

# ROME AGAINST THE BIBLE,

AND THE

## BIBLE AGAINST ROME;

OR,

PHARISAISM, JEWISH AND PAPAL.

BY WM. S. PLUMER, D.D.

---

“The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.”—Ps. xix. 7.

“Ye have taken away the key of knowledge.”—LUKE xi. 52.

---

Philadelphia :

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,  
118 ARCH STREET.

---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1854, by the  
AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,  
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, in  
and for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

---

~~~~~  
STEREOTYPED BY GEORGE CHARLES.  
PRINTED BY KING & BAIRD.  
~~~~~

# C O N T E N T S .

---

	PAGE
CHAPTER I.	
PHARISAISM AMONG THE JEWS—HOW IT KEPT THE PEOPLE IN IGNORANCE OF GOD'S WORD . . . . .	5
CHAPTER II.	
PAPISTS PRACTISE THE ARTS OF THEIR JEWISH FORERUNNERS, AND WITH LIKE EFFECTS, . . . . .	25
CHAPTER III.	
PAPISTS GO BEYOND THE PHARISEES, AND ARE HOS- TILE TO THE FREE USE AND GENERAL CIRCULATION OF GOD'S WORD, . . . . .	46
CHAPTER IV.	
SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED—ADDITIONAL PROOFS, . . . . .	62
CHAPTER V.	
THIS OPPOSITION IS UNREASONABLE AND UNSCRIP- TURAL, . . . . .	78
CHAPTER VI.	
IT IS CONDEMNED BY THE VOICE OF ANTIQUITY, . . . . .	98
CHAPTER VII.	
CONCLUSION. ADDRESS TO ROMISH PRIESTS, TO PRIVATE MEMBERS OF THE ROMISH CHURCH, AND TO PROTESTANTS, . . . . .	112

## CHAPTER I.

### PHARISAISM AMONG THE JEWS—HOW IT KEPT THE PEOPLE IN IGNORANCE OF GOD'S WORD.

IN the days of his flesh, Jesus Christ charged upon the expounders of the Mosaic institute, that they had taken away the key of knowledge. They deprived the people of the means of attaining to the knowledge of the kingdom of God.

Sound knowledge is a key to unlock the mysteries of redemption. Without it no man can effect an entrance into life. "Where there is no vision, the people perish." So important is divine knowledge that by a figure of speech it is often put for the whole of religion. The great duty of all religious teachers is to make known the truths of revelation, to open and explain the Scriptures. Thus men are led to understand, love and practise the will of God revealed for their salvation.

Yet in every age many slight or omit the duties of their office; while others turn light into darkness. They even obstruct the way of life. They practise all the arts of deception. With a pretended reverence for God's word, they neither

love nor obey it, nor wish nor encourage others to do so.

Thus it was with many in our Saviour's day. The Pharisees were the leaders in this system of perversion. With their scribes and lawyers they were prepared for any deed of hypocrisy and wickedness. Let us look at their errors.

One of them respected the rule of faith and practice. They held that it consisted not only of the written, but also of the unwritten word. Not Scripture alone, but Scripture and tradition united formed their canon. The five books of Moses and all the canonical Scriptures were received; so also was a mass of corruptions called the oral law. Whenever a conflict arose between the written word and tradition, the latter always bore away the palm of victory. The lawyers held that their traditions were as truly God's word as the sacred writings, and that the officers of the Jewish nation were appointed to transmit the oral law from generation to generation. And they pretended to show a list of those through whom, in unbroken succession, they had received these traditions. This list began with Moses; then came Joshua, the *seventy* elders, the prophets, the rabbies, &c. They held that these traditions had no less authority than Moses and the prophets, and that the written law could not be well understood

without the oral. So they were "exceedingly zealous of the traditions of the fathers," and regarded all, who forsook them, as forsaking Moses and God himself. Thus by adopting maxims and sentiments never sanctioned by Heaven, they "made the commandment of God of none effect by their tradition."

These doctors had also their Apocrypha, which they put side by side with God's word. This consisted of the writings of ancient uninspired Rabbies. Thus they held that the Targum of Jonathan had "been received from the mouths of Haggai and Malachi, which two prophets were keepers of the oral law in the consistory of Ezra." Thus they had a part of the oral law in writing, as well as much still handed down by unwritten tradition.

They also greatly erred respecting the interpretation of Scripture. They held that not the text, but the living teacher was the sure guide. The great question between them and Christ, respected the interpretation of God's word. He contended for the plain declarations of Moses and the prophets, for the obvious, grammatical sense of the inspired writers. They insisted that God's word was to be understood according to the Talmuds and Targums, (the Mishnas and Gemaras,) the agreement of the Rabbies and the decisions of

the Great Council, as expounded by the living teacher. In the Talmud it is said we "must attend more to the words of the Scribes than to those of the law." The lawyers claimed precedence of the prophets. The former held that the latter must work miracles, or give infallible signs of their heavenly mission; but that a Rabbi was to be believed without any miracle. In proof they quoted Deut. xvii. 12. "The man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, that man shall die." One of their rules was that "if a *thousand* such prophets as Elias and Elisha bring one interpretation, and a *thousand* and *one*, a contrary, we must incline to the interpretation which has a majority of *one*, and take the Rabbies, rather than the prophets." Josephus, himself a Pharisee, says, that "the Pharisees held it necessary to observe and contend for everything, which their guide commands." Here we have the clue to the right understanding of those sayings of Christ: "Be ye not called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon earth: for one is your Father which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ." Matt. xxiii. 8—10. The meaning plainly is,

'never seek to have dominion over men's faith, nor permit men to have dominion over your faith.' We must receive our doctrine from the Father and the Son. No man has original knowledge in the things of God. The Scriptures must teach us. All mere men are fallible, and so cannot be implicitly trusted. God alone is great.

In coincidence with the foregoing, these ancient errorists denied the right of private judgment. When the officers, who had been sent to apprehend Christ, returned without him, they assigned as a reason the great power of his speech and teaching: "Never man spake as this man." To this the Jewish authorities replied with an air of triumph, "Have any of the rulers believed on him?" They added, that the masses of the people, who seemed inclined to hear Christ, were no judges in religious matters. "This people that knoweth not the law are cursed." John vii. 48, 49. The rulers, the guides, the Rabbies, were to be followed; but the people were ignorant, and to be despised of men as they were cursed of God.

All these men stood quite aloof from the people. The word Pharisee means Separatist. It designated one who withdrew from familiar intercourse with the body of the people. The whole sect was exclusive and ready to curse the

rest of mankind. Their favorite maxim was, that out of their communion, and aside from their teachings, there was no salvation, but that all others belonged to a vile herd, made up of publicans and sinners, dogs and cursed. They were highly offended even at the offer of life to others. Paul says: "They were contrary to all men: forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles, that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway; for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost." 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16.

Moses and the prophets taught no doctrine contrary to the belief, that a penitent sinner of any nation might be saved. Yet so deeply impressed on the Jewish mind was the idea, that salvation was exclusively for the children of Abraham, that nothing but a revelation could bring Peter to say: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Acts x. 34, 35. This is the more remarkable, as the Old Testament frequently uses such language as this: "I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name. And again he saith, Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people. And again, Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles, and laud him, all ye people." Rom. xv. 9-11. "Behold my servant, whom I

have chosen ; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased : I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall show judgment to the Gentiles . . . . And in his name shall the Gentiles trust." Matt. xii. 18, 21. It was only as Jews, like Simeon, were taught by the Holy Ghost, that they clearly saw that Messiah was a light to lighten the Gentiles, and, at the same time, the glory of the people Israel. Luke ii. 32.

It also evinced the capricious state of the minds of the Scribes and Lawyers, when they declared against Christ, on the ground that no prophet arose out of Galilee. The same people had all admitted Jonah, who was of Galilee, to be a true prophet of Jehovah. Nazareth was an obscure place, and bore a bad name, and because Jesus had resided there a part of his life, they rejected this greatest of teachers. Jesus Christ belonged not to their company, followed not their teachings, and joined not himself to their assembly ; therefore, they rejected him, called him a glutton and a wine-bibber, ' this fellow,' Beelzebub and a blasphemer.

It is not surprising, that with such a rule of faith and practice, and with such modes of interpretation, these people embraced the doctrine, and trusted in the efficacy of the intercession of saints. In the book of Tobit, chap. xii. 12, 15,

an angel is brought in, saying: "When thou didst pray, and Sarah, thy daughter-in-law, I did bring the remembrance of your prayers before the Holy One. I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints, and which go in and out before the glory of the Holy One." How long before this time the belief of the efficacy of the prayers of saints began to prevail is not clear. It is, however, certain, that it received no countenance from the holy Scriptures. It continued to be held, more or less by the Pharisees, for a long time after the days of Tobit.

In like manner they prayed for the dead, as you may see in 2 Maccabees, xii. 39-45, where we are told that "Judas and his company came to take up the bodies of them (their brethren) that were slain, and to bury them with their kinsmen in their fathers' graves. Now, under the coats of every one that was slain, they found things consecrated to the idols of the Jamnites, which is forbidden the Jews by the law. Then every man saw that this was the cause wherefore they were slain. All men therefore praising the Lord, the righteous Judge, who had opened the things that were hid, betook themselves unto prayer, and besought him that the sin committed might wholly be put out of remembrance. Be-

sides, that noble Judas exhorted the people to keep themselves from sin, forasmuch as they saw before their eyes the things that came to pass for the sins of those that were slain. And when he had made a gathering throughout the company, to the sum of two thousand drachms of silver, he sent it to Jerusalem to offer a sin-offering, doing therein very well and honestly, in that he was mindful of the resurrection: for if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. And also in that he perceived that there was great favor laid up for those that died godly. (It was a holy and good thought.) Whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin." This is the first instance of the use of prayers for the dead, of which we have any record. But the practice is very agreeable to the natural darkened reason, and sinful affections of men. It was common among the Pharisees just in proportion as they fell into general corruption.

The same teachers were very corrupt casuists. They strained at a gnat, but swallowed a camel. They would not admit Judas's *thirty* pieces of silver into the treasury, because it was the price of blood; yet they did not hesitate to pay that sum to the traitor in order to secure the shedding

of innocent blood. They scrupled to enter the judgment hall lest they should be defiled; yet they denied the Holy One, and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto them, and killed the Prince of Life. They were very zealous about a mote in the eye of another, but perceived not the beam in their own eye. They held it very obligatory to pay tithes of rue, mint, anise, cummin, and all herbs and fruits; yet it was quite consistent with their principles to rob widows' houses. Their law forbade them to kill; but they said it was not wicked to indulge the most violent anger. They said it was wicked in common conversation to swear by God; but not sinful to swear by heaven. They held that to meditate wrong and desire to do it, without accomplishing it, was no sin. Thus Josephus in a given case says that Antiochus Epiphanes "deserved no punishment for what he only would have done, but did not." And Kimchi, commenting on Ps. lxxvi: 18, "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me," says: "He will not impute it to me for sin; for God does not look upon an evil thought as sin, unless it be conceived against God, or religion." How different this is from God's sentence, where he pronounces "every *imagination* of the thoughts of the heart only evil continually." Gen. vi: 5. Their law clearly re-

quired them to love their neighbor. This they expounded by adding these words, "and hate thine enemy." They were required to honor their father and mother; but they decided that if a child devoted to religious use any thing, by which a parent might be profited, the fifth commandment was not of force against him. Their rule was, that "vows take place, even in things commanded by the law, as well as in things indifferent: and then any one is bound by them, that he cannot, without great sin, do that which is commanded."

Thus the more these people were given to their false religion, the more corrupt they were in morals. Their law forbade them to use, or make any likeness of any thing in religious worship. This was undeniable. Their solution of the difficulty was, that to worship an idol was sin, but that it was permitted to worship God by means of an image.

They were also strict ritualists. They were very precise respecting attire, gestures and punctilios in worship. There was hardly any end to their washings of hands. One of their sayings was, that "Whosoever despiseth the washing of hands is worthy to be excommunicated; he comes to poverty, and will be extirpated out of the world." Another of their sayings made eating

bread with unwashen hands as bad as the grossest violation of the seventh commandment. Maimonides says, that "the religious of old did eat their common food in cleanness, and took care to avoid all uncleanness all their days, and they were called Pharisees; and this is a matter of the highest sanctity, and the way of the highest religion; namely, that a man separate himself, and go aside from the vulgar, and that he neither touch them, nor eat, or drink with them; for such separation conduces to the purity of the body from evil works, the purity of the body conduces to the cleansing of the soul from evil affections, and the sanctity of the soul conduces to the likeness of God." Accordingly it came to be said among them that "Whosoever has his seat in the land of Israel, and eats his common food in cleanness, and speaks the holy language, and recites his phylacteries morning and evening, let him be confident that he shall obtain the life of the world to come."

To such a people Christ could have said nothing more offensive than that "to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man." Matt. xv. 20. They tell us that one of their number, R. Aquiba being in prison, and not having water enough to drink and to wash his hands also, chose to do the latter, saying, "It is better to die of thirst than transgress the tradition of the elders." Among

them such a man was held in great veneration for sanctity. In their eyes his virtue was of a very exalted character.

From such persons you would naturally expect much ostentation. They wore long garments to give them a solemn air. They made broad their phylacteries, which were pieces of parchment with portions of Scripture written upon them. One of the Targums introduces the Jews, saying, "I am chosen above all people, because I bind my frontals to my head and my left hand, and my parchment is fixed to the right side of my door, so that a third part of it comes up to my bed, that the evil spirits may not hurt me." They disfigured their faces, that they might appear unto men to fast. They well understood the whole art and mystery of sanctimonious grimaces. In that business there has been no improvement since their time. When they were about to give alms they blew a trumpet that it might be known what they were doing. They also went to the corners of the streets, to the synagogues, and to other public places to offer up their personal devotions. All this and much more they did to be seen of men. For a pretence they made long prayers. Some of them prayed three long hours together. They used vain repetitions, and thought they should be heard for their much speaking.

Their religion was all for show. To worship God where none but God was witness was to them a dull, uninteresting employment.

Such persons were swollen with spiritual pride. Even their prayers were full of vain-glory. "God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week. I give tithes of all that I possess." This was a model prayer for a Pharisee. It made him feel good. One of their converts was more self-conceited and every way more wicked than before he fell under their influence; and that just in proportion as he was zealous in their cause. They "compassed sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he was made, they made him two-fold more the child of hell than themselves." Justin Martyr says, that these "proselytes did not only disbelieve Christ's doctrine, but were twice more blasphemous against him than the Jews themselves, endeavoring to torment the Christians, and cut them off wherever they could. In this they were the instruments of the Scribes and Pharisees." They seem to have brought all the brutality and maliciousness of heathenism into their profession of Judaism. They were monsters of depravity.

The system of the Pharisees was also full of ridiculous legends and degrading superstitions.

Old wives' fables, endless genealogies and foolish questions took the place of solemn inquiries after truth. A question deemed worthy of earnest discussion among them was this—Is it lawful to kill a flea on the Sabbath day? They superstitiously regarded it wicked for Christ to work his miracles of healing on that day; or for him and his disciples to pluck and eat the fruits of the earth, even if hungry, on that day. They invented endless and foolish distinctions. They threw away the kernel, but held fast the shell. They cast away the wheat and garnered up the chaff. The gravest questions in religion were little cared for; but those, which were contemptibly frivolous, were much dwelt upon.

Respecting justification before God their system was utterly false and dangerous. They put the types in the place of the great anti-type; the blood of bulls and goats in the place of the blood of God's dear Son: the imperfect works of men in place of the finished work of the Redeemer. They went about to establish their own righteousness, and did not submit themselves to the righteousness of God. They justified themselves. They thought that they were whole and needed not any physician. They thought that they were rich, and increased in goods, and had need of nothing; and knew not that they were

poor, and miserable, and blind, and naked, and had need of wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption through the Lord of life and glory. They trusted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others. To every other man they said, "Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou." Is. lxxv. 5. Such were a smoke in God's nose, a fire that burnt all the day. To them he said: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts. . . . Bring no more vain oblations: incense is an abomination unto me. . . . It is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Is. i. 11, 13.

As might be expected, the spirit of those who embraced this corrupt system was cruel and persecuting. They are well described in the prophet Micah, iii. 5. See also Acts xxiv. 5. The more strict any one was, the more bitter were his animosities. They killed the prophets; they murdered God's Son; they persecuted his people. The more Saul of Tarsus prized his religion, the more did he breathe threatenings and slaughter against the church of God. He haled men and women to prison and to judgment, to mockings and to death. He was exceeding mad against all who dared to profess

faith in the only Saviour of sinners. The tender mercies of such a system are cruel. Those who embrace it sit down in perfect coolness to meditate torture. They gloat over the miseries of their helpless victims. They wag the head and taunt even those who are at their hands suffering the agonies of crucifixion. They kill the body, and, if they had the power, they would kill the soul. They have no mercy. They are the enemies of the cross of Christ, haters of true godliness, and opposers of all goodness. They enter not the kingdom of God themselves, and them that are entering they hinder. Thus the Pharisees took away the key of knowledge, and left the blind, who followed them, to perish in ignorance of the truth of God.

Yet, with many, these people had a great reputation for piety. They managed to win the confidence of thousands; so that it was often said, "if but two men are saved, one of them will be a Pharisee and the other a scribe." Indeed, with many, their religion was highly popular. The reason was that it required no love, no meekness, no humility, no self-denial of the strong inclinations of the wicked heart. One could come away from his street-corner devotions as full of self-righteousness as it was possible for man to be. Even burdensome rituals are but slightly repug-

nant to the carnal mind, compared with its hatred of spiritual religion. It always has been so. It is so at this day. It will be so to the end of time. The very hardest thing in religion is, to confess that even our righteousnesses are filthy rags, that all outward services without supreme love to God are worthless, and that if we shall ever be saved, it must be solely by the rich, free, sovereign, unmerited grace of God in Christ Jesus, our Lord.

It was of these people that our Saviour said :—  
“ Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter the kingdom of heaven :”  
Matt. v. 20. If by the word righteousness is here meant personal virtue, as some think, this is a good sense, and is very true. The holiness of these men was outward, official, ceremonial, and left sin undisturbed on the throne of the heart. The holiness God requires is inward, personal, spiritual—of the heart, and universal as to the precepts of God’s law. It was the most difficult thing imaginable, to convince a Pharisee that he was a sinner at all. Paul, who had been one of their number, says, “ I had not known sin, but by the law : for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.” If one repeated the ten commandments to one of these

deluded men, his prompt reply was, "All these have I kept from my youth up." Outwardly he had done it, perhaps, even where the heart was a whited sepulchre, full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness. But if the word righteousness in Matt. v. 20, means *justifying righteousness*, as some think it does, then the sense is also good, and the doctrine most true; for the Scribes and Pharisees never sought nor desired any other ground of acceptance with God than their own merits, and God abhors all such pretensions. The grand difference between the worship of Cain and Abel was, that Cain's offerings were fit only for an unfallen creature, while Abel's well suited a sinner, who felt his lost, guilty and helpless condition. These first two men that were ever born, well represent the two classes of men that have ever since been in the world; one trusting in themselves that they are righteous, and despising others, the other crying, "God be merciful to me, a sinner."

Is it surprising, that the great infallible Teacher denounced many woes on these people? They and their followers were fearfully hardened by all their perversion of Scripture, and by all their opposition to the plain teachings of God's word. A soul steeped in falsehood and dead in unbelief is in a sad way. Very few

of the leaders in these errors were converted by our Saviour's miracles and preaching. The publicans and harlots entered into the kingdom of God before them. Nor did the conversion of great sinners seem at all to make any good impression on their minds. They were hardened in pride.

## CHAPTER II.

PAPISTS PRACTISE THE ARTS OF THEIR JEWISH FORE-RUNNERS, AND WITH LIKE EFFECTS.

PHARISAISM is quite congenial with the carnal mind of man. The false teachers in the days of our Saviour have been closely followed by the ministers of Anti-Christ. All the essential principles of the old school of Pharisees are revived in the church of Rome. The Pope, his Bishops and Priests practise very much the same arts as the Scribes and Lawyers of old, and with very much the same design and effect.

Like the Pharisees, Papists hold that the Scriptures are not the only and whole rule of faith and practice. The Council of Trent expressly says, that all "saving truth and discipline are contained both in written books and in unwritten traditions, which have come down to us, either received by the apostles from the lips of Christ himself, or transmitted by the hands of the same apostles under the dictation of the Holy Spirit;" and declares that it "doth receive and reverence, with equal piety and veneration, all the books, as well

of the Old as of the New Testament, the same God being the author of both—and also the aforesaid traditions, pertaining both to faith and manners, whether received from Christ himself, or dictated by the Holy Spirit, and preserved in the Catholic Church by continual succession.” It also says, “that whoever shall knowingly and deliberately despise the aforesaid traditions, let him be accursed.” This is explicit and unmistakable. With this agrees the Canon Law, “That all do with such reverence regard the apostolic seal, that they rather desire to know the ancient institution of the Christian religion from the mouth of the Pope, than from the sacred pages.” Cardinal Hosius says: “Much the greatest part of the Gospel is come to us by tradition, very little of it is committed to writing.”

How contrary all this doctrine is to the divine teachings is evident from the Holy Scriptures themselves. This can be shown from the Doway Bible, which in all matters of dispute between Romanists and Protestants will be quoted in this treatise unless notice to the contrary shall be given. This is done, not because that translation is the best, but for the purpose of cutting off all disputes about the rendering of the sacred text. The first proof adduced from Scripture is found in Deut xii. 32. “What I command thee, that

only do thou to the Lord : neither add any thing nor diminish." To this a note is affixed : " They are forbid here to follow the ceremonies of the heathens ; or to make any alteration in the divine ordinances." That is a good note. Yet how much Rome adds and diminishes, it is hard to say. According to Hosius " very little" of the rule adopted at Rome is written. The next text is found in Gal. i. 8, 9. " But though we or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you beside that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema. As we said before, so I say now again : if any one preach to you a gospel besides that which you have received, let him be anathema." Could the apostle in more solemn words have warned men not to add anything to God's word? In 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17, Paul asserts that " all Scripture divinely inspired is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice : that the man of God may be perfect, furnished unto every good work." By " the man of God" is certainly to be understood a minister of Christ. Yet Paul says that even he, having the Scriptures, is " perfect," " furnished." He needs no Bishops, Popes, or Councils to furnish him for his work. Such is a sample of divine teachings on this subject. See also Ps. xviii. [King James' Bible, Ps. xix.] 7-12, and Apocalypse xxii. 18, 19.

The Church of Rome has also incorporated the Apocrypha of the Old Testament into her canon, and "receives and reverences with equal piety and veneration" the five books of Moses and the two books of Esdras, the books of Joshua and Tobit, Esther and Judith, the Song of Solomon and the Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiastes and Ecclesiasticus, Hosea and Baruch, the first and second epistles to the Corinthians, and the first and second books of Maccabees. Thus Rome honors the story of Tobit and his dog as no less inspired than the narrative of Christ's triumphant entry into Jerusalem. She takes up the old rags, which even the ancient Pharisees refused to wear, and calls them beautiful garments; for the Jews never received, as canonical Scripture, any of the books held by Protestants to be apocryphal; and the Doway Bible, in a note prefixed to the first book of Maccabees, acknowledges that neither of those books was received by the Jews. A note prefixed to Ecclesiasticus also says that book "is not in the Jewish canon." That these books should not be received as the word of God is evident many ways; but we shall not now enter at length into the argument. The author of the second book of Maccabees fairly disclaims inspiration. Indeed he apologizes for the imperfection of his work. He says: "I will here make

an end of my narration ; which if I have done well, and as it becometh the history, it is what I desired ; but if not so perfectly, it must be pardoned me." 2 Mac. xv. 38, 39. The same book contains the clearest internal evidence that it is not from God, because it commends an attempt to commit suicide, which God abhors. Speaking of Rasis it says, (chap. xiv. 41, 42,) "as the multitude sought to rush into his house, and to break open the door and to set fire to it, when he was ready to be taken, he struck himself with his sword : choosing to die nobly rather than to fall into the hands of the wicked, and to suffer abuses unbecoming his noble birth." Clearly that doctrine is not from heaven. Suicide is not *noble* in God's esteem. But the object here sought is not so much to argue this point, as to show to the intelligent reader how Rome imitates the Pharisees, by honoring, as of divine authority, uncanonical books, adopting those which even the Pharisees rejected.

Having erroneously settled the canon of Scripture and the rule of faith, the church of Rome insists upon her interpretations as absolutely necessary. She contends that the written word is to be interpreted by tradition, by the fathers, by councils, by Popes, and by bishops. Thus the Council of Trent, decreed, "that in matters of

faith and morals, and whatever relates to the maintenance of Christian doctrine, no one confiding in his own judgment, shall dare to wrest the sacred Scriptures to his own sense of them, contrary to that which hath been held and is held by holy Mother Church, whose right it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Writ; or contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers; even though such interpretations should never be published." Romanists endeavor to maintain this ground by the very argument employed by the Jewish lawyers, and attempt, says Whitby, "to prove that private men, laics and inferior priests are not to be governed by their own sentiments of Christ's doctrine; but must submit to their general councils, and to the major part of their church-guides. And . . . it is as strong in the mouth of the Pharisees against Christ being the Messiah, as in the mouth of Papists against Protestants."

Papists deny that God's word is to be taken in its obvious sense. The true mode of interpreting Scripture is well expressed by Luther: "The literal meaning of Scripture is the whole foundation of faith, the only thing that stands its ground in distress and temptation." Melancthon expresses the same rule, thus, "It is necessary in the Church, diligently to investigate and adhere

to the simple, natural, grammatical sense of Scripture. We are to listen to the Divine word, not to corrupt it. We must not play tricks with it, by fanciful interpretations, as many, in all ages, have done. The plain, natural sense of Scripture always carries with it the richest and most valuable instruction." Richard Hooker also says: "I hold it for a most infallible rule in exposition of sacred Scripture, that where a literal construction will stand, the furthest from the letter is commonly the worst." But Rome puts Church authority above all rules and reason, in interpreting the lively oracles.

With such a canon of Scriptures, such a rule of faith and practice, such a denial of the right of individuals to judge of what God says, and with such arrogant pretensions to an exclusive right to interpret God's word, the results reached by the Church of Rome are much the same as those reached by the Pharisees of old. The Council of Trent, everywhere, pronounces those who differ from her, accursed, even to the extent of declaring that "whoever shall affirm, that the conjugal state is to be preferred to a life of virginity or celibacy, and that it is not better and more conducive to happiness, [*beatius*,] to remain in virginity or celibacy, than to be married, let him be accursed." Indeed, all the canons of that Council, (there are,

in all, about *one hundred and thirty* of them,) end with the awful *anathema sit*, "Let him be accursed." And we all know how, everywhere, the Church of Rome declares, that out of her communion there is no salvation, although Jesus Christ said : "He that believeth in the Son, hath life everlasting ; but he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." John iii. 36. Like the Jews of old, Papists are fond of cursing other people, and of delivering them over to uncovenanted mercies, that is, to perdition. Surely, if of any people it is true, that their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness, it is true of the priesthood of Rome. Yet they profess to be followers of Him who said, "Bless them that curse you. Bless and curse not."

The doctrine and usage of the church of Rome respecting the invocation of saints are just the same with those of the old Pharisees, in their most corrupt days. On this subject the fathers of Trent teach that "the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer their prayers to God for men ; that it is a good and useful thing suppliantly to invoke them, and to flee to their prayers, help, and assistance, because of the benefits bestowed by God through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour ; and that

those are men of impious sentiments, who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked—or who affirm that they do not pray for men; or that to beseech them to pray for us is idolatry, or that it is contrary to the word of God, and opposed to the honor of Jesus Christ, the one Mediator between God and man; or that it is foolish to supplicate, verbally or mentally, those who reign in heaven.” This is clear and decided. The practice of that church in this behalf agrees with her decrees. Open any of her books of devotion, and you will find Mary, Michael, Paul and Peter, and many others, addressed much more frequently than God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And what is well worthy of notice is, that Romanists everywhere rely on the passage already quoted from Tobit, in vindication of their belief and practice on this subject. But Colossians ii. 18, presents a very difficult text for Papists to dispose of. That text in the Doway Bible reads thus: “Let no man seduce you, willing in humility, and religion of angels, walking in the things which he hath not seen, in vain puffed up by the sense of his flesh.” The note to this passage says: “That is, by a self-willed, self-invented, superstitious worship, falsely pretending *humility*, but really proceeding from pride. Such was the worship that

many of the philosophers paid to angels or demons, by sacrificing to them, as carriers of intelligence betwixt God and men; pretending *humility* in so doing, as if God was too great to be addressed by men; and setting aside the mediatorship of Jesus Christ; who is the head both of angels and men." This note thus far seems well to accord with the text, and with other portions of Scripture. But then the note adds, what Paul "writes here, no way touches the Catholic doctrine and practice, of desiring our good angels to pray to God for us, through Jesus Christ." The text is one thing: the denial is quite another.

Papists also, like the Pharisees, pray for the dead. Their whole doctrine of purgatory is based upon the efficacy of prayers for those who have gone to eternity. The Council of Trent taught that "there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained there are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful, but especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the mass;" and commanded "all bishops diligently to endeavor that the wholesome doctrine of purgatory, delivered to us by venerable fathers and holy councils, be believed and held by Christ's faithful, and everywhere taught and preached." . . . "Let the bishops take care that the suffrages of the living faithful, masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety, which the

faithful have been accustomed to perform for departed believers, be piously and religiously rendered, according to the institutes of the church: and whatsoever services are due to the dead, through the endowments of deceased persons, or in any other way, let them not be performed slightly, but diligently and carefully," &c. In justification of prayers for the dead, Papists invariably quote 2 Maccabees xii. 43-46; thus building up the system on the example of their forerunners, the Jewish errorists of old.

In like manner Papists follow the example of the most corrupt Jews of the olden times, and employ images in worship. The Council of Trent, addressing "all bishops and others, who have the care and charge of teaching," says, "let them teach that the images of Christ, of the Virgin, Mother of God, and of other saints, are to be had and retained, especially in churches, and due honor and veneration rendered to them. Not that it is believed that any divinity or power resides in them, on account of which they are to be worshiped, or that any benefit is to be sought from them, or any confidence placed in images, as was formerly by the Gentiles, who fixed their hope in idols. But the honor with which they are regarded is referred to those who are represented by them; so that we adore Christ and ve-

nerate the saints, whose likenesses these images bear, when we kiss them, and uncover our heads in their presence, and prostrate ourselves. All which has been sanctioned by the decrees of Councils against the impugnors of images, especially the second Council of Nice." Yet they add that, "it is not to be supposed that the Deity can be seen by our bodily eyes, or that a likeness of God can be given in color or figure." A Hindoo might say, and often does say, just the same in worshiping his images. The corrupt Jews of old used the very same plea respecting their use of images.

In this corrupt practice of Rome is found the probable cause of the omission of the second commandment from many Romish catechisms. For it would be terrible for one, who in the sanctuary was kissing or prostrating himself before an image, to remember the awful words of Jehovah from Mount Sinai, which in our Bible are correctly translated thus: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of *any thing* that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth gene-

ration of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments." The precept is as clear as the threatening is dreadful. Let men beware how they trifle with God's worship. Nor are other portions of Scripture less explicit in prohibiting the use of images in worship, than this second commandment. See especially, Deut. iv. 15-18, and parallel passages.

From such principles as have been shown to belong to Rome, naturally proceeds a corrupt system of casuistry, full of endless distinctions and absurd decisions. At one time, it was designed to insert specimens of the decisions of Papal doctors and casuists; but this might lead too far from the main object, now in view. It is sufficient to say, that every commandment is subverted by their glosses, their refinements, their distinctions. In particular, their casuists adopt, to a fearful extent, the principle, that a man may do evil that good may come. "They lengthen the creed and shorten the decalogue." They hold to as corrupt principles as can, by any possibility, be formed. Lying, theft, murder, idolatry, Sabbath-breaking, lasciviousness, every vice, every crime, can be justified by their code or their authority.

Those who go thus far, have yet no objection

to a strict ritual. They will fast even more than twice in the week. They will even pretend to fast forty days, if required. It does not make war on any of their corruptions to believe that they will please the Almighty better by dining on cod or salmon, rock or shad, than on beef or mutton, pig or venison ; or that it would be much more pleasing to God, for them to dress their food with hog's lard than with butter of kine. They often believe that they are serving God by dishonoring their own bodies, by whipping themselves, and by many acts entirely contrary to the natural duty of loving and cherishing their own flesh. The rules of the different orders, all duly sanctioned, impose almost endless observances. Among the most zealous of their ritualists may be found, not only the priest, the monk, the nun, and the respectable citizen, but also the robber in the Alps and Pyrennees, and the pirate on the high seas. These often carry their images of the Virgin, say their beads with carefulness, and fast on Friday, just as if they were the most innocent in society.

Such people may, very naturally, be expected to exhibit a fondness for public religious shows. They will have their processions, they will wear their long robes, and may be found offering their personal devotions in churches, just as the Phari-

sees did in the synagogues ; and they will thoroughly study the science and art of grimaces. Who has not noticed the demure looks of Popish priests ? Many know not that all this sanctimoniousness is practised by rule. Yet such is the fact. Here are some of the rules by which the Jesuits direct their members : “ They must not lightly turn their heads this way and that way, but with gravity, when need shall require ; and if there be no need, they must hold it straight, bending it a little forward, not leaning it on either side.”—“ For the most part, they must look downward, neither immoderately lifting up their eyes, nor casting them now one way, now another.”—“ When they converse, especially with men in authority, they must not fix their sight upon their eyes, but rather a little below them.”—“ Wrinkles in their forehead, and much more in their nose, are to be avoided, that there may appear outwardly, a kind of serenity which may be a token of the inward.”—“ Their lips must neither be too much shut nor too much open.” “ Their hands, if they be not employed in holding up their garments, must be held decently quiet.” And these rules are in force in America. Could the old Jewish Pharisees exceed these moderns in rules for looks and gestures ? I trow not.

Their religious ceremonies will very naturally be

as pompous and gorgeous as possible. Romanists do, in fact, conduct their public worship in a dead language, unknown to the people.

This practice is directly in the teeth of their own translation of the 14th chapter of 1st Corinthians. There we find such passages as these: "Greater is he that prophesieth, [in a note prophesying is correctly explained to mean declaring or expounding the mysteries of faith] than he that speaketh with tongues; unless, perhaps, he interpret, that the church may receive edification. But now, brethren, if I come to you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you, unless I speak to you either in revelation or in knowledge, or in prophecy or in doctrine? . . . "Unless you utter, by the tongue, plain speech, how shall it be known what is spoken? For you shall be speaking into the air." . . . "Let him that speaketh a tongue pray that he may interpret. For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is without fruit. What is it then? I will pray in the spirit: I will pray also in the understanding: I will sing with the spirit: I will sing also with the understanding." . . . "In the church I had rather speak five words with the understanding, that I may instruct others also; than ten thousand in a tongue."

These and other similar teachings in the same chapter are felt to be hard sayings against a liturgy in an unknown tongue. Therefore a note is affixed to the 16th verse, in which it says: "The use or abuse of strange tongues, of which the apostle here speaks, does not regard the public liturgy of the church, (in which strange tongues were never used)." . . . Afterwards it adds, "Note, that the Latin, used in our liturgy, is so far from being a strange or unknown tongue, that it is perhaps the best known tongue in the world."

Was ever sophistry more shallow, or perversion of the plain sense of a writer more manifest? Strange tongues never used in the liturgy or in the church!!! None other than a strange tongue in the sense in which Paul speaks of tongues, is used in the Romish liturgy any where. And how atrocious the statement that the Latin is perhaps the best known tongue in the world, when the truth is, that in the modern sense of the word it is no longer a tongue (or spoken language) at all, but a dead language, the correct pronunciation of which is lost, nor is there a mother on earth that speaks it to her little ones, though it is studied by learned persons. Yet the English is spoken by sixty millions of people, and understood by many millions besides, and the French by probably more.

Nor need we be surprised at finding Romanists following the footsteps of Pharisees in cruelty and persecution. Every Romish Bishop is a sworn persecutor, to the extent of his power, of all who reject the ghostly authority of the Pope. The very language of his oath is: "Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord [the Pope] or his foresaid successors, I will to my power persecute and oppose." In 1845, Francis Patrick Kenrick, then Bishop of Philadelphia, now Archbishop of Baltimore, published a work, entitled "The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated." He dedicated it to the Hon. Roger B. Taney, Chief Justice of the United States. The 20th chapter is devoted to the Inquisition. More than 21 large 8vo. pages are devoted not to the condemnation of that most wicked tribunal, but to an apology, for it. In his apology he uses such language as this: "The Inquisition is not directed to the punishment of heretics, but rather to their conversion." p. 329. "The appointment of Inquisitors by Innocent III., seems to have been designed to prevent civil wars, on the score of religion." p. 332. The Inquisitors "did not thirst for human blood, nor act indiscriminately and hastily, but sought by persuasion, and every mild influence, to gain the culprits, During a long period they were members of reli-

gious orders, chiefly Dominicans and Franciscans, men advanced in age and of unblemished reputation, whose mild and peaceful habits rendered them unlikely to delight in blood. The most beautiful examples of a Christian spirit have been left by several of them." p. 333. On page 339 he tells us that "St. Theresa, and St. Ignatius of Loyola, and other holy persons commended its influence and results." He is here speaking of the Spanish Inquisition. On page 343 he says: "Although all its officers and the accuser, culprit, witnesses, and advocate were bound to secrecy, yet the number of persons engaged in the process, and the character of the judges, *precluded all reasonable danger* of injustice." No free man can read this chapter without indignation.

His Holiness perhaps never had two dearer sons than the Duke of Alva, and Charles IX. the king of France. How bloody their career was, history abundantly declares. In her arrogance Rome claims to be the mother and mistress of all churches. She always aims to lord it over God's heritage. She has her dungeons for the refractory. Wherever the law and public opinion allow it, Romish Bishops have their jails, and imprison whom they will. Religious liberty is an offence to Rome. Even toleration is not her habit, nor her principle. It is only to be extended where she can do no otherwise.

As to the superstitions of Rome, they are innumerable. Her trade in dead men's bones has brought her millions. It is quite active even at this day. In purely Roman Catholic countries, few people are found without their amulets of some kind. Even the poor savage in the wilds of America is taught by Jesuit priests to rely on his cross, his crucifix, or his picture of the Virgin, just as the African does on his Greegree. But this field is too wide to be traversed or surveyed at this time.

As to the justification of man before God, the error of Rome is as great as that of the Pharisees. Trent declares that "whoever shall affirm, that the good works of a justified man are in such sense the gifts of God, that they are not also his worthy [bona] merits; or that he being justified by his good works, which are wrought by him through the grace of God, and the merits of Jesus Christ, of whom he is a living member, does not really deserve increase of grace, eternal life, the enjoyment of that life if he dies in a state of grace, and even an increase of glory: let him be accursed." How fully this doctrine is taught by the doctors of that church, many have declared, and their own works show. The authors of the notes on the Romish Testament are full and clear beyond all dispute, and almost beyond belief in

maintaining these views, and pushing them to the utmost extremes.

Such a religious system will naturally have friends among various classes of persons. All, who are indolent and have no heart to work out their own salvation, will be very glad to employ some one to be their agent, to negotiate salvation for them. All, who dislike spiritual worship and vital godliness, will find relief in such a system as has been portrayed. In short, the mass of ignorance, vice, superstition and folly ever existing in large communities will, at least for a season, be pleased with some things in Popery. Many will praise them for one thing, and many for another. Like the Pharisees, they will by many be regarded as on the high road to heaven.

It would have been easy to trace these resemblances between Popery and the old Jewish errors much further. But enough has been said to show their substantial agreement, and especially their utter contrariety to the Holy Scriptures, the Word of God that liveth and abideth forever. The resemblance between Pharisaism in the Jewish Church and in the Papal communion having been briefly traced, other things will now claim our attention.

### CHAPTER III.

PAPISTS GO BEYOND THE PHARISEES, AND ARE HOSTILE TO THE FREE USE AND GENERAL CIRCULATION OF GOD'S WORD.

THE church of Rome quite outstrips the old Pharisees, in taking away the key of knowledge. So far as we learn they never discouraged any one from owning or reading the Scriptures. But she is hostile to their free use and general circulation. This is a grave charge, but it is not rashly made. If it is true, it is not uncharitable to believe and publish it. That it is true shall now be proven.

There is no fair ground of dispute between Protestants and Romanists, respecting the lawfulness of translating the Scriptures out of the original languages. Most men concede that Jesus Christ, and all agree that his Apostles freely quoted the translation of the Old Testament, called the Septuagint. If Protestants have Luther's and King James's Bibles, Papists have the Doway Bible in English, and Martini's in Italian. There cannot therefore be any fair ground of dis-

pute between Protestants and Romanists, respecting the lawfulness of making translations out of the Hebrew and Greek into the vernacular languages of the nations. The Vulgate itself, when made, was a translation into the vernacular of the great mass of the then existing generation.

Both Romanists and Protestants have made translations, though the latter have made many more than the former. But in allowing and doing it at all, Papists have conceded the principle. Alphonsus a Castro says, "Fatemur sacros libros olim in linguam vulgarem fuisse translatos." "We confess that formerly the holy books were translated into the vulgar tongue." In a discussion with Protestants, perhaps but few Romish doctors would refuse to concede as much; but where Popery has undisputed sway, it is different. Azorius maintains that it is a heresy to say that the Scriptures ought to be translated into vulgar languages, yet even he admits that "all were allowed to read the Scriptures for several centuries."

Many things may be found in the writings of high authorities in the Romish church, which at first sight look like a desire to bring the Bible into common use. Thus in the Ursuline Manual, "approved by the Right Rev. Bishop Hughes," of New York, it is said, "*The New Testament,*

*the Lives of the Saints, the Introduction to a Devout Life, the Imitation of Christ, the Spiritual Combat, the Think Well On't, and the Characters of Real Devotion,* are works from which young persons may undoubtedly draw the two great benefits to be derived from spiritual reading, viz., instruction in the maxims of virtue, and encouragement for reducing those maxims to practice."

At the first glance this has a plausible appearance. But you will observe that while the New Testament is mentioned, not a word is said of any part of the Old Testament. Why must Moses, and David, and Solomon, and Isaiah, and all the old prophets be thus ignored? Did not all of them say things savory and wholesome? Did not Solomon address large portions of his writings to the young? And is it not intolerable that such miserable fables, as abound in those books, called "The Lives of the Saints," should be allowed to supplant and supersede the sublime teachings of Moses, the admirable and holy songs of David, the proverbial wisdom of Solomon, and the hallowed fire and evangelical prophecies of Isaiah? What is the chaff to the wheat?

But the key of rightly interpreting this seeming recommendation of a portion of Holy Scripture, is to be found on the same page, where among the "means necessary for promoting immediate

sanctification," the first, which is stated, is "the advice of a director, which is necessary to all Christians, but indispensably requisite for youth." So, after all, even the New Testament is good for young people only when the priest recommends it, and how often he does that may be inferred from the great scarcity of Bibles in the families of Romanists, even in this country. In purely Papal lands are millions of adults, who never owned nor read one book of the New Testament; yet they were encouraged to read the Lives of the Saints.

We come now to consider the charge that the Church of Rome is, and for a long time has been, hostile to the free use and general circulation of the Holy Scriptures.

At the very threshold of the discussion some remarkable facts present themselves. One is, that although for more than three centuries the church of Rome has been engaged in missions, and boasts of converts among more than sixty different tribes of heathen, yet in all that time her missionaries have not, it is believed, translated the Word of God into the language of any of these people. If there be an exception, it has as yet eluded a pretty diligent search. Is it not strange that men should avowedly go forth to spread the knowledge of Christianity, and yet never let peo-

ple see the documents on which that system of truth depends? These missionaries do translate other books. Why do they thus pass by God's Word? Does not this look like an intentional slight, a uniform hostility to the Bible?

Another striking fact that meets us is, that there is not now known to be one Popish Bible Society on the face of all the earth, nor a single dignitary of that communion engaged in promoting the objects of such institutions. Here is something more than curious: Methodists, Baptists, Independents, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Friends, Moravians, Presbyterians, and even thousands, who belong to no communion, but are merely friends of man and of liberty, are very desirous that all the people should have God's pure word. But the authorities of the Church of Rome never send out, nor encourage others in sending out the Bible in the vulgar tongue without note or comment. They never send out agents to distribute the Scriptures, even when they have many notes, and never speak a word of encouragement to those who do these things. The consequence is that while you can get all over this land a copy of our common English Bible for twenty-five cents, or even less, a copy of the Doway Bible costs much more, often four or five times that sum. Romanists have societies for

other objects, such as buying cups, boxes for the holy wafer, rosaries, or strings of beads, and crucifixes "for their converts." The priests of this country have sent forth some very earnest appeals to their brethren in Austria and elsewhere, to send them such like gew-gaws, or money with which to buy them. But who has ever seen a petition from a priest of Rome to his distant brethren, to send him a good supply of Bibles, or money to buy them, to be given to the ignorant or the learned ?

How can this be accounted for, except on the ground that Romish priests do not like the Bible ? It makes their people ask hard questions, encourages them to think for themselves, and finally converts them to Protestantism. There never was, there is not now, and there never will be a nation of Bible-reading Papists. The teachings of God's word and Papal dogmas, are at perpetual and irreconcilable war. When the editor of the Freeman's Journal recently said : "With an Italian, the possession of a Protestant Bible with the pretence of reading it, is a *sure sign* that he is a member of one of the secret revolutionary clubs, and a conspirator against the State," what a confession did he make concerning the enormous corruptions of those governments, the eyes

of whose people are opened by the simple word of God!

Another fact is, that Romanists oppose the reading of the Scripture in Schools. This opposition is not only to *our* translation, but it is to any translation whatever. In the "Pastoral Letter" of 1840, sent out from Baltimore by the highest authorities of that communion in this land, in general council assembled, these words occur: "We are disposed to doubt, seriously, whether the introduction of this sacred volume as an ordinary class-book into schools, is beneficial to religion." Soon they wax more bold, and say: "If the authorized version be used in a school, it should be under circumstances very different from those which are usually found in the public institutions of our States." There is a great variety of "public institutions in our States," yet, according to this pastoral letter, none of them "usually found," are fit to have the Word of God; nay, the children shall not have even the Doway Bible, with its notes and comments, and bad translation. Yes, it is a bad translation. In Job, xlii. 6, of our translation, Job says, "I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes." In the Doway it reads thus: "I reprehend myself and do penance in dust and ashes." In Matt. iii. 2, our Bible says: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is

at hand." The Doway reads: "Do penance, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Then a note says: "*Do penance. Penitentiam agite. μετανοεῖτε.*" Which word, according to the use of the Scriptures and the holy fathers, does not only signify repentance and amendment of life, but also punishing past sins by fasting and such like penitential exercises." Every scholar knows how erroneous are both this translation and this note. In Luke xv. 7, our Bible reads: "joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth." In the Doway Bible it is, "There shall be joy in heaven upon one sinner that doeth penance." So obviously is our translation correct in this case that in 2 Tim. ii. 25, even the Doway Bible renders the noun of the same derivation, "Repentance." In Heb. xi. 21, our translation reads: "By faith, Jacob, when he was dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph; and worshiped, leaning upon the top of his staff." In the Doway it reads: "By faith, Jacob, when he was dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph; and worshiped the top of his rod," meaning Joseph's rod. A note says, that Jacob paid "a relative honor to the top of the rod or sceptre of Joseph, as to a figure of Christ's sceptre and kingdom." Yet with these and many other perversions of God's word in favor of Popery, found in the Doway Bible, these Ameri-

can bishops "doubt seriously," not jestingly, whether children ought to have it; nay, they are pretty confident that if used at all in school, it must be in some institution different from those we usually have in the United States. Is this fulfilling Christ's command to Peter, "Feed my lambs?"

The Metropolitan Magazine, published in Baltimore, May, 1853, says: "We must be permitted to observe here also, that there is a special folly, and a special disregard for the respect due to the sacred book, in insisting, as the Biblicals do, that it [the Bible] shall be used as a school-book." It then quotes, with approbation, Benjamin Martin, who censures the "putting of the sacred book into the hands of every bawling school-mistress, and of thoughtless children, to be torn, trampled upon, and made the early object of their aversion, by being their most tedious task and their punishment." A bawling woman is not fit to be a school-mistress with or without the Bible. Nor is the holy book put into the hands of children to be torn and trampled upon, much less as a punishment to them. But such quotations show the virulence of those who make them towards the volume of inspiration.

One would think this was going far enough. But they stop not here. The Bible must not

be read by any class of persons found in any country. In the Doway Bible, printed in 1840, and approved by Archbishop Eccleston of Baltimore, and by Bishops Connell and Kenrick of Philadelphia, and by Bishop Hughes of New York, we find the same hostility to its free use. When I first saw it, I said: Surely now, if these men approve the translation as correct, the people, at least the grown people, may indiscriminately buy and read it. No! In the third page of the book, just following the recommendations, and before a verse of the Bible is reached, there is printed what is called the "ADMONITION," in which are these words: "It was judged necessary to forbid the reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar languages, without the advice and permission of the pastors and spiritual guides whom God has appointed to govern his church. Nor is this due submission to the Catholic Church to be understood of the ignorant and unlearned only, but also of men accomplished in all kind of learning."

Here then is a Bible, approved as correct in the translation, in the notes and comments, and in the typography, and yet before we reach the first verse of Genesis we are ADMONISHED that we must not read it at all without permission from Rome, or from her emissaries. Nor is this pro-

hibition confined to the ignorant people. It extends also to "men accomplished in all kind of learning."

Is not here a marvellous thing? This is all published in the nineteenth century, and in the United States of America. If one had read in the title-page of an old manuscript volume the same *admonition*, and the date at Naples, Lisbon, or Rome, 1340, it would not have sounded so strange. But it is published in Philadelphia in 1840, in plain English, by Romish Bishops, that the most learned men in the nation must not read the very Bible approved by themselves without permission. In reading it, I have been doing so without permission. Is it a mortal sin? Can any man bring his mind to embrace the opinion, that Milton, Locke, Bacon, Hale, Washington, and Marshall could not lawfully read the Scriptures without getting permission from some poor, erring worm of the dust? Who is any ecclesiastic, that he should step in between man and his Maker's laws, between man and the promises of the Gospel? If this is not taking away the key of knowledge, what is?

Nor is this all. Papists not only have no Bible Societies of their own, but they make war on those which are formed by other people. Pope Leo XII., in his Encyclical Letter, dated at

Rome, May 3d, 1824, addressing the dignitaries of his own communion, says: "You are aware, venerable Brethren, that a certain Society, commonly called the Bible Society, strolls with audacity throughout the world; which Society, contemning the traditions of the Holy Fathers, and contrary to the well-known decree of the Council of Trent, labors with all its might to translate, or rather 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 still worse, into the Gospel of the Devil [diaboli.] To avert this plague [pestem] our predecessors published many ordinances; and in his latter days, Pius VII., of blessed memory, sent two briefs, one to Ignatius, Bishop of Gnesen, the other to Stanislaus, Archbishop to Mohilow; in which are many proofs, accurately and wisely collected from the Sacred Scriptures, and from Tradition, to show how noxious this most wicked novelty is both to faith and morals. We also, venerable Brethren, in conformity to our apostolic duty, exhort you to turn away your flock by all means [omnimodo] from these poisonous

[lethiferis] pastures. Reprove, beseech, be instant in season and out of season, in all patience and doctrine, that the faithful, intrusted to you, adhering strictly to the rules of our congregation of the Index, be persuaded, that if the Sacred Scriptures be everywhere published, more evil than advantage will arise thence, on account of the rashness of men."

Thus spoke Leo XII. in 1824. The brief of Pius VII. to Ignatius referred to above calls the Bible Society "a most crafty device, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined," a "pestilence" and "defilement of the faith most dangerous to souls."

Gregory XVI. sang the same song. Indeed he seems to have been peculiarly afflicted by the existence and labors of Bible Societies and kindred institutions, for he closes one of his bulls on the subject with the words: "We are in sorrow both by night and by day."

And to come to the present time—Pio Nono thus delivers himself on the same subject: "Among the various insidious measures of which the malicious enemies of the church, and of society, endeavor to avail themselves for seducing the people, one may be specified as more specially prominent, which they find eminently adapted to their wicked designs, namely, *the re-*

*cent improvement in the art of printing.* Accordingly they busy themselves in publishing profane, lying journals and pamphlets teeming with falsehoods, which they assiduously circulate in multiplied editions. Hence too, at the instigation and with the aid of *Bible Societies, which have been denounced again and again by the Holy See,* they have the hardihood to carry on the distribution of the Sacred Scriptures, translated contrary to the rules of the church, in the vulgar tongue, and most wretchedly perverted; and, with a wicked and almost incredible effrontery, they scruple not, under the name of religion, to recommend them to the careful perusal of the faithful. From all this you will understand, most venerable brethren, with what vigilance and solicitude it behooves you to act, so that the faithful under your charge may be put upon their guard against the poison, which cannot fail to be *imbibed by the reading of such books;* and may be earnestly reminded, *with especial reference to the Holy Scriptures,* that no person, whatever, is warranted to confide in his own judgment, as to their true meaning, if opposed to the Holy Mother Church, who alone, and no other, has received the commission from Christ to watch over the faith committed to her trust, and to decide upon the true sense and interpretation of the Sacred Writ-

ings." All this seems intelligible and unmistakable.

We have here the reigning Pope making open war on the free use and general circulation of God's Word. As to the charge of mis-translations, it may be replied that this is not the real ground of objection among Papists to Bible Societies, else they would zealously circulate what they esteem correct translations. Besides, none of our translations are as bad as the Vulgate or the Doway. None of them so far vary from the obvious sense of the original. Let any scholar compare them and judge. Moreover, as to the essentials of salvation, we find them in all the versions yet given, not excepting the Vulgate and Doway.

On this subject we may safely say with Walton, Bochartus, Buxtorf, Gerard, Michaelis and others, that there are variations in the translations, as there are also in the ancient manuscripts of the Scriptures, but these differences do not destroy a single doctrine of Scripture, do not set aside a single duty of practical religion, do not present any doctrine to our belief that cannot be disproven by the same translation. I have compared many translations of the third chapter of John's Gospel, beginning with the Vulgate, and I am not able to say which impressed the saving truths it contains in the most affecting manner.

Some years since there was published in England a document entitled, "Declaration of the Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic, and their coadjutors in Britain," in which it is declared that the unauthorized reading and circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of them by private judgment, are calculated to lead men to error and fanaticism in religion, and to seditions and the greatest disorders in States and Kingdoms." If the reading and circulation of the Scriptures, "are calculated" to produce such evils, it must be because the Word of God breathes a spirit of rebellion and contumacy—to utter which is blasphemy against the Almighty.

As there are many more proofs of the truth of this charge, preferred against the Church of Rome, it may be a relief to the reader to have them presented in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER IV.

SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED—ADDITIONAL PROOFS.

As the charge of hostility to the free use and general circulation of God's Word is one of the heaviest that can be brought against any body of professed Christians, it ought not to be preferred unless it can be proven beyond all reasonable doubt. Additional evidence is therefore given in this chapter.

We have seen a Pope referring to the Council of Trent, which is the highest authority that Romanists acknowledge. Hear Trent: "Translations of the Old Testament may also be allowed, but only to learned and pious men, at the discretion of the Bishop; provided they use them merely as elucidations of the Vulgate version, in order to understand the Holy Scriptures, and not as the sacred text itself. But translations of the New Testament made by authors of the first class of this Index are allowed to no one, since little advantage, but much danger generally arises from reading them. If notes accompany the versions, which are allowed to be read, or are joined to the

Vulgate edition, they may be permitted to be read by the same persons as the versions, after the suspected places have been expunged by the theological faculty of some Catholic University, or by the general Inquisitor. Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience, that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it, it is, on this point, referred to the Bishops, or Inquisitors, who may by the advice of the Priest or confessor, permit the reading of the Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, by Catholic authors, to those persons, whose faith and piety, they apprehend, will be augmented, and not injured by it; and this permission they must have in writing. But if any one shall have the presumption to read or possess it without such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary. Booksellers, however, who shall sell, or otherwise dispose of Bibles in the vulgar tongue to any person, not having such permission, shall forfeit the value of the books, to be applied by the Bishop to some pious use; and be subjected by the Bishop to such other penalties as the Bishop shall judge proper, according to the quality of the offence. But regulars shall neither

read nor purchase such Bibles without a special license from their superiors."

This is plain enough. Who can mistake its import? Trent is out strongly and clearly against the free use of God's Word, and Trent was the last general council of the church of Rome. Its edicts stand unrepealed, unmodified.

Evidence of the same thing is found almost everywhere in the books of Romanists. In the "Larger Catechism of the Most Reverend Dr. James Butler, to which is added the Scriptural Catechism of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Milner, the whole approved by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Kenrick," now Archbishop of Baltimore, and printed in 1841, on pp. 81 and 82, we read as follows:

*Q.* Is there any obligation of reading the Scriptures?

*A.* The Catholic Clergy are required to read and pray out of it every day. A more strict obligation of studying both the written and unwritten Word of God, lies on the Pastors, whose duty it is to inculcate it to the faithful. But there is no such general obligation incumbent on the Laity; it being sufficient that they listen to it from their Pastors.

*Q.* Is it lawful for the Laity to read the Holy Scriptures?

*A.* They may read them in the language in

which they were written, as likewise in the ancient Vulgate translation, which the Church vouches to be authentic. They may also read them in approved modern versions ; but with due submission to the interpretation and authority of the Church.

*Q.* Have any great evils ensued from an unrestricted reading of the Bible, in vulgar languages, by the *unlearned* and *unstable* ?

*A.* Yes ; numberless heresies and impieties, as also many rebellions and civil wars. ”

This Catechism is published in Pittsburgh, Pa., by George Quigley, in 1841. It is not from the press of Vienna or Madrid. It was not printed in the dark ages.

Victor Hugo, in a speech made about the year 1848, used the following language : “ There is a book—a book which is from one end to the other of superior emanation—a book which is for the whole world what the Koran is for Islamism, what the Vedas are for India—a book which contains all human wisdom—a book which the veneration of the people has called *the book*—THE BIBLE. Ah ! well ; your censure ” (he is speaking of the Jesuits,) “ has mounted up even to that. An unheard-of thing ! the Popes have proscribed the Bible ! What astonishment for wise minds, what terror to simple hearts, to see the finger of

Rome put upon the Book of God!" In like manner we might record the outbursts of a just indignation on this point from the lips or pens of many others, who have felt the debasing power of Popery at work all around them.

When we examine the writings of the most distinguished theologians of the Romish Church, on the point before us, we find their teachings in full accordance with the bulls of Popes and the decrees of Councils. Indeed, they are but a repetition of the same monstrous opinions with here and there an attempt to justify them by reasoning.

Thus Ligori, who was canonized by Pope Pius VII., on the 13th of December, 1816, and who stands at the head of all their Theologians, says: In the Council of Toledo, which was held A. D. 1239, the laity, of whatsoever rank or class they might be, were prohibited from having in their possession, during the heresy, any book of the sacred Scriptures whatsoever, except the Psalter and the Breviary." He also says, that the Council of Bitterensis, A. D. 1245, "prohibited the translation of any of the books of Scripture into the vulgar tongue. The same," he adds, "was also prohibited by the councils of Jerusalem, Mechlin, Camarace, and by many other Councils, as may be seen in a work pub-

lished at Paris, A. D. 1661, by command of the clergy of France, under the title of "A collection of the authors who have expressly condemned the translation of the sacred Scriptures into the vulgar tongue." He also refers to the fourth rule of the Index, and says that Pope Clement XI., condemned the 79th proposition of Quesnelle; which maintained that "It is always useful and necessary at all times and in every place, and for all sorts of persons, to study and to make themselves acquainted with the spirit, the piety, and the mysteries of the sacred Scriptures."

Peter Dens, whose *Theology* is said to be a text-book at Maynooth, argues at length to the same purport. Having quoted the fourth rule of the Index, he says, "This law has been received and hitherto kept (with some variation on account of the prevailing spirit of some regions,) in, by far, the greatest part of the Catholic world. More indulgence has been granted, only when it was necessary to live among heretics." And he calls special attention to the fact that "the power of granting permission to read the sacred Scriptures in the vernacular tongue belongs to the bishop, or inquisitor, not to the priest or confessor, unless the power has been conceded to them." And he maintains that even "the reading of sacred Scriptures in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, must be

abstained from, if through defect of capacity or disposition of the mind, it would be of evil tendency." One belonging to the hierarchy, is always, of course, to be the judge of such tendency.

The fact, stated by Dens, that in purely Papal countries, the law of prohibition is more rigorously enforced, than where there is some mixture of Protestantism, is certainly true.

The Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, in his "Mornings with the Jesuits," says: I had heard that it was impossible to procure a copy of the Holy Scriptures in the Italian tongue. \* \* I wished to ascertain the matter for my own information; I had gone to every bookselling establishment in the city of Rome. \* \* I found that the Holy Scriptures were not for sale. I could not procure a single copy in the Roman language and of a portable size in the whole city of Rome; and when I asked each bookseller the reason of his not having so important a volume, I was answered in every instance, that the volume was prohibited, or not permitted to be sold. Martini's edition was offered to me in two places, but it was in twenty-four volumes, and at a cost of 105 francs, that is, four pounds sterling." Many others have borne a like testimony.

Cardinal Bellarmine says: "That the people

would not only get no good, but much hurt from the Scriptures; for they would easily take occasion of erring both in doctrines of faith, and in precepts concerning life and manners."

The council of Toulouse holds this language: "We strictly forbid the Laity to have the books of the Old and New Testaments in the vulgar tongue."

Peresius says: "Shall no bounds be set to popular, rude, and carnal men? Shall old men, before they have put off the filth of their mind, and young men, that yet speak like children, be admitted to read the Scriptures? I suppose, verily, (and my opinion fails me not) this ordinance, under the pretence of piety, was invented by the devil."

Dr. Milner, in his "End of Controversy," twice says, that Christ wrote no part of the Scriptures himself, and gave no orders to his apostles to write it. He is trying to show that we are not bound to read the word of God. And yet in a subsequent portion of his work he says: "The Catholic Clergy must and do employ no small portion of their time every day in reading different portions of Holy Writ." [No doubt he calls the Breviary Holy Writ.] "But no such obligation is generally incumbent on the flock." Yet he says: "The Catholic Church never did

prohibit the reading of the Scriptures to the Laity." But he durst not say she did not forbid the reading of the Scriptures *by* the Laity. The priest may read some of it to them if he chooses, perhaps; but he is not going to read the whole of God's Word to the people.

A few years ago, Cardinal Pacca, who held office for upwards of forty years, delivered himself thus in Rome respecting Bible Societies in France: "Biblical Societies are engaged in sowing with a profuse hand copies of the Scriptures, and Protestants arm themselves with new hardihood."

The Protestant world has long looked with great charity upon the character and actions of Fenelon; yet so deeply seated are the prejudices of the Romish priesthood against the Bible, that Fenelon himself was led into the same error, and in his letter to the Bishop of Arras, as published by Romish papers in this country, he says: "Gerson cannot be reproached with having favored the maxims of ultramontanists." This author nevertheless has thus written: "It is from this pestilent fountain that have issued, and that daily increase the errors of the *Begards*, of the poor men of Lyons, and others like them, among whom many laymen produce the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue, to the great prejudice of Ca-

tholic truth. It is this which it has been proposed to correct by the project of a reformation."

In another place "the translation into the vernacular of the holy books should be prevented, especially of our Bible, except the moral and historical books."

He further says: "It is a thing too dangerous to give to simple persons who have no learning, the books of Holy Scripture translated into French," &c. All these things are quoted with approbation by Fenelon, and much more is said by him in confirmation of them.

And as if all the foregoing proofs were insufficient, "The Metropolitan," a monthly magazine, edited by a Romish Priest, and published in Baltimore, has come out on the same side. In the number for April, 1853, is an extract from Dixon's Introduction, which had previously appeared in another magazine across the water. The following sentiments are here found without any qualification: "The practice of the Christian Church, at all times upon this head, has been quite irreconcilable with the supposition, that the Founder of that Church, or his apostles, imposed any obligation upon all Christians, generally, to read the Scriptures." . . . "The private study and perusal of the sacred volume has never

been made obligatory upon them" [the simple faithful.] The prohibitions are then stated, and by whom and when made. And "this discipline" is "vindicated" at length in the number of the Metropolitan for May, 1853, in such language as this: "In the first place, then, we lay it down as certain, that no divine precept exists, imposing upon the laity an obligation to read the Scripture." "In fine, there is no passage of Scripture in which it is expressed or implied, that all Christians are under an obligation of reading the Bible." "The right which the simple faithful have to read the Scripture, is not a right independent of the sanction and approval of the pastors of the church."

Such are some of the proofs of the hostility of the Church of Rome to the free use and general circulation of God's Word. They might easily have been multiplied. Everywhere you find in that apostate church the proofs of her hatred of the free use of Scripture. Indeed the Church of Rome does not stop when she has *spoken* and *decreed* against the free use of the Bible.

She goes yet further, and well merits the title of the Bible-burning Church. This has been her character for centuries. Her gravest doctors defend this Bible-burning. Ligori says: "I cannot comprehend with what face certain persons assert

that the church has the right only of condemning bad books, but not the right of prohibiting or of burning them." Here is the doctrine. What is the practice under it? In Llorente's History of the Inquisition, we read thus on p. 42: "In 1490, several Hebrew Bibles and books written by Jews were burnt at Seville." On p. 43 we read of a period about sixty years later, where, speaking of Pope Julius III., and his zeal against books, he says the Pope showed his zeal, "particularly against Spanish Bibles." On the same page he tells us that Carranza, who composed the catalogue of prohibited books for the Council of Trent, coming into England, he "caused many Bibles which had been translated, to be burned." He immediately adds, "some Bibles, which had been introduced into Spain, and were not upon the list, were also prohibited." On p. 44, he says the Supreme Council of Spain, in 1558, "decreed that those theologians in the university, who had studied the Oriental languages, should be obliged, as well as other persons, to give up their Hebrew and Greek Bibles to the commissaries of the Holy Office, on pain of excommunication." Besides many similar things, he tells us on p. 46, that Perez del Prado thus lamented the misfortunes of his age: "That some individuals had carried their audacity to the execrable extremity of de-

manding permission to read the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, without fearing to encounter mortal poison therein."

But this Bible-burning has not been confined to Spain, Italy, and Ireland; nor to centuries long since gone by. It is the order of the day in this century, and in this country. I have seen in the hands of Rev. J. P. Carter, of Maryland, a pamphlet respecting the burning of Bibles in St. Mary's Co., in that State, in the year 1819, and have been permitted to copy the following extract from a letter there published, written by the Rev. Leonard Edelen, a Roman Catholic priest, in answer to a letter of the Rev. John Brady, of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The priest says, "Never was my surprise carried to a higher pitch than on finding, in these enlightened days, a Protestant minister so little acquainted with the ancient and uniform practice of the Roman Catholic Church, as to call in question the propriety of her pastors' conduct, for prohibiting those entrusted to their charge from the perusal of Protestant Bibles, and other heterodox books. Had you, sir, taken a deliberate and impartial view of the past ages of the Christian world, you would have been spared the trouble of writing a lengthy epistle; you must soon have discovered that Catholics, although exceedingly numerous, and

spread throughout the whole known world, and differing in almost every thing else, in their country, language, customs, laws, government, humors, interests, and often at war with each other, yet they were all perfectly united in faith: they had the same books and sense of Scripture, in all controverted points, the same rule for expounding them; in fine, one and the same supreme judge of controversies, to which all were obliged to submit. Hence, sir, you might have inferred why I called upon Catholics to deliver up Protestant Bibles, and all other heretical books in their possession; and why I was determined to commit them to the flames, or doom them to destruction in any way that I thought proper:" pp. 6 and 7.

It is true this priest does not say he had burned the Bibles, but he admits that he had "called upon Catholics to deliver up Protestant Bibles," and that he "was determined to commit them to the flames or doom them to destruction in any way that" he "thought proper." It is not probable that a determination so boldly avowed, finally gave way, or that he ever restored the Bibles to their legal owners.

In Nov., 1842, there was a great burning of Bibles by Romish Priests at a protracted meeting, which they held at the Carbo, in the township and county of Champlain N. Y. Hundreds of copies

of God's Word were by these men piled together and burned. And still more recently in Mexico, N. Y., a Romish Priest gathered all the Bibles he could collect from Romanists and burned them. Americans will understand these people after a while. The only persons in this land, who burn Bibles are Papists. Even Atheists, Infidels, and Mormons refrain from burning God's word, but Romanists put it in the fire. This work of burning Bibles, so far as we know, was begun by the heathen persecutor, Antiochus. It was afterwards taken up by that monster of depravity, Dioclesian. Since his time the trade has been chiefly carried on by the Pope, his Inquisitors and myrmidons.

I set out to prove that the Church of Rome is and for a long time has been, hostile to the free use and general circulation of God's word. Documents old and new, European and American, have been submitted to you. You must judge of their relevancy and weight. To my mind they are conclusive and overwhelming, and establish the charge beyond all reasonable doubt. The Church of Rome, as far as she can, excludes every Bible from the schools, she denounces all Bible Societies, she puts the flaming sword of her own prohibitory authority before the first verse of Genesis, warning all her people not to read

her own translations without permission. She is a Bible-hating, Bible-burning Church. She has long been and still is so. She has taken away the key of knowledge. When her children ask bread she gives them a stone; when they ask an egg, she gives them a scorpion. When they long for God's holy word, she gives them cart-loads of traditions, silly fables, bulls, extravagants, encyclical letters, rosaries, crucifixes, and such like ware. Cruel, cruel Rome!

## CHAPTER V.

THIS OPPOSITION IS UNREASONABLE AND UNSCRIPTURAL.

It shall now be shown that this hostility of the Church of Rome to the free use and general circulation of the Scriptures is unreasonable and unscriptural. One of our countrymen has well said: "I wonder, and have always wondered that the Catholics, in prohibiting the free use and circulation of the Scriptures, did not except St. Peter's epistles. Was ever any Catholic forbidden to read the letters of a Pope! I believe not. But if they may and should read the Encyclical Letters of the Popes, why not let them read the 'General Epistles' of the first of Popes, Peter? Why is it any more criminal to read the letters of Pope Peter than those of Pope Gregory? I cannot explain this."

Such conduct is the more inexplicable when we look at the epistles of Peter. In the Doway Bible a note prefixed to the first epistle says: "This Epistle, though brief, contains much doctrine concerning Faith, Hope and Charity, with divers instructions to all persons, of what state or

condition soever. The apostle commands submission to rulers and superiors; and exhorts all to the practice of a virtuous life, in imitation of Christ. This epistle is written with such apostolical dignity as to manifest the supreme authority with which its writer, the Prince of the Apostles, had been invested by his Lord and Master Jesus Christ. He wrote it at Rome, which figuratively he calls Babylon, about fifteen years after our Lord's ascension."

Now if the epistle is very fine on "faith, hope, and charity," why not let the people have it, especially as it is confessedly addressed to "all persons of what state or condition soever?" And if it proves, as here stated, the supremacy of Peter, why not send it broad-cast over the world by the aid of bulls and bishops?

As to any "supreme authority" claimed in this epistle by Peter, there is nothing farther from him. In chap. v. 1, he says, in our translation, "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder." This is far from all arrogance. He could not more effectually renounce all right and desire to lord it over God's heritage. The words translated elders and elder in the text above cited are literally "presbyters" and "co-presbyter."

As to the second epistle, Peter expressly says,

in the 15th verse of the first chapter, that he wrote it that after his decease, his views on religion might be in possession of the Church. In the Doway Bible, that verse reads thus: "I will endeavor that you frequently have, after my decease, whereby you may keep a memory of these things." Why do not Papists aid so praiseworthy an endeavor? Indeed the note prefixed admits it was written just before his martyrdom. Surely a Pope about to die, and giving his views in this way, might, one would think, be allowed to speak.

But no! The Romish Church does not freely circulate, even Peter's Epistles. I wish they would. Perhaps the reason why they do not is, that he very earnestly recommends that his brethren should attend to God's word with much care. His language is very explicit. Even the Doway translation is very strong: "We have the word of prophecy more firm: to which you do well to attend, as to a light shining in a dark place until the day dawn, and the morning star rise in your hearts." This prophecy here spoken of, means either all Scripture in general, or it means specifically those portions of Scripture, which contain predictions of future events, and which are confessedly the most difficult parts of revelation to be understood. Yet Peter says, "You do

well to attend to the word of prophecy more firm: to which you do well to attend, as to a light shining in a dark place until the day dawn, and the morning star rise in your hearts." This epistle is general, and calls upon God's people without distinction to attend unto the word of prophecy. Would that Pio Nono would say as much, and not oppose Bible Societies.

It will save time to say, that the Doway Bible is here and elsewhere, in this discourse, freely quoted, that no advantage may seem to be taken by the translation used, and thus an outcry be made by Romanists of erroneous renderings of the sacred text.

Another thing is very wonderful, that in her hostility to the free use of the Bible generally, the Church of Rome does not except Paul's epistle to the Romans. According to the Doway version, it is expressly addressed "to all that are at Rome, the beloved of God, called to be saints." And yet at this very day, no book is more inaccessible to the masses of the people in the city of Rome, than this very epistle of Paul to the Romans. How is this to be accounted for?

In a note prefixed in the Doway Bible it is said: "It was written in Greek; but, at the same time, translated into Latin, for the benefit

of those who did not understand that language. And though it is not the first of his epistles, in the order of time; yet it is first placed, on account of the sublimity of the matter contained in it, of the pre-eminence of the place to which it was sent, and in veneration of the church." If all this is true, why not circulate the epistle everywhere?

It is true, that Paul does state in this epistle many things which look as if his doctrinal views were quite different from those of modern Popes and of Trent. Yet surely Paul ought to be read at Rome, at least so far as he wrote to that church. In this epistle too, he several times makes very honorable mention of all God's word. In the 2d verse of the 1st chapter, he says that God had promised the Gospel "by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures." And in the 4th verse of the 15th chapter he says, "What things soever were written, were written for our instruction; that, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, we might have hope." And in the 26th verse of the 16th chapter it is expressly stated, that the mystery of the Gospel is now "made manifest by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the eternal God, for the obedience of faith." Can it be that the Church of Rome opposes the free use of the Epistle to the

Romans because it puts such abundant honor on the whole of the Old Testament, declares that it contains much of the promised blessings of the New, asserts that the Scriptures are vastly consolatory, and that God would have the Gospel made known by the Scriptures of the prophets? This conduct is the more remarkable and the more reprehensible, as the first Pope, Peter, makes very honorable mention of all the epistles "of our most dear brother Paul." 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.

This leads to the observation that every where the word of God claims to be read by all, who can read, and to be made known in every possible way, and asserts its own divinity and sufficiency with great clearness. The first passage adduced in proof is Deut. xi. 18—21, and reads thus: "Lay up these my words in your hearts and minds, and hang them for a sign on your hands, and place them between your eyes. Teach your children that they meditate on them, when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest on the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. Thou shalt write them upon the posts of the doors of thy house, that thy days may be multiplied and the days of thy children" &c.

Greater variety and clearness of expression could not be used in the same space to teach, 1, that the word of God is in every way to be made

easy of access, and familiar to all the inmates of a family ; and 2, that children, who are here twice named, are as proper subjects of instruction in God's word, and are as large sharers in the benefits of such truths as their parents. Indeed the whole passage is but an enlarged form of asserting what Moses more briefly expresses in Deut. xxix. 29. " Things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law." Although the Doway translation of this verse is elliptical, yet the note at the bottom acknowledges that the sense is the same as that given by our translation.

The Doway Bible also admits, (Josh. viii. 34, 35,) that Joshua, " read all the words of the blessing and the cursing, and all things that were written in the book of the law. He left out nothing of those things, which Moses had commanded ; but he repeated all before the people of Israel, with the women and children and strangers that dwelt among them " To this no note is affixed. Here Joshua brought every thing in the law right before the minds of women and children and strangers. I will not stop to argue that whatever it is proper for one man to read to another the world over, it is proper for each man to read for himself.

The three texts just quoted make special men-

tion of children as fit persons to know and be familiar with the Scriptures. We may as well here examine some other passages which relate to young persons reading the Scriptures. In Ps. cxix. 9, [in the Doway Bihle it is numbered cxviii.] we read: "By what doth a young man correct his way?" The answer given is, "by observiug thy words." The Psalmist and Trent do by no means agree. He says that even a young man will "correct his way by observing God's word." Trent says that "if any one shall possess or have it without written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he shall first deliver it up." In the same Psalm, verses 98, 99, 100, we read, "Through thy commandment thou has made me wiser than my enemies: for it is ever with me. I have understood more than all my teachers; because thy testimonies are my meditation. I have understanding above ancients; because I have sought thy commandments." In this enlightening influence of the word of God, which is here said to make men wiser than their enemies, than their teachers, than the ancients, is found the grand objection of Romanists to men's possessing and reading Holy Scripture. There never was a Bible-reading, Priest-ridden community, and no people know this better than the Papal hierarchy.

But to return to children and youth. In his

second epistle to Timothy, iii. 15, Paul says, "From thy infancy thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which can instruct thee unto salvation, through the faith, which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture, divinely inspired, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice." This would seem to be plain enough on the matter in debate. The Scriptures, which Timothy knew from childhood, were those of the Old Testament, and are confessed to have belonged to a dispensation far less luminous than the present. If they alone could make men wise unto salvation, how much more can both the Testaments, reflecting light on each other, accomplish that happy result.

But as this passage puts a powerful weapon into the hands of those, who maintain the free use of the Bible, even by children, it must not pass without an antidote. Hence the Doway Bible has this note. "Every part of Scripture is certainly *profitable* for all these ends. But if we would have the *whole* rule of Christian faith, we must not be content with those Scriptures, which Timothy knew from his infancy, that is, with the Old Testament alone." So far you will agree this is a good note. This is the very doctrine of Protestants. Let us have all the Scriptures. But the note proceeds to say that we must not be

content "yet with the New Testament, without taking along with it the traditions of the Apostles, and the interpretations of the Church, to which the Apostles delivered both the book, and the true meaning of it." This last part of the note is right in the teeth of the text.

Still, here is the Doway Bible teaching that Timothy knew the Scriptures from his infancy, and yet in the Pastoral letter from the Archbishop and Bishops, met in Baltimore, in 1840, about a page is taken up in discussing whether children and youth should use the Bible in schools, and the decision reached is that they should not, at least in any such school as is usually found in the United States of America. Their own translation says the Scriptures can instruct unto salvation, and yet Romanists, led on by Popes and Councils, will not aid existing Bible Societies, nor form one for themselves, nor desist from denouncing those who industriously circulate God's Word, calling their Society a "pestilence," "a defilement of the faith," and "most dangerous to souls." Paul says God's Word is not dangerous to souls. He says it is *profitable*. However, Paul was no Papist, nor has the world ever seen a book (no larger than Paul's epistles,) which was more utterly hostile to all the claims of the Roman Anti-Christ. Indeed, in several of his

Epistles, he plainly utters the most weighty prophecies and arguments against Popery, the spirit of which had already begun to appear and to work. See especially 2 Thess. ii. 3-10, and 1 Tim. iv. 1-3.

And Peter was as much in favor of all Christians, even the youngest, having the Bible, as Paul was. In his first epistle, ii. 2, in our English Bible, we read thus: "As new-born babes desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby." This from Pope Peter was felt to be a rather strong statement. So in the Dowsy Bible there is an attempt to darken it by a false translation. "As new-born infants, desire the rational milk without guile, that thereby you may grow unto salvation." Still, Papists will, perhaps, hardly deny that, the "rational milk" is the milk of God's word.

Having shown from the Scriptures that people, even from infancy, should know God's Word, and that it will make them wiser than the ancients, and even wise unto salvation, let us now further examine and see whether a perusal of Scripture, wherever people can read God's truth, is not required by his authority. In John v. 39, we have Christ's own words, addressed to a promiscuous audience in Jerusalem, at one of the great feasts of the Jews. Though most who heard him were

unbelievers in his Messiahship, yet he said to all, "Search the Scriptures, for you think in them to have eternal life, and the same are they that give testimony of me." There is a remarkable note affixed to this passage in the Doway Bible, saying, "It is not a command to all to read the Scriptures." Why then does their own Bible translate it as a command? For shame they were compelled to let Christ's word come forth, "Search the Scriptures;" and yet here is a flat denial of the only sense which can be drawn from that command. Origen, Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Augustine, all agree that the word rendered "search," is in this place in the imperative.

So also, Luke tells us, i. 3, 4. "It seemed good to me also, having diligently attained to all things from the beginning, to write to thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mayest know the truth of those words in which thou hast been instructed." Could that evangelist have declared in stronger terms, the use and confirmatory nature of Scripture records? And in Luke x. 25, 26, when a lawyer stood up, tempting Christ, and saying, "What must I do to possess eternal life?" Jesus said to him, "what is written in the law? How readest thou?" Could Christ have

more clearly declared that the Scriptures were for all and to be read by all, than when he thus referred even an opposer, a bitter, subtle, carping enemy to that one infallible standard?

The next passage of Scripture, showing that people, indiscriminately, as they can, ought often and diligently, to read God's word, is found in Acts xvii. 10, 11, where it is said that Paul and Silas coming to Berea, "entered into the synagogue of the Jews. Now these were more noble than those of Thessalonica, who received the word with all eagerness, daily searching the Scriptures, whether these things were so." In the margin is this note: "The Jews of Berea are justly commended for their eagerly embracing the truth and searching the Scriptures to find out the texts alleged by the Apostles; which was a far more generous proceeding than that of their countrymen at Thessalonica, who persecuted the preachers of the Gospel without examining the grounds they alleged for what they taught." All must agree that this is a good note. But if it were "noble" and "a generous proceeding," in a congregation of Bereans, to search the Scriptures and bring the doctrines of Paul and Silas, though inspired, to the test of God's word, to see whether they were true, why is it not "noble" and "generous" for

a congregation in Rome, Paris, Lisbon, Genoa, Mexico, or New York to do the same thing, when modern and uninspired men preach ?\*

Afterwards, when Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, (1 Thess. v. 21,) he said, "prove all things." How could they do this if they were implicitly to believe whatever men should say to them ? Pope Hormisdas, who lived in the sixth century, gave to this passage, the correct interpretation. He says : "We ought not to blame that diligence which runs through and examines many things, but only the inclination which leads us from the truth. By this, we often lay in a store of instruction, that is necessary for the convincing of our very rivals themselves. Neither ought it to be looked upon as a fault to *know* what we are to *shun*. Therefore, it is not those who read unsuit-

\* The "Metropolitan" for May, 1853, p. 146 and 147, tries, by bold assertions, to set aside the clear point and teachings of this passage, and says that if the Bereans had "been Christians, their conduct upon the occasion in question, would have been altogether unjustifiable." The Doway Bible, both in the text and in the note, admits that the Bereans acted nobly. Now, if it is noble in a Jew to compare the preaching of an Apostle with the Old Testament, why is it not noble for a Christian to compare the preaching of a modern minister with all God's word, and see if it is true ? To say that it is "altogether unjustifiable," is to make a bold assertion without evidence. If a Jew may search the Scriptures, much more a Christian.

able things that do wrong by reading, but those who follow that which is wrong. If it were not so, the teacher of the Gentiles would never have told the faithful, '*Prove all things; hold fast to that which is good.*' "

And did not John, in his first epistle ii. 12, 14, say, "I write to you, little children. . . . I write unto you, fathers, . . . I write unto you, infants?" But what was the use of his writing to them if they might not know all that he wrote, either by reading it, or by hearing it read?

It will hardly be denied that one of the darkest and most difficult books of Scripture, is that of the Apocalypse. Oftentimes it perplexes the learned as well as the ignorant. Yet in the 3d verse of the 1st chapter, the Doway version reads thus: "Blessed is he that readeth and heareth the words of this prophecy; and keepeth these things which are written in it." To this passage no note is affixed. By confession of Romanists, therefore, the thing is plain, and needs no comment. Blessed is he that readeth even the Apocalypse, or heareth it and keepeth its sayings.

And does not Paul often speak of his epistles as though they were to be made known to the people? Did he not write them for that very purpose? Thus in the Doway Bible we read in

Col. iv. 16, "When this epistle shall be read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and read you that, which is of the Laodiceans." So in 1 Thess. v. 27, "I charge you, by the Lord, that this epistle be read to all the holy brethren." And in 2 Thess. iii. 14, "And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and do not keep company with him, that he may be ashamed." Surely Paul did not advise the church to censure any man for not obeying an epistle, of which he had been kept in utter ignorance.

All these views derive great force from the fact, that according to the clearest teachings of God's word, a knowledge of the Scriptures is the very means appointed by Heaven for our regeneration, conversion, and sanctification. A few out of many passages must suffice. We read in James i. 18, "Of his own will hath he begotten us by the word of truth;" 1 Pet. i. 23, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by the word of God;" Ps. cxix. 59, "I have thought on my ways and turned my feet unto thy testimonies;" John xvii. 17, "Sanctify them in truth; thy word is truth;" Eph. v. 25, 26, "Christ also loved the church, and delivered himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, cleans-

ing it by the laver of water in the word of life.”

Indeed the possession of God's written word was, according to inspired teachings, the greatest distinction between his ancient people, the Jews, and the rest of mankind. So we find in the Doway Bible, Deut. iv. 8, “For what other nation is there so renowned, that hath ceremonies, and just judgments, and all the law, which I will set forth before your eyes. Keep thyself therefore, and thy soul carefully. Forget not the words that thy eyes have seen, and let them not go out of thy heart all the days of thy life. Thou shalt teach them to thy sons, and to thy grandsons.” So also in Ps. cxlvii. 19, the same is taught: “Who declareth his word to Jacob; his justices and judgments to Israel. He hath not done in like manner to every nation; and his judgments he hath not made manifest to them. Alleluiah !”

With this view well agrees the New Testament. In Romans iii. 1, 2, Paul says: “What advantage then hath the Jew, or what is the profit of circumcision? Much every way. First, indeed, because the words of God were committed to them.”

And in the great commission given by Christ to his disciples he said: “Go ye, therefore, and

teach all nations ; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Now, we know that there are many ways of teaching. One is by oral instruction. Another is by example. Another is by putting books into men's hands, and inducing them to read and study them. Very early in their ministry the apostles called men to reading their epistles and all the sacred books. Men may be saved without learning to read, but in civilized communities that knowledge will be very imperfect which is not reduced to writing, and studied in private. Indeed so convincing is the pure Scripture, that our Lord Jesus himself taught us that nothing could be better suited to bring men to repentance, and gave us a parable, the very last sentence of which is : " If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe if one rise again from the dead." Luke xvi. 29. And in John v. 46, Christ says expressly, " Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me ; for he wrote of me." The Doway Bible labors to weaken this passage by erroneously rendering it thus : " For if you did believe Moses, you would, perhaps, believe me also : for he wrote of me." But even this translation cannot destroy the force of the argument. Reading and

believing Moses will prepare the heart for receiving Christ and his truth.

And all the Scriptures teach, that whenever the doctrine of any man is opposed to God's word, it is to be promptly rejected. Isa. viii. 20. "To the law rather and to the testimony." So also in Deut. xiii 1-5, "If there rise in the midst of thee a prophet, or one that saith he hath dreamed a dream, and he foretell a sign and a wonder, and that come to pass which he spake, and he say to thee: Let us go and follow strange gods, which thou knowest not, and let us serve them: thou shalt not hear the words of that prophet or dreamer: for the Lord your God trieth you, that it may appear whether you love him with all your heart, and with all your soul, or no. Follow the Lord your God, and fear him and keep his commandments, and hear his voice; him you shall serve, and to him you shall cleave."

Here the test, by which a false teacher, however high his pretensions, should be tried, was whether his teachings tended to withdraw men from the commandments and voice or teachings of God. So also in 2 John verse 10, we read: "If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house, nor say to him, God save you."

And as we are to know teachers true or false by their doctrine, so we must judge of the church

itself by the same rule, for Christ lays it down as a universal rule without exception: "My sheep hear my voice; and I know them, and they follow me." John x. 27. Again; "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John viii. 32. So that the Church herself is to be known by the truths which she teaches, and not by poms, and vanities and lying wonders.

It seems strange that we should be compelled to argue such a point as this at large, when John tells us that he wrote his Gospel for the very purpose of settling the faith of the people in a manner that would secure salvation: "These are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, you may have life in his name." John xx. 31.

And now has it not been proven by Moses, by Joshua, by David, by Jesus Christ, by Luke, by Paul, by Peter, and by John, that it is the privilege and duty of all men, as they can, to have and to read God's blessed word? Could an argument be more scriptural, more conclusive than that fairly drawn from the texts cited? Verily Tillotson spoke well when he said, "It is a hard case the Church of Rome reduces men to, who will neither allow them any salvation out of their Church, nor the best and most effectual means of salvation when in it."

## CHAPTER VI.

THIS OPPOSITION IS CONDEMNED BY THE VOICE OF  
ANTIQUITY.

THE hostility of the Church of Rome to the free use and general circulation of the Holy Scriptures, is also contrary to the practice of the primitive Church, and the teachings of the early fathers. Roman Catholic Priests profess to regard themselves as bound to pay a very sacred regard to the usages and views of the early Christians, and to receive with great deference the opinions of the fathers. Even the Council of Trent professes to "follow the orthodox Fathers."

Now it is not venturing anything to say that no Christian writer of the first five centuries can fairly be quoted against the free use of God's word. Irenæus says: "We have learned the plan of salvation from none others than those, by whom the Gospel came to us, which Gospel they first preached, and afterwards by the will of God gave it to us in the Scriptures, as the pillar and lasting foundation of our faith." Again he says that

“prophetical and evangelical Scripture is plain and without ambiguity.”

Chrysostom says: “Is it not absurd, that, in money matters, men will not trust to others, but the counters are produced, and the sum cast up; yet, in their souls’ affairs, men are led and drawn away by the opinions of others, and this when they have an exact scale and an exact rule, viz. : the declaration of the divine laws? Therefore I entreat and beseech you all, that not minding what this or that man may say about these things, you would consult the Holy Scriptures concerning them.” Again: “There comes a Gentile and says, ‘I wish to become a Christian, but I know not to whom to adhere, for there are among you many disagreements, strifes and broils: I know not which doctrine to prefer or embrace. Each one says, ‘I speak the truth,’ but whom to believe, I know not, for I am ignorant of the Scriptures, and each one defends his own views? Verily, this makes much for us; for if we say that we believe upon the strength of our own reasonings, thou art necessarily confused. But when we receive the Scriptures, which are simple and true, it will be easy for thee to judge. If any man consents to these, he is a Christian; if he fights against these, he is far from the true precepts of a Christian.” Again: “When heresy, which is the working of

Anti-Christ, gains ground, there is no proving a Church, but only by the Scriptures.”

At the Council of Nice, the Emperor Constantine thus appealed to the common consent of the Fathers assembled: “The books of the Evangelists and Apostles, and the prophetic oracles, plainly inform us what opinions and sentiments to entertain concerning God; therefore, laying aside all unfriendly contention, let us proceed to debate and prove the things in question, from the sacred writings.”

Jerome said: “Love the Scriptures, and wisdom will love thee:” and “That which has not authority from the Scriptures, is contemned with as much ease, as its nature is proved.”

Tertullian says: “I adore the fullness of Scripture; I do not admit what thou bringest in of thine own, without Scripture.” He also says: “Without doubt that which the Church received from the Apostles, and the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God, is to be held fast.” Again, speaking of certain errorists, he says: “That doctrine of theirs, if compared with the doctrine of the Apostles, will, by its diversity from it, and by its contrariety to it, be clearly shown not to be the doctrine taught by any Apostle or apostolic man.” Again: “Whence arise heretics, alien and hostile to the Apostles, except by a diversity

of doctrine, which each one has advanced or received according to his own will, and in opposition to the Apostles." Again he says: "Let Hermogenes show where it is written, and if it is not written, let him fear that woe denounced against those who add to God's Word."

Basil says: "Let the divinely inspired Scripture determine the whole controversy among us." Again he says: "It is a proof of infidelity, or a sign of pride, to invalidate any thing of all that has been written, or to introduce any thing not found written."

Theodoret says: "Do not offer reasons and arguments that are human, and drawn from the authority of men. I believe and obey only the Holy Scripture."

Justin Martyr says: "We must know, by all means, that it is not lawful or possible to learn any thing of God, or of right piety, save out of the prophets, who teach us by Divine inspiration."

Augustine says: "Take and read the Scriptures, for whatsoever is in them is high and divine; there is verily truth, and a doctrine most fit for the refreshment and renewing of men's minds, and truly so tempered that every one may draw with a devout and pious mind, as true religion requires." Again: "Let us not hear, 'I say this and you say that,' but let us hear, 'Thus saith

the Lord.' Truly these are the Lord's books, to whose authority we all consent, which we all believe and obey; there let us seek the church; there let us discuss our cause." Again: "I have the very clearest voice of my Shepherd without any doubtfulness, setting forth and portraying to me the church. I should therefore have myself to blame, if I should be willingly seduced and led away from his flock, which is the church itself, especially as I should hear him admonishing me with these words, 'As many as are my sheep, hear my voice, and follow me.' This voice is clear, plain, and distinct. He who does not follow it, how dare he say that he is one of Christ's sheep?" Again: "To this salvation and eternal life no one attains unless he holds the head, Christ. Yet no one can hold the head, Christ, unless he be a member of Christ's body, which is the church, which church we are bound by holy canonical Scripture to acknowledge even as we do the head itself; but we are not in like manner obliged to search into the various stories and opinions of men, as to what they have done and said and seen. Let them, if they can, clearly prove the claims of their church, not by what may have been said and reported in Africa, not by councils composed of their own bishops, not by the letters of disputants, whoever they may be, not by falla-

cious signs and prodigies, but by the rules laid down in the law of God, in the predictions of the prophets, in the Psalms, in the words of the One Shepherd, in the preachings of the evangelists, that is, in all the canonical authorities of the sacred books." Again: "In the Scriptures we have learned Christ, in the Scriptures we have learned the church, we have these Scriptures in common. Why, therefore, should we not hold fast Christ and the church, as presented in them?"

Indeed, Bishop Jewel, preaching at Paul's Cross, before a great assembly, on an exciting occasion, gave this challenge, which has not been taken up to this day: "IF ANY ONE CAN PROVE BY SCRIPTURE, FATHERS, DOCTORS, COUNCILS, FOR THE FIRST SIX HUNDRED YEARS, THAT THE LAY PEOPLE WERE FORBIDDEN TO READ THE WORD OF GOD IN THEIR OWN TONGUE, I WILL YIELD AND SUBMIT."

So full and uniform is the testimony of the early writers on Christianity, on the duty of studying God's written word, and its fitness to decide controversies, and nourish the soul, that Fenelon, in his celebrated letter to the bishop of Arras, "On the Reading of the Holy Scriptures in the Vernacular," speaks as follows: "I think that in our days persons have taken useless trouble to prove what is incontestable, to wit, that during the primitive ages of the church, lay-per-

sons were accustomed to read the Holy Scriptures. To be convinced of this, we have only to open the works of St. Chrysostom. He says, for example, in his preface to the Epistle to the Romans, that he *feels a lively sorrow*, because many of the faithful do not understand St. Paul, *as they should*, and because this ignorance in some is so great that they do not *even know the number of his Epistles*. He adds, that the disorder proceeds from the fact, *that they are unwilling to have his writings in their hands assiduously*; he further declares, that ignorance of the holy Scriptures *is the source of the contagion of heresies, and of the neglect in morals*. 'Those,' he says, 'who do not turn their eyes toward the light of the Scriptures, fall necessarily into errors, and into frequent faults.' The whole of this discourse regarded the lay-persons who were accustomed to hear the sermons of this Father."

"St. Jerome speaking to Læta concerning the education of her grand-daughter, says, that when this child shall *commence* to be a *little older*, her parents must find her only *in the sanctuary of the Scriptures, consulting the prophets and apostles concerning the spiritual nuptials*. He adds: 'Let her every day bring to you her work in order, which shall be a bouquet of the flowers of Scripture; let her learn the number of the Greek

verses, and afterwards let her be instructed in the Latin editions.'

"He desires that this young maiden should *love the holy books instead of jewelry and silken stuffs*. . . . Let her learn the Psalms. . . . Let her instruct herself in the Proverbs of Solomon on the rules of life; let her, in Ecclesiastes, accustom herself to trample worldly things under foot; in the book of Job let her follow the example of courage and patience; let her pass to the Gospels, never to put them out of her hands; let her, with an ardent thirst, be filled with the Acts of the Apostles, and with their epistles. . . . Let her learn by heart the prophets, the first seven books of Scripture, those of Kings," &c.

This language of the Archbishop of Cambray is the more remarkable, as it is the first part of a letter, the object of which is to justify the Church of Rome in putting restrictions upon the reading of God's word. In a subsequent part of the same letter, speaking of the early ages of the Christian Church, he says: "Besides, in those times all the Scriptures, and even all the liturgy, were in the vernacular language. All the West understood the Latin, in which was the ancient version of the Bible, called by St. Augustine, the *old Italian version*. The West also had the liturgy in the same language, which was the language of

the people. At the East, it was the same thing ; the people there all spoke Greek ; they understood the Septuagint version, and the Greek liturgy, just as our people understand the French translation. Thus without entering upon any question of criticism, it is clearer than day that the people had in their natural language the Bible and liturgy, which they caused their children to read, that they might be properly educated ; that the holy pastors in their sermons afterwards explained to them the whole Scriptures ; that the text was very familiar to the people ; that they were exhorted to read it continually ; that they were reproached for neglecting to read it ; finally, that such neglect was regarded as the source of heresies and of the relaxation of morals. This is something which no one need undertake to prove, because it is evident in the monuments of antiquity.”\*

To every well-ordered mind these concessions of Fenelon must be conclusive as to the usage of the primitive Church. Indeed no Council, for more than six centuries after the death of the oldest apostle, is quoted by Romish authors against the free use of God’s word. So that if Roman

\* The foregoing authorities are cited at length in Bennet’s Christian Oratory, in Turretin, and in Fenelon’s Letter published in Roman Catholic newspapers in this country.

Catholics regard the unanimous agreement of the Fathers as a rule in such a matter, their conduct is wholly unjustifiable.

Indeed this exclusion of God's word from the people is so manifestly a modern invention, that Peter Dens confesses: "It must be said that in this point the discipline of the church has been changed, just as communion under both kinds, and daily communion have been changed."

"The Metropolitan" for May, 1853, p. 151, admits the same: "The Church did not, at its commencement, impose the same restrictions on the reading of the Scripture, as she found it necessary to impose in these latter times. And if the Church has never, not even in these latter times, imposed any restriction on the reading of the original texts and of the ancient versions, the reason is, because the knowledge of the original texts and of these ancient versions soon became limited to the learned and well instructed Christians." Yet the same No. p. 147, has the boldness to say that "no one of the Fathers—not even St. Chrysostom, to whom, above all others, the Biblicals appeal—has ever asserted the existence of a precept binding all Christians to read the Bible. St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome, to all of whom our opponents here refer, at the most, but exhort to the reading of the Scripture."

The policy and insidiousness of the Church of Rome, in this particular, has been well exposed by Chillingworth: "He, that would usurp an absolute lordship and tyranny over any people, need not put himself to the trouble and difficulty of abrogating and disannulling the laws made to maintain the common liberty; for he may frustrate their intent, and compass his own design as well, if he can get the power and authority to interpret them as he pleases, and to have his interpretations and additions stand for laws; if he can rule his people by his laws, and his laws by his lawyers. So the Church of Rome, to establish her tyranny over men's consciences, needed not either to abolish or corrupt the holy Scriptures, the pillars and supporters of Christian liberty. But the more expedite way, and therefore the more likely to be successful, was to gain the opinion and esteem of being the public and authorized interpreter of them, and the authority of adding to them what doctrine she pleased, under the title of *traditions* or *definitions*." Thus Rome has taken away the key of knowledge, and substituted great loads of traditions, glosses, and corruptions for the word of God.

Some may ask, how do Romanists set aside the numerous teachings of God's word, and the uniform practice of the primitive church on this sub-

ject? This question has already been, in part, answered. More particularly, Romanists claim for their church, power enough to do this or any thing else, however contrary to Scripture. Church authority is the great pillar of all their system.

But do they not attempt to show that they have some Scriptural authority for their course in this matter? They do. They rely much on two texts. In Matt. xviii. 15-17, we are told that Christ said: "If thy brother offend thee, go and reprove him between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou shalt gain thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand. And if he will not hear them, tell the church, and if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." This is the favorite passage of Scripture most frequently adduced by Papists, to show that the people must not read the Scriptures without permission. It is quoted in the "ADMONITION" prefixed to the Doway Bible, only Papists do not quote the whole, but merely the last part of it. If they should cite the whole, it would be seen that the text has no more to do with the withholding of God's word from the people than the first verse of Genesis has. In other words, they garble the text so as to make it seem to

favor their notions. This is the great foundation of their fearful prohibition to read the Scriptures. God says, that if a man is so wicked and contentious, that if you have sought every way to be reconciled to him, and all the prescribed measures have failed, then you must esteem him no longer as a brother in the Lord. This is the fair, the entire logical sense of the passage. The doctrine of Rome, drawn from it, is that the people must not read the Scriptures!

The other passage most commonly quoted by Papists on this subject, and referred to in the ADMONITION, is that found in 2 Pet. iii. 16, where Peter speaking of Paul's epistles, says, that in them "are some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as also the other Scriptures, to their own perdition."

There is no doubt that perverting Scripture is a very dangerous practice. It leads to perdition. Nor is it denied that there are in Paul's writings and in other Scriptures also, *some* things hard to be understood. But if a lesson is hard and a subject difficult, that is one reason why we should study it the more profoundly and humbly, looking to God through Jesus Christ, for the illumination of the Holy Ghost.

But Peter does not say that every thing Paul says is "hard to be understood." He expressly

limits his remark. Why not let the people have at least all except these "some things hard to be understood?" Nor does he say that the people of honest minds, anxious to know God's will, are likely to be misled; but he expressly confines his remark to the unlearned and the unstable. Yet even to them, Paul's epistles are harmless, until they "wrest" or pervert them.

But if Peter had wished to discourage the reading of Scripture, what a chance he here had to say so. Instead of that, he says in the very next verse but one, "Increase in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ." Peter, no doubt, well agreed with Paul that "all Scripture divinely inspired, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice." These apostles never disagreed as to the excellence of God's blessed word. Even Rome does not pretend that there was any difference between them on this vital matter.

## CHAPTER VII.

CONCLUSION. ADDRESS TO ROMISH PRIESTS, TO PRIVATE MEMBERS OF THE ROMISH CHURCH, AND TO PROTESTANTS.

I CLOSE this discussion by an address to several distinct classes of persons ; wishing to each all the blessings and mercies of the covenant of peace, and an interest in the adorable Redeemer.

### 1. To Priests of the church of Rome.

Friends: You and your people, you and your opposers, are passing rapidly to the bar of the unerring Judge, to whom we must all give account for the deeds done in the body. Robes of office will then be laid aside. Exclusive privileges will shield no one there. Of all the examinations and sentences, none will be more fearful than those of religious teachers who have been unfaithful to Christ and his truth. Should you, in that great day, meet one soul that had failed of salvation because of your corrupt teachings, or your sinful withholding of the Scriptures, how dreadful will be your reflections !

In your own Bible it is written that, "whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. v. 19. In your own Bible I read, "If any man shall add to these things, God shall add upon him the plagues written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from these things which are written in this book." Apocalypse, xxii. 18-19.

Men can assume no higher responsibility than by perverting, denying or withholding from the people the Holy Scriptures. By his prophets, by his Son, and by his apostles, God has spoken to all classes of men, rulers and ruled, ministers and people, husbands and wives, fathers and sons, mothers and daughters, masters and servants, rich and poor, old and young. Can it be safe for you to step forward, and say to the people that they shall not hear Jehovah speak, though they may hear you? If the Pope sends out any writing, any man may buy and read it; but if the King Eternal, immortal and invisible, who made man, and knows his sins, and sorrows, and wants, inspires men to write his will and laws, his promises and threatenings, who are you, that you should

withstand God by saying that your fellow-men must not read the writing, unless one of your number, as fallible and as sinful as themselves, shall deign to give permission, and that too "in writing?"

By your own Bible it appears that Timothy might know the Scriptures "from infancy." But who was Timothy? He was no prodigy; he was no exception to the general rule. He was the son of the pious Eunice, and the grandson of the pious Lois. If these handmaids of the Lord might instruct their little boy in the Holy Scriptures, why may not every man's child have his mind stored with the very words of the Holy Ghost? In his word God often addresses children, and says many things not a whit above their capacities. If any doubt this statement, let children be tried, let them read the Bible, and you will see how their minds will go eagerly to work, and what questions they will ask. It is in the knowledge of many great and good men, that the impressions which they received early in life, from reading the history of Joseph, of David, and of Christ, were as just and as salutary, though not as adequate, as those of riper years.

But if you will not feed the lambs, why will you not feed the sheep? Take up the language of Christ, and say to all your hearers, "Search

the Scriptures." Are there not among your hearers many hungry souls, to whom God's Word would be the bread of life; and who, on reading the Scriptures, would say, as one of old, "How sweet are thy words to my palate! more than honey to my mouth. By thy commandments I have had understanding: therefore have I hated every way of iniquity." Doway Bible, Ps. 118, (English Bible, 119,) 103, 104. If some parts of God's Word are mysteries, others, and those of the highest importance, are plain. "He that readeth it may run over it." "Fools shall not err therein." One of your popes, a thousand years ago, said: "In the Scriptures are shallows where a lamb may wade, and depths where an elephant may swim." And Pope Pius the Sixth said to Martini, respecting his translation into Italian: "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, to eradicate the errors which are so widely disseminated in these corrupt times." This was the doctrine of that Pope in "the calends of April, 1778." And Clement XIV., better known to the literary world as Ganganelli, goes so far as to say, that "the Gospels contain the religion of

Christ, and are so plain that the meanest capacity can comprehend them."

If the Gospels are so plain, why will you not grant unrestricted access to them? Why will you not circulate them? The promises and invitations of God's word are almost all plain. Those relating to the salvation of the soul, are peculiarly so. The moral law is very clear. Every honest man may know the correct rule of living, if he has the Scriptures. The threatenings of God are very plain and pungent. Many of them are rather weakened than strengthened by explanations. From God's word nothing is clearer than that we must believe in the Lord Jesus Christ with the heart, or be rejected at last, that we must truly repent of all sin or perish, that we must love God and keep his commandments, or lie down in sorrow.

Your Bible, like our own, says: "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." Heb. xii. 14. Your Bible as well as ours, says: "God forbid that I should glory but in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom the world is crucified to me, and I to the world. For in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." Gal. vi. 15, 16. Let these and other kindred truths come to all your

people in the written word. Labor and pray that all under your charge "may be filled with the knowledge of his will, in all wisdom, and spiritual understanding; that they may walk in all things pleasing; being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God; strengthened with all might, according to the power of his glory, in all patience and long-suffering, with joy." Col. i. 9, 11.

Stand aside, ye mortals! yea, retreat into your own littleness, and let Jehovah speak to his creatures; let him warn, instruct, reprove, command, comfort, invite and encourage in the very words which he has chosen, "not in the learned words of human wisdom, but in the doctrine of the Spirit." 1 Cor. ii. 13.

I am the more impelled to urge this matter because I read in your own Bible, these blessed words: "The Spirit and the bride say: Come, and he that heareth, let him say: Come, and he that thirsteth, let him come: and he that will, let him take the water of life, gratis." Apocalypse, xxii. 17.

One of your own number, Archbishop Hughes, of New York, lately scouted the idea that "the Jesuits, the Pope, and the members of the Catholic Church throughout the world, have a mortal dread of the Bible." He says: "This would be

strange, indeed;" and adds, that "the Church availed herself with eagerness, of the art of printing for the purpose of multiplying copies of the Holy Scriptures." Now if this is so, and if you are of the same mind, you will, of course, do all you can to get God's word among the people. Ask the world for money to print Bibles, and you will as surely get it as you are believed to be sincere. But, until you do this, your leader of New York will in vain, say: "It is not surprising that our Protestant neighbors will persist in supposing that we are afraid of our original and hereditary documents that have never been out of our possession?" The proper reply is, that there is nothing surprising about it, except that men will stand aloof from spreading so good a book, and then express surprise that others should think them afraid of that book.

Those of you, who are Jesuits, know very well that this is one of your rules: "Those that are admitted to do the particular offices of the house must not learn either to read or write; or, if they know anything, they must not learn any more. And no man must teach them without leave of the general; but it shall be sufficient for them to serve *Christ* our Lord, in holy simplicity and humility." How dare you thus perpetuate ignorance in your own houses? How can you thus

act, and then set up for teachers of the rest of mankind? Are ignorance and simplicity the same thing in your esteem?

2. To private members of the Roman Catholic Church.

You will not, I trust, forget these words found in your own Bible: "Every one shall bear his own burden." Gal. vi. 5. Again: "Every one of us shall render account for himself to God." Rom. xiv. 12. I know indeed that your Priests are in the habit of saying to you that if you will obey them, they will answer for you in the last day; but I know that they and every other man will have to answer for himself. You cannot send a substitute to that war. "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." Rom. xiv. 10. You cannot divest yourselves, no creature can divest you of your individual accountability to God.

Your own Bible also says: "Brethren do not become children in sense; but in malice be children; and in sense be perfect." 1 Cor. xiv. 20. The plain meaning of this is clear: "Brethren, be not children in understanding: howbeit, in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men." The verse just quoted is clearly parallel to that in 1 Cor. x. 15, where Paul says: "I speak as to wise men: judge ye yourselfe what I say."

In God's blessed word you have the key to the saving knowledge of God in Christ. Take it, and unlock the store-house of Heaven's richest, choicest mercies, and make them yours. They are offered to you by the Lord. Use your faculties with zeal and diligence in learning God's will. Lift up your voice for understanding. Cry after knowledge. Be in good earnest. Your great Doctor, Peter Dens, quotes from the 9th Homily of Chrysostom on the epistle to the Colossians this excellent advice: "Hear, I beseech you, ye laymen, all of you get Bibles for yourselves, as medicine for the soul." Oh that you would follow this advice.

Well does Dr. Manning in his *Moral Entertainments* say: "The answer of Christ to the young man who wished to know from him the way of salvation, saying, 'How readest thou?' teaches us that if we will be rightly instructed, we must go to the divinely inspired writings. The Gospel is that, which we must follow; by it we must be judged, and by it stand or fall in that day; and happy is he that shall be found able to meet that awful question of the great Judge, 'How readest thou?'"

Your position in a land of religious liberty and spiritual privileges cannot be divested of the deepest solemnity. You may avoid reflection and

action respecting your soul's affairs, and leave the matter to the care of the Priest; but this will not avail in the last day. He, who shall at last decide your destiny, has already told you that he will not hold any one innocent that slights the Scriptures: "He that despiseth me, and receiveth not my words hath one that judgeth him. The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." John xii. 48.

God has put you in a land full of open Bibles. Here "the word of God is not bound" by legal enactment. It is free, it is accessible to all. Take and read, search and meditate upon it. Nothing can be of so great value to you and your children as the life-giving truths of the Gospel.

If you should not understand any passage of Scripture, you may ask others for their views. Only you must judge whether they prove their opinion to be scriptural. Philip did not take the Bible from the Ethiopian, nor chide him for prying into the meaning of the prophet Isaiah, but like a good minister "beginning at that scripture preached to him Jesus."

And if you should be still in doubt, cry to God for the illumination of his Spirit. Your own Bible gives you the example of pious David in such a case: "Open thou my eyes: and I will consider the wondrous things of thy law." "Give

me understanding, and I will search thy law ; and I will keep it with my whole heart." Ps. cxviii. [King James' Bible cxix.] 18, 34. That blessed apostle, James, according to your own translation says : " If any of you want wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all abundantly, and upbraideth not : and it shall be given him." James i. 5. The same apostle says : " The continual prayer of a just man availeth much." James v. 17.

By leaving some things dark and mysterious, God may for a long time test your submission and docility. Even to your doctors many things in the Bible are dark. Not one of them pretends to tell who is meant by the beast, whose " number is six hundred and sixty-six." See Apoc. xiii. 18. At least all the light found in the notes of the Doway Bible is simply this : " The numeral letters of his name shall make up this number." To those who are well disposed it is often useful to be tried. Our Heavenly Father proves us by concealing some things from us for a time. It is so in all science. At first many things are dark. But even at last some things are mysterious. The stars do not all shine with equal splendor ; neither do the truths of God. But let none be offended at this. Enough is plain to keep us fully occupied, and to lead us to God.

I beseech you therefore to treasure up in your hearts the very words of God. Give ear to the gracious calls of Christ Jesus: "Come unto me all you that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you. Take up my yoke upon you, and learn of me, because I am meek and humble of heart: and you shall find rest to your souls. For my yoke is sweet, and my burden light." Matt. xi. 28-30. "Him that cometh to me I will not cast out." John vi. 37. "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." Luke xix. 10. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man shall hear my voice, and open to me the gate, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." Apoc. iii. 20.

Do you wish to know the way of life, and ask like the Jailor at Philippi, "What must I do that I may be saved?" You have the answer of inspired men: "Believe in the Lord Jesus: and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Acts xvi. 29, 30. If you would see how fully and kindly God invites men to be saved, listen to his words: "All you that thirst, come to the waters: and you that have no money, make haste, buy and eat: come ye, buy wine and milk without money, and without any price. . . . Seek ye the Lord while he may be found: call upon him while he

is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unjust man his thoughts, and let him return to the Lord, and he will have mercy on him, and to our God: for he is bountiful to forgive. Is. lv. 1, 6, 7.

And be not satisfied with having the word of God yourself. It is a duty incumbent on every man to make known the will of God to others. Your own Bible makes it your duty not only to "work your salvation with fear and trembling," but also to do good to others by "holding forth the word of life." Phil. ii. 12, 16.

### 3. To Protestants :

You enjoy, without restriction, from church or state, from priest or magistrate, free access to God's Holy Word. If you slight or despise that sacred treasure, you do it at your peril. "To whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required." Luke xii. 48. By many solemn and tender obligations you are bound to know the truth, to love it, to live according to it, and to bring others to do the same. Let your light shine. Glorify God with all your powers, and submit yourselves to his statutes and ordinances forever. Remember that an open Bible, not loved, not believed, not practised, will at last but flash damnation in your consciences.

God's word is not an amulet. It possesses no

power to save those who will not obey it. If you shall refuse to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, your destruction will be both inevitable and dreadful. "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him." Heb. ii. 3. "He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy, under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite to the Spirit of grace." Heb. x. 28, 29. If you despise the teachings of that Saviour, whose sermons you are freely permitted to read, it had been good for you if you had never been born. "He that is wise shall be wise for himself."

And be not satisfied to go alone to heaven, but persuade others to join your pious march. Wherever they are destitute supply them with the word of God. Persuade them to read it for themselves. Do all in your power to disseminate the Scriptures. You know what your Bible says in Isaiah lv. 10, 11. The Doway translation of that passage is this: "As the rain and the snow come down from heaven, and return not thither,

but soak the earth, and water it, and make it to spring, and give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: so shall my word be, which shall go forth from my mouth: it shall not return to me void, but it shall do whatsoever I please, and shall prosper in the things for which I sent it."

Let nothing discourage you. If one rejects the truth, another will receive it. God's word is quick and powerful. It is sharper than a two-edged sword. "Are not my words as a fire, saith the Lord: and as a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" Jer. xxiii. 29. "In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thy hand: for thou knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good." Ecc. xi. 6.

In particular God has in his wonderful providence, opened a wide door of usefulness to you in the Bible Society, the history of which institution has been marked by many infallible tokens of divine favor. It has multiplied the copies of God's Word at least five-fold beyond what they were before. It has been a bond of union among thousands of good men. It has greatly increased the demand for the Scriptures, and so has enlisted private capital and private enterprise in the work of spreading the Word of God.

And it is the very best book you could circu-

late to destroy the power of the Man of Sin. A great statesman well said : "The New Testament is the best book ever written against Popery."

It pours floods of light on the benighted and superstitious. It teaches all persons to call no man master. If you would pour balm into wounded consciences and tortured spirits, send abroad God's Word. It speaks words of unspeakable comfort to all the penitent. It reveals ample rewards to suffering virtue. It converts the soul. It purifies the heart. It is its own witness. It is no cunningly devised fable.

Sir Isaac Newton said : "I find more marks of authenticity in the Bible than in any profane history whatever." And even Infidelity has often been compelled to pay the tribute of profound respect to the system of truths taught in God's word. Bolinbroke said : "No religion ever appeared in the world, whose natural tendency was so much directed to promote the peace and happiness of mankind, as Christianity." "The Gospel is, in all cases, one continued lesson of the strictest morality, of justice and benevolence, and of universal charity." "The system of religion which Christ published, and his evangelists recorded, is a complete system to all the purposes of religion, natural and revealed. It contains all the duties of the former, it enforces them by asserting the

divine mission of the publisher, who proved his assertion at the same time by his miracles." Scores of infidels have confessed as much. Even Paine says of Jesus Christ, that "he was a virtuous and amiable man. The morality he preached and practised was of the most benevolent kind."

But the Bible still evinces its heavenly origin by its supernatural effects. It proves every day that it came from God. If all mankind, except a thousand, were raving infidels, scowling at all that is sacred and benevolent, and that thousand were meek, gentle, humble, penitent believers, there would be ample proof in the case of each of their number, that the Gospel was still the wisdom of God and the power of God unto salvation. God has never made the Gospel more efficacious in reclaiming the wandering, in purifying the vile, in converting the sinner from the error of his ways, than within the last century. In disseminating this book, you do not beat the air, you run not as uncertainly.

Above all things, let each one of you make sure work for eternity for his own soul. Be not merely speculative believers, but reduce all to practice. Live according to the precepts of Holy Scripture; live by the faith of the Son of God; live to the glory of Him that bought you with his blood. Then when your life shall all be

spent, and you shall enter the invisible state, nothing that occurred on earth will give you more unfeigned delight, than any part you may have had in building up that kingdom, which is righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

THE END.