

covenant with him promising to be mouth-piece if he would be wisdom and utterance. He has never failed; I have often failed. He is just as able to inspire youthful minds to-day as he ever was.

If you or I will take our stand upon this, it will not detract one single pleasure from our lives, but will increase them ten-fold and we will be enabled to look through nature up to nature's God. The more you think upon these things and consider them the more your soul will be filled with thankfulness to the Giver of all good gifts. He is willing to direct your footsteps and the mind that is in him will be kept in perfect peace. I want that we all shall be co-fellows in this work; and the crown of righteousness that was designed for the ransomed from the foundation of the world will be yours and mine to wear.

---

### MODERN PHRASEOLOGY.

---

It may seem ungrateful to refuse to own the apology made for me by the editor of the *YOUNG FRIENDS' REVIEW* in 2nd mo., but as it at once illustrates and destroys the whole point which I intended to make I must disclaim its benefits. I said "we have no right to express belief in the divinity of Jesus Christ." The editor explains that I do not deny the "divinity of Christ" and goes on to say that if that expression be understood to mean what in modern English it does not mean, we do believe in it; that our rejection of that form of words will cause us to be branded as infidels and that people will thereby be repelled from investigating our beliefs. The editor's misconception of my meaning brings out just the disadvantage to which I referred. "Christ" means to Christendom of to-day the man of Galilee. "Christ" to us as a society represented

by our most intelligent members, means the God given knowledge of right and wrong in each soul. "Christ" to the mass of our members means a hazy commingling of these ideas. This I know by considerable interested inquiry on the subject. This confusion of ideas is worse than clear cut error. The latter may be caught and killed; the former, changing color at need cannot be found—it is anything to any man.

As nearly as I can determine those who make up the bulk of Christendom ought to call us infidels and unbelievers, and it is only by marching behind a shield that shows us one color and them another that we escape epithet and denunciation. It is so easy to arrange in phraseology so as not to alarm the timid.

As to repelling people I have never heard, nor do I think, that the sincere seeker for truth will be alarmed by having the truth expressed unequivocally. The idea seems to be that the truth is a disagreeable medicine which must be administered in a wafer looking and tasting as much as possible like the world's daily bread. When it is remembered that we really believe the world's daily bread to be unwholesome this theory appears weak in the extreme. But on the other hand I believe that our danger is in another direction entirely. Why should anyone wish to examine into our beliefs if they have the same external appearance as all others? A sheep in wolf's clothing does not stand the best chance with those who have had experience with wolves. Those to whom we should look for accession of strength are they who have seen that the modern church, in spite of all the good men and good deeds to be set down in its favor, is nevertheless given over to idolatry—worshipping a great reformer instead of the God of the Universe. Because we believe that God was with the great teacher is no reason why we should give any support to the substitution of the one for the other. And I say again that we ourselves are not guiltless if we