

in the church in unknown languages. He wishes them to show more moderation, and to speak in them only where there is an interpreter. Therefore the Scriptures are to be translated into the vulgar tongues, distributed everywhere to all, and in every language? But, if so, why did not the Apostles themselves draw this conclusion, so "good and necessary" in the view of our learned acute Presbyterian divines, and give us from their own hands a Latin, a Syriac, an Arabic, a Gallic Testament? It is singular how much superior as logicians our Presbyterian divines are to the Apostles, and how inconsistent the neglect of the Apostles must appear to them. But the Presbyterians live in modern times, have the advantages of modern progress, and therefore must naturally be supposed to surpass the Apostles, who lived a long time ago, and had only the lights of divine inspiration.

We shall restrict what we have to say on the article under consideration to three questions, namely: 1. Are the Hebrew copies of the Old Testament and the Greek copies of the New, *which we no possess*, more "authentic" than the Latin Vulgate? 2. Is there a positive obligation upon all men to read the Scriptures? And 3. Is the distribution of the Scriptures to all indiscriminately in the vulgar tongue an effectual way of making *the word of God dwell plentifully in all*, and of attaining the end for which it was given?

1. The Latin Vulgate, put by the side of the Hebrew and Greek copies of the Scriptures we now have, will not suffer by the comparison; and our Douay Bible, made from it with remarkable accuracy, is superior to the version of King James, though this last purports to be made from the original tongues, since the Latin Vulgate is at least as good a Representative of the word of God as the modern copies of the original tongues now in our possession, and as the English version made from it is a far better performance than that of the translators appointed by the royal theologian. If we possessed the autographs of Moses and the other Jewish writers in Hebrew, and those of the Apostles themselves in Greek, no one would be found, of course, to contest their superiority; though, after all, they would be found to agree substantially with our modern Bible. But the autograph is lost and the manuscripts or printed copies of Hebrew and Greek Bibles are only transcriptions of other copies which are also lost, and which themselves were only transcriptions. To tell the number of transcriptions there have been in ascending from a modern Hebrew Bible to Moses would puzzle greater men than even Westminster divines. This being understood, it will not be disputed that our present copies of the Hebrew Bible may and must have mistakes and errors, unless indeed it be contended that God has by a continual miracle directed the hand of every copyist. These errors and mistakes it is true, do not affect the substance of the text, or prevent it from representing the substance of the dogmas, morals, and history recorded by the sacred penman; but they are blemishes and blemishes which place the Hebrew and Greek text as low as and even lower than an early translation, in which there must have been fewer chances of accidental variations, and in which such as did occur were more likely to be corrected. Such a translation is the Latin Vulgate, at least in the view of Catholics who respect, indeed, the Hebrew and Greek copies, but are far from considering them the only or even the most authentic monuments we now have of divine revelation.

Presbyterians seem, in their Scriptural quotations, to intimate that everything, even to a single jot, or comma, in the Hebrew and Greek copies is correct; but this it is well known is not the fact. The several Hebrew and Greek manuscripts extant are known to differ from one another by something more than jots and commas. Which of these manuscripts is the one Presbyterians declare to be genuine, the one immediately inspired? Open Griesbach's edition of the New Testament, and you shall find scarcely a page which does not present various readings, all of which are supported by Greek manuscripts, and with no possible means of determining in all cases which is the genuine reading. Who, in the face of this fact, can unblushingly assert that God by his providence has so watched over the Hebrew and Greek copies of the Bible, that they are absolutely pure, and in nothing differ from the autographs themselves? Every one who can read a word of Hebrew and Greek, and

compare editions, knows such an assertion to be false. The simple fact, then, that the Old Testament was written in Hebrew, and the New in Greek, is not, then, in itself a reason for preferring our present Hebrew and Greek copies to authentic versions, possessing the requisite qualities. The Latin Vulgate may, then, represent the word of God as well as the received Hebrew text, and we hesitate not to say that in many things it actually does represent it even better. No to enter too far into Biblical criticism, we select a couple of examples from many others we might adduce. Genesis, iv. 8, we read in the Vulgate, "And Cain said to his brother Abel, Let us go forth abroad. And when they were in the field, Cain rose up against his brother Abel and slew him." In the Hebrew the words *let us go forth abroad*, are wanting, and hence the royal theologians in the Protestant version translate, "And Cain talked with Abel, his brother; and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against his brother and slew him." The Vulgate here is far preferable to the Hebrew, and Moses must have written as in the Vulgate, and not in the modern Hebrew. The proof of this is in the fact that the Septuagint has these words, "Let us go forth abroad," the Targum of Jerusalem has them, and so has the Pentateuch of the Samaritans; and this last must be for the learned high authority. Hence St. Jerome, who had the Samaritan Pentateuch under his eyes, was induced to retain the reading which we have in the Vulgate. The context itself confirms this reading. The modern Hebrew says that Cain spoke to Abel, but, unless we add the words in the Vulgate, he is made to speak without saying anything. Moreover, if we admit that Cain said, "Let us go forth abroad," the following words, "And when they were in the field," &c., come in naturally, and with perfect propriety. Here are sufficient considerations for preferring the reading of the Vulgate to that of the modern Hebrew.

## INHUMANITY OF THE PEOPLE OF BOSTON.

We extract the following from a letter addressed to the Editor of the Yarmouth Herald by a Correspondent at Boston. We are of opinion, that no language can be too strong, for the reprobation of such unfeeling treatment to helpless men, women, and children, who had crossed three thousand miles of Ocean, to escape all the horrors of famine. We feel it our duty to publish one case of agony and death, which will make every friend of humanity shudder.

Amongst the passengers of the ill-fated Mary was a family consisting of a father and mother, and 4 children. This entire family were in good health when they arrived in the harbour of Boston. But they would not be permitted to land. They were forced again to encounter the dangers of the Ocean. Mark the sequel. The father sickened and died. Three of his children followed him.—The unfortunate widow caught the fever from hardship and grief, and she and her only remaining child are now in hospital at Melville Island. We ask the authorities at Boston; is no one responsible to heaven for those four murders? But we must give our promised extract from the Yarmouth paper:—