

may show he has no faith in them. Paul says faith is the evidence of things not seen, the substance of things hoped for, and I would define it as such a confidence in God as leads us to obey His laws and doctrines while we may not know why He requires such obedience or what may be the result. There cannot be two faiths in God or two or three confidences in Him. As God adapts His laws to meet the conditions of all classes of spiritual beings so as each has such a confidence in Him as to be willing to do what is required under the law given, though it may be widely different from that required of another. Each has the one faith, as is illustrative in the case of Paul and the other apostles. Paul found his mission extended to the Gentiles, while the other apostles confined their work largely to the Jews, yet we see all claimed the one faith.

This naturally includes the idea of one baptism, which is not of anything that is material, but one that is essentially spiritual, the term baptism in this sense meaning an immersion into or a complete union of the soul of the man with the Divine Spirit, and not such an immersion into an outward element. If we take this spiritual view of it, we can readily see that there cannot be but the one baptism, the one immersion into the Divine harmony which is the result of the one faith before referred to. Nor is it requisite that all should believe the same doctrines or accept the same dogmas, to experience this one baptism. As Paul said in our text: "But unto everyone is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ."

This presupposes that there would be a difference in the measure of grace given as to Christ in its fulness to us as we may need, but enough is given to each of us to perform our work, to keep our faith, and to experience the one baptism. And if all the Christian professors would only lay aside their differences long enough to see that while they are differing because of the many circumstances by which they are en-

vironed, they might still be of one family as the children of God, they would exert a greater power in regenerating the world, and in the eradication of the evils which afflict humanity. It would bring men to place less dependence upon their beliefs and doctrines, and cause them to make their chief object to live purer lives, to make their religion to depend less upon doctrine and more upon conduct, and thus tend to bring all classes of professors into a more loving bond of union.—*From Baltimore American of 2nd mo. 26th.*

QUAKERISM—THE FIRST STEP IN THE PROCESS OF ORIENTATION.

Is Quakerism the opinions of a Fox, or a Penn, or a Barclay, or indeed anything that is compounded of all of these opinions? Is it a something that is set forth and embodied in drab and bad grammar as some suppose? It is a mere matter of your definition of the word "Quaker" as to how much it is compounded of these aforesaid ingredients: *i. e.*, the opinions of those men and the habitual use of drab and bad grammar.

Is it not unfortunate that there should be associated with the popularly accepted definition of *Quakerism* so little that is true because it is universal, and so much that is transient because it is a mere compound of the opinions of those men and their associates, set forth with a coloring of drab and bad grammar which serve chiefly to make a quaint, picturesque figure in the social and historical world.

Possibly, even probably, the opinions of these three men were, at least, largely that which is termed *orthodox*, but even if they were wholly *orthodox* in their opinions, what of it? Was it not their privilege to think so, and if such opinion was to them reasonable was it less than their duty to think as they did? Lucretia Mott is reported to have thought Penn to be substantially un-