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On the morning of August thirtieth, 1827, a group of Hicksite Quakers from Green Street Monthly Meeting in Philadelphia approached the Western District Burial Ground, a site the meeting had purchased with four others. Green Street, however, had been recently dissolved by the Orthodox-controlled Quarterly Meeting. The Orthodox, who no longer officially recognized the meeting, had installed a locked gate at the burial ground in order to keep the Hicksites out. “Scenes were enacted,” writes Bliss Forbush, “that were disgraceful to the name of Friend:”

“Green Street members came with a ladder and axe to climb the wall and break the locks which Orthodox Friends placed on the gate. ‘Idle disposed persons came to watch.’ Green Street Friends then prepared to erect a new gate in the wall, and while in the midst of these operations one of the Orthodox committee approached and was told ‘in the perfect manner of Friends…thee had better go away; thee will get dust on thee.’ A warrant was issued against the Liberal¹ Friends by the mayor on request of the Orthodox…several Liberals spent three weeks in jail.”²

By 1827 Quakerism was so far removed from the previous century, in which there was a strong sense of unity, purpose and theological clarity, that on that summer morning the Orthodox did not even acknowledge Hicksites as Quaker. In order to bury a dead child, the Hicksites felt justified in breaking down a gate that was not theirs, and the Orthodox, rather than discuss the situation with those they had so recently considered their brethren, called the police as if they were unknown criminals. A study of the language used in the Orthodox journal The Friend will open the door to an understanding of this shift in community boundaries. The Orthodox divided everything into two categories, the

¹ In her book Forbush refers to Hicksite Quakers as “Liberals.” While this label may not be entirely inaccurate, for there was a rationalistic subset of Hicksites, I believe the moniker confers onto the Hicksites in general a level of authorial approval with which I am uncomfortable. Hence, I will change all instances of “Liberal” into Hicksite, unless they refer to the particular subset.
² P. 249; Forbush, Bliss; Elias Hicks: Quaker Liberal; Columbia University Press; New York © 1956. All future references to this text shall be as such: (Forbush, __).
worldly and the religious. The journal placed Hicksites—after they became labeled as such—with the worldly, and declared itself and the Orthodoxy it represented to be religious. It did this by employing the same vocabulary it used to describe worldly and religious literature. This paper will first provide the necessary historical background of the Quaker schism, and then examine the language of *The Friend*, starting with its conception of rationality and verdicts on literature, and then tracing the mirroring of that worldview onto the players and groups of the schism.

It is important to understand the lifestyle and theology of eighteenth-century Quakerism because the language of the schism, that of worldly and religious, originated there. At the beginning of the nineteenth-century Quakers in America were still a cohesive sect. There was a commonality of ethos that stretched from New England to North Carolina. What did this understanding entail? As Thomas D. Hamm has aptly noted, one phrase “summed up” the lives of Friends during that period: “bearing the cross.” It is a concise picture of a life that shunned quick and easy solutions. Baptism, for example, was not thought of as a rite involving holy water but rather as “the baptism of the ‘Holy Ghost and with fire.’” Friends saw baptism as a peculiar visitation of God inwardly experienced to help with growth into holiness” (Hamm, 4). These baptisms were usually manifest through “suffering and tribulation” (Hamm, 4). Throughout a lifetime of hardship and discipline, Quakers would learn to heed the Inner Light more
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fully. The goal, “the ultimate end of ‘deep baptisms’ was not merely ‘conversion’ but sanctification, a state of sinlessness” (Hamm, 5). The metaphor here is one of growth through deep inner struggle, and indeed it was used in this period by Quakers to explain their spiritual lives to others.

This life-long quest to achieve sanctification was incredibly difficult, and many Quakers never felt that they were successful. Nonetheless it was considered a legitimate goal, and with time Friends set up spiritual and social systems to help themselves along the way. One of the most important of these was the Quaker religious system called “Quietism,” which helped remove spiritual distractions. “It was, they argue, a life of meditation and reflection, focusing on the experience of the immediate working of the Holy Spirit on the soul…It deemphasized preaching and all other external means of grace and instead focused on shutting out anything that might distract from the achievement of total spiritual communion with God” (Hamm, 2). This inward religious life, and the continual baptism that was its end, was made theologically possible by the notion of the “Inner Light,” the ‘Light of Christ’ that resided in the heart of every individual. “The Inner Light made all intermediaries—priests, sacraments, offerings—unnecessary. By following the light within, anyone could achieve salvation” (Hamm, 2). The Inner Light focused Quakers’ spiritual energies inward, away from empty ceremony towards the presence of the divine. Though it was the driving force behind the construction of Quaker social structure and humanitarian work, it also enabled the Quakers to withdraw from the world, and see it as superfluous to religious fulfillment, which could only come from within. Though all Quakers held the Inner Light in high regard, there was little consensus on its finer points. George Fox, the founder of Quakerism, also felt that the
word of God was present in the Bible, and the extent to which the Inner Light was the only guide for bearing the cross was never settled. These unresolved issues would come in to play during the schism.

In order to aid Friends in hearing and following the Inner Light, Quakers “sought to hedge themselves against the encroachments of the world” (Hamm, 5) by withdrawing from it and creating their own way of life. This was another effort to ease the bearing of the cross. By the mid eighteenth-century Quakers had stepped down from the government of Pennsylvania and began to isolate themselves physically as well as spiritually. “The hedges eventually hardened into a system of mores that Friends called the plain life” (Hamm, 5). Thinking that “the world was by its nature hostile to the growth of godliness” (Hamm, 6), Quakers used the plain life as a wall that kept themselves in as much as it kept the world out. With time it expanded beyond physical isolation into the everyday lives of Friends. “Severe restrictions on amusements and diversions” (Hamm, 6) were instituted. Music, even hymns, were banned, as well as all sorts of “lighter pursuits” (Hamm, 6). These frivolous time-wasters prevented one from concentrating on the messages of the Inner Light and focusing on self-improvement. They were the distractions of the world and represented its confused and irreligious nature. The conception of the worldly was born in the isolationism of plain life.

The community played a primary role both in fortifying the boundaries of the plain life and in directing spiritual affairs. Meeting for worship was, after all, a communal event in which all stood on equal footing. Members worshipped in the same building, though men and women were separated. There was a bench in each room on which sat the meeting’s elders. These elderly members of the meeting, though they did
not command direct control over the spiritual affairs of their meetings, had the final say when it came to the plain life. Each meeting choose from the elders a group of “ overseers,” whose duty it was to “detect and to report to the monthly meeting any violation of the discipline, both to aid members in staying in the ‘strait and narrow’ and to ensure that the reputation of the society would not suffer reproach” (Hamm, 9). Their rate of success perhaps varied, but there is no doubt of their devotion to their assignment. The rules of that system were codified in a continually updated book called “the discipline.” This set the standard “expected of every Friend in everything from behavior in meeting to the style of clothing to the height of tombstones” (Hamm, 9). The discipline for each Yearly Meeting was managed by a Meeting for Sufferings, which was composed of elders from monthly meetings. Their reputation and the fear of suffering “reproach” was so important to Quakers at the time that any transgressions of the discipline were harshly punished by the overseers. Expulsions became common, and though the numbers of Quakers declined, the greater concern was the purity and dedication of the members of the Society. This culture of discipline and restraint, fueled by a desire to create for themselves a sterling reputation, drove the Orthodox reaction to the Hicksites down the path to schism and inundates the language found in The Friend.

The Inner Light and the plain life created a unique system of gender roles and norms in Quaker society. Because the Inner Light resided in every person, no matter what, Fox always preached that women were as entitled to spiritual fulfillment as men. The voice of God could come as strongly to women as it could to any other. Thus women could be preachers and elders. In meeting houses men and women not only sat in separate rooms, they also had their own Meetings for Sufferings. This spiritual equality
led to reform in all areas of Quaker life. “The discipline of the Society opened the way for women to express themselves in social, economic, and political spheres where women were, in seventeenth-century and eighteenth-century ideology, allegedly dull and certainly disabled.” The picture, however, is not completely rosy. Though Quakerism avoided the separation of the genders into different spheres of life, and “values of love, humility, empathy, and philanthropy were not feminized in Quakerism” (Marietta, 30), women were still expected to fit a certain mold. As the Orthodox preacher Joseph Gurney commented: “‘for we well know that there are no women among us, more generally distinguished for modesty, gentleness, order, and a right submission to their brethren, than those who have been called by the Divine Master into the exercise of the Christian ministry.’” In describing the most “distinguished” Quaker women, the ministers, Gurney outlines those qualities most desirable for women. “Modesty, gentleness, order”—these things were valued by Friends for all members of the Society. Quaker women had power only in so far as they acted in accordance with Quaker values. The spheres were not separated; women could only exist as rational, orderly, and sober beings. In other words, as good Quakers. Gurney also mentions that women should exercise “a right submission to their brethren.” Bacon also notes that among female Orthodox, “there was more tendency to defer to the ‘brethren’ for decisions” (Bacon, 93). Thus even though women were spiritually equivalent to men and had a legitimate voice in guiding Quaker communities, full equality eluded them, particularly among the Orthodox. Generally, since Quakerism did not make an internal distinction between the
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characteristics of the sexes, women were held to the same standards as men. This would allow *The Friend* to gender Quakerism as a whole in opposition to the world, whose qualities were also gendered.

Since the events of the schism center the Long Island minister named Elias Hicks, it seems prudent to examine the role of preaching in Quakerism at the time. Hamm, through his investigations into the subject, discovers that:

“Few Friends ever spoke in meeting, but those who did apparently did so regularly. In the nineteenth century Friends recognized a gift along this line by formally recording those who spoke ‘in the ministry.’ The word *record* is important. Human beings could only recognize a gift bestowed by God” (Hamm, 8).

The goal of a minister was to “‘persuade people to seek the Lord, and to be faithful to His word, *the inspoken words of the heart*…and then to leave them to be directed by the inward feelings of the mind’” (Hamm, 8). Thus Quaker preaching aimed to help those already living in Quietism. Preachers did not reach out to non-Quakers. Moreover, though some individuals, both men and women, were recognized as having a special gift for preaching, they still had to follow the discipline. They were not allowed to prepare their messages before meeting, bring Bibles with them to the service, “and they took the silent waiting as seriously as any other member” (Hamm, 8). Ministers were also not technically recognized as such. They kept secular employment and had no official status, though they could become quite famous, and even infamous.

There was one man who, if he did not cause the schism, was the catalyst for it. Elias Hicks was born on March nineteenth, 1748, in Long Island. He was a farmer by
trade and taught in the local schoolhouse. Recorded as a minister around the American Revolution he spent much time traveling to various meetings, preaching along the way. By 1820, when the events leading to the schism began to occur, Hicks was an old man, only a decade removed from his death.

Concerns sparked over Hicks’s theological assertions, which “can best be described as modified quietism…he was a man defending what he understood to be traditional Quakerism against the assaults of innovation and the world; he sought to reform the society by returning it to first principles” (Hamm, 15). Holding the primacy of the Inner Light central to his thought, Hicks concluded that “Christ was the Son of God in the same sense that all people were. The importance of Christ was in his example: he had achieved divinity through perfect obedience to the Light” (Hamm, 16). To Hicks Jesus lived a life sanctified, and study of his actions could inspire and guide Friends to do the same. He thought it would be a mistake, though, to place his actions above the voice of god that Friends could hear inside themselves. Part and parcel with this assertion was the dismissal of several Christian doctrines, including the Atonement and Original Sin (Hamm, 16). Also, the finality of the Inner Light sent to Bible to the wayside. “[Hicks] admitted the value of the Scriptures, but he saw the revelation in them as far inferior to that still being imparted to human beings by the Holy Spirit and thus refused to be bound by them” (Hamm, 16). Quakerism had always allowed for the message of the Bible; Hicks’s insistence on its subservience and his refusal to see Jesus as the only means to salvation therefore flew in the face of some Quakers’ beliefs.

Those who were troubled by these ideas eventually they labeled themselves “Orthodox” and took the offensive against Hicks and those who supported him. Who
were the Orthodox Quakers? “The Orthodox within the city of Philadelphia comprises a socially cohesive, business oriented, small community” (Barbour, 171). The group was determined by “geography, economic status, and kinship” (Barbour, 171). Intermarriage amongst this small, wealthy, and urban group created a strong sense of identity. The Orthodox knew one another well and were certain of their goals. They were generally wealthy merchants who had greater contact with the outside world. Their business dealings, which they “had daily shared with evangelical non-Quakers” taught them new “social programs and religious ideals,” and allowed them to see themselves as “equals in business and society” (Barbour, 167) to non-Quakers. The Orthodox sensed that Quaker influence in America was diminishing, and to them “quietism seemed inadequate to buttress the faith against the challenges of the enlightenment” (Barbour, 171). To restore Quakerism to the glory days of Penn’s Holy Experiment, they felt that it would be necessary to bring Quaker goals more in line with those of contemporary evangelical groups.

The Orthodox, theologically, differed from Hicks’s position on the nature of Jesus. “For Hicks’s opponents…the central question was Christ and his atoning sacrifice. On this issue the Orthodox took a position not much different from that of evangelical Protestants. The Orthodox were forthright in asserting the divinity of Christ” (Hamm, 17). To reconcile that belief in Jesus’ divinity with the Inner Light, the Orthodox had to conceptualize it in a radically different way. Jesus’ death on the cross, they argued, imparted the Inner Light into every person. Through this Light the sin with which each person was born could be nullified. The Inner Light, then, was the result of Jesus’ “atoning sacrifice.” The ramifications of this understanding were a reliance on the Bible,
a belief in Jesus as the divine son of god and only avenue for salvation, and sympathy for Christian ritual.

Hicks threatened the Orthodox not just because of his theology but also because they saw him as a “symptom that the rising tide of infidelity was overtaking Quakerism” (Hamm, 17). This feeling was so strong that “in the minds of the Orthodox, Hicks and his followers were not Christians” (Hamm, 18). Indeed, it was the Orthodox, not the Hicksites, who began the process of separation. “[Separation] arose not so much from a special desire on Hicks’s part to found a new sect (though he did seek certain changes) as from a determination of his opponents to purge the society of heresies” (Hamm, 15). The Friend would use that fact to its advantage when discussing the Hicksites.

In Philadelphia the Orthodox found that they were only able to go on the offensive through certain avenues:

“Unable to silence Hicks or even gain an acknowledgment of error from him, and hampered by his sympathizers even within the city, the Orthodox decided to employ the agencies at their disposal: the support of English Friends [long-time evangelical opponents of Hicks] predominance in the Meeting for Sufferings and Meeting for Ministers and Elders, and the clerkship of the Yearly Meeting.”

Orthodox ministers and elders in Philadelphia outnumbered Hicksites of the same categories three hundred eighty-nine to two hundred sixty. On the Meeting for Sufferings only ten of fifty-two members were Hicksites (Forbush, 329). These, along with the clerkship of the Yearly Meeting, were among the only bastions of power for the Orthodox in Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, however. Eleven Quarterly Meetings formed that Yearly Meeting, and only Philadelphia Quarterly had an Orthodox majority.
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(Forbush, 329). “Elsewhere the Hicksites were dominant and they claimed that twenty-eight of the original Monthly Meetings remained Hicksite [after the schism] whereas only three became Orthodox” (Barbour, 177). In terms of population in the Yearly Meeting, “Hicksites had seventy percent and the Orthodox thirty percent” (Barbour, 177). Unable to push their views through the normal consensus-based system of monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings, the Orthodox were forced to make changes from the top down using their control over positions of power in various meetings.

It was in response to the emergence of troubling Hicksite ideals that the Orthodox party formed. Their reaction to that perceived threat, in turn, caused the Hicksites to rise up in defense, though they were a less uniform group than the Orthodox. The great majority of Hicksites lived in rural areas, and was “the traditional quietists who accepted the Truth of Scripture, the divinity of Christ, and the resurrection. But the symbol they emphasized above all else was the indwelling Christ” (Barbour, 173). Though they shared some theological similarities with the Orthodox, this contingent saw the Inner Light not as the gift Jesus gave humanity with his death but as a way to connect to him directly. For them the Inner Light was still the most important spiritual tool available to them, that which enabled them to experience the divine.

Hicks was very popular with this group. He had dedicated his long life to the Society, and “his quietist posture and eloquence reminded listeners, particularly in rural communities, of the kind of Quakerism with which they had grown up. His strictures…found a sympathetic audience outside the cities” (Barbour, 175). There was another group of Hicksites, however, with different motivations and goals. They were a
minority faction within the larger coalition. These were the Hicksite liberals, and they were driven “by a more critical or rational approach to traditional Quakerism and Christian doctrines” (Barbour, 173). The liberals drew inspiration for their ideas from two sources. One was “a newly emerging view of the Church history” (Barbour, 173), mostly drawn from the work of the German Protestant Johan Mosheim. The other source was “rational Christianity and Scottish Common Sense Philosophy” (Barbour, 174). The liberals saw the growing conflict in Quakerism as a contest “between an emergent priest class…against the efficacy of the Inward Light, holy living, and the autonomy of local Meetings” (Barbour, 175). Though multifaceted, the Hicksites were no less adamant about their views on the structure and purpose of Quakerism.

Elias Hicks visited the Philadelphia area in 1822 and 1826, and with each visit animosity between the forming camps increased. Many elders spoke out against Hicks, including some Orthodox elders from the Hicksite Green Street Meeting. The meeting attempted to discipline these individuals, but the Orthodox-controlled Quarterly Meeting stepped in and protected them from reproach. Green Street refused to budge, and the Orthodox moved to lay down the meeting. “The issue now became constitutional: did effective power rest with a Monthly Meeting or a Quarterly Meeting? That question would be dealt with in the 1827 Yearly Meeting” (Barbour, 176). The Yearly Meeting took place in April of that year. The Hicksites attempted to remove the Orthodox clerk, Samuel Bettle, and replace him with sympathizer John Comly. The measure failed and, to add insult to injury, Bettle “appointed a special committee composed of evangelicals to visit each Meeting to test the soundness of the membership” (Barbour, 177). Upon this setback the Hicksites despaired of ever wresting control of the Yearly Meetings from the
Orthodox and withdrew. They called a conference and there declared that they were “the true Philadelphia Yearly Meeting” (Hamm, 18). This split led directly to others in Baltimore, New York, Ohio, and Indiana Yearly Meetings.

Before 1830 only five Quaker journals were published in the United States. Although Friends did at times participate in a larger religious dialogue occurring in journals in the early nineteenth-century (Barbour, 175-176), most of the Quaker publications were reprints of famous Quaker texts, books by noteworthy contemporary Friends, and smaller pamphlets containing a mixture of both. Hicks, for example, published nine books between 1811 and 1828. How many times these were reprinted and sampled for pamphlets and other sources is not known. From 1823 to 1828 sixty-one items were published about the growing animosity amongst Quakers, and Smith’s book cites fifteen authors that published more on the subject (Smith, 940-948). Yearly Meetings would also regularly send one another epistles, which are “more than a mere letter. It is more likely a pronouncement to the larger world.” These served as an official means of communication between meetings, and were printed and distributed widely. Individuals would also publish epistles to the greater community. George Fox, for example, published four hundred twenty epistles. A pioneer of the Quaker-specific journal was Marcus T. C. Gould, a stenographer who might not have been a Quaker but was a strong supporter of Hicks. Gould would follow Hicks in his travels and copy Hicks’s sermons shorthand. He would then publish them, first in a journal called The
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Quaker, or a Series of Sermons, by Elias Hicks, issued initially on February twenty-third, 1827, and later in The Friend: or, Advocate of Truth, a Hicksite journal. The Quaker contained mostly sermons by Hicks and other noteworthy Friends, critical remarks on those sermons, and extracts from the writings of famous Quakers. Thus the time of the schism provided the fertile needed soil for the Orthodox to publish their own journal. The means and the impetus had come together.

The first issue of the weekly The Friend: A Religious and Literary Journal was published in Philadelphia on Saturday, October thirteenth, 1827. The editor-in-chief was Robert Smith, a member of a colonial Quaker family. The journal had the support of the elite of Philadelphia Orthodox Quakerism. Its declared object was “to furnish to the member of the society of Friends, an agreeable and instructive Miscellany.”10 A majority of its pages focused on critiques of Hicks and Hicksites, accounts of Hicksite separations, and historical sketches of the Society. Excerpts of literature both contemporary and older were included frequently, as well as interesting pieces about the sciences. Finally, articles concerning the philanthropic and social work of Friends received a fair share of pages. The full title of the journal seems apt, for while the editors were concerned with refuting the Hicksites, the journal is indeed full material from many different sources and on a multitude of topics, from Yearly Meeting epistles to a stubborn turtle who returned to the same Orthodox family’s garden year after year. For brevity’s sake this paper will call the journal simply The Friend. This is not unprecedented as the journal refers to itself by the same moniker.

10 “Prospectus”; The Friend; v 1, (1827), 1. All future references to this text shall be as such: (F-Prospectus, __).
Eleven articles were chosen from *The Friend* for use in this paper. Though they vary in style and content they fall into three main categories. The first are articles in which the editors speak directly. The “Prospectus” for the journal is the most important of these. In it the editors map out their vision for the journal. Some issues also contained short editorial notices, and this paper uses quotations from two of them. The second category of articles contains those which profess and defend Orthodox Quaker values. Mined articles include “To Believe—To Understand,” about religious faith, “Pictures of the Atheism and Revolutionary Spirit of the French,” about the French enlightenment and its shortcomings, and an article sans title, written “For the Friend” by “a Water Drinker,” exposing the evils of alcohol. The final category includes those articles which specifically address the schism. “The Elders of Philadelphia and Elias Hicks,” “Elias Hicks and the Society of Friends,” “Ohio Yearly Meeting,” “Doctrines of Elias Hicks,” and another article written “For the Friend” on Green Street Monthly Meeting and its members. Except for “Doctrines,” all these articles describe crucial events in the timeline leading up to and including the schism. Many, like “Doctrines,” also address the theological issues at stake. All eleven articles were chosen not because they were the only ones of their kind, but because they best showcased the language and vehemence found in *The Friend*. The journal is filled with quotations similar to those used in this paper, but many were not deemed prototypical.
*The Friend*, as discussed above, was a true “miscellany.” Though committed to fighting the Hicksites on Quaker issues both theological and political the journal had a broad scope, filling pages with stories of the world’s wonders and history, scientific phenomena, and assorted information from the Quaker world. *The Friend*’s offerings, however, all use a common language: a binary between the worldly and the religious. Informed by the Discipline and requirements of the plain life, this language associates Quakerism with the religious: a certain level-headedness, a rational, “pure,” composed, and manly way of living in the world that is indicative of a healthy spiritual life described using the same adjectives. *The Friend* positions in opposition to this the way of the physical, the worldly: “perverse” in its sentiments, distracted by “lighter” pursuits, and exaggerated and excitable in all things. The world, according to *The Friend*, is everything Quakerism is not just as the worldly is antithetical to the religious. Science is the only connection between the two. The journal, after creating this binary, mirrors it onto the schism. The Orthodox created the adversary language of Orthodox and Hicksite, and *The Friend* levels the binary against the Hicksites, draping on them the descriptors of the world. Thus the Hicksites are stripped of their claim to Quakerism and an identity for the Orthodoxy is created. These moves were subtle; the language is there, but the journal merely claims to publish the truth, and allows its readership to come to the conclusions created and guided by the language of its pages. In the end, by banishing the Hicksites thusly from the Society *The Friend* hopes to restore Quakerism to its “primitive” glory—a civilization of the religious in the world, pristine in reputation and internal order.
Throughout *The Friend* there is a strong link between Orthodox Quakerism and rationality. The journal contains no fewer than eight poems or articles about Greece, for example, in the first volume alone. It is, however, a distinct kind of rationality which the Orthodox value, one opposed to that of the French Enlightenment, as summarized in the article “Picture of the Atheism and Revolutionary Spirit of the French.” Throughout this article *The Friend* claims that Voltaire and Rousseau, who exemplify the wrong kind of rationality, have tainted the world with their thought. Voltaire, according to the article, infused all his historical and general works with his insidious spirit, which “operated as a corrosive and destructive engine for the dissolving of all earnest, moral, and religious modes of thinking.”11 Voltaire, in doing what he could to “unsettle and relax principle” (Friend, 10), laid the foundation for Rousseau, who the article states was really destructive to religious thinking. He was such a threat because “it is only when a strong mind, striving passionately in quest of truth, pursues its researches in a wrong direction…and becomes capable of seizing possession of generous natures, whose general principles are in an unsettled state” (Friend, 10). Rousseau promoted an “atheistical [sic] system” which “was perpetually endeavoring to substitute a complete system of police in the room of the antiquated influences of religion and morality, which regarded the perfection of a few manufactures as the sole and highest object of human society, and what they called ‘the doctrine of pure ethics,’ as the *ne plus ultra* of illumination” (10), and he did such a good job that he made the monster of the atheist French enlightenment acceptable. This godless system worshipped man and sought to regulate and mechanize him. Through that process he would become as god, perfect,
capable of “pure ethics” and of an order enforced not by Christian mores but by “a complete system of police”—humanity regulating itself.

The rationality of the Quakers is more closely aligned with that of England, whose purpose The Friend claims is “exalting the character of the Creator” (Friend, 3). This is rather unsurprising, as Quakerism developed in England and even in the nineteenth-century still had close ties with the country. The purpose of living a reasoned life for Friends was to bring oneself closer to the divine; the atheist rationality employed the same means but for the completely opposite end. The article describes Rousseau as confused and misguided despite his rational prowess. There is a sense that true rationality leads one towards God and away from confusion. The article “To Believe—To Understand,” written by an anonymous author, explains the Quaker rationality. It tells the reader that all beliefs are based upon incomplete understanding because human beings do not have the capability to fully comprehend anything, whether it be physical or spiritual. Despite this shortcoming, it is possible for humans to avoid bewilderment:

“[Christian] doctrines are no more within the reach of the human comprehension than the nature of magnetism or of animal life. They are, like the ultimate facts of the sciences…objects of belief; and if the evidence which we have for their reality is indubitable, we may, as I have said before, rest assured, that they are conformable to the true nature of things, however incomplete our finite faculties may be to comprehend them” (Friend, 36).

Humans determine laws and principles by means of two faculties: for the physical world, our knowledge “is drawn from the evidence of the senses” (Friend, 36). This applies to such things as the workings of a watch for we believe the time it tells even though we do not grasp its mechanizations completely. For the “spiritual world,” on the other hand, our knowledge, “of the ways of God with man, is drawn from the Revelation of his Holy
Spirit” (Friend, 36). The article claims that the “reality” of the Christian ideals, the “ways of God with man,” is infallible because the Bible is an “authentic and indubitable record” (Friend, 36). Therefore humans can believe in it, even though they do not grasp it in its entirety, because they know it to be “conformable to the true nature of things.” Thus there is certainty of belief without complete understanding.

That is what the author of this article wants the reader to take from the argument. To do this, however, the author made an underhanded construction. Both science and religion, according to the article, are matters of belief. Humans do not fully understand scientific phenomena such as magnetism, but see the results be consistent and trustworthy. Therefore they can believe in magnetism generally. Religion, the author contends, is exactly the same. It is not understood, but we see its effects and we can always trust what it has to offer. The author uses the familiarity and trust that the readership has in science to create the same for religion by showing that they follow the same rules. Embedded in the argument is a crucial binary between the physical and spiritual worlds. There is rationality in the physical world—animal life and the movements of clocks are ordered. This world is the one in which Rousseau and his ilk reside. They are extremely rational but their understanding is limited to the physical. In opposition to this there is the spiritual world, which like the physical is understood rationally but exists on a completely different level. It is here that the truth can be discerned. Rousseau, for all his worldly understanding, was still confused and lost. Spiritual understanding, the article insinuates, can show one the “ways of God with man.” Rousseau’s rationality, moreover, could still be overwhelmed by the emotions. Spiritual understanding gives humans the ability to control themselves. The Quakers thought they
were privy to this form of understanding. Nonetheless, the binary is not complete, for science straddles the two poles. Like both it is rational. Science focuses on the world like physical understanding does, but it is informed by spiritual understanding. This keeps it free of the emotions and opens an avenue for the religious to enter the world. Despite all this, belief is ultimately still a choice. The truth is there in plain sight, but it is necessary for every individual to “consult the volume with an humble and willing heart, and an open ear” (Friend, 37). The Quaker rationality described above is the foundation for the religious-worldly binary. Science, as a sound bridge between the two, is no less crucial. This binary and the concept of the bridge are, however, only hinted at in “To Believe—To Understand.” Elsewhere in the journal they are filled out further.

This conception of rationality was applied to the categorization of Quaker social concerns in the nineteenth-century. In the “Prospectus” of The Friend the editors discuss the various humanitarian programs and issues that the journal will cover in a “fund of interesting information” (F-Prospectus, 2). These were separated into two groups, the first being those maladies which are random, crippling, and assigned by fate: “the improvements in education, in prison discipline, in the management of the poor, the sick, and the insane, and in the instruction of the dumb and the blind… in civilizing the savage, and loosening the bonds of slavery” (F-Prospectus, 2). All these problems happen to individuals without their consent or input; they are scourges which “the efforts of Christian beneficence,” inspired by belief, must combat. The second category, however, is quite different. “We shall support, whenever we have fit occasion, the views which the society of Friends entertain respecting many allowed abuses, such as lotteries, gambling, and intemperance” (F-Prospectus, 2). These are “abuses,” not the maladies of the first
category. As rational beings capable of choice Quakers believe that humans must choose
to devote their lives to God, to live in the spiritual world, by heeding the indisputable
evidence of the Bible. And, as the plain life shows, it takes a lifetime of dedication to do
so. A person can rationally decide to drink and gamble, but they cannot do that and
become closer to God. They will turn into individuals like Rousseau and Voltaire,
obessed over the physical world and its rational perfection, but devoid of any spiritual
understanding. They will be truly lost, even if they do understand “the mysterious
sympathy of the magnet” (Friend, 36). That is why in other articles of The Friend,
different types of alcohol are personified, such as “Cordial, of more insinuating address
than any of the others—a smooth faced and perfumed dandy” (Friend, 147). They are
characters that one can choose to associate with or not. Some friends, the journal
insinuates, are better than others.

What we see in the description of those ills of the second category is a connection
between outer appearance and inner state. If one chooses to engage in those abuses, they
will not be able to know God because an understanding of the spiritual would lead one
away from such abuses. They are a sign of only having physical understanding, which
necessarily leads to confusion. Thus, it is possible on a basic level to determine whether
someone has accepted God and has understanding of the spiritual world by checking
whether or not they are, say, a gambler. This correlation was strong and direct for
eighteenth and nineteenth-century Friends. “As one put it in 1841: ‘By the sadness of the
countenance the heart is made better’” (Hamm, 5). The plain life was originally meant to
reinforce and guide the spiritual journey, but it also became a sign of advancement in it.
From this rose the conception among Friends of themselves as “a leaven to the world”
Quakerism was “primitive Christianity revived,” a “light” of the spiritual to the world that had left it in favor of the physical. It was this perceived responsibility to humanity that birthed the Quaker social work of the nineteenth-century. “For many Friends it flowed naturally the Quaker conception of religious life” (Hamm, 10). By working with those taking part in the “abuses,” Quakers primarily helped those afflicted recover from their spiritual quagmire and, therefore, become closer to God. Concurrently, however, they were also doing the same for themselves. By being good Christians Quakers strengthened their spiritual state.

*The Friend* created a distinction between two kinds of reason. Though both were completely rational, one was limited to understanding the physical world, while the other was able to comprehend the spiritual. From an understanding of either of these worlds humans could choose to believe that which they wanted. Without understanding of and belief in the spiritual world, however, any person’s understanding of physical or religious spheres would be aimless and confused, and their rationality vulnerable to the passions. Science, however, begins its assignment as the connecting link between the spiritual and the world. Here already is the beginning of a divide between the worldly and the religious, and an assignment by the Orthodox of negative associations with the worldly.

When this Quaker vision of rationality, its dual conception of inner and outer states, and the strictures of the plain life are all combined, one can make sense of the language used by *The Friend* to describe Orthodox Quakers and the greater world of which they were a part. *The Friend* promotes the Orthodox vision of “religious and literary” purity, defined and informed by Orthodox rationality and the plain life. In the
“Prospectus” the editors create a vocabulary that enables them to separate “pure and simple” literature, proper for Friends of all ages, from that which is “exaggerated and overloaded,” the writing of the confused world.

To the end of promoting purity through literature the editors of The Friend state in the “Prospectus” that certain kinds of material are not readily appropriate for the journal. Contemporary literature, according to the editors, has an “exaggerated and overloaded style which has become fashionable” (F-Prospectus, 1). Nonetheless, “we shall endeavor to present a selection from the literature of the present day, purified from the exaggerated sentiments, the theatrical manner, the false morality, the perverted sublime, with which the example of a few great geniuses has infected the taste of the age” (F-Prospectus, 1). Evident in these quotations is the fine line which the Orthodox walked. They believed that Quakers needed to become more connected to the world around them, but at the same time they viewed themselves as an example to others. This literature is very clearly connected to the world, being of “the age” and “the present day.” Though it can entangle Quakers in its worldly web, it is included in the journal because it cannot be ignored.

The editors define impure literature as “the taste of the age,” “fashionable.” The qualities of this literature are impermanent, but it is also insidious in that it “has infected” the appetites of the time. Here again is the Quaker belief that you are what you eat: the world consumes these impure texts which harm them spiritually due to their vapid nature. Moreover, the metaphor of physical consumption is strong in these passages and is indicative of a further indictment against these materials and the greater world. This kind of literature satisfies temporary “tastes,” the base appetites. To be interested in this kind of literature is to be hungry. It is not rational, nor is it reserved. It is to acquiesce to
humanity’s worst qualities, the sensual, those that lead humans away from God. It seems that once one ignores the spiritual, their focus on the physical increases and the journal insinuates that their ability to be rational degenerates. This will become a sign, a marker for the Hicksites—their level of rationality will be determined by *The Friend* and used to show their lack of connectedness to the spiritual world.

But what, in the eyes of the editors, is the greater world consuming? “The exaggerated sentiments, the theatrical manner, the false morality, the perverted sublime”—these are the lamentable and dangerous qualities of fashionable literature. Deception is the key for this literature puts on a show, using the smoke and mirrors of exaggeration and theatrics to convince its audience of its moral claims and its promise of the sublime while hiding the falsity and perversion of its true self. It is like a bad actor wearing a beautiful mask. For those who wish to satisfy only their senses the mask is impermeable. Ultimately, the promises and claims of this literature are empty, for what they promise is a twisted version of the truth that only understands the physical. At the same time, however, it is incredibly dangerous because like a virus it delivers its phony guidance while distracting its host with theatrics and an inviting exterior shell. Anything relating to higher orders of thought or of divinity is false and harmful to the reader, though it appears to be sound wisdom. For those already confused from a lack of spiritual understanding this literature seems to be sound. They are easily duped. What makes the literature of the world so dangerous is that its shell is so perfect that even those with spiritual understanding can be taken in by it. Thus the editors of *The Friend* need to purify this literature both of its shell and of the “perverted” contents inside so that it cannot harm their Orthodox readership. This purpose, and the fear fueling it, is the same
as that which applies to The Friend’s dealings with the Hicksites. The “Prospectus” does not explain what this literature would be like once purified; what would remain after this process is unclear. The “Prospectus,” though, explains in detail what types of literature and other written material need no purification. It is the way they are described that completes the vocabulary of the religious and the worldly.

Pure literature has a very specific source: “The writings, both in prose and verse, of the great masters of the old English school…the simple, yet powerful touches, the happy keeping, the graceful lights and shades, which distinguish the writings of Addison and Swift, of Pope, of Goldsmith, and Cowper” (F-Prospectus, 1). In opposition to the language examined above, the editors describe the old English school as calm and positive but not frivolous. The techniques employed were bare but effective. Everything has a place and can be found exactly where it ought to be. Confusion is impossible when everything is needed and easily found. That this is reminiscent of Quaker simplicity is unsurprising. It reflects Friends’ conception of the plain life and its ultimate goals in that it can use so little to make so much. “There is a natural adaptation of manner to the subject and occasion, which is required both by good taste and sound morals” (F-Prospectus, 1). Not only is this literature simple and effective, it is also appropriate, cognizant of proper social expectations and requirements. There is a respect for acting in a particular manner in pure literature that the editors admire. The literature is concerned with moral correctness. The editors would not be promoting the old English school so much if they did not feel that it was preoccupied with and guided by the correct system of morals and tastes. It is English, and as The Friend has already claimed, the English were
concerned with is “exalting the character of the Creator.” Thus the writings of these authors must also be dedicated to that exaltation. The journal connects them with understanding of the spiritual world, and shows as evidence for that connection the style in which they were written.

Because pure literature is thusly preoccupied, “a relish for the pure and simple models of composition which [the masters of the old English school] have left, is a sure indication of correct and manly habits of thought, and will be inculcated throughout our pages” (F-Prospectus, 1). The structure of this literature is guided by a certain set of sound religious morals which must, the journal says, also be present in the individual who enjoys that literature. The enjoyment is made possible not because the literature satisfies the senses, though “good taste” is a part of the description of this literature, but because it connects to the correct “habits of thought” in the individual. The English school complements the spiritual understanding of the individual. To read and enjoy these works is another outward sign of the purity within, a specifically rational purity that is tempered, adaptable to social conditions, and simple in its operation.

These habits of thought are not merely “correct.” The rationality applauded here is also gendered as “manly.” With one short word the editors coupled purity and all that is good in literature with maleness, and by necessity false, impure literature with femaleness. Maleness would be considered the “Quaker” gender, simple, thoughtful and unflappable, and femaleness that of the world, obsessed by that which is fashionable and sensual, but ultimately devoid of meaning.

At this point the editors of The Friend have increased the vocabulary of their binary considerably. The religious, already connected to an English philosophical
tradition that exists to exalt God, and through that to a rationality grounded in belief of the spiritual now takes on additional meanings. There is a certain life that the journal aligns with this kind of thought: temperate, simplistic, and reserved, it is concerned with proper behavior and sound morals. Its qualities parallel those of the plain life. It is masculine, concerned with correctness and “powerful touches.” It does not confuse its adherents, but rather guides them into greater understanding. Finally, this lifestyle and thought system complements and strengthens each other. One is external, the other internal, and the presence of either confirms the existence of the other.

Opposed to the religious is the worldly, which is recognized as a god-less rationality of the physical. It is pervasive in the world outside of Quakerism. Associated with exaggeration and the emotions, the worldly is adrift without true guidance, obsessed with the sensual and the latest craze. Though by necessity feminine, this vocabulary of emotions and frivolity confirms the labeling. The darker side of the worldly endeavors to hypnotize good religious individuals with a mask—a theatrical act—of a false spirituality. This performance has all the promises of morals and the sublime, but in reality they are twisted and empty. This overture of seduction is feminine as well—the female worldly seeks to seduce the male religious, to draw him away from his true purpose and transform him into the feminine. The deceptive nature of the worldly, its seductive power, is dangerous on two levels. Firstly, it draws good religious Quakers away from bearing the cross and into the physical quagmire of the world. It is able to do this because of its mask, which gives it the appearance of the religious. It uses the assumption of the outer reflection of an inner state to its devious advantage. The binary
has become clear, making distinctions across the spectrum of theological and day-to-day affairs.

The old English school is not, however, the only type of “pure” source of material for *The Friend*. This other source is that bridge between the religious-worldly binary. A paragraph of the “Prospectus” is devoted to praising the sciences, another well of purity. Explorers of the far corners of the Earth, astronomers working on the magnitudes “of the stars themselves,” biologists with their microscopes, and the restoration of the “lost authors of Greece and Rome” by “the patient genius of Europe” (F-Prospectus, 1); the editors are impressed by the conquering force of nineteenth-century science and sing its praises. Information from “these inexhaustible sources” is appropriate for *The Friend* because:

“All this prodigious energy of research is guided by a practical good sense, which is continually bringing it to bear upon the common interests of mankind; and enriched by a taste and a cultivated imagination, which beautify whatever they touch, and embellish the grave sciences with all the graces of composition” (F-Prospectus, 1).

The sciences are worldly in their focus. The stars, magnetism, ancient cities, all these are physical things. Yet science is not worldly in the same way as contemporary literature. The “Prospectus” states that the wonders of science are “as instructive and elevating as they are pure and delightful” (F-Prospectus, 1). Science is pure and is grounded by reason rather than the senses, putting it on the same level as English literature. It is guided by “practical good sense,” a rational system that leads it always in “the common interests of mankind.” This system must be based in belief in the divine, for as the journal shows, the absence of that belief causes deception and seduction to become
acceptable, and they are not in the “common interests” of humanity. So science, whose outer purpose is as pure as that of “Christian beneficence,” must also be pure on the inside. And that necessitates that it be founded on the “authentic and indubitable record” of the Bible. That allows something obsessed with the world to be pure and religious.

What does science create? Its products must be good, for purity would not birth impurity. Science explores the physical world with the clear guidance of the spiritual, and draws from the world its wonders. “Cultivation,” enrichment, beautification, embellishment—science develops something beautiful and complex for all “mankind.” This thing is civilization, the marriage of the religious and the worldly, the best qualities of both combined in one manner of existence. The Quakers rejected the worldly, but they did not reject the world. The editors recognize the importance of the world for Quakerism. It just needed cultivation in order to be spiritually sound, and the Quakers, as a “light” to the world, could provide just that.

Gendered language can again be found in the way science is lauded, though it is more subtle than the declarations of manliness seen previously. The editors state that the journal will print scientific information “in place of the novel and the romance” (F-Prospectus, 1). They instead value science, which is described using such male language as practicality and cultivation. Moreover, the romance as a category of literature was considered to be explicitly feminine because of its focus on the sensual pleasures of sexuality. The novel, by being grouped with the romance, is also declared feminine. This move echoes the common sentiment of the day.

_The Friend_, commenting on the power of publishing, reveals the core of its own goals: “the press has become a powerful engine, in its operation upon society at large…it
would be difficult to assign any good reason, why our own society should not come in for
a share in the advantage, at least so far as may be practicable, in directing the disposition
for inquiry and reading into a right channel, and for salutary ends” (The Friend, 144).
The editors recognize the power of publishing in their time, and realize the potential it
has, they claim, to aid Quakers in finding the “salutary ends” of a life sanctified. They
can direct inquiry and reading “into a right channel” by what they choose to publish.
They have the power to create that civilization. Indeed, The Friend views itself as a
teacher of Quaker young:

“If we can by means of this paper, direct our young people to elevated pursuits and studies, assist
in guiding their taste, in maturing their judgments, in forming in them habits of manly and serious
thinking—in cultivating in them sentiments congenial with the doctrines and testimonies of our
religious Society—our highest ambition as to this enterprise will be satisfied” (The Friend, 5).
The Friend believes that it can teach even the young, who need the most guidance, into
“the love of virtue” (The Friend, 5). The language in the above quotation strongly
suggests that the editors intend to “mold” Quaker youth, but into what? The Friend
wants to create rational, manly, and tempered individuals. It wants to cultivate the
religious in youth. It wants to build civilization. That religiousness is, though,
“congenial with the doctrines and testimonies of our religious Society.” In short, the
journal wants to make its readership Orthodox. It plans to cultivate Orthodox ideas and
practices using the “powerful engine” of the press. It equates the religious with Orthodox
values and identity. The civilization that is the end of this process is an Orthodox world.
The only thing standing in its way is the worldly, which must be unmasked in order to be
conquered.
In *The Friend* the conflict between the Orthodox and the Hicksites mirrors the conflict between pure and impure literature. The conflict between the factions therefore becomes synonymous with that between the religious and the worldly. This is made possible because the same vocabulary is applied to both situations. Deception is again central to the journal’s characterization of all things Hicksite; just as worldly literature presents an attractive shell that promises morality and the sublime, and yet hides a destructive and ultimately empty worldview, so does Elias Hicks deceive good Quakers with his “sophistry” whilst infecting them with blasphemous theological assertions. He is the feminine deceiver, the seducer. Those who succumb to his wiles are the deceived, they who have lost their understanding of the spiritual. Once they become Hicksites these individuals become unruly and overzealous, engaging in acts prohibited by the discipline. Exposure is *The Friend*’s only weapon. The journal’s goal is to strip from the Hicksites their claims to Quakerism and the religious by bringing to light their true nature. They are motivated by their desire to cultivate an Orthodox civilization. It is interesting to note that the Orthodox themselves enabled these binaries by making the first distinction amongst Quakers by creating the terms “Orthodox” and “Hicksite” (Barbour, 173). They pushed for differentiation, which is the first step towards building their religious civilization. This then allowed for the further explication and assignments of characteristics found in the vocabulary of *The Friend*.

While the language of *The Friend* serves to promote its own program, there is truth to the Orthodox claim that Hicks was very influential: “Hicks, who was seventy-six
in 1824, had spent most of his adult life in the service of Friends, and his quietist posture and eloquence reminded listeners, particularly in rural communities, of the kind of Quakerism with which they had grown up” (Barbour, 175). It would be precisely those qualities of eloquence and piety, the qualities that made him so popular, that The Friend would turn into a weapon against Hicks. Some Hicksites accused Orthodox Friends of attempting to establish a priestly caste in Quakerism. The Friend reverses the accusation and indicts Hicks of “priestly ambition” (Friend, 183). Indeed, his popularity itself made Hicks a convenient target for the Orthodox. They could position him as the cause of all the trouble coming from the Hicksites when in fact the group did not all follow Hicks. It is easier to attack one person than to take on the whole. “In examining the conduct and practice of the individual who has been the principal cause of the troubles which have come upon our Society” (Friend, 252), the journal does not have to examine anyone else. They can be associated with Hicks, and that is enough.

Additionally, The Friend consciously tries to dehumanize Hicks. “The time has fully come, wherein we are called upon to use every proper means to arrest the progress of the spirit of infidelity which is stalking through our land, cloaked under the specious garb of spirituality and religious liberty, and which, by various delusive stratagems, is striving to beguile the unwary, and rob them of their faith and hope in Jesus Christ” (Friend, 299). This quotation robs Hicks of any altruistic motivation, kindness, or the possibility of being simply misguided. He is instead made out to be spectral, a spirit stalking the quiet countryside, robbing “unwary” passers-by of their spiritual wealth. Hicks’s internal state is matter-of-factly stated in this quotation. His spirit is that of “infidelity,” a dishonest and malevolent quality, always “striving.” His outer state
directly reflects this. Hicks’s techniques, those of worldly literature, are outlined in the quotation. He cloaks the “spirit of infidelity” in the “specious garb of spirituality and religious liberty” and then uses “various delusive stratagems” to rob the “unwary” of their religion.

The following quotation, from “The Elders of Philadelphia and Elias Hicks,” affords insight into the way in which the journal connects Hicks’s actions, as described in the previous paragraph, to those of worldly literature:

“Such, however, were the charms of his eloquence with his admirers, so great the respect for his age, his character, and the station which he filled, that few were qualified or inclined to scrutinize the tendency of the doctrines which he proclaimed with such warmth and boldness. Wherever he traveled he attracted disciples, and became the all engrossing subject of conversation” (Friend, 77).

Hicks’s intelligence, eloquence, and station all protect him from scrutiny because he looks like the prototypical Quaker elder. His appearance is familiar and disarming. It demands respect. He uses the “charms of his eloquence,” exaggeration and theatrics, to become the center of attention. Hicks insights a buzz, becoming “the all engrossing subject of conversation” wherever he goes. Seemingly benign and even full of wisdom, Quakers become intrigued by his promises of morality and the sublime. As the author of one article claims: “I am aware that Elias Hicks often delivers many excellent moral precepts, and some undeniably sound doctrines, in the course of his sermons, but these only serve to render the awful untruths which are connected with them a readier admission into the minds of his auditory” (Friend, 299). Hicks’s new admirers are ready to receive his lies because their guard has been lowered by his “warmth and boldness” and attractive promises. His true message, meanwhile, slips through the proverbial back
door and his new “followers” are caught. Hicks is a snake-oil salesman—he rolls into town, sets up his tent, wows the innocent and naive townsfolk, and gets them to buy his worthless medicine.

Hicks’s ability to accomplish all this, according to *The Friend*, has its source in his seductive prowess. Referring to Green Street Monthly Meeting, Jennings states, “the greater number of their fellow members, on the other hand, was captivated by the eloquence, and seduced by the reasonings [sic] of Elias Hicks” (*Friend*, 174). Seduction, charms, infidelity; these all have close ties to notions of the feminine. Women seduce men, not the other way around. They use their charms to draw them into infidelity, away from their wives or their life’s work or their god and towards their uncontrollable emotional side. Worldly literature, with all its bells and whistles, stops Quaker youth from developing a “love of virtue.” Similarly, Hicks seduces grown Quakers away from the rationality of the spiritual and the sanctification that it brings and into the vibrant confusion of the worldly.

How does *The Friend* respond to Hicks’s advances? Having already laid the groundwork by describing the actions of Hicks as being those of a “sophist” bent on seducing Quakers away from the religious and into the worldly, the editors take a page from the book of the old English school. Just as those authors relied on the truth to give their works meaning and power, so does *The Friend* use the truth, as they see it, to respond to Hicks’s theatrics. The editors thus align themselves—and with them the Orthodoxy—with the religious qualities found in pure literature, most important among
them truth, while reinforcing their condemnation of Hicks, the one responsible for all the troubles in the Society, as worldly.

In the “Prospectus,” the editors claim that when publishing information on individuals or the activities of Quakers,

“[Never] shall we shrink, when we think the cause of justice requires it, from a free examination of the public conduct of individuals, and a defence [sic] of the course pursued by Friends, where we believe it to be misrepresented and calumniated. In doing this, we shall allow no taint of party spirit to darken our pages. The truth itself may sometimes be severe; but whatever it may require at our hand, personalities shall be steadfastly avoided, and private character held sacred” (F-Prospectus, 2).

Claiming to be a champion of justice, *The Friend* promises to print the truth unencumbered by its admitted Orthodox alliances. The editors do not hide from the fact that harsh sentiments will be expressed, but put that back on the shoulders of those on whom they report, since they claim only to be stating what those individuals may have done themselves. Moreover, through avoiding “personalities,” the journal promises to describe private character—true self—whether good or bad. This allows the editors to claim that they can penetrate Hicks’s charming exterior and expose the pollution beneath. Hicks shows that outer appearance or “personalities” can seem to be honest. The real truth, however, when wielded by *The Friend*, bypasses that shell and illuminates the inner state of its subject.

“A free examination of the public conduct of individuals:” the actions of Hicks and other Hicksites undergo examination from the sharp eye of the journal. It is another way *The Friend* can reveal their inner states. Hicks, for example, is reported to congregate with unsavory people. When meeting with Hicks, a group of Orthodox elders
are surprised at finding in his company, “a promiscuous assemblage of persons, among whom were many not members of any meeting of ministers and elders” (*Friend*, 135). The journal is saying that Hicks can be known by the company he keeps. Hicks socializes with non-Quaker individuals and with Hicksites. Both groups are labeled “promiscuous.” The elders are disgusted by this scene and leave. The message is clear: he who would engage with the world becomes of the world. Hicks’s outer appearance, the way he lives his life, reflects his beliefs. Good Orthodox do not even remain in the presence of that which is corrupted by the worldly, for doing so could corrupt them as well.

The kind of publishing described in the “Prospectus” is analogous not only to the old English style but also to science, albeit in different ways. Science, guided by the “practical good sense” of spiritual understanding, seeks to create civilization, to transform the worldly into the religious. The editors claim that *The Friend* is led by the same spiritual understanding as science. It validates their declarations of the truth and enables them to better Quakerism just as science betters the world. The editors are not tainted by “party spirit;” rather, they are charged by the “good sense” which seeks to improve the condition of humanity generally and which calls on them to defend “the course pursued by Friends” specifically. The journal thus hopes to better Quakerism by purifying it with the disinfectant of the truth. *The Friend* can thusly be a creator of civilization.

Because *The Friend* connected truth to the power of spiritual understanding, the editors feel that the truth’s mere publication is enough to convince its readership of the journal’s claims. The introduction to “The Elders of Philadelphia and Elias Hicks”
conveys as much: “A minute narrative of the events which transpired during that visit, is due to those friends at a distance, who, having imperfectly understood the affair, have been ready to suppose, that a zeal for the truth may have led their brethren beyond the line of duty prescribed by the discipline” (Friend, 77). The purported reason for retelling the story of the schism in the journal is to correct any misunderstanding among the readership as to what really transpired during the five-year period 1822-1827 between Hicks, his followers, and the Orthodox establishment in Philadelphia. The editors assume that anyone who would be “ready to suppose” that the Hicksites act in regard to the truth must “have imperfectly understood the affair” because with true understanding they would be able to see past the charade. The cure for that misconception is “a minute narrative,” the facts, because they pierce the attractive hide of the Hicksites and pin down their actual un-Quakerly nature. There is no need for further argument, because the truth has been brought to light.

The Friend, moreover, accuses Hicks of having an aversion to the truth, that quality which is paramount to the religious: “In his conduct…a desire to evade the truth, and to stifle inquiry is most strikingly manifested, and we believe that the assertion is fully justifiable, that no man, conscious of his soundness in the Christian faith and able to give answer for the hope which is in him, would or could have acted in the manner in which Elias Hicks conducted himself” (Friend, 252). This article challenges Hicks, saying that he “would have sought investigation” (Friend, 252) if he was clear of conscious, and if he was a man. That Hicks is hiding from those who seek the truth is, according to The Friend, as sure a sign of guilt as being caught with a smoking gun. No real Quaker, “conscious of his soundness in the Christian faith,” would fear the truth
because they understand it and it is reflected in everything they do. Hicks, *The Friend* implies, has much to fear.

The journal continuously taunts and genders the evasiveness it sees in Hicks:

“Instead of an open and manly avowal of his opinions upon those subjects wherein he has been alleged to be in error, we find him constantly pursuing a negative, evasive, and contradictory policy” (*Friend*, 252). The manly thing to do in the face of accusations, so says the journal, is to make clear what one believes so that no further questions can be raised. That is the way of the truth, which erases confusion. That is the manner in which the old English school and the sciences delight readers. Hicks, on the other hand, is “evasive” and “contradictory.” He has those qualities of overblown worldly literature, of the romance and the novel. The journal mocks his masculinity by putting his actions in opposition to manliness. It characterizes him here not as dangerous, but as weak; Hicks is unable to defend himself, so he has to hide.

Jennings’s article was written in 1827, five years after the contents of his narrative. He assumes that “the peculiar tenets of Elias are now well known throughout our Society” (*Friend*, 77), and frequently manipulates that to catch Hicks in past lies. Jennings presents Hicks not only as caustic and unwelcoming, but also addresses the reader directly to be sure that they recognize Hicks’s attempts at deception:

“Elias explicitly denied that such had ever been his opinions or expressions, that Christ was the son of God, but that we had only his word for it… the reader must perceive that in the this interview, Elias Hicks, even in denying the charge of having declared that Christ was no more than man, used evasive language; and that his reception of the Elders amounted to a total rejection of their counsel and care over him. He told them they had no right to meddle with him for what he had declared elsewhere” (*Friend*, 95).
Jennings catches Hicks making a claim that the Orthodox readership of *The Friend* know is a lie. Moreover, Jennings states that Hicks rejected the care of the elders of Philadelphia, and through them of the discipline which they guard. Here Jennings uses *The Friend*’s most powerful weapon against Hicks. He takes the vocabulary of the religious, with all its assumptions about truth, masculinity, and civilization, and holds against it Hicks’s actions, which have been recounted, the journal implies, in a truthful way. Hicks’s actions do not hold up in this comparison, and Jennings describes Hicks’s failings with the vocabulary of the worldly. This instantly puts Hicks in that category, and colors everything about him as deceptive. In that moment *The Friend* strips Hicks of any legitimate claims to the religious and indeed places him in direct opposition to it, all the while claiming to expose the worldliness they associated with him as his true motivations.

And what of the other half of this equation, those deceived by Hicks? They too are strongly condemned by *The Friend* and are also declared worldly. Quakers are turned into Hicksites in two main ways, according to *The Friend*. The first is the force of Hicks’s eloquent forked tongue, as has been examined above. The other is the presence of deceptive thought passing as sound information:

“Individuals whose sources of information are very few, and who have not the means of detecting the impositions practiced upon them, frequently have their minds prejudiced by the representations of those on whose veracity they have been accustomed to rely with implicit confidence, but who, under the influence of party feeling, are induced to give them a colouring which the truth will not justify” (*Friend*, 5).
Quakers who rely only on certain places or individuals for information run the risk, says the journal, of having those sources become colored by Hicksite prejudices and party feeling—in other words, by irrational “representations.” With no means of realizing this change these poor Friends are seduced into the Hicksite camp whilst thinking that they are still good Quakers. Descriptions of Hicksites in *The Friend* divided the group into two categories, “infatuated” and “determined” (*Friend*, 253). “Infatuated” Hicksites are those merely wooed by Hicks’s theatrics. They follow his strictures passively. “Determined partizans [sic],” as they are called, are a different breed altogether. These rabid followers of Hicks are, in the eyes of the journal, just as shifty, stubborn and dangerous to Orthodox Friends as their leader.

Once their internal theological beliefs have been altered these new Hicksites necessarily change on the outside as well and begin acting in peculiarly Hicksite and dreadfully un-Orthodox ways, no matter the category into which they fall. Just like Hicks, they “show a striking inconsistency, and even contradiction, between their *professions* and their *practice*” (*Friend*, 143). Having been seduced away from the masculine stoicism and spiritual truth of the Orthodox, these Hicksites act with exaggeration and emotion, and can even become violent. In their mildest states, Hicksites “conducted themselves with much indecorum, and manifested a degree of excitement incompatible with the spirit of the gospel, and the solemnity of the occasion” (*Friend*, 144). They ignore the standards set by tradition and disregard proper behavior. Their inordinate level of excitement demonstrates to *The Friend* that the emotions of these Hicksites have taken control. This is only possible if they lack spiritual understanding, for “excitement [is] incompatible with the spirit of the gospel.” Therefore
the Hicksites have forgotten the source of the religious, and by being emotional have
become worldly.

The next level of Hicksite misbehavior described in The Friend follows from the first. In this case the excitement of the Hicksites turns against the Orthodox in a malicious fashion described as “hostile and persecuting” (Friend, 182). For the most part this entails “violent ranting” (Friend, 253). Any hope of finding reasonableness in the Hicksites begins to fade. In this state, it only takes a few small steps to create “fanatical madness” (Friend, 183): “desperate efforts were used to inflame the passions of their partizans [sic]; the rack the gibbet, the faggot, dungeons and chains, the pope and the inquisition, were summoned to give energy to their declaration” (Friend, 183). The theatrics are in full force here. The journal shows how the Hicksites, already emotion-driven and confused about the truth, easily being convinced by a “desperate” show. The Hicksites whip themselves into a frenzy over a supposed persecution at the hands of Orthodox when in reality, according to the journal, they are the ones persecuting the Orthodox.

Once this madness takes over, the Hicksites no longer resemble modern humans, let along Quakers. In the article “Ohio Yearly Meeting,” The Friend describes the manner in which the Hicksites separated from that meeting. The “interesting intelligence” was received from “correspondents” is shocking enough to warrant a warning: “many of our readers will scarcely be able to believe, that such dreadful scenes as we have detailed, could possibly occur at this day, among a people who had enjoyed the blessings of civilization [emphasis mine]…it presents…the sad consequences which must inevitably result from the abandonment of sound, moral, and religious principles”
Since the Hicksites have lost those “sound” moral and religious principles of the Orthodox they have abandoned the “blessings of civilization.” And if they are not civilized, then they become savages who know nothing of science, do not understand how to act properly, and are not Christian. *The Friend* strips them of their heritage as members of the Western intellectual and religious tradition, presenting the Hicksites as wholly worldly; completely devoid of any spiritual guidance they know only the physical world just as savages, as they were conceptualized in the nineteenth-century, know nothing of the Christian god and live as one with nature.

It is while in this state that *The Friend* accuses Hicksites of performing their worst atrocities. The journal includes many accounts of Hicksites “violently taking possession” (*Friend*, 143) of meeting houses during monthly and quarterly meetings. The following is a standard account:

“The followers of E. H. had generally gone out [of the meeting house], but in a few minutes they rushed into the house again, in a very rude manner; standing up, some on the benches, and others on the floor, and laughing and talking aloud, in derision of the Friends who were quietly sitting there…one of [the Hicksites] stepped up into the gallery, to two Friends who were sitting quietly there, and throwing out his arms towards them, exclaimed twice, ‘Here’s ranterism for you!’…While this scene was acting within doors, the minister and another party were actively engaged without. They shut the window shutters with violence…in order to darken the house…Friends rose now to withdraw, and as they left the house, the crowd at the door opened a passage for them, saluting almost every one with some epithet of derision or insult, as he passed through their ranks…One of the former accosted a ministering Friend, by declaring, with great vehemence, ‘Thee has got no principle in thee’…When the women withdrew from the house several men followed them out, and behaved in a very uncivil manner” (*Friend*, 144).

The destruction of property, disrespect for a place of worship, verbal and sometimes physical abuse, and the disregard for women—the Hicksites are depicted as a mob devoid
of any decency, and the journal spares no detail from the reader. The hope is to pierce any image the Hicksites may have been cultivating of themselves as Quakerly by depicting them as predators. As it states in the “Prospectus,” the truth may be painful and ugly, but it is The Friend’s duty to print it. The journal posts the Hicksites’ actions for all to see to hold them accountable to the readership for what they have done.

The ways in which The Friend differentiates between Orthodox and Hicksite Quakers in articles that describe violent occupations reinforce the cultivated images of each group. The Hicksites profane the site of Quaker worship by standing on benches and laughing, while the Orthodox remain quietly seated even as taunts are thrown in their faces. The Orthodox never respond, not while running the gauntlet of derision, or even when the Hicksites inappropriately chased Orthodox women. They maintained their Quaker values of stoicism and rationality in the worst of situations. “Prosperity will do justice to the motives and the conduct of the men who thus braved the storm of popular prejudice” (Friend, 183). The Orthodox individuals in this situation remained Quaker because they maintained the outward appearance and manner of Quakerism. They stood firm, with truth by their side, in the face of the savage mob.

The Friend has a theory for the origin of this extreme Hicksite fanatacism. It adds another wrinkle to the conflagration of the Hicksites with worldly literature. Some Hicksites have, in addition to “antichristian notions a strong personal veneration, nay I may say idolatry, for Elias Hicks” (Friend, 253). The Friend accuses these Hicksites, which it insinuates are of the “determined” camp, of placing Hicks on the level of Jesus himself. Rousseau, whom The Friend thinks represents the epitome of worldly confusion, also equated man with god. The accusation of idolatry puts the Hicksites in
his camp and makes each complicit in the other’s crimes. The Hicksites now appear to
deny god completely and instead worship man, and Rousseau’s atheist rationality
becomes tainted by the extreme emotionalism of the Hicksites. Both owe their states to a
dearth of spiritual understanding.

For all their reports of rowdy Hicksites, *The Friend* must be given some credit for
being honest with their belief of the outer reflection of inner states. Telling the story of
the quiet, uneventful, and orderly separation of a Quarterly Meeting in Indiana, the same
article that describes the schism in Ohio says that, “it gives us pleasure to record one
instance of such becoming moderation on the part of the new sect, and we trust that those
persons who thus evinced their regard to justice and order, will continue to demean
themselves in a manner so credible to themselves” (*Friend*, 392). By acting thusly these
Hicksites demonstrated a respect for “justice and order.” In the eyes of *The Friend* those
Hicksites are a credit to the whole group because they are Quakerly; the moderation of
these individuals is “becoming” in the pure and simple fashion of the Orthodox. The
journal acknowledges that they still have classic Hicksite thoughts, but they do not seem
to concern the editors in the same way that the Hicksites from Ohio do. They are no
longer a threat because their appearance and mannerisms are like those of the Orthodox.
That is enough to calm the fear and disgust of *The Friend*.

The main reason, according to the journal, for the existence of “infatuated”
Hicksites is a lack of verifiable information and the presence of false testimony
masquerading as it. Thus the editors make known their belief that “many of the evils
under which the society now suffers, have arisen from ignorance of our true principles,
on the part of many of those who have left our communion” (*F-Prospectus*, 2). They will
use the journal to “endeavor to illustrate, according to our ability, the genius and history of our society. Extracts from, and reviews of the writings of Friends, whether of early or modern date; and dispassionate expositions of the great principles involved in the present controversy, will be frequently and freely given” (F-Prospectus, 2). *The Friend* plans to print pure Quaker literature inspired by spiritual understanding. This, they assume, will be sufficient to make “infatuated” Hicksites realize their seduction, and when seen in comparison to the works of the Hicksites, prove them to be forgeries.

Like with Hicks, *The Friend* seems to have given up hope for “determined” Hicksites. The only course left open is to refute them in order to reduce the amount of harm they can do to the Society. “The cause of sound principles has sustained a loss for want of a means of refuting calumny, exposing sophistry, and correcting misstatements” (F-Prospectus, 2). The Orthodoxy was hurt by the accusations of these uncontainable miscreants, who maliciously slander them while remaining behind the protection of their sophist mask. The editors are confident, though, that “a character of fairness and fidelity, that shall give authority to [the journal’s] statements, and enable it to allay much of the irritation which rumour [sic] and calumny are sure to excite” (F-Prospectus, 2), will pin down these elusive Hicksites and force them to respond to the allegations of the truth. Once their power to confuse and offend is dissolved, when “the veil is taken off, and every thing brought clearly to view, we have a humble, and we trust well-grounded hope that (with the divine blessing) our Society will again put on her beautiful garments, and rejoice in that crucified and risen Savior whose blessed name and offices have been so irreverently despised and denied” (*Friend*, 253). *The Friend*’s ultimate mission, this quotation reveals, is not just to distinguish pure from impure. The journal seeks to purify
Quakerism through the schism by separating its worldly elements from the religious ones. It is a holy project whose final goal is to cloth Quakerism in “beautiful garments,” refined products of craftsmanship that can only be created in civilized cultures. The journal seeks to create religious civilization by casting off the worldly and those corrupted by it.

What accounts for *The Friend*’s use of the worldly and the spiritual? There are two driving forces—frustration and fear. The Orthodox were frustrated because the Hicksites mocked their authority and disregarded all-important Quaker tradition. They were fearful of the repercussions these actions would have on the Quaker reputation in the greater world.

Orthodox frustration came from the Hicksites, who presented “what seemed a fundamental challenge to the faith” (Barbour, 175). This was no minor disagreement—to the Orthodox, these individuals were using the name “Quaker” while disregarding all its laws and ideals. A passage from *The Friend* echoes this sentiment: “Elias Hicks carried with him the sanction and approbation of his own monthly and quarterly meetings; the presumption therefore, under the discipline, must be that all was right with him. The framers of the code never supposed, no legislator *can* suppose, that the laws which he establishes will be abandoned by a *whole people*” (*Friend*, 96). The unprecedented events of this schism were more than most Orthodox could handle. To make matters worse, “because Hicks insisted on the need for harmony and for the autonomy of the Light, his opponents seemed to many to be advocating thought control and denying freedom of worship when they claimed only to be defending Christianity” (Barbour,
Suddenly the Orthodox became the oppressors whereas they considered themselves to be the only individuals with spiritual understanding, the example to the world.

*The Friend* tells of Hicksites appealing to the popular perception of the greater world to the benefit of their cause: “the separatists, in the origin of this difficulty, foresaw the use which might be made of these circumstances in exciting the popular feeling by the cry of persecution” (*Friend*, 312). *The Friend* fights the Hicksite effort to cultivate a general conception of themselves as persecuted by telling story after story of inappropriate Hicksite actions against the Orthodox. The journal believes that it is in fact the Orthodox who are persecuted, not the other way around. It is another example of the deceptive theatrics of the Hicksites, that they would scheme, that they “foresaw the use,” in cultivating an image of themselves as persecuted when in fact they were the aggressors. The Hicksites also ignored the authority of the elders by going over their heads and addressing the greater world directly, rather than through the carefully maintained channels that already existed.

The Orthodox did indeed create broader powers for elders during the 1820’s to respond to the growing dissention. In Philadelphia the elders “shifted from using the Discipline for morals to using it for theology” (Barbour, 176). Clothing, language, manners—these had all been heavily regulated by the discipline throughout the eighteenth-century. Now, the elders became “guardians of the theological opinions of those who spoke in Meetings for worship” (Forbush, 221). This allowed them to rebuke and disown Hicksites and deny Hicks entry into meetings under their care. But it also gave rise to those conceptions of the Orthodox as draconian inquisitors. Thus *The Friend* seems compelled to defend the rights of the elders to administer the discipline.
example, in “The Elders of Philadelphia and Elias Hicks,” Jennings asserts that elders had the right to judge Hicks and his theological assertions. He appeals to the text of the discipline and interprets its statements in defense of the elders, finally concluding that the discipline, “clearly show that one of the most important of [the elder’s] duties, is to keep a guard and watch over the ministry. … A minister traveling in the service of the gospel, becomes the object of care and concern to the elders of the meeting he visits” (Friend, 95). In the journal there is a strong and persistent need to prove the validity of Orthodox actions, to show that they are within their rights to act as they did. Nonetheless Hicks ignored their claims and refused to acknowledge them, standing by his own declaration of legitimacy. This rebuttal must have been infuriating to an Orthodoxy with power they felt was grounded in almost two hundred years of tradition. Hicks just brushed the elders away; his sense of mandate nullified that of the elders. Authority was all the Orthodox had—numbers were against them. Hicks’s dismissive manner rendered the Orthodox helpless, and their fear was that as went Hicks, so would his followers.

Not only did the Hicksites allegedly persecute the Orthodox, the journal claims that they also frequently broke the rules of the discipline while professing to follow them to the letter. The following is a typical example of the allegations made by the journal. Minutes were an important tool to Quakers, who were hampered by distance and slow communication. Traveling Friends in good standing would receive minutes from their home meetings confirming their identity and status. This assured those they visited of their soundness. Concerning the minute that Hicks carried from his home meeting in Jericho, The Friend states, “the certificate and endorsement cannot, therefore, be considered as valid, inasmuch as the above cited rule of discipline, and the established
usage of the yearly meeting, have been disregarded” (*Friend*, 300). The thrust of the journal’s argument is that the Hicksites forced this minute through its meeting of origin, and that to do so they had to ignore the rules of order in the discipline to silence the dissenting voices of Orthodox there. *The Friend* repeatedly insinuates, while discussing these situations, that the Hicksites would not be able to accomplish anything if they stood by the traditions of the discipline. According to the journal they needed to ignore the “established usage” because their lies could not overcome their small numbers and the presence of prescient Orthodox. The Hicksites thus had to usurp authority from the process to which it rightfully belonged. They abandoned the tradition which gave Quakerism its distinctiveness in order to further their cause. Conversely, the legal fidelity of the Orthodox is almost as frequently reiterated. Despite the injustices they suffered at the hands of the Hicksites, the Orthodox therefore never broke the rules of their religion or of common decency. The journal sees the Orthodox as the defenders of tradition, and the Hicksites as its destroyers.

Moreover, *The Friend* holds Hicks and the Hicksites ultimately responsible for the schism. “The reader cannot fail to remark the utter unsoundness of E. Hick’s [sic] doctrines as exhibited in the narrative, and that he himself was perfectly aware, that he would produce a schism, and was determined at all hazards to maintain his opinions, and risk the consequences” (*Friend*, 77-78). The journal appeals to its readers, endeavoring to ensure that they understand that the Orthodox were merely responding as best they could to the entirely unreasonable actions of Hicks and his followers. They are the ones with an agenda, Jennings wants his readers to see, not the Orthodox.
The second account for the language in *The Friend* emerges from the first. The editors seem to fear that the reputation of the Society will be tarnished by the scandals of the schism. This reputation was very important to Quakers given the conception they held of their role in society. The “Prospectus” states that “we shall study to infuse into [The Friend] the mild and liberal spirit of our peculiar institutions, and to take from the most scrupulous mind all just cause of distrust respecting the practical tendency of our labors” (F-Prospectus, 2). Part of *The Friend*’s mission, then, is to assure “scrupulous” minds of the “practical tendency” of the Quaker religion. Orthodox Quakerism wanted “a more enlarged and exemplary career of usefulness” (*Friend*, 183). They desired to become a strong force in the sphere of humanitarian work. The Orthodox sought to strengthen their ties to evangelical social organizations, by proving their “practical tendency.” Thus the Orthodox had much to lose from the disruption caused by the schism. The Hicksites could make the whole Society look bad and provide fuel to critics who believed the Quaker project was unsustainable. The urbane Orthodox were well aware of the power of the greater world, and desired to be held in high esteem. It was therefore important that *The Friend* produce the Orthodox version of events so that they could present a positive and functional religious vision to the world.

An examination of the expulsion of some Orthodox from a meeting house at the hands of the Hicksites highlights the Orthodox concern for their reputation. *The Friend* concludes that, “being acted in the open face of day, under the observation of the inhabitants of a large village, and in a thickly settled country;—the [sic] reputation of our religious Society imperiously demanded that a strict, legal investigation should take place, in order that the odium of might be placed where it justly belonged” (*Friend*, 392).
The fear that Hicksites could, in front of an audience, ruin the Quakers’ sterling reputation is evident in this quotation. Non-Quakers would have no idea that the Hicksites and Orthodox were two opposing groups. They would merely see a mess of rowdy Friends. That is why the calm Hicksites of Indiana are acceptable to *The Friend*. They are not likely to tarnish the Quaker reputation. The Orthodox were desperate that the truth be revealed so that the Hicksites could be held responsible as Hicksites and not as Quakers. *The Friend* meant to do just that. It separated the Hicksites theologically from the Orthodox, but more importantly it divided them socially.

Orthodox frustration and fear for their reputation were certainly major forces behind the publication of *The Friend*, but one can discern that the editors were terrified of Hicks as well. One article states that those individuals best suited to provide a “barrier” against the Hicksites are “men of mature and ripened intellect; neither exposed, in the exercise of their functions, to the intoxicating influence of popular applause, nor to the deceitful workings of a heated mind” (*Friend*, 183). Here again can be found the Orthodox ideal of the male, rational, mature and stoic Quaker. But a fear is present as well. These men, despite their clear understanding of the spiritual, need to be insulated from the emotional excesses of pride that come from worldly endeavors and the seductive discourses of Hicks. Even the champions of Orthodoxy are, then, susceptible to H Hicksite philosophy. And if they are, so are all Orthodox. The Hicksites are dangerous because they used to be exactly like the Orthodox, showing that anyone can leave the fold and become a Hicksite. That is why the journal seeks to expose them. It tries to strip the Hicksites of the tools by which they seduce Orthodox Quakers. Even though they claim
that the truth needs no endorsement, *The Friend* constantly reiterates “true” versions of events, and “true” testimonies about the nature of Quakerism. It does this because the truth for the Orthodox is being effectively challenged by the Hicksites. Most importantly, the language used by *The Friend* to make their defense does not just expose and refute the Hicksites. It is the Orthodoxy’s greatest weapon—a vocabulary known by all Quakers that separates everything into two opposing ways of being—and *The Friend* turns it against the Hicksites. It shows them as worldly, emotional and deceptive, as having abandoned the all-important plain life and the ideals of Christianity. It portrays them as non-Quakers. This allows the journal to make the Hicksites the guilty aggressors in schism. Once the Hicksites are the separating sect, the Orthodox become the religious Quaker establishment, gently endeavoring to create civilization in the world. The placement by *The Friend* of the Hicksites in the religious-worldly binary gives the Orthodox the ability to discredit them and separate them from Quakerism. The language of the worldly and the religious turns the schism into a holy project whereby the Society is purged of blasphemous elements so that it can be regenerated, restored, and “again put on her beautiful garments.”

This paper’s focus is the Orthodoxy’s version of events, their spin on the schism, and they way *The Friend* created and manipulated that understanding. Yet the Hicksites were not voiceless. They too published a journal, titled *The Friend: or, Advocate of Truth*, which began its run in January, 1828. In the “Introduction” of the first issue its
editors recognize the similarity in name between the Orthodox and Hicksite journals, but claim that they had declared their title via prospectus before the publication of *The Friend*, and indeed that “ten days later, a new periodical made its appearance, entitled ‘*The Friend,∗’ evidently intended to forestall the work which I had proposed.”\(^{12}\) While the editors acknowledge the congruence between the journals’ titles they insist that *The Advocate* is completely antithetical to *The Friend*. They saw that journal as “a work…under the same name which we announced, and from the same place, but at a different price, and of entirely different character and pretensions in every particular” (*Advocate*, 3). And yet, despite their adamant assertions, *The Advocate* shares much in common with *The Friend*. It uses many of the same assumptions, and very similar language to *The Friend* to discredit the Orthodox.

In the “Introduction” *The Advocate* pokes fun at *The Friend*, saying that,

“This work will not, like some of its contemporaries, aspire at the occupancy of unlimited space; nor is it proposed to revolutionize the literary taste of the age…It will not attempt to re-adjust, or fix with greater precision the boundaries of the solar system. The compositions of Addison, Swift, Pope, Goldsmith, and others of ‘the old English school,’ must be passed over in silence as foreign to our object” (*Advocate*, 2).

The journal’s claims to spatial frugality must be taken with a grain of salt, for though it was issued monthly instead of weekly like *The Friend*, it ranged in size from sixteen to forty pages per issue, two to five times longer than its competitor. The editors held true to their promise to avoid the quoted subjects, which they recited almost verbatim from *The Friend*’s “Prospectus.” These were topics that *The Friend* lauded. *The Advocate* means to avoid them because, as its sarcastic tone indicates, it felt that they were

\(^{12}\) *The Friend: or, Advocate of Truth*; v1, no1, (1828), 2-3. All future references to this text shall be as such: (*Advocate*, __).
The editors saw their pages best filled with material more serious and consequential. The “pyramids and catacombs of Egypt” (*Advocate*, 2), were not important compared to the religious issues of the day. Just as *The Friend* associated Hicksites with the “tastes of the age,” so did *The Advocate* ridicule that which the Orthodox found pure.

*The Advocate* dedicated the vast majority of its pages to “testimonies” concerning to life and work of Hicks, accounts of Orthodox bigotry and unfairness, critiques of Orthodox writers, and reprints of Hicksite meeting epistles. One final section of *The Advocate* is of particular interest; it was called “Misstatements Corrected,” and its sole purpose was to refute claims made in *The Friend*. All of these furthered the “primary object of this publication, to illustrate the character and principles of the Society of Friends” (*Advocate*, 1-2). The editors represent themselves in the journal as Quakers, rather than a splintered group, in exactly the same way that the Orthodox saw themselves.

The editors also envisioned their role as that of a champion, defending the “Infallible Principle” of Quakerism by printing, like *The Friend*, the truth: “convinced that truth needs no foreign aid—that its own weapons are its best defence [sic], we design that our Friend, its advocate, shall be at all times characterized by ‘speaking the truth in love’” (*Advocate*, 2). The journal is the truth’s “advocate” in name and mission. Like the Orthodox, the Hicksites claim that the truth can speak for itself, and that their publication is merely a vehicle for it to do so. Once its power is open for all to read, Quakerism will be “rightly understood” (*Advocate*, 2) and the divisions occurring in the schism will heal.

Finally, the way in which *The Advocate* describes those responsible for the schism corresponds to the descriptions of worldly individuals found in *The Friend*. 
“Thus showing to the world, that the discord and animosity, which are tarnishing the long established character of this hitherto peaceful community, and lacerating the breasts of its worthy members, are not indigenous, but poisonous exotics—tares from the hand of the enemy, which have threatened by their exuberance the destruction of those native fruits of the spirit, which once characterized the Society of Friends” (Advocate, 1).

The actions of the “enemy” to Quakerism act like tares, weeds in the garden of the spirit. Like the spectral image of Hicks as a seducer, they are “exotic,” foreign elements entering this new domain to seek out and destroy the carefully cultivated “native fruits” of the “worthy members” of the community. The method they use in “lacerating the breasts” is their “exuberance,” much like the passions of the worldly Hicksites in The Friend, which physically harm Orthodox during meetinghouse occupations and spiritually mislead them by drawing them away from the religious.

Moreover, one can detect an awareness on the part of the editors of their reputation: “thus showing to the world, that the discord and animosity, which are tarnishing the long established character of this hitherto peaceful community.” Like the Orthodox, the Hicksites seem concerned that their reputation will be tarnished in the eyes of the world by the “discord and animosity” of the schism. All in all, The Advocate parallels The Friend in several ways—it shows a distain for frivolity, a desire to restore Quakerism through the publication of the plain truth, a tendency to characterize those responsible for the schism as foreign and emotional, and an awareness of the Quaker reputation.

So, in the end, what can be distilled from the actions of The Friend? For an answer, a return to the Western District Burial Ground is in order. Concerning the very
unfriendly events which took place there, *The Friend* says much, including this: “In the first place, we wish our readers to be aware, that the attempt of the separatists to possess themselves of the burial ground is a part of the system they have been uniformly pursuing” (*Friend*, 312). This system mentioned above is that Hicksite creation which incited popular feeling against the Orthodox. This quotation shows that *The Friend* distanced itself so far from the Hicksites that it could not see an attempt to bury a child as anything but a publicity act, part of a larger Hicksite plot to destroy Quakerism. For this, as well as the arrest of the Hicksite burial party at the behest of an Orthodox elder, to occur, the Orthodox must have completely separated themselves religiously from the Hicksites. *The Friend* is powerful because its use of language was an important part of that separation. By condemning the Hicksites as worldly, while putting the Orthodox on the pedestal of the religious, the journal absolves itself and its readership of any responsibilities towards their former brethren. Once they became worldly the Hicksites could never be cured—they were lost causes that needed to be cut off from everything Quaker before they could become an embarrassment to the Society or even harm it further by seducing more members. Just like that, *The Friend* turned the Hicksites into the “other,” a menace to all that was “pure” in the world. That is how the Orthodox could have them arrested, that is how Orthodox principals could expel Hicksite children from Quaker schools, that is how the elders could disown hundreds of individuals on the slightest suspicion that they sympathized with Hicks and his followers, ripping families apart in the process. *The Friend* is important because it allowed the Orthodox to act in ways they would not otherwise by making the Hicksites a dangerous threat. It enabled the Orthodox to see themselves not as closed off to differing views but as defenders of
the faith and builders of civilization. By treating the Hicksites so harshly they were purifying the Society of the worldly. And this is just one instance in which one religious group does this to another. The are many reasons why religions create stereotypes and scapegoats and *The Friend* does not encapsulate all of them, but it is one example of how that process occurs, and of its very real ramifications.
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