

and inferior to Scripture, hers must be also. The chief tradition of Peter which Rome has kept is his denial of Christ. And she has not kept this perfectly, for she has not imitated his repentance.

Mr. Maturin's plausibilities regarding tradition have now been disposed of—they have been met and refuted. It will be proper now to advance a few steps with the argument. I refer you to the pamphlet, page 44. The writer says that the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation may be proved in two ways—"positively and negatively—either by internal or external evidence,—that is, either by an *express declaration of Scripture itself* (granting its Divine inspiration and Canonical authority) or *by disproving the existence of any other rule of faith*. But where does Scripture assert its own sufficiency as a complete record of Divine revelation? Is there a single passage in the Bible which declares that the whole revealed truth of God is contained in His written Word alone? We answer, without hesitation, *there is not one*. It is usual, indeed, to refer to some remarkable declarations of Scripture which relate to this subject, and especially to those three important passages—John, v, 39, Acts, xvii, and 2 Tim., iii, 15, 17. But it requires only a little attention to perceive that these passages do not establish the point."

Thus far Mr. Maturin. He has answered without hesitation, perhaps it would have been as prudent had he paused. I am glad to have these explicit statements put forth in the midst of us. Rome shall have her answer. She has stated what is proof, and that shall be given, both positive and negative, both internal and external. The Divine sufficiency of Scripture for salvation shall be proved from its own words. The existence of any other rule shall be disproved. And while, in regard to this argument, Mr. Maturin grants the Divine inspiration and Canonical authority of Scripture, this concession is by no means accepted as a favor or as being of