

THIS IS YOUR HALO, LADIES.

[One London dealer in birds received, while the fashion was at its height, a single consignment of 32,000 dead humming birds and another received at one time 30,000 aquatic birds and 3,000 pairs of wings.]

Think what a price to pay,
Faces so bright and gay,
Just for a hat !

Flowers unvisited, mornings unsung.
Sea ranges bare of the wings that o'er swung,
Bared just for that !

Think of the others, too,
Others and mothers, too.

Bright eyes in hats !
Hear you no mother groans floating in the air,
Hear you no little moan—birdlings despair
Somewhere—for that ?

Oh, but the shame of it !
Oh, but the blame of it—

Price of a hat !
Just for a jauntiness, brightening the street,
This is your halo, O faces so sweet—

Death, and for that !

—[Faith and Works.

PLAIN LANGUAGE.

Among our vital testimonies there is no one against which our members offend more than that referring to plain language. This is more noticeable, if not more true, in our ministry than elsewhere. Of course if the phrase "plain language" refers only to a few personal pronouns this charge cannot be made good ; but I think most intelligent Friends will agree that it means other than this and far more. If language is intended to convey truth from mind to mind, then that language is plain which conveys it best. Is it the custom among Friends in the ministry to use that language which conveys their thoughts best ? And if we must answer no, as in most cases we must, is not this testimony wounded in the very citadel of its friends ? While we as a Society have a truth to teach which differs from, and in many points flatly contradicts current theology, the same

words are used and in the same connection in gallery and pulpit. It may be, indeed it certainly is, true our meaning is different ; that they and not we have perverted the language. Be it so. The fact remains that the language is perverted, and we should recognize the fact. That another and not we has turned our plowshare into a sword is no reason for using the latter in agriculture. It seems to me that we have no right to express belief in the "divinity of Jesus Christ." * Such expression has a well defined technical meaning, which is not our meaning. The average man would never understand from that form of words the idea in the mind of the speaker. Insistence on a form of speech from which the life is departed is the merest idolatry.

We should avoid as far as may be the technique of the evangelical churches. Its use tends to obliterate the boundaries between them and ourselves, which it is our duty to keep as distinct as possible, unless, indeed, it should appear that they and we are on the same ground, in which case we should go over to them without delay. If, on the other hand, our religion is one of life and work and not of belief, let us use the words of life and work, leaving the phrases of councils and church history to those whose religion is made of councils and church history. Forcing, as many do, our new wine into these old receptacles for thought only destroys the vessel and spills the wine. Those who hear think we mean the old when we mean the new ; thinking we sow wheat, we sow only chaff.

The disuse of the phrases of theology will by no means deprive us of the strength of Biblical expression, for the essentials of theology are by no means the essentials of the Bible. The Trinity is unheard of in the words of Jesus and His disciples. The subject of the atonement in its theological sense and all the references thereto would not crowd half a page. Original sin and the divinity of Christ with all their references could be left out of the New