

“Scio’s Spanish version of it was a rich blessing to Spain in its dark days, and has been the means of forming numerous Protestant churches in Mexico.

“Pereira’s Portuguese version of it brought about the great religious movement in Madeira some years ago, and is effectually used by Protestant missionaries in Portugal and South America.

“The circulation of such versions as these, *without the Apocrypha or notes*, has met with the approval of leading Protestants at home and abroad, and was sanctioned by the British and Foreign Bible Society as far back as 1812, when the leading founders of the Society still took an active part in its management. They had learnt, *first*, that these versions were substantially the same as our own; and, *secondly*, that they were the only versions which large number of Roman Catholics could be persuaded to read, being based on a translation accepted by their Church.

“The course thus taken by the British and Foreign Bible Society has been violently opposed by the Church of Rome, and also by a small section of Protestants. The one party objects to these versions because *it knows them too well*; the other, because *it does not know them well enough*. The Church of Rome dreads nothing more than that its adherents should read their own Bible without notes; for Romanism depends not on the Bible, but on human tradition. Protestant objectors, on the other hand, are misled by a few real or apparent mistranslations in these Bibles, and jump to the conclusion that they are ‘Romish’ and ‘corrupt,’ which is altogether a mistake, for no single doctrine of Rome can fairly be proved by them.

“De Sacy’s version is frequently attacked, as if it taught penance, &c. But the expression ‘*faites pénitence*,’ in De Sacy’s Bible, no more supports the Romish sacrament of penance than our word *repent* does. The true doctrine of penitence and pardon as gifts of God through Christ, the exalted Prince and Saviour, is clearly taught by De Sacy in Acts v. 31. The false doctrine of Popish penance is nowhere taught by him.

“Again, his translation of Genesis iii. 15, has no more really to do with the Virgin Mary than our own has. The verse only speaks of Eve and of her seed, which is Christ, and as the word used for seed is *race*, none but a feminine pronoun could follow it. That he had no corrupt motive in his translation of this passage is manifest from his rendering of 1 Tim. ii. 5, which is stronger than our own, and does not give Romanists the slightest loophole for Mariolatry or for the Intercession of Saints; for whilst we read, ‘There is one God, and one mediator between God and men,’ he reads, ‘There is *only* one God, and *only* one mediator between God and men.’

“His version is sometimes even clearer on the subject of justification than ours is; thus in Rev. xxii. 14, where we read, ‘Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life,’ he reads, ‘Blessed are those that wash their robes in the blood of the Lamb, that they may have a right to the tree of life.’

“The passages usually cited to prove that the Vulgate versions are Popish are not fair samples of the works. When these passages are read with their context and compared with the original texts and manuscripts, and with the general teaching of the version as a whole, the charge of Popery brought