

evidence which God is bound to give us for the guidance of our faith? Are we sure that it is really necessary that every controversy which arises in the Church should be *decided*? May not some of them be left open questions, without any prejudice to the unity of the faith? But further, cannot these controversies be decided without an *infallible* Judge? The Church of England, in her 20th Article, declares that "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith," yet she does not lay claim to any absolute infallibility in her decisions. We admit that there must be authority in every Church; but cannot this authority be final and decisive without being infallible? And surely, if there be really an infallible living judge of controversy, it is of the utmost importance for us to be provided with an infallible proof that there is one, and who he is; otherwise all speculation on the subject is practically useless. There is not a word in all the Scriptures about a living and speaking infallible judge of controversy, to whom all Christians are obliged to submit, though this is the very foundation of religion, according to the Church of Rome; and therefore we may surely infer with much more modest submission, that, since God Himself has made no revelation on the subject, the belief in the divine appointment of such a judge is purely gratuitous. We would, indeed, gladly admit the principle, if it could be proved; but as the reasons alleged for infallibility appear to us so inconclusive, we are certainly not at liberty to adopt the conclusion without a full conviction of its divine authority. Yet the supposed proof of the existence of such a judge is founded upon a general presumption of the usefulness and expediency of such a tribunal, from which it is argued that there *ought* to be one, therefore there *must* be, and therefore there *is*. But, after all, sup-