

said, now if Scripture will do for the ordinary members of the Church how are its teachers to be fitted for their responsible office? To this it is replied, "All Scripture (i. e. all books shewn to be Scripture, whether of Old or New Testament) is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God (i. e. the minister of Christ) may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." I do not wonder that Mr. Maturin felt it impossible to handle this passage. It contains a statement of our Protestant views regarding the sufficiency of Scripture so clear—a rebuke of the pretences of Rome so powerful—that I feel it impossible to add to its effect by any explanation.

It is now time to look at the negative side of this question, and disprove the existence of any other rule of faith than Scripture. There are many pretended rules of faith,—such as the Hindu Shastres, the Koran, the Book of Mormon, and the Apostolical Traditions held by Rome. The present topic requires that attention should be given to this last; and I proceed to show that the Apostolic Traditions held by the Church of Rome are not a rule of faith for Christians. What are these traditions? Mr. Maturin's description is given at length on pages 67, 68, 69. I refer you to it, and copy Mr. Newman's far more condensed and powerful definition: "Whatever doctrine the primitive ages *unanimously attest*, whether by consent of Fathers or by Councils, or by the events of history, or by controversies, or in whatever way—whatever may be fairly and reasonably considered the universal belief of those ages is to be received as coming from the Apostles." Here, in precise language, Mr. Newman defines that which never had any existence—that shadow of a shade—the unanimous consent of primitive ages. This unanimous consent does not exist, and never did exist. It is not to be found in the ancient Creeds, or in the decrees of Councils—