

then the congregation shall judge between the slayer and the revenger of blood according to these judgments; and the congregation shall deliver the slayer out of the hands of the revenger of blood."

This quotation first mentions some cases in which life might be feloniously taken away; and in each case, you will observe, the slayer is held to be a *murderer*. It then mentions some cases in which life might be taken away without blame, on the part of the slayer; and in each case, it is provided that he be allowed to flee to the city of refuge. Now whether does duelling belong to the first, or to the second of those divisions? Can it be said that the duellist comes upon his enemy *suddenly*, without lying in wait, or without *enmity*? or can it be pretended that there is any comparison between his conduct, and that of a man who takes away the life of his neighbour, by unintentionally throwing a stone in the direction in which he is, "*seeing him not*," and consequently not knowing that he is there? These things will not, for a moment, be pretended; and it therefore follows, that, upon the principles of law contained in the word of God, he is a murderer, in the full sense of the term. In whatever light he may be regarded by the world,—though he should pass without condemnation at the tribunal of the Civil Magistrate, or the bar of public opinion; nay, though he should be received by his fellow-men with honour and applause; it is plain, that, in the judgment of that God to whom he must soon give account, according as his judgment is declared in his word, the duellist is a *criminal* of the *worst* character.