

&c., &c. "Now so far is this in force with us, as a direction to magistrates, to use the sword of justice according to the good and wholesome laws of the land, for the terror of evil doers, and the vindication of the oppressed. That judge neither feared God, nor regarded man, who would not *avenge* the poor widow of her adversary. And it is in force as a rule to law-givers, to provide accordingly, and wisely to apportion punishments to crimes, for the restraint of rapine and violence, and the protection of innocency"—*M. Henry*.

Matthew v. 38—41.—*Resist not evil, &c.* "But I say unto you, that when you meet with ill usage in the world, you do not immediately set yourselves against the injurious person, in a posture of opposition, and with a resolution to return evil for evil. Had our Lord meant to in-*nuate*, that we should rather suffer ourselves to be murdered, and our families to be ruined, than resist the villain that attempts it, he would have laid down such a precept in the strongest terms; and it is very unreasonable to infer it from this passage, which speaks of so trifling an injury as a *slap on the face*, or suing a man for the value of a *waistcoat* or *cloak*. We are not to resist on these occasions, unless we be in our consciences convinced, that, in present circumstances, to stand on our defence will be more for the public good; and in those cases, this particular precept is superseded by the general law of universal benevolence. But I apprehend these expressions intimate, that on the whole, it will generally be for the best to wave rigorous prosecutions on slight occasions."—*Doddridge's Family Expositor*.

Matthew v. 38—41.—"Our Lord's expressions are strong and figurative, designed to rouse our minds to the importance of avoiding the spirit of revenge. Turn to him the other also, is a proverbial phrase, to express a meek submission to injuries and affronts:" see Isaiah l. 6. Lam. xxx. 3.—*Davidson's Pocket Commentary*.

Matt. v. 38—41.—"The preservation of life, liberty, or important duties to others, will authorise, and in some cases may require men to stand on their own defence, even at the peril of unlawful assailants." *London Religious Tract Society's Commentary*.

The whole of the arguments brought forward by *Pax*, to prove that even defensive war is unlawful, may all be summed up in these words—"I say unto you, Resist not evil." He takes the words in their literal meaning, without limitation, and without reflecting on the circumstances in which they were spoken, and the persons to

whom our Saviour addressed himself. I contend that if Scripture in all cases is to be taken thus absolutely in a literal sense, we shall be led into many gross absurdities; such, for instance, as the Popish doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, from a literal rendering of Matthew xxvi. 26—28.

I shall not now advert to all the arguments that might be brought forward to prove that defensive war is lawful; but the following are such as common sense teaches me to be right, and which I have always held, and will hold, until I get more convincing arguments to prove the contrary than any *Pax* has yet advanced. The extracts given above will also bear me out in the views I entertain on this important subject.

1. I hold that all the laws of Christ are not applicable to the civil government of the nations of the earth. Take, for instance, Matt. v. 39, or Rom. xii. 17. For what would become of any nation if the rulers or magistrates were to act on these laws, in respect to crimes committed against the peace of society? The sword is put into the hands of the magistrate for the punishment of *evil* doers. Were the doctrine of non-resistance to be acted on, it would overthrow the moral system of the universe. Men will commit evil; and how dreadful would be our situation if they were not resisted. If *Pax* is a loyal and true subject of Great Britain, a friend to peace and good order, as I have no reason to doubt, I would ask him, what would have become of us, had the lawless, blood-thirsty, infidel, godless crew who have lately invaded us from the land of "Liberty and Slavery," been unresisted? But according to his doctrine, they ought not to have been resisted. The idea, I maintain, is contrary to Scripture and common sense, the laws of nature and self-preservation.

2. I hold that it is our duty to resist evil when it would *deeply* injure us in