

Scriptures of the Old and New Testament alone, than by any other plan which can be devised. I venture to affirm there are few Presbyterians in Nova Scotia who wish to disconnect themselves from the British and Foreign Bible Society, and thus estrange themselves from the common ground on which all evangelical denominations meet, simply because that Bible Society adheres to the basis on which it was formed sixty-three years ago—to print and circulate the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament alone without note or comment.

But your correspondents make a far graver charge. They say:—"The British and Foreign Bible Society do, on the continent of Europe, circulate versions of the Scripture which contain almost all the essential doctrines of popery,—*Mariolatry, penance, angel worship, priesthood, celibacy, purgatory, sacrament of marriage, merit of good works, &c.*" This charge—unsubstantiated by a single proof—is either true or false. If true, then undoubtedly the British and Foreign Bible Society is an important auxiliary of popery. And both the writers of the letter were (as I shall presently shew) for years helping on the work. If true, then we might expect that Pope Pius, his cardinals and the Romish priesthood generally would be office-bearers, or at least members of the Society. If false, what can be thought of those so recklessly making the assertion?

What are the facts? Of the 213 versions of the Scriptures circulated less than 10 have been made by pious Roman Catholics, chiefly from the Latin Vulgate. The versions to which exceptions have been taken are, so far as I am aware, Van Ess and Kiestmaker's in Germany; DeLacy's in France; Martin's in Italy; Scio's in Spain; Perier's in Portugal. Some of these have been circulating at the cost of the Society since 1812; all of them (with the exception of Martin's, which is now discontinued) since 1820. This fact was always recorded in the Society's reports, and referred to in its meetings. From 1820, the year in which the last (complained of) version was adopted up to about 1838, no exception was taken to them. During the Apocryphal controversy, though frequent references were made to these versions, they were never objected to. Robert Haldane, who opposed the Bible Society in that controversy, and who was well acquainted with several of these versions, denounced them because they *then* contained the Apocrypha, —but on that ground alone. In 1839, the matter was fully discussed in London, chiefly through the efforts of the Trinitarian Bible Society. The fullest explanations were given. The vast majority of the Christian people of England were fully satisfied, some few were displeased and left, se-

veral of whom afterwards returned. Since 1839 there has been comparatively little heard on the subject. Five years ago, while circulating the scriptures in Earlstown, I first met the Rev. A. Sutherland. He, I presume, knew nothing of this matter then, as about that time he formed a Branch Society in Earlstown connected with the British and Foreign Bible Society. Two years ago he very kindly assisted me in forming a Bible Society in West Branch River John, of which he was elected President. To the funds of the Bible Society he very liberally contributed. About five years ago, when circulating the Scriptures in Wallace, I met Rev. John Manro. He had been, was then, and for nearly a twelvemonth after, continued President of the Wallace Branch of the British and Foreign Bible Society. At that time he wished me to do something to revive the interest of the Bible Society in Wallace. He said nothing, I presume he knew nothing then, of the British and Foreign Bible Society circulating "versions of the scripture which contain almost all the essential doctrines of popery."

It would occupy far too much space to enter on a defence of these versions. Besides, the attack made is so general. No one version is named, no particular country or countries are specified. A few general remarks only can be offered.

Perfection cannot be claimed for any modern translation of the Holy Scriptures. The Old Testament in the original Hebrew, and the New Testament in the Greek, were undoubtedly perfect. Our (perhaps unequalled) English version is not perfect. Nor are those so called Roman Catholic version, which the Bible Society circulate. But they are on the whole faithful translations. Each version was examined by Protestants in whom the fullest confidence could be placed. They were recommended by Protestants and Protestant ministers of undoubted orthodoxy. They have been circulated in R. C. countries in connection with Protestant versions, *when, and only when the Protestant version would not be taken*. If these versions "contain nearly all the essential doctrines of popery," will the writers of the letter, or will any one be kind enough to show their fruits. Again, and again, in connection with this discussion in England, it was asked, "Point to the case of a single Protestant who has been perverted by reading these scriptures, or to a single Roman Catholic confirmed in his errors by them." And no case (so far as I have learned) has ever been alleged. On the other hand, in each of the countries where these versions have been circulated, God's blessing has accompanied them. I could fill page after page of the Record with facts proving this. In France