

is not so. Friends differ; only I am glad to say they mostly agree to differ. But this I can say, that it is the tendency of Friends' belief to put greater stress upon the human side of Jesus, acting under the immediate operations of the divine spirit, than other churches have done. And just here is where their strength should be found. If Christ is to be our example we want to know what he was as a man. If he is to be only our mediator, or even our redeemer, I can understand why Catholics flee to the virgin mother to intercede between them and Christ. It is only a higher phase of the same feeling which all men experience when they confront serious or difficult problems of life. In sickness they seek a physician; in business tangles they consult a man of the law, and in the solemn hour of judgment shall they not have an intercessor to plead for them? Therefore the Catholic prays to the mother spirit to soften the presumed austere of the Son.

George Macdonald, in one of his dramas, causes a dreaming monk to exclaim, while gazing upon a crucifix, "I see the man; I cannot find the God." But it is only a dreamer who would argue thus. When we see a man living a perfect life, a sinless life in a sinful world, doing good for evil, and that continually under every provocation, and even unto death, there is no trouble about finding the God. The divine nature fills Him, illuminates Him and shines through Him with the brightness of meridian splendor.

I have been using the two words, Jesus and Christ, as one and the same individual. I do not favor the idea of separating the two names and arguing from the point of their two different meanings. In my opinion this too much savors of quibbling with Scripture, an endless, useless, foolish, unprofitable task. Where there is anything in those pages which I cannot understand, or cannot accept, I am much better content to drop it than

try to force out of it some hidden, unfamiliar or unexpected meaning. There are passages in the Bible which may be and have been twisted to suit any opinion. But how infinitely more there are clear as the air we breathe, and which stamp it as the greatest and best book in the world; crystallized truths which shine through the clouds of error and which will remain undimmed and unchangeable throughout all the changes of principalities and powers. The name Jesus Christ belongs historically to one person, and there is no advantage in trying to divide it. It stands for a being who was both human and divine—human in suffering, divine in love. I think that explanation sufficiently covers the ground as I see it.

I sometimes love to turn to my own first childish conception of Him—that He was one who had lived very close to His Father in heaven, just as I was living close to my earthly father; that He possessed, even then, all the powers and faculties, and even the form, before appearing on the earth, that He afterwards revealed to the eyes of men; that His Father, at some period in the past, seeing how wicked the people were growing here on earth, had sent Him here to make them better, just as I fancied my father might possibly send me, when I grew up, far away from home, to do some good action or beneficent piece of work; that instead of men obeying Him and growing better, they grew worse and killed Him; that then His Father very tenderly took Him back home again to Himself, still in the same form and likeness as before He went away, and that He was still there in that glorious shining city of the eternal world, sitting always close at His Father's right hand.

Such was the simple story imparted to my young mind, from what source or sources I cannot now recall.

It may be observed that this idea of the pre-existence of Jesus, as here given, is not so very far, after all, from the Bible narrative. We may observe