

ROME AND THE BIBLE.

BY THE REV. T. DONNELLY, S.J.

Introduction.

A PAMPHLET entitled *The Claims of Rome*, by Samuel Smith, M.P., is being largely circulated in this our city of Liverpool, as well as in his own constituency in North Wales. On reading this pamphlet, we began to realize more vividly than hitherto how difficult it is to kill the great Protestant Tradition. Though we have much to say, it is so hard to get a hearing in order to refute the Protestant Tradition. Here we have a man who has uplifted his voice in behalf of the oppressed and the downtrodden, a man who has a conscience which he is not afraid or ashamed to obey, a man who deserves credit for his manly denouncement of the religious indifferentism of the day, a man who has most generously opened his purse in behalf of the suffering, a man whose well-known philanthropy carried him triumphantly into Parliament in 1882, suddenly coming forth and flinging down in the arena of political strife, and amidst a people already bitterly prejudiced against the Catholic Church, a number of statements and accusations that cannot be stigmatized by a milder name than calumnies.

We do not accuse Mr. Samuel Smith of wilfully, deliberately and with eyes wide open uttering what he

¹ The substance of Sermons preached at St. Francis Xavier's, Liverpool, January, 1897.

knew to be false. His pamphlet clearly shows that he, not the Catholics, has a profound ignorance of the historical facts mentioned in the pamphlet. We were not surprised at this when we turned to the Appendix and saw the names of authorities such as Mr. Charles Hastings Collette, the Monthly Letter of the Protestant Alliance, and Janus. That he, and those who think with him, may know more clearly the value of the support upon which he is resting, may we venture to ask him and them to read a penny pamphlet by the Rev. Sydney F. Smith on *Mr. Collette as a Historian*, published by the Catholic Truth Society. In this pamphlet of sixteen pages Mr. Collette is shown to be guilty of thirty-one deviations from truth. A similar pamphlet by Mr. F. W. Lewis, on *Mr. Collette as a Controversialist*, exposes the methods of the Protestant Alliance. As to Miss Ellen Golding, Mr. Smith apparently does not know that she has disappeared from Protestant platforms; if he wishes to read a full account of her, he will find it in Father Smith's pamphlet on *Ellen Golding, the Rescued Nun* (C.T.S., 1d.). These three pamphlets throw much light upon the methods of certain Protestant agitators, as well as on the tortuous ways of the Protestant Alliance.

The Church and the Bible.

On the present occasion I propose to deal only with that part of Mr. Samuel Smith's pamphlet which deals with the attitude of the Catholic Church towards the Bible.

Two assertions stand out prominently in this portion of the onslaught made by Mr. Samuel Smith upon the Roman Church and its Supreme Head, the Pope.

First, "Wherever Rome has had undisputed sway, she has kept the Bible from the laity." In proof of this statement we are told how difficult it was for friends of Mr. Smith to smuggle Bibles into Rome; how, on the seizure of Rome by the Italians, the first wheel carriage contained a consignment of Bibles (presumably the first ever seen in Rome); how Lasserre's French translation of the Gospels, after Papal approbation, was placed upon

the Index and its sale prohibited; and how finally Pius IX. admonished the bishops to labour that the faithful may fly with horror from this poisonous reading.

Second, "Nothing is more certain than that in every country where Rome is supreme the circulation of the Scriptures is forbidden." In proof of this we are reminded of what took place not many years ago in Italy, Spain, and Austria; we are referred in the Appendix to the Fourth Rule of the Index; and we are told the opinions of Cardinals Bellarmine, Wiseman, &c.

In answer to the first statement, "that wherever Rome has had undisputed sway she has kept the Bible from the laity," it must be remembered that Rome's ecclesiastical power over Western Christendom at least was recognized up to the sixteenth century. Men might argue and quarrel as to who was the lawful Pope during the Great Schism; but the great central fact stands out all the more prominently because of the Schism, that the Pope was the chief ecclesiastical ruler of Christendom. It was not until A.D. 1229 that the first authoritative restriction on Bible reading was passed by a Council held at Toulouse to receive the submission of Count Raymond, to suppress the growing heresy and prevent its further spread. Inasmuch as these heretics, who revolted against all authority, mutilated the Bible in order to propagate their errors, the Council of Toulouse forbade the possession by laymen of the Sacred Books, especially in the vernacular.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century the Lollard cry in England was, "An open Bible for all!" meaning by an open Bible the incorrect and mischievous translation attributed to Wyclif, in which text and notes alike were made the instruments of an attack on all lawful authority. Thus we find that it was the perversion of Holy Scripture which rendered the prohibition of unauthorized translations of Holy Scripture absolutely necessary. Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Council of Oxford, 1406, after noticing the difficulties and dangers of translating the Word of God, ordained that no one should on his own authority

translate into English any portion of Holy Scripture by way of book, or pamphlet, or treatise; nor should any such book, pamphlet, or treatise, lately composed in the time of John Wyclif, or since, or which shall hereafter be composed, be read in whole or in part, publicly or in private, under pain of the greater excommunication, until such translation be approved by the Diocesan or by a Provincial Council. In spite of enactments the evil spread, and when England broke off from union with Rome the Bible was seized upon as the standard of revolt.

The right of private judgment having been proclaimed, text after text was torn from its context and used to prove the truth of any particular doctrine that made an impression on the reader. Calvinists and Lutherans, Presbyterians and Anabaptists, as well as the Anglicans, found in the pages of Holy Scripture a rich mine from which to dig any fanciful doctrine. In fact, to-day as in the past, no two Protestants agree as to the meaning of the Bible.

Dreading evils such as these, the Catholic Church judged it necessary at certain times, when men's minds were disturbed by erroneous teaching, to safeguard the Word of God, ever held by her in the utmost reverence, with various restrictions.

The Bible before Luther.

There used to be a story common amongst Protestants that Luther discovered the Latin Bible about 1507; that he was the first to translate it into German; that other "reformers" followed his example and made the first translations of the Bible into the languages of their countries, and that then for the first time the people came to know the Bible, for up to that date the Catholic Church had kept the Bible away from them—or, in other words, "wherever Rome has had undisputed sway she has kept the Bible from the laity." All this is untrue. The *Church Times*, July 26, 1878, says: "This catalogue of Bibles [in the Caxton Exhibition at South Kensington, 1877] will be very useful for one thing, at

any rate, as disproving the popular lie about Luther finding the Bible for the first time at Erfurt about 1507. Not only are there very many editions of the Latin Vulgate (*i.e.*, the Bible in Latin, the very thing Luther is said to have discovered), but there are actually nine German editions of the Bible in the Caxton Exhibition earlier than 1483, the year of Luther's birth, and at least three more before the end of the century."

Let us now see what Bibles the Catholic Church had printed before any Protestant Bibles appeared. We ought to remember that in those days most who could read read Latin, and even preferred a Latin Bible to one in their own language. Before Luther's pretended discovery the Catholic Church had printed over a hundred editions of the Latin Bible, each containing, according to Janssen, one thousand copies, although the art of printing with movable types dated only from 1441. In German there were twenty-seven editions before Luther's Bible appeared. In Italian there were over forty editions of the Bible before the first Protestant edition appeared. There were two in Spain by 1515, one with the express permission of the Spanish Inquisition. In French there were eighteen editions by 1547, the first Protestant version appearing in 1535. Although no Catholic version of the English Bible appeared in print until some time after the publication of such versions in other countries, it is clear from the testimony of Sir Thomas More, quoted in the next paragraph, that no prohibition of vernacular versions had been issued by the ecclesiastical authorities in this country, and that many manuscript copies of the same had been freely circulated subsequent to, as well as long before, the time of Wyclif.

The Bible in the Middle Ages.

As many Protestant writers and lecturers are repeatedly asserting that the earlier Bible of Wyclif was prohibited by the Church authorities in England simply on account of their general hostility to the Word of God in the vernacular, it may be well to quote the remarks of a

Protestant writer, the Rev. E. Cutts, D.D., in a work already quoted: "There is a good deal of popular misapprehension," says he, "about the way in which the Bible was regarded in the Middle Ages. Some people think that it was very little read, even by the clergy; whereas the fact is that the sermons of the mediæval preachers are more full of Scriptural quotations and allusions than any sermons in these days; and the writers on other subjects are so full of Scriptural allusion that it is evident their minds were saturated with Scriptural diction. . . . Another common error is that the clergy were unwilling that the laity should read the Bible for themselves, and carefully kept it in an unknown tongue that the people might not be able to read it. The truth is that most people who could read at all could read Latin, and would certainly prefer to read the authorized Vulgate to any vernacular version. But it is also true that translations into the vernacular were made. . . . We have the authority of Sir Thomas More for saying that 'the whole Bible was, long before Wyclif's days, by virtuous and well-learned men translated into the English tongue, and by good and godly people with devotion and soberness well and reverently read.' . . . Again, on another occasion he says: 'The clergy keep no Bibles from the laity but such translations as be either not yet approved for good or such as be already reprov'd for naught (bad), as Wyclif's was. For as for old ones that were before Wyclif's days, they remain lawful, and be in some folk's hands.'" ¹ Surely such testimony as this, coming from the pen of one who for his transcendent ability was raised to the post of Lord Chancellor of England, ought to convince Mr. Samuel Smith of the mistake he has made in asserting that "Wherever Rome has had undisputed sway she has kept the Bible from the laity."

I purposely quote non-Catholic writers in refutation of this astounding statement, as they are less liable to be suspected of partiality for Roman Catholic doctrine and practices. Dean Hook ² says: "It was not from hostility

¹ *Turning Points of English Church History*, pp. 200-201.

² *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. iii. p. 83.

to a translated Bible, considered abstractedly, that the conduct of Wyclif in translating it was condemned. Long before his time there had been translators of Holy Writ. There is no reason to suppose that any objection would have been offered to the circulation of the Bible if the object of the translator had only been the edification and sanctification of the reader. It was not till the designs of the Lollards were discovered that Wyclif's version was proscribed." Then, on p. 94, he proceeds: "When we speak of them (the Lollards) as martyrs, we ought to regard them as political martyrs rather than religious. They made religion their plea in order to swell the number of the discontented; but their actions tended to a revolution in the State as well as in the Church. . . . Both parties regarded their principles as subversive of all order, in things temporal as well as in things spiritual." Writing in the *Academy* of August 7, 1886, Mr. Karl Pearson says: "The Catholic Church has quite enough to answer for . . . but in the fifteenth century *it certainly did not hold back the Bible from the folk*; and it gave them in the vernacular a long series of devotional works which for language and religious sentiment have never been surpassed. *Indeed, we are inclined to think it made a mistake in allowing the masses such ready access to the Bible.* It ought to have recognized the Bible once for all as a work absolutely unintelligible without a long course of historical study; and so far as it was supposed to be inspired, very dangerous in the hands of the ignorant." The *Quarterly Review*, October, 1879, says: "The notion that people in the Middle Ages did not read their Bibles is probably exploded, *except among the more ignorant of controversialists. . . . The notion is not simply a mistake . . . it is one of the most ludicrous and grotesque blunders.*"

The Monks and the Sacred Scriptures.

We know, too, that it was the chief occupation of the monks to study the Bible and multiply copies of it. Thousands of copies must have been made in England

alone before the invention of printing, and these naturally fell into the hands of those who could read, like the clergy, the nuns, and, as we know from Sir Thomas More, the learned laity. But as the greater number of the laity could not read, how were they taught the Bible? They were taught by the clergy and the monks, who used as means of instruction paintings and stained-glass windows illustrating the events and lessons of the Bible; poetry, in the hymns which embodied Bible history and teaching; music, to which they set words from the Bible; the stage, by sacred representations of scenes from the Old and the New Testament, and the ceremonial of the services of the Church, in which, as the year went round, were presented, sometimes in almost dramatic form, the principal events of the life of Christ, and the history of God's dealings with man. In those days, as said the Catholic Synod of Bishops at Arras in 1203, "painting was the book of the ignorant, who could read no other." And for this reason in Catholic countries the walls of churches, of monasteries, of cemeteries, of cloisters are covered with paintings representing scenes from the Old and New Testament. In England up to the "Reformation" the Catholic Church used all these ways to teach the people the Bible "In this country," writes Mr. Henry Morley, in his *First Sketch of English Literature*, "the taste for miracle plays was blended with the old desire to diffuse as far as possible a knowledge of religious truth; and therefore the sets of miracle plays acted by our town-guilds placed in the streets, as completely as might be, a living picture-Bible before the eyes of all the people." In Germany there was a celebrated set of forty or fifty pictures of Bible subjects so popular and so much used that it was known as "The Bible of the Poor" (*Biblia Pauperum*).

Thus, before the "Reformation," not only were there plenty of Bibles for those who could read, but the Roman Catholic Church made use of every means at her disposal to teach the Bible to those who could not read.

Did space allow, it would be easy to show that the general drift of the teaching of the Fathers of the Church

on this subject was an earnest exhortation to more frequent meditation on Holy Scripture, whilst at the same time they warn the faithful against the misuse of the Word of God by heretics, who read the Scripture without penetrating its meaning, because they do not read it aright. For twelve hundred years all the influence of the Church was exerted in favour of a wider spread of the Holy Scripture and a more familiar acquaintance with its Scripture Text by clergy and laity alike. Even after the invention of printing, when a general diffusion of Bibles in the vernacular first became possible, no check or hindrance was put upon it by authority, so long as the translations used were really a version, not a perversion, of Holy Scripture, and were not interlarded with heretical or offensive annotations.

Unfortunately, in the "Reformation" days, the Word of God was turned into an instrument for the use of heresy. As in foreign countries, so too in England, the translations were falsified in meaning, and the sweet milk of Christian doctrine turned to poison. In Tyndale's translation, flavoured with the errors of Lollardism, Our Lord is made to say in St. Matt. xvi. 18: "On this rock I will build My congregation." The word "idols" is translated "images." In St. John v. 21, the Apostle warns the early Christians: "Babes keep yourselves from images." The Apostolic "traditions" on which St. Paul lays stress (2 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 6) are turned into "ordinances," and so on. It was the necessity of preserving the purity of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and defending it from perversion and misuse by heretics, and safeguarding the Faith of her children, that induced the Church to issue a series of Decrees, Encyclicals, and Briefs, all of which are aimed, not against the reading of the Word of God, but either against those whose object it was to find therein what suited their heretical purpose, and who ingeniously twisted the meaning of the Holy Scripture, or against any interpretation of it in a sense contrary to the teaching of the Church and the unanimous consent of the Fathers, doctors, and theologians.

The Circulation of the Bible.

So far we have dealt with the astounding assertion that wherever Rome has had undisputed sway, she has kept the Bible from the laity, and shown, chiefly from non-Catholic authorities, that the assertion is not only void of foundation, but contrary to fact. There is a second assertion made by Mr. Smith, and generally accepted by Protestants, which we shall prove to be as devoid of foundation and contrary to fact as the first. It runs as follows: "Nothing is more certain than that in every country where Rome is supreme the circulation of the Scriptures is forbidden."

This is indeed a very sweeping statement—a statement of the truth of which Mr. Smith is so convinced that he does not hesitate to say that there is "nothing" (not even, therefore, the existence of God or the Divinity of Jesus Christ) more certain than that the Roman Church forbids the circulation of the Scriptures. This statement is so positive and definite and precise that many a man will at once accept it, not believing that a man of Mr. Samuel Smith's position, and eminence, and straightforwardness, and rectitude would care to have his name linked with slander and calumny. It is another proof, if proof were wanted, of how the man must fare who ventures to intrude into a domain of which he has no knowledge.

In the fields of science each man sticks to his own special line, acknowledging his ignorance of other branches into the mysteries of which he has not been initiated; but in the realm of theology the most ignorant and the novice deem themselves the equals of the learned and the veteran. Mr. Samuel Smith has been led astray by his so-called authorities, who but too often have wilfully poisoned the springs and sources of historical inquiry.

As we have seen, for twelve hundred years the Roman Church, through her pastors and her doctors, praised and recommended the reading of Holy Scripture, striving by every means in her power, in those days when the art

of printing had not been discovered, to multiply copies of the Holy Scriptures; using the books of Holy Writ in the compilation of her prayer-books and books of devotion; by the arts of painting and music bringing the Scripture history down to the level of the unlearned, who knew not how to read; by scenic representations on the stage making the characters of the Old and New Testament live indelibly impressed on the souls of the spectators, bringing back, as does the Ober-Ammergau play, in a most vivid and realistic manner the grand drama of the world's history and showing how it all culminates in the awful tragedy on Mount Calvary. True it is that when the Albigenses made a new translation of the Bible and explained it in their own sense to show that the visible world was created by an evil god, who was also the author of the Old Testament; that the Body of Christ was not real; and that sins committed after baptism could not be forgiven, the Church stepped in and forbade, not the circulation of the Scriptures, but the circulation of this new translation which they explained so as to suit their heretical views.

From the very beginning of the Church there have been countless translations of the Holy Scriptures. In these latter days the process is ever going on. Translations differ very much from each other, even in the same language, and what is more important, they differ very much in passages of the highest moment. If this be so they cannot all be the sense as it was given at first by God in the original Hebrew or Greek.

Now what do we Christians mean when we talk of the Bible? We can only mean one thing—that it is the Inspired Word of God. Consequently, if we find many of these translations contradicting one another on most important points we are driven to the conclusion that they cannot all be the Bible, that many of them are the work of men—nay, the work of the devil, who has induced men to put their own meaning in the place of the inspired sense of God's Word.

Let us trace the history of the Authorized English Version. This will show us how necessary it has been

for the Church to act with caution, lest the Written Word of God should become so mutilated as not to be recognizable. First comes Tyndale's New Testament, under Henry VIII. ; then Cranmer's Great Bible (1539); then the Bishops' Bible (1568), under Elizabeth; then the Authorized Version (1611), under James I.; and finally the Revised Version, under Victoria (1881). We ask why were these successive editions brought out, and we are told in answer, because the previous ones were found not to give the Word of God in its true sense. The Rev. J. H. Blunt, in his *History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, says: "In some editions of Tyndale's New Testament there is what must be regarded as a wilful omission of the gravest possible character, for it appears in several editions, and has no shadow of justification in the Greek or Latin of the passage, 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14. Such an error was quite enough justification for the suppression of Tyndale's translation."

Cranmer himself complained to Convocation that his Great Bible contained both in the Old and New Testaments many points which required correction, and he put it to the vote of the Upper House whether it could be retained without scandal to the learning of the clergy. The majority of the Bishops decided that it could not be so retained. This was followed by the Bishops' Bible, it in turn by the Authorized Version of James I., and now we have the Revised Version of 1881.

Let us take one instance only to show how untrustworthy even the Authorized Version is. In 1 Cor. xi. 27, the translation in the Authorized Version runs: "Whoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." Note the word "and": it was an all-important word in those days in that sentence. For Protestants maintained that it was necessary to receive Holy Communion under both kinds, and backed up their doctrine by this text. Though in the days of the Manichean heresy Holy Church had insisted upon Communion under both kinds, yet her discipline for many reasons had changed upon this point, and for centuries

Communion under one kind for the laity had been the usual practice of the Western Church. If we turn to the Revised Version, we find the passage rendered now as follows: "Whoever shall eat the bread *or* drink the cup of the Lord unworthily," &c. This is the reading in the Catholic Church, and confirms her practice of administering the Sacrament under one kind. The Revised Version is judged also by many learned men to contain serious errors.

If we turn to Continental versions, it is quite sufficient for our purpose to see the estimate formed by the "Reformers" themselves of these translations. Luther's translation, in which Emser detected over a thousand glaring errors, Zuinglius declared to be a corruption of the Word of God; a compliment which Luther repaid with interest on the appearance of the translation by Zuinglius. Ecolampadius and the theologians of Basle found fault with Beza's translation because, as they say, he changed the text of Scripture. Naturally Beza retorts upon them, and declares their translation to be impious in parts. Du Moulin says of Calvin's translation, that it did violence to the letter of the Gospel, which Calvin has changed, and to which he made additions of his own. When the ministers of Geneva made an exact version of Calvin's Bible, James I. of England declared at the Hampton Court Conference that of all versions it was the most wicked and unfaithful. When the Authorized Version first appeared in England it was openly decried by many Protestant ministers as abounding in gross perversions of the original text.

Furthermore, what has been the practical outcome of the principle of private judgment in conjunction with unrestrained licence in translating the Scriptures as each man chose? What has been the result in Germany, the first theatre of Protestantism? Is it not a fact that Rationalism, a system little better than downright Deism, has frittered away the very substance of Christianity? The Rationalists of Germany have left nothing of Christianity—not even its skeleton. Is England, that imported a religion first made in Germany, in a much

better plight? Do not many fear, and rightly fear, that the same spirit will soon carry all before it in England?

The Catholic Church, the guardian of Revealed Truth, the custodian of the Word of God, both Written and handed down by Tradition, seeing on the one hand the faulty, erroneous, and mischievous translations of the Scriptures that were being spread broadcast over every Christian land, and recognizing that the so-called right of private judgment, so lauded by the "Reformers," was utterly subversive of all authority in Church and State, provided a remedy for the evil that threatened the world. As there has never been a Divine command laid upon all men to read the Scriptures (else how could the early Christians and the unlearned in all ages be saved?), the Church has the power to regulate by her disciplinary enactments whatever concerns this reading. Ecclesiastical discipline is of its very nature changeable, and is adapted to meet the requirements of times, places, and persons. Restrictive measures which had prevailed in isolated dioceses became general when the danger became universal. These measures were particularly severe on the translations made or edited by heretics, and rightly so. For very many of these translations were written off with great speed, and consequently were not very faithful to the text; then the translators, under the influence of their errors, introduced in many places interpretations diverging from the traditional sense; besides, when these editions reproduced the Catholic version they suppressed the notes by which it was accompanied; finally, the character of their authors and the independent manner in which these editions and translations were made render them objects of suspicion. Furthermore, in our own days the method of procedure adopted by the Bible Societies has added a new motive for proscribing Protestant Bibles. In fact, it is generally conceded in principle that in all the Bibles published by these societies the Deuterocanonical Books of the Old Testament are not printed, and the text given without note or explanation. These Bibles, then, are mutilated

and deprived of those helps which would render reading less dangerous.

It is to no purpose, then, that our separated brethren accuse the Roman Church of proscribing arbitrarily editions and versions approved by Catholic prelates or faculties, simply and solely because they are distributed by Protestants. It is no silly jealousy that actuates ecclesiastical authorities. It is the good of souls, gravely compromised by these productions.

The Action of the Church.

The Bishops gathered together at the Council of Trent drew up a decree relative to the reading of the Bible in the vernacular, and besought the Pope before the dissolution of the Council to publish it in a solemn manner. Pope Pius IV. yielded to their wish, and published, March 24, 1544, the rules of the Index. The third Rule is: "Translations of the books of the Old Testament can only be granted to wise and pious men, according to the judgment of the Bishop, provided that they use these translations as explanations of the Vulgate, in order to understand the Holy Scriptures, and not as the true text. As to translations of the New Testament, made by authors of the first class (the heresiarchs, Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, &c.), let them be granted to no one, because their reading cannot be advantageous, and is generally very dangerous to the readers. If annotations have been added to the versions that are allowed, or to the Vulgate, their reading can be permitted to those who are allowed to have these versions, provided that the suspected passages in them have been cut out by the theological faculty of a Catholic university or by the General Inquisition." The fourth Rule is: "As experience has shown that if the use of the Holy Bible in the vernacular be allowed to every one without distinction there results therefrom, in consequence of the rashness of men, more harm than advantage, let all submit in this matter to the judgment of the Bishop or the Inquisitor, so that they can permit, with the advice of the parish priest or confessor, the reading of the Holy

Scriptures translated into the vernacular by Catholic authors to those whom they shall judge fit to draw from this reading not harm, but an increase of faith and piety. Let this permission be obtained in writing. Those who shall dare to read, or keep these Bibles without this leave cannot receive absolution of their sins until they have given them up to the ordinary. Regulars can neither read them nor buy them without the leave of their superiors."

This two-fold rule, which became the Church's law, suppressed as far as possible the abuses without ignoring or neglecting the advantages that might spring from the use of the Bible in the vernacular. This law, faithfully and loyally kept, foiled the plans and designs of the heretics. This is the reason why such senseless cries and absurd accusations have been excited by it. Protestants would have it that this new disciplinary enactment on the part of the Catholic Church was an impious attack on God's Holy Word; that the Holy Scripture was treated as though it were a dangerous, if not a bad book; that the laity were altogether forbidden to read it, and that hence it became the monopoly of the clergy, who were now able without let or hindrance to poison the minds and hearts of the unfortunate believers in the claims of the Church of Rome. Such is the fantastic interpretation spread abroad by Protestantism with obstinate persistency, in spite of every denial and every explanation of Catholic theologians.

Now let us see what in reality was allowed by the Church in relation to the reading of the Holy Scriptures. All Catholics, laymen as well as the clergy, were allowed to read, 1st, the Old Testament in the Hebrew text, and the New Testament in the Greek; 2nd, the Greek version of the Septuagint; 3rd, the ancient translations of the whole Bible in Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopian, &c.; 4th, the Latin Vulgate. The Church knows full well that these texts and these translations are orthodox, and she was convinced that men who were capable of understanding these ancient languages were sufficiently well educated not to suffer themselves to be led astray by the

difficulties and obscurities of the Holy Scriptures. We must remember, too, that most, if not all, educated men of that time understood Latin, and in consequence were perfectly free to read the Vulgate.

The Church, however, did not allow the use of the Bible translated into the vernacular indiscriminately to all; but she gave the use of it freely and willingly through the Bishop or the Inquisitor, to all who were accounted fit to profit by its reading, on the advice of the confessor or the parish priest. Undoubtedly, then, a restriction was placed upon the indiscriminate reading of the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue. Nay more, for a brief period the restriction was drawn tighter by Sixtus V. and Clement VIII., who insisted that application for this leave was to be made to the Holy See. This legislation, however, was soon dropped, and things reverted to the state established by Pius IV. When, however, the fury of the storm had subsided, Holy Church began to relax still more the severity of the discipline. Thus we find Pope Benedict XIV. in 1757, the year that Clive founded our Empire in India by the victory of Plassey, two years before the fall of Quebec, three years before the accession of George III., a hundred and forty years ago, confirming this decree of the Congregation of the Index: "If these translations of the Bible into the vernacular have been approved by the Holy See or edited with notes taken from the holy Fathers or learned Catholic authors, they are allowable." This decree was confirmed in 1829 by Pius VIII., and is now practically the law throughout the length and breadth of the Catholic world.

Yet Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., tells us that "Nothing is more certain than that wherever Rome is supreme the circulation of the Scriptures is forbidden!" If he is not yet convinced let him pay strict attention to the words of Pius VI. writing to the Archbishop of Florence in 1778, the year that the great Commoner, William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, died, whilst the American colonies were in the midst of their great struggle for freedom. These are the words: "*You judge exceedingly*

well that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures; for these are the most abundant sources which ought to be left open to every one to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine, and to eradicate the errors which are so widely spread in these corrupt times. *This you have seasonably effected by publishing the Sacred Writings in the language of your country, suitable to every one's capacity.*" Pius VII., writing in 1820 to the English Vicars-Apostolic, urges them "to encourage their people to read the Holy Scriptures, for nothing can be more useful, more consolatory, and more animating, because they serve to confirm the faith, to support the hope, and to inflame the charity of the true Christian."

Is Mr. Samuel Smith still unconvinced? Let him turn his gaze to that vast Republic in which he has been lately travelling, and note that in that land there is a mighty episcopate which is accustomed to gather together from time to time in council at Baltimore. About ten years ago, in a Pastoral Letter addressed by them to their faithful children, they say: "It can hardly be necessary to remind you, beloved brethren, *that the most highly valued treasure of every family library*, and the most frequently and lovingly made use of, should be the *Holy Scriptures*," and after citing the letter of Pius VI. to the Archbishop of Florence cited above, they conclude: "*We trust that no family can be found amongst us without a correct version of the Holy Scriptures.*" If Mr. Samuel Smith, and those who agree with him, are not yet convinced of the error, they must be hard to satisfy. We are told to turn for a compact view of the subject to the copious writings of the Rev. J. A. Wylie, especially the one entitled *The Papacy*. We turn to it, and we read the extract which purports to be taken from an Encyclical of Pius IX. in 1850. We give the extract as it appears in Mr. Samuel Smith's pamphlet and the extract as it is in the Pope's Encyclical in parallel columns, and leave to the pious consideration of the reader the tortuous ways of some Protestant controversialists—

EXTRACT AS IN MR. SMITH'S
PAMPHLET.

“Nay, more, with the assistance of the Biblical Societies, which have long been condemned by the Holy Chair, they do not blush to distribute Holy Bibles, translated into the vulgar tongue, without being conformed to the rules of the Church. . . . Under a false pretext of religion, they recommend the reading of them to the faithful. You, in your wisdom, perfectly understand, venerable brothers, with what vigilance and solicitude you ought to labour that the faithful may fly with horror from this poisonous reading.”

EXTRACT AS IN THE
ENCYCLICAL.

“Nay, more, with the assistance of the Biblical Societies, which have long been condemned by this Holy See, they do not scruple to spread about and recommend to the faithful peoples under plea of religion, Bible, translated into the vernacular contrary to the rules of the Church, *and by this means corrupted and with reckless audacity twisted to a false meaning.* Hence, venerable brethren, you understand in your wisdom with what vigilance and anxiety you must labour that the faithful sheep of the flock may shun the pestilential reading of them.”

Is it easy to believe in the good faith of men who wilfully and deliberately print statements like the above as the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church? Where is the English sense of fair-play in such a translation? Is it not skilfully devised to lead on the readers who have neither the leisure nor the wish nor the opportunity—and they form the multitude—to verify the quotation, to believe that the Sovereign Pontiff forbids as pestilential reading God's Holy Word? The important words which give a totally different complexion to the sentence are omitted, as if they were of no importance and did not give any more light to the meaning of the sentence. When we turn to what Pius IX. did say, we find that the Pope earnestly exhorted the Bishops to labour to get their flocks to shun the pestilential reading of—what? The Bible? No; but of Bibles which had been translated into the vernacular, and which had “by this means been corrupted and, with reckless audacity, twisted to a false meaning.”

We shall later see how wise and prudent, nay, how absolutely necessary, were these orders of the Popes through the action of the Bible Societies in the East. Catholics often wonder how it is that such strong preju-

dice exists against the Church. It is fabrications such as these that keep up the bitter feeling against us.

Except in the South of France, North of Spain, and England, where restrictions were imposed by Provincial Councils in the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries respectively on translations of the Bible into the vernacular because they were accompanied by false interpretations or were false in translation, no restriction was imposed upon such translations by the Church as a whole till Pius IV. published the decree of the Index, March 24, 1544. Even then, as has been already said, the Bible could be read by all, laymen as well as the clergy, in the Hebrew and Greek texts, in the Septuagint version, in the Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopian, &c., versions, and in the Latin Vulgate. Restrictions were placed upon the reading of the translations of the Bible into the vernacular, but leave could be obtained from the Bishop or Inquisitor, through the confessor or parish priest, to do so. This legislation was, however, changed by Benedict XIV. 140 years ago (in 1757), when he confirmed the decree of the Congregation of the Index, by which the reading of Catholic translations into the vernacular was allowed if they were approved by the Holy See, or edited with notes taken from the Fathers or good and learned theologians.

Lastly, Bishops and Popes have earnestly exhorted the faithful to read the Holy Scriptures. How, then, can Protestants give utterance to statements so completely at variance with fact?

Mr. Smith, in a letter to the Liverpool papers (January 11th), quotes from the Rev. Hobart Seymour's *Mornings with the Jesuits* (1850), saying that he had sought in vain throughout Rome for a Bible in the Italian tongue. (He contradicts himself, by the way, as he informs us that Martini's translation was actually offered to him for sale.) Did the Rev. Mr. Seymour ask for the Protestant Bible? If so, of course he was told that it was not allowable. However, to obtain more definite information, as soon as I saw Mr. Samuel Smith's letter I telegraphed to an English priest stationed in Rome, and received from him a letter, which I print

as an appendix, with a pamphlet in Italian on the subject. He gives therein the same facts as I have adduced, about Martini's Bible appearing in many editions; tells us that countless copies of the New Testament were spread among the people before 1870, the Pope and Bishops encouraging their diffusion; and declares that hundreds of thousands of Curci's cheap translations of the Gospels, about 1870, have been circulated.

Mr. Smith cites a Brief sent in 1816 by Pope Pius VII. to Ignatius, Bishop of Gnesen, in which he denounces the Bible Societies, and says that the Holy Scriptures, "when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have, through the temerity of men, produced more harm than benefit." This quotation is accurate as far as it goes, but the words that follow show what it is that the Pope forbids. They are: "And this is a misfortune which we have more reason to fear in our days, as our holy religion is attacked on all sides with skilful efforts. You must then adhere to the salutary decree of the Congregation of the Index (June 13, 1757)—viz., that translations of the Bible into the vernacular (vulgar tongue) are not to be allowed, except such as are approved by the Holy See, or edited with notes taken from the holy Fathers." Clearly, then, as I have said so often, approved translations of the Bible *are* allowed.

A Protestant Device.

I have pointed out how, by misrepresentation which would seem to be wilful and deliberate, the words of condemnation of the Bible Societies by Pius IX. were made to say what the Pope never said. That you may see how common a device this is of some Protestant writers for gulling the Protestant public, let me cite an instance from the *English Churchman* of November 1, 1896: "In the year 1824, in an 'Encyclical,' Leo the Twelfth speaks of a certain society which is spreading over the world the Bible, which is the gospel of the devil." Fancy the Ruler of that Church which, as Luther said, preserved the Bible for us calling God's Holy Word

“the gospel of the devil”! The writer knew only too well that this was the food to supply to a large portion of the non-Catholic world, which has been fed for three hundred and fifty years on all kinds of mendacious statements about the grand old Church of their forefathers. These are the statements that are swallowed down wholesale by the gullible Protestant public, and which keep alive Protestant prejudice.

Now, what did Leo XII. really say? “You are aware, venerable brethren, that a certain society, commonly called the Bible Society, strolls with effrontery throughout the world; which society, contemning the traditions of the holy Fathers and contrary to the well-known decree of the Council of Trent, labours with all its might and by every means to translate—or rather to pervert—the Holy Bible into the vulgar languages of every nation; from which proceeding it is greatly to be feared that what is ascertained to have happened as to some passages may also occur with regard to others, to wit, that by a perverse interpretation the Gospel of Christ be turned into a human gospel, or, what is worse still, into the gospel of the devil.”

What are we to think of the capabilities of a man who dares thus to come forth and proffer his translation as the correct one of the Pope’s Encyclical? Most schoolboys who have even a limited acquaintance with the Latin tongue would laugh it to scorn. Yet fabrications such as these are spread wholesale against Catholicism by men who ought to—may I not add, who *must*—know better.

The Bible Societies.

Why is it that the Catholic Church is so hostile to the efforts of the Bible Societies? Is it dislike for God’s Holy Word? Every Catholic knows that such is not, such cannot be the case. The Catholic Church has too much love and veneration for all that comes from its Creator and Redeemer. The Catholic Church loves God’s Holy Word too much to expose it to the nameless horror and frightful indignities to which it has been

subjected by the action of the Societies in distributing millions of copies throughout the world.

Of the results of this action I will give a few examples. Archdeacon Grant in his *Bampton Lectures*, c. 3, p. 93, tells us: "The cause of the eagerness which has sometimes been evinced to obtain the sacred volume cannot be traced to a thirst for the Word of Life, but to secular purposes, the unhallowed uses to which the Holy Word of God, left in their hands, has been turned, and which are absolutely shocking to any Christian feeling." "They have been seen," says Dr. Wells Williams, "on the counters of shops in Macao, cut in two for wrapping up medicines and fruits, which the shopman would not do with the worst of his own books."¹ "They are employed," said Bishop Courrazy, "to roll round tobacco and bacon."² Whole cases of them were sold by auction and purchased, says another eye-witness, at the price of old paper, chiefly by the shoemakers, grocers, and druggists. Mr. Tomlin admits that the Chinese often stole them at night to apply them to domestic purposes, and that some of the missionaries appeared to consider this theft an encouraging proof of their zeal for Divine things. Marchini tells us from actual observation that they are sold by the weight to shoemakers to make Chinese slippers, and then goes on to express his astonishment, because "the English, who display so much discernment and accuracy of judgment in other matters," should allow themselves to be the dupes of salaried speculators or visionary enthusiasts.

"How degrading is the idea," says a Protestant writer in the *Asiatic Journal* (vol. ix. p. 343), "to put into the hands of every Chinese bargeman or illiterate porter a packet of tracts, to sell or give away on his journey as he pleases."

So rapid is the consumption of Bibles in the various branches of the retail trade in Hindostan that of the millions circulated it is difficult, except in the capitals, to find so much as the trace of a single copy. This we

¹ *The Middle Kingdom*, vol. ii. c. 19, p. 343.

² *Annals of Propagation of Faith*, vol. i. p. 107.

are told by Captain J. B. Seely in *The Wonders of Elora*, c. 19, p. 524, second edition. "Many of them have probably gone to the pawnbrokers," said Sir Charles Oakeley, Governor of Madras. In Ceylon they were used for much the same purposes as in India and China.

In New Zealand the Maories, according to Mr. Fox,¹ tore up the Bibles to make wadding for their guns, and even went so far, as Miss Tucker indignantly informs us, as to convert them into New Zealand cartridges. In Africa, on the West Coast at Gaboon, after a grand distribution of Bibles by the missionaries among the negroes, as soon as the sacred book had fallen into the hands of the children, M. Bessieux saw the leaves of the Bible converted into pretty kites (*Annals of Propagation of Faith*, vol. viii. p. 75). Colonel Napier's tale is that the Kaffirs converted lately, to our cost, the missionary Bibles into ball cartridges or wadding.² In Tetuan they were thrown into the flames. In Abyssinia, we are told by Mr. Parkyns that "the use to which the many Bibles given away in this country are commonly applied is the wrapping up of snuff and such like undignified purposes." Throughout the Levant, Syria, and Armenia, millions of Bibles have been distributed. Many of them have been diligently collected and committed to the flames.³ An agent of the Biblical Society resentfully records that the ecclesiastical authorities "have always strenuously opposed the distribution of the Bible in modern Greek."⁴ The Greek Patriarch, too, worried by the aggressions of the missionaries, published an Encyclical Letter in which he not only warned his people against the emissaries of the Bible Society, but described them as "satanical heresiarchs from the caverns of hell and the abyss of the Northern Sea, whose object was to proselytize and to foment division and harass

¹ *The Six Colonies of New Zealand*, p. 83.

² *Excursion in South Africa*, vol. ii. c. 22, p. 442.

³ Dr. Robertson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, vol. i. § 3, p. 140.

⁴ *Journal of Deputation to East*, vol. ii. p. 594.

their Church and fill it with heresy." He went on to forbid the purchase or use of any translation of the Scriptures made by the missionaries, whether in the Turkish, Servian, Arabian, Bulgarian, Slavonian, or other languages.¹ If such an Encyclical had appeared from the Roman Pontiff, how the pulpits of Protestant England would have resounded with declamations against the tyranny of the Papacy!

In Persia the Bibles were torn up in the presence of the missionary and trampled in the dirt. At Bassora, where Mr. Samuel, the missionary, was nearly torn to pieces, the Mahometans, more reverential than the missionary, anxious, as they said themselves, "that a book which they as well as Christians consider sacred might not be trodden under foot, resolved that the volumes should all be thrown into the river, and this order was accordingly executed."² Instances of usage such as this might be multiplied *ad infinitum*. They have cost innumerable sums, says Mr. Marshall,³ have awakened only the contempt of the few pagans who read them, have been polluted by the foulest and most degrading uses, and finally consumed as waste paper.

Degradation of the Scriptures.

Is it possible for God's Holy Word to be subjected to greater degradation? Yes, unfortunately it is so, and what is worse, it has actually undergone the degradation. We know how the "Reformers" of the sixteenth century wrangled with one another about their own translations of the Bible, how Luther's version was called by Zuinglius a corruption of God's Holy Word, a compliment returned a hundredfold by Luther on the translation edited by Zuinglius; how James I. called the translation by Calvin, edited with great care by the Genevan Ministers, the most unfaithful of translations. Have the attempts of the British and Foreign Bible Society to translate the

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 816.

² *Narrative of a Mission to India*, by V. Fontanier, Vice-Consul of France at Bassora, p. 344.

³ *Christian Missions*, vol. i. p. 22.

Scriptures into the languages of the world fared any better? Let us examine and see. Please to remember that all this time I am speaking from a historical point of view, and not as a theologian. Dr. Morrison edited the first Protestant version of the Bible in the Chinese language at a cost of more than £20,000. "It was," as the Bible Society admits, "imperfect, and not sufficiently idiomatic." No wonder, for, as Dr. Morrison says: "I edited the New Testament with such alterations as in my conscience, and with the degree of knowledge of the Chinese language which I then possessed, I thought necessary." Yet Dr. Morrison had no hesitation in proclaiming that as "the Word of God" which he had himself altered as his conscience dictated. Talk about an Infallible Pope, indeed!

Morrison's translation was followed by Marshman's, of which Mr. Malcolm says: "I am assured by private Chinese gentlemen that neither Marshman's nor Morrison's Bible is fully intelligible, much less attractive." Marchini goes further, and assures us that their Chinese versions are "an unintelligible jargon which no one could read without laughing," and that the learned Chinese complained that their sublime idiom should be so wantonly caricatured. This was so clear and manifest a truth that a solemn meeting of missionaries of various Protestant denominations was summoned to meet at Hong-Kong in 1848, to take measures for concocting one more version "better adapted for general circulation than any hitherto published." The Rev. G. Milne¹ informs us that "one or two versions were attempted, but exceedingly defective and very unsatisfactory." Many an honest man, no doubt, will scarcely be able to credit these statements. Therefore it is all the more important to get impartial testimony in proof of the statements. Mr. Meadows Taylor, Chinese Interpreter to H.M. Civil Service, describes in 1856 the real character and effect of these Protestant translations which have cost so much money as follows: "Let the English Protestant reflect on the Book of the Mormons

¹ *Life in China*, p. 50.

and on Mormonism, as it is spreading in some places in Great Britain, and he will obtain a by no means exaggerated notion of the contemptible light in which our badly-translated Scriptures and Christianity in China are regarded by the thorough Confucian, viz., as a tissue of absurdities and impious pretensions, which it would be lost time to examine."¹

If we turn to India, is the outlook different? "The translations are so grossly absurd," says a learned Protestant writer in the *Asiatic Journal*, vol. xxviii. p. 303, that "instead of promoting the service of Christianity, it is not irrational to impute some of the backwardness of the Hindoos to this cause." A copy of the Telinga version was given to some natives in the district of Bellary, but as they could not understand it, they consulted their most learned man, who after careful examination told his clients "that its style was so obscure and incoherent that it was almost impossible to comprehend it, but that he believed it was a treatise on magic." Of the Tamil version a Protestant clergyman declared that "the translation is really pitiful, and deserves only contempt." Here are some specimens of the Canara version:—"In the beginning God created the earth and the air." "Darkness was upon the water, but the soul of God wandered with delight over the water." "Let us make man like to us and having our form: let him command the aquatic insects of the sea." M. Dubois tells us that in this version there is hardly a verse correctly rendered, and that "no Indian possessing the slightest instruction can preserve a serious countenance in reading such a composition." In the "Baptist Missionary Account," 1819 (Appendix to Report), we are told that in the Hindostani version the sentence "Judge not, that ye be not judged" is rendered "Do no justice that justice be not done to you." What an idea of Christian morality to be presented to the pagan! Are we surprised, then, at the testimony given by Mr. Irving,² that these translations have been "either simply useless, or, from

¹ *The Chinese and their Rebellion*, p. 79.

² *Theory and Practice of Caste*, p. 149.

explaining the doctrines of our Faith by ridiculous forms of expression, have been absolutely pernicious"?

The Popes and the Bible Societies.

Testimonies of this kind from non-Catholic sources could be multiplied a thousandfold. If this be so, have we Catholics any reason for surprise at the words of the Sovereign Pontiffs, so continually, and persistently, and energetically warning the flock of Christ against the Bible Societies? They each and all assert the right of private interpretation of that which they claim to be the sole rule of faith, God's Holy Word, a doctrine which the Catholic Church cannot allow. Too often, as we have seen to-day, not translations, but perversions of the Scriptures are sent forth, which bring ridicule and contempt upon the religion of Christ. Too often, indeed, as Pope Leo XII. has declared, by a perverse interpretation the Gospel of Christ is turned into a human gospel, or, what is still worse, into the gospel of the devil. In conclusion, may I be allowed to state again that in all this matter I am speaking from a historian's point of view, and that in speaking of the efforts of the Bible Societies to convert the East I have confined myself to the events that took place antecedent to the year 1863.

The Bible in Rome.

In proof of his assertion that wherever Rome has had undisputed sway she has kept the Bible from the laity, we are told by Mr. Samuel Smith how friends of his had the greatest difficulty in smuggling Bibles into Rome. Presumably they were Protestant versions of the Bible, and they were prohibited by the Pope, lest the purity of Catholic faith should be impaired. Had Mr. Samuel Smith's friends taken with them Martini's approved edition of the Bible, or the approved Douay edition of the Bible in English, no difficulty would have been experienced.

The false impression is kept up in the next sentence: "When the Italian army entered Rome, the first wheel carriage contained a consignment of Bibles." What is

suggested is clearly that the poor, hungry Romans had been deprived, under the Papal sway, of God's Holy Word. How false is this suggestion may be gathered from Father Chandlery's letter (see Appendix).

M. Lasserre's Translation.

We are told (p. 13) that "the present Pope gave his approval to Lasserre's French translation of the Gospels, which had a large sale, but, strange to say, it is now placed on the Index Expurgatorius, and its sale prohibited."

Let us see what are the real facts of the condemnation of Henri Lasserre's translation of the Gospels. But first I would ask Mr. Samuel Smith not to pin his faith too strongly on an article on this subject by Dr. Wright, published in the *Contemporary Review*. This Dr. Wright, in a letter to the papers, said: "I pointed out as clearly as I could that the same Infallible Pope had officially cursed the same version of the Gospels twelve months and fifteen days after he had officially sent it forth glowing with his benediction." When asked what grounds he had for saying that the Pope cursed the book, he writes in reply, with an ignorance of the Latin tongue that would disgrace a schoolboy: "Sacra Congregatio damnavit et damnat . . ." Is it really ignorance? Is he not aware that "damnavit" means "condemned"?

Briefly, the facts of the case are these. Henri Lasserre, the well-known writer and devout client of Mary, issued what he called a translation of the Four Gospels in the French tongue, with a preface. It had received the imprimatur of the Archbishop of Paris, after passing twice through the hands of the censors, and at once had an enormous sale. It ran through twenty-five editions in twelve months, and was warmly welcomed by the Catholic Press and many of the Bishops. Lasserre presented his Holiness with a copy. Leo XIII. commissioned Cardinal Jacobini to express to the author his approval of the object with which he had been inspired in the execution and publication of the work, and his hopes that this object may be fully attained.

Meanwhile other Catholics, more solicitous about the preservation of the text of Holy Scripture from all undue interference than about beauty of style, having carefully studied the work, came to the conclusion that it was full of inaccuracies and mistranslations, and departed in many places from the traditional interpretation. Representations were made to Rome; the book was examined by the Congregation of the Index, whose office it is to point out to the faithful books which are in any way hurtful to faith or morals, with the result that the book was placed upon the Index Expurgatorius. The book was withdrawn from circulation by Henri Lasserre, naturally much to his own regret. It must be noted also, as M. l'Abbé Barbin pointed out in the *Univers* of November, 1896, that Lasserre had not made all the corrections pointed out to him, especially in his preface; and that a public and official note from the archdiocese formally warned him that this imprimatur was not an approbation properly so called, but rather a simple permission to print.

Now, in the first place, even had Leo XIII. approved the translation, there would have been no question of Papal Infallibility involved in the matter. The Pope is infallible only when he teaches the Universal Church *ex cathedrâ*. But Leo XIII. did not approve the translation in itself (we have no proof that he ever read it); he approved of the object that Lasserre had in view, the greater diffusion of the Gospel story. How does this square with Mr. Smith's proposition?

Secondly, as the Congregation of the Index is a higher court than that of any Archbishop, it has the right to revise the judgements of the lower courts.

Thirdly, let us see some of the translations given by Lasserre, which doubtless influenced the Congregation in its decision.

In the Lord's Prayer "lead us not into temptation" is changed in this wise: "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us. Yes, Lord, I say this to You, and I think it from the bottom of my heart; yes, I wish to forgive and to be generous, to

forgive those who offend me, and to be generous to my debtors. All the same, do not put me to the test, for I know myself and my own frailty." St. John xiii. 1 : "He loved them to the end" is turned into "He put the finishing touch to His love." St. John xv. 1, 5 : "I am the vine and you are the branches." He tires of the word "branches" at last, and turns it into "leaves." Do the leaves produce fruit? St. John iv. 5 : "wearied" is turned into "overwhelmed by fatigue and having no further strength." "Having no further strength" is an interpolation. St. John xii. 6 : For "[Judas] carried the things that were put therein" we have "[Judas] embezzled the things." St. Luke i. 30 : "Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found grace with God" is changed into "Fear not, Mary, for thou hast won the good graces of God." St. Luke i. 34 : "I know not man" becomes "I have no relation with my husband." St. Matthew i. 20 : "Is of the Holy Ghost" becomes "The fruit of the Holy Ghost." St. Mark xiv. 23 : "And they all drank of it" (the chalice) at the institution of the Blessed Eucharist; these words are omitted. The Passion of Our Lord in St. Mark's Gospel is told, to render it more vivid and picturesque, in the present tense. This, however, is not translating. St. Matthew xix. 9 : M. Lasserre puts aside, in sheer ignorance of the ordinary use of the word "proneia," the meaning which this passage bears by the common consent of all Christendom, and puts into Our Lord's mouth a law respecting divorce which the whole world ignores. St. Mark iii. 21 : "He is become mad" is changed into "He has fainted." St. Matthew xviii. 17 : "It must needs be that scandals come" we are told in a note probably means "It is a misfortune that scandals come." It is said that Cardinal Pitra, one of the most learned Cardinals of the time, counted more than eight hundred mistakes in the translation. Was it not time, then, to stop the circulation of the book as a translation of the Gospels?

The Abbé Barbin says of the book that from cover to cover it is a paraphrase, an adaptation, an arrangement

of the Gospel that is arbitrary, pretentious, and at times unfortunate, but that it is not a translation. Lest the meaning of Holy Scripture should be obscured, and the traditional explanation coming down from the Apostolic times be set aside and false doctrine take the place of the teaching of Our Lord and His Apostles, the Church had to step in and prohibit the circulation of such a book among the faithful. The Church values the treasure of God's Holy Word too highly to allow it to be the sport and play of any man's fancy. Had Lasserre's version been a faithful transcript of the Scriptures, no prohibition would have been issued.

The Epistle of Clement.

Mr. Smith tells us (p. 44) that "no trust can be placed in the Romish translations of the Scriptures into the vernacular, for, though almost incredible, yet it is a fact that the Rhemish Testament includes the forged so-called First Epistle of Clement to St. James." It seems needless to say that no such Epistle is to be found amongst the Canon of Scripture in the Rheims Testament.

APPENDIX.

The Bible in Rome.

THE following are extracts from the letter from the Rev. Peter Chandlery, referred to on pp. 20, 29 :—

"The Rev. Hobart Seymour states that he visited every book-selling establishment in Rome in 1850, and could not procure a copy of the Holy Scriptures in Italian. Answer (1) : I have here in my room a copy of the whole Bible in Italian, in three volumes, printed at Milan in 1848, and bought in Rome in 1850, and it is certain that this same book was for sale at all the leading booksellers' in Rome. Answer (2) : I called this morning at one of the largest booksellers in Rome, who assured me that the Bible in Italian was for sale in their shop in 1850, and has been ever since.

"He says Martini's edition of the Bible in Italian was offered to him in two places, but it was in twenty-four volumes, and the price was some £4 sterling. Answer : The edition of Martini in my room, bought in Rome in 1850, is in three volumes octavo, and has the full text and notes ; the price was not more than six francs a volume—*i.e.*, 15s. in all. Copies of the New Testament were to be had for two francs and one franc."