
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



THE BIBLE
AND
THE VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE :

OR,
THE VULGATE
COMPARED WITH THE ORIGINAL SCRIPTURES ;

BEING
AN ATTEMPT TO SHOW THAT THE VULGATE CAN NEITHER BE
MADE A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE ORIGINAL SCRIPTURES,
NOR THE BASIS OF MODERN TRANSLATIONS.

WITH APPENDICES
ON THE SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE TRANSLATIONS OF THE VULGATE.


BY C. E. STUART.



“He that hath *my* Word, let him speak *my* Word *faithfully*.”—JER. xxiii. 28.

LONDON :
WERTHEIM AND MACINTOSH, 24, PATERNOSTER-ROW,
1856.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.



**LONDON:
WERTHEIM AND MACINTOSH,
24, PATERNOSTER-ROW.**

THE BIBLE

AND THE

VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.

THE modern versions of the Bible in the European languages are derived mostly from two sources—the original Scriptures, or faithful translations, and the Latin Vulgate. The former are the source and basis of all Protestant, the latter, generally, of all Roman Catholic versions.*

The object of the present pamphlet is to compare these two sources, with a view to ascertain what are the chief differences between them, and whether the translations made from the Vulgate can be conscientiously circulated by Protestants as the true Word of God.

It will be well to state in the outset that there is no desire to disparage the value of the Vulgate when considered as one of the ancient versions. Its very age commands for it great respect ; and it cannot be denied that it has been made in former times instrumental in disseminating truth. By it Wickliffe was brought to see more clearly, and from it he made the version which bears his name. By it, doubtless, the eyes of Luther were first opened in his monastery to understand somewhat of the teaching of Scripture ; and by means of it many of the early Reformers were enlightened. Its critical value in helping to decide a doubtful reading must be also remembered. But it is one thing to respect it as a version, one voice among several

* It may interest some to be informed what are the sources of the chief modern versions. De Sacy in French, Martini in Italian, Scio in Spanish, Pereira in Portuguese, Schurin in Dutch, Torres Amat in Spanish, are from the Vulgate. While from the original Scriptures, or versions made from them, we have, Martin and Osterwald in French, Diodati in Italian, Luther in German, the States-General in Dutch, Casper Karoli in Hungarian, and D'Almeida in Portuguese.

—one witness among others to the truth of Scripture; and quite another thing to make it a *substitute* for Scripture. It is in this light that it is here examined, and any remarks which may seem disparaging to it must be taken as made only with reference to the position which the Church of Rome has assigned to it. It is not the Vulgate as Jerome left it that is here examined, but the modern Vulgate, as authorized by Clement VIII. It may be objected that some of the errors pointed out in the following pages are either older than Jerome or derived from other sources, and therefore not justly chargeable on the Vulgate. Giving the Vulgate the full benefit of these objections it must still be remembered, that the blunders of copyists, or the ignorance of the original Scriptures in former days, cannot excuse the existence of errors *now* when access to the originals is so easy.

The reader is further requested to bear in mind that in any remarks that may be made in the following pages there is no intention to charge the errors exposed *as wilful* or *fraudulent*. If we recollect how Scripture was preserved in former times, and how even in MSS. of the present day errors will arise from accident or oversight, we may well be surprised that the versions in use in ancient times have not come down to us in a state of greater corruption. Probably the present errors of the Vulgate arose from the mistakes of copyists. Their origin it is not intended to discuss. Their existence in the present authentic version, and the errors founded on or defended by them, are what we have now to do with.

Let us first see the authority on which the different texts are presented to us; the grounds on which they stand; and next, let us compare various passages as found in the Vulgate, with the existing originals, and see if that version can be taken as a substitute for the original Scriptures, or even as a basis for modern translations.

I. Let us inquire into the authority on which the different texts are presented to us.

The original Scriptures, written part in Hebrew, part in Chaldee, and part in Greek, come down to us with many witnesses to their genuineness and accuracy, and are confirmed by the great agreement which is found among the many MSS. and versions which have remained to these our days.

Many of these MSS. are very ancient. Some are imperfect, containing only the books of Moses or the four Gospels; others contain nearly all the Old or New Testament. These MSS. and versions have come from various parts of the world. Europe, Asia, and Africa have each in their turn attested the accuracy of the copies of the Scriptures, each of those quarters of the world have contributed

to swell the number of witnesses in confirmation of our present text. The Samaritan Pentateuch, kept by a sect hostile to the Jews since their return from Babylon, attests the general accuracy of the present Hebrew Pentateuch. The Targum of Onkelos bears witness that the Pentateuch we have now was the Pentateuch in use a few years before the coming of our Lord.

The LXX version, though as a translation inferior to the Vulgate, as it came from Jerome, adds its independent witness to the general accuracy of the Hebrew and Chaldee Scriptures; and though kept in Gentile hands, and transmitted through Gentile sources, proves that the Jews were faithful to their trust as guardians of the Oracles of God. The Hexapla of Origen, the Targum of Jonathan, and various Chaldee paraphrases, prove that from 200 A. D. to 600 A. D. the Old Testament was the same as we have now.

The 630 MSS., some of which contain only small portions of the Scriptures, collated of late years by Kennicott, and the 479 MSS. and 283 printed editions, collated by De Rossi, some of which are of great antiquity, add their united testimony to the genuineness and accuracy of the Hebrew Bible. The Jews, who religiously preserved the sacred Oracles of the Old Testament, bring no charge against Christians of corrupting the Word of God, except in one or two instances, but agree in bearing witness to the fact, that the Scriptures which we revere are the same which they honour and receive as the Word of God. Both parties can appeal to the Hebrew Bible as their authority in matters of controversy.

The Greek Testament comes to us with no less credible attesting witnesses. The Syriac version made very early in the Christian era, for the use of the Oriental Christians speaking that language, bears witness, as far as it goes, to the general accuracy of the present text. MSS. have been found in all parts of the old world, and many have been collated. Scholz' list numbers 674 MSS., containing many of them only parts of the New Testament. All in the main agree in bearing witness to the present text as forming the original books of the New Testament.

The ancient Fathers, Greek, Latin, and Syriac, quote very many passages from the New Testament, and these quotations (allowance being made for the differences arising from various transcriptions), agree with the Scriptures as they have been handed down to our day.*

* The following extract from the "North British Review" will show the labour which has been bestowed on the Greek New Testament:—"Since the publication of the first edition of the Greek Testament by Erasmus, in 1516, what prodigious

As far then as mere external evidence can go we have irrefragable evidence that the Scriptures we believe to be the Word of God are indeed his Word; and that what we reverence as the oracles of God were so revered, and so received, by the ancient Jewish and early Christian churches, and hence the deduction is plain, the doctrines we find in these Scriptures must be the doctrines of our faith.

The many witnesses from various parts of the old world to the truth of the present text are indeed remarkable. Their number forbids the idea or possibility of the Scriptures, which rest on their authority, being ever perverted without its being discovered. One witness may be tampered with, but many cannot, and since these witnesses are kept in different countries, watched over with jealous eyes by those who differ in creed, and even in textual readings of the Bible, we may feel sure that the present text will be preserved, intact, to the end of this dispensation.

Now let us inquire on what authority the present text of the Vulgate rests.

Of Latin versions of the Scriptures there was one made in Africa in the second century from the LXX.—Greek being then the language best known. As the knowledge of Greek declined among the Christians of Rome and other parts of Italy it became necessary to follow the African Church in using a Latin version of the Scriptures. As the demand for copies of the old Latin increased, and as time rolled on, the original text of this anti-Hieronimian version became injured. Several people revised it; and among other revisions is one made in Northern Italy, called the "Itala," and so mentioned by Augustine, who, having been brought to a knowledge of the truth under Ambrose

pains and research have been bestowed upon its text. Beza, Stephens, Usher, and Fell led the way. Then followed the many years' toil of Mill—toil only concluded fourteen days before his death. The task of his life was done, and the servant released. In Kuster's edition of Mill are supplied the readings of twelve additional MSS. The pious labours of Bengel preceded those of Wetstein, who collated upwards of sixty MSS. (really about twenty), and has appended to his text more than 1,000,000 authorities. The 30,000 various readings of Mill have in this way considerably augmented. Griesbach collated some hundreds of MSS.—(personally he collated few, but availed himself of the labours of others)—and he has been followed by Scholz, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. The readings now amount to 100,000. For not only have all the differences in all these MSS. been carefully compared and accurately jotted down, but the old versions, such as the Syriac, Latin, and Gothic, have been ransacked, and the supposed variations added to the list. Nay, the quotations found in the Fathers have been subjected to the same ordeal, and all their discrepancies seized on, and subjoined to this formidable catalogue." The reader will find a full account of the labours of these men in the "Account of the Printed Text of the Greek Testament," by S. P. Tregelles, LL.D.

of Milan, carried with him into Africa, for his own use, that version of the old Latin then in vogue in that Church.

Such was the state of matters in the middle of the 4th century. Italy owed the Scriptures in Latin to the Church of Africa. Damasus, Bishop of Rome, determined to attempt a revision of the existing version, and remedy the confusion which the several revisions had introduced. For this Jerome was employed. Having commenced with a revision of the New Testament, he finished with a translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew. By degrees, though not without some opposition, his version, the Psalms excepted, gained ground till it was generally received from the 6th century and downwards by the Church of Rome as deserving of great esteem.* From the multiplication of copies for different parts of the Western Church errors were introduced, partly from the blunders of copyists and partly from the intermixture of the old Latin version with that of Jerome's. Hence the modern Vulgate, though called Jerome's, must not be regarded as exhibiting in all its purity the text of Jerome as it exists in MSS. to this day. Such was the Vulgate at the time of the Reformation.

It was reserved, however, for the Tridentine Fathers to place it in the high position it now occupies, which is, practically, a position above that enjoyed by the original Scriptures in the Roman Catholic Church. After the decree of the Council of Trent,† anathematizing all who did not receive the Latin Vulgate as the authentic text of Holy Scripture (Sess. IV., A. D. 1546), it became necessary to publish an authentic edition of the Sacred Scriptures for the guidance of the faithful. Under the pontificate of Sixtus V. this was effected. An edition of the Vulgate was published in 1590. Care was taken to make it conformable to the existing MSS. of that version,‡ though it would seem either that the "Codex Amiatinus," which was then known, was not consulted, or its value, as exhibiting a more faithful representation of Jerome's translation, had not been recognised. His successor, Gregory XIV., suppressed the *authentic* edition of Sixtus as incorrect, and Clement VIII. issued another *authentic* edition 1592, with 2,000 alterations and emendations! Very many of these were real emendations, and rendered the text more conformable to the originals;

* Before Jerome's time the people had become familiar with the Psalms of the old Latin version, and hence that translation of them was retained in the Vulgate.

† The decree of the Council is as follows:—Sacrosancta synodus . . . statuit et declarat, ut hæc ipsa vetus Vulgata editio, quæ longo tot seculorum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus, et expositionibus, pro authenticâ habeatur, et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat.

‡ Horne's "Introduction to the Scriptures," vol. ii., p. 237.

but in some few places the infallibility of the Pontiff did not prevent his making alterations no nearer the originals than his infallible predecessor, Sixtus V.

A few examples may suffice.

In Ezek. xiv. 22, the Hebrew copies read, "They shall go out to you." The LXX, and Sixtine edition of the Vulgate, read the same. In the Clementine edition, published as *authentic*, we find the word altered to, "they shall go *in* to you," "ingredientur" for "egredientur."

In Exodus xxxii. 28, the Hebrew copies read, "*three* thousand souls." The LXX reads the same. The Sixtine edition reads, "*thirty-three* thousand." This was altered in the Clementine to "*twenty-three* thousand"—an improvement, it is true, as it lessened the number in excess, but here again infallibility erred, twenty thousand souls being declared by Papal authority to have been slain, more than the Word of God authorizes.

In Deut. xvii. 8, the Hebrew is as follows:—"If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, between stroke and stroke." In the Sixtine edition the last clause runs as follows,—“between leprosy and no leprosy.” The Clementine edition corrected this to “between leprosy and leprosy.” The word *no* is indeed omitted, as it ought to be, but the great error of the passage translating לֵבֵי by *leprosy* remains.*

Joshua iv. 23. In the Sixtine edition, instead of “the Lord your God,” it was “the Lord *our* God.” This was corrected, and very properly; but in the next verse is an omission of the words, “the Lord your God,” † which are found in the Hebrew and LXX. Here again the Clementine edition proves itself not authentic.

In Jeremiah xvii. 9, we read, “the heart is deceitful above all things.” So LXX. The Sixtine edition reads, “the heart *of man* is corrupt.” In the Clementine edition it was altered to the following, “pravum est cor omnium,” “the heart of all is corrupt.”

These passages are sufficient to prove that even the last authentic edition of the Vulgate, published by the highest authority in the Church of Rome, is by no means so free from error as we might have supposed, nor are all the corrections really for the better; in too many

* The Hebrew word translated *blood* is used with reference to the affliction of leprosy. But the question here referred to, the context shows, had nothing to do with leprosy, but with the due administration of justice in civil cases, where one party had a dispute with another, and it was brought to be adjudicated upon at the civil tribunal of the nation. In matters of leprosy the priests, not the judges, were resorted to.

† Some read the Lord our God.

cases they seem to have been made without any regard to the Hebrew originals or the Greek translations.

This little sketch of the history of the Vulgate text shows, that the only authority for the present edition is the Papal authority of Clement VIII. The modern Vulgate, therefore, as we now have it, and as the Church of Rome would have us receive it, rests solely on the dictum of one man,* claiming, indeed, infallibility; but proving, by his acts and his corrections, that he can err, and does err, in the matter of the Scriptures themselves.

What the Church of Rome has done she may do again. As the present text of the Vulgate rests on the authority of Clement VIII., and as he altered the text of his predecessor, Sixtus V., and in some places did not alter it for the better, we have no security that if it should please the present, or any future Pope, to attempt a correction of the Vulgate, we may not be called on to condemn with him, as contrary to God's Word, what we now believe, and what the Church of Rome believes, *is* God's Word, and to accept instead any translation he may choose to put forth as the only authentic edition of the Bible. In a word, if we take the Vulgate as the basis of our translations we make them depend on the beck of one man; whereas, if we defer to the originals we rest our translations—minor variations excepted—on grounds which cannot be shaken.

However much we might have thought a few years ago that Rome was under the influence of civilization and enlightenment, and that she, with the rest of the world, better comprehended what was real toleration, however much we might have hoped that the days of her arrogance had gone by, the events of the last few years are sufficient to convince the most sceptical that her hostility to the truth is as intense as ever. The burning of the Bible in Ireland, and the relentless persecution of Bible-readers in Madeira and Tuscany, prove that she still hates the truth as much as when Jerome and Huss were murdered, and the fires of Smithfield were kindled.

The late addition to her creed shows that the Word of God, the written revelation, is as much set at nought and practically denied as when the Tridentine Fathers blasphemously declared the works of erring mortals were the words of the Spirit of God. Whilst she has really changed from the Church as known to St. Paul; whilst she has changed from the Church known to Augustine and Gregory the Great; whilst she has changed her creed and added new articles of faith, she has indeed remained steadfast to one thing—her open hostility to the Word of God.

* We must, however, remember that the errors in doctrine existed long previous to the Clementine Vulgate.

II. Let us proceed to a comparison of the modern Vulgate with the original Scriptures, to ascertain whether the translation is of such a nature as may be safely made a substitute for them. To enumerate all the passages in which the Vulgate differs would be tedious and unnecessary. It will be sufficient to make a selection of passages, to establish the four following propositions :—

1. That the Vulgate countenances and teaches erroneous doctrines.
2. That the reading of the Vulgate has materially altered many passages of Holy Writ.
3. That the Vulgate has made additions to God's Word.
4. That the Vulgate has omitted words, and even whole passages of the inspired Scriptures.

For convenience, the texts brought forward will be arranged in columns. The first column will contain the Clementine edition of the Vulgate, which is the present authentic edition according to the Church of Rome. The second column will contain a translation of the Vulgate, which, except in two or three instances that are marked, is the Douay version, published in this country with the sanction of the Romish authorities. The third column will contain the English authorised version.

1. The Vulgate countenances and teaches erroneous doctrines.

(a) The Vulgate unduly exalts the Virgin Mary.

<i>Vulgate.</i>	<i>Translation of the Vulgate.</i>	<i>Authorised Version.</i>
Ipsa * conteret caput tuum, et tu insidiaberis calcaneo ejus. (Gen. iii. 15.)	She shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for her heel. (Gen. iii. 15.)	It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. (Gen. iii. 15.)
Ave gratia plena. † (Luke i. 28.)	Hail, full of grace. (Luke i. 28.)	Hail, thou that art highly favoured. (Luke i. 28.)

There is a radical error which pervades those two passages : in both of them properties which belong to God are ascribed to the Virgin. The Lord Jesus alone, as God, has power to bruise Satan. It is an act of Divine power, and as such is spoken of in Scripture :—
“Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also himself likewise took part of the same, that, through death, He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.” (Heb. ii. 14.) “The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly.” (Rom. xvi. 20.)

Again, our Lord, and He alone, as the Son of God, is said to be

* De Rossi declares that this reading of the Vulgate is a blundering corruption.

† The Syriac here agrees with the Vulgate in reading *full of grace*; and so we render “full of glory” in 1 Pet. i. 8. The force of the perfect passive is very difficult to express exactly.

“full of grace.” “The only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.” (John i. 14.) We must object, therefore, to these translations, because they ascribe to the Virgin what belongs to Christ.

In the Douay Bible we find the following note in defence of the Vulgate:—“*Ipsa*, the woman; so divers of the fathers read this place conformably to the Latin; others read it *ipsum*, viz., the seed. The sense is the same, for it is by her seed, Jesus Christ, that the woman crushes the serpent’s head.” If there is no difference in the sense, why maintain and plead for an admitted error? But is there no difference? Who could bruise the serpent? Man had fallen an easy prey to his power. Man could not resist him, Divine power alone *could* bruise him. Christ did not bruise the serpent because, or in virtue of, his *humanity*, but because of his *divinity* (if we may thus distinguish for a moment between the two natures of our Lord). Man had been led captive by the tempter, and man must overcome him; but God alone could. It required, therefore, no less a person than the God-man Immanuel.*

As to the Virgin bruising the serpent’s head, “The very drift of the sentence requires that we should understand it of the seed of the woman, not of the woman. What woman could crush the serpent’s head? Was it Mary? I am well aware that this is said by them (*i.e.*, Roman Catholics). But how? When she bore Christ? But to bear Christ is not to crush the serpent’s head. To give birth to

* However much any one may think this objectionable, and must we not add erroneous reading, is softened or explained away by the note in the Douay, as some do (see “The Bible Society, and its Versions, by a Member of the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society”), we must ever remember that we circulate the Scriptures *without note or comment*, and therefore it is imperatively required that the versions we adopt be so plain on points of doctrinal importance, that the humblest reader could not suppose that a dogma we condemn was supported by the text. These, and other doctrinal errors, are not questions of *idiomatic usage*. We must be careful, then, not to confound them with the question of various readings, still less to defend them, as has been done in the pamphlet quoted above, by placing them on a level with the little differences *not affecting doctrine or practice*, which the many MSS. of the sacred Scriptures we now possess are found to contain. A various reading is one thing, a different doctrine is another. Our Lord and his disciples quoted the LXX in places where it differs from the Hebrew Bible as it has come down to us. This is made an argument for circulating the Vulgate now. The cases are not parallel. Before such an argument can be used fairly, it must be shown that our Lord and his apostles countenanced, as doctrinally true, what the Hebrew Scriptures condemned. Besides, however various may be the differences between the LXX and the Hebrew, the two versions are generally as one on matters of doctrine, whereas the Vulgate differs from both on this important point.

Him by whom the serpent's head is crushed is one thing, and to crush the head of the serpent is another. Was it when she believed in Christ? But this applies to all believers. Christ, therefore, and Christ only, is He who, by his power, could crush and destroy the head of the infernal serpent, and rescue and deliver us out of his jaws." (Whitaker's "Disputation on Scripture." Parker Society.)

This translation has been defended by some Protestants on the ground that *ipsa, she*, refers, not to the Virgin, indeed, but to Eve. Admitting for the moment that this was true, for Eve is the only woman mentioned in the passage, it must be remembered that the Hebrew pronoun is masculine. Cyprian reads *ipse*; Irenæus and Leo, Pope of Rome, interpret this place of the seed of the woman. Jerome also teaches the same in his questions on Genesis. (See Whitaker's "Disputation," "Rosenmuller's Scholia.") It cannot be denied that the Romish divines take advantage of this error in the Vulgate to apply this passage to the Virgin. (See Calvin *in loco*.) The pictures of the Virgin trampling on the serpent in the Cathedral of Volterra, and elsewhere, are witnesses of the common interpretation too plain to be misunderstood.

Luke i. 28. The translation of the Vulgate in this passage, "full of grace," is not borne out by the original Greek word, *κεχαριτωμένη*, which implies that one has obtained favour from God. And further, it is an error to make *κεχαριτωμένη*, here applied to the Virgin Mary, equivalent to *πλήρης χάριτος* (full of grace), which is applied solely and expressly to our Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God.

However difficult it may be to express the full force of the perfect participle passive, it is clear that we need not here resort to "full of grace." If it be objected that, in several places where the perfect participle passive is found, we translate by "full of," as *ήλκωμένος*, full of sores (Luke xvi. 21); *δεδοξασμένος*, full of glory (1 Pet. i. 8); we would answer that, by these translations, we do not attribute to mortal man any property which belongs essentially to God. To prove that the translation "full of grace" is understood by Roman Catholics in a sense which can only be applied to God, it need only be observed that a Spaniard having seen a faithful copy of the New Testament, objected to it, because "it omitted the adoration, which, in his opinion, the Virgin Mary deserves next to her divine Son." (See "Spanish Evangelical Record," No. I.)

In Ecclus. xviii. 17, where the same word occurs, the Vulgate translates it by "justificatus," a proof that there is no necessity for the rendering here given. So, 1 Pet. i. 8, *glorificata*, glorified; Rev. xvii. 4; xviii. 16, gilt with gold, not full of gold, *κεχρυσωμένη*.

(b) The Vulgate teaches the worship of created things :—

<i>Vulgate.</i>	<i>Translation of Vulgate.</i>	<i>Authorised Version.</i>
Exaltate Dominum Deum nostrum, et adorate scabellum pedum ejus; quoniam sanctum est. (Ps. xcvi. 5.)	Exalt ye the Lord our God, and <i>adore his footstool</i> , for it is holy. (Ps. xcvi. 5.)	Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship at his footstool; for He is holy. (Ps. xcix. 5.)
Fide Jacob moriens, singulos filiorum Joseph benedixit, et adoravit fastigium virgæ ejus. (Heb. xi. 21.)	By faith Jacob dying blessed each of the sons of Joseph, and <i>adored the top</i> of his staff. (Heb. xi. 21.)	By faith, Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph; and worshipped (leaning) upon the top of his staff. (Heb. xi. 21.)

In both these passages the error arises from the omission of the preposition.

Psalm xcix. 5. If the Vulgate version is correct, and is to be taken as true, we must abandon the Second Commandment. For what, according to the Vulgate, we are commanded in this place to adore, or bow down to, *הַשִּׁתְּיָהוּ*, in Exodus xx. we are forbidden to worship; the very same Hebrew word being used in both places. But the Vulgate shall witness against itself. In Psalm cxxxii. 7, where we have, in the original, the same phrase as here, the Vulgate translates, "And adore *in* the place where his feet have stood." And in the last verse of this very Psalm (xcix.) where the same Hebrew words are used, substituting mountain for footstool, the Vulgate translates them, "and adore *at* his holy mountain." Another error in the passage is ascribing holiness (and hence the obligation to worship it) to God's footstool; * whereas we are taught that the very heavens are not clean in his sight. Holiness is an attribute which belongs exclusively to God; and though in a lower sense places are called holy, as the "holy temple," the "holy city," &c., it is not intended to ascribe to them any *intrinsic* holiness, or to make them the objects of worship, but only to denote that they are holy or sanctified because of God's presence.

Heb. xi. 21. The note in the Douay Bible attempts to ridicule the Greek, and the versions which adhere to it, by asking whether this circumstance, of Jacob's leaning upon his staff, were any argument of his faith, or worthy of being taken notice of by the Holy Ghost. It is not for us to determine what is or what is not worthy of the Holy Ghost's notice; but of this we may be sure, that any *erroneous* reading of Scripture is well worthy of being noticed;

* The words taken by themselves might admit of the construction put on them by the Vulgate, "for it is holy;" but the sense of the passage, and the last verse of this Psalm, plainly show that they refer to God.

and may not, then, the express reference to the position of Jacob, when blessing the children of Joseph, have been made to guard against the construction, and the use sought to be derived from that construction, which God's Spirit knew would take place. Whilst the LXX reads staff, for bed (a mistake that might easily arise from the similarity of the words in Hebrew), it expressly inserts the preposition ἐπί (upon), and does not, as the Douay translator asserts, bear out the reading of the Vulgate. Nor does the Vulgate itself, in Genesis, agree with its translation in Hebrews, though the LXX, from whom St. Paul quotes, agrees with the apostle.

We must notice an attempt which has been made to justify the Vulgate, and especially De Saci's translation of it, in a pamphlet quoted above (p. 11, note), "The Bible Society and its Versions." As the name of the author is not given, but he is stated to be one of the Committee, we may fairly conclude, that though the defence of the Vulgate is nominally the work of an individual, yet it contains the views of the majority of the Committee. The defence arranges itself under different heads:—1st. The right construction of the Greek preposition, which it is asserted is rather *towards* than *on*. 2d. That to adore is used with reference to men bowing down towards each other; and the instances of Abraham before the children of Heth, and Moses before Jethro, the sheaves before Joseph's sheaf, and the sun, moon, and eleven stars before Joseph himself, are cited as illustrations. We are then told that probably the verse in Hebrew, enumerating Jacob's acts of faith, is adduced to show the fulfilment of Joseph's dream, that his father and brethren should bow down to him. "If it be merely understood," says the writer, "that Jacob worshipped God, *leaning* upon the top of his staff, then we are at a loss to discover any special act of faith at all suitable to the apostle's argument. Jacob was eminently a man of devotion; prayer with him was not an occasional exercise, but the habit of his life; and if any particular instance were to be produced, it would have been much more to the apostle's purpose to have cited the scene at Peniel, when he wrestled with the angel and prevailed." After a few more remarks, the writer concludes that De Saci has well brought out the meaning of the passage, when he reads, *that he bowed himself low before the staff of authority which his son bore*.

Now, 1st, we must observe that, if De Saci has well brought out the meaning of this passage, he is the only translator of the Bible who has. Neither the Vulgate nor our authorised version, neither the Rhemish nor Tynedale, neither Scio nor Valera, neither Torres Amat nor Martin, neither Pereira nor Almeida, neither Osterwald

nor Luther, neither Martini * nor Diodati, have hinted at the staff of office borne before Joseph.

2d. However difficult it may be for us to see wherein lay Jacob's faith in the instance cited, if we find that, as far as we can ascertain from the most ancient codices, the present reading of the original is the correct and apostolic one, we are not to reject it because we cannot fathom it. Nay, rather may not the fact of Jacob's faith being evidenced in this act be recorded to try our faith in believing the Word of God, however difficult to comprehend it! And surely it ill becomes us to suggest to the Holy Spirit, speaking through St. Paul, a better illustration of the lesson He intended to teach.

3d. Though it be true that the word *προσκυνεῖν* is used by the LXX to express the act of obeisance of Abraham to the children of Heth, and Moses to Jethro, there is this difference between them and this passage—they made obeisance to fellow-men, which we can understand, without supposing an act of worship; but if the Vulgate reading be true, Jacob made obeisance to a staff, an inanimate thing, to which no honour in itself was due. We can only understand this act, therefore, as one of worship.

4th. The question of the true construction of the Greek preposition is nothing here, because the Vulgate ignores it altogether. But had the Vulgate translator, or the author of the present reading (whoever he may be), have intended to express a movement of Jacob *towards the staff of authority of Joseph*, of which we must remember there is not a word in the original, is it not likely he would have used a construction similar to what we find in Genesis xlvii. 31:—"Adoravit Israel Deum, *conversus* ad lectuli caput." "Israel adored God, *turning* to the head of the bed." The word *God* is not in the original. Its insertion in the Vulgate is a proof that the translator considered Jacob to have made an act of Divine adoration.

(c) The Vulgate fails to express the deep depravity of man:—

<i>Vulgate.</i>	<i>Translation of Vulgate.</i>	<i>Authorised Version.</i>
Et cuncta cogitatio cordis intenta esset ad malum omni tempore. (Gen. vi. 5.)	And that all the thought of their heart was bent upon evil at all times. (Gen. vi. 5.)	And that every <i>imagination</i> of the thoughts of his heart was <i>only</i> evil continually. (Gen. vi. 5.)

* In the annotations which accompany Martini's Bible this text is explained according to the translation of De Sacy. Without the notes, and the Bible Society very properly does not circulate them, we could not know that such a construction was put on the passage.

Pravum est cor omnium, et inscrutabile. (Jer. xvii. 9.)	The heart of all is per- verse and unsearchable.* (Jer. xvii. 9.)	The heart is deceitful above all things, and des- perately wicked. (Jer. xvii. 9.)
---	---	---

In both these passages the Vulgate has omitted most important words. In both cases the Hebrew is most precise. In the first, "every formation or imagination of the thoughts of his heart were only evil continually." In the second, "The heart of man is deceitful above all things, and incurable."

Gen. vi. 5.—"It is one thing to be *intent upon evil*, and another to be evil, and only evil; for it is a lighter thing to be propense toward evil than to be already actually evil. Besides, the Vulgate translator says that every thought of man's heart was intent on evil; as if the Holy Spirit only blamed the thoughts, whereas He condemns both the thoughts, and the principle, and source of all the thoughts. The faults of this passage, then, are these:—First, there is nothing in the Hebrew to answer to the word *intenta*. Secondly, 'every thought of the heart' is substituted for 'the whole figment of the thoughts of man's heart.' Thirdly, the particle *only* is omitted, which hath the greatest possible weight." (Whittaker's "Disputation," p. 165.)

Jer. xvii. 9. The preposition before "all" (כָּל) is omitted, which considerably alters the sense.† To assert that the "hearts of all men are depraved" is one thing; but it is quite another thing, and a far deeper condemnation, to declare that "the heart is deceitful above all things." The first accusation most men will admit, but how few, comparatively speaking, subscribe to the second.

"*And unsearchable.*" The Hebrew word שֶׁנֶּאֱמָר means *incurable*; a mortal wound that cannot be healed. To this the Vulgate itself bears witness in Jer. xxx. 12, 15, where it translates this same word *insunabile*. Out of the eight times that we meet with שֶׁנֶּאֱמָר in the Bible, it is only here that the Vulgate renders it by *inscrutabile*. There is nothing in this passage about the impossibility of looking into the heart, but a great deal about its grievous state, so bad as to be incurable. We should not learn this from the Vulgate. It must, therefore, be admitted that it fails to express fully the complete depravity of man.

(d) The Vulgate exalts human merit:—

* The Douay reads, "The heart is perverse above all things." Can the Vulgate mean this?

† Whilst the ancient versions differ as to the meaning of שֶׁנֶּאֱמָר, they all recognise the preposition which the Vulgate has omitted.

Vulgate.

Quamobrem, rex, consilium meum placeat tibi, et peccata tua eleemosynis redime, et iniquitates tuas misericordiis pauperum: forsitan ignoscet delictis tuis. (Dan. iv. 24.)

Beneficentiæ autem et communionis nolite oblivisci: talibus enim hostiis promeretur Deus. (Heb. xiii. 16.)

Et alius Angelus venit, et stetit ante altare habens thuribulum aureum: et data sunt illi incensa multa, ut daret de orationibus sanctorum omnium super altare aureum, quod est ante thronum Dei. Et ascendit fumus incensorum de orationibus sanctorum de manu Angeli coram Deo. (Apoc. viii. 3, 4.)

Translations of Vulgate.

Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable to thee, and *redeem thou thy sins with alms, and thy iniquities with works of mercy to the poor*: perhaps he will forgive thy offences. (Dan. iv. 24.)

And do not forget to do good and to impart; *for by such sacrifices God's favour is obtained.* (Heb. xiii. 16.)

And another Angel came, and stood before the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given to him much incense, that he should *offer of the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which is before the throne of God.* And the smoke of the incense *of the prayers of the saints* ascended up before God from the hand of the Angel. (Apoc. viii. 3, 4.)

Authorized Version.

Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable to thee, and *break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor*; if it may be a lengthening of thy tranquillity. (Dan. iv. 27.)

But to do good, and to communicate, forget not: *for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.* (Heb. xiii. 16.)

And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer (it) *with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne.* And the smoke of the incense (which came), *with the prayers of the saints*, ascended up before God, out of the angel's hand. (Rev. viii. 3, 4.)

Dan. iv. 24.—It is not easy to understand what is meant by redeeming one's sins by alms. To redeem is to buy back—to get back something we have lost or forfeited. Thus our souls are redeemed by the blood of Christ. We are redeemed *from* sin and death. What is wanted is, not to buy back one's sins, but to get rid of the consequences and dominion of sin—to be redeemed from sin.

In the next place, the words in the original, if rightly translated, should not be taken in this sense. It is true that the Chaldee, *פִּרְקָא*, is sometimes used in the sense of redeeming, but more generally in the sense of breaking off. Rosenmüller, on this passage, after stating that *פִּרְקָא* is used for the Hebrew *פָּדָה*, as 2 Sam. iv. 9, Job v. 20, Ps. lxxviii. 42, remarks,—“But since it is clearly incongruous to say, redeem sins by alms, the word *פִּרְקָא* must be taken in this place in the sense of *breaking off*, in which sense it is used both in Hebrew and Chaldee, as Exod. xxxii. 2, ‘Break off the golden earrings:’ in which place Onkelos retains the word *פִּרְקָא* in his Commentary.”

This verb occurs twelve times in the Hebrew Scriptures, and once in the Chaldee, in this place. The Vulgate translates it four times by *redimere*—Ps. vii. 3; cxxxvi. 24; Lam. v. 8, and this place. The Vulgate is clearly wrong in its translation of Ps. vii. 3; and if we look at the two passages where the sense is fairly expressed by *redimere* (Ps. cxxxvi. 24, and Lam. v. 8), we shall see that the verb is in each case construed with the preposition מִן, *from—to get deliverance, be drawn from*. But where the verb is without any preposition to qualify or explain it, it cannot be taken in the sense of redemption.

Eleemosynis (alms).—מִצְדָּקָה is *righteousness*, not *alms*. It does not appear that it is ever translated *alms* in the Old Testament except in this place; wherefore we must conclude that the version of Daniel's speech given by the Vulgate cannot be accepted as true, even though it can plead the LXX* and Theodotion in its behalf. What Daniel exhorted Nebuchadnezzar to do was, to show true repentance, to manifest a deep contrition and inward change, by working righteousness, and showing mercy to the poor. If we put *alms* for *righteousness*, we put a part for the whole; for charity is only one phase of righteousness; it is comprehended in doing righteousness, but it does not comprehend it; nor, as was said above, can we speak of *redeeming sin*. Scripture speaks of redemption *from the curse of the law—from sin*—by the blood of Christ. This is the *only redemption* we can trust to. Nothing short of this, nothing else but this, is the redemption unto life.†

Heb. xiii. 16.—God's favour is not obtained by anything we can do. The only pathway to acceptance and favour is the death and righteous-

* Perhaps it is in that version that the error originated, or the translator may have had the Syriac use of the word in his mind: for in Matt. vi. 2, 3, we have $\int \Delta \zeta \eta$ for alms.

† How this passage is made use of to support the Roman Catholic doctrine of good works, the following extract from the last pastoral letter of Cardinal Donnet, Archbishop of Bordeaux, will show:—"The soul of man is not subject to any ills from which it cannot obtain deliverance by almsgiving; there are no sorrows of heart which may not be cured; no clouds in the mind which may not be dissipated; no temptations which may not be overcome, by almsgiving. See this prince (Nebuchadnezzar), whom an ignominious catastrophe is about to punish for his pride; the Prophet, while pronouncing his sentence, shows him there is reason for hope, in almsgiving. '*Redeem thy sins by almsgiving.*' See the Centurion, Cornelius, who seemed plunged for ever into the night of infidelity. Almsgiving ascends to Heaven, and, in truth, brings down the most precious of all gifts."—*Evangelical Christendom*, March, 1856.—Should we countenance the teaching of the Cardinal by circulating the errors of the Vulgate, or expose the errors, by using only *faithful translations of the originals*?

ness of Christ. Believing in Him, God's favour is obtained for us—not because of any sacrifice we can offer, but solely from the all-sufficient merit of the sacrifice of Christ. Unless we are believers in Him, God's favour will never be extended to us; if we are in Him, we enjoy God's favour before we can do good works.

Therefore, as nothing we can do—no prayers, no penances, no mortifications, no alms-deeds, can procure for us favour and acceptance, unless we are first in Christ, we must reject this translation as unsound and unscriptural. Does *ἐναποστρέψαι* ever mean to obtain the favour of a person? In Heb. xi. 5, 6, the only other place in the Bible where it occurs, and in Ecclus. xlv. 16, the Vulgate translates “placuit,” *be pleased*. Why, then, put a different meaning on the word here, when the common interpretation will suit?

Rev. viii. 3, 4.—Here, again, human merit is exalted. In the Greek we read, that “to the angel was given much incense, that he should give it with,” or “add it to, the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar;” thus teaching that even the prayers of saints are not in themselves acceptable to God.

Is not the angel here mentioned the Lord Jesus Christ himself, who, in his priestly office, like the high priest, his type, offers up incense with the prayers of his people? The Vulgate ignores all this, and leaves it to be inferred that the prayers of saints are in themselves acceptable to God, an assertion which this passage of Scripture directly controverts. How different from this is the language of the Prophet,—“All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags.” (Is. lxiv. 6.) How different, too, the experience of one who had learned from the uncorrupted fount of Scripture the utter worthlessness of all he could do:—

“My prayers and alms
Forgive their evil, and accept their good;
I cast them at Thy feet;—my only plea
Is, what it was—dependance upon Thee.”—*Cowper*.

(e) The Vulgate makes marriage a sacrament:—

<i>Vulgate.</i>	<i>Translation of the Vulgate.</i>	<i>Authorized Version.</i>
Sacramentum hoc magnum est. (Eph. v. 32.)	This is a great sacrament. (Eph. v. 32.)	This is a great mystery. (Eph. v. 32.)

If it be true, as the Church of Rome and all Christian Churches teach, that a sacrament must have been ordained by Christ himself, then marriage can be no sacrament; for it was ordained in Eden. The reference generally made to Matt. xix. 5, 6, proves nothing more than that marriage, having been abused, our Lord thought fit to restore it to its primitive use. If what is there said be held conclu-

sive for making it a sacrament, we might every bit as well make the Sabbath a sacrament. Both were instituted in Eden; both had been abused; and both were restored by our Lord to their primitive use. As to the translation of the Vulgate in this place, though *μυστήριον* (mystery) is met with in twenty-six other passages of the New Testament, it is only translated by "sacramentum" in eight of them.* Now, since from this unfortunate translation the error of making matrimony a sacrament has evidently arisen, it is plain that if marriage is a sacrament in the ecclesiastical sense of the term, all the other things called sacraments—such as the calling of the Gentiles, the seven stars, &c.—are sacraments. No one will assert that these are. Marriage stands or falls with them. Either "mysterium" and "sacramentum" are convertible terms, or not.† If they are, then marriage cannot be called a sacrament, without calling every mystery a sacrament. If they are not, then the calling of the Gentiles, &c., are sacraments.

In commenting on this and some other passage, it is not intended to make out the Vulgate guilty of *wilful* fraud, but rather to show how the translation, whether it originated in ignorance or not, has opened the door to great errors. We must remember that the Vulgate is known and read *now*; and therefore, however well its peculiar phrases may have been understood, as implying or teaching nothing contrary to truth in the age when it appeared, we cannot only judge it by the light then enjoyed, or the terms then used, but must determine its *present* value, and the advisability of its continued circulation in these days, by the opening which it affords for the encouragement of error.

(f) The Vulgate countenances the doctrine of purgatory:—

<i>Vulgate.</i>	<i>Translation of the Vulgate.</i>	<i>Authorized Version.</i>
In quo et his, qui in carcere erant, spiritibus veniens prædicavit. (1 Pet. iii. 19.)	In which also coming he preached to those spirits that were in prison. (1 Pet. iii. 19.)	By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison. (1 Pet. iii. 19.)

"That were in prison." The *were* here is an interpolation; the Greek is simply *ἐν φυλακῇ*, *in prison*—*i. e.*, now in prison. The translation of the Vulgate can only be understood on the supposition that there is a purgatory—an intermediate state after death, where the salvation of the soul, neglected during life, may be obtained. For the only object of preaching is to convince sinners. (1 Pet. iv. 6.)

* Ephes. i. 9; iii. 3, 9; v. 32; Col. i. 27; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Rev. i. 20; xvii. 7.

† In Ephes. iii. 3 *μυστήριον* is rendered by "sacramentum," in verse 4 by "mysterium."

Scripture speaks of no second probation or further purgation. "After death the judgment." (Heb. ix. 27.) "In the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be." (Eccles. xi. 3.) Further, if the Vulgate be correct, unbelief persisted in till death does not of itself destroy the soul. Those who perished in the flood perished from unbelief. They refused to hearken to the preaching of Noah. The words of our Lord, however, are very precise on this point,—“He that believeth *not* shall be condemned.” (John iii. 18, 36 ; viii. 24.)

It is plain that we cannot believe the Vulgate and the Scriptures. If we accept the one, we must reject the other. Their teaching is at variance on a most important subject—viz., whether unbelief persisted in till death will subject us to everlasting woe, or whether after death there is another period of probation. This translation is most unfortunate for the Church of Rome ; for we are told by her divines that unbelief is a mortal sin, and that venial sins alone are purged in another state. Either, therefore, mortal sins can be forgiven or purged away in a future state, or unbelief is not a mortal sin. We may leave them to reconcile their Bible and their teaching ; but should we disseminate such teaching side by side with the Word of God ?

(g) The Vulgate countenances the idea of a continuous sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ.

<i>Vulgate.</i>	<i>Translation of Vulgate.</i>	<i>Authorized Version.</i>
Purgationem peccatorum faciens, sedet ad dexteram majestatis in excelsis. (Heb. i. 3.)	<i>Making</i> purgation of sins, <i>sitteth</i> on the right hand of the majesty on high. (Heb. i. 3.)	When He <i>had</i> by himself <i>purged</i> our sins, <i>sat down</i> on the right hand of the majesty on high. (Heb. i. 3.)
Unam pro peccatis offerens hostiam, in sempiternum sedet in dextera Dei. (Heb. x. 12.)	<i>Offering</i> one sacrifice for sins, for ever <i>sitteth</i> on the right hand of God. (Heb. x. 12.)	After he <i>had offered</i> one sacrifice for sins, for ever <i>sat down</i> on the right hand of God. (Heb. x. 12.)

By the present reading of the Vulgate the sacrifice of Christ is represented as continuous, instead of being once for all finished when He offered up himself on the cross. This translation, we know, is in full accordance with the Romish doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, to support which they are bound to show that the sacrifice they profess to make continually has never been completed. Probably this error originated through carelessness. Jerome, we know, read “sedit,” *sat*, though he used the present participle in both cases instead of the more correct expression “cum obtulisset,” “cum fecisset.” (See “Christian Annotator,” vol. iii., pp. 228, 229.)

The foregoing extracts may be deemed sufficient to justify the heavy charge brought against the Vulgate—that of being unsound in doctrine. In the writings of men, if there be anything which does not commend itself to our reason, or judgment, or any doctrine contrary to what we believe to be the truth, we are at full liberty to reject it. But, with a book purporting to be a correct version of the Bible, we cannot so act. It stands on very different grounds; it proclaims itself to be God's message to sinners; the Word of the Lord sent to guilty, rebellious man, "Whether he will hear, or whether he will forbear." We may despise it, but there it remains; we may refuse to receive it, but that does not affect it. Should we find it at variance with our preconceived notions of right and wrong, *they* must give way; our lives and actions must be squared by this book. We cannot deny its truth, or excuse ourselves from obeying its precepts, even though we may think them inconsistent. It commands our obedience, it summons us to give earnest heed, and that at the peril of our soul's destruction. Its doctrines we cannot dispute, for they are revealed by God. Of what importance, then, is it that we should possess an accurate and faithful version of the Scriptures? and if it is important for us it must be equally so for all our fellow-creatures. For the revelation therein contained concerns all alike; the offer of the Gospel thereby made is free to all who will receive it. The same humbling truths are necessary for all to learn; the same way of acceptance with God must be trodden by all. Of what importance, then, that the versions we circulate should be faithful and accurate; that the doctrines they contain and teach should be the doctrines we find in God's own Word; that there be no exaggeration or diminution; no undue prominence given to this or that peculiar dogma or favourite Article of Faith; that the version should rightly declare, and truly reflect, the meaning of the originals themselves. And this is only what we have a right to demand.

The Vulgate translation professes to be made from the original Scriptures—we have a right then to expect that it should reflect the teaching of those originals. To those who can refer to them a fault in the translation is not of such moment; but to the unlearned, a version in their own tongue comes to them with authority hardly inferior to that of the originals. It is, to all intents and purposes, as if God had chosen their language to be the medium of communication to mankind; as if the words and phrases they read were the exact expression of the Divine Spirit.

If, therefore, we circulate a version it behoves us to take every pains that it be conformable to, and, as far as the language will admit,

an exact reflection of the original. But is this the case with the Vulgate, and the versions made from it ?

Surely not. How shall we reconcile our preaching and our practice? We denounce the worship of anything but God, and plead the warrant of Scripture on our behalf, while, at the same moment, we give what we call the Scriptures, containing a command to worship the footstool of the Almighty. We tell the Roman Catholic that the Virgin is only a sinful creature like ourselves, and plead Scripture for the assertion; and we provide him with a translation of the Scriptures in which especial properties, belonging only to the Lord Jesus Christ, are ascribed to her. We declare to him, on the authority of Scripture, the utter depravity of man, and we give him a book purporting to be Scripture, which is manifestly at variance with our teaching. We denounce the Romish doctrine of purgatory as contrary to Scripture, and we give him a version of the Scriptures in which that doctrine is expressly countenanced. We acknowledge but two Sacraments—Baptism and the Lord's Supper—and declare that God's Word authorizes no more; and we give him a translation of the Bible in which marriage is called a sacrament.

We will now proceed to the examination of the three remaining propositions. To quote all the passages which might be adduced would be tedious. A selection must, therefore, be made. And in order to do this no passage will be brought forward in the three following tables, in which the LXX or the Peschito* version of the New Testament can be pleaded in support of the Vulgate. Let it not, however, be supposed that by this proceeding any claim to be placed on a par with the inspired originals is conceded to these versions. Far from it. The originals alone are the standard of appeal. But this course will not be without its advantage. For while the field for selection of passages will be much limited, every passage brought forward will tell more against the Vulgate.

(2.) The Vulgate materially alters many passages of Holy Writ.

<i>Vulgate.</i>	<i>Translation of the Vulgate.</i>	<i>Authorized Version.</i>
Dixitque Cain ad Dominum: Major est iniquitas mea, quam ut veniam merear. (Gen. iv. 13.)	And Cain said to the Lord: My iniquity is greater than that I may deserve pardon. (Gen. iv. 13.)	And Cain said unto the Lord, My punishment is greater than I can bear. (Gen. iv. 13.)
At vero Melchisedech rex Salem, proferens	But Melchisedech, King of Salem, bringing	And Melchisedek, King of Salem, brought forth

* This is the most ancient Syriac version, and was made at the close of the first or early in the second century.

<i>Vulgate.</i>	<i>Translation of the Vulgate.</i>	<i>Authorised Version.</i>
panem et vinum, erat enim Sacerdos Dei Altissimi, benedixit ei. (Gen. xiv. 18.)	bread and wine, for he was the priest of the Most High God, blessed him. (Gen. xiv. 18.)	bread and wine: and he was the priest of the Most High God, and he blessed him. (Gen. xiv. 18, 19.)
Parvi pendens quòd primogenita vendidisset. (Gen. xxv. 34.)	<i>Making little account of having sold his birthright.</i> (Gen. xxv. 34.)	Thus Esau <i>despised his birthright.</i> (Gen. xxv. 34.)
Accusavitque fratres suos apud patrem crimine pessimo. (Gen. xxxvii. 2.)	And he accused his brethren to his father of a <i>most wicked crime.</i> (Gen. xxxvii. 2.)	And Joseph brought unto his father <i>their evil report.</i> (Gen. xxxvii. 2.)
Ostendasque populo ceremonias et ritum colendi. (Exod. xviii. 20.)	And to show the people <i>the ceremonies and the manner of worshipping.</i> (Exod. xviii. 20.)	And thou shalt teach them <i>ordinances and laws.</i> (Exod. xviii. 20.)
Cumque descenderet Moyses de monte Sinai, tenebat duas tabulas testimonii, et ignorabat quòd cornuta erat facies sua ex consortio sermonis Domini. (Exod. xxxiv. 29, 30, 35.)	And when Moses came down from the Mount Sinai, he held the two tables of the testimony, and he knew not that his face <i>was horned</i> from the conversation of the Lord. (Exod. xxxiv. 29, 30, 35.)	And it came to pass, when Moses came down from Mount Sinai with the two tables of testimony in Moses' hand, when he came down from the Mount, that Moses wist not that the <i>skin of his face shone</i> while he talked with Him. (Exod. xxxiv. 29, 30, 35.)
Nolite multiplicare loqui sublimia, gloriantes; recedant vetera de ore vestro. (1 Kings ii. 3.)	Do not multiply to speak lofty things, boasting; let <i>old matters</i> depart from your mouth. (1 Kings ii. 3.)	Talk no more so exceeding proudly; let <i>not arrogance</i> come out of your mouth. (1 Sam. ii. 3.)
Futurum est autem, ut quicumque remanserit in domo tua, veniat ut oretur pro eo, et offerat nummum argenteum et tortam panis. (1 Kings ii. 36.)	And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall remain in thy house, shall come <i>that he may be prayed for</i> , and shall offer a <i>piece of silver</i> , and a <i>roll of bread.</i> (1 Kings ii. 36.)	And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left in thine house shall come <i>and crouch to him for a piece of silver</i> and a <i>morsel of bread.</i> (1 Sam. ii. 36.)
Levitæ quippe faciliiori ritu sanctificantur, quam Sacerdotes.	For the Levites are sanctified with an <i>easier rite</i> than the priests.	For the Levites were <i>more upright in heart</i> to sanctify themselves than the priests.
Lætatusque est Ezechias, et omnis populus, eo quòd ministerium Domini esset expletum. (2 Paralip. xxix. 34, 36.)	And Ezechias and all the people rejoiced because <i>the ministry of the Lord was accomplished.</i> (2 Paralip. xxix. 34, 36.)	And Hezekiah rejoiced, and all the people, that <i>God had prepared the people.</i> (2 Chron. xxix. 34, 36.)

<i>Vulgate.</i>	<i>Translation of the Vulgate.</i>	<i>Authorized Version.</i>
Quam ob causam magis confortavi manus meas : et ingressus sum domum Semaïæ filii Dalaïæ filii Metabeel secretò. (2 Esd. vi. 9, 10.)	Wherefore I strengthened my hands <i>the more</i> : and I went into the house of Samaia, the son of Dalaia, the son of Metabeel <i>privately</i> . (2 Esd. vi. 9, 10.)	Now therefore, O God, strengthen my hands. Afterward I came into the house of Shemaiah the son of Delaiah the son of Mehetabeel, who <i>was shut up</i> . (Neh. vi. 9, 10.)
Voca ergo, si est qui tibi respondeat, et ad aliquem sanctorum convertere. (Job v. 1.)	Call now if there be any that will answer thee, and <i>turn to some of the saints</i> . (Job v. 1.)	Call now, if there be any that will answer thee ; and <i>to which of the saints wilt thou turn?</i> (Job v. 1.)
Dominus quoque consensus est ad penitentiam Job, cum oraret ille pro amicis suis. (Job xlii. 10.)	The Lord also <i>was turned at the penance of Job</i> , when he prayed for his friends. (Job xlii. 10.)	And the Lord <i>turned the captivity of Job</i> , when he prayed for his friends. (Job xlii. 10.)
Viduam ejus benedicens benedicam. (Ps. cxxxi. 15.)	Blessing I will bless <i>her widow</i> . (Ps. cxxxi. 15.)	I will abundantly bless <i>her provision</i> . (Ps. cxxxi. 15.)
Neque dicas coram angelo : non est providentia. (Eccles. v. 5.)	And say not before the angel : there is no <i>providence</i> . (Eccles. v. 5.)	Neither say thou before the angel, that it was <i>an error</i> . (Eccles. v. 6.)
Quiescite ergo ab homine, cujus spiritus in naribus ejus est, quia excelsus reputatus est ipse. (Isa. ii. 22.)	Cease ye therefore from the man, whose breath is in his nostrils, for <i>he is reputed high</i> . (Isa. ii. 22.)	Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils : for <i>wherein is he to be accounted of?</i> (Isa. ii. 22.)
Babylon dilecta mea posita est mihi in miraculum. (Isa. xxi. 4.)	<i>Babylon my beloved is become a wonder to me</i> . (Isa. xxi. 4.)	<i>The night of my pleasure hath he turned into fear unto me</i> . (Isa. xxi. 4.)
Et hoc est nomen, quod vocabunt eum, Dominus justus noster. (Jer. xxiii. 6 ; xxxiii. 16.)	And this is the name that they shall call him : The Lord, <i>our just one</i> . (Jer. xxiii. 6 ; xxxiii. 16.)	And this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord <i>our Righteousness</i> . (Jer. xxiii. 6.) She shall be called, &c. (Jer. xxxiii. 16.)
Alii in vitam eternam, et alii in opprobrium ut videant semper. (Dan. xii. 2.)	Some unto life everlasting, and others unto reproach, <i>to see it always</i> . (Dan. xii. 2.)	Some to everlasting life, and some to shame <i>and everlasting contempt</i> . (Dan. xii. 2.)
Ab ortu enim solis usque ad occasum magnum est nomen meum in Gentibus, et in omni loco sacrificatur, et offertur nomini meo oblatio munda. (Mal. i. 11.)	For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place <i>there is sacrifice</i> , and there is offered to my name a pure offering. (Mal. i. 11.)	For from the rising of sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles ; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering. (Mal. i. 11.)

<i>Vulgate.</i>	<i>Translation of the Vulgate.</i>	<i>Authorised Version.</i>
Hic est enim sanguis meus novi testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. (Matt. xxvi. 28.)	For this is my blood of the New Testament which <i>shall be shed</i> for many unto remission of sins. (Matt. xxvi. 28.)	For this is my blood of the New Testament, <i>which is shed</i> for many for the remission of sins. (Matt. xxvi. 28.)
Mortuus est autem et dives, et sepultus est in inferno. (Luke xvi. 22.)	And the rich man also died; and he was buried <i>in hell</i> . (Luke xvi. 22.)	The rich man also died and was buried; and in hell he lift up his eyes. (Luke xvi. 22, 23.)
Unus-quisque in suo sensu abundet. (Rom. xiv. 5.)	Let every man <i>abound in his own sense</i> . (Rom. xiv. 5.)	Let every man be <i>fully persuaded in his own mind</i> . (Rom. xiv. 5.)
Omnes quidem resurgemus sed non omnes immutabimur. (1 Cor. xv. 51.)	<i>We shall all indeed rise again: but we shall not all be changed</i> . (1 Cor. xv. 51.)	<i>We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed</i> . (1 Cor. xv. 51.)
Ipsi enim sumus factura, creati in Christo Jesu in operibus bonis, quæ preparavit Deus ut in illis ambulemus. (Ephes. ii. 10.)	For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus <i>in good works</i> , which God hath prepared that we should walk in them. (Ephes. ii. 10.)	For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus <i>unto good works</i> , which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them. (Ephes. ii. 10.)
Ergo adulteri, et non filii estis. (Heb. xii. 8.)	Therefore ye are <i>adulterers*</i> and not sons. (Heb. xii. 8.)	Then are ye <i>bastards</i> , and not sons. (Heb. xii. 8.)
Ut salvemini. (Jas. v. 16.)	That you may be <i>saved</i> . (James v. 16.)	That ye may be <i>healed</i> . (James v. 16.)
Beatus, qui legit, et audit verba prophetiæ hujus. (Rev. i. 3.)	Blessed is he, that readeth and <i>heareth</i> the words of this prophecy. (Rev. i. 3.)	Blessed is he that readeth, and <i>they that hear</i> the words of this prophecy (Rev. i. 3.)

Gen. iv. 13.—The translation of the Vulgate seems to make a difference between sins; that by some means, we may deserve a pardon for certain sins, but that others, like Cain's, are too great for this. Such an idea is quite contrary to the teaching of the Scripture, which declares that "he that offends in one point is guilty of all," and "the soul that sinneth it shall die." If we reflect for a moment on what sin is, a failing of our own free will to discharge the debt of obedience due to God, we shall see that we can never *deserve* forgiveness any more than a debtor who of his free will fails to discharge his debts

* The Douay reads bastards, but certainly without authority. It is instructive to remark how the translations from the *authentic* version of Scripture vary when they think the authentic version is wrong. It is certainly an admission that the Vulgate is *not* authentic.

deserves to have them cancelled. The only desert of sin mentioned in Scripture is death. (Rom. vi. 23.)

Gen. xiv. 18.—The error of the Vulgate here consists in translating “*for* he was priest” instead of “*and* he was priest,” from which the Roman Catholics argue that the bread and wine brought forth were for the purpose of sacrifice, and that in this Melchisedek was a type of Christ, who gave his body and blood as a sacrifice for our sins. It is remarkable that the apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews, when showing how Melchisedek was a type of Christ, omits all mention of the bread and wine offered as a sacrifice. This fact, this silence on such a point, should be of itself a strong argument against the construction sought to be put on the passage. But the words themselves will not bear the meaning attempted to be got out of them. The bread and wine were *not offered*, but *brought forth* as a kingly present to refresh Abraham and his followers, and the mention of Melchisedek’s priesthood has reference not to the bread and wine, but to the blessing—an explanation, a reason why he blessed Abraham, and why Abraham gave him tithes. It may be observed, in passing, that there is no ground for the Roman Catholic idea of a sacrifice; and hence the sacrifice of the mass. For לֶחֶם, translated *bread*, is used to signify food in general. (See 1 Sam. xx. 24; Ps. cxxxvi. 25; Prov. vi. 8, &c.) Probably in this place it means the same.

Gen. xxv. 34.—To “*make little account of having sold his birth-right*” and to “*despise the birthright*” are two very different things. We could conceive Esau thinking that the extremity of hunger he was in might be considered a justification or palliation of the step he took. But the original goes beyond this. It supplies the motive for the sale, *because he despised it*, or accounted it of little value. “But what was this birthright which Jacob so greatly coveted, and which his brother so lightly esteemed? The ordinary privilege of the first-born consisted in precedence over the other brothers and in a double share of the paternal estate. To this some add, upon doubtful reasoning, the privilege of the priesthood. But the early Jewish writers, who naturally felt much interest in the subject, and were well able to investigate it, think that the privilege which Jacob desired and obtained had nothing to do with present secular advantages, but had reference to that heritage of the promises made to Abraham, which was supposed to go to the eldest born . . . To be the heir of the promise—to acquire possession of Canaan—to be associated with God in Abraham’s covenant—and, under it, to be the instrument of imparting a blessing to all the earth, were matters on which Jacob’s thoughts were fixed.” (Kitto’s Bible Illustrations.)

Gen. xxxvii. 2.—As in the passage previously considered, the Vulgate softens down the sin spoken of, so here it aggravates it. There is nothing in the original to make us conclude that Joseph's brethren had been guilty of any one heinous crime, but only that they were not living as good and as holy lives as they ought. He does not accuse them of some one act, but spoke of their general conduct. "The word רָצוֹן , translated *crimen* by the Vulgate, is derived from רָצַף , and, according to Rabbi Nathan, signifies meditation, or discourse. As a noun it occurs nine times, and from the context it is evident that it must generally signify *malevolent discourse*, or *talking*. So Numbers xiii. 32; xiv. 36. They 'brought up an evil report,' spoke evil of the land. In Gen. xxxvii. 2 it seems to express only 'report,' for it is qualified by the adjective רָצוֹן . Its primary sense is from the Arabic verb signifying to *creep*, and hence figuratively a report which obtains circulation imperceptibly; in the manner of a person who creeps or moves gently from place to place." (Phillips on Ps. xxxi. 14.) In none of the other places mentioned does the Vulgate translate רָצוֹן by *crimen*.

Exod. xviii. 20.—There is nothing in this passage to make us restrict the *ordinances and laws* to *ceremonies and the manner of worshipping*. The words מִצְוָה and דִּבְרֵי are used for ordinances and laws of any kind. (See Deut. v., vi.; Ps. xix. 8.) The context must fix the precise meaning, and here it does not require us to understand the rites and ceremonies of religion.

Exod. xxxiv. 29, 30, 35.—We can readily believe that Moses knew not that his face was *horned*. Doubtless this mistake arose from assigning to the verb נָרַץ its ordinary meaning. What the Vulgate translates "horned" should be *shone*, or *emitted rays of light*. If we supply *skin*, which is omitted by the Vulgate, the absurdity of the translation will be more apparent. How the skin of his face was horned would indeed require an infallible interpreter to explain. Nor can we imagine why immediate intercourse with God should have the effect of distorting man by giving him an appendage foreign to his species. But it is not difficult to understand that the effulgence of Divine glory might be reflected from the face of Moses, who had been permitted a more than ordinarily close intercourse with God. How this text is understood those will remember who have seen at Rome Michael Angelo's famous statue of Moses with two flaming horns proceeding from his head.*

1 Sam. ii. 3.—Why *old* things should depart from one's mouth is a question difficult to answer. עָרֵךְ , here rendered *old*, means *arrogant*,

* In Hab. iii. 4 our own translation has fallen into a similar mistake. The marginal reading, however, corrects it.

biting, sarcastic. In the other places where the word occurs, the Vulgate translates it by *iniquity*. (Ps. xxxi. 18 ; lxxv. 5 ; xciv. 4.)

1 Sam. ii. 36.—“ *That he may be prayed for, and shall offer a piece of silver and a roll of bread.*” This translation is quite contrary to the meaning of the Hebrew. Is there not a design in all this to exalt the benefit of, and make a Divine precedent for, priestly intercession ?

לְהִשְׁתַּחֲוֹת לוֹ means *to supplicate him*—the high priest of that time. There is no word in the Hebrew answering to “ *shall offer ;*” and the sense of the passage requires that the piece of silver and the morsel of bread be taken as the things for which supplication to the high priest should be made. As sheer want was to drive the descendant of Eli to seek relief from the high priest, it is unlikely that he could have a piece of silver and a morsel of bread to offer.

It may be objected that under the law priestly intercession was a recognised appointment of God, and hence the Vulgate cannot be justly charged with seeking to exalt it. But we must remember that the Hebrew does not bear out the Vulgate here ; and, further, since the Vulgate was made after the abolition of priestly intercession, and has been for so many centuries the recognised authorised version of the Church of Rome, any unnecessary interpolation or unwarranted translation, favouring the peculiar tenets of that Church, must be viewed with suspicion. And even should it be proved that here, as elsewhere, the translation existed before the error it favoured was put forward, we may still ask why an erroneous translation should be persisted in, and adopted by Protestants as truth.

2 Chron. xxix. 34.—“ *For the Levites are sanctified by an easier rite than the priests.*” There is no mention in the original of the length of time required for the sanctification of either Priest or Levite. The Hebrew words thus strangely translated by the Vulgate בְּיִשְׁרָיִם לֵב mean, *upright in heart*. These same words occur in nine other places in the Old Testament, and are correctly translated *recti corde*. Ignorance of the real meaning of the words cannot, therefore, be pleaded as an excuse for the translation ; and no reason can be assigned why it should be retained, unless, indeed, there was a wish to turn the reader from the true lesson intended to be conveyed, viz., that the Levites were more zealous for God, and more willing to help on the work of reformation, than the priests, who should have been at the head of the movement. It would be well were the Jewish priests the only people against whom such a charge could be brought, but the history of most national reformations but too well corroborates the fact, that those who should be foremost in restoring the true

worship of God are frequently the most backward, and but too often prove the greatest obstacles in the way.

Verse 36.—Here, again, the Vulgate is wrong. There might have been rejoicing because the reformation was effected, but a far deeper joy was caused, because God had prepared the people's hearts to bring about this wondrous change. In 2 Chron. xii. 14 we meet with the same Hebrew phrase, *הִכִּין לִבּוֹ*, which the Vulgate rightly translates *præparavit cor suum* (prepared his heart).

Neh. vi. 9, 10.—“Wherefore I strengthened my hands *the more*.” “*The more*” is an interpolation, not warranted, and not wanted. I strengthened should be in the imperative, and not in the perfect tense, and refers to God—a petition that God would give Nehemiah strength at such a crisis. *Secretly* is a mistranslation of the Hebrew *עָצַר* a *prisoner*; one bound, shut up. We must object to the translation here, first, because it would make Nehemiah appear cowardly, by going secretly to Shemaiah; and, secondly, because *עָצַר* (shut up) refers to Shemaiah, and not to Nehemiah, as the Vulgate makes out. In Deut. xxxii. 36, where *עָצַר* again occurs, the Vulgate rightly renders it *shut up*.

Job v. 1.—It must be confessed that the Vulgate translation here is very liable to be abused to inculcate the invocation of saints. And “some,” says Owen, “would foolishly hence seek to confirm the invocation of saints departed, when, indeed, if they were intended, it is rather forbidden and discountenanced than directed to.” However ambiguous this translation may be, the original is quite plain—*וְאֵלֵי־מִי מִקְדָּשִׁים תִּפְנֹה*, “and to which of the saints wilt thou turn?”*

Job xlii. 10.—It would require the original to be *תִּשׁוּבָה* (repentance) instead of *נֶזֶק־שְׁבִיַת* (captivity) ere we could accept the version of the Vulgate in this place. The LXX paraphrases the words, “The Lord increased Job.” Does not the translation of the Vulgate draw the mind from the true sense of the passage? Job had been tried by God. Satan had been permitted to afflict him. To prove that he indeed feared God, much had been said by the patriarch

* In “The Bible Society, and its Versions,” an attempt is made to defend this translation of the Vulgate on the ground that it is often a matter of question whether a sentence should be rendered interrogatively or not, there being no mark in the original to determine; and Ps. cxxi. 1 is cited as an instance. It is most true that often we are left to gather from the sense how we should translate the passage; but in this place the original puts the matter beyond a doubt. We have the interrogation expressed in *הֲיֵשׁ שִׂנְיָ*, which of itself would lead us to take the rest of the verse as a question. But this is not all; the interrogative pronoun *מִי*, who, or what, requires the interrogative sense.

which was reprehensible, but still more by his friends. God then interferences, convinces Job of his impotency and foolish reasoning. Job then repents, and humbles himself. God accepts him, and desires his three friends to make him intercede for them, else He would visit them for their conduct. Job does this, and having done it, God mercifully turns his captivity, and grants him greater prosperity than before. God did not wait for Job to pray for his friends before He accepted him, but, having accepted him, He signified that they should be accepted through the intercession of Job. Surely, then, the Vulgate, which represents God as being turned and softened towards Job, when he prayed for his friends, and thus manifested repentance, is wrong, because God had previously accepted him, and appointed him as the intercessor. Job's position as intercessor was the proof of previous acceptance, not the cause of his pardon.

Ps. cxxxii. 15, Vulg. cxxxi.—*His widow.* This is an error, which arose from some Greek copies, and is remarked on by Jerome as erroneous. The Hebrew word לַחֵם means prey taken in hunting, and hence food of any kind. (Neh. xiii. 15, and Josh. ix. 14.) The LXX renders it by $\thetaήραν$. But another reading of the Greek is $\tauὴν χήραν αὐτῆς$, whence arose the Vulgate translation, *viduam ejus, his widow,** which is also the rendering of the Arabic and Ethiopic versions.

Eccles. v. 5.—“*There is no Providence.*” The argument of the Preacher is not directed against infidels or atheists, but against those who, having made an inconvenient vow, absolve their consciences from performing it by asserting that it was “an error,” or “a mistake.” אִיגְנוּרְאִיָּה , here translated “Providence,” is elsewhere rightly translated “*ignorantia.*” (Numbers xxv., &c.)

Isaiah ii. 22.—“*For he is reputed high.*” Such a reason is scarcely sufficient to enforce the injunction, “Cease ye from man.” But the Hebrew is different—“For wherein is he to be accounted of?” $\text{אֵי בְּמַה נְהַיָּבָה הוּא בְּיַד אֱדוּמִים}$. After describing the impotency of man in the day of the Lord, the prophet ends with an injunction to cease from putting trust in man, or any child of man, for there is no help in them; and further adduces a most powerful reason, because man is nothing, and can avail nothing in the hour of calamity. Though the printed copies of the LXX omit this verse, it is found in some MSS. and in the Complutensian Polyglott, taken, probably, from

* Some idea of the antiquity of this error may be formed from the fact that, though the Vatican MS. of the LXX is correct, the Alex. MS. reads $\chiήραν$. Jerome notices this as an error in the versions of the Psalms used in his day, which was made from the old Latin, and has been retained ever since.

Theodotion. The Targum, with the Syriac versions,* and Aquila have it. The error of the Vulgate has arisen from taking בְּמָוֶז for בְּמָוֶז .

Isaiah xxi. 4.—The Hebrew will bear no such sense as the Vulgate puts upon it. How such a translation arose Jerome explains as follows:—"That which we translate 'Babylon dilecta mea,' is, in Hebrew, הַמְּשֻׁקֵּת ; and it is the same word which is placed in the beginning of the burden of Babylon (chap. xiii. 2), † "upon the black mountain;" and this city is so called on account of its height and its neck of pride, "lifted up to heaven." But the words הַמְּשֻׁקֵּת and בְּמָוֶז are *not* the same. The former is a substantive, signifying *twilight*, whereas the latter is a participle in Niphal of מָוַז *to rise*, be conspicuous. ‡ הַמְּשֻׁקֵּת occurs in several other places (see Job iii. 9; xxiv. 15), where the Vulgate translates it by "Caligo," *darkness of night*. Again, הַמְּשֻׁקֵּת , translated "dilecta mea," *my beloved*, is a substantive, signifying *desire*. (See 1 Kings ix. 1, 19; 2 Chron. viii. 6.)

Miraculum, *wonder*.— הַיָּמִינִי means *fear, terror*. In 1 Sam. xiv. 15, the Vulgate translates this word as in this place, but without any grounds. In several other places where it occurs the translation is rightly given—*terror, stupor*. In truth, the Vulgate has wholly missed the meaning of this verse. The Prophet is personifying Babylon on the night of its capture by Cyrus—a night previously devoted to feasting, which ended in surprise and capture. The words should be rendered, "The night of my pleasure is become one of terror to me."—*Henderson*.

Jer. xxiii. 6; xxxiii. 16.—"The Lord our just One."—This translation fails to express the sense of the original words: $\text{יְהוָה יִצְדִּיקֵנוּ}$; § for *just One* is יִצְדִּיק (tsaddik), and not יִצְדֵּק (tsedek). || The Prophet is undoubtedly speaking here of Christ, "who of God is made unto us righteousness." (1 Cor. i. 30.) It is a name given to Christ, but

* The Syriac version, made from Origen's Hexaplar, which agrees with the LXX where it differs from the Hebrew, has the verse, though it notes that it is not in the LXX. Origen marked it with an asterisk.

† על הַמְּשֻׁקֵּת

‡ הַמְּשֻׁקֵּת . Professor Lee derives its meaning from the refreshing breezes which, in hot countries, generally blow at the time of twilight. So an Arabic root, signifying ventilant flatu motuque frumentum. הַמְּשֻׁקֵּת , on the other hand, he derives from an Arab root, signifying, apparuit nova luna, persona.

§ The LXX, in chap. xxiii., leaves the Hebrew untranslated—*Ἰουσεδεκ*, "Josedeck." Chap. xxxiii., from ver. 14 to the end, is wholly omitted.

|| In other places, where יִצְדִּיק , righteousness, occurs, the Vulgate correctly renders it by "justitia;" e.g., Ps. xvii. 1 (xvi. in Vulgate).

it is more—it implies what the Lord Jesus Christ is to his people. It is not merely a distinctive name, but one full of meaning to God's people. And what imports the name of "Jehovah our Righteousness"? Nothing less than this: that "we are all as an unclean thing, that all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags." (Is. lxiv. 6.) That we have no righteousness of our own to plead before the Throne as an answer to the requirements of a broken law; but that in the Lord Jesus we have all we want. His righteousness is our righteousness; his meritorious fulfilment of God's law, his unflinching obedience, are reckoned to us. We are justified by His righteousness; in Him we are accepted, and accounted righteous before God. Does the Vulgate teach this? Could we learn from it that, though full of sin, though daily transgressing God's holy law, we, believing in Christ, have in Him an answer to all the claims of a broken law, have fully satisfied offended justice, and can point to his life as a complete satisfaction for all that is required of us?

In chap. xxxiii. 16, the Vulgate translates, "They shall call *him*," in place of "They shall call *her*;"—לֹא for לָהּ. This difference of translation does not affect the name referred to. Bishop Pearson would render the words in this place—"He who shall call thee is Jehovah our Righteousness." Whether we adopt the Bishop's rendering, or take the words as applied to Jerusalem, we must admit that the phrase imports more than the Vulgate implies in "our just One."

Dan. xii. 2.—"Ut videant semper," "To see it always." To see *what* is difficult to understand. But it is not difficult to see that the translation is quite foreign to the original. לִרְאוֹן has nothing to do with seeing. A kindred word, רְאוֹן, occurs in Isaiah lxvi. 24, rendered by the Vulgate, "*Usque ad satietatem visionis,*" a loathsome sight (Douay). רְאוֹן, in this place, must be taken in a similar sense. The Vulgar translator probably connected it with רָאָה, *to see*, with which the word has nothing in common.

Mal. i. 11.—This passage is brought forward as a prediction of the sacrifice of the mass. (See a Table of reference at the end of the Douay Bible.) The original מִקְטֹרֶת מִגִּזְמֵי וּמִנְחָה מְדוּרָה in no way countenances such an idea. מִקְטֹרֶת which the Vulgate renders by "sacrificatur," "there is sacrifice," is the part. Hophal of קָטַר "to burn incense," and is put for the substantive מִקְטֹרֶת, or קְטֹרֶת. Having mis-translated מִקְטֹרֶת the next change—the consequence of the first—was the removal of the copulative ו from מִנְחָהּ to disconnect this latter participle from the preceding word and to make it apply exclusively to מִנְחָה "an offering," no regard being had to the genders. For מִגִּזְמֵי is masculine, and מִנְחָהּ is feminine. Probably

the Vulgate has in this place followed the old Latin, for Justin Martyr read *θυσία* (sacrifice), though the LXX has *θυμίαμα*. In whatever way the error arose, it is evident that the Vulgate as it now stands cannot be accepted as a faithful reflex of the original since we find in it such strange misstatements and such disregard to gender. The Chaldee paraphrase of this passage is quite as free from any idea of sacrifice as the Hebrew and LXX. "In that time when ye shall do my will I will receive your prayers, and thus my great name shall be sanctified by means of you, and your prayers shall be as a pure oblation before me."

Matt. xxvi. 28.—"Effundetur," *shall be shed*. Will the Greek admit of a future signification? In the parallel passages the word is the same, τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον, *which is shed*. See also Mark xiv. 24; Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 24.* That this change of tense is not necessary, is clear from Luke xxii. 19, where τὸ δίδόμενον, referring to our Lord's body, is rendered *datur*. However ancient this reading may be, now that error has crept in respecting the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ once for all, does not a translation like this favour without any just foundation the idea of a continuous sacrifice?—and hence the daily sacrifice in the Mass.

Luke xvi. 22.—"And was buried in hell." This is clearly a mistake. The words "in hell," or *hades*, the place of departed souls, should be connected with the verse immediately following.

Rom. xiv. 5.—A needless admonition, surely. *πληροφορέω* is used in a similar sense, in the passive voice, in Rom. iv. 21; and there the Vulgate translates *plenissime sciens*. In the Epistles of Clement (1 Cor. xlii.) we find the same word used in the passive voice, in a similar sense. The Latin translation is "plena certitudine imbuti." So Ignatius, ad Mag. viii., xi., ad certificare, certificemini. These instances are adduced to show that, in the sense here required, there are in the Latin tongue words better suited to express it. De Saci

* This is the reading of the Vulgate printed at Antwerp, 1599. In a copy printed in 1852, without printer's name or country, circulated by the British and Foreign Bible Society, we find in 1 Cor. xi. 24, *traditur*, "is delivered." Which rendering is in conformity with the authentic Papal edition? De Saci, Martini, Scio, and Pereira agree in using the future. In the latter edition there are several differences from the former. The Psalms are numbered according to the Hebrew instead of according to the LXX—Psalm xi. of the LXX being Psalm xii. in this edition. In Jer. xvii. 9 there appears a misprint—*quia* for *quis*; and in 1 Cor. xv. 51, "we shall indeed rise, but we shall all be changed," *nos* for *non*. These two instances show how easily error may arise even in printed books. What need, then, for exactness and care in editing the Bible!

and Martini give here a better translation than the Vulgate, while Scio and Pereira follow it most literally.

1 Cor. xv. 51.—The reading of our authorized version is here much to be preferred to the translation of the Vulgate. Upon this subject Whitby remarks:—"This reading ('We shall not all sleep, &c.')

is much to be preferred before either of the other two—viz., 'We shall all rise,' or 'We shall all sleep, but shall not all be changed,' as being not only the reading of Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact on the place, but also of Origen, Theodotus, Apollinarius, Jerome, and of Pseudo-Justin."* The Apostle elsewhere declares the very opposite to what, according to the Vulgar translator, he would here teach. In 1 Thess. iv. 15—17, he tells us all will not sleep before the Lord comes, but some will be found alive in the earth, who will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air. All, therefore, must be changed, but all will not sleep. "This corruption must put on incorruption;" the vile body must be glorified, but death is not necessary to secure that.

Eph. ii. 10.—"In operibus bonis," *In good works*. The reading of the Vulgate is countenanced by some Greek copies, which read *év*. But surely the statement here set forth is contrary to Scripture. We are not brought into a state of salvation *by* works, or *in* good works, as this translation makes out; but, being wholly corrupt, are created anew in Christ Jesus to bring forth good works. Good works are the *object*, not the *means*.

Heb. xii. 8.—Ambrose reads, "adulterini," spurious. This gives the sense of the original. Has the reading of the Vulgate been altered since his day, by the omission of the last syllable, *ni*; or did he only give a more correct rendering of what was extant in his day? The present reading makes nonsense.

James v. 16.—This verse is commonly brought forward to support the dogma of Confession. "That ye may *be saved*." These words must of necessity give weight to the injunction, and, if they were genuine, might seem to make confession necessary to salvation. But *saved* is put for *healed*. The Apostle is speaking of sickness; and his argument appears to be that, since sickness is sometimes the result of sin—and hence is a chastisement for sin,—if we have cause to believe that the sickness is a chastisement, we should make

* The Vulgate has some Greek MSS. in its favour—e.g., the Clermont MS. Lachmann follows the Alexandrine. The Vatican reads as our authorised version. See Penn's Annotations on the New Covenant. The reader is also referred to Tregelles on the Printed Text of the Greek Testament for a full account of the several authorities in favour of the three different readings.

acknowledgment of it, and the only reparation in our power, by confessing our sins to those against whom we have offended. The words, "one to another," most effectually guard the text against inculcating confession to the priest. It is confession to the injured party, according to Matt. v. 24, which is here enjoined.

Rev. i. 3.—"And that heareth." The Greek reads, "And they who hear," plural. Is there not apparently an idea conveyed in the original, that one shall read while others listen to God's words? The Vulgate restricts the blessing to him who reads and hears. The original pronounces a blessing on him who reads, and on those who hear, teaching that *all* may, and should, come under the sound of God's Word, and that none should be kept from the knowledge of it by ignorance—that if all cannot *read*, all can *hear* the truth. Were the modern Vulgate right the educated class alone would obtain the blessing, but God, "who giveth to all men liberally," would keep none from participating in the blessings if only they *will* hear.*

It may excite some surprise that no notice has been taken of the phrase "agere pœnitentiam," which so constantly occurs as the translation of μετανοεῖν to repent. It appears, however, from a reference to Jeremiah xviii. 8, 10, that the Vulgar translation did not attach any improper idea to the words such as is now implied by the phrases, "faire penitence," "fare penitenza," "hacer penitencia," "fazer penitencia," "do penance," because the phrase is there used with reference to God, of whom it cannot be said, nor can we suppose that the Vulgate translation would say, that He did penance.

But though the Vulgate must be acquitted here of all charge of intentionally, or otherwise, on this point, perverting the Word of God, it must be confessed that the phrase is most objectionable, because it appears to countenance, as we well know, a false and erroneous idea; and further, it must be admitted that it is not necessary, for in some places the Vulgate uses "pœniteo."

The Reformers, Beza, Luther, Calvin, Tynedale, and Erasmus, confess that the phrase, "agere pœnitentiam," is not sufficient to express the value of the Greek word. Beza thus speaks,† "Ceterum μετανοεῖν, quum est verbum absolutum, proprie significat *post factum*

* The real reading of the Vulgate is correct—"Qui legit et audiunt." The present reading arose, probably, from the blunders of copyists. While, therefore, the Vulgate must be acquitted of all intentional misrepresentation in this matter, we cannot acquit the modern editions of a blunder which may lead to serious error.

† Fulke's "Defence of Translations of the Bible." Parker Society Edition. P. 155.

sapere, et de errore admissio ita dolere ut corrigas : quod (ut opinor) Latinis proprie significat resipiscere." Annot. Matt. iii. Erasmus added to the phrase, "agite pœnitentiam, *vita prioris*," "of your former life."

Luther thus speaks, "Pœnitentiam agere, *actionem* magis sonat quam mutationem affectus, et Græco ille, *μετανοεῖν*, nullo modo satisfecit." "To do penance rather implies an action than a change of mind, and in no way satisfies the Greek."

As Tynedale has been cited as favouring the term "agite pœnitentiam," it may be well to quote his own words. Speaking of penance he says, "Penance is a word of their own forging, to deceive us withal, as many others are. In the Scripture we find 'pœnitentiam, *repenting*, agite pœnitentiam, *to repent*, pœniteat vos, *let it repent you, metanoyte*, in Greek, *forethink ye, or let it forethink you.*' Of repentance they have made penance, to blind the people, and to make them think that they must take pains, and do some holy deed, to make satisfaction for their sins, namely, such as they enjoin them."—Tynedale's Works, vol. i., p. 260. Parker Society Edition. In this extract Tynedale draws a most marked difference between *repentance* and *penance*; and while he admits, as is true, that the phrase of the Vulgate is of itself correct, he most distinctly condemns the modern translation of it—penance.*

These witnesses will perhaps be objected to as prejudiced against the Vulgate. Let us hear, then, others. Lactantius thus writes, "Aptius Græce, *μετανοια*, et Latine, resipiscentiam dici, quam pœnitentiam." Take Tertullian, who thus defines the meaning of the Greek word as having reference to, "*not* the confession of a fault, but a *change of mind.*" † Augustine uses "agere pœnitentiam" to express the repentance of Peter; and adds this caution:—"But where it is said that Peter did penance, we must beware that he be not thought so to have done it as they do it in the Church, which are properly called *pœnitentes*. And who can abide this, that we should think that the chief of the apostles is to be numbered among such penitents? For it repented him that he denied Christ, which thing his tears do show." ‡

* If this Reformer had really no objection to this phrase, as the writer of "The Bible Society and its Versions" declares (p. 3), we might expect to find it *sometimes* in his New Testament. But we must differ from the anonymous writer, and believe that he *scrupled* to use it, for he carefully avoids all mention of these words.

† Nam et in Græco sono pœnitentiæ nomen, non ex delicti confessione, sed ex animi demutatione compositum est. Adversus Marcionem. Lib. ii. Opera, p. 472. Quoted in Fulke, p. 155.

‡ Augustin, Epist. cclxy. Opera, Vol. ii., pp. 1,359, 1,360. Fulke, p. 438, note.

These quotations show that the phrase objected to now, though used in the early ages of Christianity, did not convey the meaning put upon it by the Church of Rome.

To those who have not been actively employed in the work of Bible distribution among Roman Catholics, it may appear of little moment to retain translations in which this phrase is found. But some, perhaps many, if we could rightly ascertain their number, have found that the phrase "do penance" has proved a stumbling-block by confirming those educated in the Church of Rome in the idea of bodily penance, and even making them, in the hour of death, wretched in the extreme, and unable to take any comfort, till assured that "to do penance" was not required by God, but the change of mind, wrought by the immediate operation of the Spirit. A soldier in the South of France, whose heart had been opened to perceive and receive the truth, had been provided, by an Englishman, with a De Sacy's New Testament. After a time he requested a copy of Martin's; and, on being asked why, said, that in his copy he found "faites penitence," whereas in the other it was written, "convertissez vous." If Roman Catholics see the difference between these two translations, and reject the one in favour of the other, shall we continue to circulate the two as if there was no real difference?

When treating of the Vulgate, and the various translations made from it, we cannot pass over the word *hostia*—a victim offered in sacrifice. As it stands in the Vulgate nothing can be said against it. But we must regret that the word was ever introduced, even into the Vulgate, because it opens a door for its retention in modern versions. Were there no peculiar meaning attaching to the word "*host*," beyond the common idea of a victim slain in sacrifice, no one could take exception to it. But we all know that *host*, derived from *hostia*, is the term employed to denominate the pretended sacrifice in the mass. Hence, when met with in modern translations, a Roman Catholic reader would understand the Sacrifice of the Mass. What construction, for instance, could the unlearned Roman Catholic put on the following translation:—"Ma questi, offerta per sempre una sola ostia pei peccati, siede alla destra de Dio." "But this one having offered one only host for sins for ever, sits down at the right hand of God." Heb. x. 12 (Martini). "Celui-ci ayant-offert une seule hostie pour les péchés, il est assis pour toujours à la droite de Dieu." "This one having offered one only host for sins, has sat down for ever at the right hand of God" (De Sacy). See Pereira's Portuguese version on the same passage, in the Appendix.

The foregoing examples are sufficient to prove that the Vulgate materially alters many passages of Scripture so as to change their

sense. It is evident that in just so much as the sense of Scripture is changed, in so much is the value of the Vulgate as a guide in the teaching of Scripture lessened. Is it too much to ask that every version of the Bible, which claims to be a translation, should be faithful to the original, should present the mind and sense of Scripture as literally as the respective idioms of the two languages and human imperfections will allow. How much more is this requisite in the Vulgate, which is taken as a substitute for Scripture, and from which many modern versions are made. We value literal exactness in worldly matters; shall we value it less in spiritual matters? Where our property is at stake, or the safety of our persons concerned, we are fully alive to the value of a literal construction of the laws. In science, too, we recognise the need of precise language. Is there not, let us ask ourselves, as great need of precision in language, and literal exactness, in questions which more intimately concern the safety of our immortal souls? Is it less a matter of importance, that souls should be enlightened, their doubts solved, and questions affecting their eternal interests be placed beyond the reach of misconception, than the accurate construction of a legal instrument? Are questions of eternal moment of less value than those which concern the things of time and sense?

The Bible is the highest legal authority,—it contains the fundamental code of laws. Its precepts are to be our guide, its laws our rule. It is also the highest book of science; it treats of the sublimest of all subjects, the being and attributes of God, and the future state of our never-dying souls. How can we apply to ourselves, or others, the laws of God, if the translation we have of them cannot be relied on as correct? How shall we trust to a translation which we know differs so materially from the original of which it professes to be a faithful reflection? How shall we present to others, as the Word of God, a version which we well know teaches many things contrary to that Word? Tried by the world's standard of prudence we are found wanting; tried by the Christian standard of doing to others as we would be done by, are we not found still more wanting? Let us look to ourselves, lest in the end, while professing to banish errors and destroy the stronghold of Satan, we be found fighting in the ranks of the enemy, by confirming with our imprimatur the very errors we repudiate, and leading souls astray on the very points on which we profess to be better instructed.

Let us now proceed to the examination of the remaining propositions.

3. The Vulgate has made additions to God's Word.

Vulgate.

Expavit Isaac stupore vehementi; et ultra quàm credi potest, admirans, ait. (Gen. xxvii. 33.)

Respondit Jacob: quòd inscio te profectus sum, timui ne violenter auferres filias tuas. (Gen. xxxi. 31.)

Hucusque refertur quid in commentario scriptum fuerit, exin Nehemiæ historia textitur. (2 Esd. vii. 69.) *

Qui nititur mendaciis, hic pascit ventos: idem autem ipse sequitur aves volantes. (Prov. x. 4.)

Animæ dolosæ errant in peccatis: justi autem misericordes sunt, et miserantur. (Prov. xiii. 13.)

Qui credit in Domino, misericordiam diligit. (Prov. xiv. 21.)

Pigrum dejicit timor: animæ autem effeminatorum esurient.† (Prov. xviii. 8.)

Prædicare annum Domini acceptum, et diem retributionis. (Luke iv. 19.)

Qui cum justitiam Dei cognovissent, non intellexerunt quoniam qui talia agunt digni sunt morte. (Rom. i. 32.)

Translation of Vulgate.

Isaac was struck with fear, and astonished exceedingly: and wondering beyond what can be believed said. (Gen. xxvii. 33.)

Jacob answered, *That I departed unknown to thee* it was for fear lest thou wouldest take away thy daughters by force. (Gen. xxxi. 31.)

Hitherto is related what was written in the record. From this place forward goeth on the history of Nehemias. (2 Esdras vii. 69.)

He that trusteth to lies feedeth the winds: and the same runneth after birds that fly away. (Prov. x. 4.)

Deceitful souls go astray in sins: the just are merciful, and show mercy. (Prov. xiii. 13.)

He that believeth in the Lord loveth mercy. (Prov. xiv. 21.)

Fear casteth down the slothful: and the souls of the effeminate shall be hungry. (Prov. xviii. 8.)

To preach the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of reward. (Luke iv. 19.)

Who having known the justice of God, *did not understand* that they who do such things are worthy of death. (Rom. i. 32.)

Authorised Version.

And Isaac trembled very exceedingly, and said. (Gen. xxvii. 33.)

And Jacob answered and said to Laban, Because I was afraid: for I said, Peradventure thou wouldest take by force thy daughters from me. (Gen. xxxi. 31.)

Hitherto is related what was written in the record. From this place forward goeth on the history of Nehemias. (2 Esdras vii. 69.)

He that trusteth to lies feedeth the winds: and the same runneth after birds that fly away. (Prov. x. 4.)

Deceitful souls go astray in sins: the just are merciful, and show mercy. (Prov. xiii. 13.)

He that believeth in the Lord loveth mercy. (Prov. xiv. 21.)

Fear casteth down the slothful: and the souls of the effeminate shall be hungry. (Prov. xviii. 8.)

To preach the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of reward. (Luke iv. 19.)

Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death. (Rom. i. 32.)

* These words are omitted in the edition of the Vulgate before referred to (p. 32), printed in 1852. They are in both Scio's and Pereira's versions, though printed as in the Douay and Vulgate of 1599, in italics.

† The Vulgate here exhibits an attempt to please two parties. The words quoted above are found in the LXX, but the former part of the verse is found *only* in the Hebrew in this place.

<i>Vulgate.</i>	<i>Translation of Vulgate.</i>	<i>Authorized Version.</i>
Qui est in dextera Dei, deglutiens * mortem ut vitæ eternæ heredes efficeremur: profectus in cœlum subjectis sibi angelis, et potestatibus, et virtutibus. (1 Pet. iii. 22.)	Who is on the right hand of God, <i>swallowing down death, that we might be made heirs of life everlasting</i> : being gone into heaven, the angels and powers and virtues being made subject to Him. (1 Pet. iii. 22.)	Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject unto him. (1 Pet. iii. 22.)

It will be observed that the additions made to some of the passages here brought forward are more amplifications of the text than the insertion of new matter. (See Gen. xxvii. 33; xxxi. 31, &c., &c.) But in others the additions alter the sense; as Luke iv. 19, where the addition of the words "*day of retribution*," which are found in the prophet, give quite a different colouring to the passage. Our Lord was pointing out the fulfilment of the prophecy (Isaiah lxi. 1, 2) in his own person, and he concluded with the words, "The acceptable year of the Lord." For as yet the "day of vengeance" had not arrived. The mistake, it must be confessed, is one that might easily arise; and similar mistakes are found in the common Greek text. A quotation from the Old Testament is amplified by continuing the citation. It is noticed here simply to show how a most important passage connected with the true interpretation of prophecy is by this means rendered useless. The prophets, when predicting the future, grouped together different events, separated from each other by greater or less periods of time, and made them appear as if so connected that the fulfilment of some necessitated the immediate fulfilment of all. Our Lord's quotation from the prophets here adduced unfolds to us a most important principle, viz., that there may be a most decided break in time between two events linked in the prophecy, as it were, inseparably together. So he therefore proclaimed "the acceptable year of the Lord," but not "the day of vengeance." *That* had to come; it has still to come. The former part of the prophecy was fulfilled on that day when He stood up in the synagogue, and with the eyes of the whole congregation fixed in wonderment on Him, read from this part of the prophetic volume. But the *day of vengeance is still future*.

Romans i. 32.†—The insertion of the words "*did not understand*"

* From this strange gloss—probably a marginal note incorporated into the text, one MS. is free. It probably is to be traced back to the old Latin.

† This interpolation is older than the Vulgate of Jerome. It is found, though not genuine, in old Greek copies, and Cyprian quotes it.

completely changes the sense. The apostle is declaring as a further aggravation of the wickedness of the heathen world that they were well aware that the commission of these crimes deserved death, and yet they not only committed them, but took pleasure in them that did such things. According to the Vulgate the heathen were ignorant that these crimes here enumerated were worthy of death, and, therefore, would be punished for their ignorance; the apostle all the while being at pains to show that ignorance could not be pleaded as an excuse for their acts.

Regarding the four quotations from Proverbs, which are clear additions to the sacred text, nothing need be said. It will be sufficient to remember that in the same Book we read, "Add thou not unto his words lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." (Chap. xxx. 6.) We may, however, remark in passing, that if the Apocrypha is no longer circulated, because we would not mix men's words with God's revelation, so should we discard all versions which, in a more dangerous, because more subtle way, interlard the Sacred Writings with the comments and additions of fallible men.

4. The Vulgate has omitted many words and even whole passages of the Inspired Scriptures.

<i>Vulgate.</i>	<i>Translation of Vulgate.</i>	<i>Authorised Version.</i>
Et cunctis animantibus terræ, omnique volucris cœli, et universis quæ moventur in terra, et in quibus est anima vivens, ut habeant ad vescendum. (Gen. i. 30.)	And to all beasts of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to all that move upon the earth, and wherein there is life, that they may have to feed upon. (Gen. i. 30.)	And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, <i>I have given every green herb for meat.</i> (Gen. i. 30.)
Nec quidquam aliud noverat, nisi panem quo vescabatur. (Gen. xxxix. 6.)	Neither knew he any other thing, but the bread which he ate. (Gen. xxxix. 6.)	<i>And he left all that he had in Joseph's hand; and he knew not ought he had, save the bread which he did eat.</i> (Gen. xxxix. 6.)
Omitted. (Gen. xlix. 32.)	Omitted. (Gen. xlix. 32.)	<i>The purchase of the field and of the cave that is therein was from the children of Heth.</i> (Gen. xlix. 32.)
Sic facies per singulos boves et arietes et agnos et hœdos. Tam indigenæ quam peregrini eodem ritu offerent sacrificia. Unum præceptum erit atque ju-	Thus shalt thou do for every ox, and ram, and lamb, and kid. Both they that are born in the land, and the strangers, shall offer sacrifices after	Thus shall it be done for one bullock, or for one ram, or for a lamb, or a kid. According to the number that ye shall prepare, so shall ye do to

Vulgate.

dicium tam vobis quam advenis terræ. (Numbers xv. 11—15.)

Translation of Vulgate.

the same rite. There shall be all one law and judgment both for you and for them who are strangers in the land. (Numb. xv. 11—15.)

Authorised Version.

every one according to their number. All that are born in the country shall do these things after this manner, in offering an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord. And if a stranger sojourn with you, or whosoever be among you in your generations, and will offer an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord; as ye do, so he shall do. One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation, and also for the stranger that sojourneth with you, an ordinance for ever in your generations: as ye are, so shall the stranger be before the Lord. One law and one manner shall be for you, and for the stranger that sojourneth with you. (Numbers xv. 11—16.)

Ne commisceatur possessio filiorum Israel de tribu in tribum. Omnes enim viri ducent uxores de tribu et cognatione sua: et cunctæ feminae de eadem tribu maritos accipient; ut hereditas permaneat in familiis. (Numb. xxxvi. 7, 8.)

Lest the possession of the children of Israel be mingled from tribe to tribe. For all men shall marry wives of their own tribe and kindred: and all women shall take husbands of the same tribe: that the inheritance may remain in the families. (Numb. xxxvi. 7, 8.)

So shall not the inheritance of the children of Israel remove from tribe to tribe; for every one of the children of Israel shall keep himself to the inheritance of the tribe of his fathers. And every daughter that possesseth an inheritance in any tribe of the children of Israel, shall be wife unto one of the family of the tribe of her father, that the children of Israel may enjoy every man the inheritance of his fathers. (Numb. xxxvi. 7, 8.)

Sed cunctis præsentibus

But with all that are

But with him that

<i>The Vulgate.</i>	<i>Translation of Vulgate.</i>	<i>Authorised Version.</i>
bus et absentibus. (Deut. xxix. 15.)	present, and that are absent. (Deut. xxix. 15.)	standeth here with us this day before the Lord our God, and also with him that is not here with us this day. (Deut. xxix. 15.)
Fili mi, da gloriam Domino Deo Israel, et confitere, atque indica mihi quid feceris, ne abscondas. (Jos. vii. 19.)	My son, give glory to the Lord God of Israel, and confess, and tell me what thou hast done, hide it not. (Jos. vii. 19.)	My son, give, I pray thee, glory to the Lord God of Israel, and make confession <i>unto Him</i> ; and tell me now what thou hast done; hide it not from me. (Josh. vii. 19.)
Cunque Dominus iudices suscitaret, in diebus eorum flectebatur misericordia, et audiebat afflictorum gemitus, et liberabat eos de cæde vastantium. (Jud. ii. 18.)	And when the Lord raised them up judges, in their days he was moved to mercy, and heard the groanings of the afflicted, and delivered them from the slaughter of the oppressors. (Jud. ii. 18.)	And when the Lord raised them up judges, <i>then the Lord was with the judge</i> , and delivered them out of the hand of their enemies all the days of the judge: for it repented the Lord because of their groanings by reason of them that oppressed them and vexed them. (Jud. ii. 18.)
Et misit ad me Sanaballat juxta verbum prius quinta vice puerum suum, et epistolam habebat in manu sua. (2 Esd. vi. 5.)	And Sanaballat sent his servant to me the fifth time, according to the former word, and he had a letter in his hand. (2 Esdras vi. 5.)	Then sent Sanballat his servant unto me in like manner the fifth time with an <i>open</i> letter in his hand. (Neh. vi. 5.)

The quotations from Ps. xcix. (xcviii.), and Heb. xi., given above, may be referred to here as instances of omissions involving most important consequences.

Gen. i. 30.—There was a great distinction between the food of man and animals, even at the creation. To Adam was given “every herb bearing seed, and every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed;” whilst to the beasts, fowls, and creeping things, the green herb alone was allotted for meat: but, according to the Vulgate, man and animals ate the same food.

Josh. vii. 19.—The pronoun *him* is here most emphatic. The omission of it leaves it an open question whether Achan was to con-

fess to God or man ; the original puts the matter beyond the reach of doubt.*

Neh. vi. 5.—The word *open* is also emphatic, and is requisite to show that an insult was offered to Nehemiah. The mere sending of a letter was nothing, but to send it open to a person of Nehemiah's rank was a direct insult.

Gen. xxxix. 6, xlix. 32 ; Numbers xv. 11—16, xxxvi. 7, 8 ; Deut. xxix. 15 ; Judges ii. 18, are examples where the Vulgate either wholly omits, or materially abridges, the passages of Holy Writ. Will any object that these omissions and abridgements do not affect the sense, or alter the teaching of the Bible, and, therefore, are unimportant ? Let them remember that no word is unimportant which God has spoken. If God has thought fit to make a revelation of anything to man, every word He has employed in making that revelation is important for us ; and whatever may be our ideas of inspiration, whether we believe in the plenary verbal inspiration of Scripture, or whether we only allow a general direction of the Holy Spirit, which kept the sacred writers from manifest errors, this much all must admit, that they used the words and phrases best calculated to convey the meaning they intended to convey, and hence we, in seeking to be made acquainted with their writings, desire and require to have them translated without omission or abridgement of any kind.

These few examples will be sufficient to demonstrate the truth of the fourth proposition, that the Vulgate omits words, and even passages, of the sacred writings.

We have now completed the examination of the Vulgate by establishing the four propositions we stated in the earlier part of this pamphlet. Many other passages might be brought forward to substantiate further the charges there made ; but it must be admitted that enough has been adduced to prove the Vulgate an unsound teacher, and an unfaithful witness of the truth of Scripture. It has been tried by the only standard of appeal—the originals—of which it professes to be a translation, and we have found it unsound in doctrine, teaching idolatry, making the creature equal to the Son of God, exalting the merit of human works, adding to the number of the sacraments, and countenancing the dogma of purgatory. We have found it altering the Word of God, besides adding to, and, in some places, omitting words. We must therefore admit that it is *not* a faithful translation, and, further, that no version made from it *can* be a faithful translation

* Though the LXX omits the pronoun, the Complut. Polyglott inserts it, and therefore the passage is here brought forward.

of the Bible ; and hence, that we should cease from circulating it, and the several translations made from it.

This is an important fact, and well worthy of being remembered ; for it is the fashion with some of our Roman Catholic brethren to stigmatise the English authorised version, and other translations made from the original Scriptures, as blasphemous productions, and dangerous publications. It would be well did they remember that *every* version sanctioned by their Church, and made from *their* recognised standard of revealed truth, the Vulgate, *must* be unsound and erroneous, because their standard of appeal is unsound and erroneous.

Such being the case, it may be asked why the Vulgate itself, and versions made from the Vulgate, are circulated in preference to, and side by side with, versions made from the originals. For this practice three reasons are commonly adduced, which, must we not confess, seem more like excuses for an admittedly bad custom, than reasons for a sound principle.

1st. We are told the necessity of the case requires that these versions should be circulated, or, in other words, that the hindrances to the circulation of purer versions do not apply to them. This requires further proof. We know full well that the Church of Rome hates the circulation of the Bible ; and whilst in theory she admits that it should be in the vulgar tongue, she, by her practice, so hedges it round, that the common people cannot get access to it. But what seems more especially to contradict this plea, that these versions can be circulated where others cannot, is, that in no country where the introduction of pure versions is *impossible*, do we find those made from the Vulgate accessible to all who wish for them. The practice of the Church of Rome is to keep out all Bibles till forced by public opinion, or the presence of pure versions, to circulate those of which she professes to approve. Does this assertion need proof ? We appeal to the evidence of the late Drs. Doyle and Murray, before a Parliamentary Committee. Dr. Doyle had been educated in Portugal, Dr. Murray in Spain, and both of them confess that in neither country had they seen a translation of the Bible in the vulgar tongue allowed by public authority.* We have recently seen this further proved in the ecclesiastical authorities of Madrid prohibiting the publishing of a Spanish translation made from the Vulgate. This reason, therefore, for the circulation of versions made from the Vulgate, cannot be accepted as sound. The only cause why the Church of Rome in any

* Stanford's "Handbook to the Roman Controversy," p. 180. Dr. Doyle had never heard of a Bible in Portuguese in Portugal. Dr. Murray had heard, but could not vouch for the existence, of a Spanish Bible.

degree sanctions the Bible to be circulated and publicly sold, is, because she cannot help it. We have a recent instance of this in Tuscany. The Archbishop of Florence has published an edition of Martini, *with notes*, to counteract, if possible, the spread of Diodati. This step was taken, not before, but after, the people had manifested an urgent desire to have the Word of Life.

We may rest assured of this, that in every place where the priesthood permits the sale of any version of the Scriptures, it is only because they cannot help it, and because other purer versions are circulated. Is it not true that if England, if France, if Piedmont, were to-morrow under the thumb of the priesthood, not only would all translations of the originals be banished the country, but the Douay version, along with De Sacy and Martini, would no longer be accessible to all. What was the reason given for publishing the Douay version in the first instance; simply this,—that versions of the Bible, in English, were so common and so accessible to all who wished for them, that the Roman Catholics were obliged to make a new translation for themselves to defend some of their errors, and thus keep their people from becoming Protestants. It was not choice, but necessity. See “The Book and its Story.”

2. We are told that the people desire these versions in preference to those made from the originals. This also requires further proof. Some there are, undoubtedly, who, in deference to the authority of their priest, refuse to take a Bible at all. Others, again, may be found who desire the version sanctioned by their Church; but, with the majority, such is not the case. Where the people are at liberty to choose, and where, in spite of priestly interference and civil persecutions, they desire the truth, the versions most sought after are *not* those made from the Vulgate. We need only appeal to Tuscany and Piedmont in support of this. In the former the people seek for Diodati’s version, even though it may subject them to imprisonment. The testimony of one who was largely engaged in distributing Bibles and Testaments among the troops of the latter country in the Crimea is to this effect:—“*They generally prefer Diodati.*” And are there not many engaged in the work of Bible distribution in other lands whose testimony and experience coincide with this? * But suppose the people did desire these versions, and would receive no other, are we to give them as the Bible what we know is not the Bible? Are we to connive at their errors, and confirm them in those

* As soon as the people discover that the priests have been teaching them *falsely*, they distrust Romish versions, and turn about to look for those made from the original Scriptures.

errors by erroneous versions of the Scriptures? Surely not. The only warrant we have for circulating the Bible is the Word of God, and the command of our risen Lord to preach the Gospel to every creature. But that command contains no dispensational clause, or discretionary power, to act as circumstances may permit. Though the Jews might reject, the learned Greek ridicule, or the unlettered barbarian turn a deaf ear to the preaching of St. Paul, yet he faltered not for a moment, nor changed the burden of his preaching. We must act in the same spirit. If translations of the Vulgate be used at all, let them be used under protest, and used only to show how even there no countenance is given to certain of their errors. But let us beware how we mingle the words of man with those of God—how we pervert the message we are entrusted to deliver, under the specious guise of removing opposition and allaying unnecessary jealousy.

3. We are further told that the translations made from the Vulgate are more classical in their language, and therefore more acceptable than the others. If this be the case, should we not endeavour to remove this objection against the pure versions by revising them, rather than put them aside, and adopt versions which we cannot approve of?

Granting that these versions are more classical, are they more eagerly desired? It appears not. There is no difficulty in circulating Diodati on that ground.* The persecuted Christians of Florence do not reject it; the Piedmontese soldiers gladly receive it; and in other lands where a desire for the Bible is springing up, the versions of the Church of Rome are generally distrusted,—and more classical?—no, but more *faithful* versions are urgently demanded.

Such are the reasons generally adduced for the continuance of this practice. Are there no reasons equally or more cogent for abolishing it?

We ought not to circulate these versions, for—

1. *The Word of God cannot be tampered with.* If God vouchsafes a revelation at all, there is a *prima facie* evidence that it is a revelation needed, and we must assume that He chooses the words and phrases best suited by which to make known his will. Does not Scripture bear us out in this by the denunciations contained in it against altering his Word? “Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God.” (Deut. iv. 2.)

* If a correspondent of the Bible Society is authority in this matter, we find it asserted in the Report of 1855, that Diodati is reckoned by Italians as more elegant,

“What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.” (Deut. xii. 32.) Will it be said that these words refer to the law of Moses only? We find in Proverbs the same warning—“Add thou not unto his words, lest He reprove thee,” &c. (Prov. xxx. 6); and in Rev. xxii. 18, 19. So also in the Prophets we read, “He that hath my Word, let him speak my Word faithfully.” (Jer. xxiii. 28.) So, too, the commission of Ezekiel,—“Thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith *the Lord God.*” (Ezek. ii. 4.)

With these declarations and denunciations before our eyes, and written in that very book we engage to circulate, how shall we be found mingling with God’s words what we know He never said, and what we further know contradicts his message?*

2. *Since the errors of the Vulgate are the errors of the Church of Rome, we cannot confirm the members of that Church in these errors.* Our object in giving the Bible is to enlighten those who are in ignorance of the way of salvation, and their present state before God. If we circulate the translations of the Vulgate, we uphold many errors which we repudiate, and truly declare have no countenance from Scripture.†

3. *Such a course makes Scripture a nullity.* We are ready enough to repudiate the assertion of Pighius, that the Scriptures are like a nose of wax, to be pulled about and twisted as each one wishes;

* In a public Meeting of one of the branches of the Bible Society in the west of England, the deputation from the parent Society is reported to have urged as a reason for not amending the errors in the versions they circulate, that they *dare not tamper with them.* This defence would not have been noticed, had it not been put forward by one officially connected with the parent Society. Is it come to this—that we dare not tamper with Martini, and therefore must tamper with the word of one greater than Martini? Is God’s Word to be mutilated to spare man’s work? Who will believe us if we make such a declaration? If we tamper with the greater, are we likely to spare the less? Such a defence is best characterized in our Lord’s words, “straining out a gnat, but swallowing a camel.” In a pamphlet, having for its object to show the importance of faithful translations, special care should be taken to prevent any error in quotations. *Out* is here used, as it seems to express more correctly the Greek, and, moreover, is found in Tyndale’s, Cranmer’s, the Geneva, Vulgate, and Rhemish versions.

† In the Report of the Society’s work for 1855, we find, under the head of Italy, a communication from a correspondent, stating that the translation of Martini is, *for the most part, unexceptionable.* It is much to be regretted that the Society lends its name and the weight of its authority to statements of this kind. A very little examination would prove that since Martini is a translation of the Vulgate, it must be most objectionable, and that the differences between his version and that of Diodati are by no means trivial.

but are we not practically acquiescing in this assertion by distributing in the same country and language two versions of the Bible, differing not only in minor matters, but also on the most important doctrinal points. Are we not also practically countenancing the priests in their assertion, that there is no certain interpretation of Scripture? Does not such a course of action seem as if we thought there was no difference between the doctrinal teaching of the Vulgate and the original Scriptures? Many of the peculiar errors of the Church of Rome are grounded on, or countenanced by, the errors of the modern Vulgate. If, therefore, we circulate the version of the Scriptures declared to be authentic by the highest authority of that Church, side by side with versions made from the originals, however clearly we may point out the errors of Rome, however openly we may protest against her unauthorized tampering with the truth, all our words are but idle tales. So long as we distribute as God's truth what we declare and believe is not the truth we place ourselves in a false position, for our actions belie our words.

4. *Such a course of action deprives the British and Foreign Bible Society of the support of many earnest Christians.* This reason applies peculiarly to the Bible Society. True it is that the Society has a large income, and is well supported; its prestige is great, but is it not also true that very many Christian people (and surely their support is most desirable) stand aloof from it because of such acts? Were the Society to renounce this practice its supporters would increase, and many who are really anxious about Bible distribution, would flock to its standard. Is it not a fact that, though its income is large, and its influence great, though in its sphere of labour it far surpasses other kindred Societies, yet it has not that cordial support from all Christian people which we might have expected? The reason is plain, because its principle of action does not inspire confidence. Shall we be told, in opposition to all this, of the large number of copies of God's Word it annually distributes? Shall its wide sphere of labour, and the blessing that has attended its operations, be pointed to as a proof of God's favour on its behalf? True, it has been permitted to do much; it has been, under God, of great use. It has circulated the Bible in many languages, hitherto unwritten, and even unknown. But let us, while remembering how much has been done, see what we have left undone; how far we have come short of our mission of evangelising the world, and how little has been done of the work we have undertaken, so well described in the last Report of the Society, viz., "to scatter the Scriptures of truth in every nation, and deposit a copy in every family." When we

remember how long the Society circulated the Apocrypha with the Scriptures, let us rather believe that God has prospered us, not because of our faithfulness, but in spite of our unfaithfulness ; and, whilst looking with thankfulness on what has been done in past years, let us hail it as an omen that, with more zeal, faithfulness, and boldness on our parts, He will more abundantly bless us, till, through our instrumentality, the promise be fulfilled, "The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." Will it be considered out of place to enforce the proposed change by another argument—*one drawn from our national position* ? We are a small people compared with some nations, and our island is of limited extent ; but it has pleased God to exalt us among the nations of the earth, and to place one-fifth of mankind under our rule ; our influence, also, from commerce, &c., extends to every part of the habitable globe. Let us ask ourselves why we have been thus favoured. Is it not to further the designs of God ? We have been blessed for three hundred years with the light of his Word. Is not our present high position, then, given us that we should become the evangelists of the world ? Much of late years has been done in this matter, but how little compared with the work before us. Other nations have held as conspicuous a position in the world of their time, but have passed away into obscurity or oblivion. Let us profit by the lesson they read us ; and, while there is time, let us remember that our position entails responsibilities ; that, since God has given us so high a place among the nations of the world, since He has committed to us the light of his truth, it is our duty to let that light shine with undiminished lustre, and to impart to others, unimpaired, and uncorrupted, the blessing entrusted to us.

Need any reason be adduced why we should *immediately* change our practice ? Let it be found in the present state of the Continent. The events of the past few years have, under God's providence, opened out most unexpectedly countries and cities to receive the Word which were formerly inaccessible. Till lately, therefore, the question might not have seemed so pressing. But while new countries are opening out, others seem likely to become still more inaccessible. Austria has lately given herself up hand and foot to the Roman Pontiff. Rumours are heard of Naples and Tuscany forming new Concordats, based on that of Austria. In Spain, too, which lately seemed breaking away from the paralyzing dominion of Rome, we see the authorities stifling, as far as possible, attempts at evangelization, and apparently drawing closer the ties which bind them to the chair of St. Peter. Surely, then, we should use all

diligence. "As we have, therefore, opportunity, let us do good unto all men," is the apostolic precept, most applicable to us in our present state. Life is uncertain, souls are perishing, opportunities are passing away; delay is madness, folly in us, cruelty to others. *Now* is the only time we can call our own; and how long will it be ere the time for distributing the Bible will close? We know not. We cannot interpret unfulfilled prophecy; we may not peer into the future. But we do know that the time is short. We are warned that it is yet a very little while, and the heavens and the earth shall be shaken, and He that shall come will come—"Behold, I come quickly." Let us, then, seize on the opportunities presented to us. If we value the privileges accorded to us, if we value the souls around us, if we would be found diligent and faithful at that day, let us strain every nerve, and take advantage of every opening, to disseminate far and wide the Word of truth uncontaminated and unchanged.

Shall we be told that, when pressing this question, we are doing the work of the priests, helping forward, though it may be in ignorance, their designs? What, doing the priest's work, when seeking to circulate Diodati only! Why, this is the very version they most cordially detest. What, doing the priests' work when wishing to stop the distribution of Martini! Why, this is the version they have recently published afresh in Tuscany, and are circulating throughout Italy, and even in Rome itself.* Such an accusation falls harmless before those at whom it is levelled, but recoils with tenfold force on the head of those who make it.

Nor let us be deterred from our course by the assertion that the errors of the Vulgate are trivial or microscopic. Is it a matter of indifference whether we believe in the utter worthlessness of all our works to justify us before God, or cling to the dogma of human merit? It is a small thing to change *e* into *a*; but that change, small as it may seem, involves tremendous consequences: it is no less than ascribing to a creature power nothing short of Divine. (Gen. iii. 15.) It may be deemed a little error to omit a preposition, but that omission is of the utmost consequence, as a command to idolatry is by that means enforced. (Ps. xcix. 5; Heb. x. 21.) In truth, no matter regarding the sacred

* In "Evangelical Christendom" for May, there is a communication from a correspondent in Rome, stating he could buy a New Testament of Martini, with notes, in a bookseller's shop, for 3s., about the same price as is asked for it in Florence, probably the same edition. We should, however, remember, that *three* shillings is, to the Italian, a more formidable sum than it is to us. When the price and the bulk of the volume is considered, we need not be surprised if the demand for it is not very great.

Scriptures is too trivial to be rectified, or too small to be noticed. To quote the words of a modern writer, speaking of the English Bible, "The notion that slight errors, and defects, and faults are immaterial, and that we need not go through the trouble of correcting them, is one main cause why there are so many huge errors, and defects, and faults in every region of human life, practical, speculative, moral, and political. Nor should any error be deemed slight which affects the meaning of a single word in the Bible, where so much weight is attached to every single word, and where so many inferences and conclusions are drawn from the slightest grounds; not merely those which find utterance in books, but a far greater number springing up in the minds of the millions to whom our English Bible is the code and canon of all truth. For this reason, errors, even the least, in a version of the Bible, are of far greater moment than in any other book, as well because the contents of the Bible are of far deeper importance, and have far wider influence, as also because the readers of the Bible are not only the educated and learned, who can exercise some sort of judgment on what they read, but vast multitudes who understand what they read according to the letter."

Again, when urging this point, some meet us with the practice of the Society for Irish Church Missions, and affirm that since that Society, so blessed of God in its work, makes use of the Douay Bible, and with great success, therefore we must not condemn, nor seek to effect an alteration in, the practice of the British and Foreign Bible Society in distributing on the Continent versions made from the Vulgate.

To this we would reply,—

1. That the same rule holds good in the case of Societies that we recognise in that of individuals—viz., that the example of any man, however good he may be, is no real guide to us; we have to act, not according to what others do, but according to what God has commanded.

2. If the Society for Irish Church Missions does distribute the Douay version of the Scriptures as a *faithful* translation of the Bible, then most assuredly, however good may be the men under whose sanction the practice prevails, that Society is countenancing many doctrinal errors.

3. But if that Society uses the Douay version to convince the Roman Catholics that even in their Bible the doctrines upheld by Protestants are plainly taught, and many of their own doctrines cannot be found,—if it uses the Douay to convince them, on the grounds which they will recognise as good, of the unscriptural character of

their Church, without compromising itself by declaring that translation a faithful version,—then the cases are not parallel, and no argument in support of the practice here condemned can be drawn from the acts of that noble Society. It is not the reference to those translations that any one can find fault with, but their being substituted for other and better versions.

One more objection must be noticed. It has been asserted that the Vulgate cannot be Popish in its tendency, because it was made by Jerome, who lived before Popery was what it now is.

This, indeed, is no argument; for certainly we do find the errors of Popery, to use the word of the objector, in the present Vulgate. The principle of the objection, however, demands a fuller notice. We have nothing to do with the private opinions of any translator of the Bible. Be he pious or not, a believer or unbeliever, our first concern is not with his *opinions*, but with his *translation*. We ask if he has faithfully performed his task. If satisfied on this point we want no more. Would Jerome, were he now alive, accept the Clementine text as his own? We think not. De Saci may have been a second Tynedale, Martini a second Savonarola, Scio a second Luther, but what matters that if the versions that bear their name and were really made by them, are neither in agreement with the original Scripture nor the Latin Vulgate, of which they *profess* to be translations. Were all the errors of the modern Vulgate placed there by Jerome we have only one proof the more of the need to abstain altogether from blindly following any man, however much reputed for learning or piety.

But how far is it correct to assert that the Clementine text is the Vulgate of Jerome? The part Jerome took in forming the Vulgate is well known. He translated the Old Testament from the Hebrew. The Psalms, however, we must remember, as we have them, were translated from the LXX, and are not Jerome's version. He revised the then existing Latin version of the New Testament by comparing it with, and correcting it by, those Greek codices which were esteemed in his day the oldest and the nearest to the original MSS. We know further, that some years after his death his version was used by the Church of Rome besides the old Latin. The question then arises, is the Vulgate now presented to us the text of Jerome?

Besides translating the Bible into Latin, Jerome has left behind other works from which we can gather his opinion on certain passages and words which we now find in the Clementine Vulgate. For instance, "egrediamur foras," "*let us go out of doors*" (Gen. iv. 8), Jerome pronounces an interpolation. We know, also, that in Heb.

i. 3, x. 12, Jerome read "sedit," *sat*, in the place of "sedet," *sits*. He blames, also, several words which are now found in the New Testament. In Matt. vi. 34, he would read *afflictio* instead of *malitia*. In Gal. i. 16, he would read *non contuli* instead of *non acquievi*. See, for further instances, Whitaker's "Disputation on Scripture," and "Willet's Synopsis Papismi," vol. i. Without insisting on the last two examples cited from the New Testament, because since Jerome only revised that part of Scripture, he might have left many words which, though they did not please him, yet he did not feel justified in correcting; the three other instances cited should make us examine the question. Now, from the fact that in these passages Jerome did not read with the present Clementine Vulgate, and that, as regards Gen. iv. 8, the modern reading was extant and well known in his day, we must conclude that his version has been altered not only by the ignorance or carelessness of copyists, by which means the reading of Heb. i. 3, x. 12 probably arose, but also that it has been altered from a desire to correct his version by older readings.*

We must account, then, for the present text in one of two ways—either to suppose that it is not Jerome's, because it differs in several places from him, or (which is the more probable) to believe that his version has been corrected by the old Latin. This latter supposition commends itself; for, 1st, It has been the universal opinion, in the Western Church, for many centuries before the Reformation, that the Vulgate, as then received, was Jerome's version. And, 2d, because we possess in the "Codex Amiatinus," which is said to be the nearest approach to Jerome's text now extant, a general agreement with the Clementine text, though it corrects that text in at least 2,000 places, and exhibits a most important agreement with the oldest and best Greek copies in opposition to the more modern Greek Testament. This is just what we might have expected from Jerome's version; because, as has been said above, he used for his revision the oldest and best Greek codices he could find. Admitting, then, that the present Clementine Vulgate is Jerome's version, altered by the insertion of readings from the old Latin, as well as the errors of copyists, we should pause to ascertain how far the best authenticated MSS. of Jerome's version support the Clementine text before we father on him all the errors which are charged against the modern Vulgate.

But supposing that there never had existed a separate Latin version

* Cassiodorus is mentioned as having been the innocent cause of mixing the text of Jerome with the old Latin, by causing the two texts to be written in parallel columns, that the old version might be corrected by the Vulgate.—Horne's *Intro.*, vol. ii., p. 236.

beside that of Jerome, yet even then we could not be sure that the present text of the Vulgate is the text of Jerome. For the Vulgate has been so many times revised ; 1st, As early as the time of Charlemagne, at whose request, considering the corrupt state of the text, Alcuin revised it, by comparing the copies then in use with others that were reckoned old and good. Again, in the eleventh century, Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, attempted a revision from other Latin copies, in connexion with other learned men of his day. The result of their labours did not probably get known much beyond England. In the twelfth century Cardinal Nicolaus revised the existing text from Latin MSS. When printing was invented, and the Vulgate was first published about the year 1462, the corruption of the text became so manifest that several editions were published with various readings—one by Adrianus Gumelli, Paris, 1504 ; another by Alb. Castellanus (Venet.), 1511 ; the Franciscan Petrus (Brescia, 1496) ; and the Editors of the “Complutensian Polyglott” attempted to issue more correct editions—these, however, were chiefly corrected by means of the original text. So, also, Robert Stephanus, who superintended eight editions. The learned Catholic Jean Benoist (Paris, 1541), and Isidor Clarius (Venet., 1542), executed their editions in the same way ; and still the latter complained of the numerous errors with which the text abounded. On the 17th March, 1546, a Commission, under the presidency of Archbishop Filhol, which had been commanded to report on the state of the text, declared that it was in such a dreadful condition that the Pope alone was competent to correct it.* Hence arose the authentic editions of Sixtus V., and afterwards of Clement VIII., the present authorized version of the Church of Rome. See Hävernicks “Introduction to the Old Testament.”

Surely in this question our course is plain. We should circulate as God's Word only what we know is his Word. Are we afraid that the simple Word will fail to take effect ? What says the Bible ?—“Is not my word like as a fire ? saith the Lord ; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces ?” (Jer. xxiii. 29.) And, “The word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” (Heb. iv. 12.) Do we fear that the people to whom we offer it will refuse it ? That is not our affair. We have a duty to perform to

* This statement may mean that the various readings were so numerous, and their nature but little known.

God as well as to them. Their acceptance or rejection of it rests not with us, but with themselves: it is entirely a matter between God and them. But we act too much as if we thought it a matter between us and them. We charge ourselves not only with the responsibility of giving them the Bible, but also with the responsibility of their rejecting it. It is our duty, indeed, to see that no hindrance is placed in their way, by any act of ours; that our lives are in harmony with the precepts of the Bible; that our teaching agrees with the doctrine there set forth. But surely here our responsibility in the matter ends. We are only agents, evangelists, to carry forth the Gospel to the ends of the earth. We must speak and teach and circulate the truth, whether men will hear or whether they will forbear. What was the conduct of the apostles and disciples in this matter? In the instruction given by our Lord to the seventy disciples we find the following, "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet." (Matt. x. 14.) They were not to alter one jot of their message to suit the varied caprices of the men they might meet. They were to declare the message as they received it, leaving it to their hearers to receive or reject it.* In a similar way did the apostles act afterwards. See Paul at Antioch. Did he for one moment accede to the desires of the Judaizing Christians? By no means. What was his language to the Galatians? "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed. For do I now persuade men, or God? or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." (Gal. i. 8—10.) What God has declared, that we must speak; what God has revealed, that we must deliver. What should we think of the ambassador who departed from the peremptory instructions he had received, in deference to the scruples or the whim of the Court to which he was accredited? And what are we but ambassadors for God, agents in his work, labourers in his vineyard? We cannot—shall we not say, we *dare* not?—alter one jot, one letter of his Word.†

But let us look at the case in a different point of view. The

* So the words of our Lord—"He that hath ears to hear let him hear," seem to imply.

† In a pamphlet just published, entitled, "Romish Versions of the Bible," the reader will find all the arguments urged in support of the present practice of the Bible Society, well met and answered.

Bible Society is a Missionary Society, and a missionary Society of the highest order.

We can send forth the Bible alone on its mission, at once of conquest and of peace. We have no fear of its encouraging Antinomianism on the one side, or legality on the other. Neither superstition nor infidelity will find countenance in its pages. The harmony of truth will, we know, be maintained. No favourite doctrine will be magnified. No important or necessary truth kept back. Above all, no compromise will be admitted. The eye of man may not mark its progress, nor the ear be startled by the sound of its approach, but though silently, yet not the less surely, it does its work. And a conflict is going on wherever it is received; a conflict far greater, and involving far more momentous consequences than ever were settled in an earthly battle-field, for the whole powers of hell are arrayed against it. No earthly revolution so complete, or so effectual, has ever been accomplished. By it thrones are overturned, and provinces wrested from the grasp of a despotic and insatiable tyrant. By means of it men are changed, their passions subdued; that which the cleverest man or the greatest tyrant could never do, it has full often accomplished. We know the cause of its success, for "the sword of the Spirit is the Word of God." But as we condemn, and justly, those Jesuit missionaries who, to make their mission more acceptable, engrafted heathen superstitions on Christian truth; so, to be consistent, must we condemn all attempts to disseminate versions of the Scriptures which contain errors most pleasing and acceptable to those among whom they are circulated.

Have we magnified the evil? If any think so, let them read the following extract of a sermon preached by Dr. Bentley before the University of Cambridge, in which, speaking of enhancing the authority of the Vulgate above the Greek original of the New Testament, he thus delivers himself:—"What can I better begin with than what our text suggests—their enhancing the authority of the Vulgar Latin above the Greek original?—so that we must search for St. Paul's meaning here, not in the notion of *καπηλείοντες*, but of *adulterantes*—not of *οἱ πολλοὶ*, but of *multi*, without its article; an original defect in the Latin tongue. Now, can anything be more absurd, more shocking to common sense, than that the stream should rise above the fountain? That a verbal translation, which, were the author of it inspired, must yet from the very nature of language, have several defects and ambiguities; that such a translation, I say, by a private, unknown*

* Bentley must be understood here as speaking of the old Latin version of the New Testament, which Jerome revised.

person, not pretending to inspiration, should be raised and advanced above the inspired Greek? Is it possible, those that enacted this, could believe it themselves? Nor could they suggest, that the first Greek exemplar had been more injured by the transcribers and notaries, than that of their version. More ancient manuscripts were preserved of this, than they could show for the Latin. There were more, and more learned commentators to guard it: no age of the Eastern empire without eminent scholars; while the West lay sunk many centuries under ignorance and barbarity. And yet, in defiance of all this, the Latin is to be the umpire and standard; and the Apostles to speak more authentically in that conveyance, than in their own words. Nay, a particular edition shall be legitimated and consecrated, with condemnation of all various readings; and two Popes, with equal pretence to infallibility, shall each sanctify a different copy with ten thousand variations." (Wordsworth's "Ecclesiastical Biography," vol. i., p. 148.)

Before concluding, we must notice the recent attempt of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge to settle this question, by publishing revised editions of translations made from the Vulgate.* The language selected on which to make the experiment was the Spanish, and the translation that of Bishop Torres Amat. This step is of great importance, in a twofold point of view,—

1. Because it is a candid admission by the Committee of that Society that the errors of the Vulgate, and of the translations made from it, are not so trivial as some would have us believe, and that the original Scriptures, to which this revised Bible is made more conformable, must be the ultimate standard of appeal.

2. This step is important, because it demonstrates the impossibility of making these translations conformable to the original Scriptures without almost translating them afresh. It is true that the glaring errors of the Vulgate are by this means expunged; but it must be confessed that this method of settling the question is by no means a happy one; for if we once admit the expediency or the principle of revising translations made from the Vulgate, we must abandon all idea of upholding that version. For the only ground for circulating these translations is, that the Roman Catholics are more willing to receive them than others which are more faithful. But this ground is effectually cut away from us when we give them a revised version, with the chief distinctive peculiarities of the Vulgate amended. It ceases to be a translation of the Vulgate, without becoming a transla-

* In the Appendix No. 2 will be found some quotations from this revised Bible, to show how far this attempt has succeeded.

tion of the originals. It can show no authority for itself as a whole, for while in some cases it agrees with the originals, in others it yet bears the impress of the Vulgate. It ceases to be Scripture. It is only a compilation of Scripture. We may revise a version made from the originals as often as we like, and its value will be enhanced in proportion as it exhibits more faithfully the words and teaching of the real Word of God. But a revised edition of a translation made from the Vulgate is depreciated in value by just so much as it ceases to bear the distinctive peculiarities of its original. Clearly, therefore, this compromise cannot be countenanced. There is no middle way by which to reconcile all differences, and retain both translations. Either the Vulgate or the originals must be our standard. There is no other source.

If we undertake, in *any* degree, to be the harbingers of the Gospel of peace, the heralds of the truth, we must deliver our message in its integrity. We cannot shelter ourselves from the responsibility which rests on us of faithfully rendering and transmitting to others the written revelation of God's will. To say that we are not translators, but disseminators of the Bible, will not avail; for we are clearly responsible for *all* that we circulate. We are certainly bound to ascertain that the goods we warrant as genuine are indeed so. We shall be held accountable for our doings. Nor can we plead as an excuse the practice of some of the Reformers, who used the Vulgate, quoted the Vulgate, and even through its instrumentality were brought to see the truth. They used that version which was best known and best understood. They used the best means they had. Let us imitate them in spirit, and use the best means we possess, the most faithful revision we can find. If we undertake to supply men with Bibles, we undertake to give them a true Bible, and a true Bible we must give, leaving them to reject or accept it. Their conduct cannot excuse us, though ours may be an excuse for them. But, to return to the British and Foreign Bible Society, do we not stand condemned by its first rule, which declares that the authorized version *alone* is to be circulated in Great Britain? Why omit the Douay, to which a large number of our fellow-countrymen look up, unless it be an unsound and erroneous version? Why prohibit the circulation of translations from the Vulgate in England and encourage them abroad, if there are no differences of importance?

It cannot be urged in support of this rule that the Douay version is erroneous; for it is not worse, and perhaps not so bad, as others which are circulated by us abroad. It cannot be pleaded that we bow here to the feeling of the majority, who are Protestants; for abroad we

circulate in most countries of western Europe two opposite versions, even where the majority of the people are Roman Catholics. Besides, if this plea were admitted, we ought in common fairness to furnish an edition of the Douay for Ireland. Nor can we shelter ourselves from the charge of inconsistency by urging the existence at home of our authorized version ; for the existence of an authorized version, however good it may be, is no reason, in itself, for precluding the circulation of other versions, where it is not received as correct.* If, then, we circulate abroad versions which it is thought may more readily be accepted by the Roman Catholics, we ought, in common fairness, to act in a similar spirit here. If expediency is a valid argument for our conduct abroad, it must be equally valid for our conduct at home. We must act at home as we act abroad, or act abroad as we act at home. The same argument applies for the adoption of the Douay here, as applies for the adoption of other translations of the Vulgate abroad. May we not be charged with a further inconsistency ?

In the last Report of the Society's operations we find the following words:—"Many foes yet wage a deadly warfare against the circulation of the Word of God. But the weapon that we wield is too strong for them. That blade is of heavenly temper, and no man can turn its edge ; it is of power to subdue the nations of the earth and to slay the enmity of an apostate world." These are noble sentiments, worthy of a Bible Society, conscious at once of the justness of its cause and the source of its strength. But let us ask ourselves, are we acting in the spirit of these professions ? If we believe that nothing can withstand the might of God's Word, why seek to curry favour with the opposers of that Word ? If we believe that none can turn the edge of the heavenly blade, why mix the clay of human error with the iron of Divine truth ? If we believe that the Bible can subdue the nations of the earth and slay the enmity of an apostate world, why seek the assistance of those opposed to it ? Why resort to the miserable subterfuge of expediency ? True it is that our work will ever be imperfectly performed, because much of human imperfection is mingled with our best performances. But if we believe in the invincible character and ultimate triumph of God's Word, why should we act as if we needed to conciliate our open enemies ? Let us act differently from henceforth ; let us resolve by God's grace, in dependance on the Divine assistance, to raise our practice to a level with our profession.

Should it be necessary to plead with a Bible Society in behalf of

* In Holland, where the translation made by order of the States-General is considered the authorized version of the Dutch Church, the Bible Society circulates with it Schurin's translation; made for Roman Catholics.

the Bible? Must we confess that the common courtesy claimed by friends, and extended to enemies, of not intentionally misinterpreting their words, is denied to this Book? * Shall the Word which shall judge us at the last day be thus treated with indifference? Shall the revelation made by God in mercy to a ruined world be made to speak diametrically opposite to that which He has declared? Shall what is most hateful to Him be confirmed as truth? Shall his honour be given to another? Oh! let us remember the work we have undertaken to perform. Must we supplicate—shall we not rather demand—that the Bible be placed in its *true* position, that the Word of God be our guide, and as a Bible Society, organised to circulate his truth, that our principles and actions be deduced from and made conformable to the words of Divine revelation. Let us rise to the greatness of our task. Let all erroneous versions be for ever banished, and believing that the work we have undertaken is the work of God, and agreeable to his will, in humble and prayerful dependance on Him for aid and success, no longer bidding for man's favour by countenancing in any way self-righteousness, let us, in the words of the book we circulate, "go in the strength of the Lord God, making mention of his righteousness, even of his only."

* A protest against disseminating erroneous versions was last year presented to the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society from the chief officers and others of the Plymouth Auxiliary. The answer returned was far from satisfactory. It is time that the question should be really looked into. If the Committee are unwilling in this matter, are the majority of subscribers equally immovable? We may not be critics, but if we undertake the responsibility we constitute ourselves critics; for we circulate some versions and not others, we make a choice of versions.

APPENDIX, No. 1.

THE SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE TRANSLATION OF THE VULGATE.

IN a former pamphlet, entitled "The New Testament and its Translations," it was shown that the versions of Martini and De Saci, made from the Vulgate, contained many errors in doctrine, which make them unfaithful exponents of Divine truth. It will be a fitting sequel to this pamphlet to examine (though it must be briefly) the Spanish and Portuguese versions, made from the Vulgate. By this means the English reader will be able to form some idea of the versions made from the Vulgate, in these four languages, and arrive at the conclusion that, though they may differ in the quantity of error they contain, yet each and all teach many things contrary to God's Word.

In the Spanish language, of versions made from the original, there exists one by Cyprian de Valera, published at Amsterdam in the year 1602. He is said to have revised an earlier one, made by Cassiodore de Reyna, from the original Scriptures (though assistance was derived from the Latin versions of Pagninus and Leo Juda), in the year 1569. Of versions made from the Vulgate there exist two which are in use, one by Don Phelipe Scio de San Miguel (subsequently appointed Bishop of Segovia), first published in 1793—4, in ten folio volumes. Another translation from the Vulgate appeared in 1824, by Bishop Torres Amat, of which some account is given in the following Appendix.

Of Portuguese versions there exist one, made by Joao Ferreira d'Almeida, in 1748—53, and another, made from the Vulgate, by Antonio Pereira, and first published as a whole in 1783.

The following remarks are confined *exclusively* to the Spanish version of Scio, and the Portuguese version of Pereira, as printed and published by the Bible Society.

The reader must be informed that the edition of Pereira's Bible adopted by the British and Foreign Bible Society is the second. It received his latest corrections, though he died before it was all published. Between the two editions there are great differences, and all apparently in favour of the second. It may be well to note some of them. Acts xiii. 2:—In the first edition we read, "At the time when they were *offering the sacrifice* to the Lord." This attempt to give a scriptural basis for the mass is very properly corrected in the second edition. 1 Cor. x. 19:—"That the idol is anything" is omitted in the first edition. Exod. xxi. 16:—"He that shall steal a man, a *Hebrew*." This interpolation, favouring slavery, the second edition omits. I should add

that I am chiefly indebted for the remarks on the Portuguese translation, and the instances cited, to a pamphlet published some years ago by the Trinitarian Bible Society, for the special purpose of exposing the errors of Pereira's Bible.

1st. *These versions exalt unduly the Virgin Mary.*

Gen. iii. 15. *Scio*.—Enemistades pondré entre tí y la muger, y entre tu lineage y su lineage: ella quebrantarà tu cabeza, y tú pondrás asechanzas á su calcañar.

I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and between thy lineage and her lineage; she shall break thy head, and thou shalt place ambushments for her heel.

Gen. iii. 15. *Pereira*.—Eu porei inimizadas entre ti, e a mulher; entre a tua posteridade, e a sua d'ella. Ella te pizará a cabeça, e tu armarás traições ao seu calcanhar.

I will put enmities between thee and the woman, between thy posterity and hers. SHE shall bruise, &c.

The word *posteridade* is feminine, and hence an ambiguity might arise as to whether the woman or her seed might be meant by the feminine pronoun *Ella*; but all ambiguity is cleared away by "d'ella" in the preceding clause, which restricts the sense to the woman, and not to her seed; hence the Roman Catholic reader would at once understand it of the Virgin, not of our Lord.* (See the pamphlet noticed above.)

Luke i. 28. *Scio*.—Dios te salve, llena de gracia.

God save you, full of grace.

Luke i. 28. *Pereira*.—Deos te salve, cheia de graça.

God save you, full of grace.

The Virgin is further honoured by *mother* being written, in some places, with a capital m. "La *Madre*," and not "*madre*." (*Scio*.) John ii. 1, 3, 5; xix. 25, 26, 27.

Pereira.—"Mäi," instead of "mäi." Matt. xii. 48, 49; xiii. 55. Mark iii. 31, 32, 33. Luke i. 43; ii. 48, 51. John ii. 1, 3, 5. There seems no rule for this peculiarity, as it will be seen that, in some places (John xix.), *Scio* writes "*Madre*," while *Pereira* has "mäi;" and, in others, *Pereira* writes "Mäi," while *Scio* has "*madre*." But this peculiarity is most objectionable, because it seems an attempt to place the Virgin on a level with God. "Padre" and "Pai" are used when the reference is to God the Father. To write "*Madre*" and "Mäi" seems to (and to the ignorant Romanist would) imply that they were on an equality, or, at least, that she was more than a mere woman. It may be objected that this peculiarity is not universal. But if it is not needed in one place, it cannot be needed in another; while it may lead ignorant people into error. Proper names and offices are, in these

* In an appeal to the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society by Dr. Tregelles, recently published, the reader is cautioned against supposing Valera to have fallen into the same mistake because he uses the pronoun *Ella*. For the word for seed which he employs is feminine, and he adds a note to explain this, lest any should think that he intended to apply the pronoun to the Virgin. The same remark applies to the revised version of Torres Amat. The feminine pronoun refers to "raza."

versions, written generally with capitals, but not the relationships of life; and, further, this peculiarity is restricted to the mother of our Lord. Neither Scio nor Pereira appear to use it to express either mother in general, or the mother of any one else in particular.*

2. *The worship of created things is countenanced.*

Scio.—Y adorad el estrado de sus pies, porque es santo. Psalm xcvi. 5.

And *worship the place of his feet*, for it is holy. So Pereira.

Scio.—Y adoró la altura de su vara. Heb. xi. 21.

And he (Jacob) *worshipped the top of his staff*.

Pereira.—E adorou a summidade da sua vara.

And *worshipped the top of his staff*. Heb. xi. 21.

An attempt has been made to defend the Portuguese rendering by supposing that *a* here stands for the preposition. But it is the article. Were the preposition expressed, it would be blended with the article and written *á*; as Heb. x. 38:—“*Não agrada á minha alma,*” he will not please my soul. But supposing the preposition were intended, the Portuguese version would still be wrong. See Rev. xxii. 9:—“*Adora a Deos,*” worship God; and hence the words above must be rendered, “*worshipped the top of his staff.*”

3. *Human merit is exalted.*

Scio.—Para que durmiendo en su ropa, te bendiga, y tengas mérito delante del Señor Dios tuyo.

That, sleeping in his apparel, he may bless thee, and thou mayest *have merit* before the Lord thy God. Deut. xxiv. 13.

Pereira.—A fim de que elle dormindo na sua roupa, te abençoe, e tu tenhas merecimento de justo diante do Senhor teu Deus.

And thou mayest have *the merit of a righteous man* before the Lord thy God.

Do not these translations attribute more to the man who restores the pledged garment, according to God's command, than the original warrants?

Scio.—Redime tus pecados con limosnas, y tus maldades exercitando la misericordia con los pobres. Dan. iv. 24.

Redeem thy sins by alms, and thy iniquities by exercising mercy to the poor.

Pereira.—Rime os teus peccados com esmolas, e as tuas iniquidades com obras de misericordia para com os pobres. (Dan. iv. 24.)

Redeem thy sins with alms, and thy iniquities *with works of mercy* to the poor.

Pereira.—Porque com taes offrendas he que Deos se dá por obrigado. (Heb. xiii. 16.)

For with such offerings *God gives himself for obliged*—*i. e.*, is obliged.

Scio.—Y le fuéron dados muchos perfumes, para que pusiese de las oraciones de todos los Santos sobre el altar de oro, que estaba ante el throno de Dios. Y subió el humo de los perfumes de las oraciones de los Santos, &c. (Rev. viii. 3, 4.)

And there was given to him much incense, that he should *put the prayers*

* Matt. xii. 50 cannot be quoted as an exception to this rule; for our Lord is there declaring that every one who does his Father's will He regards with the same affection and love that we are wont to extend to our relations according to the flesh.

of all the Saints on the altar of gold, which was before the throne of God. And the smoke of *the perfumes of the prayers* of the Saints ascended from the hand of the angel before God.

Pereira.—E lhe forão dados muitos perfumes, das orações de todos os Santos, para que os pozesse sobre o altar de ouro, que estava ante o Throno de Deos. E subio o fumo dos perfumes das orações dos Santos, da mão do Anjo diante de Deos. (Rev. viii. 3, 4.)

And there was given him much perfume *of* the prayers of all the saints, in order that he should place them on the altar of gold, which was before the throne of God. And the smoke of the perfumes of the prayers of the saints ascended from the hand of the angel before God.

Pereira.—E de vos presentardes com confiança diante do Filho do Homem. (Luke xxi. 36.)

And of presenting yourselves *with confidence* before the Son of Man.

Pereira.—Mas não acho o meio de o fazer perfeitamente. (Rom. vii. 18.)

But I find not the means of doing it *perfectly*.

In the following instance Scio is also wrong:—

Scio.—Para que no hagais todas las cosas que quisiéreis. (Gal. v. 17.)

So that ye may not do *all* the things that ye would. ●

Pereira.—Para que não façais todas aquellas cousas que quereis. (Gal. v. 17.)

In order that ye may not do *all* these things that ye wish.

4. *The complete depravity of man is not always fully expressed.*

Scio.—Que todos los pensamientos del corazon eran inclinados al mal en todo tiempo. (Gen. vi. 5.)

That *all the thoughts of the heart* were always inclined to evil.

Pereira.—Que todos os pensamentos dos seus corações em todo o tempo erão applicados ao mal.

That *all the thoughts of their hearts* were turned to evil always.

Scio.—Torcido es el corazon de todos, é impenetrable. (Jer. xvii. 9.)

The heart of *all* is perverse and impenetrable.

Pereira.—Depravado he o coração de todos, e impenetravel.

The heart of *all* is depraved and impenetrable.

5. *Purgatory is countenanced.*

Scio.—En el que tambien fué á predicar á aquellos espíritus, que estaban en cárcel.

. he went and preached to those spirits *which were* in prison. (1 Pet. iii. 19.)

Pereira.— foi prégar aos espiritos, que estavam no carcere. (1 Pet. iii. 19.)

He went to preach to the spirits *which were* in the prison.

Pereira.—Que não succeda virem tambem elles parar a este lugar de tormentos. (Luke xvi. 28.) “Lest they also come *to stop*, to this place of torment.” *To stop* is an interpolation, which implies that they might go there for a time, without remaining for ever.

6. *Marriage is called a sacrament.*

Scio.—Este Sacramento es grande. (Ephes. v. 32.)

This sacrament is great.

Pereira.—Este Sacramento he grande.

This sacrament is great.

Will it be attempted to excuse this translation on the plea that it only follows the Vulgate? It is true that the Vulgate here uses the word "sacramentum," a translation which is the source of this error; but in that version there are several other places where *sacramentum* is used for *mysterium*. The translations of Scio and Pereira have not followed, and very wisely, the Vulgate in *all* these passages. For instance, Ephes. i. 9, in Pereira's version, we have *segredo*, secret; Scio has *sacramento*. In Col. i. 27, Rev. i. 20, xvii. 7, "sacramentum" of the Vulgate is translated in both versions by "*mysterio*." Now, since the only ground for marriage being called a sacrament is the translation of the Vulgate in Ephes. v. 32, it follows that in every place where *sacramentum* is used, it should be rendered "sacramento." But, since this is not done, we have a tacit confession that *sacramentum* in this place does not mean a sacrament in the ecclesiastical sense of the word, but only a *mystery*, as Scio and Pereira in the other places so render it.

In Ephes. iii. 3, 9, 1 Tim. iii. 16, the "sacramentum" of the Vulgate is retained in both these versions. "By revelation he hath made known to me the sacrament," and "to manifest to all what may be the communication of the sacrament," "great is the sacrament of piety."

It is worthy of remark, that while in both versions "Sacramento" in Eph. v. 32 is printed with a capital S, the same word in 1 Tim. iii. 16 is printed with a small s. In Eph. iii. 3, 9, while Scio has "sacramento," Pereira has "Sacramento." Why this difference of letters? Why a capital S in one place and not in another?—unless to intimate that the sacrament in its ecclesiastical sense is intended by the Apostle. However, it may be pleaded that the words are thus printed in the edition first published in Spain and Portugal respectively, should a Bible Society, instituted by Protestants and supported by Protestants, give any countenance to such ideas?

While on this subject, the translation of Heb. xiii. 4 may be noticed:—

Scio.—Sea honesto en todos el matrimonio. Let marriage be (*accounted*) *honest* in all. This fails to express either the force of the original Greek or the Latin. "Honorabilis" can hardly be translated by "honesto." The translation of Pereira falls still more short:—"Seja por todos tratado com honra o matrimonio"—"Let marriage be treated by all with honour." Should we learn from this that all might marry?

7. *Honour is given to the priests.*

Pereira.—Pelo motivo de que não terião d'alli em diante consciencia de peccado algum os Ministros, que huma vez fossem purificados. (Heb. x. 2.)

Because that *the ministers*, once purified, should have no more conscience of any sin.

The insertion of *ministers* here is entirely without warrant, and can only be to exalt the priesthood in the eyes of the people.

8. *Canonical hours are countenanced, and the apocryphal apostolic canons mentioned.*

Scio.—"Hora de terciã," hour of *terce*; "hora de sexta," hour of *sixth*, "hora de nona," hour of *none*. (Mark xv. 25, 33, 34; so also Matt. xx. 3, 5, 6, 9.) In these two latter verses we read "hora de vísperas," the hour of *vespers*, for the eleventh hour. (So also Acts ii. 15; iii. 1; x. 3, 9, 30; John xix. 14.)

Pereira translates many of these passages like *Scio*, but not all.* For instance, in Matt. xx. 3, we have "junto da terceira hora," about the *third* hour, so Acts ii. 15; "da hora sexta," *sixth* hour; Matt. xx. 5, 6, 9, John xix. 14.

These variations in the translation of the same words prove that there is no need to resort to the present ecclesiastical phrase of canonical hours to express the time at which the events spoken of took place.

Pereira.—Ordenando—lhes que guardassem os Canones dos Apostolos, e dos Presbyteros. (Acts xv. 41.) Commanding them that they should keep *the canons* of the Apostles and Presbyters. Were there no such writings extant as those called Apostolical Canons, this translation would matter little; but since the Church of Rome has before now appealed to them in proof of the antiquity of her practice, this attempt to introduce the mention of them into God's Word deserves notice.

9. *The dogma of penance is taught.*

Scio.—Y él hiciere penitencia de su pecado, y obras de equidad, y de justicia. † (Ezek. xxxiii. 14.)

And he *shall do penance* for his sin, and works of mercy and of justice.

Pereira.—E elle fizer penitencia do seu peccado.

And he *shall do penance* for his sin.

There is no need to translate the Hebrew עָוֹן in this way; for in verse 11, where the same phrase occurs, "evil way" being substituted for "sin," no such objectionable phrase is used in the translations. It cannot therefore be needed.

In 2 Chron. vi. 24 and 37, Solomon in his prayer is made to say, "If thy people *do penance*, in the land of their captivity, then pardon their sins." The word in Hebrew is the same as above. In verse 24 both *Scio* and *Pereira* have inserted "*do penance*" without any necessity, for they thus translate "y convertidos hicieron penitencia," "and being converted *shall do penance*;" thus making two acts to express the one Hebrew word, which is well expressed by the first act, "return, be converted."

In chap. vii. 14, where we read of God's gracious answer to this prayer, *Pereira* makes the Lord to say, "and shall *do penance* for their wicked way." *Scio*, however, used the better word "arrepentir." That this word well expresses the Hebrew עָוֹן, and is quite capable of conveying the meaning intended, *change of mind*, may be seen by reference to Jerem. xviii. 8, 10,

* Is there any reason for printing "hora de Terça," "hora de Sexta," "hora de Nona," with capitals, whereas "da terceira hora," &c., are printed without capitals?

† By making "obras de equidad y de justicia" (works of equity and justice) to be governed by the word "hiciere," *shall do*, the idea of penance, some outward act, seems more clearly implied.

where the repentance of man and of God are both expressed by this word in Spanish and Portuguese.

What is true of the Hebrew is equally true of the Greek *μετανοεῖν*; though in very many places we find "Hacer penitencia" and "Fazer penitencia." Yet in Luke xvii. 3 and Acts iii. 19 both Spanish and Portuguese agree in substituting "arrepentir" and "arrepender" for "hacer penitencia" and "fazer penitencia."*

10. *The sacrifice of the mass is countenanced.*

Scio.—Será derramada, "shall be shed" (Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24; Luke xxii. 20); será entregado, "shall be delivered" (1 Cor. xi. 24). So *Pereira*. This rendering opens a door to the sacrifice of the mass; for if our Lord spoke of the future, when shall it be said that the sacrifice has been offered? But that there is no need of the future rendering is plain from Luke xxii. 19, where *Scio* has "es dado" (*is given*), and *Pereira* "se dá" (*gives itself*, or, *is given*); while the Greek construction is the same in all the passages.

Pereira still further countenances the mass by the use of "hostia" (Heb. x. 12) for "sacrifice;" *Scio* more correctly uses "sacrificio."

To these let there be added two passages bearing on the Scripture. *Scio*.—"Toda escritura divinamente inspirada es útil para enseñar" (2 Tim. iii. 16), (All divinely inspired Scripture *is* useful for teaching). So *Pereira*. The proper translation of this passage in the Greek is disputed. There is, however, in Hebrews a similar construction (iv. 13), "πάντα δὲ γυμνὰ καὶ τετραχλισμένα," which is translated "all things are naked *and* open," not "all things naked are open." So in 2 Tim., καὶ before ὠφέλιμος should not be changed into a verb, as is done in the Vulgate and other versions, but be considered as a conjunction. (Rev. i. 3.) *Scio*.—El que lee y oye. So *Pereira*, "He who reads and hears." The blessing is not so restricted in the original, but extends to all *who hear*.

Here we might stop. Sufficient has been adduced to show the objectionable character of these versions. Will it be argued that they translate from the Vulgate, and, therefore, they must of necessity follow that version in its errors? This is no reason, no excuse for such errors. In some places, as we have seen, they have departed from the translation of the Vulgate; for instance, as regards the word "sacramentum." There is quite enough of independence in these translations to prevent their being defended on such grounds. It will be well to point out a few places where they differ both from the Vulgate and the originals. In Matt. xvi. 25 we read in *Scio*, "Porque el que su alma quisiere salvar, la perderá" (For he that shall wish

* That these phrases cannot be considered synonymous, the following anecdote will show:—A missionary, speaking to a Spaniard about the Bible, asked him what idea he attached to the phrases, "hacer penitencia" and "arrepentir." "The two are very different," he replied. "If," said he, "I am to do penance, I may act as I have seen many a man do, viz., take a long piece of rope, and twist it around my body next to my skin, and let it remain until I had endured a certain amount of suffering, or torture myself in some other way. But if I am to repent, I must forsake my sins."

to save his *soul* shall lose it); so *Pereira*. In the latter half of the verse the same mistake occurs of using *alma* for *vida*, which makes the sense still more (if we may say so) absurd.

In Col. ii. 18, "Affectando en humildad dar culto á los angeles;" *Scio*, "affecting in humility to worship the angels;" it should be "affecting humility *and* worshipping of angels." *Pereira* is right here.

Acts xviii. 27.—"Fué de mucho provecho á los que habian creido," was of *much profit* to those who had believed.—*Scio*; so *Pereira*. *Through grace* is omitted in the Vulgate, and hence in these translations.

Let each one after reading these pages ask himself, what is his duty in this matter? Can we conscientiously circulate these versions as being God's word? It is of no use to shift the responsibility from our shoulders, for assuredly all who associate in the work of Bible distribution make themselves by that act responsible for the Bibles distributed. Nor let us, while acquiescing in the evil of disseminating Roman Catholic errors as Bible truth, sit down with the quiet assurance that the Committee of the Society are alone concerned in this matter. All are concerned in it. The Committee is but the exponent of the general feeling of the Society. To an appeal lately made to them they have returned an answer declining to act as the memorialists suggested.* The subscribers must therefore do their part in vigorously remonstrating till the change is made. We would not wish to engage in any proceeding which may appear to be a factious opposition to the Committee. Far be it from us to ask or even wish others to take a part in any such proceedings. But there seems no alternative. Either we must acquiesce in the present system of giving two versions in the same language teaching very different doctrines as equally the true Word of God, or if we believe that *one* of these translations contradicts the truth, we must oppose by every means in our power its further distribution.

All have some degree of influence. Let each one use the influence he possesses. Let each auxiliary make its voice of remonstrance to be heard. Let each branch come forward, boldly protesting against the continued circulation of error instead of truth. Let all unite in the common cause, and the result will not be uncertain. Where prayer is systematically and on principle excluded, how can we hope that affairs will be conducted aright? What right have we to hope that if we fail to seek God's direction and blessing on our labours He will direct and keep us from error? Let, then, all who desire a better state of things, all who value a pure Gospel, all who love his word, all who seek the salvation of others unite as one man in the common cause, seek wisdom and grace in prayer that their efforts may be directed aright, that this anomalous state of things may be arrested, that the word of the *Lord* be henceforth the object of our work, that the Bibles issued by the Society be no longer corrupted by man's additions or inventions, and that when any nation of Europe wants the pure Word of God it may be supplied without a moment's hesitation and the Society be not again in the humiliating condition it at

* See "The Versions of Holy Scripture for Roman Catholic Countries;" an appeal to the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, by S. P. Tregelles, LL.D.

present is of finding itself still unable, though more than a twelvemonth has elapsed, to comply with the earnest request of a people in Europe who, rejecting the translation made from the Vulgate (the only version hitherto supplied to them), desire to read and study God's Word by the aid of a faithful translation which has existed for more than 200 years, and which is the only translation in their language now extant made from the original Scriptures.

We must remember that our work does not only consist in endeavouring by all lawful means to introduce the Scriptures into other countries, we should also provide that any stranger speaking one of the 152 languages into which the Bible has been translated, should be able, if willing, when he visits our shores, to procure for himself or others a faithful translation in his own tongue. However difficult it may be to introduce faithful versions into some countries, there is no hindrance to our having them in our own. But have we them in *all* these languages? Notwithstanding the many million copies of God's Word in the 152 languages which this Society has been the privileged and honoured instrument of distributing—notwithstanding the large income every year received—notwithstanding the great interest taken in its work by large numbers of Christians in this and other countries—and notwithstanding the many years it has been permitted to carry on its work and to send forth ship-loads of Bibles to distant parts of the globe, Spaniards cannot yet procure for themselves in this free and Protestant country a copy of the Bible free from Romish error. Surely this fact, astounding as it is, should humble us not a little. While we have been permitted to send thousands and tens of thousand copies to China, while the Sandwich Islander, till recently a heathen, sunk in the grossest idolatry, whilst the New Zealander in his forests, and the Esquimaux in his ice-bound country, can read for themselves, in their own tongue, the glad tidings of redemption, the Spaniard, and the Mexican, and the large Spanish-speaking population of South America, cannot yet receive from the British and Foreign Bible Society any other version than that by Scio.

It is but lately that a Mexican, who had been led by the providence of God to visit our shores, was brought into contact with a missionary, and his heart was opened to receive the things spoken to him by the messenger of God. He heard for the first time, in his own tongue, the Ten Commandments, and, while listening to them with eager interest, the remembrance of his former idolatrous worship in his own land came vividly over him. He was quite overcome. Before leaving England he desired to have a Bible, that he might take it to Mexico for the use of his parents, and brothers and sisters. The Society had not then, it has not now, any version of the whole Bible, but that of Scio; so the missionary was forced to give that, though well aware of its errors. However, through the instrumentality of some other Society (should it not rather have been of the British and Foreign Bible Society?) he was supplied with a copy of Valera's Testament. But this is not the only case which has lately occurred. When a body of emancipated slaves visited one of our sea-port towns, on their way to Africa

some time last summer, they were visited by a missionary and supplied with a Bible for each family, but the version was Scio's. Why should this be? What a fine opportunity was then lost, as far as *we* are concerned, of conveying into the interior of Africa, by means of these emancipated slaves, the pure Word of God. We boast that our country is free; and that the slave which touches British ground is free from his earthly master. Shall we not see that for the future *all* who visit our shores may, if they will, be set free from the slavery of idolatry and sin, by reading in their own tongue the *true* Word of God. Surely any foreigner who has heard of the treasure we possess (the pure Word of God) would expect that if he came to England he might procure for himself a faithful copy of the Bible. Let it be so henceforth. Let the Bible Society be a *Bible* Society; and whilst it refuses, and very properly, to circulate the works of man, so may it also refuse to circulate as God's Word the erroneous versions of that Word which men have made. Let it never again be said, that a single foreigner, whose language was known to us, asked our Society for a faithful version of the Scriptures on British ground, and asked in vain.

Let all who support the Bible Societies—and surely they are deserving of support—seek each one for himself to realise more fully the blessing of God's Word; to feel more and more its peace and comfort in his own soul, and then shall we see more clearly the immense, the paramount importance and duty of offering to other nations as the Word of God in their own language, a version made from the originals, and conveying, as far as the imperfections of man will allow, a faithful representation of the lively oracles of God.

APPENDIX No. 2.

THE REVISED SPANISH VERSION OF TORRES' AMAT, LATELY PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

IN 1824 Don Felix Torres Amat, Bishop of Astorga, published a Spanish version of the Bible made from the Vulgate, to which numerous notes were appended. This work originally appeared in eight volumes, 4to., rather bulky, and certainly unfitted from its size, if from nothing else, for an extensive circulation among his countrymen.

A second edition of this work was published in 1832—35 at Madrid, in six volumes, small quarto; an improvement, it will be remarked, as regards bulk; but we can hardly consider it any great boon, when the approbation of the "Congregation of the Index" at Rome was obtained *only* on the condition of his consenting to inform his readers that *the reading of the Scriptures is not necessary to salvation*. See "Horne's Introduction," vol. v.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge have lately issued a revised edition of this version.

Doubtless many of the distinctive features of the Vulgate are altered, and many errors corrected. But has the attempt been successful? Can we say that the edition now presented by that Society for circulation among Spaniards is such as we can approve of, and would adopt for our own use? Let each one judge for himself by the following examples:—

1. The doctrine of indulgences is countenanced—

In 2 Cor. ii. 10. Lo que vosotros le concediereis por indulgencia, yo se lo concedo tambien : porque si yo mismo uso de indulgencia, uso de ella por amor vuestro en persona de Cristo. That which you shall grant him by indulgence, I grant it to him likewise; for if I myself use indulgence, for your sake do I use it in the person of Christ.

It should be remembered that this is the chief place pointed to by the Church of Rome to prove the doctrine of indulgences. We should be very jealous, therefore, of all unnecessary mention of the word *indulgence*.

If we compare this place with the Spanish version of Scio, himself a priest, and therefore not indisposed, as may be seen in the preceding Appendix, to countenance the errors of his Church, we shall not find the word *indulgencia* in this verse—Scio uses *perdonar* and *condonar*. It is true that in verse 7 we find in Scio the words “debeis usar con él de indulgencia.” “You ought to use towards him indulgence.” So the revised version. This translation, though differing from the Greek, and therefore to be rejected, is, however, very different, and it would seem far less objectionable than the phrase “that which you shall have him granted by *indulgence*,” instead of “to whom you forgive.” It is further clear that *χαριζεσθαι*, *to forgive*, does not require such a translation, because in Luke vii. 42, 43; 2 Cor. xii. 13; Ephes. iv. 32; Col. ii. 13, iii. 13; we find *perdonar*—*to pardon* employed.

2. The complete corruption of human nature seems ignored—

Por cuyo motivo no haceis vosotros todo aquello que quereis. (Gal. v. 17.) For which reason ye do not *all* that ye wish. *All* is an interpolation which considerably affects the sense.

3. The host seems countenanced—

No nos queda hostia que ofrecer por los pecados. (Heb. x. 26.) There remains not a *host* to offer for sin. It may be objected that *hostia* is only the Latin word, meaning a victim. But it is the word commonly used now for the host. That it is not necessary here is plain from the other passages where the same Greek word is differently translated. “*Hostia*” again occurs in Rom. xii. 1; Ephes. v. 2; Philip. iv. 18. Is it not better to remove every stumbling-block, and reject every translation which is not *needed*, if it may be perverted to a bad purpose?

4. The mass seems to be countenanced in the following passages:—

Esta es mi sangre del nuevo testamento, la cual será derramada por muchos. (Mark xiv. 24.) This is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be *shed* for many. So Luke xxii. 20. If we compare these passages with Matt. xxvi. 28, “derramada,” *shed*, and Luke xxii. 19, “se da,” *is given*,

(literally, gives itself) and "es rompedo," *is broken*, 1 Cor. xi. 24, we must conclude that there is no need to use the future tense, thus leaving it undetermined when the offering of our Lord's own body and blood was made.

6. Canonical hours are countenanced—

Mark xv. 25, 33, 34: La hora de tercia, la hora de sexta, la hora de nona. The hour of tierce, the hour of sexta, the hour of none. So Acts iii. 1, x. 3, 9, 30; Matt. xx. 3, 5. This phrase is not necessary, for in Matt. xx. 6, we have "hora undecima" *eleventh hour*; Acts ii. 15, "la hora tercia del dia," *the third hour* of the day.

7. *The complete depravity of man is not fully expressed.* Y que todos los pensamientos del corazon de ellos no eran sino mal continuamente. (Gen. vi. 5.) And that all the thoughts of their heart were only evil continually.

8. *The worship of created things seems countenanced.* Y adorad el estrado de sus piés; and worship the *place of his feet*. (Ps. xcix. 5.) Adoraremos la peana de sus piés; let us adore *the footstool (pedestal)* of his feet. (Ps. cxxxii. 7.) In Scio and Pereira the preposition is introduced:—En el lugar en donde estuviéron sus pies; in the place where his feet have been. (*Scio*.) It would seem that the construction of Torres Amat's version favours idolatry, for, in Heb. xi. 21, we find the preposition expressed "y adoró *sobre*," and worshipped upon. So, also, Ps. xcix. 9, "adoradle *en* su santo monte;" and worship Him in his holy mountain. The construction in the Hebrew is precisely similar in the two verses of Ps. xcix. just quoted. The pronoun *le* him, in ver. 9, is inserted by Torres Amat. This last instance (cxxxii. 7) is the more worthy of remark, because Torres Amat *alone*, it would seem, has thought of mistranslating the Vulgate, which agrees with the Hebrew.

Other passages which require revision may be mentioned. Viendo la restauracion del culto del Señor (2 Chron. xxix. 36), "*seeing the restoration of the worship of the Lord.*" It should be, "*because God had prepared the people.*" Matt. x. 8, Dad gratuitamente lo que gratuitamente os ha sido dado. Give freely *that which* has been freely given to you. The insertion of "lo que," *that which*, alters the sense in some degree, and is not required, as Scio attests, who translates "graciosamente recibisteis, dad graciosamente."

Luke vii. 8 supplies us with a curious reading,—

Que soy un oficial subalterno. I am a subaltern officer. He was indeed one under authority, but was a centurion a subaltern officer in the modern acceptation of the word?

Luke vii. 17: Y esparcióse la fama de este milagro por toda la Judea; and the fame of this miracle spread throughout all Judea. *Miracle* is an interpolation. It should be the fame of *Jesus*.

See also 2 Tim. iii. 16; James v. 16; Rom. ix. 5; Heb. xiii. 16; Matt. vi. 7.

The above passages are sufficient to prove that at present the Revised Version is far from what it should be. Would it not be better to revise the obsolete expressions (if any) in Valera's version, and send it forth as a faithful translation of the original Scriptures, rather than to spend time and money in revising a version which, after all, *must* differ very materially from those

Scriptures to which we appeal as our rule of life and faith? Since the above was in print the writer has been informed that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has decided to follow in the steps of the Trinitarian and British and Foreign Bible Societies, by preparing an edition of Valera's translation for the use of Spaniards. God speed the work! We should ever remember that to Spain we are indebted for the *first* attempt after the invention of printing to give to the Christian world the New Testament Scriptures in their original language. It is right, therefore, that we should endeavour to discharge the debt of gratitude we, in common with the rest of Europe, then contracted, by giving to Spain a *faithful* version of the Scriptures, in a language understood by the people.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

In 8vo., price One Shilling,

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND ITS TRANSLATIONS:

Being an attempt to show whether the Protestant or the Roman Catholic Version, in French and Italian, is most in accordance with the Inspired Original and the Latin Vulgate.

Also, recently published, in 8vo., price Sixpence,

ROMISH VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.

FACTS AND ARGUMENTS FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF BIBLE SOCIETIES.

BY THE REV. J. D. HALES, M. A.,
Incumbent of St. John's Church, Richmond, Surrey; formerly
Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Also, in 12mo., price Twopence,

**THE VERSIONS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE FOR ROMAN
CATHOLIC COUNTRIES.**

An Appeal to the British and Foreign Bible Society.

BY S. P. TREGELLES, LL. D.

WERTHEIM AND MACINTOSH, 24, PATERNOSTER-ROW, LONDON.