lay down so large a meeting, was thought to be a dangerous experiment. How then, was it to be brought under cantrol? The way was easy.

John Hall, proposed in the Quarterly Meeting, (the day after the Quarterly Meeting of Ministers and Elders,) the appointment of a committee, to assist the Monthly Meetings. I wished to know the object of this appointment. The Monthly Meetings had nothing to do, that required the assistance of the Quarter, and it seemed strange to appoint a committee, without any object. He was not allowed time to explain, if he had been prepared to do so, before W. Wood objected to any such explanation. Jacob Branson and B. W. Ladd joined in the objection, and the committee was appointed: and B. W. Ladd was one of them. This committee could attend the Monthly Meetings, and if any of the ministers had proposed a religious visit they had the power to prevent it.

An acknowledged minister of Short Creek Monthly Meeting had obtained a certificate to travel, a few months before, and being at a neighbouring Quarterly Meeting, she wished to have a meeting in a town just by. But B. W. Ladd and B. Hoyle, who were there, interfered, and put a negative upon it, and thus the meeting was prevented.

By the appointment of the two committees, the one by the Quarterly Meeting, the other by the Quarterly Meet-

ing of Ministers and Elders, an arrangement was made to cover the whole ground. B. W. Ladd and his associates, in the one committee, had complete control over the Monthly Meeting, in all its proceedings. No minister could be set at liberty to travel, nor any thing else be done by the meeting, without their consent. The other committee, having B. W. Ladd also in it, could, at its leisure, take hold of the ministers, on any vague, indefinite charges they pleased, and at their own discretion, hand them over to the care of the Monthly Meeting—in which case, whatever might be the judgment of the Monthly Meeting, they would cease to hold the station of ministers, till re-acknowledged as at first; which requires the concurrence of both the Preparative and Quarterly Meeting of Ministers and Elders.

The Conservatives were now quite at ease. The business was all arranged, and could be finished at their leisure.

In "The Friend," No. 22. vol. 9. there appeared an article, headed, "Standards of Doctrines," in which the writer endeavoured to prove that the Scriptures could not be the Standard of Doctrines—but that our own writings were to be regarded in that character. This was the open, avowed object of the article; and to this day, so far as I am informed, the sentiment stands uncorrected, as the sentiment of the conductors and supporters of that paper. "The Friend" is under the control of the leading members of the Society in Philadelphia. And we are very sure if the article was not in accordance with their views, it never would have been admitted into its pages. It is patronized by the most prominent members of the Society the world over. But have any of these, through its pages, ever corrected a sentiment thus openly advanced, and strenuously maintained in it? No, never. And I do say, that considering the manner in which that Periodical is conducted, its circulation, and high estimation in the

Society, the Society itself is answerable for articles which are inserted in it, and pass uncorrected there. If the Orthodox Friends made the other division of the Society answerable for the "Berean," published, as it was, without the name of the editor, how much more must *they* be answerable for the "Friend," conducted as it is, by the leading members of the Society in Philadelphia, and patronized by the ruling members of every Yearly Meeting in the world!

The project had been ingeniously contrived for William Evans and Thomas Evans, to take into their hands the whole mass of the writings of Early Friends, enormously voluminous as they are, and now insisted on in the Friend, and in various other ways, as the Standard of Doctrines for us, and by a monthly Periodical of 40 octavo pages each, under the title of the Friends' Library, to give, in a few years, all that is desirable of those writings, for general reading, and with their intrinsic value enhanced. That is, to take into their hands the Faith of the Society, and its Standard of Doctrines, and abridge or modify, and remould the whole, to suit their views, or the views of the revising committee that the Meeting for Sufferings there, appointed to assist them. And such has been the easy pliability of the Society, that some, if not all the Yearly Meetings, sanctioned the work before the first number was published; and the Monthly Meetings are converted into agents for it, to promote subscriptions and receive collections. "The Friend," No. 25. contains an article from a distant correspondent, representing that paper, and the proposed "Friends' Library," as "spiritual food," and proposing that poor farmers should "look over their farms, (no matter how small), and see if there is not some spot which they have not designed to cultivate, or from which they expect little benefit, and if they find such, consider whether they cannot employ some of their leisure time in cultivating some crop, from which they

may realize a sufficient sum to be set apart for this desirable purpose."

Whoever examines the course pursued by the Friend, and the measures and sentiments which have been brought out by the Conservative members in the several Yearly Meetings, will perceive a concert of purpose and of action, altogether remarkable.

While these public and private measures were going on, perceiving that my friends in many places were alienated from me, and that measures of an official character were determined on, to crush, or expel me from the Society, while every means was taken to deprive me of an opportunity of a fair investigation of the grounds of these proceedings, I made use of the opportunity that was in my hands, in the closing numbers of the 5th volume of the Repository, to publish my own Vindication. This, I thought, was imperiously demanded from me, in justice to myself, to my friends, and to the cause of Truth.

I thought it right to complain of the unfairness which had been practiced towards me; and to declare my belief on those points of Doctrine, on which I had reason to believe there had been dissatisfaction, or misrepresentation. This article gave additional dissatisfaction to the leading members of the Yearly Meeting. They were displeased with my views of the authority of the Holy Scriptures—with the doctrine of the Resurrection, and final Judgment,—of Faith in Christ, and Justification by Faith—and of Prayer. And the mild intimation which I gave of *some* imperfections, which are to be found in the writings of Early Friends, and the need of a discrimination between these imperfections and what they said well, gave great offence.

The attempts which have recently been made, officially to deny the opposition which was manifested to the above mentioned doctrines of Christianity, are very unworthy the character of upright men. And this departure from

uprightness and candour, is the more remarkable, as the facts to which it relates, were, many of them, of public notoriety: and *all* of them were extensively known.

In the mean time I concluded to return to England, not on a visit of ministry, but in the exercise of my own individual discretion; and with no other privileges than those which I could rightfully claim without any special credentials. It is quite common for members of the Society of Friends, like other people, to go about their own business, in their own way, depending on the common courtesy of mankind, for reasonable civilities wherever they go, without carrying in their pockets, formal certificates from their friends at home. They travel on business or for pleasure, where they please, and expect, like other people, to be treated with common civility where they go. Perfectly aware of these facts, I thought my common privileges were similar to those of others, and that I might enjoy them at my own discretion.

Up to that time, my name had never been on the records of any meeting as an offender. The committees had never informed me that *I* was an object of *their concern*. And six weeks, or thereabouts, elapsed, after their appointment, before I left home, on this second visit to England. I visited a number of my friends, to take leave of them, and *many* came to take leave of me. And not a single intimation was given by these committees, that I was, in any sense of the word, under *dealing*, or under their care or controul.

Scarcely had I left the American shores, when another clamour was raised, because I dared to leave home without a certificate.

Such an insult offered to the rights of men, deserves a severe rebuke; and will not fail to be regarded in a proper point of view, by those who are not under the influence of an overbearing party.

On reaching England, I still carried on my Repository, which had been resumed a few months before. Four numbers had been published in America, containing my Vindication, and several other articles.

In the Vindication, published in the 19th and 20th numbers of the Repository, I made the following remarks:

"I should think this declaration of the standard and test of doctrines sufficient, if I were not aware, that *some* will claim the *writings of some of our own members*, as something that more immediately concerns *us*, and therefore more fit to be taken as the *standard of our doctrines* than the *Scriptures*. I hope the number is not large, who would entertain this idea; but whether there are many or few, I shall dissent from it in decided terms. It is not my intention, directly, or indirectly, to countenance the idea, that the dispensation of grace, which was introduced by the Son of God, has undergone any change; or that any individuals whatever, have ever been able to set forth the doctrines to be believed, and the duties to be performed, so clearly as our Lord and his apostles did—or that any authority whatever is to be set up, in competition with the authority on which the Holy Scriptures rest,—which is the authority of God.

"In regard to the writings of our own members, I believe they contain many excellent sentiments, examples, and testimonies, in accordance with the Scriptures. But I believe they have some imperfections, which ought to be distinguished from what they said well. And this discrimination would be made, if, with minds enlightened by the Holy Spirit, we brought them to the test of Holy Scripture, which is a principle most distinctly laid down by Robert Barclay. * * *

"I know that there is *now* an *injudicious* turn, with *some*, (to make the best of it,) to press the indiscriminate commendation of those writings into a sort of test of sound

principles. Such an indiscretion must necessarily involve those who desire to hold the simple and plain doctrines of the Scriptures, in the painful alternative, of being regarded as apostates, or of entering into an investigation of a very mortifying character."

These mild exceptions to *some parts* of the writings of early Friends, were regarded as highly offensive; and gave rise to many severe reflections on me. The *investigation* which I predicted has been begun, but when it will end, no one, I conceive, is able at present to decide. Much of a mortifying character has already been elicited; much will be brought to light in the subsequent part of this work; and much will still be left behind for future examination.

But the touching of these things, has been like the application of *fire* to the Society. They should remember, however, that nothing short of *fire* will purge away the *dross*, the *tin*, and the reprobate silver. And my prayer to the Lord is, that he would carry on his work of refinement, till these things are thoroughly destroyed.

When I attended the Yearly Meeting in London, it was found that I was, by the constitution of that meeting, an official member of it, on an equal footing with the representatives themselves—being a correspondent for Ohio Yearly Meeting, and as such entered upon their records. An attempt was made *in the meeting*, to deny me the right of exercising the privileges of a minister, in the meetings for worship connected with the Yearly Meeting; but the subject was instantly rejected by the clerk of the Yearly Meeting. Thus was this matter disposed of, after it had been rung through the United States and Great Britain.

I pass over the various vexatious proceedings that were taken to harrass and discourage me in the preaching of the Gospel, even while the persons thus engaged, were compelled to confess the doctrines were sound. And yet

it was perfectly evident that the doctrines were the grounds of dissatisfaction.

At the same time, sentiments identical with those which characterized the doctrines of Elias Hicks, were promulgated with freedom, from the gallery and the press.

While in London, a friend purchased for me, at the office of the Yearly Meeting, in Devonshire Meeting House, a Tract, published by George Jones and others, of a Tract Association. The following is an advertisement, relating to this Tract Association:

"Manchester and Stockport Tract Depository; For the sale of Cheap Tracts, and other Publications: some explanatory of, And all in unison with the Principles of Christianity as held by the Society of Friends.

"The object I have in view is, not only to afford a greater facility for obtaining a variety of suitable Tracts for general distribution, tending to promote an increase of piety and virtue, but also to furnish Friends with an opportunity of supplying their own and Monthly Meetings' Libraries with tracts and books published by our Society; believing there is, at the present day, not only a wide field open for the distribution of Tracts generally, but that there exists a great desire in the minds of many to receive correct information relative to the *fundamental* doctrines of Friends; knowing they are much misrepresented by some in the present day.

"The publications of this Depository may be had on application to me; John Harrison, Printer, Manchester; or Isaac Patching, 86 Houndsditch, London. Ten per cent. discount upon the purchase of twenty shillings' worth and upwards at one time. Also considerable allowance to the Trade.

"N. B. When the discount to retailers is taken off the tracts, issued by this Depository, the price is not sufficient to pay the expenses and to allow of a suitable gratuitous

distsibution. A few friends have kindly subscribed towards promoting so desirable an object; but there are still many calls for supplies of this kind, in quarters where it is likely they might be useful. If such friends as are of ability, and who have not the opportunity of disposing of Tracts, incline to assist in promoting their circulation, donations or subscriptions from them will be carefully applied.

Stockport, 1835. GEORGE JONES."

This advertisement directly implicates the whole Society by freely using its name, and declaring the Tracts, explanatory of, or in unison with the principles of Christianity, *as held by the Society of Friends*—and as giving "*correct* information relative to the *Fundamental doctrines of Friends*." The object too, is declared to be, not only to circulate Tracts, thus characterized,—but to enable Friends to *furnish their own*, and MEETINGS' LIBRARIES, *with tracts and books* PUBLISHED BY OUR SOCIETY." And the Society, with these pretensions publicly advertised, and the Tracts circulated accordingly—suffers this responsibility, quietly to rest upon it, not only not disclaiming them,—but by suffering them to be Deposited for sale or distribution at its office, in the Yearly Meeting house.

The Tract to which I have alluded, as having procured through a friend, from Isaac Patching, a clerk in William Manley's office in Devonshire Meeting House, is called: "An Incitation to Professors seriously to consider, whether they or we fail in the true acknowledgment and owning of the Christ which died at Jerusalem. By Isaac Pennington."

In that Incitation the writer makes the following declarations:

"First, that we do really in our hearts own that Christ, who came in the fulness of time, in that prepared body,

to do the Father's will, (his coming into the world, doctrines, miracles, sufferings, death, resurrection, &c.), in plainness and simplicity of heart, according as it is expressed in the letter of the Scriptures.

"Secondly, that we own no other Christ than that; nor hold forth no other thing for Christ, but him who then appeared, and was made manifest in flesh." P. 2.

The reader is requested to notice here, that it is not the *man* that walked about the streets of Jesusalem, as Elias Hicks used to say—it it not the outward person that suffered, as William Penn said, that is acknowledged by Isaac Pennington, as the Christ. It is something that was *in* him. It should also be noticed that I. P. is positive, "that we *own no other Christ than that, nor hold forth no other* thing for Christ," &c.

To put the subject beyond all doubt, I. Pennington goes on to say:

"*Now the Scriptures do expressly distinguish between Christ and the garment which he wore: between him that came, and the body in which he came; between the substance which was vailed, and the vail which vailed it.* 'Lo! I come; a body hast thou prepared me.' *There is plainly he, and the body in which he came. There was the outward vessel and the inward life. This we certainly know, and can never call the bodily garment Christ, but that which appeared and dwelt in the body.* Now if ye indeed know the Christ of God, tell us plainly what that is which appeared in the body? Whether that was not the Christ before it took up the body, after it took up the body, and forever?" p. 4.

This very passage was one of the earliest selected from the writings of Primitive Friends, in support of the doctrines of Elias Hicks. It is found in the Berean vol. 2, p. 278, under date 3 mo. 7, 1826, and italicised nearly as George Jones has done it. The difference is, that G. J. has italicised 5½ lines more than the Berean did. He

makes the reference also, to I. Pennington vol. 3, p. 61, which is not done in the Tract.

Every body who knows any thing of the doctrines of Elias Hicks, knows perfectly well, that this notion of the character of Christ, lay at the very foundation of them.—It is not the question that I intend to investigate in this place, whether the quotation before us, conveys the real sentiments of Isaac Pennington or not. But that it conveys those of Elias Hicks not one of *his* friends and advocates will deny. And that George and Ann Jones, should select this passage, in a cheap Tract—and not only so, but have it printed in Italics, as correct information relative to the *Fundamental* doctrines of Friends, could not have happened from mere inadvertance.

And at a time when Isaac Crewdson was undergoing the most severe course of censure by the Society, both in England and America, for a work refuting the doctrines of Elias Hicks, not only did this Tract pass currently in the Society, but received all the evidences of approval, that the nature of the case would admit, short of the direct official action of meetings.

It is of some importance too, to remember, that Ann and George Jones were among those of the English Conservatives who were the most decidedly hostile to me.—They were among the leaders of the opposition to me—and of the intimate friends and correspondents to whom Thomas Evans refers in his letter to B. W. Ladd, which was copied and widely spread in the western country, and reviewed in the Repository, vol. 5, p. 398 to 412.

A number of other recent publications were put into active circulation, some letting down the conclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures—others taking that mystical view of the character of Christ, of his body and blood, which formed so prominent a part of what was called Hicksism. Among these were T. Thompson's Letter, Hancock's Defence, Truth Vindicated, several of George

Jones' Tracts, one by George Richardson, a Pamphlet by Samuel Rundle, &c. &c.

In the mean time the Yearly Meeting's Committee, were carrying on their operations against Isaac Crewdson, W. Boulton and some other friends, who were known to hold the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, Justification by Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, &c.

It is an important fact, that Joseph John Gurney, and several members of that committee, who had been understood to hold those doctrines as fully as Isaac Crewdson himself did, lent themselves to the views of the high conservatives, to crush a man who would not truckle, and make terms at the expense of a sacrifice of the most important principles.

The Beacon, being in its most prominent character, a refutation of the acknowledged doctrines of E. H. the suppression, or professed suppression of the work, which was what the committee required, must of necessity be understood to be a recantation, as to the most obvious character of the work. For his refusing to do this, the committee determined to silence I. Crewdson's ministry, at the same time declaring that they had *passed no judgment on his ministry.*

In a Society, acknowledging the high character of the ministry, as does the Society of Friends, and while Isaac Crewdson's ministry stood recognized as being under divine influence—to suppress that ministry, because he could not be induced to compromise the very first principles of the Gospel, to please those, who from the facts already disclosed, were radically unsound in those doctrines, is not only cause of astonishment but of deep regret.

In the progress of the dealings of the committee with Isaac Crewdson, in which those who had been prominent for holding Evangelical doctrines, were particularly careful to have it understood that that committee were fully *united*, some facts of a striking character, were brought

out. I shall mention but one, in addition to those already noticed.

Isaac Crewdson, had made some remarks on *Elias Hicks's* doctrine of the Inward Light, to which he applied the terms, "*this* delusive notion." In the second Edition of the work he made a Note, in which he says: "We declare the Hicksite theory of the inward light, to be a delusive notion: but we believe and maintian the Scripture doctrine of the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit, both in opening the heart, and in enlightening the understanding. See Acts xxi, 14 and 2 Tim. ii 7."

The committee object to the first remarks in the Beacon, and say: "The note given (in the 2nd edition) as an explanation of this passage, is liable to precisely the same objection, as the passage itself."

The Note, it will be observed, acknowledges a full belief in the *Scripture doctrine* of the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit, both in opening the heart, and in enlightening the understanding—and restricts the objection *entirely* to the *Hicksite theory* of the *inward light.* It is then beyond all contradiction, in defence of *the Hicksite theory of the inward light*, that the committee declared in the following decided language. "While the author of the Beacon here repeats his acknowledgment of the immediate operations of the Spirit, he denounces the [Hicksite] doctrine of the inward light, as the theory of an infidel.—*Now we regard the* [Hicksite] *doctrine of the 'inward light' as absolutely identical with the doctrine of the Spirit.* The heresy of Elias Hicks, consisted not in holding, or pretending to hold this precious part of divine truth, but in denying other parts of the great plan of redemption."—See defence of the Beacon p. 37, 38.

It has already been noticed that the committee, and especially those members of it, who were regarded as holding Evangelical doctrines, were careful to propagate the idea that they were *united* in their acts; and as they were not

only performed under the authority of the Yearly Meeting, but have been approved by that body since they were transacted, they must be regarded as the acts of the Society. In the above quotation, I have put in the word *Hicksite*, in brackets, because simple justice to Isaac Crewdson demands that it should be done. The committee knew, for they had it before their eyes, that Isaac Crewdson's objection was to the *Hicksite theory*, and to this alone; and that he expressly distinguished it from the Scripture doctrine of the Holy Spirit. They have come forward, not only with a direct vindication of that theory, thus distinguished from the Scripture doctrine of the Holy Spirit, but in defence of Elias Hicks, so far as *his doctrine* of the *inward light* is concerned. And they declare his theory of the *inward light*, to be "*absolutely identical with the doctrine of the Spirit.*"

They do indeed object, or leave an objection to be inferred, against E. H. for "*denying* other parts of the great plan of redemption." But this places his error on *negative*, and not on *positive* ground. It recognizes all that he *asserted* in reference to the *inward light*. If then E. H. had gone, no further than the affirmative part of his doctrines, he would have met the cordial concurrence of the committee.

Now the very *essence* of the error of E. H consisted in *his* doctrine of the *Inward Light*, because he held it to be, absolutely Christ. If this be granted, as to all the practical effects of the unsoundness, the *denial* of Jesus of Nazareth to be the Christ, need not have been made. The sum and substance of the heresy was stated in the doctrine of E. H. of the *inward light*: and its effects, in all probability, would have been more extensive if the negative part of the system, had not been formally expressed.

But such is the nature of the case, that it is utterly *imposible* to admit E. Hicks's theory of the inward light, (for that is the matter in hand) without a *virtual denial* of es-

sential "parts of the great plan of redemption." Let the reader take those parts of the sermons of E. H. in which he brings out his theory of the inward light, in the most explicit terms, both in his *positive* and *negative* assertions; let him take notice how he makes it out to be *Christ*, in the full sense of the term—and how he denies the man "that walked about the streets of Jerusalem," to be the Christ—let him then strike out of E. H's language, every plain and literal *denial* of the Lord Jesus, and ask himself if E. H's. theory of the *inward light as he actually held it*, is changed? No man of common sense, can, for a moment, suppose that any change whatever, in the theory, as it *was* held by him, would be made, by the omission, in words, of the denial of Jesus as the Christ. It was what was intended by the theory of the *inward light*—it was the point to which that theory was naturally carried out. And the plain, and formal defence of E. H. which is made by the committee, is a virtual admission of his whole error, in regard to the character of Christ and the means of Redemption.

We cannot excuse the committee on the plea of inadvertance on their part, or lack of ability. They had had the subject long under consideration: and some at least, of their number, were men by no means under mediocrity, in their talents or acquirements.

It will be seen however, in the progress of this work, that the defence which has been set up for the whole of the writings of Early Friends, in which the committee are involved, cannot be confined to the mere affirmative parts of the doctrines of E. H. They make as plain a denial of Jesus of Nazareth, and of the efficacy of his blood, as E. H. ever did. While these thing were going on, nearly thirty friends in England, including some of the most estimable ministers there, who unflinchingly preached the doctrine of Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and Justification by Faith—were more or less annoyed, and subjected to difficulty by the Conservatives.

The most common mode of procedure was, at least it was so in my case, to avoid discussions of doctrines; and to rest the objection to the ministry of the person, on the pretended lack of *life*. As the preaching of the Apostles, was in that day, to some, the sovour of death unto death—as Paul expressly declared that the time would come, when they would not endure sound doctrine—so it was at the time of which I am speaking. It was acknowledged to be sound doctrine, but it could not be borne, and every means almost that was possible, were resorted to, in ORDER TO STOP IT.

After I had spoken at some length on Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, at a large meeting at Newington, on a first day morning, an individual in the youth's gallery made a vehement objection—that they had heard much of an outward Christ—but nothing of the Christ within, the Hope of glory. Some time after this, the meeting was broken up in a disorderly manner, by W. Allen, who, with Barnard Dickenson, William Richardson and several other prominent members, rudely stopped me as I was coming down out of the gallery, and upbraided me with *imposition*, "*great darkness*," &c. &c. in the face of a large company of strangers; though I requested if they had any thing to say to me, they would take another opportunity, when I could have some of my friends with me. But this reasonable privilege was refused. In all my intercourse with the world, I never met with such treatment before.

It was then and there, that W. Allen said that he was informed that my friends were very uneasy with me at home, and that a committee of the Quarterly Meeting was appointed to have the care of the Monthly Meeting of which I was a member; but he would not inform me, from whom he received that information.

That he had been informed from America, that the committee of Short Creek Quarterly Meeting, was appointed on my account, rests on his testimony: and I have

no doubt it was true. But when I called for the reasons for appointing the committee, in the meeting itself, the author, and advocates of the measure steadfastly refused to give any reasons at all. But it was now brought to bear upon me in a foreign country, plainly for preaching the only hope of salvation.

Two official deputations waited upon me in London, during the Yearly Meeting; the first of which grew out of the meeting of which I have just spoken. But in both cases they were driven to confess that the doctrines I preached were sound. Besides these, Eight of the most prominent Ministers and Elders, after the Yearly Meeting, called upon me to discourage me from preaching, while they all, on being questioned, acknowledged that my doctrines were sound; and on being pressed by me on that point, they acknowledged I had not delivered a sentence against which an objection could be made. The prevailing theme of my ministry, like that of the Apostle Paul, was repentance toward God, and Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. But it was unpalatable, and every means in their power was taken to discourage and stop me.

The Apostle rejoiced that Christ was preached, whether sincerely or not. But different, far different were the feelings of those that waited on me, though not one of them called in question my sincerity, or the soundness of my ministry.

After the Yearly Meeting in London, I passed through Manchester, where I preached Christ unto them, and remission of sins through faith in his name.

Here too it was thought to be intolerable, and they held a consultation (as I was informed,) to stop my preaching. But their counsel was thrown into confusion, and the plan failed.

At Kendal the clerk of the Quarterly Meeting—Samuel Marshall, paid me a visit, requesting me to be silent as a minister. He made a direct objection to my preach-

ing Faith in Christ. In the conversation, he unhesitatingly declared his approval of Penn's Sandy Foundation Shaken.

Thus it was, that I was prosecuted through the whole length of the Society, from Indiana in the west, to London in the east. Private detraction, and defamatory letters, were succeeded by intrigue and management, to bring the power of the Society to bear upon me, in a way wholly incompatible with the prescriptions of the Discipline.—And the ruling Ministers and Elders of the Society, gave themselves up to the impulse of their feelings, in the prosecution of measures, which all the rules of common decency forbid.—And this determined hostility, was plainly because I held, and uncompromisingly preached, the conclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures, and according to their clear testimony, I endeavoured to call my hearers to a deep consideration of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and testified that God commandeth all every where to repent, because he both appointed a day in which he will Judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead—that we ought to *repent* and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance, laying hold of the offers of eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord—To him give all the Prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins.—The Justification of the transgressor, however penitent he may be, is only through Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, who died a sacrifice for our sins. The condemnation for the sins that are past, must be removed by the efficacy of that one offering, applied to our hearts by Faith, which Faith is one of the fruits of the Spirit. In intimate connection with these views, I insisted on the duty of Prayer, as that duty is clearly set forth in the Holy Scriptures.—Here was the ground of offence, and the more clearly I explained my-

self, the more determined and violent the persecution became.

My Vindication was printed in the 1st month, 1836, but not *generally* distributed to subscribers till the 2nd mo. This was like adding fuel to the fire. The leading members here, who had been dissatisfied with the doctrines I maintained, were now *more* dissatisfied—because they saw them so clearly stated, and so fully sustained.

The Vindication Reviewed, was published on the 15th of 5th month following.

When the Society had been prepared for it, by private management, the Meeting for Sufferings of Ohio took up the case, thus entirely inverting the order prescribed in the Discipline, which directs, that individuals who give occasion for uneasiness, should be first treated with in private —that the Overseers should then take charge of the case, extending further care, in private. If this should prove ineffectual, report is to be made to the Preparative Meeting. This latter meeting is to appoint a committee to endeavour to convince the offender of the impropriety of his conduct. It being understood in all cases, that the offence charged upon the individual, should be disownable by the Discipline. There must be the violation of a law—for where no Law is there is no transgression.

It is by such a process as I have discribed, that those who transgress the Rules of the Discipline, and violate the terms of membership, are to be disowned.

But in order to secure the rights of individuals, there is the privilege of *appeal* from the judgment of the Monthly, to the Quarterly Meeting—and from this to the Yearly Meeting. And in order to maintain that safeguard to the rights of members, the superior meetings must keep clear of any action in the case, so as not to have prejudged it, while in the meeting below.

But in all these cases, the preliminary steps of private dealing with me, as the Discipline directs, were wholly

disregarded—a system of defamation and detraction was let loose upon me, from one end of the Society to the other—the rules of common civility as well as of the Discipline, were trampled under foot, even in the place for the worship of God. Meetings both for Discipline, and those of Ministers and Elders, stooped to the most unworthy artifices of intrigue and duplicity, to effect unworthy objects. And now when the way was fully prepared for it, the Meeting for Sufferings—which like an executive branch of government, represented the Yearly Meeting, determined to pass a censure upon me, that should not only result in my disownment by the Monthly Meeting—but destroy my religious character, throughout the whole Society.

CHAPTER III.

It was in the beginning of the 9th month, that the Meeting for Sufferings entered upon the measure of issuing a document against me. The whole machinery which had been contrived to crush me, had failed to execute the intended purpose, as soon as had been desired. And though I was in a foreign country, I still preached the same doctrines for which I had been proscribed—and all the difficulties which had been thrown in the way by open enemies, and false friends—all the complaints about the lack of life, and the burden of the doctrines I preached—and the correspondence between the conservatives in this country and that—still I had the privilege of attending meetings as they came in course—and of speaking in them when I believed myself called to do so, by the Head of the church. This was too much to be borne, and the Meeting for Sufferings arose, in all its might, to accomplish the work at one blow—and that leveled against me in my absence.

It was at the commencement of the Yearly Meeting, when all the Ministers, as well as the members of the Meeting for Sufferings, had an opportunity of attending. Influential persons were also here from the Yearly Meetings of New England, Philadelphia, N. Carolina, and Indiana. Among these were William Evans, the Senior Editor of the Friends' Library, Thomas Kite, and Jeremiah Hubbard.

The Meeting for Sufferings, led on by B. W. Ladd, B. Hoyle, &c. &c., first objected to my publishing the *Vindication*, without the consent of that Meeting. But it was replied that the article alluded to, was published before

I left this country for England. This suggestion, if I am rightly informed, was made by J. Hubbard. It was also mentioned, that in regard to the matter of *publishing*, the meeting itself had set me at liberty, and had never recalled that liberty.

This of course presented an obstacle to the plan of procedure. The Vindication Reviewed was then taken up, and a number of charges were founded on it: some affecting my moral character, some addressed to the prejudices already excited against me, but in relation to which there was no rule of discipline at all—and some having reference to the discipline, in regard to publications, which they, themselves, in their official character, and which all the leading members in their individual capacities, had virtually laid aside. The meeting was distinctly informed at the time, that the statements which it made could not be sustained. But they were determined to go on. It was carried through the Meeting for Sufferings, and read and adopted in the Yearly Meeting. John Howard, an acknowledged minister, who had personal knowledge of some of the facts, to which the document related, objected to it in the meeting. This was made a grave offence against him, by B. W. Ladd, in a committee of the Yearly Meeting of ministers and elders, and brought forward to prove that John Howard stood opposed to the *body of Society*. Thus even the private rights of members, to express their sentiments on subjects of importance, when brought before meetings, were violated or trampled under foot, the simple exercise of these rights being made the ground of censure, in a committee of ministers and elders.

I ask, Where, in civil or religious society, can such an example of high-handed misrule be found?

Thus while I was absent in a foreign country—without the least notice of an intended prosecution against me, was this document carried through the highest meetings of the Society here, although testimony which would have

been taken in any court of Law, in any country, was offered at the time, in opposition to some of the most material statements which that document contained.

The order prescribed in the Discipline for treating with offenders was completely *inverted.* Instead of private labour, and fair investigation before the overseers, in which the accused party might have an opportunity of meeting his accusers to the face—the Yearly Meeting itself passes judgment against him—and sends that judgment down to the Monthly Meeting for execution. Thus every rule of right was violated, in the first place—rules which even Pagan Rome considered most sacred—and every hope was cut off, of either justice by the Monthly Meeting, or justice by an appeal to the Quarterly or Yearly Meeting.

And not only so: the document, directly affecting my moral character, in charging me with making statements "disingenuous and untrue," was directed to be sent—not only to Short Creek Monthly Meeting, for its action in my disownment—simple execution of me would not do.—In days of darkness and barbarism, a spirit of vengeance was sometimes indulged, which could not be satisfied with simply putting a man to death. His mutilated mortal remains must be *exhibited* in the most public manner possible. Whether it was a shoot from the same stock or not, I leave; but the Meeting for Sufferings, at B. W. Ladd's recommendation, determined to send the document against me, to all the other meetings for Sufferings—not for investigation, but for advertisement and record.—The usage of the Society, in the correspondence of those bodies, would make what passed between them matters of record—and also bring it before the respective Yearly Meetings—not, as already observed, for inquiry—but as matters settled in the wisdom and authority of Truth.

It is to the credit of the Society in other places, and I gladly avail myself of the opportunity to state the fact,

that in some, at least, of the meetings for sufferings, I hear it was received with evidences of disapprobation. My information may be defective; but I understand that the meeting for Sufferings of Indiana, merely minuted that a document was received—without stating its object. The meeting for Sufferings of Virginia, received it with decided disapprobation. The meeting in New York neither took it upon record, nor made any minute of its reception, and let it fall *dead* in the hands of the clerk. Up to the last accounts from London, it had not made its appearance in the meeting for Sufferings there. From Philadelphia, New England, Baltimore, North Carolina, and Ireland, I have not heard. In the first-mentioned place, I have no doubt it was cordially received.

When it had passed the Yearly Meeting here, my children applied to Benjamin Hoyle, Clerk of the Meeting for Sufferings, and to B. W. Ladd, Clerk of the Yearly Meeting, for a copy of it; to give *me* information of what had passed against me, and to enable *them* to defend my reputation, in my absence; but they were coldly, and contemptuously refused. After I returned home, I made a written demand on the meeting itself, but it was totally disregarded, and neither was the document furnished, nor any message sent by that body. Secure in the possession of power, they sat at their ease, and looked with contempt on the object of their persecution.

It may not be improper here to remark, that some time after the Yearly Meeting in London, (the committees, and other Conservatives in this country, having held no communication with me), apprehending that I *might* possibly remain in England till the Spring—I wished to show all reasonable respect to the constituted authorities of the Society there. When I went over, it was with some expectation that I might return in the 7th or 8th month. The common privileges, and common responsibilities in the Society, which attach to a member known to be such,

was all that I expected, and all that was necessary for the short time, to which I supposed my visit might possibly be contracted. In addition to this, the appointment I held as a Correspondent, gave me privileges in the Yearly Meeting, on an equal footing with the Representatives themselves. But now, when it seemed not unlikely, that I should remain there some time longer, I determined to request a Certificate for a temporary residence.

I well knew that according to the discipline, this request would bring objections *here* to a point—that if the dissatisfied members, were disposed to maintain their dissatisfaction, they must reduce it to a distinct form, and send the complaint against me, to the meeting where I was residing—that I might be treated with—the monthly meeting *here* retaining the power of decision in the case.

The request for a certificate was accordingly made, but it did not reach the friends here, till after the Yearly Meeting. A committee was accordingly appointed to make the necessary inquiry, whether one could be granted or not.

Before I had heard from America, as to the proceedings that were going on, I became impressed with the necessity of returning home. I had maintained the ground successfully there; and the opposition stood at bay. I believed the time had come, for me, as soon as possible, to return home, and meet the preparations which, I was persuaded, were making for a formidable attack upon me here. This impression rested with increasing weight upon me; till at length I formed the determination to return, just about the time that the Meeting for Sufferings was concocting its measures against me.

I mention the latter fact, merely as a singular coincidence of circumstances.

It appears to have been the intention of my enemies, to disown me *here*, before I returned, if not before I should receive any official notice of the charges brought against

me. But from the application for a certificate, and the novelty of the course pursued by the Meeting for Sufferings, some doubts had arisen as to the mode to be adopted, and thus some delay took place. The document had come down to the Preparative Meeting, and there I found it, when I reached home in the 11th month.

It is proper also to remark, that every meeting, both of ordinary members and of Ministers and Elders, from the Yearly, down to the Monthly Meeting, had appointed Committees to assist the Meetings below. The whole powers of the Society were mustered and arranged for the most decisive and efficient action. These combined committees attended even the Preparative Meeting, and directed the Overseers what to do. B. W. Ladd was put on the committee of every meeting of which he was a member. He was the *nucleus* upon which they were all formed—he was the moving power, which gave action to the whole system. In Short Creek Monthly Meeting, he scouted the idea of *investigation* of the charges brought by the Meeting for Sufferings. The doings of that body, were not then to be called in question.

But when I returned home, they knew that I would insist upon investigation, and that they could not, now that I was on the spot and demanded a hearing, carry on even the *forms* of disownment, without it. They knew that their document, was *hollow* in its pretensions; that it could not stand the test; and that accumulated disgrace must fall upon its authors; not only for the palpable mis-statements which it contained—but for the conviction of the authors of it, of being guilty of those very things which, to cast a censure upon me, they had pronounced a reproach to the Society.

B. W. Ladd and his associates, under the authority, some or other of them, of the Yearly, Quarterly, and Monthly Meeting, attended the Preparative Meeting in the 12th month, the first which occurred after my return.

Enoch Harris, one of the Overseers, had made out a complaint, founded on the document, which, however, he had not presented to me, nor did I know that such a thing was to be offered to the Preparative Meeting. This, B. W. Ladd and the Committees, totally rejected. The document was declared not to be a *charge*, nor so intended by the Meeting for Sufferings; and the Paper prepared by E. H., embracing the charges contained in it, was thrown out. And B. W. L. went to the Clerk's Table, and drew up a *new* charge—merely for publishing the Vindication Reviewed, without the consent of the Meeting for Sufferings, asserting that it had caused disunity and discord.

This was to be no act of the Meeting then. No—it was to be understood as originating, some time after, with the Overseers, and as having been kept on that ground of private dealing which the Discipline directs, though transacted in the face of the Preparative Meeting; and the *authority* of the Committees was held over the Overseers, to carry this contemptible piece of mummery into effect.

They had determined that they would never meet me in a fair investigation of the things contained in that extraordinary document;—and thus, after all the combinations to get it up, and all the formidable display of it before the world, they now threw it away with their own hands, rather than face me with it.

After this exhibition of unfair dealings, as I had been publicly accused, condemned, and held up to the world, both as to my religious and moral character, I determined to meet the charges against me, in print, as the only mode of defence now left me. I accordingly published the "Refutation." As soon as it was out, B. W. Ladd called on me, to get one of them, which I readily gave him. I also presented copies to several other persons concerned, and sent one to each of the Meetings for Sufferings. I

likewise sent one to Benjamin Hoyle, Clerk of the Meeting for Sufferings, to be preserved among its Papers—accompanying the Pamphlet with a note, explaining the object I had in view, and telling him, that I wished the Meeting to know, that if it was not satisfied with the statements I had made, I was willing to meet, either a committee of that body, or the whole of it together, in a free, open, and friendly discussion of the subject. In like manner, I also wished the individuals whose names I had used, to know, that if they thought I had not done them justice, I was willing to meet any, or all of them, in setting the matter right. I wished to maintain nothing but the truth, and I invited investigation, and earnestly wished that good feeling might be preserved.

The Clerk happening not to attend, the letter was presented to the meeting. Dr. Parker, John Street, and David Fawcett, were directed to examine it; and they took B. W. Ladd along with them. On their return, they informed the Meeting, that the letter did not require its notice.* Thus both the Meeting itself, and the indi-

---

* A curious circumstance occurred at this Meeting. While the four persons named were out, examining my letter to the Clerk, W. Wood opened a "concern," that he had. To make a short story of it, Joshua Shinn, a member, had concluded to reprint the Sermons of Wm. Penn, &c. And W. Wood thought, to reprint *sermons*, for sale, was making merchandize of Friends' sermons, and a violation of our Testimony against a hireling ministry. When B. W. L., and the others, came in, it was proposed that W. Wood's *concern* should be opened again.

Dr. Parker thought that as the individual had paid the printer, he might reasonably sell the books. But he thought it not consistent to have them reprinted without the consent of some revising body. He did not seem to have thought of the fact, that they were published in the time of early Friends, and never called in question by them. Nor did the idea appear to have occurred, that those sermons were professed to be delivered under the immediate motion of the Spirit. And if that profession was true, *revision* was *preposterous.*

B. W. Ladd thought the reprinting of such things was *by no means proper*, however excellent they might have been at the time. Indeed he had thought it might be compared to the manna that was

viduals whose names I have used in the Refutation, have had as full an invitation to meet me, if they were dissatisfied, as I could give, or they desire. And I do insist, that a total failure on their part, both as respects the meetings and the persons immediately concerned, to meet the statements contained in the Refutation, is a virtual, but full admission of its correctness. But they have not met it, either publicly or privately.

---

gathered yesterday. By being kept beyond the time, it bred worms, and stank.

Now, whether these sage reflections had any intended allusion to the old papers of George Fox, contained in the Appeal, which had then recently been published in this country, I shall not determine. But if the very sermons of our Early Friends, are such as to *breed worms* and *stink*, in the estimation of one of their most zealous advocates, the members at large ought to have the information.

CHAPTER IV.

While the Conservatives in England, had been completely beaten off from the ground of the doctrines I preached, and from the cavilling objections to my being there without a certificate, I had been painfully struggling with an apprehension of duty, to prove, by evidence that could not be resisted by reasonable men, that George Fox was certainly mistaken in *some* of his claims to extraordinary revelation. On subjects of Christian doctrine, continually rising in the Society, instead of a simple recurrence to the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, the views of George Fox, and of early Friends, were regarded as conclusive. This ground was taken by the most prominent members in England. "The Friend," had come forward boldly in making the writings of Friends, *the Standard* of doctrine for us. Thomas Evans, in his letter to me, had rejected all idea of making any reformation in those writings—and B. W. Ladd, in his letter to J. H. and D. B., had made a high charge against me, that I did not hold myself bound to respect the writings of our early standard authors, any further than they accorded with my understanding of the doctrines of Christ and his apostles. And in his interview with me, in the 2nd mo. 1835, he said that if I went beyond early Friends, I would be a Reformer, and carry off a party. And on my saying that I intended to keep very close to the Scriptures, he replied, No—the writings of our early Friends are something that has risen up between us and the Scriptures, and we must not go beyond them. I could recite much of a similar character, operating in

various ways, to require some remedy for so fatal an error, as to take the views of George Fox as infallibly right, and not subject to correction by the Scriptures themselves.

The Manuscript Journal of George Fox, had fallen into my hands; and in that MS. there were papers, plainly intended by him for publication, which prove to every dispassionate person, that he, and some of his most intimate and most esteemed friends, were, at *some times*, and on *some points*, under a most extraordinary infatuation. The evidence to the point, for the establishment of which the Society was so deeply suffering, was clear, beyond all rational contradiction. I believe there was a hand of Providence in putting these papers in my possession, and I deeply felt the responsibility which rested upon me, in regard to them. I saw that the direct testimony of the Holy Scriptures was laid waste, by a mistaken estimate of the claims of George Fox, to extraordinary revelations; and it seemed that now, in a most peculiar state of things, we might almost say, a voice from his grave, admonished the Society of its delusion and of its danger. I felt that it rested upon *me*, to make this important disclosure to the Society, authenticated as the facts were, in the hand writing of George Fox, and arranged by him for publication.

The thought of the work, however, was painful, from the mortifying character of the facts to be disclosed. I yielded, at length, to the impressions of duty, and prepared the Appeal, though I had not time to have it carried through the press. This task was undertaken by Robert Benson, who prefixed an Advertisement.

I chose to have the Appeal published *there*, because the Papers were all there, except one of the Letters, which I have in my possession.

While this work was in progress, another important event took place.

It was on the 15th of the 9th month 1836, that I was baptized by John Pye Smith, at his own house, at Homerton, near London. My investigations of the subject had commenced about three years before. Those examinations had been carried on, in regard to the primary question, about one year, when I fully gave up my former arguments, and those of the Friends, for the *disuse* of water baptism. But difficulties attended my mind, in regard to the adoption of the apostolic *practice*. These difficulties were not removed, till a short time before I was baptized. For as I had long been convinced of the doctrine in the abstract, and had often fervently prayed, that I might be enabled to see with clearness the path of practical obedience, when the main difficulty was removed, I felt it my duty to press forward.

I had not made baptism a subject of preaching; nor indeed had I discussed the doctrine in conversation, except a very few times, when it was forced upon me. For I could not see the propriety of urging it on the attention of others, till I had given evidence of the sincerity of my own convictions.

Baptism, then, like the Appeal, is an offence of recent date. They have both transpired since the document was written; and even the 23rd No. of the Repository was published full three years and a half, after I had been denounced, as doing more mischief than Elias Hicks had ever done in the same length of time.

I state these facts to show, that the charges which have been taken up for the purpose of placing official censure upon me, have all departed from the original ground of dissatisfaction.

In a few days after I was baptized, I received a very friendly letter from Samuel Gurney, inquiring if the report which he had heard was true? I immediately replied—informing him that it was. I have never supposed

that S. G. intended any thing more than a perfectly friendly inquiry. I think he was drawn in by others to become a party to transactions, of which he had no intention in the beginning.

In the mean time, I took the earliest opportunity, to let my friends at home know what had taken place. One of the letters that I wrote by the very first packet, by which I could write to America, was to the Clerk of the Monthly Meeting, authorizing and requesting him, (if he thought proper to do so), to let the Monthly Meeting know the step I had taken—not as the acknowledgment of an offence, but as an act of respect to my friends at home, and to open the way for inquiry and full satisfaction, in regard to what I had done. I also wrote, as soon as possible, "A Letter of Reasons," &c., addressed to the Society of Friends, which I printed in England.

Samuel Gurney showed my letter to him, to Josiah Forster and George Stacy. And they concluded to write me a joint letter on the subject. To that letter I immediately replied, asking them some simple and plain questions, which brought the recent declaration of the London Yearly Meeting, in which they had had an immediate agency, directly to bear on the subject of our correspondence. My object was, to bring them to a scriptural discussion of the subject, rather than to appeal to the views of Friends, as conclusive in the case. They let me know, in their letter, that they thought it right to inform my friendsat home. In my reply, I informed them that *I* had done this myself already.

Instead of replying to my letter, or letting it drop as a correspondence which they were unable or unwilling to maintain, they threw the subject into the Morning Meeting, for that body to take it up, as a formal complaint against me, to fix a principle for the action of the Society, and send it over to the Ministers and Elders of Short Creek Monthly Meeting.

Such a document was issued; a copy was sent to Dr. Parker and B. W. Ladd, and another to me, together with a letter from J. Forster, the clerk; informing me that he had written to Samuel Parsons and Jonathan Evans, on the subject. In that letter he told me that they declined controversy—that he was unfit for it, &c., and recommended me to the green pastures and still waters of life.

Against all these proceedings from the beginning to end, I thought I had abundant reason to complain.

In the first place, I thought it was a violation of the rules of propriety, to open a private, and, as I supposed, friendly correspondence, and failing to sustain their views, to throw it into an official channel, and bring the whole weight and power of the Society to bear upon me as an offender. And this ground of complaint on my part, was increased by the fact, that there was no rule of discipline on the subject, and the Morning Meeting was acting extra-judicially in the case. I complained too, that J. Forster should, in addition to all the rest, busy himself in sending the case to the *correspondents* of two other Yearly Meetings. And then to finish off the business, in which he had been so *active*, and that worse than gratuitously too—when he felt, and virtually acknowledged, that he was not able to sustain the position he had taken, in regard to the subject of baptism—after he had brought all the powers of the Society to bear upon me—with all the coldness which could well be imagined, he recommended me to the green pastures and still waters of Life!! Had he himself been occupying those pastures, or seeking to enjoy those waters, he had not busi ed himself with a correspondence, in which he cast a heavy reflection on the Apostles and apostolic church, nor would he have set to judge me according to the Law, and command me to be smitten contrary to the Law.

I replied to him at some length, and with freedom;

letting him know, that I should call upon them publicly, to sustain the ground they had taken, or frankly to acknowledge that they could not. And I left the correspondence in England, to be printed, if J. F., S. G. and G. S. did not do something to place the subject in a different position. After waiting some time, my friend James Foster received from Josiah Forster, information that they did not intend to write any thing further. The correspondence was then put to the press.

The Document from the Morning Meeting was received by the meeting of Ministers and Elders of Short Creek; and a committee of four Elders was appointed to treat with me. The result of which will appear, when giving an account of the dealings of the Monthly Meeting's committee.

The last visit of the Elders was on the evening preceding the Monthly Meeting in the 1st month, when Baptism was completely given up, as a ground of censure. The Preparative Meeting for Mountpleasant, was held on 4th day of the week before. At that time the committee attended, but the Overseers refused to bring forward the charge which had been drawn up by B. W. Ladd, and the whole project was a failure.

It was evident that no other charge could then be taken up, to be sent to the Monthly Meeting, unless I had been treated with, by the Overseers for it. And thus I was left without any prosecution lying against me.

It was not a week after this, when the Monthly Meeting was held, Dr. Parker proposed that the several committees and all the Overseers of the Monthly Meeting, should withdraw: which they did. On getting together out of meeting, he inquired why the complaint against me, which the committee had made out a month before, had not been forwarded to the Monthly Meeting? One of the Overseers replied, that that complaint was too vague and indefinite, and that it could not be sustained. He in-

quired why some other charge had not been brought forward? To this it was replied, that the complaint drawn up by B. W. L. had been palmed upon them, and they had to get rid of that first.

It turns out, as I understand it, that these committees of superior meetings, had felt so indignant at the opposition they had met in the Preparative Meeting of Mountpleasant, a few days before, that they had determined to take, in that Monthly Meeting, some coercive steps in regard to it. When I called on Dr. Parker, in the Monthly Meeting's committee, to explain this most novel proceeding, he replied, that if I knew the circumstances of the case, I would see that it was the very best that could be done at the time. I told him that the only explanation I could give to his remark was, that the committee had determined to lay violent hands on the Preparative Meeting, unless some measures against me could be agreed on. To this he made no reply—it having been distinctly stated to the Dr. before, that when I asked a question, I should consider *silence* as an admission of the thing suggested.—So it was plainly understood, as granted by Dr. Parker, to be as I supposed.

Whether Enoch Harris had had any intimation of what was intended or not, he came prepared, and took out of his pocket the following written charges:*

"Elisha Bates has written and published an address to friends of Ohio and Indiana Yearly meetings.. which relates to our religious principles, and Testimonies, without the advice and concurrance of the meeting for sufferings Also has written, and has had published a pamphlet in England, an appeal to friends, which exhebits the most insidious attempts to destroy our religious society and George Fox's Christian characture and religious reputation, by calling in question the soundness of his religious writ-

*The *Address* to the Preparative Meeting is omitted.

ings. He has denyed the immediate revelation of the Holy spirit, independant of the scriptures; as it appear by his late publications, therefore he is not one in faith with us.

He acknowledges himself to have submited to the right of Warter Baptism, and in this he has violated a well known principle of our society."

The Overseers were directed to go on, in treating with me on these charges, and then the company being satisfied, returned.

From this time, my friends gave up the matter to be disposed of as those who held the reins and used the whip of the Society, might please. I too saw that with such men, it was in vain to reason, and in vain to plead.

In the transaction, immediately before us, there was a total disregard of the order of discipline.

1. It was out of order for Enoch Harris to present a set of charges to such a company, before he had treated with me, upon them.

2. It was not merely a departure from the forms of Discipline, but a violation of the guarantee of the rights of individuals, for such a company to pass judgment, in any way, on a set of charges, before the accused individual had had an opportunity of a trial, before the constitutional officers of the Society. Here were the authorized agents of the Monthly, Quarterly and Yearly Meetings, determining on the charges on which I was to be prosecuted. Where then was the probability of a fair trial in the Monthly Meeting, or of redress by an appeal to the Quarterly or Yearly Meeting? Not only the ruling members, but the appointed agents of all those meetings had decided beforehand, what prosecution should be brought: they were in fact, the accusers, prosecutors, and judges. And who that had the least sense of moral uprightness, the least regard for his own rights, the least feeling of self respect, would recognize such a tribunal, as acting "in the wisdom and authority of truth."

Let it be remembered that this prosecution, is both formally and in fact, the act of the Society on the broad scale. The Morning Meeting in London laid the foundation for one branch of the action. The whole subject has evidently been a matter of correspondence, between the influential members of the several Yearly Meetings, or some of them at least. The complaint, in relation to the Appeal, was predicated on an English copy of that work, which I was told belonged to B. W. Ladd, and by him put into the hands of Enoch Harris. The company of official persons, which was called out of the Monthly Meeting, acting in stern authority, as they did, over the Overseers, and intending, as it appears, an immediate chastisement of the Preparative Meeting, if the Overseers had not agreed to act on the charges before us—did undeniably approve the forms of the charges, and give their clearly understood judgment, that the things so charged were disownable. They were not called out as mere individual members, to consult on some private matter, and give their private opinions. Reference was made to the appointments which they held—as Overseers, members of the committees, &c., when they were called out of the meeting, and therefore it was the authority of the meetings by which they were appointed, that was intended to be brought to bear upon the subjects laid before them.

When the Overseers had waited upon me with the charges as directed, laid them before the Preparative Meeting, and that meeting had forwarded them to the Monthly Meeting, I wrote to that body a letter of Resignation of my membership, giving some of my reasons for doing so. But at the same time I gave them an assurance that I would most readily meet their authorised agents in any investigation of the matters at issue between us.

The following is a copy of it, together with the Advertisement.

LETTER OF RESIGNATION *of the right of Membership in the Society of Friends: Addressed to Short Creek Monthly Meeting.*

ADVERTISEMENT.

The following Letter was presented to the Monthly Meeting which was held at Short Creek the 21st inst. when the Charges referred to in it, were received from the Preparative Meeting.

Two individuals were requested to go out and examine it, to see if it was suitable to be read. When they came back, they neither returned the Letter, nor gave any report or information respecting it.

In this proceeding there was not only a manifest departure from good order, but an act of disrespect both to the writer of the Letter, and to those to whom it was directed. Every man has an undeniable right to leave a Society with which he may have been in connection.—And if so, he has a *right to be heard.* To refuse this privilege is an assumption of Church Power, inconsistent with the understanding of the age in which we live. And those to whom the Letter was addressed, were the proper judges of its suitableness to the occasion. It was both their duty and their right to have heard what I had said. But it is an evil of increasing magnitude in the Society of Friends, that the most important matters are disposed of by a *few*, while the great body of the members do not understand what is going on.

The charges sent up by the Preparative Meeting are as follows: which, to be better understood, I have numbered.

1. "The Overseers inform that Elisha Bates has written and published an Address to Friends of Ohio and Indiana Yearly Meetings, which relates to our religious principles and testimonies, without the advice and concurrence of the Meeting for Sufferings.

2. "Also has written and has had published a Pamphlet

in England, An Appeal to Friends, which exhibits the most insiduous attempts to destroy the Society, and George Fox's christian character and religious reputation, by calling in question the soundness of his religious writings.

3. "He has denied the immediate revelation of the Holy Spirit independent of the Scriptures; as it appears by his late publications, therefore he is not one in faith with us.

4. "He acknowledges himself to have submitted to the rite of Water Baptism, and in this he has violated a well known principle of our Society."

When the subject was introduced into the Meeting, by reading the forgoing charges, some discussion took place, and various changes in the charges themselves were proposed. But the Meeting could agree in none, except in leaving out the *third* charge altogether. The others remained as sent up, and a committee was appointed to treat with me on them.

But as the Resignation of Membership in the Society was complete on my part, the Letter is now offered to the public, not only for the information of the members of the Monthly Meeting of Short Creek, but of the whole Society, and the community at large.

Mountpleasant, 2nd Mo. 22, 1837. E. BATES.

Mountpleasant, 2nd mo. 20th, 1837.

To Short Creek Monthly Meeting:

Dear Friends—

I have now, for upwards of four years, suffered an almost unexampled course of unkindness, from those I had regarded as my friends. The causes of this, so far as I am able to speak with confidence, have been:

1. My holding the divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures *as conclusive* in all matters of Faith and Practice; and preaching the leading doctrines contained in them—

constantly holding, at the same time, that no doctrine which is contained in the Scriptures should be rejected, nor any doctrine that is not contained in them be believed or promulgated.

2. For cautioning my Friends against those errors in regard to fundamental doctrines, which have been productive of the most lamentable consequences in the Society; and which are still exerting a deadly influence—clothed, as they were in the late schism, with the character of the *Spiritual Views of Early Friends.*

Called, as I believe I have been, by the Head of the Church, to testify the gospel of the grace of God, I have been engaged to promulgate those blessed doctrines which are recorded in the Scriptures; and to warn against those things which appeared to operate against a free and heartfelt reception of them. Of this description are sentiments and form of expression, which lie scattered through the writings of our Early Friends; and also that implicit confidence in them which would recognize those writings as the *depositories* of the true meaning of Scripture. I have believed it to be my duty to show that this confidence rests on a false foundation—is fallacious in principle, and pernicious in practice.

Deeply sensible of the infirmities of human nature, for which I was willing to make large allowances to our Early Friends, I have desired that we might escape their weakness, and correct their mistakes, by a recurrence to the revealed Will of God—receiving the doctrines as there taught, and seeking the help of the Holy Spirit, to write them on our hearts, to give us access to God through Jesus Christ, to shed abroad in our hearts the love of God, and to lead us in the way of the obedience of Faith.

For these causes my religious reputation has been assailed, by various modes of private detraction. And when the minds of Friends were prepared for it, official measures were taken, affecting both my moral and religious

character, and plainly intended to result in my disownment.

These measures were either *without* Discipline, or *contrary* to its provisions.

Immediately after the Document of the Meeting for Sufferings had been abandoned, and the new charge which was got up at the Preparative Meeting by a combination of committees, had been shown to be futile and untenable, a company was called out of the Monthly Meeting, consisting of members of various committees, the Overseers of the Monthly Meeting, &c., in which a new set of charges was agreed upon—which was afterwards presented to me by the Overseers of this Meeting, laid before the Preparative Meeting, and by that forwarded to you.

This whole proceeding was out of order, and subversive of those privileges which the Discipline was intended to secure.

This set of charges is divided into *four heads*. The *first* relates to a material part of the Refutation of the Document, by which I proved myself to be in the *right*, and the Meeting for Sufferings to be in the *wrong*. By the publication of the Address it is shown that the opposition which was made to it, was to the doctrines of the Resurrection of the Dead and the Day of Judgment, *as set forth in Scripture language*. It shows also that the statement in the Document, that it contained "*few* or *no* quotations" from our acknowledged works, is *incorrect*. To bring forward this charge was contrary to the Scripture which says: "Keep thee far from a false matter: and the innocent and righteous slay thou not: for I will not justify the wicked." Ex. 23, 7. The *second* charge assumes that the *writings* of George Fox are not to be *called in question:* having particular reference, though not exclusively, to the Extracts which I have lately made both from his manuscript and printed Journal, in a Pamphlet entitled "An peal to the Society of Friends." And in the face of the

most mortifying facts, it so fully takes upon the Society, the responsibility of those Extracts, and of his religious writings without limitation, as to represent the calling of them in question as an insiduous attempt to *destroy* the Society—and as such, a disownable offence.

The *third* head is in terms that I may not understand. And when I asked the overseer who presented it, for the ground on which he rested it, he gave me no distinct reply. If it means, that I do not believe we are warranted to expect a *revelation* of the *doctrines of Christianity*, independent of the Scriptures, it is *true*. If it means, that I deny the immediate work and witness of the Spirit, in the heart, it *is not true*. I *never* denied that doctrine, and I trust never shall. If this is the idea intended to be conveyed, I unhesitatingly pronounce it *false*.

The *fourth* head, relating to Baptism, places the Society in a strongly marked opposition to the commandments and example of the Apostles, and to the Practice of the Church while under their immediate direction, and while in the possession of the highest degree of spirituality, and the most extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, ever conferred on the Church. To suppose the ordinances have *ceased in point of obligation*, is one thing. To make the observance of them *a disownable offence*, is another. The first I believe is unwarranted by Scripture, and contrary to the Practice of the Apostles and Apostolic Churches. The second I apprehend is a *new thing* in Christendom.

While these things have been going on, persons in prominent stations, have been countenanced in preaching and otherwise promulgating doctrines, identical with those of Elias Hicks. And on the other hand, many estimable members of the Society, who were known to maintain the doctrine of Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and Justification by Faith, have been subjected to various harrassing proceedings, to discourage them from promulgating those

doctrines, to destroy their influence, and finally to put them down.

After the unhappy effects of many passages in the writings of Early Friends, had been exemplified in the late Separation, and after the attention of the Society had been called to the danger of the same things, those very writings have been earnestly recommended to Friends generally, and especially to the youth—without any discrimination, or any caution, against the unsound or unguarded sentiments and forms of expression which are scattered through them. And not only so, but the Doctrinal Treaties of the early Members of the Society, which really contain the most objectionable passages, have been recognized as in *strict accordance* with Holy Scripture.

I object to the course of proceeding against myself—and complain of the unkindness, and the unfairness with which they have been marked. And I protest against the dissemination, and recognition of unsound doctrine, and the opposition which in various ways has been made to that which is sound. And I exceedingly regret that the Society, by a combination of measures, should have fixed upon itself, a character so decidedly opposed to Primitive Christianity.

My principles have been openly held. When I have found an opinion to be contrary to Scripture, I have abandoned it; while the doctrines which I believed to be established by that authority, I have maintained without fear, and without compromise. I have sincerely endeavored to promote a christian reformation in the Society—without walking in craftiness, or handling the Word of God deceitfully. And now, as the Society, in its official capacity, has shown a determination to reject both me and my labours, I feel no disposition to impose myself upon it. And though I am fully sensible that there are many individuals in the Society, who truly love the Lord Jesus Christ, yet the official acts of the Body, have fixed

upon it a character, with which I dare not be identified.

I therefore have concluded, painful as the conclusion is, to offer you the RESIGNATION OF MY RIGHT OF MEMBERSHIP in the Society of Friends.

I do not take this course to prevent investigation; for it is my intention, at a suitable time, and that before long, to publish a Summary View of the Case, embracing a reply to the new charges. And I shall always hold myself ready to meet any official member of the Society, or any individual whose name I may have used, in a fair and friendly investigation of any doctrine I hold, or any fact I may have stated.

And now, in the dissolution of the bond by which we have been bound together in a social relation, I desire that *that* Charity, which is an essential part of vital religion, may suffer no diminution.

I do not feel myself as placed without the pale of the Church. I recognize the true believers in the Lord Jesus, whatever may be their denomination—and I trust that I shall be recognized by them. I trust that in the common Faith, the language will be reciprocated, "One is our Master, even Christ, and all we are brethren."—May they know more and more of the consolation in Christ, the comfort of love, and the fellowship of the Spirit—and increase and abound in those Christian virtues and works of righteousness, by which our Heavenly Fathers is glorified.

"Christ loved his Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, and present it to himself, a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing." The work of Reformation and the purging away of corruptions, arise from the love of Christ. And happy will it be for those who do not despise his love, or resist his work of purification.

Assured beyond all doubt, that the hand of the Lord is

at work, to carry on a Reformation, and extend the Redeemer's Kingdom in the earth—by the revival of vital Christianity, as it was presented to the world by the Son of God and his Apostles—I cannot believe that it will be frustrated. The instruments which he may be pleased to employ—however they may be despised, he is able to sustain and bless. With this persuasion, I cast myself on his unfailing care—and leave events to his unerring Wisdom.

With deep sorrow for the present state of the Society—with earnest desires for the effectual conversion of those by whom its affairs are conducted—and tender sympathy with its sound and suffering members,

I remain your friend,

ELISHA BATES.

This Letter when presented to the meeting, instead of being read, as is uniformly done where the rights of individuals are at all respected; was referred to Dr. Parker, and Robert Ladd, to go out and see if it was fit to be read. On their return, they kept the Letter, and said not *one word* to the meeting about it.

The Meeting took up the charges from the Preparative Meeting, and concluded to drop that which relates to revelation. They were now reduced to three.

1. For publishing the Address, which forms a part of the Refutation. 2. For calling in question the writings of G. Fox, noticed in the Appeal. 3. For being Baptized.

CHAPTER V.

The plan of the prosecution being thus agreed on, a Committee was appointed to carry out the disownment. The usual number appointed to treat with an offender is two. But in my case they selected *four*. These were John Loyd, Robert Ladd, John Hall, and John C. Hill.

I then published my Letter of Resignation, and determined to claim a release from all obligations to the Society: but at the same time, I resolved to meet its accredited agents, with all readiness, in a full investigation of every thing they had to lay to my charge.

The Morning Meeting in London, in its document sent over to the Ministers and Elders here, in order to bring me under dealings, had taken the position of bearing a *public testimony against* the practice of baptism, as no part of the Christian Dispensation. And the Elders in Liverpool, just before I embarked for America, sent me a note, signed by five men and five women—in which, after mentioning my "having submitted to the rite of water baptism," they say; "In this thou hast violated a well known principle of the Society,* and in our judgment, thou art thereby disqualified from any longer exercising the office of a minister among us, and it is our advice to thee to abstain therefrom."

Considering these official acts, and what the Meeting for Sufferings had done in my absence, I determined, on

* The framers of the charge sent up to the Monthly Meeting on the subject of Baptism, have used the language of the Liverpool Elders.

returning home, to decline the attendance of meetings.—I could neither discharge the duties of a minister, nor take my usual seat in meeting, without being regarded and represented by my enemies, as *imposing* upon the Society. And to lay myself under any restraints in regard to preaching, or to change my seat, would have been to exercise an agency in my own degradation. And as the offence was against the undeniable doctrines of the Apostles, I did not think it proper to be subject, no not for an hour, in that way, to those who would degrade me for holding the doctrines of Christ. But I continued my custom of reading a portion of the Scriptures in my family, and on *first* days I held these simple religious services at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, to which many of my neighbours came.—For though I had it distinctly understood that these Scripture readings were intended as a domestic regulation, yet their sympathy with us in our peculiar situation, led them to participate with us, on these occasions.

The manner of conducting them was, to read a portion of the Old Testament, and then another in the New; and I usually made some comments on the passages I had read. And as I felt my mind so engaged, Prayer was offered, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. I did not introduce singing, though our hearts were often made to rejoice, under a sense of the goodness of God to us. For being still a member of the Society of Friends, I did not wish to violate its order any further than an imperious sense of duty demanded.

On the first visit of the committee of elders, that waited on me, on the subject of Baptism, I mentioned my conclusion to decline the attendant of meetings, and my practice on first day afternoons. All which they said they approved. But the Conservative Friends made great objection to it; and especially to my *praying*, and my children's *kneeling* with me on those occasions. And threats were thrown out, of taking under dealing any members who might attend.

When my Letter of Resignation of Membership was published, I commenced holding public meetings: which have been largely attended: and in reference to which I can say: "Hitherto the Lord hath helped me." Having claimed the liberty of the Gospel, I set out to preach those doctrines for which I had been so long persecuted in the Society of Friends. The believers in Christ in the different denominations, gave me the hand of christian fellowship, and opened their meeting houses for me wherever I went.

The Friends, however, were still pressing on with their measures for my disownment. They were aware of the sympathy which was excited towards me in the christian public; and they manifested an anxious solicitude to destroy it. In the Document issued by the Meeting for Sufferings, in my absence, they had charged me with making statements *disingenuous and untrue.* And though I had triumphantly refuted the charge, and turned it back upon those who made it—so that they have not dared to meet me in their own defence, though they have been invited to do so; yet they have still endeavoured to fix the charge of falsehood upon me; to destroy both the sympathy in the public mind, and the effects of the statements I had made, and those which they knew it was in my power to make. They endeavoured, too, to prejudice the other societies against me, by telling them that I would soon raise the same difficulties among them, that I had raised among the Friends. The object plainly was, to make me an outcast in religious society, shunned and hated by all. But through mercy these measures have been over-ruled, to produce results, exactly the reverse of those which were intended.

On the first visit of the committee, (Robert Ladd, John Hall, and John C. Hill), we discoursed freely on the several charges which had been brought against me.

On the first, I showed that the Address was published

as a necessary part of my defence, against the unjust, and injurious attack which the meeting for sufferings had made upon me. That attack had impeached my moral character, in regard to the statements which I had made in the 23rd number of the Repository. I had been virtually advertised to the world, as a mean and artful *liar*. This was done when I was not only *absent*, but in a foreign country. And on my return, a trial on the charges contained in the Document, was denied me, and investigation before the constitutional authorities of the Society had been evaded, by the most unworthy artifices. I had no other alternative, than to appeal to the Society, and to the christian public, in print.

In doing this, the Address itself was called for. And by the publication of it, I showed that the Doctrine of the Resurrection, which was so offensive, *was set forth in Scripture language*. I proved, also, that the meeting for sufferings was *wrong*, in saying that it contained *few* or *no* quotations from our acknowledged works.

These facts were *material* to my defence. And I could not possibly have established them as I did, without publishing the Address itself.

It was therefore most unreasonable, that I should be made an *offender*, for publishing a necessary part of my own defence—a part, too, which convicted the meeting for sufferings of being in manifest error—it was a testimony against which they have not ventured to make a defence.

After I had made some free remarks on the unreasonableness of this charge, I said to one of the committee, that, as a man of sense and uprightness, I was sure he was ashamed of the charge. His reply was, that he was sorry that it was put in. To this the others made no objection. This charge was therefore completely given up by the committee, as improper to have been brought against me.

When we came to the second charge: "Also he has

written and has had published, a pamphlet in England, "An Appeal to Friends,' which exhibits the most insidious attempts to destroy our religious society, and George Fox's christian character, and religious reputation, by calling in question the soundness of his religious writings:" I inquired of the committee what was the *offence?* Was it in merely *publishing* the Appeal, or was it in *calling in question* the things it contained from the Journal of Geo. Fox? I told them that I thought the language of the charge was clear. But I wished to know whether we were agreed. For, if the offence was in the *publication*, they would be *nonsuited.* Because it was a principle in all jurisprudence, that offences were to be tried by the laws which were in force *where the offence was committed.*—For example, a man cannot be tried in Ohio, for an offence committed in Virginia; and when there was no Law in Virginia that was violated. I showed them that the Appeal was published in England, where there was no prohibition of discipline against publishing, without the previous consent of some supervisory body. And besides all this, it was neither printed nor published by me, though I freely confessed that I both wrote it, and consented to its publication.

After making some remarks on the invalidity of a charge, resting merely on the *publication* of the pamphlet, they freely and fully concurred with me, that the offence charged by the society, was for my calling in question the things to which the Appeal related. In fact, it is impossible to give the language of the charge any other meaning.

When we had agreed thus far, I took up the Appeal, and read George Fox's Letter to Oliver Cromwell; in which he calls himself "*the Son of God*," and says: "My kingdom is not of this world." And I asked them if they were prepared to show that I was wrong, in calling such language as this in question? Robert Ladd asked, if the

Scriptures did not speak of *sons*? I answered—"True—But does not the most ignorant believer that you can find, know the difference between the term, "*a son*"—and "*the Son*," which is applicable only to the Lord Jesus Christ?" John C. Hill said, he did not suppose that George Fox knew the difference. I said, "If you admit that he did not know that difference, or *mean what he said*, you must admit, at the same time, that he was *not moved by the Lord to say it*. And if he was not moved by the Lord, as he said he was, he was under a *delusion*." J. C. Hill replied, that he would rather believe that he was under a *delusion*, than to believe that he meant what he said. I answered: If you grant this, we are agreed. But then you are not acting in conformity with your appointment; for you are appointed to treat with me for *calling in question* the *soundness* of these things. You must remember, too, that you have no right to find out *meanings* for George Fox—it is the *writings*, that the society has determined to defend, and you are to take them as they are.

I then read the Letter of Margaret Fell and others to George Fox: and remarked to them—that they were appointed to treat with me for calling in question the soundness of these things, and I wanted them to set about it.

John Hall remarked, that they did not *know* that "them papers" were George Fox's. I told him if they *knew nothing* about it, they were of course incompetent to *say* any thing. But apart from that, the meeting had raised no objections to the genuineness of the papers before us, and it was not for them to do it. The meeting, in fact, had fully admitted their genuineness, in recognizing them as the writings of George Fox, and in making it a disownable offence to call them in question. For in their zeal to defend the character of George Fox, they had entirely forgotten to make the distinction between what he wrote himself, and what others wrote to him: and included the whole under the general terms of "his religious writings."

I showed them that these papers were directly blasphemous: and that the Society had made it a disownable offence to call those blasphemies in question! that Quakerism, in fact, was to stand or fall with them.

After remarking at some length, on these things, and showing the monstrous absurdity of them, I asked them if they had any thing further to say, why I should not have called them in question? But they had nothing to say.

We then passed on to the subject of Baptism. John C. Hill appeared to be relied on for this part of the business. And he began to ask me some questions about the *use* of Baptism. I told them that they had come to discuss the subject in a business point of view. I was charged with having violated a well known principle of the Society. And I inquired for the Discipline on which I was to be tried. They confessed that there was no discipline in the case.

J. C. Hill remarked, that there was no discipline to disown a member for joining another religious society. I replied, That is true, and there is no need for any. For in such a case, the individual wishes to leave the Society, and it is a matter of *agreement* between the parties.

J. Hall replied, that they should suppose that any one that had acted as contrary to the views of Friends as I had done, would wish to leave the Society. But, I answered, you are as wrong in your supposition, as you are in your doctrine; for when I received baptism, I *did not* wish to leave the Society.

I still pressed them for the *rule* by which I was to be judged, and wanted to know if it was the mere *will* of the ruling members—and showed that if this principle were admitted, the rights of individuals would be open to invasion—and the greatest improprieties might follow.

They had, in the previous conversation, expressed their belief in the Scriptures: and I asked them for a rule of Scripture to justify their proceedings. Where did they

find in Scripture, that the receiving of Baptism was a cause of *disownment*, or even of *disunity*, in the Christian Church? J. C. Hill, to whom the question was particularly addressed, confessed that there was nothing of the kind to be found in the Scriptures. And he went on to say, that he did not believe that the receiving of baptism would hurt any one, and he was sorry that it was put into the charges. The others were entirely unable to sustain the charge as a *disownable* offence, nor do I recollect that they attempted to do it, from Scripture, from discipline, or from reason. And thus the third and last charge was left, in fact, given up—one of the committee wishing it had not been put in, and the others having nothing to say.

Instead of making any sort of candid representation of the case, to the Monthly Meeting, they made a long Report, as it appears, prepared by some other hand for them, in which they said, in a phraseology that is very common on such occasions, that I was not in a suitable disposition to condemn my deviation, or something equivalent to this; and then went on to take up a number of new charges.

To this E. Harris, one of the overseers, objected, as contrary to the discipline. He said that the Yearly Meeting had decided, that no acknowledgment should be received by a monthly meeting, for any charges which had not regularly come through the Preparative meeting. And if they went on to disown, on charges thus introduced by the committee, the meeting in future would have no right to receive any acknowledgment from me, in order for my reinstatement in the Society.

This argument, however, had no weight against taking up the new charges. They were received, and three other persons were added to the committee. These were, Dr. Isaac Parker, James Steer, and Evan Hurford: The two first being Elders.

On the first day of the 4th month, several of this com-

mittee called upon me, without having furnished me with a copy of the new charges, or even notified me of the time they intended to come.

To such proceedings I objected in decided terms. I told them that it was altogether a matter of condescension, to meet them at all. And after the surprising course they had taken, it surely was as little as they could do, to furnish me with a copy of the *new* charges, and notify me of the time they intended to call upon me. It was then agreed that we should meet again on the 14th of the month. On making this arrangement, I told them, that I was determined it should be a thorough investigation of all the charges; and that for this purpose, we would adjourn from day to day, if necessary, for a month.

Before we parted, I told them, I should ask them, when we met again, Whether the *principle* which the Society said I had *violated*, in receiving water baptism, was in force in the time of the apostles or not? And I stated it then, because I wanted them to take time, and be prepared to answer it correctly.

They gave me the following paper, as the Report which they had made to the previous meeting: and as the minute of that meeting. It will be observed, however, that it has neither address, signature, nor date. It has not one single line, in the character of a minute of the meeting. It carries on the face of it no evidence of having ever been before the meeting. They presented no document to show what the meeting wished—nor the appointment of the new members of the committee—nor the continuance of the old. The following is an exact copy:

"The Committee appointed to treat with Elisha Bates report they have had an oppertunity with him and find upon examination of the case, he has in one of his essays in his repository falsely charged the meeting for sufferings of Ohio Yearly Meeting with being opposed to the doctrine of the Reserection and the day of Judgment; and

in another he charges erroneously the society with being inveterately and extensively opposed to evangelical doctrine, and to the preaching of faith in Christ, and says the society is holding up their own writings as standards of doctrine, more immediately binding on us than the scriptures, he has also published various pamphlets without the consent of the Meeting for sufferings, in violation of our discipline calculated to promote discord and disunity in the society.

He has recently sent in his resignation of right of membership which we propose read in this meeting. His writings and general conduct clearly manifesting that he has not unity with the society."

I have followed the original in punctuation, &c., that I might not be charged with having made alterations.

It turns out, that this paper contained neither the minute of the meeting, nor the report of the Committee.—The facts drawn from them on their last visit were briefly these—That when they met on the morning of the monthly meeting, to agree on a report, a paper for that purpose was presented by one of their number, and accepted.—But on my inquiring if it was written by that member, or by some other person, they refused to answer the question—saying it was none of my business. On inquiring, if the paper they had given me, contained a true copy of that which was adopted by the committee as their report, and as such presented to the monthly meeting, they confessed that it did not. On asking what were the changes which had been made in it? they affected to be unable to define what they were. On inquiring who had made the changes, they seemed to be much at a loss for an answer. I asked them if *they* had done it? They answered, No. I inquired if the *meeting* had altered it, or authorized its being altered? They replied that it had not—and thus they left the matter. The result of these disclosures is the proof that they consented to be the mere *tools* of other

persons, who directed what they should do, and what they should say.

The time of meeting arrived: and I thought it proper to have some friends present, who had personal knowledge of some of the matters connected with the charges. I had given them to understand this, when the appointment was made, and had let them know that I thought proper for Benjamin W. Ladd to attend. This was the more necessary, as he had denied saying that "the writings of our Early Friends were something that had risen up between us and the Scriptures, and we must not go beyond *them*;" which I was prepared to prove he *did* say. I had accordingly notified him to attend. He called at my house, in the morning, before the committee arrived: and after sitting a few minutes, he went off, remarking that he had a little business to attend to in town. I told him, he would of course return—to which he assented.

The time appointed for the meeting of the committee was 10 o'clock. But they did not come till 1. They were, however, in the neighbourhood, consulting with different persons, as I was informed—and among the rest with B. W. Ladd. At 10 o'clock, five of the committee, Robert Ladd, John Hall, James Steer, Evan Hurford, and J. C. Hill, came to my house. The first thing they did, was to object, in positive terms, to having any person with us, except my own family, and my son-in-law Horton J. Howard. I told them that I wanted witnesses to prove certain facts, which were material in the case. They said they did not want to have much to say; but just to have an opportunity with me alone. I let them know that if they did not intend an investigation of the charges, I wished to have nothing further to say to them. But if they would go into a fair investigation, which had been agreed to in making that appointment, I would waive my claims to having witnesses present, at that time.

The friends whom I had summoned to attend to give evidence, if necessary, were requested to withdraw, but not to leave the house. In the course of the afternoon, the committee proposed that B. W. Ladd should be sent for. I told them that as soon as they would admit other witnesses to be called in, I was willing that B. W. L. should be admitted. But this they would by no means agree to. And this objection to the presence of witnesses, was tenaciously maintained, till they broke up, in confusion, in the evening. In the mean time, B. W. L. went home: and the next morning, when the committee met, no objection was made to the company of witnesses, or even of spectators, of which several attended.

I mention these facts to show the sort of *management*, to which the committee and their advisers, resorted.

When we proceeded to business, I called for the minute, under which they were acting: but they produced none. I then entered into the inquiries already noticed, in regard to the paper which they had given me as their report, when we were together before.

I then inquired why they made no report to the Monthly meeting, on the old charges,—but introduced other charges, which had not been before the Preparative meeting? The only reason they gave was, that they thought it right. I wanted to know if it was not to lose sight of the old charges, without saying any thing about it? To this they gave no definite answer.

I asked them what were the reasons, so far as they knew, for taking up the first charge, relating to the publication of the Address? The reason given was, that it was contrary to Discipline. I inquired if they did not know that this rule of discipline has been violated in the publication of "The Friend," "The Defence of Friends," (an 8vo. vol. published anonymously by Friends of Philadelphia, during the Hicksite controversy), and sundry Pamphlets published by Friends of Philadelphia? And

had not *they* themselves, disregarded, and virtually broken, the Rule of Discipline, by receiving and countenancing some or all of those publications? The committee made no reply to the first part of the inquiry—but J. C. H. remarked, that there was no discipline against *reading* such things. But I inquired further, "Is it according to order for a member to *support* a religious periodical relating to our doctrines, &c., that is not published under the supervision of the Meeting for Sufferings?" The answer by J. C. H. was: "I do not think it would be."

After some remarks on the unfairness of the attack which was made upon me by the Meeting for Sufferings—and of the evasion of an investigation of its document, I asked: "Was it reasonable that I should have submitted the Refutation of the Document of the Meeting for Sufferings, to that meeting itself, for revision?" To this *no* answer could be had. They sat mute, till I was tired of waiting, and went on to another subject.

When we passed on to the 2nd charge I said:

"The Committee are requested, each one, distinctly to say, whether they are disposed to treat with me as an offender, for calling in question the language used in George Fox's Letter to Oliver Cromwell, and in the Letter of Margaret Fell and others to George Fox, and in the Letter of M. Fell to J. Naylor, and in Ann Curtis's Letter to G. F., and in Thomas Lowers' Letter to George and Margaret Fox?"

James Steer said, They were there to treat with me for calling them in question: and he was sorry that I called them in question. John C. Hill appeared to be alarmed at this answer, and entered his dissent from it: but without giving one of his own. James Steer then added: "I dont think those things would do now." Evan Hurford said he hardly thought they were George Fox's papers. "If they were, he was either a fool or a mad-

man." But he thought it could be proved that he was neither. On finding that I had written down his answer, (for I not only did it before them, but read their answers for correction), he begged me not to retain it. But I told him it was too good an answer, and too creditable to him, to be spared.

Robert Ladd would give no answer to the Question, but said: "It was wrong in me to look up all those old writings and publish them, whether they were their writings or not."

John Hall had nothing to say.

Q. "Do you think that those who cannot defend the language of those letters, as sound and proper, can consistently censure me for calling them in question?"

James Steer answered for the committee, that I was taking them beyond their limits.

Q. "Do you think that those who regard these letters as capable of no defence, and as reproachful to the Society, can maintain that the writers of them, at the time of writing them, were moved by the Lord, or under the influence of the Holy Spirit?"

Evan Hurford replied, that his answer was conclusive on that: and that he had nothing to say to it.

Q. "Do you not admit that those persons, in some of their claims of revelation, or of being moved by the Lord, were under a delusion?"

To this no answer could be obtained.

Embarrassed, and not knowing what to say, it was not to be expected that they should treat with me, as they had been appointed to do, for calling in question the soundness of the writings before us. And after having given them ample opportunity for the purpose, or for extricating themselves from the difficulty they were in, if that had been practicable, I proceeded to the third charge, which says:

"He acknowledges himself to have submitted to the

rite of water baptism, and in this he has violated a well known principle of our Society."

I recurred to the notice I had given them two weeks before, and said: "Will the committee say, whether that *principle* (which the charge asserted I had violated,) was in force in the time of the Apostles or not?"

James Steer answered: "We need not go so far back. We need not go back further than the rise of our Society." No objection was made to this, and it was written down as the answer of the committe—and the result of two weeks consideration and consultation.

I asked: "Then was it a principle of Primitive Christianity?"

To this *no answer* was given.

After waiting some time, I proceeded: "Will you show how this charge does not apply to the Apostle Paul, who both received and administered baptism; and to the Apostle Peter who *commanded* it, both to Jewish and to Gentile Converts; and to the other Apostles who concurred in its being so commanded; and to the Apostolic Church, in which it was practiced—as fully, and as censoriously as it applies to me? Was not their practice as irreconcileable to the principle in question as mine?"

To this no answer was given.

Q. "Can you show by Scripture that the practice of Water Baptism was ever laid aside in the Christian Church?"

The answer was given by James Steer in these words: "Very short. Pass over that as easy as thee can."

Q. "Do you admit that the Apostles were authorized to introduce Baptism into the Christian Church, or were they in error in introducing it as they did?"

Ans. "The committee were not appointed for that. It is not a fair question."

Q. "Is it lawful to call in question either the authority of the Apostles, or the doctrines which they taught?"

Ans. "We were not appointed to answer such questions."

Q. "Can any Society have a valid claim to the christian character, that makes it a disownable offence for its members to obey the commands, and follow the example of the Apostles?"

A long pause was made, but no answer given.

Robert Ladd being one of the present committee, and having been one of the committee of elders that waited on me on the subject of baptism: I made the following statement as a question:

"You know that these three charges were shown to the company which was called out of the Monthly Meeting in the 1st month; and by them agreed to, as the ground for disciplinary proceedings. Did not Dr. Parker, Robert Ladd and Samuel Barber, on the preceding evening, in the capacity of a committee from the meeting of Ministers and Elders, acknowledge to me: 1. That Baptism was practiced by the Apostles: 2. That there was no evidence in Scripture that it was laid aside: 3. That the subject was now open for examination by the Society: 4. That the question must be decided *by the Scriptures:* 5. That if Baptism could be proven by the Scripture, the Society of Friends ought to adopt it: 6. That acting conscientiously as I did, I was not only *not* to be blamed for being baptized, but that I would have been to blame if I had not been baptized?" This was read with pauses at its several divisions, and agreed to by Robert Ladd.*

Q. "Will you reconcile these concessions with the steps taken the next day, in declaring it to be a violation of a well known principle of the Society, and in bringing me under dealings, in order to my disownment for it?"

Robert Ladd said he thought "it unreasonable for me

* Dr. Parker being present the next day, the statement was read to him and agreed to by him.

to go so contrary to the views of the Society, and yet to expect to continue in the Society."

Q. "Did not John C. Hill in the first visit paid me by this committee admit: 1. That Baptism was practiced by the Apostles and early christians: 2. That there was no evidence in Scripture, that the receiving of Baptism was ever a cause of Disownment, or even of disunity in the Apostolic Church: 3. That he did not believe that the receiving of Baptism would do any one any harm: 4. And that *he* was sorry the charge was taken up?"

These sentiments were admitted.

But the next day he wished the statement no. 4. to be altered to read as follows: "And that *he* should not have taken that up against me." On writing this down, he wished to add the words: "Especially in the form it was in." On asking him if he "would make it a matter of disownment?" he replied that he "was not prepared to say positively."

Q. "The committee will now say whether the charge rests upon the views of Early Friends—or on the views of the Apostles, as exhibited in the doctrines and practices of the Church, under their teaching—or in other words, on the testimony of the Scripture?"

James Steer replied, that I had "adopted something different from any thing that has ever been in *our* Society."

Considering further questions on this subject unnecessary then, I proceeded to the *Report*, which the committee had made to the preceding Monthly Meeting, and to notice the new charges contained in it.

Q. "Did the examination of the case, of which you speak [in the Report] take place in the visit to which you allude? Was the Repository brought before us during that visit?"

Ans. "No; it was not."

Q. "Where do you find in the Repository, the charge which you say I have made against the Meeting for Sufferings?"

The committee referred to the 23rd no. of the Repository; and that part of it in which, speaking of presenting the *Address* to the Meeting for Sufferings (See Refutation,) I said: "The Address was decidely opposed, and after various proceedings and discussions, it was withdrawn.—The opposition was to the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Day of Judgment, *as* set forth in Scripture language;" &c.

To this I replied: "You know that I have said in the 'Refutation,' p. 7, that I neither said nor intended to say, in the 23rd no. of the Repository, that the opposition which was made to the Address *in* the Meeting for Sufferings, was *by* the meeting—but on the contrary, that the Address was withdrawn; and so the meeting did not come to a formal decision upon it. Robert Ladd, and Dr Parker were furnished, each with a copy of the Refutation on the evening before the Monthly Meeting in the 1st month. Do you consider notwithstanding all this, that the opposition which I stated to have been made to the Address *in* the meeting, should be understood as made *by* the meeting?"

Robert Ladd, (a member of the Meeting for Sufferings,) said, "the Address was opposed in the Meeting, by the most who spoke upon the subject."

On my inquiring if he remembered any objection made in the meeting, to the Address, on any other subject than the Resurrection and Day of Judgment—he replied that he did not.

Q. "Do you want proof that such an opposition as I stated in the 23rd no. of the Repository was made, or do you admit that it was made?"

On this question they would neither admit it, nor refuse to admit it, nor allow me to bring in witness to prove it, nor refuse to allow me that privilege. I think I never saw men more completely confused than they were. And they broke up, without agreeing to any thing—even whether we should have another meeting or not.

I had given them to understand, that I considered they had gone out of their way, to charge me with *falsehood*—that I was resolved not to submit to the charge—and they must either formally retract it, or have it examined by the testimony of witnesses.

The committee broke up, and John Hall and James Steer quitted without ceremony. But Robert Ladd, Evan Hurford, and John C. Hill remained behind, to tell me that they *did admit* that the opposition was made, as I had stated. I told them they were not then in a committee capacity, and I insisted on a formal retraction of the charge.

On this they went off, and in about half an hour, James Steer called to tell me, that they would be there the next morning at 8 o'clock.

CHAPTER VI.

THE next day, that is, 4th mo. 15th, Dr. Parker, Robert Ladd, John C. Hill, and James Steer attended. The Dr. remarking that he could not stay long, I wished to embrace the opportunity of asking *him* some questions; which were as follows:

"Did Dr. Parker ever say to me—1. That the doctrine which I held of the Resurrection and Day of Judgment, was the doctrine of the Scriptures—2. That it would finally prevail in the Society—3. But that we must wait till some of the *old ignorant* ones died off?"

To which he answered—1. I don't know that I ever did—but I don't doubt that I did; for I fully believe it. 2. I dont doubt that in the least. It does now as far as I know. 3. I can't tell. I might have used the expression." But on being more closely pressed, he *admitted* that he did say, that we must wait till some of the old ignorant ones died off.

Q. "Did Joshua Lynch ever say to Dr. Parker, in reference to the doctrine of the Resurrection which I preached; 'That you elders ought to stop such preaching?' "

Ans. "I do not remember the particular expression which he used, but I remember his expressing dissatisfaction."

Q. "Does not Dr. Parker know, that there was an *extensive dissatisfaction* with me, on account of my preaching that doctrine?"

Ans. "If we take the sentiments of people from what they say, we must know it. But I believe it was not extensive."

Q. "Does not Dr. Parker know that William Flanner was opposed to the doctrine?" I waited some time, but received no answer. On this I remarked to the Dr. that I should consider silence, as admitting the affirmative.—With this understanding we went on, and I gave the following names: "William Wood?" No answer. "Jacob Branson?" No answer. "Jacob Holloway?" Ans. "I don't know his sentiments." "Joshua Lynch?" He referred to his former answer as to him. "Benjamin Hoyle?"* Ans. "I don't know what to say. I don't remember any thing particular about him." "Jacob Ong!" Ans. "Jacob Ong† said something, but I don't know what it was." 'Benjamin W. Ladd?" Ans. "I am sure I don't know what to say."

Q. "Dost thou not know, that certain prominent individuals, hold that the Day of Judgment, and the great Day, is the day of each one's death?"

Ans. "I don't remember that any one has made that observation to me."

Q. "Did not William Wood preach that doctrine at Short Creek meeting in the presence of several other ministers? And did an overseer of Mountpleasant meeting, speak to thee on that subject?"

Ans. "Well, I guess he wont preach it any more."

Q. "Dost thou know that he has abandoned that opinion?"

Ans. "I can't tell any thing about it. I have never heard any thing of it since."

The other parts of the committee now put in to tell me, that they had agreed to something that would render these inquiries unnecessary. This related to the retraction of the charge, on which they had broken up in confusion, the evening before. It was then proposed that they

*B. Hoyle objected to the Address in very decided terms.

†Jacob Ong said he "had attended the meetings of Friends [I think 47 years] and never heard such doctrine before!

should retire to have a consultation among themselves.—At first Dr. Parker refused to go with the other part of the committee, remarking that it was something in which he was not concerned. But they would not go without him: and he consented to go—taking charge of the report of the committee. After a short conference they returned and agreed to *retract* the charge, which I wrote down in the following words:

"The committee refer to the statement made in the Refutation, that I neither said nor intended to say, that the opposition to the Address in the Meeting for Sufferings was *by* the meeting, or in other words, the act of the meeting. And on this ground, they agree to *retract* the charge contained in the Report, that I had *falsely* charged the Meeting for Sufferings, with being opposed to the doctrine of the Resurrection and Day of Judgment."

This, after some conversation was agreed to by the committee and myself, as a full *retraction* of the charge. I told them it was material that the reference should be made to the Refutation, because a part of the committee that presented the Report to the Monthly Meeting, had been furnished with the Refutation two months before that Report was so presented—and therefore were in possession of my explanation. It was material too to retain the words, "*neither said nor*," because I did not say in the 23rd no. of the Repository that the opposition was the act of the meeting. I was decided too that the word *retract* should be in the written statement: because I would accept nothing short of a RETRACTION.

One of their number, J. C. Hill, had cavilled on the words referred to—or several of them—but the others agreed that I was right, and the statement which I had written for their conclusion was correct. And one or two of them used some arguments to convince J. C. Hill that he was wrong.

After some conversation on the manner in which the

Report was originally prepared, and on the alterations which had been made in it, as already noticed—we proceeded to the second charge contained in it: that "in another [essay] I had charged *erroneously* the Society with being inveterately and extensively opposed to evangelical doctrine, and the preaching of faith in Christ."

They read parts of the Address in the concluding number of the Repository, as the ground of this new charge. In that Address I said: "The re-action which has taken place in the Society, and the fearful relapse into Hicksism, has been the work of a wily and unwearied enemy.—And now one of the most dangerous symptoms of that relapse, is a confidence that those who so lately testified against that heresy, cannot now fall into it. Facts are stubborn things. The most palpable doctrines of Hicksism are now, in print, declared to be the doctrines of Friends. And never—no, never—during the bitterest time of that controversy, were evangelical doctrines so extensively and so inveterately opposed, as they are now. I was a witness of the worst of those times. I bore the heat and burden of that day. And I know well what it was. And I say again, and am prepared to sustain the statement by a reference to *facts*—that there never was, within the range of my acquaintance in the Society, at that period—so wide spread—so decided—and so crushing an opposition to the doctrine of Justification by Faith, and other doctrines, inseparably connected with it, as there is in the Society at the present time. The unkindness, the extensive plan, and the perseverance in it, to put down the preaching of Faith in Christ, which is now going on among us, *never was equalled*, by those we denominate Hicksites."

When the committee had referred to this passage, as the ground on which *they* had made the charge under consideration, I appealed to their own knowledge of facts, in my own case, as fully justifying the statement I had made.

I was placed, however, in a singular position. The committee, as it appeared, yielding themselves as the instruments to other hands, had taken up a paper which had been prepared for them, as their report: and containing a set of new charges. But in doing this, they had become my *accusers*, while they held the office of my Judges. Instead of standing as impartial persons, investigating charges brought in an open, and regular way by others, and which the accused party had had the opportunity of meeting in the previous stages of the business, they occupied the position of *accusers*, (directed indeed by others), and sitting in judgment on the charges which they themselves had brought against me. In a court of Law, a Judge would not sit, in a case in which he had been a party, or even an advocate. But in the case before us, the committee were the *accusers*, and the *judges*, in their own prosecution. And having consented to place themselves in this position, by the adoption of the Report, it was not to be expected that any defence which could be made, would be regarded.

I reminded them of the leading features of the Hicksite separation, and of the small number of those called Orthodox Friends, who were prosecuted for their principles by the followers of E. Hicks—and I compared with these, the cases which I knew of Evangelical Friends, who had been brought into difficulty by the present Conservatives. They themselves had knowledge of some of these cases. In regard to myself, I had always readily obtained liberty to travel as a minister, during the contest with the Hicksites; and when travelling, with a few exceptions, I had been treated with personal civility. But now I had been persecuted for more than four years, by private defamation and public hostility. I mentioned cases of personal insult, and of official indignity which had been practiced upon me, from London to Indiana. With all the freedom with which I handled the subjects of the Hicksite contro-

versy, the friends of Elias Hicks had never brought me under dealings. But now I was on the point of being disowned, by the Conservatives; and the committee, and every body else acquainted with the subject, know perfectly well, that it was for the doctrines which I held, and which they were afraid *now* openly to call in question. And more than all this, the Conservatives had actually employed my former professed intimate friends, as the active agents for my execution. I told them that *they*, in the Hicksite controversy, and in the beginning of these difficulties, had professed unity with me. They knew the hostility that had been manifested towards me, and they knew the grounds of it. And yet they could now lend themselves as the instruments for effecting my disownment, for the maintenance of principles which they themselves had acknowledged to be correct.

I then mentioned cases of official, and unofficial action on sundry friends in England. But the committee refused to admit cases in that country, though the article to which they referred was written there, and had direct reference to the state of the Society in that country as well as in this. I then mentioned the opposition which had been made to Jonathan and Hannah C. Backhouse, while on their visit in this country—an opposition known to have arisen on account of the doctrines which they sometimes held—and more especially on account of their efforts to promote among our members, the study of the Bible.—Knowing the morbid sensibility which existed in the Society on this subject, they had adopted a plan of Scripture study, which directed the attention almost exclusively to the historical parts of the Old Testament. And yet, so great was the opposition to this, that this scripture study was pronounced by a prominent minister of this Yearly Meeting, to be worse than Hicksism. And that minister, still standing, not only in unity, but high in esteem here, had refused an interview with H. C. B., who requested it

when she attended the Yearly Meeting at Mountpleasant in 1835.

I referred to the course which had been pursued towards Rebecca Updegraff, a minister of Short Creek Monthly Meeting, on account of the doctrines which she was understood to hold. I mentioned the paper which B. W. Ladd got up, and had it signed by the ministers and elders of the other two monthly meetings, to stop her from performing a religious visit, after she had been liberated by the Monthly and Quarterly meeting. And I asked Dr. Parker, who was well acquainted with this business, If he ever knew such a proceeding in the Society before? He replied, it was a new thing to him.

On the subject of the doctrines involved in these proceedings, I reminded them of what *they knew* in regard to the opposition to the doctrine of the Resurrection, Justification by Faith, Prayer, and the conclusive authority of the Scriptures. I read a part of George Jones's Tract, called, "An Incitation," (to which I have already referred), and asked the committee, if they acknowledged this to be consistent with the true doctrine of Faith in Christ? Dr. Parker answered, that he should not hold up such doctrine as this.*

I mentioned the interview which I had with Charles Osborn, William Hobbs, James White, and John Poole, in which a most decided opposition was made, and that gratuitously, to the doctrine of J. J. Gurney on Justification. I read two letters from Sarah Grubb, (a prominent minister near London), and my answers—the prominent subject being that of Faith in Christ. I related a discourse which I had with a prominent minister in England, in which he declared that it was no justification that a doctrine was the doctrine of the Scriptures—for the doctrines of the Scriptures were not the doctrines of Qua-

* And yet this doctrine is openly vindicated in print by one of the committee of London Yearly Meeting.

kerism—that Quakerism consisted in a certain modification of the doctrines of religion, a particular view, which particular view, George Fox had by revelation and not from the Scriptures—that he did not believe a knowledge of the doctrines of Christianity was necessary for the salvation of Cornelius, or that the faith of Abraham was faith in Christ. I mentioned another prominent minister who declared in my hearing, in a large public meeting, That the work of the true ministers in all ages had been, to turn people from every external thing, to Christ Jesus revealed in the secret of the soul. I told them of another that I had heard, warn Friends not to put too much dependence in the sacrifice of Christ—and on another occasion, in a large public meeting, he said, By grace ye are saved—and this grace in the heart is the true Saviour—there are not *two* Saviours. And the blood by which we are sanctified is the Spirit. I mentioned the prayer which I had heard delivered in a meeting of ministers and elders—that "that Book called the Bible, might not be made an idol."

I read Thomas Evans's Letter to me, dated 7 mo. 25, 1835—his Letter to B. W. Ladd, 4 mo. 25, 1835—mentioned B. W. Ladd's declaration to me, before B. Wright and Dr. Parker, that the writings of our early Friends are something that has risen up between us and the Scriptures, and we must not go beyond them.—I adverted to the preaching of certain ministers, who plainly rested Justification on works—&c. And noticed the dissatisfaction which was raised by the article called my Vindication.

In making these statements, I told the committee, that if they would not admit them in evidence, I would be at the trouble of collecting testimony from London to Indiana. They told me they did not call them in question.

On the charge contained in the report, relating to the standards of doctrine, I referred them to the article in the Friend, upon that subject; and to other things, of a corresponding character.

When I had presented these facts, Dr. Parker confessed that I had given more evidence of the opposition to Evangelical doctrine and the preaching of Faith in Christ, than ever he had thought of before. This was assented to by the other part of the committee. When I read the note I had made of his concession, he added—that it was from a quarter that he had not thought of.

They have charged me also with publishing *Pamphlets*, calculated to promote disunity and discord in the Society. I inquired of them, what were the pamphlets, and what the point of doctrine to which they alluded? I told them I had published but three—which I named. They said they alluded to two of them. I remarked that they were virtually included in the first charges: and asked why should they charge them again? They admitted that the charging of them again was redundant.

The committee having made a sort of general accusation, in the conclusion of their Report, I asked—"Why did you make, in the conclusion, a vague, indefinite charge against my writings and general conduct, to stand upon the records, without specifying what the grounds of dissatisfaction were? What did you mean?" John C. Hill replied, "that they meant nothing but the pamphlets."—"Then [I said] you have charged them not only *twice*, but *three* times."

In conclusion, I appealed to the committee, that they knew how devotedly I had served the Society, on all occasions; not regarding the sacrifice of my time, my health, my business, and domestic comforts, whenever the Society called for my services: that in the late contest, I had maintained the authority of the Holy Scriptures, and the great doctrines of Christianity, which they contained.—And now it was for the same principles that I had been pursued, with unrelenting persecution for the last four years and a half. It had been for the Word of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ. And I reminded them of

the agency which *they*, my former reputed friends, had had, in these proceedings; and endeavoured to make them sensible of the extreme hardness of my case. I showed them how determined, how violent, and how contrary to the rules of discipline, the measures against me had been. And I called their attention to the fact, that they had completely failed to support the charges, or any of them; and that they were bound, in common uprightness, to retract the *whole* of them. They were not at liberty now, to take up the Letter of Resignation, and accept it. Having treated that Letter as they had, and determined to prosecute me on the charges, for my *disownment*, when these charged had failed, they were bound to acquit me. The Monthly Meeting should now do me an act of simple justice, for injuries which had been inflicted upon me.—And the Meeting for Sufferings also, should retract its Document.

According to all the rules of regular and orderly proceedings in such cases, when a prosecution cannot be sustained, the defendant is permitted to stand again, in the full enjoyment of the privileges which he would have enjoyed, had the prosecution never taken place. But waiving this undeniable right, I told the committee, that if the meeting would do me the simple act of justice which I had mentioned; I would be willing to meet them in a calm and friendly conference, to see if an accomodation could not be effected. I stated that I did not wish to leave the Society. But if the difficulty were adjusted, it must be on the plain doctrines of the Scriptures—as resting on the authority of God himself; without admitting an appeal to any other authority whatever.

They heard me with patience. They asked for no additional evidence in support of the defence I had made. They had nothing to say in support of the charges. But seemed heartily glad that the interview was coming to a conclusion.

They made a Report to the Monthly Meeting, with which I have not been furnished: but which was designed to result in my disownment. They proposed however that the charge, which they had *retracted*, should be dropped—not on the grounds to which they had explicitly conceded, but, as they said, because I had denied *intending* to charge the Meeting for Sufferings. In this proceeding there was a direct breach of faith. But notwithstanding all this, it was put into the paper of disownment.

On receiving the Report of the Committee, the meeting concluded that I ought to be disowned, and a committee of three persons was appointed to inform me of this conclusion, and to prepare the document for the purpose. These were Dr. Parker, James Kinsey, and Elisha Bracken.—The two first declined seeing me on the subject, and sent Elisha Bracken, who, to do him justice, was more candid and reasonable in his remarks, than some of his predecessors had been. When he informed me that he was directed to let me know the judgment of the meeting in my case; I asked him, on what charges had the meeting determined to disown me? He replied that he could not tell! I then gave him a brief history of the interviews I had had with the committee—with which he seemed much surprised—and said they had not represented the case in that light to the meeting. I told him that I thought it was great injustice, both to me and to the meeting, for the reports to have been given as they had been.

I touched briefly on the several charges which had been made against me, and the results of the investigation of them. When I came to that of Baptism, I reminded him that the Apostles undoubtedly commanded it—that it was the practice of the Church, and never laid aside in the Apostolic age. And then I inquired—"Suppose it were possible, to transfer the Apostle Paul into the Society of Friends, just as he was in his life time, would you not dis-

own *him*, on the ground you have taken with me?" He paused awhile, and then replied, that he supposed they would!!!

The following is a copy of the Paper of Disownment:

"Elisha Bates has written and published, contrary to discipline, Sundry articles or pamphlets relating to our religious principles and testimonies calculated to excite disunity and discord and containing unfounded charges against the meeting for Sufferings and our religious Society in matters of faith and doctrine alledging errouniously that our Society is inveterately and extensively opposed to evangelical doctrines and to the preaching faith in christ and says the society is holding up their own writings as standards of doctrine more immediately binding on us than the scriptures, he has insidiously attacked the christain character and religious writings of George Fox, he has also departed from our christain belief of the one essential and saveing baptism that of the holy Spirit by submitting to the cerremony and use of water, in a communication which he forwarded to this Meeting in th 2nd month last tendering the resignation of his right of membership, he further evinces that he is not in unity with us and haveing been treated with, endeavours to Justify him self in the course he has pursued against the society and manyfesting no disposition to condemn his deviation we there fore testify against his said conduct and disown him from being a member of our religious society, nevertheless we sincerly desire he may be favoured with a true Sence of his present condition and become prepared to condemn his late course of procedings to the Satisfaction of friends and to the peace of his own mind

Signed in and by direction of Short Creek Monthly Meeting held 23rd, day of 5th month 1837

NATHAN HALL *clk*"

From this document it will appear, that the three original charges are, in substance, retained—though, in some

degree, modified in form—and that the matters contained in the Report, are also included, even that which the committee formally agreed to *retract*. The Society had determined on the grounds of its prosecution, and was not to be turned from them. It was to no purpose to show to their appointed agents that a charge was not *true*, or that another was not actionable by the Discipline, or that one was *absurd*, another a vindication of Blasphemy, and a third an open attack upon the Apostles, and on the whole Christian Church. Like a wheel in a deep rut, they could not turn on either hand, but must be dragged on, or stick fast.

The whole proceeding was commenced contrary to the provisions of the Discipline.

The first charge was ridiculous in the extreme—as it ostensibly made the offence to consist in publishing the Address, without the revision of the Meeting for Sufferings—when I was driven to the necessity of publishing it, in my own defence, against the Meeting for Sufferings. It is the more absurd, inasmuch as it convicts the Meeting for Sufferings of having made a statement, *utterly at variance* with the facts of the case.

The second charge, without discipline—makes it a disownable offence to call in question the soundness of G. Fox's religious writings. This is virtually claiming infallibility for him—and establishing a precedent, that forever seals the lips of the members of the Society, in regard to whatever G. F. said or did. Those who are in power, or in favour with those who are, may feel themselves secure from danger. But the precedent is settled, in making it a disownable offence to call in question the soundness of G. F.'s religious writings: and any man, hereafter, may be taken up and disowned, for objecting to any thing contained in G. F.'s religious writings. But while this ground is taken, the Scriptures are called, in the writings of Early Friends, a *corrupt stream*, a *nose of wax*, a *Lesbian Rule*,

&c.—and now, the popular ministers are publicly declaring, that the Apostles did not understand their commission,* &c. But the application of this precedent, not only makes it disownable to call in question the *published*, but *unpublished* writings of G. F.: and those which, taken in the plain and literal meaning of the words employed, contain *blasphemy*. The charge was not for giving the writings a *construction*, for they were given as the writers had left them, and allowed to speak for themselves. It was not therefore a *forced construction*, that I called in question, but the letters themselves, taken in the common meaning of the terms employed by the writers. So then, if G. Fox's writings contain the grossest Blasphemy, it is disownable to call it in question—the very existence of the Society depends on maintaining it. The committee appointed to treat with me, could not deny that the Letters in question did contain *Blasphemy*.

The third charge arrays the Society against the Apostles and the whole Christian Church. Instead of insisting, as some of the Early Friends did, that Baptism had ceased in point of obligation, and that the *disuse* was not to be *condemned*, by those who still practiced it—they come out now, in making it *penal*, and carry back the censure for the use of it, to the Apostles themselves. I ask, has any Society using the christian name, ever taken such high, presumptuous ground?

There is no possibility of making a valid defence for the disuse of Baptism, but by proving that it was not included or intended, in the commission given by Christ to his disciples, after his Resurrection. And this cannot be done, but by proving that the apostles did not understand the commission. For the manner in which they carried that commission into practice is undeniable. If, then, the Lord Jesus did not intend Baptism in the common ac-

* This was said by J. Hubbard, in the Quarterly Meeting at Mountpleasant, in the 5 mo. 1837.

ceptation of the word, the apostles were *mistaken:* for they caused it to be administered in that sense; and commanded it, as distinctly *in the name of Jesus Christ*, as they did *Repentance.* Had they his authority for preaching Repentance, as they taught it? No one will deny this. Had they his authority for *commanding* the converts to be baptized, as they *did command* it? If they had, all disputation on the subject is at an end. If not, the apostles were in a serious error. For they did not introduce Baptism as an indifferent thing—a mere condescension to the prejudices of the new converts,—no—they commanded it—*Repent and be Baptized every one of you*, IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST, *for the remission of sins*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.—And they that *gladly received his word were baptized.*" No man in his sober senses, can deny that the apostles introduced it, and not the converts—that it was done with apostolical authority, and not as an indifferent thing—that it was rested on the authority of Jesus Christ, as fully as the command to repentance was. Were the apostles *mistaken*, or not?—Certainly they could not be in error—not only from the opportunity they had of knowing from Christ himself, what was the meaning of the term—but because they were, on the Day of Pentecost, filled with the Holy Ghost—and *spake as the Spirit gave them utterance.* To charge them with error, in what they then said and did, is not merely to impeach the apostles, and whole body of the church then assembled, but to charge the *Holy Ghost* with error: for agreeably to Christ's own words, it was not they that spoke, but the Spirit of God that spoke in them.

But while the Lord Jesus commanded Baptism, without any thing to turn it from its simple and obvious meaning—while the Apostles, under the extraordinary influence and direction of the Spirit, commanded it, in that sense, and claimed the authority of Christ for doing so—while the

believers, "every one," of them received it on that ground, and the practice, prevailing universally in the Church was continued through the Apostolic age, and descended, with undiminishing force, to the immediate successors of the Apostles—the Friends have made it a cause of disown ment from the Society. Where now is their claim to Primitive Christianity Revived? So far from its being *Revived*, they inflict upon those who dare to *revive* it, the highest penalty which is known to the Discipline.

The charges contained in the Report—made out by some one behind the screen; were taken up altogether out of order, in the first place. One of them was retained in direct violation of a written agreement; I successfully defended myself on every point—and the committee, beaten on their own grounds, were unable even to defend themselves, for having taken up such accusations! They had all the evidence that reasonable men could desire, to prove that I had ample grounds for all that I had said, to which the objections were made.

But they saw that if this prosecution failed, I should stand once more at liberty in the Society. And on what other grounds could they attempt to disown me? It was plain that if these charges would not do, they must come at last, to the great doctrines on which the dissatisfaction begun, and which were at the bottom, through all. But they dared not to meet me upon these. On the contrary, the most unworthy methods were practiced, to induce an opinion that they never were dissatisfied with me upon those points. Even on the subject of the Resurrection, on which they had blown the Society into a flame, they have tried to make it appear that they never denied the doctrine which I held. The document of the Meeting for Sufferings, carries this complexion on the face of it.

They knew that they were defeated in this attack. But they knew also, that they would fare no better in any other they could contrive. And as they had determined to

Disown me at all events—they concluded it would be as well to do it after *one* defeat, as after *two*, or a still larger number.

But if they dropped the present prosecution, two inferences must follow—First, That George Fox and his friends must be admitted to be wrong, and thus the very Foundation of the Society would be loosened. Second, That the members were at liberty to follow the *Apostles*, where the Early Friends differed from them in doctrine and practice. This would, at once, be taking the Key Stone out of the Arch of their *Peculiarities*; and it would not require the gift of Prophcy to foretel the consequence.

Let the revelations of George Fox and his Friends be called in question with impunity, and the foundation of the Society will begin to give way—hence the official acts of the Society represent the calling of the old Letters in question, as "an *insiduous attempt* to destroy the Society." Let Baptism and the Lord's Supper be resumed, and a prominent part of the superstructure will already be in ruins. And therefore, though they had *no Discipline* in either case, though they were, or would be, completely disgraced before the Christian world—yet rather than incur the risk of consequences, they determined to persevere.

But I ask, will not these things tend to open the eyes of the better part of the Society? Will they consent to be blinded by such proceedings? They must see that there has been, on the part of the ruling members, a departure from Discipline, and from all fair dealings. They must see that I have been injured—persecuted—defamed, and finally disowned, while I was able to defend myself on every point, though they had appointed a committee of *seven* to treat with me. They must admit, also, that I have truth and sound doctrine on my side. Wherever matters of *fact* have been brought into discussion, I have triumphantly refuted every charge that has been made

on my veracity. And on the point of doctrine, for which I have been censured, even the committee themselves have admitted, that the censure applies as fully to the Apostles themselves as to me. How then can any one evade the conclusion, that the Society has unchristianized itself—and that Quakerism and Primitive Christianity, are utterly at variance. For surely, to use an *old adage*, the rule must work both ways. If Quakers disown Christianity, Christians must disown Quakerism. If Quakerism will disown a man for conforming to the doctrines and examples of the Apostles and early Christians—Christianity must reject the peculiar views of Quakerism—from which such results have proceeded.

It has been my wish, that the feeling excited among the members of the Society, by these transactions, may not be of a personal or party character. It is not against *persons*, in this view, that I wish to raise objections—but against the principles and their natural fruits, which are found among the Friends, that I have endeavoured to give a faithful warning. I have not endeavoured to form a party around myself, but to point them to Christ Jesus, the Holy Head of the Church; and to that blessed *order*, which he established in his own house.

If the Friends are wise, they will be wise to themselves, and if they scorn, they alone shall bear it. It is for *their* benefit, not *mine*, that I have set before them the corruptions, both in principle and practice, which are found in the body of which they are members, and for the official acts of which, they must be responsible, in some degree, so long as they are thus identified with it.

I am quite aware that *many*, very *many* of the members of the Society, most heartily disapprove the measures which have recently been pursued by the Conservatives—and know and lament the maintenance of the *principles* from which those measures have arisen. And while they occupy this ground, without the least compromise, or con-

cealment of their real sentiments, I can most tenderly sympathise with them. But they must bear two things in remembrance. That the true Christian can make no compromise with that which is evil. He should neither unite with it, nor *seem* to unite. And further: That there is a limit, beyond which, connection with an unsound body becomes criminal and highly dangerous. "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

When any Associate Body, by its official acts, becomes decidedly unsound, and plainly, and openly opposed to Christianity, as exhibited in the doctrines and practices of the Apostles, connection with that body becomes extremely dangerous, if not directly sinful.

I have known some individuals, who in the commencement of these difficulties, saw that the predominating party were wrong. But observing the strong current which was running in that direction, concluded to go a little with that current, that they might not entirely lose their *influence*, and the opportunity of doing good. But in a very short time they were going thoroughly with the ruling party, and became the active agents of carrying their plans into execution. People must not attempt to do evil that good may come. They must not give up the cause of Christ, nor seem to do it, in order that by some management, they may, either underhandedly, or at some future time, promote it more successfully.

I know, that the sound members of the Society are so much in the *minority*, and have so little influence, that they cannot arrest the present course of proceedings. But they certainly could bear an open testimony against it. They may not be able to prevent the Society from taking, as it has done, a position totally irreconcileable to the doctrine and practice of the Apostles—but they can search the Scriptures, and give practical evidence of their sense of the obligation of the doctrines therein contained.

They may possibly think, it is in vain for them to contend against the general current. But they ought to be faithful in their own practice. But this is not all. For as the candle is not lighted to be put under the Bed or the Bushel—neither ease nor advantage should induce them to relinquish the full amount of influence which they might be able to exert, for the spreading of the Kingdom of the Redeemer, and the gathering of souls to him.

The love of ease, and the attempt to establish peace, upon a false and rotten foundation, never can lead to any happy results. We cannot suppose that God will always suffer corruption to be covered up, in the bosom of a highly professing Society. And however painful the operation may be, the Society must prepare to have its ulcers probed to the bottom. Nor should they think it unnecessary, if the knife should be applied, to open some of those more hidden receptacles, in which offensive matter has long lain, pent up, and concealed from superficial observation. As in the human, so in the social system—disease must prey upon the very vitals, so long as corruption lies any where concealed in it. It must all be discharged, before there can be any radical cure.

For the *Society*, in its official character, I confess I have no hopes of a reformation. I think its character is *fixed*, and will go with it to the grave. How long its existence may be protracted, is not for me to pretend to determine. But all who are acquainted with it, know perfectly well that it is on the *decline*. And causes for that decline are constantly increasing. However the older members may regret to let go their hold on the Society of which they are members—with education and intelligence increasing among the young people—with the knowledge which *they* and the christian public will have of the position which the body has taken—we cannot expect that the next generation will feel and act as *their* fathers have done.

The results of its History show to every dispassionate person, that the Society of Friends is not designed by the Great Ruler of the Universe, to be the nucleus, on which the Church General is to be formed. Taking the numbers, which are pretty clearly ascertained to have been included in the Society in the year 1660, and the natural increase of population would amount to *ten* times the present number, both of Orthodox and Hicksites. Taking, then, the whole amount of prosolytes into the account, the Society has not retained more than one tenth of its own children, during the last 175 years. How then should it gather other churches into it? And much less should it evangelize the world.

But it has heretofore been understood, that while the labours of missionaries sent out by other societies, have been abundantly blessed—Friends *could not send missionaries.* Their *peculiar views* forbid it. And though the Yearly Meeting of London has, in some sort, encouraged missionary visits, at *great expense*, yet compared with the success of others, it has resulted in a *failure.* But this is not all. For with all their zeal for meliorating the condition of the African Descendants, (which has been laudable), and with the advantage of the opportunity of instilling their principles into the minds of the coloured people under their care—few, very few, have ever been induced to join the Society. I could not count up one dozen, of all that have ever become members. The case of the Indians, is not less striking than that of the African descendants. No people have stood higher in the estimation of the Aborigines of this country than the Friends. But with this advantage of *influence*, and with an almost constant intercourse with them for the last 150 years, and several stations maintained among them at the expense of many thousands of dollars, there never has, so far as my information has gone, been made one prosolyte to the Society of Friends: while the labours of other societies

have been blessed, in bringing many of these children of the wilderness, to the Faith once delivered to the saints.

These facts must be admitted to speak a very solemn language. Taken in connection with the proceedings and principles examined in this volume, they show that there is a deeply seated malady in the body—that the seeds of this disease were sown in its very formation, and the fruits have been almost continually developing themselves. Sentiments of the most objectionable character, are found not only in the unpublished writings of the Early Friends—disclosing what were their real modes of thinking—but also in their printed works. The extravagances of the followers of James Naylor, and we may now class the followers of George Fox with them, show the pernicious tendency of the erroneous views they entertained of divine revelation, and of the indwelling of Christ in man. The views of Wilkinson and Story, in opposing the establishment of any system of Church Government, on the plea of the sufficiency of the guidance of the Light within, was but the carrying out of the original principles of George Fox and his coadjutors. The heresy of Hannah Barnard, and that outbreaking of Unitarianism, (to use no stronger term), which swept over the Society in Ireland, like a deluge, about the beginning of the present century, were defended by the writings of the Early Friends, and especially by Penn's Sandy Foundation Shaken. These same writings have been fruitful of mischief down to the present day—and with a knowledge not only of the General history of the Society, but of many of the particular passages in the writings of our Predecessors, which have stumbled the minds of hundreds and thousands of the members of the Society—the Yearly Meeting of London has earnestly recommended those writings, without any exception or any caution; and the Meeting for Sufferings of Ohio has declared the Doctrinal Treatises in which all those unsound passages

are contained, to be in strict accordance with the Holy Scriptures, and to give a clear view of the true Christian divinity!

In the mean time, God, in his over-ruling Providence, is shaking the Society from the centre to the circumference. The corruptions which have been covered up in it so long, are opening out, the dangerous delusions which possessed the very Founders of it, are coming to light—the high claims which have long been made to superiority over every other denomination of Christians, are sinking before the discovery of facts: and the unworthy conduct of those who now direct the affairs of the Society, gives further evidence of the badness of that system from which it proceeds, and which it is designed to uphold.

CHAPTER VIII.

As the "Appeal holds a prominent place among the charges on which I have been disowned, so likewise it holds a prominent place in the feelings of the Conservative Friends. The disclosure of the papers of George Fox has filled them with indignation; while many sound friends, feel an inexpressible mortification, in deriving their religious views from a man who was evidently the subject of a most extraordinary delusion. As soon as *the Appeal* reached the hands of the conservatives at Mountpleasant, it was made the foundation of a prosecution, in order for my disownment, for attempting, as they said, to destroy the Society and G. Fox's Christian character, and religious reputation, by calling in question the *soundness* of his religious writings.

But it was not enough, in their estimation, to make it a matter of disownment, to call in question any thing that G. F. said or did. Many persons confidently denied the genuineness of the papers published in the Appeal. It was represented as a base forgery, and as such demanding the reprobation of all respectable people. Others, who could not be persuaded that the papers were a forgery, severely censured the *exposure* of them, while in doing so, they fully admitted the disgrace that was attached to George Fox and his most intimate friends—and to their successors in religious profession. And all the blame which they bestowed upon me, for the disclosure of real facts, passed over with increased weight, to G. F. and Early and modern Friends.

This perplexing and, to the Friends, vexatious business, could not be suffered to remain, without further effort to counteract the effects of the Appeal.

Soon after it made its appearance, the Meeting for Sufferings in London, issued an Epistle, eulogizing the Early Friends, but saying nothing of the Appeal. In the latter part ofthe 3rd month, George Richardson, one of the Conservatives in England, a minister, and one of the noted committee of the Yearly Meeting, in the case of Isaac Crewdson, wrote a pamphlet, entitled "Brief Remarks on some of the charges recently made against the Early Writers of the Society of Friends."

Subsequent to this, as it would seem, another work has been given to the public, by Samuel Tuke, a minister, a member of the aforesaid committee, and Clerk of the Yearly Meeting in London. This work is entitled "Plea on behalf of George Fox and the Early Friends."

George Richardson, and Samuel Tuke, however have not exactly taken either of the grounds to which I have alluded in the beginning of this chaper; and in fact have relieved me of the censure cast upon me by all three of these parties. They have acknowledged the objectionable character of the language used in the letters; and therefore they have virtually condemned the *Society* in prosecuting me for calling the writings in question. They have FULLY admitted the *genuineness* of the papers; and thereby they have silenced forever the imputation of forgery. They have turned the force of their talents against me, for the representation which they say I have made of the views of G. Fox and his friends, and thereby they have virtually released me from all blame which had been cast upon me, for suffering the *papers to speak for themselves.* In fact, these friends have too much discernment not to see, that no defence whatever could be made for George Fox and his friends, on the ground that their letters, taken by themselves, and speaking for themselves,

were scandalous. And yet they have involved themselves, in no small degree of contradiction and absurdity.

Let the reader then bear in remembrance that the genuineness of the papers in question, is fully admitted.

Before descending to the arguments used by these writers, in defence of G. Fox, I will make one remark which I think of importance. Neither of them has done me *justice* in stating the plainly declared object of the Appeal. And this is the more to be complained of, as that object is spread *broadly* on its pages, in the commencement, and is again distinctly referred to in the conclusion. To state the object unfairly, is to place the *whole subject,* in an unfair point of view. Samuel Tuke begins his Plea with the following paragraph: "The following pages are devoted to the consideration of two charges affecting the character of the Society of Friends, the first being against George Fox, viz: '*that he assumed to himself attributes which belong only to the Divine Being:*'—the second against the Early Friends, viz: 'that they ascribed such attributes to him.' " Plea p. 1.

To enable the reader to judge of the fairness or unfairness of this representation, I will refer to the Appeal; and more especially to the following passages.

"I ask then, where are we to find Primitive Christianity clearly and authoritatively set forth? in the Holy Scriptures, or in our own writings? If we take the Holy Scriptures, some parts of our own writings must be given up. If, on the other hand, we take our own writings, some parts of the Scriptures will be virtually set aside. Should this preference to our own writings be so enforced upon our members, by official acts, as to subject *those* to censure who *do* conform to the Scriptures, but, who, in so doing deviate from some sentiments expressed in our own writings, then, plainly, *Quakerism* will be set up in opposition to Christianity, and the language and authority of *early Friends* be opposed to the language and authority of *Jesus*

Christ. I ask you, my friends, are you prepared to take this ground?"

"The controversy now existing in the Society arises from a difference on the fundamental doctrines of religion; but it is not confined to those fundamental doctrines. On one side, the Holy Scriptures are taken as containing the whole body of Christian doctrine as God himself was pleased to give it. On the other hand, it is insisted, that *our* writings contain the form of doctrine which is binding upon *us*. However speciously some may endeavour to conceal the fact, it cannot be denied that a fair examination of our own writings by the standard of Scripture is not allowed; but, on the contrary, we are enjoined to receive the Scriptures as they are interpreted by our early Friends."

"Now, besides the fearful discredit which is thus cast upon the Word of God, the question arises,—Are our own writings in full and perfect agreement with the Holy Scritures? This, of necessity, brings us to an examination. To make this examination fairly, we must not entertain the belief that our early Friends were infallibly led by the Holy Spirit. Their inspiration was so confidently asserted by some of them, and has been so often repeated and admitted, that even the intimation that this was not the case, is regarded by many as proof positive, that the individual who entertains doubts on this subject is himself under a delusion."

"Considering the important bearing of these things on individuals, and on the very truth of the Gospel itself, how, I ask, are they to be met? The privileges of the members of this society—the prosperity of the body—the salvation of souls, and the honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, are all immediately concerned. To say in general terms, that our early Friends were *mistaken* in some things, in which they supposed they were led by immediate revelation, is regarded at once as evidence, that those

who say so are in error. This, if it related only to personal reputation, might be endured. But when it bears directly on things which relate to life and salvation, it becomes a serious question, how far we shall refrain from stating facts, to prove, not only that our early Friends were *fallible*, but that, *on some important points, they really were mistaken*, when they confidently professed, that they were taught by *immediate revelation*. The great mass of their writings which are still extant affords many examples of the kind to which I have alluded. Should the position be denied, this whole mass of writings lies open before us, for the collection of proof. At present I shall confine myself to very narrow limits, and take only a few examples which directly, or indirectly relate to George Fox. I do this because he was the Founder of the Society, and as such, demands the first place of consideration among our early Friends."

"In venturing to take notice of the opinions and conduct of that very extraordinary man, I do sincerely desire not to place his character in any improper point of view; nor to withhold from him any of those charitable and reasonable allowances which *can* properly be claimed for him. His *sincerity* and *zeal* will not be called in question. Of these qualities, his deep sufferings, and his unweared exertions, are sufficient proofs."—*Appeal, pp.* 5, 6.

"Let the reader, however, reflect for a moment on the depth and long continuance of his distress, and then say, if it was not sufficient in ordinary cases, to have affected the powers of Judgment, at least on some particular points? We know that it is not at all uncommon for what is called religious melancholy, or gloomy and distressing views of religious subjects long continued, to produce such an effect."—*ib. p.* 7.

"This appears to have been in the year 1648, when George Fox was twenty-four years of age. Let the reader reflect for a moment on the prominent circumstances

of the case, and say if there is not some special allowance to be made. Here was a *youth*, with so little education that he could scarcely write legibly—of a peculiar turn of mind—who had passed a number of years in the deepest distress, from his peculiar views of religious subjects—who at length, was carried along by an idea of *extraordinary revelations* made immediately to himself, and with an apparent defect of *judgment on that particular subject.* It is evident that his *imagination* was powerfully excited, in supposing that he had "come up in spirit *through the flaming sword* into the *Paradise of God.*"—*ib. p.* 8.

"That this was the result of an *excited imagination*, with a want of *judgment on the subject of immediate revelation*, I should think very few, at this day, will venture to deny.—I sincerely desire that every allowance which the circumstances of the case will admit may be made; but one thing is of too serious importance to be passed over, and that is—the danger of holding the idea of having revelations which are not to be 'subjected to the test of the Scriptures.' "—*ib.*

"I could bring forward abundance of evidence, to prove that claims to revelation, and to the *power of God*, were made, both by George Fox himself and by his friends, which must be abandoned on calm and dispassionate examination. Those papers which I have now produced, and others in existence, furnish undeniable proof, that there was the assumption by him, and the ascription to him, of *attributes which belong only to the Divine Being.*—From them it is apparent, that we have been greatly mistaken in the estimate which we have made of the extraordinary *clearness* of the views of our early Friends; and that the danger is extreme in suffering the views of such men to alter or pervert any of the doctrines of religion, as taught in the Bible."—*ib. p.* 21.

"It is not my intention, at the present time, to follow out the inquiry respecting the *frailty* and *fallibility* of

George Fox and his Friends. Enough has been adduced to show that they were not only *fallible but did fail*, in some cases, when they made the highest professions of divine guidance. The existing circumstances of the Society not only call for these facts to be brought to light, as examples of warning to show the awful danger of slighting in any degree the recorded will of God, and of mistaking the workings of our own imaginations for immediate revelation; but also to prove, by undeniable evidence, that we *are not authorised* to receive the views of George Fox as infallible, any more than those of other fallible men.—I ask, then, will you still receive his views implicitly as the result of revelation, and be actually prevented, thereby, from coming directly to the Holy Scriptures, in all matters of faith and practice?"—*ib. p.* 22.

These copious extracts, and others which might be quoted, show the object of the Appeal. It was plainly to call back the Friends to the Scriptures, as the only divinely authorized record of the Will of God, in matters of Faith and Practice—and to show that George Fox and his friends were not only *fallible*, but that they *did fail*, *in some cases*, when they made the highest professions of divine guidance—and that we were not warranted to "recieve his views implicitly, as the result of revelation, and be actually prevented by them, from coming directly to the Holy Scriptures, in matters of faith and practice."

Samuel Tuke is admitted on all hands to be a man of more than ordinary talents, and high standing in the Society. But how did it happen that such a man should overlook the *design* of the Appeal as he has done? I am far from imputing unworthy motives to him. For though I think his representation is *unfair*, I do not mean to charge him with *intentional unfairness*. I think, with all his *sagacity*, he could see no other way of defending George Fox and Early Friends, with any sort of plausibility, than that which he took. And I give him full credit, as an *advocate*,

for having made the most specious Plea that could have been made.

But it would have lost much of its plausibility if it had shown the declared object of the Appeal to be, to present conclusive evidence, that G. F. and the Friends alluded to, were *mistaken* in certain specific cases distinctly brought into notice. I grant that the exhibition of those cases, results in the conclusion that G. F. and the other persons whose letters are given in the Appeal, judging from what they said—did, on the one hand claim, and on the other hand grant, to G. F. titles and attributes which belong to no human being. But this is the effect of their own papers, rather than the *object* which I had in view.—Had I taken a *mild* or unimportant case, to show that they were *mistaken*, it would have produced no other effect on the Friends, than to have increased their confidence in G. F. from the supposed impotence of all attempts to call his views in question. It was necessary that strong cases should be taken: which I hoped would be conclusive with all persons of impartiality. But in doing this, the *nature of the mistake* could *not be concealed*. And it would have been laying myself open to a most serious imputation, from all intelligent christians, if I had not shown that I both understood the *common* meaning of such language as was used by G. F. and his Friends, and most heartily reprobated its application to him, or to any other man.

I have proven *mistakes* in particular cases. And the Society, and the christian public must be aware of the direction taken by these mistakes.

Alarmed at the obvious bearing of the language used by G. Fox and others, the author of the Plea set himself to work, to prove that they did not *mean* what they said. Now, without at all admitting that he has succeeded in maintaining his position, let us, for a moment, grant that he has proven that they did not mean, what the terms

they used, would in their common acceptation convey. Does not every man of common sense perceive that he has established, by another process, the very thing that I intended to prove, by publishing the Appeal? Certainly if they expressed themselves in terms as far from the ideas they intended to convey, as blasphemy is from sound principles—then such productions cannot be taken as of authority in matters of religion. The *writings* cannot be taken as the *representations* or the *evidences* of the "extraordinary *clearness* of the views of our Early Friends." I ask Samuel Tuke, as an intelligent and honest man, if he has not proved, (if we admit his own arguments), that the writings of the Early Friends cannot be taken in the common and obvious meaning of the language they used? I put this question now in the outset, and he may take which horn of the dilemma he pleases. If he should insist on the correctness of the *writings* themselves, he must abandon the whole ground of his plea—and either give up the Early Friends as guilty of blasphemy—or vindicate blasphemy himself. If he maintains the ground he has taken, that the Friends did not mean what they *said*, or *seemed* to say—he gives up their *writings*, as a clear exposition of truth.

Now, if he will prove that the Early Friends did not *mean* any thing *improper* in what they wrote—and at the same time have it clearly understood, that their *writings* are to be *corrected*, and taken entirely out of the way of *preventing* the members of the Society, "from coming directly to the Holy Scriptures, in all matters of faith and practice," I will be one among the many, that will most heartily congratulate him. But the first he has not yet done; and the last I presume he will not say he intended to do.

But granting, as I have done, for argument sake, that S. Tuke has proved that the Early Friends *did not mean what they said*—and it follows, beyond all contradiction,

that they were not divinely inspired at the time. But here again S. T. may take his choice of difficulties. For if they *did not mean* what they said, *they could not be inspired;* and if they *did mean it*, the claim to *inspiration* is equally preposterous. But the claim to Inspiration was made by the writers of both letters—that of M. F. and others to G. F., and his Letter to O. C. The writers of the first say: "We thy babes with one consent being gathered together in the power of the Spirit," &c. And G. F., (as the Printed Journal has it), says: "I was moved by the Lord to write a paper to the Protector," &c., and "When I had written what the *Lord had given me to write*, I set my name to it." And the witnesses to the paper, as it would seem, testify—that "G. F. *was moved of the Lord to give out these* WORDS following." These claims to the Influence of the Spirit, are plainly and palpably unfounded. S. T. dare not say the parties were inspired, in using the language which they did use.

The plea of knowing "little of the *grammar* of language," Plea, p. 10. will not apply to M. F. and her children, who no doubt were persons of good education.—But even to G. F., to whom it does apply—it is perfectly preposterous, to advance such an idea, in a case of pretended revelation. Shall it be said, that the man was moved of the Lord to write—and he did write "what the Lord had given him," and yet that he knew so "little of the grammar of language," that it came out something entirely different from what was intended? Such a supposition as this, is calculated to bring *these* claims to revelation, into perfect contempt, before all intelligent men.

But the author of the Plea, and every other man of sense, must admit that the writers of these letters were *not inspired, as they professed to be.* Of course they were under a *delusion.* Then I ask, what becomes of their high claims to revelation? In the particular cases before

us, every body must see that they are given up, even by their most zealous *advocates*. But the matter does not end here. For if they were under delusion in these particular cases, it follows, that they could not distinguish *true revelations*, from the workings of their own *imaginations*, or the transformations of Satan.

This consequence, which I conceive must be admitted by all candid persons, has a most important bearing, not only on their particular claims to revelations, but on certain doctrines which, it is well known, have marked the Society from its rise to the present day. I refer more particularly to the doctrine of the Primary Rule of Faith and Practice, which is said to be inward—the Spirit, or the Influence of the Spirit, immediately in the mind of man. It shows most strikingly the fallacy of reasoning from the infallibility of the Spirit, abstractly taken, to the *certainty of our own impressions*. Now if the very *Founder* of the Society, and the most distinguished Early Friends, were *mistaken* when they confidently claimed being moved by the Lord, and being gathered together in the power of the Spirit—how completely does this fact show the danger of taking supposed revelations, as the rule of faith and practice, independent of the Scriptures! I say *supposed revelations*, for the facts before us prove, that in the case of the Early Friends themselves, the doctrine, when reduced to practice, landed there—and in some most striking instances, in *delusion*.

I consider it altogether a shrinking from the prominent points of the case, to go from a close and candid examination of the Letters themselves, to *general reasoning* on the *general character* of George Fox and his Friends. It is very much like the instinct of the old bird, who, well knowing the spot at which the objects of her solicitude are immediately in danger—flutters on the ground to lead the pursuer in an opposite direction, into the open field—where, when the design is accomplished, she can mount

into the air, and leave the pursuer to blame himself for the fruitlessness of the chase. I shall therefore leave S. T. and his coadjutors, to say all the excellent things they can find, of the general character of G. F. and the Early Friends. With such exhibitions I have nothing to do. They may flutter on the ground, or wing the trackless regions of the air, at their own discretion. It is with the particular cases, contained in the Appeal, that I am immediately concerned—and to show that the advocates of G. F. and Early Friends, instead of invalidating the Appeal, have confirmed it as to the genuineness of the papers published in it, and the objects for which it was professedly written.

But first I will remove out of the way some caviling objections, which have been raised by these writers.

S. T. says: "It may not unnaturally be asked, where this letter of [of M. Fell's] has been, that it has only now, after the lapse of almost two centuries, made its appearance?

"To this it may be briefly replied, that one of the descendants of the Fell family has, it appears, in his possession, a mass of old papers relative to G. Fox, and amongst which is a journal of many of the principal circumstances of his life. There are in it several original letters, endorsed by G. Fox, as having been filed amongst his papers. The letter in question, as well as that to Oliver Cromwell, are of this number." Plea, p. 8.

Here, let the reader observe, is a complete acknowledgment of the genuineness of these letters. George Richardson, also, who had the MSS. some time in his possession, fully admits the genuineness of the letters in question. S. T. further says: "That he put the letter [of M. F.] by; that he endorsed it, and that he wrote on it something relative to the result of his return to Swarthmore, is readily admitted."

In connection with the quotation before the last, S. T.

proceeds: "It is admitted that this collection is not the MSS. from which the Journal as printed, was taken, and no evidence is adduced to prove that George Fox placed the letter where it now is, in the MSS. collection, or had any other but the most private view in its preservation." P. 8.

To this passage there are several objections.

After admitting the genuineness of the papers immediately in question, a shade of uncertainty is attempted to be cast over the Manuscripts, as *the Journal*. As to its not being that from which the Printed Journal was taken, this must be evident to every one that reflects for a moment upon the subject—from the simple fact of the numerous discrepancies between the two. But who prepared the MS. from which the printed Journal was taken? Certainly not G. F., as I shall presently prove.

To the remark that "no evidence is adduced to prove that G. F. placed the letter where it now is, in the MSS. collection, or had any other but the most private view in its preservation," it may be replied, that this alters not the case, as it respects the blame which attaches both to the writer and receiver of the letter. The genuineness of the letter is both proven and admitted: so likewise is George Fox's reception of it—together with the endorsement, and note which he placed upon it. And whether the parties intended to keep these matters secret or not, we see what sentiments passed between them. An unlawful action does not become blameless, by the intention of the parties to keep it secret. Neither does it alter the character of the *letter* to suppose that G. F. did not place it in his Journal, but file it with his valued papers. But the author of the Plea is mistaken, in saying, "no evidence is adduced to prove that G. Fox placed the letter where it now is in the MSS. collection." The fact of its being a part of his *Journal*, is sufficient proof that it was placed there by him. The same objection might be made to his

putting any other paper into the collection, and so on, to the whole of it. But if such objections as this were allowed, where is the manuscript in the world, that could be traced to any man, or body of men, whatever? The collection, now in the possession of one of the descendants of the Fell family, is found in the form of a *Book*—with all the marks of age, not only of the papers, but of the putting of them together. The general arrangement is such as to preserve the order of dates, referred to in the narrative part, and in the original letters. These letters are interspersed through the whole body of the collection. The tradition in the family is, that this was the Journal. As such it was shown to me on my first visit to London, before the objectionable matters were found in it—and as the *Journal*, it has been shown to many a stranger.

I believe that it is a rule in relation to *evidence*, universally admitted, that no kind of proof, which would be unreasonable to be expected, in the circumstances of the case, is to be required. Now, I ask, what sort of evidence does S. T. require to establish the fact, that this collection of narrative and original letters, was the Journal prepared by G. F. himself? Does he want somebody to testify that he saw him put into that collection, with his own hands, every individual paper that is in it? No: Such evidence would be a refutation of itself. We have the *Book* made up, with all the evidences of age, necessary to carry it back to the time of George Fox. We have the *Tradition* of the *Family*, in which it has been handed down, as a precious relique. And we have G. Fox's own hand writing upon the particular papers—by which they were respectively verified by him. And in addition to all this, it was in the hands of Margaret Fell twelve years after the death of George Fox—and by her, at her death—at the advanced age of 88, handed down to one of her daughters, who was immediately concerned in the letter in question. Now I ask, what further evidence can any

reasonable man demand, to establish the character of the collection, as *the Journal*, and not as mere private papers? It appears to me to be a mere *quibble*—an objection that can bear no serious examination. The reflection on the family, and on me, for exposing *private* papers, is *repelled:* and S. T. is called upon to prove that they were so—or to retract the charge.

Again, S. T., after quoting from the Printed Journal, the account there given of the Letter to O. C., says: "This is his own description of the letter." But I ask, where is the evidence, or even the *probability*, that this description was given by G. Fox himself? The representation is materially different from that contained in the MS. Journal. And who prepared the copy that went into the hands of the printer? Not. G. F., as already observed. *It was the work of Thomas Ellwood, after G. F.'s death.* I refer the reader to J. Wyeth's supplement to Ellwood's Life, London ed. 1765, pp. 367, 368: where he will find the following statement: "Our dear friend George Fox dying in the 11th month 1690, and leaving behind him an excellent Journal of his travels and sufferings, our friend T. Ellwood (as no body fitter) about this time was at the pains of transcribing it, and fitting it for the Press, (a laborious work): which was printed next year, [1694], in a large folio."

Here then we have the testimony of one of the Early Friends, that G. F. left, at his death, a *Journal*, &c., and the tradition of the family in which it is preserved, says that the MSS. in question is that Journal—and all the internal evidence of the papers themselves, including the well-known hand writing of G. F. verifying the most important of them, proves the fidelity of this Tradition. J. W.'s testimony is conclusive, that it was T. E.'s manuscript, and not the *original* Journal, that went into the hands of the printer—so it was T. Ellwood's account, and not George Fox's.

J. W.'s language allows a fair inference, that T. E. made important changes in the Journal—in *fitting* it for the Press—for which no one was *fitter* than he. It was no doubt a *laborious work*. And while I could pity the man who had to perform it, I could neither approve the freedom which was taken, nor the principle on which it was conducted. I think that the *Founder* of a Society, has as much right to hand down his own character, in his own way, to his followers, as any man has to make his own *will*, for the disposal of his property after his death. Should there be *incapacity* in either case, the Journal or the Will might be set aside. But it does not appear to me, to be correct, to make *changes* either in the Journal or the Will—and let it go to record in the *name* of the deceased. But the idea of revising *revelations* is perfectly *absurd*. Those who undertake the revision of things professed to be by *immediate revelation*, virtually declare that they believe the pretension unfounded. But G. Fox not only made such a profession in particular cases mentioned in the Appeal, but he claimed again and again to be in the same spirit and power that the prophets and apostles were in. But it is a complication of contradictions, to *revise* the pretended revelations of George Fox—to retain the claims which he made to revelation—and then to insist on the clearness of his views, and the authority of his opinions, as thus *revised*, without acknowledging the fact that they are so.

But it turns out, that great liberty *was* taken, in revising George Fox's *revelations*. It was not only found that those revelations would not do, without passing through the hands of some one that "knew [a] little [more] of the grammar of language," than he did, but that the pruning knife must be put to the revelations themselves. Why else was it, that in preparing G. F.'s *excellent* Journal for the Press, the words "George Fox who is the Son of God," and "My kingdom is not of this world," were left out?

If, as is said, "any candid reader of this letter, who is at all acquainted with the character of the writer and with his usual style, especially at that period, will find no difficulty in understanding the passage in a wholly inoffensive sense;" Plea, p. 5, why was so much care taken to keep these expressions out of sight?

On the subject of revision, a comparison of the MS. with the Printed Journal, will show, that great and important changes were made. And these changes were not confined to the first edition of the work. G. F. died in 1690; but so great was the work of preparing the Journal for the Press, that it was not accomplished till 1694. In 1765, an edition was published, greatly changed from both those which had preceded it. The two first retained the cases of *Witches*, (in the common sense of the term), which G. F. professed to discover by revelation. The 3rd edition left out the word *witches*, and put in *wicked* persons—retaining all the former claims to *revelation*. Here was evidence that the revisers believed he was *mistaken* in the very thing said to be *revealed;* and yet they retained the claim to revelation—applying it to quite a different character of subjects.*

---

* Another illustration of the difficulty of coming at the real intention of George Fox, by what is given to the world in print, by his zealous admirers, occurs in the Friends' Library, now publishing in monthly numbers, edited by William and Thomas Evans of Philadelphia. In that work, p. 96, the editors have given what is represented to be one of George Fox's old manuscripts. It relates to certain bequests which he made: and among the rest, a *Case and Bottles*, which G. F. is made to say, in the Friends' Library, he gave to stand in the meeting house to hold "*water*" for Friends to drink. I have in my possession an old paper, which was preserved with the Journal, but not embodied in it, in which G. F. says: "My wife shall have the profits or use of Pettyes with the land as long as she doth Live, if she will, and then after her Death to ye. Lord & Friends as ye Deed doth order of mine. And my Eboney Bed with the curtins & my great Chair & my Sea Case with the Glass Bottles in itt. I doe Give to stand in the house at Pettyes which I have given for a meeting place, & ye Chair will serve for Friends to sitt on & ye Bed to Lie upon, and ye Sea Case will hold Some Liquor or Drink if any should be faint."

Here let it be observed, that the version of this bequest, as given

One argument used by the advocates of G. F. in defending him in the use of the terms *the Son of God*, as applied to himself, is, that if it had been considered objectionable by Cromwell, he would not have suffered it to pass as he did. This however is perfectly beside the matter. It is not the question what Cromwell thought of the expressions, or what were his motives for passing it by: but whether it was *correct*. On this there ought now to be no difference of opinion. That O. C. at the time of the writing of this Letter, was using his utmost address to attach G. F. to him, and his policy, is fully evinced in the printed Journal. And if he, in carrying on an artful piece of management, to promote his own schemes of ambition—gave countenance to any erroneous sentiments or forms of expression in G. F's. letter, it becomes no rule of decision in the case for us.

I confess that I am really surprised that the Friends, in order to defend G. Fox, should even *seem* to justify the use of the terms *the Son of God*, as applied to him or any other man. Let S. T., G. R. and others reflect on the zeal which has been displayed from the days of G. F. to the present time, against the commn mode of *salutation*, because the Early Friends and their successors thought those salutation, made too near an approch to the honour which belongs to God only—though every body knows

---

in the Friends' Library, destroys both the *letter* and the *spirit* of the original. Every body who knows any thing of the terms in question, knows that *Cases* were used to hold *ardent spirits*. G. F. thought it necessary to keep a supply of this article at the meeting house, "if any should be faint." But the version of the legacy contained in the Friends' Library—(not saying that the editors altered it), puts G. F. in advance of all Temperance reform that ever has been thought of. For who would think of keeping *water*, *bottled* up in a *case*, at a meeting house, while springs or wells afforded a supply?

One word, as we pass along, on the singularity of making the *Lord* a *joint reversionary legatee*, with Friends, to come in, after the death of the widow, to the permanent possession of this lot of land called Pettyes, containing about three acres: which seems also to have been previously secured by deed.

perfectly well, that they are not used to express any thing in the character of divine honours. Let them also consider what has been said against calling the Scriptures the Word of God, though in numerous cases in Scripture it was used to signify the message which God had sent to men. The perpetually recurring objection to this has been, that the term belongs peculiarly to Christ. Why should G. F. have been so sensitive in these cases, and so dull of apprehension in the other? He could call it blasphemy to apply the term *the Word of God* to the Scriptures—and yet he could receive the appellations of the Bread of Life, the Fountain of Life, the Father of Eternal Felicity &c. &c. and could call himself not *a Son*, but *the Son* of God. You may take a Hottentot, or Greenlander—and if he knows the first principles of the Gospel of Christ, he will know that the terms *the Son of God* apply to the Lord Jesus, and to him alone. How awfully ignorant then, do the advocates of G. F. represent him to have been, when he had been a preacher seven years, and had already gathered a large Society! But such is the plea which his ablest advocates are making for him—such the extremities of the case—either to suffer him to be reputed a blasphemer, or make him out consummately ignorant. But in either case, his authority as an inspired teacher is gone.

S. T. observes, page 2, that the charge against G. F. and that against the Early Friends are almost inseparable. And yet he say, pp. 8, 9, in regard to George Fox, "I must utterly deny that there is one tittle of evidence that he approved the offensive expressions in this Letter. He doubtless knew how to distinguish between enthusiastic feeling in new converts, leading to extravagant expressions and grossly misapplied Scripture terms, and the impious ascription to him of that which belongs to the Lord of Life alone; and there is no reason whatever to doubt, that the least idea of such an ascription would have drawn

from him the indignant exclamation substantially used by him on another occasion, *I am nothing, Christ is all.*"

Here S. T. completely inverts the natural order of evidence. He utterly denies that there is one tittle of evidence that he approved the offensive expressions in the letter—and assumes that the least idea of such an ascription as the plain meaning of the words conveyed, would have drawn from him the indignant reply I am nothing, Christ is all. But what, I ask, would the form of expression here quoted from him amount to, with the notion held by Nayler and others? Would it have been a rejection of the title of Christ? It is a form of expression as equivocal as that used by Nayler himself—"to ascribe this Name, Power and Virtue to *James Nayler*, (or to that which had a beginning, and must return to dust) or for that to be exalted or worshipped, to me is great Idolatry, and with the Spirit of Christ Jesus in me it is condemned;" &c. And yet it was the notion both of Nayler and his followers, that *they* might worship the *Christ that was in him.*

As G. R. has acknowledged the letters to G. F. and the worship paid to J N. to be of the same character, and S. T. has also referred to the case of Naylor, in a manner corroborating the views of G. R. as will be more fully shown hereafter, I shall make the following quotations relating to this most extraordinary case. When Nayler was examined by the committee of Parliament, he said: "I do abhor that any honour due to God should be given to me, *as I am a creature.* But it pleased the Lord to set me up as a sign of the coming of the righteous, One, and what has been done as I passed through these towns, I was commanded by the Lord to suffer such things to be done by me, as to the outward, as a sign, not as I am a creature." Burton's Diary, vol. 1. p. 11.

Again. "Being asked about assuming the title of *the fairest of ten thousand*, he shifted it notably thus. He that

has a greater measure of Christ than 10,000 below him, the same is the fairest of 10,000."—*ib. p.* 46.

Again, in reference to the women he said: "It is not true. They gave no worship to me, I abhor it, as I am a creature."—*ib. p.* 47.

Every one acquainted with the case, knows perfectly, that these *seeming* censures on worship offered to him *as a creature*, was no condemnation in fact, either on himself or his followers, for they are mixed with direct justifications of both.

But what did G. F. ever say of Margaret Fell and her daughters, of Thomas Salthouse and William Caton (both of whom became prominent ministers) and of Thomas Lower, a son-in-law, that even made an approach to the appearance of censure here expressed by Nayler on his followers? J. N. could deny *worship*, offered to him *as he was a creature*, and yet recieve and justify it, on the perverted view which was entertained by himself and his deluded followers, of the indwelling of Christ in him, and the character which he claimed from that indwelling. And yet when "*Sir Gilbert Pickering* offered another question (being unsatisfied) about what his hope was in Christ's merits, and how he prayed to Christ that died at Jerusalem," T. Burton says: "Whereupon Nayler was called in again, and answered *pretty Orthodoxly* to those questions, and gave an account of his faith in God and Christ." vol. 1. 48.

So he could, on such questions as these, answer *pretty orthodoxly*, and yet hold his own wild and visionary views, in regard to his own character, and justify his followers in their extravagant admiration of him. I make there remarks from the acknowledged affinity of the two cases—and from the fact that S. T. rests an important point of his plea, on the *orthodox* statements, which G. F. made on the same points, with those embraced in Sir Gilbert Pickering's questions. The case of Nayler shows completely, the fallacy of arguments drawn from the circumstance of his having answered such questions *pretty orthodoxly*.

There certainly were reasons why the Society made up with J. N. as they did. But his *Recantation* bears strong marks of an adherence to his original opinions, which led to those unhappy results. He still retained the form of expression, limiting his condemnation to the worship paid to his *person*—to him *as a creature*, which left the essence of the delusion out of view: or passed it over virtually justified. This was the perverted doctrine of the indwelling of Christ, and the character thereby conferred, instead of those pure and simple views of the subject presented in Holy Scripture. Thus in one of his papers, speaking of his previous experience he says: "Into that Life I was comprehended, and the apple of that pure eye was opened in me, which admits not an evil thought, but is wounded and bruised with the least appearance of evil, even this birth was born which reigns through righteousness, and suffers till all righteousness be fulfilled in every particular. *And this is the Son of God* forever, and into this Life and Kingdom I was translated." Collection of sundry Books &c. by J. N. London ed. 1716, p xli.

And again, speaking of a letter written to him, in which it was said: 'Thy name shall no more be James Nayler, but Jesus;' he says: "So this I deny also, That the Name of Christ Jesus is received instead of James Nayler, or be ascribed to him; For the *name* is to the Promised Seed to all generations, and he that *hath the Son*, HATH THE NAME which is Life and Power, the Salvation and the unction, into which all the children of Light are baptized,"—*ib.* p. liii.

Now I ask any man of common understanding, if this is not claiming the *Name* at the very moment he was seeming to reject it? He that hath the *Son* hath the *Name*, &c.

But to return from this necessary digression to S. T's. assertion, that there is not a tittle of evidence to prove that G. F. approved the offensive expression contained in

the letters—we are directly at issue. I insist that the fact of the preservation of the letter, as it was preserved by G. F., the endorsement upon it, and the note on the face of it, in his own hand, are *prima facia* evidence that he did approve it. The whole body of the Letter is improper, yet the printed Journal makes him say, that he felt freedom from the Lord to comply with this most extraordinary requent. The same authority makes him say, before this letter was written, the Power of God broke in upon M. Fell and her daughter Sarah &c. He received and preserved similar letters through a period of 23 years, without one single indication of disapprobation.

The author of the Plea, should know, that the burden of *proof* now lies upon *him*, if the *disapprobation* of George Fox, on these letters is to be contended for. But in taking this ground, there is a most striking incongruity with the position laid down in the beginning of the second part of the Plea, where he says: "The claim and the grant cannot be separated, for there can be no doubt that George Fox and his coadjutors were essentially united in opinion on substantial points!" The use which he makes of these two positions is this. There is no evidence that George Fox approved the offensive expressions of Margaret Fell and others—therefore he did not approve them, of course he was free from blame. The writers of the Letter were free from blame also, for there could be no doubt of their being united in opinion &c. This is the substance of the argument—the weakness of which is not to be attributed to the want of talent in the *advocate*, but to the total *badness* of the cause.

But if G. F. did not see the objectionable character of the Letter in question, it is no great argument for the clearness of his perception. Comparing this letter with his supposed revelation, forbiding him to say "good morrow" &c. reminds me of one of those formerly who, (in figurative language,) strained at a gnat, and swallowed a camel.

But wether he was capable of discovering the objectionable character of the terms used in the letter or not—taking the language in its plain and obvious meaning of the words, it was ascribing to him what belonged only to Christ, in the fulness of his divine character. As to the *meaning* of the writers—there is one general rule; to judge of what people *mean*, by what they *say*.

S. T. and G. Richardson both lay great stress on the shortness of the time which had elapsed from the convincement of these persons, to the date of the letter. But a weaker apology could scarcely be thought of. Suppose it were placed in the very hour—or under the immediate influence of the preaching of G. F. you would only have a more distinct illustration of the effects of his ministry.—The further you trace the parties from the time of their hearing G. F. the more time you give for their own sober reflection to correct the immediate effects of his preaching. But here we have it so early, as to be at no loss for its origin—and we have it so late as to put all idea of a mere momentary transport quite out of the question. G. R. and S. T. both entirely overlook the fact, that this same Margaret Fell wrote the Letter to J. Nayler four years after the Letter to George Fox was written. They forget that Ann Curtis's Letter was written eight years after M. F's. and that Thomas Lower's was written *twenty-three years* after the first of this description. How weak then is the apology, which has been made, on account of the shortness of the time after their first acquaintance with G. F.!

G. Richardson gives, as one Apology, that M. F's. daughters were *mere girls*, inferring that it was a sort of *girlish* indiscretion. Let the Letters Speak for themselves. Margaret Fell evidently held the pen for herself and family. She was 38 years of age, the wife of a man of distinction, with her daughters and servants about her. In the absence of her husband, she had embraced the views of a stranger, and on the approach of her husband, grieved and

offended with what had transpired in his family—she writes to this stranger the Letter now before us.* Let the reader examine that letter, and its peculiar features. They begin by calling G. F. "our dear father in the Lord"—which might pass as unobjectionable, but for what follows, "Eternal Praises be to our father." Now I ask what idea can we suppose they had of G. F. to consider him as an object to receive "*Eternal Praises?*" Is any being to receive Eternal Praises but God? And this sentiment is immediately connected with the following: "We thy babes, being with one consent gathered together in the power of the Spirit." &c. Will S. T. and G. R. or any one else, dare to say that this was true? They might as well say that the worshipers of Nayler were INSPIRED. But here is a direct claim to the influence and power of the Spirit. If this was true, G. F. was an object of worship—if it was not true, they were under *a delusion.* But to proceed. Let us first notice the allusions to the particular *difficulties* which they had in their minds in writing to G. F. "And let not that beastly power which keeps us in bondage separate thy bodily presence from us, who riegns as King above it, and would rejoice to see thy kingly power here triumph over it."—"My own

*There is some discrepancy between the accounts given by M. F. in her "Testimony," and that in the printed Journal, as revised by Ellwood. M. F. represents Nayler and Farnsworth, as in the house at the time Judge Fell came home: and that she had received information, or in the some way understood that G. F. would come that night, which he did. Of course G. F. was sent for before Judge Fell came home, which no doubt was the case. Ellwood's version of the story, (which must be incorrect) is this: "Soon after Judge Fell being come home, Margaret Fell his wife sent to me, desiring me to return thither. And I feeling freedom from the Lord so to do, went back through the country to Swarthmore." But both accounts agree in representing his being sent for, as on account of Judge Fell. M. F. says: "And any may think what a condition I was like to be in, that either I might displease my *husband*, or offend God, for he was very much troubled with us all in the house and family, they had so prepossessed him against us."—*M. F. Testimony.* p. 5.

dear hart, though thou hast shaked the dust of thy feet at him who would not receive thee, nor is not worthy of thee which shall be a testimony against him forever, yet thou knows that *we* have recieved thee into our hearts and shall live with thee eternally, and it is our life and joy to be with thee. And soe my dear hart let not the power of darkness separate thy bodily presence from us which will be a grief and trouble to us, and especially thorrow him, whom thou knowes can call nothing his own but the plagues and woes.

"My soul thursts to have thee to come over, if it be but for two or three days to strike down the deceit in him for the truthes sake. And if thou do not come, it will add abundantly to our sorrow & strengthen the beastly power," &c. M. F.'s Special Letter.

G. F. writes under this, the following note: "This was sent to G. F. and he came back againe to thes that sent for him & he, that he shaked the dost of hise feet against was not long after convinsed."

What, it may be asked, was the *beastly power* that kept them in bondage, over which G. F. reigned as King—and over which they would rejoice to see his kingly power triumph? Who was it that G. F. had shaked the dust of his feet against—who could call nothing his own but the plagues and woes—and in whom G. F. was to strike down the deceit? Who was it, that was not long after convinsed? G. F. says in the printed Journal: "Where when I came, I found the priests and professors and that envious Justice Sawry had much incensed Judge Fell and Captain Sands against the Truth, by their lies. But when I came to speak with him, I answered all his objections: and so thoroughly satisfied him by the Scriptures that he was convinced in his judgment."—Journal P. 1. p. 150.

I shall now proceed to other parts of this extraordinary letter.

Passages in the letter addressed to G. F.

"*O thou bread of Life*" without which bread our souls will starve."

"O *forever more give us this bread.*"

"*Oh our life*, our desire is to see thee again."

"Our desire is to see thee again that we may be refreshed and established, and so *have life more abundantly.*"

"We hope thou wilt not leave us comfortless, but wilt come again."

"Though that sorrow be for a time, *yet joy cometh in the morning.*"

"Oh our life, we hope to see thee again, that *our joy may be full*, for *in thy presence is fullness of joy*, and where thou dwells *is pleasures forever more.*"

Passages of Scripture nearly or quite in the same form.

"Jesus said unto them, I am *the Bread of Life.*"–Jno. 6, 35.

"Then said they unto him Lord, *evermore give us this bread.*"—ib 34.

"When Christ who is *our life* shall appear."–Col. 3, 4.

"I am come that ye might have *life*, and that ye *might have it more abundantly.*" Jno. 10, 10.

"I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you."—Jno 14, 18.

"In his favour is life, weeping may endure for a night, *but joy cometh in the morning.*"—Ps. 30. 5.

"These things have I spoken unto you that my joy might remain in you, and that *your joy might be full.*" —Jno. 15. 11.

"*In thy presence is fullness of joy;* at thy right hand there *are pleasures forever more.*—Ps. 16. 11.

The letter goes on to say:

"Oh *thou Fountain of eternal life* our souls thursts after thee, for *in thee alone is our life and peace*, and without thee have we no peace for our souls is much refreshed by seeing thee, and *our lifes is preserved by the, O thou Father of Eternal Felicity.*" "*Thou art the Fountain of life.*" "*Our life and peace is in thee.*"

Eight years after the date of this letter, Ann Curtis, not a *mere girl*, but the wife of a man of wealth and distinction (for so it appears Thomas Curtis was,) a woman who was considered a suitable person to wait upon the King, to procure the release of G. F. from prison, writes

a letter to him, filled with most extravagant expressions of regard for G. F. and concluding with these words: "O what shall I say, for my heart is rafeshed and I am over come with thy love, and the excellency of thy beauty that my desire is after thee, *in thee is the everlasting being, the fulness and fountain of eternity, in thy presents is life*, O my dear father bless me with thy presents, and grant that I may live with thee forever, and be cload with thy righteousness." &c.

Fifteen years after this—Thomas Lower, as already noticed, wrote to G. and M. F. saying of the former, "Whose company is a blessing to all that see, know and receive him as he is, a blessing to the nations, and the joy of his people, *the second appearance of him who is blessed forever*." These were not the transports or "enthusiastic feelings of new converts."

But how did it happen that these things should have been said again and again to G. F. by his most intimate friends—and nearest relatives, and the very persons who were most likely to know what would be agreeable? How was it, that he preserved these letters—verefied by his own hand, and the most offensive of them bearing on the *same page*, a note which showed that the whole subject was in his mind, as well as in his eye?

George Richardson gives a solution of this most extraordinary portion of the History of the Society, and of the Early Friends. His words are these:

"But the real fact appears to be, that some of the early converts, previously to the fall of James Nayler, and possibly some instances may occur later—intending reverence to the Power and Spirit of Christ, with which these chosen vessels were eminently filled, do not appear on all occasions, in their language at least, to have duly discriminated between the mortal instrument, and that divine influence by which they were actuated. The fall of James Nayler forcibly drew the attention of the yet infant So-

ciety to this danger; and a perceptible change in their style and phraseology too place. A more chaste assumption of divine authority, and less fullness of expression, is very observable. Thus a Gracious and Mercifull God, by that painful event, gave them a salutary admonition." Brief Remarks, p. 6.

S. Tuke substantially corroborate this statement, by saying: "I am willing to admit, that the fall of James Nayler was mercifully over-ruled to the lasting benefit of the Society." Plea, p. 25.

Here G. R. professes to disclose the *real fact*, and every impartial person must admit that he has done it. I am much obliged to him for placing the subject in a point of view, that fully justifies all that I said upon it in the Appeal. He has made a full confession, that the idolatrous worship offered to James Nayler, and these addresses to George Fox, originated from the same cause. He goes further, and says, that these "*converts*" do not appear on all occasions, in their language at least, to have duly discriminated between the *mortal instrument*, *and that divine influence* by which they were actuated." Then, in language *at least*, it was WORSHIP—*divine honour*, paid to the MORTAL INSTRUMENT. It is proper however to notice some incongruity in this passage. The "chosen vessels," as he calls them, were plainly George Fox, and James Nayler. And if these men were "eminently filled" with the "Power and Spirit of Christ"—if they were *actuated* by the *divine influence*, how did it happen that they suffered their deluded followers to go on in this shocking course? How could they have silently received, to use the language of S. Tuke, "*extravagant expressions* and GROSSLY MISAPPLIED SCRIPTURE TERMS;" or permitted without reproof or even instruction, language to be addressed to the *mortal instrument*, which belonged only to Deity? The only reasonable answer that can be given is, that the persons who received these idolatrous addresses, were under the same

misapprehension of terms or of subjects, which led their followers into these extravagances.

But the origin of this truly disgraceful business, appears to be an erroneous idea of the character of Christ. They appear to have regarded this term, essentially to belong to a mere inward "principle." That Jesus of Nazareth was not truly or properly *the Christ*, but that the Christ was in him.—And that the outward person was so denominated, in consequence of that which was *in him*—applying, by a sort of figure of speech, the term to "the thing *containing*"—which belonged to "the thing *contained*." We may easily perceive how this perverted idea of the character of Christ, was carried out by the deluded followers of Fox and Nayler, (for G. R. justly classes them together in the *real fact* of the case,) to the monstrour extravagances of language which they used. For if it was intended to distinguish between Jesus of Nazareth and Christ—to deny utterly that the outward person that suffered was properly the Son of God, and yet to admit the titles to be applied to him, on account, merely of what was in him—and that he was an object of worship on this ground—the delusion, could easily be carried out, as the *real fact* of the case demonistrated, to apply to these men, the same epithets, and the same language of adoration, that was offered to him—it being supposed, that the same thing was in *them*, that was in that outward person that suffered at Jerusalem.

We can easily concieve also, how, under this delusion, a man should suppose the term, *the Son of God*, might be applied to himself—and how he could grow up into the condition of Jesus Christ, as well as into the condition of the Prophets and Apostles, and of Adam before he fell.

It is now matter of history, that this was the delusion of Nayler and his followers. He condemned the practice of his followers, so far as they had *idolized* his PERSON. But I am not aware that he ever saw the root and origin

of the evil. He never, so far as I know, condemned the *principle* from which these extravagances proceeded.

But in the case of G. F., he as fully admitted the Idolatrous language offered to him, as Nayler did—and even more so. J. N. put the letter of one of his friends into his pocket—not intending that any one should see it. G. F. preserved, not one letter only, but a number—written through a series of 23 years.—He not only kept them, but he *endorsed, and under wrote* them. And not only so, but he wrote a letter to the Chief Magistrate of the nation, in the very same strain, and applied to himself a title which all christians use to Jesus Christ, and to him only. He not only preserved these letters, written by himself and his friends, but he kept them to the day of his death—and those the most nearly related to him, and who knew his sentiments and feelings the best, handed them down to *their children.*

If G. F. ever went as far as J. N. in denying the propriety of applying such titles to *him* AS A CREATURE, he did not do it like James Nayler, with direct referance to his friends who had used such language to him. Instead of reproving Margaret Fell for her folly in writing to him as she did, he showed all along the highest respect for her —and eleven years after the death of her former husband, he married her—without any evidence of a change of opinion. And five or six years after they were so married—a son-in-law, standing high in esteem—speaks of G. F. as the *second appearance of him who is blessed forever!*

G. R. thinks the fall of Nayler forcibly drew the attention of the yet infant Society to this danger;" in which S. Tuke concurs. I think this is very probable. And that it might have been the means of saving the *Society* as a body, from worshipping George Fox. I think it also probable, that this might have induced T. E., W. Penn and others, the more determinately to resist the insertion of these letters in the *printed Journal*, as they stood in the

Manuscript. Both the *disgrace* and the *punishment* of Nayler, were calculated forcibly to draw attention to the danger. He was regarded as a *blasphemer*—was branded in the forehead with the letter B: bored through the tongue with a hot iron—whipped most dreadfully, and immured in a dungeon. It may well be supposed that some at least of G. F. friends became more cautious how they expressed themselves. But it is perfectly astonishing, that he should have kept the letter which had been written to him, and that others of the same stamp should have been written *afterwards*. A. C's. letter was written *four* years, and T. L's. *nineteen* years after the affair of Nayler broke out.

These facts prove beyond all question, that the delusion had taken *deep root*, in the minds of G. F. and his friends, and there is no evidence, in my possession, to prove that it ever was effectually removed.

All the arguments about the *change* of the meaning of words, in the lapse of time, are lost in the admission which the advocates of G. F. have made.

For they are admitted to have been *improper*, *offensive*—*grossly misapplied Scripture terms*—and identical with the delusion of Nayler and his followers. It is well known that the public considered the honours paid to N. as Idolatrous and Blasphemous. When R. Barclay was called upon by an opponent to say what he thought of these things he replied, I think them *both wicked and abominable*. The attempt to soften the matter by pleading a change in the meaning of the terms has failed—the more the case is examined, the more decidedly reprehensible it appears. And now, as G. F. and his friends are placed on the same ground with Nayler and his followers, the language of Barclay, must apply to them all—it was *both wicked and abominable*.

And now, the two champions in the cause, may set down and condole each other, not only in their signal failure,

but in their having cut up their own cause at the very root—not only in having proven, that the Early Friends were not inspired, when they claimed inspiration in the most positive terms; but that their writings are not to be taken for what they say—and over and above all this, in having connected G. F. and his friends with N., and to draw upon them the full and unequivocal censure pronounced by R. B.

G. R. speaking of the case of Nayler, and acknowledging as the *real fact*, that the two cases originated in the same causes—says: "Thus a Gracious and Merciful God, by this painful event, gave them [the Early Friends] a salutary admonition." Brief Remarks, p. 6.

And by the exhibition of these letters, another "salutary admonition" is given. But instead of receiving the admonition, and profiting by it, the official acts of the Society have made it a disownable offence to call in question, language which in its plain, and literal meaning is Idolatrous and blasphemous; and some of the most distinguished men in the Society have come forward to *Plead* for the authors of such things!

The ingenuity of the author of the Plea, was displayed in *shifting*, as much as possible, from an examination of the particular cases noticed in the Appeal, and dwelling largely on *far-fetched* conclusions from G. Fox's general doctrines and general character. I have often said, and am willing to repeat it again, that G. Fox said many excellent things: and so did James Nayler. But those excellent things in either case, are perfectly irrelevant when opposed to facts, both proven and admitted. Nor does it follow that because either of them could write or speak *pretty orthodoxly* on faith in Christ, that they and their followers were not under delusion, when they claimed inspiration, in receiving or ascribing to the *mortal instrument* titles and honours due only to him who is the object of worship, both of saints on earth and angels in heaven.

The remark which I made in the Appeal, Am. ed. p. 21, brings the charge to specific cases—and this, not as the object of the Appeal, but as the result of the papers. "*Those papers which I have now produced*, and others in existence, furnish undeniable proof, that there was the assumption by him, and the ascription to him, of *attributes which belonged only to the Divine being*." This position has been fully maintained, in the foregoing remarks.

But the argument used in the beginning of the second part of the Plea, is entitled to some attention. In the first part of the Plea he says: "In regard to George Fox I must utterly deny that there is one tittle of evidence that he approved of the *offensive* expressions in the letter." Plea, p. 8. And again: "but these circumstances certainly furnish no evidence of his approbation of the terms in which the letter is couched." ib. p. 9. But hear him in the place to which I have alluded. "If I have succeeded in relieving the character of George Fox from the imputation of assuming to himself divine attributes, the character of the Early Friends must also have been in a great degree relieved from the imputation of ascribing those attributes to him. The claim and the grant cannot be separated, for there can be no doubt that George Fox and his coadjutors were essentially united in opinion on substantial points;" &c. First he gives up the letters, and endeavours to justify G. F. by denying that he approved them, while all the facts of the case were directly against him. And having, as he seemed to suppose, brought G. F. off clear of *approving* the things contained in the letter, he attempts to bring off the writers also—by the argument, that if G. F. was clear, *they* must be clear also—for they were no doubt united in opinion. If this is not *special pleading* I know not what is.

Now I will admit most readily that "the claim and the grant cannot be separated." What follows? If it had not been claimed it would not have been granted. If it

was granted, it had been claimed. I ask if these are not undeniable conclusions from S. T's. own premises? We come to the question, Did the writers of this letter grant as criptions of divine attributes to G. Fox? No man in his sober senses can deny that they did. George Richardson places them along with the worshipers of James Nayler, and Robert Barclay pronounces *their* extravagance, "both wicked and abominable." Oh! but G. Fox was not to blame—He did not approve of this gross misapplication of Scripture terms—and therefore *they* were not to blame, for there could be no doubt that he and they were united in opinion, and the claim and the grant cannot be separated!!!

What a logical conclusion! What a a noble Plea for G. Fox and Early Friends!

The writers of both pamphlets, ought to know, and no doubt do know, for I have made the declaration again and again in print, that I believe George Fox and Early Friends said many excellent things. The same may be said of James Nayler himself. But this is no argument against their having been in error in particular cases.

Such particular cases, I have proven, in reference to George Fox and some of his particular friends, to show the danger of resting unduly upon them, or making their writings the standard of doctrines: or admitting the notion, that they received their doctrines by immediate revelation, independent of the Scriptures.

The evidences of *delusion* on the part of those immediately concerned in the papers published in the Appeal, are such as to render it imperious on every member of the Society of Friends, to take *nothing* on the bare authority of those individuals, and of their supposed revelations.—They must come directly to the *Scriptures* for doctrine, and not to George Fox. Whatever he held or whatever he did, that was according to the Scriptures, I would with all readiness approve. But I would not agree that he

was in the same spirit and power that the Apostles were in. I would not unite with those who suppose that all Creation was open to him—or that he *wrought miracles, detected witches*, or *cast out devils*.* I believe, to use the language of R. B., "it was both wicked and abominable," to suppose that he was "The Son of God" or "before language were"—or the "Bread of Life," the "Fountain of Life."—The "Father of Eternal Felicity"—"the Second Appearance of him who is blessed forever." And I think it is a *disgrace* to the Society of Friends, and an insult to the good sense, and the christian feeling of the age in which we live, for such things as these to be openly defended; and the maintenance of them made essential to the very *existence* of that Society.

I am deeply impressed with the conviction that the Society of Friends, is imperiously called upon, to make a thorough, christian reformation—and purge out those unsound things which have so long been covered up among them. To aid them in this reformation, as well as to show them the necessity for it, I shall present them with some passages contained in the printed works of the Early Friends.

But before proceeding to quotations from the printed works, I think it proper to insert the following letters; which were published in the Appeal, as taken from the MS. Journal of George Fox; that they may speak for themselves, whether I have misrepresented either the letters or the writers. A dispassionate examination of them, is necessary to place the Brief Remarks of G. R. and the Plea of S. T. in a proper point of view.

---

* For MIRACLES see the Index to the Journal. For *Witches*, see Journal 2nd ed. Lond. 1709, Part 1. pp. 194, 195. For casting out Devils See Part 1. p. 70, where it it said: "For the Lord made bare his Omnipotent Arm, and manifested his power to the astonishment of many; by the healing virtue whereof many have been delivered from great infirmities, *and the Devils were made subject* through his Name, of which particular instances might be given beyond what this unbelieving age is able to receive or bear."

Letter from Margaret Fell and others to George Fox: MS. Journal.

for g. f. (45)

Our dear ffather in the Lord for though wee have ten thousand Instructers in Christ, yet have we not many fathers for in Christ Jesus thou hast begotten us thorrow the Gospell, eternall praises be to our father, wee thy babes with one consent being gathered together in the power of the spirit thou being present with us our souls doth thirst & languish after thee, & doth challenge that right that wee have in thee, O thou bread of life, without which bread our soulls will starve, oh for ever more give us this bread & take pitty on us, whom thou hast nursed up with the brests of consolation, oh our life our desires is to see thee againe that wee may be refreshed & established & soe have life more abundantly, & let not that beastly power which keepes us in bondage seperate thy bodyly presence from us, who reignes as King above it, & would reioyce to see thy kingly power here triumph over it, oh our dear nursing father wee hope thou wilt not leave us Comfortlesse, but will come againe, though that sorrow be for A time, yet ioy comes in the morning, oh our life we hope to see thee againe, that our ioy may be full, for in thy presence is fullness of ioy, & where thou dwells is pleasures for evermore, oh thou fountaine of eternall life our soulls thursts after thee, for in thee alone is our life and peace, & without thee have we no peace for our soulls is much refreshed by seeing thee, & our lifes is preserved by thee, O thou father of eternall felicytie.

Margrett ffell
Tho: Salthouse
Ann Cleaton
Mary Askew
Margrett ffell
Bridgett ffell
Will: Caton

O my dear ffather when wilt thou come, Susan ffell,
Dear ffather pray for us Sarah ffell
Oh my dear hart shall wee not see thee once more againe
Issabell ffell
Thou art the fountaine of life Mary ffell

My owne dear hart, though thou has shaked the dust of thy feet, at him who would not receive thee, nor is not worthy of thee, which shall be A testimony agt. him for ever, yet thou knowes that we have received thee into our harts, & shall live with thee eternally, & it is our life and ioy to be with thee, And soe my dear hart let not the power of darkenesse seperate thy bodyly presence from us which will be A greefe & trouble to us, & especially thorrow him, whom thou knowes can call nothing his owne but the plagues & woes.

My soull thursts to have thee to come over, if it but for two or three dayes to strike downe the deceite in him for the truthes sake.

And if thou doe not come, it will add abundantly to our sorrow & strengthen the beastly power, I know it is A burden & suffering to thee, but thou hast borne our burdens & suffered for us & with us, & now dear hart doe not leave us nor forsake us, for our life & peace is in thee.

M ff

1652

Under this, in George Fox's writing is the following note:—

this was sent to gff
& he came back againe
to thes that sent for him
& he, that he shakd the
dost of hise feet aggainst was
not long after convin
sed

Account of George Fox's letter to Oliver Cromwell, as given in the MS. Journal.

"Upon the 5th day first month Captaine Drewry who brought G ff up to London by order from Colonell Haggar did come to the Inn into the Chamber where G ff lay and said it was required of G ff from Oliver Crumwell, that hee would promise that hee would not take up a sword against the Lord Protector or the Government as it is now And that G ff would write downe the words in answer to that which the protector required, and for G ff to set his hand to it the fifth day of the first month: G ff was moved of the Lord to give out these words following which were given to Oliver Crumwell and G ff was then presently brought before him by Captn Drewry."

George Fox's letter to Oliver Cromwell.

"I who am of the world called George ffox, doe deny the carrying or drawing of any carnall sword agt any, or agt thee Oliver Crumwell or any man in the presence of the lord god I declare it god is my wittnesse, by whom I am moved to give this forth for the truthes sake, from him whom the world calls George ffox who is the son of God, who is sent to stand A wittnesse agt all violence, & agt all the workes of darkenesse, and to turne people from the darkenesse to the, light, & to bring them from the occassion of the warre, and from the occassion of the magistrates sword, which is A terrour to the evilldoers which actes contrary to the light of the lord Jesus Xt, which is A praise to them that doe well, which is A protection to them that doe well, and not,, the evill and such souldies that are putt in that place, no false accussers must bee, no violence must doe, but bee content with their wages, and that magistrate beares not the sword in vaine, from under the occasion of that sword I—doe seeke to bring people, my weapons are not carnall but spirituall, And my kingdome

is not of this world, there fore with the carnall weapon I doe not fight, but am from those things dead, from him who is not of the world, called of the world by the name George ffox, and this I am ready to seale with my blood, and this I am moved to give forth for the truthes sake, who A wittnesse stands agt all unrighteousnesse, and all ungodlynesse, who A sufferer is for the righteous seed sake, waiteing for the redemption of it, who A crowne that is mortall seekes not for, that fadeth away, but in the light dwells, which comprehends that Crowne, which light is the condemnacon of all such, in wch Light I wittnesse the Crowne that is Imortall that fades not away, From him who to all your soulls is A friend, for establishing of righteousnesse and cleansseing the Land of evill doers, and A wittnesse agt. all wicked inventions of men & murderous plotts wch Answered shall bee with the Light in all your Consciences, which makes no Covenant with death, to which light in you all I speake, & am clear

ff G

who is of the world called George ffox
who A new name hath which the
world knowes not

Wee are wittnesses of this Testimony
whose names in the flesh is called
Tho Aldam Robert Creven

Letter of M. F. to J. N.

Swarthmore 15*th of ye* 8 *month* (56)

Dear Brother

I have received thy letter and it was gladness to me when I received it, and I could receive and bear wt. thou had written in it if thou had kept in subjection love and unity as thou did express in thy Letter, But since I have heard that thou would not be subject to him to whom all nations shall bow, it hath greeved my spiritt Thou hath confessed him to be thy Father and thy life bound up in

him and when hee sent for thee and thou would not come to him where was thy life then; was thou not then banished from the Fathers House, as thou knows thou hath writ to mee And yt wch shewed thee this wch was to come I owne, but that wch banished thee I must deny and when he bended his Knees to ye most high god for the Seed's sake and thou would not bend nor bow nor Joyne with him, How wilt thou answer this to him who hath given him a name Better then every name to wch every Knee must bow This is contrary to what thou wrett to me where thou saith he is buring thy name that hee may raise his owne but it was thy name yt stood agst him then And thou wrett to me ye truth should never suffer by thee for where ye seed Suffers the Truth suffers doth not ye seed & all ye body suffer by yt spiritt yt houlds not the head But rebells against him; oh consider what thou art doing I am sure ye lamb in his suffering is in subjection not resisting nor exalting but in the time of his Suffering hee is servant to all ye seed and if Thou stood in ye suffering for ye seed thou had not resisted him who is the prmise of the Father to ye seed who hath said blessed are ye yt are not offended in me. oh deare heart mind while it is called to day wt thou art doeing. Least thou walke naked and be a stumbling blocke to the simple & bee tender of the truth which thou hath [*not legible*] before & suffered for, which draws thyne eare from unclean spiritts wch is like frogs which cometh out of the Mouth of the dragon ye Beast and the false P.fitt these was seene when the first Angel poured out his vial upon ye great river Euphrates read and understand and return to thy first husband my deare brother, I can beare all yt hath been past, if thou wilt be subject to ye will of the Father & hee who doth ye will hath Learned obedience & is subject & I could ly downe at thy feete yt thou might trample upon me for thy good & soe I know would hee whom thou hath resisted though to yt spiritt yt rebels it cannot bee

for that is not one wth ye father, soe in dearness & tenderness have I written to thee my Father shall bear me witness and I warn thee from the Lord God yt thou beware of siding with unclean spirits Least thou bee cut of for ever, Let me heare from thee shortly as thou can after the receite of this

Thy dear Sister in the
eternal love

M. F.

I wrett to thee after I had
received thy Letter whch
may bee may come to thee after this but then
I did not know of this

My husband tooke some letters from the *feeld* post which was to me which mentioned the difference between G and thee & he read them

Letter from Ann Curtis to George Fox, from MS. Journal.

Reading the 23 of the 5th Month 1660.

Deare G. F.

My true faithfull & inexpressible love is to thee, deare thou art to me, fare beyound what I can declare doe I greatly love, & highly honour thee with my soule & with my whole heart am I freely given up to be thine, to doe thy will in all that I can, if my life would be an exceptable sacrifise for or to thee I have freely given it up & it would be my greatest Joy if I might be Accepted for thee, Oh there is nothing soe deare to me as thou art, O what shall I say for my heart is rafeshed & I am overcome with thy love, & the exlency of thy beauty that my desire is after thee in thee is the everlasting being, the fullnesse & fountain of eternity in thy presents is life, O my deare father, blesse me with thy presents & grant that I may live with thee forever & be cload with thy righteousnesse which is my true desire who am thine true and faithfully & I beleeve soe shall continue unto the end thine A. C.

Letter from Thomas Lower to George and Margaret Fox: MS. Journal.

Dear & ever honored ffather & mother

Yours of ye: 24 of ye 12th wee received, & our heartes and soules doth praise & magnify ye: name of ye: Lorde for his abundant mercyes & favours towards us all & as oft: as wee think off ye: overuleing arme & power yt: sett my ffather on toppe off all his & truths adversaryes: & wrought his deliverance after such a noble & honorable manner wee cannott but ascribe ye: praise & glory thereof unto him whoe rules In ye: heavens above; & in ye: earth beneath doth whatsoever pleases him: whoe drew pharoh & his hoast to follow ye: Isralites Into ye: way prepared for there safe passage: & then caled to ye: waters to returne & destroy yt harde hearted persecuter: even soe hath hee suffered these blinde & harde hearted ones to persecute & pursue our deare ffather as farre as they in there envy coulde goe: & then when hee saw fitt hath caled to ye: waters to returne & come over: ye: horse & Its rider our Justices & there beast-like clarke: glory bee unto ye: Lorde for ever: who caused Moses & ye: Isralites to beholde ye: deade carkasses of there enemyes: and to rejoyce over them and singe ye: songe of deliverance even soe hath hee caused our Moses & all ye: true upright Isralites: to beholde his & truths adversayes defeated and slaine & to ly as deade carkases: before ye: feet of our Moses & his people: & therefore our heartes are engaged to singe praises unto ye: Lorde whoe is our deliverer now as hee was his peoples In agés past: praises: praises: honnor glory & renowne bee unto ye: Lambe yt: Sitteth upon ye: throne for ever & for evermore Amen saith my soule:

Wee are all well heere praised bee ye: Lorde My wife something better since shee tooke some off my pills: little margarett a lovely thriveinge childe; wee greatly rejoyce to heare of our sister Rouses happy deliverance:

and good houre wherein my ffather visited her: whose company is a blessinge to all yt: see knowe and receive him as he is a blessinge to ye: nations and ye: Joy off his people: ye: second appearance of him whoe Is blessed for ever:

We greatly rejoyce to heare off your Inclinations Into these parts: & If my ffather intends to come before ye: general meetings: I desire to heare by ye: return of ye: next post thereof yt: I may provide ye: [*some kind of carriage, the name of which cannot easily be made out*] to meet you att Westchester, &c. [*The remainder relates to family matters.*] Soe rests

Your dearly loveing Son
Thomas Lower
Swarthmore this 4th of ye: 1st mo th 167$\frac{1}{3}$

The monstrous sentiments contained in these letters, in so many varied forms of expression, through a period of 23 years, must be shocking to every sincere christian.

CHAPTER. IX.

In the notice already taken of these pamphlets, (The Brief Remarks and Plea,) which have been industriously circulated, I have passed over some passages, which are more conveniently answered a part from the refutation of the principal arguments, on which the respective writers relied.

George Richardson, without the least foundation, has endeavoured to convey the idea, that I do not hold the doctrine of the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit on the human mind. Thus he says at page 9. "E. Bates's remarks on the *sorrows* which George passed through are most extraordinary. He has adopted Water Baptism.—Does he mean really to undervalue—is he about to speak disparagingly of the true and essential baptism of Christ (the dispensation which George Fox was passing through at the time alluded to, evidently being of this character—) as though these conflicts were evidence of unsoundness of faith in the article of Justification."

And why, I ask, did he introduce the subject of Water Baptism here? The connection explains the object. It was to prove that I did not believe in the baptism of the Holy Spirit. But I ask, if such an argument as this, is not an insult to the whole christian Church, to the Apostles themselves, and to Him also, under whose commission and in whose name they *commanded* the converts to Christianity to be baptized?

But in answer to G. R's. enquiry, I will tell him no. I certainly do not mean, and never did mean—nor did the Apostles or primitive believers mean, to undervalue

or speak disparagingly of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit.

But he confidently asserts that the *sorrows* of George Fox were of this character! And here I must take the liberty of remarking, that G. R. shows himself as ignorant of the *Baptism* of the Spirit, as he is hostile to the doctrine and practice of the Apostles. Let the reader examine the examples given in the New Testament, of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, and see if he can find in them the *least resemblance* to the *sorrows* of George Fox. In the 2nd ed. of the Journal, part 1. p. 31, he says: "And after some time, I went into my own country again, and was there about a year, in great sorrows and Troubles, and walked many nights by myself." And after going from Priest to Priest to seek for comfort, but finding increase of Trouble and sorrow he says: "After this I went to another, one Macham, a priest in high account. And he would needs give me some physic, and I was to have been let blood." Here it is evident, his adviser thought him labouring under some physical malady. "But [says he] they could not get one drop of Blood from me, either in my arms or head (though they endeavoured it) my body being, as it were, dried up with sorrows, grief and troubles." p. 32.

Do we find the Apostles, and others who were assembled on the Day of Penticost, "in great sorrows and troubles," by the out pouring of the Holy Spirit upon them? Did they go from Priest to Priest, to inquire what was the matter with them? Did they endeavour to get cured of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, by taking physic, and getting bled? Were they so dried up with sorrows, grief and troubles, as the effect of that Baptism, that a drop of blood could not have been got out of them either in their arms or heads? Ought not the Society of Friends to blush for shame, not only that their ministers should represent this as the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, but that a Pamphlet containing such a representation

should be *approved* and sent out by thousands among their members?

George Fox says: "But *Temptations* grew more and more, and I was tempted almost to *despair*. And when Satan could not effect his design upon me that way, then he laid *snares* for me, and *baits* to draw me to commit some sin, whereby he might take advantage to bring me to despair," part 1. p. 30. And again: "I was about twenty years of age when these exercises came upon me; and some years I continued in that condition, in great *troubles*, and fain I would have put it from me."—*ib.*

Now I ask the true christian, if this was *evidently* the baptism of the Spirit? Was this the joy and peace of believing?

The Baptism of the Spirit is to be distinguished not only from the besetments of Temptation, but from those operations of the Spirit, by which Temptation is discovered, the snares of the devil laid open, and a sense of the sinfulness of sin, and its deep demerit, powerfully impressed upon the heart. It is no where said, that the multitude who assembled on the day of Pentecost, were baptized with the Spirit, when they were pricked in their hearts, and inquired of the Apostles—what shall we do? But Peter told them to "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, *And ye* SHALL *receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*" It is not said that Paul was baptized with the Holy Ghost, at the time that he saw the Lord Jesus by the way—nor during the three days that he fasted and prayed in Damascus. But Ananias was sent to him, that he might receive his sight, be baptized, and "be filled with the Holy Ghost." Then, and not till then, did he enjoy this high privilege.

And now, the Friends, ministers and others, instead of keeping to the simple and clear views of this doctrine, as presented in the Holy Scriptures, are adapting their ideas of it to the example of George Fox, when he was, from his

own account, for years, under strong temptations which he could not put from him; and when he was in an extremely disordered state of mind.

G. R. says: "If G. Fox's mind had not been frequently in an excited state, especially in the year 1652 [the date of Margaret Fell's letter to him] he must have been more than human." Rrief Remarks p. 7. Then why, I ask, should he quarrel with me, for suggesting that he was at times in a state of mental excitement?

Again, in the same page, he says: "How dare these apostatizing friends thus attempt to vilify and calumniate the character of such a man?"—*ib.*

If G. R. had not been blinded by the smoke of his own zeal, he might have seen that I neither vilified nor calumniated the character of G. Fox. I published a few papers from his manuscript Journal, which G. R. who once had that MS. in his possession, fully admits to be genuine. And I apologized for G. F. by supposing that he might have been, at times, in a state of mental excitement. And G. R. says if this had not been the case, he would have been more than human. And in addition to all this, he tells us that the "*real fact*" appears to be—what? Why, that the case of G. F. and his friends, was of the same character with that of Nayler and his deluded followers!!!

G. R. in connection with his passionate, but ill-timed and ill directed inquiry first quotted, goes on to ask: "Was the work in which he [G. F.] was engaged, of man, or of God." I answer, that whatever good things G. Fox might have done or said (from which I never wished to detract in the least degree) no man in his sober senses can suppose it was the work of God, to write, or to sanction, or now to defend, such things as are contained in the letters published in the Appeal. And G. R. and the Friends are mistaken in their estimate of the understanding of the age in which we live, if they think that such

gross delusions, can be passed off as the fruit of the Spirit, and the work of God.

"I have already proved" says he, "and it is universally allowed that the doctrines taught by George Fox, when faithfully put in practice, do produce good fruit." Brief Remarks p. 9.

Then why are not his doctrines universally adopted—at least by the sincerely pious? If by *good fruit*, he means morality, in the common sense of the term, and by the *doctrines*, he means only *some* of the *doctrines* taught by George Fox, he has said what amounts to *nothing* for his purpose. But if by *doctrines* he intends to include all that G. F. held and taught, and by good fruits, he means both faith and practice in general terms, his assertion is not true in either of its parts. Neither has he proven it, nor is it universally allowed. To say that G. Fox taught *some* or even many good things, is what I never denied.—But I object to *some things* which were held by G. F. and the Early Friends, and I published the letters &c. contained in the Appeal, to show that we cannot accept the whole of what they said and did, as correct. This point is now established beyond contradiction. Then a discrimination, and separation of the good from the bad, is the imperious duty of the Society. But the moment this position is allowed—that investigation and discrimination are admitted—the detection of errors will follow in rapid succession. The Conservative Friends *know* this; and therefore their utmost exertions are used to stop inquiry—to shut up the minds of their members against conviction—and to prevent the very grossest mistakes, and most palpable errors, both in Faith and Practice, from being represented in their real character, or acknowledged to be wrong. Nothing is too shocking to be palliated or even directly defended, lest the work of discrimination should begin, and the members of the Society, encouraged to *think* for themselves, should bring the opinions and practices of their fore-fathers to the test of Holy Scripture.

The contest now is, in the first place, for the Vindication on the one hand, and the exposure on the other, of the grossly unsound, and unscriptural parts of the writings of G. Fox and his cotemporaries. The Society, in its official character, has recognized and recommended, the writings of the Early Friends without exception. And I have shown that they wrote many things utterly incompatible with Christianity, and subversive of its most important doctrines. But the Society, has made it a disownable offence, to call the writings of G. Fox in question. And George Richardson and Samuel Tuke have come forward to defend him and Early Friends in cases which must astonish the Christian world.

Perhaps it may be said, that G. R. and S. T. both gave up the Letter of M. Fell and others, as highly objectionable.

But I ask, do G. Richardson or S. Tuke admit that G. Fox or any of the writers of those letters were in error? Do they give up one *iota* of their claims to *revelation*, when writing those grossly offensive things? No. The great object of both these writers, is to *justify* George Fox and the Early Friends. To what purpose then is the *pretended* admission of the objectionable character of the Letter of Margaret Fell, and others? The letter contains very objectionable expressions—say these apologists, but the writers were not to blame. And even though they claimed to be gathered in the power of the spirit—yet no idea is to be entertained of their being under a delusion.—The writing was wrong, but not the writers. And then to cap the climax, the *Society* has made it a ground of disownment to call in question the soundness of those writing!!!

George Richardson thinks I *overshoot the mark* by saying, in a Note in the Appeal, "As to the martyrdom of one thousand Christians at Lichfield, in the time of the Emperor Dioclesian, I have not been able, after consider-

able research, to find any foundation for the story. This historical fact, he says, is supported by the most unquestionable evidence.—

But what, I ask, if it be so? Suppose we grant that there was *foundation* for the story—it only follows that I had not *found* it. And George Richardson may claim the credit of more extensive *researches* than *I* had ever made. And most readily do I concede to him the palm that is due to his erudition. But this has nothing to do with my objection to the conduct of George Fox, at Lichfield. The *doubt* which I had of the truth of the story, was merely suggested in a *Note*. It was the transaction itself, proceeding as it did, on the high claims to revelation, that I wished to present to the view of the Friends, as an example of *mistake*, in taking the wild fancies of *imagination*, for immediate revelation. And I again Appeal, not only to the Friends, but to the Christian public, if they can believe that George Fox was directed by revelation—and not by imagination, in that extraordinary business?

First he says: "And as I was one time walking in a close [or field] with several Friends, I lift up my head, and I espied three steeple-house spires: and they struck at my life. And I askt friends what they was, and they said Lichfield. So the word of the Lord came to me, thither I might go." I think the indications of a disordered mind, meet us at the very commencement of the narrative.

He proceeds: "And I bid friends that was with me walk into the house from me, and they did. And as soon as they was gone, for I said nothing to them whether I would go; but I went over hedge and ditch till I came within a mile of Lichfield, and when I came into a great field where there was shepherds keeping their sheepe, I was commanded of the Lord to put off my shoes of a sudden. And I stood still, and the word of the Lord was

like a fire in me. And being winter, I untied my shoes and put them off. And when I had done, I was commanded to give them to the shepherds, and was to charge them to let no one have them except they paid for them. And the poor shepherds trembled and were astonished." Here are at least *three* special revelations. And coming over hedge and ditch (he does not tell us how far, but as it would seem a considerable distance) he had, no doubt, become quite warm—and this he supposed was the *Word* of the Lord in him. It is not at all surprising that the Shepherds, seeing him coming over hedge and ditch, and acting in all respects as strangely as he did, should tremble and be astonished. It was an age of superstition. G. F. tell, in his Journal, of a great woman that thought he was an angel or spirit, when he went into a place of public worship—and he relates several cases in which the people thought the house *shook* where he was. And in another place in his Journal, he says he spake through Kendal upon a market day; "And so dreadful was the power of God that was upon me, that the people flew like chaff before me into their houses." On another occasion he says, "The power of God thundered amongst them, and they did fly like chaff before it." And in another place he says: "So that it was a dreadful thing unto them when it was told them, *The man in Leathern Breeches is come.*"

But to proceed, he says: "And so I went about a mile till I came into the town. And as soon as I came within the town the Word of the Lord came unto me again to cry Wo unto the bloody City of Lichfield. So I went up and down the streets crying Wo unto the bloody city of Lichfield. And being market day, I went into the market place, and went up and down in several places of it, and made stands crying Wo unto the bloody City of Lichfield. And no one hushed me, or laid hands off me."

But what effect did this wonderful exhibition produce? No body seems to have been frightened—no one run away—the man with the leathern breeches, passed without interruption—but some of the most considerate, wondered what had become of his *shoes!* He says in immediate connection with the foregoing quotation: "And so at last, some friends and friendly people came to me and said, Alack George where is thy shoes? And I told them it was no matter." Whoever would have thought of such a sequel to such an exhibition! Both his conduct, and the manner of relating it, show that his mind was under the influence of a most singular excitement.

He proceeds: "So when I had declared what was upon me, and cleared myself, I came out of the town in peace; about a mile to the Shepherds. And there I went to them, and took my shoes, and gave them some money. And the fire of the Lord was so in my feet, and all over me, that I did not matter to put my shoes on any more, and was at a stand whether I should or no, till I felt free dom from the Lord."

Here was another *revelation* to wear his shoes again. And the *heat* that was produced in his feet, and all over him, by this singular proceeding—while every boy in the streets, could have told him the cause of it—he supposed to be the *Fire of the Lord*—So thoroughly was his mind carried away with this notion of *extraordinary* divine influence.

That he was sincere, I never doubted. But I think—and in this, I shall not be alone—that he was *mistaken* in regard to these supposed Revelations. He was evidently carried away with the flashes of imagination, while sober judgment, appears to have exercised no controul over his feelings.

But this is not all, for he says in the subsequent part of his story, "But as I went down the town, There run like a channel of blood down the streets, and the market

place was like a pool of blood. This I saw as I went through it crying Wo to the bloody city of Lichfield." And now the Friends are required to believe all these special revelations, and this vision of Blood, and all the conduct connected with them, as being the result of immediate, divine influence; and the terrors of the disowning powers of the Society, are held up over them to extinguish every doubt upon the subject! How, I ask, in the present enlightened age, can the intelligent members of the Society submit to these things, or hold up their heads among their well informed neighbours!

It was after G. F. had washed his feet in a ditch, and put on his shoes, that he began to consider, why he should go and cry against that city, and call it that bloody city, for he does not seem to have thought of the inquiry before. He now recollected that much blood had been shed there in the civil wars, but a short time before this —"yet" says he, "that could not be charged upon the town?" Many of the actors in those scenes of blood were no doubt still alive. He does not tell us why, but he releases the town from all blood-guiltiness on that account, though it had occurred but a few years before, and for any thing that we know—some of the blood might have been still visible, in some of their houses.

It was *after* this, as we are informed, that G. F. "came to see that there was 1000 martyrs in Dioclesians time was martyred in Lichfield. And so I must go in my stockings through the channel of their blood, and come into the pool of their blood in their market place. So I might raise up the blood of those martyrs that had been shed, and lay cold in their streets which had been shed above 1000 years before."

But admitting the story of martyrdom to be true—how was that blood to be charged upon the town, when the blood which had been shed only a few years, could not? As G. F. has not explained this mystery, I confess I do not see how any one else can.

G. F. says the persecution under Dioclesian was "above 1000 years" before his visit to Lichfield. Dioclesian resigned the Empire in the year 305.* And G. Fox's visit to Lichfield was in 1651. It was no great matter, to be sure, to mistake the date of the tenth Persecution, by a few hundred years. But now as to the certainty of the Lichfield Martyrdom.

George Richardson, refers to Camden—to Dr. Johnson's Dictionary, and to Aytlett Sammes. But after returning my acknowledgments to him, for the light he has shed upon the subject, from "the Antiquities of Ancient Britain" by A. Sammes, I must still confess that my doubts of the truth of the story are not at all removed. And however G. R. and the Friends, who I dare say depend more upon G. Fox's revelations in the case, than on the evidence of History, may look down with contempt upon my ignorance, I am not ashamed of the company in which I am found, in regard to this matter.

Eusebius who gave an account of the Dioclesian persecution, both at Rome, and in distant countries, and whose means of information exceeded those of all other historians whose works are now extant, is entirely silent upon this important matter. And I conceive it to be altogether unreasonable to suppose that the murder of one thousand christians in a single town, should not be extensively known, and receive a place in history, while the death of single individuals, and those in some cases obscure persons, should be so carefully preserved. I refer to Eusebius's History, as one written not very long after the persecution in question, by a man of extensive information.

Neither Mosheim, Milner, nor Jones, three able writers of Ecclesiastical History, has ventured to record the Lichfield Martyrdom, as an historical *fact*, or even to name

*See Milner's Church History, in one Vol. Edinburgh ed. 1833, p. 201.

it. Nor is this all. The celebrated John Fox, who flourished in the reign of queen Elizabeth, compiled a "Universal History of Christian Martyrdom," in which his biographer says he was engaged, "with prodigious pains, and constant study—eleven years." This work was written about a hundred years before G. Fox went barefoot through Lichfield. And yet it takes no notice of this wonderful martyrdom. E. Blomfield wrote a "History of the Martyrs, or an authentic narrative of the Sufferings of the Church of Christ in every part of the world." It forms two quarto volumes, one of 652, and the other of 544 pages. Yet no mention is made of the event in question. I could mention other historians of acknowledged merit, who, as it would seem, were not willing to risk their reputation, by giving it a place in their respective histories.

While therefore G. Richardson and other Friends, will regard the truth of the story of the martyrdom, as an evidence of the certainty of G. Fox's revelations in the case, I shall take the liberty of entertaining doubts in regard to the thousand martyrs, regarding it as a mere Roman legend, which found its way into the writings of some men, whose credulity was greater than the soundness of their judgment. In reference to the *conduct* of George Fox, entirely independent of the truth or falsehood of the story—I believe it to have been a striking case of delusion, and a practical comment on his notion of Revelation.

Near the close of his defence of G. F., the writer of Brief Remarks, inquires: "But what will the world gain —what will any individual gain—if these dessentients should succeed in destroying Quakerism!" pp. 15, 16.

In reply to this inquiry, I will ask, what of Quakerism have I ever attempted to destroy, but manifest corruptions? If these corruptions constitute the very essence of Quakerism, which I am almost persuaded now to be-

lieve—let it be *destroyed*, and the sooner the better for the Friends themselves, and for the world at large. It is true, that there is nothing valuable in Quakerism, that was not in Christianity long before Quakerism existed. But there are many things in the latter that never were, and never will be in the former. The plea, the appeal, the earnest expostulation of George Richardson, is not for Christianity—but for Quakerism—and for those gross errors, or forms of expression, if he please, which are not only totally incompatible with Christianity but totally subversive of it. And what can *he* or the *Friends*, *gain* by defending, and retaining those corruptions, in the bosom of Society? As respects the Society, it must be fatal to its character, if not to existence—and as relates to individuals—may God have mercy upon them!

G. R. says: "The working of this subtle spirit which has got abroad; this old accuser of the Brethren—has been very insiduous; it has been at work for *many years*—but durst not avow its real object and character. It pretended it was attacking Hicksism, but it was easy to see, *long ago*, that genuine Quakerism was meant. It is now throwing off the mask, and showing itself in its real colours." *ib.* p. 16.

Now I think, in all candour, that the mask is pretty fully thrown off here. The *many years*, and the *language*, necessarily carry us back, not only through the heat of the controversy about the doctrines of Elias Hicks, but to the very rise of that controversy. G. R. saw long ago that *genuine Quakerism* was meant by those who called the trines of E. Hicks in question. I can honestly say that I was not aware of the fact at the time. But I am convinced of it now. And I freely acknowledge that it is so. And I do most earnestly wish that George Richardson may convince the whole body of Friends, as fully as I am convinced, that instead of Hicksism—instead of any *new thing* that we were then contending against, it was no

other than *genuine Quakerism.* His arguments, I think, are conclusive on this point, much as he has failed to prove that G. Fox, Margaret Fell, and the others mentioned in the Appeal, were divinely inspired, when they wrote the monstrous things contained in the extracts from the MS. Journal.

To complete his object G. R. undertakes a formal defence of Isaac Pennington's Incitation, Penn's Sandy Foundation Shaken, and Barclay's Vehiculum Dei. For a further notice of these pieces, I refer the reader to the following Chapter. But for the present, I only say, that the open, unqualified vindication of these parts of the writings above named, is an open and direct vindication of the doctrines of Elias Hicks.

The passage from I. P. which I shall give hereafter, represents Jesus, as the garment of Christ, and distinguishes between him that came, and the body in which he came; between the outward vessel, and the inward life. And makes this strong declaration: "This we certainly know, and can never call the bodily garment Christ, but that which appeared and dwelt in the body." That is, the *inward life*, as distinguished from the outward vessel. I stated in the work to which G. Richardson referred, that the whole passage did convey the doctrines of E. H. on the point in question. This he does not *pretend* to deny. And he undertakes to vindicate the doctrine. That it was called Hicksism, every intelligent member of the Society to which that epithet was applied, will fully prove. That it is genuine Quakerism, has been proved by George Richardson, George Jones, and many other Friends.

G. Richardson gives a reason why George Jones published this extract from Pennington, in one of his Stockport Tracts. He says that an extract from Pennington's Incitation "was previously published and widely circulated by some Dessentients at Bristol, with the design ap-

parently of bringing the writings of I. P. and other early Friends, into contempt, which induced a friend at Manchester, to print it more at length, with a view of allowing the writer to explain his own views more fully." p. 17.

But George Jones did not even intimate that the additional passages which he selected, changed the view which would be given by that published at Bristol. The more extended extract was given not as a *change*, but to *confirm* the sentiments contained in the smaller extract. In G. Jones' selection I. P. declares that they "hold forth *no other thing for Christ*, but him who then appeared, and was made manifest *in* flesh." Tract p. 2. Take this along with the *distinction* which was so positively made between *Christ*, and the body in which he came, the outward vessel and the inward life, and it amounts to as positive a denial as could well have been made—of Jesus of Nazareth —to be the Christ. It exclusively applies the character of Christ to the inward Life, which is supposed to be in every individual, as well as in Jesus.

G. R. says I have not made an appeal to Scripture, in objection to the passage from I. P.—If this had been so I might have replied that this was done in the former controversy—and it might have been hoped that now, the mere *fact* of its being proved to be a revival of the doctrine of E. H. would have been sufficient to insure its rejection on the part of those called the Orthodox. In this however I find myself mistaken. Without even pretending to deny that it was the doctrine of E. H. (which it would be in vain now to attempt) it is openly defended as genuine Quakerism. This Tract of G. Richardson's has been reprinted in America; large numbers have been sent to the western country, and no doubt to other parts of the U. S., and the clerk of Ohio Yearly Meeting, during the late Session of that body, was seen industriously handing it out.

But that their *distinction* between the character of Christ, and the bodily garment, may not go without a direct reply, I may remark that the Apostle says: "It was *Christ* that *died*, Yea rather that is risen again." Now it is evident that both the death and resurrection are applied to that which I. P. calls the bodily garment, which he declared they never could call Christ. Again the Angel said to Mary "Therefore that Holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God"—Peter said that he, the Son of man—was "Christ, the Son of the living God." And after the Ascension the same inspired Apostle said: "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same *Jesus* whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ." But of this I shall have occasion to speak again hereafter.

G. R. when he comes to defend the Sandy Foundation Shaken, shows that he was conscious he had a difficult cause in hand. He admits that W. P. "some times expressed himself in such a manner as was open to misapprehension on the part of his hearers or readers. This has been the origin of many of the charges and accusations which have been brought against him; and there cannot be a doubt but that in reference to some instances, had he been aware of this danger at the time, he would have been more guarded in his language." Brief Remarks p. 17.

It happens however that though W. Penn was fully apprised of this danger, by being imprisoned the very same year in which he wrote the Sandy Foundation Shaken—though the points in controversy were incessantly agitated, yet five years afterwards, in his Reason against Railing, he repeats some of the worst parts of the Sandy Foundation Shaken. Nor is this all, he never *recanted* his published sentiments. And more than all this. The Friends after his death, embodied the Sandy Foundation in his *selected* works. The Sandy Foundation was printed in

1668, and in 1671 he *utterly denied* the *outward person that suffered to be properly the Son of God.* And when his works were published in fol. in 1726, this shocking declaration was inserted, and it stands there uncorrected to the present day.

In regard to Barclay's *Vehiculum Dei*—a Latin term, which means the *vehicle of God*, there could scarcely be conceived a notion, that when carried out, would more completely pervert the Gospel of Christ. The reader will find it among the quotations in the next Chapter.—But it is a most remarkable piece of consistency in George Richardson, after defending the Letters contained in the Appeal, and the wildest enthusiasm to be found in G. Fox's MS. Journal—and virtually asserting that by the attack which was made upon Hicksism, genuine Quakerism was the real object assailed—he goes on to defend I. P's. Incitation, W. P's. Sandy Foundation, and R. B's. Vehiculum Dei. Admit these to be correct, or any one of them, and Hicksism is completely recognized.

It ought not to be over looked, that when G. Richardson affected to doubt whether G. Fox used the *definite* article *the*, in his Letter to O. Cromwell, S. Tuke very fully admits that he *did* use it. He says: "The question which arises upon this letter is, Did George Fox, *in using the term*, 'The Son of God,' intend to assert that he was Christ?" Plea, p. 4. He knew that the attempt that G. R. had made to induce a belief that it was written *a Son*, could not bear examination. To resort to such a trifling pretence, gives no credit to the cause that could be no better defended. For as the copy from which the fac simile was taken, was verified by G. Fox's own hand, every body might see that there is no room for a vague story, of another copy, where, or by whom made, even G. R. himself has not ventured to tell.

But I blame both those writers, for endeavouring to lower down the difference in the use of the article, in the

case before us, as they have done. I have not the least doubt, that as G. F. used the article *the*, and two such prominent ministers as S. T. and G. R. have defended him—many of the friends will be weak enough to think, that it made little difference whether the one or the other articles were used.

S. T. after admiting that G. F. did use the definite article, endeavours to bring him off by supposing he "only designed to speak of himself as *as one of the Sons* of God." Plea, p. 5. But the very natural question arise—If he intended this, why did he not say so? If such liberty as this is to be taken, we never can be sure of the meaning of any man. But how does it happen that the doctors disagree in the case? G. Richardson amends the letter by making it read *a Son*, S. Tuke don't seem to like this, and would have it *one of the Sons*, and Thomas Ellwood, who had the whole case before him, with the Widow, and the children to explain any matter of doubt—slipped silently over the passage, and said nothing of the *sonship* at all. And as he adopted neither of the modern amendations, we may take it for granted that neither of them was the true reading of the Letter. And that T. E. saw no way of getting over it, but by leaving it out altogether. Thus these three correcters of the text, set each others amendations aside, while the Letter, risen, as it were from the dead, speaks out for itself, and tells the world what George Fox *did say*, and any man of common sense can tell what the language means. His ignorance then is his only possible defence. And I am willing that he should have the full benefit of this plea: and I am quite aware that it will go very far, in covering some features of the charge. But that which comes under the head of *delusion* it will not touch. In fact, it brings this out in more bold relief. He claimed such wisdom—such authority—such revelation for what he said, that now to excuse him from Blasphemy, by sheer *ignorance*, is to stamp him with most *awful delusion*.

And as it turns out, the delusion does not rest upon a single mode of expression: as the following chapter will show.

Samuel Tuke in p. 9 of his Plea, has the following very ingenious remark; "But we are willing and *anxious that the examination of the charge should not be confined to the consideration of the documents referred to, or to any other papers in which ambiguous expressions may be found.*"

This was no doubt regarded as a very bright idea. It suggests a most convenient mode of disposing of a difficult case. It is no more nor less than to pass as quickly as possible from the documents immediately in hand—and from every other paper of a similar character, and to make out from other papers, a selection of passages that would look as well as possible upon paper. S. T. accordingly takes up but two of the letters noticed in the Appeal, and passes all the rest over in silence. And for these two he makes the most miserable apologies. And then he goes off to other matters, foreign to the case in hand, to make out G. F. and his friends to be incapable of entertaining the sentiments most plainly expressed in their own writings. By such a process as this who, I ask, might not be cleared from any charge whatever? What man would ever be convicted of a crime, if the advocate were allowed to leave the evidence immediately relating to the case, and take up such transactions as had never been called in question? Does S. T. suppose, that with the dexterity of a lawyer, he is to be allowed to slide off from the *documents*, referred to, in a specific case; and not only from these, but from all *other papers* of a similar character? *Facts* are stubborn things; and so are *documents*. But release him from being *confined* to the consideration of these—and from every thing else of a similar character—release him, in fact, from the case immediately in hand, and he can easily show himself to be

"An excellent painter who makes it his care
"To draw men as they ought to be, not as they are."

But with his *Fancy Pieces*, I wish to have nothing to do. And though he is so *willing* and ANXIOUS not to be *confined* to the *consideration* of the documents referred to, or to any other papers in which there are what he calls ambiguous expressions, I feel myself under no obligations to indulge him in these wishes. And I call upon him to take up the *whole* of the *documents*, contained in the Appeal, and reconcile *them* with sound doctrine. He has totally failed with those he has taken in hand, and the great body of them lies untouched. And in the mean time, I will offer for his consideration, a *few* passages, out of the printed works of the Early Friends.

Let it be remembered that it is not about the *good things* that were said by the Early Friends, that we are now contending. I insist that they said some things that were highly objectionable—and that they were *mistaken* in some of their claims to revelation. And I contend that no amount of good that could be selected from their writings, should ever give impunity to one single error, to be lodged with that good, or to be recommended as truth. In proving the existence of errors, we must take them as they are.

CHAPTER. X.

Having shown that the Brief Remarks, and Plea for George Fox and Early Friends, do not touch a large proportion of the documents referred to in the Appeal; and that so far from proving the correctness of those which are particularly noticed, the writers of these two pamphlets have established the fact, that the letters are not only highly objectionable—but that they are to be ascribed to the same causes which produced the delusion of James Nayler and his company—and not only so, but that the essential principles of Quakerism and Hicksism are identical—I shall now present the reader with a few quotations from the printed works of Early Friends.

George Fox. "All languages are to me no more than dust, *who was before languages were*, and am come'd before languages were, and am redeemed out of languages into the power where men shall agree; but this is a whip and a rod to all such who have degenerated through the pride, and ambition from their natural tongue, and languages, and all languages on earth is but natural, and makes none divine, but that which makes divine is the Word, which was before languages, and tongues were." Preface to the Battledore.

Here G. F. asserts his own pre-existence before languages were—in almost exactly the same terms that he declares the pre-existence of the Eternal Word.

"Again, thou makest a great pudder *that any one should witness that he is equal with God.*" Great Mystery, p. 67.

"He that hath the same Spirit that raised up Jesus from the dead is equal with God." Saul's Errand to Damascus, p. 8.

"Pr. Thou (Alexander Ross,) sayest, It is horrid blasphemy to say the Scripture is not the Word of God, and to say that the soul is a part of God. Answ. The Scriptures are the words of God in Exodus, and the four Books of the Revelations, but Christ is the Word in whom they end; *and it is not horrid Blasphemy to say that the Soule is part of God*, for it came out of him, and that which came out of him, is of him, and rejoiceth in him." Great Mystery, p. 273.

"Moreover the Lord God let me see (when I was brought up into his image, in righteousness and holiness, and into the Paradise of God) the state, how Adam was made a living soul; and also the *Stature of Christ*, the Mystery, that had been hid from ages and generations: which things are hard to be uttered; and cannot be borne by many. For of all the Sects in Christendom (so called) that I discoursed withal, I found none that could bear to be told, that any should come to Adam's Perfection, into that Image of God, and righteousness, and holiness, that Adam was in before he fell; to be so clear and pure without sin, as he was. Therefore, how should they be able to bear, being told, that *any should grow up to the measure of the Stature of the fulness of Christ*, when they cannot bear to hear, that any shall come whilst upon earth, into the same Power and Spirit, that the Prophets and Apostles were in? Though it be a certain truth, that none can understand their writings aright, without the same Spirit by which they were written." G. Fox's Journal, 2d ed. part 1, pp. 59, 60.

As already intimated, the *ignorance* of George Fox, must be the apology, if any apology can be offered, for the language used in these quotations. But what can we think of the claims to extraordinary revelation, set up for such a man, both by himself, and others down to the present day? And what will become of the cobweb excuses of G. Richardson and S. Tuke? To claim *equality* with

God—to suppose that the *Soul* is a *part* of God—and that he "*should grow up to the measure of the fulness of the Stature of Christ*," in a sense which so far exceeded coming to "Adam's Perfection," and being in the same spirit and power which the Prophets and Apostles were in—that it was not to be wondered at, that the professors of christianity could not *bear to be told of it!* Do not these things accord with his applying to himself the title of *The Son of God*, and receiving from his intimate friends the appellations of the Bread of Life, the Fountain of Eternal Life, the Father of Eternal Felicity, the *Second appearance of him who is blessed forever*, &c. &c.?

The reader will please to remember that one of the official charges on which I was disowned was, that I had made an "insidious attempt to destroy the Society, and George Fox's christian character and religious reputation, by calling in question the soundness of his religious writings." This charge referred to the documents published in the Appeal. But it is not in the MS. Journal alone that the sentiments contained in the old letters are found. They are, together with others not less revolting, in his printed works. And the very *existence* of the Society, is made to depend on the maintenance of them—not even to be called in question!!

"The Scriptures were the prophets' words, and Christ's and the Apostles' words, and what, as they spoke, they enjoyed and possessed, and had it from the Lord—*Then what had any to do with the Scriptures, but as they came to the Spirit that gave them forth.* You will say Christ saith this, and the Apostles say this: but what canst thou say?" M. F's Tes. G. Fox's Journal, part 1, p. 3.

"These things I did not see by the help of man, nor by the Letter, (though they are written in the Letter), but I saw them in the Light of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by his immediate Spirit and Power, as did the holy men of

God, by whom the Holy Scriptures were written." Journal, part 1, p. 61.

"They [the Scriptures] *are not the word of God* as thou (C. Wade) hast *blasphemously* affirmed, but Christ is the Word of God." Great Mystery, pp. 246, 247.

Yet G. Fox in a great number of places applies the terms to his own communications.

Thus he says: "The Word of the Lord God to all people that follow priest Lampitt." Journal, part 1, p. 179.

"And to you this is the Word of God. *ib.* p. 181.

"The Word of the Lord God to thee priest Tatham, who art found out of the doctrine of Christ." *ib.* p. 182.

"And to thee this is the Word of the Lord." *ib.* p. 184.

"So this is the Word of the Lord God unto all." *ib.* 482.

"This is the Word of the Lord God to you all: go not forth to the aggravating part." *ib.* p. 393.

Having taken a few quotations from the published works of George Fox, I shall now arrange the following selections under the heads of subjects to which they relate. In regard to some of the writers to whom I shall refer, I freely acknowledge, as I have done, again and again, that they made many declarations, which, taken separated, and purified from the errors which lie scattered among them, might be regarded as excellent. But none that love the truth, and have a due regard for the honour of God, or the salvation of souls, can harbour the wish to adulterate, or contradict, those valuable passages, by retaining along with them, sentiments totally subversive of the Gospel. I am perfectly astonished at many of the Friends, from whom I had hoped better things, who are exerting their whole amount of influence, to prevent a developement of the unsound parts of the writings of Friends, and to suppress among the members, every doubt in regard to the *unclouded clearness*, of the views of our predecessors. The doctrines of the Gospel may be corrupted—the cause of Christianity scandalized, by connect-

ing with it the grossest absurdities—awakened souls may drink in the deadliest poison—rather than call in question the infallibility of Early Friends, and discriminate between their errors and what they said well!! Let these Friends remember that they that love Father or Mother more than Christ are not worthy of him. And if to offend one of his little ones, is worse than for a millstone to be hung about their necks, and they to be cast into the sea—how dreadful must it be to recommend such sentiments, as may occasion the eternal ruin of those who receive them!

OF THE SCRIPTURES.

"Next the literal knowledge does kill, and not make alive: and the Letter may also be called Dead, because it makes dead by Killing, as well as that in another sense there is no life in it: But we know that the strict sense of the place [2 Cor. 3. 6, 7,) to relate to the dispensation of the first covenant." Penn's Works, fol. vol. 2, p. 144.

A certain J. Turner, having said that it was a principle with the Friends—"That saints were not to do duties by, or from a command without, but from a command within; and that the word commanded in Scripture, was not a command to them, till they had a Word within them"—Edward Burroughs answers:

"That is no command from God to me, what he commands to another; neither did any of the saints which we read of in Scripture act by the command which was to another, not having the command to themselves." E. B. Works, p. 47.

If it be said that E. B. intended private duties—it may be observed that the objection, and of course the answer, related to *duties*, without any such limitation.

"Christ left nothing in writing for the rule of faith and practice that we hear of; and it is not to be thought that he was less faithful in his house, than Moses; and doubt-

less, had he intended the rule of his followers to have been a written rule; he would have left it upon record with all punctuality; this must be believed and that done, on pain of eternal death." Penn's Select Works, vol. 1, p. 307.

This argument was used by Elias Hicks, borrowed, of course, from W. Penn. And George Jones selected this passage for one of his Manchester and Stockport Tracts. The argument, however, is perfectly destitute of foundation. For if the Apostles and Evangelists were inspired —if they wrote the mind of Christ—if the Holy Ghost spoke by them—then what they so wrote was of the same force and authority as if it had been written by Christ himself. Their testimony is clothed with the authority of God himself. The doctrines of revealed religion ARE *left upon record with all punctuality.* And they are to be believed and obeyed, on pain of eternal death. But let it be observed, that the argument of W. Penn goes to destroy the authority of the Scriptures—that they are not to be regarded as coming from Jesus Christ. What then? Is not the idea naturally suggested that the Apostles and Evangelists were not authorized to write them? And this fallacious argument against their authority as the Rule of Faith and Practice, lands in a virtual denial of their obligation. By a negative mode of reasoning he gives us to suppose, that as Christ did not write them himself, we are not bound to believe *this* and do *that* on pain of eternal death. For if this obligation to believe and obey the Scriptures, be acknowledged to exist, then the argument amounts to nothing at all. But if it *does not exist*, then we are at liberty in regard both to Faith and Practice, to set the Scriptures aside with impunity.

"Nay the Scriptures (says W. Penn) cannot be properly styled the revelation of the Will of God, till they are first opened by him, who was found worthy to unseal the Book, that *Spirit of Truth* that opens and none shuts; and shuts and none opens." Vol. 2, p. 37, fol.

It was the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Root of David, the Lamb that was slain, that was spoken of in the Revelations, that was found worthy to open the Book and to loose the seals. But W. Penn says it was the Spirit of Truth—and thus he confounds the character of Christ with that of the Holy Spirit. And as W. Penn declared the Spirit to be the Rule of Christians, he at the same time applies the terms to Christ, whom he makes identical with the Spirit; and thus, "involves the danger of a very fatal heresy."

In the language of the "Strictures on Truth Vindicated," W. Penn, "of course cannot regard the Scriptures as 'the written revelation of the Will of God,'" because their being the revelation of his Will, is made entirely to depend on a new revelation. And till that revelation is received, they cannot be properly styled a revelation of the Will of God!

I have often quoted a passage from R. Barclay, declaring that "we do look upon them [the Scriptures] as the only fit outward judge of controversies among Christians: and that whatsoever doctrine is contrary to their testimony may therefore be rejected as false. And for our parts, we are very willing that all our doctrines and practices be tried by them, which we never refused nor ever shall, in all controversies with our adversaries as the judge and test." And most earnestly did I labour to establish this rule among the Friends. But in practice it is daily trampled under foot.

There is in it however, a clause, which is commonly used at this time, to render it a nullity. It is—"the only fit *outward* judge of controversies." This unhappily opens the door for individual impressions, to hold the highest place, as Judge of controversies. And indeed there is much reason to believe that this was the intention of the writer, who contended for the *Spirit*, as the Primary Rule of Faith and Practice. With such a modification, the

practical effect of the declaration of the authority of Scripture, must be greatly diminished, if not totally destroyed.

But R. B. did not stop here. After having dwelt largely on an exaggerated view of the *uncertainty* of the text of Scripture, he says: "I say, all these, and much more which might be alleged, puts the minds even of the learned into *infinite doubts*, *scruples* and *inextricable difficulties*." Barc. Works, fol. p. 353.

This statement I venture boldly to *contradict*. For it is a fact admitted by the learned, that all the various readings of ancient copies of Holy Scripture, which have arisen from copying and re-copying, have not deprived us of one single doctrinal sentiment, one single moral precept, or one single historical fact. How much to be regretted is it, to see such a writer as R. Barclay, falling in with the current of argument which has been relied on by the enemies of revealed religion! The reason is obvious—it was to destroy a dependence on the Scriptures, as the Rule of Faith and Practice, in order to establish the notion that the Spirit himself is *the Rule* of Christians. And in his zeal for this favourite opinion, he even subjects the Scriptures themselves, to the test of immediate revelation. "When we doubt," says he, "of the streams of any river or flood, we recur to the Fountain itself, and having found it, there we sist; we can go no further: because there it springs out of the bowels of the earth, which are inscrutable. Even so the *writings* and sayings of *all men* we must bring to the Word of God, I mean the *Eternal Word;* and if they agree hereunto, we stand there; for this Word always proceedeth, and doth eternally proceed from God, in and by which the unsearchable counsel and will conceived in the heart of God is revealed unto us. Works, fol. p. 298.

"For I have known some of my Friends, who profess the same Faith with me, faithful servants of the most High

God, and full of the Divine knowledge of his Truth as it was immediately and inwardly revealed to them by the Spirit from a true and living experience, who not only were ignorant of the Greek and Hebrew, but even some of them could not read their own vulgar language; who being pressed by the adversaries with some citations out of the English Translation, and finding them to *disagree* with the manifestation of Truth *in their hearts*, have boldly affirmed, *The Spirit of God never said so*, and that it was certainly wrong, for they did not believe, that any of the holy Prophets or Apostles had ever written so.—Which when I on this account seriously examined, I really found to be Errors and Corruptions of the Translators; who (as in most translations) do not so much give us the genuine significations of the words, as *strain* them to express that, which comes nearest with that opinion and *notion* they have of truth." *ib.* p. 303.

Here it may be remarked, as we go along, that R. B. has not given us the corrections of the Translations, which these *illiterate* men made by revelation. We have only *his* opinion that the English translation was erroneous in the cases alluded to. But why did he not give the correction of the texts in question, that others might judge of the translation as well as himself? His object was not to correct particular errors in the translation, but to establish the rule of bringing the Scriptures themselves, to the test of individual revelation. Nor is this all: for he passes a sweeping censure upon the Translators, and upon most translations.

And where, I ask, is this discredit of the Scriptures, and this latitude of bringing them to the test of immediate revelation to end?

This is in the celebrated Apology—a Standard work, reprinted, and circulated in various parts of the world, by the Yearly Meetings themselves.

"Shall we think that the literal text, in the very trans-

cripts he so talks for, is any other than he calls it as to its most ancient translation, a *corrupt stream*, *a Lesbian Rule*, pp. 15, 16, or *any other than some call it*, *a nose of wax*, *no certain stable Rule or standard*, *to try all truth by*, *and guide throughout in the knowledge of the will of God?*"

"Shall we think, because J. O. thinks so strangely, that so *corruptible* and *corrupted* a stream as the meer Letter now is, since *vitiated* and *interpolated*, can be judged a fit measure to judge the fountain by (i. e.) the Light, Word, and Spirit it came from? and a fit measure to correct, and authoritatively to examine and determine those originals by?" S. Fisher's works p. 397.

I could quote much more of the same kind from the writings of this author. Comment on such language is unnecessary.

"And here thou hast much manifested thy folly and weakness, who would have the Gospel contained in *a book* which all the books in the world cannot contain." (A. Parker, Testimony of God p. 26.

"He [that is an apponent] said the Scripture is the Word. I answer [said the writer] that is another lie, and the Scripture is a witness against thee, it saith, God is the Word, and the Word became flesh," &c. (T. Lawson and J. Slee, Untaught Teacher, p. 11.)

"He said the Scripture was the Word of faith. I answer that is another lie, and here thou denies Christ, who was before the world was, or heresy, schism, antichrist, or false prophet was." (*ib.* pp. 11, 12.)

"He said the Scriptures did lead into the truth. I answer, that is another lie, and the Scriptures are witnesses against thee, which saith, the Spirit of truth leads into all truth; &c. (*ib.*)

"He said, the Scripture led into the knowledge of God, and did teach man the knowledge of God. I answer, that is another lie, and the key of knowledge thou here denies, so thou art brutish in thy knowledge." *ib.* p. 13.

"Matthew Caffin said, the Scripture was the Touchstone to try spirits withall. I answer that is another lie, the Scripture is not the tryer of spirits, to try the living by the dead, that I deny:" &c. (*ib.* p. 14.)

"Dost not thou teach men to follow the Scripture that was never given from God to thee nor them; certainly they must neglect that portion of the spirit given to all, enlightening all, for no man can serve two masters. Mat. 4. That which kills is your Teacher, because you have chosen it:" (J. Humphreyes, Vision of Eternity, p. 2.)

"For the Devil's Foundation is the Letter; and if he should deny that, it would be enough to plenetative his members with a suspicious Jealousy that he were deculating that which for many years he hath taught them by his education to super-edificate or build up. Now to prove the Letter his maxim, is easier for me then for him in thee to prove another Temple besides the Saints' bodies, though presumption blusheth not at folly. The Apostles argument is not particular, as to the Letter of the Law; for if so, why was he so *logosevacuate*, or empty of expressions as not to express it particular; but seeing he did not well take the Devils Liberty to keep close to the Letter which is expressed in general terms, *viz: The Letter kills*: Now the Devils name in Hebrew signifies a Destroyer, and I hope betwixt them two there's little difference, *viz: killing and destroying*." (Vision of Eternity, p. 11.)

This is plainly asserting that there is little difference between the *Scriptures* and the *Devil!!*

This piece was published in the year 1657, and in 1708, was recognized by John Whiting in his Catalogue of Friends' Books, p. 81.

The passage, so often used in Friends' writings—"The Letter killeth," has been, and still is, most grossly perverted, by applying it to the Scriptures; and representing *them* as producing spiritual death. The meaning of

the Apostle evidently was the *Law*, simply considered, with reference to its high obligations—and the *penalty* of death, which it pronounces upon the transgressor. The quotation last made from that preposterous piece called the Vision of Eternity, will serve to show the awful extent to which false principles may be carried.

OF CHRIST: THE SEED, AND UNIVERSAL, SAVING LIGHT.

"By this *Seed*, *Grace* and *Word* of *God*, and *Light*, *wherewith we say*, *every man is Inlightned*, and hath a *measure* of it, which strives with them in order to *Save* them, and which may by the *stubbornnees* and *wickedness* of man's Will be *quenched*, *bruised*, *wounded*, *pressed-down*, *slain* and *crucified*, we understand not the *proper Essence and Nature of God precisely taken;* which is not Divisible into parts and measures, as being a must Pure, Simple Being, void of all Composition or Division, and therefore can neither be resisted, hurt, wounded, crucified or slain by all the Efferts and Strength of men. But we understand a *Spiritual*, *Heavenly* and *Invisible Principle*, *in which God*, *as Father*, *Son and Spirit dwells:* a measure of whioh *Divine* and *Glorious Life* is in all men, as a *Seed*, which of its own nature *draws*, *invites and inclines to God.* And this we call *Vehiculum Dei*, or the *Spiritual body of Christ*, the *flesh and blood of Christ*, which came down from Heaven, of which all the Saints do feed, and are thereby nourished unto Eternal Life." Barclay's Works, p. 333.

"As this Seed is received in the heart, and suffered to bring forth its *natural and proper Effect*, *Christ comes to be formed and raised;* of which the Scripture makes so much mention, calling it the New man; Christ within, the Hope of Glory. This is *that Christ within*, which we are heard so much to speak and declare of; every where preaching him up, and exhorting People to believe in the *Light* and obey *it*, that they may come to know *Christ in them to deliver them from all sin.*" *ib.* p. 334.

"I do freely Affirm, that I believe, Man fell, and was degenerated both as to Soul and Body: and I understand the first Adam, (or Earthly Man) to Comprehend both. But that there was *something in Adam*, which was no part of his Soul and Body, nor yet Constitutive of his being a Man (in my Judgment) *which could not degenerate*, and which was in Adam by the Fall *Reduced to a Seed*, and could never have been Raised in him again to his Comfort, but by a New Visitation of Life, which from Christ by the Promise was Administred unto him, and is to all Men in a Day." *ib.* pp. 761–2.

That there is much *confusion* and *contradiction* in Barclay's notions of the Vehiculum Dei, will be apparent to all those who have time and opportunity to trace out the various passages in his writings which relate to this subject. In some places he makes it the purchase of Christ's death, but in the last quotation it is undoubtedly represented as something that was in Adam before he fell, and which, by the Fall was reduced to the condition of a seed. But even in this, he falls into a palpable absurdity, in representing it not only as a spiritual, heavenly, invisible principle, but as a "divine and glorious Life,"—in all men as a seed, which of its own nature draws, invites, and inclines to God—and yet that this *seed* could never have been raised in Adam again to his comfort, but by a new visitation of Life.

In speaking of man in the Fall—p. 764, he says: "In whom albeit there remained a Seed of Righteousness, yet no other ways, than as a *Naked Seed*, in barren ground, in virtue of which he can do nothing, until visited by a New Visitation, which he receives by virtue of Christ as Mediator."

So then, it is not the *Seed* that is *purchased* but a *New Visitation* to the Seed. And though the Seed is a spiritual, heavenly, invisible principle, in which God as Father Son, and Spirit dwells—in which "God and Christ are as wrapped up" (pp. 333, 334)—though it is supposed to be

a divine and glorious Life—and by its own nature to draw, invite and incline men to God—yet it is but a *Naked Seed* in barren ground in virtue of which man can do nothing, until visited by a New Visitation!

These are some of the incongruities which arise from attempts to modify the doctrines of the Scriptures by a speculative philosophy. But the mischief does not end here. For Barclay says that this *Seed* is the "Spiritual body of Christ, the flesh and blood of Christ, which came down from Heaven, of which all the Saints do feed."

But Jesus Christ declared, "The Bread of God, is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the world." "I am the Bread of life." "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." "I am the bread of life. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Who so eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my Flesh is meat indeed, and my blood drink indeed." &c.

Nothing can be more clear to my mind, than that the Lord Jesus was here speaking of himself personally. His coming down from Heaven asserts his divine character, as the Son of God. The *flesh* which he says he would give for the life of the world, was literally the body that was wounded on the cross. For if an invisible principle, constituted the flesh that was given for the life of the world—then the actual flesh of Jesus, was not the flesh that was given for the life of the world.

This is exactly the doctrine of Elias Hicks.

But it was the actual flesh of the Lord Jesus, and not a mere invisible principle that was given for the life of the

world. And as he was literally crucified—his body broken, and his blood shed as the sacrifice for our sins—so to believe in *him* as the Saviour—to look by faith, to that atoning sacrifice, is figuratively to eat his flesh, and drink his blood. It is an act of Faith—and it has direct reference to that one offering which he made to God for us, when he offered up himself. To change this plain and simple doctrine so clearly taught in the Scriptures—and represent the flesh and blood of Christ—which he gave for the life of the world, as a mere inward principle—a universal and saving Light—is to deny the person of the Lord Jesus—to set aside his sufferings and death, as the *alone sacrifice* for sins—and thus "to involve the danger of a deadly heresy."

It is not the question here, whether Barclay intended this or not—nor does the inquiry arise in this place, whether he declares the Orthodox faith in other parts of his writings.

I am speaking of *particular* passages. If he was sound in the faith, his works should be *corrected*, and nothing be suffered to remain in them, contrary to the intention of the writer, or dangerous to the reader. If he was really unsound—his works should be rejected entire. In either case there can be no valid plea for arresting the inquiry; and recommending the work with all its imperfections.

"As this Seed" says he "is received in the heart."—But how *received*, if it be in all men, already? But waiving this objection, we will follow R. B. a little further in his explanation. He says: "As this Seed is received in the heart, and suffered to bring forth its natural and proper effect, Christ comes to be *formed* and *raised*, of which the Scriptures make so much mention, calling it the New Man, Christ within, the Hope of Glory. This is that Christ within, which we are heard so much to speak and declare of; every where preaching him up, and exhorting the people to believe in the *Light*, and obey it, that they

may come to know Christ in them, to deliver them from all sin."

Now I would ask the reader, what relation this universal saving Light—this invisible principle, has to Jesus of Nazareth? And if this is *that Christ within* which the Early Friends preached up—how can it be identical with the Christ that was crucified at Jerusalem? The more we examine the subject, the more we shall see its utter inconsistency with the doctrine preached by the Apostles and Evangelists—"That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing we might have life through his name."

I am quite aware that Barclay in his Apology, written in 1675, says: "that we understand not this Divine Principle to be any part of man's nature, nor yet to be any Relicks of any good which Adam lost by the Fall." Works, fol. p. 337. Yet in the Apology Vindicated, written in 1679, he clearly states it, as already shown, to be something that was in *Adam*, which could not degenerate, but which by the Fall was reduced to a seed.

And here it may not be improper to observe, that within the year past, I have found a work of Samuel Fisher's, published in the year 1661, in the character of a *Revelation*. He calls it "Some Certain Hidden, or Vailed Spiritual Verities Revealed," &c. It was in answer to certain Queries propounded to him, George Fox, Edward Burroughs, and John Perrot. This was before either Penn or Barclay had joined the Society; and stands as acknowledged authority, as to the views of Friends. W. Penn refers to this piece, and endeavours to explain the views of George Fox on the basis laid down by S. Fisher.

The 3rd Query was: "Whether are the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Man, and the Spirit of the Devil, three distinct Spirits?" To this question Fisher answers in the affirmative, that they were three distinct Spirits.

The queries then demand among other things, whether

the Spirit of Man, be distinct from the body when expired? Whether is there a soul in man distinct from the aforesaid Spirit, &c. &c.

Fisher answers very plainly, "That man (as God at first made him) was a creature consistent of these *three*, namely, Body, Soul, and Spirit," "Each of which, though concurrent with the rest, to the complete making up of that one composition or creature called man (as God at first made him,) are yet *distinct* in themselves, and separable the one from the other." P. 11.

In describing what these three constituent parts of man are, he says of the Spirit of man, (the reader will take notice that this is distinguished from the Spirit of God,) "As to the Spirit of *man*, which is the best, highest, and most noble of the three aforesaid, which concurs to the constituting of *man*, in his primitive perfection, it is that *Breath of life*,* which God breathed into his soul, after he had formed him (as to his body) of the dust of the earth, whereby he came to be a living soul;" p. 13: with more to the same effect, which for brevity sake, I omit. "This" says he, "is that *noble*, *royal*, *righteous*, *holy*, *seed*, which while man was at first *born*, *made*, *created*, and planted after the nature and image of, he was said to be planted a noble vine, wholly a right seed," &c. &c. p. 14. He calls it "the seed of the kingdom," "the royal seed, that right seed, that holy seed," &c. p. 15. He says "it is *natural*, i. e. pertaining to the very *nature* of that man which God first created"—and "supernatural, as in reference to man in the fall, who is of the Devil's marring." p. 16.

He comes at last to the winding up of this curious theory. "At the dissolution of the composition, or whole man, which consists of the three aforesaid, each from the other,

*The term applies to other creatures as well as man. "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died. Gen. vii. 21, 22.

then the body returns to the dust from whence it came; and the said spirit returns up to God that gave it; and that *soul* together with it, that hath stood in the counsel of it: while *that soul* which the body dies from, while they both lived together in sin, dies both from it and from God that gave it, forever; and is left *naked*, and divested, both of its own *body*, and *its own spirit* also, and lies in separation, not only from *both* these, but also from God, and *his good Spirit*, tormented among all evil spirits forever." pp. 18, 19.

As he begun with distinguishing the Spirit of God, and the spirit of man—so he brings out this distinction in the conclusion. But mark the absurdity of the notion. He seems to have not the least idea of the Scripture doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead. One third of each individual he gives to the dust, and there he leaves it, without regarding it as a seed, sown in dishonour, to be raised in glory. Two-thirds of each good man, and only two-thirds, he sends to heaven. But of every sinner—he consigns one-third to the dust—one-third to God, and one-third to the Devil! Now, (passing over the monstrous absurdity of this division of every individual) I ask, how are we to suppose *the spirit of man*, is to be *happy* in heaven, while *its* soul is tormented in hell? Or how can the *soul* be tormented in hell, while *its spirit* is happy in heaven? Or how can the future state of the wicked be said to be either happy or miserable?

Of all the extravagant visions of imagination run wild, I have never met with any thing more preposterous than this. And yet, William Penn, in his works, refers to this very piece, in explanation of George Fox's calling the *soul a part of God.*

This, then, is the true version of Barclay's *Vehiculum Dei*—Something that was in Adam before he fell, which could not degenerate, and which by the fall was reduced to a seed—a Universal Saving Light—which being received

and suffered to produce its natural effect—Christ comes to be formed—that Christ within of which the Friends were heard to speak so much. But such a Christ as had no relation to Jesus of Nazareth!

We can readily perceive how it should be said, that it is not of the proper nature and essence of God precisely taken, being supposed to be the spirit of man. We can account for its being reckoned a *Universal Light*—that is, pertaining to *all* men: for the same reason. But it is equally obvious, that if by this we are to be *saved*—if the *spirit of man* is a *saving*, as well as *universal light*—if by *this*, *Christ* comes to be formed—born, brought forth, raised in us—if this is that *Christ within*, the hope of glory, which was the peculiar doctrine of Early Friends, it is another gospel from that which was preached by the Apostles. Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and remission of sins through his Name, are no necessary parts of the system. The doctrine of atonement is laid aside. The *spirit of man* becomes the Saviour—the Inward Light, another term for the same thing, is the Supreme Rule of belief and action—and this also is the ground of *Justification*. For Barclay makes *justification* to consist in having *this Christ*, formed, born, raised, &c. in us.

That he does acknowledge the Lord Jesus, his sufferings, death, resurrection, ascension, and mediation, I well know. That we could select from his writings declarations going to all the points of the Christian Faith, I am not disposed to deny. But my astonishment is, that such a mass of error should be so thoroughly incorporated with so much Truth. And not less do I admire that such an incongruous mass should pass so long as correct, among the Friends, many of whom are both pious and intelligent. I wonder that such a man as Barclay should have been so bewildered. I wonder that his successors should not have detected the error—and last, but not least, I admire that I myself did not sooner discover the inconsistency which

there is between this system, and the simple plain doctrines preached by the Apostles.

I do not think that this notion originated with G. Fox: for in endeavouring to adopt it, he made so great a blunder, according to W. P., as to take the *soul* for Fisher's *spirit of man*—which was one and the same with Barclay's Vehiculum Dei, or Universal Saving Light. And indeed they were both so completely identified with the *mnn*, that it is not strange that *George Fox* should mistake the one for the other. But this whole theory evidently arose *after* the delusion had taken place with G. Fox, the Fell family, and with Nailer and his company. For Fisher's Revelation was in 1661, the Fell letters in 1652, G. F's. letter to O. C. in 1654, Nailer's affair in 1656, A. Curtis's letter in 1660, and the Battledore the same year. Thomas Lower's letter, though written 14 years after Fisher's Revelation, seems to have no connection whatever with it. If it was not a direct, unqualified, ascription of Messiahship to G. F., I can form no idea of what was intended.

Elias Hicks, in one of his sermons, said: "'If we walk in the Light as he is in the Light, we have fellowship one with another; and, as in our translation, 'the *blood* of Jesus Christ his son cleanseth from all sin.' What kind of Blood? Has he any such blood as we have; any such flesh? No, he has no such blood nor never has had. The *immortal soul* has not such blood. The blood is the life of the animal, and so it was the life of Jesus Christ the Son. The *light* is the *life* which the apostle declared was in him; it is the *light* which cleanses us from all unrighteousness." Pha. Ser. p. 260.

Here we have material parts of Fisher's and Barclay's notion of the Universal Saving Light, the Spirit of man, and life of the soul—the *flesh and blood* of Christ.

E. H. says: "So it is with this Christ, this light within, because it is a manifestation of the Spirit of God, and this manifestation is given to us to profit withal. And it would

be better for all professors to keep it under that name; because when we mention Christ, men's minds are turned outward, so that sometimes we are almost afraid to name the name of Christ, as it leads them to the contemplation of an outward body, a visible object." Quaker, vol. 2, p. 267.

"For the true Saviour was actually hid from their eyes, they could only see the *garment* in which he dwelt." Quaker, vol. 3, p. 217.

"What is the *Blood* of Jesus Christ? Is it material? Certainly not, for that must perish." Quaker, vol. 3, p. 255.

"Now this must be experienced; this Son of God in our souls must take the rule, it must be exalted above all in us, and every thing must be subject to it." *ib.*. 3, vol p. 243.

"But dont believe that I mean that outward Christ that walked about the streets of Jerusalem, but that divine power, that Christ that travelled with Israel in the wilderness." *ib.* vol. 3, p. 104.

"We see that this *flesh* and *blood* never could have been in a strict sense, the Son of God." &c. Pha. Ser. p. 251.

Such were the views entertained by E. Hicks, of Jesus Christ, his *flesh* and *blood*, and of the Inward Light.

Isaac Pennington, in the extract selected by George Jones, and defended by George Richardson, says: "Now the Scriptures do expressly distinguish between *Christ* and the *garment* he wore; between *him* that *came*, and the *body* in which he *came*, between the *substance* which was veiled, and the vail which vailed it. 'Lo! I come; a body hast thou prepared me.' There is plainly *he* and the *body* in which *he* came. There was the *outward vessel* and the *inward life*. This we certainly know, and *can never call the bodily garment Christ, but* THAT *which appeared and dwelt in the body*." Pennington's Works, vol. 3, p. 61.

E. Hicks evidently borrowed the ideas of I. P. for he

uses the very term *garment*, as Pennington does, to designate the *person* of Christ. But we find I. P. using various forms of expression, to define what he understood to be *the Christ*, as distinguished from the *bodily garment*, the *outward vessel*, the *veil*, &c. And beyond all contradiction, it was the *inward life*, and this *alone*, that he regarded as the *Christ*.

William Penn, agrees exactly with I. P. in distsnguishing between Christ and the outward person. In his Apology, speaking of an opponent, he says:

"First, He takes up an whole chapter in his endeavors to prove that we deny the Lord that bought us, though very falsely and equally unsuccessful.

"*Because we deny that Person (the Son of God) that died at Jerusalem to be our Redeemer.*

"Which most horrid imputation has been *answered more* (I believe) *than a thousand times, by declaring that* HE that laid down his *life*, and suffered his BODY to be crucified by the Jews without the gates of Jerusalem, is *Christ the only Son* of the Most High God: But that the *outward Person* which *suffered, was properly the Son of God*, we UTTERLY DENY, and it is a perfect contradiction to their own principles; 'A body hast thou prepared me,' said the Son, then the Son was not the body, though the *body* was the Son's." Penn's Works, fol. vol. 2, p. 65.

Here it will be seen that W. Penn is as positive in denying the Lord *Jesus* to be the Son of God, as E. H. ever was, in his most objectionable declarations. I know of no passage in E. H's sermons, from beginning to end, that conveys the idea in question more distinctly, or in more positive terms. He makes the same distinction which I. Pennington made, and which was made by E. Hicks and his friends.

I know that it is contended by some of the advocates of Early Friends, that W. Penn's declaration, only goes to the denial that the *Body*, and the *body alone* was the

Son of God. But why might not the same apology be made for E. Hicks? He said expressly "we see that this *flesh and blood* never could be, in a strict sense the Son of God." But does not every one perceive that this denies the miraculous conception? But W. P. goes still further than E. H. did. He does not confine his denial to the mere *flesh* and *blood*, but takes in the whole *Person*; including in it the capacity of *suffering*.

But it has been said, that the word *properly* shelters W. P. Then why not allow E. H. to be sheltered under the terms, *in a strict sense?* The cover is quite as broad in the latter, as in the former case. But neither of them can be allowed—for they strike alike at a historical fact of Fundamental importance. Grant this single position, that the outward person that suffered, was not strictly and properly the Son of God, and a flat and downright contradiction is given to the testimony of the Apostles and Evangelists—of the Angel from heaven, and of God the Father, himself. The Evangelist John said These are written that ye might believe that JESUS is the CHRIST, the SON of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name. And when he had asked his disciples "Whom say men that I, the *Son of man* am?" he addressed the question to *them*. "But whom say *ye* that I am." And Peter answered, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." The Angel said to Mary—in reference to the miraculous conception: "*Therefore that Holy thing that shall be born of thee*, shall be called *the Son of God*." And the voice which came from heaven declared, both at his Baptism, and at his Transfiguration: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

It should not be overlooked that W. Penn, in the forepart of the sentence, makes *Christ* and the *only Son* of the most High God, synonimous terms. They are both used, and applied to the same object. And in denying the title of *the Son*, to the outward person that suffered, he denied

that of *Christ* also. For it was *Christ* that died—We were reconciled to God by the death of his *Son*. The prophets spoke of the *Sufferings* of *Christ* and the glory that should follow. *Christ* also hath *suffered* for our sins." But, "Who is a liar, but he that denieth that *Jesus* is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and and the Son."

If it should be said that this was a mere *metephysical* speculation in W. P. improperly endeavouring to defend the Sonship—I answer, and why was it not so with Elias Hicks also? It matters not how the error originated. It is contrary to the truth of the Gospel, and totally subversive of the Faith once delivered to the Saints. Let no man spoil you through philosophy, and vain deceit, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ, for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the God head bodily."

The denial of the Lord Jesus, is but the counter part, of the mystical character of *Christ*, which so often accurs in the writing, of early Friends.

Humphrey Woolrich. "And this is your fallen estate, saith the Lord God, which know not Christ in you the hope of glory. Even the same that was before the world was, one with the Father, and filleth Heaven and Earth, and was never seen with any carnal eye, nor his voice heard by any carnal ear." A. Declaration &c. p. 13, 1659.

"And therein have ye imagined a God above the clouds and afar off, but know not the Christ who is the express image of the Father's person, to reveal the Father in you; even he who is born of the Spirit and is Spirit, and the only begotten of the Spirit, the glory of him, I say, you are changing in your vain imaginations into the glory of a corruptible man." "And you are speaking of a *Christ*, some of you, *of five foot long*, and asking how he can dwell in a man, and calling it blasphemy to say, that *Christ* which suffered at Jerusalem, of five foot long, can

be in a man; thus you are in your imaginations, and therein have set up a carnal Christ in your carnal minds, but to this day are altogether ignorant as Philip was." *ib.* p. 12.

The same writer, published a pamphlet entitled 'This is written in singleness of heart,' &c. In the title page the author says: "Written from one who have been in the pit, Death, Grave and Hell; But am come from far, and am sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the heavenly places." &c.

In that pamphlet the writer asks this question:

"Whether *Christ* were not the same before the world or Virgin Mary was, as he was in the days of the Jews, and his body the same which descended with that which ascended? and whether any other body did ascend into Heaven, but the body which is spiritual, and the only begotten of the Spirit, and was never seen with any carnal eye?" p. 8.

That *Jesus* was strictly, and properly the *Son* of God, and in reference to the misaculous conception, is true, if Christianity itself is true. And he that would deny the *Sonship* of the Lord Jesus, would make God "a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his *Son*." It was evidently in reference to the *Sonship*, that the *Son of man*, was said to have come down from heaven. Here the ASCENSION of the Lord Jesus is virtually denied, on the same ground on which he was contemptuously called "a Christ five foot long."

JOHN HUMPHREYS. "What saist thou to a Scripture weapon, Call no man master; and, Thou shall not worship the likeness of any thing in heaven, or the earth beneath; but man is a likeness: *ergo*, he that worship man breaks God's command. By the way; the likeness of any thing in Heaven neither; but one question, How do you escape the violating of this *moral* (as you call it) command when you pretend to worship *Christ*, and say he is in

Heaven with a humane body? Certainly a humane body is a likeness: certainly you are worse then the *Papal* Church, who allow the Picture of Christ, and maintain a company of poor men to make them; for a poor trade is held up by them." Vision of Eternity, p. 8.

"Now concerning thy *human bodied Christ*, did not God make all things by Christ, and was not he a perfect Christ from the beginning, or before (as to particulars) and was a perfect Christ, and Lamb slain from the beginning of world? then surely that humane body was not him." *ib.* p. 17.

"Thou in answer to my 6 query saist, that Christ is another gess spirit then the saints, or not the same; but whether thou meanest not so in *quality* or *quantity*, or neither I know not; but this I know, They are kings and priests on earth, and Christ is no more. 2. I say, That there is no difference in, or of him that sanctifieth or he that is sanctified; read Heb. 2, 11, 12. For they are all one saith the text, which comprehends both *quality* and *quantity*." *ib.* pp. 17, 18.

"Christ shall direct the way of the perfect; or God in Flesh shall direct the way to the perfect, as in Heb. for he directs all to perfection thats past the Creator." *ib.*

It will be seen that the radical error exhibited in the foregoing extracts, (of which a much larger collection might be made) relates not only to the character of *Christ* but to that of the *Holy Spirit* also. And the poisonous quality of this error extends throughout the whole body of doctrine. I shall give a *few* examples, and on a *few* other points of doctrines.

ATONEMENT, SANCTIFICATION, JUSTIFICATION.

In quoting from R. Barclay and W. Penn, I give them full credit for saying many things on the subjects before us, which had there been nothing of a contrary nature,

might have ranked them high among christian writers. But as they committed errors of a most dangerous character, we ought not to forbear to put their readers on their guard, lest they receive *deadly poison*, while they suppose they are only taking wholesome food, from the hands of their "dear fore-fathers."

Robert Barclay. This so highly esteemed writer, places the proposition on *Justification*, immediately after that on the Universal and Saving Light. It begins in these words: "As many as resist not this *Light*, but receive the same, *it becomes* in them a holy, pure, and spiritual birth, bringing forth holiness, righteousness, purity, and all those blessed fruits, which are acceptable to God; by which holy birth, to wit: *Jesus Christ*, *formed within us*, and working his works in us, as we are *sanctified*, so are we *Justified* in the sight of God, according to the Apostle's words; But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are Justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God, 1 Cor. 6. 11. Therefore it is not by our *works* wrought in our *will*, nor yet by *good works*, considered as of themselves; but by *Christ*, who is both the *Gift* and the *Giver*, and the *Cause* producing the *effects* in us: who, as he hath reconciled us, while we were *enemies*; doth also in his wisdom *save* us and *justify* us *after this manner*, as saith the same Apostle elsewhere: According to his Mercy he hath saved us, by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. Tit. 3. 5." Apology, Prop. vii.

And here it may be observed, that his notion of the *Vehiculum Dei*, lies at the foundation of his doctrine of Justification. It is this Universal Saving Light—this Spiritual Invisible Principle, this something that was in Adam—not of the proper nature and essence of God, precisely taken—which being *received*, becomes a Holy, Pure, and Spiritual Birth, which birth, we are told, is *Jesus Christ* formed within us. So then, it is this Invisible Principle,

that becomes *Jesus Christ* within us! He does not make the knowledge of the peculiar doctrines of Christianity necessary to this result. This Christ within, the hope of glory, is not that same Jesus Christ whom the Jews crucified—who bore our sins in his own body on the tree—whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through Faith in his blood—to whom all the Prophets gave witness, that through his Name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins. No; it is a Christ formed of an Invisible Principle—and this, as it would seem, without ever hearing of the name of Christ, or having any reference to him who died for us. Thus it is evident, that by following a speculative philosophy, instead of the testimony of Evangelists and Apostles, he stumbled at the very threshhold of his subject, and merged the character of our Holy Redeemer, into a mere Invisible Principle!!

And then, instead of setting out, as the Apostles did, with Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, he goes to *works*, not indeed in our own wills, as he says—nor considered in themselves—but wrought by "this Christ within." By these *works* we are said to be *Sanctified*—and "as we are *Sanctified* so we are *Justified* in the sight of God."

As this exposition is wrong in the ground work—in taking the strange theory of the *Vehiculum Dei*, or Universal Saving Light, instead of the simple and plain doctrine of *Faith* in our Lord Jesus Christ, who died upon the Cross, a Sacrifice for our Sins, and ever lives to make intercession for us—which Faith is the work of the Spirit, in the use of the Word—So the structure which he raises on that false foundation cannot stand.

I wish the reader distinctly to understand, that I believe it is the Spirit that reproves the world—It is the Spirit that quickens. The Spirit *testifies* of Christ, and glorifies him, in pointing the awakened sinner to him, and inspiring a living Faith in him. We are *strengthened* by the

Spirit, in our Christian course. He helps our infirmities, and when the adoption is obtained, bears witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God—and powerfully sheds the love of God abroad in our hearts: the earnest of the promised inheritance, the foretaste of the joys of heaven.

But the Lord Jesus, is emphatically our Redeemer. As we have all sinned and come short of the glory of God, we are under the curse of the broken Law, and thereby are obnoxious to the wrath of God, and vengeance of eternal fire. Nor is this all: there is attached to us, as the consequence of sin, a *pollution*, totally incompatible with the purity and holiness of God. And besides this, we are under the *dominion*, and in the servitude of the devil. We may consider the condition of the sinner, in a three fold point of view. 1. Guilty and condemned. 2. In pollution and corruption; and thus totally unfit for heaven. 3. An alien from God and servant of the Devil. This whole character must be changed, in order to experience Redemption. In that Redemption which comes by Jesus Christ, *Justification* stands opposed to the *first* part of our ruin: *Sanctification*, to the *second:* and *Adoption* to the *third*.

I do not mean to say, that these three parts of our redemption, are carried on to completion, in the order in which I have mentioned them. Nor would I be understood, that *sanctification*, has respect only to the pollution of *past* sins: for it embraces the present temper and disposition of the mind.

The *Love* of God, is the source from which the whole means of our redemption proceeded. God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. The *Spirit* is the Powerful Agent, by whom those means are effectually applied to us. And it is by his present help and energy, immediately operating upon the

heart, that the temper and inclination to sin are subdued, and the defiling habits and love of sin destroyed.

When, therefore, the deep sense of the sinfulness of sin is produced, and Repentance experienced—it is the office of the Spirit, by whom the work was begun, to fix the Faith on Jesus Christ, as the sacrifice for our sins, and the Advocate with the Father for us: as said the Apostle: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." And this remission and Justification, we receive through Faith. "Therefore, being justified by Faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom we have access, by Faith, into this grace (or favour) wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." Without shedding of blood there is no remission—and the remission of our sins, is not by the shedding of the blood of bulls and goats, but of the Lamb of God, the Lord Jesus Christ. And its efficacy is applied by Faith in his Name. "Believe in the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved."

And as the awful demerit of sin, and the riches of the Love of God, are both set forth in the amazing price that was paid for our redemption—that the justice of God might be maintained, and mercy extended to the transgressor—that God might be declared to be Just, and the Justifier of him that BELIEVES *in* JESUS—so the obligations of gratitude and love, as well as the assurance of redeeming mercy, are set forth in the strongest point of view, in the plan of redemption. We are not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious *blood* of Christ. We are bound not to live unto ourselves, but unto him that died for us, and ever liveth to make intercession for us.

Thus the remission of our sins, is the direct effect of the death and intercession of Jesus Christ for us—we coming on the ground of Faith and Repentance.

The *pollution* of sins is washed away, by the Blood of

Christ. Thus the Saints in heaven, are said to have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Almost all things, said the Apostle, are by the Law purged with Blood—And if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh—how much more shall the BLOOD of *Christ*, who through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

At the same time, as the Spirit is the immediate agent, in applying the testimony of the Word—and the efficacy of the blood of Christ, (by Faith on our part), both in our Justification and Sanctification, so likewise He changes the sinful temper of our minds, and produces the fruits of obedience, and sheds abroad in the heart the Love of God.

Here is an important change of condition and character, and along with it is the *Adoption*. And because we are sons, God sends forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying Abba, Father, the Spirit itself bearing witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God. And if children, then *heirs*, heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ.

"Thus being made free from sin, and become servants to God, we have our fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting Life."

Here I might say something of the formal Profession of allegience to our rightful Sovereign, in passing from under the Powers of Darkness, into the kingdom of the dear Son of God. But this would lead to other points of doctrine, which for the present I shall pass over.

But I do enter my solemn protest, against Barclay's doctrine of the Vehiculum Dei, both as it respects the character of Christ, and the doctrine of Justification. It is totally at variance with the facts of Gospel History, and the plan of Redemption, as laid down in the Holy Scriptures. To consider an Invisible *Principle*, as the *body*,

flesh, and *blood* of Christ, is virtually to deny that body that was broken, and that blood that was shed upon the cross, as *the* Sacrifice for our Sins: and to regard that Invisible Principle, as forming Christ in us—is virtually to deny the Lord Jesus, our Crucified, Risen, and Ever Living and Glorified Redeemer—who dwells in the hearts of believers—*by Faith.* And to suppose that by the effect of that inward principle, working works of holiness in us, and forming "this Christ within," we are Sanctified, and so Justified, is to dispense, at once, with the whole doctrine of atonement, which formed so striking a feature of the previous figurative dispensation, and which stands out so prominently in the death of the Lord Jesus for us—who bore our sins in his own body on the tree—and died for our sins, the Just for the unjust, to bring us to God. It entirely subverts the doctrine of Justification by Faith, and substitutes that of Works, though the Apostle declares that by the deeds of the Law no flesh shall be justified—and if righteousness come by the Law, then Christ is dead in vain.

It is to no purpose that other parts of Barclay's works, may recognize the doctrine of Faith in Christ. If he has expressed clear and Scriptural views—retain them—but free them from every mixture of error. Reject every sentence, every line, and every word, that is not conformable to the Truth, as it is in Jesus.

But so long as this *Vehiculum Dei*, this Universal, Saving Light—this *seed* in Barren ground—this Glorious Life, though not of the proper nature and essence of God precisely taken, is retained as the Foundation of the System, so long as it is convertible into the character of Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, and made the Primary Rule of Faith and Practice: error—incurable and deadly error, may be expected to prevail in the Society holding such a system.

William Penn. Few men have ever written with more

incongruity than W. Penn. Some of his sentiments are so excellent, that we are carried into admiration of the powers of his mind, and the beauty of his illustrations. While others are so excessively erroneous, as not only to call in question the soundness of his principles, but to give rise to astonishment, that things so contradictory, and irreconcileable to each other, should have emanated from the same mind, without any evidence of recantation, or change of opinion.

I believe the Friends, both collectively, and as individual writers, have acted on the principle, never to *retract* any doctrinal sentiment once published. There may be exceptions, but I do not recollect any. The cause is easily explained. With their peculiar views of Revelation, it would be mortifying to themselves to acknowledge error, for this would, at once, confess *delusion*. In addition to this, opponents would not fail to use it as an argument, if not against the doctrine, at least against the claims to revelation. But by the course pursued, consequences incalculably more dangerous and more disgraceful have followed. The principles of the Society have become confused, beyond any example whatever. The most deadly heresies are mixed up with undeniable truths. And the grossest absurdities, and even blasphemies, are retained and defended, as having been dictated by Inspiration. Treatise has been added to Treatise, and official declaration to official declaration, without being understood to repeal, or extinguish any thing that had gone before. From Whiting's Catalogue, and the knowledge we have of works published since that Catalogue was made out, the writings of Friends, were they all collected, would amount to some *hundreds* of Volumes. By these writings you may *attack* or *defend* almost every doctrine of Christianity—or every heresy that has ever disturbed the peace of the Church. I have said *almost* every doctrine—for I believe we could not defend the Ordinances,

and perhaps a few other Christian doctrines, by the writings of Friends. But I believe *all* heresies might be both resisted and defended by them.

It has often been said that W. Penn, in his Sandy Foundation Shaken, was exposing the errors of his opponents, in the objectionable terms which they used. But if so, he should have shown the error of the *terms*, in contrast with the doctrine to which they were applied. But instead of this, he denies the doctrine of satisfaction,* or as he represents it, the payment of the debt by another, and places our acceptance as the mere *forgiveness* of our sins. This notion sets the doctrine of a *Sacrifice* entirely aside. For the atoning Sacrifices under the Law, and even from Abel, all pointed to the one great offering, which was made by the Lord Jesus, when he offered up himself. In all those atoning sacrifices, the life of the victim, was taken, instead of that of the transgressor, who stood exposed to the penalties of the violated Law. This is the simple, obvious nature of a sacrifice. It is the suffering of the innocent victim, for the exemption of the transgressor. But the whole range of W. P's. arguments is directed against this doctrine. In opposition to it, he insists upon mere mercy, pardon, and forgiveness.

He calls it the "Vulgar Doctrine of Satisfaction;" by which I presume he means the *common* doctrine.

After quoting Neh. 9, 16, 17, he says: "Can the honest hearted reader conceive that God should thus be mercifully qualified whilst executing the rigor of the Law transgressed, or not acquitting without the debt be paid him by another? I suppose not." Penn's Works, fol. vol. 1, p. 255.

After quoting Isa. 55, 7; he says: "Come, let the unprejudiced judge, if this Scripture doctrine, is not very

*Other doctrines of Fundamental importance might be mentioned; but they are omitted for the present, for the sake of brevity.

remote from saying his Nature cannot forgive sin, therefore let Christ pay him full satisfaction, or he will certain ly be avenged; which is the substance of that strange opinion." *ib.*

Again, in the same page, after quoting Jer. 31, 31. 33, 34, he says: "Here is God's mere Grace asserted against the *pretended Necessity of a Satisfaction*, to procure his Remission; And this Paul acknowledgeth to be the dispensation of the Gospel in his 8th chap. to the Hebrews: So that this New Doctrine, doth not only contradict the nature and design of the second covenant, but seems, in short, to discharge God both of his Mercy and Omnipotence." *ib.*

And again, after quoting Mic. 7. 18, and making some comments upon it, he says: "So that if the Satisfactionists should ask the question, who is a God like unto ours that cannot pardon iniquity nor pass by transgression, but retaineth his anger until somebody make him satisfaction? I answer, Many amongst the harsh and severe rulers of the nations." *ib.* p. 256.

I have often been astonished at the arguments of W. P., on account of the sophistry of his reasoning, and the little regard which he frequently paid to the most *obvious facts.* The 8th chapter of Heb. to which he refers, begins with a direct reference to the *Priesthood* of the Lord Jesus. And in the last verse but one of the previous chapter, in speaking of his priestly office, he says: "For this he did *once, when he offered up himself.*" Here is the ground of the remission of which the Apostle speaks. And in the next chapter, he returns to the same subject again; and carries it through the remainder of that, and a great part of the tenth chapter. He shows that the sacrifices of the legal dispensation pointed to the death of Jesus Christ, as a Sacrifice for sin—that by *his own blood* he entered into the Holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us—that it is this that purges our conscience from dead works to serve the living God—that the force of the

Testament depended on the *death* of the Testator—that almost all things are by the Law purged with blood, and *without shedding of blood there is no remission.* And as if to guard against a mystical construction of this great doctrine, he clearly shows that this shedding of blood was not to take place often—but ONCE. "So Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of many."—"For by *one offering* he hath forever perfected them that are sanctified."

Here is the ground, and only ground of the free mercy of God to sinful man. It is really astonishing that W. P., with these clear testimonies before his eyes, should argue as he did in his Sandy Foundation Shaken.

The arguments drawn from the passages quoted from the Prophets, are equally fallacious. For the doctrine of Sacrifice was one of the most prominent features of the Dispensation under which the Prophets wrote. And all the Promises of God, under that Dispensation, had an undeniable reference to the principles embodied in the Law, and the provision which God had made for the remission of sin. Does any one suppose that the promises which were held out to penitent sinners, were to be enjoyed on any other condition than those which God himself had laid down in his Word? Did he intend to lay the Law aside, and abolish sacrifices before the coming of Christ? Certainly not. The Law was in full force. The sacrifices were to be duly observed. And those sacrifices pointed to the sufferings of Christ.

Thus all the promises of God, centre in Him, of whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets did write.

Had W. P. been willing to see, he might have seen in the 53d chapter of Isaiah, (the next but one to that to which he referred), the Christian doctrine of Satisfaction most distinctly stated. "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have

turned every one to his own way; *and the Lord hath laid on him* the iniquity of us all." Read the whole chapter: as strikingly setting forth the vicarious and satisfactory nature of the sufferings of the Son of God.

The whole Treatise is one consolidated mass of error. But I will quote a few more passages, as illustrative of the manner in which this most important subject is treated. Under the head of "The Absurdities that unavoidably follow the comparison of this doctrine [of Satisfaction] with the sense of Scripture," he says:

"1. That God is gracious to forgive, and yet tis impossible for him, unless the debt be fully satisfied. 2. That the finite and impotent creature [by which Jesus Christ is plainly intended] is more capable of extending mercy and forgiveness than the Infinite and Omnipotent Creator. 3. That God so loved the world he gave his only son to save it; and yet that God stood off in high displeasure, and Christ gave himself to God as a complete satisfaction to his offended Justice; with many more such like gross consequences that might be drawn." Vol. 1, p. 257.

Whatever may be said of the term *impossibility* in respect to God's pardoning sinners in any other way: and while the perfect freedom of Deity, to do any thing not inconsistent with his nature, must be maintained: the necessity for the plan of salvation may be fairly drawn from the fact of its adoption. There is a perfect fitness in the Will of God; as there is a perfect harmony in all his Attributes. But it is clear that the arguments of W. P. were not directed to the question of the abstract possibility or impossibility of the thing—but to the doctrine itself.

If it be said that he was writing against a *rigid satisfaction*, I would ask: If the doctrine of Satisfaction be admitted at all, what can it be short of a *rigid* or complete Satisfaction? A satisfaction not complete, is a contradiction in terms. But it was the doctrine on the broad ground against which he was contending.

Among the "Consequences, Irreligious and Irrational," as he calls them, he says: "That it was unworthy of God to *Pardon*, but not to inflict punishment on the innocent, or require satisfaction where there was nothing due." * * * "It no way renders man beholding, or in the least obliged to God, since by their doctrine, he would not have abated us, nor did he Christ the last farthing, so that the acknowledgments are peculiarly the Son's, which destroys the whole current of Scripture Testimony, for his good will towards men.—O the infamous portraiture this doctrine draws of Infinite Goodness: Is this your Retribution, O injurious Satisfactionists?" *ib.* p. 258. And in conclusion he says: "But many more are the *gross absurdities* and Blasphemies, that are the genuine fruits of this so confidently believed doctrine of Satisfaction."

How shockingly irreverent is this strain of argument, as well as subversive of the whole scope of Scripture testimony!

The Plan of Redemption originated in the Perfect Wisdom, the Abounding Love, and Amazing Goodness of God. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." "He was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, that he by the grace of God, should taste death for every man." "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through Faith in his Blood—To declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare I say as this time his righteousness, that he might be Just, and the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus."

The Sandy Foundation Shaken, so far as my information extends, is universally admired by Deists and Unitarians. It was printed by the latter class of persons in England, and circulated, as the best Tract in their collection,

The author of that piece, on another occasion expressed himself in a manner as different from the foregoing passages, as language could well be. But in the passage to which I allude, he discovers a remarkable misapprehension of terms. He introduces it by saying: "In short, Justification consists of *two* parts, or hath a two fold consideration, viz. *Justification* from the *guilt* of sin, and *Justification* from the *power* and *pollution* of sin." Works, fol. vol. 2, page 868. Now I would ask what ideas a man could have of *Justification*, to apply that term to the *power* or *pollution* of sin? If Justification could, by any *possibility*, be applied in the case of the *power* of sin, it would amount to Antinomianism: or Justification in the *practice*, and under the power of sin. I do not suppose the writer intended this; but used the term for *Sanctification* and *Obedience*. With this correction, I will give the passage to which I have alluded:

"The first part of Justification," says he, "we do reverently and humbly acknowledge, is only for the sake of the Death and Sufferings of Christ. Nothing we can do, *though by the operation of the Holy Spirit*, being able to cancel old debts, and wipe out old scores. It is the power and efficacy of that propitiatory offering, upon *Faith and Repentance*, that Justifies us from the sins that are past: and it is the Power of Christ's Spirit in our hearts, that purifies, and makes us acceptable to God." *ib.* Here we have the doctrine concisely stated. And I give it as a total refutation of the deistical arguments of the Sandy Foundation Shaken.

But I ask if it is not passing strange, that both doctrines should come from the same man, and without any acknowledged recantation? And is it not a continuation of the paradox, that his friends, after his death, should preserve the Sandy Foundation Shaken, as well as the other? And it is more surprising still, that the Society, after witnessing the use which has been made of that work, to

serve the cause of Unitarianism, and even of open Deism, should insist on recognizing it, as in strict accordance with Holy Scripture—and affectionately recommend it, along with the rest of the writings of early Friends, to the frequent and serious perusal of Friends generally, and especially to the youth.

Another passage from W. Penn, and I have done. In his Christian Quaker, he says: "And as at any time disobedient men have hearkened to the still voice of the Word, that messenger of God in the heart, to be affected and convinced by it, as it brings reproof for sin, which is but a Fatherly chastisement; so upon true brokenness of soul, and contrition of Spirit, the very same principle and Word of Life in man, *has Mediated and Atoned*, and God has been *Propitious*, lifting up the light of his countenance, and replenishing such humble penitents with divine consolations. So that still the same Christ, *Word-God*, who has lighted all men, is by sin grieved and burdened, and bears the iniquities of such as sin, and reject his benefits. But as any hear his knocks and let him into their hearts, he first wounds, and then heals; afterwards he *Atones*, *Mediates*, and Re-instates man in the holy image he is fallen from by sin. Behold this is the state of restitution!" Works, fol. vol. 1, p. 574.

Here we have the character of the Lord Jesus Christ, reduced to a mere Principle in Man. And then this Principle is said to *Atone*, *Mediate*, and *Re-instate* man, &c. A greater perversion of the doctrine of *Atonement* could scarcely be conceived. But it should not be overlooked, that he takes the sinner here, from his first convictions, through the several stages of his change, to the state of *restitution*. Yet Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, with reference to his Incarnation, Sufferings and Death, as a real sacrifice for our sins, is entirely left out. And the only *atonement* HERE mentioned, is that of a Principle in man!

If we take the Scripture doctrine of the death of Christ upon the Cross—we know that this occurred but *once*—death hath no more dominion over him. It is *one offering*, and that *offered* but *once*. For by *one offering* he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. And again: "Now, *once*, in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself." "He was once offered to bear the sins of many." Then there is no room left for the sacrifice of a Principle.

But this supposed slaying of an inward Principle, on this hypothesis, must have taken place often, even innumerable times since the foundation of the world. But the true sacrifice was offered but *once*.

But, no man was ever yet justified in the sight of God, by the sacrifice of a good *principle* in himself.

But on the other hand, if this doctrine of mysticism be taken, and the efficacy of an inward sacrifice, and an inward atonement be acknowledged, then there is no place left for the actual death of the Lord Jesus—except, (as William Penn elsewhere places it), in the character of a martyrdom. But a mere martyrdom can have no necessary connection with our salvation.

OF GOD.

We have already seen that George Fox contended for *equality with God*. W. Penn in his apology for him, vol. 2, p. 433, says: "he [G. F.] understood no more by *Equality*, than unity." And that "he observes no niceties of expression." If this be true, G. F. could not have used, either the words which *man's wisdom* teaches, or which the *Holy Ghost* teaches. For neither the one nor the other, ever dictated such an application of terms. That G. F. was extremely ignorant of language, is no doubt true, yet this fact cannot satisfactorily explain his using such language again and again: and this at intervals of several years.

But he was not the only Friend that advocated the same opinion.

Francis Howgill, was a prominent minister, and not particularly chargeable with lack of education. In a piece entitled Darkness and Ignorance Expelled, p. 21, he says:

"And the first thing that thy dark mind stumbles at is, that some have said *That they that have the Spirit of God, are Equal with God.*

"He that hath the Spirit of God, is in that which is *equal*, as *God is equal:* and his ways *equal.* And he that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit, there is unity, and the unity stands in *Equality itself.*

"He that is born from above, is *The Son of God*, and he said I and my Father are one." Here F. H. puts every regenerate man, into the same character as Jesus Christ, *The Son of God.* But to proceed—"And when *the Son* is revealed and speaks, the Father speaks in him, and dwells in him, and he in the Father. In that which is equal, in *Equality itself*; there is equality in nature, though not in stature. Go learn what these things mean, the understanding and learned will know what I say; and this is neither damnable nor blasphemous; but on the contrary it is saving and precious to them that believe.

"And thou concludes, Though they be glorified in heaven, yet are they not equal with God.

"Here thou blasphemes; *The Son* is glorified with the Father in the same glory he had with him before the world began; the glory is in purity, equality, immortality and eternity."

Such language as this is perfectly horrible. The character of The Son is claimed and repeated, and the monstrous notion of Equality with God defended by arguments. Here it is clear that *unity*, in any sort of allowable sense, was not intended, for he says the *unity* stands in *Equality itself.* And as for the equality in nature but not in stat-

ure—it makes the matter no better—for the nature of God is Infinite—all his attributes are infinite. Omnipotence, Omniscience, Self-Existence, are among the Attributes which are inseparable from his nature. And how are there to be different statures in these? How is one infinity to be less than another?

Whatever might be *intended*, it is with the *language* that we are particularly concerned. And there can be no danger in saying that the terms are *blasphemous*, and the arguments perfectly absurd.

John Humphryes. "*For all things visible and invisible are God in a Lump*, but otherwise properly called his sons or idems." "Nature orders its motions so, as to previate itself into its former Egrediention, or going forth in the visible, its incipation and original being itself. *God* could not come forth in any thing but himself, seeing himself was all things." Vision of Eternity, p. 19.

This is plainly the ancient Heathen Pantheism, which is the root and ground of modern Atheism.

In my Vindication, Repository, Vol. 5, No. 19, after speaking on the obligation of coming directly to the Scriptures as the Rule of Faith and Practice, I said: "In regard to the writings of our own members. I believe they contain many excellent sentiments, examples, and testimonies, in accordance with the Scriptures. But I also believe they have some *imperfections*, which ought to be distinguished from what they said well. And this discrimination would be made, if with minds enlightened by the Holy Spirit, we brought them to the test of Holy Scripture."

And after making a large allowance for the circum-

stances in which the Early Friends wrote, I added: "And when the weakness or mistakes of eminent men, are attempted to be *included along with truth*, or to be set up as fundamental principles, the necessity for such a discrimination becomes a subject of very serious consideration."

This gave great offence to the leading Conservatives. Much censure was cast upon me in conversation. In the mean time, an Article appeared in the Friend, Vol. 9, No. 22, under the head of Standards of Doctrine. The object of the writer was to prove, that from the different constructions given to the Scriptures, the writings of the Early Friends, and not the Scriptures, were to be the Standard of doctrine for us. This article in the Friend, I briefly Reviewed in the Repository, Vol. 5, No. 25. But to meet the objections which had been made to the sentiments contained in my Vindication, published in the 19th and 20th numbers of the Repository, I published, in the 23rd number, an Article under the head of E. Bates's Vindication Reviewed. In that piece I said:

"In reference to the writings of our Early Friends, it ought to be remembered, that the general recommendations of those writings, necessarily include the *whole* of them." * * * The "sincerity [of our fore-fathers] is proved by their many and deep sufferings. But these sufferings do not prove their infallibility, or the correctness of *all* their writings. Their piety and acceptance with God are not questions at all to be agitated by me, and it is equally far from me to pass a censure upon their writings, in a general and summary way. But I am bound for truth's sake, to say, that some *parts* of their writings, cannot bear the test of Holy Scripture."

In the same article I had noticed the Address to the Members of Ohio and Indiana Y. M. which I had written; and in which I had stated the Doctrine of the Resurrection, in the language of Scripture. And I mentioned that when I presented this Address to the Meeting for

Sufferings for its approval, it was decidedly opposed—a committee was appointed to endeavour to modify it—and the modification proposed was, to take out the passages of Scripture on this subject, and supply their places with quotations from the writings of Friends—all which statements, I have fully proved to be true: and for the proof I refer the reader to my Refutation of the Document of the Meeting for Sufferings.

That Meeting, as already noticed, issued a document against me, without previous notice, and when I was absent in England, and without ever to this day furnishing me with a copy of it. It was read and approved in the Yearly Meeting—directed to be forwarded to all the Meetings for Sufferings in the world—and sent down to Short Creek Monthly Meeting for my disownment.

In that Document they say, the "allegations" I had made in regard to the Address, were "disingenuous and untrue"—"that the doctrinal treatises of the early writers of the Society, who were insrumental in the Lord's hand in gathering us to be a seperate people, *are in strict accordance with the Holy Scriptures, and contain a clear exposition of the true christian divinity.* Hence we view with deep concern and disapprobation, the attempts which are made in the publication before us, to lessen the christian reputation of our worthy forefathers in religious profession, and to discredit their approved writings."

The Yearly Meeting of London, in its Epistle of Counsel of 1835, which was adopted by the Y. M. of Ohio, and sent down to its members—said: "Whilst thus alluding to our predecessors in religious profession, we would earnestly but affectionately recommend to our dear friends generally, but especially to those in early life, *the frequent and serious perusal of their writings;* REPLETE as they are with instructive evidence of the sufficiency of that foundation on which it was their concern to build, and eminently calculated, as we believe they are, to impress the mind

with a deep sense of the importance of the experimental work of religion on the heart."

With the history of the Appeal, the reader is already made acquainted. And the foregoing collection of Extracts from published writings, will show what shockingly unsound things they contain. The determination of the Conservatives seems to be, to maintain the writings as *sound*. The Friend of 8 mo. 5, 1837, contains an angry article on The *principles of primitive Friends;* in which the writer says: "What superior advantages do those of this day possess, who seem to wish the Society to take their commentaries as its creed, instead of the doctrines of Fox and Penn, and the masterly Apology of Barclay?" Here the doctrines of Fox, and Penn, and the Apology of Barclay are claimed as the *Creed* of the Society. But he is totally mistaken in supposing that *I*, for one wish, *my* commentaries taken for a *Creed*. I wish the *text* of *Scripture* to be accepted as it was by the Primitive Believers. But we have seen what doctrines are contained in the writings of Fox and Penn, and the masterly Apology of Barclay.

The same writer goes on to say: "Do persons of this character come forward to tell us that the truth is not to be found in the excellent writings of Fox, Barclay, or Penn?" No. But we say that there are errors of a most dangerous character in them, which are conveyed with the greater effect, by the truths with which they are connected. The true or plausible parts of the writings—like water, or like food, become the vehicle by which the poison is communicated.

The writer proceeds: "And where is it [that is the truth] to be found?"—[if not in the writings of Fox, Barclay or Penn] I answer—In the Scriptures, which the writer did not seem to have thought of.

But the excellence of the writings of Early Friends is the theme of conversation and of declamation. It is

poured out in their Periodicals—it meets us in the official documents of Superior meetings, claiming to be *owned* by the great Head of the Church—and it forms the subject of sermons, delivered under the high profession of immediate Inspiration. But after the exhibition has been made of what they contain—the presumption of declaring them sound—under pretension of revelation, may be seen by the weakest capacity. The younger part of the Society will be *ashamed* of holding such things in this enlightened day; and many an older Friend, will feel sick at the very heart, when he thinks of what they have been contending for, and what is now, by themselves, made identical with Quakerism, before the world. And they will lament the day, when they undertook to defend corruption and error, and to retain it in the bosom of Society—or to place Quakerism in open and avowed opposition to Primitive Christianity—as is done in the case of the Ordinances, and other points of Christian doctrine.

I know that there are many specious reasonings, by which some persons are induced to think, that by a little *management*, in not pushing the reformation too fast, it would ultimately prevail; and that the errors for which Conservative Friends so earnestly contend, would, of themselves, sink into oblivion and be forgotten.

I would remind these Friends, that the experience of nearly two hundred years, proves the total fallacy of all this fond expectation. But a few years ago, upwards of Thirty Thousand of our fellow members, were led away by the very errors in question. Nor is this all—but by the official acts of the Yearly Meetings, both of London and Ohio, the same things have been completely recognized, as essential to Quakerism. Error is not of a nature *to die of itself*, in the present state of the world. Two hundred years more might roll over, and if the Society lasted so long, the same things would be as tenaciously held as they are now: while no man could culculate the extent of the mischief which might ensue.

When God is pleased to raise up reformers, he does not send them to sew pillows under arm-holes, or to cry "peace, peace, when there is no peace;" or to hold out the idea that corruption and error are not to be *exposed*—or when they are discovered, to apologise for them, and turn against such as, under a deep sense of duty, have been endeavouring to cleanse the camp. What reformation would Luther and his fellow Reformers, have effected, if they had not *exposed* the *corruptions* of the church of Rome? Or how would they have sustained the cause, if they had shrunk from the frowns of the Conservatives of that day; and to keep peace with them, had recognized the authority of the Traditions, in which the corraptions in question were entrenched?

Not only the Reformers, but the Apostles also, *exposed corruptions*, both among the Jews and the Gentiles, and in the Churches. Nor did they suppress or modify the doctrines of the gospel, to avoid opposition. "If I yet please men," said the Apostle Paul, "I am not the servant of Christ."

But when we reflect on the Sovereignty and Majesty of God, and his utter abhorrence of evil; with his *power* and *will* to destroy it; how can we dare to tamper with it, as if it might be tolerated in the Church, or were too formidable to be openly assailed! The example of Achan, is a solemn warning in regard to *concealed* forbidden things. Here an individual, by *stealth*, introduced the accursed thing into the Camp; and buried it in his own tent. Though the body of the people knew nothing of the transaction, they could not stand before their enemies, in consequence of the concealed transgression, and God caused the offence to be searched out: and an example was made, both of the accursed thing, and of him that introduced it. Surely this was written for our sakes, as well as for those who were the immediate witnesses of it. And if such was the displeasure of God in this case—what

would have been the chastisement, if the rulers and people had forbidden the search—and when the accursed thing was brought to light, they had excused the transgression, and insisted on retaining the forbidden things!

My very soul is grieved for my former friends, when I reflect on the position in which they stand; and sometimes I tremble for the consequences which they may draw upon themselves. The language is clear—"His Fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor; and gather the wheat into the garner—but the *chaff* he will burn with unquenchable fire." The chaff—the chaff must burn—and if they keep it in their bosoms—they cannot shield it from the flames—but must expose themselves to the danger of devouring fire. I beg them for the sake of themselves, for the sake of the objects of their affection—for the honour, the love, and the *fear* of God, not to strive with the Almighty—nor attempt to defend or retain that which he has appointed to destruction.

In conclusion, it is proper briefly to remark, that I have shown that the proceedings of the Friends against me, were unfair, dishonourable, and in violation of their own rules of Discipline. I have proven that these extraordinary transactions, were on account of my holding, with uncompromising firmness, doctrines, in regard both to Faith and practice, which are most clearly recorded in the Holy Scriptures.

I have made it appear, by the most humiliating evidence, that the Founder of the Society, and several of his intimate friends, were under *delusion* in some of their highest claims to immediate revelation; and that they used forms of expressions, at different times and on various occasions, which no persons could have used, who had clear views of christian doctrine, and a just estimate of themselves. This remark will apply to printed works, as well as to authenticated manuscripts. And the christian world is now a witness, that those objectionable writings

are *defended by the Society.* The Friends have made it a disownable offence to call, even the worst of those writings, in question. They have officially declared the Doctrinal Treatises of the Early Friends, (which include all the works from which the foregoing Extracts are taken,) in strict accordance with the Holy Scriptures. And they have earnestly recommended those writings, without distinction, to the frequent and serious perusal of their members. Their ministers, under the profession of divine influence, carry out this recommendation, and endeavour to stop inquiry, and remove every doubt, of the *unclouded clearness* of the testimony of the Early Friends. In conversation, the same general course is pursued, and the highest censure is passed on those who point out the errors contained in the writings of Early Friends.

As respects the proceedings of the Society against myself—the detales which I have given were necessary, in order to present a history of the case; which cannot fail to be interesting both to the Christian public, and to such of the members of the Society of Friends, as are not willing to be *ignorant* of transactions, for which they must be responsible. As to the mere *personal character*—of these proceedings, they are now past. A gracious God, who saw my afflictions, and knew the cause of my sufferings, interposed his Hand to sustain me, so that when my enemies came upon me, they stumbled and fell.

In the day of battle, he taught my hands to war and my fingers to fight—and though I have had to stand, almost *alone*—though the powers of the Society, throughout the length and breadth of it, have been combined against me —on every position they have taken, they have been defeated. The champions who have come forward, with confidence to the onset, have been confounded, and have shrunk from a fair and honourable discussion of positions which they had chosen themselves; and thus have given the strongest evidence, that *they knew* the truth was on my side.

In the dispensations of God, these things have been made to work together for good. They have given me a place in the hearts of the pious of all denominations. They have proven that my opponents were in error—and given additional confirmation of the importance of the principles for which I have contended. And in the abundant evidence which has been afforded, of the unfailing care of the Shepherd and Bishop of Souls, my Faith and consolation have been increased.

Let not my former friends, then grieve for me, but for themselves. Nor let them suppose that I shall indulge the feelings of malice or resentment against those who have done me wrong. Like Joseph's brethren, they intended it for evil, but God has turned it to good—a good which *they* themselves may participate in, to the lasting benefit of themselves and their children.

In regard to the writings of the Early Friends, every enlightened christian, who will be at the pains of an impartial examination, must see that there are errors in them, which are in their character, totally subversive of the christian Faith. And while I have fully admitted that there are many members of the Society, who love sound doctrine and desire to hold it—*Christian charity* must suggest the inquiry—whether it is possible, for persons to be *clear* in their views of christian doctrine, and duly sensible of the high obligations of revealed truth—and fully alive to the danger of error in Faith and Practice—and at the same time to defend the highly objectionable things contained in the writings of the Early Friends—or wish to retain them, embodied in those writings, without any caution to the ignorant or unsuspecting readers? I say Christian charity must suggest the doubt of the clearness of the views of such Friends, if not of the soundness of their principles. For we can hardly conceive, that persons believing those parts of the writings of the Friends to be really *dangerous*, could consent to their be-

ing blinded with sound doctrine, and *recommended*, without the least caution, or discrimination. We are sure that no person of sound mind, could recommend the ignorant and unsuspecting, to go into an enclosure, with exaggerated representations of the flowers and fruits to be found there, if they knew there were in that very place, the most ferocious beasts of prey, and the most insiduous, and venomous reptiles. No man, not mentally or morally deranged, would recommend to his friends, and even to his own children, a dish, in which he knew there was deadly poison—and when the fact was disclosed—be angry with the informer—contradict the statement—and endeavour to remove every apprehension of danger, from the minds of those who had taken an alarm. The necessary inference from these considerations is, that the Friends who defend the objectionable parts of the writings of the Early Quakers, or who wish no mark to be set upon them as errors—or endeavour to persuade the members of the Society, that there are no *dangerous* sentiments in those writings, must be themselves, according to their own representations, substantially satisfied with those passages which have been brought into question. If they admit that the *form* of expression is not exactly the best that might have been used—they must, at the same time conclude that if they are taken in their obvious meaning, no serious danger is to be apprehended. And as there has been a practical demonstration, within the last fifteen years, that this obvious meaning has been, and still may be taken—there connot be at heart, any serious objection to such results. It is more charitable to suppose, that they believe the doctrines in question, either as absolutely right, or at least as not hurtful—than to suppose they see the passages in their real character, and at the same time directly recommend them—or give them a place, and a character, to exert their whole malignant influence, without suspicion of the danger.

A very large amount of the passages to which I allude, convey the very same sentiments, for which E. H. and his friends were condemned. This will hold, both in the *affirmative*, and *negative* parts of the system commonly denominated Hicksism—but now proven to be original Quakerism. The recession of the Orthodox, from holding the *sound* parts *only*, of the writings of the Early Friends, and the recognition, and defence of those parts which express the doctrines held by Elias Hicks, is a complete acknowledgement of those very doctrines as essential to Quakerism.

I do not say that the Society called Hicksites, is responsible for all that is contained in the writings of their predecessors. There are sentiments in the Manuscript Journal of George Fox, and in some of the foregoing Extracts, and others which might be made, which I am not aware *they* ever defended, or held—but for which the Orthodox are now completely committed. If then *the Quakerism* for which the Orthodox, (so called) now plead, is not identical with what is called Hicksism, one point of difference is to be found in the grossest parts of those writings, for which the Orthodox contend.

Another point of difference may be in the hostile attitude assumed by the latter, against the Practices of the Apostles and Apostolic Church, in regard to the use of the Ordinances. The Hicksites have merely *disused* the Ordinances—the Orthodox have made the *use* of them a ground of disownment. In this the Hicksites have the fairest claims to the character of the Early Quakers.

Perhaps, I might here mention another point of difference. The Orthodox regard *singing* as highly offensive, and not to be *allowed*. From The Quaker. Vol. III. p. 265, it appears that a female repeated a hymn in the public meeting in Mountpleasant, during the Hicksites' Yearly Meeting, 1828. The reporter does not inform us to what *tune* it was sung—but we are very sure

that there was a *tune*—natural or artificial. And here again they have the nearest resemblance to the Early Friends. George Fox once sung so loud as to drown the music of a fiddle, (G. F. Jour. P. 1. p. 201,) and James Lancaster, as G. F. informs us, (Jour. P. 1. p. 465) sung "with a melodious sound" through the streets of Johnston, while *he* preached to the people as they went along.

In short, if the two Societies do not now occupy precisely the same ground, it must be admitted that the Orthodox have made some *innovations* of the usages of their forefathers—and that, on the other hand, *they* now come forward to defend passages in their old writings, which are too monstrous to be tolerated for a single moment: and for many of which the Hicksites do not appear to be committed.

The Friends cannot therefore complain of being identified with the Hicksites. Objections might be raised on the other side, to which some of the milder features of original Quakerism seem to belong: if Quakerism is not to be subjected to the absolute authority of Holy Scripture, as *the Rule of Faith and Practice*. Those among the Orthodox who cannot reconcile themselves to this character, must take the necessary means to disclaim the public Acts of the Society, and to distinguish themselves from those who defend the objectionable parts of the writings of their fore-fathers—or who would have them retained, without a censure fixed upon their literal and obvious meaning.

I am fully convinced that the passages is question, have had a deeply injurious effect—in leading many from the Faith once delivered to the Saints—and in blunting the religious feelings, and diminishing the perceptions of divine truth, of many who still profess sound doctrines. The present state of the Society is conclusive proof of the correctness of this opinion. A deep and radical unsoundness is withering the branches of the Society, and causing

the trunk to decay—and the end is neither doubtful nor perhaps very distant.

I can see no possible remedy for the present state of things, but a breaking up of the whole system of delusion. The writings of the Early Friends must no longer be taken as the Standard of doctrines. The errors contained in them must be freely admitted as such, and a mark set upon them as a warning to the ignorant. Unfounded pretensions to revelation must be abandoned. The Holy Scriptures must be accepted as the Rule of Faith and Practice, and their authority practically submitted to. The ordinances must be received. Devotion must become more lively, fervent, and practical—in private, in families, and in meetings. There must be more prayer, more *gospel* preaching—and the *praise* of God must not only be tolerated, but become a part of public and private devotion. The regulations of the ministry must be new moddeled, and more effectual care be taken, to prevent *ignorance*, or *unsoundness* from being covered with the profession of divine Inspiration. Make these changes, and the Society of Friends will have lost its present character, and would certainly deserve another name.

To accomplish such an object, demands a truly Missionary Zeal. Those who are in fatal errors, are not to be left to themselves. The whole business of spreading the Gospel of life and salvation, proceeds on a principle of Love. It is this that arms the missionary with courage and patience, to meet the dangers and endure the sufferings attendant on his labours. It is this that demands the efforts now making, to release the Inhabitants of India, of Africa, of Greenland, and the Islands of the Pacific Ocean, from the errors in which they are involved. And are the Friends less to be regarded as objects of Christian love? I earnestly invite the believers in the Lord Jesus, of every denomination, to unite their *prayers*, and their christian labours, for the help of this class of their fellow

men. Let the Friends, as they pass the worshipping families, or worshipping congregations of their pious neighbours, hear the fervent prayer, ascending to the Father of Mercies for *their* recovery from every delusion—and for their final eternal salvation. Let them meet the serious expostulation, in the conversation of those with whom they converse. Let them see the expression of christian solicitude in every face, till they are made willing to let go every error, and to receive the truth, as it was preached by the Lord Jesus and his Apostles—till instead of being the Advocates of the *errors* of their predecessors, they may be the possessors, and zealous defenders, of the Faith once delivered to the Saints.

Great efforts have recently been made by Conservative Friends, to regulate the consciences and abridge the liberties of their more liberal members. Barriers are raised around them as high as possible, to keep them from *information* which might result in conviction. But they cannot be defended from the moral influence of the christian public, informed of the circumstances of the case, and stimulated by the love of God, to do them good. The prayers of the Churches of Christ, and the public and private testimony to the truth, which may arise around the Friends, like the sound of the Trumpets of the host which surrounded the walls of Jericho—will give the sure presage, that when the united voices of Christians, through all their tribes and divisions, shall be raised—the walls which have been built up broad and high, will tremble to their very foundation, and the boasted towers lie prostrate in the dust.

God will carry on his own work. Corruption and error must be exposed and purged away. The Kingdom of the Redeemer will be extended in the earth. Believers will still more and more unite in carrying on the work. And angels look down from heaven with joy, on the increasing glories of Messiah's Reign.

FURTHER FACTS AND REFLECTIONS RELATING TO BAPTISM.

THE Examination of Proceedings and Principles, involved in the case before us, would be incomplete, without a notice of a few other facts.

While the Society was pressing on its private and public measures against me, several articles appeared in the Friend, (a sort of semi-official paper published in Philadelphia), evidently intended to prepare the Society for its final action upon me. While I had a periodical in my hands, the conductors of the Friend most carefully avoided coming into open controversy with me, though I reviewed, with freedom, several articles which they had published. After the Repository had been discontinued, they inserted in the Friend, the Chapter on Baptism, from a work which I had published twelve years ago, and of which I had secured the copy-right. That work had passed through several editions, and was extensively circulated. Notwithstanding these circumstances, they thrust it gratuitously into their columns, without consulting me, and after they knew my sentiments on that subject had changed.

I considered such a freedom with my privileges, and evidently intended to bear upon me, while the whole machinery of the Society was in operation, to crush, and to render me odious, as a departure from the rules of propriety. They should have respected personal rights. And if they wanted to say any thing on the subject of Baptism, they should have drawn upon their *own* resources, *if they had any.*

I wrote a letter to the Conductors, complaining of this proceeding, but offering to be satisfied, if they would allow me to Review my own Chapter, which they had so officiously given to their readers, and give me the further opportunity, of replying to any article which *they* might publish, in opposition to the Review. The editor replied to my letter, justified what they had done; refusing either to allow me the liberty of the proposed Review, or to publish the letter in which the request was made.

The reason for this proceeding is obvious. They were not desirous that their readers should be led into a fair examination of the question. It was not the doctrines of Jesus Christ and his Apostles—but the *peculiar views of Friends*, that they wished to establish. And they were

not willing to meet a Scriptural discussion of the subject. It was not *Christianity*, but *Quakerism*, for which they were concerned: and this was to be maintained by the arguments on *one side* ONLY. I say this, because there could not possibly be a case, in which there would be a stronger claim to the admission of the other side of the question.

When my disownment was effected, the two subjects of the writings of Friends, and the doctrine of Baptism, were chosen as themes of preaching and conversation, having a direct and special bearing upon me: in order to enlist the sectarian prejudices of those, who might have some remaining favourable impressions concerning me. I was stigmatized as the greatest enemy the Society ever had; and the members were charged to have no intercourse with me. Those who attended my meetings were threatened with disownment. And particular pains were taken, to induce the pious of other denominations, to regard me at an unworthy and dangerous person. The cruel design appeared to be formed, to make me an *outcast* from all religious society! And this was done by ministers and other prominent members, and clothed in the garb of "religious concern."

In this state of things, the Yearly Meeting of Ohio came on, the beginning of the 9th month, this year.

Joseph John Gurney, well known as a highly esteemed writer, and a prominent minister among the Friends in England, landed in Philadelphia, on a religious visit to the United States, a few days before the commencement of the Yearly Meeting in Ohio.

And here, I feel bound to pay a just tribute of respect, to this estimable individual. As a writer, he stands in the very first rank, in the Society of Friends. And although, on some points of doctrine, he has followed Barclay and Penn, rather than Saint Paul and his Inspired cotemporaries, yet on doctrines of Fundamental importance, and on many subordinate branches, he has made a wide departure from the mystical parts of the writings of the Early Friends. His published works may be regarded as making large and rapid strides, towards an Evangelical Reformation in the Society. On the conclusive Authority of the Holy Scriptures, the doctrine of the Trinity, especially in reference to the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and the Personality of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of

the Atonement, and of Justification by Faith, the Resurrection of the Dead and the Day of General Judgment at the End of the World, the Duty of Prayer, and the Moral Obligation of the Sabbath, the writings of Joseph John Gurney present a *striking contrast* with a large portion of the accredited writings of the Early Friends. And they form a prominent feature of the present excited state of the Society. Nor is the individual of whom I am speaking, less remarkable for amiable private character. His urbanity of manners, his christian charity towards other professors, his humanity and benevolence, secure him esteem wherever he is known.

Immediately after landing in Philadelphia, he came directly to Mountpleasant, to attend the Yearly Meeting there. And (I would say) was unhappily drawn into the prevailing current. On First day morning, at the commencement of the Yearly Meeting, he preached, among other things, on the clearness of the views of the Early Friends, and on the doctrine of Baptism, which, he said, had recently been agitated among them. On this latter subject, he seemed particularly solicitous to lay aside the outward Ordinance. To effect this object, he raised the question, whether the gift of the Spirit is continued in this day or not: saying: "That is the question."

It did not, however, seem to have occurred to him, that as the gift of the Spirit, did not conflict with the administration of Water Baptism, in the days of the Apostles, so neither could it *now*. He could not have chosen premises more completely inapplicable to his purpose, or foreign from his conclusion, if he had taken the whole range of Christian doctrine.

To prove that the gift of the Spirit is continued, he referred to the testimony of the Apostle Peter on the Day of Pentecost, and showed that being filled with the Holy Ghost, his testimony on that occasion was the testimony of the Spirit. But in quoting that testimony, he passed over the whole of the fore part of Peter's answer to the converts: "Repent and be Baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins;" and began at these words: "For the Promise is to you and to your children, and to them that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Why was this garbling of the language of the Holy Ghost? Why was the *body* of the answer left out—the very *conditions* on

which the *promise* rested? Plainly because, as the word of Inspiration, it commanded, "repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." He knew it was impossible to explain away this positive command—or to admit the authority of the Apostle in one part of the sentence, and deny it in the other. There was no way to get along with the *views of Friends*, but to garble the text; and to leave out that, on which the concluding clause, absolutely depended.

Every impartial reader must see at once, that no assurance was given to the three thousand, that *they* should receive the Holy Ghost, without Repentance and Baptism. If he intended to prove that this gift is continued without these conditions, he selected a text directly against himself. It is the *text*, and the arguments which are to be legitimately drawn from it, with which we are now immediately concerned. But that text, undivided, proves at once, the divine authority of water baptism. And if the perpetuity of the doctrine embraced in one part of the sentence, be insisted on—the perpetuity of the former, and that on which the latter depended, must be granted also. If the *promise* then held out to the three thousand, be claimed as descending to us—it must be on the same grounds, and with the same clearly expressed qualifications.

He also quoted Eph. 4. 5: "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism;" applying the passage to the Baptism of the Spirit. To this construction and inference there are several insuperable objections.

The term baptism, without something in the context, or in the nature of the subject to which it is applied, to turn it from its natural import, literally means an outward act.

But there is nothing in the context, nor in the nature of the subject, to turn the word from its natural and literal meaning.

Therefore the literal meaning is to be taken.

Again: The Apostle spoke of *facts*, and in the present tense. He did not say. Though there are various baptisms, there is but *one* really necessary. And if he had, it would bave been proper that he should have told which it was that was necessary. But from the construction of the passage, if the word *necessary*, or any other qualifying term be applied to baptism, it must also be understood as applied to the other objects mentioned in the text. As

if he should have said, there is only one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all—necessary——implying that, in point of fact, there was a plurality of all these—but only one of each was essential. The absurdity of such a perversion of the text, must be apparent to all.

The Apostles then made a simple and plain declaration, positively true in point of fact. In the literal meaning of the term, there was emphatically *one baptism*, which was practiced in the Church; carefully distinguished from the washing of the Jews, and from the baptism of John; (Acts 19, 1–5) and equally guarded from every perversion, which might arise from attaching any thing to it, from the personal character of the individuals by whom it was administered. (see 1, Cor. 1). If therefore, the term be here taken in its figurative, as well as literal meaning, instead of proving that the baptism of the Spirit was the one baptism—it would prove that both this, and the Baptism of Persecution or Suffering, had ceased.

For the outward baptism being in practice at the time, if there was *but one*, in any and in every sense of the word, *that* must be the one. And as the Apostle had himself, recently enforced outward baptism, on some of the very persons to whom he then wrote, the Friends must prove that it *had been laid aside*, before they can possibly get over recognizing *this*, as the one baptism. But this is impossible for them to do. They must then give up the figurative meanings of the word, or the text will, in their very teeth, prove that the baptism of the Spirit and the baptism of Suffering, had both ceased at the time the Apostle wrote the Epistle to the Ephesians.

But I take it in its literal meaning; and thus am free from drawing any such conclusions. It was plainly the common Christian baptism, by which they had all been formally united to the one visible Body—the Church, and had all professed the one common Faith in the one Lord, of which the Apostle was speaking. Take the text, simple and literally as it stands, and all is clear and harmonious. Give it the construction for which the Friends contend, and the whole passage is thrown into confusion—and after all, their object is totally defeated.

He quoted, 1 Cor. 12, 13. "For by one spirit, are we all baptized into one body," &c. But it would be perfectly preposterous, to carry out this figurative use of the term, to any other result, as applied to us, than was intended, as

applied to them. But it had no such meaning or effect with the Corinthians, as to produce the disuse of water Baptism. Let J. J. G. and the Friends, show that the passage was so understood by the early christians, or so intended by the Apostle, if they wish to draw from it any such conclusion, as to us. But while it remains an acknowledged historical *fact*, that water baptism, was then, and continued in successive ages to be, practiced, the *disuse* of baptism can no more be inferred from it for *us*, than it was for them.

The passage contains a beautiful figurative use of the term, to show the *spiritual*, as well as *formal* relation in which they stood. And this figure derived all its beauty, and all its force, from the well known ceremony to which it alluded.

In the evening he introduced the subject of Baptism by a reference to the commission, recorded in Matt. 28, 19, 20, &c. And he denied that it had "any reference whatever to a mere outward ceremony."

The reasons which he gave for this bold assertion, were, That our Lord had used the term in a spiritual sense; as when he spoke of the *cup* which he should drink of, and the Baptism, with which he should be baptized—and when he told them that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost, &c.

In regard to the Cup, and the Baptism spoken of to the sons of Zebedee, it will appear by what immediately precedes it, Matt. 20, 18, 19: that he was speaking of *persecution*. "The Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priest, and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles, to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him." And so far as his disciples were to partake of this baptism, they were to be the baptized, and not the baptizers. To suppose that *this* was the baptism intended in the commission, would be to change the whole character of the Gospel; and represent the Apostles as sent out into the world, to baptize the nations with *blood*, instead of *water*.

On the baptism of the Holy Ghost, he admitted that it was not strictly the work of man; but that man was empowered to perform it.

This is assertion without proof. Let J. J. G. or any other Friend, show if they can, that man was either empowered to baptize with God, (for the Holy Ghost is God,

and J. J. G. fully admits it), or let them prove by plain Scripture, that any man ever did administer this baptism. By the concurrent testimonies of the Prophet Joel and the Apostle Peter, it is *God* that pours out the Spirit. And it is the Risen and Glorified Redeemer, to whom this office belongs. And John, his fore-runner, makes it peculiar to him—and a conclusive evidence of his *Sonship*. To suppose that this office of the Son of God, is delegated to men, is as preposterous as to suppose his character of Deity is also delegated. In fact, the arguments made use of by the Friends, will just as soon prove the one as the other.

Job Scott, in whose track J. J. G followed in this particular, said that man, as man, could not baptize with the Holy Ghost—neither could he, merely as man, preach the Gospel. The proposition, he said, was just as true, that no man could preach the Gospel, as that no man could baptize with the Holy Ghost. Merely as *man* he could do neither. But by divine assistance he could, and did, do both.

The fallacy of this mode of reasoning will be readily seen, by comparing it with an argument formed on precisely the same principles, from an illustration I once heard from another friend, in his preaching. He said that "man, as man, could no more preach the Gospel than he could create a world."

Take then the two propositions and form an argument from each.

Man as man, can no more preach the Gospel than he can baptize with the Holy Ghost.

But he is empowered to preach the Gospel.

Therefore he can baptize with the Holy Ghost.

This is just the substance of Job Scott's argument—and the idea which others after him seem to intend to convey. But without taking the trouble, to show the departure from the rules of reasoning, which there is in the structure of the argument, I will give another constructed exactly like it.

Man, as man, can no more preach the Gospel than he can create a world.

But he is empowered to preach the Gospel.

Therefore he can create a world.

The conclusion is just as logical in the one case as in the other: and both are equally unwarranted by Scripture and by reason.

The disciples clearly understood the commission to relate to Water Baptism—for so they carried it into effect. But the Friends are driven to suppose, that they were actually empowered, as well as commissioned, to baptize with the Holy Ghost—and yet, notwithstanding this extraordinary endowment—were totally mistaken, and fell into the unaccountable error, of baptizing with *Water*, instead of the *Spirit!*

On the day of Pentecost, it was the Risen Saviour that shed forth the Spirit, or in other words, administered the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. In the case of Cornelius and his household, Peter said that "*God* gave unto them, the like gifts, as he did unto us in the beginning." In the case of the Samaritans, the Apostles Peter and John *prayed*, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. These, and other testimonies which might be mentioned, are conclusive, that it is the *Son*, in his character as God, that sheds on us, the Holy Ghost.

The idea of Baptizing by preaching, is strictly a Quaker doctrine. But if Peter did not baptize the three thousand by preaching, (which it is very clear that he did not, for they were neither baptized with water nor by the Spirit, when they inquired, What shall we do?) the Friends might quietly give up the pretension of doing it. And as there is no such a term in the New Testament, as a *Baptizing ministry*, because there was nothing to which such a term could apply, the Friends can have no occasion to *invent* such an epithet, unless they have also invented a ministry which the Apostles had not. But as it is proved that the baptism which they could administer by preaching, could not be that of the Spirit—it could only be the baptism of suffering, in some of its modifications.

But to return to J. J. G's. second meeting. In expounding the Commission, he seemed to have totally forgotten the favorite doctrine of the Friends, that there is *but one* baptism. For, whether he intended it or not, he certainly treated the subject, as embracing three *distinct* and *separate baptisms*. He first undertook to explain what it was, to be baptized into the name of the Father. And this he did at some considerable length. And then he invited the meeting, to "Come and be Baptized into the Name of the Father." He next proceeded to explain the Baptism into the name of the Son; and here he introduced the doctrine of the Atonement, and of Faith in a cru-

cified Saviour. And then he invited his hearers, to "Come and be Baptized into the name of the Son." After this, he proceeded to explain what it was to be baptized into the name of the Spirit, and went into the description of his office in our Conversion, Faith, and Sanctification: and called upon the congregation, to "Come and be Baptized into the name of the Spirit." From the very ground on which he set out, the idea was clearly conveyed, that he considered himself, as the *baptizer* into these three baptims.

On the following Fifth day, he preached another Sermon, in which he said: "The only water baptism which is necessary, under the glorious gospel dispensation, is the *baptism with tears.*"

It is deeply affecting to see such efforts, to lay waste the plain and undeniable doctrines of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, and the clearly established order of the Church; and to substitute for them, almost any wild or crude opinion, that imagination can suggest.

In the meeting on First day morning, 9 mo. 3rd, J. J. Gurney said, while speaking on the leading doctrines of Christianity, that the Early Friends "*always* maintained a clear testimony to these doctrines." And in the evening of the same day, he said, that "by a measure of the same Spirit, by which the Apostles were inspired, (though a smaller measure than the Apostles had), they were enable to *maintain* a CLEAR, UNCLOUDED testimony to those doctrines." Being present at these meetings, and knowing the pains which the Friends had taken, to enlist the prejudices of their own members, and the feelings of the community at large, in reference to the two subjects above mentioned—and to give them a direct bearing on the position which I now occupy, before the members of that Society, and the Christian world—I felt myself called upon, publicly to meet, both the statements which he had made, and the doctrines he had delivered, on these two points.

Accordingly I wrote to him the next day: expressing my surprise and regret at many of his remarks; the obvious tendency of which was, in my apprehension, to prevent a truly christian reformation in the Society of Friends. But I called his attention more particularly to the two subjects above mentioned. In reference to these, I said:

"The first is, the view which thou presented, in both meetings, of the writings of the Early Members of the Society of Friends. I understood thee to say, that they *always* maintained a *clear* testimony to the great doctrines of Christianity—and that they were enabled to maintain a *clear*, *unclouded* testimony to those doctrines. Thou hast said in reply to Truth Vindicated, (I quote merely from memory), that error is never more dangerous than when mixed with undeniable truths—that it resembles *poison* mixed with wholesome food, which has occasioned the death of many an unsuspecting individual. And we may readily perceive the danger of recommending, as safe and excellent, a dish containing deadly poison; however abundant or fair in appearance, the food itself may be. I therefore invite thee to a public examination of the subject. And I offer to prove, that though the writings of the *Early Members* of the Society of Friends, may contain many excellent examples and sentiments, (which I have always most freely admitted and maintained), there are in them sentiments or forms of expression, which are calculated to lay waste the authority of the Holy Scriptures, and to subvert the most important doctrines of Christianity. The subject is one of incalculable importance. The passages to which I allude, have produced, and are still producing, the most unhappy consequences. And the more they are directly or indirectly recommended, the more those consequences may be increased. I therefore call upon thee, for the sake of the Faith once delivered to the saints—for the regard which we are bound to have for the honour of God, and the salvation of souls, to meet a public examination of the subject, which thou hast gratuitously brought to the notice of two, large and mixed assemblies. And I pledge myself, either to show, that there are, in those writings, sentiments of a highly objectionable and dangerous character—or publicly to retract every thing that I have said in the way of calling them in question.

"The second subject, to which I wish to call thy attentioe, is that of Baptism. The Society of Friends has now made it a matter of *disownment*, for its members to receive Water Baptism. And from the manner in which thou introduced the subject, into both the sermons to which I have already alluded, I must regard thee as thoroughly uniting in these views of the Society. You have taken a

position, in relation to the apostolic Church, which no other Society ever dared to take. You now occupy, not the ground of *defence*, but of *attack*. You are *bearing a testimony against* the practice—and exercising the *influence of the ministry*, and the *disowing power* of the Society for its suppression. In such a state of things, the best interest of the Society, and the cause of Truth, demand a fair and impartial examination of the subject.

"From the peculiar circumstances in which I stand, and from the ground taken by the Society of Friends, my place, in reference to this doctrine, is that of *Defence*.—But if thou should think that this would afford me any peculiar *advantages*, I will waive them for the sake of an investigation. I do therefore call upon thee, for a public examination of the doctrine of Baptism, taking the Holy Scriptures as the Rule of Decision: and offering thee the choice, either of the *offensive* or *defensive* position.* In either case, I will undertake to prove, that Water Baptism was introduced by the Apostles into the Christian Church—that this was done in their apostolic office—in the name of Jesus Christ, and under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit—and that their authority is conclusive.

"I am aware of thy superior talents and acquirements, and of the advantages which thou hast, in the advice and aid of a large number of thy friends, yet I am not thereby in the least intimidated. My object is the maintenance of the Truth, and of this *only*. Relying solely on the Word of God, and the present help of his blessed Spirit, I am willing to march directly to the subject. And I ask thee, my honoured friend, to meet me there, that, if possible, we may be brought to unite harmoniously in promoting a revival of "Primitive Christianity."

"It is due to thee to know, that some of the sentiments contained in thy published writings, have given offence to many prominent members of the Society, as not in accordance with the writings of Early Friends. And further, that a report has been circulated in this country, that thou hast made some acknowledgments, which have given satisfaction. Both the Society, and the Christian public should know, whether there is any foundation for this re-

*That is, either to *attack* the doctrines which I hold, or to defend that which is hsld by himself and the Friends.

port or not. And that the inquiry may not be left in a vague and indefinite way, I take the liberty of asking, if thou hast ever retracted thy sentiments, as contained in thy Essays on Christianity, thy Portable Evidences, and other works—1. On the conclusive authority of the Holy Scriptures. 2. On the Doctrine of the Trinity, the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and the *Personality* of the Holy Spirit. 3. On the Resurrection of the Body, and the Day of Judgment. 4. On the doctrine of Justification. 5. On Prayer. 6. On the Moral Obligation of the Sabbath.

"An early reply to these inquiries is respectfully requested. In regard to the invitation to discuss the two subjects of the writings of Friends, and the doctrine of Baptism, it will be necessary to give me information by eight o'clock to-morrow morning, whether it is accepted or not, that the necessary preliminary arrangements may be mutually agreed upon.

I am with much esteem thy friend,

E. BATES."

To this letter, he returned the following answer.

"*Mountpleasant*, 9 *mo.*, 4th 1837.

ELISHA BATES:

DEAR FRIEND—The views which I was led to express in the discourse to which thy letter alludes, are those which we once held in common, both as it regards fundamental doctrine, and as it respects the distinguishing religious principles of Friends. No change whatever that I am aware of has taken place in my opinions, and most heartily do I regret and deplore the change which has taken place in *thee*, and which has been the means of separating thee from a body of Christians, to which thou wast, at one time, so firmly attached.

"If I stated any thing yesterday at varience from the acknowledged principles of that body—principles which I hold to be true and scriptural—I am of course amenable to the Society; but I must entirely decline entering into any discussion on the subjects which were adverted to by me in ministry, with any other persons.

With much love to thyself and thy family

I am thy friend and well-wisher,

J. J. GURNEY.

"P. S. The Report mentioned by thee respecting my writings, is wholly without foundation—no concession of the kind alluded to having either been made or asked for.

"I hope to be able to call upon thee and thy children before I leave this place."

To this I immediately replied in another letter, regretting his conclusion to decline the proposed discussion—and giving him to understand that I considered the usage of the Early Friends, and of distinguished theologians of the present day, in this country at least, was against him, in shrinking, (in all the circumstances of the case), from the discussion. I told him that the whole manner in which he had treated the subjects in question, "had a most obvious allusion to me. * * * When, therefore, thou, as the champion for the views of the Society, hast immediately taken hold on the two subjects, of Baptism and the Writings of Friends, and brought them prominently to the notice of the Christian public, and in a way directly to bear upon me, thou must not be surprised that I should promptly call thee to a public examination of the positions thou hast advanced. It would have been an act of cowardice on my part, unworthy of the cause for which I have suffered so much, and for which I am bound to contend, if I had not called for investigation."

And after some free remarks on the position in which he had placed himself, I informed him that I should deliver a Lecture on Baptism, in the Presbyterian Meeting House, the next Fifth day, at 3 o'clock: in which I should show, that the Early Friends *did not*, ALWAYS, maintain a CLEAR, UNCLOUDED testimony to the great doctrines of Christianity. And as I should probably use both his name and his sentiments with freedom, I respectfully invited him to attend: informing him that if he should wish to be heard, I would most readily enter into arrangements with him for that purpose. To this letter no reply was given.

Now I ask, if the inferrence to be drawn from these facts is not *fair*, that the Friends, and especially those who have thrown themselves into collision with me, do know that they cannot stand the test of fair and Scriptural examination? I have said enough to prove the utter inconsistency of the high character of the writings of the Early Friends. And facts are daily proving that their

most distinguished advocates are perfectly aware, that the ground on which they stand is hollow.

On the other subject, I do not hesitate to say, that the present leaders of the Society, *know*, that Water Baptism was taught and enforced by the Apostles—that it harmonized with the highest spirituality the Church, or any members of it ever enjoyed upon earth—that it was not laid aside by the Apostles, nor by their cotemporaries or immediate successors. The official agents of the Society, after two weeks consideration of the question, have declared that we need not go any further back, for the principle of the Friends, than to the rise of the Society. They have admitted that the censure passed upon me in the case, applied no less to all the Apostles, and to the whole Christian Church, than to me. And one of them acknowledged, that if the Apostle Paul, could now be transferred into the Society, just as he was in his life time, they would *disown* HIM!!

I have no doubt, that many of the Friends, will lay the responsibility of these things, on the individuals themselves. But if a body of men is responsible for its official agents, unless their transactions are officially disclaimed—then the Society of Friends is fully responsible for these things.

In addition to this, it is proved in the very face of the champions of the Society, that they are out of the doctrine and practice of the Apostles, and by necessary consequence, they are out of the doctrine of *Jesus Christ.*

How fearful then is an open and continued rebellion against him, of whom it was said, Let all the angels of God worship Him! And who declared: "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I have commanded you." Now if the Friends should determine, to hold the doctrine of George Fox and his cotemporaries, rather than those of the Lord Jesus and his Apostles, how dreadful will be the consequences! And the more they depreciate the things in question, and represent them as *little*—or unimportant, the more they must necessarily condemn themselves: first for so characterizing institutions, which were appointed by the Lord, and so solemnly taught and enforced by his Apostles—and secondly, for refusing a service, which they themselves represent as so very easy to be performed.

"Having tasted the terrors of the Lord we persuade men." I beseech my former friends, to lay down the pride of opinion—to let go the prejudice of education—to

disregard the frowns of Conservative Friends, and the scorn and contempt of the unconverted—and to be baptized, as was the great Apostle of the Gentiles, and as were the many thousands of believers, who gladly received the words of the inspired ministers of Jesus Christ.

I reverently thank God, and magnify his mercy and goodness, for the light he has been pleased to shed upon my own mind—for the support he has given me under the pressure of peculiar trials—and for the consolations of the Gospel, with which, again and again, he has replenished my soul.

The humble hope—the blessed *assurance*, which he has given me, of his redeeming Love, through Jesus Christ, is more to me than all the world. The afflictions of the present time, which are but for a moment, are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed.

But this is not all: for the same Good Hand has been at work, in other hearts as well as mine. And some of these have been made not only my companions in tribulation—but also in the consolations of the Gospel. Tracing his Providence in wider circles of his works, I have found brethren and sisters in Christ, when I had expected to feel as a stranger and a pilgrim in the earth.

The Church universal, is now widely spread: the living members of it, are experiencing increasing degrees of the Unity of the Spirit. Many are running to and fro, and knowledge is increasing. Though iniquity still abounds, many are turning from darkness to light, and from the power of satan to God. The Gospel is penetrating into regions where the name of Christ was never heard. And every thing around us, bears testimony to the progress of a work of God.

But there is no part of the human family, for which I feel a more intense solicitude, than I do for the Society of Friends. My prayers are not only for those who, in various degrees, unite with me on the points which have been brought into discussion—but for those also, who have been my opposers and persecutors. I earnestly desire that the eyes of the blind may be opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped; that the lame may leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing.

NOTE.

As an apology for the lack of methodical arrangement, and grammatical accuracy, in the foregoing Examination, &c. it may be proper to state, that it has been chiefly written, as the successive portions have gone into the printer's hands.

In the begiuning, I intended to publish sundry letters and papers, which are in my possession, as having an immediate relation to the case in hand, and accordingly made some reference to them, in the fore part of the work. But as they would considerably increase the size and expense of the book, they are omitted. Enough has been given, to shew the nature of the controversy which has been forced upon me, the extent of the combination which was formed by the Friends, the unfairness of their proceedings, and the unsoundness of the doctrines for which they are contending. The difficulty has not been for the want of materials, but to give the most important of them, in the smallest compass. In attempting this, I have left out a large amount of evidence, of the unkindness, unfairness, and unsoundness of the Friends, and I *may* have inserted some things, which might have been spared.

I ask no more than a reasonable allowance, for the peculiar difficulties of the situation, in which I have been placed. And this, I am sure, the enlightened and pious part of the community will readily grant.

I had entertained some idea, of appending to this "Examination," a Review of the "Doctrines of Friends." But on more mature reflection, I have concluded to decline it. A close Review of that work, would require a volume of considerable size. And a partial correction of passages with which I am dissatisfied, might be construed into an approval of all, to which special objections were not made. In some parts, it would require arguments to refute error—in others, extended criticisms to distinguish between a correct principle, and an incorrect modification of it.

On the whole, I have concluded to refer the Christian public, to the foregoing work, to the "Refutation," the "Appeal," the "Letter" on Baptism, and the last ten numbers of the "Miscellaneous Repository," as a general correction of my former publications: leaving any further work on the subjects alluded to, entirely to the Providence of God.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION Page iii
Formation of the Society vi
Its Church Government xi

CHAPTER I 21
Hicksite controversy 22
Course pursued by the author 23
Proposes to visit G. Britain 25
Preaches the Resurrection 26
Writes an Address 27
Sets out to England 29
Returns home 31
Proceedings in London Y. M. 33
In N. E. and O. 37
Document of 1835 38
Reviewed 41
B. W. Ladd's Letter 58
Reviewed 60

CHAPTER II 80
Interview with C. O. 81
With B. W. L. 83
Proceedings against author 84
Standards of Doctrines 88
Friends' Library 89
E. B. writes his Vindication 90
Second visit to England 91
Y. Meeting in London 93
G. Jones's Tracts 94
Proceedings in England 98

CHAPTER III 107
Proceedings in Ohio 107
Document issued 108
Author returns home 112
Document thrown aside 113
The Refutation published 113
Meeting for Sufferings and individuals concerned called to investigation 114

CHAPTER IV 116
Grounds taken by Conservatives 116
Cause for publishing Appeal 117
Author Baptized 118
Correspondence with J. Foster, S. Gurney, & G. Stacey 119
Document issued by Morning Meeting 119
Proceedings upon it 121
Charges taken up 122
Irregularities of proceedings 123
Letter of Resignation 125

CHAPTER V 133
Proceedings of Monthly Meeting 133
Visits of the Committee 135
New Charges taken up 140
Further visits of committee 143

CHAPTER VI 152
Visit of commit. continued 152
Committee's report 162
Paper of disownment 163
Brief Review 164

CHAPTER VIII 175
Defence of the Appeal

CHAPTER IX 219
Same subject continued, in Reply to G. R. and S. T.

CHAPTER X 239
Errors in printed works 239

Reflections on extracts, &c. 281
Further facts and reflections relating to Baptism 295
The Friend 295
Joseph John Gurney 296
Correspondence with him 303
Note 311

683

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: April 2006

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 238 824 8