

when he reads St Paul's declaration, "A night and a day I have been in the deep," concludes that he was on a plank upon the water, and another that he was under the water, will it be necessary to conclude that one or the other of these wrests the Scriptures to his own destruction, and must necessarily be lost? Nobody can believe it. Then it cannot be of such interpretations as these, or the misapprehension of such matters as these, St. Peter speaks; but we must understand him to speak of such matters as Christians generally, and Presbyterians particularly, hold to be necessary. For instance, St Paul tells us, "Abraham believed and it was reputed to him for justice", are we, therefore, to hold ourselves secure, if we only believe, but are careless about everything else? So of innumerable other questions which immediately concern religion and morality.

Presbyterians, then, evidently fail to make out that the obscurities of Scripture are confined to things which are not necessary; let us see if they succeed better in making out that it is clear in things necessary,—clear not for the learned only, but also for the unlearned, and not by extraordinary means or helps from above, but by the due use of the ordinary means. Their whole proof of this rests on the texts from the Psalmist, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path," "The entrance of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding unto the simple." David, writing his Psalms under the influence of divine inspiration, says the word of God is a lamp to his feet, a light to his path, and therefore, every Presbyterian, in case he has the written word, is to conclude that he is equally privileged? David says in the same Psalm, "I rose at midnight to give praise to Thee." Shall we, therefore, conclude, forthwith, that all Presbyterians rise at midnight to sing Psalms? But admitting the text to be applicable to all Christians, nothing proves that David spoke of a word known to him by his own reading of the Bible, or even by the common tradition of the Jews and consequently the text proves merely that knowledge of the law of God, when once obtained, however obtained, whether by reading the Bible or from oral tradition, is a lamp and a light. It does not say this knowledge is obtained or obtainable from reading the Bible, much less does it say the Bible by the due use of ordinary means is clear even to the unlearned in all necessary things. Any man knowing the true religion, might and would apply the words to himself, even though unable to read a syllable. The text, moreover, makes no reference to the distinction between things necessary and things unnecessary. If, then, it prove the necessary facts of the written word to be clear, it proves the unnecessary facts to be equally clear. Finally, it is presumable that St Peter knew the Psalms of the royal prophet, and the particular passage in question, at least, as well as modern Presbyterians know them, and he expressly and solemnly asserts that there are things in the Scriptures "hard to be understood; which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction. But it is unnecessary to say more on such proofs as these. Presbyterians cannot be supposed to place any confidence in them themselves.

There is no need of dwelling longer on the fact that the Scriptures are not clear in everything necessary. It is altogether silent on many points of great consequence, as we proved in our former article, and it barely alludes to others no less important. After what we have said we may conclude the discussion of the clearness of Scripture with the remark, that Presbyterians must have an unenviable share of assurance to assert, as they do, and apparently without blushing, notwithstanding these words of Scripture, "If any man be sick among you, let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil," &c., or these other words, "Take ye and eat, this is my body, Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," that it is clear there is no such thing as the Real Presence in the Eucharist, and that Extreme Unction is a Popish imposition; or to assert, as they also do, in the face of the declaration of St Paul, "He that is without a wife is solicitous for the things which belong to the Lord; but he that is with a wife is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife: and the unmarried woman thinketh on the things of the Lord, that she may be holy

both in body and in spirit," 1 Cor. vii. 32, 34, that it is, nevertheless, clear from Scripture that monastic vows of perpetual celibacy are superstitions and sinful snares. While they reject Catholic dogmas and practices so unequivocally expressed in the Scriptures we can only smile at their simplicity, or grieve at their impudence in asserting that they find clearly stated in Scripture all the rules enjoined for keeping Sunday, and all the impediments to marriage originating in consanguinity or affinity. They can quote long Scripture passages on these points it is true, but these passages are from the law of Moses, which every one admits to have been abrogated by Christ, yet this is nothing to Presbyterians. They are bent upon finding Scripture authority for the practice they have determined to adopt, and they can hardly be expected not to succeed—in some way; especially since their people were blessed with a plentiful share of ignorance and credulity. We would, however, since they insist on quoting the law of Moses, when it suits their premeditations, recommend them to go the whole length of the thing; and, if they will quote the Old Testament for the keeping of Sunday, let them keep also the "Sabbath of years," and leave their land fallow every seventh year, Lev. xxv. 4. Let them also keep all the laws of Moses on marriage; and in particular the law in Deuteronomy xxv. 6, 10. They would then preserve at least some show of consistency. But enough on this branch of the subject.

We have now reached the eighth article, which will detain us a little longer.

"The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old) and the new testament in Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations) being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic, so as in all controversies of religion the Church is finally to appeal unto them. But because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God, who have a right unto and interest in the Scriptures, and are commanded in the fear of God to read and search them, therefore they are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation into which they come, that the word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship him in an acceptable manner, and through patience and comfort of the Scriptures have hope.

"Matt. v. 18. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Isa. viii. 20. To the law and to the testimony, &c., Acts xv. 15, John v. 46, John v. 39. Search the Scriptures for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me. 1 Cor. xiv. 6, 28. Col. iii. 16. Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly," &c. Rom. xv. 4.

Before proceeding to consider the real merits of the question involved in this article, we must say a word or two on the remarkable appositeness of these Scriptural authorities. We have so often been compelled to notice the peculiar beauty and force of Presbyterian logic in the application of Scriptural texts, that our readers may be well nigh surfeited, as we confess we are ourselves. Too much of a good thing says the proverb, is good for nothing. Nevertheless, we must sit yet longer at the feast. Christ said, "One jot or one tittle shall not pass from the law till all be fulfilled"; therefore the Hebrew and Greek copies of the Scriptures which we now have are authentic, and have been kept pure in all ages! It is not easy to surpass this. But add, for the greater edification of pious Presbyterians, therefore the Bible of King James is authentic, correctly translated and perfectly pure! The marvellous appositeness of this proof is in the well known fact, that St. Matthew from whom it is taken, wrote his gospel in Hebrew, and that Hebrew text is lost and we have only a translation of it! Again. "To the law and to the testimony"; therefore, if we have a religious controversy to settle, we must run and learn Hebrew and Greek for it is only by appealing to the Hebrew and Greek copies that we can have a reasonable hope of arriving at the truth. Wonderful logic! Who but Presbyterians could ever have compassed it? St. Paul found fault with certain primitive Christians, who, having received the gift of tongues, were eager to speak