

have been indeed very infantile and obscure. How blind, how deceitful, how perverse is the human heart! In such inferences as *these*, W. G. must admit there is no absurdity. And I prefer them to his own, because they are, in my opinion, more congenial than his, to the spirit of the gospel—to the nature of Christ's kingdom—and to *all* that we know of his own example and that of his Apostles. If it is so—why cavil at the truth, and suggest other inferences, carnal and worldly, which tend to make one part of New Testament Scripture appear at variance with the scope and tenor of the whole New Testament dispensation?

If wisdom itself had devised in what terms most emphatically might be represented to the benighted understanding of man, *the opposition in which the spirit of "FIGHTING" stands to the spirit of the Gospel of Peace*, could it have been possible to frame language more plain, unequivocal, and expressive than this:—Jesus said: "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight; but now is my kingdom not from hence."—Now, what inference shall be drawn from this? Unavoidably *this*—that *Christ's servants do not fight*. The peaceful, holy, silent example, of Christians, is efficiently instrumental in the building up of this "kingdom."

It now remains for your readers to judge, whether the position assumed by W. G. or that of Pax, as persons professing to "follow Jesus in the regeneration," is most consonant with the character, hopes, and instrumentality of his "good and faithful" servants, who are looking and longing for the time when, as saith Isaiah, "they shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain." If there is any question, on the firm and absolute negative decision of which, a disciple of Christ is imperatively required to stake the loss of all he holds dear and valuable in the world, the "confidence" which truth inspires says—let it be this—"Is it lawful for a professed disciple of Christ, as a subject of his kingdom—which is a kingdom of "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost"—to assume the profession of Arms; or to hold it as a principle that in certain circumstances, or in obedience to human authority, he may with deadly weapons of war spill the blood or take the life of his fellow-man?—It is, says W. G.—It is NOT, saith Christ and his Apostles.

Dec. 25.

PAX.

—
To the Editor.

DEAR SIR,—In your last number, there appears a letter from "A Female," containing certain strictures on my letter to you in the *Magazine* for October; and as there is

evidently a misapprehension of my meaning on her part, I beg you will allow me room in your next number for the following observations.

1. "A Female" says: "Strange to think that people once believers in Christ, followers of the Lamb, now perishing for lack of knowledge." Upon reference to my letter, no such expression will be found. I have no where said they were followers of the Lamb, or believers, only that "they had left the fatherland where they long enjoyed the services of the sanctuary, and sat under the sound of the gospel." Now, those I had chiefly in view, were those who needed to be pointed to the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world; for even in our highly-favoured "fatherland," there are many who, though sitting under the sound of the gospel, are yet ignorant of the truth as it is in Jesus. I rejoice to say, that while on the journey referred to in my letter, I found some of the followers of the meek and lowly Jesus, and it was my privilege to hold sweet communion with them: but, oh! the number of those compared with the population is lamentably small! To this small number, and some others who are friendly to the cause, I am to be understood to refer, when I say "many are very anxious that ministers of the gospel might be sent among them."

2. "A Female" says: "Does any person then say, they are destitute of the gospel being ministered among them while they have the Sacred Volume." My object in visiting these "wild regions" was to promote the circulation of the blessed word of life; and I may say here, that I was credibly informed by those who had opportunities of informing themselves of the fact, that *many* were destitute of the word of God; and I trust I may be acquitted of any intention of undervaluing the Holy Oracles, and will at once say, the Bible contains all that is necessary for salvation, with the aid of the Holy Spirit. But I must take leave to differ from "A Female" in her interpretation of the *ministering of the Gospel*. The passage quoted in her letter, had it all been given, would alone have established the necessity of the preaching of the word, viz.: Rom. x. 14, 15. "How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear *without a preacher*? and how shall they preach *except they be sent*?" By some strange oversight your correspondent began her quotation in the middle of a verse, just where I have stopped, and passed over the 16th verse. "But they have not all obeyed the gospel; for Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? or, as the margin reads, "hearing of us," or "preaching."