

them," (Acts xx. 20-27), while afterwards, he said to King Agrippa, (Acts xxvi. 22), "Having obtained help of God I continue unto this day ministering both to small and great, saying none other things than those things which the Prophets and Moses did say should come." It thus appears that Paul taught all saving truth, and yet taught nothing, which, in germ and principle, was not to be found in Moses and the Prophets. All saving truth is therefore to be found in the Old Testament Scriptures. *A fortiori*, it is contained in the Old together with the New Testament Scriptures.

3. In confirmation of the perfection of the Scriptures, we may refer, in the third place, to the *recorded prohibitions against adding* to their contents. In Deut. iv. 2., it is written, "Ye shall not add to the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you." Again it is said (in Prov. xxx. 5-6), "Every word of God is pure, He is a shield unto those that put their trust in Him. Add thou not unto His words, lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." (In Gal. i. 8), Paul thus writes, "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." (It is here to be remembered that Paul preached none other things than those which were recorded in Scripture). Once more we find the faithful witness himself saying in Rev. xxii. 18, "Testify unto every man that heareth the words of this book—if any man add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." Of course such prohibitions as these do not refer to the successive additions which were to be made to the sacred volume itself by divinely inspired men. They evidently, however, do forbid the addition by uninspired men of new doctrines, as necessary to be believed in order to salvation, and they plainly imply that all necessary saving truth is contained in the inspired volume.

4. In connection with this argument it may be added, in the fourth place, that the Scriptures *specially condemn such traditions* as are usually resorted to as containing a supplementary rule of faith. Of the manner in which tradition is condemned, the following are examples. (Matt. 2, 3, 6 and 9), "Why, (said the Scribes and Pharisees unto our Lord) do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders, for they wash not their hands when they eat bread? But he answered, and said unto them, why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition. Ye make the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. But in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." In Col. ii. 8, Paul thus writes, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, and not after Christ." So also in writing to the Thessalonians (II. Thes. ii. 2) Paul exhorts them that they should not be shaken in mind or be troubled neither by spirit nor by letter *as from him*—which is equivalent to an exhortation against trusting to unwritten tradition. From such declarations as those just quoted, it is very plain that the Scriptures need no supplement in respect to articles of faith, and certainly no such supplement as is furnished by tradition.

It has already been mentioned that the writings of inspired men may be of advantage in the way of confirming our faith; it would therefore be consistent with our position to appeal to the early Christian fathers, and to confirm our views respecting the perfection of Scripture by showing that these views harmonize with the teaching of the very men to whose writings Romanists refer as containing supplementary articles of faith. But, I deem it unnecessary at present to cite the opinions of the fathers, or to advance any further arguments in proof of the perfection of Scrip-