

1. The Perfect Guide

COULD it be thought possible that an all-wise Creator would bring so many millions of people into existence, as the inhabitants of this earth, and give them no information as to why they are here, or what His will is concerning them? No, that would be unreasonable. Just as surely as there is a judgment day coming, on which we all shall be called to account for our conduct, so surely He must have given us an infallible rule of life. But what is this "infallible rule"? The Roman Catholics say it is "The Church, with its traditions." But the Church has changed so greatly since its origin that if the apostles could arise from the dead they would not recognise it as the church they established. As for "tradition," it is like a story that grows and changes as it travels. No government would be satisfied with oral laws. In so important a matter as our eternal happiness we need a rule that is more stable and unchangeable, and this we have in God's infallible word, the Bible.

The Inspiration Of The Bible

The Bible is not the product of man's thought and planning. "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Peter 1:21. (Compare Isaiah 55:8,9; 2 Corinthians 3:5) Peter says: "The Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake," and David himself declares: "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me." Acts 1:16; 2 Samuel 23:2. Of Jeremiah we read: "Then the Lord put forth His hand, and touched my mouth. And the Lord said unto me, Behold, I have put My words in thy mouth." Jeremiah 1:9. Thus the whole Bible is God's word spoken through human instrumentality, for "God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began" (Acts 3:21), and His hand guided them while they wrote. "All this," said David, "the Lord made me understand in writing by His hand upon me." 1 Chronicles 28:19. And so, the prophets, after writing of Christ's coming, were "searching" their own writings to find out "what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." 1 Peter 1:11.

We have now presented the testimony of the Bible itself to the fact that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God." 2 Timothy 3:16. No consistent person can, therefore, receive one portion of it while he rejects another. Jesus says: "The Scripture cannot be broken." John 10:35. He, the author of the Scriptures, displayed such implicit confidence in them, that even the devil did not dare to question their authority, when Christ faced him with the words: "It is written." Matthew 4:4, 7, 10. Yes, "devils also believe, and tremble" (James 2:19), for they know the Bible is true, while critics today doubt and ridicule (Jude 10). What has caused such terrible unbelief among men? We shall now briefly review the causes and the history of modern "Higher Criticism."

Rome Versus The Bible

After the Church had fallen from its apostolic purity of life and doctrine, it found that, where the Bible was read by the common people, they lost faith in the Church and opposed her worship as a species of idolatry. This was particularly true of the Waldenses, who had retained the Bible in their native language hundreds of years before the Reformation, and had copied and spread its pages over Catholic Christendom, wherever their missionaries travelled. It was natural, therefore, that the Roman church, instead of supplying the common people with the Scriptures in their native tongue, should oppose this. Cardinal Merry del Val says that on account of the activity of the Waldenses, and later of the Protestants, in spreading the Scriptures in the native language of the people, "the Pontiffs and the Councils were obliged on more than one occasion to control and sometimes even forbid the use of the

Bible in the vernacular." He also says: "Those who would put the Scriptures indiscriminately into the hands of the people are the believers always in private interpretation - a fallacy both absurd in itself and pregnant with disastrous consequences. These counterfeit champions of the inspired book hold the Bible to be the sole source of Divine Revelation and cover with abuse and irate sarcasm the Catholic and Roman Church!"- *"Index of Prohibited Books, revised and published by order of His Holiness Pope Pius XI," "Foreword" by Cardinal Merry del Val, pp. x, xi. Vatican Polyglot Press, 1930.*

These plain words from such an authentic source need no comment. Ever since the first "Index of Prohibited Books " was issued by Pope Paul IV, in 1599, the Bible has had a prominent place in these lists of forbidden books. And, before the invention of printing, it was comparatively easy for the Roman church to control what the people should, or should not, read; but shortly before the Reformation started, the Lord prepared the way for its rapid progress by the discovery of the art of printing. The name of Laurence Coster, of Holland, is often mentioned in connection with the story of the first production in Europe, in 1423, of movable type. In 1450 to 1455 John Gutenberg printed the Latin Bible at Mentz (Mainz), Germany. He endeavoured for a time to keep his invention a secret, but Samuel Smiles relates:

"In the meanwhile, the printing establishments of Gutenberg and Schoeffer were for a time broken up by the sack and plunder of Mentz by the Archbishop Adolphus in 1462, when, their workmen becoming dispersed, and being no longer bound to secrecy, they shortly after carried with them the invention of the new art into nearly every country in Europe"-*"The Huguenots," p. 7. London: John Murray, 1868.*

There being so few books to print, and there being a ready sale for Bibles, the printers risked all hazards from the opposition of the Church, and printed Bibles in Latin, Italian, Bohemian, Dutch, French, Spanish, and German. While these were so expensive that only the wealthy could afford to buy them, and their language was not adapted to the minds of the common people, yet they "seriously alarmed the Church; and in 1486 the Archbishop of Mentz placed the printers of that city, which had been the cradle of the printing-press, under strict censorship. Twenty five years later, Pope Alexander VI issued a bull prohibiting the printers of Cologne, Mentz, Treves, and Magdeburg, from publishing any books without the express license of their archbishops. Although these measures were directed against the printing of religious works generally, they were more particularly directed against the publication of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue."- *Id., p. 8.*

The Reformation And The Bible

The time had now come for the light to shine, and God's word could no longer be kept from the people. Prophecy states that in spite of captivity, fire, and sword, "they shall be holpen with a litle help." Daniel 11:33, 34. But the people had been kept in darkness so long that they could not endure the glaring light of all the Bible truths at once. They had to come gradually, and the hour had struck for the Reformation to begin.

In preparing for the Reformation, the Lord had worked in marvelous ways to provide protection for the Reformers. The night before Martin Luther nailed his ninety-five theses on the door of the castle church at Wittenberg, the Elector Frederick of Saxony had a remarkable dream. In relating it to Duke John the next morning he said:

" I must tell you a dream which I had last night... For I dreamed it thrice, and each time with new circumstances. . . . I fell asleep, . . . I then awoke. . . . I prayed . . . God to guide me, my counsels, and

my people according to truth. I again fell asleep, and then dreamed that Almighty God sent me a monk. . . . All the saints accompanied him by order of God, in order to bear testimony before me, and to declare that he did not come to contrive any plot. . . . They asked me to have the goodness graciously to permit him to write something on the door of the church of the Castle of Wittenberg. This I granted through my chancellor. Thereupon the monk went to the church, and began to write in such large characters that I could read the writing at Schweinitz. The pen which he used was so large that its end reached as far as Rome, where it pierced the ears of a lion that was crouching there, and caused the triple crown upon the head of the Pope to shake. All the cardinals and princes, running hastily up, tried to prevent it from falling. . . . I awoke, . . . it was only a dream. [Again he fell asleep.]

"Then I dreamed that all the princes of the Empire, and we among them, hastened to Rome, and strove, one after another, to break the pen; but the more we tried the stiffer it became, sounding as if it had been made of iron. We at length desisted. . . . Suddenly I heard a loud noise - a large number of other pens had sprung out of the long pen of the monk. I awoke a third time: it was daylight.' . . .

"So passed the morning of the 31st October, 1517, in the royal castle of Schweinitz. . . . The elector has hardly made an end of telling his dream when the monk comes with the hammer to interpret it." - *"History of Protestantism," J. A. Wylie, LL.D., Vol. I, pp. 263-266.*

One can hardly wonder that the Elector of Saxony became Luther's protector during his long struggle with the Papacy. The greatest work that was accomplished by these "pens" of the Reformation was the translation of the Bible into the language of the common people. True, there had been some attempts made before this time to produce the Scriptures in the vernacular, but without much success, as the language was almost unintelligible to the common people, and the price prohibitive.

After Martin Luther had spent much time in the homes and company of the people that he might acquire their language, he, with his co-workers, translated the Bible into a language that, while it was dignified and beautiful, was so natural and easy to be understood by the ordinary mind that it made the Bible at once "the people's book." The New Testament was translated in 1521, and fifty-eight editions of it were printed between 1522 and 1533: seventeen editions at Wittenberg, thirteen at Augsburg, twelve at Basel, one at Erfurt, one at Grimma, one at Leipzig, and thirteen at Strassburg. The Old Testament was first printed in four parts, 1523 to 1533, and finally the entire Bible was published in one volume in 1534.

In 1522, Jacques Lefevre translated the New Testament into French, and Collin, at Meaux, printed it in 1524. In 1525, William Tyndale translated the New Testament into English. All these New Testaments were translated from the original Greek, and not from the imperfect Latin Vulgate, used by the papal church.

Printing presses were kept busy printing the Scriptures, while colporteurs and booksellers sold them to the eager public. The effect was tremendous.

"Every honest intellect was at once struck with the strange discrepancy between the teaching of the Sacred Volume and that of the church of Rome." - *"Historical Studies," Eugene Lawrence, p. 255. New York: Harper Brothers., 1876.*

In the Book of God there were found no purgatory, no infallible pope, no masses for the dead, no sale of indulgences, no relics working miracles, no prayers for the dead, no worship of the Virgin Mary or of saints! But there the people found a loving Saviour with open arms welcoming the poorest and vilest

of sinners to come and receive forgiveness full and free. Love filled their hearts and broke the shackles of sin and superstition. Profanity, coarse jests, drunkenness, vice, and disorder disappeared. The blessed Book was read by young and old, and became the talk in home and shop, while the Church with its Latin mass lost its attraction.

Rome's Fight

Rome was awake to the inevitable result of allowing the common people to read the Bible, and the Vicar of Croydon declared in a speech at St. Paul's Cross, London: "We must destroy the printing press, or it will destroy us." - *"The Printing Press and the Gospel,"* by E. R. Palmer, p. 24. The papal machinery was therefore set in motion for the destruction of the Bible.

"There now began a remarkable contest between the Romish Church and the Bible between the printers and the popes. . . .

"To the Bible the popes at once declared a deathless hostility. To read the Scriptures was in their eyes the grossest of crimes. . . . The Inquisition was invested with new terrors, and was forced upon France and Holland by papal armies. The Jesuits were everywhere distinguished by their hatred for the Bible. In the Netherlands they led the persecutions of Alva and Philip II; they rejoiced with a dreadful joy when Antwerp, Bruges, and Ghent, the fairest cities of the working men, were reduced to pauperism and ruin by the Spanish arms; for the Bible had perished with its defenders. . . .

"To burn Bibles was the favorite employment of zealous Catholics. Wherever they were found the heretical volumes were destroyed by active Inquisitors, and thousands of Bibles and Testaments perished in every part of France" - *"Historical Studies,"* Eugene Lawrence, pp. 254-257.

In Spain, not only were the common people forbidden to read the Bible, but also university professors were forbidden by the "Supreme Council" of the Inquisition to possess their valuable Bible manuscripts.

"The council, in consequence, decreed that those theologians in the university who had studied the original language, should be obliged, as well as other persons, to give up their Hebrew and Greek Bibles to the commissaries of the holy office, on pain of excommunication." - *"History of the Inquisition of Spain,"* D. J. A. Llorente, Secretary of the Inquisition, p. 105. London, 1827.

"In 1490, Torquemada [the Inquisitor-General] caused many Hebrew Bibles and more than six thousand volumes to be burnt in an *Auto da fe* at Salamanca." - *"Literary Policy of the Church of Rome,"* Joseph Mendham, M. A., p. 97. London, 1830.

How many thousands of invaluable manuscripts thus perished in the flames of the Inquisition, eternity alone will reveal. It is exceedingly difficult for a Protestant in our days to fathom the extent of this fear of and enmity against the Bible, manifested by the Roman church. With her it was actually a life or death struggle! A person must read the history of the Inquisition, and examine the Roman Indexes of Forbidden Books, to understand her viewpoint. Inquisitor General Perez del Prado gave expression to her feelings and her bitter lament when he declared in horror "that some individuals had carried their audacity to the execrable extremity of demanding permission to read the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, without fearing to encounter mortal poison therein." - *"History of the Inquisition of Spain,"* D. Juan Antonio Llorente, p. 111.

The funeral piles were lit all over Europe. Samuel Smiles says of France:

"Bibles and New Testaments were seized wherever found, and burnt; but more Bibles and Testaments seemed to rise, as if by magic, from their ashes. The printers who were convicted of printing Bibles were next seized and burnt. The *Bourgeois de Paris* [a Roman Catholic paper] gives a detailed account of the human sacrifices offered up to ignorance and intolerance in that city during the six months ending June, 1534, from which it appears that twenty men and one woman were burnt alive. . . . In the beginning of the following year, the Sorbonne obtained from the king an ordinance, which was promulgated on the 26th of February, 1535, for the suppression of printing! "*The Huguenots*," Samuel Smiles, pp. 20, 21, and first footnote.

"Further attempts continued to be made by Rome to check the progress of printing. In 1599 [1559] Pope Paul IV issued the first *Index Expurgatorius*, containing a list of the books expressly prohibited by the Church. It included all Bibles printed in modern languages, of which forty-eight editions were enumerated; while sixty-one printers were put under a general ban." *Ibid.*, p. 23.

"Paul IV, in 1559, put it [Sully's name] in the first papal *Index Expurgatorium*." *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, Henry Charles Lea, Vol. III, p. 587.

"The first Roman 'Index of Prohibited Books' (*Index librorum prohibitorum*), published in 1559 under Paul IV, was very severe and was therefore mitigated under that pontiff by decree of the Holy Office of 14 June of the same year. "*Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. VII, p. 722, art. "Index."

Persecution raged more or less all over Europe: "In 1545, the massacre of the Vaudois of Province was perpetrated"; the 24th of August, 1572, the St. Bartholomew Massacre commenced, and continued until between 70,000 and 100,000 innocent and unsuspecting persons were murdered in cold blood for being Protestants. The massacre was secretly planned by the leaders of the Roman church.

"Sully says 70,000 were slain, though other writers estimate the victims at 100,000." "*The Huguenots*," Samuel Smiles, pp. 71, 72.

"Catherine de Medicis wrote in triumph to Alva, to Philip II, and to the Pope. . . . Rome was thrown into a delirium of joy at the news. The cannon were fired at St. Angelo; Gregory XIII and his cardinals went in procession from sanctuary to sanctuary to give God thanks for the massacre. The subject was ordered to be painted, and a medal was struck, with the Pope's image on one side, and the destroying angel on the other immolating the Huguenots." *-Id.*, 71, 72.

New Lines Of Attack

Finally, however, the papal church discovered that her opposition to the Bible only betrayed the sad fact that, instead of being the divinely instituted church of the Bible, she and the Scriptures were deadly enemies, and that her open fight was furnishing the world with the clearest evidences to justify the Reformation. Her relentless persecution was making martyrs, but not loyal Catholics. She must halt her course and forge new weapons against Protestantism, if she ever hoped to win the battle. But what were these weapons to be? These we shall consider in the next two chapters.

2. Forging New Weapons

THE Roman church had discovered that the root of her troubles lay in the reading of the Bible by the laity, and had opposed it with all the power at her command. But she finally realized that her open war on the Scriptures had aroused suspicion that her life and doctrines were out of harmony with God's word, and could not endure the light of an open Bible.

To allay such feelings she must make it appear that she was not opposed to the Scriptures, but only to the "erroneous Protestant Bible." But how could such an impression be made, when that Bible was a faithful translation of the Hebrew and Greek texts, in which the Scriptures were originally written? Then, too, the Protestants had, at that time, some of the most able Hebrew and Greek scholars in all Christendom.

Providence had brought the Reformers in contact with some of the best sources of Bible manuscripts: (1) When the Turks captured Constantinople in 1453, many of the Greek scholars fled to the West, bringing with them their valuable manuscripts from the East where Christianity originated, and then Greek and Hebrew learning revived in the West.¹ (2) With this influx from the East came also the Syrian Bible, used by the early church at Antioch in Syria (Acts 11:26), which was translated directly from the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts long before the Massoretic (O.T.) text, and is the oldest known Bible manuscript (unless it should be the one lately discovered by Chester Beatty.² (3) During their severe persecutions the Waldenses came into contact with the Reformers at Geneva, and thus their Bible, which had been preserved in its apostolic purity, was brought to the Reformers.³

Translations direct from the original languages in which the Holy Scriptures were written, and comparisons with ancient sources, by men of high scholarly ability and sterling integrity, gave the Protestants a perfectly reliable Bible. In spite of these plain facts, the Catholic authorities had to do something to turn the minds of their people away from the Protestant Bible, so widely distributed. They therefore advanced the claim that Jerome's Latin Vulgate translation was more correct than any copy we now have of the original Hebrew and Greek texts. We shall now examine this claim.

The Latin Vulgate Bible

At the Council of Trent (1545-1563), in the fourth session, the second Decree, in 1546, they decided that the Latin Vulgate should be the standard Bible for the Roman church. But then they discovered a curious fact, that during the 1050 years from the time Jerome brought out his Latin Vulgate Bible in

¹ See "History of the English Bible," by W. F. Moulton. pp. 34-36.

² Copies of the Syriac Bible were later found among the Syrian Christians at Malabar. South India, with all the earmarks of the old Syrian manuscripts. See "The Old Documents and the New Bible." by J. P. Smyth, pp. 166, 167; "Indian Church History.--by Thomas Yates, p. 167, "Christian Researches in Asia," by Claudius Buchanan, pp. 80, 143.

³ An illustration of how some learned Roman Catholics have estimated the Protestant Greek New Testament can be seen when we read of the Catholic legislation on forbidden books. A commentator says:

"In diocesan seminaries the textbook prescribed in Greek was very often some portion of the original text of the New Testament, and Protestant editions were selected as they contained a more ample vocabulary, and, perhaps, better grammatical annotations than Catholic editions. Such an act would appear quite pardonable and excusable as the text was entire and pure. . . . But according to the present rule . . . bishops have no power to select such works." *A Commentary on the Present Index Legislation,- Rev. T. Hurley. D. D.. p. 70.. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1908.*

With their feelings against Protestant books, such permits could not have been given, unless the superiority of the book demanded it.

405 A.D., until John Gutenberg printed it in 1455, it had been copied so many times, mostly by monks, and so many errors had crept in, that no one knew just what was the actual rendering of the original Vulgate. The learned Roman Catholic professor, Dr. Johann Jahn says of it:

"The universal admission of this version throughout the vast extent of the Latin church multiplied the copies of it, in the transcription of which it became corrupted with many errors. . . . Cardinal Nicholas, about the middle of the twelfth century, found 'tot exemplaria quot codices' (as many copies as manuscripts)." *"introduction to the Old Testament."* Sec. 62,63. (Quoted in *"History of Romanism,"* Dr. John Dowling, ed. of 1871, P. 486.)

The Catholic Encyclopedia says of the Latin Vulgate:

"From an early day the text of the Vulgate began to suffer corruptions, mostly through the copyists who introduced familiar readings of the Old Latin or inserted the marginal glosses of MSS. which they were transcribing." - *Vol. XV, p. 370, art. "Versions" "The Vulgate."*

The Council of Trent having made Jerome's Latin "Vulgate the standard text,"⁴ it must now determine which of the hundreds of copies (all differing) was the correct "Vulgate." A commission was therefore appointed to gather materials so as to "restore St. Jerome's text," but its members were "not to amend it by any new translations of their own from the original Hebrew and Greek."⁵ They "were merely to collect manuscripts and prepare the evidence for and against certain readings in the text, after which the Pope himself, by reason not of his scholarship, but of his gift of infallibility, decided straight off which were the genuine words!" - *"The Old Documents and the New Bible,"* J. Paterson S7nyth, B.D., LLA, pp. 17-1f, 175. London and New York: 1907.

Pope Sixtus V undertook this work of revision, and to make sure of its being correct, he read the proofs himself. This edition was printed at Rome in 1590, accompanied by a bull forbidding the least alteration in this infallible text. "But alas! . . . The book was full of mistakes. The scholarship of Sixtus was by no means great, and his infallibility somehow failed to make up for this defect." - *Id., p. 175.*

The Catholic Encyclopedia comments:

"But Sixtus V, though unskilled in this branch of criticism, had introduced alterations of his own, all for the worse. . . . His immediate successors at once proceeded to remove the blunders and call ill the defective impression." - *Vol. II, p. 412.*

All available copies of the Bible of Pope Sixtus were called in and burnt as were the heretics. Pope Clement VIII, in 1592, ordered a better edition to be made, accompanying it with a similar bull. Dr. James, keeper of the Bodleian Library at Oxford, where one of Pope Sixtus's Bibles remained, compared it with that of Pope Clement, and found two thousand glaring variations in them. He published his findings in a book called: "Bellum Papale, i.e. the Papal War." (*"History of Romanism,"* Dr. J. Dowling, p. 487. New York: 1871)

Dr. Thomas James, in the following statement, gives valuable information on the Vulgate Bible:

"Isidorus Clarius hath noted eight thousand places erroneous in the vulgar bible, the divines of

⁴ See Cardinal Gasquet's article in the Forum for August, 1926, p. 203

⁵ "History of the Council of Trent,- T. A. Buckley, Part II. chap. 16, p. 127.

Louvaine, and Joannes Benedictus have observed above twice as many differences, from the original Hebrew and Greek fountains. If Paulus V., the now pope, will take the pains to reform these also; in my judgment, he shall do a work very acceptable unto the whole Christian world, both Protestant and papist." - *"A Treatise of the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers," p. 208. London: 1843.*

The Catholic Encyclopedia says of the latest revision of the Vulgate by Pope Clement:

"This revision is now the officially recognised version of the Latin Rite and contains the only authorised text of the Vulgate. That it has numerous defects has never been denied." - *Vol. XV, p. 370.*

That the Roman church is not satisfied with the present Vulgate text is seen by the fact that in 1907 Pope Pius X, according to the Forum, commissioned H. E. Francis Aidan Cardinal Gasquet, with his Benedictine Order, to reproduce the true Latin text of St. Jerome by a new revision. Cardinal Gasquet says of the former attempt made by Pope Clement VIII, in 1592:

"The commission laboured for some forty years, and strange to say, many of the changes proposed by them were never inserted in the final revision. From the notes of this commission it may be safely said that had they been accepted we should have had a much better critical text than we now possess." - *"Forum," August, 1926, p. 203.*

The Catholic Encyclopedia points out a fact often overlooked by scholars today, that "the Hebrew text used by St. Jerome was comparatively late, being practically that of the Masorettes. For this reason his version, for textual criticism, has less value than the Peshito and the Septuagint. As a translation it holds a place between these two." - *Vol. XV, p. 370.*

E. S. Buchanan, M. A., B. Sc., says of Jerome's translation:

"Jerome, to the great loss of posterity, did not dig deep into the history of the text. He did not revise on the Latin and Greek texts of the second century but solely on the Greek text of the fourth century, and that was a text too late and too limited in range and attestation on which to base an enduring fabric. . . . He was not bidden to search for the earliest MSS. He was not bidden to bring together the versions of the East and the West. He was not bidden to make inquiry for the lost autographs with a view to the reconstruction of the Apostolic text. He was only bidden to prepare a suitable text for ecclesiastical usage. And this he has done; but it is painful to think of all he left undone, that with his position of vantage he might have done." - *"The Records Unrolled," p. 20. London: John Ouseley, Ltd.*

From these considerations we see, that, even if the original text of Jerome's translation could be reconstructed, it would not be of as much textual value as is sometimes supposed. We are not depreciating the Catholic Bible. We wish Catholics would read it more than they do. All we are here aiming at is this: When leading Catholic authorities admit that their Bible is of so little value as a "Standard Text," then why do they so relentlessly oppose the circulation of the authorised Protestant Bible, which is translated from the best original sources? Henry Guppy, M. A., D. Ph. et Litt., Librarian of the John Rylands Library, England, says:

"The Church of Rome has always bitterly opposed any attempt to circulate the Bible in the language of the people, and license to read the Scriptures, even when truly and catholicly translated, was but sparingly granted. "In spite, however, of the denunciations uttered by the Roman Catholic priests against what they were pleased to term the incorrect and untruthful translations which were in circulation, the Bible continued to be read by increasing numbers of people. Indeed, the attempts to

suppress it created a prejudice against the Roman Catholic Church; and, as time wore on, it was felt by many Catholics that something more must be done than a mere denunciation of the corrupt translations in the direction of providing a new version which the Roman Church could warrant to be authentic and genuine. *"A Brief Sketch of History of the Translation of the Bible," p. 54. London: University Press, 1926.*

After the Jesuits had been expelled from England in 1579, they settled at Rheims, France, where they translated the New Testament from the Latin Vulgate into English. This was printed in 1582. Later they moved to Douay, where they printed the Old Testament in 1609. We have seen that the learned Catholic doctors, Johann Jahn and Isidor Clarius, acknowledged that there were 8,000 errors in the Vulgate Bible, and as a stream cannot be expected to rise higher than its fountain, we must conclude that the errors are carried over into the Douay Version. We shall take the space to mention only two of them:

1. The Douay Bible uses the word "adore" where the Protestant Bible has "worship." (Compare Matthew 4: 10 in both Bibles.) While the Protestant Bible says that Jacob "worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff," the Douay Version says that he "adored the top of his rod." Hebrews 11: 21. "The Approved Holy Catholic Bible," with "Annotations by the Rev. Dr. Challoner," and approved by Pius VI, says: "Jacob . . . worshipped the top of his rod." Thus Catholics have proof for worshipping relics.

2. Our Protestant Bible more correctly translates 2 Timothy 3: 16 to read, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," but the Douay version reads: " All scripture, inspired of God, is profitable." As can be readily seen, this latter rendering gives no assurance that the Bible is inspired, but simply makes the superfluous statement that what is inspired is profitable. And so it is left with the church to say what is inspired.⁶

In full view of all the foregoing facts, how can Roman Catholic authors shut their eyes to it all, and brazenly declare that their church alone has the true and correct Bible? They say:

"She alone possesses the true Bible and the whole Bible, and the copies of the Scriptures existing outside of her pale, are partly incorrect and partly defective.

"This Bible was the celebrated Vulgate, the official text in the Catholic Church, the value of which all scholars admit to be simply inestimable. . . . The Council of Trent in 1546 issued a decree, stamping it as the only recognized and authoritative Version allowed to Catholics. . . . It was revised under Pope Sixtus V in 1590, and again under Pope Clement VIII in 1593, who is responsible for the present standard text. It is from the Vulgate that our English Douai Version comes." *"Where We Got the Bible," Right Rev. Henry G. Graham, pp. 7, 16, 17. London: Eighth Impression, 1936.*

Do these men actually believe that Protestants have no access to the facts of history, but are dependent on such misstatements! Or are they vainly hoping that the public will have no opportunity to read the Protestant side of the story?

The interesting part of it all is the fact that the Catholic Church, after proclaiming so loudly since 1546 that the Latin Vulgate is "the only recognized and authoritative version," and crying out against the Protestant Bibles (translated from the original Hebrew and Greek text) as "heretical," is herself at last

⁶ The new Catholic version of 1941 renders it: 'All Scripture is inspired by God.'

driven, by facts long known within her own circle, to translate the Bible "from the original text," Hebrew and Greek. What a complete somersault! This late Catholic version is called "The Westminster Version" (printed by Longmans, Green and Co., London). But, as the work is intrusted mostly to the Jesuits, we can expect very little change from their former Douay Version, except that it will be more carefully written to conform to the Roman viewpoint judging from the portions that have already been published). For instance, the correct note under Revelation 13:18 is entirely changed, but Revelation 22:14 reads the same as in the Douay Version: "Blessed are they that wash their robes." In our Authorized Protestant Version (King James) it reads: "Blessed are they that do His commandments."

Inspired by Revelation 22:14, P. P. Bliss, musician assisting D. L. Moody, wrote the hymn:

"Hear the words our Saviour hath spoken,
Words of life unfailing and true:
Careless one, prayerless one, hear and remember,
Jesus says, 'Blessed are they that do.'
Blessed are they that do His commandments,
Blessed, blessed, blessed are they."

Later Mr. Bliss went to Rome, where he learned that "Blessed are they that wash their robes," "must be the correct" rendering. And "during his last week in Rome," he told his brother-in-law that he was sorry he had written that hymn. He declared: "I see so clearly its contradiction of the gospel that I have no liberty in singing it." Then he wrote the hymn: "Free from the law, oh, happy condition." - *Memories of Philip P. Bliss,* D. W. Whittle, pp. 131, 132. New York: A. S. Barnes and Co., 1877. It is deplorable that this good Christian man should get such impressions at Rome. But, sad to say, P. P. Bliss is not the only beloved Protestant that has been in touch with Rome, and lost his desire and liberty to teach the good old truths of the Protestant Bible.

Some follow the Roman Catholic translation of Revelation 22:14, because the Vatican possesses one of the three oldest Bible manuscripts (Codex Vaticanus). But that manuscript ends with Hebrews 9:14, so that it could not give Catholics the proper rendering of Revelation 22:14.⁷

⁷ For further light on this point see "A Brief Sketch of the History of the Translation of the Bible," H. Guppy, p. 7, and "The Records Unrolled" by E. S. Buchanan, p. 50.

3. Rome Undermines the Protestant Foundations

THE second, and more effective, weapon Rome used against the Reformation was "higher criticism," in an effort to undermine the very foundation of Protestantism.

The strongest appeal of the Roman Catholic Church lies in its claim to "apostolic succession," that is, that its popes descended in direct line from the apostles. Protestants, originating in the sixteenth century, have no such appeal. Their strong argument lies in their exact conformity with the Bible in faith and morals. "The Bible, and the Bible only" is their battle cry. The Bible reveals man's utter inability to attain justification by his own works, and offers it as a "free gift," obtained by faith in the merits of Jesus Christ alone. The Bible presents good works only as the natural fruit of genuine faith. On this foundation was Protestantism built. Before going further we shall let Catholics and Protestants state their foundations.

Catholic Foundation

"Like two sacred rivers flowing from paradise, the Bible and divine Tradition contain the Word of God, the precious gems of revealed truths. Though these two divine streams are in themselves, on account of their divine origin, of equal sacredness, and are both full of revealed truths, still, of the two, Tradition is to us more clear and safe." - *"Catholic Belief," Joseph Faa di Bruno, D.D., p. 88. New York: Benziger Brothers., 1912.*

"But since Divine revelation is contained in the written books and the unwritten traditions (Vatican Council, I, II), the Bible and Divine tradition must be the rule of our faith; since, however, these are only silent witnesses, ... we must look for some proximate rule which shall be animate or living The Bible could not be left to interpret itself." Therefore Catholics declare the "Church to be its acknowledged interpreter." And under the heading: "The Catholic Doctrine Touching the Church as the Rule of Faith," we read: "Now the teaching Church is the Apostolic body continuing to the end of time." But of the teachers of this body, they say: "Unless they be united with the Vicar of Christ [the Pope], it is futile to appeal to the episcopate in general as the rule of faith." They then sum up their rule of faith thus: "Hence we must stand rather by the decisions which the pope judicially pronounces than by the opinions of men, however learned they may be in Holy Scripture." - *"Catholic Encyclopedia," Vol. V, pp. 766-768, art. "Faith, Rule of."* The teaching Church, with the pope at its head, is therefore the Catholic "rule of faith."

Thus we see that the Roman Catholic Church places tradition above the Bible as more safe, and substitutes the pope for the Holy Spirit as the guide. Christ promised His followers: "Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth." "He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance." John 16:13; 14:26. That these promises are not confined to the leaders of the church, is made plain by John, who applies them to all Christians: "But the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, . . . - ye shall abide in Him." 1 John 2:27. In answer to these Scriptures the Catholic writers say:

"Nor can it be said that being a divinely inspired book, its prime Author, the Holy Ghost, will guide the reader to the right meaning." - *"Things Catholics Are Asked About," M. J. Scott, S. J., p. 119. New York: 1927.*

Protestant Foundation

Protestants have announced as their rule of faith: "The Bible, and the Bible only," with the Holy Spirit as its sole Interpreter. William Chillingworth, M. A., says:

"The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants! I for my part, after a long and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial search of 'the true way to eternal happiness,' do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot but upon this rock only. I see plainly and with my own eyes, that there are popes against popes, councils against councils, some fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age, the church of one age against the church of another age. . . . In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only for any considering man to build upon." - *"The Religion of Protestants," William Chillingworth, M. A., P. 463. London: 1866.*

'The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants!' Nor is it of any account in the estimation of the genuine Protestant, how early a doctrine originated, if it is not found in the Bible. . . .

"He who receives a single doctrine upon the mere authority of tradition, let him be called by what name he will, by so doing, steps down from the Protestant rock, passes over the line which separates Protestantism from Popery, and can give no valid reason why he should not receive all the earlier doctrines and ceremonies of Romanism, upon the same authority." - *"History of Romanism," John Dowling, D. A, pp. 67,68. New York: 1871.*

This childlike faith in the Bible as God's infallible word carried the Reformers above all opposition, and swept over Europe with an irresistible force which threatened to engulf the old, decaying structure of the Roman church. This unabated force could be broken only by robbing Protestants. of their implicit faith in the Bible. They would then lose their power as surely as did Samson, when he was shorn of his locks. (Judges 16:19, 20)

Rome Undermining Protestant Foundations

Richard Simon, a Roman Catholic priest, called the " Father of Higher Criticismn," in 1678 wrote "A Critical History of the Old Testament" in three books, laying down the rules for a more exact translation. He advanced the new theory that only the ordinances and commands of the books of Moses were written by him, while the historical parts were the product of various other writers. Simon's declared purpose was to show that the Protestants had no assured principle for their religion. (See edition of 1782) "This work led to a very extended controversy and the first edition was suppressed.¹ So vigorous was the opposition of the learned, that his theory lay dormant for seventy-five years. The Catholic Encyclopedia says:

"A French priest, Richard Simon (1638-1712), was the first who subjected the general questions concerning the Bible to a treatment which was at once comprehensive in scope and scientific in method. Simon is the forerunner of modern Biblical criticism. . . . A reaction against the rigid view of the Bible [was one of] the factors which produced Simon's first great work, the *'Histoire critique du Vieux Testament'* ['Critical History of the Old Testament'] which was published in 1678. . . . It entitles him to be called the father of Biblical criticism." - *Vol. IV, P. 492*

¹ Catalogue of R. D. Dickinson. 1935. No. 462. p. 10, book No. 167.

"In 1753 Jean Astruc, a French Catholic physician of considerable note, published a little book, *'Conjectures sur les memoires originaux dont il parait que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genese* (Conjectures on the original records from which it appears that Moses composed the book of Genesis)." - *Id., same page.* (See also *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. I, p. 336, art, "Jean Astruc."*)

His book is rightly named, for in it he conjectured that the book of Genesis must have been written by two different authors, because the Creator is there called "God" ("Elohim.") in some places, and "Lord" ("Jehovah") in other places. Such a line of reasoning would be as inconsistent as to claim that Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, for instance, must have been written by two different apostles, because our Saviour is there called "Jesus" in some places, and "Christ" in others. But what about the places where He is called "Jesus Christ"? And so in Genesis. Who wrote the five passages where He is called "Lord God" ("Jehovah Elohim")? In 1792, Dr. Alexander Geddes, a Roman Catholic priest of Scottish origin, carried this "fragmentary hypothesis" still further. Absurd as this theory was, the Protestants fell into the trap set for them, and Germany, the seat of the Reformation, became the seat of this destructive "higher criticism." Today this inconsistent criticism of the Bible has invaded the seminaries, colleges, and universities of practically all Protestant denominations, and few ministers are free from its blighting influence. Edwin Cone Bissell, Professor in McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, carried out this "fragmentary" theory in his book, *"Genesis Printed in Colors, Showing the Original Sources from Which It Is Supposed to Have Been Compiled"* (Hartford, 1892), displaying the seven colors of the rainbow in shorter or longer fragments, each representing a different author or editor.

Harold Bolce spent two years investigating American colleges from Maine to California, and wrote his astounding findings in the *Cosmopolitan Magazine*, May to August, 1909. Here are a few expressions culled from his report:

"In hundreds of classrooms it is being taught daily that the Decalogue is no more sacred than a syllabus; that the home as an institution is doomed; that there are no absolute evils; that immorality is simply an act in contravention of society's accepted standards; . . . and that the daring who defy the code [the moral law] do not offend any Deity, but simply arouse the venom of the majority - the majority that has not yet grasped the new idea; . . . and that the highest ethical life consists at all times in the breaking of rules which have grown too narrow for the actual case. . . .

" There can be and are holier alliances without the marriage bond than within it. . . . Anything tolerated by the world in general is right. . . . The notion. . . that there is anything fundamentally correct implies the existence of a standard outside and above usage, and no such standard exists." - *Pp. 665, 666, 674, 675, 676.*

Can anyone wonder at what Dr. Charles Jefferson declares? He says:

"A theological student at the end of the first year of his seminary course is the most demoralized individual to be found on this earth. His early conception of the Bible has been torn down all the way to the cellar, and he is obliged to build up a new conception from the foundations." - *"Things Fundamental," pp. 120, 121.*

In regard to the inevitable result of teaching the rising generation such revolutionary ideas, and of undermining completely their moral standards, and their belief in God, the editor of the *Cosmopolitan Magazine* says in a note to Mr. Bolce's articles:

"These are some of the revolutionary and sensational teachings submitted with academic warrant to the minds of hundreds of thousands of students in the United States. It is time that the public realized what is being taught to the youth of this country. 'The social question of to-day,' said Disraeli. 'is only a zephyr which rustles the leaves, but will soon become a hurricane.' It is a dull ear that cannot hear the mutterings of the coming storm." - *"Cosmopolitan Magazine," - May, 1909, p. 665.*

The Bible declares: "They have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind." "There is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land. By swearing, and lying, and killing, and stealing, and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood." Hosea 8:7; 4:1,2. (Compare 2 Timothy 3:1-5) Yes, the saying is true, that " whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Galatians 6:7.

The Christian Register for June 18, 1891, page 389, commenting favorably on the work of higher criticism, says:

"Thomas Paine, though stigmatized and set aside as an infidel, finds reincarnation in the modern scientific Biblical critic. . . . He lived too far in advance of his age. The spirit of modern scientific criticism had not yet come. . . . And now it is interesting to find that, in a different spirit and with different tools, and bound by certain traditions. . . the professors in our orthodox seminaries are doing again the work which Paine did."

As long as these men domineered over the Old Testament, most of the Christian teachers remained silent. But the work did not stop there. The Lutheran Pastor Storjolian of Oslo, Norway, says of Wellhausen:

"After they have permitted him to domineer over the Old Testament for more than twenty-five years, it is not more than reasonable, and a just punishment, that he in his presumption has now undertaken his war on the Gospels." - *"Bibelen paa Pinebaenk [The Bible on the Inquisitorial Rack]," p. 7. Christiania, 1907.*

In closing let us briefly point out the road which higher criticism had to travel, after it had taken the first step: When critics had denied the historicity of the books of Moses (the Pentateuch), they discovered that the Psalms referred to them as acknowledged history. (Psalms 33:6,9; 29:10; 77:20; 103:7; 105:6-45; 106:7-33.) To be consistent, the Psalms had to be rejected. They also found that the books of Joshua, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and Nehemiah, and the prophets acknowledged the Pentateuch as the inspired work of Moses (Joshua 23:6; 1 Kings 2:3; 2 Chronicles 35:6, Nehemiah 8: 1, 8; Daniel 9:11,13; Malachi 4:4), so these books had to be rejected.

But then they found that the New Testament repeatedly referred to the Old Testament as inspired authority (about eight hundred twenty-four times), and to their consternation they discovered that Jesus declared the first five books in the Bible were written by Moses (Mark 12:26; Luke 24:25, 44, 45), and that He asked: "If ye believe not his [Moses'] writings, how shall ye believe My words?" John 5: 46, 47. The critics had declared that the account of the Flood was only a myth, which no intelligent person could believe. But Jesus said: "Noe entered into the ark," and "the Flood came, and took them all away." Matthew 24:33, 39. He even believed the truthfulness of the account of Jonah's being in the great fish for three days, and of his preaching in Nineveh afterwards - (Matthew 12:40,41.) There was, therefore, no way of reconciling Jesus to higher criticism, so they rejected Him as the divine Son of God.

For if Jesus did not know that those Old Testament stories were only myths, He was deceived. If He knew this, and yet taught them, He was a deceiver. In either case He could not be divine, they reasoned.

"If in the dawning of the fortieth century, it shall be found that the law and the prophets are obsolete, the Gospels and Epistles discarded, Moses forgotten, and Paul and his writings set aside to make room for the inerrant productions of [higher critics]. . . . if it shall then appear that the hunted prophets who wandered in sheepskins and goatskins, and were destitute, afflicted, and tormented, 'of whom the world was not worthy,' have gone down before the onslaught of the learned and well salaried professors of modern universities; if it shall appear that the word of the Lord which they uttered at the loss of all things and at the peril of life itself has paled its ineffectual fires before the rising radiance of oracular higher criticism; if it shall then be learned that God hath chosen the rich in this world, poor in faith, and heirs of the kingdom - who can tell how welcome this information may prove to those who suppose that gain is godliness, and that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a poor man to enter the kingdom of heaven?" - *"The Anti-Infidel Library," H. L. Hastings, "More Bricks from the Babel of the Higher Critics," pp. 172, 173. Boston: Scriptural Tract Repository, 1895.*

Some might properly ask how Romanists dared to start higher criticism. Would not this menace be equally dangerous to their church? Absolutely not! The Roman church rests on an entirely different foundation. The Church, and not the Bible, is her authority. She flourishes best where the Bible is least circulated, as history amply shows. But Protestantism that rejects the inspiration of the Bible, has abandoned its foundation, and stands helpless. It is like a ship that has lost its mooring, thrown away its chart and compass, and is drifting toward - Rome.