

the *Epistles* of St. Paul (as the English Translation would seem to imply), but to the *things* referred to by the Apostle, as is evident from the different genders in the Greek words, according to the received text. Nor is it certain that St. Paul's Epistles are expressly included among "the other Scriptures" here mentioned; and it is remarked by a learned Biblical Critic, that, in this passage, "*some think* the Writings of Paul and other Apostles are meant".\* Besides, there is no enumeration here given of St. Paul's Epistles, though you state that they were "fourteen in number", because these are all that we *now* possess. And yet we find that St. Paul himself refers to three of his Epistles which have, most probably, long since been lost, (1 Cor. v. 9. Eph. iii. 3. Col. iv. 16), though these must have been included among "all his Epistles" referred to by St. Peter. Further, it must not be forgotten, that St. Peter's Second Epistle itself was one of the last admitted into the Canon of the New Testament, as there were considerable doubts as to its authenticity in the primitive Church; and, indeed, Origen is the only one of all the Fathers of the first three Centuries, who expressly refers to it, though with some doubtful marks of approbation. When, therefore, you refer to St. Peter's authority relative to St. Paul's Epistles, and "by parity of reasoning, to the other parts of the New Testament", you forget the important fact, that the Canon of the New Testament was not settled for several Centuries after the time of St. Peter; while there is nothing whatever in their own language to justify the assertion that "it is evident, from the testimony of these two Apostles, that all that was known as Holy Scripture, contained suffi-

\* Robinson's Greek Lexicon to New Test, p. 157. (Ed. Edin. 1838.) Vid. Schleusner Lexicon in Nov. Test. Vol. I. p. 420. (Ed. Lond. 1829.)