

of a country having adopted the new creed, or rather creeds, in Holland; in which there were two or three vernacular versions of scripture before the Reformation; but it must be admitted that the political position of Holland influenced, if it did not create, the adhesion of the Dutch to Protestantism. And there is this compensation, that in no country in Europe are the inhabitants returning more quickly or more numerous to the Catholic faith than are the Dutch. But of the countries we have above mentioned as being peculiarly Protestant, it is remarkable that Protestantism was introduced into England by Henry VIII., and into Denmark by Christiern II., two of the greatest monsters that ever disgraced, not only the throne, but human nature!

Sixth—That the first versions of the Bible in the English language published after the commencement of the Reformation were—1stly, Tyndal's; 2dly, Coverdale's;—both in the reign of Henry VIII.;—3dly, that called "The Bishop's Bible," in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; and these three possessed the exclusive circulation of England till the year 1611, when the present "authorized" version was published in the reign of James I. The three former versions having prevailed for a period of nearly sixty years as the authorized versions of the sacred Scriptures for the English Protestants.

Seventh—That these versions were so full of gross errors that they were declared by more than one thousand ministers of the English Protestant church to be "in some places absurd; and in others, as taking from, perverting, obscuring, and falsifying the word of God;" and as being what James himself called "a most corrupt translation." Yet it was from such versions that the biblical christians of England had, for a period of nearly sixty years, to select their religion.

Eighth—That the present authorized version, that of king James, had not escaped Protestant censure of the most emphatic nature. Protestant divines of the highest character: I name Louth, Newcome, Wakefield, Bellamy (and I could name others), admit that *the errors in the Protestant authorized version are frequent, and that a revision is desirable*. And a more recent and laborious Protestant writer, the Rev. Mr. Horne, in his "Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures," vol. ii., fully concurs in the opinions of the more ancient Protestant divines.

Yet it is from this version, in which, in the mitigated language of Protestant divines, "*the errors are frequent*," and of which a revision was declared to be very desirable, that you Wesleyan Methodists, and the rest of the Protestants of England, collect your religion.

Ninth—The persons who revised, and under whose sanction the present Protestant version was produced, were men whose character and strength of mind may be judged of by their having dedicated their new version of the Bible to James I., that slobbering and disgusting creature, who has been so justly described as the shame alike of royalty and of manhood!—and in their dedication having called him "the Sun in his strength;"—"whom the heavenly hand

of the Lord hath enriched with many singular and extraordinary graces, that he may be the wonder of the world!"

Tenth—The Catholic authorized version was first published at Douay in the year 1609. It was the result of forty years toil and labor, and can fairly stand a comparison with any other version of the sacred Scriptures, published in any country, either Catholic or Protestant.

Eleventh—I close my statement of these interesting notices, with reminding you that the Catholic needs not, and does not rely upon any particular Catholic version of the sacred Scriptures. It has an ever-living and a speaking authority to resort to. It is the duty and it is the happiness of the Catholic that he should

"Her alone for his director take  
Whom God has promised never to forsake."

Having thus thrown before you facts, the verification of which is familiar to any instructed biblical scholar, I proceed to consider as rapidly as so important a subject will permit, another topic of great importance in itself, but which I think you have been exceedingly incautious in bringing forward. It is a topic which, in my humble judgment, you should have cautiously abstained from. It can do you nothing but mischief. It appears to me to be a disavowal of the very first principle of Protestantism. It is that in which you complain of the dangers to which your children "would be exposed, by the exhibition of rival sects contending for rival versions of the Bible—and by the spirit of doubt, if not of absolute infidelity, in which that exhibition would be so likely to result."

And is it so, Wesleyan Methodists? Is there, then, danger of doubt! is there, then, danger of absolute infidelity from the exhibition of rival versions of the Bible.—And are you thus determined to rear up and educate your children in the ignorance of that most important fact? And will you conceal from those children, too, who *they were* from whom that spirit of doubt emanated, and with whom the danger of that absolute infidelity originated, and by whom it was continued? Meditate well upon your own words; and bethink you if they are not destined to rise in judgment against you, and to produce your condemnation out of your own mouths?

For, speaking of protestantism as a fact, and, for the present not condemning, and [of course] not approving of it—is it not this, the right of private judgment, and the right, as well as the duty of each individual to examine and decide for himself, by selecting from the written word of God, and from that alone, the tenets of his religion?

This is the principle of your religion, else you are not Protestant: "The sole sufficiency and the *all-sufficiency* of the written word of God, with the right of each individual to expound its meaning for himself;"

Now, come with me, I pray you, for one moment, and tell me whether this principle does not necessarily and inevitably imply a perfect knowledge of what is and what is not, "*the written word of God*?"

There is an accurate, though parlia-

mentary language, a previous question, or rather questions, before you can use any book as containing the word of God.

First—Is it certain that the book *does* contain the word of God?

Secondly—Is it certain that it contains the entire word of God?

These two questions should be fully and satisfactorily answered before any Protestant can safely use his Bible. In fact, it is plainly the duty of every member of the Protestant churches to satisfy himself individually of the ground whereon he receives the Protestant Bible. This information is of the utmost and the most vital importance. The Protestant has thrown off the authority of the church to decide the canon of Scripture. It would be absurd to suppose that, disclaiming the authority of the church, he is to rely upon that of the King's printer!! To be consistent, therefore, with Protestantism, you should instead of *shrinking from the investigation*, consider it your first duty to teach your children to authenticate the genuine canon of Scripture, and, of course, to distinguish the false and erroneous versions from the true.

The fact is that your children, in order to be safe in reading the book you put into their hands as the Bible, should be taught, firstly, the authenticity of the several books composing that volume; secondly, the divine inspiration of the writers of those several books. They should be able to give a reason why the books of St. Mark and St. Luke, who were not apostles, should be received as genuine, and, above all, as inspired; while they are called upon to reject that written by St. Barnabas as *not* inspired, although it is certainly authentic, and, although he is certainly known to have worked miracles, and is described in your Bibles to be *an apostle, and full of the Holy Ghost*.

These questions do not create doubt; they do not excite to infidelity in the mind of the Catholic, who relies on the authority of the church for the authenticity and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, the sacred deposit in all times and in every age of the Catholic church.

But you, Wesleyan Methodists, what are you to do? Are you to control the reason and judgment of your children by an ephemeral claim to spiritual authority? And if you have not that authority [as you assuredly have not] it is in vain for you to hope that you can stifle doubts by leaving your children in ignorance of the real nature of the controversy; or subdue the germs of infidelity by insisting upon a submission to what you have no species of rational claim.

In sober truth, the doctrine of church authority in these matters, is so plainly consistent with the dictates of common sense that you yourselves unconsciously resort to it and admit [without intending it, but in explicit terms], that the Anti-Catholic rule necessarily leads to doubts, and has a direct tendency to promote infidelity.

Wesleyan Methodists, I have done with you for the present. I shall not notice any *anonymous* publication that may appear in reply to this letter.

But I proceed to conclude my address to you with these observations:—

First—That you allege that it is not honest to apply the money of the Wesleyans to educate persons in the Roman Catholic religion. I admit it. But is it not equally dishonest to apply Roman Catholic money for the education of Wesleyans, or of any other sect, in doctrines which Catholics believe erroneous? As Cobbett coarsely says, "what is sauce for the goose, is sauce for the gander."

Secondly, Your letter is full of the above dishonesty. You desire that the money of *all* persuasions should be applied to the education of only some.

Thirdly, the Catholics, on the other hand, desire to deal honestly by all.—They insist upon the principle of common justice—that the money of all should be applied to the education of every one.

The Catholic church at every period and in every country, has been the promoter of education. Before the Reformation every great church, and all the monasteries, friaries and convents, had schools attached to them for the poor, who were educated gratuitously. In Oxford alone, before the Reformation, there were 300 halls and private schools *besides* the colleges. Where are they now?

Wesleyan Methodists, I conclude for the present. You have provoked this contest by the bigotry and injustice of your narrow views on the subject of education. I rejoice in your affording to me the contrast between genuine Catholic liberality and the intolerance of Wesleyan Methodism. You have been driven actually to contradict Protestant principles in order to palliate that intolerance.

How true it is,

"Et socum petulans ementia certat!"

Your organization is extensive, and would be formidable, but for its inherent spirit of uncharitable antipathy to your fellow Christians. You desire to make converts of the Catholics. Can you hope to succeed by the exhibition of pecuniary injustice and spiritual virulence?

Your No-Popery cry is daily losing its force and its efficacy. At the present period you could no more get up an insurrectionary movement against the Catholics as you did in 1780, then you could subvert the throne of the constitution. Instead of injuring, you serve the cause of Catholicity, because you place in the most powerful contrast with your labors the exertions of the Catholics to promote liberality, general education, and a perfect exemption for all Christians from any local or temporal fetters upon the freedom of conscience.—

I am, Rev. Sirs, and Gentlemen,

With all the usual compliments of ceremony,

Your humble servant,  
DANIEL O'CONNELL.

The poor-law Act will be so amended next session as to punish any person transporting paupers from England to Ireland, a common practice with the officials of London, who send over poor people in crowds by the steamers.—*Limerick Chronicle*.

The Earl of Shannon has sent one hundred pounds to provide coals and fuel for the poor at this inclement season, on his estates in the county Cork.