

and a comparison of the obscure, the mystical and figurative, with his occasional indulgence in the more modern, direct and familiar style, where his ideas are simplified, we will be almost sure to misunderstand him, as has so often been the case with Friends, which has led to the conflicts and divisions in the Society.

Where he has departed from the Scripture style and given us a brief explanation, in more modern phraseology, he makes his thoughts so lucid and rational we can scarcely fail to understand, if our mental attitude and the absence of prejudice are such as to leave the mind open to the receptivity of an unpopular or unorthodox truth, should it be such a one.

Some of his earlier explanations of Scripture teachings, when catechised, show his immaturity of thought, and do not harmonize with his later revelations. His greatness was a growth and came with his mature years, and the more deep attention he gave to solving and understanding the Scriptures in order to maintain from them what he believed was revealed to him as the truth.

If young Friends, or older ones either, could be induced by competent assistance to enter into the spirit of George Fox, the founder of the sect to which they are attached, and to study him through his writings, how much more they might learn and better understand what are called Friends' principles. I know many think it would be a waste of time to spend it over this old-fashioned and out-of-date literature, and these crude and obsolete notions of primitive Quakerism. It may be a task, but to read and understand his journal would give such an insight to Quakerism as can be found in no other exposition of it.

The most liberal modern Friend would scarcely risk to equal George Fox in radicalism, and in steadfastly maintaining or enunciating his views, and heroically standing his ground. It was his open, rational liberalism that excited the persecuting spirit of the

orthodox, sectarian bigots. His cause was just, his objects right, and he vindicated himself finally before his enemies.

The most critical and intelligent Friend can find no better ground of faith than that occupied by George Fox.

Quakerism originally was a scientific religion, or a religion according with science, and George Fox was its first, and really, its most able representative.

His contemporaries awarded him this pre eminence.

William Penn, speaking of his remarkable gifts and power, says:—

"He was a man that God had endowed with a clear and wonderful depth. * * So that, as to man, he was an original, being no man's copy.

"His ministry and writings were not notional and speculative, but sensible and practical truths. In his testimony, or ministry, he much labored to open truth to people's understandings. He had an extraordinary gift in opening the Scriptures, and would go to the marrow of things

"I can say I never saw him out of his place, or not a match for every service or occasion. A divine and a naturalist, I have been surprised at his questions and answers in natural things; he had in him the foundation of useful and commendable knowledge, and cherished it everywhere. Very temperate, eating little, and sleeping less, though a bulky person." William Penn was a competent judge, and his testimony must be taken as entirely reliable.

Thomas Ellwood says:—"He was valiant for the truth, bold in asserting it, patient in suffering for it, immovable as a rock. He was quick in discerning, sound in judgment, able and ready in giving, and discreet in keeping counsel, instructive in discourse, and free from affectation in speech or carriage."

These witnesses say much more of his wonderful qualities of mind.

If George Fox could have had the advantages of a liberal education, in-