

could not produce *any thing else*, and that it will continue to create disunion, and separation, and contradiction of creeds, as long as it shall be applied. Suppose the Laws of the Land were published in one large volume, and mysteriously written, and that no Judges, or Magistrates, or Lawyers, were appointed to interpret or expound them, or to decide between those who expounded them differently, but that each subject was told to get a copy of the Laws, and read them for himself, and interpret them for himself, and regulate all his social and civil conduct according to his own interpretation, how long could society exist in peace? How would the rights of property be respected, or the duties of the subject performed, or the integrity of the social compact be preserved?

And yet, if we admit the Protestant Rule of Faith, we must own that Christ has acted with less wisdom and foresight than all human legislators—that though he wished to establish one Church, one Law, one common code of faith and morals, by which all his children should be united, and one, even as he and his Father are one, he established a Rule which defeats all his objects, which makes men even more divided than they were before his coming, and which in a word, considering the nature of man, renders all religious union impossible.

We beseech the enemies of the Church to ponder seriously on those things, and their common sense will tell them that a God of goodness and justice, a God who wills the salvation of all mankind, a God who died for all, a God who is no respecter of persons, a God who loves union, harmony, and peace, a God who descended from Heaven to bring Peace and Good will on earth, could not have been the author of such a Rule.

The questions which we have lately put on the authenticity and inspiration of the Bible, have as yet received no answer. One of the Journals indeed, tells us, that we are ourselves well acquainted with all the proofs in favour of the Bible, thereby insinuating that the Protestant and Catholic arguments are one and the same, on this point, and that they possess equal authority. We will never admit this. Our arguments in favour of the Scriptures and of our Religion deduced therefrom, are consistent and Catholic and capable of refuting all our adversaries, whether Christian, Jewish or Infidel. Not so with Protestant reasoning. It is the mantle of Catholicity stolen for an occasion. It is a Jackdaw in borrowed plumage: and therefore Protestantism should stand on its own merits, and not lean on Catholic support for the sustenance of its crazy creed. When you remove this adventitious aid, it tumbles to the ground:

—“Miserum est alienæ incumbere fame
Ne collapsa ruant subductis tectâ columnis.”

We will now resume our questions on the Bible, the Protestant Rule of Faith:

Did not two of the Evangelists who were not Apostles write their Gospels from hearsay and tradition?*

Why do we believe their testimony when they had not seen or witnessed the things which they relate?

How can any Protestant tell which books of Scripture, are canonical, and which not, on Protestant principles?

If it be easy to determine this question now, why was it so difficult in the early ages of the Church, and in the times next

* “According as they have delivered them to us, who from the beginning were *eye witnesses* and ministers of the word.” Luke i. 2.

to the Apostles, during which the most learned of the Fathers doubted what was Scripture and what was not?

By what authority and on what Protestant grounds, does a Protestant receive the present canon of the English Bible?

In the times of early Christianity an Epistle was published said to be written by Christ himself to Abigaris, King of Edessa. Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical history tells us that he transcribed it from the public records of Edessa. (Lib. I. C. 13.) Count Darius alludes to it in a Letter to St. Augustine. St. Ephrem of Edessa quote it as universally received in his time (In Testam. Tom. II. 235.) Procopius, Evagrius, St. John Damasceno in Ancient times, and Dr. Cave, Bishop Montague Dr. Gravo and many other modern Protestant Divines admit its authenticity. Now we ask:

On what authority can any Protestant reject this Epistle from the Canon of the Scriptures?

How can they prove what is Scripture, and what is not, unless by their own judgment, or the testimony of others?

What satisfaction can their own private judgement give them in the great question that some Books are authentic and others not?

If they decide the question by the testimony of others what authority so strong as that of the Catholic Church, and how can they consistently appeal to her authority on this vital point?

If the Bible and nothing but the Bible was the sole rule of faith amongst the early Christians why did they not immediately get each part of the New Testament transcribed, after it was written, and together with the whole of the Old Testament distribute it amongst every body of the faithful?

Does Scripture itself give a list of all the inspired Books?

How can a reference from one Book of Scripture to another, prove that other to be inspired, when the Book in which the reference is made requires a proof of its own inspiration?

Baruch, Tobias, Judith, and Wisdom, are rejected by Protestants as Apocryphal, and why do they admit Micheas, Numbers or the Canticle of Canticles which contains not one word of God or Lord?

Are not the former books as remarkable as the latter for majesty of style, beauty of expression, and piety of feeling, and how is it possible for a Protestant to decide between them from internal evidence?

“THE SECOND COMMANDMENT.”

“We now have the Editors of the Cross avowing that they have mutilated the Bible, and withheld from their people the knowledge of the Second Commandment.”

“The Romish Church has dared to say that God gave to Moses a commandment too much. . . . Again it seems that in the disposition of the ninth and tenth commandments, the all-wise giver of them did not pursue the proper course. The Church of Rome has taken upon herself to alter the arrangement of these also.”

We have extracted the above Protestant lies, from the columns of the Guardian, and we have done so for the purpose of stamping *falsehood* upon them. We request our readers to look back at what we have said in a former number on the lying Protestant objections about the Second Commandment, and we ask them, is there *any truth* in the first sentence which we have quoted above? Did we ever avow that the Catholic Church mutilated the Bible, or kept from the people the knowledge of the second Commandment? Certainly not. What then are we to think of the cool assurance of the writer who asserts that we did? His impudent falsehood was not published for the benefit of Catholics, but for the deception of the readers of the Guar-