

concerned. Having none other than feelings of kindness and good will toward all men, Mr. Taws included, I do not write to you from any motive but such as you would approve if you could realize that it existed.

Speaking of the evangelists to whom I have alluded, (their names being Black and Oliphant) you were pleased to say that they were not only errorists but taught error unmixed—that they were Satan's agents in the garb of light—that they were unlearned men—that Paul would not and did not preach where others had preached the gospel.

Your remarks, friend Taws, may be divided into two sections: 1st. Our learning. 2nd. Our theology. The first department may be disposed of thus: Will you meet us with your Greek Testament (I take it for granted you have one) and your English Grammar, for the purpose of testing before any learned community whether or not we can tell *tupto* from *tupti*, and whether or not we know a verb from a noun? I ask you the simple question, Mr. Taws, whether you will consent to appoint a time and a place to make good your assertion concerning our lack of learning. If you do not, will it be surprizing if some of your friends should affirm that you are more disposed to make assertions when we are absent than to meet us face to face and show that you "speak the words of truth and soberness."

But I have far more to say about our theology. I am truly sorry to learn that you are afraid of our teaching because we have renounced all standards of religious instruction but the Book of God—that you set us down as not only entertaining error, but disseminating unmixed error, because we point men to the language dictated by the Holy Spirit—that you view us as the emissaries of the Enemy of souls because we preach the same things preached by the apostles, instead of preaching the Covenants and Catechisms ordained by Scotland's and England's learned sons—that we are looked upon as building on another man's foundation because we have come peaceably into this vicinity to preach Christ and him crucified. Paul, you say, never preached where others had previously preached; but you and the evangelist Luke differ widely here, for Luke says at the close of the Acts that Paul preached the gospel at Rome after he was taken there as a prisoner, and you will doubtless admit that the apostle had written his letter to the saints in Rome long before he ever saw the city, plainly showing that he did labour in the gospel both by word and writing where others had laboured before him. And it was his common practice to send labourers into cities and countries where he himself had laboured.