Convincement of young Friends in the nineteenth century

Jonathan Pyle

29/IV/1999

To convince their children to become Friends, Quaker parents in the nineteenth century had to do more than "[b]e patterns, be examples."[1] Young Friends were likely to marry out of unity, due to many factors including the scarcity of Quaker mates, the social costs of maintaining Quaker testimonies, and the repressive nature of Quaker social control. Parents and meetings secluded and shielded their children until adulthood from the "temptations" of the non-Quaker world. During the nineteenth century, however, Friends gradually replaced or augmented coercive practices of behavior control and indoctrination with more indirect methods of moral inculcation. The development of such methods appears to be influenced not only by a rising liberalism, but by the particular circumstances of the Hicksite and Orthodox sects.

Religious education before the middle of the eighteenth century was not gentle. Quaker parents did not merely encourage their children to have religious experiences. That the religion was noncredal did not mean there was no information to be learned. Even George Fox wrote a catechism for children. But the primary mode of acculturation was immersion. Children, presumed to be Quaker by "birthright," had to sit with their parents through four hours of silent meeting every first day.[2] Quakers tried not to acknowledge that children had a different level of intelligence or sensibility, and instead expected children to act like adults as soon as possible. From parents and from meeting, children got the full dose of talk about sin.[3]

After 1760, however, Quakers became more sentimental about children, and religious education became less severe. They began to write catechisms in a more motherly style, drawing upon obedience to parents instead of obedience to God. Rather than expecting their children to act like adults, they now treated childhood as a special stage. Rather than teaching children to avoid evil solely by instilling in them a heavy sense of guilt, they wanted to preserve what they thought was children's natural innocence by shielding them from knowledge of the existence of evil. Although teaching became lighter on doctrine,

[1] George Fox, *Journal* in *Quaker Spirituality: Selected Writings,* ed. Douglas Steere (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1984), 93.

[2] J. William Frost, *The Quaker family in colonial America; a portrait of the Society of Friends* (New York: St. Martin's, 1973), 79.

[3] *Ibid.,* 80, 84. There were reports of children spontaneously bursting into tears when they contemplated their sin.

shielding required heavier social controls. Habits of dress and speech were more rigorously enforced, and freedom of association with non-Quakers was curtailed. The family, more than the meeting or the school, was the primary agent of Quaker socialization.

In the beginning of the nineteenth century, parents gave more responsibility to to the Quaker schools for religious education. From the beginning, of course, Friends had established public primary schools like Penn Charter to teach not just the basics, but also to instill piety and virtue in children. As Quakers lost cultural dominance and dispersed from urban centers, they created private secondary boarding schools in which to protect their children from the evils of the world. Since they wanted to give Quaker children a "guarded, religious, and useful education," these boarding schools performed the functions of seclusion, ideological transmission, and practical training.[4] Westtown, established in 1797 on a 600 acre farm, was a total institution, where boys and girls, who were kept rigidly separate, lived in spartan conditions and studied essential subjects like grammar and mathematics.[5] Teachers maintained discipline with corporal punishment, not by successfully causing the students to internalize feelings of guilt at wrongdoing. Westtown had a fair share of mischievous boys, and endured several instances of mass disobedience.

Doctrinal education was originally the responsibility of parents, and catechisms were designed for families. But by the 1820's Westtown's students were coming from homes where they were not even required to say "thee" and "thou," and the school began to augment scripture reading at Collection with curricular Bible study. Like other subjects at the school, Bible lessons were taught by rote.[6]

The style of catechisms began to change early in the century, but slowly. Friends designed new catechisms for the use of families and schools which recognized that children could not understand scripture and sin, but could understand concepts like comfort and naughtiness[7] Yet well into the century teachers at Westtown taught Quakerism with Barclay's *Catechism,* Bevan's Brief View (1810) and Murray's *Compendium of Religious Faith and Practice* (1815) all of which centered on scripture.[8] Friends continually reprinted Robert Barclay's 1673 catechism, and in the first eight years of the century republished Samuel Fuller's 1733 and Abiah Darby's 1763 childrens' catechism; early in the century there was a high degree of continuity in religious education. In 1822 Friends published a pamphlet of "selections affectionately addressed to young persons . . . containing Lindley Murray's advice, T. Wilkinson's verse on J. Parnel, T. Raylton and J. Churchman's religious experience, whilst in early life," written in the eighteenth century Quaker style of confessional journal writing. Even though attitudes toward childhood were changing, Quakers before the Separation continued to instill Quaker values in children with heavy doses of scripture and with telling the story, for example, of a

[4]William Dunlap, *Quaker education in Baltimore and Virginia Yearly meetings with an account of certain meetings of Delaware and the Eastern shore affiliated with Philadelphia: based on the manuscript sources* (Philadelphia: Science Press, 1936), 510–515.

[5]Helen Hole, *Westtown Through the Years: 1799–1942,* (Philadelphia: Lyon and Armor, 1942), 171. Quaker practices were rigidly enforced: you would be forced to sit at the "disgrace table" for accidentally saying "you," or reprimanded for wearing a light-colored dress (68, 166). The library banned all fiction (except *Pilgrim's Progress*), but allowed students to check out Fox's *Book of Martyrs* (74, 107).

[6]Hole, *supra* note 5 at 150, 221.

[7]Frost, *supra* note 2 at 85.

[8]Hole, *supra* note 5 at 152.

seventeenth century teenage Quaker martyr.[9]

The Separation of 1827 changed religious education dramatically. At Orthodox-dominated Westtown, students were forbidden to talk about the disunity in the Society, but ignoring the problem did not make it go away, since religious education was at the center of the conflict. Hicksites maintained that Quakerism meant something more than parroting scripture, but religious education at Westtown emphasized exactly that, and the conflict culminated in disaster, as sensationally described in a letter by an Orthodox Friend:

> the boys chiefly from twelve to fourteen years of age refused to comply with the rules of the School in reading the Scriptures. Every means was used by argument and persuasion to convince of the impropriety of the course they were pursuing, but they persisted, urging their right to freedom of opinion, calling the New Testament the *Pope's Book,* till they began to cut up their Bibles and burn the New Testament—when the teachers called a meeting of the Committee, who also used persuasion and argument, but all proving unavailing, a number of them were expelled from school.[10]

Westtown's enrollments plummeted after the separation, and the school reformed itself by reducing tuition and improving religious education. When enrollments were back up, the school officially excluded Hicksites.[11]

The Hicksites and the Orthodox developed different methods of religious education, in part because they had very different approaches to education in general. Edward Hicks derided high schools as elitist "nurseries of pride, indolence, and effeminency [sic],"[12] since the advanced subjects taught there were not immediately practical, but served to grow the mind, which was exactly what quietists wanted to diminish. The Orthodox at Westtown, however, gradually incorporated more and more subjects into the curriculum. By 1838, children could study Latin, Greek, algebra, geometry, and natural philosophy.[13] Living conditions grew less Spartan, but fiction and recreations remained banned until mid-century.[14] Thus, there was a growing Orthodox appreciation of knowledge for its own sake, and a softening of the curriculum, even as seclusion and coercion remained the dominant methods of teaching.

The Hicksites did not value seclusion and rote learning as much as the Orthodox. They created their own schools that enforced Quaker customs, but they were willing to allow their children to come into contact with Orthodox or non-Quaker teachers and classmates, and went easy on simple dress requirements.[15] Hicksites avoided making religious education part of school, since they wanted the schools to teach little more than the basics.[16] The Hicksites

[9] *Selections affectionately addressed to young persons of the Society of Friends: containing Lindley Murray's advice, T. Wilkinson's verse on J. Parnel, T. Raylton and J. Churchman's religious experience, whilst in early life* (Stockport: J. Lomax, 1822).

[10] Quoted in *supra* note 5 at 150.

[11] Margaret Hogan, "The Schoolhouse and the Schism," (History thesis, Swarthmore College, 1992), 121–23.

[12] *Ibid.,* 90–99

[13] Hole, *supra* note 5 at 171.

[14] *Ibid.,* 190, 173

[15] Hogan, *supra* note 11 at 121, 128.

[16] *Ibid.,* 137.

had a harder time starting schools than the Quakers, since the Orthodox kept most of the schools after the split, and Hicksite parents were more willing to send their children to public schools. Thus, at least until the Civil War, Hicksites had a set of educational values opposite to that of the Orthodox: they scorned the expanded curriculum, and relied less on seclusion and coercion.

Thus, there were great differences in opinion about the goal of education that would affect the differences between Hicksite and Orthodox religious education. But the separation itself had its own effect. Both sects of the Society were afraid of declining membership. The Orthodox, afraid that their members would be tempted by Hicksite ideas, moved to strengthen indoctrination. The Hicksites were afraid that their members would abandon Quakerism all together, so they tried to create schools that were comfortable and attractive in order to bring back straying Friends.[17]

A catechism published by Orthodox Friends in 1854 reflects not only Orthodox belief, but a particular way of introducing Quakerism. The first fourteen pages of questions are wholly about the Bible, and contain responses that most Protestants would have given about the origins of the Bible and the act of repentance. The first mention of the Society of Friends comes more than halfway through the 24 page booklet.[18] The questions about Quakerism ask the student to give the scriptural basis for Quaker practices, such as saying “thee” and “thou,” and dressing simply.[19] They do not ask about the Quaker faith, so that the catechism as a whole implies not that Quakerism is a separate religion, but that Quakers are Protestants who happen to have a few quirky practices. The catechism suggests that the Orthodox wanted their children to understand the Bible and observe Quaker practices, but not to think that their faith was different from that of other Protestants.

The redirection of focus away from Quaker ideological supremacy toward solidarity with Protestantism is seen also in *Aunt Jane's verses for children,* written in England but reprinted in Philadelphia in 1859 by the Association of Friends for the Diffusion of Religious and Useful Knowledge, an Orthodox publisher. The book contains long, dramatic odes to ancient Christian heroes, flowery descriptions of Emperor Hadrian, and biographies in verse of Reformation heroes like Bernard Gilpin. In part, the deemphasis on Quakerism might reflect what one historian finds to be the tendency of Evangelical Quakers in England to teach the core of religion in first day schools without Quakerism's particular tenets.[20] The interest in ancient Rome itself may reflect the resurgence of dead language studies at Westtown around this time.[21] Apparently the Orthodox publishers found celebrations of early Christianity and generalized Protestantism to constitute “Useful Knowledge,” even though

[17] *Ibid.,* 126.

[18] In a very similar catechism published five years earlier, the first question about Quakerism, “What is peculiar in the mode of worship in the Society of Friends?” appears on page 30 of a 35 page book. The last five pages read like an excerpt from a faith and practice book; the copy owned by the Friends' Historical Library contains a handwritten update of the answer to a question about Quakers' reasons for avoiding music. New York Yearly Meeting, *A catechism designed for the use of the schools and families of the Religious Society of Friends* (New York: Collins and Brother, 1849).

[19] *A catechism, explanatory of some of the principles and testimonies of the Society of Friends, for the instruction of its youthful members* (Philadelphia: Kite and Walton, 1854), 14–16.

[20] Elizabeth Isichei, *Victorian Quakers* (London: Oxford, 1970), 260.

[21] Hole, *supra* note 5 at 171.

they did not relate those subjects to Quaker belief or feeling.

A Hicksite book of "moral and religious stories" for children published in 1859 and owned for many years by the Swarthmore first day school, was premised quite differently.[22] In a preface, it explains,

> The mind is never too young to receive impressions; and if the simple beauty of scriptural texts could be made plain to childhood, we should not know of the repulsion felt by so many at being compelled to hear what had no definite meaning.

The Hicksites, perhaps, recognized such "repulsion" as one reason for the failure of traditional indoctrination methods to keep young Friends in the Society. Or, perhaps, they were criticizing the compulsive nature of Scriptural education that the Orthodox were giving at Westtown when the Hicksite boys ripped up their Bibles. Hicksites recognized that knowledge of the Bible was decreasing with each generation, and that some mode of doctrinal education was therefore necessary. But many Hicksites were suspicious of first day schools when they originated in the late 1860's, criticizing them as programmed "Bible classes."[23]

Their solution to these conflicts was to tell moral stories based on easy-to-remember Bible quotations, such as "blessed are the peacemakers" and "the meek shall inherit the earth." In "The Peacemakers," a girl sacrifices a sled in order to make peace between two fighting boys, and she is rewarded with popularity. She does so not because she feels the presence of a punishing God, nor because she wants to be popular, but because a selfless motivation for peacemaking, which she learned in a lesson like this one, arises spontaneously within her.[24]

The Hicksite lessons take advantage of an affinity between quietism and the innocence and imagination of childhood. In one poem,

> Little Mary stood by a "singing brook"
> And heard the brook sing "sweet, sweet, be sweet."
> Then Mary wondered what they meant,
> The pleasant words she heard;
> And she found the voice was in her heart
> And not in the flower or bird.[25]

and in another poem,

> Let me hear the gentle voices
> Ever whispering unto me;
> ever calling me from sinning,
> Bidding from the wrong to flee.[26]

[22] M. L. Willis, *Scripture illustrated by moral and religious stories: for little children* (New York: J. Tiffany, 1859).

[23] Horace Mather Lippincott, *Abington Friends meeting and school 1682–1949* (n.p. 1949), 55–56.

[24] Willis, *supra* note 22 at 18.

[25] *Ibid.,* 26.

[26] *Ibid.,* 44.

and in another story, a girl who goes too far into the woods hears a bird say "naughty girl, go home!"[27] The poems and stories seem intended to give young readers an embryonic concept of the divine light. Without mentioning God, the text teaches children to recognize God as the "voices," or thoughts that pop into their heads when they enjoy nature or wonder if they are misbehaving. The Hicksite stories are like the *Peanuts* comic strip in that adults are not present; the children exercise the responsibility of moral regulation of self and peers. The fact that the unreal voices are those of brooks and birds, rather than parents, suggests to the children that moral direction comes from out of the blue during experience, and not simply from remembering parental instructions.

The main goal of moral education in the Hicksite text is thought reform, not just behavior reform. In the stories, girls and boys alike are motivated by hope, not fear, to avoid "selfish" thoughts and seek "kind, loving" thoughts. Although the stories stress sacrifice and altruism, they imply that the rewards of such values are as good or better as the fruits of selfishness. The peacemaking girl wins popularity, and the meek boy inherits "industrious[ness]" and a nice house and garden.[28]

The Orthodox also wrote inspirational poems for children. A child-sized volume of *Devotional poetry for the children,* published in 1870, promotes the achievement value to a greater degree than the Hicksite poems.[29] While the pervading Hicksite metaphor for the human religious spirit was "the voices," the Orthodox metaphor was a "clock:"[30]

> Not set in gold, nor decked with gems,
> By wealth and pride possessed;
> But rich or poor or high or low
> Each bears it in his breast.[31]

The clock is a simple clock, and it respects no persons, yet it is the embodiment of the Protestant ethic, and will make the good Quaker rich. The ticking of the clock within the breast reminds Quaker boys not to lose time, unlike the "voice" that "was in her heart" which told the young girl to "be sweet." The poem continues, "and tho' we may waste many moments each day / He notices each that we squander away."[32] While birds in the Hicksite stories were valued for their voices, here the "early bird" is emulated for obeying the clock:

> I'll learn of thee, thou little bird,
> And slothful habits scorning,
> No longer sleep youth's dawn away,
> Nor waste life's precious morning.[33]

The exhortations to business are pervasive: "sit not down to useless dreaming,— / Labor is the sweetest joy."[34] A poem praising the beauties of morning glories asks, "what, if they

[27] *Ibid.,* 49
[28] *Ibid.,* 35.
[29] *Devotional poetry for children: 2d pt.* (Philadephia: Friends' Book Association, 1870).
[30] *Ibid.,* 5.
[31] *Ibid.,* 6.
[32] *Ibid.,* 7.
[33] *Ibid.,* 17.
[34] *Ibid.,* 41.

close at mid-day? 'Tis because / Their work is done."[35] Even the flowers have work to do. The 1854 Orthodox catechism, similarly, emphasized the Biblical injunction against being "slothful in business."[36] The emphasis on achievement in literature for children was nothing new, since it was prevalent in nineteenth century primers.[37] The Hicksites may have emphasized the work ethic less because they held a more romantic view of the child's capacity for religious devotion than the Orthodox.

The achievement ethic is entangled with the concept of God in these poems. God supplies the clock, counts our wasted minutes, and gives plants the strength they need as they strive to grow. Unlike in the Hicksite poems, where God was merely implied and moral direction came from inner voices, in these Orthodox poems children depend on and appeal directly to God for everything. Children pray "that God would please to give us power / To chase the naughty thought away,"[38] and even to "make me sorry for my fault."[39] The poems emphasize that will, even the will to avoid sin, should not stem from the self, but from God, and be channeled through the self. At the same time, they emphasize that children are capable of serving God and doing good, even though they are just children, by performing "little acts of kindness."[40] The dominant motivation for being good comes not spontaneous hope, as in the Hicksite stories, but from fear of loss of purity:

> The little sins and follies
> That lead the soul astray
> Leave stains, that tears of penitence
> May never wash away.[41]

The Hicksite poems also referred to the perceived innocence of children, but did not teach children guilt and fear about irreversible damage caused by "little sins."

Although the Hicksite text emphasized inner voices, and the Orthodox emphasized God, both strove to instill the gentleness of John Woolman, if not all of his ideology of quietism. The 1854 Orthodox catechism concludes with the values of mercy and kindness "to people and dumb animals,"[42] and the book of "devotional poetry" contains a poem unsubtly titled "DON'T KILL THE BIRDS," possibly inspired directly by Woolman's journal.[43] The Hicksite book contains a very similar story about the naughtiness of killing birds.[44] Behind all of its exhortations about the importance of industry, the Orthodox poetry book promotes compassion: "hearts there are oppressed and weary; / Drop the tear of sympathy."[45]

---

[35] *Ibid.,* 24.

[36] *Supra* note 19 at 23.

[37] Thomas Woody, *Early Quaker education in Pennsylvania* (New York: Columbia, 1920), 196–201. Friends schools in the late eighteenth century may have even used Franklin's *Primer,* as it was available in Philadelphia. But Quaker students also read journals of famous Quakers like Fox, Churchman, Edmundson, and Woolman, who did not emphasize the value of time.

[38] *Supra* note 29 at 22–23.

[39] *Ibid.,* 20.

[40] *Ibid.,* 34,44.

[41] *Ibid.,* 22. Later, "may innocence and purity / my clothing ever be" (49).

[42] *Supra* note 19 at 24.

[43] *Supra* note 29 at 43.

[44] Willis, *supra* note 22 at 19.

[45] *Supra* note 29 at 41.

Another Orthodox first day school textbook,from 1872, was premised on the notion that interest in natural history can increase the devotional spirit, without the intervention of Bible quotations.[46] From a story about a boy who enjoys observing birds building a nest in a bird house, students learn that "a happy home is the brightest spot on earth."[47] By observing that young chicks follow the mother chicken, students are expected to learn that they are bound by the natural order to obey their mother and Father.[48] Although the book begins with a poem entitled "Time" about time and its units, and praises the spider for being "industrious" and for having "a good trade," it does not promote industry as often as it exhorts children to think about those who are poor.[49] The poor provide the reason why the student should save his pennies and eat all of his supper. Although God the Creator and his "all-creative hand" are present in the lessons, the moral authority of religious doctrine is absent, and parents are frequently compared to God: "obedience to parents may be called a child's religion."[50] Like the volume of "devotional poetry" published two years earlier by the same publisher, the book's imperative tone teaches that moral knowledge comes directly from teachers and parents, not from discovery. The two books demonstrate that the Orthodox used the child's concept of God to teach about obedience and achievement, and vice versa.[51]

Both Hicksite and Orthodox used the natural world as a source of moral truth. The Hicksites taught children to experience nature and hear its moral lessons while acting as children romping through the forest. The Orthodox, however, thought that moral lessons could be derived from nature only by scientifically observing natural creatures, acquiring knowledge about them, and applying the premise that no creature is morally bad, but God created everything for a purpose.[52] The Orthodox, perhaps, inherited more of the eighteenth-century tradition of expecting children to emulate adults rather then follow their own ideas.

In 1867, Benjamin Hallowell published the *Young Friend's Manual,* explaining with rational arguments the general views of Hicksites.[53] The manual is written in the catechismal style, but the answers are only partially scriptural. The book is not as suited for young children as the rote catechisms and simplistic stories discussed above, since it spoke directly and somewhat objectively about Hicksite ideology, making intellectual distinctions between conscience and light, much like the present day Philadelphia *Faith and Practice.*[54] Hallowell stated his intention that the manual be used with children in first day schools, that "they

[46]Jane Johnson, *Primary lessons for first day schools* (Philadelphia: Book Association of Friends, 1872), 1.

[47]*Ibid.,* 17.

[48]*Ibid.,* 53.

[49]*Ibid.,* 6, 10, 15, 26.

[50]*Ibid.,* 18.

[51]The book acknowledges that children occasionally have moral inspirations, and suggests that in such cases "we should be very still and let the thought stay with us a little while," but at the same time it denegrates such inspirations as a "still small voice" that arises within the child not to help him or her resolve a moral amiguity, but rather to tell him or her what to do that day (9).

[52]*Ibid.,* 42.

[53]Benjamin Hallowell, *The young Friend's manual: containing a statement of some of the doctrines and testimonies of Friends, and of the principles of truth professed by that society* (Philadelphia: Baltimore Yearly Meeting, 1867).

[54]*Ibid.,* 53.

may grow up to" the "principles and testimonies" contained within.[55]

That Hallowell was willing to present children with the unabridged, unsimplified "long-standing opinions" of Hicksites,[56] rather than presenting a memorizable creed, a set of martyr stories, or a series of pleasant poems and fables, indicates a remarkable development in Quaker religious education. Assumptions about the natural sinfulness, innocence, or simplicity of young people did not drive Hallowell's presentation of Quaker doctrine. Children using his book likely perceived Quakerism to be complicated and unofficial, requiring an intellectual capacity to understand, even though Hallowell argued in the book that Quakerism deemphasizes intellect. They may have perceived that their elders respected their intelligence and free will.

The questions alone demonstrate to children a different conception of what was valuable in Quakerism. The first questions and the first forty pages contain questions about Quaker history, starting with George Fox. The questions then move to the ideology of Quakerism, asking, "what is the distinguising belief of Friends?"[57] and then explain in detail the concept of "this internal Word" called "light" with both qualitative and scriptural arguments.[58] Hallowell emphasizes not the importance of being Christian, nor the importance of Quakers' peculiar practices (which were prominent but declining in 1867) as did contemporary Orthodox, but rather the beliefs of Quakers. After discussing the "inward light," he introduces Protestantism during a comparison of Quakerism to primitive Christianity, and after that he discusses Quaker practices and testimonies on oaths, titles, and amusements.[59] He even includes a "suggestion that might aid a young person in getting the mind gathered in meeting, and performing acceptable worship."[60]

Benjamin Hallowell demonstrates how much religious education had changed in the 19th century. He had taught at Westtown for three years in the 1820's, where religious indoctrination, which entailed memorizing Bible passages, was less important than religious acculturation, which was achieved through strict rules and a closed environment.[61] Hallowell, a Hicksite who avoided using corporal punishment, left Westtown to teach at non-Quaker schools, though in his autobiography he praised Westtown's "system, regularity, and order that I loved."[62] In 1837, at a time when Westtown was introducing less severe religious education, Hallowell started his own not-exclusively-Quaker school, which taught Latin, Greek, and other subjects that Hicksites scorned, but no curricular moral education. He prohibited students from going to plays or circuses because, he wrote, "such things have a tendency to abstract the mind greatly from their studies,"[63] but his Yearly Meeting, Baltimore, gave the

[55] *Ibid.,* viii, xi.

[56] *Ibid.,* ix.

[57] *Ibid.,* 39. The answer is that every rational soul receives some manifestation of the spirit of God.

[58] *Ibid.,* 51.

[59] *Ibid.,* 100–120.

[60] He advises Friends to have an "earnest, heartfelt desire to love, please, and serve God," while "endeavor[ing] to let aspirations arise from the heart somewhat to the effect: 'Create in me a clean heart, oh God! And renew a right spirit within me. Wash me, and purify me, that I may be clean.'" His advice seems designed for all Friends, not just young Friends.

[61] Hole, *supra* note 5 at 124.

[62] Quoted in *supra* note 4 at 145.

[63] *Ibid.,* 154.

real, Quaker justification: that such amusements "lead away from that humility and obedience which are the true ornaments of the Christians."[64] By the 1860's, Hicksite Quakers, who had trouble creating their own schools, were stuck in the position of having to couch Quaker lessons in secular terms. Orthodox Quakers, more successful in maintaining exclusive schools, did not have to create books like Hallowell's, since they could teach young Friends about Quakerism as much in the schoolhouse as in the meetinghouse. Although Hallowell and the Hicksites may have had many reasons for introducing children to Quaker faith as well as practice in first day schools at an earlier age than the Orthodox, they could have done so solely because there was no other medium through which Hicksites could teach young Friends about the ideology of Quakerism before they grew up and had the opportunity to abandon the faith.

The Hicksites regained influence in education by embracing the liberalizing trend in education. By 1866 Edward Parrish could write a tract on *Education in the Society of Friends* presuming that his readers recognized the inherent worth of a liberal education.[65] When Swarthmore College decided to end its secondary school program, it started George School, one of whose first headmasters, Joseph Walton (1901–12), rejected both the coercive and protective values of Quaker education.[66]

By the end of the nineteenth century, both Hicksite and Orthodox sects began to treat children as tools of moral reform. Quakers issued tracts on the importance of teaching temperance in first day schools, calling education "the lever of enlightened progress."[67] In a New England Orthodox catechism of 1888,[68] the answers to questions consist of extremely brief segments of the Bible, so that students do not have to remember long passages, only important one-line phrases. After establishing the Trinity, the catechism mixed justifications for simple dress with injunctions against alcohol. Readers of this catechism may likely have perceived Quakerism to be first rooted in the text of the Bible, secondly spiritual (but not mystical), and thirdly distinctive only because of the maintenance of testimonies about peace and temperance. Children were not urged to be industrious or obey their parents, but expected instead to hold the correct beliefs and morals. That women took on the task of writing religious literature for children during the nineteenth century likely aided the influence of moral reform on Quaker indoctrination.

Most differences between the modes of religious education can be attributed to differences in the doctrine taught, or differences in the importance of doctrine in different time periods and sects. But there are significant differences that do not correlate particularly well with ideology or time. If the Hicksites and the Orthodox were equally capitalist, why did the Hicksites not emphasize the achievement motive in children's literature? If the Orthodox were vehemently opposed to the Hicksites, why did their literature not discourage excessive spirituality? And, even more interesting, did the Orthodox emphasis on Quakerism as a peculiar Protestantism, and the Hicksite emphasis on Quakerism as a religious orientation

[64] *Ibid.*, 515.

[65] Edward Parrish, *Education in the Society of Friends* 1866.

[66] Kingdon Swayne, *George School: the history of a Quaker community* (Philadelphia: Phil. Y. M., 1992).

[67] New York Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, "Temperance education in first day and other schools," in *New York Yearly Meeting Temperance Conference* (New York: John Jackson, 1885).

[68] Ruth Murray, *Catechism for the use of young Friends* (New York: Friends' Book and Tract Committee, 1888)

with its own history, account for the triumph of Hicksite liberalism over the Orthodox in the early twentieth century?