

British and Foreign Bible Society, and put it out of the power of any one to question her interest in the good work. Ah! we suppose that when it comes to this point, the Doctor remembers again that the Bible is a very dangerous book, which may lead men into the worst errors and the most fearful blasphemies!

On the Dr's. list of editions and versions, taken from an un-named author, we remark :

1. Some of them were made by *private* persons, for whose work the Church of Rome deserves neither credit nor blame. She had no more to do with them than with the Battle of Hastings, or the discovery of America.

2. That so far as they were sanctioned by the Church of Rome, they were not intended for general circulation among the laity. The free use of them was never allowed to the people. Dr. O'Connor does not venture to affirm, nor will any honest man of competent information assert, that the people were allowed to peruse them, without restriction. Yet this is the only point he needed to prove. Indeed many of these versions were mere abortive attempts at translation, which were quite unfit for general use. As regards the early German versions, Michelet observes from Seckendorf, "that they were neither suited for nor allowed to the people. '*Nec legi permittebantur, nec ob styli et typorum horridatam satisfacere poterant.*'"

3. That the list is in many respects *unreliable* and *deceptive*.

We can only give a few specimens by which the reader can judge of the credit due to this un-named author, whom Dr. O'Connor follows. The very first version on his list is one printed so early that it has neither date nor name of place on it; and had the writer been candid, he would have added that the *author*, whether Turk, Catholic or heretic, is *unknown*, and that were he known, it would probably be seen that the Romish Church had just as little to do with his version as with the discovery of the art of printing.

His second version is one, said to have been printed by Faust, in 1472, of the existence of which we can find no indication. And as Faust is believed to have died in the plague of Paris in 1466, he can hardly have printed a Catholic version in 1472, unless Dr. O'Connor has private information that his old business was carried on by the printer in the *intermediate state*.

A Bohemian version of 1488 does duty in the learned Doctor's catalogue. But the only Bohemian version of that date of which I can find any trace is one issued by the United Brethren of Bohemia. Does Dr. O'Connor imagine that because the Church of Rome with all her persecutions failed to exterminate these Brethren, that she has a right to confiscate their translation of the Scripture and claim the honor to herself?

* Vide E. B. Elliott Horae Apoc. II., 92.

† Vide E. B. Elliott Horae Apoc. II., 571; and Book and its Story, page 170.