

with the authority of his tradition? Did he not tell of the wonders of the resurrection—the vision of angels—the glory of Jesus—his marvellous ascension—his kingly throne at the right hand of the Father? adding that of these things we are witnesses. Thus was the New Testament Church “built on the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone,”—and the great test, the square and rule applied to the whole was the one Infallible Word of God—the Scriptures which are the testimony of the Father Himself regarding Jesus. It is most certainly not on this principle that Romanists act in reasoning with Protestants. They do not test every fact, every doctrine taught them by their Church, with the touchstone of Scripture; but, placing their Church in a position which Christ and His Apostles never assumed, they make the holy Word of God bend and bow to their tradition.

There still remains for examination the third of the passages on which Mr. Maturin has chosen to hang the settlement of this question. And here I must complain of the discreditable method adopted by him in handling the passage. On page 44 he refers to it correctly enough, as 2 Timothy, iii, 15-17. But on page 46, when he comes to grapple with the difficulty it presents, he takes care to quote and comment on only one verse—leaving out of sight the remaining two verses, which present insuperable obstacles to the Romish doctrine. I forbear further remark on this conduct.

Let it be remembered that the question in dispute is this: “Does Holy Scripture contain all things needful to Salvation?” Can there be a plainer answer—“From a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.” To add one word would weaken the force of this inspired answer. But as though to meet an objection, more is said in the verses left out by Mr. Maturin. It might be