

4295A

UC-NRLF



B 2 792 356







# REVIEW

OF THE  
CONDUCT OF THE DIRECTORS

OF THE

**British and Foreign Bible Society,**

RELATIVE TO

**THE APOCRYPHA,**

AND TO THEIR

**ADMINISTRATION ON THE CONTINENT.**

WITH AN

ANSWER TO THE REV. C. SIMEON, AND OBSERVATIONS ON  
THE CAMBRIDGE REMARKS.

---

BY ROBERT HALDANE, Esq.

---

“Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.”—*Prov. xxx. 6.*

“Shouldst thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the Lord?”—*2 Chron. xix. 2.*

---

SECOND EDITION.

EDINBURGH:  
PRINTED FOR WILLIAM WHYTE & CO.  
13, GEORGE STREET;

SOLD BY M. OGLE, AND W. COLLINS, GLASGOW; A. BROWN & CO.  
ABERDEEN; BY THE BOOKSELLERS IN PERTH AND DUNDEE;  
J. FINLAY, NEWCASTLE; LONGMAN & CO.; HAMILTON  
ADAMS & CO., AND J. NISBET, LONDON; AND W. CURRY,  
JUN. & CO. DUBLIN.

1828.

---

*Price Two Shillings and Sixpence.*

LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO, ILL.

1900

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO, ILL.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO, ILL.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO, ILL.

42159

BV2370

B8H35

1828

MAIN

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	<i>Page</i>
1. Authenticity of the Scriptures, . . . . .	1
2. Addition of the Apocrypha, . . . . .	12
3. Letter to one of the Secretaries of the Bible Society, . . . . .	15
4. Minutes of the Edinburgh Bible Society. . . . .	21

CHAPTER II.

1. Answer to Mr Simeon, . . . . .	26
2. Rules of the Bible Society, . . . . .	27
3. Circumcision of Timothy, . . . . .	43
4. Meats offered to Idols, . . . . .	49

CHAPTER III.

1. Review of a Letter from a Swedish Nobleman, . . . . .	56
2. _____ L. Van Ess, . . . . .	58
3. _____ Paris, . . . . .	65
4. _____ Professor Keiffer, . . . . .	68
5. Testimonies to the practicability of circulating the Bible without the Apocrypha, . . . . .	74

CHAPTER IV.

1. The question of adding the Apocrypha to the Scriptures, . . . . .	86
2. Scriptures { Character and Inspiration of . . . . .	89
{ Additions to them prohibited . . . . .	94

CONTENTS.

3. Apocrypha.	}	Claims Inspiration,	96
		Not Canonical,	97
		Accursed,	101
4. Adulteration of the Scriptures by the Bible Society,			107

CHAPTER V.

1. Abuses in the Administration of the Bible Society,	114
2. Character of Bible Societies on the Continent,	117
3. Lausanne edition of the Bible,	121
4. Strasburg Preface,	124
5. Additions of Notes and Comments,	130
6. Evils arising from the State of the Foreign Societies	133
7. Necessity of Reformation in the Bible Society,	138
8. Duty of Christians to circulate the Scriptures,	144

APPENDIX

1. . . . .	1
2. . . . .	2
3. . . . .	3
4. . . . .	4

APPENDIX

1. . . . .	1
2. . . . .	2
3. . . . .	3
4. . . . .	4
5. . . . .	5
6. . . . .	6
7. . . . .	7
8. . . . .	8

APPENDIX

1. . . . .	1
2. . . . .	2
3. . . . .	3



## PREFACE.

SINCE the following pages went to press, it has been reported that the Sub-committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society have resolved to propose to the General Meeting, that its funds shall no longer be applied to the printing of the Apocrypha. Supposing the report to be correct, it does not render this publication the less necessary. It remains to be seen whether the line of conduct finally adopted, shall be such as to prevent the funds of the Bible Societies of Britain from being indirectly instrumental in aiding the circulation of the Apocrypha by the Foreign Societies. It is said that some of the leading members of the Committee have agreed to the proposal, not from being convinced that the former practice of the Society was improper, but in deference to public opinion. This is low ground, and very likely to be abandoned if the discussion should hereafter be revived. It is therefore necessary to call the attention of the public to the magnitude of the question, and, by proving not only the unlawfulness of making any addition to the Scriptures, but also the practicability of circulating the Bible on the Continent without the

Apocrypha, to secure the entire and permanent discontinuance of a practice which cannot be too severely condemned.

It is also proper to expose those false principles, and dangerous misapplications of Scripture, which appear in Mr Simeon's pamphlet, published in defence of the circulation of the Apocrypha, in answer to the Statement of the Edinburgh Bible Committee.

A further object is to correct the wrong impressions which the public may have received by the extracts of four letters from abroad, in the Cambridge Remarks, as well as to counteract the influence of that publication and the pernicious tendency of some of its reasonings.

It is likewise important to direct the attention of the Supporters of the British and Foreign Bible Society to those abuses in the administration of its affairs on the Continent of Europe, which, although little known to the Auxiliary Societies in this country, are very seriously counteracting the object it has in view in the circulation of the Scriptures. This subject, entirely distinct from that of the Apocrypha, demands the attention of those Societies, and requires to be fully investigated.

The questions involved in the discussion of the above topics are not of local or temporary interest: all of them enter deeply into the system of Divine Revelation, and are of much practical concern to every Christian.

Edinburgh, November 1825.

## REVIEW.

---

### CHAPTER I.

**AUTHENTICITY OF THE SCRIPTURES.—ADDITION OF THE  
APOCRYPHA.—LETTER TO ONE OF THE SECRETARIES OF  
THE BIBLE SOCIETY.—MINUTES OF THE EDINBURGH  
BIBLE COMMITTEE.**

**A**MIDST the various proofs with which we are surrounded of man's alienation from God, none is more striking than his conduct in regard to religion. The Lord was pleased to reveal himself to fallen man as the just God and the Saviour, and to encourage his apostate creature to confide in his mercy. But, notwithstanding his condescension, a very few generations were sufficient almost to eradicate the knowledge of God from the earth,—and the human race, with the exception of one family, was, in consequence, swept away by the flood.

The descendants of Noah, unawed by this catastrophe, did not retain God in their knowledge, but changed the image of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Even that nation which the Lord chose to be his witnesses, to be the salt of the earth, and the light of the world, changed his judgments into wickedness; and, with the exception of a very small remnant, cast off their allegiance to the God of Israel.

At length the Saviour appeared; the kingdom of God was taken from the Jews, and the gospel was preached to the Gentiles, for the obedience of faith. Its progress was rapid and extensive: many were brought from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God. The sound of the apostles went into all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In the mean time the enemy was not idle, and the tares which he sowed soon made their appearance. The mystery of iniquity was discernible in the Apostolic age, and it continued to work till the man of sin was established on his throne, and the religion of Jesus changed into an unshapely mass of gross idolatry and degrading superstition.

But the Lord's counsel shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure. He has given to his Son the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession. For the accomplishment of this promise, he has made ample provision by inspiring holy men to commit to writing the revelation of his will; so that, notwithstanding all the corruptions of religion, an infallible standard is provided,—a standard untainted by error, and unalloyed with falsehood, by which we may try every doctrine, and detect every imposition; and thus the mind of Christ is communicated to us on whom the ends of the world are come.

This holy book is the palladium of our rebellious world. Like its divine Author, it is imperishable. “The word of the Lord endureth for ever:” it is the incorruptible seed of the new and spiritual creation, which is the chief of the ways of God, and therefore he hath “magnified his word above all his name.” Hence neither the indifference nor the wickedness of man has been permitted to corrupt its purity, or sully its lustre. It has, for a season, been made void by vain traditions,—it has been taken out of the hands of the people, and has appeared to be almost forgotten; but, though heaven and earth shall pass away, the word of God shall remain until it accomplish his gracious purposes towards this sinful world.

While the preservation of the Scriptures is thus infallibly secured, it is no less the incumbent duty of all, into whose hands they may come, to beware of countenancing any measure which has a tendency to corrupt them, lest haply we be found to fight against God.

The Holy Scriptures were delivered to the first Christians pure and unadulterated; but although any addition is excluded by their nature, and by their language expressly prohibited, yet, after a few centuries had elapsed, the Apocrypha, a volume of spurious writings, usurped, at first, a suspicious affinity to the sacred record; was afterwards joined with it; and, at length, in the progress of the mystery of iniquity, became actually incorporated as a part of holy writ. At the era of the Reformation this flagrant evil received a check, but was by no means wholly eradicated. The reformers, although they denied that the Apocrypha formed a part of the sacred volume, yet allowed it to retain that place which at first had been conceded to it, as a useful appendage for "example of life, and instruction of manners." This unlawful ground the Apocryphal writings have, ever since their time, extensively occupied; and, for several years, they have been sanctioned, in all the various forms of their usurpation, by the British and Foreign Bible Society, without the knowledge of its supporters.

To arrest this wide-spreading mischief, attempts, for a considerable time past, have been made in private; but every means hitherto used having proved ineffectual, the matter has at length been brought before the public, and has now given rise to a very important discussion. As the subject stands especially connected with that part of Scripture called the Old Testament, a brief view of the proof of its authenticity may not be deemed superfluous.

It was the chief advantage of the Jews that to them were committed the oracles of God, and it is their highest commendation that they were faithful to this trust. With whatever faults they are justly chargeable, no accusation can be preferred against them as guardians of the Scrip-

tures, which were delivered in such a manner as to preclude the possibility of any mistake respecting their divine origin.

The plainest directions were given to the Jews for ascertaining the truth of the mission of those who declared themselves prophets; and although false prophets did arise, and for a time obtained a degree of influence, their wickedness was exposed by the failure of their predictions, or by the judgments of God inflicted on them, as in the case of Hananiah. During the whole period from Moses to Malachi, a succession of prophets was raised up, under whose direction the word of God was infallibly distinguished from all counterfeits; and by their means, in connexion with the visible interference of the God of Israel in punishing those who made the people trust in a lie, the Scriptures were preserved pure and unadulterated. The books which compose the Old Testament were accordingly held by the Jews, in every age, to be the genuine works of those persons to whom they were ascribed, and to have been universally and exclusively, without any addition or exception, written under the immediate influence of the Spirit of God. These writings they preserved with the greatest veneration; at the same time they carefully guarded against receiving along with them any Apocryphal or uninspired books.

We are assured by Josephus, that, although there were innumerable books among the Jews, they received none but twenty-two as divine. "We have," says he, "two-and-twenty books which are to be believed as of divine authority, and which comprehend the history of all ages: five belong to Moses, which contain the origin of man, and the tradition of the succession of generations down to his death.—During so many ages no one has dared to add any thing to the twenty-two books, or to take any thing from them, or to alter any thing in them; for it is implanted in the nature of all Jews, immediately from their birth, to consider these books as the oracles of God; to adhere to them; and, if occasion should require, cheerfully to die for

their sake." Josephus has given a list of these books as they stood in his time, and as they had been transmitted for ages. These are precisely the same which from the beginning have been received by Christians, and which are still acknowledged by the modern Jews.

Owing to the important connexion subsisting between the Old and New Testaments, the early Christian writers carefully examined the authenticity of the Jewish Scriptures. In the second century, Melito, Bishop of Sardis, travelled to the East on purpose to investigate the subject. The learned Origen, in the third century, gives a list of the twenty-two books. Athanasius, in the fourth century, specifies the twenty-two canonical books, which he says "are received by the whole church." Gregory Nazianzen and Jerome affirm that the twenty-two books alone were received as canonical. This fact is confirmed by the council of Laodicea in the year 363. To all this it is important to add, that there is no contradictory testimony.

On such indubitable proofs does our conviction of the authenticity of the Old Testament Scriptures repose. But, clear and satisfactory as these testimonials are, they are neither the only ones nor the highest to which we can appeal. The grand and conclusive evidence to every Christian on this subject is, that the Jewish canon was sanctioned by Jesus Christ. The Scriptures as held by the Jews, were acknowledged by the Lord and his apostles, who frequently appealed to them, and never once intimated that they had been changed or corrupted in the smallest degree. Thus, previously to the rejection of the Jewish people, the Son of God stamped, with his authority, that part of revelation which had been committed to them. It is the characteristic of his Gospel, that it is preached to the poor; and he has so ordered it that the authenticity of that word, by which all are to be judged, should not be a matter of doubtful disputation.

We have noticed the care with which the earliest Christian writers examined the authenticity of the Old Testa-

ment Scriptures. Those who succeeded them were not, however, so scrupulous as their predecessors and the consequence was, that those writings, which are called Apocryphal, were at length connected with the books of the Old Testament, first added and afterwards intermingled with them.

Of the Apocryphal books, Horne, in his introduction to the critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, says,—“ They are not mentioned in the Catalogue of inspired writings, made by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, who flourished in the second century, nor in those of Origen, in the third century, of Athanasius, Hilary, Ciril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Amphilochius, Jerome, Rufinus, and others of the fourth century; nor in the catalogue of the canonical books recognized by the council of Laodicea, held in the same century, whose canons were received by the Catholic Church; so that, as Bishop Burnet well observes, “ we have the concurring sense of the whole church of God in this matter.” To this decisive evidence against the canonical authority of the Apocryphal books, we may add, that they were never read in the Christian Church until the fourth century, when, as Jerome informs us, they were read “ for example of life and instruction of manners, but were not applied to establish any doctrine.”

The consequence of the admission of these uninspired books to be read in the churches along with the word of God, although at first carefully distinguished from it, might have been easily foreseen. In a little time they came to be intermingled with the Sacred record, and afterwards to be received as a part of it. “ From the middle of the fourth century, (or, perhaps, earlier)” says Mr Gorham, “ till 1534, they took their place in the Sacred volume, *intermingled*, indeed, but avowedly as *human* writings. From that period to the present moment they have usurped the name of *inspired* Scriptures in the Bibles of Roman Catholics.” This “ impious violation,” (as he most properly terms it) “ of the integrity of the inspired word” originated



in the decree of the council of Trent, session iv. 1546, which he quotes as follows.

“ The sacred, œcumenical, and general synod of Trent . . . having this object perpetually in view, that errors being removed, the real purity of the gospel may be preserved in the church ; which, promised aforetime by the Prophets in the Holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, first promulgated by his own mouth, and afterwards ordained to be preached to every creature by his Apostles, as being a fountain of all saving truth and of instruction of manners ; knowing, moreover, that this truth and instruction is contained in the WRITTEN BOOKS, AND IN THE UNWRITTEN TRADITIONS, . . . RECEIVES AND VENERATES WITH SENTIMENTS OF EQUAL PIETY AND REVERENCE ALL THE BOOKS, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, since one GOD WAS THE AUTHOR of them both, and also the traditions relating as well to faith as to morals. . . . Moreover, it has determined to annex to this Decree an index of the SACRED BOOKS ; lest a doubt should arise to any one which they be, that are received by this Synod : they are written below. Of the Old Testament,

5 of Moses, <i>i. e.</i>	Esther [containing the	12 Prophets the less, <i>i. e.</i>
Genesis,	<i>Rest of Esther,</i> ]	Hosea,
Exodus,	Job,	Joel,
Leviticus,	David's Psalms, 150	Amos,
Numbers,	Proverbs,	Obadiah,
Deuteronomy,	Ecclesiastes,	Jonah,
Joshua,	Song of Songs,	Micah,
Judges,	<i>Wisdom,</i>	Nahum,
Ruth,	<i>Ecclesiasticus,</i>	Habakkuk,
Kings, 4.	Isaiah,	<i>Bel and the Dragon.</i> ]
Chronicles, 2.	Jeremiah, with	Zephaniah,
Ezra, I. and II. called	<i>Baruch,</i>	Haggai,
Nehemiah,	Ezekiel,	Zechariah,
<i>Tobias,</i>	Daniel, [ <i>Song of 3 Child.</i>	Malachi
<i>Judith,</i>	<i>Susanna,</i>	<i>Maccabees, 2, 1 and 11.</i>

(Then follow the books of the New Testament, which are all the same as in the Protestant Canon). . . . “ But if

any one shall not receive, for SACRED AND CANONICAL, *all those Books, with all their parts*, as they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church, and are set forth in the old Vulgate Latin Edition, and knowingly and advisedly shall contemn the aforesaid traditions, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA.\*

Of the occasion of the above decree, Mr Gorham gives the following account:—"The Papists began to tremble for their faith when the Reformers brought their doctrines to the test of the pure WORD OF GOD; and they perceived that some of the leading tenets of their church were undermined when Luther denied the authority, both of tradition and of all *merely ecclesiastical writings*. The Romish hierarchy was in danger; the Vatican took the alarm: it was necessary to adopt some decisive measures; and therefore the Council of Trent was summoned to meet this tremendous crisis. One of the most learned Roman Catholic Bishops plainly affirms this: the conduct of the Protestants he says (expressly in reference to the Canon of Scripture) "was intolerable," it was time to expose this outrage, and to put an end to discussions by an eternal Anathema. Under such circumstances did the Council of Trent issue its infamous decree, in which it not only declared that the writings esteemed by us (and formerly by the Romish doctors themselves) *uninspired*, were *sacred and canonical*, but that these Apocryphal books (and all parts of them) were to be received "*with the same piety and reverence as the other Scriptures*."—

"Though every scholar is acquainted with the fact, it is not popularly known, that the Apocryphal matter in the body of these two books" (Daniel and Esther) "is so completely interpolated in many *modern Catholic Bibles*, that there is not even a distinction of *chapters* presented to the eye, in some parts; the *verses* reading on, as if the sacred

---

\* "The words between hooks are not in the decree, but are here added for *distinctness*; for the same reason the Apocryphal Books are printed in the *Italic type*."

writer were still continuing his narrative. “*The song of the three children*,” e.g. forms Daniel iii. 24—90 ; standing between verses 23 and 91 ; *Susanna* forms Daniel xiii ; “*Bel and the Dragon*,” Daniel xiv. *The rest of Esther* forms Esther x. 4. to end, and xi. to xvi. In this respect *modern Catholic Bibles are more deceptive than even the Vulgate* ; for the Pope, and the Council of Trent, *left* the notes of St Jerome, in *the body of the sacred text*, pointing out its redundancies ; but these notes have, in recent times, disappeared altogether ; and thus some of the most absurd parts of the Apocrypha have merged into the Holy Volume. St Jerome tells us that, according to his custom, he had marked those Apocryphal interpolations with a dagger † placed horizontally, for the purpose of stabbing them. It would be well if the insidious place they occupy were *still* so denoted.”

Such is the book which the Directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society have, for several years, been circulating on the Continent under the title of THE HOLY BIBLE, CONTAINING THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS—a book consisting of sacred writings and human forgeries mingled and jumbled together, not by accident, but, as is seen above, with a deep and insidious design. Nor can it be pleaded in palliation of this most unjustifiable abuse of the trust committed to them, that their attention has not been called to the subject. From the following letter, which I wrote to one of the secretaries, after fully conversing with him and another of the secretaries, and with some of the directors, and which, I was informed, was read in the committee, it will be seen that four years have elapsed since the business of the Apocrypha was brought under their notice:—

“ Auchingray, October 6, 1821.

“ MY DEAR SIR,

“ Amidst the multiplicity of your business in Earl Street, you and your friends may not recollect the communication from the Edinburgh Bible Society, respecting the Apocry-

pha, a copy of which I now send you. Its language is very strong and decided. A representation to the same effect was made, I am informed, by the Glasgow Society. From the minute subjoined to it, it appears to have been understood, that you had given up the practice of circulating the Apocrypha with the Bible. The fact that this is not the case, is, I believe, altogether unknown in this country. All here seem to have the same conviction which I had at Montauband, that, under the rules of your Society, no such thing exists, or can in fairness exist. How indeed can it be otherwise, when your "laws and regulations" are published yearly, intimating, no doubt, that you faithfully adhere to them? For who could suppose that, while thus periodically brought into view, they are systematically violated? In addition to this, the language of your reports is in strict unison with your regulations. In the report of this year, for instance, you hold it out as the fact, that you and the Bible Societies on the Continent print only the Bible and Testament. Thus, in page 19, you say, you have printed at Toulouse "10,000 *Bibles* and 5000 *Testaments*." Again, page 34, "The whole amount of the issues of the Hanoverian Bible Society has been 15,027 copies of the *Scriptures*." Page 44, "The *word of God* is now translated, sold, and given away." "The *oracles of God* are consulted." Page 45, "The Society finds itself daily advancing towards the day when the *divine word* shall be found in every house." Page 46, "The circulation of the *Scriptures*, its exclusive object." Page 47, "In tracing the progress of the *Holy Scriptures* over the Russian Empire." Page 48, "The Bible Society, whose sole object is the increase and circulation of the books of *Holy Writ*." Now, as it is your constant practice on the Continent to join the Apocrypha to the Bible, often intermixed with it in all its books, is it possible more completely to identify these merely human, erroneous, and self-contradictory writings with the word of God, than by such expressions as those above quoted from your report.

For, observe, you bestow on the mixed book which you circulate, partly divine, partly human, every epithet that can designate it as wholly from God. Is not this giving your testimony, before all who know what in fact you are doing, (that is, before all the nations on the Continent of Europe,) to the Apocrypha, as an integral part of the Bible? You have distinctly declared it to be so in your Italian Bible, both in its title-page and in its enumeration of the books of the Old Testament.\* And who can conclude that this is not your deliberate opinion, when, knowing what your practice is, they read your first and second regulations, and see you affirming in your last report, in the face of the world, and in the most positive and unqualified language, that yours is “AN INSTITUTION WHICH CONFINES ITSELF WITH RIGOROUS EXACTNESS TO THE DISSEMINATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES?”

Some may endeavour to vindicate your joining the Apocrypha to the Bible, by observing that in England the former is often bound up with the latter. But, whatever may be said of the propriety of this, it does not by any means justify your practice. The Apocrypha at home is placed by itself, which is not always the case in the mongrel book that you circulate on the Continent. There is

---

\* The following is a literal translation of the title page of the Italian Bible, printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society:—“THE HOLY BIBLE, CONTAINING THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS, according to the Vulgate. Translated into the Italian language, by Monsignor Antonio Martini, Archbishop of Florence. Edition formed upon the original published at Turin; with which, while in the act of printing, it was minutely compared by Giambatista Rolandi. London; from the press of Benjamin Bensly, Bolt Court, Fleet Street. 1821.”

On the next page,—“Table of THE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, according to the order in which they are placed in the version of Monsignor Martini, preserved in the present edition.”

Then follow the Canonical and Apocryphal books intermingled, without the smallest intimation of this addition: on the contrary, *the whole* are positively declared to be “*the books of the Old Testament.*”

The titles of the Spanish and Portuguese Bibles are, I am informed, precisely similar.

another most material difference ; you are precluded from adopting what is thus practised in England by the fundamental principle of your Society, whose sole object, it is declared, is to promote the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment. The English Bible too is distinguished from the Apocrypha which accompanies it, while, notwithstanding that the latter forms a part of your book, you solemnly, earnestly, and repeatedly profess, both in your regulations and reports, that you circulate nothing but “ the Bible”—“ the Oracles of God”—“ the Divine Word ;”—that you “ confine yourselves with rigorous exactness to the dissemination of the Holy Scriptures.” Here then, if your professions are to be depended on, you actually maintain that the Apocrypha is a part of the Bible, without which it would be incomplete. If, in fact, however, you do not believe it to be so, you stand self-condemned as acting unfairly, and you are chargeable with adding to the words of God.

By your present practice you are doing all in your power to foster and perpetuate a very pernicious error widely diffused in the Greek church, and among Roman Catholics, and with which the Protestants on the Continent are deeply imbued. But, if you will continue to add the Apocrypha to the Bible, do it avowedly ; declare it in your reports, and change the name of your Society and its regulations. Let the fact as it really exists be no longer concealed, or rather expressly denied by you. In this way you will act honestly—you will deal fairly with your subscribers, whose money you are at present employing in a way of which many of them are little aware. For implicitly confiding in your professions, they have no suspicion of what you are actually doing. Much less mischief, too, will then result from your practice than from giving, as at present, the strongest sanction in your power to the supposed divine authority of the Apocryphal books.

Consider the influence which this sanction of yours to the Apocrypha, as constituting a part of the Bible, must

have on the Continent! On the other hand, had you adhered to your own rules and repeated declarations, much would have been done by this time to counteract the error of the Roman Catholics and others, who, as was stated in your hearing, *bona fide* regard the Apocrypha as a part of the Bible. But, instead of this, taking it for granted that you could not succeed by any other means in the circulation of the Scriptures, you have yielded to the principle of *doing evil, that good may come*. From what I have witnessed abroad, however, I am well convinced that, if you had acted as you profess to do, your success would have been very little, if at all, short of what it has been. Much time, as Mr Chabrand told you, would have been gained in preparing editions of the Scriptures. Much money, as he likewise observed, would have been saved; and surely the getting rid of so enormous an expenditure as the printing of all the copies of the Apocrypha that you have produced, must be a matter of no trifling consideration to those who, to use your own language, (last report, p. 89, 90,) find that “the demands upon their generosity, and even their justice, very greatly exceed all the means which have been or which still are at their disposal.” And who “regard it as an important branch of their general administration to economize the resources consigned to their disposal.” Had you conscientiously adhered to your own declarations, that it was the word of God alone which you came to disseminate, multitudes everywhere would have been found ready to accept of your gift; and if in any instances it had been refused, because you withheld something which those to whom you offered it were accustomed to revere, still the principle you acted on would have been respected, and its soundness acknowledged. On similar grounds to those on which you have yielded this point, and *added* the Apocrypha to the Bible—still affirming that you are circulating only the Bible—you might add Ostervald’s notes to all your Protestant versions; for this was much desired by many of the Protestant Churches in France when the

Montauban Bible was printed: and, because it was not conceded, the first Protestant pastor in that place, the President of the Consistory, refused to join the Bible Society there. In the same way, too, as you yourself observed, the Society might subjoin to the Bible some of our books of piety; many of which are far more conformed to the Holy Scriptures than those of the Apocrypha.

A deliberate intention of misrepresentation in your reports is by no means to be suspected, nor that you have annually published your regulations to mislead your subscribers. On the contrary, I am persuaded that you have not attended to the force and full import of your declarations, while the intention in what you have done has been good, and the practice inconsiderately admitted. But I am equally convinced, that now, since your attention has been directed to this matter, you must, in fair dealing, abandon that practice. You must, I repeat it, either alter your rules and reports, and the designation of your Society, or, *bona fide*, adhere to your explicit declaration that you are *an Institution which confines itself with rigorous exactness to the dissemination of the Holy Scriptures.*

The evil of adding to the word of God, against which there are such repeated and solemn warnings in that word, is very great, and cannot be justified by any argument of expediency or prospect of beneficial result. If persevered in, it will be attended with ruinous consequences to the Society. A very general secession of Auxiliary Societies and subscribers will take place. In Scotland, I doubt not, it will be universal. I trust this evil will soon be done away. You may turn to your monthly extracts, Nos. 7 and 10, 1818, in which you will find an example of a resolution being rescinded, owing to a representation that was made against it."

In the above letter reference is made to a prior communication of the Edinburgh Bible Society respecting the Apocrypha. The Authors of the Cambridge Remarks assert



that, "in the million and a half of Bibles, which it, (the British and Foreign Bible Society,) has distributed, in Great Britain, there has never been a thought of inserting the Apocrypha." That, on this point, they have been misinformed, will appear from the following minutes of the Edinburgh Bible Committee:—

*Extract from the Minutes of the Edinburgh Bible Society,  
15th December 1817.*

"Mr Anderson, (one of the secretaries,) stated, that the  
' had received two Bibles from the British and Foreign  
' Bible Society, containing the Apocrypha. The meeting  
' considered this a great deviation from the original sim-  
' plicity of the principle on which the Society was formed,  
' and on the faith of a strict adherence to which this So-  
' ciety connected itself with the parent establishment. The  
' Secretary (Mr Anderson) was, in consequence, instructed  
' to procure an explanation of this occurrence from the  
' Society in London."

*19th January 1818.*

"Mr Anderson informed the meeting that he had had  
' no occasion to correspond any more with the British and  
' Foreign Bible Society, regarding their circulating the  
' Apocrypha along with the Bible, in consequence of his  
' having received a letter on the subject from that Society,  
' wherein he is informed, ' that, on reconsideration, the  
' Committee had determined to leave out the Apocrypha,  
' Index, and translator's preface.' This reconsideration  
' was said to be in consequence of a former note from Mr  
' Anderson."

These minutes prove the uniform and consistent view which the Edinburgh Bible Society has all along taken of the addition of the Apocrypha to the Bible. The following extracts from their minutes equally evince their decided

opposition to any deviation whatever from the fundamental law of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which, as they express it, is as clear and definite as the English language can make it."

16th March 1818.

" Mr Noel being called to the chair, and the minutes of last meeting being read, the Directors turned their attention to the monthly intelligence of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Among other extracts from No. VII. just received, and now first presented to the Directors, there was read, by the Secretary, one, of which the following is a copy:—

" Queries recently proposed by the Rev. William Milne, now employed, in conjunction with the Rev. Robert Morrison, D.D., in translating the Scriptures into Chinese at Malacca, and the determination of the Committee respecting them. What is the real import and utmost extent of the Society's motto, ' Without note or comment ?' "

*The following is the answer of the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, to various queries put to it by*

*Mr Milne:—*

" The Committee having taken the above inquiries into consideration,—  
 " Unanimously resolved, that, it being the object of the British and Foreign Bible Society to restrict itself to the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, the terms in which the restriction is expressed, (viz. ' Without Note or Comment,') must be construed to exclude from the copies circulated by the Society every species of matter but what may be deemed necessary to render the version of the sacred original intelligible and perspicuous. The latter appearing to be the sole and exclusive design of the queries proposed by the Rev. Mr Milne, nothing contained in them can be considered as precluded by the prohibition of Note and Comment.

" While the Committee give this opinion, and express their high approbation of the conduct of Mr Milne, they recommended to his attention, and that of translators in general, *the English version, with marginal renderings and references*, as affording a correct example of that sort and degree of explanation which it may be permitted to introduce into those copies of

“ the Bible which answer to the Society’s definition and requirement, of their  
 “ being without Note or Comment.”

Extracted from the Minutes,

JOHN OWEN,	} Secretaries.
JOSEPH HUGHES,	
C. F. A. STEINKOFFF,	

‘ The meeting having taken these queries and the official  
 ‘ reply to them into their most serious consideration, can-  
 ‘ not refrain from expressing on this, the earliest opportu-  
 ‘ nity, their *unanimous* opinion. Various gentlemen hav-  
 ‘ ing declared their sentiments at length, it was then

“ Resolved unanimously,—

‘ 1. That the above resolution, extracted from the  
 ‘ minutes of the Parent Society, dated February 1818,  
 ‘ contains expressions which involve a most serious and  
 ‘ alarming departure from the original and sole object of  
 ‘ the Bible Society, and particularly from the spirit and  
 ‘ literal meaning of the laws of the institution just quoted ;  
 ‘ and, therefore, it is requested that, as the Committee value  
 ‘ the *prosperity*, the *harmony*, and even the *existence* of the  
 ‘ Institution, they will take the subject into their immediate  
 ‘ consideration, and communicate the result to this Com-  
 ‘ mittee.”

#### “ Reasons for the last Resolution.

“ Because the terms, ‘ without *Note or Comment*,’ are  
 ‘ absolute, and cannot be construed to admit of *any addi-*  
 ‘ *tion whatever* to the authorised version ; that is, the *text*  
 ‘ of the sacred original. In every instance the explanation  
 ‘ given must of necessity obscure the meaning of the So-  
 ‘ ciety’s fundamental law, which, as it stands, is as clear  
 ‘ and definite as the English language can make it.

“ 2. Because the resolution contains these expressions,  
 “ without *Note or Comment*, must be construed to exclude  
 “ from the copies circulated by the Society every species of  
 “ matter but what may be deemed necessary to render the

“ version of the sacred original intelligible and perspicu-  
 “ ous,” which, in reality, constitutes the single solitary  
 ‘ translator, all over the world, the absolute and final judge  
 ‘ of a “ sort and degree of explanation” which, according  
 ‘ to the Society’s fundamental regulation and constitution,  
 ‘ is unlawful.

20th April 1818.

‘ The meeting, aware that the prosperity of the institu-  
 ‘ tion depends essentially upon a rigid adherence to the ori-  
 ‘ ginal and fundamental laws of the Society ; and being  
 ‘ satisfied that deviations from first principles are easiest  
 ‘ corrected at their commencement, appointed the following  
 ‘ gentlemen as a sub-committee to investigate into an al-  
 ‘ leged departure from the Society’s regulations by the  
 ‘ parent Institution ; and to lay the result before the com-  
 ‘ mittee at a subsequent meeting, viz. Rev. Mr Dickson,  
 ‘ Mr Noel, Mr Ross, the Secretaries and sub-Treasurer.  
 ‘ The departure from the original laws of the Society al-  
 ‘ luded to is the publishing of the Scriptures with marginal  
 ‘ references and copious introductions to chapters.

15th June 1818.

‘ The Secretary, Mr Anderson, then read to the meet-  
 ‘ ing an extract from the Minutes of the parent establish-  
 ‘ ment, contained in No. 10. of their monthly sheet of in-  
 ‘ telligence, from which the meeting were happy to learn  
 ‘ that, in consequence of representations from this and  
 ‘ other societies, they have rescinded their resolutions in  
 ‘ answer to Mr Milne’s queries of 19th January last, con-  
 ‘ tained in No. 7. of the intelligence sheet.’

*The following is the Resolution of the Committee of the  
 British and Foreign Bible Society, dated May 4, 1818.*

“ The committee think it their duty to state, for the information of the  
 “ members of the British and Foreign Bible Society, that they have received  
 “ representations from some zealous and respected friends of the Institution,

“ objecting to the resolution which they adopted on the 19th of January last,  
 “ in answer to the queries submitted to them by the Rev. William Milne, re-  
 “ lative to his proposed translation of the Scriptures into the Chinese language,  
 “ and which resolution was published in No. 7. of the Monthly Extracts of  
 “ Correspondence.

“ The committee cannot but regret that the terms in which that resolution  
 “ was expressed should have been deemed liable to any exception. As this,  
 “ however, is the case, the committee have not hesitated to show their defer-  
 “ ence to the opinions of their highly-respected correspondents, by rescinding  
 “ the resolution in question; and the same is hereby accordingly rescinded.”

Extracted from the Minutes,

JOHN OWEN,	} Secretaries.
JOSEPH HUGHES,	
C. F. A. STEINKOPFF,	

The foregoing documents show that the “ Statement,” lately published by the Edinburgh Bible Society, has not appeared in consequence of opinions hastily formed. But, if the question be asked, why, since they held these opinions, did they not remonstrate sooner against the practice of the British and Foreign Bible Society respecting the Apocrypha?—it is answered, that they were not aware of it. Those in Scotland who were acquainted with that practice, never, till last winter, brought the matter before the Edinburgh Committee, being always in expectation that it would at length be abandoned without the necessity of a public discussion. There was the more reason to hope for this, because some highly respectable members of the Bible Society in London were endeavouring to put a stop to it. But, at length, when all prospect of their success appeared to be at an end, and when there was reason to apprehend that a compromise, such as that contained in the resolutions of the Bible Society of August 19, 1822, and December 20, 1824, would be permanently acquiesced in, so that the addition of the Apocrypha would be continued in an indirect manner, the matter was then brought before the Edinburgh Committee. The Committee immediately entered into correspondence with the British and Foreign

Bible Society, and, on the 17th of January last, they passed those resolutions which appear in their Statement. Through the winter they continued their correspondence with the London Society, and their Statement was not published till the 18th of May, when their reiterated remonstrances had failed to make any impression.

An account of the vacillating conduct of the Directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society since the date of the above letter, (October 6, 1821,) may be seen in the Edinburgh Statement. In consequence of that publication, some friends to the circulation of the Apocrypha have come boldly forward to vindicate the conduct of the Directors, and to encourage them to persevere in the same course as formerly; calling upon them not to yield "one inch" to those who oppose themselves to this addition to the Bible, even in the most objectionable form: Among these the Rev. C. Simeon of Cambridge has appeared in the foremost rank, and with the most decided resolution.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### ANSWER TO MR. SIMEON.

#### RULES OF THE BIBLE SOCIETY.—CIRCUMCISION OF TIMOTHY.—MEATS OFFERED TO IDOLS.

---

Mr SIMEON's letter, recently published, is entitled, A Vindication of the Proceedings of the British and Foreign Bible Society, against the Statement of the Edinburgh Bible Society, relative to the circulation of the Apocrypha. In animadverting on this statement, Mr Simeon observes, that the grounds on which the authors of it profess to act,

are two :—“ 1st, That the British and Foreign Bible Society, as long as they shall, directly or indirectly, contribute in any degree to the circulation of the Apocrypha, are guilty of violating the fundamental principle on which the Society was at first formed: And 2dly, That in contributing, directly or indirectly, to such an object, they actually sin against God.”

Mr Simeon then quotes the fundamental rules of the Bible Society, which, he says, “ stand thus :—

“ 1. The designation of this Society shall be, THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY, of which the sole object shall be to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures, without note or comment. The only copies, in the languages of the United Kingdom, to be circulated by the Society, shall be the authorised version.”

“ 2. This Society shall add its endeavours to those employed by other societies, for circulating the Scriptures through the British dominions; and shall also, according to its ability, extend its influence to other countries, Christian, Mahometan, or Pagan.”

“ Now, in these rules,” says Mr Simeon, “ there is nothing about the Apocrypha, nothing *in express terms*, either for the admission or rejection of it.”

“ But is there nothing in *the spirit* of the rules to show what was the mind and spirit of those who formed them?”

In order to answer this question in a way satisfactory to himself, Mr Simeon proceeds as follows :—

“ In the former of the two rules, it is said, ‘ The only copies, *in the languages of the United Kingdom*, to be circulated by the Society, shall be the authorised version.’ This shows, that there was no intention to make our authorised version a standard for *the whole world*. On the contrary, the fair inference is, that a similar deference should be paid to the authorised versions in every country; (without considering whether they accord with ours or not;) that so all jealousies might be avoided, and a greater facility might be given to the circulation of them.”

“ In the second rule, it is said, ‘ This society shall add its endeavours to those employed by other societies, for circulating the Scriptures through the British dominions.’ Now, the Society which circulates ten times more Bibles than all the other societies in the kingdom together, is THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE; which

‘ society does often print and circulate the Apocrypha, as well as the canonical books of Scripture. So that here, so far from there being any protest against the Apocrypha, there is, on the part of the British and Foreign Bible Society, an express avowal of a readiness to “ add its endeavours” to those of that other society notwithstanding it circulated the Apocrypha.’

“ Again : the rule says, “ This society shall also, according to its ability, extend its influence to *other countries*, whether *Christian*, Mahometan, or Pagan.”—But of “ Christian” communities, the great mass actually circulate the Apocrypha : So that, if it was intended to proscribe all concurrence with them, the rule was a nullity and a falsehood. This, then, is a further proof, that, whatever opinion the framers of that rule might individually entertain respecting the Apocrypha, there was in them, collectively, no desire to interfere with other churches in relation to it.”

“ To all this it may be replied, that the rules refer to ‘ the Holy Scriptures ;’ and to them ‘ without note or comment.’ To this I answer : They did refer to the Holy Scriptures, because it was the Holy Scriptures alone that the founders of the Society wished to circulate. But they did not take upon themselves to determine what books were canonical, and what were not. As far as the British dominions, and an English version, went, the authorised version was to be the standard : but, with respect to other countries and other languages, no standard was fixed ; or, if any bias was shown, it was in favour of authorised versions, so far as they could be employed, all the world over.”

In Mr Simeon’s attempt to prove that the practice of adding the Apocrypha to the Bible is consistent with the rules of the Bible Society, there is an utter failure ; and in the whole of his observations on this part of the subject, there appears more of an evasive subtlety, than of that godly sincerity which might have been expected from the author.

Mr Simeon tells us there is nothing in the above rules in *express terms* about the Apocrypha. Nor is there any thing in *express terms* about the Koran ; but there is, in *express terms*, what excludes the Apocrypha as clearly as it does the Koran. If the sole object of the Bible Society be to circulate the Holy Scriptures, then the Apocrypha is excluded, for it is no part of the Holy Scriptures in the estimation of those who compose that



Society. The observations on this point in the Statement of the Edinburgh Bible Society, are not only unanswered, but unassailed by Mr Simeon. The Apocryphal books, whether bound up or not with the Bible, are never in Britain called or considered any part of the Bible or Holy Scriptures. If any of the early Protestants gave them this appellation, it was a fundamental error; and, at all events, no such name is ever given them in this country by Protestants of any denomination.

The limitation, without note or comment, also excludes the Apocrypha. It is true the Apocrypha is neither a note nor a comment; but the same reason that forbids notes and comments, will much more forbid forged books to be added to the Bible. If the Bible Society bound up its own hands in order to secure unanimity, so that it cannot give the simplest explanation of a difficult passage in any valuable note or comment in which all might agree, then it is evident that the spurious addition of forgeries is much less allowable. Would it not be strange that the most useful and generally approved notes should be prohibited, to prevent disputes, while books might be added with the approbation of all, which all believe to be spurious?

Mr Simeon's inference from authorised versions is unfair: it confounds two different things,—1st, The objection to the Apocrypha does not suppose an attempt to make our version a standard for *the whole world*. The dispute is not about translations of the true books of Scripture, but about additional forged books. 2dly, This language does not imply that a similar deference should be paid to authorised translations in every country. All sects here agree in the general excellence of our common translation. It does not follow from this, that they think as highly of the common translation of every country. But a version, or translation, of the Bible, good or bad, contains nothing besides the Bible,—while the Apocrypha is not the Bible, nor any part of it.

Equally unfair is the inference from the words, *shall add its endeavours, &c.* This does not imply a readiness to do every thing that is done by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, but only to add its endeavours to circulate the Scriptures, of which the Apocrypha is no part, although it may be circulated by that Society along with the Scriptures. Though that Society may circulate prayer-books with the Bible, such a declaration does not imply that the Bible Society meant to circulate prayer-books.

Altogether unfounded is Mr. Simeon's reasoning from the words, "extend its influence to other countries whether Christian, Mahometan, or Pagan." This does not intimate an intention of circulating any thing but the Scriptures; and the Bible Society no more pledged itself to extend its influence to circulate the Apocrypha in Christian countries, than it did to circulate the Koran in Mahometan countries. What is it to the purpose that the great mass of Christian communities circulate the Apocrypha? This rule does not bind the Society to act like the great mass of Christian communities. Neither does a purpose to circulate nothing but the Bible, make it either a nullity or a falsehood; nor, in effect, has it been found to be so. The Society has been enabled to realize, to a very considerable extent, the object of this regulation, in the circulation of New Testaments. Mr. Simeon at length admits, that the rules of the Society refer to the Holy Scripture, and that it was *the Holy Scripture alone* which the founders of the Society wished to circulate. But he endeavours to show that, in regard to what constitutes the Holy Scriptures, it was the duty of the Society to accommodate its views to the opinions of any church with which it might co-operate. He had been labouring to stretch the meaning of the rules of the Society so as to include the Apocrypha; now he makes a bolder thrust, and affirms, that, with respect to foreign countries, no standard is fixed by which to determine what is Scripture.

"They did not," Mr. Simeon says, "take upon them-

selves to determine what books were canonical and what were not," A most extraordinary position. The Bible Society earnestly, and repeatedly declaring to the world, that its sole object is to circulate the Holy Scriptures, does not take upon itself to determine what constitutes the Holy Scriptures! Did ever a Society come forward to proclaim such an absurdity? "Being a Bible Society, our sole object is to circulate the Bible, but we do not take upon us to determine what forms the Bible." A Bible Society necessarily must hold something as forming the Bible; and it has always been the understanding of the British and Foreign Bible Society, as well as of its supporters, that those books form the Bible which the different denominations of Christians in this country esteem to be the Bible, and which are contained in the authorised version. When the Bible Society declared, by its rules, that its sole object was to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures, it distinctly referred to that book which those, on whom it called for support, esteemed to be the Holy Scriptures; and, by pledging itself to circulate the Scriptures only, it expressly excluded every thing else.

"Whether foreign churches," adds Mr Simeon, "admitted fewer books to their canon of Scripture, or more, was not with them (the Society) any question at all; they had nothing to do with it. Every church must determine that for itself; and on it alone would rest the responsibility of forming an erroneous or a correct judgment. If any church either added to the Scripture, or took from it, it was *their* concern, and not the concern of this Society; who are no more responsible for the books comprehended by this or that church, in their canon of Scripture, than they are for the correctness of the versions that are in use among them."

Has Mr Simeon any conviction of the authenticity of the canon of Scripture received in this country? Has he any fixed opinion upon the subject? The simple repetition of his former statements is a sufficient refutation of them; their inconclusiveness is at once apparent. But here is

something that is indeed serious ; for more extraordinary, more lax, and, were it not for their obvious fallacy, more dangerous assertions than those just quoted cannot be imagined. The Bible Society, Mr Simeon has dared to affirm, has no concern as to what books it circulates under the name of the word of God. Every church, he says, must determine that for itself, and on it alone would rest the responsibility of forming an erroneous judgment. Yes: And every man must determine for himself, whether the Bible contains the true sayings of God, or if it be a forgery from one end to the other. But he does it at his peril ; and so does every church in determining what constitutes the Bible. And does not equal responsibility attach to those who concur in this judgment and carry it into effect ? But, let every church determine for itself, still the Bible Society is obliged by its rules to give them nothing but the Bible, and that must be understood of its own canon, and not of the canon of other churches.

“ If any church added to the Scripture, it was *their* concern, not the concern of this Society.” Is it not the concern of this Society, if it lend its assistance in adding to or taking from the Scriptures ? What meaning does Mr Simeon affix to those awful threatenings by which the canon of Scripture is guarded ? May we with impunity follow a multitude to do evil ? What force then would there be in the reproof, “ When thou sawest a thief then thou consentedst with him, and hast been partaker with adulterers ?” Does a participation with others in crime diminish our guilt ? and if we transgress knowingly, while they do so partly in ignorance, have not we the greater sin ?

‘ If any church either added to the Scripture or took from it, it was *their* concern.’ Certainly it is their concern if left to themselves to provide their Bibles ; but, if we furnish Bibles for them, it is our concern. According to Mr

Simeon, if a man asks poison instead of food, we may innocently give it to him, as it is his own concern. If, however, his friend requested of him a dose of arsenic instead of medicine, and he gave it, Mr Simeon would find that the law would make it *his* concern. This mode of reasoning would excuse our giving to others the worst book that ever was written, provided they called it the *Bible*. Why should not the canon be enlarged so as to include the Koran? Why should not the Mahometan have his Bible? Is it not his own concern? And if the Bible, as the writers of the Cambridge Remarks argue, may do good in company with the Apocrypha, it may do good in company with the Koran. It is no argument to tell us, that all the good done by the Bible on the Continent has been effected by the Bible with the Apocrypha. The Bible would do its work if bound up with the Koran; but this will not excuse those who join them together.

According to Mr Simeon, the Bible Society is no more responsible for the books comprehended by this or that church in the canon of Scripture, although furnished to them by the Society, than for the correctness of the versions that are in use among them. "Admitting," says Mr Gorham, "that, in a lower sense, there may be some defect, even in inspired writings, arising from the errors of translations in a few words or passages, is not the *avowed interpolation of whole books of Apocryphal matter*: something very different from imperfection?"

"Had the founders of the Society," continues Mr Simeon, "chosen to express any opinion about the Apocrypha at all, they would have been at liberty to say, We will confine our bounty to the circulation of what we ourselves believe canonical."

What they did say is as express as this. They pledged themselves to the Christians of Britain to circulate the Scriptures only; and the Scriptures, in the estimation of the people of Britain, do not contain the Apocrypha. And

here let it be observed that, on Mr Simeon's own principles, the Bible Society is precluded from circulating the Apocrypha among Protestants, for their canon is the same as ours, and they do not reckon the Apocrypha a part of the Bible.

“ But they were not at liberty,” Mr Simeon adds, “ to erect themselves into a Society that should judge for the whole world, and dogmatize to every people under heaven. Yet this is what the Edinburgh Committee conceive to have been done by them ; and what that same Committee are now taking upon themselves to do, and are calling upon all the members of the Parent Society to unite with them in doing.”

Can any thing be more disingenuous than this? Is it dogmatizing to others to give them only the Scriptures? We do not require foreign churches to limit their canon ; we only refuse to give them any books, along with the Scriptures, that do not belong to the Scriptures. Now, foreign churches might accept this gift without renouncing their own canon. This neither implies dictation on the one hand, nor renunciation on the other.

How well might Mr Simeon's language be adopted by a Mahometan or a Hindoo. What ! Do you come to judge for us and to dogmatize to us? You say that the book you offer to us is the word of God—a revelation from heaven—and that there is none other besides. Give us our Koran, our Shasters—you have nothing to do with what we hold to be the word of God—this is not the question with you at all—we must determine this for ourselves, and on us will rest the responsibility of forming an erroneous or a correct judgment. If we corrupt the book of God it is *our* concern and not the concern of your Society, which is not responsible for the books it circulates, provided they be received by this or that country as divinely inspired. Would such language, uttered by a Mahometan or a Hindoo, be listened to for a moment by the Bible Society? But, on the principles which Mr Simeon has laid down, it

is sound and legitimate in the one party and demands the acquiescence of the other.

“ In support of their views,” continues Mr Simeon, “ the Edinburgh Committee urge, that all the writers and speakers on the part of the British and Foreign Bible Society have gloried in this as the chief distinction of the Society,—that it published the Scriptures *without note or comment*. But what was meant by the original rule respecting this, and by all its advocates? It was never intended to express any sentiment about the Apocrypha, which is neither a note nor comment.”

Nor was it intended to express any sentiment respecting the Koran, which is neither a note nor a comment; but it was intended to announce the fact, that the Scriptures alone were to be published without any addition whatever. The Apocrypha is worse than a note or a comment. Notes and comments may be good—it is essentially bad. The rule that excludes notes and comments from the Bible much more excludes additions to the Bible.

“ But is it not strange, that, when we have all agreed to merge our own peculiarities, and to forget every thing which separates us from one another, for the benefit of the world, we should now be called upon to withhold that same candour from the churches abroad, and actually to build a wall that shall separate us for ever from nine-tenths of our Christian brethren, and exclude whole kingdoms from any participation of the benefits which we are endeavouring to bestow? The expediency of such conduct is not the present question. The question is, *was such conduct contemplated and enjoined by the founders of this Society?* If it was not so contemplated and enjoined, then the first argument used by the Edinburgh Committee falls to the ground: and the Parent Society ought to be upheld in the exercise of that Christian candour which has hitherto regulated their proceedings.”

How have we agreed to merge our peculiarities? Not by publishing a Bible not acknowledged by any part of us, but by excluding from the Bible every human addition. Now this ground is abandoned as soon as the Apocrypha is added. Why does not the Bible Society publish the

Manual along with the Bible? Why does it not publish the Common Prayer Book? Why does it not publish the Westminster Confession? These would not be notes or comments more than the Apocrypha. If it be said, this would create jealousy and opposition, will not the Apocrypha do the same? "But why should we now be called upon to withhold the same candour from the churches abroad?" Is less granted to foreign churches than to any church in Britain? Is any thing published by the Society out of complaisance to any one church in Britain of which the rest disapprove? No evidence can be more complete than that the constitution of the Bible Society forbids the Apocrypha.\*

In agreeing to publish the Scriptures without note or comment, no Christian denomination in this country gave up any thing that they considered to be matter of duty. But how different is this from agreeing to become partakers of other men's sins in adulterating the Bible by a spurious addition such as that of the Apocrypha, which so many consider to be wrong. Yet Mr Simeon speaks as if this would only be the exercise of the same candour which led them to agree in what all of them believed to be right. The simple statement of such an idea sufficiently exposes the incoherence of Mr Simeon's reasoning; yet, in the midst of this confusion, he is heard proclaiming his supposed triumph, and announcing that "the first argument offered by the Edinburgh Committee falls to the ground."

---

\* The following declaration was made by the Directors of the Bible Society, August 19, 1822:—"Resolved, That, when grants shall be made to any of the Bible Societies in connexion with this institution, which are accustomed to circulate the Apocrypha, it be stated to such Societies, that the attention of the Committee having been called to the fundamental rule of the Society, as limiting the application of its funds to the circulation of the Holy Scriptures, and it appearing that this view of the said rule having been taken, from the beginning, by the great body of its members," &c.



Mr Simeon's manner of treating the whole of this subject, respecting the rules of the Bible Society, tends to unsettle every thing that relates to the authenticity of the Scriptures. He speaks as if there was nothing certain on this point, and as if every one were at liberty to acknowledge, as canonical, only what part of Scripture he chose; to make any additions to the Divine Word, and even to assist others in circulating, as a part of that word, writings which he knows to be spurious and of human invention. But, if the authenticity of the books which we receive, as given by inspiration of God, be a matter of the highest concern to Christians, is it to be thus lightly surrendered, and treated as a doubtful point? and shall we be induced to believe, that not only a variety of opinions concerning it may be innocently entertained, but that we may lawfully join in making additions, suggested by ignorance or wickedness, to that word which we consider as divine? Is it not a bold imputation on the watchful care of the good Shepherd over his flock, to pretend that he has left them without a certain rule whereby they may ascertain what he would have them to do? "My sheep," says he, "hear my voice;" but, unless they know where his word is to be found, how can they listen to his voice, or distinguish it from the voice of a stranger? To speak, therefore, of those Scriptures which he has delivered to his church, and stamped with his authority, as if there was any uncertainty respecting them; or that they may be altered or added to, or in any way tampered with, without incurring the deepest guilt, is both highly criminal in itself, and leads to the most pernicious consequences.

According to Mr Simeon's argument, it follows that, as all men must judge for themselves, respecting every *doctrine* contained in the Sacred Volume, so we are at liberty to join with others in whatever conclusions they may form of those doctrines, and to act with them accordingly. On this ground the Arian, or the Socinian, may claim our co-

operation. If we send Missionaries to preach the Gospel, we must enjoin them to preach it in Protestant countries, as it is generally received in such countries; and in Roman Catholic countries, according to the Roman Catholic system. In the one, they must teach the worship of God alone, through the mediation of the Saviour; in the other, the invocation of the Virgin Mary, and the intercession of Saints. In the one, justification by faith; in the other, justification by works. Among Arians, they must preach Arianism, and among Socinians, Socinianism, according to the corruptions of their respective systems. And all this may be done with perfect safety; for in every country the people must determine for themselves what is truth and what is error,—upon them alone rests the responsibility of forming an erroneous or a correct judgment concerning the gospel. If they add to it, it is their concern, not ours—this is not with us any question at all—we have nothing to do with it. All this too must be practised by us, in order to escape the accusation of erecting ourselves into a Society which judges for the whole world, and dogmatizes to every people under heaven. To such lengths are we conducted by the principles, in regard to the canon of Scripture, which Mr Simeon lays down as indubitable; for, if we are at liberty to circulate an adulterated Bible, it must be lawful to preach a corrupted gospel.

It is said that Mr Simeon has proposed that two separate funds shall be established by the Bible Society; the one for the publication of the canonical books, the other for the publication of the Apocrypha along with them. Why then may he not also recommend the appropriation of a third fund, for the addition of the Koran; and a fourth for that of the Shasters, supported by the same argument—that this Society has pledged itself that, according to its ability, it will extend its influence to other

countries, whether Christian, Mahometan, or Pagan ; and, unless it acts in the above manner, this pledge is a nullity and a falschood.

But, whatever meaning Mr Simeon may impose on the rules of the Bible Society, still it must be admitted that, if they do indeed bear his interpretation, and allow the publication of the Apocrypha as a part of the Bible, they have been constructed in such a manner as to deceive the supporters of that Institution. I have never met with a single individual in this country who was aware of the fact, that the practice of the Society was to print the Apocrypha, on the Continent, along with the Bible. The supporters of the Society believed that their subscription-money was employed in the publication of the Bible alone. Both the designation and the rules of the British and Foreign BIBLE Society, precluded the smallest suspicion that the fact was otherwise. Had it been possible to have entertained a doubt on the subject, the precise and uniform language of the Society's annual reports must at once have dissipated it. So explicit on this point were the rules and reports, that they not only misled its subscribers in every part of the country, but even one, it has been reported, who holds the highest official situation in the Society itself.

If, then, it were conceded to Mr Simeon, that, in the rules of the Society, there is nothing in express terms for the rejection of the Apocrypha, and that there is something in their *spirit* which shows, that the mind and spirit of those who formed them were favourable to its admission ; yet, as they convey no such meaning, either in their letter or spirit, to the bulk of mankind, to persons either in inferior or elevated situations, the principles of fair-dealing demand that, if the Society shall persevere in its present course, and resolve not to "yield one inch," as Mr Simeon counsels, its name, its rules, and the language of its reports shall all be changed.

The first rule may run thus—"The designation of this Society shall be the British and Foreign Bible and Apocrypha Society; of which the sole object shall be to encourage a wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment, but with the addition of the Apocrypha, wherever it is commonly received." The language of the reports must also be in so far reversed as henceforth to declare that, "This is a Society which does *not* confine itself with rigorous exactness to the dissemination of the Holy Scriptures, as they are received by Christians of different denominations in this country, who have all resolved to merge their peculiarities so as to agree in publishing, as the Bible, whatever shall be considered to be the Bible, whether in Christian, Mahometan, or Pagan countries: to all of which it has pledged itself to extend its influence. Without acting in this manner, it might well be accused of erecting itself into a Society which judged the whole world, and dogmatized to every people under heaven: and the above pledge would be a nullity and a falsehood. For, whether foreign churches admit fewer books into their canon of Scripture, or more, is not the question with the Society at all. It has nothing to do with it. Every church must determine that for itself, and on it alone the responsibility rests. If any church either adds to the Scripture or takes from it, that is their concern, not the Society's. On these grounds this Society holds itself justified in publishing whatever books any church in the world chooses to designate as the Holy Scriptures, although the Society should be fully convinced that they form no part of the Sacred Canon." When these corrections in the rules and reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society have appeared, it will not, we believe, require the addition of either note or comment to persuade the great body of its supporters to transfer their subscriptions, for the wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures, to some other association for that purpose.

We have seen in what way Mr Simeon has endeavoured to dispose of the first objection of the Edinburgh Bible Society. We shall now attend to his manner of meeting the second.

“I now come,” says Mr Simeon, “to the second objection which the Edinburgh Committee urge against the Parent Society; namely, That if they even assist with the Bible those who at their own cost circulate the Apocrypha, they indirectly contribute to the circulation of the Apocrypha itself; and, in so doing, they sin against God.”

Mr Simeon here refers to that part of the Edinburgh statement, which notices two resolutions passed by the British and Foreign Bible Society; the object of which was, to enjoin the Foreign Bible Societies to apply all the money transmitted from England in printing the canonical books; but leaving them at liberty to make use of their own funds for printing the Apocrypha, and afterwards to bind and circulate the whole in one volume. To the Edinburgh Committee these resolutions appeared to leave the matter just as it was before, with this difference, that what had formerly been done avowedly and directly, would afterwards be effected in a manner indirect and concealed. “The real operation of these resolutions,” they observe, “is merely to administer a salvo to the consciences of objectors at home, whilst abroad the evil remains precisely the same as before.”

The justice of this remark is evident. Two funds are provided sufficient for the publication of the Bible and the Apocrypha, the amount of which, let it be supposed, is L.3000. Of this sum L.2500 are remitted by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and L.500 are provided by the Society abroad. The first sum is sufficient for the publication of the Bible, the last for the addition of the Apocrypha. The money being thus obtained, the book is sent to press; and the previous stipulation, that the funds shall be preserved distinct from each other, is strictly adhered to. The paper and printing of the canonical books are accordingly

paid for with the first portion of the funds, and those of the Apocrypha with the last; while the result is exactly the same as it was before this plan was resorted to. The Bible and the Apocrypha appear together in one volume; while the publisher, if questioned as to the process adopted, may truly affirm,—“I said unto them, whosoever hath ‘any gold, let them break it off: So they gave it me: then ‘I cast it in the fire; and there came out this calf.” The Christian public, it is presumed, will not allow themselves to be entrapped in this manner; and the British and Foreign Bible Society, it is to be hoped, will not finally become a party to such a disingenuous compromise.\*

In order to obviate the objection of the Edinburgh Bible Society, to contribute in any way to the circulation of the Apocrypha, which, Mr Simeon says, he will meet fairly, and, he trusts, “satisfactorily, to the minds of all ‘who make the Scriptures the standard of their faith and ‘practice,”—he begins by putting the following speech into the mouth of “the very gentleman” who drew up the Edinburgh statement, which he supposes him to have addressed to the Apostle Paul on the occasion of his circum-

---

\* If the addition of the Apocrypha is to be made at all, it should, at least, be done fairly and avowedly, and not in this manner, by “*Canny Convoyance*,” as a member of the Westminster Assembly on a certain occasion expressed himself.

“Ever since the votes of 19th of August 1822,” says one who deeply interests himself in the circulation of the Scriptures on the Continent, “the Committee has been telling the Foreign Societies, We cannot vote you money to print the Apocryphal books; but we will vote you enough to print the others,—and you must raise money amongst yourselves to print them,—and bind them up both together. May they not, upon the same plan, vote money for printing Martini’s Testament, telling the Italians to provide money for the notes; and the same with the Spanish, or any other edition? And, if their conduct be proper with respect to the Apocrypha, it is clearly as proper with respect to the notes; and much more so; for the one goes out under the false name of the Word of God; whereas the other avows itself to be the work of men.”

cising Timothy—"What would he have said to the Apostle?" exclaims Mr Simeon. "He would have been struck with horror. Paul, what are you about to do? Forbear? At the peril of your soul, forbear! That you mean well, I do not deny: but you are wrong; as I will show you in a moment."

The Edinburgh gentleman then goes on to remind the Apostle, that circumcision is abolished—that, by circumcising Timothy, he would countenance the error of those who supposed that it was yet in force—that he would countenance the damning error of such as blend it with the gospel, as a joint ground of their hope before God—and that, if he but connived at the circumcision of Timothy, much more if he was accessory to it, he would commit a damning sin; and, finally, if he persisted in this, the Edinburgh gentleman would disclaim all connexion with him, and do his utmost to make every one of Paul's followers renounce him too.

"And now," says Mr Simeon, "what may we suppose the Apostle to reply? Methinks he would answer to the following effect." A long answer by the Apostle follows accordingly; in the course of which the reader is not left to infer that Paul would have approved of adding the Apocrypha to the Bible; but sees it announced in *express terms*. But truly the speech of the Edinburgh gentleman appears to be a very foolish one, and,—since we are given to understand that the case is clearly determined in the Scriptures,—so arrogant and profane, that to many it will occasion some surprise that he should presume to utter it. As to the Apostle's reply, it is not so much to be wondered at, for so many extraordinary meanings have been attached to his writings, and so many strange sayings have been ascribed to him, that, had he foreseen the one, or heard the other, he would have stood aghast in perfect amazement.

Among the numerous specimens which we have seen of very

extraordinary speeches attributed to the Apostle Paul, the one before us, though last, is not the least remarkable. It not only matches in folly the speech of the Edinburgh gentleman, but equals it in profaneness. It goes directly in the face of the threatening denounced against all who shall add any thing to the word of God; for it strenuously maintains the propriety, nay, the duty, in certain circumstances, of adding the Apocrypha to the Bible. "Unto the Jews," the Apostle is made to say, "I became as  
 ' a Jew, (to the Papists as a Papist,) that I might GAIN  
 ' the Jews: to them that are under the law, as under the  
 ' law, (to them that require the Apocrypha, as conceding  
 ' the Apocrypha,) that I might GAIN them that are under  
 ' the law."

But what is the ground that appeared to Mr Simeon so strong as to warrant his making such extraordinary suppositions, not to say disrespectful, to the Edinburgh gentleman, but highly derogatory to the character of the Apostle Paul? The whole foundation of his argument is this, that the cases of circumcision and of the Apocrypha are parallel. Of this Mr Simeon is so fully convinced, that, on the supposed parallelism, he stakes the whole value of his argument; for, after he has announced that it is brought to a close, he adds,—“ If any one set himself to answer it, he must  
 ' show; either that the parallel drawn between the Apos-  
 ' tle's conduct and that of the British and Foreign Bible  
 ' Society is not just; or that the Apostle both erred in his  
 ' judgment, and sinned in his conduct.”

Were we to adopt the latter alternative, we should be guilty of blasphemy against the word of God; but nothing can be more safe or easy than to establish the former. At once, then, I affirm that the parallel drawn between the Apostle's conduct in the circumcision of Timothy, and that of the Bible Society, in adding the Apocrypha to the Word of God, is NOT JUST. So far from being parallel, two cases cannot be supposed to which the idea of parallelism can, with less justice, be attributed. To have



rendered them parallel, the act of circumcision and that of adding the Apocryphal writings to the Word of God must either be both right, or both wrong, or both indifferent. Now, this is so far from being the case, that, in the act of circumcision, there is nothing either right or wrong; it is in itself perfectly indifferent. "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." On the other hand, the adding of the Apocryphal writings to the Word of God is a double evil. It is wrong to add any thing to his word; and these writings, "advancing" as they do "a deceitful claim to reverence and attention, upon the pretext of being inspired," and containing false doctrine and gross errors, contrary to the Word of God, are absolutely bad in themselves. The two cases then are NOT parallel.

It is true indeed that the act of circumcision, which is indifferent in itself, may, in certain circumstances, become wrong. When this is kept in view, the conduct of the Apostle Paul in circumcising Timothy, on one occasion, and in refusing, on another, to circumcise Titus, is vindicated from all appearance of inconsistency. A proper understanding of these two cases will not only show the absence of a parallel, but the total dissimilarity between the conduct of Paul, in circumcising Timothy, and that of the British and Foreign Bible Society with regard to the Apocrypha. Yet this case of the circumcision of Timothy, is Mr Simeon's strong-hold; and, after the long irrelevant argument upon it which he has put into the Apostle's mouth, he exultingly introduces it once more at the conclusion of his pamphlet:—

"This I say, my Lord, that no man who protests against the measures of the British and Foreign Bible Society would have *advised* Paul to circumcise Timothy under the circumstances as they existed at that day: no, nor would he have *approved* of Paul's conduct; he would have called it "*doing evil that good might come.*" And if any man will get out of this dilemma, let him show that St Paul was right in what he did; and then mark

‘ the difference between his conduct, and that of the British and Foreign Bible Society, so as to show, that though Paul was right, the Bible Society is wrong. Let him, I say, get out of this dilemma. If he choose to condemn St Paul, and *that* in a point where he has so plainly proposed himself as an example to the Church in all ages, I shall consider him as actually conceding the point in question.’

To extricate ourselves from this vaunted dilemma will be no great achievement. It is a dilemma existing only in Mr Simeon’s imagination. The whole of the above passage betrays a very culpable want of consideration and much misunderstanding of the case referred to. Mr Simeon speaks of Paul’s conduct in circumcising Timothy as if it was his own discretion that directed him in this act. Yet he says, that, in doing so, Paul has “plainly proposed himself as an example to the Church in all ages.” And a little before, he had introduced the Apostle affirming,—“I will record my decision, for the benefit of the Church in all future ages.” Now, can Mr Simeon, when he gives himself time to reflect,—can any one who has considered the nature of the Apostolic office, and the qualifications necessary for executing the high commission of binding and loosing in heaven and in earth,—conceive for a moment that the Apostle would have dared to use such language except as inspired and guided by the Holy Ghost?

It is a fundamental error to suppose that the Bible, in recording the conduct of the Apostles, as an example to the church in all ages, holds out to us the idea that they acted according to their own discretion, and not under the infallible guidance of the Spirit of God. If this were the fact, we might have *advised* Paul not to circumcise Timothy if we had judged it to be wrong, and we might not have *approved* of his conduct in doing so; and it is possible that in all this we might have been right and Paul wrong. But, believing, as we do, that this Apostle acted under the immediate influence of the Holy Ghost in all that he recorded

in the Scriptures, when he proposed himself as an example to the church, we would not have presumed to offer him any *advice*, far less to have disapproved of his conduct, but, with all due reverence, would have admitted that he "was in the right in what he did." Under this conviction we shall now with perfect ease "get out of this dilemma," and both show that Paul was right and that the Bible Society is wrong.

Paul circumcised Timothy because of the Jews. Although, in consequence of the offering up of the one sacrifice by which the Redeemer hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified, the ceremonial law was fulfilled in all its parts; yet, as the Jewish polity was not then wholly put an end to, the prejudices of the converted Jews who continued zealous for the law, were borne with. They knew that the law was from God; they had been brought up in the observance of it, and they continued to keep up the distinction of meats, and used the ceremonial purifications, attended the Temple service, and celebrated the feasts that had been appointed. In all this the Apostles, *acting under divine direction*, bore with their prejudices, and even themselves conformed to them. On this ground, as circumcision was a thing indifferent in itself, and at that time, by reason of God's indulgence to the Jews, a matter of liberty to them, which they might or might not observe, Paul circumcised Timothy in order to remove an obstruction to the exercise and success of his ministry among the Jews, and to render it as acceptable to them as possible. Thus, to the Jews he became as a Jew that he might gain the Jews; and in doing so he gave up no part of his duty. But the same Lord who permitted circumcision to be continued to the Jewish believers, positively prohibited its observance to the Gentiles; and, therefore, when an attempt was made to impose circumcision on the Gentile believers, this Apostle opposed it in the most decided manner, and would on no account permit Titus to be circumcised, for in that case it was no longer a matter

of indifference, but positively wrong. To those, therefore, who required its observance, he gave place by subjection, no not for an hour.

This matter, so clear in itself, Mr Simeon has contrived to perplex. He has adduced the example of Paul, where, in the case of Timothy, that Apostle practised a rite indifferent in itself, the continuance of which, as well as its original appointment, was sanctioned by divine authority. This example is placed before us by Mr Simeon to justify the introduction of what is positively wrong and contrary to the express command of God. God has solemnly prohibited the adding of any thing to his word in any circumstances, or the holding out any thing as his word which is not his word. In direct contravention to this command, Mr Simeon contends for the adding of the Apocryphal to the sacred books, and the delivering of the whole to the people as the word of God. Nor is this all; he even attempts to sanction this violation of the divine law by the example of the Apostle. But, since Mr Simeon has adduced the example of Paul in circumcising Timothy, why has he kept back his positive refusal to circumcise Titus? Had he referred to this case, along with the other, he would have at once exposed the fallacy of his assertions and the unsoundness of his argument.

There is one thing more I must notice on this point: Mr Simeon makes the Apostle speak of his conduct in the circumcision of Timothy as a *sacrifice* for our imitation in respect to the Apocryphal books. But, if to circulate them be the will of God, it is not to be done with reluctance; and if it be not God's will, we have no right to make such a sacrifice to him. He will no more receive it than he did that of Saul. The circumcising of Timothy was in conformity with his will; besides, being a thing not sinful in itself, it can never be alleged as a warrant for what is in any manner sinful and wrong. The lawfulness, then, of adding the Apocrypha to the Bible must first be proved before it can be justified by the circumcision of Timothy.

In the address of the Apostle Paul, in defence of adding the Apocrypha to the Holy Scriptures, besides adducing his own example in the circumcision of Timothy, he is made to quote the precept which he has delivered, Romans xv. "We that are strong, (as the Edinburgh Committee 'feel themselves to be,) OUGHT to *bear* the infirmities of 'the weak, and not to please ourselves." According to Mr Simeon, Paul affirms, "I deliver this command even 'in reference to the eating of meats offered to idols, where '*the apparent evil is far greater* than in the act you censure, and where *the reason for exercising such forbearance 'is far less.*" But a reference to what the Apostle has actually said, must convince us that this precept, in the connexion in which it stands, has nothing to do with meats offered to idols. In Rom. xiv. xv., the Apostle is treating of Jewish, not heathen prejudices. If Mr Simeon denies this, he must suppose the Apostle to affirm that the man who eateth meats offered to idols, eateth to the Lord; and that he who regardeth a day set apart for the service of an idol, regardeth it unto the Lord; but this cannot be his meaning, because it is altogether different from his doctrine, when professedly treating of meats offered to idols.

In 1 Cor. viii. the Apostle sets out by observing, that an idol is nothing in the world; and admits, that we are neither the better nor the worse for eating of any particular food; but, at the same time, he prohibits believers from sitting at meat in an idol's temple,—1st, Because this might embolden weak brethren to eat what was offered to idols; and cause them to put away a good conscience and make shipwreck of faith; 1 Cor. viii. 10, 11:—And, 2dly, He prohibits such conduct, because it was holding fellowship with, and partaking of the table of devils. 1 Cor. x. 19. 21. This is very different language from what is employed in regard to Jewish meats and days in the Epistle to the Romans.

The Apostle concludes his instructions respecting meats

offered to idols, by teaching, that we should, without scruple, eat whatever is sold in the shambles; that a believer might lawfully accept an invitation to a feast given by a heathen, and eat whatever was set before him; but if he was informed that such a thing was offered to idols, he was not to eat of it, because this would have been giving countenance to idolatry. Such is the Apostle's doctrine; and certainly it affords no support to Mr Simeon's argument in favour of distributing the Apocrypha with the Word of God.

Had the Apostle permitted believers to please idolaters by inviting them to a feast, and rendering it more acceptable, by setting before them meats offered to idols, this would have been somewhat analogous to the line of conduct which Mr Simeon exhorts the Bible Society to pursue. But the Apostle gave no such licence. He commanded Christians, without being deterred by the apprehension of being branded as unsociable, and charged with dogmatizing to the whole world, positively to refuse to partake of what their host informed them had been offered to his gods. This would have made them partakers of other men's sins. It might have procured to them the praise of liberality and candour, but it would have rendered them accessary to the perdition of those who knew not God and obeyed not the gospel.

In a note, Mr Simeon says, "In eating things offered to idols, a person did *that which he might well consider as forbidden*: nor could he plead for himself, that he hoped by means of it to *save a multitude of souls*." What is meant by—He might well consider it as forbidden? Was it actually forbidden? If not, why might he well consider it to be so? And, if it was forbidden, does Mr Simeon affirm that we are at liberty, nay bound to do what is forbidden, when we expect it to be attended with good effects? This would completely justify Saul in offering the sacrifice, 1 Sam. xiii. 9. to prevent the people being scattered from him; but his conduct was condemned, and himself stripped

of the kingdom for his presumption. But was his presumption greater than ours, if, with a view of saving a multitude of souls, we countenance the desecration of God's holy word, by the spurious addition of the Apocrypha, in order to render it more acceptable?

This was not the manner of the Apostle Paul. To have preached and practised circumcision, would have put an end to the Jewish controversy by which the churches were so much harassed, and have brought many Jews to acknowledge Christ as the Messiah, and would have caused the offence of the cross to cease; but he entered into no such compromise. Like Jeremiah, he stood as a brazen wall on the foundation which God had laid in Zion; and whether men would hear, or whether they would forbear, he did not suffer the Gospel of Christ to be corrupted. But what would either circumcision, or the eating of meats offered to idols, have been in comparison of corrupting the word of God by the profane addition of Jewish fables, of which the Apocrypha is composed, and against which the Apostle repeatedly cautions us in his Epistles.

The doctrine of forbearance, to which Mr Simeon has appealed, does not authorise a Christian to do what he knows to be opposed to the will of God; but teaches him to please his neighbour for his good, as far as he possibly can, without doing that which is contrary to his paramount duty to God.\* To act otherwise, is *to do evil that good may come*. This instance, then, respecting idols, no more serves Mr Simeon's purpose than that of circumcision. Mr Simeon makes the Apostle say, in reference to the case of Timothy,—  
“ Let me see any of my Christian brethren carrying this

---

\* “ En rappelant tout ce qui a été dit à ce sujet, il paraît que le devoir du support mutuel peut être contenu dans les deux règles suivantes: 1<sup>mo</sup>, Ne rien faire pour conserver nôtre communion avec nos frères, qui pût violer nôtre communion avec Dieu par la désobéissance: 2<sup>do</sup>, Garder nôtre communion avec nos frères autant que nous le pouvons sans violer nôtre communion avec Dieu.”—*Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, by the Author; tom. ii. p. 248.*

concession to an extent that will be injurious to the souls of men, and I shall withstand them." The concession Mr Simeon would have the British and Foreign Society make, in mixing the Apocrypha with the Bible, is injurious to the souls of men. It is delivering to them writings as a part of the word of God, containing doctrines opposed to that word; and, if imbibed by them, not merely injurious, but destructive to their souls. It is sinning not only against man, but against God, who has strictly prohibited any such addition. To put a book into a man's hand as containing only the Old and New Testaments, when we know that it contains something that is neither the Old nor the New Testament, is an evident deception. It is giving him, what you assure him is all wholesome and nutritive food, when you know it contains deadly poison.

Not only does Mr Simeon make the Apostle Paul say, in *express terms*, "To them that require the Apocrypha, as conceding the Apocrypha," but also "to the Papist (I became) "as a Papist." So, then, the Apostle to be consistent with himself, and in order to gain the Papists, must speak and act as the Papists do. How easy would it be to expose the impropriety, and even the absurdity of ascribing such a sentiment to the Apostle. How different would this be from becoming to the Jews as a Jew. In the one case, so far from doing any thing contrary to the will of God, Paul acted by Divine authority in observing that which was in itself indifferent. In the other case, he must have acted expressly contrary to the authority of God, in things that were in themselves sinful. This very Apostle was divinely commissioned to predict the great apostacy, that unhallowed mixture of Christianity, Judaism, and Paganism, which was to take place in latter times. Is it possible, then, that Paul would have countenanced such abominations? How unbecoming—How improper is it to put in his mouth, *to the Papists I become as a Papist!* Who, that is acquainted with his character and writings, could recognize the Apostle Paul, as Mr Simeon has portray-



ed him, arrayed in the attire of the Mother of Harlots, going forth to the nations with the Apocrypha in his hand, and reading, for their instruction, the history of Bel and the Dragon!

The arguments which Mr Simeon has used in justification of the practice of the British and Foreign Bible Society, in relation to the Apocrypha, are similar to those by which the Jesuit Missionaries in China vindicated their conduct in permitting their converts to pay religious adoration to their deceased ancestors. Their plea was, that without this they could have been of no use, and that they gained a great end by a slight sacrifice. "*To the Chinese I became as a Chinese, that I might gain the Chinese.*"—This very much resembles the reasoning of Mr Simeon and the friends of the Apocrypha. They say the word of God will soon eclipse it, and so said the Jesuits. "They are but specks, the error will be neutralized by the truth." But neither is Mr Simeon's language, nor that of the Jesuits, the language of the word of God: "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump."

Notwithstanding the inconclusiveness of Mr Simeon's reasonings, and his misapplications of Scripture, he has indulged in a strain of invective against the Committee of the Edinburgh Bible Society, which, even were he the advocate of a better cause, would not only be unwarrantable, but extremely indecent. If, however, he could not abstain from this, how improper was it to make an Apostle the vehicle of such language? In the following not very courteous strain, the Apostle Paul is represented as assailing "the Edinburgh Gentleman:"—"I should have been better pleased if your zeal had been more according to knowledge, and if it had been blended somewhat more with modesty and love—I am made all things to all men, that I might *by all means* SAVE some. This, my brother, is what I do: but in YOU I see not one atom of such a spirit: You will make no concessions whatever: No, forsooth, the GAINING of immortal souls, though they

‘ be millions upon millions, is no such object with you :  
 ‘ it deserves no sacrifice at all, in YOUR estimation : You  
 ‘ know that circumcision is abrogated, and you will not be  
 ‘ accessory to the observance of that rite, no, not in a  
 ‘ single case, to save the whole world.—We that are strong  
 ‘ ought (not to treat with contempt and disdain, but) to  
 ‘ BEAR the infirmity of the weak, and not to please our-  
 ‘ selves.—We that are strong (as the Edinburgh Committee  
 ‘ feel themselves to be) ought to *bear* the infirmities of the  
 ‘ weak, and not to please ourselves. No, indeed: the in-  
 ‘ sisting upon our own humours, and our own conceits,  
 ‘ and requiring all our Christian brethren to submit to us,  
 ‘ is not the spirit that I approve.” The reader will judge  
 whether such an address to the Committee of the Edin-  
 burgh Bible Society be justifiable in Mr Simeon, especially  
 when professing to plead the cause of love and forbearance ;  
 and whether the strength of his reasonings warrant the  
 severity of his language.

After the perusal of such a pamphlet as Mr Simeon’s,  
 any one who has little acquaintance with the subject in  
 debate, might be induced to suppose that the Apocryphal  
 books are very harmless in themselves, and that the adding  
 of them to the Scriptures is a matter of no great moment.  
 But, considering the specimens of them given in the Edin-  
 burgh Statement, in which so many false principles and  
 destructive errors are exposed, some notice of these, it might  
 be expected, would have been taken by Mr Simeon, and  
 some defence attempted of a book which he insists may be  
 lawfully added to the word of God. The Edinburgh  
 Statement declares, that “ the whole work is replete with  
 instances of vanity, flattery, idle curiosity, affectation of  
 learning, and other blemishes ; with frivolous, absurd, false,  
 superstitious, and contradictory statements.” These serious  
 charges are supported by proofs exhibited under the follow-  
 ing heads :—Absurdities and contradictions,—magical cere-  
 monies,—transmigration of souls,—prayers for the dead,—  
 sinless perfection in this life,—gross superstition,—lies and

falsehood,—assassination and suicide commended,—justification by the works of the law.

“From these brief statements,” it is added, “which might have been continued to a much greater length,—“we trust it will appear that our opposition to the printing and circulation of the Apocryphal books, whether intermixed with, or appended to the sacred Scriptures, is neither frivolous nor vexatious:—that, so far from being a harmless appendage to the word of God, they are in direct hostility to it; and, if bound up with it, must powerfully tend to counteract its holy and saving influence on the mind. So pernicious are the doctrines which they teach,—so immoral are the examples which they present, that no reason, it is conceived, can be imagined sufficiently powerful to warrant a Bible Society to countenance, directly or indirectly, their circulation. Instead of preparing the way, and enticing men to read and study the sacred volume, their low and vulgar puerilities, their gross errors and immoralities, are much more calculated to produce, in the considerate mind, aversion and disgust. Whatever incidental sentiments of real value they may contain, these books, when brought into connexion with the pure oracles of heaven, prove, at once, an encumbrance and a snare. In such a connexion they can be viewed in no other light than as a presumptuous addition, which it is no less dangerous to give than to receive; for every addition to the Scriptures is forbidden by their Divine Author in the strongest terms.”

Considering the above weighty charges against the Apocrypha, it is truly astonishing that Mr Simeon should stand forth a strenuous advocate for adding it to the Holy Scriptures. If, however, he must still appear in this character, why has he not endeavoured to refute these charges? Do they seem to him so trivial as not to deserve his notice, or is he conscious that it is not in his power to repel them?

## CHAPTER III.

OBSERVATIONS ON EXTRACTS OF FOUR LETTERS IN THE CAMBRIDGE REMARKS.—THE PRACTICABILITY OF CIRCULATING THE BIBLE ON THE CONTINENT WITHOUT THE APOCRYPHA.

Mr Simeon, and others who contend for adding the Apocrypha to the word of God, take for granted the impossibility of circulating the Bible on the Continent without this spurious appendage. This, however, has not been proved; and the contrary appears to be the fact, as will be seen in the sequel. If there is a demand for the Apocrypha, it is greatly owing to the mismanagement of the Directors of the Bible Society. Had the foreign societies been told from the beginning that no aid could be afforded them from England except for promoting and circulating the Bible alone, and had this declaration been steadily adhered to, the result, it is believed, would have been a more extensive circulation of the Scriptures of truth. Great efforts, however, are now made to impress on the minds of all, the necessity of adding the Apocrypha in order to the circulation of the Scriptures on the Continent.

To prove the necessity, as well as to vindicate the lawfulness of adding, and even of *intermingling* the Apocryphal writings with the canonical books, a paper, entitled "Remarks," &c. has been recently published at Cambridge, in the introduction to which a long list of signatures appears, "restricted," it is said, "to masters of arts and persons of superior degrees." In this publication extracts of four letters are inserted. Two of the letters are from Paris, one from L. Van Ess, and another from a Swedish nobleman. To these letters I wish to direct the reader's attention, since

they are produced as quite conclusive on the subject; in one word, they are pronounced "irresistible."

In the extract of the letter from the Swedish nobleman, we find him expressing his apprehension, that in Sweden the exclusion of the Apocrypha will put a stop to the circulation of the Scriptures. But this correspondent produces no facts to support his opinion; and, from the indiscriminate and exaggerated terms in which he speaks of the religion of his countrymen, so common in letters from the Continent, and so much calculated to mislead their readers, those who are acquainted with the real state of things there will lay little stress on this communication. "Will not," he says, 'the exclusion of the Apocrypha lessen, or put an entire stop to this circulation, among those humble though sincere lovers of our religious records, who, perhaps even without being aware of a distinction between the canonical and Apocryphal books, have found edification from them all? and many of whom may have first been induced to read the Bible, by those affecting histories by which we were so delighted as children, and those beautiful moral precepts which we admire still as men. You know well the attachment of our peasants to the Bible, but they will have *their* Bible; that Bible which their ancestors loved, and out of which their religious parents used to read to them as children."

Such is the substance of this letter, in which the writer throws out a vague opinion, while he does not even hint that any trial has been made to ascertain the matter in question. He sees no harm in making an addition to the Word of God. On the contrary, according to him, it produces a most beneficial effect. It is even absolutely indispensable; for, without this passport, the Bible would be rejected by the sincere lovers of the religious records,—the want of it would put an entire stop to the circulation of the Scriptures. He himself appears fully to participate in the strong predilection with which he would persuade

us his countrymen are imbued, having been delighted in his childhood with the pretty stories of the Apocrypha, and now in his manhood admiring the beautiful moral precepts which it contains. What weight can any considerate person attach to such a testimony as this? It is fitted rather to amuse by its simplicity than to produce the smallest conviction on a grave and important subject.

Here, however, we have an irrefragable proof of the mischief of connecting the truth of God with the lies of men in one volume under the title of the Word of God. Both are viewed as coming from Him,—both are equally received as religious records,—both are considered by the people as component parts of the Bible,—“*Their Bible.*” This attestation comports very ill with the testimony given to their piety, while it completely exposes the fallacy of the opinion advanced by the writers of the Cambridge Remarks, that “men will learn to distinguish “the voice of “the true Shepherd, and a stranger will they not hear.” ‘In comparing one part with another, they will soon discover that there is an authority and efficacy in the one, to ‘which the other does not pretend.” Instead of *soon* discovering this difference, the Swedish nobleman tells us of generation after generation of “religious” people remaining entirely ignorant of it. As far then as the vague, unauthenticated statements of this letter go, from which it appears that the writer possesses no information on the subject of his communication, they tend only to the confirmation of the opinion which those who produced it wish to establish.

---

Professor L. Van Ess, in his letter, (which is addressed to Dr Steinkopff, one of the secretaries of the Bible Society), intreats the committee of that Society to allow the Apocrypha to be intermingled with the canonical books in 8000 copies of his translation of the Old Testament which

they have purchased. In urging his request, which he does both from personal and from public considerations, he attaches no importance whatever to the violation of the integrity of the inspired word, by intermingling the apocryphal with the canonical books. Speaking of the Apocrypha, he says, "The view taken by members of ' both (the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches) is ' in a doctrinal sense the same, the mere order in print- ' ing the Apocrypha books is different. Whether the ' books happen to stand in one place in the Bibles of Ro- ' man Catholics, and in another of those of Protestants, ' is surely a point of no importance."

Such is Mr Van Ess's light manner of speaking on the subject; and to this flagrant violation of the Divine Word has he conjured the Society, "in the name of the Redeemer himself," to consent. But, even were that which he pleads for lawful, there is nothing so forcible in his letter as to convince us that it is necessary. On the contrary, an attentive perusal of this extract will lead us to conclude that the opinion he gives as to the impracticability of circulating the old Testament among Roman Catholics without the Apocrypha is unfounded.

He declares it to be a fact, that the desire of the Roman Catholic population to obtain possession of the whole Bible was never so strong and so vehement as at present. He further tells us of the numberless letters he has received, and is daily receiving, from Roman Catholics, both of the clergy and the laity, all breathing the strongest desire to possess his translation of the Old Testament when completed, and which, he says, 'in fact, the whole Roman Catholic public in Germany seems anxious to obtain.' Again, he speaks of the thousands and thousands among Roman Catholics who thirst after the whole Bible, and hunger after that bread of life which no one gives them. In addition to all this, he informs us that the distribution of the New Testament has been abundantly blessed of God.

Such are the details which Van Ess exhibits as *facts*; after which it would require very strong evidence indeed to prove that the Bible, if presented in its native excellency and purity, would be rejected by persons in such a state of mind? Yet he wishes us to believe that the success of its circulation cannot be risked without the addition of what the Swedish nobleman calls, "the affecting histories and beautiful moral precepts of the Apocrypha." But, to produce this conviction, the only means which he has in his power to employ, is to *oppose his own OPINIONS and conjectures to the FACTS he has stated*. At the same time he informs us that "things have scarcely ever worn so portentous an appearance as at the present moment, when so great is the excitement visible among the members of both persuasions, that we cannot but be apprehensive of its leading to some important crisis." In other words, circumstances are so much changed, that, to reason from the past to the future, as to the reception of the Scriptures by the public, is very precarious.

If his representations be well founded, why is it necessary that the Bible Society should purchase his translation of the Old Testament for the purpose of circulating it, whether with or without the Apocrypha? "The desire," he says, "of the Roman Catholic population to obtain possession of the whole Bible was never so strong and so vehement as at present." In another letter, dated April 26, 1824, (two months prior to the date of the above letter, published in this year's Report of the Bible Society,) he observes, "The inquiry after my translation of the Old Testament exceeds belief, from clergymen as well as from the laity; since there are no other Catholic translations in the German language, excepting such as are filled with notes and comments, and in general sell at a very high price, which cannot be paid either by clergy or laity in these times of distress. The demand for my version, when fully com-



pleted will be so considerable, that 100,000 copies will be required. Wherever my New Testament has found access, and Christ is revealed by its perusal, the people are anxious to seek him also in the prophecies and types of the Old Testament. I receive letters by every mail containing applications for copies." If all this be true, what need is there for the interference of the Bible Society, far less that it should become a party to the violation of the integrity of the Scriptures. Booksellers enough will be found both to remunerate the author, and to defray the expenses of printing a book of which 100,000 copies will be required to supply the demand. Here we have sufficient proof that the conjectures of Van Ess, that the Bible would not circulate without the Apocrypha, are entirely groundless. *The facts which he states, if admitted,* must convince the most incredulous that the Old Testament would be received, and gladly received, by the people of Germany, though unadulterated. For can any one imagine that, when the inquiry for the Bible exceeds belief, and when it is *out of the power of the people to obtain it elsewhere,* they will be deterred from procuring the object of their desire wherever it can be had, even though they supposed it to be in some respects defective.

Above all, is it possible for any one to bring himself to imagine that those to whom *Christ has been revealed* by the perusal of the New Testament, and who are *anxious to seek him also in the prophecies and types of the Old Testament,* will refuse to accept of it because it wants the Apocrypha? Such a supposition carries absurdity on the face of it.

Van Ess, as if he himself were sensible that his *conjectures* are insufficient to counteract the impression that will be made by his *facts,* endeavours to add to their weight by referring to certain personal inconveniences to which he would be exposed were he to publish the Bible without the Apocrypha. His character and reputation, he tells us, as well as his adherence to canonical order,

would be immediately degraded. But such considerations as these can never justify Christians of this country in adulterating the Scriptures; nor do his *opinions*, opposed to his *facts*, carry such evidence as to lay them under a temptation to violate their duty. We shall afterwards refer to the judgment of one who is well acquainted with Germany, who affirms, that “*the assertion that the Bible will not be received in Germany without the Apocrypha is a gross misrepresentation.*”

In publishing extracts of this letter from Van Ess to persuade the public that the Bible will not be received by Roman Catholics without the Apocrypha, the authors of the Cambridge Remarks have *kept back an important testimony on the opposite side contained in the same letter, by striking it out of a sentence which they have quoted.*

In what they have published we read, in the end of one sentence and in the beginning of another, as follows: “By the circulation of my translation of the Old Testament, separate from the Apocryphal books. When, at the same time, I call to mind the numberless letters which I have received,” &c. Now, let the reader observe what has been done to conceal the *hiatus*. The last clause of the former sentence is struck out together with the first word of the latter sentence, and the second word is made to begin with a capital. In the letter itself the whole runs thus, the second sentence beginning a new paragraph:—“By the circulation of my translation of the Old Testament, separate from the Apocryphal books; notwithstanding, it is but candid to say, that, individually, I, like many other enlightened Roman Catholics, feel disposed to take no umbrage whatsoever at such a separation.”

“But, when at the same time I call to mind the numberless letters which I have received,” &c.

The *fact* thus suppressed and intended to be concealed from the public is a very material one, and, must have appeared so to those who have omitted it, otherwise they would never have resorted to so base an artifice. According

to Van Ess himself, *many enlightened Roman Catholics feel disposed to take no umbrage whatsoever at the separation between the Bible and the Apocrypha.*

The writers of the Cambridge Remarks have not only attempted the concealment that has been just exposed; but, with equal art, they have also omitted the relation of another very material *fact*. In one of the extracts that has already been quoted, and which they have *detached* from the other extracts, and *huddled up in a note* at some columns distance, they have again made an important *omission in the middle of a sentence*. In their note we read: "The mere order in printing the 'Apocryphal books is different. Whether the books happen to stand,'" &c. In the letter itself we read—"the 'mere order in printing the Apocryphal books is different; '—let them be paid for by others, and the resolution of 'the Committee *not to print the Apocryphal books at their 'expense*, will not be violated.—The Committee permit the 'distribution of the Apocrypha if done at the expense of 'others;—whether these books happen to stand," &c.

In another part of his letter, Van Ess calls upon the Bible Society to make an exception from the rules in their resolution respecting the Apocrypha, "or at least," he adds, "so far to modify the resolution, *that the Apocryphal books 'and portions of the Old Testament, agreeably to the order 'of the Vulgate, and intermingled with the canonical books, 'may be allowed to be printed at the expense of others and 'then circulated in the 8000 copies of my Old Testament, 'the canonical books of which, the B. and F. Bible So- 'ciety have purchased.*" Again, it is said in the same letter—"Towards the expenses of printing the Apocryphal 'books, I am ready to advance 4000 florins, which I have 'received from Amsterdam towards establishing a fund for 'the Bible."

All the above quotations of the letter of Van Ess, are not only omitted in the extracts given by the Cambridge writers, but as we see by the above omission, carefully kept out of view.

Let the reader, however, remark the last words that have been quoted—*which I have received towards establishing a fund for the Bible*. This explains what was the effect of the resolutions of the British and Foreign Bible Society of August 1822, and December 1824, which have been animadverted on, page 37; and the justice of the following remark in the Statement of the Edinburgh Committee, already referred to, will now be obvious. “The real operation of these resolutions is merely to administer a salvo to the consciences of objectors at home, whilst abroad the evil remains precisely the same as ever, and those sacred funds which had been subscribed on the express condition and in the full confidence that they should be expended in encouraging the circulation of *the Holy Scriptures only*, are still lending an indirect influence to the circulation of vital error.”\*

Whether or not the authors of the Cambridge Remarks had the paragraph of the Edinburgh Statement just quoted in view when they presented to the public the garbled sentence in their detached note, is best known to themselves. In the end of the “Remarks” they indeed say, “In the case of the foreign letters, it must be borne in mind that the writers are not answerable for any inaccuracies which may have arisen in the translation.” The above, however, is not an inaccuracy in translation, but an omission similar to the former one pointed out, and to another garbled quotation of which Mr Gorham has convicted them in his pamphlet, 1st edition, page 31. That men who possess common honesty, not to say Christian principle, or who have any regard for their own characters, should have been guilty of the frauds pointed out above, in order to mislead the public, is altogether unaccountable. That cause

\* Mr V. Ess here solicits the British and Foreign Bible Society to furnish him with money to pay for his printing the canonical books, while he informs them that he will print the Apocryphal books with money which he says he has received from another Society *for establishing a fund for the Bible*. In this way he assures them their rules will not be violated! Will the Christians in Britain consent to such manœuvring as is here exposed?

must indeed be desperate, which prompts its adherents to resort to such a mode of supporting it.

In the letter of Van Ess, he says, “When under this impression, I advert to the wide, the very wide field which appears to be opened for us among Roman Catholics, by means of the dissemination of the *whole Bible, translated from the original, and arranged according to the Roman Catholic order of the books.*” Upon this the writer of the “Preface to Observations on the Circulation of the Apocrypha,” makes the following note:—“Now here I must stop to remark, that there is a manifest contradiction very likely to mislead the unwary. By the word *original*, we mean in English, the Hebrew, Chaldean, and Greek. Van Ess must mean the Latin Vulgate, for if he means any thing else, his version and he himself are both *ipso facto* excommunicated, by the Council of Trent, by the two congregations for interpreting its decrees, assembled by order of Pius IV. and Sextus V., and by very many subsequent bulls. However, if he does not mean the Latin Vulgate, he could not find some of the Apocryphal books at all, and *none* of them in Hebrew, and consequently he could find none arranged according to the Roman order; therefore he does not mean the Bible translated from the original, but from the Latin Vulgate.” It appears then that the translation of Van Ess, of which the Bible Society has purchased 8000 copies, is not made from the original Hebrew, but from that other translation which, on account of its corruptions, a learned Bishop calls the Puddle. “The Hebrew, he says, is to be considered as the fountain—the Greek the stream—and *the Latin the Puddle.*”

---

In one of the two letters from Paris, the writer declares that he wishes to see the Apocrypha separated from their own Bibles—that he often sighs when he thinks upon the time and money spent in reprinting writings, which though some few of them, he says, may contain good

lessons of morals, are for the most part absurd. He also acknowledges that the French Churches are wrong, in having the Apocrypha joined to the Bible. Yet, after all these admissions, he thinks it should not be withheld by the Bible Societies. "Our reformers," he says, "should have enlightened us on this question, as they have done on many others, and have relieved our Bible from this superfluity. After them our Synods alone are able to decide the question; but they have not to my knowledge meddled with it. Nor should the Bible Societies; nor ought they, in my opinion, to take away the Apocrypha till the Church gives, at least tacitly, a general consent to it."

I am extremely sorry to see such sentiments expressed by the author of this letter; but purer Popery, I am compelled to observe, never proceeded from the Vatican. The thing is bad in itself, and the practice is wrong; but we must adhere to it. Our reformers have not enlightened us on this point. If this be sound doctrine, Christians, at the Reformation, only exchanged the infallibility of the Pope for the infallibility of Luther and his coadjutors. But the Reformers did enlighten us on this point, or at least put us in the way of enlightening ourselves. They opened to us the Scriptures, and appealed to them for what they advanced, calling on all to examine them for themselves, and constantly affirming that they are able to make men wise unto salvation. This was the grand principle to which they attained, and which they promulgated; and great would have been their concern had they foreseen that, three hundred years after their time, those who professed to follow them in their reformation would cling to what was acknowledged to be wrong, because it was an evil which they had not marked with due reprobation. How justly might they have complained that this was loading them with a degree of responsibility which, upon their own principles, they were entitled to disclaim; and removing the very foundation on which their reformation was built.

The next appeal, it is asserted, should be to the Synods; but no relief, it seems, can be obtained from them: They have not decided the question: and now, since they exist no more, there is no prospect that they ever shall decide it. Last of all comes "the Church," and on it the responsibility of the continuance of what is confessed to be wrong is ultimately cast. Here we are thrown back into that very situation from which the Reformers laboured to deliver us. The Bible is withheld from the Roman Catholics, because the Church decides that it is not fit for the people; and Protestants must receive it degraded by what they know to be "absurd," until the Church shall give its consent to suffer it to appear by itself, in its native, heaven-born purity and beauty. Nay, we may even feel ourselves at liberty to do what we know to be *wrong*, and to continue to do so till the Church gives its consent to our doing what we know to be right. Thus the authority of the Church, and not the authority of God, is appealed to, and the latter is made to yield to the former.

The Apostles of Christ taught that "we ought to obey God rather than man;" to the Rulers, and Elders, and Scribes they put that conclusive question: "Whether it be right, in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." Yet here persons, who profess to have received their testimony, avowedly hearken unto men rather than unto God. Whatever is "wrong" is contrary to his will; but in this instance we are taught systematically to disregard the will of God, till it shall have received the sanction of the will of man; and, as long as these stand opposed to each other, to make the former give way to the latter. This is worse than Popery. The Roman Catholic does not believe his Church, to whose decision he bows, to be wrong. On the contrary, he is convinced that it is right, and that, in yielding obedience to it, he is submitting to the will of God. But here, although it is both clearly seen, and fully acknowledged that the Church is *wrong*, its decision is adhered to. The

Roman Catholic, of the two, is the more consistent, and the less guilty.

Instead of the inquiry being, "What saith the Lord?" it comes to be, "What saith the Church?" But what is the Church but the collective body of believers? and are believers in their collective capacity at liberty to dispense with the law of God? The Lord Jesus Christ placed the keys of the kingdom of heaven in the hands of his Apostles; and who but antichrist will maintain that, since their time, they have been committed to the Church? We may ask, concerning the Church, what Paul asked the Corinthians in reference to himself. "Was Paul crucified for you?" Has the Church a power to remit sins? Will the Church answer for us in the great day of account, or bear the punishment of our sins? Perhaps the Church, too, will decide that the people shall never read the Bible without Ostervald's Notes, an appendage without which it is not permitted to appear in French pulpits! In this letter it is affirmed that the edition of the Montauban Bible has sold only since the Apocrypha was added to it. That this assertion is entirely groundless will afterwards appear.

---

The other letter, from Paris, is written by Professor Keiffer; and both to the reasoning and the alleged facts of this correspondent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, it is necessary to pay particular attention.

Mr Keiffer admits it to be generally agreed that the Apocryphal books are not divinely inspired, but asks—

'Why cannot we follow, with respect to them, the precept which our Divine Saviour himself gives us in the parable of the tares, which had come up in the field where good seed had been sown. (Matt. xiii.) When the servants of the master of the field offered to gather up the tares, the master forbade it, saying,—'Gather not up the tares, lest ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest, and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn.' The precept contained in this parable may, I think, be applied to the discussion which is now carried on concerning the Apocryphal books.'



The precept in this parable is completely irrelevant to the subject. Such licentious misapplications of passages of the word of God deserve the severest reprehension; they are only calculated to perplex and mislead the ignorant and unwary. An opposer of the Apocrypha might meet the above question by inquiring, Why cannot we follow the rule delivered by the Lord to his prophet, "If thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth?" Jer. xv. 19. The parable of the tares refers to persons, not to doctrines. In regard to the latter, our rule is to hold fast the form of sound words; to cease to hear the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge; and on no account to presume to add to the words of God.

'Ought we not with perfect confidence,' adds Mr Keiffer, 'to leave to the Almighty the means, and the time, which in his incomprehensible wisdom he shall consider the most fit and proper for separating these books from the inspired writings?'

If such a mode of reasoning as this were allowed, it might be applied to the translation of the Scriptures into the languages of the world, and employed to paralyze every exertion for the spread of the Gospel. We might say, with some of old, "The time is not come, the time that the Lord's house should be built." But those who employed such language were reprov'd and convicted by their practice in regard to their own houses. They found difficulties in the way of building the Lord's house, and made them a pretext for giving it up altogether; while, notwithstanding the obstacles which they had to encounter, they contrived to erect ceiled houses for their own accommodation, Haggai i. 2. 5. But, in waiting for the interference of the Almighty before separating between the Scriptures and the Apocrypha, we should be much more inexcusable than the Jews. God had limited a particular period for the desolation of Jerusalem; but he has limited no period during which his people are to countenance the adulteration of the lively oracles by corrupt additions.

False prophets have risen up in every age, and those who tremble at the word of God have always been commanded to turn away from them. Men may indeed turn away their ears from the truth, and be turned unto fables; but the people of God are not in any way to give them their sanction. "If there come unto you any, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds," 2 John x. 11.

The Apostle Paul was not directed to wait till God should destroy the influence of false teachers in the church at Corinth. He denounced them as deceitful workers, as ministers of Satan; and thus by the blessing of God the evil was checked. We cannot feel too strongly our absolute and entire dependance on God, and that, except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it; but we are not to wait until the Lord shall point out to us the proper time for building his house by causing it to spring up without our labour. He has given us his Holy Word; he has commanded us earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, and to preserve pure and uncontaminated that book by which all shall be judged at last.

According to M. Keiffer's application of the parable of the tares, the Bible is the wheat, the Apocrypha the tares, the devil is the author of it, and the servants are forbidden to take away what he has indited. Extraordinary as it may appear, that, in pleading the cause of the Apocrypha, he should have laid down such premises, the conclusion which he draws is still more remarkable. In plain language it is as follows:—Let us then imitate the conduct of this enemy, and, as long as the servants shall sleep, unite with the devil in sowing tares among the wheat by continuing to print the Apocrypha. Arguments like these should arouse the most dormant and inconsiderate, while they prove to what lengths such perversions of Scripture would conduct us.

After giving the above specimen of his manner of applying Scripture, and reasoning upon the subject, Mr Keiffer proceeds to his statement of facts, which are published with a view to sway the public mind, and are held forth as decisive on the subject in question.

“ When the Bible Society at Paris,” he says, “ began its labours six years ago, the only Bibles ready for distribution were two editions which had been printed by some pious persons at Toulouse and Montauban, which did not contain the Apocrypha. With these two editions the Society began its distributions, but soon there was a protest on all sides against the omission of these books, and a formal demand was made, that the Apocryphal books should be added to these two editions. In order to conform to the French Churches, the Society was obliged to print the Apocrypha at Toulouse and at Montauban, and to add them to the editions which had already been published there. A little while after, the British and Foreign Bible Society caused Martin’s Bible to be printed at Paris, in a small form, and gave a great number of copies of it to the Paris Bible Society; but though this edition was advertised in the annual reports, and in several of the Society’s circulars, and though it was offered at a very low price, nobody asked for it. The Auxiliary Societies to which these books were sent, as a gift, received them with reluctance, because the Apocryphal books were not in them, and the Society was obliged to print them in a small form, as the only means of distributing these Bibles. These facts appear to me more than sufficient to prove the aversion which the French Protestants have for Bibles without the Apocrypha, and the impossibility of introducing them into our churches.”

It is difficult to repress our indignation when we see statements of this kind published under the name of facts, in order to influence men’s minds, and which are calculated to mislead the public on so important a subject. We have already seen one letter addressed to a Secretary of the Bible Society, laid before the public in a mutilated state, with material *facts* which it contained purposely suppressed; and now we have extracts of a letter written by a correspondent of the Society, whose competency to judge in religious questions the reader has already had an opportunity of appreciating. In this letter he gives various statements which are contrary to fact, and yet he affirms that these *facts* appear more than sufficient to prove

the aversion which the French Protestants have for Bibles without the Apocrypha, and the impossibility of introducing them into their churches.

To show that I am not treating Mr Keiffer's facts worse than they deserve, I must enter into some details, and shall proceed to state facts derived from much more competent judges on religious subjects than Mr Keiffer. His facts relate to three editions of the Bible—the Toulouse and the Montauban editions, and Martin's pocket Bible. I shall take them in their order.

---

Mr Keiffer affirms that the Toulouse edition of the Bible was printed by *some pious persons at that place*, and that the Bible Society at Paris began the distribution of it *before the Apocrypha was added*. Both these assertions are unfounded. The Toulouse Bible was *not* printed by some pious persons at Toulouse, and the distribution of it was *not* begun without the Apocrypha. The history of this edition is as follows:—

In consequence of a representation that was made, at my instance, to the British and Foreign Bible Society, soon after the Montauban Bible went to press, stating, that a much greater number of Bibles was wanted to supply the French Protestants, an edition of 10,000 copies, to be printed *solely at the expense of that Society*, was ordered at Toulouse. The printing of this Bible was placed under the superintendence of M. Chabrand, the Protestant pastor and President of the Consistory there, whom I had recommended as a fit person to be intrusted with it. This edition was far advanced when I left France, without any mention being made of adding the Apocrypha; nor had M. Chabrand the smallest idea that this would ever be done. But, when the work was nearly completed, he received an order to print the Apocrypha along with it. Against this he repeatedly remonstrated.

Of this transaction, so important in the annals of

the British and Foreign Bible Society, as it throws much light on the conduct of its directors respecting the Apocrypha, Mr Gorham gives the following account:—"But, in some instances, the Committee have gone beyond this step, by *encouraging the introduction* of such an Apocrypha, and by *printing it at the expense of our Society*. A remarkable instance occurred in the *French Bible (Martin's)*, ten thousand copies of which were printed at Toulouse, 1819, *by our funds*, for the Protestants in the South of France. From the proceedings in our Committee, on 31st January, 6th March, and 16th March 1820, (See *Minute Book*,) it appears that the Paris Bible Society stated that the omission of the Apocrypha would give offence. The Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society requested the Rev. M. Chabrand, President of the Consistory of Toulouse, and the Bible Society at Montauban, "to consider the propriety of adding the Apocrypha. M. Chabrand stated his objections to doing so—alleging, *that there was danger of the Protestants confounding the Apocryphal with the Canonical books; and of their being thus led to adopt some of the errors of Popery (particularly that of PURGATORY), to which they were already too much inclined.*" (See *Letter Book*.) The point was then referred to a correspondence between M. Chabrand and Professor Keiffer of Paris;—the result was, *the adoption of the Apocrypha*. Through the same influence, *for fear of giving offence to Roman Catholics*, M. Chabrand was directed to omit David Martin's admirable preface to the Apocrypha, (one of the most luminous views of the history and errors of those writings)—a brief and tame superscription being substituted! We feel confident that the great body of subscribers to the British and Foreign Bible Society would have expressed astonishment and dissatisfaction, had they been distinctly informed of this affair."

On the same subject, a correspondent who has seen the *Minute Book* of the Society, writes as follows:—"It appears that a letter was read recommending the addition of

the Apocrypha, and the Committee ordered that it should be done. Then came another meeting, when a strong remonstrance from Mr Chabrand was read—an answer was sent recommending him to give up his opposition. Next came a letter from Mr Chabrand, still objecting in the strongest terms. The matter was then referred to the Paris Bible Society, which of course decided against Mr Chabrand. A request was then made by Mr Chabrand, that a preface to it should be inserted. This was positively refused by the Committee. Thus it appears that Chabrand fought his ground inch by inch.” Let us now hear Mr Chabrand’s account of this business, and his opinion on the subject of the Apocrypha, as given by himself in a letter dated August 30th, 1825:—

“The Toulouse edition of the Bible was never published without the Apocryphal books. Having been charged by the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society with the direction of that work, I expected, it is true, to print only the canonical books; but, at a period when the work was already far advanced, the London Committee having made over that edition to the Paris Society, I received, on the part of the latter, an order (*invitation*) to join the Apocrypha to the Canonical books. I took the liberty to make some representations to them on the subject, which I transmitted to the Committee through Professor Keiffer; but all that I could obtain was, that, in order to make a difference between the Apocryphal and Canonical books, I should place the former at the end of the whole Bible,—that I should prefix to them an advertisement, which they adopted only in part,—that, instead of following the division by verses, as in the Bible, I should distribute them into paragraphs; and finally, that I should print them with a smaller type than the rest of the volume.

“My purpose in printing the Apocryphal books at the end of the Bible, and in the smaller type was, to prevent

‘ the ignorant people from confounding it with the Canonical books, as they do so often when they are placed between the Old and New Testaments, and printed in the same way.

‘ I still think that there are weighty objections, *graves inconveniens*, (at least among us on account of ignorance) to joining the Apocryphal to the Canonical books :  
 ‘ 1. Because, as I have just said, the people confound the one with the other : that the book of Tobit teaches the merit of works ; that the books of Maccabees establish purgatory and prayers for the dead, &c. ; and that, in general, as the Fathers of the Great Synod of Dordrecht say, they are filled with tales, and ridiculous fables ; such as the history of the Devil Asmodeus, &c.

‘ I know of only two reasons alleged by those who desire to see them always occupy that place. 1. Use, that is to say, custom. 2. As historical documents following up those of the Old Testament. As to the first reason, viz. custom, it seemed to me that the people belonging to our churches had so much lost sight of the word of God, that the moment to disencumber the canon of the New Scriptures of that improper (*inconvenant*) appendage, namely, the Apocrypha, appeared to me favourable ; and, as to their being historical documents, I proposed that they should send them into the world and into libraries, by causing them to be printed apart.”

Here we have Mr Chabrand’s opinion on the subject— an opinion which he has held all along. When the addition of the Apocrypha was ordered, he was so much hurt, that he has since affirmed, that, if he had known the Apocrypha was to be added, he *would have had nothing to do with the superintendence of printing the Bible*. He declared, too, that he placed the Apocrypha at the end of the Bible, and printed it in a smaller type, that it might be *as little noticed, and do as little harm as possible*.

So far from their being “ a protest on all sides” against the omission of the Apocrypha, as Mr Keiffer has assert-

ed, Mr Chabrand, who lives in the midst of the Protestants, has never to this day *heard a single complaint on the subject*. In his letter quoted above, he says, "I have ' never heard one, neither Church nor individual, in ' France, complain of the absence of the Apocryphal books ; ' but I have known a great many pastors (*beaucoup de ' pasteurs*) disapprove of their insertion in the volume of ' the Bible." So much for the Toulouse edition of the Bible. I come now to that of Montauban.

---

Being at Montauban in the year 1817, I found among the French Protestants a deplorable want of Bibles, I therefore suggested the propriety, and even the necessity, of endeavouring to obtain a sufficient supply. To encourage them to this, I offered a donation of L.100, and to give L.100 more afterwards if it should be needed ; at the same time I assured them that, from what I knew of the British and Foreign Bible Society, I was convinced that, if applied to, it would afford them very effectual aid. The subject was immediately taken into consideration, and in a few days a letter was forwarded to that Society, to which an answer, offering a very liberal donation, was soon after received. It was then resolved to commence the work. In communicating to me this resolution, it was stated that the Apocrypha would be published with the Bible. Against this I immediately remonstrated. I observed, that the donation I had offered was for the publication of the word of God ; but, if the Apocrypha was to be joined with it, I could have no part in such a transaction. I farther told them, that on the same grounds I was certain the London Society could afford them no aid, for that, even were the Directors of that Society willing to assist in such a work, it was not in their power ; as it would be a violation of their rules, and consequently of their engagements with those who supported that institution. This was my firm belief at that



time, for I had then no suspicion of what I have since found to be the practice of that Society on the Continent, respecting the Apocrypha. This remonstrance produced the desired effect. Within a few days, I was informed that it was resolved to omit the Apocrypha, and to publish the Bible alone.

The Protestant Churches throughout France were then applied to, and the greater part, if not all of them, subscribed to the proposed work, each engaging to take a certain number of copies. I continued at Montauban about two years afterwards, while the printing of the Bible, consisting of 6000 copies, was going forward; during all which time not a syllable was uttered about adding the Apocrypha; *nor did I ever hear of the least complaint being made on the subject of its omission by any of the French Churches, or by any individual.* Among the last things I did before I quitted France, was to pay the money I had subscribed, under the stipulation that the Apocrypha should not be added to the Bible. Up to that period there was not the smallest intention of adding the Apocrypha: for I am certain that the person to whom I paid the money, *who had the best access of any man in France to know the state and sentiments of all the French Protestant Churches,* possessed too much Christian integrity to have allowed him to receive it if he had entertained the most distant idea that such an intention existed.

At length the Montauban Bible was published and circulated. But long afterwards, and *after 3000 copies had been disposed of,* the Paris Bible Society (the instrument, under the British and Foreign Bible Society, of all this mischief) desired that the Apocrypha should be added to it. The *Christians* at Montauban decidedly opposed the measure. They knew by experience that the Bible would circulate freely in France without the Apocrypha—they detested that carnal policy which would lead men to adulterate the word of God—they insisted, that, if those who

desired this addition were indeed convinced that the circulation of the Bible was the work of God, they would not fear its being retarded because it had not the Apocrypha joined with it; and they added, that printing the Apocrypha would both be contrary to the rules of their Society and the *violation of a positive engagement* which they had entered into,—in the faith of which, money had been received by them. Whatever force was in these arguments, they were overruled. The *others* yielded to the Paris Society, and 2500 copies of the Apocrypha were printed and added to the copies of the Montauban Bible that had not been disposed of.

Mr Marzials, the first Minister of Montauban, and President of the Consistory,\* says, in a letter dated from Montauban, August 30, 1825:—“ The cause of the printing of it (the Apocrypha) is frivolous, and we contended (*combatue*) against it when it was proposed.—Mr Bonnard† and I did not choose to have any thing to do with that work. The Bible Society at Paris held out (*pretendit*) that the Apocrypha was required by many of those who purchased the Montauban Bible, and that, in order not to stop its distribution, it was necessary to print a number of copies of it. As I do not like such compliances, (*complaisances*), because it is more than improper (*plus qu'inconvenant*) to join in the same volume the profane with the sacred, I represented that, if they were forcibly convinced that the Biblical work was the work of God, they would not be in the least afraid that the circulation of the Montauban Bible would be retarded because it had not the Apocrypha; and that they ought not to incur an expense contrary to the rules of our Society. Our brother Bonnard spoke

---

\* It was to the former President of the Consistory that I referred in my letter of October 6, 1821, page 20.

† Mr Bonnard is the *Doyen* of the Faculty (that is, Principal of the College) at Montauban.

‘ to the same purpose with me, and several others of the  
 ‘ Committee supported our opposition.—I have heard it  
 ‘ said that some persons complained that the Apocrypha  
 ‘ was wanting in our Bible; but, as to myself personally,  
 ‘ not one has made that complaint to me, although in this  
 ‘ Church and in some others I have distributed very many  
 ‘ (*beaucoup*) copies. Before the printing of the Apocry-  
 ‘ pha, about three thousand copies of the Montauban Bible  
 ‘ had been already sold.”

Respecting the printing of the Apocrypha, both in the Montauban Bible and in other Bibles for the Roman Catholics, Mr Marzials writes as follows, in a letter to a friend of his in this country, dated August 4, 1825:—“None of us approved of the printing of the Apocrypha; and I believe, as you do, that the Bible Society of Paris should not have occupied themselves with it. It was thus that I declared my opinion here when the question was agitated. People often think that they are acting with prudence in their operations, when they do every thing to avoid offending any one; but then they often lose sight of the rights of faith, (*les droits de la foi.*) Happy will it be when human prudence shall not paralyze the action of Christian prudence. They have wished to pay their court to the Roman Catholics in printing these books, and they have not seen that, in associating them with the holy books, they doubted the efficacy of these for their conversion.”

Here I cannot but exult in the Christian conduct of my good friends at Montauban. I feel high satisfaction when I compare it with the worldly policy of many. In all things they have approved themselves to be clear in this matter. Thus wisdom is justified of her children. The weight of the opinions of such men on a religious subject is very different indeed from that of many of the correspondents of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

It was necessary to give a detailed account of the above proceedings, in which Mr Keiffer bore a distinguished

part. While it overthrows Mr Keiffer's facts, it proves not only the forwardness of the Directors of the Bible Society to add the Apocrypha to the sacred volume, but their culpable lack of information, and want of discernment respecting the affairs of the Continent. To those who know of what materials the Paris Bible Committee is generally composed, it will be matter of astonishment that an opinion given by it on a religious subject should be preferred, or even for a moment put in competition, with that of experienced Christians.

---

I now come to Mr Keiffer's testimony respecting Martin's pocket Bible, of which he says, "Though this edition was advertised in the annual Reports, and in several of the Society's circulars, and though it was offered at a very low price, nobody asked for it." So far is this from being the fact, that a great number of copies of this Bible was sent to the South of France, where it circulated freely, and sold *better* than the Bibles to which the Apocrypha was joined. I have lately received this account from a friend who was residing in the South of France when it was sent there, and who has full information on the subject, having taken a particular interest in the circulation of the Scriptures in that country. In Mr Marzial's letter above quoted, he says, "A very great number of the small Bible of Paris have been distributed in this city." M. Chabrand, in his letter above quoted, gives the following decisive testimony, both as to the sale of this Bible and as to the Apocrypha:—"What proves that the people would never have required the Apocrypha, is, that the pocket Bible of Paris, which has it not, any more than the edition of Drummond's Bible, also in 18mo. printed at Geneva, both sold most promptly, (*tres promptement*,) and the edition of the Montauban Bible had not the Apocrypha added to it, till a long time after the circulation of a great number of these Bibles."

So much for Mr Keiffer's facts, which appear to him more than sufficient to prove the impossibility of introducing the unadulterated Bible among the French Protestants.

But Mr Keiffer presents us with another of his facts—“ Let them (the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society) think of the incalculable good they may still effect through Divine grace, amongst twenty-nine millions of souls earnestly seeking salvation.” *Twenty-nine millions of souls*—the whole population of France, *earnestly seeking salvation!* What Christian would not rejoice, were the day arrived when this shall indeed be realized? But what man, who knows any thing of the present state of France, will attach the smallest weight, on a religious subject, to the opinion of one who was capable of making such a statement? Yet, behind such authority would the Directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society shelter themselves, and endeavour to palliate their unjustifiable conduct in adulterating the Bible.

The public will now judge of the Pæan chanted by the Cambridge “ writers,” after exhibiting extracts of the above four letters to the world:—“ These letters contain an irresistible appeal to the members of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and warrant the assertion that the desirable period has not yet arrived, when the uninspired books can be separated from the sacred volume, without very materially diminishing its circulation throughout the greater part of the Christian world, and without endangering the connexion of the Society with all the Continental churches.”

Before quitting this subject, I must observe that Mr Chabrand, to whom the Bible Society intrusted the publication of 10,000 copies of the Bible, together with 5000 Testaments, and 10,000 copies of the books of Psalms, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, and the Christians at Montauban to whom I have alluded—men in the highest situations

in the Protestant College, and in the church, and in civil life—are in every respect far better judges than even *such* of the British and Foreign Bible Society's correspondents in Paris *as are Christians*. They reside in that part of the country where the great body of the Protestants is found. Montauban, in which is the seat of the Protestant College for the education of their ministers, may be styled the root or centre of the French Protestant Churches, where a regular official correspondence is maintained with them all. They have not only a more accurate knowledge of the Protestants throughout France, but are men of much longer standing, and of much greater experience on all religious subjects. Had their opinion been acted on, the Bible would now have been circulating among the Protestants of France without the Apocrypha, and thus a great point would have been gained, even according to the admission of its most strenuous supporters. The truth is, that the Protestants in that country, when the Montauban and Toulouse Bibles were published, had, as Mr Chabrand has observed, so little acquaintance with the Scriptures, that they would never have considered, or even noticed or known, whether or not the Apocrypha was appended to them. So scarce were Bibles when I was at Montauban, that there was not one to be purchased. Several of the students of divinity did not possess one, and were glad to receive from me even the New Testament. I was informed, that, in some of the Protestant churches there was not a Bible to be found in the pulpits. Thus the Directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society, by departing from its fundamental rules and constitution—by consulting persons incompetent to give them advice, and by refusing to listen to experienced Christians, have been the means of contaminating twelve thousand five hundred copies of the Bible, and of reviving and riveting a most baneful and dangerous error and prejudice, with which formerly the minds of multitudes had been deeply imbued.

Not only in France, but over the other parts of the Continent, might the Scriptures be circulated without the Apocrypha. We have seen the testimony of Van Ess to *facts* which, though his intention in producing them was very different, confirm this conclusion; while he has expressly declared, that many enlightened Roman Catholics feel disposed to take no umbrage whatever at the separation of the Apocrypha from the Bible.

Mr Empeytaz, a well known, an experienced, and highly respected Christian pastor, on the Continent, who is well acquainted with Germany, affirms that he has good grounds for stating, that the assertion that the Bible would not be received in Germany without the Apocrypha is “*a gross misrepresentation.*”

Dr Naudi, a physician at Malta, and Secretary of the Bible Society there, writes, (in English,) as follows, Aug. 29, 1825:—“In a letter which we just received by the packet, from the British and Foreign Bible Society, they say that there is in London again additional commotions about the printing of the Apocryphal writings among the inspired books of the Holy Scriptures; and that at Scotland a most powerful opposition rose against the uninspired books. This question in favour of the Scriptures, *viz.* to publish them without any human mixture, should been ended with the British and Foreign Bible Society long before the present day. The vulgar in general in Papal countries know very little about the Scriptures, much less about the controverted parts of them. And the Malta Bible Society did not experience a sensible loss in circulating the Italian Bible without the Apocryphal writings.” Towards the end of this letter, Dr Naudi says, “I desire you would advocate the cause against any mixtures with holy inspired writings. If I were not so pressed for time, as you know according to my last, I would make a kind of tract on this subject, for which I have at hand all the necessary materials.”

About two years ago the Maltese Bible Society, after mature deliberation, sent a remonstrance to the British and Foreign Bible Society against the Apocrypha, and declared they would no longer circulate a spurious intermixture with the Bible. An angry letter was in consequence dispatched to them by the Society, with an order to send off the spurious books to another station.

Here a Bible Society, in the midst of a Roman Catholic population, possessing the means of ascertaining that the Holy Scriptures, unadulterated by the Apocrypha, would be accepted by the people, lifts up its voice against this profanation? And how is the remonstrance received? Is the mistake which the Directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society laboured under, which the above declaration ought to have corrected, candidly acknowledged, and the profane practice gladly abandoned? On the contrary, their indignation is excited, and their adulterated book, falsely called the Bible, instead of being suppressed, is dispatched to some other quarter, where "that man of sin" requires its support, and where, owing to the ignorance of his votaries, no obstacle will be presented to its reception.

In the above case we have the important testimony of Dr Naudi, a foreigner, a witness worthy of credit, formerly a Roman Catholic, and consequently well acquainted with the sentiments of such, that, after a long trial, a Bible Society, in the midst of a Catholic population, *did not experience a sensible loss in circulating the Bible without the Apocrypha.*

Mr Malan, of Geneva, gives it as his decided opinion that the Bible would circulate freely in every part of the Continent without the Apocrypha. In a letter, dated September 26, 1825, he says, "A Bible without the Apocrypha would be received EVERYWHERE (PARTOUT) upon the Continent, excepting by certain pastors who are obstinate in preserving these bad books; but of these there are very few. This is also the opinion of Mr Rochat. The Bible which Mr Drummond caused to be



' printed has not the Apocrypha, and it has a great sale  
 ' (*elle se vend beaucoup*). I consider that to print and  
 ' distribute the Apocrypha, is to sell bread with needles  
 ' concealed in it. He who eats it might perhaps feel some-  
 ' thing prick him, and he might reject what he had taken,  
 ' but it is also to be feared that the needles might choke  
 ' him. It is inconceivable how Calvin and Luther could  
 ' print these books. Why did they not also print the Apo-  
 ' crypha of the New Testament? I have read the discus-  
 ' sion of the Church of Scotland, (I mean of the Bible  
 ' Society,) and I have been grieved (*affligé*) by the reply  
 ' of the Society of London. This I have in detail from a  
 ' member of the London Bible Society who was lately here.  
 ' I do not think that such a work will be blessed, since it is  
 ' interdicted, and God wills that His Word alone should be  
 ' distributed. Let us not fear that the removal of this  
 ' poison will deprive one soul of that morsel of the heavenly  
 ' bread which God has appointed for him. What an error  
 ' is it to believe that a lie can be a useful introduction to  
 ' the truth! Must the Spirit of the Lord in any way have  
 ' for door-keeper (*portier*) the spirit of the darkness of  
 ' this world? I regret much (*Je plains bien*) that Van Ess  
 ' has believed that this concession should be made. *Il a*  
 ' *mis du feu dans son fenil.*"

The more the alleged necessity of adding the Apocry-  
 pha to the Bible is investigated, the more unfounded will  
 the opinion appear, while we see that the policy which  
 dictates this measure, so unlike the character and the  
 whole procedure of the Divine Author of the Christian  
 dispensation, is held in abhorrence by well-informed Chris-  
 tians on the Continent. "Will ye speak wickedly for God?  
 and talk deceitfully for him?"—Job. xiii. 7.

## CHAPTER IV.

THE QUESTION RESPECTING THE ADDITION OF THE APOCRYPHA TO THE SCRIPTURES.—CHARACTER OF THE SCRIPTURES.—CHARACTER OF THE APOCRYPHA.—CIRCULATION OF THE APOCRYPHA BY THE BIBLE SOCIETY.

WHILE arguments are used to prove that the circulation of the Word of God will either be promoted or retarded by the measures which are adopted for the purpose, we should never lose sight of what ought to be the grand object of inquiry respecting the important question now agitated in every Bible Society in Britain—Whether we are at liberty to make an addition to the Book of God, in order to procure its admission among the nations?

The wide circulation of the Holy Scriptures is a matter of the utmost importance. They are able to make men wise unto salvation. Those who have experienced their saving efficacy should earnestly desire to impart this inestimable treasure to all their fellow creatures. Recollecting, however, that the conversion of the soul can only be effected by the power of God, they should aim at its accomplishment in those ways alone which, in his infinite wisdom, he has pointed out. God himself must prepare the hearts of men to receive the good seed; he only can make them willing in the day of his power. Without this all the means which we can employ will prove ineffectual. We may put the Scriptures into men's hand; but, unless they have an inclination to read them, they will only be a treasure in the hands of a fool. This consideration should by no means induce Christians to relax in their endeavours to circulate the Scriptures. The sovereign purposes of God are not our rule of duty. Faith, he has assured us, cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word

of God; but it ought to admonish us to proceed, in all our exertions to promote his glory and the good of immortal souls, according to the rule he has laid down in his word. Following that, we shall both proceed in safety to ourselves and with the greatest benefit to others.

The question, then, of the lawfulness and even of the expediency of adding the Apocrypha to the Holy Scriptures, in order to procure for them a wider circulation, resolves itself into this, "*What saith the Scripture?*" On this point, as on every other, we ought carefully to consult the living oracles, lest it should be said to us as to the Sadducees of old "*Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.*"

Mr Simeon is fully sensible that this is our duty. Ardent as he is for continuing the former practice of the Bible Society, respecting the Apocrypha, he appears to be convinced that it can only be vindicated if found consistent with the divine record. To it, therefore, he has appealed; with what success his readers will determine. It is to be hoped, however, that all who shall henceforth advocate the cause for which he pleads, instead of trifling any longer in producing human authorities, and urging the length of time that has elapsed since the Apocryphal writings usurped a place in the sacred volume, will argue on what shall appear to themselves to be scriptural grounds. We may reasonably expect, too, since this matter has been fully brought to the view of Christians, that nothing less will satisfy them than the conviction that they are borne out in their final decision by the word of God.

At present there are two questions before the British and Foreign Bible Society. The one is, Shall the practice of intermingling the Apocryphal with the Canonical books be continued, or shall it be abandoned? The other is, Shall the Apocrypha be added in any way to the Bible?

The former of these questions, we may conclude, is already settled. Since the impious practice of the intermixture of the Apocryphal with the Canonical books has been

exposed in all the deformity of its presumptuous wickedness, in confounding the language of Holy Writ, converting it into a very Babel, and in drawing a darker veil over the hearts of men already seduced by the sorceries of Babylon, we may presume that it will speedily disappear.

We come then to the second question, Whether it be lawful for the British and Foreign Bible Society to add the Apocrypha to the Bible in any way whatever? Here it is not necessary to repeat what has been already advanced, that, if this Society shall persist in its present practice, it is imperiously required, on the grounds of integrity and fair dealing to change its name and its fundamental rules, with the language of its reports; in short, to new-model the whole of its constitution. Nor shall I dilate on what has been proved in the Statement of the Edinburgh Committee, how much more pernicious it is to join with the Holy Scriptures the Apocryphal books—writings which are viewed by many as of divine origin, than to send forth the sacred volume, accompanied with notes and comments confessedly of human composition.

Let this question then be divested of every adventitious circumstance, and considered simply on its own merits; and let us recollect, that it is a much more serious question than many seem to suppose. Those who have hitherto treated it lightly, or have not viewed it as involving much personal responsibility, would do well to pause and reflect before they give countenance any longer to the practice referred to. Let us then put entirely out of view every argument from expediency, every inquiry respecting the rules or practice of the British and Foreign Bible Society, every consideration connected with the opinions or authority of men, of whatever name, ancient or modern; and, turning our eyes to Him who hath commanded us to call no man father upon earth, examine this question, which now comes practically home to every one of us, in the light of that Word which he hath given to be a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path. For this purpose,

it is necessary to bring into view the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures. The common erroneous idea, so degrading to their character, that the Scriptures are written under different degrees of inspiration, induces some to favour the practice of joining with them the Apocrypha; and on this very ground its lawfulness is sometimes defended.

---

The Bible is the book of God, in the writing of which, the men who were employed were only instruments in his hand, who often did not understand the meaning of the words they were inspired to utter or to record. *All scripture is given by the inspiration of God, and on this account it is called the word of God.* This plenary inspiration, claimed by the Scriptures, signifies the infusion of ideas and words into the minds of the writers by the operation of God. *“And he said unto me, Son of man, go, get thee unto the house of Israel, and speak with my words unto them. Moreover, he said unto me, Son of man, all my words that I shall speak unto thee receive in thine heart, and hear with thine ears. And go, get thee to them of the captivity, unto the children of thy people, and speak unto them, and tell them, Thus saith the Lord God, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear.”* Ezek. iii. 4. 10. 11.

The Scriptures contain the revelation of the will of God; and he is able to communicate his will to the instrument he makes use of for this purpose, in whatever way he pleases, although the manner of his operation we cannot trace. In the words spoken by the ass of Balaam, we have an example of this communication through an unconscious and involuntary instrument: In Balaam himself, through one who was conscious, but involuntary: In Caiaphas, through one who was voluntary in what he said, but unconscious of its import. And in the writers of the Scriptures we have an example of agents both voluntary and conscious, but equally actuated by the Spirit of God.

The sacred writers uniformly claim for the Scriptures

this highest degree of inspiration, and give no intimation of their being written under an inspiration of any kind but one. The declaration of the Apostle, that all Scripture is given by the inspiration of God, refers to the whole of the Old Testament, which Timothy had known from his childhood. But, as part of the New Testament was at that time written, and as the whole of it is classed by its writers with the Old Testament, this expression of Paul equally applies to the New. The Apostle Peter ranks all the epistles of Paul with "*the other Scriptures,*" thereby intimating that they are of the same authority, and showing that the writings both of the Old and New Testaments went by the name of "Scriptures."

To the writings of the Old Testament this highest degree of inspiration is ascribed in the New. "Well *spake the Holy Ghost* by Esaias the Prophet," Acts xxviii. 25. "As *he saith* also in Osee," Rom. ix. 25. "Wherefore also *the Holy Ghost saith,*" Heb. iii. 7. "Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us, for after that *he had said,*" Heb. x. 14. "Searching what or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when *it testified* before hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow," 1 Peter i. 11. "*Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said,*" Acts iv. 25. Thus God "at sundry times, and in divers manners, *spake* in time past unto the fathers by the prophets," Heb. i. 1.\*

In like manner it was promised to the Apostles, that they should receive the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon them, Acts i. 8. Accordingly, on the day of Pentecost, they began to speak with other tongues, as *the Spirit gave them utterance,* Acts ii. 4. "They were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the *word of God* with boldness, Acts iv. 31. "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the

---

\* "*He saith*" is repeated, or must be understood in verses 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 13, of this first chapter, in the various quotations from the Old Testament.

Holy Ghost teacheth," 1 Cor. ii. 13. "Since ye seek a proof of Christ *speaking* in (or by) me," 2 Cor. xiii. 3. "The things that I write unto you are the *commandments of the Lord*," 1 Cor. xiv. 37. "When ye received the word of God which ye heard from us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, *the word of God*," 1 Thess. ii. 13. "He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man *but God*, who hath also given unto us his Holy Spirit," 1 Thess. iv. 8. Such was the inspiration by which the Apostles wrote, nor do they ever once intimate that they were not writing under its influence; and such inspiration, and no less, was indispensably necessary for those to whom the keys of the kingdom of heaven were committed. The word that the Apostles were to declare, was to open and to shut, to bind and to loose, in heaven and in earth. "He breathed on them, and saith unto them, receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained," John xx. 22. "*He that heareth you, heareth me*," Luke x. 16.

From the above, and many other passages of Scripture, we are taught the nature of that inspiration by which the prophets and apostles wrote. The manner of communicating the revelations might differ, as we learn, Num. xii. 6. 8.; but their certainty and authority were the same, "for the prophecy came not of old time by the will of man, but holy men of God *spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*." Neither was it the apostles who spake, but it was the Spirit of their Father, who spake in them, Matt. x. 20.\* This full inspiration of the

---

\* Irenaeus, who conversed with Polycarp, the disciple of John, who himself lived but a few years after that Apostle, says, concerning the inspiration of the Scriptures, "Well knowing that the Scriptures are perfect, and dictated by the word of God, and his Spirit." "The sacred books," says Origen, "came from the fulness of the Spirit; so that there is nothing in the

Book of God, without which it could not properly be called his “*word*,” should teach us to regard it with the highest veneration. “The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times,” Psal. xii. 6. “The law of the Lord is perfect,” Psal. xix. 7.\*

The Bible, indited by God himself, stands alone in the world. It differs from all other writings, not in degree only; but also in kind. It is the voice of Jehovah, the word which he hath spoken, which he hath magnified above all his name, Psal. cxxxviii. 2., by which he will judge the world at the last day. No book, whatever may be its origin, however excellent in itself, however true and unexceptionable it may appear to us, can be placed on a level with the Bible. No book exists which can be pronounced to be like or second to it:

“*Cui par est nihil, et nihil secundum.*”

The Bible is an emanation from Him who is the light of the world, and it conveys that light to men. Other books may borrow from this light, and hold up to view the light which they borrow; but no book besides transmits it immediately from Him.

The Bible, as it bears the divine image and superscription, speaks with the authority of God. As no other book contains one spark of original divine light, so no other book possesses one grain of divine authority. The Bible

---

Prophets, or the law, or the Gospel of the Apostles, which descends not from the fulness of the Divine Majesty.” And again Origen speaks of the Scriptures, “*not as the writings of men*, but that they have been written and delivered to us from the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, by the will of the Father of all things, through Jesus Christ.”

\* On the inspiration of the Scriptures, see “The Evidence and Authority of Divine Revelation,” by the Author, vol. i. chap. 5.; and the Remarks on that Chapter in the Christian Observer, vol. [xxii. p. 488. A new edition of that work will shortly be published.



is *the sword of the Spirit—the sharp two-edged sword* which proceeds out of the mouth of Him who is the first and the last—the Almighty ; it is the *fire and the hammer* of God.

If the Apocryphal books appeared to us the most excellent, next to the Bible, that ever were written, still it would not be lawful to join them to the sacred record. This would be *wrong* in itself, and its *consequences* must be bad. It would be wrong to allow human writings to usurp, in a certain measure, however inferior in degree, a place of the same kind, with those that are divine. This would be a degradation of the word of God ; a presumptuous attempt to invade that consecrated ground which their divine Author has assigned to the Holy Scriptures, and on which he has purposed that they shall for ever stand alone. It would be a daring imputation on that word, as if it were not perfect and complete in itself—divinely fitted to make men wise unto salvation, and thoroughly furnished unto all good works,—as if something, which God had omitted in his word, was required to be supplied. Many human writings are good in their proper place. Men of God, taught by his Spirit, have been raised up in every age to preach his gospel, and to place before others, in writing, the things they ought to believe and to practise ; but all they have spoken, and all they have written, that is good and useful, has been taught them by the Holy Spirit, through the medium of his own word ; they have brought forth no new truth that it does not contain. When the canon of Scripture was closed, all that divine light which it pleased God to vouchsafe to this sinful world was imparted, and not a single ray was to be added.

It is not only wrong in itself to connect the Apocryphal writings with the Holy Scriptures, placing them side by side, but its consequences must also be bad. It leads to a certain undefined idea, in the minds even of those who are aware of the distinction between them and

the canonical books, that to these Apocryphal writings belongs something of that emanation of divine light with which the Holy Scriptures illuminate the world, and of that divine authority with which they address the children of men. A portion of the inherent qualities of the one will, in the reader's imagination, be imperceptibly transferred to the other, and the immeasurable space betwixt them will gradually diminish, if it does not altogether disappear. The reiterated explanations which the most enlightened abettors of the Apocryphal books have felt it necessary to append to them, prove how much they are aware that this must be the case. Such is the anti-scriptural nature of these writings, so directly do they stand in opposition to the revelation of the grace of God, that if any man receives the doctrine they contain, and continues in that doctrine, he shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.

The above considerations serve to show the unlawfulness and the guilt of adding the Apocrypha, of human invention, to the Bible, of Divine origin; but the question has not been left to be decided solely on this ground. God has been pleased to interpose his authority to settle it for ever.

It is his gracious design to bring back fallen man to himself, and to preserve him from being led astray by the erring dictates of his own blinded reason. For this purpose, he has vouchsafed a perfect revelation of his will, to guide and to direct him in the way he should go. But man, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, is ever prone, like Uzza, presumptuously to put forth his hand to support the sacred ark. To guard against this tendency, and to preserve his revelation pure and entire, God has annexed the most awful threatenings to the slightest attempt to add to, or to corrupt his word; and, as on Mount Sinai, when he delivered the first part to the Jews, he has fenced it with bounds round about, that neither priests nor people may break through. These warn-

ings, backed by the most awful sanctions, it should be particularly noticed, are interspersed through every part of the sacred volume; and each one of them is, for the same reasons, equally applicable to the whole.

In this manner, that portion of the Scriptures called the *Law* is guarded:—“*Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it,*” Deut. iv. 2.; xii. 32.

In the next division, called the *Hagiographa*, it is written, “*Every word of God is pure: He is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.*” Prov. xxx. 56.

In the prophetic writings, the warning is again repeated. They are closed with an intimation, that no more prophets were to be sent, till the Forerunner of Jehovah, who was to come suddenly to his temple, should appear. Israel is then commanded to remember that revelation which had been made to Moses concerning Jesus, which the prophets had been commissioned to illustrate, but not to alter. “*Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments,*” Mal. iv. 4.

To guard the inviolable integrity of the sacred Scriptures from their commencement to their close, the flaming sword is once more unsheathed. As, at the termination of the Old Testament, where the attention of Israel is called to the first appearance of the Son of God as the Saviour, they are instructed that the prophetic testimony to him is finished; so, at the conclusion of the New Testament, when the attention of all men is directed to his second coming as the Final Judge, an assurance is given that the canon of Scripture is completed. Then, when the last sound of the voice from heaven is heard, words are uttered by Him who has the keys of hell and of death, at which both the ears of every one that heareth them should tingle. “*I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophe-*

*cy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book ; and if any man shall take from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. Rev. xxii. 18, 19.*

The Apocrypha is an *addition* to the Bible. It presents itself to the world as such. It professes to contain messages from God, sometimes communicated immediately by himself, sometimes conveyed through the medium of angels, who are represented as standing before his Sacred Majesty. The claim to inspiration is not more explicitly asserted for themselves by the writers of the Scriptures than it is arrogated by the authors of the Apocryphal books. No higher demand for attention to their message can be made by holy prophets and apostles, than when they assert, "*Thus saith the Lord.*" Yet this is the language in which the Apocrypha addresses mankind.

In the second book of Esdras, the writer, having begun by declaring his lineage, affirms, "the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Go thy way, and show my people," &c. "Speak thou therefore unto them, saying, *Thus saith the Lord.*"—"Thus saith the Almighty Lord." This expression occurs four times in the first chapter. The second chapter opens with, "Thus saith the Lord," which, in the course of it, is repeated nine times ; and then an angel is represented as speaking to the writer, "Then the angel said unto me, go thy way, and tell my people what manner of things, and how great wonders of the Lord thy God thou hast seen." The rest of the book proceeds in the same manner, the author continuing to recite divine communications, made to himself, as they had been to Moses. Baruch xi. 21. *Thus saith the Lord.*

In the book of Tobit, a long interview with an angel is related, who affirms that he is one of the seven holy angels who go in and out before the glory of the Holy One.

“Now, therefore,” says this angel, “give God thanks, for I go up to him that sent me; but write all things which are done in a book,” Tobit xii. 15. 20. God himself is often introduced by the Apocryphal writers, as communicating his will to them; and long speeches are ascribed to Him.\* Thus the writers of the Apocrypha come as the bearers of messages from God, and as such they deliver them to mankind. They pretend to communicate a portion of spiritual light, not borrowed from the Holy Scriptures, but immediately derived from the source of light. In every sense of the word, these books, then, present themselves as an addition to Divine Revelation; and, if they were what they pretend to be, would be entitled to equal attention and reverence with whatever is contained in the Scriptures. Here then there is no medium. The conclusion is inevitable: *the Apocrypha is either an addition to the Scriptures by God himself, or it is the work of lying prophets.*

Now, then, we come to the great question, the resolving of which will decide the lawfulness or the guilt of adding the Apocrypha to the Holy Scriptures: Is its claim to be a revelation from God, well founded, or is it not?

The oracles of God were committed to the Jews. God made his ancient people the depositaries of the Old Testament Scriptures, as long as that dispensation continued; and in his holy providence he so influenced their minds, that, in this respect, they were entirely faithful to the trust committed to them. Although, in general, ignorant of their spiritual meaning, yet did they hold the “living oracles” in such veneration, that they maintained that “God had more care of the letters and syllables of the law than of the stars in heaven; and that upon each tittle of it whole mountains of doc-

---

\* The absurd, unintelligible speeches, replete with trifling nonsense, ascribed to God in different places, prove the Apocrypha to be not only a human, but a most *impious* composition.

trines hung." Hence, every individual letter was numbered by them, and notice was taken how often it occurred. They preserved the Scriptures pure and unadulterated, without either addition or diminution, until Shiloh came, to whom the gathering of the people was to be, and until, having stamped them with his divine authority, he delivered them to his church as those Scriptures that testify of Him. Do then the Apocryphal books, all, or any of them, form a part of those sacred writings committed by God to the Jews, and preserved entire by them? *No.* Have they received, like those Holy writings, the attestation of Jesus and his apostles, placing upon them the broad seal of Heaven? They have *not.* The question then is forever decided. The evidence against them is conclusive, after which not the shadow of a claim can be advanced in their favour as forming a part of the Word of God.

Although, however, the question be thus decided, yet, in order to produce the fullest conviction in the minds of all who know the truth as it is in Jesus, and to exclude every doubt, let us call another witness. We shall appeal, then, to the internal character of those writings—a species of proof of which every Christian can judge, and which of itself is sufficient to determine the point at issue, although no other evidence on the subject existed. If the Apocryphal writings be of God, they will bear the impress of their divine original. Let us try them by this test. *“To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.”*

Viewing, then, the Apocryphal writings as standing by the side of the Holy Scriptures, what character do they present? Do they offer any thing new; any thing that might be of importance to know beyond what is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament? Do they teach us the way of God more perfectly? This will not be pretended by any one. Do their histories, which they present to us as true, and their manner of

narrating them, comport with the dignity of holy writ? Do they possess internal marks of being authentic? Do they bear the character of a Revelation from God, given for our instruction? So far is this from being the case, that many of their narrations are absurd, incredible, and self-contradictory, and others are at variance with the canonical Scriptures; while they contain doctrines on the most important subjects directly opposed to the testimony of God. "Grant me the Apocrypha as a part of the inspired volume," said a speaker lately in one of the Bible Committee Meetings, "and with this engine I will undertake to overturn all the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God: and, in their stead, to establish every heresy which disfigures the Church of Rome—the doctrine of purgatory—prayers for the dead—the intercession of saints—and justification by works."

The above assertions are fully confirmed by the writers of the Cambridge Remarks, published for the express purpose of supporting the practice of the Bible Society in adding the Apocrypha to the Word of God. On the idea of the Society's abandoning that practice, they say, "Let us suppose the case of a Bible not containing the Apocrypha, to fall into the hands of an inquirer after the truth: upon reading it he exclaims, "I find here none of the doctrines upon which so much stress is laid by my priests!" The British and Foreign Bible Society has furnished the priests with an obvious and prompt answer: "No," reply the priests, "you find not our doctrines in the Bible you have read, but count the number of the books in your Bible, and see whether none have been left out. Look at Daniel and Esther, and count the chapters, and you will see enough to convince you that Protestants have been tampering with the Scriptures." Here is an unequivocal testimony, from persons who advocate the cause of the Apocrypha, that it is the production of false prophets who have brought in damnable heresies, teaching doctrines different from those of the Holy

Scriptures, which are the great supporters of the mystery of Babylon.

Proofs that the Apocrypha is “abundantly interspersed with absurdities, superstitions, falsehoods, false doctrines, and contradictions, both of itself and of the Word of God,” have already been referred to in the specimens annexed to the first statement of the Edinburgh Committee, and their number might be vastly increased.\* But, waving for the present every other charge against it, let us turn our attention to a single point of the last importance, which involves an answer to that most momentous of all questions, *How shall man be just with God?* The Scriptures assure us that, if any man denies the doctrine of justification by faith without works, he becomes a debtor to do the whole law. What judgment then are we bound to form of a book which, openly contradicting this fundamental doctrine, and exhibiting another way of acceptance with God, makes void the whole plan of redemption? To this one point, then, of the explicit contravention, by the Apocrypha, of the grand scripture doctrine of justification, I now call the reader’s attention;—that doctrine which is peculiar to the Christian religion, and unknown to every false one; that doctrine which so remarkably illustrates and honours the finished work of the Redeemer; that doctrine of which God in his word has affirmed, that the man who perverts it, Christ shall profit him nothing.

It is written in the Apocrypha, “*Whoso honoureth his father maketh an atonement for his sins.*” And again, “*Water will quench a flaming fire, and alms maketh an atonement for sins.*”—Eccl. iii. 3. 30. Among all the lies by which the great adversary of God deceives the na-

---

\* See the “Admonition concerning the Apocryphal books, wherein are showed the reasons and grounds wherefore they are here (in their Bible) omitted. Ordained at the Synod of Dort, in the year 1618. Set out and annexed by the Deputies, to the end of the Dutch Bible newly translated.”



tions, none was ever forged by him calculated to make more deadly havoc among the fallen children of Adam. More explicit contradictions of the true sayings of God, more completely subversive of the way of salvation by Jesus Christ; sentiments more dishonourable to God, more contrary to his holiness, more derogatory to his justice, or more fraught with mortal poison, and more destructive to the souls of men,—cannot be imagined.

The Apostle Paul solemnly declared to the churches of Galatia, that if an angel from heaven should preach any other gospel than that which he had preached unto them, he should be accursed. The very thing which the Apostle here supposed has, in the Apocrypha, been realized. An angel from heaven, it assures us, has descended, who says he comes from God. “*I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints, and which go in and out before the glory of the Holy One—not of any favour of mine but by the will of our God I come.*” —Tobit xii. 15, 18. And that very doctrine does this angel explicitly contradict which the Apostle so earnestly inculcated, accompanied with the solemn asseveration that the curse of God should rest on any creature who should dare to pervert it. “*It is better,*” says this angel, “*to give alms than to lay up gold, for alms doth deliver from death, and shall purge away all sin.*” —Tobit xii. 8, 9.

If the man or angel, who shall preach another gospel than that which the Bible contains, is, by the Holy Ghost, pronounced accursed, then does this awful denunciation apply to a book which, pretending to record the message of an angel from heaven, teaches another gospel. Under this anathema then the Apocrypha lies. By the authority of an apostle we are bound to hold it accursed.\*

---

\* Is it possible for the writers of the Cambridge Remarks to enter their dissent from this conclusion, and at the same time to continue their signature to the following article?—“They also are to be had accursed, that presume

“The prophet which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die.”—Deut. xviii: 20. The writers of the Apocrypha have spoken in the name of God what he hath not commanded them to speak: They have contradicted the word that he hath spoken: They are therefore false prophets, deceitful workers, worthy to be adopted by him who speaks lies in hypocrisy: The man who has given heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, when he reads the Bible, as delivered by God, exclaims, *I find here none of the doctrines upon which so much stress is laid by my priests!* No, reply the priests of the man of sin, *you find not our doctrines in the Bible you have read, for the addition which we had made to it, where they are contained, is taken away.*

—The Bible, then, and the Apocrypha stand in direct opposition the one to the other. The Bible predicts the coming of that wicked one whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming. The coming of that wicked one “is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received

---

“to say that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature. For holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.”—Article xviii. of the Church of England. All those Directors of the Bible Society who have signed the above article, should seriously consider what they are doing in holding out to the nations another Gospel,—another way of salvation. I do not quote the above article merely as an *argumentum ad hominem*. It contains essential truth, and therefore it behoves as much those who have not signed it, as those who have, to consider what they are doing in adding a book to the word of God which expressly contradicts it, and which that word pronounces *Accursed*.

‘ not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And  
 ‘ for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that  
 ‘ they should believe a lie ; that they all might be damned  
 ‘ who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unright-  
 ‘ eousness.” That wicked one, as the Spirit expressly fore-  
 told, has appeared. But, unable to support himself by  
 means of his most subtle perversions of the Holy Scriptures,  
 in which he finds “ none ” of his peculiar doctrines, he has  
 resorted to the impious fraud of adulterating them. Satan,  
 transformed into an angel of light, has provided a large  
 addition to the Word of God in the Apocryphal books.  
 These forgeries “ the Son of Perdition ” has eagerly grasped  
 at : he even intermingles them with the Scriptures in such  
 a way that, to the great body of his adherents, it is impos-  
 sible to distinguish the one from the other. This spurious,  
 motely book, which he calls “ the Holy Bible,” contain-  
 ing partly the light of heaven, and partly the smoke of the  
 bottomless pit, he has adopted as his own. He seals it,  
 for himself, and thunders out his anathema against all who  
 shall not receive it as “ SACRED AND CANONICAL.”

This poisoning of the waters of the sanctuary in their very  
 source, may be designated the chief of the ways of “ that  
 ‘ old serpent called the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth  
 ‘ the whole world.” *None of all his works can be compared  
 with this.* It is here the man of sin has entrenched him-  
 self. Once possessed of this mongrel book, his fortress is  
 impregnable. He can now maintain all his falsehoods. This  
 book being placed in the hands of his adherents, that  
 complaint, which otherwise would have sounded in his ears  
 as the knell of death, shall no more be heard. “ *I find  
 ‘ here none of the doctrines upon which so much stress is  
 ‘ laid by my priests.*”

The writers of the Cambridge Remarks, speaking of  
 the peculiar tenets of Popery, affirm, that only *two errors*  
 out of the whole list seem to receive any support from  
 Apocryphal quotations,—purgatory, and the invocation of  
 saints ; and, by a misapplication of Scripture, they endea-

vour to prove, that one of these errors is taught by the word of God; thus seeming to be regardless what mischief they do, provided they can successfully advocate the cause of the Apocrypha. But are these gentlemen, amidst their quotations from Rainolds, and Doddridge, and Hooker, &c. &c. by which they would prop up and apologise for these "*Jewish fables*," and vile forgeries, calling them "Holy," "Sacred," and "Divine;"\* and affirming that their fitness "for the public information of life and manners," is "most worthily approved" by the whole church of Christ;—are they so utterly forgetful of what was the grand hinge of the controversy between the Reformers and Roman Catholics—the doctrine of justification by faith without works—as to make the above assertion?

But these writers have another method of vindicating the conduct of the British and Foreign Bible Society in circulating the Apocrypha on the Continent. After adducing the authority of those whose names have been mentioned, they triumphantly add, as if they had been quoting Scripture, "to these passages we offer no addition." And then they proceed:—"But it may be well to remark a fact, of which many who have taken upon themselves to censure the Apocrypha, seem not to be

---

\* The Cambridge writers give the following quotation from Hooker:—"Is it not acknowledged that these books are holy, that they are ecclesiastical and sacred, that to term them divine, as being for their excellency next unto them which are properly so termed, is no way to honour them above desert?" Were they not ashamed when they produced such a quotation? It is to be hoped, that so monstrous an example of prejudice or ignorance, extracted from the writings of a human author, whatever distinguished epithet may be generally attached to his name, will convince every one of the necessity of calling no man father upon earth; but of recurring, in every question in which our duty to God is concerned, to the living oracles which never can mislead us. Because Hooker called the Apocrypha *divine*, which the Scriptures denounce as *accursed*, are we to set aside *their* authority and bow to *his*? Because Augustine, whom these gentlemen also quote, could not distinguish between the doctrines of justification and sanctification, are we to give up the important distinction?

‘ aware, viz. that the different versions vary materially from each other; so that any particular passage may not wear the same objectionable appearance in a foreign translation it does in our own.’ Here then is another shelter provided for the Apocrypha in the midst of this bush fighting, in which these gentlemen have engaged in its defence. Let us see, then, what “appearance” the passages above quoted “wear” in that translation of the Apocrypha which the British and Foreign Bible Society has caused to be circulated among the whole Protestant population of France. “*Qui honore son père, expie ses péchés.*” *L'eau étient le feu ardent, et l'aumone fait l'expiation des péchés.*” Eccles. iii. 4. 31. “*Il vaut mieux faire l'aumone que de thésaurier de l'or; car l'aumone délivre de la mort, et nettoie tout péché.*” Tob. xii. 8, 9. Thus among these ignorant people has the British and Foreign Bible Society been scattering firebrands, arrows, and death. In giving them the Apocrypha with the Word of God, they have been administering poison along with wholesome food. “In the mixture of poison,” says Claude, “with what is wholesome food, the poison overcomes the food, and not the food the poison; so that it is not the food which hinders the bad effects of the poison, but it is the poison, on the contrary, which prevents the good effect of the food. In the same way, in the mixture of Romish errors with evangelical truths, the force of the errors surmounts that of the truth; and the truth, however salutary it may be, does not prevent the effect of the error which causes the damnation of the man; but, on the contrary, the error prevents the good effect of the truth.”

Many woes are denounced in Scripture against false prophets, who are accused of treading down the pastures, and fouling the residue of the waters with their feet, Ezek. xxx. 4. In opposition to their folly and wickedness, the Lord says, “The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully: What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord. Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a

hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?" Jer. xxiii. 28. These and many other passages, are directly applicable to the Apocrypha. The writers of it may be justly termed prophets of deceit, and of their own heart, that prophesy lies in the name of the Lord, *Saying, I have dreamed, I have dreamed*, Jer. xxiii. 25, 26. They have, indeed, imitated the style of the Scriptures, like the impostors, concerning whom it is written, "Therefore, behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that steal my words every one from his neighbour. Behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that use their tongues, and say, He saith. Behold, I am against them that prophesy false dreams, saith the Lord, and do tell them, and cause my people to err by their lies, and by their lightness; yet I sent them not, nor commanded them: therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the Lord." Jer. xxiii. 30. "Thus saith the Lord God, woe unto the foolish prophets, that follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing! Have ye not seen a vain vision, and have ye not spoken a lying divination, whereas ye say, the Lord sayeth it; albeit I have not spoken? Therefore thus saith the Lord God, because ye have spoken vanity, and seen lies, therefore behold I am against you, saith the Lord God. And mine hand shall be upon the prophets that see vanity, and that divine lies." Ezek. xiii. 3, 7.

Again it is written,—“If a man, walking in the Spirit and falsehood, do lie, saying, I will prophesy unto thee of wine and of strong drink; he shall even be the prophet of this people.” Micah ii. 11. This censure is applicable to those who read about Tobit and his Dog, and Bel and the Dragon, conceiving them to form a part of the word of God. And do those who circulate the Apocrypha for the purpose of rendering the Scriptures palatable to persons plunged in the grossest superstition and ignorance, using it as a passport for the Bible, really believe that God would have permitted the writings of those who prophesied lies, to be appended to the instructions which he delivered to his servants for the purpose of inducing

Israel to peruse them? No. He declares that the tendency of their dreams was to make the people forget his name. Jer. xxiii.

Never since the Reformation has so much been done to corrupt the word of God by blending it with the Apocryphal writings, as by the British and Foreign Bible Society—a Society which designates itself exclusively a *Bible* Society; which holds out to the world, by its rules, that it publishes nothing but the Bible; which anxiously repeats this in every variety of expression in its reports; and most complacently records the flattering messages on this head which it receives from all quarters, and the many adulatory speeches to which it listens in its annual meetings.\*

---

\* At the annual meeting of the Bible Society, in May 1821, one of the speakers expressed himself as follows:—"That Holy Book which has brought us together, tells us, that we ought to give flattering titles to no man, and that we can do no more than our duty to God in promoting his cause, since, in so far as it is promoted, the success is to be ascribed to an influence which may excite our gratitude, but can lay no foundation for self-complacency."

"There is only one thing more I wish to add," said another speaker, "and that is on the manner of conducting the general meetings of the Bible Society. I long to see the day when they shall be conducted with perfect simplicity, and when we shall studiously avoid every thing of panegyric or eulogy. This line of conduct we have adopted at Norwich, and it appears to me to have greatly increased the success of the Bible Society there.— My heart went along with my friend from North Britain, when he was speaking of the evils of panegyric. We do not come here to panegyricize, but to acknowledge the unmerited mercies of our God and Saviour. We come to acknowledge, as in the dust, that we have all sinned and come short of his glory; and that, so far from having any degree of merit for what we have done, we have cause to lament that we have done so little."

Whoever has read the accounts of the annual meetings of the British and Foreign Bible Society, will see how suitable such admonitions were. The sentiments delivered by these speakers are worthy of the attention not only of that Society to whom they were addressed, but of every society of a religious nature. There is often much to reprehend on this point. The practice, too, which has unhappily crept in, of expressing approbation by tokens of applause that may befit a theatre, or any worldly meeting, are altogether incongruous in a religious assembly. This subject deserves the serious attention of all who wish to see such meetings conducted with that solemnity

What conclusion must the well instructed Roman Catholic form when he receives that book which this Society circulates on the Continent? Will he not say, "If I am to believe that these men are acting honestly, I must be convinced that they, equally with myself, consider the Apocrypha as part and parcel of the word of God? This whole volume, which they have put into my hands, contains, according to them, neither more nor less than the books of the Holy Scriptures; for, in the most solemn manner, they certify, that "the Society is an institution which confines itself with rigorous exactness to the dissemination of the Holy Scriptures."\*

---

which, while it comports with their proper character, is calculated to produce a beneficial effect on those who are present.

\* The circular letter of the Society addressed to the Bible Societies of Germany, Prussia, and Switzerland, dated May 15, 1820, (See Report 1821, p. 81.) concludes as follows:—"And it (the Society) begs leave most distinctly to state, that, with the only exception of the historical records of its transactions, (such as its annual reports, extracts of correspondence, &c.) it confines itself exclusively to the translation, printing, and circulation of the Holy Scriptures." Who, upon reading this, could conceive that the directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society, who have been *printing and circulating* the Apocrypha all over the Continent, do not really regard it as a part of the Holy Scriptures?

If any one wishes to be acquainted with the various shifts and subterfuges to which the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society has been driven, in this discussion respecting the Apocrypha, he may peruse that able pamphlet lately published, entitled, "*Preface to observations on the circulation of the Apocrypha.*" It is there mentioned, that "a very distinguished member of the committee contended, that "Although the words Holy Scripture meant nothing but the inspired Word of God, these words, Holy Scriptures, meant something more than the inspired Word of God only, and might therefore fairly include the Apocrypha." "It is so notorious," says the writer of the Preface, "that no report has ever directly or indirectly informed the subscribers that their money was expended in the propagation of the Apocryphal fables—that the committee dread the fact being declared, which they could not dread if it had been clearly expressed in the reports. The intention of these words, (without note or comment,) was to convey to the country, that God's Word was circulated, without any mixture of man's word. So conscious was the committee of this, that al-



But what shall an unlearned Catholic suppose, when a book is given to him by this Society, designated, on its title-page, "The Holy Bible of the Old and New Testaments," without the smallest intimation that any thing besides is contained within its boards; while in this volume he finds the books of inspiration, and the Apocryphal books, alternately and variously intermingled, and actually incorporated; so that no man, without an intimate acquaintance with the Bible and its doctrines, could possibly distinguish the one from the other? Must not he be convinced that this book is in very deed what the British and Foreign Bible Society holds to be the Bible? Is it possible that he should form a different conclusion? Has any thing more effectual been done by the Church of Rome, practically to sanction the Apocryphal books, to authenticate them as inspired writings, or even to identify them with the Sacred Volume?\*

The necessity of adulterating the Scriptures, in order to their circulation on the Continent, it has been shown, does not exist; but, if it actually did exist, is the British and

'most every one who spoke, expressed his fears lest the delusion which they had been practising should be published." At another place it is said, "Delusion has then been practised,—if the prospectus (of the Society) speaks of the inspired Word of God;—if the reports of the Society invariably speak of the "pure Word of God,"—"unadulterated Word of God,"—"unmixed Word of God;" and yet the committee meant something that was not pure, not unmixed, not unadulterated," p. 25, 11, 14.

\* Even comparatively learned and enlightened men are in this way misled. Some time ago, a person at Malta was engaged in conversation with a well-informed Englishman, a member of the Committee of the Bible Society there, and was reproaching the practice of intermingling the Apocrypha, and thus falsifying the Sacred Word. The member of Committee argued that the Apocryphal writings might be easily distinguished from those that are Canonical. The other immediately produced a Bible, and pointing to one of the books in which the Apocrypha is intermingled, said, can you tell me what parts are Canonical and what are not? After attentively looking at the book for some time, he replied, "Really I am not so well acquainted with this part of the Bible, and cannot tell."

Foreign Bible Society at liberty to neglect, nay even to oppose and to brave the repeated and solemn warnings, contained in the Scriptures against adding to the word of God? Is it lawful for that Society to present to the world, as on a level with inspired writings, what it *knows* to be uninspired—to send forth with the prophets of the Lord, prophets that prophesy lies?—To mingle, with the true sayings of God, the falsehoods of lying prophets who, both in the Old Testament and in the New, are denounced as under his curse.

The Apocryphal writings delivered to the people as part of the divine oracles are calculated, by their absurdities, to make men deists or atheists rather than Christians—and, by their false doctrines, to cause their readers to wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction. When the British and Foreign Bible Society, therefore, send out these writings as a part of the divine word, is it free from the blood of the men who, incapable of separating the chaff from the wheat, shall eternally perish by imbibing the false doctrine it contains?\*

Why has not this Society listened to the speech lately intended to be made in its Committee, by the much respected Rector of a parish in the neighbourhood of London? He had “come to town,” he said, “on purpose to bear his testimony ‘against the horrible idea of man’s attempting to bolster ‘up the word of the living God by a lie. Granted, that ‘the Catholics will not receive the Bible without this false ‘book being appended to it—and let all the priests array ‘themselves to oppose it—let there be a pitched battle, and ‘see whether God or man will prevail. Can he who gave

---

\* A Christian officer lately visited the sick-bed of a soldier in the last stage of an incurable illness. It was in vain that the dying man was urged to rest all his hopes of salvation on the merits of a crucified Saviour; he resisted every passage of the word of God, by adducing doctrines from the Apocrypha at variance with the Gospel; and thus it was found impossible to convince him of sin, and to lead him to rely on the finished work of Christ.

‘ that word not open a door for its reception. Or has the  
 ‘ Society the presumption to imagine that God will go  
 ‘ forth to battle with such miserable aid to secure his vic-  
 ‘ tory ?”

Admitting it to be a fact, that the whole Bible cannot be circulated on the Continent without the Apocrypha, this gives no licence to any man to do evil in order to attain the good he hopes for. If the people there will not receive it without this deleterious mixture, the Bible Society is not entitled to prepare and to put into their hands this poisoned cup. Supposing such a state of things really to exist, the way of the Society is sufficiently clear. Let them print the Bible in the different Continental languages, placing it with booksellers at a low price, and with those persons who will interest themselves in its distribution; \* and, in the meantime, go on circulating the New Testament as extensively as possible, to which there is no obstruction. When, by means of the latter the eyes of any are opened—when they are brought to a concern about their eternal state, there is no reason to fear that they will not purchase the whole Bible without the Apocrypha annexed to it. Thus nothing will be lost. A man, ignorant of

---

\* Mr Dwight, in his speech at the anniversary meeting this year of the British and Foreign Bible Society, stated, that he “ had just returned from a tour of 8000 miles on the Continent of Europe, during which he chiefly visited Roman Catholic countries. He had frequently heard, what to him appeared surprising accounts of the scarcity of the scriptures in several parts of the Continent, and had directed his inquiries to enable him to ascertain the truth or falsehood of the report. In fifty towns he had gone into the book-stores, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the Bible could be found in them, and, with two exceptions, his search had been fruitless, till he had arrived in Germany. In one of those instances where he had been fortunate enough to meet with the Holy Scriptures, they consisted of a copy in 10 vols. folio. The other copy which he discovered contained merely the four Evangelists, (but one half of the New Testament,) and was in the Latin language, with an Italian translation.” This account but too clearly proves, notwithstanding all the self-gratulatory display made in its reports, how much the business of the British and Foreign Bible Society is mismanaged. Had

God and of salvation, is, at least, as likely to read the New Testament if put into his hands, as the whole Bible, which is a larger book; and, if the whole Bible cannot at present be given to all, it is better to give New Testaments to an hundred individuals than Bibles only to thirty. Portions, too, of the Old Testament may be circulated without obstruction—a method which the British and Foreign Bible Society adopted at Toulouse, and which I practised with success in different parts of France.

But if, after all, the Bible could not obtain circulation on the Continent except by unlawful means, then the door would, for the present, be evidently shut. In that case the exertions of the Bible Society would be as clearly precluded in that quarter, as those of the Apostle Paul in Bithynia, when he assayed to go there, “*but the Spirit suffered him not.*” Still the whole funds of the Society would be in active operation. Among the nations in the East the word of God is received by the people pure and unmixed. It is truly lamentable to reflect, that *while many translations of that word are at a stand in our own colonies for want of funds*, the Bible Society, intrusted with the offerings of the Christians in Britain, for the service of the sanctuary, should, for many years past, have been applying on the Continent the enormous sum of a sixth part of these sacred funds to the publication of forgeries and falsehood. What means, then, that cry,—“By

---

the Directors of the Society at the commencement of their exertions on the Continent, endeavoured, in each country, to find out proper individuals with whom to co-operate, and intrusted to them the publication of editions of the Scriptures from the most approved translations, as they did in the case of Mr Chabrand at Toulouse; and had they placed these Bibles in the shops of booksellers, at a low price, in all the towns as far as they had it in their power, their efforts in that quarter would have been far more effectual. This would have also prevented the mischief, in all its various ramifications, which has resulted from their connexion with *such* societies as those which, at a great expense, they have created and supported.

not adding the Apocrypha, you are withholding the Bible from millions?" On the contrary, by making this addition to God's word, the propagation of the Scriptures is circumscribed, and their circulation diminished, and thus they are withheld from *multitudes*, for whom, otherwise, they might be provided.

There is one circumstance in this controversy that appears to have been entirely overlooked. Whenever the question of the Apocrypha has been agitated, the attention of all has been exclusively directed to Roman Catholics and Protestants, and much stress has been laid on the prejudices of the one body, and on the opposition of the priests as influencing the other. But let it be remembered that there is a third and very numerous class, who partake not of the feelings of the former, nor are in the smallest degree controlled by the power which restrains the latter. A multitude of people on the Continent—no trifling proportion of the whole population,—are neither Protestants nor Catholics; who make no profession of religion. Yet, in the present state of things, while so many of those who assume the name of a particular religious sect have nothing beyond a mere profession, the attention of this third class to any religious subject may be as easily engaged as that of many of the others. To those persons it is obvious, the want of the Apocrypha, of which they probably never even heard, will form no barrier whatever to their receiving the Bible. And, perhaps, in looking over the reports and letters published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, it will be found, that some of these have received and been benefited by the Sacred Record.

## CHAPTER V.

ABUSES IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE BRITISH AND  
FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY ON THE CONTINENT.

UNHAPPILY the evil of adding the Apocrypha to the Bible does not exist alone: There are other abuses in the management of the British and Foreign Bible Society which loudly call for reformation. The Society is charged, by those who have an opportunity of observing its conduct abroad, with adopting a worldly policy, and of preferring men of eminence and learning, to those of real piety and devotedness to God. This policy has been pursued on the Continent to a very considerable extent. The Society's concerns have been placed under the management of men of no religion, of Arians, Socinians, or Neologists; and while these free-thinking philosophers are represented to the world as Christians, because they are at the head of Bible Societies, they are in reality the greatest opposers of the gospel.

Mr Simeon observes, that "we (I presume he means Christians) have all agreed to merge our own peculiarities, and to forget every thing which separates us one from another for the benefit of the world." Is it possible, when Mr Simeon speaks of merging peculiarities, and of "all sects and parties meeting upon one common basis," that he can refer to Arians and Socinians? Does he esteem them to be Christians? I will venture to say he does not; and that, when he spoke of all meeting upon one common basis, he had in his mind the basis of the gospel. Christians, in their co-operation for the diffusion of divine truth, may so far merge their peculiarities, as to act together in whatever they are agreed; but are they at liberty to lose sight of all that is essential to the gospel of salvation? Are the foundations to be destroyed? Arians and Socinians

remove the very foundation of the gospel. Were *their* systems according to the truth of the Bible, the life-giving word would at once be converted into a killing letter, and the whole of the ministration of righteousness into the ministration of condemnation. Every man would be subjected to the curse of the law, and then it had been better for all that they had never seen the Bible to aggravate their guilt and enhance their punishment. If Arians and Socinians are to be acknowledged as coadjutors in the service of the gospel, it is altogether in vain for Mr Simeon, or any one else, to appeal to Scripture principle, or Scripture example, on any point whatever. Arians and Socinians pervert the whole Bible from beginning to end.

Shall it be said, that the rules of the Bible Society admit all who subscribe to it to be members of that institution? This may be so; but it never could have been the intention of its Christian founders to receive those among its counsellors whom they considered to be decidedly opposed to Christianity. On this principle, deists and atheists, if subscribers, may be admitted, for there is nothing said about them in its fundamental regulations. Shall it be replied, that these do not acknowledge the Bible to be from God? Still the rules do not exclude them; and they may deem the Society to be a useful political institution; and so wish to join themselves to it. But shall they not be excluded from its counsels? And if these be excluded because they do not acknowledge the Bible to be of God; shall those be admitted who deny the God of the Bible? If the British and Foreign Bible Society effects much good in circulating the Scriptures, it does much evil in countenancing Arians on the Continent. The mischief that a Society, which has attained so high a name, may occasion in this way is incalculable. While it is distributing Bibles with the one hand, it is dealing out misery and death with the other.

The Continent is at present overrun with Arianism, which, with its pestilential breath, blights, and withers,

and desolates whole provinces and countries, putting the public ministry, as Claude has observed, in such a state, that salvation, by means of it, becomes absolutely impossible. Is this a time, then, for such a Society to countenance this destructive heresy? By doing so, it is counteracting the diffusion of the Gospel, and strengthening an influence which may be extended to future generations. To those who shall lift up their voice against Arianism, it may, according to the manner of speaking on the Continent, be hereafter objected:—That great Society of England, which evinced so much zeal in circulating the Bible all over the world, must have been well acquainted with its contents, and versant in the true nature of its doctrines.—That Society did not intimate by its conduct any disapprobation of Arianism. On the contrary, both by its messengers abroad, and by its fraternal congratulations of Arian deputations at home, it has given us every reason to conclude that it regarded that system, equally as any other, to be of heavenly origin. That great Society proved its liberality in this as in all other respects; and sufficiently marked its disapprobation of those narrow and bigoted notions, which, cramping and fettering the human mind, and retarding the dignified march of human intellect, would prevent us from keeping pace with the increasing lights of our age, and would even carry us back in a retrograde course to the beclouded times of the Reformers, who, in their zeal to sweep away certain abuses in regard to ceremonies, introduced a dark, uncharitable, dogmatizing spirit; in short, principles which, if admitted by us, would go the length of unchristianizing nine-tenths of Christendom; and would, at last, conduct us to the gloomy superstition of the darkest ages, if not land us in absolute barbarism.\*

---

\* In a periodical publication at Geneva, it was some time ago asserted that the Methodism of England, (by Methodism meaning evangelical religion,) threatened to conduct the world back to barbarism.



The state of Bible societies on the Continent, according to the most recent accounts, is truly deplorable. A well-informed foreigner, who has lately been travelling among them to ascertain in what state they are, gives it as his decided opinion, that Christians have very little weight in the several committees, which, in general, are wholly under the direction of Free-thinkers. Such is his report of them from one end of the Continent to another. Other foreign Christians, who have visited this country, confirm this report, and have given the names of many Arians and Socinians who are the sole governors of several societies abroad. A few weeks ago I received the following account of the secretary and treasurer of one of these Bible societies:—

“The Secretary is the idol of the fashionable world here, because, to use the words of the treasurer, “ he preaches in such a refined style, that none but well-educated persons can understand him, and the morality he inculcates is so pure and excellent, that it surpasses the precepts of the Bible; he therefore alludes seldom to the Bible, and makes very little use of biblical expressions.” This secretary affirms that the epistles contradict the gospel.

I have myself known a Bible society abroad which had for its secretary a Socinian, if he was any thing at all, and who was *one of the active agents employed in adulterating the Scriptures by the addition of the Apocrypha*, both of which to him were equally indifferent. Of the same society the treasurer was the *avowed author of a large and elaborate book against the divine origin of the Bible*. This may prove a warning to many not to take it for granted that every man who appears among the leaders of a Bible Society on the Continent, or as an apparently zealous correspondent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, is of course a friend to the Bible.

Were any one to judge of the religious condition of the Continent by the reports and extracts of letters annually published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, he would form a very erroneous estimate on the subject. Those who are

acquainted with the real state of things there, must feel the greatest surprise when they read in these reports such encomiums on the zeal which it is asserted discovers itself for the circulation of the Scriptures and the diffusion of the Gospel. When they observe the signatures of some of the letters by persons with whom they happen to be acquainted, and of others whose total indifference to the gospel, or decided hostility to it, is well known,—and when they see the accounts that are given of them, and of the religious state of the districts in which they reside, they are filled with amazement. A person lately observed, that it seemed as if the Millennium was begun on the Continent. Certainly the reports of the Bible Society are much calculated to mislead the public, and must therefore have a most pernicious effect. In how very different a light is the subject placed by some well-informed foreign Christians that have lately visited this country, who, in public, have affirmed and lamented “*the gross darkness of the Continent.*”

“I can say, in truth,” said Professor Thulock, in a speech delivered this year (1825) in a public meeting in London, “that, until my seventeenth year, I was neither acquainted with any vital Christians, nor had I ever heard there were such persons.” Amongst other melancholy details, having stated that Halle, where there are between five and six hundred students of divinity, is “*the seat of infidelity,*” he says,—“While the Continent, upon the whole, lies in the darkness of that *enlightening* of which they boast; in some provinces a spirit of persecution against the truth prevails, not at all inferior to that of the Romish Church.” In Geneva, an account of whose religious state I have given in my letter to Mr Cheneviere, Professor of Divinity there, published last year, the opposition to the gospel is said to have even increased. Very lately a pastor of a church there, was twice stoned and his life endangered; Mr Malan also was threatened. These tumults were attributed to a discourse of one of the Socinian clergymen.

Things often assume a very different aspect upon a closer

and more deliberate survey, than when viewed at a distance, or reported in the journals of hasty travellers. When I went abroad I read such accounts, then recently published, of the state of religion on the Continent, as completely deceived me, and afterwards filled me with astonishment. Is it surprising, if one, going forth in the name of a great society, empowered to give grants of money, to erect societies with presidents, secretaries, treasurers, &c. should be received with flattering attentions by many who have not the smallest regard for the object which he wishes to promote? In such circumstances men, decidedly opposed to the gospel, or totally indifferent to it, press forward and pay the most marked attention to the society's representative, and profess to enter most warmly into the object of his mission,—men who, were he to remain a few weeks in the place, and to discover any attachment to the gospel, would withdraw from him, and oppose him with all their might. I am not making suppositions; I am recording what I know to be fact, and what I have witnessed.

An agent of the Bible Society will judge very superficially, if he concludes that all who thus flock about him and greet his arrival at those places which he visits, are what at first sight they appear to be. He will act very rashly, if, without further inquiry, he places confidence in them, and intrusts the business with which he is commissioned to their hands, and if, to crown all, he writes home a most flattering account of his reception, and of the religious fervour of his new friends, to be published in the reports of the society. The effects of the arrangements he has thus made may easily be foreseen. The apparent zeal of these persons who have been so prematurely eulogised, soon evaporates, and the show that is made by the correspondence they afterwards keep up with those who conferred on them their official dignities, and who continue to patronize them, will very far surpass the reality of the good that is effected.

From this year's Report of the Bible Society, any reader

would conclude that the Bible Societies in France are in a flourishing condition ; but the contrary is the fact. “ Our societies” says Mr Chabrand in his letter of August last, “ increase in number, but many of them drag on languishingly, rather do not go on well, (*plusieurs se trainent languissement, plutot, qu’elles ne vont bein.*) I speak of France in general.” And what else can be expected of societies formed of such materials? “ It is not to be dissembled,” says Mr Marzials in his letter of the same date, “ that in this work, so excellent, the greatest number of the members that compose our committees act more on worldly considerations, (*des vues humaines,*) that in a true spirit of faith. I believe that everywhere the propagation of the Holy Scriptures would proceed with more rapidity if all who occupied themselves with it, or who have the appearance of doing so, (*ou qui ont l’air de s’en occuper,*) were animated by the Spirit of Christ.”

A few Christians, where these can be found, were the work put into their hands, might not make such a show at the beginning, but their path would be as the path of the just, shining more and more. Yet it has happened that the affairs of the British and Foreign Bible Society have been connected on the Continent with Arians and Socinians, while the Christians have been avoided and kept at a distance. Can such proceedings be accompanied with the blessing of God?

The bad effects of the system that has been so extensively followed by the Directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society on the Continent, are now becoming more and more apparent in counteracting its particular object, as well as in producing other most mischievous effects. “ I heard,” says a correspondent, who has just returned from it, “ a very bad account of many, I should say all, the Bible Societies on the Continent. One very serious charge is made both in France and Germany, that *there are large depots of Bibles at different places ; but there is so little zeal on the part of the managers, that they remain*

‘locked up—while the universal testimony is, that the people are desirous of possessing the Word of God.’ A member of a Bible Society abroad refused, within these few months, to give Bibles to one who applied for them, who had opportunities of circulating them to advantage. Their conversation then turned on repentance; when, the member of the Society, a pastor, alluding to it, spoke of the “Damnable preaching of repentance;” and added, “it is the devil’s work.”

Sufficient care has not been taken by the British and Foreign Bible Society to ascertain the religious sentiments and character of men to whom a licence has been given to alter the old translations of the Scriptures. An example of this may be found in an edition of 10,000 copies of the Bible, published at Lausanne, in 1822. The British and Foreign Bible Society assisted the pastors and professors of that place, to a very large amount, to publish this edition; in which, taking Ostervald’s translation as the basis, they were permitted to make what alterations they judged proper. The new version which has appeared in consequence is a very unfaithful one—the true sense of a multitude of passages being perverted or lost. And what else could be expected from intrusting such a work to men who were ignorant of the gospel of the grace of God, and who are decidedly opposed to it—to a set of pastors and professors, who are notorious for their profanation of the Lord’s day, and who have lately exhibited themselves as *the greatest persecutors in modern times of the religion of Jesus?* If it be rejoined, that this persecution has taken place since that edition of the Bible was completed, I answer, that this will not justify the Directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society, since, before these men were intrusted with such a work, their characters ought to have been ascertained; and this might easily have been done. One of those who was intrusted with the correction of that edition of the Bible, and who was then entirely ignorant of the gospel, has, since that period, been converted.

Having heard of the unfaithfulness of this large edition of the Bible, now circulating on the Continent, and known to be patronized by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and not having yet procured a copy—I requested Mr Malan of Geneva to give me some account of it. In his answer, dated September 26, 1825, after pointing out numerous examples of passages unfaithfully translated, he adds, “While I was writing, Mr Rochat, a faithful minister of the Canton de Vaud, (the Canton of which Lausanne is the capital,) has come to see me. He himself was one of the translators of the Bible which we are examining: I told him what I was doing; and I asked him his opinion of that version. He said, ‘It is exceedingly unfaithful, (*Elle est très infidèle*;) those who made it did not know the grace of God: I was then myself an unbeliever. (*J’étois moi-même alors un incrédule*.) However I do not think that there was any culpable intention in the translators; at least, I was very sincere myself. It is true that I was too complying, (*trop foible*,) and at some times I ought to have quitted the committee, and not to have satisfied myself with protesting against the false translations.”

“I asked him,” says Mr Malan, “what passages above all were unfaithful. He pointed out some of them which I have been examining, and others, such as Tit. iii. 5, “*Par la régénération qui donne le baptême*,” &c. He said on that passage he had a long dispute, and that the passage thus distorted, (*travesté*,) was adopted by a majority of voices.” 2 Cor. v. 17. “*Si quelqu’un veut être en Christ, QU’IL SOIT une nouvelle creature*.” In fact, (says Mr Malan) this translation is horrible; and it is impossible to preach more openly righteousness by works. This single passage shows what was the spirit of the translators. Again, Matt. iv. 4. “*L’homme ne vivra pas seulement de pain, mais de tout ce que Dieu ordonne, QUI LUI SERVE DE NOURRITURE*.” According

‘ to this the multitudes did well to follow Jesus *pour cette*  
 ‘ *nourriture-la*. Ah, it is a sacrilege thus to despoil, (*dé-*  
 ‘ *piller*) the Saviour! Mr Rochat adds, that the Lon don  
 ‘ Society made indeed some slight representations, on their  
 ‘ not publishing the text of Ostervald pure; but they easi-  
 ‘ ly pacified (*appaïsa*) the Society, and continued their  
 ‘ changes; after the publication, there were also remon-  
 ‘ strances respecting one or two passages: but all was  
 ‘ quieted, and the Bible was circulated.”

Mr Malan states, that neither the pious ministers of the Canton de Vaud, nor those of Geneva, will circulate this Bible among the people. It is some years since he warned his congregation, from the pulpit, against it. Thus is the British and Foreign Bible Society chargeable with the circulation of this unfaithful translation of a large edition of the Scriptures; and not only was their conduct inexcusable in committing such a work to persons who were manifestly ignorant of the gospel, but also in allowing it to be circulated without a public protestation against it: for they are not ignorant of the unfaithfulness of this translation—information of which was long since officially communicated to them.

The following notice of this edition appears in the report of the Bible Society of 1821:—“Lausanne, Neufchatel,  
 ‘ and Geneva, continue to take their respective shares in  
 ‘ the common work. The revision of the text of Oster-  
 ‘ vald is carried on with indefatigable attention and per-  
 ‘ severance, and, although it delays the quarto edition of  
 ‘ the Bible, which has been so long in hand, the evil of that  
 ‘ delay will, it is believed, be abundantly compensated by  
 ‘ the improved state in which this version will eventually  
 ‘ appear.” We now see what this improved state has turned out to be. In the Society’s report of 1822, it is said in a letter from Lausanne, “The zeal of the clergy is reviving.” The first fruits of this revival of zeal has been the commencement of a cruel persecution against the servants of

Jesus Christ, of which many of them are the victims at this hour.\*

An edition of 10,000 copies of the Bible was published at Strasburg, in a great measure at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society; the translation is that of Luther, corrected only in a few old words. In this work the British and Foreign Bible Society co-operated with a set of pastors and professors more decidedly removed from every appearance of the knowledge of the gospel than those of Lausanne. The greater part of them are *Neologists*. This edition of the Bible appeared with a preface attached to it, subversive of its character as a Divine Revelation. The preface was prepared by Professor Haffner, *one of the correspondents* of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

Although this Bible, with its deistical accompaniment, was published in August 1819, it was not till October 1821, that the Bible Society took proper steps to check this impious proceeding. This is the more remarkable, as information concerning the preface was sent to England as soon as it was published, and communicated to the Society. At length, at the distance of two years, we find the following notice in a letter from one of its agents, dated Strasburg, October 5th, 1821, Report 1822, p. 37:—“Leaving Paris in the morning of the 29th ult., I reached Strasburg on the 2d instant. Here I learnt that the Society had printed 10,000 Bibles, and an equal

---

\* In this persecution, ministers of the gospel, and students in divinity, are imprisoned, banished, and expelled, for no other crime but their adherence to the doctrines of the Confession of Faith of the Church of Lausanne. When the British and Foreign Bible Society commenced its connexion with the pastors and professors of Geneva, their hostility to the religion of Jesus had fully manifested itself in their avowed sentiments and persecutions, which were only restrained from going greater lengths by the civil authorities. Those of Neuchatel were not a whit behind the others in their decided opposition to the gospel. Such is the *trio* celebrated in this report as the coadjutors of the Bible Society—coadjutors only exceeded by its Neologian confederates.



‘ number of Professor Haffner’s introduction ; that nearly  
 ‘ one-half of the Bibles and prefaces were brought into  
 ‘ circulation ; that such Bibles as were circulated gratis,  
 ‘ were generally without the preface ; but that the copies  
 ‘ sold by the Society were bound up with it, unless the  
 ‘ purchaser did not wish to have it.” Thus it appears  
 that, during two years, the Bible Society suffered this pre-  
 face to be circulated with the Bible published by their  
 means ; and, although during that time the business was  
 one of public notoriety, they did not put a stop to it until,  
 by their own account, *nearly one-half of the Bibles and pre-  
 faces were brought into circulation.*

After all, it seems doubtful whether this matter would  
 ever have been adverted to even in the tardy manner in  
 which it was at length taken up, had it not been forced  
 upon the notice of the Society by means of a pamphlet  
 published against the preface, as soon as it appeared, by a  
 faithful preacher of the gospel, who had been sent to  
 Strasburg. An account of this transaction, in the follow-  
 ing communication from that preacher, who is well ac-  
 quainted with Germany, will tend to throw much light on  
 the subjects that have been alluded to, respecting the con-  
 nexions which the British and Foreign Bible Society has  
 formed on the Continent, and the effect of such con-  
 nexions.

“ Mr Haffner is doctor and professor in theology, mem-  
 ber of the Directory of the Lutheran churches of several de-  
 partments of France, pastor and vice-president of the Bible  
 Society at Strasburg. The pastors and professors of Stras-  
 burg are, for the most part, below Socinianism, that is to  
 say, Neologists ; some of them approach by shades, much  
 diversified, to better principles : but there is a very small  
 minority, 2, 3, 4, who give evidence of being evangelical. In  
 that city, which contains about 50,000 inhabitants, of which  
 30,000 are Protestant, there is a numerous seminary. You  
 may figure to yourself what is the character of the instruc-

tion given in that seminary. Mr Haffner in particular habitually treats theology and the Scriptures in the tone of railery, (*la ton de la raillerie,*) and a lecture seldom passes in which the students do not laugh at these subjects; and very often make a representation of them in caricature, describing the outline of the lecture. All this is without exaggeration. Here I must explain the term Neology:—

“By Neology is generally understood infidelity, (*l'incrédulité*) with the different shades of dissimulation which it wears among the German theologians. The system that has generally prevailed in Germany for fifty years past, and which was avowed and professed among the learned (*les savants*) in the theological chairs, and even more or less in the public preaching, is, that the Bible is absolutely *nothing more* than a theogony (generation of the Pagan gods,) like all the others, a collection of old traditions of superstitions, mixed with the universal ideas of natural religion. The characteristic feature of Neology is the precaution with which they introduce it; and also that it has been introduced by men appointed to instruct in the gospel. It is this last circumstance, undoubtedly, that has engendered the hypocrisy of expression which distinguishes that system. All the attacks are made under the cover (*sous le manteau*) of praise. They call Jesus the Divine Master—the Great Teacher of the people—the Friend of humanity; and, *in this sense* also, the Saviour of men. Respectable pastors have assured me, that in one of the largest churches of Berlin, on a Christmas-day, a preacher began his sermon by saying,—*Although it be not true that Jesus is risen.* They treat the miraculous histories as allegories. People have no idea to what a point of depravation the preaching, in many countries of Germany, has reached by means of this procedure (*marche.*)

“Mr Haffner, and the majority of the pastors and professors of Strasburg, are, and particularly were, in 1819, in this system, though, it must be confessed, more reserved

(*réténus*) than those in the centre of Germany ; but, however, much more hardy and declared against the gospel than the clergy of Geneva. The Preface of 37 pages, large 8vo. was all composed in this spirit.

According to this Preface, “ The history of the fall is allegorical, and the serpent is the seduction of vice. The books of Joshua and Judges contain the heroic age of the Jewish people. Much of this book breathes a warlike courage, mixed with an immoveable and sometimes *superstitious* confidence on God. What is *extraordinary* in the actions of the judges ought not to astonish us ; their actions were certainly celebrated in the beginning by songs of triumph, and *embellished* with poetical ornaments. It is from these sources, *probably*, the writer has drawn his narrative. The Psalms of David contain the expression of various feelings which agitated him during his life. Some of the others are songs of war and victory, which bear, in some parts, the impression of the yet imperfect moral sentiments of early times. David curses his enemies, Christ teaches us to pray for them. The Song of Solomon has given rise, in former times, to mystical and forced explanations, for they have thought proper to set out on the principle that the bridegroom and the bride were Jesus Christ and his church. The difficulties disappear if we consider this book as a pretty little poem, in which chaste love and conjugal fidelity are depicted in such colours as are very pleasing to eastern nations. The prophets were clear-sighted men, zealous patriots : their extensive view of the present, discovered to them what would soon take place, and gave them a presentiment of distant future events. Jesus had conceived, for the good of humanity, a plan which no sage had ever conceived before him. He had also a presentiment of the manner of his death. His moral system, as, among other things, the danger of riches, was in a great measure only for his own time.” On the Apocryphal books in general a great eulogium is pronounced in this Preface.

“After my attack on the Preface, the business made some noise throughout all Germany, and the committee of the Bible Society at Strasburg declared that they separated it from the Bible. But that measure has been in fact illusory in several circumstances; the Society itself has distributed Bibles with that preface. I believe that these things continue nearly on the same footing, (this was written September 27, 1825,) though altogether this affair turned out ill for Mr Haffner and the Neologists. They procured an order for my expulsion; but a conversation with the prefect prevented the execution of it, and the mayor gave me very distinguished marks of approbation.”\*

The above is the history of the Strasburg Preface: it will now be proper to observe in what manner this business has been communicated to the public by the Directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society in their report of 1822, p. xxv:—

“Your committee consider it their duty to state, that some temporary obstruction to the good understanding heretofore subsisting between your Society and that of Strasburg, had been occasioned by the annexation of a preface, from the pen of a distinguished member of the latter, to the Bibles issued from its depository. An explanation having, however, taken place, the preface was withdrawn, and harmony was accordingly restored. The Report of the Strasburg Bible Society, adverting to the fact, correctly states the proposition for renouncing the

---

\* The persecuting spirit of Arian, Socinian, and Neologian pastors on the Continent, forms a prominent feature in their character. Although, in some countries, only tolerated themselves, they are the greatest persecutors. When a preacher of the gospel appears among them, they are ever ready to denounce him to the civil authorities. Happily, however, the moderation of the governments has been such that their disgraceful proceedings in this way, have generally, as in the above instance, been checked.

‘ Preface as having been made to its committee by the Rev. Author himself. “ A proposal so liberal,” it is added, “ could not but obtain the approbation of this committee ; and, as an offer was made by an anonymous friend to purchase the remaining copies, we willingly acceded : and confidently hope that this step has given satisfaction to the Christian public. This society has thus renounced the Preface in question, having refunded the sum expended for the printing ; the copies on hand being transferred to the person above alluded to. In consequence of this arrangement, our society will, in future, sell the Bible without any addition whatever.” Such generous sacrifices to the principle of our common union deserve, and, your committee are persuaded, will receive the cordial thanks of every friend to the British and Foreign Bible Society.”

From this statement of the matter, what opinion must the public have been led to form ? Could it be supposed, by the most clear-sighted reader, that this report referred to such a history as that which has now been detailed ? On the contrary, it would seem to allude to an occurrence of no great importance,—an event which, in its issue, may be contemplated with the most perfect complacency. Some temporary obstruction to a good understanding with a foreign Bible Society has arisen, occasioned by the annexation to the Bibles which it issued, of a Preface from the pen of one of its *distinguished* members. An explanation having taken place, the Preface has been proposed to be withdrawn by its *Reverend Author*. The *liberality* he has thus discovered is highly applauded by the society abroad, and the British and Foreign Bible Society is persuaded, that this *generous sacrifice deserves*, and will *receive*, the *cordial thanks* of every one of its friends.

How smoothly may we suppose the reader of the Report to glide over this pleasant narration, which discovers in all its features so much urbanity and good humour ! At worst, it may appear to him, that this is such a Preface as might

be expected from the pen of a *Reverend and Distinguished Member of a Bible Society*, unexceptionable in itself, yet inadmissible, as being contrary to the rule which prohibits any addition whatever to be made to the Scriptures; and that this irregularity has been no sooner noticed by the Bible Society than it has been speedily corrected. But far will he be from conceiving that the transaction alluded to is one of the blackest description,—that the Preface in question is subversive of the whole system of divine truth contained in the Bible,—that the reverend and distinguished author of it belongs to the sect of Neologians, occupying a place between Socinians and avowed Infidels, and one who habitually turns the Scriptures into ridicule,—that the Bible Society, of which he is vice-president, combined with the reverend author in affixing this Preface to the Bible, and in defraying the price of 10,000 copies of it from funds which had been intrusted to them solely for the publication of the Scriptures,—and that, during *two years*, this Society persevered in circulating 5000 copies of its adopted Preface; and, finally, that they used their endeavours to banish, as an evil doer, a faithful preacher of the gospel, who had dared to raise his voice against their impious proceedings, and, like the prophets of old, to warn them of their sin and danger! Here, then, we have a specimen of the way in which the public is misled by the Reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society respecting the religious state of the Continent, and also of the effects of the ungodly confederacies which it has formed in that quarter.

The recollection of the Strasburg Preface naturally leads to the inquiry, whether the Bible Society is acting fairly with its supporters—excluding all notes or explanations of every kind from those Bibles of which it assists the publication? The reader has observed, (page 21–25,) the remonstrances on this head, made several years ago by the Edinburgh Bible Society, and the retraction of a resolution on the subject by the British and Foreign Bible Society in consequence. But there is reason to apprehend that the

latter have relapsed into a still greater deviation than formerly from their fundamental regulation, without informing their supporters of that change. In the Lausanne Bible there are, I am informed, prefaces to each of the books inserted, varying in length from 10 to 20, or 30 lines or more, explaining their scope and objects, some of which misrepresent their meaning, and are calculated to mislead the reader. In the letter of Van Ess, which has been brought into view, he speaks of his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, of which the Society has purchased 8000 copies. When these are circulated will that introduction appear with them? It is asserted that notes, or comments, are appended to some of the Bibles or New Testaments on the Continent belonging to the Society, or whose circulation has been aided by it. If this report be without foundation, it will be well to contradict it. But how comes it that, in any instance, or in any way whatever, the fundamental rule of the Society—that the word of God shall be circulated without note or comment—is violated?

The checking of the circulation of the Scriptures, by their being buried in the deposits in which they are stored, and the authorising of men to make changes in the old translations, who are altogether incompetent to such a work, are not the only evils produced by the line of conduct which the Bible Society is pursuing on the Continent. Other consequences of most pernicious tendency, both *abroad* and at *home*, follow in their train.

By forming ungodly men into organized societies, for a religious purpose, placing them in prominent situations, and furnishing them with means to extend their influence, one of the greatest barriers is erected against the progress of the gospel. The additional power which they thus acquire, they do not fail to employ in opposing the diffusion of the knowledge of salvation. Their exertions for this purpose are brought into more activity, and their efficiency is greatly augmented. Societies composed of

such characters become so many strong-holds, by which the god of this world fortifies his dominions, and in which, being transformed into an angel of light, he is prepared, with the greatest advantage, to repel every attack. The uneasiness which a faithful preacher of the gospel in their neighbourhood will occasion to such associations, and the opposition which they will raise against him, can easily be supposed. The attempt to banish that servant of God from Strasburg, which has just been related, as soon as he exposed the work of darkness of the Bible Society of that place, exemplifies, in one instance, what may be certainly looked for in every similar case. The increased power to oppose the progress of the gospel, arising from the association of men who are enemies to it, is duly appreciated by some of the best pastors in France, who rejoice that, in the present state of religion among them, the Synods of the Protestants are not permitted to be held in that country.

Nothing can have a more pernicious effect on such persons themselves as those are whom the Bible Society collects on the Continent into kindred associations, than its fraternal co-operation with them—extolling their zeal, intrusting to them the revision of translations of the Scriptures, and speaking of them, as they do of Mr Haffner, as distinguished members of Bible Societies! Can any thing have a stronger tendency to confirm these men in their several infidel systems; and is no regard due to them in this matter? Is no caution to be exercised lest they should be hardened to their destruction? Was this the manner of the apostles of Christ? Was it by such means that *they* sought the conversion of the world? In attempting to do good in one way, are we at liberty to lose sight of every thing besides? In our zeal to circulate the Bible, are we permitted to trample on the principles which it inculcates?

If the British and Foreign Bible Society did not present itself to the world as a religious Society—if this Society professed to circulate the Bible merely with a view to the



good it is calculated to produce on men in temporal things, without any respect to its influence on their eternal condition; then it might be at liberty to instal, not only Arians, and Socinians, and Neologists, as the counsellors and directors of the Bible Societies abroad, but also Deists and Atheists. But, while it continues to hold out to the Christians of Britian, that its ultimate object in circulating the Holy Scriptures is the extension of the kingdom of the Redeemer in the world, and the salvation of the souls of men,—by which professed design it secures their support,—is it to be tolerated that, over the whole of the Continent, the chosen friends of the British and Foreign Bible Society, those whom it generally appoints or countenances as the leaders in the various Bible Societies which it creates, shall be Arians, Socinians, and Freethinkers? Is it to be connived at, that, through their hands, the Scriptures shall be delivered to the people: thus giving all the sanction in its power to the characters, the opinions, and the qualifications of these men as public religious instructors—while, at the same time, the leading directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society, as well as the various denominations of Christians throughout Britian, by whom the Society is upheld, are convinced that the religious systems of these pretended pastors are as completely opposed to the gospel, and as subversive of the whole system of divine truth contained in the Bible as the grossest system of Pagans, Deists, or Atheists?

By erecting Bible Societies on the Continent, composed of the enemies of the gospel, the prejudices of Roman Catholics against Bible Societies, and their operations, are increased in the greatest degree; and not only against these Societies, but also against the Reformation. Let any one for a moment consider what effect must be produced on the mind of a reflecting Roman Catholic, when he sees Arians and free-thinking philosophers at the head of Bible Societies. He knows that the system of such men is subversive of every fundamental doctrine of the

gospel which is held by the Roman Catholics. He is aware that, between them and him, there are questions of the most vital importance. He is convinced that these men have no real religion; and he ascribes the sin of their apostasy to the fault of Luther's Reformation. Hence he is more than ever confirmed in his attachment to the Church of Rome. Although he may be so far enlightened as to discover some of its evils, yet, amidst all the errors with which it is chargeable, he knows, perhaps experimentally, that the fundamental doctrines which it maintains, are the power of God unto salvation. That this feeling among Roman Catholics on the Continent, against both Bible Societies and the Reformation, is strongly excited, by observing the materials of which these Societies are composed, is a well-known fact.

A correspondent, who has lately visited the Continent, writes—"I saw it stated, in a Catholic tract the other day, that Protestants care much less about opposing sects which deny the divinity of Jesus Christ, than about opposing Catholics. I met a well-informed French Catholic count, who said, the state of religion among the Protestants abroad, especially at Geneva, was a strong argument against the Reformation." The testimony of a Roman Catholic Priest, lately given on the subject, is very striking. "It was not possible," he observed, "for the priests to believe that the British and Foreign Bible Society was actuated by love to Jesus Christ, when they united themselves to so many of his professed enemies; and that, for this, above all other reasons, the right-feeling priests refused to join it." *The receiving of Arian deputies, or men of no religion, from Foreign Bible Societies, by the London Bible Society at its annual meetings*, has given the greatest disgust to pious Catholics abroad. Before this, they had attacked the Foreign Bible Societies; but now their language is, "You see the British and Foreign Bible Society is no better than the rest."

The conduct of the Bible Society even respecting the

Apocrypha, in adopting that crooked policy by which it intends to conciliate the favour of Roman Catholics, proves, as might be expected, a stumbling-block to them. Dr Naudi of Malta, in his letter of the 29th of August last, says, "I have lately, and but very lately, for these reasons, obtained a copy of a long paper written, as I am informed, by Bishop Comperie of Bagdad, the French Consul of that place. Among other odd things, the author accuses the Society of *much deceit*, in printing the books of the Apocrypha, which the Protestants, the members of that Society, must deem to be uninspired."

If the manner in which the British and Foreign Bible Society has conducted its business has been productive of much evil abroad, it has also been attended with effects that are most prejudicial at home. The accounts it has annually published, which lead the Christians in this country to form so false an idea of the state of religion on the Continent, has paralyzed those exertions, which, had they been aware of the real condition of the neighbouring countries, they would have pressed forward to make for their relief. To what other cause can it be attributed, that those who have shown themselves so laudably zealous in sending missions to the heathen countries, have discovered such coldness when called on to promote the preaching of the gospel on the Continent? yet the divine blessing has accompanied it in that quarter with a very uncommon degree of success, as far as the scanty means contributed for this end have extended. This remarkable supineness, in a cause so much connected with the glory of God, and the salvation of the souls of men, must have arisen from the wrong impressions they have received. Here, then, we see the mischief occasioned by those statements which periodically appear in the British and Foreign Bible Society's reports, filled with so much false colouring, and so devoid of just discrimination.

The operation of the cause that has just been adverted to,

appears to have greatly circumscribed the efforts which might otherwise have been made for the diffusion of the gospel among the nations of the Continent. Another cause, originating from a different source, has contributed to the same effect. Unhappily, some of those who are most properly zealous for the circulation of the Scriptures, have imbibed the idea that the promoting of the preaching of the gospel in countries *called* Christian, would counteract the success of that desirable object. If, however, the preaching of the gospel shall, in any circumstances, be found at all to impede the circulation of the word of God, it is a certain indication that the way which has been adopted is unscriptural, and consequently wrong. Yet considerable jealousy, on this point, has discovered itself among some supporters of the British and Foreign Bible Society, ever since an opportunity, by the return of peace, has been afforded to Christians at home to make any efforts in that quarter. Such efforts, it has been apprehended, would excite discussions, and lead to differences of opinion unfavourable to the end proposed by the Bible Society. If discussions and differences of opinion be not excited by giving men the Bible, it is owing either to its being neglected, or to their mistaking the religion which it inculcates. But so far are discussions, on the subject of the gospel, from retarding the circulation of the Bible, that it is only when they take place that its circulation is promoted. I saw this verified in a remarkable manner at Montauban, and in the surrounding country. Just in proportion as discussions respecting the gospel were excited, the demand for the Scriptures increased. I also witnessed the truth of this, when a missionary was dispatched from that place to a district in France, called the High Alps. Soon afterwards there was a large demand for the word of God, where there had been none before; and a great number of Testaments were, in consequence, circulated in that quarter. The giving of tracts, which also leads to discussion, has likewise been

much blessed in exciting a desire to possess the Holy Scriptures.\*

The preaching of the word preceded, at the beginning, the circulation and even the publication of the Scriptures; and, before even the transactions of his life were recorded, the Divine Author of the gospel sent forth his missionaries into all the world. Let Christians then contribute to this grand object, under the conviction that the declaration of the truth, by the living voice, is much called for on the Continent, and that, instead of counteracting or impeding the circulation of the Bible, it will promote that most desirable object in the highest degree.

\* The following occurrence is related in the Report of the *Glasgow Foreign Religious Tract Society*, published last year. The Secretary of that Society is acquainted with the person referred to.

“A translation of the tract “*Serious Thoughts on Eternity*,” had found its way into the shop of Mr B——, a manufacturer of considerable influence and property in B—— in the South of France, a town containing, without a single exception, a thoroughly Popish community. He took it up and read it; it alarmed him, and he read it again; he pondered much over it for some time, as it was the only book of the kind that had ever fallen in his way. In this tract were several references to the New Testament; this was a book he had never seen, and he longed to search further into a subject which now appeared to him of immense moment: he searched every store in town to see if they contained such a book, and at last in the shop of a bookseller to whom a Protestant clergyman had sent a few copies, with the faint hope that they *might* meet a purchaser, he discovered the volume he wanted; he read the tract again, and consulted all the passages in the New Testament referred to; he pondered what these things could mean; he was awakened to a serious concern for his immortal soul; and the New Testament was now his constant study. At length he thought with himself,—are there none that are concerned about these truths? and he concluded, that the individual who had sent the New Testament to the bookseller must surely feel their importance and value. He made the necessary inquiries, and found that it had been sent by the Protestant clergyman at Toulouse; he wrote to a friend in the same town, requesting him to call upon the clergyman to say that he had seen the New Testament, and was desirous of corresponding with him on the subjects contained in it. Of this invitation the clergyman gladly availed himself; and commenced a correspondence which was not speedily terminated. Mr B——’s

It is earnestly to be desired, that the zeal of those who direct the affairs of the British and Foreign Bible Society were a zeal according to knowledge, and that every abuse which has crept into its management, and the departures that have taken place from its fundamental rules relating to the Apocrypha, and the admission of any thing like Notes or Comments, may be speedily rectified. The marked disapprobation of its conduct on the subject of the Apocrypha, which, in many quarters, has of late discovered itself, it is now to be hoped, will lead the Directors to abandon a course, which, if longer persisted in, will prove the ruin of the institution. This evil, it was long expected, would have been remedied without being made public, and efforts were made for this purpose, till at last the case became absolutely hopeless. But, here, I am happy to be able to say, that the guilt of the line of conduct which has been pursued respecting the Apocrypha, by no means attaches to all the Directors of the Bible Society. On the

---

heart was touched by the influence of the Holy Spirit, and his mind gradually opened to the knowledge of divine things. He left the Roman communion, and is now a most useful and devoted servant of the Lord Jesus. By a letter lately received he had sold, at reduced prices, in the town where he resides, and villages around, upwards of eleven hundred New Testaments, and had also sold and distributed several thousands of religious tracts. He has been the means likewise, it is added, of awakening the attention of several of his friends to a concern for their souls, and amongst others two popish priests, who, although they have not left the Church of Rome, are now active in exhorting their parishioners to read the Scripture. Thus it is that by the blessing of God, *one single tract* has been the means of the circulation of *upwards of eleven hundred New Testaments, several thousand tracts, the conversion of at least one individual, and the awakening*, and it is to be hoped the conversion also, of *two popish priests*. Let us not therefore remove our hand from a work so auspiciously commenced, but steadily persevere in the diligent use of the means, praying withal for a still more abundant outpouring of the Divine Spirit to accompany them."

Subscriptions for this Society are received by Mr Duncan, the Secretary, No. 37, Virginia Street, Glasgow; and by Mr Oliphant, Bookseller, No. 22, South Bridge, Edinburgh.

contrary, some of the ablest and most respectable among them took their ground, and made a stand against the practice complained of from the moment their attention was called to it.

A bad spirit has been attributed to the Edinburgh Bible Society for the part they have taken in the publication of their Statement. But where is the bad spirit? They observed an enormous evil taking place in an institution which they have long and zealously supported, and to which they have largely contributed. The practice complained of, they considered to be contrary to the will of their Divine Master—a violation of his Holy Law—an adulteration of the integrity of his sacred Word. Ought they then to be silent? What have they done? They earnestly, yet respectfully remonstrated. They waited for a considerable time to see what effect would be produced. When all they could say was found to be of no avail, they withdrew from those who refused to listen to them; and, believing that other Bible Societies, from the one end of Britain to the other, were ignorant of the unfaithfulness of the Parent Society in the instance of which they complained, they published their reasons for the decisive measure they had been compelled to adopt. Is this acting in a bad spirit? The charge of acting in a bad spirit must rest with those who, notwithstanding all the remonstrances that have been made to them for years past, have pertinaciously adhered to a line of conduct which cannot be defended on Christian principles, or even on those of fair dealing.

What advantage is gained by saying, Peace, when there is no peace; by calling evil good, and good evil? A woe is pronounced on those who do so. If, in the circumstances in which the Edinburgh Bible Society was placed; to remonstrate as they have done, indicates a bad spirit, then the prophets were commanded to act in a bad spirit, when it was said to them, “Cry aloud, and spare not; lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their

‘ transgressions, and the house of Jacob their sins.’ The apostles as well as the prophets delivered messages, which, however unpleasant to those to whom they were directed, were calculated to give warning, and to save them from death. To all of us it is said, “ Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart; thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him.” Far less are we at liberty to partake with him in his evil deeds.

*Il y a des cas où toute la charité est dans la vérité.*

The watchmen of Israel were commanded to blow the trumpet, and give warning to the people on the approach of danger or the commission of iniquity. In professing to circulate the Scriptures, Bible Societies have in some sort taken upon them the office of watchmen. When, therefore, the Edinburgh Bible Society observed the inroad which the enemy had made, and the great cause, for which they were organised, endangered by a palpable departure from those stipulations on the faith of which the friends of the Bible had united, was it not their duty to use their endeavours to stop the progress of the evil, and, when these had failed, to warn others and deliver themselves?

If the friends of the circulation of the pure word of God had continued longer silent, it would have been on their part a dereliction of duty. And, since an evil of such magnitude as the adulteration of the sacred Word does exist, it is better that it should be publicly known, in order that it may be checked and remedied, than that it should go on producing extensive mischief. However prosperous the British and Foreign Bible Society outwardly appeared, it was, while this evil adhered to it, like the gourd which had sprung up flourishing and green, while a worm unseen was smiting it at the root.

Christians all over Britain, confiding in the constitution of the Bible Society, its rules and annual reports, have unsuspectingly intrusted it with very large funds. The amount



of these funds that has been expended in printing the Apocrypha must be very considerable. It was time, then, to sound an alarm, and to give notice to the supporters of the Society of what was going on in their name. If any of them shall choose to have their donations applied to the publication of the Apocrypha, let it be done with their knowledge. If any wish to have a Bible and Apocrypha Society, let them erect one; but let not a course be persevered in, unauthorised by the name and constitution of the *Bible Society*, and unknown to those who uphold it.

The voice of the Auxiliary Societies throughout the country, it may be confidently expected, will now be raised in language so firm and unequivocal as will bring about a change of management in the Bible society. They should, however, beware of being satisfied with the adoption of any half measure, which would have precisely the effect described in the Edinburgh Statement, and clearly exemplified in the letter of Van Ess. What difference will it make whether the British and Foreign Bible Society shall furnish funds to the Foreign Societies to assist in printing the Bible and Apocrypha, or if it shall give them money for other purposes, such as for the journeys of their secretaries, &c. while the whole of the funds of these Societies may be appropriated for printing the Apocrypha, to be added to the Bibles which they receive, bound or unbound, from the British and Foreign Bible Society? If, therefore, it holds connexion with those Societies that print and circulate the Apocrypha, and provides them with funds for any purpose whatever, the Auxiliary Societies may be assured that part of the money which they subscribed for the printing of the Holy Scriptures, will still go *indirectly* to the circulation of the Apocrypha—and, in so far, the circulation of the Word of God will be diminished. On the other hand, were the British and Foreign Bible Society to withdraw its support from the Societies, until, *bona fide*, they acted as *Bible Societies*, there is little doubt that the greater part, if not all of them, would

give up the circulation of the Apocrypha, and use the money they collect in printing the Scriptures, which, in the former case, they would apply in printing the Apocrypha, trusting to the British and Foreign Society for a supply of the canonical books. The Auxiliary Societies ought also to be satisfied that their money shall not be applied in printing notes or comments, or any additions whatever to the sacred text. Such application of its funds is directly contrary both to the rules of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and to its public declaration, dated May 4, 1818, in consequence of the remonstrance of the Edinburgh Bible Society.

The principal cause of that prosperity and pre-eminence which, through the Divine blessing, the British and Foreign Bible Society has enjoyed, was the power and simplicity of the uniting principle on which it was founded—"the circulation of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment," which commanded the co-operation of Christians of all denominations. If this uniting principle be finally abandoned on any grounds whatever, or if any other principle, however unexceptionable it may appear, be substituted in its place, an end, we may be assured, will be put to that co-operation. But how much more certainly may we predict that this will be the case, if it shall be departed from on grounds which, the more they are examined, the more they will be discovered to be untenable, unsound, and unscriptural.

This view of the matter is distinctly recognised in the Society's circular letter, published in the report of 1821, where it is said—"In conclusion, we beg leave to observe, 'that the British and Foreign Bible Society owes its present 'prosperity, next to the blessing of the Most High, to the 'simplicity of its object, and the zeal, fidelity, and perseverance with which that object has been pursued; and we 'respectfully solicit all our fellow-labourers and friends, 'never to deviate from the plain and avowed object of all 'Bible Societies, "the circulation of the Holy Scriptures

‘ without note or comment.’ If this Society had indeed pursued this avowed object with the *fidelity* which is here professed, it never would have been found in its present unhappy predicament—at variance with its own constitution and rules and most positive declarations. “ *Thy rowers have brought thee into great waters.*”

The warfare in which the Directors, in the early periods of the Bible Society, were engaged, was with the enemies of the gospel; over whom, by wielding the sword of the Spirit, they speedily triumphed. But now they are ranging themselves against their most zealous supporters, who are equally desirous with themselves to promote the extensive diffusion of the Word of God. This is the more to be regretted; since, had they acted in such a manner as to maintain unbroken that co-operation of Christians which was so happily established, this institution might have long continued to prove a blessing to the world.

The existence of a body so powerful and efficient as the British and Foreign Bible Society, was calculated to animate and encourage the friends of the Bible. The amount of its funds, the extent of its influence, the weight of its name, and the unity of its object, strongly recommended it. The expectation, however, which has been formed of its permanency may have been too sanguine. It is impossible to forget, that the operations of such a Society may become so complicated and extensive as to render it impracticable for its Directors to bestow that care and attention on the various details which are necessary in order to prevent flagrant abuses. It is certain that there is a point beyond which the business of a society cannot be extended without great injury to the cause for which it was constituted. Whether or not the British and Foreign Bible Society has reached this point, it is not my object to inquire; but the conduct of its Directors, with regard to the circulation of the Scriptures on the Continent of Europe, and the inaccuracy of the information to which they seem to have given implicit credit, together with the characters of those

abroad with whom they have connected their operations, are strong symptoms of faults and deficiencies in their system of operations, which call for an immediate reformation. Yet, if such a reformation were now made in the conduct of the Society, and if they consent to abide by their avowed principles, they might still continue to enjoy the support and prayers of many, who earnestly desire that the Word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified.

But whatever may be the course which the Directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society shall finally adopt, there is no reason to entertain any apprehension of the failure of that cause of which it has hitherto been the general organ. God has put it into the hearts of his people to desire the diffusion of the Holy Scriptures; numerous societies are instituted in all parts of the country with a view to this object; and means will not be wanting to carry it into effect. Nor is there much danger that the annual contributions towards it will be materially diminished. Many, indeed, who have hitherto appeared as its supporters, but who felt no real concern in its advancement, may be expected to fall away. But whether the great work of the circulation of the Holy Scriptures be conducted by one leading Society in Britain, or by two, or three, or more, in different parts of the country, the contributions of Christians may still be expected to continue and to augment. And thus will be realized, what is so well conceived, and so happily expressed in the Perth Report, and adopted into that of the London Society of this year: "It is not mere money that is wanted, nor money extorted from the man who, in parting with it, knows not what he is doing: but it is consecrated money—money deposited as the free and considerate expression of intelligence and choice; money, in short, which is brightened in its hues, and enhanced in its value, by the glowing fervour of Christian zeal." Of this money, the amount that will be forthcoming, we may confidently anticipate, will not be diminished.

How imperative, on British Christians, is the duty of

seeking to diffuse the blessings of salvation? What gratitude do they owe to the Father of mercies, the God of all grace and consolation, who has distinguished this nation with his peculiar benefits in so remarkable a manner! Here he has preserved the knowledge of his name, while darkness has covered the other parts of the earth, and gross darkness the people. From the Continent of Europe the light of divine truth, with which it was once eminently favoured, has been withdrawn. The Lord has had a controversy with the nations, and has come out of his place to punish them. Where is the capital city, in the whole civilized world, which has not been occupied by a foreign enemy, or whose government has not been overthrown within the last thirty years, excepting that of Britain, whose favoured shores no hostile invader has been suffered to approach. While other countries have been visited by a famine of the Word of Life, a gracious revival in this land has been vouchsafed, and multitudes have been turned to the Lord. As to Israel of old were committed the oracles of God, so now he has made this country the grand depository of his Sacred Word. He has placed an hundred millions of idolaters under its dominion in the East, that to them might be communicated the knowledge of himself. From Britain he has caused his word to sound out to all the regions round about, even to the almost unknown islands of the remotest ocean. Britain, like the fleece of Gideon, has been watered with the dew of heaven, while all the nations around have been parched and scorched. In all its dwellings there has been light, while thick darkness brooded over other lands. Is it, then, to the superior faithfulness of the inhabitants of this country—to the better improvement of privileges and advantages vouchsafed, that the origin of all this favour should be traced? No; but to the sovereign good pleasure of Him who hath mercy on whom he will have mercy. It is the Lord's doing, and it is wondrous in our eyes! What an unspeakable honour hath he thus conferred on Britain,—appointing

it the great instrument in his hand of that extensive reformation which now appears to be commencing in the world,—of that preparation which is visibly making for ushering in the glory of the latter days. “Surely the isles shall wait for me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel.”

Christians in this country have every encouragement to persevere in the great work of the circulation of the Scriptures. “The breaker is come up before them: they have broken up, and passed through the gate, and are gone out by it; and their King shall pass before them.” The time is now approaching when the “fulness of the Gentiles shall come in, and so all Israel shall be saved;” as it is written, “There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.” “There shall be an handful of corn in the earth upon the top of the mountains; the fruit thereof shall shake like Lebanon: and they of the city shall flourish like grass on the earth.” In Britain is this animating prediction now fulfilling,—Britain, formerly buried in Pagan darkness, and superstition, and idolatry,—which might be termed the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and the cage of every unclean and hateful bird,—Britain, once proverbially said to be divided from the whole world,—as unlikely to be destined to nourish the handful of seed of the Word of God to shake over all the earth, as the barren craggy mountain top to be the embryo depository of the future golden harvests of the fertile plains.

THE END.

EDINBURGH:

PRINTED BY J. AND D. COLLIE.

## WORKS ON THE APOCRYPHA CONTROVERSY,

Published by *WILLIAM WHYTE & Co. Edinburgh.*

In 8vo. (Second Edition) price 3d.

STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE OF THE EDINBURGH Bible Society, relative to the Circulation of the Apocrypha by the British and Foreign Bible Society.

In 8vo. price 2s.

SECOND STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE EDINBURGH Bible Society, relative to the Circulation of the Apocrypha by the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

In 8vo price 1s. 6d.

THIRD STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE EDINBURGH Bible Society, being a Statement respecting their conference on April 4th, 1826, with a Deputation from the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, relative to the circulation of the Apocrypha.

In 8vo. price 6d.

REVIEW OF THE EVANGELICAL MAGAZINE AND Christian Guardian, for May 1826, on the Apocrypha Controversy.

In 8vo. price 9d.

REVIEW OF THE LETTERS BY AMICUS, In defence of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and of the Eclectic Review, and Congregational Magazine for April 1826, on the same subject.

In 8vo. price 6d.

REVIEW OF "APOCRYPHA"—PERTHSHIRE BIBLE Society, containing Strictures on the Resolution of the Perthshire Bible Committee; the London Committee's proceedings in the cases of the Wallachian Scriptures, and the Grant of Books to Dr Van Ess. The conduct of Mr R. Steven as a member of the London Committee; and the attack made by the Rev. Messrs Esdaile and Young of Perth, on the Edinburgh Committee; containing also a copy of the resolutions of the Glasgow Bible Committee; dated March 16, 1826, &c. &c. &c.

In 8vo. price 6d.

REVIEW THE APOCRYPHA CONTROVERSY, Containing Supplementary Catechism, addressed to the London Committee; Strictures on the Case of their Grant of Books to Dr Van Ess; and a Commentary on their "Observation" relative to the expenditure.

In 8vo. Price 6d.

REVIEW OF THE STATEMENT OF THE GLASGOW Dissenters. Letter from the Rev. Mr WARDLAW with comments upon it. The Trust-worthiness of the London Committee particularly considered; various interesting Facts connected with the state of the dispute, &c. Mr Brandram's Pamphlet in defence of himself and his coadjutors.

In 8vo. Price 9d.

REVIEW OF THE APOCRYPHA CONTROVERSY, Containing remarks under the following heads; Glasgow Dissenters—Mr M. Gavin—Rev. Mr Ewing—Cambridge Meeting—Missionary Register—State of Feeling in England—Facilities for pure Circulation—Zeal for the Apocrypha—The Unitarians—Glasgow Dissenters again—Inaccuracies—151st Psalm—Dr Wardlaw's candour—Mr Lessignol—Official dishonesty—Dr Steinkopff's resignation—Congregationalist and Eclectic—Scottish Societies and Pocket Gaelic Bible.

In 8vo. Price 1s.

REVIEW OF THE TRANSACTIONS RESPECTING Professor Haffner's Preface to the Strasburg Bible; with Remarks on Letter from one of the Founders of the British and Foreign Bible Society; Mr MacGavin and Rev. Mr Ewing; London Committee and Leander Van Ess.

In 8vo. Price 6d.  
**REVIEW OF MR. PLATT'S LETTER TO DR. WARDLAW ;**  
With Remarks on Mr M'Gavin's Pamphlet.

In 8vo. Price 6d.  
**REVIEW OF ACCOUNT OF THE PRINCE OF SALM,**—Salm and Stockes' Letter to a Clergyman—also, Additional Remarks on Platt's Letter to Wardlaw.—New and important Facts—Question of Inaccuracy decided against Platt and Wardlaw—Pure Bibles preferred in France—Illegal conduct of Dr Pinkerton and the London Committee—Mr M'Gavin.

In 8vo. Price 9d.  
**REVIEW OF THE EARL STREET COMMITTEE'S** Minutes, &c. respecting the Lausanne Bible—Mr Platt's Second Letter to Dr Wardlaw, and Mr M'Gavin's Fourth Letter to Mr M'Farlane ; also, Remarks on the Sheet published by the London Committee, explanatory of their conduct with regard to Leander Van Ess.

In 8vo. Price 6d.  
**REVIEW OF THE REV. FRANCIS CUNNINGHAM'S** Letter to Lord Bexley.—Account of the Annual Meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society—Proceedings of the Earl Street Committee—and Account of the First Public Meeting of the Newcastle-upon-Tyne, North Shields, South Shields, and Sunderland Bible Society.

In 8vo. Price 6d.  
**REVIEW OF THE APOCRYPHA CONTROVERSY,** containing Remarks on the Aberdeenshire Auxiliary (to the British and Foreign) Bible Society—Forres Bible Society—Elgin and Morrayshire Bible Society—the London Committee and their deputation to the Continent—Edinburgh Corresponding Board—Aberdeen Bible Society (newly instituted) &c.

In 8vo. Price 3d. Second Edition  
**BRIEF STATEMENT OF REASONS** for Bible Societies in Scotland withdrawing their confidence in the British and Foreign Bible Society. By Amicus Secundus.

In 8vo. Price 9d.  
**COMPENDIOUS VIEW OF THE PRINCIPAL CHARGES** which have been preferred against the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

In 8vo. Price 3d. Second Edition.  
**REPLY TO AN ANONYMOUS PAMPHLET,** Circulated under the title Apocrypha. By the Rev. W. A. THOMSON.

In 8vo. Price 1s.  
**THREE LETTERS TO A FRIEND, ON THE MORAL** Bearings of the Bible Society Controversy. By the Rev. ROBERT BURNS, Minister of St. George's, Paisely.

In 8vo. Price 1s. (Second Edition.)  
**SPEECHES DELIVERED AT THE EIGHTEENTH** Annual Meeting of the Edinburgh Bible Society, held in the Assembly Rooms, George Street, Edinburgh, on Monday, the 9th July 1827.

In 8vo. Price 3s.  
**SECOND REVIEW OF THE CONDUCT OF THE DIRECTORS** of the British and Foreign Bible Society ; containing an account of the Religious State of the Continent, in Answer to a Letter addressed to the Author by the Rev. Dr Steinkopff. By Robert Haldane, Esq.

In 8vo. Price 2s.  
**A LETTER TO THE RIGHT HON. LORD BEXLEY,** in consequence of the Speech, which his Lordship delivered at the Anniversary of the Kent Auxiliary Bible Society, on Tuesday, October 10, 1826. By Andrew Thomson, D.D., Minister of St George's, Edinburgh ; and one of the Secretaries of the Edinburgh Bible Society.

In 8vo. Price 9d.  
**ANGLICANUS SCOTCHED.** By the REV. MARCUS DODS.  
N.B.—The Number of the Christian Instructor for January 1828, will contain a full Review of the Letters by Anglicanus, recently published.





**RETURN CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT**  
**TO → 202 Main Library**

LOAN PERIOD 1	2	3
<b>HOME USE</b>		
4	5	6

**ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS**

1-month loans may be renewed by calling 642-3405

6-month loans may be recharged by bringing books to Circulation Desk  
Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior to due date

**DUE AS STAMPED BELOW**

NOV 4 1979 7 9		
REC. CIR. NOV 13 1979		

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

FORM NO. DD6, 60m, 11/78

BERKELEY, CA 94720



U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C031031401



