

exist a single week. He omitted to say *literally observed*, but he vindicated his utterance very triumphantly in a magazine article afterwards.

Let it be remembered that in all ages of the world, speakers who desire to be specially emphatic, have used a figure of speech which is called hyperbole. God is reported to have used it in his first command to Adam, forbidding him to eat the fruit of the tree of knowledge, "for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Adam indeed died after eating, but not the same day. The intention of hyperbole, say the books, is to emphasize, is to rouse the dull mind. Jesus used it for this purpose. "Be ye therefore perfect, *even as your father which is in heaven is perfect.*" This is pure hyperbole. Man can not be perfect—surely at least not as perfect as God. Then again, "If any man come unto me and hate not his father, and mother, and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." This also is pure hyperbole. Jesus meant no more than when he elsewhere said. "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me," only he wished to intensify it.

And then, what is resisting evil? When Jesus took a scourge in his hand and went into the temple and drove out those that sold sheep and oxen and doves, and overturned the tables of the money changers, was he not resisting evil with a strong hand? And if it was not wrong, may I not with a club instead of a scourge, drive out a thief from my house, as he did thieves from the so-called house of God?

But now think a moment of the consequences of a literal construction. I see two young men about to outrage a child of eleven years, and then choke her to death—such a case as that of Ida Gaskell in yesterday's paper. I must not lift my hand for her protection, however she may appeal to me.

I must wait till the horrid deed is accomplished, and the child is dead, and then I may arrest the brutes and have them punished. Is that the meaning of Jesus?

And then as to the idea that if we refrain from protecting ourselves, God will protect us. Now in the first place it is obvious that the merit of not protecting ourselves, lies in the willingness to bear the evil uncomplainingly, and he who declines to protect himself in the confidence that he will be otherwise protected by divine interposition, is no better than he who relies for protection on the police. He is not willing to suffer and expects to escape.

But what reason is there for expecting divine protection as the reward of non-resistance? It is not promised, and I am sure that experience does not authorize the expectation. In the same yesterday's paper I read that an aged couple were murdered in bed and their house robbed. As no noise was heard by the occupant of the next room, it is clear they made no resistance: indeed they were killed by crushing their skulls with a heavy hammer, and they never waked. Thousands of babies are murdered every year in the great slums: they make no resistance. When the Arab slave hunter attacks the African village, the negroes make no resistance, unless flight be resistance and is so forbidden. Of those caught the very young and very old are massacred and the rest made prize. It is then perfectly plain that mere non-resistance will not secure the protection of heaven.

And then another consideration arises: is it lawful to punish what it is not lawful to prevent? If I cannot lawfully prevent an outrage on my wife and daughter, can I lawfully prosecute the perpetrator to punishment? Is the law of God so different from man's reason as to involve this absurdity, that I cannot without sin prevent rape and murder, but I may punish him that commits those crimes? If so I agree with Mivart,