

of faith, through any want of *perspicuity* in it. This point is settled.

But Paul says something more to Timothy about these same Scriptures, "*which*," he says, "*are able to make thee wise unto salvation.*" Why, what is the matter with the man? He has taken lessons of Luther. When did he live? They say the Protestant religion is only three hundred years old; but here is a man who lived well-nigh eighteen hundred years ago, that writes amazingly like a Protestant about the Holy Scriptures! He says (and I have just been looking at the Greek to see if it is so there, and I find that it is,) they are *able to make thee wise unto salvation*. Now, who wishes to be wiser than that? And if they can make *one* thus wise, they can make any number equally wise. So, then, the Scriptures can be known by children, and can make wise to salvation those who know them. This is Paul's decision, and here should be an end of the controversy. If this prove not the sufficiency of the Bible as a rule of faith and guide to salvation, I know not how anything can be proved. I will tell you what I am determined to do the next time a Roman Catholic opens his mouth to me about the insufficiency and obscurity of our rule of faith. I mean to take hold of the sword of the Spirit by this handle, (2 Tim. iii. 15,) and I mean to hold on to this weapon of heavenly temper, and to wield it manfully, until my opponent surrender or retreat. He can not stand before it.

But, before I close this, I must say that, if the Scriptures, which existed when Paul wrote to Timothy, were able to make wise unto salvation, how much more are they with what has been added to the canon since? And here, by-the-way, we have an answer to the question which the Roman Catholic asks with such an air of triumph:—"How, if this be

your rule of faith, did Christians get along before the New Testament was written and received?" Very well; they had Scriptures enough to make them "wise unto salvation" as early as the time of Timothy; and as they had many years before that, all the Old Testament, and a part of the New, with Moses and the prophets, and the Psalms, and Matthew's gospel, and perhaps some others, together with a large number of divinely inspired men, I think they must have got along very comfortably.

One thing more I desire to say. It is this: that there is an advantage in understanding the Bible which does not belong to any book whose author is not personally accessible. The advantage is, that we have daily and hourly to *consult the Author of the Bible on the meaning of it*. We can, at any moment we please, go and ask him to interpret to us any difficult passage. We can lift off our eyes from the word of truth, when something occurs which we do not readily comprehend, and direct them to the throne of grace. And what encouragement we have to do this! James tells us, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." So, then, we have the Bible to inform and guide us, and we have constant opportunities of consulting its Author in regard to its meaning. Is it not enough? I, for one, am satisfied. I can dispense with the fathers, &c. &c. —*Baptist Register*. NEVINS.

---

THE WONDERFUL CHIP; or, the  
Mysteries of Written Language.

The astonishment excited in the mind of an untutored heathen by written communications may be seen in the following incident, which occurred at Rarotonga:—

"In the erection of this chapel, a circumstance occurred which will