

never saw Him. If I had lived when He did, or He now; if I could really see and know Him I suppose I should love Him, of course. But I don't see how I can very well love a person that lived nineteen hundred years ago."

Is this a better spirit than would be evinced by the hearty Presbyterian reply, "Love my Saviour? yes, indeed I do. Was not His precious blood shed for me? Ten life-times of loving service could never repay His mercy to me a sinner. Works are useless; I simply trust in His sacrifice?"

Our profession is not below that of the Evangelical churches. It *has* something to offer quite as good as this; but how many of our members can define it? I wish that some of them would write replies, and that the *Intelligencer* would publish the clearest and most concise that may be sent us. I should be more than pleased to learn the candid views of intelligent and whole-hearted Friends upon this question through your columns. It is vital.

A.

WHAT THE FAITH OF FRIENDS OFFERS.

The motive of the religion outlined by "A." in the "Query," is the *wrath* of God. "Love for Jesus" cannot be the motive, for, from the statement of the creed, He is loved because "*He died for you*" that "*you might be saved from pain.*" However we may put this doctrine, it represents a *wrathful* God, whose vengeance was appeased only by the sacrifice, as the statement puts it, "of a pure and perfect being."

This is not the groundwork of the religion of Friends, nor, as says the respondent, "R.," is it any part of the teaching of Jesus himself. Jesus was born in an eminently religious nation. No people could be more punctilious, more rigid in their religious observances; but theirs was a religion of tradition, of fear, and not of affection. The motive of their religion was a

similar motive of that expressed in the Orthodox creed—the reconciliation of an outraged Deity.

Mark how different the teaching of Jesus! His was indeed a new doctrine, *fc.* He iterated and reiterated the thought of a *loving Father*. The expression was almost original with Jesus. It is true that the Psalmist had before compared the Lord to a father that "pitieth his children," and Isaiah had said that "his name shall be called the everlasting Father," but nowhere in the Scripture history, antecedent to the teaching of Jesus, was the relationship of God to man significantly set forth as that of a loving Father. Read the sermon on the Mount, and note how Jesus dwelt upon this thought. "Your Father,"—"Your Heavenly Father,"—"Your Father in Heaven,"—"Thy Father,"—twelve times thus addressing them in this one discourse, once associating Himself with His audience in the expression "My Father in Heaven." Can anyone fail to realize the import of this message that should take away the *fear* of a *wrathful God*, and substitute a *love* for a Divine *Father*? Or can anyone fail to note the significance of His more frequent use of the words "your Father" than of "My Father," classing Himself with His hearers, by the latter expression, under the universal Fatherhood, and into the universal brotherhood, but by the former often-repeated expression, emphasizing the application to them, because *they* most needed the lesson: He whom you must serve and love is "*your Father in Heaven.*" Friends accept this teaching of Jesus, and the only motive of their religion is the *love* of the Divine Father and *that* "love casteth out all fear."

It is impossible for the writer to conceive a condition of happiness arising from the contemplation that "a pure and perfect" being died for him, to save *him* from the just punishment of his own wickedness; the doctrine is