

families where every member detested every other member.

It may be said, and indeed is urged by some, that if men would not resist evil, but would renounce the right of self-defence, God would protect them. Jesus never promised this, and all history proves the contrary, from the chapter of Numbers, which tells how Moses massacred the mothers of Midian and their boy babies, to the tragical stories of the Albigenes and the Armenians.

While, therefore, I would agree with the Archbishop of York, in the opinion that no government could be conducted on Christian principles for a single week, if I thought Christian principles involved a submission to all kinds of violence and the extinction of property, I yet hold that governments could be conducted on Christian principles, because Christian principles do not involve any such consequence. And I also hold that those are no true friends of Christianity who represent it as a code of conduct which mankind will never accept—cannot accept. It is as fatal to Christianity as the Calvinistic doctrine, which, as Wesley said, makes God worse than Satan, condemning men to eternal torment for his own glory and not for the ill they had done, for as yet they were not in existence.

A word now as to the reason of Jesus for uttering such expressions as I have referred to. Every discourse to be effective must be adapted to the intelligence of the hearers. Jesus made great use of parables, short stories, pictures, illustrating some principle. We use such every day in teaching our little children. His disciples asked him why he spoke in parables. His answer, as reported, does not appear apposite or clear, but when we consider that the conversation was not written down for certainly thirty years, and perhaps not for sixty or a hundred years after the words were spoken, some obscurity is only natural. Jesus evidently said that the common people would but understand a principle when

expressed in a concrete form, while his disciples would understand abstract propositions. Jesus also sometimes used metaphors as when he declared that his disciples were his mother and his brethren. And he also used another figure of speech which is in common use at this day, viz.: hyperbole, which is defined to be a figure by which more is expressed than is *intended* to be conveyed. Example of this one formed in the injunctions to turn the other cheek when one is smitten, to give to anyone whatever he asks, and to hate father, mother, wife, children, brothers and sisters. The object of the hyperbole is to rouse attention, and these things were said to the crowds of common people and not to the educated Scribes and Pharisees or even to the disciples who, though poor enough and uneducated, were continually with Jesus, and could be more carefully instructed. What was intended to be conveyed was that one should be *very* slow to resent injuries, should be *very* liberal to the poor, and should not suffer the dearest of earthly ties to hinder the observance of Christ's precepts.

JNO. D. MCPHERSON.

Washington, D. C.

THE INNER LIGHT.

Continued from 1st mo. 1st.

This Light is a common right or an inherited capacity, for it is a natural legacy of all human kind. It is not a special quality or gift to any class or sect of men. Its efficacy consists in its simple purity, unclouded with the darkness of the imaginations, the theories and doctrines and dogmas invented by designing or misguided men. The pure light of science as reflected from the outward universe, revealing "the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen being understood by the things that are made, even the eternal power and God-head," in the language of Paul. For that which may be known of God is manifest in man.