

CORRESPONDENCE

TO THE REV. JAMES McDONALD, P.P. INDIAN RIVER.

REV. SIR,—Having observed in the Examiner a reply to my first letter to you, published in the Protector, I beg leave to make it the subject of a few remarks. You endeavor to fix upon me the charge of falsehood, and in other respects blacken my character. You say my logic is bad; but if I were to affirm that, in your letter against me, there was more abuse than sound argument, I would not err from the truth. A good cause does not need such artifices for its support; drawing men catch at straws. I do not intend to imitate your example. I desire to keep in mind the principle of truth, which says, "Give to every one that which he asks you, a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear." I trust I love the persons of Roman Catholics, and seek sincerely pray for their salvation; but I cannot but abhor their system, as reasons to souls. In regard to your character, it is before the public, and there I leave it, confident that it will not suffer in the opinion of any whose esteem is worth possessing. My design in writing, if I have any success, is to benefit you and your people. I pray God I may be successful.

But let me proceed to an examination of your statements. You say, "I reject, as wholly unworthy, his perverted and garbled extracts from the rules of the Congregation of the Index, produced without date and authority, and his pericope comments thereon." This, Sir, is a very extraordinary way of getting out of your point, and is not satisfactory to the public: Will you not say, that if I had falsified the extracts from the Rules of the Index, the natural method for you to pursue would be to produce a correct copy, and compare the one with the other, and that the matter would be patent to all. But, as long as you hide yourself under generalities, the public will suspect that there is something behind the scenes. A person may be guilty of deception by concealment as well as by positive falsehood. Will you not point out the particulars in which I have falsified the extracts? Until you show wherein they are incorrect, they must be considered as valid. I ask you, if, in the 18th session of the Council of Trent, certain Fathers were not specially chosen, who should carefully consider what ought to be done, in the matter of censures and books, and report to the Council; if this report was not given at the 24th session, when the matter was referred to the Pope; and did not Pius IV. prohibit, in 1564, a Bull, sanctioning an index of prohibitive books, and imposing upon the Church 10 rules, which have been printed in all indexes since published, under the title of "Regule fidei, in sacro sacrosynodi Tridentinae sessionibus," &c.?

You say, "His quotations from Pops, Archbishops and Bishops, are quite irrelevant and beside the question; they relate to corrupt and schismatical Bibles; and of course, no Bishop could sanction the distribution of these Bibles in the diocese, nor could Catholics receive and read them." Sir, we have your word for it that Protestant Bibles are "corrupt and schismatical." This may be a sufficient proof for your followers, who are bound to obey implicitly to Rome's dictates; but Protestants do not believe that God has bestowed upon them the faculty of reason to be seduced at the arbitrary injunction of any man or body of men. They think it no presumption to judge for themselves. We shall take the liberty of inquiring how far your assertions, that our Bibles are corrupt, are true.

Since, in your extract from Dr. Wiseman, Home is mentioned, without the Scriptures any longer from the common people, printed an English New Testament at Rheims. It is translated, not from the original Greek, but from the Latin Vulgate of the Greeks (whose names are unknown), retained a number of Greek words untranslated, under the pretense of wanting proper and adequate English terms by which to render them. Hence the historian Fuller remarks, that it was "a translation that needed to be translated." The Old Testament was translated from the Vulgate at Douay (whence it is called the Douay Bible). Annotations are subjoined, which are ascribed to Cardinal—Allen, Gregory Martin, and Richard Bristow. This translation, with the Rheims version of the New Testament above noticed, forms the English Bible, which alone is used by the Romanists of this country. We may add, that different editions, with notes, have been published.

New, let us come to the authorized version. It was commenced in the spring of 1607, and the completion of it occupied nearly three years. No less than 47 persons were employed in its translation. They were eminent for their profound learning and distinguished piety. The greatest pains were employed to secure accuracy. The translators were divided into companies; each company had a particular portion of Scripture assigned to it; every individual translated the whole of this portion, all then compared notes; and then it was sent to other companies; if they did not agree, it was referred to a committee of the whole; if there were particular difficulties, learned men were appointed; and the whole was at length revised by six chosen persons, and lastly, by two distinguished individuals.

Allow me here to mention some of the translators of the authorized version from the original into English. "Lancelot Andrews, Bishop of Winchester, intimately acquainted with fifteen languages; Overal, Dean of St. Paul's, whose scholarship alone raised him to eminence; Andrew Smart, a Scotsman; Richard Clarke, celebrated for his profound acquaintance with Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; Bedwell, the very first Arabic and Oriental scholar of his day; Lively, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, the flower of the University for knowledge of tongues; Dr. Rainolds, professedly read in all kinds of learning, and most excellent in tongues; Kilby, renowned for his Hebrew and Rabbinical learning; Miles Smith, so government and expert in Chaldean, Syriac, and Arabic, that he made them almost as familiar as his native tongue; Brent, Rector of Quenston, famous for learning as well as piety, and versed in the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldean, Arabic, and Ethiopic tongues; Ward, reputed to be the best Greek scholar in Europe." These are only a few of the translators of our authorized version, and certainly, they were eminently qualified for the work to which they were appointed.

To the excellence of our authorized version we might produce a host of the most competent testimonies; we mention only a few. The learned Golden says, "The English translation of the Bible is the best translation in the world." Dr. Adam Clarke says, "For accuracy and general fidelity, competent judges allow that this translation greatly exceeds all modern versions, either English or foreign." Dr. Goldie, a learned Roman Catholic, candidly admits, "If accuracy, fidelity, and the strict attention to the letter of the text, be supposed to constitute the qualities of an excellent version, this of all other versions must in general be accounted the most excellent. Every sentence, every word, every syllable, every letter, every point seems to have been weighed with the most scrupulous care, and expressed either in the text or in the margin, with the greatest precision." Even Dr. Doyle says, "Though it has many errors, I consider it as one of the noblest works,—one of the oldest translations that has ever been produced."

But let us examine a few passages in the Douay version, and see how far it is inaccurate. In 1st Peter, v. 2, the Douay version has: "Neither as loading it over the strong (you know) but being made a pattern of the flock from the least." Let us see how this translation will suit in some other passages of Scripture, where the same is said in the original Greek. Acts i. 26, "And they gave forth their clergy; and the clergy (clerus) fell upon Matthias. Acts xxvi. 18, "That they may receive the forgiveness of sins, and clergy (clerus) among them that are sanctified." The term *clerus* signifies lot, or inheritance; but, by the rendering in the Douay version, we may see that no meaning and common sense do not always agree. In Eph. v. 22, it is said, "This is a great mystery," the rendering in the authorized version; in the Douay, "This is a great sacrament;" but in twenty-five other places in the Douay Bible, it is rendered "mystery." Why is this, but to serve a purpose?—to prove the pretended sacrament of marriage? Again, the word denoting reputation you translate penance, where it will serve your purpose; but, in other places, where it would make nonsense if so translated, you render it by its true meaning, as—"to give repentance to Israel." I do not wish to be tedious, otherwise, I could multiply criticisms, translated to show which is the corrupt version—the Douay or the authorized. The public, I trust, by this time, will see that I am chargeable with no harshness of expression when I say, that the Church of Rome betrays a wretched degree of arrogance and officiousness, when she pronounces our version of the Scriptures "corrupt."

Now, Sir, I am prepared to show, from your own admissions, that they are in fact false, in that which you write for the people. It is an incontrovertible fact, that our Catholics have sold, or given gratis, Bibles to many Roman Catholics in this island. Previous to their reception of these, it is evident that they had in their hands no version of the Scriptures; for had this been the case, how are we to account for their reception of them? You will not allow them to retain our version of the Scriptures. Do you ask me how I prove this? I answer,—from your own words. "They are," you say, "corrupt schismatical Bibles, and of course, no Bishop could sanction their distribution in his diocese, nor could Catholics receive and read them." Although your logic may be bad, I imagine this is plain enough to any one. Thus it comes out, that many of your people are without the Scriptures, and you will not allow us to put them into their hands. You say, "With what assurance did the Rev. Mr. Patterson come before the public and say, that the Catholic Clergy take the Bible from the people, when he knows, and every Catholic knows, that they read it for them and recommend them to read it." I do know, that the Catholic Clergy have great influence with their people. I do know, that their followers are compelled to attend them as well as obey them. If, therefore, they were to seize upon them to procure Bibles, scarcely a man or woman of them would be without them. Is not passing strange, then, that when, as you say, they are to be sold by the hundred, and by the thousand, so many should have no Bibles? Actions speak louder than words. Protestants show their love for the Bible by contributing to its substance, and sending their agents to circulate the word of God. Do Roman Catholics give smaller proof of their love for the Bible?

Sir, you say I have the hardihood to proclaim the intermeddling propensities of my family, in tampering with the religious convictions of servants. And what is the nature of this tampering?—putting the Bible into their hands at their own request. Is this a tampering of which they shall ever have reason to be ashamed? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

see how far it is inaccurate. In 1st Peter, v. 2, the Douay version has: "Neither as loading it over the strong (you know) but being made a pattern of the flock from the least." Let us see how this translation will suit in some other passages of Scripture, where the same is said in the original Greek. Acts i. 26, "And they gave forth their clergy; and the clergy (clerus) fell upon Matthias. Acts xxvi. 18, "That they may receive the forgiveness of sins, and clergy (clerus) among them that are sanctified." The term *clerus* signifies lot, or inheritance; but, by the rendering in the Douay version, we may see that no meaning and common sense do not always agree. In Eph. v. 22, it is said, "This is a great mystery," the rendering in the authorized version; in the Douay, "This is a great sacrament;" but in twenty-five other places in the Douay Bible, it is rendered "mystery." Why is this, but to serve a purpose?—to prove the pretended sacrament of marriage? Again, the word denoting reputation you translate penance, where it will serve your purpose; but, in other places, where it would make nonsense if so translated, you render it by its true meaning, as—"to give repentance to Israel." I do not wish to be tedious, otherwise, I could multiply criticisms, translated to show which is the corrupt version—the Douay or the authorized. The public, I trust, by this time, will see that I am chargeable with no harshness of expression when I say, that the Church of Rome betrays a wretched degree of arrogance and officiousness, when she pronounces our version of the Scriptures "corrupt."

Now, Sir, I am prepared to show, from your own admissions, that they are in fact false, in that which you write for the people. It is an incontrovertible fact, that our Catholics have sold, or given gratis, Bibles to many Roman Catholics in this island. Previous to their reception of these, it is evident that they had in their hands no version of the Scriptures; for had this been the case, how are we to account for their reception of them? You will not allow them to retain our version of the Scriptures. Do you ask me how I prove this? I answer,—from your own words. "They are," you say, "corrupt schismatical Bibles, and of course, no Bishop could sanction their distribution in his diocese, nor could Catholics receive and read them." Although your logic may be bad, I imagine this is plain enough to any one. Thus it comes out, that many of your people are without the Scriptures, and you will not allow us to put them into their hands. You say, "With what assurance did the Rev. Mr. Patterson come before the public and say, that the Catholic Clergy take the Bible from the people, when he knows, and every Catholic knows, that they read it for them and recommend them to read it." I do know, that the Catholic Clergy have great influence with their people. I do know, that their followers are compelled to attend them as well as obey them. If, therefore, they were to seize upon them to procure Bibles, scarcely a man or woman of them would be without them. Is not passing strange, then, that when, as you say, they are to be sold by the hundred, and by the thousand, so many should have no Bibles? Actions speak louder than words. Protestants show their love for the Bible by contributing to its substance, and sending their agents to circulate the word of God. Do Roman Catholics give smaller proof of their love for the Bible?

Sir, you say I have the hardihood to proclaim the intermeddling propensities of my family, in tampering with the religious convictions of servants. And what is the nature of this tampering?—putting the Bible into their hands at their own request. Is this a tampering of which they shall ever have reason to be ashamed? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

Catholic servants to carry a Bible with them is the duty of their conscience, how are we to account for their refusal of them? Is it a tampering for which they will be condemned at the great day of account? Sir, I could mention a species of tampering by persons of your own communion, which will cover its agents with confusion at that day when the conscience of every man will be compelled to speak out.

friends of God are unshaken when they see, and such an unshaken mind may suffer the great enemy to come and take away the soul to death, as an unfaithful man would suffer the thief to approach the dwelling without warning the inmates. But the man is usually more faithful than such a ministry. To far-distant shame of me it is spoken, that there are more ministers of religion unfaithful than of the cause raise. Instant prompts them to see the part, which God intends,—but alas! there are men,—men in the ministry, whose selfishness, not conscience, nor reason, nor hope, nor love, nor the commands of God, nor the apprehensions of eternal judgment, will induce them to put forth unweary efforts to save souls from an eternal hell.

Is the Bishop of this kind? W. C. MCKINNON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTECTOR.

SIR,—In the last Examiner I perceive a communication which is said to have accompanied a Bible presented to Mr. Robert Barker by Mr. Watkinson and others. Is it possible, Sir, that the very man who treated with contempt the petitions of thousands of our Bible-loving fellow countrymen, and closed that blessed Book with the Koran and the Book of Mormon, could immediately solicit subscriptions to purchase a Bible presentation, and subscribe himself as one who is "devoted that Religious Tolerance should not be obstructed in this island;" and that also after having voted against allowing the Bible to be read in our public schools, when desired by the parents of the children? Truly, Sir, we live in strange times. Equally as a loss as I understand how Mr. Barker can reconcile with truth a statement of his in reply to Mr. Watkinson, wherein the Editor of the Protector is said to have written—"that the Protestants of P. E. Island are the true friends of religious liberty, but liberty for all." Now, Sir, this statement of Mr. Barker intimates that which is false of people under similar circumstances. It is to be known to be untrue, as imply a falsehood in that which he writes, for that statement, Mr. Barker would wish it to be inferred that Christian friends of the Bible in P. E. Island, the evangelical Christians of all denominations, are averse to religious liberty; and that they are in fact endeavouring to control their fellow countrymen, Roman Catholics,—the true friends of the Bible, the Editor, represented them to be, notwithstanding all the disclaimers that have been published to the contrary, and in fact of the express resolution of the Protestant Meeting held on this exciting topic, and embodied in the petition to the Legislature passed at the same Meeting, where Mr. Barker figured as one of the speakers. It is impossible for Mr. Barker to be ignorant of the fact, that the Protestants of P. E. Island are the true friends of religious liberty. But what do we now see? We see that Mr. Barker, in his letter to the Editor, has endeavored to represent himself as a man who is devoted to religious liberty, and yet who is endeavoring to control the rights of his fellow countrymen, Roman Catholics, by the aid of the Legislature. This is a contradiction, and it is impossible for Mr. Barker to be ignorant of this. He is either a hypocrite, or he is a liar, or he is a man who is not worthy to be trusted. He is a man who is not worthy to be trusted. He is a man who is not worthy to be trusted. He is a man who is not worthy to be trusted.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTECTOR.

SIR,—It is a common delusion that, in a country where every regard is paid to moral character, truth, justice, and integrity, parties would be found capable of the deceit and misrepresentation which are so common in the present. The House of Commons, in its Assembly, on the Protestant movement respecting the Bible in our educational institutions, was at present call attention to a long Circular, which was the subject of a resolution, which was passed, and which was designed to overthrow the present government. This resolution was passed by a large majority, and it was a great triumph for the Protestant cause. It was a great triumph for the Protestant cause. It was a great triumph for the Protestant cause. It was a great triumph for the Protestant cause.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTECTOR.

SIR,—I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTECTOR.

SIR,—I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTECTOR.

SIR,—I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTECTOR.

SIR,—I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTECTOR.

SIR,—I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTECTOR.

SIR,—I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTECTOR.

SIR,—I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTECTOR.

SIR,—I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am. I am personally acquainted with the Bishop, and am satisfied that he would be as ready to speak in favour of the Bible as I am.

ward significances of the Holy Spirit, to a performance of external duties,—away from the evidence of pardon which the Spirit brings, to the supposed abolition of a spirit,—in one word, away from the heaven-revolved doctrine of regeneration, justification and sanctification, the only path to Heaven, into a mass of error and corruption, by which they are deceived and perished for ever. That such a complicated and destructive system of error should have so long existed, and extended so far, need awaken no astonishment, when we consider man's insatiable love of sin and proneness to deception, and remember that Paganism was established by the most enlightened part of the ancient heathen world, and still numbers its hundreds of millions, while Mohammedanism, twelve hundred years after its origin, has not the possession of the finest portions of earth, with its hundred millions of devotees. For Paganism and Mohammedanism some excuse may be given, but for Rome none. She has the Scriptures within her reach, but refuses to regulate herself by them. From the days of Vigilantius to those of Janinius, her heresies have been multiplied, but in vain. Wald, Wycliffe, Huss and Jerome, and many others long before Luther, labored hard to bring back the Scriptural purity and primitive discipline of Apostolic Rome, but were rewarded with cruel persecution, if not with martyrdom. It was to be hoped that when the art of printing, and the study of the Bible, spread light and liberty, at the era of the Reformation, and the unity heretics and schismatics of the so-called Catholic Church were laid bare, some reformation towards early purity would, from shame if not from fear of God, be sincerely attempted. But no; shame and the fear of God have long left the Babylonian harlot. If any doubt our statements, let him visit Rome, "the centre of unity," during the carnival. Rome refuses to be reformed, and hence is inflexible, and therefore, unchanging character. Instead of returning to the doctrine contained in Paul's epistles to the church in Rome, which ought to have been her standard if claiming any connection, much more identity with ancient, Apostolic, Christian Rome, she affixed her seal of approbation, in the Council of Trent, called a few years after her reformation, to such heresies and absurdities as have for ever departed from the claim to be regarded as a Church of Christ. But she has gone even lower. The doctrine of the Jesuits, which up to the foundation of his morality, the criminality of which the celebrated Pascal so fearfully exposed, have been declared by her perfectly orthodox and free from error. And to all her other heresies, she has added, in this generation, the novel absurdity of the Immaculate Conception. If these things are true, could any man, or any body of men, enlightened by the Scriptures, or having any fear of God within them, or any desire for the salvation of their souls, remain in connection with such a fallen, heretical sect? Assuredly not. Having refused to be reformed, it becomes every man within her pale that desires to escape the wrath of God, to obey the Divine injunction: "Come out of my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." (Rev. 18-4. The prophets have left her to follow the blessed light of heaven—the Holy Scriptures—and protest against other things against her opposition to the manifested will of the word of God by the common people, against her services in an unknown language, by which poor sinners are kept in ignorance,—against her neglect of preaching the cardinal doctrine of regeneration, justification by faith alone, and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, by which souls might be saved,—against the impious assumption that a spirit is able, by saying a few Latin words, to change a wretch into the body and blood, soul and divinity, of our blessed Redeemer,—against the monstrous absurdity that such a show as Purgatory exists, in which poor souls are kept just as long as the priests may wish, and for an escape from which they must be paid,—against auricular confession, which is an engine of intolerable oppression, utterly unauthorized in God's word, and often destructive to the morals of the confessor and confessed,—against the enforcement of seven sacraments, when Jesus instituted only two,—against the ceremonial observance of the Pope, when Christ said that none should be called by His name,—Father,—on earth; and that it has been proved by the history of the Popes in Rome, when in all probability, Peter never was in Rome; Papias, a poor credulous man, a hundred years after Peter's death, being the first to broach the imaginary tradition,—and against the assumed titles of "Infallible," and "Catholic," since all men are fallible, and Catholics who have been condemned by each other, and Councils, who have been second Council of Nice in approving the absurdity of transubstantiation, when all our senses deny it and become, instead of being "Catholic," the first far outnumbered by Greeks and Protestants united, and will soon be by Protestants alone. Such heresies and corruptions have fully warranted a separation from Pagan Rome in the days of the Reformation;—and such causes exist in a still greater degree to keep us separate. What then is the duty of Roman Catholics? Plainly, if they value their souls, to search the Scriptures for themselves, and believe their Bibles; but what God has taught. Follow sinners to you, who are proudly absolute, but seek pardon from Jesus Christ alone,—believe in no transubstantiation, and in no communion with the Council of Trent in confirming the absurdity of transubstantiation, when all our senses deny it and become, instead of being "Catholic," the first far outnumbered by Greeks and Protestants united, and will soon be by Protestants alone. Such heresies and corruptions have fully warranted a separation from Pagan Rome in the days of the Reformation;—and such causes exist in a still greater degree to keep us separate. What then is the duty of Roman Catholics? Plainly, if they value their souls, to search the Scriptures for themselves, and believe their Bibles; but what God has taught. Follow sinners to you, who are proudly absolute, but seek pardon from Jesus Christ alone,—believe in no transubstantiation, and in no communion with the Council of Trent in confirming the absurdity of transubstantiation, when all our senses deny it and become, instead of being "Catholic," the first far outnumbered by Greeks and Protestants united, and will soon be by Protestants alone. Such heresies and corruptions have fully warranted a separation from Pagan Rome in the days of the Reformation;—and such causes exist in a still greater degree to keep us separate. What then is the duty of Roman Catholics? Plainly, if they value their souls, to search the Scriptures for themselves, and believe their Bibles; but what God has taught. Follow sinners to you, who are proudly absolute, but seek pardon from Jesus Christ alone,—believe in no transubstantiation, and in no communion with the Council of Trent in confirming the absurdity of transubstantiation, when all our senses deny it and become, instead of being "Catholic," the first far outnumbered by Greeks and Protestants united, and will soon be by Protestants alone. Such heresies and corruptions have fully warranted a separation from Pagan Rome in the days of the Reformation;—and such causes exist in a still greater degree to keep us separate. What then is the duty of Roman Catholics? Plainly, if they value their souls, to search the Scriptures for themselves, and believe their Bibles; but what God has taught. Follow sinners to you, who are proudly absolute, but seek pardon from Jesus Christ alone,—believe in no transubstantiation, and in no communion with the Council of Trent in confirming the absurdity of transubstantiation, when all our senses deny it and become, instead of being "Catholic," the first far outnumbered by Greeks and Protestants united, and will soon be by Protestants alone. Such heresies and corruptions have fully warranted a separation from Pagan Rome in the days of the Reformation;—and such causes exist in a still greater degree to keep us separate. What then is the duty of Roman Catholics? Plainly, if they value their souls, to search the Scriptures for themselves, and believe their Bibles; but what God has taught. Follow sinners to you, who are proudly absolute, but seek pardon from Jesus Christ alone,—believe in no transubstantiation, and in no communion with the Council of Trent in confirming the absurdity of transubstantiation, when all our senses deny it and become, instead of being "Catholic," the first far outnumbered by Greeks and Protestants united, and will soon be by Protestants alone. Such heresies and corruptions have fully warranted a separation from Pagan Rome in the days of the Reformation;—and such causes exist in a still greater degree to keep us separate. What then is the duty of Roman Catholics? Plainly, if they value their souls, to search the Scriptures for themselves, and believe their Bibles; but what God has taught. Follow sinners to you, who are proudly absolute, but seek pardon from Jesus Christ alone,—believe in no transubstantiation