

and the government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the world, which are always to be obeyed."

The proofs of the three parts of the article are,—

"1. 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. All Scripture is given inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. 2 Gal. i. 8. But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. 2 Thess. ii. 2. That ye be not soon shaken in mind or be troubled, neither by spirit or by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. 3. St John, vi 45. It is written in the prophets, and they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me. 1 Cor. ii. 9, 10, 12. But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his spirit; for the spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things which freely given to us of God. 1 Cor. xi 13, 14. Judge in yourselves, is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?—Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair it is a shame unto him? 1 Cor. xiv. 26, 40. How is it, then brethren? when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying. Let all things be done decently and in order."

This article is designed to establish the sufficiency of the Scriptures, and to reject the traditions of the Catholic Church, and we should undoubtedly be bound to admit it, if Presbyterians could show conclusively that all was written, and that all not written is necessarily tradition of men. But this, we proved in our former article, by undeniable facts and even by Scripture itself, they do not and cannot show. We also showed that the Scriptural texts which they had adduced to prove the whole word was written, prove no such thing, and when adduced for such a purpose are mere mockery, or rather an imposition attempted on the people. It is not necessary to go anew over the ground we then surveyed; it is enough for us now simply to examine the additional text which the Presbyterian divines quote in support of the sufficiency of the Scriptures, and against Catholic tradition.

We remark, in passing, the palpable contradiction which the article just quoted bears on its very face. Its authors evidently felt themselves in an awkward position. They were under the necessity of making the article say, The Scriptures are sufficient yet something is wanting in them; they contain every thing, yet still something must be added. For, after asserting that the Scriptures contain the whole counsel of God, every thing necessary unto faith and life, they suppose that "good and necessary consequences" are still to be drawn from them, as the condition of obtaining what is truly necessary for faith and life. Is not this asserting and denying the sufficiency of the Scriptures in the same breath? If the Scriptures had been intended by Almighty God to contain his whole counsel, and to furnish us with all things for his glory, and man's salvation, faith, and life, would they not of themselves draw these good and necessary consequences, and not leave a matter so important to the discretion and judgement of our Presbyterian divines? To draw good and necessary consequences from given principles is far from being an easy matter, and is not unfrequently quite impossible. In science for instance, the law of gravitation contains all the motions of the planets and comets, and he who could draw all the good and necessary consequences it involves would be the paragon of astronomers. This drawing of good and necessary consequences is, in fact the real difficulty. What more absurd than to assert, that nothing must be added to the law of gravitation in astronomy, or that he who knows that law knows the whole of astronomy? The whole of civil and municipal law is contained in the principle, Give to every one his due. Is

every man able to deduce the whole, by 'good and necessary consequences,' from this principle? and all works on law to be condemned and reprobated, on the ground that every man knows the principle, and the principle is all that needs to be known? The immense number of volumes on jurisprudence have been written solely because, in the various cases which arise, it is not always easy to determine what really are the good and necessary consequences to be drawn and applied to each particular case.

Is it different in religious matters? Take, as an example, carrying the Lord's supper to the sick. This is not expressly commanded in Scripture. But it is expressly stated that the Lord's Supper is to be celebrated, and that, unless one eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, he shall not have life in him. Now, what are the 'good and necessary consequences' to be drawn from these two statements as to carrying the Lord's Supper to the sick? Catholics draw one consequence, Presbyterians another; which proves that it is difficult to draw 'good and necessary consequences' from Scripture alone. In point of fact the Scriptures neither expressly command nor forbid the practice, and it must therefore be impossible from them alone to come to any certain conclusion respecting it, since the practice depends on the will of Christ, and they, in this instance, tells us nothing particularly of that will, one way or the other. Presbyterians consider the practice superfluous and even superstitious; while the Catholic Church, the Church of England and all the Oriental sects are solicitous to impart this sacrament to the dying Christian, and we believe this to be not only the most plausible consequence of the words of Scripture, but a positive institution of the Apostles and of our Lord himself. Who dare assert that 'good and necessary consequences' from Scripture forbid it? especially since they say nothing expressly about it, and it has been observed from the time of the Apostles down, by so many millions of Christians, as an Apostolic practice,—not indeed written in a book, but entrusted to living men, who continually observed it, and could not possibly mistake or forget it? This is one example among a thousand equally clear and conclusive. It is, then, perfectly idle to tell us that the Scriptures are sufficient, and yet tell us that 'good and necessary consequences' remain to be drawn from them, without which they would be insufficient. The great difficulty is in drawing the consequences, and it is in the consequences they draw that men chiefly differ one from another, and fall into their dangerous errors and heresies. No book could be sufficient which should not itself draw and set down expressly all the good and necessary consequences requisite to God's glory, and man's salvation, faith, and life; and as the Bible does not by the confession of Presbyterians themselves, do this, it is evidently insufficient, and they confess it to be insufficient, even while insisting on its sufficiency.

The article contains, also, another contradiction not less palpable. It affirms the Scriptures to be sufficient for all that concerns God's glory, and man's salvation, faith, and life, and yet asserts that besides them, "the illumination of the Spirit of God is necessary to a saving understanding of the word." There is more in this apparently modest and pious assertion of the necessity of inward illumination to the saving understanding of the Scriptures than may at first appear. It leaves the Scriptures open to every visionary or enthusiast, and wholly destroys their credibility as a monument of our faith. The meaning of a book is to be made out from the natural sense of the terms and expressions it employs, as understood by the community which uses them. If something interior and invisible is necessary to determine that meaning, the book is a mere scrawl or riddle; and utterly unfit to serve any purpose for which written documents are needed or used among men. The words 'this is my body' have a meaning of themselves, which must be sought in the religious community for which the book containing them was written. If, then, a Presbyterian comes forward, and tells us, that these words mean "this is *not* my body but bread," and and grounds his assertion on the assumed fact, that he has the Spirit and we have not, we can only treat his assertion as a like folly would be treated in a civil court. The assertion of the necessity of the inward illumination to the saving understanding of Scripture, is then, a flagrant contradiction of the assertion