

GENERAL LIBRARY
OF
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

PRESENTED BY

Daughters of Mr. Dunster Jan 1900

THE BURNING OF THE BIBLES.

DEFENCE

91154

OF THE

PROTESTANT VERSION OF THE SCRIPTURES

AGAINST THE ATTACKS OF

POPISH APOLOGISTS

FOR THE

CHAMPLAIN BIBLE BURNERS;

BY

JOHN DOWLING, A. M.

PROVIDENCE R. I.

WITH INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY

W. C. BROWNLEE, D. D.

PHILADELPHIA :

PUBLISHED BY NATHAN MOORE,
NO. 3 NORTH EIGHTH STREET.

1843.

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1843, by
NATHAN MOORE,
in the Clerk's office of the District Court of the United States,
for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

STEREOTYPED BY S. DOUGLAS WYETH.
No. 7 Pear Street, Philadelphia.

PUBLISHER'S NOTICE.

MS. A. T. T. 17-55

The first two chapters of the following able "Defence of the Protestant Scriptures," originally appeared in the form of two articles in the Providence Journal, from the pen of the Rev. John Dowling of Providence R. I. in reply to a letter from Father Corry, a Roman Catholic Priest, published in the same paper, in which Mr. Corry first denies the fact of the burning of the bibles, and then, upon the supposition, that it were true, proceeds to justify the act upon the ground of the alleged unfaithfulness of the Protestant version of the Bible.

At the urgent request of the publisher, and other friends to the Protestant cause, the respected author has consented to their publication in the present form, after having considerably enlarged the articles by the

addition of valuable particulars, which for the sake of brevity, were omitted in the original publication. Mr. Dowling has also prefixed an authenticated historical statement of the atrocious act of Popish intolerance and sacrilege, which gave rise to the controversy; and added a conclusive and learned refutation of a rejoinder to his first articles, from Father Ivers, Catholic Priest, of Pawtucket, R. I.

The introductory remarks from the pen of the Rev. W. C. Brownlee, D. D. will be regarded as a valuable addition to the work.

INTRODUCTION.

ONE of the striking peculiarities of Romanism, is the relation of the Holy Bible to it, and its relation to the Holy Bible. This must be obvious to every one, on a moment's reflection. The rise, progress, power, and fearful results of Popery, are clearly indicated in the holy epistles of Paul and visions of Daniel, and the beloved John.

The Bible, also, gives a detail of certain peculiarities of this enemy of God and man. It was to be the grand "apostacy" from the christian faith: it was to "give heed to seducing spirits," false prophets, and *saintly* impostors, laying claims to miracles: it was to revive Demon-worship, in the worship of "saints;" it would "utter lies in hypocrisy," by palming a new religion on the world, in the name of God: it was "to forbid marriage, and prohibit the use of meats," at certain seasons.

Such is the striking relation which the Holy Scriptures bear to the Roman Apostacy.—A Roman Catholic once said in my hearing:—the

Bible cannot be true without Holy Mother of Rome. He meant to say that the Pope gives it all its evidence and authority. "Very true!" said a protestant: "for as the Holy Bible has predicted the rise, power, and calamities of Popery—if these predictions had not been fully manifested in the actual existence and tremendous evils of Popery, the Bible would have wanted the fulfilment of its prophecies, and therefore, would not have been true!"

The relation of Romanism to the Holy Bible, is no less remarkable.—In apostolical and primitive times, the reading of the Holy Scriptures occupied a most important part of the services in the house of God. This was in obedience to Christ, who said, "Search the Scriptures;" and who also said by the mouth of his servant Paul,— "I charge you by the Lord, that this epistle be read to all the holy brethren," "and, when this epistle," to the Colossians, "is read unto you, cause it also to be read in the church of the Laodiceans." Hence the appeal was constantly made to the BIBLE in all matters. It was paramount to all things. It was the beginning, the middle, and the end of all the pastoral instructions in those times. All traditions, and all doctrines, and all oral teachings were regulated, absolutely,

by the HOLY BIBLE. It was avouched to be the *only*, and perfect rule of faith on *all* points.

But alas! just in proportion as the church of Rome receded from pure and primitive christianity, in her awful apostacy, did she recede farther and farther, from the love and obedience of the Holy Scriptures. She swung loose from the only safe anchorage. She was given up "to believe a lie." Hence she invented new offices, new and unheard of sacraments, rites, new doctrines, new habitations for departed souls! And as she could not find these novel fictions in the Holy Bible, she withdrew the Holy Bible from the high elevation and throne of its supremacy; and thence elevated "Traditions," and the vagrant opinions and doctrines of men, called "Fathers," into the lofty place! And, in order to silence the voice of the Holy Bible, where men still happened to possess copies of it, she put forth the arrogant claim, on the part of her newly invented head, the pope, that he had the exclusive right, not only to convey to the Scriptures all the authority which they possessed; but also to determine, and declare *the only true sense* of the doctrines of the Bible. And as the sense of the Bible is the Bible: therefore by this

fatal step, God's eternal word of truth was subjected to the authority of the Roman primate!

That followed which all good men anticipated. In the Dark Ages, the Holy Scriptures disappeared, and became unknown to the people of the nations of Europe; and, also, to the great body of the priests, and even bishops of Rome. The enemy of the Bible succeeded in this measure, by pursuing these *two* courses, first, the Bible sunk into "desuetude," and, in course of time, was thrown away among the dust and rubbish of cloisters, where "fat contented ignorance" dozed in the dreariness of mental sleep, and, second, the few copies, in the hands of scholars, were still locked up from the people; being retained in the Latin, which to them, was a dead language.

As the final results of these measures, the nations of Europe, under the influence of popery, fast receded into barbarism. Hence the Dark Ages! for no fact is more clearly established than this, that when the Bible is abstracted from the people, and they are left to the *oral* teaching of self-styled priests, they are necessarily thrown back into the original state in which they were, before the Holy Bible, and the ministry are given to them by Jesus Christ.

THREE grand events occurred in the providence of God, to throw a flood of heavenly light and life, over this frightful chaos, existing under the leaden sceptre of Antichrist. The first, as preparatory, was the revival of Greek letters, and, thence, the revival of Literature, in general. The second, was the invention of printing,—one of the mightiest instruments the world ever received from Divine Providence, for the diffusion of knowledge, among our species. And, lastly, the “Ever Blessed Reformation,” came to consummate the regeneration of the slumbering nations of Europe now roused from the deadly sleep of the Roman sorcerer’s cup! Then, the God of Zion raised up learned and pious men who translated the Holy Bible into the vernacular tongue of the nations. They seized the mighty engine of printing and put these translations into the hands of the people, as well as the ministry, and the holy impulse, *then* given, by heaven, is felt to this day; and it has originated the most christian resolution never to pause in labours of love, until every family, and every individual of the human family, shall possess a copy of the Holy Bible!

So early as A. D. 1446, an edition of the Bible was published in German. But the first

correct copy, was that of Luther issued first, in parts, from A. D. 1517 to 1532:—In A. D. 1530 the first complete copy of the Bible was published by Luther. Tindal and Coverdale brought out their translation of the New Testament, in A. D. 1526 ; and the entire Bible in 1535. And by the singular providence of God, was the blessed volume given to the other nations, in the following years.

The Bible which Protestants now use, was translated by order of King James. It was published in A. D. 1611. It is perhaps, the most accurate that has been made, in any language.

It is the joint labour of forty seven of the most learned oriental scholars in Europe ; men of pure piety and christian honour. They were divided into six companies : each man had his share assigned to him : each company examined each translation made by individuals : each part of the translated Bible was examined, at least, *fourteen* times : and, was finally, adopted by the companies in full assembly.

Besides, let it be distinctly observed that this admirable translation was made, *not* from a translation ; but from the original Hebrew, and Greek of the Holy Spirit's inspiration. In this, have the defects, and errors of preceding trans-

lations, been carefully corrected. Some men have emitted editions on their own responsibility, and *they* are accountable for their errors. The Protestants are not to be held accountable for these any more than Rome is, for the errors in her Breviaries. We beg to direct the Roman catholic writers, to the edition of the Bible by Dr. Blaney ; and, most especially to the editions of 1806 and 1812 by the printers to the king, Eyre and Strackan. This is usually called "the Immaculate Edition ;" and which has been pronounced **THE STANDARD EDITION.**

But, we wish it not to be forgotten, by Roman catholics and Protestants, that, while we call this "the Standard Edition," our final appeal, in all disputed passages, or doctrines, is to **THE ORIGINAL HEBREW AND GREEK.** For these contain the very words, as well as the very ideas, and doctrines, dictated to the inspired writers, by the Holy Ghost.

This naturally leads us to notice the unfair, and scandalous practice of the Roman catholic priests, in their ill-concealed opposition to the Holy Bible which is used in the Protestant churches. They industriously collect "the errors" found in the *preceding* translations, and in the incorrect editions thereof: and these faulty "trans-

lations," "defects," and the typographical mistakes, they swell to a vast amount : and they charge them on the "malignant" designs of "heretics," in "corrupting the Holy Bible !"

This practice of the Romish priests must proceed from one, or both these causes :—either from an inexcusable ignorance of the date of our present Protestant translation, in which all preceding errors are carefully corrected : or, from sheer malice, which gratifies its propensity in misrepresentation, on this matter. From one or other of these, must proceed all the foul and impious charges, which have been lately made, and persisted in, since the late God-provoking deed, of burning the Holy Bibles, in New York !

I wish to call attention to another remarkable instance of very unfair dealing on the part of the Roman prelates, and priests.

In A. D. 1582 the English Jesuits of Doway seminary, published their translation of the Scriptures. This is a translation from a translation. Of course it falls far short of the genuine meaning of the Original. The Latin Vulgate, from which it is made, is far from being an accurate translation. It interests the evil propensities, and mistakes of its times. It is papal in its bearings. This is fully established by this

fact, that the "*holy and inspired council of Trent*," with all its popery, "*dyed in the wool*," pronounced it *the only true and authentic edition of the Bible* ! Had it been as much opposed to popery, as God's pure word is, it never would have thus been elevated to supremacy as the Rule ! Then, let me add, that the Doway translation inherits an additional portion of the original depravity of the Jesuits of Doway. Hence, this is a popish translation from the popish Vulgate ! It is doubly dyed in the wool !

Hence, as the best judges have observed, it is studiously obscure on points deemed hazardous to papal Rome. "It is a translation," says the historian Fuller, "which needed to be translated ! Yet, after all, imperfect, obscure, and erroneous as it is, we are disposed to wish it to be given into the hands of the people, if no other can possibly be made to reach them. For the gospel, and the way of life, is yet found in it, among its errors. But, the fact must not be concealed. The outcry of the Roman prelates and priests against "the Protestant Bible," invidiously called, "King James' Bible," is a mere pretence and subterfuge. The enmity is deeply settled in the breast of every prelate and priest, against the BIBLE, as rendered into ANY vernacular of the

people. *This*,—**THIS** is the grand secret. It has been fully discovered. And we hold it up, in the most public manner to the world. The instructive saying of the old vicar of Croyden in the dawning of the Reformation, speaks the real belief of all Roman priests. "We must put down the press: or the press must put us down!" So say the prelates: "We must put down the Bible: or the Bible will put us down!" No man is more fully aware of this fact, than are the priests, that when the people of the Roman catholic sect, are allowed to read God's Holy Word, they soon cease to be papists. The knowledge of the Bible scatters with amazing power and swiftness, the dark and pestilential clouds of Romanism!

The vows and deeds of the priests establish these facts. They are zealous in their denunciations of "the Protestant Bible;" yet, as Mr. Corry does, they profess a reverence for *the Bible*. But, do they distribute any Doway Bibles? No. Do they recommend to their people the study of the Doway? Never. Yet they clamorously oppose *our* Bible, and bepraise *their* Bible.

But, to set the honesty and truth of the professions of these men, on this point, in their

true light, I beg the Christian public to ponder these *four* facts, which no prelate will venture to deny, over his own name, publicly.

First:—The present Pope, Gregory XVI., and his predecessor, Pope Leo XII., denounced all Bible Societies, declaring that by the Bibles they distributed, “they converted the Gospel of Christ into a human gospel, or what is still worse, into the gospel of the devil.” [Pope Leo XII., Bull of 1824.] And yet they allow no distribution of Doway Bibles. Second:—The Council of Trent has most positively and peremptorily prohibited the reading of the Holy Bible, by the people, in their own vernacular. See the canons concerning prohibited books, Reg. X., sect. 4. Third:—The Holy Bible is a prohibited book in the Roman Catholic “**INDEX PROHIBITORIUS.**” I have therein seen it, and read it with my own eyes, in the copy which I used. Fourth:—And I beg very particular attention to this point; there is not an authorized copy of the Bible, in English, in the Roman Catholic Church. This most important disclosure is published in the folio copy of the Minutes of the examination of the Irish prelates and priests, before the British Parliament, in reference to Megworth College. It was there declared, upon

oath, that *there is not an authorized version of the Bible, in English, in the Roman Catholic churches in Britain and Ireland !!!*

My meaning in the above assertion is *not* that *no copies* of the Doway Bible, accompanied with notes, are *not* circulated under the sanction of popish prelates. What I mean to say is this, that even while these prelates affect to favour the circulation of *their* Bible, and pretend to encourage the reading of the Doway Bible, by the people, they do play a double game, and impose on the easy credulity of the Protestant community. My proof is twofold. First:—They make this pretence of zeal for encouraging of the reading of the Bible, in the very face and direct violations of Rule IV. of the Ten Rules “Concerning Prohibited Books;” for this rule, we repeat it, prohibits the use of the Sacred Scriptures in *any vernacular of the people whatever!* This new-born zeal about their encouraging their Roman Catholic people to read the Bible is an open and positive violation of one of the canons of the Council of Trent. Hence, we must either question their sincerity and honesty in these professions of countenancing the reading of the Doway by their people; or, we must believe them

to be in open rebellion to the Pope and their "Holy Councils."

Second:—We mean to say, distinctly, that there is **NOT AN AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE BIBLE IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE**, in the Roman Catholic Church! I am aware that it will be said, "Why here we have, in the editions of the Doway, the approbation and sanction of the Archbishop of Baltimore, and of the Bishops of Philadelphia and New York!"

It is very true! But have you carefully read the phraseology of this approbation? Have you not yet studied the cunning of the Jesuit! They do take care *not* to call it *a version authorized* by the Pope, or a Council, or by that anomalous thing, their "Church." No, they tell you that it is an excellent *translation* from the Vulgate.

And the Irish Catholic prelates declared upon oath, in their examination before the British Parliament, that there was **NO AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE HOLY BIBLE IN ENGLISH**; because it never had been sanctioned by the Pope, nor had been received by the Roman Church! And, reader, would you believe that these prelates declared this, **UPON OATH**, relative to that very Doway, and Rhemish New Testament, which they had publicly recommended to their

people as the true and best version of the Latin Vulgate. This duplicity, so characteristic of the Jesuits, affords us a key to unlock the duplicity of the American prelates of Rome.

It will not be out of place to add here, that, in the Philadelphia edition of the Doway, of 1836, the Roman prelate, Mr. Henry Conwell, has, with all *his* share of Rome's infallibility, fallen into a ludicrous blunder. In his official approbation of this Doway translation of the Bible from the *Latin Vulgate*, he has actually proclaimed to all the world, of both "the faithful" and "the heretical," that this translation of *the Latin*, is "the most accurate and genuine translation of the Holy Scriptures from the languages in which they had been **ORIGINALLY WRITTEN** ; and, therefore," adds this man of astonishing research, "I do hereby recommend it." And he does recommend, under his "diocesan ring and seal," this English translation from the Latin Vulgate, as *the* translation from the Hebrew and Greek, in which alone the Bible was originally written !

Now what must we think of Messrs. Corry and Ivers, whom my friend, Mr. Dowling, shows up in the following pages ? And what must we say of the New York prelate and priests, who

speak so bitterly of "the corrupt Protestant Bible," and, at the same time, allude to *this* Bible as most pure and most exact, while they hold it up to view as the *only one* they are willing to be distributed and read by all!!! And yet, after all, that they have not one authorized copy, in English, which they *can* or *dare* present to the people!

These sentiments I have expressed at the request of my valued friend, the Rev. Mr. Dowling, whose oriental learning and accuracy of historical Bible knowledge has been so very successfully exhibited in defence of the Holy Bible against the Roman priests of Providence and Pawtucket, Rhode Island. Hence the following pages will be read by the Protestant Christian public with no common interest.

W. C. BROWNLEE.

New York, }
March 4, 1843. } .

THE BURNING OF THE BIBLES.

IN the early part of December, 1842, the following extract of a letter from a gentleman in Chazy, Clinton County, N. Y., dated November 28, was published by most of the newspapers in the United States, under the following caption, viz. :

A ROMAN CATHOLIC PROTRACTED MEETING.

Burning of Bibles by Hundreds.

“ We had a sort of *auto da fe* at the Carbo, (a village in the township of Champlain) a short time since. The Roman Catholics had a protracted meeting, and during its progress they called in all the Protestant Bibles which had been distributed and purchased among them, (except some few who would not give them up) and made a public bonfire of them. It was said, by those who witnessed it, that the number thus burned was between two and three hundred. Efforts were

made to purchase them, but to no effect. We have had a public meeting both here and in Champlain, to give some expression of sentiment with regard to the wicked outrage."

Soon after the publication of the above, an article was published by the Rev. Bernard O'Reilly, a Roman Catholic priest of Rochester, N. Y., denying the truth of the facts alleged in the above letter from Champlain; and this denial also went the rounds of the newspaper press; and it was very industriously circulated, that, after all, the story of the burning of the Bibles had turned out to be false, a mere invention of the Protestants, framed for the purpose of exciting public odium against the Roman Catholics.

In consequence of this denial, the following certificate, with the signatures of four responsible gentlemen, inhabitants of Champlain, was prepared and published; fully establishing the truth of this atrocious act of Popish intolerance, without the possibility of evasion or denial.

CHAMPLAIN, Dec. 27th, 1842.

Messrs. Hale & Hallock :

Dear Sirs,—Observing in the New York Journal of Commerce of the 21st inst., the copy of a letter from Bernard O'Reilly, Pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Rochester, addressed to the editor of the Rochester Evening Post, charging falsehood upon the brief account you published some weeks since of the burning of Bibles in this town by Catholic Priests, we the undersigned, a committee appointed by a large public meeting of the Protestant inhabitants of Champlain, to draw up and have published an account of this sacrilegious affair, offer the following statement of facts in the case, to substantiate the truth of the letter of your Chazy correspondent.

About the middle of October last, a Mr. Teimont, a missionary of the Jesuits, (who bear the name of Oblats as we understand) with one or more associates, came to Corbeau in this town, where the Catholic Church is located, and as they say in their own account given of their visit in the La Minerve (which we send you,) by the direction of the Bishop of Montreal.

On their arrival they commenced a protracted meeting, which lasted several weeks; great numbers of Catholics from this and the other

towns of the county attended day after day; after the meeting had progressed several days, and the way was prepared for it, an order was issued requiring all who had Bibles, or Testaments, to bring them in to the priest, or lay them at the feet of the missionaries, (to use their own language in La Minerve.) The requirement was generally complied with, and day-after day Bibles and Testaments were carried in; and after a sufficient number was collected, they were burned. By the confession of Telmont, as appears from the affidavit of S. Hubbell, there were several burnings, but only one in public. On the 27th of October, as given in testimony at the public meeting held here, Telmont, who was a prominent man in all the movements, brought out from the house of the resident priest, which is near the church, as many Bibles as he could carry in his arms at three times, and placed them in a pile, in the open yard, and then set fire to them and burned them to ashes. This was done in open day, and in the presence of many spectators. The number burned altogether we are not able accurately to ascertain; more than a hundred no doubt; perhaps two or three hundred.

The Canadian Catholic population of this county has become, since the rebellion in Canada

in 1838, very large, amounting probably to some thousands. In this town alone there are more than a hundred Catholic families. For several years our different town Bible Societies have been in the habit of supplying those of them who could read, with Bibles, in common with other destitute families. In 1841 there was a thorough supply of the Canadian as well as other destitute families in most if not all the towns in the county. In this town alone about sixty Catholic families were supplied with French Bibles. During the meeting the President of our town Bible Society, learning that the Catholics were carrying in their Bibles that they might be burned, took with him Silas Hubbell, Esq., a respectable lawyer of this town, and waited on the Priests at the church, and requested, that inasmuch as the Bibles had been given by the different town Societies, they should be returned to the donors, and not destroyed. Telmont, with whom they had the interview, replied to their request by saying, that it was out of their power to comply, for they had burned all they had received, and intended to burn all they could get. To this account of the interview with Telmont, and his declarations, we have the affidavit of S. Hubbell, Esq. It was but a short time after these gentlemen parted from

Telmont, and returned home, that the public Bible bonfire of which we have spoken, took place. The day but one before their meeting closed, the Bishop of Montreal landed at Rouse's Point in this town, from the steam boat, and was received and escorted by a very large procession on horseback, to Corbeau. On the 8th, the last day of the meeting, he administered the sacrament to immense crowds; and there is no question but the Bishop gave his sanction to all the sacrilegious acts of Telmont and his associates.

Meetings of the Protestant citizens, similar to the one held in this town, have been held in a number of the adjoining towns; and resolutions passed expressing strongly their indignation at this insult offered to God and our country. We would remark in view of Mr. O'Reilly's suggestion, that the story of the burning cannot be true because the Protestant population of this section of country would not quietly have tolerated it, that it was not because there was any want of public indignation at the act, or none found who were ready to revenge it even with blood; but because the blessed influence of the Protestant faith was strong enough, over the community, to prevent any unlawful expression

of that indignation, or any resort to unlawful and unchristian retaliation.

We trust that this brief statement of facts will be sufficient to satisfy the public, and even Mr. O'Reilly himself, that the story of the Bible Auto-da-fe was no humbug. If more proof is wanted, it can be had; it was a matter of as much notoriety here, as any other act that has taken place in open day, and in the presence of a crowd of witnesses. The children in our streets know all about it. And we now trust, that Mr. O'Reilly and all Catholics who want, as Mr. O'Reilly expresses it, the hostility between them and us to be of an honourable kind, will entertain the same views of this reported outrage, now when they find it to be truth, that they did when they supposed it to be untrue.

A. D. BRINCKERHOFF.

L. DOOLITTLE.

AZARIAH HYDE.

BENJAMIN MARVIN.

Although the preceding testimony is abundantly sufficient to silence for ever all denial of this act of sacrilege, on the part of the Roman Catholics, yet as it is *Protestant* testimony, it may not unlikely share

the fate of such testimony in general, and be laid to the account of "*Protestant forgeries and lies.*" For this reason the following extracts are subjoined from two Catholic publications, that the denial of Mr. Corry may be stamped with the brand of falsehood, even by his own brethren.

*Translated from the Montreal Minerve of
November 7th.*

We have procured the following details of a mission undertaken by the R. P. Oblats to Corbeau, near Champlain, in the U. States. We love to record these transactions; they recall grateful recollections.

Details.

"We are happy to announce to our fellow citizens the consolations resulting from a mission which has been performed by the R. P. Oblats, to the Canadians living upon the left bank of the Champlain. The Bishop of Montreal, who is an eminent man of God and the country, did not hesitate to detach two of his missionaries, that they might fly to the succour of those who had upon him the double claims of brethren and

children. Those good Canadians have worthily responded to these invitations of grace. The Protestants of every sect living in the midst of them had distributed Bibles in all their houses where they would accept them. Upon the advice which was given them that these were only sacrilegious counterfeits of the word of God, these Catholics brought to the feet of the Missionaries all the copies which had been given them. Fifty or sixty persons whom this seduction had led away from the faith, have re-entered the bosom of the Catholic Church."

The reader will perceive that the Editor of the *Minerve* does not mention that these Bibles were burnt. He possibly thought that light enough had been thrown on that subject already. The following extract will render the testimony complete.

From the Catholic Herald.

"The Bibles were not burnt in any public place, nor with any view of wounding Protestant feelings. The priest had warned the Catholics of the impropriety of keeping in their possession, and reading adulterated editions of the Bible, as Bishop Doyle in Ireland is known to have done,

some fourteen or fifteen years ago. The Catholics, in compliance with this admonition, brought the Bibles which certain agents of the American Bible Society had distributed amongst them, and delivered them to the priest, who chose this method of ridding himself of the incumbrance. They were burnt in a private yard, and not in the public streets. This appears to be the naked truth.

FATHER CORRY'S DENIAL
OF THE
BURNING OF THE BIBLES, AND ATTACK
UPON THE PROTESTANT VERSION.

THE present defence of the Protestant version of the Scriptures was called forth by a most gross, wanton, and vulgar attack upon that version, contained in a letter of Rev. John Corry, a Popish priest of Providence, R. I., published in the Providence Journal of January 9, of which the following are the most important parts :

“MR. EDITOR,—I perceive in your paper of last Friday, a long article signed C., on the burning of the Bible by the Catholics. In the first place, I deny the assertion that they did burn it, and secondly, admitting, for argument's sake, that they did burn what he calls the Bible,

what of it? He should know, that the Catholics never admitted the Protestant version or translation of the Bible to be correct. And had he read the public prints, he never would make so mournful a cry about the destruction of a book so full of misrepresentation and errors, as the Protestant version or translation of the Bible is."

To prove this charge, Mr. Corry proceeds to quote from an old number of a paper called the *Fall River Monitor*, an article as follows :

"**FALSIFICATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.**—A reverend gentleman in England, named Curtis, has recently made some appalling disclosures, in relation to the careless and iniquitous manner in which the University editions of the Holy Bible, published by the king's printer, are put forth to the world. Mr. Curtis has exposed some enormous errors and variations from the original text as given in King James's time. Six hundred mistakes have been found in one book, and eight hundred in another, many of them most important, and all of them inexcusable," &c. &c.

After this quotation, Mr. Corry proceeds to express himself in the following *disgraceful* language.

“If, then, such a version of the Bible should not be tolerated, the question then is, which is the best and most respectful manner to make away with it, an account of the word of God so mixed up and corrupted by the machinations of evil-designing men? *As for myself, I would not hesitate to say, that the most respectful would be to burn it*, rather than give it to grocers and dealers to wrap their wares in, or consign it to MORE DISHONOURABLE PURPOSES (!!) and I hardly think, that there is a man of common sense, be he Catholic or Protestant, that would not say the same.”

After considerable more abuse of the Protestant Bible, in a similar strain, Mr. Corry proceeds to recommend the Bible Societies to publish the Doway Bible, and adds,

“I am certain they will get every Catholic priest in America to help them in the distribution of it.”

Mr. Corry then roundly denies the persecutions, which, he says, have been "so often and falsely attributed to the Catholic religion. Long since," he adds, "all those charges have been proved to be false." He then closes his letter by pronouncing an eulogium upon Popery, or *Catholicity* (as he calls it) asserting that it is "unchangeable," &c., &c.

DOWLING'S DEFENCE
OF THE
PROTESTANT BIBLE.

CHAPTER I.

Mr. Corry's Denial—Doway Bible—Two Infallible Popish Editions with two thousand variations—Instances of False Translation—Doing Penance—Bunyan's Giant Pope.

MR. EDITOR,—In your paper of the 9th inst., I read, with much astonishment, a gross attack, by the Reverend Mr. Corry, a Roman Catholic priest of this city, upon that version of the English Bible in common use among Protestants.

I have been looking with some anxiety over your columns every day since that time, for the appearance of a vindication of our excellent version of the Scriptures, and a demonstration of its immense supe-

riority over the Doway, or Popish Bible, which is so strongly recommended to the patronage of Protestants in the article referred to.

I regret that such a vindication from some of the learned professors of our University, or from some other abler pen than my own, has not hitherto appeared. As such, however, is the fact, I am constrained by an imperative sense of duty to attempt, to the best of my ability, to obviate the mischief produced, or intended, by this Jesuitical attempt to destroy the confidence of unlearned Protestants in their Bibles.

As this attack is one which requires fact and argument, and not mere assertion to repel it, I shall have to claim the indulgence of your readers for a second article, about equal in length to this. The article referred to, was written in reference to the bonfire of Bibles made by the Papists of Champlain, (N. Y.) a few weeks since, and which has excited so general a feeling of indignation throughout the country.

“In the first place,” says Mr. Corry, “I

deny the assertion that they did burn it; and, secondly, admitting, for argument's sake, that they did burn what he (a former correspondent of the Journal) calls the Bible, what of it?" He then proceeds to justify the act, if it had occurred, by an attempt to show that the Protestant version of the Bible is "full of misrepresentation and errors"—"corrupted by the machinations of evil-designing men," &c., and that the Doway Bible is alone worthy of confidence and distribution. To meet these allegations, I shall proceed to state a few facts in relation to both these versions, and then leave the reader to judge for himself. I trust I shall be able to prove, that the latter assertions are as false as the denial of the burning of the Bibles was proved to be, by the certificate from Champlain, published in the same paper with Mr. Corry's letter.

1. Let us inquire what are the claims of the *Doway, or Popish Bible*, which Mr. Corry invites the Bible Societies to publish and circulate, in place of the commonly received version.

Perhaps it is hardly necessary to inform the reader, that the Old Testament was originally written in Hebrew, and the New Testament in Greek; and that a translation immediately out of those languages is *cæteris paribus*, more likely to be accurate, than *a translation of a translation*. Now, let it be observed, the Protestant version was translated by a company of forty-seven of the most learned men of the most learned age, immediately out of the inspired Hebrew and Greek originals into English. The Doway version consists of a New Testament, printed at Rheims, under the title of a Rhemish Testament, in 1582, and an Old Testament, printed at Doway, in 1609, both translated, not from the inspired original, but, as it is printed in the title page, out of the "authentic Latin"—A MERE TRANSLATION OF A TRANSLATION.

The translation used as an original on this occasion, was the Latin Vulgate, which had been made the sole standard of authority by a decree of the Council of Trent,

in 1546. "Whoever," says that decree, "shall not receive as sacred and canonical, all these, and every part of them, and as they are contained in the Old Vulgate Latin edition, LET HIM BE ACCURSED."

In a brief history of the Council of Trent, chiefly drawn up from the works of Pallavacina and Sarpi, the following account is given of the adoption of this decree :

"It was alleged in the Council, that the existence of so many versions, often varying from one another, tended to involve the meaning of Scripture in uncertainty, and that the only way to remedy this would be to fix upon some one version and declare it to be the authentic and acknowledged authority in all cases of controversy. The difficulty lay in the choice. Cajetan's opinion was quoted, who strongly urged the study of the Hebrew and Greek originals, and was accustomed to say, 'that to understand the Latin text was not to understand the infallible word of God, but of the translator, who might err; and that if the divines of former ages had held the same sentiment, Luther's heresies would not have so easily prevailed;' and a canon was mentioned which

enjoined the examination of the Old Testament in the Hebrew language, and of the New in the Greek. It would seem, indeed, that on this question no argument was necessary, and that none would fall into the absurdity of preferring a version to the original. Yet so did the divines at Trent. They said that unless the Vulgate were declared to be divine and authentic in every part, immense advantage would be yielded to the Lutherans, and innumerable heresies would arise and trouble the church; if any one might examine that version, either by comparing it with other versions or with the originals, every thing would be thrown into confusion, these new grammarians would assume the office of the judge, and pedants instead of divines would be made bishops and cardinals; nor would the inquisitors be able to execute their office without the knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, since the heretics would be sure to turn round and tell them that the translation was incorrect. Some added, that as Divine Providence had given to the Jews a Hebrew, and to the Greeks a Greek original, it was reasonable to suppose that the Latin church enjoyed a similar favour, and that the Spirit of God who had dictated the sacred

volume to the heavenly penman, had in the same supernatural manner presided over the translation."* Such cogent reasoning could not be resisted ; the Vulgate was undoubtedly divine !

The consequence of these discussions was the insertion of the following celebrated passage in the decree passed at the fourth session of the Council. It is given to the reader both in the original Latin and in English :

“ *Insuper eadem sacro-sancta Synodus considerans non parum utilitatis accedere posse Ecclesiæ Dei, si ex omnibus Latinis editionibus, quæ circumferuntur, sacrorum librorum, quænam pro authentica habenda sit, innotescat, statuit, et declarat, ut hæc ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quæ longo tot seculorum usu in ipsa Ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus, et expositionibus pro authentica habeatur ; et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat.*”

“ Moreover, the same most holy council, considering that no small advantage will accrue to

Sarpi, lib. ii. s. 51. Pallav. lib. vi. c. 12, 15.

the church of God, if, of all the Latin editions of the Sacred Book which are in circulation, some one shall be distinguished as that which ought to be regarded as authentic—doth ordain and declare, that the same old and Vulgate edition, which has been approved by its use in the church for so many ages, shall be held as authentic, in all public lectures, disputations, sermons, and expositions; and that no one shall dare or presume to reject it, under any pretence whatsoever.”

As the Vulgate was thus exalted by this Popish Council, to the place of the inspired original, it was, of course, necessary to prepare an authorized edition of this Latin version, as there were innumerable variations in the different editions of the Vulgate issued previous to that time. To effect this object, Pope Sixtus V. commanded a new revision of the text to be made, and corrected the proofs himself of an edition which was published at Rome in 1590, and proclaimed, by his *infallible* Papal authority, to be the infallible standard of Scripture.

It was very soon discovered, however, that this edition abounded with errors, though it had been accompanied by a bull, enjoining its universal reception, and forbidding the slightest alterations, under pain of the most dreadful anathemas.

The Popish dignitaries thus found themselves in a most embarrassing predicament, and that whichever horn of the painful dilemma they choose, *if the facts only became known*, it would be equally fatal to themselves! Either this edition must be maintained as a standard with thousands of glaring errors, or infallibility must be shown to be *fallible*, by the correction of these errors.*

* In a rejoinder to this letter by Father Ivers, one of the Popish Apologists for the Bible Burners, he makes the following remarks in reference to the above paragraph.

“What comes next? Oh! the old stale objection about fallibility and infallibility. We do not believe that the Pope is infallible, nor any living creature, since the demise of the Apostles.”

Whom does Mr. Ivers mean, when he says, “We do not believe that the Pope is infallible?” If he means the great body of the Roman Church, he

To make the best of a bad thing, the edition, as far as possible, was called in, and a more correct edition issued by Pope

writes what he knows to be false ; if he means that *he*, (Mr. Ivers,) does not believe the Pope's infallibility, then I shall prove from the testimony of writers of his own communion, notwithstanding its boasted unity, that *he*, Mr. Ivers, is guilty of *heresy*. Let it be remarked, that the three writers now cited were celebrated authors, and that Bellarmine, who, for his great exertions in the cause of Popery, was made a Cardinal, was probably the most powerful champion the Romanists ever had :

1. *Lewis Capsensis* de Fid. Disput. 2, sect. 6, affirms: " We can believe nothing, if we do not believe with a divine faith that the Pope is the successor of Peter, and **INFALLIBLE!**"

2. I shall quote the words of *Cardinal Bellarmine*, as they are very remarkable, in the original Latin, (de Pont. 4, 5.) " Si autem Papa erraret præficendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare." That is, " But if the Pope should err, by enjoining vices or prohibiting virtues, the Church, unless she would sin against conscience, would be bound to BELIEVE VICES TO BE GOOD, AND VIRTUES EVIL."

Though these quotations might be largely multiplied, one more must suffice.

3. *Rhodius* de Fid., Quest. 3, sect. 4, contends that " *The infallibility of the Pope is an ESSENTIAL ARTICLE, and to deny it is HERESY!!*"

Clement VIII. in 1592, accompanied by a similar bull. Happily for the cause of truth, the Popish doctors were unable to effect an entire destruction of the edition of Sixtus. It is now exceedingly rare, but there is a copy of it in the Bodleian library at Oxford, and another in the Royal library at Cambridge.

The learned Dr. James, who was keeper of the Bodleian library, compared the editions of Sixtus and Clement, and exposed the variations between the two in a book which he called, from the opposition between them, *Bellum Papale*, i. e. the *Papal War*. Dr. Townly, in his illustrations of Biblical literature, has the following remark, in reference to this work:—
“Dr. James, in his *Bellum Papale*, notices

I shall leave Father Ivers to settle this matter with these celebrated Roman Catholic writers, simply remarking, that if the boasted unity of the Roman Catholic communion is not all a farce, then it may be a happy thing for Mr. Ivers that he lives in a country too enlightened and free to permit the existence of the Bloody Inquisition, or he might perhaps have an opportunity of reconsidering this subject in one of its cells.

2000 variations, some of *whole verses*, and many others clearly and decidedly contradictory to each other. Yet both editions were respectively declared to be authentic by the same plenitude of knowledge and power, and both guarded against the least alteration by the same tremendous excommunication."

"These fatal variations," says the learned Thomas Hartwell Horne, in his Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures, "between editions, alike promulgated by Pontiffs claiming infallibility, have not passed unnoticed by Protestant divines, who have taken advantage of them, in a manner that sensibly affects the Church of Rome; especially Kortholt, who has, at great length, refuted the pretensions of Bellarmine in a masterly manner, and our learned countryman, Thomas James, in his *Bellum Papale, sine Concordia Discors Sixti V.*, (London, 1600, 4to.,) who has pointed out very numerous additions, omissions, contradictions, and

other differences between the Sixtine and Clementine editions.”

From this very curious and now rare volume, the following specimens of the 2000 differences between these two editions are transcribed from Horne :

1. Clauses omitted in the Sixtine, but inserted in the Clementine Bible.

Num. xxx. 11. Uxor in domo viri, &c. to the end of the verse.

Prov. xxv. 24. Melius est, sedere in angulo domatis, &c.

Lev. xx. 9. Patri matrique maledixit

Jud. xvii. 2, 3. Reddidit ergo eos matri suæ, &c.

1 Kings, iv. 21. Quia capta est arca Dei.

2. Clauses or words introduced into the Sixtine, but omitted in the Clementine Bible.

1 Sam. xxiv. 8. Vivit dominus, quia nisi dominus percusserit eum, aut dies ejus venerit ut moriatur, aut descendens in prælium periret;

propitius mihi sit dominus ut
non mittam manum meam in
Christum Domini.

- 1 Sam. xxv. 6. Ex multis annis salvos faciens
tuos et omnia tua.
- 2 Sam. vi. 12. Dixitque David, ibo et reducam
arcam.
- 2 Sam. viii. 8. De quo fecit Salomo omnia vasa
ærea in templo et mare
cæneum et columnas et altare.
- 2 Sam. xix. 10. Et concilium totius Israel venit
ad regem.
- Prov. xxiv. ult. Usque quo piger dormis? usque
quo de somno consurges.

3. Manifest contradictions, or differences
between the editions.

- Josh. xi. 19. *Sixt.* Quæ se non traderet,
Clem. Quæ se traderet.
- Josh. xiv. 3. *Sixt.* Tuo, *Clem.* Meo.
- 1 Sam. iv. 9. *Sixt.* Nobis, *Clem.* Vobis.
- 1 Sam. xx. 9. *Sixt.* A me, *Clem.* A te.
- 1 Kings, vii. 9. *Sixt.* Intrinsicus, *Clem.* Ex-
trinsicus.
- Hab. i. 13. *Sixt.* Quare non respicias, *Clem.*
Respicias.
- Heb. v. 11. *Sixt.* Interpretabilis ininterpre-
tabilis.
- 2 Pet. i. 16. *Sixt.* Indoctas, *Clem.* Doctas.

4. Differences in numbers.

- 1 Kings, iv. 42. *Sixt.* Quinque millia, *Clem.*
Quinque et mille.
- 2 Kings, xiv. 17. *Sixt.* Viginti Quinque, *Clem.*
Quindecem.
- 2 Kings, xxv. 19. *Sixt.* Sex, *Clem.* Sexagenta.
2. Chron. xiii. 17. *Sixt.* Quinquagenta, *Clem.*
Quingenta.

5. Other remarkable differences.

- Ps. xli. 3. *Sixt.* Ad Deum fontem vivum,
Clem. Ad Deum fortem,
vivum.
- Pro. xx. 25. *Sixt.* Devorare sanctos, *Clem.*
Devotare sanctos.
- Pro. xix. 23. *Sixt.* Qui affligit patrem et fugit
matrem, *Clem.* Qui affligat,
&c. et fugat, &c.
- Ezek. xiv, 22. *Sixt.* Egredientur, *Clem.* Ingre-
dientur.
- Sirach xxxviii. 25. *Sixt.* Sapientiam scribe, *Clem.*
Sapientia scribe.
- Sirach xlii. 9. *Sixt.* Adultera, *Clem.* Adulta.
- Isaiah, xlvi. 12. *Sixt.* Justum, *Clem.* Avem.
- Jer. xvii. 9. *Sixt.* Cor hominis, *Clem.*
hominum.

Now be it remembered, that the Do-
way or Popish bible is acknowledged to

be a mere translation of the above named *Latin Vulgate*, and that the various editions of this Latin version differed far more widely from one another than the different editions of the English bible referred to in the newspaper extract quoted by Mr. Corry.

I shall show in my second communication that the errors spoken of in that article are almost entirely such as do not affect the sense—such as the occasional printing of a word in italics in one edition, and in Roman letters in the others, &c.

In the meantime I shall quote a few passages from the two versions, that the scholar may decide between their comparative faithfulness, and even the unlearned man of common sense may judge which of the two versions is most worthy of the confidence of the public.

Mark ix. 42, Doway: "Whosoever shall scandalize one of these little ones," &c.; v. 43: "If thy foot scandalize thee, chop it off," &c. Protestant: "Whosoever shall offend," &c.

Luke xxii. 1. Doway : " And the festival of the *Azymes* approached, which is called *Pasch*." Protestant : " Now the feast of *unleavened bread* drew nigh, which is called the *passover*."

Luke xxii. 7, Doway : " And the day of the *Azymes* came wherein it was necessary that the *Pasch* should be killed." Protestant : " Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the *passover* must be killed."

The above are instances of concealing the meaning, by giving a Greek word instead of an English, and justify the remark of the learned historian Fuller, that this Popish translation was one which "needed to be translated," and that its editors "by all means laboured to suppress the light of truth under one pretext or other."

I will add a few other instances of gross errors, as specimens of hundreds of similar ones which might be produced, which are such evident departures from the inspired original, that charity itself cannot

but conclude that they are intentional mistranslations for the support of Popish errors.*

The word *metanoeo*, (to repent, change one's mind,) which every Greek scholar knows refers to an operation of the mind (*nous*) they render "do penance." Thus, Matt. iii, 2.: "*Do penance*, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Luke xvii. 3.: "If thy brother sin against thee, rebuke him; and if he *do penance*, forgive him." Acts viii. 22. Peter to Simon Magus: "*Do penance* therefore, from this thy wickedness."

In every one of these instances, it is scarcely necessary to say the Protestant version renders the term *repent*, as the meaning of the Greek word undoubtedly requires.—They even carry this mistranslation into the Old Testament, for instance, Job xlii. 6. "Therefore I reprehend myself and *do penance* in dust and ashes." Pro-

* For a curious account of the Bordeaux testament, more grossly corrupted than the Doway for the support of Popish errors, see Appendix A.

testant: "Wherefore I abhor *myself*, and repent in dust and ashes."

Ezek. xviii. 21. "If the wicked *do penance* for all the sins which he hath committed," &c. Protestant: "But if the wicked will turn, &c.

The idea which the common people, among Papists, entertain of *doing penance*, is well illustrated by a reply once made by an intelligent Spaniard to the Rev. Dr. Maclay; of New York. "It means," said he, "to eat no breakfast—very little dinner—no tea; not to lie in bed, but on the floor, and (suited the action to the word) whip yourself! whip yourself!! whip yourself!!!"

The next instance is an evident attempt to sanction the worship of images, relics, &c. Heb. xi. 21. Doway: "By faith, Jacob dying, blessed every one of the sons of Joseph, and *adored the top of his rod.*" Protestant: By faith Jacob, when he was dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph; and worshipped, *leaning upon the top of his staff.*

I will add only one more, the intention of which is too evident to be mistaken. Heb. xiii. 17. "Obey your *prelates*," &c. Protestant: "Obey them that have the rule over you," &c.

And THIS is the version, fellow-citizens, which you are taught to believe is preferable to the good old Bible which you have loved from your infancy, and whose excellencies (I will venture to say, in anticipation of my next article) as a whole, have never been surpassed.

In reference to the Popish version, a few of whose errors have been pointed out, I will not retort the peculiarly *delicate* idea of Mr. Corry, where he *elegantly* says that "the most respectful way" to dispose of the Protestant Bible "would be to burn it, rather than to give it to grocers and dealers to wrap their wares in it, or consign it to *more dishonorable purposes*," (!!!) but I will say, that the man who can permit himself to use such language in enlightened New England and in the nineteenth century, outrages the moral sense of the community

in which he lives, and exhibits a spirit worthy of that anti-christian church which has ever been "drunk with the blood of the saints," and has delighted not only in the burning of Protestant Bibles, but Protestant men and women.

But, in the words of good old John Bunyan, though the giant Pope be still alive, sitting "among the blood, bones, ashes, and mangled bodies of pilgrims that had gone this way formerly," yet, "by reason of age, and also of the many shrewd brushes that he met with in his younger days, he has grown so crazy and stiff in his joints, that he can now do little more than set in his cave's mouth, grinning at pilgrims, as they go by, and biting his nails, that he cannot come at them."

Providence, Jan. 20th, 1843.

CHAPTER II.

*King James' version—Mr. Curtis's statement—
Testimonies to the value of the Protestant
version—Father Corry's testimony—Persecu-
tion.*

IN my former article, I endeavoured to show that the Doway or Popish Bible, which Mr. Corry so strongly recommends to the patronage of Bible Societies, is a mere translation of a translation, and that neither the Latin Vulgate, or the English Doway translation of it, is free from the grossest errors. In this I shall proceed—

II. To *defend the version of King James* from the aspersions so unjustly cast upon it.

In Mr. Corry's letter he says, "If your correspondent wishes the Catholics to read the Bible, let him prove to them that there is *no error* in the Protestant version of it."

Whatever may be said of the Protestant version, I think it was proved in my last, that the Doway version is very far from possessing this qualification of entire freedom from error.

It may be easy for the Papists to *prove* their Bible to be free from error, at least to the satisfaction of their easily-deluded adherents, by the simple process of an infallible Popish decree, declaring it to be so. We have seen this power already exercised in declaring two different editions, between which there were more than two thousand variations, to be, each of them, positively free from error.

The Protestant, however, makes no such claim to infallibility, and therefore can only appeal to the Greek and Hebrew originals as the criterion of the fidelity of his version. The Protestant believes that they alone constitute the inspired standard of ultimate appeal, and dares not imitate the Popish Council of Trent, in elevating any human translation to an equality with the inspired original. He believes that "to err is hu-

man," and as the work of translating and setting up types is a human work, he admits the possibility of error. All he claims is, that the soundest learning, the most conscientious fidelity, and the most untiring industry, have been employed in making his version as nearly perfect as possible.*

We challenge the Papist to prove his own Bible to be free from a multitude of the grossest errors by any other process than an appeal to *Popish infallibility*.

* In recording the above opinion in relation to the qualifications of King James's translators, and their fidelity in performing their task, the author would qualify it by expressing his regret that their consciences were trammelled by the following rule, which is the third in the king's list of instructions to the translators, viz. :

"3. The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, as the word *church*, not to be translated *congregation*."

Without expressing an opinion in relation to the particular word mentioned here as an instance of one of a class of words, the author would take this opportunity of stating his solemn conviction that the conscience of a translator should be left perfectly free and untrammelled by any rules, except that of giving the exact meaning (as nearly as he can ascertain it, by earnest prayer and diligent study) of the original text. The Papists, however, can derive

If Mr. Corry should attempt to prove the fidelity of the Doway version, by an appeal to the Hebrew and Greek originals, I hereby engage to show FIVE instances of incorrect translation in the Doway version, for every ONE that he will prove to be so in the Protestant Bible.

Mr. Corry attempts to prove his charge that the Protestant version is "full of misrepresentation and errors," by an extract from an old copy of an obscure newspaper published some nine or ten years ago, in a country town in Massachusetts, in which it is said that a "reverend gentleman named Curtis has exposed some enormous errors and variations from the original text as given in King James's time," &c. "Six hundred mistakes have been found in one book, and eight hundred in another," &c. &c. After quoting these extracts, Mr. Corry proceeds to repeat the assertion that

no advantage from this confession, as they have retained in the Doway version a much larger number of *untranslated ecclesiastical words* than have the translators of the common version.

such a version ought not to be tolerated, and that the most respectful way to dispose of it would be to burn it, &c.

The evident design of Mr. Corry is to weaken the confidence of Protestants, in the fidelity of the common version of the Scriptures, and to make them suppose it contains many hundred instances of false translations from the original. It is necessary, therefore, to furnish the unlearned reader with some explanation of the above statement of Mr. Curtis. The statement was made before a Committee of the House of Commons, in reference to the question whether accuracy in *printing* Bibles would be best secured by continuing the monopoly which had existed for many years, or by promoting competition by opening the business to all.

1. Let it be remembered that the question in relation to which Mr. Curtis was examined by the committee, was not as to the conformity of King James's version with the Greek and Hebrew original, but in relation to the conformity of various

subsequent editions with the first edition of that version published in 1611.

2. That the "600 mistakes in one book," &c. are merely slight variations between different editions of the same version.

3. That these different editions have never, each of them, been declared absolutely perfect, by an *infallible Protestant bull*.

4. That these variations are, a large portion of them, unimportant typographical errors.

5. That nearly all the remainder consist of differences in the matter of *italics*, and many of them the most unimportant words, such as, for instance, the word *the* or *and*, and some other unimportant word being in italics in one edition, and in Roman letters in the other. Probably ninety-nine out of a hundred of all these variations between different editions, of which Mr. Corry attempts to make so much capital, consist in the fact that the *same word* is printed in *straight* letters in one edition, and in *slanting* letters in the other.

The American and Foreign Bible Society have lately published an edition, *verbatim et literatim*, from the edition of 1611, and by comparing a copy with the common editions, any person may decide for himself as to the accuracy of the above observations.

The charge which I am prepared to establish against the Doway Bible is not that in different editions, a word may be found in one in straight, and in the other in slanting letters, which does not affect the sense, but the more serious one that in many instances it falsifies, and in more it obscures, the meaning of the inspired Hebrew and Greek original.

The circumstances under which the Protestant version was prepared by forty-seven of the most learned men of the reign of King James I., so eminently adapted to secure its fidelity, are too well known to need repeating. I will quote testimonies to its value from some of the most learned scholars and theologians that England ever produced, and append to these testimonies the

opinion of one Romanist divine, that all may be able to judge of the value that is to be attached to the one or to the others. And though the testimony of so humble an individual as myself can add but little to the value of an opinion expressed by these giants in Biblical literature, yet I will add, that, after more than one careful comparison of the whole Hebrew and Greek originals with the version in common use among Protestants, though I am, by no means, convinced that King James's version is absolutely perfect, and I therefore rejoice in the additional light thrown upon many passages by the labours of Lowth. Doddridge, Campbell, M' Night and other more recent scholars, yet AS A WHOLE, I have never yet seen a version which I would be willing to substitute for that as the commonly received version of the mass of the people. I have seen many which I would have *lay by its side* to assist in the reading of it, but none which I should wish TO TAKE ITS PLACE.—The following

testimonies might easily have been increased.

John Selden.—"The English translation of the Bible is the best translation in the world."

Bishop Walton.—"The last English translation, made by divers learned men, at the command of King James, may justly contend with any now extant in any other language in Europe."

Bishop Lowth.—"The common translation of the bible is the best standard of our language."

Dr. Geddes.—"If accuracy, fidelity, and the strictest attention to the letter of the text be supposed to constitute the qualities of an excellent version, this, of all versions, must, in general, be accounted the most excellent. Every sentence, every word, every syllable, every letter and point, seem to have been weighed with the nicest exactitude, and expressed either in the text or margin, with the greatest precision."

Dr. Doddridge.—"On a diligent comparison of our translation with the original,

we find that of the New Testament, and I might also add that of the Old, in the main, faithful and judicious."

Rev. J. W. Whitaker.—"It may be compared with any translation in the world without fear of inferiority; it has not shrunk from the most vigorous examination; it challenges investigation, and in spite of numerous attempts to supersede it, it has hitherto remained unrivalled in the affections of the country."

Dr. Adam Clarke.—"The translators have seized the very spirit and soul of the original, and expressed this, almost every where, with pathos and energy. The *original* from which it was taken, is alone superior to the bible translated by the authority of King James."

I will add the opinion of but one more divine concerning this version, and then leave the reader to judge between the testimonies of the above learned men, and the following:—

Rev. John Corry, Catholic Priest, of Providence, R. I.—"As for myself, I would

not hesitate to say, that the most respectful [way] would be to burn it, rather than give it to grocers and dealers to wrap their wares in, or *consign it to more dishonourable purposes ; (!)* and I hardly think that there is a man of *common sense, (!!)* be he Catholic or Protestant, that would not say the same.”(!!!)

IN reference to Mr. Corry's denial of Popish* persecutions, I would write another

* In employing the terms *Papist* and *Popery*, where Papists themselves would use *Catholic* and *Catholicism*, I use them not as terms of reproach, but simply because they are in my estimation the correct terms. When I speak of Popery, I cannot call it the *Catholic religion*, because I believe that it possesses, less than any other system a claim to this title. The primary meaning of *Catholic* as given by Webster is “*universal or general,*” the secondary meaning is “*liberal ; not narrow minded, partial, or bigoted.*” Now as Popery possesses no claim to the term *Catholic* in either of these senses, and in the latter, less claim than any other system which has ever passed under the name of Christianity, it is not the CATHOLIC RELIGION.—The term *Papist* comes from the Latin word for

article, did I deem it necessary so to do. The horrid butcheries of sincere and pious Christians, by the Pope and his adherents, are too well known to need proof. Even our very children are familiar with the dreadful cruelties inflicted in the dungeons of the Popish inquisition, the burning of *heretics* by scores at the Popish galas, called *auto da fes*, the crusades against the Albigenses and Waldenses, the burnings at Smithfield under that faithful daughter of the Pope, 'Bloody Queen Mary,' the Popish massacres of St. Bartholomew in 1572,* and of Ireland 1641, &c. &c.

Really, Mr. Corry must think he resides in a very benighted community, or that we

Pope (*papa*) and the term Popery from the English word. These terms are therefore the most suitable and fair descriptive words that can be employed. I hope Protestants in future will universally avoid the inconsistency of applying the term *Catholic Church*, to a community which they believe to be nothing more nor less than the grand ANTICHRISTIAN APOSTACY.

* When the news of this horrid massacre of 30,000 Protestants reached Rome, the Pope ordered a solemn procession to the chapel of St. Marks, to thank God for the *extirpation of the heretics*.

are guided in our course of reading by the Popish *Index expurgatorius*, or the index of prohibited books, to think of denying a fact written in lines of blood in the history of most of the nations of Europe Does Mr. Corry suppose that the American Protestant community are altogether ignorant of the existence of a book entitled *Directorium Inquisitorium*, (Directory for Inquisitors) published at Rome in 1584, by command of the Cardinals Inquisitors General, with the approbation of Pope Gregory XIII, printed with it? in which book are found such precious specimens of Papal *mercy* as the following—“*A whole city must be burnt on account of the heretics who live in it. Whoever pleases may seize and kill any heretics,*” &c. &c. If necessary, I am prepared to furnish from this book a number of similar extracts, illustrative of the *tender mercies* of Popery.

“Oh,” but say some, “Roman Catholicism is changed now from what it was in those days of darkness.” No, fellow citizens; **POPERY IS “UNCHANGABLE.”** Here for

once Mr. Corry is right, when he asserts that Popery, or as he calls, "Catholicity, is unchangeable." Yes, the very idea of Popish infallibility, forbids the possibility of change. If Popery, therefore, ever persecuted heretics—if she ever kindled the fires of Smithfield—if she ever tortured the humble but helpless followers of Christ, in the dungeons of the Inquisition, she would do it now, *if she only had the power*. Popery is the same now as when she established that horrid tribunal, and, in the burning words of Pollock—

———"With horrid relish drank the blood
Of God's peculiar children—and was drunk;
And in her drunkenness dreamed of doing good.
The supplicating hand of innocence,
That made the tiger mild, and in his wrath
The lion pause—the groans of suffering most
Severe were nought to her: she laughed at groans;
No music pleased her more; and no repast
So sweet to her as blood of men redeemed
By blood of Christ. Ambition's self, though mad,
And nursed on human gore, with her compared
Was merciful. Nor did she always rage:
She had some hours of meditation, set
Apart, wherein she to her study went;

The Inquisition, model most complete
 Of perfect wickedness, where deeds were done,
 Deeds! let them ne'er be named,—and sat and
 planned

Deliberately, and with most musing pains,
 How, to extremest thrill of agony,
 The flesh, and blood, and souls of holy men,
 Her victims, might be wrought; and when she saw
 New tortures of her labouring fancy born,
 She leaped for joy, and made great haste to try
 Their force—well pleased to hear a deeper groan.”*

Yes, Protestant fellow citizens, Popery is unchangeable. If she ever was a wolf, though she may try to hide her teeth, and cover herself with the skin of a lamb, she is a wolf still; but, blessed be God, she is *muzzled!* May God preserve America from ever being brought under her tyrannical and bloody rule!

I would be the last unnecessarily to raise a single note of alarm, in reference to the increase of Popish power in the United States. Till within a few months past, I have been disposed to think an unnecessary

* For a thrilling and accurate description of the tortures of the Inquisition see Brownlee's Letters, pages 333—340.

degree of apprehension has existed in the minds of many on the subject.

I cannot, even yet, bring myself to believe that in the midst of intelligence, such as prevails in this country, Popery can ever so far regain its lost power, as to renew the scenes of Smithfield and of Oxford, in the burnings of the Bradfords, and the Rogers, and the Ridleys, and the Latimers, of our American Zion—but from the spirit lately exhibited, I am satisfied it will not be *for the want of a disposition* on the part of the Papists to renew these cruel scenes if they could.

Is there not something ominous in the resemblance between the atrocious act of burning the bibles at Champlain, which Mr. Corry justifies, and the similar conduct of the Papists in the horrible Irish massacre, during which 150,000 Protestants were murdered by the Papists? Says Rev. John Lewis, in his *History of Translations*, p. 355: “In that horrid rebellion which the Irish Roman Catholics raised in that kingdom A. D. 1641, among other instan-

ces of their hatred of the Protestant religion, which they then gave, this was one, their tearing, burning, wallowing in the mire, and cursing the English bibles, of which they burnt no fewer than 140 at one time, saying, when they were in the fire, that it was hell fire that burned."

The act of burning our bibles is a bolder step than I had supposed these minions of Rome YET dared to take at least PUBLICLY, (though many priests have long been in the habit of doing it privately).

Let us see to it that they do not succeed in bringing back those days, when they burned Protestant bibles *in the same fires with their owners!*

FATHER IVERS' ADDITIONAL ATTACK UPON THE PROTESTANT BIBLE.

After the appearance of the foregoing deserved rebuke of Mr. Corry's outrageous attack upon the Holy Bible, another Popish priest, named Ivers, of Pawtucket, a village

four miles from Providence, came to the assistance of his crestfallen brother, and published a renewed attack upon the Protestant version of the scriptures in the shape of a long letter, of which the following are extracts. The literary character of Mr. Ivers' production is below contempt, and would disgrace a common school boy, and its style is so far beneath the dignity of any person claiming the character of a *clergyman* or a *gentleman*, that I should suffer it to pass with the silent contempt it deserved, were it not for the service it will render to the cause of truth, by the additional illustration it presents of the spirit of Popery, and the opportunity it affords me of stating some additional facts in relation to the Popish and Protestant scriptures, which for want of room were withheld in the articles published in the Providence Journal.

The following extracts from Mr. Ivers' letter, are inserted, because in them the charges of Mr. Corry against the Protestant bible are renewed, and because they

afford a fair specimen of the style and *argument*(?) of this Popish Apologist Number 2, for the Champlain Bible burners.—

1 “*Doctor Doctorum, Doctissime, Doctor Dowling.* 5 D’s I give thee for thy title !! All thy weeping and gnashing of teeth cannot avail thee, nor save the good old concern (meaning the Protestant bible) from its impending fate, unless thou provest to the Rev. Mr. Corry, who hath thee completely muzzled, that what thou callest the bible is the word of God.”

* * * * *

2 “You say that it is a translation from the original tongues. I answer that, if you can prove *that*, I will trumpet your praises to the world, as far as my feeble voice can waft them. Doctor Doctorum Doctissime Doctor Dowling, “*hic labor hoc opus est.*”—If you say that your bible is a spurious translation of spurious copies of Hebrew and Greek I shall not quarrel with you—but if you mean to say that it is a correct translation of the pure original copies of Hebrew and Greek then I beg leave to differ with you.”

* * * * *

3. "Does not the celebrated Tertullian, as well as St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and other Fathers and Doctors of the Christian Church complain and testify that "both the Hebrew and Greek editions are most foully corrupted by the Jews and Heretics, since the Latin was truly translated of them, whilst they were more pure, and that the same Latin hath been much better preserved from corruptions, so that the old Latin vulgate edition hath been preferred and used as most authentical, for more than 1300 years."

* * * * *

4. "Doctor Doctorum—I have proved your Bible to be incorrect, from Protestant authority—why do you not prove mine to be incorrect from Catholic authority, or from decision of an Œcumenical Council, or even from Protestant authority, as far as sense and meaning are concerned? I defy you to do so; and I must say, until you prove to the Rev. Mr. Corry, who has you completely muzzled, that your bible is the word of God; or in other words, that it is a correct translation from the pure original copies of Hebrew and Greek, I shall consider you a very harmless watchman on Zion's walls. But you must prove it otherwise than by silly plagiarisms, puerile

ipse dixits, funny Bunyanisms, and unfounded assertions. I must confess you have acted prudently in calling upon the gentlemen of the University, to supply your deficiency.* But take heed that it may not turn out with these gentlemen as with the Puseyites in England, who translated the Holy Fathers and the Roman Breviary, with a view to detect and expose Catholicity, but who ended by their becoming members of the Catholic church."

* * * * *

5. D. D. D. D.—you say that we conceal the meaning by giving a Greek word instead of an English word, and then you give examples.—Doctor are you not ashamed of yourself—I should rather say are you not ashamed of your gross ignorance even of your own bible? I say if it be wrong in us to do so you are guilty of the

*In relation to calling on the gentlemen of the University, to supply my "deficiency" I would observe that I have made no call on them whatever, in relation to this whole matter, and the only allusion I have made to them, is an expression of regret in my first article, that I had been driven to the task of defending the Holy Bible, from these Popish attacks, because "a vindication from some of the learned professors of our University, or from some other abler pen than my own," had not appeared.

same. Do you not also reserve words of the original tongues, Hebrew and Greek, in your spurious translation, such as Sabbath, Ephod, Pentecost, Proselyte, &c.? With what good grace this comes from your D. D. D. D. D., let the erudite Protestant reader judge. In retorting the argument, I cannot help addressing, in the words of the Scripture, "Out of thine own mouth I judge thee thou wicked servant." As I perceive you are ignorant of the cause why a few words of the original tongues are retained in *your* and *our* translation, I will tell you the reason, and let it not escape your memory. The poverty of the English language, is the cause—not having sufficiently appropriate words or terms to express those particular words in the original tongues, and therefore St. Jerome and others of the Holy Fathers, as well as your holy interpreters, retained those words in the original tongues, or gave them an English termination to avoid a multiplicity of English terms, without which, the meaning of the word in the original tongue could not be expressed or signified in the vernacular language."

CHAPTER III.

*The five D's—Amusing blunder of Mr. Ivers—
Catholic bible proved erroneous from Catholic
authority—Dr. Jahn—Reasons why so many
words are left by the Papists untranslated.*

So far as the five D's are concerned and all else of the preceding remarks of Mr. Ivers, which may be classed under the head of *slang*, I shall leave the reader to attach just so much weight to them, as he thinks they deserve. Certainly, no reader will doubt the justice of a cause which is supported by arguments so powerful as the tenfold repetition of five D's!!

If any one should think that the man who employs such *weighty* arguments, has established a just claim to a title, not of five D's, but of five letters, of which the first is a D; and the last, the next in the alphabet, I shall not dispute the correctness of his conclusion.

The most amusing, to the scholar, of the above extracts from Mr. Ivers, will be that numbered 3, in which he puts into the mouths of Tertullian, St. Ambrose, and St. Jerome, the words printed in marks of quotation, commendatory of "the old Latin Vulgate edition," and stating that it "hath been preferred and used as most authentic for more than 1300 years." I was disposed to think that this singular statement must be a mistake of the printer, till I saw certain errata corrected in the next number of the paper, in which there was no allusion to this. Now let the unlearned reader be informed that the St. Jerome mentioned there, was *himself the translator of the Latin Vulgate*, and that he flourished near the close of the fourth century, and that both Tertullian and St. Ambrose lived and wrote *before the Latin Vulgate was in existence*, the former near 200 years before. How it was possible for them to express such an opinion of a translation made after their death, I am unable to imagine, unless by a Popish miracle, it was

handed down, by them, from heaven, in return for the favour of being enrolled in the calendar of Popish saints.

I can conceive of no object which Mr. Ivers could have in this absurdly false statement, unless it was to throw dust in the eyes of the unlearned reader, by the mention of great names of Saints, and Fathers, and Doctors, and to leave the impression that the man who could quote such names must be profoundly learned and wondrous wise! Said an individual to me, after reading Mr. Ivers' bombastical letter, "Well, this Mr. Ivers is more of a man than Mr. Corry, and I should suppose much better read, for he refers to a great many ancient writers." If this was the effect he intended to produce, he has most singularly failed, except with the grossly ignorant; for with all the coarse vulgarity, and unfounded assertion of Mr. Corry, he has written nothing which exhibits so much of either consummate ignorance or wilful deception, as the above and some other of the statements of Mr. Ivers.

In number 4 of the above extracts of Mr. Ivers inquiries—"Why do you not prove my translation to be incorrect from Catholic authority?" I will endeavour to accommodate him by giving the opinion of a learned Roman Catholic in relation to the Latin Vulgate of Jerome, from which the Popish translation is made. The writer I shall refer to is John Jahn, Doctor of Philosophy and Theology, and Professor of the Oriental Languages, &c., in the University of Vienna. In Jahn's Introduction to the Old Testament, § 62, the learned author remarks that Jerome, the translator of the Vulgate, "Did not invariably give what he himself believed to be the best translation of the original, but occasionally, as he confesses (*Præf. ad Com. in Eccles.*) followed the Greek translators, although he was aware that they had often erred through negligence, because he was apprehensive of giving umbrage to his readers by too wide a departure from the established version; and therefore we find that, in his commen-

taries, he sometimes corrects his own translation. Sometimes, too, he has substituted a worse in place of the old translation."

In § 64 of the same work, Dr. Jahn says, "The universal admission of this version throughout the vast extent of the Latin Church multiplied the copies of it, in the transcription of which it became corrupted with many errors. Towards the close of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century, it was, at the command of Charlemagne, corrected by Alcium from the Hebrew text. This recension was either not widely propagated, or was again infected with errors; for which reason Lanfrancs, Archbishop of Canterbury, who died in 1089, caused some copies to be again corrected. Nevertheless, Cardinal Nicholas, about the middle of the 12th century, found *tot exemplaria quot codices* as many copies as manuscripts, and therefore prepared a correct edition."

In the year 1540, the celebrated printer, Robert Stephens, printed an edition of the Vulgate with the various readings of three

editions and fourteen manuscripts. "This again," says the learned Roman Catholic writer, "was compared by Hentenius with many other manuscripts and editions, and he added the various readings to an edition published at Louvain in 1547. This edition was frequently reprinted, and was published at Antwerp in 1580, and again in 1585, enriched with many more various readings, obtained by a new collation of manuscripts by the divines of Louvain."

It was the immense number of errors existing in copies of the Vulgate previous to the year 1590 that led to the attempt of Pope Sixtus V. to settle for ever the text by an edition, issued under infallible Papal authority, the errors of which have been already sufficiently exposed in the present work, (see page 46.)

As it is not unlikely that some of the Papists may deny the correctness of what has been stated in relation to the 2000 variations between the Sixtine and Clementine editions of the Vulgate Bible, it may be well to quote the words of this

learned and candid Romanist professor. Says Dr. Jahn, § 66, "The edition of Sixtus appeared in 1590, and its use was enjoined upon the whole Latin Church by a constitution of perpetual obligation, while at the same time the future publication of the Vulgate with various readings prohibited. Sixtus V. dying soon after, his edition was found to abound in errors, and under Gregory XIV. it was corrected in nearly 2000 places. This new edition appeared under Clement VIII. in 1592, and has been followed by every other which has since been published." I would recommend Messrs. Corry and Ivers, with other eulogists of their "incomparable Vulgate," to ponder the following sentence of Dr. Jahn: "The more learned Catholics have never denied the existence of errors in the Vulgate, on the contrary, Isidore Clavius collected EIGHTY THOUSAND." It is amusing to notice the embarrassment caused to this learned Romanist, by the decree of the Council of Trent establishing the authority of the Vulgate. As a good

Catholic he was bound to receive that decree, and yet his learning forbade him blind his eyes to the errors of that version, elevated by the said decree to a higher stand than the original Hebrew and Greek text. The attempt of Dr. Jahn to explain the decree of the Council of Trent, so as to reconcile it with his own enlightened views of the Latin Vulgate, exhibits an amusing specimen of ingenuity, and may be seen in his Introduction to the Old Testament, § 65.

As the stream cannot rise higher than the fountain, and the Popish Doway Bible is nothing more than a translation of this corrupt Latin Vulgate, it is evident that all the errors which exist in the one will be perpetuated in the other, besides, in all probability a large addition to their number from the process of translating from one language to another, viz., from the Latin to the English. As the Popish Testament was published in 1582, and consequently before the appearance of either the Sixtine or Clementine edition of the Vulgate, it is

impossible to say from which one of the hundreds of various copies of the Vulgate, this translation was made.

The learned Dr. Adam Clarke states in his Introduction to his Commentary on the Four Gospels, that he had in his possession several manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate, "written from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, which," says he, "are exceedingly discordant among themselves."²

Now, I would ask again, which is to be preferred, a mere translation of a translation, the Doway English translation of the Vulgate Latin translation, or a translation made by competent and faithful men immediately out of the inspired Hebrew and Greek?

The insinuation of Mr. Ivers, in extract 2, that "the Protestant Bible is a spurious translation of *spurious* copies of Hebrew and Greek, is so contrary to universally known and acknowledged historical truth, that I shall not pause to give a word of reply. The writer himself did not believe

it, when he permitted his pen to record so foul and unblushing a calumny and falsehood.

I have a few words to say in relation to extract from Mr. Ivers, number 5, in which he supposes, or affects to suppose, I am ignorant of the fact, that some few words have been transferred without being translated in our own Bible. I must certainly confess my obligations to the *obliging* Mr. Ivers for his *self-complacent* offer to enlighten my ignorance on this subject. Perhaps, however, he might have spared himself the trouble, had he happened to have seen a little work written by his *docile scholar*, some five years ago, when pastor of a church in New York, the express design of which is to show that in the work of translating the Scriptures no word ought to be *transferred* which is capable of a literal *translation*, when the said *transference* requires the coining of a new word, before unknown in the language. For the *profound* piece of instruc-

tion which Mr. Ivers bids me not to allow to escape my memory, viz., that the poverty of the English language is the cause why the Papists have left so many words untranslated, &c. &c., I beg to return him my humble acknowledgments. I will return the favour by suggesting, however, a few more probable reasons, for their shutting up so large a portion of the Scriptures in an unknown language, as follows :

“The plan of covering up the meaning of many of the words in the Sacred Scriptures, by leaving them untranslated,” says a sensible and judicious writer, “*was an expedient to which the Roman party had recourse, in order to keep the laity partially in the dark, when they found they could not keep them in the dark wholly, but must allow them something that should be called a translation.*”

Every one acquainted with the true character of Popery, knows that it hates the Bible, and that the only light which Popish priests would willingly shed from the Bible, (as it was recently remarked on

the occasion of the Bible conflagration,) is THE LIGHT OF ITS HOLY LEAVES ON FIRE. Most gladly would they continue to lock up the whole Bible from the people in an unknown tongue as they did for centuries, if public sentiment permitted it. Since, however, the progress of light has forbidden the continuance of this spiritual tyranny, and compelled them to give the people something that shall be called a translation, they conceal the meaning of as many words as they dare in an unknown tongue, and then keep even this *apology for a translation* from as many of their deluded adherents as will submit to their ghostly domination.

This view of the subject is confirmed by the following historical fact from Bishop Burnet, the celebrated ecclesiastical historian, in relation to the notorious Gardiner, one of the most bloodthirsty of the Popish Bishops, who, in the reign of bloody Queen Mary, gratified their hellish malignity with the dying agonies and groans of the suffering martyrs of Jesus,

who won the martyr's crown amidst the fires of Smithfield.

The crafty Bishop Gardiner, finding in the later part of the Reign of Henry VIII. that to withhold an English testament was impossible, maintained that there were many words in the New Testament of such majesty, that they were not to be translated; but must stand in the English Bible as they were in the Latin. A hundred of these he put into a written list, which was read in convocation. "His design in this," says Burnet, "was visible; that if a translation must be made, it should be so daubed all through with Latin words, that the people should not understand it much better for its being in English. A taste of this the reader may have by the first twenty of them: *ecclesia, pœnitentia, pontifex, ancilla, contritus, olocausta, justitia, justificatio, idiota, elementa, baptizare, martyr, adorare, sandalium, simplex, tetrarcha, sacramentum, simulachrum, gloria*. The design he had of keeping some of these, particularly the last

save one(*simulachrum*, an image,) is plain enough ; that the people might not discover that visible opposition which was between the Scriptures and the Roman church in the mater of images. This could not be better palliated, than by disguising these places with words that the people understood not."

CHAPTER IV.

*Popish Priests hate all bibles in the vulgar tongue
—Proof from Council of Trent—From Pope
Gregory XVI—Doway Bible not allowed with-
out Popish notes—Auto da fe of CATHOLIC
Bibles.*

THE pretence of Popish Priests, that their objection to Bible Societies, is owing to their circulating the "corrupt Protestant version," is only an ill-designed attempt to conceal their hatred to any and every version of the Holy Bible in the vernacular tongue. Their hatred is not to any one particular version of the Scriptures, but to every version in a language that the people can understand. Hence Popish Priests dare not allow, even the corrupt Doway Bible to be circulated *without note or comment*. Accordingly we find in those copies which a portion of the Papal community in this country are allowed to use,

notes appended, especially to those passages, where the reader would be likely to discover the inspired picture of the Papal Antichristian Apostacy, unless guarded against this discovery by the explanatory notes; which notes, a good Catholic is bound to receive with the same reverence as the words of the Scripture itself, because they contain the sense of "holy mother church, whose right it is" in the words of the Council of Trent, "to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Writ." Hence THE RIGHT OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT is absolutely forbidden to the Roman Catholic, and the corresponding right of freemen, THE LIBERTY OF THE PRESS is denied to every votary of this enslaving superstition. This is the grand reason why I have little fear of the spread of Popery among FREEBORN AMERICANS, *if they only understand it.*

Americans claim the right of thinking what they please, and publishing what they think, being amenable only to the civil government for the use of that right.

Popery forbids them the liberty of either thinking for themselves, or publishing for themselves, unless "examined and approved by the ordinary," or sanctioned by "the license of his superiors."

In order to shut out the possibility of denial of these charges by the Popish priests, whose settled Jesuitical policy it is to deny every thing, however well established, if the denial will be for the advantage of "holy mother church," I will quote from their own decree passed at the fourth session of the "Sacred, Holy, Œcumenical and General Council of Trent." The italicising is my own, for the purpose of calling the special attention of *free Americans* to the passages so marked.

"In order to restrain petulant minds, the Council further decrees, that in matters of faith and morals and whatever relates to the maintenance of Christian doctrine, no one, confiding in his own judgment, shall dare to wrest the sacred Scriptures to his own sense of them, contrary to that which hath been held and still is

held by holy mother church, whose right it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Sacred Writ; or contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers; even though such interpretations should never be published. If any disobey, *let them be denounced by the ordinaries, and punished according to law.*

“ Being desirous also, as is reasonable, of setting bounds to the printers, who *with unlimited boldness, supposing themselves at liberty to do as they please,* print editions of the Holy Scriptures with notes and expositions taken indifferently from any writer without the permission of their ecclesiastical superiors, and that at a concealed or falsely-designated press, and, which is worse, without the name of the author—and also rashly expose books of this nature to sale in other countries; the holy Council decrees and ordains, that for the future the sacred Scriptures and especially the old Vulgate edition shall be printed in the most correct manner possible; and no one shall be permitted to print or cause to be printed any books relating to religion without the name of the author; neither shall any one hereafter *sell such books, or even retain them in his possession,* unless they have been first examined

and approved by the ordinary, under penalty of *anathema*, and the *pecuniary fine adjudged by the last council of Lateran*.* And if they be regulars, they shall obtain, besides this examination and approval, the license of their superiors, who shall examine books according to the forms of their statutes. Those who circulate or publish them in manuscript without being examined and approved, shall be liable to *the same penalties as the printers*; and those who possess or read them, unless they declare the authors of them shall themselves be considered as the author."

To prove that Popery has not changed its deadly hostility to liberty of conscience and liberty of the press, since the date of the Council of Trent, in the sixteenth cen-

* A. D. 1515. The decree of that Council was to this effect; that no book whatever should be printed without examination and license by the bishop, his deputy, or an inquisitor; and that those who offended should forfeit the whole impression of the book printed, which should be publicly burnt, pay a fine of 100 ducats, be suspended from the exercise of their trade for one year, and lie under excommunication!

tury, I will present the reader with the following quotations from a document, which no Roman Catholic will presume to dispute, emanating from the Supreme Pontiff himself, of no older date than August 15th, 1832. The document is the famous Encyclical letter of the now reigning Pope,—Gregory XVI.

1. "From that polluted fountain of indifference flows that absurd and erroneous doctrine, or rather raving, in favour and in defence of '*liberty of conscience*,' for which *most pestilential error*, the course is opened by that entire and wild *liberty of opinion* which is every where attempting the overthrow of civil and religious institutions; and which the unblushing impudence of some, has held forth as an advantage of religion."* * * *

"From hence arise these revolutions in the minds of men, hence this aggravated corruption of youth, hence this contempt among the people of sacred things, and of the most holy institutions and laws; hence, in one word, that *pest of all others most*

to be dreaded in a State, unbridled liberty of opinion."

2. Again: "Hither tends that worst and never sufficiently to be execrated and detested liberty of the press for the diffusion of all manner of writings, which some so loudly contend for and so actively promote."

3. And again; "Nor can we augur more consoling consequences to religion and to government, from the zeal of some to separate *the church from the state*, and to burst the bond which unites the priesthood to the Empire. For it is clear that this union is dreaded by the profane lovers of liberty, only because it has never failed to confer prosperity on both."*

Here is documentary evidence of the

* If any reader thinks there is no danger to the liberties of this country from the prevalence of a system thus hostile to liberty of conscience and the press; a system that acknowledges allegiance to a potentate at Rome, who has "power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths and governments," as "illegal without his sacred confirmation," let him peruse the Jesuits' oath. See Appendix B, at the end of this volume.

highest kind to show that Popery is *unchanged*, to prove that the Popery of the nineteenth century and the Popery of the sixteenth are the same. Here we have it officially promulgated by the *present Pope*, that LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE, LIBERTY OF OPINION, THE LIBERTY OF THE PRESS, AND THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE, are four of the sorest evils with which a nation can be cursed!

It is not to be wondered at that Popish priests should be afraid of the right of private judgment in reference to the Sacred Scriptures. There is abundantly sufficient, even in the corrupt Doway bible, to convince the unprejudiced reader who exercises the right of judging for himself, that Popery is the great Apostacy predicted in 2 Thess. ii. 34, and that "the man of sin," "who opposeth and is lifted up above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God," is no other than the Papal Antichrist.* Hence

* Among the distinguished writers who have

we are at no loss why the copies of the Doway bible are accompanied by a note, giving some other explanation to this passage. Who can doubt, if allowed the exercise of his own private judgment, that the above passage is descriptive of the Popes of Rome, especially if he read in connexion with it, the description given by a Roman Catholic traveller of the manner in which the Pope is ordinarily received at Rome, when he shows himself to the multitude after performing divine service in the church of St. Peter's.

maintained the identity of Papal Rome with Antichrist, may be mentioned, in addition to *all* the continental and British Reformers, the names of Mede, Sir Isaac Newton, Brightman, Cressener, Whiston, Bishops Newton and Hurd, William Lowth, Dr. H. More, Daubuz, Jurieu, Vitringa, Pyle, and Dr. S. Clarke. Of the *Churches* which have borne the same testimony in their authorized doctrinal standards it will be sufficient to mention the Lutheran Church, the Church of England, and its daughter the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, the Church of Ireland, the Baptist Church, the Reformed Church of Holland and Germany, the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the various branches of the Presbyterian Church in Europe and America."—*Address of Protestant Association.*

“The immense area and colonnade, before the church,” says Eustace in his classical tour “are lined with troops, and crowded with thousands of spectators. All eyes are fixed on the gallery, (in front of the church;) the chant of the choir is heard at a distance; the blaze of numberless torches plays round the columns; and the pontiff appears elevated upon his chair of state, under the middle arch. *Instantly the whole multitude below fall on their knees*; the cannons of St. Angelo give a general discharge, while rising slowly, from his throne he lifts up his hands to heaven, stretches forth his arm, and thrice gives his benediction, to the crowd, to the city and to all mankind: a solemn pause follows, another discharge is heard, the crowd rises, and the pomp gradually disappears.” Whenever the pontiff appears in public, all kneel in his sight; and in private there are “greater appearances of splendour in the approach to his person than in an introduction to any other sovereign.” In the ceremony called the adoration of the Pope, which takes place almost immediately after his election, “he is placed in a chair *on the altar* of the Sixtine chapel, and there receives the homage of the cardinals; this ceremony is again

repeated *on the high altar* of St. Peter's." "But why"—asks the writer quoted above—"why should the altar be made his footstool! The altar, *the beauty of holiness*, the throne of the *victim-lamb*, the *mercy-seat* of the temple of Christianity; why should the altar be converted into the foestool of a mortal? Why, indeed, I ask, but as a fulfilment of the apostolic prediction—"He as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God?"

Another instance where the plain reader, if allowed the exercise of private judgment, when reading his Doway bible, *without note or comment*, would be likely to recognize Popery, would be 1 Tim. vi. 1—4, where certain are spoken of who should "depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error," &c., "*forbidding to marry*," &c. What more natural than to conclude that the persons who should depart from the faith are Papists, and that here is an allusion to the enforced celibacy of the Popish clergy? and hence there is a caption at the beginning of the chapter, "he warns him

against *heretics* ;” and a note appended to guard against applying the passage to Papal Antichrist, and the Papist *dares not think* for himself, or read his bible without the accompanying note. The same remark may be made in reference to 1 Tim. iii. 2. “It behoveth therefore a bishop to be blameless, *the husband of one wife.*” (*Doway version.*) Lest the honest reader, should, in the exercise of his own private judgment, suppose this passage to be a little inconsistent with the usages of that apostate church which “forbids to marry,” and will not allow a bishop or other clergyman to have a wife at all, a note is appended, making a most lame attempt to explain away the plain and obvious meaning of the passage. It is a little remarkable that in the edition from which I quote (*Philadelphia edition*, published with the approbation of the Bishops of Baltimore, Philadelphia and New York,) there should be no note appended to the fourth verse of the same chapter, in relation to an additional qualification of a bishop, “one that ruleth well

his own house, having *his children* in subjection with all chastity." Perhaps it was not thought necessary to say any thing about a bishop governing his children, who had no wife, because it is so notorious a fact that the bishops of Rome, and other Popish bishops, have too often presented the disgraceful spectacle of unmarried men with large families of children. It will not help the cause of popery, to retort this charge upon Protestants, as it is well known that whenever a Protestant clergyman is convicted of such an offence, he is invariably deposed from his ministerial office, while the Bishops of Rome and multitudes of other ecclesiastics have lived for years in the public and notorious practice of the grossest licentiousness, and yet retained all the honours and emoluments of the episcopal and priestly office. If this statement should be denied, I am prepared to publish statements, from *Roman Catholic*, as well as *Protestant authorities*, of the scandalous lives of Popes Alexander VI. and his incestuous family, Julius II. and Leo X.,

as ought to make the ears of every adherent of the Papal mother of abominations "to tingle."

Notwithstanding the loud boast of Mr. Corry, therefore, that if the Bible Societies would publish the Doway Bible, they would "get every Catholic priest in America to help them in the distribution of it," Mr. Corry himself knows, that if it were *without Popish notes*, he would no more dare to circulate it than he would the Protestant version. In proof of this statement I quote from two Catholic documents.

1. From the "Declaration of the Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic, and their coadjutors in Great Britain." Thus they write :—

"When the reading and the circulation of the Scriptures are urged and recommended as the entire rule of faith, as the sole means by which men are to be brought to the certain and specific knowledge of the doctrines, precepts, and institutions of Christ! and when the Scriptures so

read and circulated are left to the interpretation and private judgment of each individual; then such reading, circulation, and interpretation, are forbidden by the Catholic Church, because the Catholic Church knows that the circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of them by each one's private judgment, was not the means ordained by Christ for the communication of the true knowledge of his law to all nations." "That the unauthorized reading and circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of them by private judgment, are calculated to lead men to *contradictory doctrines on the primary articles of Christian belief, &c.*"

2. From the fourth rule of the "Congregation of the Index."

"It is manifest from experience," say they, "that if the Holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it."*

If any additional proof is needed that

the hostility of Popish priests to the Bible is not merely against *any one* version, but against all versions in the vulgar tongue, the following letter, communicated by the Rev. J. C. Brigham, Secretary of the American Bible Society, received by him from a worthy agent of that society, in Chili, South America, giving an account of a public *auto da fe* of Spanish New Testaments, not of the Protestant version, but *translated from the Roman Catholic Vulgate, by a Spanish Roman Catholic Bishop*, must certainly be sufficient.

BURNING OF SPANISH CATHOLIC NEW TESTAMENTS, AT CHILI.

REV. J. C. BRIGHAM.

My Dear Sir,—Soon after my arrival in this place, some persons informed me that the New Testament had been taken from them as a proscribed book, and that several copies were to be BURNED in the public square on the following Sabbath. Letters had been received, I was further informed, from the Pope himself, cautioning the bishops and priests against spurious edi-

tions of the New Testament printed in England, and circulated gratuitously in South America, for the purpose of creating divisions and heresies in the church. In order to obviate misapprehensions of this kind, I have repeatedly presented your edition of the New Testament to the clergy for their inspection, requesting them to compare it with their own copies of Scio, at the same time offering to give up all the books in my possession (for I had Testaments only,) in case there should be discovered the slightest discrepancy between them. As the comparison has uniformly resulted in our favour, the clergy have resorted to the old objection, that *all editions of the Bible and Testament without notes are prohibited by a decree of the Council of Trent.* On Sabbath evening, the time fixed for the sacrilegious conflagration, a procession was formed, having the curate at the head, and conducted with the usual pomp, the priest kneeling a few moments at each corner of the square, and placing a large crucifix upon the ground. This was done in conformity with an uncertain tradition, that the Saviour fell four times on his way to Calvary under the weight of the cross. A temporary pulpit had been erected in the square,

and a sermon was preached containing some useful exhortations, and enforcing the necessity of frequent bodily discipline. During the afternoon a fire had been kindled for the purpose, I was told by several bystanders, of burning heretical books which ridiculed the mass and confession; and among the number was mentioned Abelard and Eloisa, Volney's Ruins, and the New Testament. A guard of soldiers prevented me from examining them separately, but I stood sufficiently near to discover that the greater part were copies of the New Testament issued by the American Bible Society. As the flame ascended, increasing in brightness, one of the clergy shouted "Viva Deos," (Let God reign,) which was immediately echoed by the loud acclamations of a large concourse of people. For the time I forgot what a late writer says, "We must always remember that South America is a Christian and not a heathen land." The outrage was public, and instead of being disowned, was openly defended, and done, it was said, in compliance with the decree of an infallible Council."

"The Scriptures burned," adds Mr. Brigham, "were of the approved Spanish version, translated from the Vulgate by a Spanish bishop.

They were New Testaments too, so the plea that the Apocrypha was excluded could not be urged. They were portions of their own acknowledged word of God, solemnly committed to the flames !”

Well and truly was it remarked recently by a reverend gentlemen in the city of New York, “That Romanism is the same in this country as in the old world, is sufficiently manifest from its *hostility against the Scriptures*. We have witnessed in this very State a monstrous act of sacrilege, in an *auto da fe* of Romanists for the burning of the Word of God, and *two hundred Bibles were committed to the flames!* I confess that I am afraid of the action of Romanism upon my country’s liberties. *I am afraid of the influence of whatever is afraid of the Bible*. If there be a sect that lives by shutting out the light, in a country like ours, such a system is dangerous.”

CHAPTER V.

PERSECUTION.

Mr. Iver's funny Bunyanism—His denial of persecution—Popish butcheries—Father Ivers, versus Cardinal Bellan.

FROM the lofty and unjust assumptions of the Popish church to bind the conscience as quoted in the last chapter, from official documents, springs the supposed right to persecute even to death, all who may disbelieve her dogmas or resist her authority.

Says President Wayland, "The corrupt Romish church assumes that it has the power and the right, to bind the conscience in all matters both of faith and practice; and, upon this assumption, all the superstructure of her hideous superstition has been reared."*

* Wayland on human responsibility—Page 129.

In maintaining this power, the Papacy has not hesitated to employ the most bloody persecutions to force the consciences of men. The ravages of cruel, exterminating war, carried by merciless crusaders to the peaceful abodes of the Albigenses and Waldenses, the wholesale massacres of unsuspecting and defenceless Huguenots and Protestants, the tortures and auto da fes of the Inquisitors, and the fires of Smithfield and Oxford, fed by the holy martyrs of Jesus—all have been used as the engines of Papal ecclesiastical tyranny to bind and to enslave those consciences, which were made

“To be the Lord’s alone.”

It is not a little astonishing that the Popish Apologists for the bible burners, should persist in the face of all historical evidence in denying the bloody persecutions of Popery. Says Mr. Ivers “It is much easier for you to invent and exaggerate a stale fiction about persecution than to prove that assertion.” I closed my first letter to the

Providence Journal with the following remark in reference to the crippled power of the persecuting Popish church—

“But, in the words of good old John Bunyan, though the giant Pope be still alive, sitting “among the blood, bones, ashes, and mangled bodies of pilgrims that had gone this way formerly,” yet, “by reason of age, and also of the many shrewd brushes that he met with in his younger days, he has grown so crazy and stiff in his joints, that he can now do little more than sit in the cave’s mouth, grinning at pilgrims as they go by, and biting his nails, that he cannot come at them.”

Mr. Ivers affects to be amused with this “funny Bunyanism” as he terms it, yet I will venture to say that there was not a single sentence in the whole letter, which was more unwelcome to him, and which, if he has a particle of shame, compelled him so to blush for his apostate church as this same admirable and truthful picture, from that prince of allegorists, good old John Bunyan.

It may perhaps be *fun* to Popish priests who "approve of the deeds of their fathers" to contemplate the pictures of helpless sufferers, enduring the horrid tortures of the cells of the Inquisition, or blessed martyrs roasting in the fires of Smithfield, kindled by Popish persecutors; but it was any thing but *fun* to those who endured such sufferings, and "who were tortured, not accepting deliverance." Yes, it may perhaps be *fun*, for those who are hoping that Bunyan's giant GRIM is recovering from his rheumatism, and is renewing his strength, and are feasting their imagination with the hope, (I trust in God, a delusive one!) of a return of those days of Papal power and tyranny—but the picture is any thing but *fun* to those who can recognize among the "ashes, and mangled bodies of pilgrims," the venerated relics of their own ancestors, who, in those days of anguish, fell a prey to the maw of the blood-thirsty GIANT POPE!

But says Mr. Ivers, "I refer you to the pages

of the third Council of Lateran, where the *Catholic church* recorded her abhorrence of persecution. I defy you to give one instance in which the *Catholic church* ever persecuted."

I have already referred to the settled policy of the Jesuitical defenders of Rome to deny every thing, if such denial may be for the advantage of "holy mother church." I have but little doubt that the man who wrote the above sentence is himself a Jesuit, and in denying a fact, known to almost every one, he is but acting in accordance with the principles of his order. The denial is in perfect keeping with the principle upon which the Jesuits have ever acted, *that lies are lawful, and frauds are holy when practised for the good of the church*, and that NO FAITH IS TO BE KEPT WITH HERETICS. Jesuit priests, however, like their master, the Devil, sometimes outwit themselves, by injuring the cause they are endeavouring to establish, and by denying facts, when they suppose the proof of these facts to be inaccessible to an oppo-

nent, and afterwards find themselves mistaken. I have no idea that Mr. Ivers would have written the above sentence, had he supposed that the means of responding to it, from Roman Catholic authorities were within my reach. I am aware, that when I refer to the massacres, and torturings and burnings of such faithful defenders of Popery as Simon de Monfort the blood-thirsty butcher of the Albigenses of France in the thirteenth century, or Charles IX. who destroyed more than 30,000 Protestants in the massacre of Bartholemew in 1572, or Louis XIV, who let loose his hordes of brutal Popish troopers to torture and abuse the defenceless Protestant men, women and children of France, at the revocation of the edict of Nantes, in 1685, or Mary of England, who during her short reign of five years, kept the fires of Smithfield almost continually alive with the bodies of Protestant heretics—I say, when I refer to these, I am aware, from the words which Mr. Ivers has italicised, that his answer will be—all this may be true, and

yet neither the earl of Monfort, nor Charles IX., nor Louis XIV., nor Queen Mary, was the *Catholic church*. When I reply that Simon de Monfort was the commissioned agent of Innocent III. then Pope of Rome, and that after the massacre of Bartholomew's, Pope Gregory XIII. marched with his cardinals to the church of St. Mark, to thank God for so great a blessing conferred on the see of Rome, and published a Jubilee to the Christian world in token of gratitude to God for the extirpation of the heretics; when I add that Louis XIV. was loudly applauded by Pope Innocent XI. and Queen Mary by Pope Clement VIII. for their cruelty towards the helpless Protestants, Mr. Ivers will perhaps reply that neither Pope Innocent III. nor Gregory XIII. nor Innocent XI. nor Clement VIII. was the *Catholic church*."

Leaving it with the candid reader to decide whether Popery is or is not chargeable with these, and hundreds of equally cruel persecutions, when the actors in them were but complying with the exhortations,

and meriting the praises, afterwards so liberally bestowed, of the Popes, the acknowledged head of the Roman Catholic religion, I shall proceed to give a brief account of two of these persecutions, and then to show that the punishment of heretics even with death, is advocated and enjoined, by what Mr. Ivers himself, in the above extract understands as the *Catholic church*.

MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLEMEW'S IN 1572.

“No country perhaps has ever produced more martyrs than France: after many cruelties had been exercised towards the Protestants, there was a most violent persecution of them in the year 1572, in the reign of Charles IX. Many of the principal Protestants, were invited to Paris, under a solemn oath of safety, upon the occasion of the marriage of the king of Navarre with the French king's sister. The queen dowager of Navarre, a zealous Protestant, however, was poisoned by a pair of gloves before the marriage was solemnized. Coligni, admiral of France,

was basely murdered in his own house, and then thrown out of the window to gratify the malice of the Duke of Guise; his head was afterwards cut off, and sent to the king and queen-mother; and his body, after a thousand indignities offered to it, hung up by the feet on a gibbet! After this, the murderers ravaged the whole city of Paris, and butchered in three days, above ten thousand lords, gentlemen, presidents, and people of all ranks. A horrible scene of things, says Thuanus, when the very streets and passages resounded with the noise of those that met together for murder and plunder; the groans of those who were dying, and the shrieks of such as were just going to be butchered, every where heard; the bodies of the slain thrown out of the windows, the courts and chambers of the houses filled with them, the dead bodies of others dragged through the streets, their blood running through the channels in such plenty, that torrents seemed to empty themselves in the neighbouring river: in a word, an innumerable multitude of men, women with child, maidens, children, were all involved in one common destruction, and the gates, and entrances of the king's palace all besmeared with their blood. From the city of Paris, the

massacre spread throughout the whole kingdom. In the city of Meaux, they threw above two hundred into jail ; and after they had ravished and killed a great number of women, and plundered the houses of the Protestants, they executed their fury on those they had imprisoned, and calling them one by one, they were killed, as Thuanus expresses, like sheep in a market. In Orleans, they murdered above five hundred men, women, and children, and enriched themselves with the spoil. The same cruelties were practised at Angeirs, Troyes, Bourges, La Charite, and especially at Lyons, where they inhumanly destroyed above eight hundred Protestants ; children hanging on their parents' necks, parents embracing their children ; putting ropés about the necks of some, dragging them through the streets, and throwing them mangled, torn, and half dead into the river. According to Thuanus above thirty thousand Protestants were destroyed in this massacre, or, as others affirm, above one hundred thousand. But what aggravated these scenes with still greater wantonness and cruelty, was the manner in which the news was received at Rome. When the letters of the Pope's legate were read in the assembly of the cardinals, by which he assured

the Pope that all was transacted by the express will and command of the king, it was immediately decreed that the Pope should march with his cardinals to the church of St. Mark, and in the most solemn manner give thanks to God for so great a blessing conferred on the see of Rome and the Christian world ; and that, on the Monday after, solemn mass should be celebrated in the church of Minerva, at which the Pope, Gregory XIII., and cardinals were present ; and that a jubilee should be published throughout the whole christian world, and the cause of it declared to be, to return thanks to God for the extirpation of the enemies of the truth and church in France. In the evening the cannon of St. Angelo were fired to testify the public joy ; the whole city illuminated with bonfires ; and no one sign of rejoicing omitted that was usually made for the greatest victories obtained in favour of the Roman Church !”

PERSECUTION OF THE FRENCH PRO-
TESTANTS AT THE REVOCATION OF
THE EDICT OF NANTES.

“The edict of Nantes was a merciful decree of Henry IV. of France, granting liberty of conscience to the Protestants, drawn up at Nantes in the year 1598. This edict was revoked, after having continued in force eighty-seven years, by Louis XIV. of France, in the year 1685, at the instigation of the Popish bishops and Jesuits by whom he was surrounded. It cannot be pleasant to any man’s feelings to recount the dreadful scenes of cruelty, horror and devastation, which followed the revocation of the edict of Nantes;”

“but to show what superstition, bigotry, and fanaticism are capable of producing, and for the purpose of holding up the spirit of persecution to contempt, we shall here give as concise a detail as possible. The troopers, and soldiers, and dragoons went into the Protestant’s houses, where they marred and defaced their household stuff; broke their looking-glasses, and other utensils; threw about their corn and wine; sold what they could not destroy, and thus, in four or five days,

the Protestants were stripped of above a million of money. But this was not the worst, they turned the dining rooms of gentlemen into stables for horses, and treated the owners of the houses where they quartered with the greatest cruelty, lashing them about, nor suffering them to eat or drink. When they saw the blood and sweat run down their faces, they sluiced them with water, and, putting over their heads kettle-drums turned upside down, they made a continual din upon them, till these unhappy creatures lost their senses. At Negreplisse, a town near Montauban, they hung up Isaac Favin, a Protestant citizen of that place by his armpits, and tormented him a whole night by pinching and tearing off his flesh with pincers. They made a great fire round about a boy, twelve years old, who, with his hands and eyes lifted up to heaven, cried out, "my God help me!" and when they found the youth was resolved to die rather than to renounce his religion, they snatched him from the fire just as he was on the point of being burned. In several places the soldiers applied red hot irons to the hands and feet of men, and the breasts of women. At Nantes, they hung up several women and maids by their feet, and others by their

armpits, and thus exposed them to public view stark naked. They bound mothers that gave suck to posts, and let their sucking infants lie languishing in their sight for several days and nights, crying and gasping for life. Some they bound before a great fire, and being half roasted, let them go: a punishment worse than death. Amidst a thousand hideous cries, they hung up men and women by the hair, and some by their feet, on hooks in chimneys, and smoked them with wisps of wet hay, till they were suffocated. They tied some under the arms with ropes, and plunged them again and again into wells; they bound others, put them to the torture, and with a funnel filled them with wine till the fumes of it took away their reason, when they made them say they consented to be Catholics.

“They stripped them naked, and after a thousand indignities stuck them with pins and needles from head to foot. If any, to escape these barbarities, endeavoured to save themselves by flight, they pursued them into the fields and woods, where they shot at them like wild beasts, and prohibited them from departing the kingdom, (a cruelty never practised by Nero or Diocel-sian) upon pain of confiscation of effects, the

galleys, the lash, and perpetual imprisonment. With these scenes of devastation and horror the Popish clergy feasted their eyes, and made only matter of laughter and sport of them!!!”

See Enc. of Rel. Knowledge.

It would be easy to multiply these recitals of Popish butcheries of holy but helpless martyrs of Jesus, but the above will be sufficient. I now return to the words of Mr. Ivers “I refer you to the pages of the third *council of Lateran*, where the *Catholic church* recorded her abhorrence of persecution. I defy you to give one instance in which the *Catholic church* ever persecuted.”

If ever the Roman Catholic church expressed her abhorrence of persecution, it was like the hypocritical professions of the bloody Spanish Inquisitors, who after inflicting the most excruciating tortures upon their victims in the cells of that horrid tribunal—the tortures of the pulley and weight, the rack, and the chafing dish of coals, applied to the soles of the feet till they were roasted,—in passing sentence

upon their victims as incorrigible heretics, and delivering them over to the "secular power," would then hypocritically exhort the secular powers to *mercy*, &c., when they knew all the while, that even these secular authorities did not dare to omit the burning of these victims at a public *auto da fe*, under penalty of becoming themselves liable to the pains and penalties of the "holy office."* I will give one sentence from the council of Lateran, held in 1215, and let the reader judge how well it accords with the above statement of Mr. Ivers.—In canon III—*De hereticis*, it is enacted—"Let secular powers if necessary be compelled by church censures, to endeavour in all good faith, according to their power, to destroy all heretics, marked by the church, out of the lands of their jurisdiction." It then proceeds to enact that if princes refuse to cut off, and destroy heretics "they shall be accursed, and their subjects absolved from their allegiance."

* See an interesting "History of the Inquisition" just published by Nathan Moore.

At the council of Constance, at which Pope Martin V. presided, it is well known the holy martyrs HUSS and JEROME of Prague, were condemned and most cruelly burned alive. This council also issued their terrific anathema against the millions of heretics all over Europe, and *commanded* all potentates to extirminate them by fire and sword.

Now according to the above language of Mr. Ivers, I conclude that when a thing is done by a council he considers it as done by the Roman *Catholic church*.

We have seen then that the last council of Lateran and Constance have recognized persecution, and the latter most cruelly practised it *while in session*. It is proved, therefore, without the possibility of denial, that what Mr. Ivers terms *the Catholic church*, but what I regard as the Anti-christian apostacy has persecuted. Q. E. D.

But says Mr. Ivers—"I defy you to give one instance in which the *Catholic church* ever persecuted." Instead of furnishing any more answers to this defiance myself,

I shall hand Mr. Ivers over as I did on a former occasion to the great champion of Popery, Cardinal Bellarmine in his book *De Laicis*, Lib. iii. cap. 22—Luther had asserted that it was not the mind of the Spirit of God that heretics should be burnt. Now follows the reply of the Cardinal, in the name of all Popery; “This argument admirably proves, not the sentiment, but the ignorance or impudence of Luther; for as *almost an infinite number were either burned, or otherwise put to death*, Luther either did not know it and was therefore ignorant; or if he knew it, he is convicted of impudence and falsehood. For that *heretics were often burned* BY THE CHURCH may be proved by adducing a few from many examples.”

How profoundly learned this Popish apologist for the bible burners, who undertakes to enlighten my ignorance must be *in the writings of his own church*, I leave every reader to judge. *Heretics were often burned* BY THE CHURCH, says the great Catholic champion, Cardinal Bellar-

mine. There YOU LIE, Cardinal, says the little Mr. Ivers, "I defy you to give one instance in which the *Catholic church* ever persecuted."——I shall leave these two Popish champions to fight it out between themselves.

To prove that the lawfulness of persecuting heretics is still held by the Roman Catholic church, I add the following testimonies from Roman Catholic authorities, and then I shall hasten to a few remarks by way of conclusion, and for the present dismiss the subject.

The following three extracts are taken from the theology of Peter Dens, a book which is used in the R. C. College at Maynooth, Ireland. An edition of this work has been published at Mechlin, in the Netherlands, as recently as the year 1838. It is there distinctly asserted that :

1. "Baptized infidels, such as heretics and apostates usually are, also baptized schismatics, may be compelled even by corporeal punishments to return to the Catholic faith, and the unity of the Church.

“The reason is, because these by baptism have become subject to the Church, and therefore, the Church has jurisdiction over them, and the power of compelling them through appointed means to obedience, and to fulfil the obligations contracted in baptism.”

Again it is said by the same author:—

2. “The rites of other infidels, viz : pagans and heretics, in themselves considered, are not to be *tolerated* : because they are so bad that no truth or advantage for the good of the Church can be thence derived. Except, however, unless greater evils would follow or greater benefits be hindered.”

After stating that heretics are deservedly visited with penalties of exile, imprisonment, &c., this author asks :

3. “Are heretics *rightly punished with death?*”

“St. Thomas answers (2. 2. quest. XI., art. 3, in corp.) *Yes*, because forgers of money or other disturbers of the state, are justly punished with death ; therefore also heretics, who are forgers of the faith, and, as experience shows, grievously disturb the state.”

CONCLUSION.

IN drawing this little work to a close, I have no apology to make for the plain and sometimes severe language which I have found it necessary to use, in relation to the Papal "**MOTHER OF ABOMINATIONS.**" Let the reader examine the picture which is drawn of the Papal **BABYLON THE GREAT**, as recorded in the 17th chapter of Revelations, and the prediction of her fall in the 18th chapter, and he will not accuse me of being more severe than the Bible. "And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, **COME OUT OF HER**, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities. Rejoice over her, thou heavens, and ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her. And a mighty angel took up a stone, like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, thus with violence shall

that great city, **BABYLON**, be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all. And in her was found the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth." (Rev. xviii. verses 4, 5, 20, 21, 24. Let the reader peruse carefully the whole of the 17th and 18th chapters.)

The fact is, that when an act is committed, so sacrilegious, and so **GROSSLY INSULTING** to the feelings of the whole Protestant population of the United States, as the public burning of hundreds of copies of the Holy Bible, (that blessed book which they reverence above all other books,) and when that atrocious act is openly and publicly justified by Popish priests in the columns of widely circulated secular papers, it is then time to **SPEAK OUT**, and to **SPEAK PLAINLY**. Away, then, with that truckling and time-serving policy, which has silenced the voices of so many of the prominent Protestant clergy of America, in relation to the alarming encroachments among us of Popery, that sworn foe to

liberty of *thought*, to liberty of *speech*, to liberty of the *press*, and to the BIBLE!

Had an act similar to the burning of the Bibles been committed in any land where Popery is predominant; had a few Protestants in Lisbon, in Madrid, or in Rome, or even in Cork, collected two or three hundred copies of Doway Bibles, or of Breviaries, or Prayer Books, which they reverence more than the Bible, and publicly burned them, in the face of day, I will venture to say the perpetrators could not have escaped with their lives.

I rejoice to know that no violence was offered to the guilty perpetrators of the act of burning the Bibles, by the Protestants of Champlain; and I firmly believe that if the same sacrilegious act were to be repeated in State street, Boston, Market Square, Providence, or Broadway, New York, the spirit of Christianity, as understood by Protestants, would prevent any act of personal violence, and that the only rebuke the Papists would receive, would be those which are allowed to all in this

free and happy land, the scorching rebukes of an outraged and insulted community, uttered in trumpet-tones from the *pulpit* and the *press*.

Protestant America has admitted this "foreign foe" to a participation in her dear-bought privileges; she has received this lately torpid Popish viper into her bosom, till, warmed into life, it is attempting to fix its poisonous fangs into her vitals. Since, therefore, the spirit of our holy religion forbids us, even to hurl the viper from our bosom, let us, at least, while it nestles there in unmolested security, put on the golden breastplate of truth and argument to protect our country, our institutions, our Bibles, and ourselves from its poisonous and deadly venom.

Let us use no unchristian weapon of unkindness or persecution, when contending with this foe; especially let us compassionate the tens of thousands of deluded, priest-ridden, simple hearted men and women from Ireland and Popish Continental Europe, who are employed on our rail-

roads, in our manufactories, and in our families. It is not this class of Papists who are plotting the downfall of our free institutions, and the destruction of our Bibles. When removed from the influence of their tyrannical and crafty priests, residing in parts of the country at a distance from any Roman Catholic church, we generally find them among the most honest, industrious, and grateful portion of our population. Let us remember that they are blinded by ignorance and superstitious fear of their priests, and that probably three-fourths of them do not even know how to read.

Those whom we ought to fear, and against whose encroachments we ought to guard with increasing vigilance are the thousands and tens of thousands of crafty Jesuits and other educated priests, who are continually arriving on our shores, sent hither by funds raised by the influence of the Pope of Rome, and the Popish despots of Europe.

Before closing this little work let the

reader remember that the following facts have been unanswerably established by Popish authorities, and Popish documents.

1. In reference to the Doway version of the Scriptures, that it is not a translation of the inspired Hebrew and Greek originals, but a mere *translation of a translation*.

2. That the Latin Vulgate from which it is translated, abounds with a vast multitude of errors, and that even Jerome, the translator of it, did not always give the best translation that he could.

3. That two different editions of this Latin Vulgate were published by two different Popes, both, according to Catholic authorities, absolutely infallible, and yet that between these two absolutely *perfect* editions, 2000 variations have been found to exist.

4. That the Doway version leaves a large number of words untranslated for the purpose of concealing as much as possible of the Scriptures from the people,

when the Papists could no longer conceal the whole.

5. That in the Doway version a large number of mistranslations are made, (such as translating *repent, do penance, &c.*) for the purpose of sanctioning Popish errors.

6. That even this translation, corrupt as it is, Popish priests will not, and dare not circulate *without note or comment.*

7. That Popery condemns the circulation of any translation of the Scriptures, in the vulgar tongue, as productive of "more harm than good."

8. That Popery is the sworn and deadly foe to *liberty of conscience, and liberty of the press.* The latter being termed by the present Pope, Gregory XVI., "*that most vile, detestable, and never sufficiently-to-be-execrated LIBERTY of booksellers, of publishing writings of whatever kind they please.*"

9. That the doctrine of Popery, as illustrated in its bloody history, and taught and practised by its Popes and its Councils is, that *heretics, that is Protestants, may, for*

their heresy, be lawfully punished with death, and that the only reason why Popish priests do not now act out this bloody creed is, that they are *destitute of the power*.

I cannot believe, Protestant fellow-citizens, that Papists will ever regain that power, yet I can not but regard it as a singularly startling fact, as proved by the recent developments of Popery in this country—that the question is not now whether Papists shall be tolerated in Protestant America, but whether Protestant Americans themselves, their worship, and their Bibles, shall be tolerated in their own land.

Once more I call upon my Protestant brethren in the ministry, to remember the massacres of the Waldenses, the Huguenots, and the Protestants, to think of the cells of the Inquisition, and the fires of Smithfield, and then to **BLOW THE TRUMPET IN ZION!**

APPENDIX.

A.

An interesting account of the Popish Bordeaux Testament, from the pen of a respectable English Baptist clergyman, who, by the politeness of the Duke of Sussex, was permitted to examine the copy in his valuable library, one of the only four copies which are known to exist in Great Britain, may be found in Cramp's Text Book of Popery, pages 65—68.

B.

JESUIT'S OATH.

“I, A. B., now in the presence of Almighty God, the blessed Virgin Mary, the

blessed Michael the Archangel, the blessed St. John Baptist, the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and the saints and sacred host of heaven, and to you my ghostly father do declare from my heart, without mental reservation, that Pope Gregory, is Christ's Vicar General, and is the true and only Head of the universal church throughout the earth; and that by virtue of the keys of binding and loosing, given to his holiness by Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose *heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths, and governments*, all being illegal, without his sacred confirmation, and that they may safely be destroyed; therefore to the utmost of my power, I will defend this doctrine and his holiness's rights and customs against all usurpers of the heretical or Protestant authority whatsoever, especially against the now pretended authority and Church in England, and all adherents, in regard that they be usurped and heretical, opposing the sacred mother church of Rome. I do renounce and disown any

allegiance as due to any heretical king, prince, or state, named Protestant, or obedience to any of their inferior magistrates or officers. I do further declare the doctrine of the Church of England, of the *Calvinists, Huguenots*, and other Protestants, to be damnable, and those to be damned who will not forsake the same. I do further declare, that I will help, assist, and advise all, or any of his holiness's agents in *any place wherever I shall be*; and do my utmost to extirpate the heretical Protestants' doctrine, and to destroy all their pretended power, legal or otherwise. I do further promise and declare, that notwithstanding I am *dispensed with to assume any religion heretical*, for the propagation of the mother church's interest, to keep secret and private all her agent's counsels, as they entrust me, and not to divulge, directly or indirectly, by word, writing or circumstance whatsoever, but to execute all which shall be proposed, given in charge, or discovered unto me, by you my ghostly father, or by any one

of this convent. All which I, A. B. do swear by the blessed Trinity, and blessed sacrament, which I am now to receive, to perform and on my part to keep inviolably; and do call all the heavenly and glorious host of heaven, to witness my real intentions to keep this my oath. In testimony hereof, I take this most holy and blessed sacrament of the eucharist, and witness the same further with my hand and seal, in the face of this holy convent.”

