

conflict in his time, never alleged that it was unlawful to resist evil, and never quoted these words of Jesus', but placed his prohibition on the ground that wars originated in the lusts of the flesh and were contrary to the spirit of Jesus. I am quite sure that had anyone attacked his Margaret, George would have thought it no sin to seize him and hold him fast.

The words of Jesus stand in the authorized version as above quoted, but in the revised Gospel they read, "Resist not him that is evil," as if it were lawful to resist a good man who by any mistake should ignorantly seek to do an evil, and that entire immunity was to be reserved for the wicked.

JOHN D. MCPHERSON.

Washington, 10th mo. 19, 1895.

"EXTREME DOCTRINES."

Elsewhere in this paper will be found an article bearing the above title, written by John D. McPherson. In comparing the views therein stated with the convictions of our own mind, we were led to marvel how different were our estimation of that conspicuous and emphatic command of Jesus, "Resist not evil." I had always viewed it, with its associate injunction to "Love your enemies," as the supreme condition and bearing of all who were truly the followers of Jesus. It seems to me as the necessary resultant of that God-love, Christ-love in the soul that is expected of every son of God, and heir of the kingdom. My faith, even while reading John D. McPherson's article, has never wavered in the belief that love and the bearing of non-resistance that this love in the soul dictates, and would dictate at the spur of the moment, in any and every emergency, is mightier against evil, and the agents of evil, than the puny arm of force. Have we not instances innumerable where we, or God, for God is love, through the bearing of non-resistance has dis-

armed violence. The ruffian arm that rises against unresisting innocence fails in its strength and the blow falls harmless. There is no one so lost but has some spark of divinity within that this bearing of non-resisting love appeals to with greater persuasion and better results than meeting blow with blow. I would lament to think that our Society generally would consider this command of Jesus, as explicit and authoritative as any He ever uttered, as "extreme doctrine," and "simply ignore it." My friend, after acknowledging Barclay's Apology to be regarded by Friends as correctly stating their principles, takes exception to that authority on this particular point. Not only did Barclay coincide with Jesus in this higher and diviner theory of non resistance to evil, but the histories and biographies of Friends, written and traditional, down through all the turbulent and revolutionary times, furnish example after example of its being lived out in practice. Did not Jesus, the promulgator of the doctrine, testify to its genuineness, and seal its truth by his own non-resistance to the mob that seized him and crucified him? See how he even chided Peter for attempting to protect Him. What command did Jesus carry out more plainly than this very one? Was it not His life-long bearing? Must it not be ours if we are His true followers?

Allow me to introduce here as evidence, if you please, as authority, one of the greatest writers of this age, and one who has made these three words, as found in the command of Jesus, an especial study, resulting in his acceptance of the simple but positive command. To Count Lyof N. Tolstoi this solution was the key that opened up to him many of the passages of the Bible that were before obscure, yea, even the key that opened the single eye of the mind through which the light of heaven poured in and flooded his soul. On his just solution of this simple command turned the aimless life of Tolstoi to one of vast purpose