

Quaker was sometimes used as an explanatory term, as "The people of God called Quakers," the Society of "Friends or Quakers," &c. It is, in reality, the only name by which the Society is recognized throughout the world, the obloquy attached to its origin having been lost sight of, and, viewing it from this standpoint, it is at this day perhaps the most appropriate of any that could be given as enabling us to fix it where it properly belongs. I can not close this article without quoting from a recent publication* descriptive of early days in Ohio in which the writer evidently by birthright or descent connected with the Society, has in terse and fitting words brought this question fully into view, affording food for thought and reflection.

"I could never see why members of the Society of Friends—a sect not without history, nor devoid in the past of influence in affairs—should so generally object to the good old term of Quaker. Granted that it was a term of contumely and reproach, but its very meaning and aptness offer most conclusive evidence of their early earnestness of purpose. Did they speak, those early Friends, in season and out of season? Did they exhort alike priests and mobs of rough men, throwers of hard words, of stones and of garbage? Did they convert the jailer, puzzle the squire, and cross-examine and outwit the judge? Did they encourage the parson, and wear their hats in the presence of royalty? And did they do all this with unctuous blandness and *saue*, self-satisfied serenity of demeanor? Not so! but with trembling limbs and bodies shaken by the fear of God.

Quaker! Quaker! shouted the mob. It did not mean merely Friend! Friend! in those rugged days, my good neighbors and kinsmen. It was then a larger term. It meant a Friend who would endure for his convictions gibe and jeer and the sting of the lash; whose spirit was so much exalted above

his trembling limbs that it carried him to the gibbet rather than abate a little of its high estate.

And is the name Quaker a term of derision now, or a patent of nobility? Is it not glorified by the single-minded earnest martyrs who first won it and bore it through ignominy and pain, until the term is of sweet savor among the right feeling—a crown to be worn with pride were self-complacency permissible. 'Love the early Quakers,' said Lamb; he did not say early Friends. Perhaps he spoke with discrimination. Are the present members of the sect entitled only to the name they prefer? Should they be called Friends merely? Ah! we hope, we must believe, that the early spirit still lingers, awaiting the travail which shall justify the early epithet, and that there are Quakers to-day, as in the days of Fox."

GEORGE S. TRUMAN.

Genoa, Neb.

RELIGIOUS TEACHING.

"Shall we confine ourselves strictly to religious teaching?" is asked of us to-day. Suppose we should ask ourselves, "Shall I confine my diet strictly and solely to bread?"

Bread is the most essential article of food, and any attempt to dispense with it entirely, would be likely to meet with unfavorable results; while on the other hand, if one were restricted to that solely, he might thereby deprive himself of both pleasure and profit. So with religious teaching in its confined sense. Methinks there might be times when to the active, sincere and inquiring mind, it might become a trifle "dry," and, if the pupil be not of a particularly reverential disposition, he might even consider it "stale."

Then, too, religion is very simple, and its vital lessons soon taught. The need is not so much to know the law, as to know how and when to apply and observe its provisions. To understand the requirements of religion as applied

*"Down the Ohio," A. McCling & Co., Chicago.