

From the Catholic Advocate.

ORIGIN OF BIBLE SOCIETIES.

The first Bible Society was started in London, on the 7th of March, 1804. The *Encyclopedia Americana* says:

"Bible Societies adhere to the principle of publishing the Bible without notes, starting from the Protestant principle, that the bible, and the bible alone, is the foundation of Christian faith. Undoubtedly, the various sects of Christians differing so greatly as they do, and always must, respecting certain points of faith and the interpretation of particular passages of the scripture, could not be made to co-operate with zeal in the distribution of the bible, if the texts were accompanied with commentaries. But now ministers must supply by verbal explanation the place of notes, because it is clear to every body that the bible cannot be understood, without the explanation afforded by study.—Thus the opinions of individuals, bravely delivered, are substituted for the more precise and profound criticism of united commentaries."

We perceive from this Protestant testimony, that to make "various sects unite" for bible societies, they had to adopt the Protestant principle, that "the bible alone" is the foundation of faith, although the Apostles taught the faith orally, and averred that "Faith cometh by hearing." In consequence of their principle, they had to exclude "notes and commentaries."—In consequence of this exclusion, and "because it is clear to every body that the bible cannot be understood without the explanation afforded by study," they had to supply this want of notes and commentaries, by "verbal explanation," necessarily "less precise and profound."

This "verbal explanation" must be given by the agents and missionaries of these "various sects," and must necessarily be sectarian. These missionaries and agents are consequently perambulating notes and commentaries on the Protestant Bible.

Now, in sober reason, we ask, how could the Catholic church, with views and principles so different from these, to approve of the scheme of bible societies?—Could she be duped by an artifice, designed to exclude her "precise and profound commentaries and notes," in order to substitute the perambulating notes and commentaries of the bible society, in the shape of agents and missionaries giving "verbal explanations" of the written word of God?

Let Mr. Humphrey tell the world of a heathen nation converted by his bible societies. Let him point to a single people converted from heathenism by any bible missionaries since the days of John Calvin. Let him begin by proving the Divine institution of bible societies—their Divine mission—the Divine promises made to them. Let him show what particular sects or denominations of Christians, should join together in this scheme for spreading the gospel. Let him settle the question as to which of these denominations should send its ministers with their Confessions of Faith, as a comment and key to the bible. Let him do all this at least, before he hazards this grave accusation against the Catholic Church, that she hates the word of God. He leaps to his conclusions with an unseemly haste, and coolly takes for granted the very point to be proved. If he will allow the Catholic Church to send her own bible, with her own ministers, and her own symbols, she will thank him for his contributions, and encourage him to exert his zeal in taking up collections for spreading the gospel; but if he wishes her to give her blessing to his scheme of spreading his Protestant bibles, together with the standards of Westminster, and a number of agents and ministers, who are to make the heathen lands ring with denunciations of the church of Rome and "the Scarlet Lady,"

she will not be silly enough to say "God speed!"

And yet, she will continue, as she has done, to preach God's word, amid perils from pagan enemies, which would soon cool the ardour, abate the zeal, and blanch the cheeks, of the devoted missionaries of the Bible Society. What money has this Society had in China, who had seized the glorious palm, in company with those whose heroic sacrifices of friends and life, has so recently reflected honor on Catholic zeal for the gospel? What names can it write on its catalogues of men or women who have proved their affection for God's word, by the out-pouring of their blood beneath the sword of pagan persecution? There are none. And yet, Mr. Humphrey accuses the Catholic Church of "hating God's word," while her missionaries are willing to preach it, even at the peril and cost of their lives.

To show how the Church of Rome "hates the bible," the reverend gentleman read from some book, we know not what, an anecdote, given on the authority of a certain Doctor Clarke, of Philadelphia, who, while at Rome, wanted a Bible, and asked his landlady for one, and she did not know what a Bible was, but bro't him a Mass book instead: And when the Doctor had made her understand what he meant, she told him: "Oh, yes they have them in their big libraries, &c. &c."

Quere: Did said Doctor speak the language of his landlady well? Or did he substitute some *lingo* of his own? Perhaps, he was as well versed in Italian as Pat was in French, when he went to borrow the gridiron. Said Pat to an old Frenchman:

"Parley vous Frongzey?"

"Oui Monsieur," answered the polite Frenchman.

"Then," responds Pat, will you lend me the loan of a gridiron?"

"Je n'entends pas," said the puzzled Monsieur.

"I want none of your *tongs*," says Pat indignantly.

And after many unsuccessful endeavors to get the gridiron, Pat had to give up in despair, convinced that the French did not understand their own language, or that there were no gridirons in France.

Dr. Clarke and Rev. Mr. Humphrey are satisfied that there are no Bibles in Rome. They are convinced of this fact from the conversation between Dr. Clarke and an Italian landlady.

Now, is it not a pitiful thing, to see men of reputed sense and information, stand up in a church, and so insult the reason and intelligence of their hearers? Did Mr. Humphrey believe this? If so, how gross his ignorance! If not, how incomprehensible his insincerity! Is he capable of stooping to such means, to bolster up the walls of that Sion, for which he battles?

Is Mr. Humphrey aware, that there have been in Italy, Italian versions of the Scriptures, ever since the first translation made by the Dominican Jacobus Voragine, afterwards Archbishop of Genoa, about the year 1292? Did he ever hear of the translation by Nicholas Malermi, a Camaldulose monk, printed at Venice in 1471, and with alterations, printed at Rome the very same year; reprinted at Venice in 1477, both in folio and quarto, and which, before the appearance of Luther's translation, had passed through thirteen editions? What is more, is he aware that these all bore on them the strange sentence, "with the leave of the Inquisition"? Is he aware that eight new editions of the same appeared before the year 1567? Did he ever hear of the version of *Brucchioli*, translated from the Latin version of *Pagnini*, and which, in the space of twenty years, passed through ten editions—all very inaccurate, and several of which were formally condemned?

The first edition appeared in 1532. In spite of the *Index* it passed through ten editions in twenty years. Did he never hear of the Catholic translation of Antonio Martini, Archbishop of Florence, published with the Sanction of Pope Pius VI—the New Testament, having been printed in 1769, and the Old in 1779? But both have been often since reprinted. So that, in the very hot bed of Popery, not less than thirty distinct editions of the Scriptures in Italian, were issued during the short space of seventy years!!!

THE SPIRIT OF METHODISM.—We take the following extract from the Christian Advocate, the organ of the Wesleyites in New York.

"Great complaints are made against the Prosecuting attorney, for challenging all the Romanists who had been summoned, as jurors. But this was a legal right, and if he believed that Romanists could not be impartial jurors, it was the official duty of the law officer to challenge them; and it is evident that if a Romanist is sincere in his profession, he dare not agree in a verdict against O'Connell, whatever may be the evidence in the case. Where the hopes of eternity depend upon the favor of the Priesthood, the Priesthood must be obeyed."

The publication of the grossest Calumnies, and the avowal in private life of the most disreputable prejudices, are procuring for them and their creed a character for cruelty and spitefulness, heretofore supposed to be confined to the followers of Mahomet. A little moderation, or rather less desperation in their language would secure some small share of credit for their statements amongst the lower orders of their sect, whose minds and morals are degraded by Camp meetings; but they are grievously deceived when they imagine that men with any pretensions to the decencies of life, will attach any importance to their vindictive puerile declamation. There are doubtless many people in their society, who are willing to believe at a minute's notice, the foulest stories which a pampered and corrupt Preacher of their sect can invent, or a lying newspaper like the Christian Advocate and Journal circulate amongst its readers, but it is to be hoped that the slime of the serpent is not on the hearts of all, and that many amongst them may be found who have not bowed the knee to the idols of falsehood and intolerance.

Under existing circumstances, some little reserve should be practiced by the methodists when speaking of Ireland. Though we know that they do most cordially and from the very depths of their souls, hate and abhor the Irish Catholic, and instead of breaking his chains would add to the strength and weight so as to crush him if possible into the earth; yet whilst the eyes of mankind are turned in astonishment at the scene now exhibited by a people struggling against the worst tyranny ever known on earth, such a time is unpropitious for charging them all with perjury. The Tories of England may approve such conduct; we know that the bitter Tory John Wesley, if living, would approve it, but in a country where some respect is felt for those who are oppressed, we are greatly deceived, if such base accusations will recommend their authors to the respect of the good, or even the veneration of their dupes. If the writer in the Christian Advocate and Journal believes what he has written, his heart must be as black as midnight, and there would surely be a poor chance for escape from an unjust verdict if such minds were to preside in the Jury when the accused was a Catholic.—*Cath. Herald*.

THE TWO CHRISTIANS.—It is not long since it was announced to the world, by a Methodist Preacher, as a matter of special wonder and congratulation, that the Hon.

* Refer to Le Long. Bib. Sac. T. I. and to the Dublin Review, No. II. Art. I.

Henry Clay was a believer in Christianity; we have scarcely recovered from the effect of this announcement, when the country is again convulsed by the startling intelligence, that the Hon. Daniel Webster, in a recent trial at Washington, did actually vindicate Christianity!!—Why one would suppose that this was a Heathen land, so great is the joy which prevails amongst certain people when any of our great statesmen make professions of Christianity. The land of bibles and tracts, of societies for the conversion of the Heathens, the land whose zeal goes on voyages of discovery, "this Protestant land" as it is humourously called, struck almost dumb with astonishment and delight, because the great Daniel Webster vouchsafed to say something in praise of Christianity!!—Well! no doubt he is a very exemplary Christian and a member of the Temperance Society! He believes now in the bible, and who knows but he may be converted to another creed—which teaches a commonwealth to remunerate those whose property has been destroyed by a mob!!—Believing in Christianity, is popular—making restitution for the destruction of a convent is quite the reverse in New England.—*Catholic Telegraph*.

CHRISTIANITY AND CHARITY.—The following remarks, taken from the London News, will give the reader an insight into the effects produced by the Poor Laws in England. We have been incessantly directed to turn our eyes to that Country, as a specimen of the perfect civilization, and national honor which the reformed religion was alone able to accomplish. Thank God! the history of no Catholic nation can exhibit such a picture of inhumanity.

"But no! A system of political economy the most cursed in its spirit and operation—of philosophy the most foul, heartless and hollow, set itself to work to overturn the spirit of the ancient law—and destroying that fair beauty which was before only corrupted and not consumed, erected that code which is now ruining the happiness and morals of the people, and those architectural sarcasms which—mocking their memory of a bygone benevolence—are become the prisons of their poverty, and the punishment places of their distress."

Both in England and Ireland the New Poor-Laws have done more to distress the community than any other of the social mischiefs which attend the rapid progress of art and science—and corrupt too sadly while civilizing too fast. The poor laws in England was a cruelty, in Ireland a crime! It was and is essentially degrading in all its features. It refuses to assist poverty without disgracing it. It says to patient and pining industry, "Come into the workhouse or you shall have no aid—break stones or you shall break no bread!" It banishes in principle from the breasts of the rich all sympathy with the domestic affections of the poor. It says in plain terms—"poor men, we will help you, but you must leave father and mother, wife and child. If you take our ironhearted pittance—our State-charity that does not feel." It is a bad, bitter, brutalizing law. The mother execrates it—the wife regards it with horror—the child rushes for its assistance with a young but sickening disgust. It has throughout all its operation tainted the loyalty of the poor—tended towards democracy and discontent—engendered dissatisfaction and distrust, and been the means in hundreds of cases of despair and death. It is instinct with the very passion of cruelty, and refines the torture which Christianity most abhors. And all this is known. Men cannot be ignorant of it—Ministers know it well—it is the daily truth that forces itself upon our Magistrates, and fills the columns of our newspapers with tales of grief. Nothing has been more creditable to journalism than its opposition to this monstrous Act. The fire and eloquence, power and persuasion of the *Times*—the liberal spirit of the *Sun*—the hardy strength of the *Standard*—humane tenderness of the *Herald*, and the consistent energy of the *Post* have all been directed against it with sincerity, plain as pure. The most able and honest, and vigorous of the weekly journals have opposed, and only a few cold organs of its wicked economy have endured its life with praise. All the homely family of social England despises it—all the warm and fruitful generosity of Ireland recoils from it—revolts at it with mingled rage, hatred, and disdain. It has nothing to keep it fair in men's eyes—to make it reconcileable to men's scruples—it is all bad—bitter bad—bad helplessly—to the core.—*Id.*