

Walton, making the same attempt, with the learned Catholic Bellarmine, and the learned sceptic Boyle, to watch them; or Grotius expecting to pass off his perversions under the keen eyes of the men of the Sorbonne; the thought is too absurd to be entertained by any one only moderately acquainted with the Scriptural history, and aware of the fact that any thing of the kind, besides the special hazard alluded to, would have been in mad defiance of ages of critical and devotional examination of these universally accepted and universally cherished writings. However different the dogmatical interpretations of these learned men, they were, nevertheless, interpretations of the same writings substantially, and of the same grammatical sense.

It may be safely said, too, that the more truly religious among Catholics would not refuse to use Protestant versions, should they be placed in circumstances under which the consultation of these versions would be more effective in bringing out the meaning or spirit of the original. Take men like the Port Royal Christians of a former age, such as Pascal and Fenelon; or the later Catholics to whom we have already several times alluded; they, doubtless, have a deep affection for the version so intimately connected with their more devotional feelings. But men like these, we may well believe, would never think of stigmatizing the version of King James, or that of Luther, as a false, heretical book, to be classed among profane and infidel productions, and to be read only on peril of damnation. Although Rome has long been opposed to the reading of the Scriptures by the common people, even when accessible in Catholic translations, yet it is only in modern times that such a style of speaking has been employed by her toward versions known to have come from the highest scholarship of the Reformation. It has been because since that period there has come a new thing into Rome itself, a new plague, exceeding in evil that of the former papacy, dark as was its mediæval history. When, therefore, we say Rome, we mean Rome strictly—Papal Rome, Jesuit Rome, Rome “that sitteth on the seven hills”—and not that great and venerable body called “the Catholic Church” as it exists in Europe, and on which this papal power has so long been sitting like a dire, stifling incubus she could not throw off. It is a distinction that Protestants ought ever to make, as enabling them, on the one hand, to preserve their charity, and, on the other, sternly to maintain the true interpretation of those solemn prophecies which so fearfully paint this terrible evil that was to be developed in the history of the Church. We can thus preserve a feeling of brotherhood for our fellow-Christians of Germany, France and Spain; we can love them for the zeal saintliness often exhibited in their communions; we can pity what we regard their errors, as growing out of this long, malarious oppression; we can ask their charity, in turn, for confessed defects in our own Protestantism; but with Jesuit Rome, Papal Rome, the Rome of Hildebrand and Borgia, there can be no communion. She herself utterly repels it, and we can only prefer her ban to her embrace. When Rome is gone; when this Jesuit Italian power has sunk like the millstone that “the angel cast into the sea” (Rev. xviii. 21), then may there be again one venerable mother, one Catholic faith, one Church with its open visible communion, as well as its pure spiritual unity.

The Jesuit opposition to the Bible in our schools is an opposition to the Bible itself, to any Bible, to any version, under whatever form it may come, and from whatever authority it may emanate. For centuries has Rome been seeking to get wholly off from the platform of the Scriptures, and to seat herself broadly and firmly upon another—even the foundation of absolute papal infallibility. There can be no compromise with her. The Jesuit is dishonest in this matter, and the Protestant who is aiding him by making the schools as irreligious as he describes them, is, to say the least, unwise. Courtesy may prevent our calling him “foolish,” but we cannot help regarding his course as being most mischievous, as it is most inexcusable.—*Prof. Taylor Lewis, in Christian World.*