

our persons, families, or property. But we should not resist in the spirit of revenge, but for a good end; and we ought not to resist where the matter is of trivial importance. It is better to suffer wrong to a considerable extent than resist. For instance, if a person deeply affronted me before others, rather than challenge him to a duel, or take measures to be revenged on him, I would consider it best to suffer the affront. If a person owed me a debt which was so large that it would injure me to lose it, and he refused to pay, though able, I should consider it right to sue him at law for the same; but if small in amount, I would rather lose it than do so.

3. I hold that aggressive war is wrong, and contrary to the Bible; but that defensive war is right and lawful. And *Pax* himself must know that if the principles of defensive war were universally acted on, there would be no war, for every one would keep within his own territory, and there would be no occasion for war.

In conclusion, I would remark that the passages of Scripture brought forward by *Pax* ought to be fully acted on by Christians in all cases, except when a literal rendering of any of them would lead to non-resistance where life, liberty, the preservation of valuable property, or good order in society, are concerned.

W. G.

#### READING THE SCRIPTURES.

Do not Christians, at the present day, amid the multiplicity of other means of grace, too much neglect, or but negligently improve, opportunities for the reading of the word of God? But few, it is to be hoped, comparatively, habitually neglect its daily perusal, either in private, or in their families; but is it not, too often, as a matter of course affair, rather than one in which the *heart* is interested as it should be? Is it not seldom the

case that the Christian is seen to sit down to the perusal of the Bible, for an evening, with that sort of interest that he would to some of the new publications, so often teeming from the press?

There may be reasons given, no doubt, why this should be the case; but probably the most substantial one, after all, would be found to exist in those very habits of thought and feeling with which they generally set about the duty. In order to enter into the spirit of the sacred writings we must truly *love* them; and feel in our souls that we can honestly say that we instinctively prefer them to every thing else that can be presented to our attention;—and that, instead of laying down with reluctance the *new book* (or any thing else that may have engrossed our thoughts), in order to attend to our *customary religious duties*:—we shall find it to be, like leaving the society of strangers, to return to the counsels of a tried and valued friend.

Is there not an obstacle, also, to the ‘entrance of that word which giveth light,’ into our souls, by our relying too much upon other *helps*, than upon that spirit which is promised to guide us into all truth? Commentaries, &c., are useful in their places, but if men rely upon them too much, may they not serve as *hindrances*, rather than *helps*, to obtaining the spiritual ideas of the Bible, which the vigorous contact of our own spirits with the simple Word of God is calculated to elicit?

Is not the Word of God read, also, in too detached portions?—and in too limited quantities? and with too little meditation, self-application, and prayer? Do we even give the Bible a chance (so to speak) to show us the power it can exert over our minds and thoughts? Now, as one very important method of studying Scripture, in order to keep its connection, as well as to become familiar with its