heart of Judas when those tender hands were on his feet!

V. 8.—Observe the reply of Jesus to Peter: "If I wash thee not thou hast not part with me." He does not say, "If I wash not thy feet."

V. 9.—Peter has now a glimpse of his Master's meaning and a sense of his own

pollution.

V. 10.—The meaning of this verse is, One after washed his whole body needs not wash but his feet which have been soiled in walking from the bath. The feet are most The lesson conveyed is that oasily soiled. we need constant cleansing at the hands of Jesus even after the washing of regeneration. He now explains the meaning of what He had done. It was to teach humility and mutual helpfulness.

## LESSONS.

(The Pope imitates, or rather burlesques, this solemn service by washing the feet of twelve beggars once a year. In this case it is mere sham and show.)

1. Jesus loves His people with a love conger than death V. 1.

stronger than death

2. The devil tempts to evil; but he can be resisted by the weakest believer. Judas opened his heart to the tempter.

3. He who washed His disciples' feet can wash our souls from every stain of sin.

- While in the form, and doing the work, of a slave, Jesus was God-man and had all things under His command.
- If Jesus washed the feet of the traitor Judas, knowing him to be such, what ought we not to do for our friends, our neighbours, our foes!
- 6. The washing of the feet typifies all loving offices: as Jesus acted towards His disciples so they are bound to act towards each other
- 7. Let us remember the warning given to Peter:—Unless we are washed by Jesus we have no part in Him.

## DOCTRINE.

Christ requires humility, Phil. ii. 5-8; Matt. xi. 29; James iv. 10. ---

## Correspondence.

To the Editor of the Home & Foreign Record.

SIR,-In the January No. some remarks appeared, which we deemed it our duty to make respecting a statement in the Report of the F. M. Board. There we stated, that the B & F. Bible Society are circulating versions of the Scriptures, containing almost all the principal errors of popery. That they circulate such versions, is no longer denied. Sufficient evidence of the corruptness of such versoins, is at any time within reach of our clerical brethren; but not of the general public, who yet have a deep interest in this very important subject. For their sakes, we return to this subject; and shall produce such evidence as, we think, can leave no doubt upon their minds as to the truth and propriety of this statement.

The principle upon which the Scottish National Society, the Trinitarian, and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge proceed, is, "to circulate only the purest versions of the Hebrew and Greek Testaments." The B. & F. Bible Society's "fundamental law," as they term it, is "to circulate the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment." That there is a great difference will appear in the sequel. If this law has force at all, the Society hereby pledge themselves to circulate "the pure word of God" only. Indeed this is acknowledged by the London Committee, in Regulation I. of 1827, as then applied to the Apocrypha. See Report 1866, p. xi. To act otherwise, violates the basis of the Society's existence, breaks faith with their supporters, and above all, misrepresents God and his word to those to whom they give corrupt versions.

How, then, is this law maintained? any Annual Report, that of 1866 for example, under the headings, "Books on sale by this Society," pp. 21-23, and "Languages and Dialects," pp. 65, 66, will be found as "published for," and sold by the B. & F. B. S., Martine (Italian), De Saci (French), Pereira (Portuguese), and Scio (Spanish). All these are Romish versions, and all Romish versions are made, not from the Hebrew and Greek originals, but from the Vulgate. The qualifying clause "with-out note or comment," however intended, is really most delusive. The errors of these versions are not so much in the notes as in the text from which they are translated, and so long as the priests are the public teachers of religion, and the manuals of devotion are in the people's hands, "notes" or no "notes" matters little. Versions from the originals are in each of these languages, and advertised in the same pages. Now we shall

First—As briefly as practicable show the historical character of the Vulgate. About 285, B.C., the Hebrew Scriptures were at Alexandria translated into Greek, as far as appears, by the Jews Sanhedrim, and for the use of their brethren whose spoken language at that time was Greek, hence called the Alexandrian, or LXX. version. A version, in the nature of things. cannot equal the original; and by transcribing copies. and succession of editions, it has been invariably corrupted. Early in the second century of the christian cra, a translation was made into Latin for the use of Christians in the Western Empire, not from the