

A PROTESTANT'S APPEAL TO THE DOUAY BIBLE.

The Rev. John Jenkins' thesis is, that "Protestantism is the OLD RELIGION," that is, the Christian religion as it came from its founder, pure and undefiled: and by way of relieving us from much embarrassment, he defines the period when the Christian religion flourished in its primitive integrity, and to which the name of OLD may be applied. If then, Mr. Jenkins' thesis be true, it is during this period that we must look for the doctrines of Protestantism as by him defined.

"The corruption of the Church of Rome may be said to have commenced in the time of Gregory the Great."—p. 401.

Now certainly that which is not strictly true "may not be said" by the minister of the Gospel from the pulpit, which is, or should be, emphatically the chair of truth; therefore, if it "may be said" that "the corruption of the Church of Rome commenced in the time of Gregory the Great," it must be true that before the time of that celebrated Pontiff, the Church of Rome was free from all corruption: pure in doctrine and discipline. We shall therefore confine our examination of the doctrines and discipline of that Church to the period preceding the installation of Gregory in the Chair of Peter, A.D. 590.

The first Protestant principle as laid down by Mr. Jenkins is:—

"That of all revealed truth the Bible is the sole fountain."—p. 15.

And from this first principle naturally proceeds the first negation, or Protest against the authority of the Church as a teacher, or as the depositary of Divine truth. In this negation is contained the formal difference betwixt Catholicity and Protestantism; and had Mr. Jenkins succeeded in establishing it, he might justly boast of having overthrown the whole structure of Catholicity. He would have proved the falsity of the claims of the Church, to our dutiful submission, as the divinely appointed organ for the transmission of revealed truth, and would therefore, have fully established the truth of Protestantism, or the Protest against these claims. If therefore, Mr. Jenkins' thesis "that Protestantism is the OLD RELIGION" be true, the Protestant principle—"that of all revealed truth the Bible is the sole fountain"—must have universally and constantly obtained during the first and uncorrupt ages of Christianity, prior to the time of Gregory the Great. Or in other words, the Canon of Scripture, as at the present day accepted by the majority of the Protestant world, and contained in King James' Bible, must have been the sole, and universally recognised "Rule of Faith" amongst Christians, during the whole of that period. This we believe, Mr. Jenkins will admit to be a fair exposition of his meaning.

According to all the rules of controversy we should be perfectly justified in throwing the burden of proof upon our opponent's shoulders, by calling upon him to prove, that the Canon of Scripture, as he receives it, contains and exhausts, the Christian Revelation, or the "Word of God." Upon Protestant principles he is bound to prove this from the book he calls the Bible, and from nothing else; for, according to the Sixth Article of the Church of England:—

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

Now, if this article be true, as Mr. Jenkins asserts—if it be requisite to Salvation to have a right "Rule of Faith"—and if the true Canon of Scripture can alone afford us that right "Rule"—it is clear that no Canon of Scripture which cannot be read in the Bible, or "proved thereby,"—is to be required of any man that it should be received as an Article of Faith. In other words, if Mr. Jenkins cannot prove the correctness and completeness of his Canon of Scripture by the Bible alone—if he cannot prove thereby that all the books that it contains are divinely inspired; and that no divinely inspired books are therefrom omitted—he cannot, upon Protestant principles, expect us to receive his Canon of Scripture as an Article of Faith. And from the impossibility of doing this, we should have the right to conclude to the absurdity of the first Protestant principle—that, in matters of religion, nothing is to be believed but what may be proved from the Bible, or—"that of all revealed truth the Bible is the sole fountain."

In fact, in his very attempts to prove the truth of his "first Protestant principle," Mr. Jenkins admits its falsity. Though—if the Bible be the sole "Rule of Faith" for Christians, a certain knowledge of the Canon of Scripture, or of what books the Bible is composed, is indispensably requisite to every man—the Bible alone must be able to furnish us with that indispensably requisite knowledge—Mr. Jenkins does not so much as attempt to prove the accuracy of his Canon of Scripture from the Bible; but refers us to authorities which are not the Bible—to the decisions of Synods—the traditions of the Church—and the opinions of Fathers—thus, by implication, admitting that there must be an authority, extrinsic to the Bible, from which we must learn our first lesson in religion—viz: what writings are to be accepted as Canonical Scriptures.—If there be no such authority, how, would we ask of the Rev. Mr. Jenkins, is the ignorant man to know what writings should be so accepted? If there be such an authority, what, would we ask him again, becomes of his first Protestant principle—that the Bible alone is the sole fountain of all religious knowledge? Surely, to know which books are Canonical, and which are not, is a very important item in religious knowledge.

And though we might well be content to here rest our case—and, from the impossibility of establishing the Canon of Scripture, except by referring to some authority which is not the Bible, logically conclude

to the absurdity of the "first principle of Protestantism"—"that of all revealed truth the Bible is the sole fountain"—or that, in matters of religion, nothing is to be believed but what can be proved from the Bible;—we will do more, and undertake to prove that this, the first "principle of Protestantism," was not recognised in the first ages of Christianity; and that therefore, Protestantism, which is based upon, and must stand or fall by the truth of, this "first principle," is not the "OLD RELIGION."

The Bible—comprising under the term Bible, the writings both of the Old and New Testament—was not, to the first Christians, the "fountain of all revealed truth," or the source of all religious knowledge, because countless multitudes of Christians, lived, and died, for their religion, before the Christian Bible was in existence. Either then the Christians of the first century had some "Rule of Faith," which was not the Bible, or book to which Mr. Jenkins refers, or they had no "Rule of Faith" at all.

The Bible could not have been, to the Christians of the second and third centuries, the "sole fountain of all revealed truth," because—1st—although the books, of which the Bible is composed, were written, there was no universally recognised Canon of Scripture; and 2nd—because, dispersed as the Christian converts were over the face of the known world—from Spain to the confines of India—it is impossible that any complete collection of the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists could at that time have reached them, as is evidenced by St. Irenæus, who, speaking of the conversion of many barbarous tribes, observes that "without paper and ink they have the words of salvation written in their hearts through the Holy Ghost." Vide Neander, Eccl. Hist., Sect. 1, c. 2.

Nor was the condition of those early Christian communities that possessed scriptures much better in this respect. As, until the determination of the Canon, their members had no means of distinguishing the apocryphal, from the genuine, writings of the Apostles, many works, which the Church has since rejected, were then read, and appealed to, as genuine Scripture. There were apocryphal gospels, and apocryphal epistles—read, some in one city, some in another—but there was no Christian Bible, in the modern acceptance of the word. We will quote the learned Geiseler, an ecclesiastical historian, whose strong Anti-Catholic prejudices must strongly recommend him to all his brother Protestants. Describing the "Internal Fortunes of the Church," from the second to the third century, he says:—

"There was no universally received collection of the Evangelical narratives, and the existing ones comprehending besides our canonical Gospels, also the Gospel of the Hebrews, that of the Egyptians &c., served in their spheres only for private use. After the churches had now come into closer communion, they communicated to one another, in their common interest against heretics, the genuine Apostolic writings, and thus the canon began to be formed in the first half of the second century, in two parts ("to Evangelion" and "to Apostolikon") although in the different communities there continued to be other writings, which were valued almost, if not altogether, as much as those which were universally received." (Comp. of Eccl. Hist. by Geiseler, c. 3, ser. 51.)

If then Geiseler may be relied upon, the Bible, as accepted by Mr. Jenkins, was not, in the second, any more than in the first century, "the sole fountain of all revealed truth." The Christians of that age recognised another source of religious knowledge, or "Rule of Faith." At that early period, ere corruption had commenced, according to Geiseler:—

"The Catholic Christians began to establish, as the unalterable regula fidei, that complex notion of doctrine which could be shown, as well in the consciousness of all Christian communities, as also in the Apostolic writings, to be an essential basis of Christianity, and which must remain untouched by, and be necessarily laid at the foundation of every speculation."—Ib.—Ib.

Again then, we adduce unexceptionable Protestant testimony, that, in the ages of Christianity immediately subsequent to the Apostolic, the Bible alone was not the "Rule of Faith;" and that consequently the "first principle of Protestantism," was not recognised by the primitive Christian Church. We have therefore established our proposition, that Protestantism, as defined by Mr. Jenkins is not the "OLD RELIGION."

The second Protestant principle, as laid down by Mr. Jenkins, is:—

"Protestantism enters its Protest against any addition whatever to the Old and New Testament Scriptures, as binding upon the faith and practice of the Church, or upon the conscience of its members."—p. 17.

Before any definite meaning can be attached to this Protest, we must ascertain of what the Old and New Testament Scriptures consist: for to talk of adding to, or taking away from, an unknown quantity is an absurdity—Mr. Jenkins thinks to evade this difficulty by appealing to the decision of the Synod of Laodicea—A.D. 360—and by assuming that the quantity of scriptures, to be received as Canonical, was definitively settled by that assembly.

"The decision of the Council of Laodicea, omitting the Apocrypha, was received by the universal Church."—p. 19.

This we deny. This decision of the said Synod was never received as binding, or esteemed authoritative "by the universal church." But admitting that it had been, for the sake of argument, Mr. Jenkins' position would not be one whit improved. The Canon of Scripture generally admitted amongst Protestants to-day, is not the Canon that Mr. Jenkins asserts was once "received by the universal Church;" and, therefore, Protestantism of the XIX century can claim no spiritual affinity with the Christianity of the IV. Protestantism has both added to, and taken

* Sine charta et aramento, scriptam habentes per Spiritum in cordibus suis saluam.

away from, the Old and New Testament Scriptures, as defined by the Synod of Laodicea. From the Old Testament Scriptures, it has taken away, Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremias, which the Synod included in the Canon; to the New Testament Scriptures, it has added the Apocalyptic vision of St. John, which the same Synod omitted. Therefore, if the Canon of Scripture, as decided by the Council of Laodicea "was received by the universal Church,"—and as the Protestant Canon of Scripture at the present day differs in many most important particulars from that once universally received Canon—it follows, that Protestantism of the XIX century differs from the Christianity of the IV. and that, therefore, Protestantism is not the "Old Religion." It must be remembered that we are not arguing for the Catholic Canon of Scripture, but merely against Mr. Jenkins' assertion of the identity, of old Christianity, and modern Protestantism.

The third Protestant principle—which indeed is but another form of expression for either of the preceding—is:—

"Protestantism rejects an unwritten word:—it rejects all oral tradition as a rule of faith * * it denies the possibility, for any practical, authoritative purpose, of an unwritten word."—p. 20.

Had Mr. Jenkins' lot been cast amongst the heathen of the Apostolic age, when there was only an "unwritten word," with these principles he would most assuredly never have been converted to Christianity. And again, as Christ left no written word—as it cannot be read in Holy Scripture, nor proved thereby, that Christ ever directed His Apostles to commit His doctrines to writing—and since, "whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of Faith"—it follows necessarily, that no man can be bound, upon Protestant principles, to accept any scriptures as authoritative at the present day. Thus the logical consequence of Mr. Jenkins' Protest would be, if rigidly and consistently adhered to, that all who adopted them would remain heathens until the consummation of all things, as they would have no "word" at all, either written, or unwritten, to guide them. To be sure, the fault in that case would be Christ's, and not man's; for, if an "unwritten word" be, for all practical and authoritative purposes, worthless, He should have taken care not to leave the world, which He came to enlighten, without a "written word;" He should, at least, have imparted to the Apostles the mysteries of printing, and the art of type founding, ere He sent them forth to preach His Gospel. But, this Protestant principle carries its own refutation with it. Christianity was established, and propagated, by means of an "unwritten word"—and therefore, unless Christianity be a humbug, an "unwritten word"—may be of practical and authoritative value. This Protest of Mr. Jenkins' against the possibility of religious doctrines being transmitted, incorrupt, from generation to generation, by means of an "unwritten word" is but another proof that Protestantism eliminates the supernatural from Christianity—that it has no faith in the promise of Our Lord—to be perpetually with His Church. True, if left solely to natural agencies, for their transmission, oral, or unwritten, as well as written, traditions—might, and most likely would, in process of time, become corrupt. But the Catholic believes that the promise of Christ was something more than an idle word; and trusts, for the pure transmission of the "unwritten" and the "written word," not to mere natural, but to supernatural, agencies—to the constant assistance of the Spirit of Truth. Knowing then that Christ left His Church only an "unwritten word"—and relying upon the promised assistance of the Holy Ghost—the Catholic believes in the "possibility, for all practical and authoritative purposes, of an "unwritten word"—as did also the Christians of the I. century, who believed, and we trust were saved, by the instrumentality of an "unwritten word," which Protestantism in the XIX. century enters its Protest against. That an "unwritten word" was accepted by primitive Christianity is then another proof that the Protestantism which rejects it is not the "Old Religion."

We have confined ourselves to merely glancing at the formal difference betwixt Catholicity and Protestantism: in our next we propose to touch upon some of the material differences, and see if they bear out the Rev. Mr. Jenkins' thesis.

ARRESTS FOR MURDER.—The following persons have been arrested on the charge of being accessories to the murder of James Walsh, and M. Donnelly, who were shot on the evening of the 9th of June by the armed party which sallied forth from Zion Church. Murdoch Morrison—R. D. Collis—A. Heward—J. Boyd, gunsmith—Cooke—C. F. Hill—Adams, a dancing master—and G. M'Ever, latter. The accused have been admitted to bail.

We regret to say that the language and demeanor of certain of the accused towards the witnesses, during the proceedings in Court, were most indecorous. Mr. M. Morrison, the lawyer, vowed vengeance, declaring that he would shoot the first two Papists he should meet. Mr. Devlin, advocate, quietly told him that "he would do no such thing," and treated his ruffianly threats with becoming contempt. Dark and mysterious hints, too, were held out, of a contemplated withdrawal of allegiance, if these proceedings, against the worshippers of Zion church, were continued; these threats did not seem to have much effect on the Court. It is possible, too, that should these awful tidings reach Queen Victoria's ears, in her peaceful Highland retreat at Balmoral, Her most Gracious Majesty will be able to survive it; and that the glories of the British Empire will not fade, nor the British Lion quake, even though it should have to forfeit the allegiance of lawyer Murdoch Morrison.

ARREST.—Michael Devaney, charged with riotous conduct on the evening of the 9th June, was arrested on Saturday last, and bound over to appear before the next Court of Queen's Bench.

The Annual Meeting of the Young Men's St. Patrick's Association was held on Tuesday Evening last, when the following persons were elected to serve as Office-Bearers for the ensuing year:—

- President, . . . B. Devlin, Esq.
 - 1st Vice do., . . . M. P. Ryan.
 - 2nd Vice do., . . . Francis Farrell.
 - Treasurer, . . . Thomas Redmond.
 - Secretary, . . . Frederick Dalton.
 - Assistant Sec., . . . James Fennell.
- Committee—Messrs. M. O'Keefe, D. M'Cann, J. Hurley, J. Breene, J. Brennan, W. Cunningham, P. J. Fogarty.

We congratulate the "Young Men" on the flourishing state of their excellent "Association," and on their choice of a President for the ensuing year. Mr. Devlin's exertions in behalf of his trodden countrymen are well known; and his election as President of the "Young Men's St. Patrick's Association" shows that his services are properly appreciated.

We have received the Prospectus of a new Irish and Catholic weekly paper, to be published in Albany—as the "Catholic Pioneer and Irish Standard;" the first number to be issued on the 10th.—We wish the Pioneer all manner of good luck, and a long list of paying subscribers.

The first number of the Protestant Times—the new Anti-Catholic organ of Quebec—has made its appearance; it is to be published tri-weekly, and threatens to knock the "Man of Sin" into fits.—Some remarks that we were about to offer upon the merits of our new cotemporary have been anticipated by the Morning Chronicle, who characterises "the first attempt at whipping the enemy, as so puerile as to seem like the attack of an infant upon a giant." In "Our Address" the editor gives the reasons for the publication of a fresh Protestant organ, and defines his position; the latter being "the severance of all functions of government between this and the Mother country." The reasons assigned for this policy are, that the British Government have been guilty of concessions "to the Lucifer of Revolution, and the Moloch of Popery;" and that the "Traitor of Tamworth has moreover exulted every rebel from his lurking-place, in order to cover him with his Sovereign's favor"—till writing this, and no mistake. As a specimen of our cotemporary's Protestantism, we may add, that he inserts a story about His Excellency Mgr. Bedini having "skinned and scalped the accomplished patriot Basset" with his own hands. He should have added, that "he afterwards roasted and eat him; and still wears his bloody scalp round his neck in lieu of a pectoral cross." We throw this out as a hint to our cotemporary in the "Art of Lying;" an Art in which he must become a proficient if he expect to continue the "Protestant Times."

We read in the Catholic Mirror of Baltimore, of several conversions that have lately taken place in that city. The Rev. Mr. Lyman, late an Episcopalian minister, was received into the Catholic Church by His Grace the Archbishop, on the 27th ult. Mr. W. Oston, formerly a Methodist, also made his recantation of Protestantism in the hands of the Rev. Mr. Lebel.

We read in the New York journals accounts of a great "Temperance Convention" lately held in that city. The speakers were chiefly of the "soft sex," as Mr. Sam Weller calls it, and came out amazingly in favor of Temperance, and "Woman's Rights," the latter including of course, divorce, and the bifurcated garment. Mr. Greely followed, and moved, that "the use of fermented, or alcoholic, wine in the solemn celebration of the Eucharist, be impeached as a profane and impious desecration." This speaker begged leave to differ from the previous speakers on the subject of divorce.

The Catholic Telegraph warns all manner of men against trusting a scoundrel, now traversing this continent in every direction, and who "changes his name, borrows money, steals horses, marries a wife, and runs away from her, takes agencies for Insurance Companies, and declares himself a candidate for the Presbyterian Ministry." Look out for the fellow in Canada.

REMITTANCES RECEIVED.

- Aylmer, J. Doyle, £25; Quebec, M. Enright, £5; Cornwall, Rev. A. M'Donald, 12s 6d; Ormstown, Rev. Mr. Doyle, 12s 6d; Worcester, U.S., N. P. Moore, 6s 3d; St. Johns, D. McDonald, £1 17s 6d; F. Marchand 12s 6d; Pike River, Rev. J. Leclair, 12s 6d; J. Healy, 12s 6d; J. P. Foly, 6s 3d; Long Point, Rev. Mr. Legarde, 6s 3d; Toronto, M. Malone, 12s 6d; W. Hally, £1 15s; Sherrington, J. Hughes, 8s 9d; Williamstown, D. McDonald, 6s 3d; Howick, J. Garey, 5s; Etchemin, J. Neville, 15s; St. George, Rev. Mr. Campeau, 12s 6d; T. M'Intyre, 6s 3d; T. Rachford, 6s 3d; Perth, A. Leslie, 12s 6d; St. Columban, Rev. Mr. Falvy, 12s 6d; J. Phelan, 12s 6d; St. Sophie, Rev. Mr. Brosnan, 12s 6d; Cobourg, T. Duignan, £1 5s.

Married.

At Trenton, on the 29th August, by the Rev. P. J. Madden, D.D., Mr. James Lenihan, merchant, Perth, C. W., to Miss Elibabeth Macaulay, daughter of Denis Macaulay, Esq., Trenton, C. W.
August 10, at St. Mary's Church, Rathmines, Ireland, by the Rev. Mr. Meagher, P.P., assisted by the Rev. Mr. Clarke, Thomas Creagh Deey, Esq., son of the late Theophilus Deey, Esq., M.D., of Cahirciveen, to Bessie, daughter of the late William M'Mullen, Esq., of Dublin.