

transmit the truth to all ages in all its integrity, if he had let this illustration alone, for we find that the first half of these palmy days of 'oral tradition' and 'oral teaching' ended by leaving no more religion in the world than was found in the Ark, and that the second exhibits almost as great a corruption, when well nigh the only godliness left was found in the household of Abraham.

Dr Walsh tells us that under the Mosaic dispensation, the "sole means" for "determining the true doctrine, or deciding religious disputes" was the "authority of the Jewish Priesthood and the Jewish Church", and, in support of this extraordinary assertion, quotes, as an 'evident' proof of its correctness, our Lord's saying, "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in the chair of Moses, according to what they say to you do ye: but according to their works do ye not".—Unfortunately for the sense Dr. Walsh draws from these words, we have an indisputable statement of their meaning from Christ himself, who, so far from inculcating on the people a blind and implicit obedience, or investing even the Pharisees with 'authority' in matters of faith, expressly tells his disciples to "take heed and beware of their doctrine" (Matt. xvi. 6. 12.); denounces them as 'blind guides', and affirms that they made their proselytes "children of Hell". Still more—he speaks thus of their "oral tradition", so lauded by Dr. Walsh, which was a great part of their teaching: "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God for your tradition—you have made void the commandment of God for your tradition. Hypocrites! * * in vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines and commandments of men"! (Matt. xv. Dy. vn). Now is it conceivable that Christ would enjoin the people to obey them in those things in which they made "void" and "transgressed" the "commandment of God", and their worship was "vain" from their "teaching doctrines and commandments of men"? Would he require them implicitly to follow "blind guides", or to listen to all they said, and so be made "children of Hell"? Far be it from us ever to cast such an imputation on our blessed Lord. The quotation of Dr. Walsh, then, amounts only to this, that, as public teachers of the Law, and as much of their instruction, notwithstanding all their corruptions, was in harmony with it, Jesus desired to uphold them so far as they kept by its precepts. When they "transgressed" it or "made" it "void", the command was—"Take heed and beware of their doctrine". Will Dr. Walsh allow his people the same liberty to try his 'doctrines' by Scripture? It is not the case that "the Jewish Church and Priesthood" were the authoritative interpreters of the Scriptures in any sense like that claimed by the Church of Rome. Neither the Priests nor any other class laid claim to the right of exclusive or authoritative interpretation, as Dr. Walsh would have us believe. Jesus 'preached' and 'taught in the synagogues'. Yet assuredly he did not give the interpretations of the 'Jewish Church and Priesthood'; nor, certainly, did his apostles, and yet they, also, as we see in the book of Acts, had the synagogues freely open to them. The fact is, that any person who was thought to be able, was at liberty to read or to preach, especially, among others, one who appeared in the character of the head or leader of a new sect, probably that the audience might be fairly informed of their principles, and not condemn them unheard or unknown.

Dr.
exclus
economi
ence o
religio
in each
what l
he om
ons of
of pain
simple
if it ca
Now,
nected
pelling
what i
a tyrann
main f
God.
church
vice—
Now
so who
He wo
end?
faith v
the bo
The o
ment
We
ply ass
is that
Rome.
ficient
to us v
private
'author
comman
rity" he
it amo
touch
mind.
The
sound,
power
with th
child t
should
"Sailor
--blind
accepti
silent—
the sou
What
"Soldier
does it
mind h
eviden
of the