

figurative sense alone we are to understand the verb is in the words of Institution. But like every other fallacy, this attempt to mystify the plain words of Christ, has been signally refuted by the ablest oriental scholars. For the fact is, that no language in the world contains more verbs which mean to *signify*, to *represent*, or *denote*, than the Syro-Chaldaic. Some authors give a list of forty one, others of forty-five Syro-Chaldaic verbs with this signification, any one of which Christ could and would have used in place of the verb *is*, if he intended to convey a *figurative* and not a *REAL PRESENCE*.

We have now answered a question or two, and we will take the liberty of putting a few in return to the objector. We are tempted to do so by his pompous declaration of war against tradition and the Holy Fathers, and of profound attachment to the Scriptures. He says: "My hopes depend upon the words of Sacred Writ."

But before his hopes can be grounded "on the words of Sacred Writ" he must be first satisfied that his Bible contains the words of Sacred Writ, and next that his interpretation of these words is a correct one. We humbly maintain that he can do neither of those things, and that consequently he can make no act of Divine Faith either in the Bible, or in any doctrine which he may deduce from it. We commend the following queries, which will embody our objections, to the special notice of the Theologians of the Times, the criminal of the Guardian, and to every Protestant in the community, and we think they would be much better employed in elucidating them, than in pouring torrents of unmerited abuse and filthy calumnies on their Catholic neighbours.

How do you know that your Bible is the word of God?

Did you ever see the original of the Bible? or would you understand it if you did?

How do you know that the books contained in the Bible were written by those whose names are prefixed to them?

How do you know that the various writers of the Old and New Testament were inspired?

How can you prove their inspiration from their own assertion since even Christ said of himself: "If I give testimony of myself my testimony is not true?"

How can the Bible prove itself to be inspired, or how can any part of the Bible, prove that every other part is inspired?

If the Bible be the only rule of Faith, as Protestants allege, how could the first converted Jews or Pagans receive the Apostles as such, before they saw the Bible, or before any part of the New Testament was written?

How could all those Christians who died in the belief of Christ during the long period between his death and the completion of the New Testament be saved without the Bible?

For fifteen hundred years before the invention of printing when manuscript copies of the Bible were so rare and so costly that it was absolutely impossible for the immense majority of Christians to procure a Bible at all, how could the countless millions of believers attain to the knowledge of the True Faith, without the Bible?

If the Bible alone be the Rule of Faith what will become of all those who cannot read, and who are consequently unable to avail themselves of the Rule?

Why do you admit into the Scriptural Canon the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke who were *not* Apostles and reject the writings of St. Barnabas *who was*, and of whom it is said in the Acts, that "he was full of the Holy Ghost and of faith?" (xi. 24.)

Does it not appear from the Bible itself, that many other sacred books have been written, of which we have now no account and which are lost for ever?

In order to form or apply the Rule of Faith, is it necessary to read the whole of the Scripture, or only a part? If the whole is it not impossible to be produced? If a part only, on what authority do you declare any part of the Bible to be sufficient?

Where is the 'book of the Wars' (Numbers xxi. 11) the 'book of the Just' (Joshua x. 13. 2 Kings i. 19) the 'Acts of King David' (1 Chron or Paralip xxix. 29) the 'book of Samuel the Seer,' of 'Nathan the Prophet,' of 'Gad the Seer' (Ibid) the 'Acts of Solomon' (2 Chron or Paralip ix 29) the 'Prophecy of Ahijah,' the 'Visions of Addo the Seer' (Ibid) the 'Acts of

Josaphat' (xx 34) the 'Book of Jehu' (Ibid) the remainder of Solomon's 3000 parables, and 1005 poems' (3 Kings iv 32) or his treatise on 'plants and animals?' (v 33)

What has become of Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, which was written previously to that now denominated his *First*, and alluded to in (1 Cor. i. 9) 'I wrote unto you an Epistle, &c.' or of his Epistle to the Laodiceans which he commands the Colossians to read? (iv. 16.)

Where are the sentences our Saviour himself wrote twice on the ground? (John viii. 6.)

If these and many other parts of Scripture be irrevocably lost how can you tell but that the best portions were inspired, and also necessary for the integrity of the Rule?

How do you account for the fact that Christ never gave his Apostles any command to *write*, but *ensured* them to *preach* and *bear* the Gospel to *nations* and *every creature*, and also for the singular fact that the only words which he is said to have written himself, have not been preserved, nor handed down to us?

Here are a few preliminary questions to which we shall confine ourselves this week, and which ought to furnish serious matter for reflection to all those who cry out that the Bible alone is the Rule of Faith. Though we never expect to hear one rational or consistent reply to those queries, we will continue them in future numbers for the purpose of shewing our Protestant neighbours, on what uncertain and dangerous quicksands, they are building their faith, and their hopes of salvation.

GREAT PROTESTANT LIES, AND HUGE "PROTESTANT IGNORANCE."

"Quid irascitur est, quam mentes mortalium falsis et mendacibus visis concitare?" Cicero 2 de Divinis. c. b. 2.

Falsehood is dangerous and foolish as well as criminal, for when detected it is sure to recoil upon its author. This truth is exemplified every day in the numerous conversions to the Catholic Church. Her doctrines have been calumniated and misrepresented by Protestants with such unblushing audacity that when their honest senses begin to open their eyes, and to discover that what they were taught from their infancy to be Catholic doctrine is a gross caricature of our holy Religion, and a whole tissue of lies and absurdities, they are so indignant at the vile trick played off on their credulity that their first movement is one "in the direction of Rome."

And surely nothing can be more natural. Conceive a member of any of the Protestant Churches, trained up from his infancy in the belief that Catholics hate him, that they would think it no crime to injure him—that they have no respect for the sanctity of an oath—that they can obtain the pardon of any crime for money—that they can get leave to commit any sin they please, by paying a stipulated sum—that with them, the end justifies the means no matter how wicked—that they make a Goddess of the B. Virgin, and worship her as such—that they adore angels and saints and offer them the homage that belongs only to the Deity—that they place their hopes of salvation in their priests, or in prayers, fasting and superstitious practices and not in the merits of Jesus Christ's Passion and Death—that they hate the Bible, and are not permitted to read it, and prefer human traditions before it—that they make idols and images and set up Relics to adore and pray to them as if they were God—that their priests preach to them in unknown tongues, and that they have blotted out or concealed one of the commandments lest the deluded people should see the danger of Idol worship—that the Pope can give them a dispensation to do any thing no matter how wicked provided it be for the good of the Church, that there is a regular list kept in a book at Rome