

To the Editor.

PAX, IN REPLY TO W. G. ON WAR.

SIR,—As W. G. has published his final reply to Pax, Pax may perhaps be allowed a little space in your Magazine for a final rejoinder to him. He says that the controversy should be dropt, as being unedifying and unprofitable! Possibly indeed his own resistance and rejection of the truth have been unedifying; but may I not hope that the subject as it has been treated by me, in close and direct reference to the example and precept of the worthies of the New Testament, has not been altogether unprofitable. The voice—the still small voice of truth is never heard entirely in vain. Like the dew of heaven, or like a grain of mustard seed, it may fall unseen and unknown; but it shall prosper, and, although it may be after many days, its salutary influence will be felt, recognized, and developed, even amidst the ungenial opposition, contradiction, and derision of carnal mindedness and popular error. To itself, as well as to the church in her redeemed purity, it may be said that—“Though thou hast been forsaken and hated, so that no man passed through thee, yet I will make thee an eternal excellency, the joy of many generations.” Insensible as W. G. himself seems to be of it, I perceive that his mind has been touched by its hallowed power opposed to him in his ungraceful and unconscious encounter with it. He says—“*Pax has said in plain words that he (W. G.) is not a Christian.*” Nothing like this did Pax ever say or write. So far from it, I even expressly recognized him as a Christian brother; although chargeable with a gross error in judgment. The only “*plain words*” referred to, must have been the *plain words* of New Testament precept, doctrine, and example. From these only has W. G. unwittingly but conscientiously drawn an inference so condemnatory of himself and of his worldly doctrine. His having inferred that—“if what Pax says is really the judgment of the New Testament Scriptures, upon the folly and fiendishness of deadly violence, is true, *I (Warrior G.) am not a Christian,*” is his own inference, and no assertion of mine. For the truth of this I refer to my former communication.

It is needless for me to attempt to lay and establish the truth upon this subject more plainly and forcibly than I have already done for his conviction. He has not even approached the broad, safe, and blessed ground on which, I humbly think, I shewed the position taken by me in opposition to him, was that in which stood the Lord Jesus and all who in the days of his flesh sat at his feet to hear his word, to learn meekness and low-

liness of heart, and to find rest to their souls. What!—Is it indeed possible for a man poor in spirit, filled with the broken spirit of penitential humility—prostrate in the very dust under a deep and awful consciousness of his own guilt and unworthiness, and yet exulting in the discovered mercy of God, and the amazing love and abounding grace of Christ,

“Not to be thought of but with tides of joy,
“Not to be mentioned but with shouts of praise.”

—Is it possible for such a person—for a true Christian, in his right mind, thus turned “from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God,” to conceive for a moment *that it would be lawful for him*, under any circumstances of provocation or apprehension whatever, to wield a deadly weapon against the life of his fellow-man? Unless W. G. can discover *there*—at the feet of Jesus—somewhat to sanction his alleged occasional lawfulness of bloody and deadly violence, let him, for consistency’s sake, renounce either *that position or his own*. Is it lawful for one who professes to be numbered among a peculiar people, born of God, and zealous of good works, to teach for doctrines such worldly popular notions of men, as, when realized in their sanguinary hideousness, exhibit the *most gross and most flagrant* violation of the fundamental laws of Christ’s kingdom? Is it lawful for him to draw from incidental and isolated passages of the New Testament Scriptures, hypothetical inferences, that are at utter variance with such laws, and with the spirituality, peaceableness, holiness, gentleness and meekness, *for the sake of exhibiting which*, to a “crooked and perverse generation,” Jesus and his first followers laboured and suffered and died, *so painfully and ignominiously*? Can it indeed be lawful to do so, while it is possible to draw from such passages inferences that perfectly harmonize with “the truth as it is in Jesus”? Might not swords have been allowed for defence only against beasts of prey, which infested the banks of Jordan? Might not the Apostle Paul, most consistently, at one and the same time, deprecate the use of deadly weapons in war by Christians, and also place himself under the protection of the Chief Magistrate? Might not the mere profession of Arms assumed by men in “times of ignorance,” before they were “renewed in the spirit of their minds;” and permitted to be held by them in the dawn of the Gospel dispensation, be yet deemed inadmissible now in the fulness of his revealed will, and when the “glory of the Lord is risen” upon this benighted world in his wide-spreading kingdom. “*Do violence to no man,*” was the Saviour’s injunction to soldiers, whose conceptions of the nature of his kingdom must